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Abstract

Temporary international migration for the purpose of work has become increasingly prominent the world over. As these movements proliferate, so too does the regulation of such movement through the implementation of temporary migration programmes. However, regulation and policy flaws have been criticised as being inherent within temporary migration programmes. Consequently, this causes numerous issues from social exclusion to citizenship acquisition. Current scholars commonly note that temporary migration programmes fail because they do not allow temporary migrant workers the opportunity of upgrading into permanent residency.

This research focuses on the implementation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in New Zealand, a temporary worker programme, and the most ambitious ever implemented in New Zealand. The research assesses the efficacy of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme with a focus on the experiences of temporary workers from Vanuatu within the context of Te Puke, New Zealand.

The research found that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is working well. The research often reflected previous research and found similar issues. It found minor issues with the implementation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme on a day-to-day basis. But more significantly it found issues centred on the regulation and procedural difficulties that can, at times, render the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme as inefficient and ineffective. However, the most alarming results are the challenges and changes that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is likely to face within the next few years.

Consequently, the research provides a number of recommendations, largely directed at the New Zealand government. The most pertinent invites the New Zealand government to consider the implementation of a points system within the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme that would include a well designed mechanism allowing for limited and conditional upgrading into permanent residency. This would enable the New Zealand government to
withstand pressures for permanent residency, while providing opportunities to Pacific Islands, and contributing positively to New Zealand’s economy.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

International migration has become increasingly prominent the world over as globalisation has widened, deepened, and speed-up worldwide interconnectedness (Castles and Miller 2009). Consequently, people are able to migrate around the world much more easily than ever before and they have done so, more frequently, on larger scales, and for numerous reasons.

Such liberalisation coupled with the western nation-states’ domination and regulation of global inter-relations has split the world into geo-political divisions. These divisions are commonly, but not unanimously, labelled as the developed and developing world, and are wealthy and poor respectively. The developed world has significant power of the developing and is able to largely dictate migratory flows. As the developed world has an aging population, therefore, it has gaps in varying labour sectors, whereas the developing world experiences the opposite. Subsequently, the developing world is in position to supply the developed world with a supplementary labour supply, thus creating a symbiotic relationship.

As a result, migratory movements for the purpose of work have become common throughout the world since the conclusion of World War II. It is argued that these movements have provided benefits, largely economic, for developing, or ‘sending’ nations as their citizens are pushed and pulled to developed nations (Castles and Miller 2003). As these movements proliferate, so too does the regulation of the movement, and temporary migration programmes have been implemented to allow the process to occur in a formal
structure. This usually means that bilateral agreements are entered into by developing and
developed nations, and they operate as both a recruitment and foreign policy tool (Ruhs 2002). This often results in developed countries targeting those nations within close
proximity as it helps to maintain security within particular regions, and it allows for easy
transfers of workers between sending and receiving nations (Ramasamy et al. 2008).

However, temporary migration programmes are often criticised and several scholars
maintain that the regulation of temporary migration programmes is a major issue (Martin
2003). Such issues have rendered the failure of almost all temporary migration programmes
(Ruhs 2008, Martin 2003, Castles and Miller 2009). Vigorous debate surrounds the likely
pitfalls of temporary migration programmes and is centred on the programme’s policy
structures and the reluctance of developed nations to provide citizenship. Citizenship is
inextricably linked to related debates around the rights, or lack thereof, for temporary
migrant workers. Other common issues include the social exclusion and feminisation of
migration, both having an effect on temporary migrants’ experiences while working
offshore. Consequently, the combination of these issues also creates broader concerns for
the governance of temporary migration programmes on global and local scales.

1.2 Research Problem and Rationale

Temporary worker programmes have proliferated throughout the world and the New
Zealand government implemented the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in 2007. The
Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is the most prominent and ambitious temporary
worker scheme ever implemented in New Zealand (Ramasamy et al. 2008). It was
developed to enable the horticulture and viticulture industries to meet labour demands as
prior immigration policies were rendered insufficient for such purposes. Pacific nations are
capable of supplementing the labour supply and are the most significant contributors to
New Zealand under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. However, the Recognised
Seasonal Employer scheme is subjected to the same problems that all other temporary worker programmes have experienced.

The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme seeks to give priority to workers from five ‘kick-start’ Pacific nations, including Vanuatu. Vanuatu was initially the only Melanesian nation to be included in the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and has consistently been the largest supplier of labour to New Zealand since the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme’s inauguration in 2007. In the 2008/09 season 2,523 Ni-Vanuatu workers were employed in New Zealand under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme (Evalue Research, 2010).

Te Puke, in New Zealand’s Western Bay of Plenty region relies heavily on the horticulture industry, namely kiwifruit, to support its local economy. Te Puke is regarded as being New Zealand’s most important kiwifruit producer and the horticulture industry gathers the majority of its crops from Te Puke. The Western Bay of Plenty region has experienced shortages in labour and had “the second largest number of Recognised Seasonal Employer workers during the first two seasons, with 3,029 workers”, thus resulting in an influx of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers to Te Puke (Evalue Research 2010, p. 62).

The implementation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in Te Puke has raised issues with respect to the facilitation, and regulation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. As the Ni-Vanuatu make up the most significant proportion of Recognised Seasonal Employer workers throughout New Zealand, they have experienced the scheme in Te Puke’s horticultural industry. The combination of these factors allows the forthcoming research to assess the facilitation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. It does so by analysing the experiences of government and horticulture industry representatives,
service providers, and Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in the Te Puke context. Subsequently, the research has developed an aim and three objectives.

1.3 Aim and Objectives

The aim and objectives of this research has provided a direction for the entire research process. The aim:

*To assess the efficacy of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme with respect to the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in Te Puke, New Zealand.*

1. How do Ni-Vanuatu workers experience the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in Te Puke, New Zealand?

2. How do the horticulture industry and the Te Puke service providers experience Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme?

3. How can the New Zealand government and its departments facilitate the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in a more effective and efficient manner?

Objective one will indentify the experiences of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme from the perspectives of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in Te Puke. Therefore, it will provide a basis for understanding how the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme can be facilitated in a more efficient and effective manner for all workers, but more specifically, Ni-Vanuatu workers.

Objective two will establish the experiences of the horticulture industry, and service providers’ experiences of the Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in Te Puke. It will also facilitate an understanding of how the horticulture industry and service providers experience the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme.
Objective three will enable analysis of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme’s implementation and facilitation in New Zealand while considering the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers, government and horticulture industry representatives, and service providers.

The combination of these objectives will allow conclusions to be drawn regarding the experiences and facilitation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in Te Puke while identifying recommendations for the Vanuatu government, but more appropriately, the New Zealand government.

1.4 Research Structure

Chapter two begins the research with the examination of the relevant literature, and will critique the theory and underlying principles that are associated with temporary worker migration. Themes, issues, and gaps will be derived from the literature so they can be used to provide assistance for the research process with regards to the facilitation and the experiences of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in New Zealand.

Chapter three will provide a broad contextual overview for this research by outlining the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and its current operational structure and implementation process in New Zealand. The overview will include detailing relevant policy structure and processes, the importance that Vanuatu and Ni-Vanuatu workers have within the research, outline the Te Puke case study.

Chapter four will outline the research strategy taken to collect and process the data while contributing to the aim of the research. It details several methods and techniques adopted to
Chapter One

conduct the research including the research design, data collection and analysis. Lastly, it will outline the major reflections and limitations.

Chapter five will synthesises the functions of the preceding chapters to allow for the illumination of the findings required by objective one, and two. Therefore, it presents an understanding of the Ni-Vanuatu workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers’ day-to-day experiences under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in Te Puke, New Zealand.

Chapter six replicates the role of the chapter five but presents the findings required by objective three. Consequently, it will outline the efficiency and effectiveness of the regulation, implementation, and future of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in Te Puke, New Zealand.

Chapter seven provides an analytical synthesis of the findings with respect to the objectives and literature. It does so by discussing the key themes from the literature and relating them to the key findings presented in chapters five and six respectively. It also explains the findings required from the objective while teasing out conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter eight combines the conclusions drawn out of the research process while providing recommendations and alternative courses of action that could enable the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme to be facilitated and implemented in a more effective and efficient manner.
2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

Davidson and Tolich (2003, p. 17) note that “research without theory is mere data collection”. Accordingly, the purpose of this chapter is to examine the theory and underlying principles that are associated with temporary worker migration. The chapter will analyse relevant contemporary literature with respect to temporary migration for the purposes of work by focusing on various pertinent themes. Therefore, it will firstly outline a basic understanding of the wider context of contemporary migration, before discussing the case of worker programmes and their related issues, notably the debates surrounding the provision of citizenship. Secondly, the chapter will narrow by reviewing the rights of temporary migrant workers, before discussing the feminisation of migration, social exclusion, and the relevance for government and planning. These themes will be analysed so they can be used to provide assistance later in the research process with regards to the facilitation and the experiences of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in New Zealand.

2.2 Contemporary Migration

Discussions about migration commonly start with a description of flows between developing and developed countries (United Nations 2009). Therefore, before further discussion, it would be wise to outline the terms developing and developed nations as this will provide a wider contextual understanding of contemporary migration, a major focus of this research. Potter et al. (2008, p. 4) explain that:

_one of the main divisions of the world is between so-called ‘developed nations’ and ‘developing nations’ in a manner that is frequently understood to involve stages of advancement and evolution...At the simplest level, developed countries are seen as_
assisting the developing countries by means of development aid, in an effort to reduce unemployment and other indicators of ‘underdevelopment’.

Thus, developed nations are those regarded as wealthier, whereas, developing nations are labelled as much poorer respectively. Other terms for this division of the world include the First and Third world and the global North and South. Potter et al. (2008) note that the so-called ‘Third World’ is a concept that has its origins in the global geopolitics of the post-Second World War period, but now it is regarded as outmoded terminology. The United Nations (2009) indicated that it is inaccurate to use the terms global North and South with respect to contemporary migration. Consequently, the terms developed and developing will be used henceforth to describe the division of the world. It is of importance to clarify this issue because of the relevance of such terminology throughout this research.

Castles and Davidson (2000, p.8) note that “the period since 1945 and especially since 1980 has been marked by large-scale migrations of all kinds: temporary and permanent movements; labour migrations and refugee exoduses; individual and family flows”. These movements can be largely attributed to the processes of globalisation, a concept that has gained significant attention the world over and is the crucial context for 21st century migration (Castles and Davidson 2000). Castles and Miller (2009, p. 51) characterise globalisation as:

*The widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life. Thus a key indicator of globalisation is a rapid increase in cross-border flows, starting with finance and trade, but also including democracy and good governance, cultural and media products, environmental pollution and – most important in our context – people.*

By taking Castles’ and Miller’s (2009) assessment into consideration it would be fair to suggest that globalisation is a driving force behind modern migration, and understanding it helps to frame the background within which modern forms of migration have developed.
However, it would be wise to assess more closely migrants and their motivations, and how globalisation influences the concept of migration.

### 2.2.1 Migrants and Motivations

Globalisation has enabled people to migrate around the world much more liberally than ever before, and they have done so, more frequently, on larger scales, and for numerous reasons. “In 2002, approximately 185 million people had lived for more than 12 months outside the country in which they were born, the equivalent of a little more than 2 percent of the world population” (Castles and Miller 2003, p.537).

People often migrate temporarily for a number of reasons and these can be categorised into both push and pull factors. It is important to distinguish the differences between these factors as they are considered important by Castles and Miller (2003) for assessing the motivations of migration. Castles and Miller (2003) assert that push and pull factors are largely economically based, with push factors including demographic pressures, dearth of economic opportunities and political oppression, while pull factors can include demand for labour, economic opportunities, and political freedoms.

Although the rationale for migration can often be credited to a number of push and pull factors, there are more complex concepts that drive these factors, ultimately leading to migration. Satzewich (1991, p. 15) suggests that to truly understand the reasons behind migration it is imperative to approach it in a manner that “examines material processes of capital accumulation and uneven development”, thus pertaining to globalisation, but more importantly to the global divisions of the developed and developing world that it has helped create. Castles and Davidson (2000, p. 9) note that this division, essentially economically and theoretically developed, was created by the “historical success of the western nation-states in establishing the domination of the Third World... this domination has led to linkages that facilitate the movement of not only capital and commodities, but also people
and ideas – in both directions”. Although Castles and Davidson (2009) point out that these movements occur in both directions, it is important to note that western nation-states have largely regulated these movements just as they have regulated most spheres of global interrelations. As a result, movements largely flow from the developing to the developed world.

The United Nations notes a number of factors that have seen migration increase, especially from developing to developed nations, these are largely “[d]emographic trends—an aging population in developed countries and young, still-rising populations in developing countries—and growing employment opportunities, combined with cheaper communications and transport, have increased the ‘demand’ for migration” (United Nations 2009, p. 2). Such factors can be largely attributed to the effects of globalisation as developing countries are placed in positions that pressure people to migrate through a range of push and pull factors. Therefore, developing nations are often termed “sending countries” because they are in positions which compel, through various push and pull factors, their own citizens to leave on a temporary basis to pursue economic ends (Lindio-McGovern 2003, p.524).

Migrants are often choosing to leave for various developed nations because they have a need. Employment opportunities are a major pull factor as many developed nations have gaps in specific employment areas and need these to be filled, thus positions are vacant, and as many citizens of developing nations are pushed by the a lack of employment in their own countries, positions overseas are becoming a logical option. There are numerous examples the world over that illustrate movements from the developing to the developed world, including flows from the Philippines to Italy (Lindio-McGovern 2003), from Mexico to Canada (Bauder 2005, and Basok 2000), from Poland, Morocco, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia to Germany, and more recently from Ecuador and Colombia to Spain (Ruhs 2008). The list is immense and could go on, thus demonstrating how pervasive migration from the developed to the developing world has become. Although there are migrations of
people from the developed to the developing world, these are not of importance for this research and are usually not a result of similar pressures.

The movement of migrants from developing to developed nations for the purpose of temporary employment is an inherent aspect of modern temporary migration. Globalisation, it can be argued, is a driver of global inequality, therefore enabling such migration to occur (Hurrell and Woods). Wark (2002, p. 1) goes as far as arguing that:

\[ \text{Migration is globalisation from below. If the “over-developed” world refuses to trade with the underdeveloped world on fair terms, to forgive debt, to extend loans, to lift trade barriers against food and basic manufactured goods, then there can only be an increase in the flow of people.} \]

Although globalisation is often regarded in a somewhat negative light, in the case of temporary migration it can be argued to have presented a number of positive outcomes, especially for the purposes of work. The focus will now turn to a discussion of temporary migration for the purpose of work.

\[ \text{2.2.2 Temporary Migration} \]

Temporary migration and labour recruitment has been significant for centuries throughout the world. Chapman and Prothero (1985, p. 6) argue that temporary forms of mobility are “a time-honoured and enduring mode of behaviour, deeply rooted in a great variety of cultures and found at all stages of socioeconomic change”. Examples of this include Chinese labourers in Malaya and the Dutch East Indies, and more recently, exploitive systems developed by the Nazis to fuel their war economy (Castles 1986). The development of temporary migration programmes for the purposes of work “have often followed on from slavery, and have been seen as preferable in terms of flexibility and controllability” (Castles 1986, p. 761). Temporary migration for the purpose of work in today’s world is regulated in a much more formal setting than it ever has been, but it is important to note that this has not always meant uniformity.
Beer and Lewis (2006, p. 103) note that “foreign workers are ideal targets for future labour demands – a tap can be turned off or on when necessary”. Working tourists are a resource that is often targeted in many tourist destinations, however, Beer and Lewis suggest that they are less willing to work for low wages and represent a less certain supply of labour in comparison to workers that migrate specifically for the purpose of work. It is the workers that migrate for specific reasons that this research is interested in. It would be useful to define such migration and workers, especially because a plethora of terms exist due to a wide range of studies previously conducted, including temporary workers (Martin 2003) guest workers (Connell & Hammond 2009), migrant workers (Maclellan 2008) and domestic workers (Lindio-McGovern 2003). The term ‘temporary worker’ has been used thus far and the research will continue to do so because it is the most appropriate term within the context of this research.

Bedford et al. (2009, p. 14) define temporary migration as the movement of a person “temporarily from his/her country of residence for a period of at least three months but less than a year for purposes of work and study”. Bedford et al. (2009, p. 16) note that within temporary migration “the largest body of experience comes from seasonal worker programmes”. In recent decades there has been a considerable proliferation of seasonal worker programmes as issues surrounding regulation have become prominent.

It is clear that temporary migration has been an important aspect of migration history. Temporary migration is now regulated by a new and very different set of influences and this has bought temporary migration for the purpose of work to the fore. The research will now focus on worker programmes for temporary labour migration by going into detail about the programmes that support and administer it.
2.3 The Case of Worker Programmes

As a result of the driving forces behind modern migration, temporary migration for the purpose of work has become a common trend. Martin (2003, p. 6) states that “demographic and economic differences encourage individuals to migrate, but it takes networks or links between emigration and immigration areas to enable people to cross borders.” Thus, there are pressures on receiving countries to employ formal mechanisms to allow workers to efficiently and effectively cross, and stay within another country’s borders legally.

Migration for the purpose of work is a phenomenon that is of considerable importance to both sending and receiving countries. There is a need from developed nations for workers and there is a want from developing nations for employment. As a result, significant collaboration between developing and developed nations is imperative, especially because there is a desire from both parties to fulfil a relationship that is of symbiotic importance. Castles and Miller (2009, p. 222) refer directly to this point:

*It is often said that labour migration from poor to rich countries meets mutual needs. Poor countries have too many young labour market entrants for their weak economies to employ, so they ‘need’ to export surplus workers. Rich countries, by contrast, have declining numbers of young people entering their labour markets and cannot fill the growing numbers of jobs, so they ‘need’ to import labour.*

Consequently, this relationship has witnessed the development of temporary worker programmes to instil formal regulation into the process. Temporary worker programmes are essentially still in their infancy and have much scope for constructive adjustment, and although many scholars suggest that temporary worker programmes are fundamentally
flawed and are destined to fail, others do not always explicitly agree. This matter needs clarification and further assessment will follow.

2.3.1 The ‘Triple Wins’

The most widely accepted benefits of worker programmes are often referred to as ‘triple-wins’ because, in theory, such programmes benefit the sending and receiving countries as well as the workers involved (Ramasamy et al. 2008). Bedford et al. (2009, p. 17) explain that – “these ‘wins’ can be achieved by alleviating short-term labour shortages in destination countries, minimising the adverse effects for developing countries and providing migrants with enhanced skills, knowledge and earnings.” Therefore, economics underpins the desires of both parties and Castles & Miller (2009, p. 221) provide clarification by deeming that “sending countries look to remittances, investments and technology transfer by migrants as resources for economic growth, while receiving countries are concerned with the role of migrants in meeting demand for labour skills.”

Much research has been conducted in relation to the economic effects that worker programmes have on both sending and receiving countries, but the wider social effects of these programmes have not been covered to the same extent. Some of the most recent research conducted in New Zealand noted that “there was no direct interaction with the workers in the research process, therefore, there is potential for future research in regards to the workers perspectives in the host community” (King 2009, p. 66), thus, presenting a gap that this research will address.

2.3.2 Programme Development

The very first temporary worker programmes grew out of the history of slavery; however, today temporary worker programmes are usually formed on a bilateral basis. They are often
open to nationals of any country and are developed to regulate “international migration flows and to make major contributions to promoting co-development” (Ramasamy et al. 2008, p. 172). They also operate as bilateral recruitment agreements and target specific nationalities like previous programmes in the United States, Germany, and Spain (Ruhs 2002) have done, while coordinating the improvement of economic conditions in both areas of origin and areas of destination based on the complementarities between them (Ramasamy et al. 2008). However, Ruhs (2003) asserts that once temporary worker programmes are in place they can be difficult to terminate.

Worker programmes are not only implemented for reciprocal economic gains but also political ones on a foreign policy level. This often results in countries targeting those nations within close proximity as it helps to maintain security within particular regions and it allows for easy transfers of workers between sending and receiving nations. Bilateral agreements are a fundamental building block of any temporary worker programme, but policies and programmes are built specifically for the process to occur in a formal structure. Martin (2003, p.27) pointed out that “during the 1990s, most industrial countries developed multiple guest worker programs, each aimed at filling job vacancies in particular labour markets. The number of such micro programs is likely to grow.” Martin (2003) was correct with such an observation as there has been a proliferation in the development of these programmes. As a result, issues related to the programmes have compounded, therefore, there is a heightened need to understand the programmes further.

2.3.3 The Process of Programme Implementation

The structure and development of worker programmes are crucial to understand as they are the basis that shapes such policy. Castles and Miller (2009) argue that regulation of international migration is one of the central issues arising from the population movements of the current epoch. A number of other scholars would also agree with this point,
especially because temporary worker programmes take on a variety of forms and policy structures (Ruhs 2006, 2008, Martin 2000, and Basok 2004). Ruhs (2006) attempts to classify these variations in a broad sense:

1. The mechanisms for admitting migrant workers;
2. The policies for selecting migrants;
3. The rights granted to migrants;
4. And the primary policy objectives.

Most temporary worker programmes the world over are structured in a very similar manner; however, they can differ slightly depending on the context. The four classifications above are used to structure the forthcoming discussion by elaborating on each classification in more depth, thus allowing a greater understanding of the structure of worker programmes.

**Admitting Migrant Workers**

Prior to allowing recruitment to occur it is necessary to ensure that there is an actual need for temporary workers in developed nations. There are often misconceptions within labour markets as there is not always a need for labour, but more so a drive from industries because they want cheaper and more readily available labour forces (Carens 2008). To ensure that there is an actual need for workers; Ruhs (2008) suggests that labour market tests should be employed as they ensure that local employers recruit migrant labour only after having made every effort to recruit local workers. However, Ruhs (2006, p. 19) also notes that “[s]uch tests have proved notoriously difficult to implement in practice, not least because employers have shown considerable ingenuity in ensuring that no local workers are found to fill their vacancies when it suits them.”
The next step in the processes is finding a source, as mentioned, sources are most likely going to be developing nations with a readily available supply of workers, and the most effective way to achieve this is through bilateral agreements. If bilateral agreements already exist with a country that is capable of sending workers, then these agreements can be developed further to co-develop a programme, otherwise a new bilateral recruitment agreement can be established (Beer and Lewis 2006).

Selecting Migrants

When selecting migrant workers, the first step is assessing the migrant’s level of skill and drafting workers into a sector of employment within the receiving country (Ruhs 2005). Although Ruhs (2003) argues that “the decisive factor of whether to admit and employ a foreign worker or not should be whether his or her skill level is in demand in the host country”, the majority of workers that take up positions in temporary programmes, usually come from developing nations, and often fill seasonal or domestic positions that do not necessarily need specific skills (Lindio-McGovern 2003). The United Nations adds that “[m]ore than three quarters of international migrants go to a country with a higher level of human development than their country of origin” (United Nations 2009, p. 2). This further justifies that the flow of workers is occurring from developing to developed nations, but it is also of considerable importance because thought needs to be given to how these people will be looked after when abroad, especially because they are likely to be coming from the contrasting environments of the developing world.

Migrants are either selected through a private or a public recruitment agency. Private agencies will take up this role when a government does not have the resources to facilitate the process (Ruhs 2003). There are often difficulties pertaining to the control of the selection process, especially because there is an emergence of increasingly formal and globalised networks of recruitment (Beer and Lewis 2006). Beer and Lewis note that such
formalities include setting up immigration consultancies and mediating agents, placing workers into the glob flow of migrants, and transporting the workers across borders.

Many programmes are based around certain sectors of employment and workers are chosen on the basis that they will fulfil certain requirements needed for that sector. Seasonal worker programmes are one prominent example of a sector-specific programme and the fundamental focus of this research.

Rights Granted to Workers

The rights granted to workers after they have been admitted to a programme generally include the duration of their stay and other conditions attached to the visas issued, however, there are also restrictions that affect rights, and these vary between countries and programmes (Martin 2003). In the definition of a temporary migrant as outlined, Bedford et al. (2009) note that workers spend at least three months, but less than a year abroad. This definition alludes to seasonal work, as positions are semi-permanent in nature. Ruhs (2006, p. 12) strengthens this argument by declaring that “permits that are valid for less than a year are typically issued under seasonal worker programmes addressing strictly labour shortages.”

The rights of workers while participating in temporary worker programmes are one of the most contentious issues within this field of study. This is largely because “the sending country does not have any legal jurisdiction outside its territory, the host country, on the other hand, is often reluctant to assume full responsibility unless migrant workers are permanent residents or become citizens” (Ruhs 2003, p. 13). Consequently, workers are constantly in limbo in terms of their rights and this is another important issue that is covered in-depth in section 2.6.
Policy Objectives

Policy objectives are the last step of the implementation process, and Ruhs (2006, p. 13) notes “that there is significant room for policy variation in such programmes...the optimal decisions on the various policy parameters will always critically depend on country-specific institutional settings and economic circumstances.” Temporary worker programmes are often critiqued with respect to policy design as they guide the management of the programmes. Such policy has been assessed often, a common critique is that policies can often bloat, thus reducing the policy-makers’ control over the policy. Ruhs (2006, p. 17) asserts that the programme can “take on a life of its own” and can generate very different results from what the policy was initially designed to do. Further discussions of the issues related to policy design are covered throughout forthcoming sections.

In summary, the process of programme implementation and the continued management and regulation of these policies is fundamental to the experience of workers while abroad, and understanding them is a primary objective of this research.

2.4 Current Issues in Temporary Worker Programmes

It is clear that temporary worker programmes include an extensive implementation process and this can be detrimental to their implementation. However, to further understand the current issues of temporary worker programmes it is crucial to outline them in greater depth. This section will do so by outlining the major arguments that seek possible solutions to the issues.
2.4.1 Are Temporary Worker Programmes Doomed to Fail?

There exists a rich history of failed temporary worker programmes including examples from Germany, Kuwait, Singapore, Switzerland, and the United States (Ruhs 2003). Martin (2000, p. 1) goes as far as saying that “guest worker programmes have failed wherever and whenever they have been tried” Martin and Teitelbaum (2001, p. 131) have argued that they are a mirage and elaborate by explaining that:

*Importing labour is far more complicated than importing other factors of production, such as commodities or manufactures, precisely because labour is not simply a component of the production cycle. Migration involves human beings, with their own beliefs, politics, cultures, languages, loves, hates, histories, and families—none of which accompanies imported goods. This extra baggage carried by imported temporary workers means that many of them, enjoying the greater income and higher quality of life away from home, do not wish to remain temporary.*

Ruhs (2003, p. 31) provides opposition to these arguments and states that “some of the fiercest critics of T.F.W.P.s [(Temporary Foreign Worker Programmes)] argue that [the] adverse consequences are in fact inherent to the concept of T.F.W.P....I suggest that this negative interpretation of the empirical evidence is unwarranted.” Consequently, Ruhs (2003, p.23) provides two arguments with regard to the fate of temporary worker programmes:

1. It could be “argued that T.F.W.P.s simply do not work and should therefore be abandoned all together (the negative argument)”

2. Or, “it could be argued that the empirical evidence simply suggests that T.F.W.P.s – as we know them – do not work, but that there is a possibility, and a need, to learn from past policy failures and design new types of T.F.W.P.s that avoid these mistakes (the positive argument)”
What is important to understand is that both of the arguments suggest that temporary worker programmes do not work at present, but are there any alternatives? Ruhs (2003) answers this by listing four possible alternatives:

1. Rely on foreign humanitarians to fill shortages;
2. Tolerate illegal immigration;
3. Close borders to workers with strict enforcement;
4. Or, grant permanent residence to workers.

However, Ruhs (2003) has assessed these alternatives and argues that all of them are unsatisfactory and finding more genuine solutions is the best way forward. Ruhs asserts that the majority of temporary worker programmes differ slightly in design and programmes are experiencing very similar issues, and because of the similarities, there are ways to solve them. By suggesting so, Ruhs points out opposition to arguments held by both Martin (2000) and Martin and Teitelbaum (2001) who previously pointed out the difficulties and failures of temporary worker programmes.

While it is obvious that issues exist, there remains a degree of optimism that temporary worker programmes can be changed to curb ongoing problems. The next section will discuss citizenship, the complications of the concept, and further assess it as a plausible alternative to worker programmes.

### 2.5 Citizenship

Citizenship is a concept that a number of scholars argue as being an issue as well as a possible solution for temporary worker programmes (Martin 2000, Martin and Teitelbaum...
2001, and Castles and Miller 2009). The complexities of citizenship can have numerous effects when coupled with temporary migration of workers and the related programmes. This section will provide an understanding of citizenship’s links with temporary worker programmes.

Basok (2004, p. 51) claims that citizenship is a form of social membership and that denial of such membership to migrants “deprives these migrants of the opportunities to acquire knowledge, learn skills, or secure support to claim legal rights to which they are entitled”. Falk (2000) argues that the denial of citizenship to temporary migrant workers serves as a pretext to impose burdens on the most vulnerable members of society. Therefore, citizenship, or lack thereof, is causing migrant workers to experience a number of negative situations. It has been argued that for temporary migrant workers to have a more positive experience abroad that they should be granted citizenship, Castle and Miller (2009, p. 274) declare:

\[
\text{In order to cope with the difficult experience of settlement in a new society, immigrants and their descendants need their own associations and social networks, as well as their own languages and cultures...the best way to prevent marginalisation and social conflicts is to grant permanent immigrants full rights in all social spheres. This means making citizenship easily available, even if this leads to dual citizenship.}
\]

These scholars provide a clear argument that suggests that temporary worker programmes should be replaced by full citizenship; otherwise their experiences abroad will be marginalised. This provides an alternative to providing temporary worker programmes. However, Ruhs (2003) has already discarded a blanket provision of citizenship to all temporary workers as an alternative, suggesting a solution lies elsewhere. Thus, two arguments have been presented, both suggesting that there are definitely issues with temporary worker programmes, but they differ with respect to how they should be counteracted. To illustrate these arguments clearly, they are provided side-by-side:
1. Temporary worker programmes fail because workers are denied the right of citizenship, such programmes should be removed and these workers should be given full citizenship rights (Castles and Miller 2009).

2. Temporary worker programmes fail because of flaws in the design of related policy, and these need corrections (Ruhs 2003).

To further discuss these arguments it would be wise to outline permanent residency as it is the core of these two arguments, and is a major issue for temporary migration policies.

### 2.5.1 Permanent Residency

One of the most topical issues concerning citizenship is whether the provision of permanent residency should be provided to temporary workers, and if so, at what stage? As Ruhs (2006, p. 31) has argued, temporary worker programs fail because of policy design flaws, namely that when temporary workers seek permanent residency there needs to be a “well designed mechanism for limited and conditional upgrading into permanent residence”, however, these have not been present in temporary worker programmes in the past.

Ruhs (2006, p. 28) notes that “[t]he experiences of the Gastarbeiter and Bracero programmes\(^1\) – and indeed those of most guest-worker programmes in liberal democracies – make it clear that any TMP [Temporary Migration Programme] will always generate pressures for permanent settlement”. Such pressures stem from unmanaged demand of migrant labour, citizenship rights, migrant networks, and agency pressures (Ruhs 2006). Ruhs (2003, p. 15) elaborates by suggesting that once temporary worker programmes are in

---

\(^1\) *Bracero* programme was implemented in the United States (1942-64) and the *Gastarbeiter* programme in Germany (1955-73).
place, they are difficult to terminate, and as temporary workers who initially intended to stay temporarily, “adjust their expectations to a longer stay, permanent residency, and/or citizenship.” However, Ruhs also points out those receiving countries allowing temporary migrants to gain permanent residency may generate distinct benefits for those countries as temporary workers are likely to be more successful when fitting in with a receiving country’s communities. The United Nations notes that Italy, Portugal and the United Kingdom grant the opportunity for migrants to convert temporary into permanent status after several years of regular residence, however, this is conditional on the migrant’s labour and criminal records (United Nations, 2009).

It is important to clarify that although Ruhs understands that there are benefits for permanent residency, he acknowledges that this is not a goal of temporary worker programmes, thus illustrating a significant flaw currently inherent in policies of temporary worker programmes, and an area that needs correction. Although providing permanent residency is not a goal, Ruhs maintains that it is something that will happen with any temporary worker programme, but it can be regulated within policy so that it can provide benefits for the receiving country. Rather than being an unintended flaw, it is something that needs to be recognised as inevitable when a temporary migration programme is put in place (Ruhs 2003, 2006). Therefore, planning for such an eventuality it is necessary to ensure that it is done in a manner that is controlled, and beneficial for the receiving country.

Ruhs (2008) uses the success of the Canadian Commonwealth Caribbean and Mexican Agricultural Seasonal Workers Program (A.S.W.P.) to illustrate how programmes can effectively control permanent residency of temporary workers. The A.S.W.P. employs a points system for workers who intend to apply for permanent residency where applicants must “(i) meet certain minimum work experience requirements, (ii) prove that they have the funds required for settlement, and (iii) earn enough points on six selection factors to meet the “pass mark”” (Ruhs 2006, p. 31). The Canadian experience is one that illustrates that
even though permanent residency will occur to an extent, it can be controlled to benefit the receiving country.

Such discussion illustrates that pressures exist for receiving governments when allowing temporary workers to their shores for the purposes of temporary employment. Although Canada has experienced success in regulating who they provide permanent residency to, other programmes have failed due to insufficient policy design. It is likely that other programmes throughout the world may not experience such success; however, if Canada has set a precedent, then this issue may have been overcome. Subsequently, the next test will come when implementing such policy in a context outside of Canada. The current research is likely to present results that illustrate that temporary worker programmes, and their policy design in New Zealand, are currently failing to fully learn from Canadian success. If so, it will add to the plethora of international examples that intended to develop policy that does not allow temporary workers to gain permanent residency. Thus, it will again illustrate that “there is nothing more permanent than temporary foreign workers” (Ruhs 2006, p. 7).

By outlining the arguments surrounding citizenship, and the provision of permanent residency it provides insights as to why worker programmes and related policies fail to achieve their intended outcomes. It also provides an extended validation for this research by having steered it in a direction that argues the source of the most current and significant issues, that being the theoretical underpinning of citizenship. Consequently, it would be useful to discuss these issues in further depth.
2.6 Rights

Rights ascribed to migrant workers depend largely on what type of programme they have been employed under, or whether they have been granted citizenship. Abella (2006) asserts that one of the major and current issues, for temporary migration policies, is considering the rights and protective measures temporary migrant workers should be entitled to. This section will discuss, in detail, the issues of rights for migrant workers while abroad. The discussion will be framed around the theoretical understanding of modern slavery, while making a comparative assessment between modern slavery, and temporary migration for the purpose of work.

However, it is firstly important to note that citizenship is inextricably linked to rights, as teased out in the theory of citizenship in the previous section. Castle and Miller (2009, p. 44) note that “citizenship designates the equality of rights of all citizens within a political community, as well as a corresponding set of institutions guaranteeing these rights.” Thus, attaining citizenship provides access to rights within a country, however, the majority of worker programmes do not allow temporary workers access to citizenship, instead they are granted access to working visas or permits which do not provide workers with the same equality of rights as citizens. Within the literature there a number of reasons that seek to justify why temporary workers are not granted full citizenship, Bedford et al. (2009, p. 16) argue that it is largely because it “is often viewed as a more ‘palatable’ idea than permanent migration, particularly for low-skilled workers”, however, significant debate surrounds this topic.

Workers are often seen as a trading product, and once the work has been completed, the product should return. Ruhs (2003, p. 26) suggests that “workers are effectively “sold” to employers who assume almost full control over their purchased “property””. Lindio-McGovern (2003, p. 520) elaborates, suggesting that “modern slavery makes the relationship short-term and the enslaved disposable”. The relationship with temporary
migrant workers and their employers is also short-term, and once the work has been completed, the workers return, or are ‘disposed’, to their own nations. With such an assessment it could be argued that temporary workers could be considered modern slaves (Lindio-McGovern 2003, and Bales 2004) Lindio-McGovern (2003, p. 530) trusts that migrant “labour outflow benefits more the receiving country by commodifying the migrants as cheap, docile and disposable labour force [and that]...The export of service workers links reproductive labour to capital accumulation in ways that receiving and sending states...and employers profit from.” This argument would therefore consider that the theory of ‘Triple-Wins’ be discarded, while ascribing some accreditation to the theory that temporary migrant workers can be regarded as slaves.

Bales provides a comparison of ‘old slavery’ with ‘new slavery’ (Table 1), this will be used as an aid to understanding, in further depth, the argument – can slavery be compared with temporary worker migration? Although this could be considered a slightly unconventional question to pose, it would be of value to critique this argument, and provide discussion to assess its legitimacy. Bales (1999) and Lindio-McGovern (2003) present findings that link the features of new slavery to the rights of temporary workers in receiving countries. The features listed in Table 1 will be used to compare the rights of temporary migrant workers in various worker programmes outlined in the literature.

*Table 1: Differences between old and new slavery. Source: Bales 1999*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Old slavery</th>
<th>New slavery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Legalized</td>
<td>Legalization avoided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profits</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Maintained</td>
<td>Disposable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic difference</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6.1 Ownership

Ownership refers to the way in which slaves are ‘owned’ and temporary migrant workers are often placed in positions where they too could be considered to be owned by the receiving country or their employers. Bauder (2005, p. 53) asserts that “migrants are valorised as workers but devalued as human beings, making them a desired labour force but unwanted people...this not only commodifies offshore labour but also represents offshore workers as an inferior product.” Ruhs (2003) also reports this and has already referred to workers in a sense of ownership by using the terms ‘sold’ and ‘property’, so not only is there reference to workers being owned, but also that when a receiving country no longer needs the worker they can return them. Martin (2003, p. 6) argues that:

\[ \text{In the face of rising differences that encourage and enable migration, governments often revert to the instrument over which they have the most control, individual rights, and seek to manage migration by adjusting the especially the rights of newcomers...Reconciling these difference and equality logics in a manner that ensures that labour migration contributes to equality and prosperity in a globalizing world is a major challenge.} \]

Martin (2003) mentions that by controlling workers rights you manage their migration and through such management there is a sense of control and ownership. Martin (2003) also, and importantly so, notes that the management of rights is a major challenge. In Abella’s (2006, p. 3) case study in the United Kingdom it was noted that:

\[ \text{...Temporary worker schemes have been preferred over general relaxation of immigration rules as they allow specific labour market demands in the UK to be met in the short-term, without making longer term commitments and in a way that in principle reassures the UK electorate that the government retains control over immigration.} \]

This helps to understand how governments use their powers to control temporary migrants and through this control it could be suggested that there is an element of ownership. However, Lindio-McGovern’s (2003) case study of Filipino domestic workers in Rome develops a theory termed ‘floating labour force’ which would suggest that temporary
workers are not actually owned. The theory maintains that temporary workers are not owned by any country in particular as they never settle permanently in one country. Once the workers return from one temporary position abroad they are often unable to find employment in their country of birth, so they seek overseas work again. This is an example of migratory movement that is often referred to as circular migration (Castles and Miller 2009, Basok 2004). If temporary migrant workers are regarded as a floating labour force, it would be most likely that they would not be considered modern slaves, especially given the fact that they have the liberties to migrate in a circular fashion, if they wish to do so.

Ownership can also be linked back to the concept of citizenship because temporary workers do not often receive citizenship, they are required to acquire a visa or permit which could be disputed as essentially a form of temporary ownership on the part of the receiving nations (Castles and Miller 2009). This strengthens the argument that temporary migration is in fact similar to modern slavery because full legalisation is avoided; however, to the contrary, temporary working visas are a legal form of migration. Although temporary visas and permits do legalise workers it is well known that there are many migrants working illegally the world over (Castles and Miller 2009). The idea that temporary migrant workers are owned is a point of much contention and it could be argued both for and against.

2.6.2 Cost and Profits

As argued in the ‘Triple-Wins’ theory, the costs and profits for the receiving and sending countries, and the migrant worker would be fair and equal. However, if temporary migrant workers are regarded as slaves under Bales (1999) theory then there are going to be obvious discrepancies between the two theories. Bales (1999) argues that in contrast to the old, the cost of modern slavery is very low but profits are high. Ruhs (2006, p. 14) strengthens this argument by mentioning that “employers are in a position to lower costs by offering wages and employment conditions that are below minimum standards, [as] the demand for
migrants is likely to be higher than what it would be if employment laws were enforced.” Thus, employers are in positions where they can control the costs they incur when involved with worker programmes, and therefore, reap increased profits. Native workers are much less likely to take up such employment positions as they are used to having better profits, however, workers from developing nations are willing to work because their options are in comparison, limited.

Again, this places employers in a position of control and the workers in a position of exploitation, which could be regarded as a position of modern slavery. With reference to Table 1, the costs for the employer are low, whereas the profits are high as the worker is subjected to poor conditions and profits. This provides another swing of the pendulum in the slavery argument by suggesting that temporary workers are subjected to a degree of modern slavery.

### 2.6.3 Relationship and Maintenance

The relationships that occur under temporary migration policies, notably those between the employer and employee, are often contentious, especially with regard to modern slavery. Stasiulis and Bakan (1997, p. 122) declare that there is an “asymmetry of power between live-in foreign worker and citizen employer.” Basok (2004, p. 58) agrees by stating that there is an “enormous degree of power to the employers over their workers”. Worker programmes are well known for such power struggles and this is a common theme throughout the literature.

This power struggle is set to continue as Martin (2003) notes that with respect to the Canadian case study “the trend in expanding seasonal worker programs is to “trust the employer”, to give employers or employer organisations more voice in admissions, transportation, and employment decisions”. The Canadian A.S.W.P. is widely regarded as
the best temporary migration model designed to date (Bauder 2005, Basok 2004, Greenhill 2000, Mueller 2005, and Preibisch 2003). Although Walia (2010, p. 72) argues otherwise and notes that the “Canadian migration policy is the result of a perfected system of social control, containment, and expulsion.” Therefore, it could be argued that the A.S.W.P. has ensured that employers and governments have considerable powers over employees and migrants. This is important because the programme has set a precedent and new programs are now being modelled on its debatable success.

Ruhs (2006, p. 24) suggests that to ensure that there are effective protective measures of migrants’ rights, there needs to be “at least some portability of temporary work permits, enabling migrants to change employers whenever necessary.” This would allow workers to have some degree of control over their employment experience and if they are stuck in a power struggle with their employer then they can at least look to others to alter the situation, however, the majority of programs do not allow such freedoms. Martin (2003, p.27) provides another angle to the argument and asserts that:

*If all migrants are legal, and they receive the same benefits as local workers, employers are likely to request fewer, posing a number versus rights dilemma – do we want more employed abroad or better conditions for migrants? The logic motivating migration is differences, while the logic of protection seeks equality. There is no easy way to resolve this numbers-rights dilemma.*

Therefore, it would seem that the power struggles underpinning the maintenance of relationships that workers have with their employers are inherent to worker programmes. Although, steps have been taken by the United Nations to try and ensure that the migrants’ rights are protected, as discussed in the forthcoming section, it seems as though there may need to be more research implemented in this area for future success.

The relationships that the workers have with their employers are obviously intrinsically short-term and because of the position migrant workers find themselves in, their rights are
often exploited. As a result, it could be argued that migrant workers are in a position that could be regarded as one of slavery. Lindio-McGovern (2003) provides a reminder that modern slavery is also comprised of short-term relationships and slaves are, in addition disposable, thus a direct assessment with comparison to Table 1.

### 2.6.4 Ethnic Difference

The final feature of the slavery theory that requires debate is ethnic difference. Throughout history, slaves have predominately come from black ethnic backgrounds. Bales (1999, p. 11) argues that “in modern slavery, in contrast to the old slavery, the question is not ‘Are they the right colour to be slaves?’ but ‘Are they vulnerable enough to be enslaved?’” This argument alludes to a very traditional form of slavery, however, Bales (1999) suggests that the degree of vulnerability is now the chief concern. It has been continually pointed out throughout this review that temporary migrant workers are often in positions that force them to migrate; they are subject to inequality and struggle with maintaining their rights. This vulnerability that Bales (1999) indicates is of importance, is significant to the wider theoretical arguments of globalisation and the divisions of the developed and developing world.

Although this is an important link to have made, there is also another side to this argument. Lindio-McGovern (2003, p. 522) observes that there is “an assumption in Bale’s typology that is problematic: his criterion that ethnic difference is not as significant in modern slavery as in the old may not be absolutely true...” For example, Lindio-McGovern (2003, p. 522) clarifies that “one immigration policy states that domestic help for Italian citizens is one of the few categories of work open to foreign workers...The other categories are such that Filipinos could rarely ever fit into them.”
Both of these arguments have merit and it could be contended that both of them are in fact correct. By assessing who the most vulnerable people are in the world, one would first look to the countries located within developing nations, this supporting Bales (1999) argument. Secondly, the majority of the population within these countries are of different ethnic backgrounds to the countries in which they are temporarily migrating – developed and largely of European ethnicity.

Although there have been examples of temporary worker programmes where ethnicity has not been a point of difference, for example, the Swiss recruitment of Italians after the second world war, the majority remain divided by ethnicity, but also their place within the developed and developing world (Martin 2003). The Canadian A.S.W.P. recruits from the Caribbean and Mexico, and the Braceros programme also recruiting from Mexico to the United States, another significant case study within the literature and an example of the mix of ethnicities (Martin 2003). The United Kingdom is an example which did not mix ethnicities with workers coming from former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics after World War II, however, this exemplifies the argument that workers are coming from less developed nations. Although the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was never classed as developing, it was definitely not developed, especially concluding the war (Martin 2003).

Having compared Bales’ and Lindio-McGovern’s two arguments, it is clear that both of them have valid points and a strong argument, however, after such deliberation it would be more likely to conclude that if a nation is vulnerable, disregarding ethnicity, that they would be more likely to become involved in temporary worker programmes. This would support the argument that temporary migrant programmes do have some similarities with modern slavery.
2.6.5 International Recognition

As a result of continued rights violations of migrant workers, in 1990 the United Nations adopted the Convention on the Rights of Migrant Workers and Their Families, however, it did not come into force until 2003 because so few immigration countries refused to sign (Castles and Miller 2009). By 2006 only 34 countries had signed the convention, the majority of these being countries of emigration, a further example of the global divide between the developed and developing world, and a sign that those from sending nations do experience inequalities while working offshore (Castles and Miller 2009). Even though there is some recognition that there is a problem, the convention is essentially useless. Canada, a nation credited with having the best temporary migration programme in the world “has not signed the UN convention on migrant workers, [however,] it adheres in part to the spirit of this international document” (Basok 2004, p. 54), thus profoundly exemplifies its futility.

By assessing the issues of rights surrounding temporary migration programmes within the theoretical framework of modern slavery, it has allowed an interesting discussion to transpire. It not only brought a number of varying issues to the fore, but it also provided an argument that may initially have been regarded as unconventional, and allocated it a degree of realism. A number of other more micro related issues are still yet to be discussed, these are driven by a more socially constructed set of theoretical forces and are more concerned with community based issues of temporary workers, including the experiences of women and the development of immigrant sectors.

2.7 Female Migrants

Women are an important yet misunderstood facet within contemporary forms of migration especially due to the fact that “over the past four decades, the number of female migrants globally has risen significantly, from an estimated 35.3 million in 1960, to 95.5 million in
2005” (Bedford *et al.* 2009, p. 21). As a result, the feminisation of migration is becoming increasingly important; however, it is an area of study that has received little attention.

### 2.7.1 Gender

It would be sensible to outline a basic understanding of contemporary gender thought to frame the topic, before women are discussed with respect to the current trends within temporary worker programmes. Ridgeway and Correll (2004, p. 510) define gender as “an institutionalised system of social practices constituting people as two significantly different categories, men and women, and organising social relations of inequality on the basis of that difference.” Ridgeway and Correll (2004, p. 511) continue by adding that “widely held gender beliefs are in effect cultural rules or instructions for enacting the social structure of difference and inequality that we understand to be gender.”

Pessar and Mahler (2003, p. 816) argue that “people – irrespective of their own efforts – are situated within power hierarchies that they have not constructed.” Pessar and Mahler (2003, p. 816) suggest that such hierarchies are present within a theory they term ‘social location’ that is “created through political, economic, geographic, kinship-based and other socially stratifying factors.” Therefore, depending on where woman migrate to, there will be differences in these factors, or to theorise – a difference in their social location, thus resulting in varying affects on their experiences.

Although migrant men are often also within the same social location while abroad, women are more likely to be subjected to further positions of marginalisation because of factors inherent within gender. Castles and Miller (2009, p. 39) refer to these factors by noting that it is “particularly easy to ascribe inferiority to women migrant workers, just because their primary roles in patriarchal societies were defined as wife and mother, dependent on a male
breadwinner. They could therefore be paid lower wages and controlled more easily than men.” Pessar and Mahler (2003, p. 822) summarise – “In other words, the playing field is not level for all participants, and this is particularly true for international migrants whose desire for actual border crossings initiate them into new power hierarchies”, and social locations that are likely to be more exacerbated for women.

By understanding the basics of some contemporary thought within the field of gender, namely those that are closely associated with female migration; it provides a base to allow a further understanding of the issues that are currently facing female temporary migrant workers. However, even though the feminisation of migration has become increasingly significant, “nonetheless, gender has been regularly sidelined in the scholarly research on international migration over the past 100 years.” (Pessar and Mahler 2003, p. 812).

### 2.7.2 Current Trends

Female migration has increased considerably over the past few decades and the issues that have been discussed in the wider context of this review have thus far provided an account of what temporary migrant workers are exposed to. However, the literature suggests that temporary migrant workers are likely to be exacerbated with respect to the experience of women, especially considering women are marginalised further within temporary migration groups, simply due to gender alignment. Women are also migrating due to push and pull factors as discussed, however, what is increasingly important is that they “represent a readymade labour supply which is, at once, the most vulnerable, the most flexible and, at least in the beginning, the least demanding work force” (Castles and Miller 2009, p. 235). As a result, they are becoming increasingly popular ‘property’.
Women are also in high demand because they tend to fill positions that other people are not willing to take, especially men, as Castles and Miller (2009, p. 133) state:

\[
[M]ost \, migrant \, women \, are \, concentrated \, in \, jobs \, regarded \, as \, ‘typically \, female’: \, domestic \, workers, \, entertainers \, (often \, a \, euphemism \, for \, prostitutes), \, restaurant \, and \, hotel \, staff \, and \, assembly-line \, workers \, in \, clothing \, and \, electronics. \, These \, jobs \, offer \, poor \, pay, \, conditions \, and \, status, \, and \, are \, associated \, with \, patriarchal \, stereotypes \, of \, female \, docility, \, obedience \, and \, willingness \, to \, give \, personal \, service.
\]

For women, hierarchy is a much stronger social force and one they are exposed to on various levels, especially due to conditions within their social location. Domestic work is one example of temporary work that is “marked by a hierarchy of work tasks, of formal and informal modes of employment, and of groups with varied statuses. For instance, Filipina domestic workers are preferred in some places due to their better education and English, but rejected in others because they are seen as too active in defending their rights” (Castles and Miller 2009, 237). This assessment highlights a hierarchy within a specific social location, but more significantly it illustrates how woman can grow to become a more demanding work force, an area that has had little scholarly research applied.

Not only do women face hierarchical issues while abroad, but because their social location has changed so too has the social location of others they have left behind. Bedford et al. (2009, p. 36) mentions that “some studies have argued that the out-migration of women has resulted in marital conflict as men struggle to retain their masculine identities while performing household duties that were traditionally considered ‘women’s work’.” Castles and Miller (2009, p. 133) add another relevant yet interesting point by asserting that “female migration has considerable effects on family and community dynamics in the place of origin. Married women have to leave their children in the care of others, and long absences affect relationships and gender roles.” These points are of importance for the research because of the potential affects that may occur by having male migrant workers from the same sending country in the same social location as women.
There remain many areas of indifference with respect to women in temporary migration for the purposes of work. Although this discussion has only shed light on a few issues, it has highlighted that there needs to be further attention allocated to gender and women in temporary migration as very few studies within this field have provided any significant understanding. It is, however, now widely known that “the disadvantaged position of migrant women persists today as the OECD found that immigrant women are generally the group with the least favourable outcomes in the labour market” (Castles and Miller 2009, p. 236). This brief analysis would consider that it is obvious that women are subjected to numerous issues within this type of migration, to the same extent as men; however, they have to contend with the issues of culture, hierarchy, and social location in more intense and different ways than men do, thus making the experience for women considerably difficult.

### 2.8 Social Exclusion

As temporary worker programmes proliferate so too do the number of temporary workers living in receiving communities. As these workers create sectors within communities often referred to as immigrant sectors. Temporary worker programmes “have often been accompanied by the segmentation of the host country’s labour market and the emergence of “immigrant sectors”, understood as sectors that employ, primarily or exclusively, foreign workers” (Ruhs 2003, p. 10). Beer and Lewis (2006, p. 96) elaborate by stating that “as employers have turned increasingly to labour from outside the region, increasing numbers of outsiders have created new community impacts and new tensions”. Therefore, immigrant sectors could be considered to be synonymous with worker programmes and these outsiders could influence change in seasonal communities. As a result, the creation of immigrant sectors introduces a number of other factors that contribute to the experience of migrant workers while in receiving countries, thus, increasingly affecting their experiences within
such social locations. The following discussion briefly outlines related contributing factors and the resulting issues.

One of the major factors contributing to workers experiences within their receiving community, or social location is exclusion. In Lindio-McGovern’s (2003, p. 528) assessment, results suggested that “the growing army of Filipino domestic labour in Rome is creating an urban migrant underclass occupationally segregated based on gender, race and nationality”. This outlines the factors that drive the exclusion of migrant workers within their adopted social location.

Racism is one of the most common forms of social exclusion the world over. Spoonley and Bedford (2008, p. 212) note that “newcomers will face racism and discrimination in many communities, irrespective of size, but in smaller regional communities, such experiences can be intensified”. This is important in the context of this research because, as mentioned, the majority of workers coming from the developing world are more than likely to be of different ethnic backgrounds. Yet this also points out a new observation – many of the migrant workers are temporarily migrating and living in small communities. This is relevant to the temporary worker because the majority of programmes that are implemented are a result of the shortage of labour in many rural areas, for example, in seasonal industries. What is often salient in smaller communities is that social pressures, such as racism, are likely to be more acute. Basok’s (2004, p. 56) case study in Canada suggested that “Mexican migrants limit[ed] their social interaction mainly to others within the Mexican community”. Like the Mexicans, many temporary workers are likely to interact with people from similar backgrounds because this is the only social group within which they feel that they belong.
Exclusion through gender, race, and nationality denies migrants the full experience of social membership, thus affecting their opportunities to acquire knowledge, learn skills, or gain support to claim legal rights (Martin 2003). For example, “Mexican workers were limited in their knowledge of the English language or ways of operating in a new society and thus were virtually denied the knowledge they needed to claim their rights” (Martin 2003, p. 55). Even if migrant workers were to try to gain access to their rights, it is likely to be much more difficult because of exclusionary factors that work against them.

Although exclusion is prevalent in migrant working communities, Castles and Davidson (2000) suggest that within this sea of exclusion “religion is the ‘hard kernel’ of identity through which migrants can compensate for the loss of social orientation caused by displacement to another society. Where settlement is experienced in terms of economic marginalisation, social isolation and racism, religious solidarity becomes a key form of resistance” (2000, p. 136). This is an area of interest that the research will seek to understand further by collecting data that will provide insights into temporary workers social experiences and relationships with religious and church groups.

2.9 Implications for Government and Planning

The issues that have been discussed throughout this review would suggest that multiple problems exist for temporary worker programmes, the workers and the communities that they inhabit while abroad. Although some programmes claim to be working well, it could still be argued that migrant workers are subjected to a number of issue particularly rights, outside of their control, and are socially excluded from their social locations. They can also have issues on receiving communities, such as the formation of immigrant sectors. As a result, government and policy developers are responsible for ensuring that such issues are managed, however, the United Nations (2009, p. 2) asserts that:
Governments tend to be far more ambivalent with respect to low-skilled workers, whose status and treatment often leave much to be desired. In many countries, agriculture, construction, manufacturing and service sectors have jobs that are filled by such migrants. Yet governments often try to rotate less educated people in and out of the country, sometimes treating temporary and irregular workers like water from a tap that can be turned on and off at will.

Vitiello (2009, p. 246) notes that with respect to planning and policy on a local level:

[F]ew planning departments have made immigration issues a major priority, through their plans and codes still impact immigrant communities...Like the communities that receive migrants, planning professionals over the past century have had ambiguous and ambivalent relationships with immigration and migrant communities.

Therefore, not only do these issues exist but they also receive little attention from central and local government in a planning context. For these issues to be squashed it is vital that governments and planning departments take action.

2.10 Conclusion

This chapter aimed to review and analyse the relevant literature regarding temporary migration programmes for the purpose of work. By doing so, the chapter is essentially broken down into two major sections. The first section provides a background of the wider theoretical forces that influence temporary migration in today’s world. It does so by detailing contemporary migration, worker programmes and the current issues for temporary migration. This analysis provides the scope to understand the fundamental problems that face temporary worker programmes, and suggests that temporary worker programmes are influenced by a number of global forces and are flawed in their policy design.

The second section narrows and details more specific social issues for workers employed under temporary worker programmes which primarily stem from the broad global
influences and policy flaws. These include workers rights, the feminisation of migration, and social exclusion. Finally it briefly outlines the indifferences of governments and planning agencies with respect to such issues.

This critique of the relevant literature has enabled the illumination of various theoretical frameworks through the identification of themes, issues, and gaps. This identification process allows previous research to inform the current research and provides it with extended validation. The review enables this research to mould a clear orientation based on the themes, issues, and gaps derived from this process. The next chapter will outline the contextual background of the research.
3 Context

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will provide a broad contextual overview for this research by outlining the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and its current operational structure and implementation process in New Zealand. The overview will include detailing relevant policy structure and processes, the importance that Vanuatu and Ni-Vanuatu workers have within the research, and outline the Te Puke case study.

3.2 Worker Programmes in New Zealand

New Zealand’s seasonal horticulture and viticulture labour market has experienced employment shortages over the last decade. Evaluate Research (2010, p. 3) noted that:

*In 2000–2004, New Zealand’s horticulture and viticulture exports increased more than 30 percent. At the same time, unemployment rates were falling and the national labour market was tightening. A labour supply shortfall was identified as a potential risk to national export earnings and regional economic development and as a constraint on business growth.*

As a result, a number of policy initiatives were taken to try and reduce such shortages. The development of policy initiatives has been made easier due to the processes of globalisation, as discussed in the previous chapter, which has enabled western nations to access offshore labour sources. By acquiring an offshore labour supply it has allowed the employment gap to be filled by supplementing the existing supply. However, the difficulty with such policy is that it is very broad and it not only acts as an employment policy but also an immigration policy, thus, complicating the policy design and implementation (Evaluate Research, 2010).
During the period 2001 – 2006 various immigration policies attempted to encourage effective labour supply, these were regarded as ‘top-up’ schemes with the aim of increasing the number of workers in the horticulture industry. Such schemes included the Approval in Principle, Working Holiday Scheme, Variation of Conditions Scheme, and Seasonal Work Permit, the latter was used as a pilot scheme for potential future schemes (Evalue Research, 2010). These ‘top-up’ schemes proved to be largely insufficient, however, the Seasonal Work Permit pilot, according to the majority of growers, was working well and was consequently extended (Ramasamy et al. 2008).

Further demands from the seasonal horticulture industry continued to escalate as the employment shortage worsened (Evalue Research, 2010). Eventually the government decided that intervention was the best way to safeguard the horticulture and viticulture industry’s future, and a number of government departments and industry organisations were brought together. Representatives from the Department of Labour, the Ministry of Social Development, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, New Zealand Trade and Enterprise, the Ministry of Economic Development, and Inland Revenue were then advised to collaborate and implement strategies to reduce employment pressures (Evalue Research, 2010). This led to a partnership and the formation of the Horticulture and Viticulture Seasonal Working Group (2005, p. 3) that noted further reasons for increased labour demands:

*Increasing sophistication of horticultural operations and continued growth means that demand for labour is constantly evolving and increasing. Simultaneously labour supply is limited by poor perceptions, low awareness of employment opportunities in the industries and increasing competition in this country’s tightening labour market.*
The government department responsible for labour in New Zealand is the Department of Labour. The Department of Labour has a significant role to play with labour related issues. Hence, it is important to outline the Department of Labour’s responsibilities and involvement.

### 3.2.1 Department of Labour

The Department of Labour is a government department responsible for maintaining a functional national labour market and immigration system. The Department of Labour is located in Wellington with regional offices located throughout the country. The Department of Labour states that its central aim is to “[grow New Zealand’s economy and improve the quality of lives through a high performing labour market and immigration system” (Department of Labour, 2010). The Department of Labour has two fundamental responsibilities. First, the Department of Labour has a responsibility to supervise and control the labour market in New Zealand by working with employers and industries to improve the safety of workplaces, as well as facilitate further innovation and production of the workforce (Department of Labour, 2010). The second major responsibility for the Department of Labour is to research workplace opportunities and develop international relations to promote New Zealand as a practical place to work (Department of Labour, 2010). This function is supported by the administration arm of Immigration New Zealand, also located in Wellington, and together they support the labour market through the provision of worker programmes.

As a result, the Department of Labour is the primary government body responsible for the implementation and management of worker programmes in New Zealand. The Department of Labour coordinates the implementation of worker programmes, such as the aforementioned, with governments and industries to solve employment problems. To assess the options and to try and reduce the issues concerning labour strategies, the Horticulture and Viticulture Seasonal Working Group coordinated the implementation of the Seasonal
Labour Strategy. Therefore, it would be wise to provide a further understanding of this strategy.

3.2.2 The Seasonal Labour Strategy

In 2005 the Horticulture and Viticulture Seasonal Working Group implemented the Medium – Long-term Horticulture and Viticulture Seasonal Labour Strategy (Seasonal Labour Strategy). The Seasonal Labour Strategy is an overarching strategy with the central focus of ensuring that the horticulture and viticulture industries maintain a reliable seasonal workforce. Although co-chaired by the Department of Labour and Horticulture New Zealand, the strategy is regarded as “a true partnership consisting of representatives from government, industry, and trade unions” (The Horticulture and Viticulture Seasonal Working Group 2005, p. 1).

The strategy is directed by five key objectives, and the most relevant objective with regard to the present research, is the assessment of a global labour supply. The strategy explains that for the industry to have access to global labour is crucial when there are domestic labour supply shortages (The Horticulture and Viticulture Seasonal Working Group, 2005). It is important to note that the strategy seeks to ensure that New Zealand workers are provided with job opportunities before utilising the global supply. It was from the production of the Seasonal Labour Strategy that the Recognised Seasonal Employment scheme, a policy that is a fundamental focus of this research, ultimately emerged.

Since the 2005 Seasonal Labour Strategy, a 2010 Strategy has been produced which identifies key goals for the next five years. It briefly notes that the introduction of the Recognised Seasonal Employment scheme was a key achievement of the 2005 strategy. As the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is of the utmost importance to this research, it
is pertinent to provide an understanding of its brief history, the related recruitment processes it employs, and the administrative support that it is ascribed.

### 3.2.3 The Recognised Seasonal Employment scheme

In April 2007 the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme was implemented for the first season (Ramasamy et al. 2008). The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is the most prominent and ambitious temporary worker scheme ever implemented in New Zealand (Ramasamy et al. 2008). Throughout the research, the term Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme will be used, however, this is not always possible and sometimes the terms programme and policy replaces scheme.

There are a number of reasons why the programme was implemented, and although some of these were outlined earlier, it would be sensible to detail the most significant reasons outright. First, employers in the horticulture and viticulture industries could not meet their labour demands. Second, current immigration policies were insufficient, and third, temporary work access for Pacific nations could contribute to New Zealand’s broad foreign policy objectives (Ramasamy et al. 2008). Spoonley and Bedford (2008) assert that there were also pressures from the Pacific Forum countries to further opportunities for temporary labour in the region. Consequently, the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme attempted to solve these issues by accessing a supply of readily available employees from a number of Pacific and Asian nations, thus, allowing the seasonal industry’s needs to be met, contributing to existing ‘top-up’ schemes, and taking over from previously failed programmes.

The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme seeks to give priority to workers from five ‘kick-start’ Pacific nations; these include Tonga, Samoa, Tuvalu, Kiribati, and Vanuatu.
This is not surprising considering New Zealand’s connections with the Pacific region. The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme intends to advance New Zealand’s foreign policy and aid by supporting the Pacific nations economically, largely through the benefits of remittances (Bedford et al. 2009). Historically, New Zealand has labour circulation links with the Pacific and Bedford et al. (2009, p. 20) note that “short-term labour circulation between the Pacific Islands and New Zealand has been occurring for over a century”. Ramasamy et al. (2008, p. 172) outline the significance of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and states that:

*It is a novel initiative for New Zealand in that it is the first significant attempt to develop an international migration policy that explicitly attempts to achieve the triple win for migrants, their countries of origin and destination countries, and has come to dominate the discourse about international migration and development in the twenty-first century.*

The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme was modelled on a Canadian temporary worker programme and is an initiative that Australia’s immigration authorities are watching closely (Spoonley and Bedford, 2008).

The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is not only an employment policy but also an immigration policy, this means that “the government will always have a role in ensuring border security and employer compliance” (Evalue Research 2010, p. 73). Therefore, the policy is multi-faceted and this requires a number of players to implement and continually monitor the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme throughout New Zealand and the Pacific. It would be wise to further detail the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and exactly how it works.
The Process of Recruitment

To understand how the policy works it is imperative to illustrate its initial processes. The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme employs a four step process to recruit workers from the Pacific and bring them to New Zealand; this is outlined in Figure 1.

**Figure 1: The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme Accreditation and Recruitment of Employees Process** Source: Department of Labour, 2010.

It is important to allow for a thorough understanding of the four stage process illustrated in Figure 1 as it makes up the fundamental structure of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme; therefore, further detailed information is provided below.

1. Permission to recruit is not automatic as employers need to apply to become Recognised Seasonal Employers through the Ministry of Social Development and the Department of Labour. This includes labour market tests to ensure that they
have genuinely attempted to employ New Zealanders but failed. Work and Income will also check their records before approval is given. Other specific criteria needs to be met also, including paying the workers for at least 30 hours work a week, providing accommodation, meeting health and safety requirements, and paying half of the return airfare (Ramasamy et al. 2008).

2. Once employers are granted Recognised Seasonal Employer status they need to obtain an Agreement to Recruit from the Department of Labour which includes specific details about the workers being recruited, and these details need to be provided to the Ministry of Social Development. This needs to be done every season and before the employer can recruit workers. Under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, up to 8,000 workers can be employed within a season throughout New Zealand’s horticulture and viticulture industries (Evalue Research, 2010).

3. The third and final stage of the process is for the workers. The workers need to apply for a Seasonal Work Visa once they have been selected for employment. Before workers leave for New Zealand they must attend a pre-departure orientation, and they must attain a medical certificate and police clearance (McKenzie et al. 2008).

4. As long as the conditions outlined in step four are met then individual workers can return under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and there is no restriction on the number of times they can return.

The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme utilises a four step recruitment process to admit offshore labour to work in New Zealand’s horticulture and viticulture industries. Employers must meet a number of pre-requisites before they can be registered as Recognised Seasonal Employers, and employees must attain visas. This process requires significant administration support; therefore, it would be sensible to outline such supportive measures.
Administrative Support

The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is very unique, especially considering the way it is administered, and this is largely due to the breadth that the policy encompasses (Ramasamy et al. 2008). The Department of Labour is the primary government body responsible for the implementation and management of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. However, there are other agencies that are also important. Ramasamy et al. (2008) note that other significant players include the Ministry of Social Development who are responsible for registering, and also ensuring there is a genuine need to recruit labour from abroad. Work and Income New Zealand check employers’ records, and New Zealand Aid negotiates with Pacific governments.

The Department of Labour takes an overriding facilitative role that requires them to link with all the players involved, including government departments, industry bodies, the New Zealand trade unions, and employers and employees. The Department of Labour also operates at a regional level to allow effective cooperation with representatives of employers and employees. The Department of Labour is also required to continually maintain and evaluate the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme while addressing any shortcomings which it does so in a responsive, ad hoc manner (Evalue Research 2010).

As the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is administered by a number of organisations and is regarded as a broad and ambitious policy, it means that there are, at times, implementation issues. Since the policy was introduced there has been significant public and media interest, and critics from organisations such as Pacific groups, labour unions, human rights organisations, and church groups. Areas of critique have most often included pastoral care issues and the allocation of inadequate accommodation. Along with these social issues, other more politically and economically aligned issues do also present
themselves, and as noted, the Department of Labour endeavours to deal with these as they arise.

By outlining the administrative support required for the Recognised seasonal Employer scheme it is clear that it is a considerably large and complex programme, especially because of the range of countries involved. However, this research has a particular focus on Vanuatu; therefore clarification of Vanuatu’s involvement is necessary.

3.2.4 The Vanuatu Link

It is of the utmost importance to note that the research is fundamentally focused on assessing the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme with regard to the experiences of the workers from Vanuatu only. Therefore, it would be wise to provide a basic background understanding of Vanuatu, the Ni-Vanuatu people, and their relationship with the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. To briefly explain, the term Ni-Vanuatu is used to describe the people of Vanuatu and the prefix *ni-* is derived from a widely distributed preposition in local vernaculars that means ‘of’ (Crowley, 2000).

Vanuatu is an archipelago consisting of 83 islands with a population of approximately 215,000 and is a politically independent republic located in the south-western Pacific between Fiji, Solomon Islands and New Caledonia (Figure 2) (McKenzie et al. 2008). Vanuatu was not established until 1906, which possibly makes Vanuatu the last part of the pre-colonial world to have ever been colonised by a European power (Crowley, 2000). The Human Development Index for Vanuatu is 0.693, which gives the country a rank of 126th out of 182 countries, New Zealand is ranked 20th comparatively (United Nations 2010). Vanuatu is the only Melanesian nation included in the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, this is significant as Bedford *et al.* (2009) note that Melanesian nations are of particular concern for the wider Australasian community as they are often described as ‘failing states’ that have growing numbers of unskilled workers. As a result, there are a
number of readily available Ni-Vanuatu workers prepared to come to New Zealand for seasonal work.

Figure 2: Vanuatu and New Zealand in the South Pacific. Source: adapted from Crowley, 2000.

The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme can be accredited with helping to reduce the number of unskilled workers by providing them the opportunity to up-skill and earn money in New Zealand. As noted, it is also proving to have fundamental economic benefits for the archipelago, and Evaluate Research (2010, p. 47) stated that the “remittances from Recognised Seasonal Employer [(R.S.E.)] workers are becoming one of the biggest earners of foreign exchange in Vanuatu, second only to the tourism industry. R.S.E. remittances exceed foreign exchange earnings from copra and other rural activities.”
Vanuatu has consistently been the largest supplier of labour to New Zealand since the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme’s inauguration in 2007. In the 2008/09 season 2,523 Ni-Vanuatu workers were employed in New Zealand under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, the next highest contributing nation that season was Tonga with 1,361 (Evalue Research, 2010). This highlights the contribution that the Ni-Vanuatu workers are providing for New Zealand’s seasonal industries.

Ni-Vanuatu workers must be 21 years or older and must not hold a university degree or other professional qualification, or work for the government to be eligible for selection (McKenzie et al., 2008). The Ni-Vanuatu Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme participants are generally male in their late 20s to early 40s, most of who are married and have children (McKenzie et al. 2008).

To summarise, there are several worker programmes operating in New Zealand which seek to supply labour to areas experiencing shortages. The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is the most prominent of these programmes and is an ambitious policy coordinated and implemented by a number of organisations. The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is a crucial element of this research and equally so are the Ni-Vanuatu employees who contribute the most workers compared with any other nation. To effectively investigate the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu workers, a case study method has been applied. The forthcoming discussion briefly provides details about the case study location, Te Puke, Bay of Plenty.

### 3.3 The Case Study: Te Puke, Western Bay of Plenty

The Western Bay of Plenty is located on the east coast of New Zealand’s North Island, about 200 kilometres south-east of Auckland. The case study for the research is Te Puke,
located in the Bay of Plenty’s western area approximately 25 kilometres from Tauranga (Figure 3) Te Puke is a small New Zealand town with a population of just over 7,000 (Statistics New Zealand 2010). Te Puke relies heavily on the horticulture industry, namely kiwifruit, to support its local economy.

Before further discussion, it is important to note that although the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme has been implemented for both the horticulture and viticulture industries, Te Puke does not have a viticulture sector; therefore, the research is only concerned with the horticultural industry in the Te Puke context.

![Figure 3: The Western Bay of Plenty. Source: adapted from the Western Bay of Plenty District Council, 2010.](image-url)
3.3.1 The Te Puke Horticulture Industry and the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme

New Zealand’s horticulture industry is located predominantly in the Western Bay of Plenty region with around 2,000 orchards. “Currently 10.3 per cent of the [Western Bay of Plenty’s] workforce is employed in the agriculture sector” (Western Bay of Plenty District Council, 2010). Te Puke is regarded as being New Zealand’s most important kiwifruit producer, as the horticulture industry gathers the majority of its crops from Te Puke (New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated, 2010). Thus, Te Puke claims to be the ‘The Kiwifruit Capital of the World’ and uses the horticulture industry to market itself (Figure 4).

Figure 4: The Giant Kiwifruit, Te Puke. Source: Personal Collection, 2010.

The region has experienced shortages in labour and is therefore reliant on migrant workers from Pacific nations to ensure that the region’s economic backbone is maintained. The region had “the second largest number of Recognised Seasonal Employer workers during
the first two seasons, with 3,029 workers” and numbers continue to remain at such levels (Evalue Research 2010, p. 62). As a result, there has been an influx of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in the region, especially in Te Puke, and this has had implications for the town. However, it is difficult to calculate the exact number of workers in Te Puke because they are employed by various companies throughout the Te Puke area and are continually transient.

The “kiwifruit industry suffered significant losses in the two seasons before the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme due to labour shortages” (Evalue Research 2010, p. 63), however, such shortages have now been filled with the implementation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. There is often a difficulty for kiwifruit employers in the region as they can often not “estimate effectively how much labour would be required...Kiwifruit farming was particularly unpredictable, since a wet season reduced production and most farmers overestimated their needs” (Connell and Hammond 2009, p. 90). This means that employers in Te Puke have trouble with labour estimations which has implications for the Ni-Vanuatu workers employed in Te Puke.

3.3.2 Local Governance

The Western Bay of Plenty region is governed by the Western Bay District Council, a unitary authority established under the Local Government Act of 2002 (Western Bay of Plenty District Council 2010). The Western Bay District Council oversees the management of the region with the powers, functions, and duties of a territorial authority, and the head office is located in Tauranga. The Western Bay District Council is required to prepare a Long Term Community Council Plan, otherwise known as the Long Term Plan (Western Bay of Plenty District Council 2010). The Long Term Plan focuses on supporting the local community by implementing relevant social, economic, environmental, and cultural strategies. The Long Term Plan needs to be reviewed every three years as required by the
Local Government Act (2002). Outlining these community responsibilities is of importance to this research as the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme attracts migrants which can change community dynamics in Te Puke.

### 3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a broad overview of worker programmes in New Zealand, namely, the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. It has also provided a background of Vanuatu and its contribution to the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. Finally, it outlined the significance of Te Puke as the case study for this research. By doing so, this chapter has provided the foundations on which to take out this research. Consequently, the next chapter will provide the methodology that was used to accomplish this research.
4 Methodology

4.1 Introduction

Davidson and Tolich (2003, p. 17) note that “theory without research is mere speculation.” Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to outline the research strategy taken to collect and process the data while contributing to the theory as discussed in chapter two. The methods employed were selected to contribute to the aim of the research, to assess the efficacy of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme with respect to the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in Te Puke, New Zealand. There were several methods and techniques adopted to conduct the research and this chapter will detail these with respect to the research design, data collection and analysis. Lastly, an outline of the major reflections and limitations are discussed.

4.1 Research Design

An interpretative paradigm has been employed as it is an approach that is often associated with qualitative research strategies. An interpretative paradigm seeks to “develop an appreciation of the underlying motivations that people have for doing what they do” (Henn et al. 2009, p. 175). When assessing the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers, it is pertinent to assess such experience through the motivations of the workers themselves. It is also important to take into account the experiences of others around them, as this will have a contributing effect on the experiences of the Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers.
4.1.1 Case Study Approach

The research applies a case study approach as it seeks to understand and gain an in-depth appreciation of the issues in Te Puke, New Zealand. Denscombe (2007, p. 36) explains that such an approach allows research to search for insights that concentrate efforts on one case rather than many by “illuminat[ing] the general by looking at the particular”. Through the assessment of individual cases it is more likely that the results will be able to tease out wider implications that would not come to light through broader research strategies (Gray, 2004).

4.1.2 Qualitative Research

Henn et al. (2009) explain that research that focuses on a case study is an important feature of qualitative research; consequently, to address the research problem, qualitative research methods were applied. Sarantakos (1993, p. 6) states that qualitative research:

...refers to a number of methodological approaches, based on diverse theoretical principles, employing methods of data collection and analysis that are non-quantitative and aiming towards exploration of social relations and describes reality as experienced by respondents.

A qualitative method can therefore be regarded as the most effective research technique to apply to the present research as it seeks to understand the social relations and experiences of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in the Te Puke context.
4.2 Data Collection

Secondary and primary data collection methods were employed throughout the research, and triangulation was used to ensure the data was fairly represented.

4.2.1 Triangulation

When gathering data in a qualitative manner, there are a number of methods that can be employed to ensure that the results are representative of the data collected. Denscombe (2007, p. 134) notes that “triangulation involves the practice of viewing things from more than one perspective...The principle behind this is that the researcher can get a better understanding of the thing that is being investigated if viewed from different positions.” This research employs triangulation as it uses multiple research methods, including interviews and focus groups among others, to collect data. The research also collects data from multiple sources, including government departments, community groups, and businesses. Triangulation also complements the research strategy as it is widely known to sit comfortably with case study approaches (Denscombe, 2007). By using triangulation, the researcher can compare and contrast the data in a number of ways while reducing the sources of error and allowing for a more effective understanding of the data (Gray, 2004). The experiences of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in Te Puke can be affected by a number of influences and a wide range of opinions have presented themselves, therefore, the use of triangulation allows for a thorough validation of the interpretation and analysis process.

4.2.2 Secondary Data Collection

The initial step that the research took was to conduct an assessment of current and relevant international academic literature, as presented in chapter 2. A literature review assesses “previous research and previous theories [and] provide[s] the key to deciding which features of the situation warrant the focus of attention” (Denscombe 2007, p. 210).
Conducting a literature review allowed an understanding of what research gaps were present, enabling an understanding of what areas could be focused on. As a result, the literature review helped to tease out and formulate the research aim, objectives, and theoretical framework while building an appropriate research strategy. Ultimately, the literature review determined the fundamental themes of this research and these were then used to interpret and analyse the data and produce conclusions.

4.2.3 Primary Data Collection

The primary data collection took place in Te Puke and Tauranga, in New Zealand’s Bay of Plenty region from 4th – 11th August, 2010. Some interviews were conducted in Tauranga, however, this is only because it was some head offices were located in Tauranga and it was a more convenient place to meet. The primary data was collected through the use of semi-structured interview and focus group techniques.

Semi-structured interviews were one of the principal data collection techniques employed and were used for interviewing the key informants. Key informants were selected from a number of organisations and sectors associated with the Te Puke horticulture industry, they were deliberately chosen because of their extensive knowledge concerning the research topic. A list of the key informants can be viewed in Appendix E. Semi-structured interviews were chosen because “the structure of the interview is flexible and the restrictions minimal, in most cases taking the form of guides rather than rules” (Sarantakos 2005, p. 268). The line of questioning that was used as a guide during the semi-structured interviews can be viewed in Appendix G. Employing the semi-structured interview as a data collecting method meant that the interview could be tailored to each interviewee’s responses and the line of questioning could be adapted with respect to the answers given, and this enabled neutral probing to take place (Sarantakos 2005).
Another research technique, ‘snowballing’, was used throughout the process of conducting semi-structured interviews. Flowerdew and Martin (2005, p. 117) describe the technique as:

*using one contact to help you recruit another contact, who in turn can put you in touch with someone else....The strength of this technique is that it helps researchers overcome one of the main obstacles to recruiting interviewees, gaining their trust.*

Snowballing occurred on a number of occasions and it was important for the research as it allowed for the acquisition of further primary data.

Another significant primary data collection method used was focus groups. The focus group technique was used when talking with the people at the centre of this research, Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers. Initially it was difficult to gain access to the Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers because ‘gatekeepers’ created a barrier. Burgess (1984, p. 84) describes gatekeepers as “those individuals that have the power to grant or withhold access to people or situations for the purposes of research.” However, through the use of effective communication measures the focus groups were eventually finalised and were run with 27 Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers, in total, participating. The Ni-Vanuatu workers included came from various islands including Efate, Espiritu Santo, and Tanna\(^2\) (Appendix F). Hennink (2007, p.5) highlights that focus groups allow the attention to shift “away from the dominance of an interviewer to focus on generating a discussion between participants on certain issues.”

Hennink (2007, p. 67) points out that “[i]n some countries there exists a large number of regional or tribal languages, but also a national *lingua franca*, which is the common language between people from different regions.” Vanuatu is an example of such a country

---

\(^2\) Espiritu Santo is located in the north, Efate in central, and Tanna in the south of the Vanuatu archipelago. Efate is home to the capital, Port Vila, and Espiritu Santo is home to the second largest urban settlement, Luganville. Tanna is considered isolated and undeveloped comparatively speaking (Lindstrom 1990).
and the focus group participants could not speak English. However, the researcher has previously lived in Vanuatu for a year, and is fluent in Bislama which is the country’s \textit{lingua franca} and it was used to conduct the focus groups. Because the researcher has such a capacity, it allowed the focus groups to feel comfortable.

As the research is concerned with the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers, it is inherently cross-cultural in its analysis. Davidson and Tolich (2003) confirm that cross-cultural research is common in New Zealand, especially when considering the country’s growing cultural diversity; as a result, research often traverses cultural or ethnic boundaries and this has heightened ethical implications.

\textbf{Figure 5: The researcher with participants of focus group two.} Source: Personal Collection, 2010.
4.2.4 Ethical Considerations

Denscombe (2007) argues that ethical research needs to respect the rights and dignity of participants, avoid harming participants, and operate with honesty and integrity. To ensure that such ethics were adhered to throughout the research process, ethics approval was required from the University of Otago’s Human Ethics Committee. As the research deals with collecting personal data from temporary migrants and traverses cross-cultural boundaries it is considered highly sensitive, therefore, Ethics A approval was needed for the research to progress. Ethics A is the strictest form of ethics that can be approved at the University of Otago and its purpose is to ensure that the collection of significantly sensitive data is done in the most ethical manner possible.

In terms of the ethical position of the research, it was committed to contributing positively to the issues and lives of the Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers. Cloke (2002, p. 591) asserts that positive contributions are becoming less frequent within human geography academia, and as researchers are more concerned with personal career and financial advancement they are “too often breez[ing] into and breez[ing] out of research situations, with insufficient commitment to the people and issues concerned.” Therefore, the research attempts to create some form of reciprocity between the researcher and researched, thus allowing for a practical contribution to be made to assist the Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers (Cloke, 2002).

Sultana (2007) asserts that when conducting cross-cultural research it brings in different dynamics, in terms of insider-outsider and the politics of representation, and this can place the researcher in an ‘othered’ position. However, Sultana (2007) elaborates by noting that commonalities can be created through such things as ethnicity, gender, attire and the ability to engage in a common dialect, thus enabling bridges to be created and allowing participants to become more accepting. To allow such bridging to occur the researcher wore a tee-shirt with ‘Wan Smolbag’ written on it, this was the researcher’s previous place of
employment and is a well known community organisation in Vanuatu. As mentioned, the researcher can speak the lingua franca of Vanuatu and as a result, these two commonalities allowed gaps to be bridged and a greater acceptance by participants was experienced.

Before any data was collected key informant and focus group participants were informed of their rights and were made aware that their participation was voluntary. All participants were given an information sheet and were asked to sign consent forms before any recorded discussions took place. The information sheet and consent forms can be found in Appendix A and C respectively. This information was also translated into Bislama for the Ni-Vanuatu participants.

**4.3 Data Analysis**

Denscombe (2007) notes that there are several steps that need to be taken before data can be used for analysis and research purposes, Minichiello et al. (1990, p. 286) elaborate by stating that “the researcher has to identify common themes which link issues together, and ground the analysis in the informant’s understandings.” Davidson and Tolich (2003) detail these steps as the collection of data, as discussed, followed by data reduction, data organisation, and data interpretation. These steps are outlined below.

**4.3.1 Data Reduction**

Heen et al. (2009) point out that the analysis of qualitative data is recognised as a time consuming practice due to large quantities of data that is collected through extensive transcriptions from interviews. All interview and focus group transcriptions were, however, transcribed word for word. In some instances this was not possible when translating from Bislama to English, in such cases the most relevant terms and words were used as
replacements. Throughout the transcribing process, notes were also taken in reflection, especially when there were obvious variations within the conversations. Henn et al. (2009, p. 249) state that such practice is important because “hesitation and pauses in speech can be as telling as the actual words.” Once the reduction of data into written transcripts was completed it allowed for much easier organisation.

4.3.2 Data Organisation

After reducing the data into a more manageable form it was then organised around a number of themes derived from the literature review and reoccurring points made during the discussion by participants. This was done using the coding technique which is used to classify data by attaching labels to raw data. Strauss (1987, p. 27) notes that this is a very important process as “[t]he excellence of the research rests in large part on the excellence of the coding”. The first steps taken to code the data was to rearrange specific words, phrases and themes into a unit of analysis. By breaking the data down into analysis units it enabled the researcher to interpret the key informant and focus group participants’ ideas, thus allowing for translation into the relevant theoretical underpinnings of the research (Minichiello et al. 1990).

4.3.3 Data Interpretation

The final data analysis step was interpreting the data. This process patterns the data and enables concepts to be developed allowing the research to draw conclusions (Davidson and Tolich, 2003). Such conclusions were made while considering the aims and objectives of the research.
4.4 Reflections and Limitations

The research strategy employed faced a number of limitations that impeded the research process and these may affect the outcome of the results. Fortunately, the majority of these limitations were recognised at the inception of the research; therefore, measures were taken to mitigate obstructions.

One of the major and unforeseen limitations was the language barrier. As Hennink (2007, p. 66) notes “linguistic traditions vary between regions and it is common for different languages to be prominent in different regions.” Although the researcher is capable of speaking Bislama, the national language or *lingua franca* of Vanuatu, it is important to note that “Vanuatu is linguistically the world’s most diverse nation in terms of the number of actively spoken indigenous languages per head of population, with at least 80 local languages spoken by an average of only about 2500 speakers each” (Crowley 2000, p. 50). When conducting the focus groups, the researcher found that the participants were all from the same island in Vanuatu, Tanna, and could all speak the same local language. This meant that when questions were asked in Bislama the participants would sometimes discuss them in their local language before discussing them with the researcher in Bislama, which resulted in the loss of some information. However, the amount of time the participants spent speaking in their local language was minimal, and the researcher took into account the context of each situation and was satisfied that little important information was lost.

Another language limitation presented the researcher when the collected data needed to be transcribed. Hennink (2007, p. 66) notes that “time and resource constraints lead many research projects to conduct the tasks of translation and transcription simultaneously.” This method was employed to help reduce the amount of time and resources spent translating the data from Bislama to English.
Another limitation that confronted the research was the barrier of gatekeepers, as outlined earlier. When the researcher attempted to contact New Zealand’s Department of Labour, communication advisors acted as gatekeepers and it proved too difficult to gain access to key informants within the timeframe allocated for the field research. However, the researcher persisted with the gatekeepers and eventually was able to discuss the research over the phone with the desired key informant.

A final reflection that is important to note is that by having focused on Te Puke as a case study it means that obtaining data from only one area is not representative of other areas and it is often difficult to generalise from a specific case (Gray, 2004). Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers are located in other areas of New Zealand and this research does not represent such areas. However, the research intentionally focused on Te Puke and by doing so has filled a gap. Although this gap has been filled, there is still potential for similar research to be conducted in the future in other areas of New Zealand.

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter has supplied a summary and justification of the methods and techniques employed for the purpose of this research. The research focused on the case study of Te Puke, New Zealand and used qualitative methods to ensure a thorough understanding of the experiences of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, and Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers. The qualitative approach used two significant methods, semi-structured interviews, and focus groups to collect data. As a result of using various methods, triangulation was a tactic that naturally eventuated and was used to complement the results. Several data analysis techniques were then employed which allowed for conclusions to be drawn. The limitations that this research encountered were largely overcome with a combination of the methods outlined which enabled the research process
to be successful in its implementation. The important roles that these methods have played are illustrated by the forthcoming results chapters.
5 The Experiences of Ni-Vanuatu Temporary Workers in Te Puke, New Zealand

5.1 Introduction
The previous chapters have outlined contemporary literature on the topic, provided a contextual understanding of the research, and set out the methodological approach used. As a result, they have provided a basis on which to structure the findings.

This chapter presents an understanding of the Ni-Vanuatu workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers’ day-to-day experiences under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in Te Puke, New Zealand. The provision of such results is pertinent to this research as it allows clarification and illumination of the requirements set out in research objectives one and two.

The topics covered in this chapter, broadly speaking, include the settlement of the Ni-Vanuatu workers in Te Puke, the working experience, and cultural and behavioural issues. The forthcoming discussion provides detailed results related to these key areas while presenting an understanding of the experiences of the Ni-Vanuatu workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers.
5.2 Settling in Te Puke

It is important to understand the experiences of the Ni-Vanuatu workers while settling into Te Puke as it was their home throughout the 2010 season and the case study for this research. When the Ni-Vanuatu workers were asked about Te Puke, and if they enjoyed the town as a place to live and work, all of the focus groups responded unanimously and positively, a male from Focus Group 3 stated that:

*We have made some good friends, some of the Māori especially...[t]he people are very friendly. We like being in small towns like Te Puke, it’s more peaceful. We have also been able to meet some of the Islanders here, including Fijians, and Solomon Islanders. We have made more friends, and we feel like we are at home.*

This evidence would suggest that the workers are comfortable in Te Puke, however, it is important to note some underlying reasons for such positive reactions, and one of the most prominent is the workers’ connections with church groups. The Ni-Vanuatu workers talked openly and fondly of their links with the church, and when asked whether they went to church there was an overwhelming consensus in their response with all of them saying “Yes!” One women went on to say that “[w]hen we are in Vanuatu we all go to different churches, but when we are here we go to the Te Puke church3, it’s a good church” (Focus Group 1). Although the workers attend a number of different churches in Vanuatu, a human resources manager noted that prior to bringing workers to Te Puke it was made clear that “[w]e wouldn’t be able to take them all to the right churches because some are Catholic and others are different, and they told us that ‘We all worship one God, so we will go to any church that you take us to’” (Key Informant 1). Key Informant 2, a church representative, said “[g]oing to church is a key part of their lives...They are very friendly and lovely people, they are very willing to come along and be a part of our church.” Key Informant 6, an employer, noted that “[in] the community, especially in the church – there is this desire to help”. It was clear that the church representatives and community seemed pleased to have the workers included, and it is evident that being involved with the church was not
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3 The name of the particular church will remain anonymous.
only very important for the workers personally, but it has also been fundamental in helping them settle into the Te Puke community.

The Ni-Vanuatu workers believed that the locals were also welcoming and respected their presence. When the workers were asked if they liked going into the Te Puke town centre, and if the locals liked them, one male worker said that “[y]es, they like us. They always say hello, and even take us to their houses. Everyone here is really nice” (Focus Group 4). However, Key Informant 11, a representative of the Te Puke Police noted that some of the “public are threatened by them... possibly due to the colour of their skin or that they are going in groups.” Key Informant 6, an employer, mentioned that “New Zealanders have a fear of black people and if you meet a Black Ni-Vanuatu man at night, you get scared. He may be a very nice person but it is the fear of the unknown.” However, a Te Puke resident and Western Bay of Plenty District Council planner pointed out that it was largely in the “early days [that] people were a little afraid, now [it’s] fine because people are used to seeing them and they are here over a period of 9 to 11 months, so we are used to seeing them” (Key Informant 5). Although the Ni-Vanuatu workers were initially seen as a threat, the community became familiar with their presence.

The Ni-Vanuatu workers felt that the community and church were welcoming; however, they often mentioned that the major difficulty with settling in was the weather. The weather was something that came as a shock to the workers and they found it constantly difficult. One woman from Focus Group 2 provided evidence and stated that “[i]t is very cold, sometimes when we work we are cold. We have clothes that we have bought here but the biggest difference is definitely the cold.”

In summary, the evidence suggests that the workers found Te Puke a welcoming and pleasant town to be based in, and this was markedly aided by the presence of the church.
However, the weather did prove to be a hampering factor. The local community have grown familiar with the workers presence and felt that they have been a beneficial addition to the community. To further understand the Ni-Vanuatu workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers’ experiences, it would be useful to look at the time spent at work, and the array of experiences that work encompasses.

5.3 The Working Experience

The Ni-Vanuatu workers’ lives revolve around work while in Te Puke and the following results will cover the workers’ savings and costs, accommodation, and transportation. To provide a basic background understanding of the workers experiences in Te Puke, several broad questions were initially put to them. One of the first questions the researcher asked the Ni-Vanuatu focus groups was whether they liked the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. This question always gained an outright positive consensus from each focus group. When the researcher asked the Ni-Vanuatu workers whether they had had any problems with the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, a man from Focus Group 2 said “[n]o, this year it is very good. The people here have been trying their hardest over the past few years to make sure everything gets better, and it is.” Such positive comments were plentiful across the four focus groups. The workers would also often outline their roles and one woman noted “[s]ome of us work in grading, stacking, tray preparation, and I’m a cleaner, and sometimes I grade” (Focus Group 4). Although the workers were largely satisfied with the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and their jobs, they did highlight problem areas. Such areas include savings and costs, accommodation, and transportation related experiences.
5.3.1 Savings and Costs

The Ni-Vanuatu workers often spoke of their savings and costs, and the related issues. The workers all appreciated the opportunity to go to Te Puke and work. One woman from Focus Group 2 said that “once we found out that the R.S.E. scheme had started we saw it as a good opportunity to work and come and earn some Vatu because life in the islands is a little bit hard”. A man from the same group said “[i]t is good that we can come here and make money and then take it back to Vanuatu”.

The workers were also asked if they had financial goals, all the workers made it obvious they did and that it was of significant importance to them. All the members of Focus Group 2 individually noted what their goals were: “I want to buy a bus; pay for school fees; build my house; keep building my house – I’m using concrete. I’m paying for school fees and helping my family, we bought a bush cutter. I’m also building my house, we all have similar goals.”

Although the workers had goals, there were issues that were negatively affecting their savings goals. One of the most common issues for the workers was that they got frustrated when there was no work, and this was largely because of the weather, but they felt that this was unfair considering their contracts. A man from Focus Group 2 described the situation:

*I haven’t been able to work enough. Sometimes even when it is sunny they don’t have work. I want my one day off a week, but no more, as it says in our contract, we don’t want to be on holiday. At the moment we haven’t been working, not even in the pack house, there has not been any work... Just the amount of work hasn’t been enough and we came here to save but we struggle in this situation.*

Another man from Focus Group 2 said that “[w]hen there is no work we just sit and we still pay for transport and food and so on.” Key Informant 6, an employer and horticulture industry representative discussed their contracts and said that if you “sign a contract for
three months then you can only stay that long. They can’t be extended to six months. Contracts are signed in Vanuatu for either six months or three months”. The Ni-Vanuatu workers noted that “some people come for three months and some for six months, doing three months is not enough, you can’t make enough money in this time” (Focus Group 2). One woman from Focus Group 2 provided a possible alternative to allow the workers to make additional capital by saying that “[p]ersonally I think that we shouldn’t have to sign a contract with just one employer because when they don’t have any work we don’t work. So if other companies need workers for one day we could go and do that job, rather than being here and waiting for our pack house to get more work.”

The Ni-Vanuatu workers also outlined the costs with taxes and exchanging their money, thus further reducing their total savings. One man highlighted this issue and said that what “makes it even harder is that when we change our money into Vatu it becomes worth less, it’s very expensive” (Focus Group 1). All four focus groups mentioned exchange and remittance related costs. A male from Focus Group 3 explained the issues in further depth:

> When we send money back it’s too expensive and we don’t get a lot for it. We do need a R.S.E. government rate; it’s a problem that the Vanuatu should fix, not New Zealand... The government gets so much money from us R.S.E. workers but we are all investing in Vanuatu so it’s only fair that we get an equal or special rate. We help the government but they are not helping us. We make a little bit of money but the government makes a lot, it’s not fair.

This result seems to suggest that the Ni-Vanuatu workers are being doubled taxed by the Vanuatu government upon return. When discussing this point with a representative from the Department of Labour, the informant was clearly worried:

> I don’t know about that, I am now concerned because our inter-agency understanding is that the [Vanuatu] government department doesn’t have a double tax. I will take this to the Vanuatu high-commission to find out, but when the R.S.E. scheme was first implemented I asked the high-commission if they were being double taxed but they said “no they are not being taxed” (Key Informant 4).
A woman from Focus Group 3 added further evidence of a potential double tax and pointed out that “[w]e get taxed more than anyone else in Vanuatu, so it’s not really fair for R.S.E. workers”. The workers suggested that they have to pay costs to exchange and remit their money, as well as an extra tax enforced by the Vanuatu government, something that they should not have to do. However, it is important to note that this issue may have been lost in translation, but it is of considerable importance to highlight nonetheless. The Ni-Vanuatu workers also have to pay tax while they are working in New Zealand, and Key Informant 6, an employer said that “[t]he R.S.E. workers are on very low tax rate – 17%, and last year it was 16.7%. They are on a special tax code, a NSW tax code”, the Key Informant went on to say that although they are paying tax they “aren’t entitled to any tax returns, which I think is quite unfair.” The issues related to tax will be discussed further in the forthcoming chapter. To further recognise the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers’ it is necessary to explain their accommodation situations.

5.3.2 Accommodation

The accommodation that the Ni-Vanuatu workers reside in throughout their time in Te Puke is usually occupied by horticulture industry workers and is often within close proximity to pack houses and orchards where the workers are employed. Other workers, generally travelling workers on differing visas; often share accommodation with the Ni-Vanuatu workers and will also be working in the horticulture industry.

Before further discussion, it is important to note that two specific and prominent accommodation sites in Te Puke were used to understand the experiences of the Ni-Vanuatu workers lifestyles. One was a large site that Key Informant 3, the accommodation representative described as a “complex [that] houses up to 350 R.S.E. workers”, the key informant went on to note that “I have been here for three years and in that time we have
probably had 300 or 400 Ni-Vanuatu workers come through, most stay anywhere from 3 to 6 months”. This particular site was located a few kilometres east of Te Puke’s town centre and was made up of one large building that contained bunk rooms and common areas with some cabins scattered around the large building (Figure 6). For clarification purposes and to ensure anonymity, the larger facility depicted in Figure 6 will henceforth be labelled the ‘Complex’. It is also important to point out that the focus group sessions were all run at the Complex as this was easier, simply because of the quantity of Ni-Vanuatu workers present there.

![Complex accommodation facility](image)

**Figure 6:** ‘The Complex accommodation facility.’ Source: Personal Collection, 2010.

The other site was considerably smaller and was situated in the centre of Te Puke near a large pack house that employed a significant number of the Ni-Vanuatu workers. This site was more of a general campsite that supplied campervans and accommodated for workers as well as other users. Both sites differed from each other considerably. Again, for clarification and anonymity, the second site will be labelled ‘the Campsite’ (Figure 7).
One of the major issues with the accommodation that was made clear throughout the results was that the costs were high. It was cheaper for the workers to stay at the Campsite in comparison to the Complex. Key Informant 12, an employer and horticulture industry representative noted that the Campsite is “not particularly salubrious but [the workers] wanted it because it is cheaper, I would rather they stay at [the Complex] because it is cleaner, but they said themselves, they want cheap.” Key Informant 9, the Campsite representative said that the workers “say that it cost[s] too much to be elsewhere. We are the cheapest and they want to earn as much as they can. They don’t want to spend more money on accommodation when they know that with us, they can get it half price. That is the problem.” When discussing the issue with Focus Group 2 one man noted that “It would be better if the accommodation [cost] was standard. If the price and everything was standardised, that would be better.” Key Informant 12, an employer of Ni-Vanuatu workers explained that “we spend a lot of our time, trying to screw all of the local people down on the accommodation prices, or vehicle prices, so we can maximize their income potential.”

Figure 7: ‘The Campsite accommodation facility.’ Source: Personal Collection, 2010.
When discussing the costs of the accommodation with an horticulture industry representative and whether businesses are making a lot of money from the workers, Key Informant 7, a New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated executive team member declared:

It is the same price for both R.S.E. workers and other seasonal workers. Although with R.S.E. workers, there is a little discount due to employers negotiating it down. But some accommodation providers take the opportunity of trying to increase its profits which we do not approve of.

To further compare the two accommodation facilities it would be wise to allow a closer look at the accommodation provided at the Complex. Figure 8 illustrates a standard dorm room where most Ni-Vanuatu workers reside when living at the Complex in Te Puke. There are ten bunk beds to a room, and blankets are draped over the sides of the bunks.

*Figure 8: A typical bunk room at the Complex accommodation facility.* Source: Personal Collection, 2010.
Although there are differences in the costs of accommodation, one of the strengths that the Complex offers that the Campsite does not, is an educational element. The Complex representative said that the accommodation facility works alongside a voluntary church group called “Freedom of the Pacific Trust which is aimed at education and aid for the workers, not only Ni-Vanuatu workers but for all the R.S.E. workers that come here... [T]hose education aids have been a big help here this year” (Key Informant 3). The Ni-Vanuatu workers elaborated and a male from Focus Group 2 revealed that “[a]t the weekends we have been watching Wan Smolbag educational videos like Love Patrol. Last weekend we went to Auckland for a trip which also doubled as a celebration of Vanuatu Independence, thirty years of Independence now.”

A further comparison that can be made is that the Complex has banned drinking alcohol on the premises, whereas the Campsite does not impose such rules. When the workers were asked what they thought of the alcohol ban, a man from Focus Group 4 outlined the situation:

*It’s good because we save more. When people are allowed to drink they say they will have one tin but they have more than that. Some other places have banned drinking too, last year they may not have had a ban but now more of them do. Sometimes people will go outside and drink in the orchards and then come back drunk, that’s another reason why they blocked it.*

By understanding the situation the Ni-Vanuatu workers face with their accommodation facilities it has allowed a comparison of two facilities, and provided illumination of the related issues. Other issues that the Ni-Vanuatu workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers’ made evident were associated with transportation.
5.3.3 Transportation

When the workers from Focus Group 2 were asked about their experiences with transportation and getting into Te Puke, initially there was a group consensus suggesting that it was fine, and one male said “[w]e can get there, it’s easy”. However, it was clear that the Ni-Vanuatu workers did not want to sound as though they were complaining, they paused and then the group started talking in their *lingua franca*, and then one woman said “[s]ometimes we call the taxi to come and get us, but it is expensive. Sometimes we wait for the service bus from here; it costs three dollars each way”. Focus Group 1 made further links with transport and costs with one man saying “[i]t would be good if we were close to work, but we’re not and it’s costing us a lot more to be far from work. If we had the opportunity we would stay in a place closer to work”.

As Focus Groups 2 became increasingly comfortable with the researcher, the Ni-Vanuatu workers became progressively open about the issues and one woman explained:

*In the first year they provided vans that we could use and it was easier but there were too many accidents so now we all use the bus, it’s not a bad thing but because we are so far from work it makes it hard. It’s hard to get to everything we need, like accessing the super market, and out here we are a long way from Te Puke. It’s reducing our freedom to an extent.*

Focus Group 3 provided further details on the issue of access to the super market, with a male participant noting that:

*Some places supply food but not here, we need to go and buy it, it is just a case of managing it each week. The hardest thing is that we can only go once a week and that is a transporting issue... at the weekends when everyone is busy, and people want to buy food, it can be hard because we have to wait for someone to drive us, and they might go to a meeting, so we wait, and then they might be busy again, so we wait.*
Therefore, it is obvious that the Ni-Vanuatu workers did have qualms with the transport, but to better understand the situation it would be wise to gain a perspective from employers. Key Informant 12 outlined the situation by noting the responsibility that the employer has and said “[w]e take them to work, bring them back home and we take them shopping. They have got a lot of freedom.” Key Informant 1, also an employer said that they make sure that the workers get to and from work and the supermarket and elaborated to say that “[t]heir friends come over and they can go to places. Only thing is that they can’t freely go out at any time to anywhere because of the busses, but that keeps them out of harm’s way.” Key Informant 2, a church representative noted that because of the “absence of a vehicle, they cannot go around as much and constantly have transport problems - some of them have not seen a lot of New Zealand in their time here.”

In summary, it is evident that the Ni-Vanuatu workers have difficulties with the accommodation and transportation. Accommodation issues are primarily related to the costs and the restrictions due to their locality of the facilities. In terms of transportation provisions, the major issues also include costs and the distance from town. More importantly, because the Ni-Vanuatu workers do not have access to their own vehicles, their freedom is restricted and they are reliant on service providers for basic transportation requirements. As a result, these issues affect the experiences of the workers, horticulture industry representatives and service providers involved with the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. To further understand the issues experienced under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, it is important to shed light on the cultural differences faced by the workers and how acclimatising to them has created behavioural issues and affected the workers, the horticulture industry representatives, and service providers.
5.4 Cultural Differences and Behavioural Issues

The evidence suggests that Ni-Vanuatu workers had to deal with a considerably different culture in New Zealand to what they are used to in Vanuatu. Cultural differences played a significant role in the experiences of the workers and these differences often lead to behavioural issues on behalf of the workers. The forthcoming evidence provides an illumination of such cultural differences and behavioural issues.

Key Informant 2, a church representative noted that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme “gives a great opportunity to people from Vanuatu to experience a different culture.” However, Key Informant 3, a representative of the Complex accommodation facility, noted that the cultural experience is complicated and that the “[f]irst year was pretty difficult all around [as] they [were] not used to New Zealand culture, climate, conditions, food, and housing, so it was quite a difficult time.” Key Informant 12, an employer of the Ni-Vanuatu workers went as far to say that the workers are:

\begin{quote}
\textit{too culturally different, and it’s going to be a number of years more before they are going to cope culturally in our environment, I think it’s too different and at the moment, we are asking them to make too much of a shift. Even for them to go from Tanna to Vila it’s a significant shift, so to come from Tanna to here, it’s too much. They are too frustrating to work with.}
\end{quote}

When Key Informant 9, the Campsite representative, was initially asked by the researcher about the Ni-Vanuatu workers and claimed that:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Out of all of them, they are the ones who give us the most problems. They are awfully messy, they don’t clean up after themselves. They like to drink and we have to watch them when they drink. They are polite enough though, but we just have to watch them a little bit more than anybody else.}
\end{quote}

Key Informant 12 elaborated on the Ni-Vanuatu workers hygiene and detailed examples with the researcher, and the following conversation transpired:
R: Can you provide examples of the workers hygiene practices?

K.I.: When they left there were dishes in the sink, nothing had been cleaned, there were wet towels left behind, and I made some of our naughty boys go and clean it.

R: Naughty?

K.I.: Yeah, I made some of the naughty Tongans or Ni-Vans go and clean it up, and then the cleaners went in and they said they had never seen anything so disgusting and vile about where they lived, it was just vile.

This example further illustrates cultural differences, or potentially a lack of awareness on behalf of the Ni-Vanuatu workers with respect to appropriate practice in New Zealand. Cultural differences are entrenched throughout the results and can often be linked to related behavioural issues with the Ni-Vanuatu workers. These behavioural issues include male dominance and sexual issues, alcohol and how access to and consumption of it has affected working conditions, and lastly the effects on the workers’ reputation and employability.

5.4.1 Culture and Hierarchy

The differences in the social hierarchy in New Zealand were particularly difficult for the Ni-Vanuatu men in Te Puke. The following excerpt from a discussion with Focus Group 2 highlights the essence of the issue:

R: “Does Vanuatu have a patriarchal social system?”

F.G.: The men in the group all nodded their heads and repeatedly said “Yes”.

The conversation continued,

R: “[b]ut when you come to New Zealand is it different?”

Male from F.G.: “Yes, it is a cultural difference. In Vanuatu the man holds the authority but we see that when we come here it is different, here the women are the same as men.”

R: “[d]o you think this is good?”

This gained a few slightly awkward “yeses” from the group, “it’s good.”
The Ni-Vanuatu men further illustrated the difficulty of dealing with the social structure while in Te Puke, one man from Focus Group 3 said:

> It can be a little bit hard when women are telling you what to do and you can get a little bit cross with them, but it is because Vanuatu is different and we are not used to that. At home men can do whatever they want, whenever, but when you come here some women are in higher positions and you cannot do what you want... When we come here we need to respect the rules of New Zealand and listen to women. In Vanuatu it is different, but when we are here we are respectful.

Employers and accommodation representatives often provided evidence that exemplified the hierarchical structure of the Ni-Vanuatu culture. The researcher discussed this issue with Key Informant 3:

> I know that in Vanuatu it is a male dominated society, have you seen any evidence of that? Oh yeah, for sure. You get the young guys here having the young girls cleaning their rooms, washing their clothes and it is just an accepted part of who they are, I don’t interfere with that, that’s the way they live.

Key Informant 9, a representative of the Campsite, provided very similar evidence and noted that the Ni-Vanuatu men “expect the women to do everything; they do rely heavily on the women.” Not only did the Ni-Vanuatu workers experience in Te Puke render difficult because of the workers cultural differences, but it was also creating changes in the workers cultural in Vanuatu.

Further discussions with the focus groups provided insights into what the cultural experiences in Te Puke meant for the workers, and whether they would see changes when they returned to Vanuatu as a result. When the researcher asked “[d]o you think the woman will go back to Vanuatu and feel that they are equal after their experience here?” there were a number of interesting, and mixed responses:
Yeah, yes, it has become a lesson for everyone and it is making changes in Vanuatu too. It’s good but not too much; it’s good for the women but not the men in Vanuatu. (Focus Group 1)

No, it will be the same in Vanuatu. So we just change between each culture. (Focus Group 2)

When we go back to Vanuatu it is back to the normal way of life, but I think because of the experiences of women in New Zealand, women are feeling as though they should be respected more and in some cases, there are examples of women getting closer to the men, but they are still not equal. (Focus Group 4)

A number of key informants discussed the cultural exchange that was occurring as a result of the workers experiences in New Zealand. Key Informant 12, an employer, outlined the situation:

The question to ask is “Is this going to change that person’s culture?” it will happen over time anyway due to colonisation but it will happen at a much faster rate now... But we are changing the face of their culture and I’m not sure they are happy about that? And we have not told them “We are going to change the face of your culture far faster” but I’m not sure if that is what they want. And I don’t think they have thought about that.

Key Informant 10, a Te Puke ward councillor, also mentioned the issue and noted that there needs to be work done in Vanuatu as well as New Zealand to look after the workers. The informant said “I’m not too sure if the Ni-Vanuatu workers’ taking our culture back is good; I don’t know how helpful it will be for them...I think there needs to be [as] much support for the workers in Vanuatu as there is here.” Key Informant 3, an accommodation provider also mentioned the social issues but highlighted them on community and family level by saying that:

I can see a lot of marriage break ups as a result of coming out here and so I’m not sure how that goes with the communities back home...I have heard and seen the results of family bust ups...Having 6 months away from teenage children, that can’t be that good. It’s a long time. I mean I sit here and watch them on the phone and at times there is often a lot of shouting and tears and I think is it worth it?
It was clear that cultural differences and experiences played a role in the workers’ experiences while in Te Puke. The horticulture industry representatives and service providers’ also have concerns due to exposure of the New Zealand culture. The experience has created changes in the workers understanding of culture, and these changes can be reflected through the cultural exchange that is taking place when the workers return to Vanuatu. The differences in culture clearly affect the workers understanding of the New Zealand culture, and this affects the behaviour of the workers.

5.4.2 Sexual Behaviour

This section details the sexual behaviour between the Ni-Vanuatu men and women while in Te Puke. The affects of Ni-Vanuatu hierarchical cultural also affected the sexual behaviour of the workers in Te Puke as the results suggested that the women were inferior to the men. Key Informant 12, a employer, said that the women were controlled by the men to such a great extent that “[t]he women seem to defer to the men at all times, even when making decisions, any decision, where they are going to eat, or whether they should get drunk.” Key Informant 12 elaborated on this point and stated that:

*I have a strong suspicion, based on my gut and various observations, that sexual cultural issues are different, and I wonder how much power the women have when the man says that he wants sex, I’m not sure about that, I don’t know, and I only get snippets of stories, but I wonder what their ability to say no is.*

Key Informant 4, a Department of Labour representative, strengthens the assumptions made by Key Informant 12 by noting that although it is “not just the Ni-Vanuatu workers, there have been incidents were there has been sexual activity against the law.” Key Informant 2, a church representative, provided a specific example of such activity and said that “[l]ast year, we had an instance where a woman who had come to this church had been raped, a Ni-Vanuatu woman, and she had been raped by a person from within her community.”
Due to the provision of such examples, the researcher discussed the issue with the Ni-Vanuatu workers and asked if they were aware of such abuse. The workers were understandably protective in their response and Focus Group 4 initially discussed the issue in their *lingua franca*, then one man said that “[y]es, there is some sexual abuse…But not us, we don’t.” The workers did not elaborate. The researcher understood that acquiring such information was unlikely and Key Informant 4, the Department of Labour representative, pointed out why the workers may have been unlikely to reveal such information by noting that they will often try and deal with their own issues through “a hierarchical process that...sometimes protects incidents, but the major ones do come out.” Through the provision of such evidence, it is apparent that the hierarchical nature of the Ni-Vanuatu culture transcends cultural boundaries. This is exemplified through the example of a rape, where a Ni-Vanuatu man has used his higher social rank to engage in an illegal activity while in Te Puke.

Other sexually related incidents were bought to the fore by the key informants, and they often noted that the Ni-Vanuatu workers regularly engaged in sexual conduct, whether it was illegal or not. Key Informant 9, the Campsite representative, noted that “out of all of them, they like to mate. The only problem is that they leave their condoms all over the place.” The Ni-Vanuatu women’s sexual behaviour was also mentioned a number of times by key informants. Key Informant 12, an employer, indentified that “a woman asked if we could procure an abortion because they had become pregnant to another R.S.E. worker”. Key Informant 12 went on to reveal some alarming evidence:

*I know that there was a lot of sex taking place, and I have a strong suspicion that some women were making money out of it this year. Well at least they are getting paid for it, it’s probably better that they are getting paid for it, and I guess it’s a better business enterprise than giving it away for free. I think the women used that money to pay for their belongings to go into containers and the shipping fees. This is my strong suspicion but again based on bits of things I hear.*
This result is significant, especially considering the hierarchical nature of the Ni-Vanuatu culture. It is a considerable shift in terms of the workers cultural norms and this is a point that Key Informant 12 also made, saying that “It’s interesting to see that the women now have some power with that, it has turned around.” Key Informant 12 went on to note that, in comparison to other Pacific Islanders, and Ni-Vanuatu workers, this type of behaviour was:

\[H\]appening with the Ni-Vanuatu women only, most definitely, and it is only one group of them, the ones from Tanna. All the issues that we have [are] from the people from Tanna. We are going to deliberately reduce the number of people we have coming from Tanna, I don’t want them back... They left the places in a pig sty, the way they left the places was just obscene, the way they lived, and the level of cleanliness or lack thereof, it was just vile.

The results identified, with regard to the Ni-Vanuatu workers sexual behaviour, are interesting as they exemplify a broad range of issues, from rape to prostitution. This is interesting because it illustrates a significantly contrasting behaviour as it places men in a submissive position while women assume control. Again this suggests that cultural influences are, to a degree, indirectly responsible for such behaviour. Another major issue that the workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers’ experienced as difficult, was the access to, and consumption of alcohol.

### 5.4.3 Alcohol

Issues related to alcohol were prominent throughout the results collected, and a significant proportion of the horticulture industry representatives and service providers’ discussed these issues. Key Informant 3, an accommodation provider, said that “past issues have all been based around work issues and unfortunately vices, they find themselves attracted to alcohol, and gambling here, and everything that goes with that.” Key Informant 2, a church representative, believed that the workers were attracted to such vices because:
There are a few things which are difficult to gain access to [in Vanuatu] - for instance, alcohol, bars and pubs and things like that. When they come here, that is all readily available and when they mix with people from work, they invite them to pubs and all. They do not have safe guards and are a little naïve. They can quite easily mix up in bad situations - they can get drunk and that can lead to repercussions.

As the workers were able to easily access alcohol Key Informant 4, a Recognised Seasonal Employer policy manager, noted that “alcohol is often all compliance teams’ deal with it”. Key Informant 3, an accommodation provider, said that “[a]s soon as they hop on that, they become a different beast and it doesn’t take them long, 2 or 3 cans of beer.” The informant went on to say that “in our first year we often talked about not having them back...because the alcohol related issues just were huge.” Key Informant 6, an employer, explained an example of a previous alcohol related issue, saying that “[i]n 2009, by half way through the season, we lost half of one of our Ni-Vanuatu teams due to alcohol related issues because we had to send half of them home.”

Key Informant 6 went on and pointed out the difficulties with the situation, noting that “[a]lcohol is an issue, but how do we tell a person “You cannot drink”? That is against their human rights.” To try and reduce the problems, Key Informant 3, the Complex service provider said that they had banned alcohol consumption at the accommodation facility. Staff at the Complex were also working with the employers to control the alcohol issue “because when they go to work hung over there is no productivity, so they are also onboard with that, and it is really, really helpful” (Key Informant 3).

Although alcohol was definitely an issue that affected the workers, Key Informant 3 elaborated noted that the issue is now not as significant by saying that “[a]t night they would fool around and make a bit of a den [in the orchard] where they would go and drink, but they have curbed that. Now they are actually a joy to have around.” It is clear that there are issues with the workers, and their access to, and consumption of alcohol. This,
combined with other behavioural issues, as outlined, has meant that employers have become concerned with employing Ni-Vanuatu workers in the future.

5.4.4 Ni-Vanuatu Workers’ Future.

The Ni-Vanuatu workers' behavioural issues have had a detrimental effect on the workers, horticulture industry representatives and, service providers working collectively under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. The provision of such results is important for this research and the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme because Ni-Vanuatu workers make up the highest percentage of Recognised Seasonal Employer workers coming to New Zealand. Key Informant 4, a representative from the Department of Labour, pointed this out and said that:

*Ni-Vanuatu workers are the most here, this is because of the Approval Principle Programme that was piloted using Ni-Vanuatu workers [before the Recognised Seasonal Employer policy was implemented] and employers have been loyal to Vanuatu.*

Therefore, not only are Ni-Vanuatu workers important to the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme but the horticulture industry has maintained a loyal relationship with them due to their longevity with the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and previous pilot policies. However, because of the issues discussed, this loyalty is beginning to subside. Consequently, employers are consciously looking to reduce the amount of Ni-Vanuatu workers that they employ. Employers are also specifying particular workers that they are seeking to avoid. The results have already noted that the workers from Tanna are unlikely to gain reemployment with Key Informant 12, a large employer of Ni-Vanuatu workers. Another employer, Key Informant 6, also noted that Ni-Vanuatu women will not be considered for future employment.
Key Informant 6 has already actively started to reduce the number of Ni-Vanuatu women employed because “we struggled to motivate the women, they were very hard to get on board and make it happen... Some of them were the nicest people on earth but were just slow to start and didn’t have the drive”. The informant added that in the 2008 we “had had 116 [Ni-Vanuatu] men and 89 women... but in 2009 we dropped down to 24 men and in 2010 to 22 men...we didn’t have any women.” Not only was there a significant reduction in the number of Ni-Vanuatu workers in general, but after the first year the Ni-Vanuatu women specifically, did not return to work for this employer.

Although some employers had simply reduced the number of Ni-Vanuatu workers they employed to reduce the issues with them, other employers provided alternative solutions to reducing the issues with Ni-Vanuatu workers. Key Informant 1 and claimed that:

\[
\text{I definitely think recruiting from a community is better as they all know each other...[and they] feel that by coming here to New Zealand they are representing their village so they will work together to ensure there are few problems.}
\]

Key Informant 6 added that “I think if you have got too many from one nationality it is detrimental to the programme.” Therefore, employers are changing their methods to try and get what they need from the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. Employers are also gaining a gradual and better understanding of the Ni-Vanuatu culture and how to make the most of their Ni-Vanuatu employers. Key Informant 4, the Department of Labour representative, said that:

\[
\text{Most employers are mixing up their basket. Employers will spread their risk so that if there are issues within a specific nation they are not too tied down by the workers they have...I have seen the results of employers diversifying; all over the country this is taking place.}
\]

The results suggest that because the policy is still relatively young, there is a lot to learn to ensure that it is used in an effective manner. As the policy matures, so to do the horticulture
industry representatives and service providers, as they are able to tease out teething issues experienced under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. The Ni-Vanuatu workers are in a similar position, and as they continue to experience working in Te Puke they will mature to further understand New Zealand’s culture and behavioural expectations. Key Informant 3, an accommodation provider, made a particular comment which closely illustrated this by stating that “over the last two years not only have they improved a lot, companies have improved a lot in understanding them, we have improved a lot in understanding how they live, and they have improved a lot in understating how things work here.”

The results have provided some evidence that suggests that the Ni-Vanuatu workers are in fact getting better at dealing with these difficulties. Key Informant 6, an employer, noted that in every year preceding 2010, Ni-Vanuatu workers had often been linked with ill discipline; however, “In 2010 we haven’t had any discipline issues. I don’t think I have issued one letter of warning this year to any of the Ni-Vanuatu workers.” Key Informant 12, another employer, made an important link between the issues and cultural awareness:

This year and last year we have not had the range of sexual exploit stories as we did in the first and I think this is because those people come back and understand a bit more about the culture and expectation here.

An interesting point to illuminate in relation to these findings is that a woman from Focus Group 2 said that “there were discussions in the villages and the Chiefs talked strongly about [the issues] and that it needs to stop happening...The Chiefs raised the possibility of punishments and the issues have become much better since then.” Therefore, a potential association could be made with the discussions from village Chiefs’ back in Vanuatu and the positive behavioural changes mentioned, but are these changes too late?
In summary, it is clear that the Ni-Vanuatu workers have struggled with adapting to New Zealand’s culture and this has indirectly affected their behaviour. The Ni-Vanuatu workers’ have an engrained social hierarchy which has been reflected in the men’s actions which, in one particular case, has led to a breach of the law. The results have suggested that the Ni-Vanuatu workers often partake in unhygienic and overt sexual activity. The Ni-Vanuatu women have even been portrayed as having sold sex to Ni-Vanuatu male workers, thus resulting in a contradiction to the Ni-Vanuatu cultural norm. Access to, and consumption of alcohol was also highlighted as being another damaging issue. The combination of these issues has meant that horticulture industry representatives have had to make changes to the way they operate under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. Such changes have meant that workers’ have experienced a reduction in their independence and difficulties with access to certain amenities. The issues have also meant that horticulture industry representatives and service providers’ perceptions of Ni-Vanuatu workers have altered as the workers are not considered as loyal as initially assumed. Ni-Vanuatu workers have also adapted over time to a number of difficulties that have proven to be detrimental to their reputation. But it may be too late for the workers to turn these reputations around as employers seem content with employing reactionary methods, such as diversification of employment, to overcome issues that appear to be culturally inherent with employing Ni-Vanuatu workers under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter has presented an understanding of the Ni-Vanuatu workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers’ day-to-day experiences while working under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in Te Puke. In doing so, the chapter has covered the experiences with respect to settling in Te Puke, the working experience, and cultural differences and the related behavioural issues.
The research found that the workers settled in Te Puke with little difficulty, however, there were a number of complications for the workers in terms of the accommodation and transportation provided. The workers also struggled with adapting to New Zealand’s cultural environment and this indirectly affected their behaviour which is beginning to have repercussions in terms of their future employment in Te Puke. As a result, horticulture industry representatives and service providers’ have dealt with the related issues that affect their operations while working under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. The next chapter presents findings that focus on the experiences of regulation and processes of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme.
6 Regulation, Implementation, and the Future of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme

6.1 Introduction

This chapter reports the results with respect to the third objective by outlining the efficiency and effectiveness of the regulation, implementation, and future of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. Consequently, it highlights the evidence provided by key informants in Te Puke regarding employment related issues, the horticulture industry and government relationship, and changes, challenges, and the future of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme.

6.2 Background of the Implementation of Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme

Before revealing specific results, this section will provide a background understanding of the implementation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, largely hailed as a success by the majority of key informants. Key Informant 7, the Chief Executive of a prominent horticulture industry organisation said that “the experience has been very positive so far.” Key Informant 2 elaborated on the positives:

*I think the scheme is really a good one. I think if it’s done well, it gives a great opportunity to people from Vanuatu... I think it’s an excellent initiative and its smart move to increase the workforce, especially at this time and in places such as Te Puke. So it’s a win-win situation if it’s done well.*
Key Informant 4 also noted that “[i]t is a good programme, especially because of the aid it provides, and the government is aware of that.” Although the key informants believed that the policy is working well, they also pointed out impediments. Key Informant 12, a Recognised Seasonal Employer of Ni-Vanuatu workers provided further insight and noted that it:

*Is an excellent programme [but] there is a lot to be done to improve its timeliness and the speed at which things are enacted, and I have to respect that it is only a few years old and so it’s going to take time for everyone to bed it in, but it is becoming more efficient and effective.*

Key Informant 2 also indicated that it will get better with time and said “I think it’s just a case of trying to learn about the issues that the Ni-Vanuatu workers have and putting that across to the employers to find solutions, and that will take time.” Key Informant 4, a Department representative expressed further analysis of the schemes implementation and said that “[i]t’s all trial and error; we have to build as we go. However, we can only change the process once we experience problems. So this is continual and we need to make these changes to ensure R.S.E. isn’t bought into disrepute.”

Although there seem to be concerns with parts of Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme’s implementation, key informants emphasise that the scheme is a work in progress as those involved learn how to apply it more effectively and efficiently over time. However, to thoroughly assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the scheme, it would be wise to exemplify some specific successes and issues presented in Te Puke. The next section will outline employment complications under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme.
6.3 Employment Issues under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme

The most significant employment issues for the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme were the difficulties with the recruitment of Ni-Vanuatu workers and the application of New Zealand’s employment law. Recruitment issues will firstly be highlighted followed by employment law complexities.

6.3.1 Recruitment of Ni-Vanuatu Workers

The recruitment process was identified as being difficult, largely because of the issues involved in employers acquiring an Agreement to Recruit from the Department of Labour in New Zealand, and accessing workers in Vanuatu. Key Informant 12, an employer of Ni-Vanuatu workers, noted the difficulties with the timing of the Recognised Seasonal Employer recruitment process and said that:

*We have to have our Agreement [to Recruit] in by September but [the Department of Labour] won’t make a decision by November...Last year I heard back at the end of November and a week later I was flying out to Vanuatu...It just takes time, but it’s just too slow at the moment, way too slow.*

Key Informant 12 continued and outlined that because of the timing issues it made it:

*Difficult to estimate the number of workers we need to fill the employment gap and if I have called it wrong, and I actually need more workers than I originally asked for, then I’m going to need to do the whole process over again, and I’ll run out of time.*

As a result, such issues can affect the number of workers that the employer will receive. However, Key Informant 4, a Recognised Seasonal Employer manager and Department representative provided a government perspective on the recruitment process and explained that:
The [Recognised Seasonal Employer] policy seeks to ensure that employers can plan out their employment process; we know that it is just a plan; we don’t hold them to it. Their projections could be well out, but they can reduce their numbers at any time and we will give them that, and they have the capability to reduce the numbers and apply for more if it shows that there is more [fruit] to be harvested. But it is an up and down thing and we will work with the industry so that they get the numbers when they want.

These results suggest a lack of communication between employers and the government as they essentially contradict each other with regard to the recruitment issues. Key Informant 4 noted that recruitment is increasingly difficult because the current labour climate is “an up and down thing”, and Key Informant 12 elaborated:

[B]ecause our unemployment is currently high it will go down at some stage and then the number of R.S.E.s will need to rise respectively...[Therefore,] we will need to control the R.S.E. worker population, which is fine as long as [the Department of Labour] can turn that tap off and on.

Another issue expressed was the difficulty involved with recruitment in Vanuatu, or as Key Informant 6 expressed “importing and exporting people”. As mentioned, Key Informant 12 travelled to Vanuatu once an Agreement to Recruit had been processed, and this is because the informant recruited workers in Vanuatu on behalf of the business rather than using a recruitment agent. When discussing the reasons behind this decision, the following conversation transpired:

R: So you are your own recruiter?

K.I.: Definitely, we did have a recruiter in Vanuatu but the process was just too difficult...Some of [businesses] go themselves; a lot of them are going themselves. That is becoming more popular from the people I know.

Key Informant 1, an employer in Te Puke, exemplified this and said that “I now go over to Vanuatu to do the recruitment instead of using an agent because it became too difficult...[W]e go out to an island in Vanuatu and recruit ourselves and bring back a community”. Key Informant 6 pointed out that recruitment was previously “working well for [Vanuatu], they had a really good recruitment structure in 2008, and in 2009 it was still
pretty good, but this year it was hopeless” Key Informant 6 continued and exemplified the
difficulties faced during the 2010 season:

\[\text{We would ask for these 10 people, but they would say ‘we can only give you 4 of}
\text{those and we will find another 6’...but we’d say ‘if you can’t get those 10, we don’t}
\text{want anyone’... My feeling was that there was some political play and the Vanuatu}
\text{government wants to rotate who comes onto the programme.}\]

Key Informant 12 elaborated:

\[\text{Vanuatu is a story in itself...the problem is that is that they are not consistent, it’s}
\text{hugely frustrating, and to try and get everything done within the time frame is}
\text{difficult, it’s just exceptionally frustrating to go through the processes.}\]

Key Informant 12 added that the Ni-Vanuatu people “rip you off, they ask for a fee for
everything... The system is just so corrupt, it’s dreadful. I don’t trust it”. Key Informant 1
exemplified such corruption and said that when they stared to recruit themselves from a
particular community “[t]hey started asking us for money and gifts...[But] that money and
gifts are not going to the community or to the schools - it is going straight to the Chiefs and
the Chiefs Council.” Therefore, employers are growing apprehensive about recruiting from
the archipelago. Key Informant 12 identified evidence of this:

\[\text{I [would] prefer to move away from Vanuatu but we already have some people we}
\text{like who are working there, so we are stuck. Vanuatu is so slow. Tonga is better, the}
\text{administrators in their Department of Labour are far more efficient...I know a}
\text{company down the road is thinking of reducing their Vanuatu workers, because}
\text{Vanuatu is so bad.}\]

The results suggest that the recruitment process is of particular concern for employers
working under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and it could prove detrimental
for Vanuatu as employers are growing progressively hesitant about maintaining
employment ties with the nation. However, the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is
not responsible for Vanuatu’s actions. Another complication for employers evident in the
results was their responsibility to the Ni-Vanuatu workers, and the application of the current New Zealand employment laws.

### 6.3.2 Employment Law

The results collected found that all employers were lawfully responsible for the Ni-Vanuatu workers within working hours and afterhours. Therefore, employers are responsible for workers 24 hours a day while under contract in Te Puke, and this proved to be complex.

Key Informant 12 explained that “under New Zealand employment law you are not responsible for your staff 24 hours a day...[however] with the Recognised Seasonal Employer workers you are responsible for them 24 hours a day and that is where there is a legislation hole.” The informant went on to indicate that this creates a huge “palaver because we operate under New Zealand law and the [Ni-Vanuatu] workers operate under a different set of laws, so we are responsible for so many more things... [As a result] the employment law doesn’t quite fit the R.S.E. programme.” Key Informant 6 stated that “[t]he difficult thing is that we have all of the responsibility but none of the legal rights outside of the work environment.” Key Informant 12 pointed out a related complication and noted that because of this legislation hole, community groups and service providers do not:

*Understand the degree of complexity and so they start fighting for everybody’s rights...but they don’t understand the complexity from a company law legislative perspective and also from a company business perspective that we are liable if anything were to go wrong.*

As a result, these employers have started taking matters into their own hands to try and reduce the setbacks of working under New Zealand law. Key Informant 6 outlined methods utilised to get around legislation concerns:

*In 2008, we came up with a Code of Conduct, which tells [the workers] their rights outside of working hours - so that has become like our employment contract here. I have also put together a handbook which goes over anything Recognised Seasonal Employer [related] - it covers everything about their pay, and behavioral problems,
but it does not give any legal rights to us or the employee. The Code of Conduct is our only recourse.

Key Informant 6 went on to reveal further details and said “[m]ost employers just have a two page code of conduct covering basic things. Ours is more informative. It looks at traveling out of zone, alcohol, and so on. A lot of things the employment contract doesn’t cover.” Key Informant 12 explained that:

We spend a lot of our time and money on working on their rights. Partly it is my moral code and partly it is due to good business practice.... We will do anything we can to protect their rights because I don’t believe in abusing people’s rights.

Therefore, the codes of conduct are not only a regulatory necessity for employers but they are used to ensure the rights of the Ni-Vanuatu workers are maintained. Employers are also putting the codes of conduct in place because New Zealand’s law and the workers’ contracts do not provide sufficient scope to effectively and efficiently implement the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. It is evident that there are issues related to the recruitment process and employment law, thus affecting the implementation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. To further understand the New Zealand government and horticulture industry’s successes it is important to outline the relationships between them, and the next section will do this by illuminating appropriate results.

### 6.4 Government and the Horticulture Industry’s Relationship under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme

To provide a comprehensive view of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme’s implementation in Te Puke it is of importance to present results related to the current relationship between the government and the horticulture industry.
The meetings and conferences attended by horticulture industry and government representatives were frequently raised by key informants. Key Informant 6, a Recognised Seasonal Employer, outlined who attends such events and said that “[w]e meet on a regular basis with the Inland Revenue Department, [Work and Income New Zealand], the Department of Labour, the Ministry of Social Development, other employers, growers, and with the guys who actually develop the policy.” This indicates that government department’s makeup a significant proportion of those in attendance. Key Informant 7, an horticulture industry representative indicated that “[o]ur key success factor is working very closely with the government.” Key Informant 12 provided further details of the relationship between the horticulture industry and the government:

You’ve got to go and play nice in the sandpit and develop good relationships and all that...We have a conference every year and that is successful because I think that the collective group of R.S.E. employers are there and they send some very strong messages. I think that over time we are getting some better relationships with the government departments which are more effective. We have some key relationships with some key people and they have managed to work more effectively as a mediator between employers and government departments to improve the scheme.

This evidence clearly illustrates that the relationships formed between the government and the horticulture industry are important for creating a successful Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. As an employer, Key Informant 6 was in an position to provide an assessment of the relationship and government performance and explained that “I think the huge positive is the government actually listens – that is the ones who create the policies [and]…For me, working with the government with this programme has been very positive.” The key informant continued:

It showed the government in a very different light, very flexible, easy to communicate with and, because it was such a new policy you could pretty much say that there was something wrong, or that there was an error in something, and within 2 weeks it would be sorted out.

Key Informant 7, a horticulture industry representative, elaborated on the government’s involvement and performance by indicating that “both Governments have embraced the
scheme and also ensured that the horticulture industry in New Zealand can remain competitive. We have got incredibly good support from Labour and also from National.”

The results point out that the relationships between all those involved have been crucial to the success of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. As the government and horticulture industry experience the scheme, and work together to create changes, it enables it to become increasingly effective and efficient. However, aside from the success, key informants did outline issues with the governance of the policy. Key Informant 12 discussed the governments influence on the horticulture industry’s implementation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme:

*The R.S.E. programme means [Work and Income New Zealand] are far more vocal and visible, before R.S.E. began we would hardly be in contact with them...they wouldn’t have any comment about how we run our business and neither would the [Department]...but now that we have the R.S.E. programme we have had a lot more input...They tell us how they want our businesses to be run...They slow the process down, they slow it down a lot...I understand that it is a very political situation with R.S.E. scheme and I get that totally, but they need to have greater understanding of our situation – we have fruit, fruit roots. If it’s not picked and packed at the right time you lose growers income, and you just can’t do that. The pressure here is like a pressure cooker and the government departments don’t understand the pressure that these places are under, it’s extreme.*

When revealing these issues to a representative from the Department of Labour, the researcher asked if government departments are a hindrance to business, and Key Informant 4 said:

*Yes because we need more in-depth compliance and standards, so it is a hindrance to business...[However] It is not a hindrance, it adds values to the industry, and this industry has moved mountains on their planning and productivity, from being non-compliant to compliant.*

Key Informant 4 initially accepted that the government can be a hindrance to the horticulture industry under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme but then turned that statement around suggesting otherwise. However, the informant continued and noted that by having the scheme in place it:
[P]rovides [the horticulture industry] with the insurance that they can now develop the industry further, as the current strategic direction for the industry is to build the economic strategy to 20 billion...[but] before R.S.E. policy they couldn’t do that because they couldn’t rely on the labour force, or plan the industry’s future effectively.

Illuminating these results clarifies the relationship that exists between the government and the horticulture industry. They have also outlined the government’s performance, which has generally been regarded as largely positive. However, the horticulture industry did outline that government departments are having significant input into the way business operates, thus placing pressure on their relationships. To further assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, the next section will identify the changes and the future challenges that the scheme may face.

6.5 Changes, Challenges, and the Future of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme

They key informants often discussed the future of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, the changes that are taking place, and future challenges. This section will outline the results with respect to these specific areas.

The majority of the key informants noted that it is important that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme continues. When the researcher asked Key Informant 12 whether they wanted to see the policy maintained, the informant said:

Absolutely, absolutely, at a time of high unemployment now, it’s not as important, but yes we need [the workers] at a time of low unemployment, you won’t get this job done without them especially because backpackers come and go easily, so the R.S.E. has to stay... The next test will come when we have high unemployment again, and then seeing if [the Department of Labour] actually let us increase the numbers.
Key Informant 7 also emphasised this and said “Yes, it needs to stay and it will as the Pacific Islands governments’ and the New Zealand government have committed to it. It is a fantastic scheme.” The informant was then asked, “How long can you see R.S.E. running for? Forever, Labour introduced it, and National enhanced it. So that is that.”

When discussing whether there would be changes made to the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme Key Informant 7, an horticulture industry representative, believed that there will only be “[m]inor changes related to pastoral care, but the essential foundations of the policies won’t change.” Key Informant 4, a Department of Labour representative, explained that:

*The scheme is continually being tweaked, and it is becoming business as usual, there are small and minor things that we are tweaking and it will be another 2-3 years before it is business as usual...[T]here could be room for improvement but as a whole it is working quite well... [i]f changes [are] to be made, it is up to the industry to ask for that, up until then, our job is to monitor and manage it by making sure it works.”*

Key Informant 4 exemplified one area that the government is looking to tweak:

*The government believes that the workers are not getting benefits from the tax system in New Zealand, so we are looking at that closely with the [Inland Revenue Department], the arguments are strong that it can be reduced, but it is about making it fair. It’s at 15.5% at the moment and this is a recent development so we cannot detail what that will be reduced to, however, I’m optimistic that it can be reduced because they genuinely work hard, they generate a lot and they also spend a lot yet they are not allowed our health benefits so we are looking at getting something more balanced for them.*

The researcher asked Key Informant 4 if the policy could be turned off and on in the future depending on New Zealand’s labour market fluctuations, the response was that “[n]o policy is brave enough to be turned on and off, it will remain on at this stage especially because the horticulture industry is trying to expand.” The informant continued and indicated that “[t]o be honest this scheme will not be turned off there is too much buy in by the
government and it would create political unrest if it were to.” In a later meeting, the informant revealed significant details about what the government is likely to do with the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme:

\[W\]e are looking to expand the scheme into other industry sectors, and that comes with the foresight that after the current recession there will not be enough labour in other sectors. At their peak, they will need extra labour. I believe that it will not be turned off at all. The government is looking into expanding the R.S.E. scheme into other industries, this will happen within the next 2\-3 years.

This is an interesting result as it is clear that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme will not only be maintained at present but it is also seeking expansion into other labour sectors within New Zealand. This is a finding that local government should be made aware of as Key Informant 8, a strategic policy analyst from the Western Bay of Plenty District Council noted that “[i]n the Long Term Plan there is a community strategy and in that we have identified the needs for migrants as a gap, but it is something we haven’t explicitly done a lot to address with the increasing number of migrants coming into the region.”

Key Informant 4, a Department of Labour representative, made further points regarding the future of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and stated that:

\[I\d say that within the next few years the industry will become self regulated and reliant with its own compliance system, that will make it more transparent for the industry and it will allow them to get rid of those people who are not complying and giving the industry a bad name.\]

The results also uncovered areas that may challenge the effectiveness and efficiency of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in the near future. One of those is the development of a similar policy in Australia which was often raised by key informants. Key Informant 1 said that “the Australian Government has come up with a new policy as well…They piloted it last year but it just hasn’t been that successful. There are a lot of rules and regulations around it.” Key Informant 12 added that “it was brought up at the R.S.E. conference and it
does not sound like it is as good as our one... they are going to have the same problems as we did.” However, what could potentially prove to be a challenge for New Zealand’s Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is that “there could be competition for labour [from the Pacific] and under the current situation, Vanuatu cannot supply us and Australia. They don’t have the organization or infrastructure for it.” What could intensify such a challenge is that “salary levels are far higher in Australia and we cannot compete on that” (Key Informant 12). The Ni-Vanuatu workers also pointed this out and a woman from Focus Group 3 noted that “the money in Australia would be a bit better, probably because their dollar is stronger.” However, Key Informant 12 expressed that “because of the relationship that [New Zealand] has already established with the islands it is going to be very hard for Australia to break through.”

Another result that could prove to be a challenge for the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme was the desire of Ni-Vanuatu workers to attain Permanent Residency in New Zealand. A male from Focus Group 2 revealed such desires in-depth:

say if we lived here for five years and were good citizens and we didn’t have a bad record or anything it would be good if we could get permanent resident status. If we are good workers, we are experienced, and we fit into the industry and we are helping the economy then we should be allowed P.R. after five years, I have been here three years now and I have a good record. I think that the government should think about that. It is something I have been thinking about for a while now. We want the government to do this for the good workers like us. If there are no problems with the workers and they need to keep them returning why don’t they give us permanent residency so that we can stay in the industry and keep working in it? If that happened I would continually be supporting the New Zealand government. I think this is a very important point and you need to make note of this. We could have cross cultural exchanges and there could be lots of opportunities.

However, when discussing the desires of Ni-Vanuatu workers with the Department of Labour representative, the informant explained:

They are on a road to going nowhere if they are seeking Permanent Residency, it needs to be understood that the policy is about New Zealand first and for New Zealanders to
fill those positions initially. The primary outcome for R.S.E. is to do well for our economy and for the workers to take those skills home. They cannot seek Permanent Residency and I do sympathise with them, but unfortunately that is not going to happen. There is nothing that can be done and the government will never change it, so personally I see it as a take it or leave it situation (Key Informant 4).

These results have illustrated that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme will be maintained at present and that it is likely to expand. There may also be challenges for the policy in the near future due to the introduction of a similar policy in Australia and the desire of Ni-Vanuatu workers to attain permanent residency in New Zealand.

### 6.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has outlined the results with respect to the implementation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. The results have suggested that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, has thus far, been a positive policy experience for the horticulture industry; however, there are minor issues, including the recruitment process and employment law complications. This chapter has also outlined the relationships that exist between the horticulture industry and government which have also been largely positive but issues are raised concerning the government’s involvement with the horticulture industry. Lastly, this chapter has provided details relating to current changes, future plans for expansion, and challenges for the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. By doing so, this chapter indentified areas of efficiency and effectiveness, and lack thereof. The following chapter will provide analysis and discussion that will further achieve the aim of the research.
7 Discussion

7.1 Introduction
This chapter will provide an analytical synthesis of the value and meaning of the findings with respect to the objectives and the literature. The chapter will be structured in a similar format to the previous two chapters. Therefore, the first section will focus on objectives one and two of the research – the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in Te Puke. The second section will focus on the third objective – regulation, implementation, and the future of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. However, before doing so, it would be wise to provide a contextual understanding of how the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme fits into temporary migration on a global scale.

7.2 The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme on a Global Scale
The United Nations (2009) calculates that the majority of international migrants go to a country with a higher level of human development than their country of origin. Such is the case for Ni-Vanuatu workers as they move from their developing country to New Zealand under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme (Lindio-McGovern 2003). Therefore, the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is enabling an increase in cross-border flows from Vanuatu, the “sending nation”, reflecting the effects of globalisation on international migration (Castles and Miller 2009).

The research has found that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme promotes co-development and operates as a bilateral recruitment agreement and foreign policy tool for New Zealand and Vanuatu (Ramasamy et al. 2008). The flow of temporary migrant workers from Vanuatu to New Zealand meets mutual needs, thus achieving the concept of triple wins (Ramasamy et al. 2008). These wins have been illustrated as the Ni-Vanuatu
workers gained monetary and skills capital, while filling employment gaps in New Zealand’s horticulture industry. However, such a statement is a generalisation, and although the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme has essentially been achieving the triple wins, there are constraints.

Martin (2000) and Ruhs (2006) argue that temporary worker programmes such as the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme have failed wherever and whenever they have been tried, largely because of flaws inherent in their policies that do not provide for limited and controlled permanent residency provisions. Although the Recognised Seasonal Employer has definitely not failed, there are concerns. Concerns range from the day-to-day implementation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme to broader policy issues. Although Martin’s (2000) argument may not currently be justified with respect to the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, it is important to remember that the policy is young, and faces uncertainties in the future, thus providing scope for it to fail. The next section will assess the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers with respect to the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme by providing further analytical discussion.

7.3 The Experiences of Ni-Vanuatu Temporary Workers in Te Puke, New Zealand

This section of the research interprets the findings in relation to objectives one and two by reflecting on the findings, and relevant literature. It will discuss settlement in Te Puke, the working experience, and cultural and behavioural issues.
7.3.1 Settling in Te Puke

Spoonley and Bedford (2008) suggested that temporary workers are likely to face racism, especially in smaller communities. However, the Ni-Vanuatu workers interviewed for the research did not identify any race related issues, they actually became friends with locals, notably Maori, and key informants noted that the Te Puke community grew comfortable with the workers’ presence. This somewhat contradicts Basok’s (2004) suggestion that temporary workers limit their social interaction to those within the same community. Castles and Davidson (2000) explained that religion is the ‘hard kernel’ of identity for migrants, and is often used as a means of resistance to exclusionary social forces, such as racism, when displaced in a new settlement. Although the Ni-Vanuatu workers embraced the church and it provided them with a sense of familiarity, the workers had made friends, and were welcomed by the church and the Te Puke community. The church did not represent resistance to exclusionary social forces, but more a sense of belonging. This is further indicated by the desires of the church to be involved with, and help the workers, thus the relationship was mutual. Although the workers settled in Te Puke easily, Bedford et al. (2009) note that out-migration can result in marital conflict, and Castles and Miller (2009) also explained that long absences affect relationships with families and partners. These points were reflected in the results which indicated there had been a number of marriage break-ups.

7.3.2 The Working Experience

The Ni-Vanuatu workers have been pulled to New Zealand because of economic opportunities (Lindio-McGovern 2003). As the workers earned and remitted their money, it meant that when they returned to Vanuatu they were able to finance basic amenities, and educate their families. This exemplified employment aid on behalf of New Zealand as a developed nation (Potter et al. 2008). However, New Zealand tax, accommodation, and transportation issues were identified by the Ni-Vanuatu workers as they rendered hidden costs, and these costs were exacerbated by the limited availability of work.
When New Zealand employers had no work available due to weather volatility, the Ni-Vanuatu workers lost money. Consequently, they questioned their contracts which they said affords them six working days a week, however, they did not always receive that. Ruhs (2006) suggests that workers should be able to change employers whenever necessary, a possible solution also posed by the Ni-Vanuatu workers. The Ni-Vanuatu workers claimed that a three month contract was not long enough and it could not be extended while in New Zealand. In this instance, it could be stated that the Ni-Vanuatu workers experienced a degree of exploitation as the employers have been placed in positions of control (Bales 1999). To allow the workers some control of their own employment it may be beneficial for them to have flexible contracts (Ruhs 2006).

The Ni-Vanuatu workers’ ability to save was also hindered by their current tax rates in New Zealand which key informants regarded as too high, and unfair. However, the Department of Labour and Inland Revenue were looking to reduce the tax rate for all workers employed under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. The Department of Labour believes that the current rate is unbalanced considering the workers contribution to the economy, and their inability to access health benefits in New Zealand. However, by enforcing a reduction of the tax rate, it could be used as a justification to reduce and restrict the workers’ rights, and continue to disallow them access to the health system, or even citizenship (Castles and Miller 2009). This epitomises the fine balance between regulation and rights; however, implementing regulation will always apply some degree of control over the workers (Castles and Davidson 2000). The results also revealed that the Ni-Vanuatu workers seemed to be getting double taxed by the Vanuatu government, and the Department of Labour representative noted that that should not be occurring. This is an important result as it prompted the Department of Labour representative to clarify the situation with the High Commission in Vanuatu. Thus, allowing the potential problem to be checked, and addressed.
The Ni-Vanuatu workers accommodation experience was also affected by cost related issues which made financial planning difficult. The workers promoted the standardisation of accommodation costs and thought that the additional costs, such as transportation and amenity usage, could be included within that. The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme could set standardisation requirements on approved accommodation facilities. This would mean that workers would understand the financial requirements of accommodation facilities, allowing them to make financial planning easier.

Ruhs (2006) noted that employers are in positions to lower condition standards below the minimum to reduce costs. The research had found that the Campsite was regarded as a less salubrious facility than the Complex, and consequently, some workers chose to move to the Campsite to reduce their costs. This created contrasting experiences for the Ni-Vanuatu workers as those residing at the Complex had educational opportunities and were not allowed to drink alcohol, whereas, the opposite situation was present at the Campsite. If standardisation were to occur, additional requirements could be set under those standards, such as blanket policies on alcohol and education. Such standardisation could enhance the workers experience, set greater rights equalities, and provide them with increased skills to take home. However, it should be noted that this would create a social control not present in the rest of the community.

The Ni-Vanuatu workers’ transportation experience also revealed associated costs, but more significantly it exemplifies freedom restrictions as employers only provided limited transportation services. Therefore, it could be regarded that there is an enormous degree of power available to employers over their workers (Basok 2004). Although, the Ni-Vanuatu workers had previously been provided vehicles, there had been a number of accidents and the provision was retracted to ensure the safety of the workers, thus, further limiting the workers’ freedom. Although the Ni-Vanuatu workers were restricted to a certain extent this
was able to be justified because Recognised Seasonal Employers are responsible for workers 24 hours a day. In this situation, the solution is not simple, and it essentially comes down to finding a balance that reflects the desires of the Ni-Vanuatu workers and their employers. However, currently there seems to be an imbalance as employers are able to control the Ni-Vanuatu workers’ freedom, thus they are not fully satisfied.

To further understand the experiences of the Ni-Vanuatu workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers working with the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, interpretation of the Ni-Vanuatu workers’ cultural differences and behavioural issues is necessary.

### 7.3.3 Cultural Differences and Behavioural Issues

The results revealed that one of the pull factors that influence the Ni-Vanuatu workers to come to New Zealand is the opportunity to experience a different culture. Such an experience was definitely the case in Te Puke, especially considering the workers were moving from the developing world to the developed. Such a transition meant that the workers needed to become accustomed to a completely new environment, and most importantly in this case, a new culture.

The results illustrated that the cultural shift was a considerable challenge for the Ni-Vanuatu workers, especially for those coming from Tanna. The hierarchical nature of the Vanuatu culture was reflected throughout the results as the Ni-Vanuatu men found it difficult to understand the New Zealand culture and lack of social hierarchy, sometimes making them angry. This lack of understanding intensified the workers’ challenge to culturally adapt. To apply theory to this situation, Pessar and Mahler (2003) outlined the concept of social location in the literature which claims that people can be affected by
socially stratifying factors within a social location. In this instance, the social location is Te Puke. As workers were exposed to the social location, it meant that cultural norms suddenly became cultural differences. As a result, the Ni-Vanuatu workers were often unaware of the New Zealand culture and failed to understand what appropriate practice is. To further analyse this cultural confusion experienced by the Ni-Vanuatu workers, the provision of more examples from the results is necessary.

The Ni-Vanuatu workers maintained their cultural norms while in Te Puke, and this was obvious to horticulture industry representatives and service providers. An example of this was that Ni-Vanuatu women remained inferior, as the men were said to use the women to do their jobs, and even made decisions on the women’s behalves. This was echoed in the literature as Castles and Miller (2009) noted that what makes it even easier to ascribe inferiority to women migrant workers are their primary roles in patriarchal societies.

Ridgeway and Correll (2004) provided further scope for interpretation and explained that gender is essentially a set of cultural rules that creates a social structure of difference and inequality. These cultural rules were mirrored in the results, and in one instance, such inequality was exemplified to the highest level in Te Puke, when a male Ni-Vanuatu worker raped a Ni-Vanuatu woman. Further concern can be ascribed to this issue, as the results noted that Ni-Vanuatu workers often employ a hierarchical process to sort out their own in-house problems. If this is the case, it may be possible that other cases of unlawful activities are confined within a hierarchical in-house process. Although it can be said that the Ni-Vanuatu workers are unaware, or even ignorant, of New Zealand’s cultural values, such ignorance can never justify illegal activities.

However, other sexually related behavioural issues could potentially use cultural ignorance as an excuse, namely, informal prostitution on behalf of the workers from Tanna. Whether
this can be accepted is a matter that cannot be solved within this research, however, revealing such information is important. What makes this alarming is that the workers are making money through informal measures which is supposedly being used to support the workers shipping costs under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. Declaration of this is important as it is likely that prostitution will be frowned upon by the government departments who implement the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, and it may be an area that needs to be administered to ensure that the Ni-Vanuatu workers experiences are enhanced.

The existence of prostitution is an interesting finding because it illustrates a deviation from the hierarchical nature of the Vanuatu culture, as it places the men in a submissive position, while the women assume control. Another cultural deviation presented was that Ni-Vanuatu women experienced a higher degree of equality and power when working in Te Puke as they were given equal status from other employees. Consequently, both Ni-Vanuatu men and women were exposed to a more equally balanced social hierarchy. However, the Ni-Vanuatu men still expressed a desire to revert back to their patriarchal culture when they returned to Vanuatu. As the Ni-Vanuatu workers experienced the differences that the Te Puke social location provided, it acted as a cultural exchange, as their experiences are taken back to Vanuatu. Key informants revealed concerns about such an exchange as it is likely to influence Vanuatu’s culture. Although cultural changes may only be occurring slowly in Vanuatu, over time these changes will compound, thus increasing the effects on the Vanuatu culture. The presentation of such a proposition is important as it provides a result that this research did not intend to uncover, but more importantly, it highlights a potential future issue for Vanuatu. Therefore, to ensure that Vanuatu’s culture is prepared for change, further research and energy needs to be allocated to this topic.
Alcohol

A behavioural related issue that the results brought to light was the Ni-Vanuatu workers’ access to, and consumption of alcohol. This can be ascribed to the workers’ social location as workers would not usually be able to afford alcohol, and in some cases, access it in Vanuatu. The Ni-Vanuatu focus group participants included in the study were forbidden to drink at their accommodation which raises questions about their level of freedom. The results illustrated that alcohol related incidents were significant. However, incidents were subsiding as workers experienced the New Zealand culture through a gradual understanding of cultural normalities, thus reducing their behavioural related issues.

The Ni-Vanuatu Product

The issues experienced with the Ni-Vanuatu workers were not as prevalent with workers from other nations. Comparison of Recognised Seasonal Employer workers by employers was common, thus reflecting the idea that the Ni-Vanuatu workers are perceived as a “product” (Bauder 2005). A Recognised Seasonal Employers noted that Ni-Vanuatu workers are “too culturally different” and are a difficult product to work with. The Department of Labour representative noted that employers are “diversifying” their product. Castles and Miller (2009) add further credence to this concept and stress that woman are a more demanding workforce, or product, than men. The results reflected this as employers compared the Ni-Vanuatu women with other workers and noted that they are difficult to motivate, engage in sexual misconduct, and have issues with pregnancy. When these issues are compounded with alcohol it has rendered the Ni-Vanuatu women a less desirable product. Consequently, Ni-Vanuatu women workers in Te Puke are being consciously avoided by employers, thus emulating Castles and Miller’s (2009) assertion that women are generally the group with the least favourable outcomes in the labour market.
The research pointed out that the Ni-Vanuatu workers were confronted with a significantly different culture in the Te Puke social location. As Vanuatu’s and New Zealand’s respective cultures were experienced together by the Ni-Vanuatu workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers, it resulted in behavioural issues. Although some behaviour’s could be excused as a lack of cultural understanding on behalf of the workers, the majority, are inexcusable. As a result, workers were assessed like a product, and the Ni-Vanuatu workers, notably the women, have been regarded as being a less desirable product.

This section has provided insights through a discussion of the Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in Te Puke. This included interpretation of the Ni-Vanuatu workers settlement in Te Puke, the working experiences for the Ni-Vanuatu workers and informants exposed to them, before providing in-depth understanding of culture, a re-occurring theme throughout the research, and behavioural related issues. The next section will further analyse the results and literature.

### 7.4 Regulation, Implementation, and the Future of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme

This section will present the research with interpretation of the regulation, implementation, and future of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. It will outline the importance of the results in relation to recruitment and regulation, employment law, and future challenges. By doing so, it will help to understand how the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme can be implemented in a more efficient and effective manner, which is the primary requirements of objective three.

#### 7.4.1 Recruitment and Regulation

Several authors indicated that regulation of migration is one of the major issues arising from temporary migration (Castles and Miller 2009, Ruhs 2002, Basok 2004). Regulation is
a fundamental facet of ensuring the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is implemented efficiently and effectively. Key informants often noted that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme has a good management process and relationships are working very well in Te Puke. Both key informants from the horticulture industry and government often mentioned the success of such relationships. However, one regulatory issue experienced in Te Puke was the timing of the Agreement to Recruit process. This could be attributed to a weakness in the relationship between the horticulture industry and government and is likely being exacerbated by the current labour climate, which is “an up and down thing”. However, it is more likely that the government is still learning how to effectively and efficiently implement the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, and over time, the process is likely to get better.

The Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme acts as a recruitment and foreign policy tool, therefore, it means relationships exist on several levels, and this complicates its implementation. One of the major relationships the research found to be inadequate was that between employers and Vanuatu. Martin (2003) asserts that it takes networks and links between countries to enable people to cross borders. However, employers in Te Puke are experiencing recruitment issues in Vanuatu because of poor relationships between them. Hence, employers are considering recruiting from other nations as the product coming from Vanuatu is proving to be difficult to import. Therefore, employers are looking to turn the “tap off” for Ni-Vanuatu workers (Beer and Lewis 2006). For the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme to work to its full potential, the relationships between Recognised Seasonal Employers and Vanuatu needs to be working more effectively and efficiently. To do so, the New Zealand government could intervene by setting up immigration consultancies and mediating agents to allow for an easier recruitment process (Beer and Lewis 2006). However, it could be argued that this is not a government responsibility, but one that needs to be administered by employers individually.
7.4.2 Employment Law

The research has illustrated that current New Zealand employment law does not quite fit the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. Consequently, employers are responsible for workers 24 hours a day while they are in Te Puke. This creates rights-related issues which are a major concern for temporary migration policies like the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme (Abella 2006). As employers are responsible for Recognised Seasonal Employer workers at all times, they have implemented Codes of Conduct as recourse to supplement the legislative hole. The Code of Conduct could be regarded as a form of control over workers, because by managing the rights of workers there is a sense of ownership over them (Ruhs 2003 and Martin 2003). However, this is not a responsibility or form of ownership that employers want to deal with, but it is something they need to grasp to ensure the safety of their businesses and workers. Therefore, Codes of Conduct are of significant importance to ensuring the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is implemented smoothly and can barely be regarded as a form of control, but rather, a necessity. As employers experience the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme over time, they are learning how to apply methods to effectively and efficiently implement the scheme. However, it is important to provide balanced provisions of rights that replicate the needs and desires, where possible, of both the Recognised Seasonal Employers and all Recognised Seasonal Employer workers.

7.4.3 Future Challenges of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme

There are a number challenges that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is likely to face in the near future, and it is important to discuss these to allow a deeper understanding of the research.

The results noted that Australia has implemented a policy like the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme; however, it was having a number of regulatory issues. This adds further
weight to Castles’ and Miller’s (2009) assertion that temporary programmes often struggle with regulatory issues. However, the results suggested that in the future, there could be competition for the workers coming from the Pacific between New Zealand and Australia. Despite this, the research only very briefly touched on the issue, therefore, considerable scope for future research in this area exists.

The research also found that horticulture industry representatives are generally satisfied with the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme because the horticulture industry would not be able to meet its requirements, or move forward without it. The government is looking to shift the responsibilities of compliance and regulation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme to the horticulture industry, therefore, the horticulture industry will become self-regulated. This is going to have significant repercussions for the horticulture industry; as such a shift of responsibility will potentially create further regulatory difficulties for the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme (Castles and Miller 2009). Horticulture industry representatives were seemingly unaware of such changes; however, it is more likely that key informants avoided the disclosure of such information.

Ruhs (2003) asserted that once temporary worker programmes like the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme are implemented, they are difficult to terminate. The research reflected this, as key informants noted that it is unlikely that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme will be turned off; one key informant noted it would stay on “forever”. Not only does the Recognised Seasonal Employer look set to continue, but the policy is looking to expand, and this is a significant finding. Ruhs (2006) stressed that temporary worker programmes often “bloat” as they expand; consequently, they can take on a life of their own rendering control of such policy difficult. Policy makers need to be aware of this, as the expansion, or bloating, of the scheme may generate different results from what was initially intended (Ruhs 2006). For example, “immigrant sectors” could emerge, thus creating an urban migrant underclass in Te Puke (Ruhs 2003 and Lindio-McGovern 2003).
If the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme does experience bloating and immigrant underclass sectors do form, this will create new community impacts and tensions for a small township like Te Puke (Beer and Lewis 2006).

Subsequently, planning for such an eventuality should be considered, and appropriate planning departments, namely the Western Bay of Plenty District Council, should be made aware of these potential repercussions. The Western Bay of Plenty District Council has not yet enacted multi-cultural plans in the Long Term Plan which may prove detrimental to future planning in Te Puke. The lack of such plans demonstrates that planning departments have ambiguous and ambivalent relationships with immigrant communities (Vitiello 2009). In light of these findings, it would be sensible for the Western Bay of Plenty Council to consider implementing such plans. These findings are important because the effects of bloating are likely to affect a number of small towns throughout New Zealand, not just Te Puke. Therefore, all appropriate local governments should be made aware of the impending expansion as it unfolds so they can plan with foresight.

One of the most significant results revealed was the desires of Ni-Vanuatu workers to gain permanent residency through the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, however, this is not currently possible. Workers only acquire temporary visas which Bedford et al. (2009) suggest is often viewed as more palatable than permanent residency, especially because seasonal workers like the Ni-Vanuatu are low-skilled.

Ruhs (2006), Martin (2000), and Castles and Miller (2009) assert that temporary migration programmes often fail. Ruhs (2006) believes that they fail because of policy flaws that do not allow conditional upgrading into permanent residency. Consequently, Ruhs would argue that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is likely to fail. Ruhs (2006) notes that temporary migration programmes that do not allow workers access to conditional
upgrading will initially experience pressures for permanent settlement. Therefore, the desires of Ni-Vanuatu workers can be regarded as the origins of such pressures and the potential failure for the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. As the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme expands into other industries, it is likely to face increasing pressures.

Accordingly, the New Zealand government may need to consider implementing a well designed mechanism in the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme to allow for additional upgrading into permanent residency. If the government decides otherwise, pressure is likely to build to such an extent that the government will be faced with a Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme that is inefficient and ineffective as migrants’ networks and representatives will hinder its implementation (Ruhs 2006). Thus, the government is likely to have two options:

i. Leave the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme’s policies as they are and deal with pressures on an ad hoc basis, or;

ii. Implement a well designed mechanism that allows for limited and conditional upgrading into permanent residency, similar to the Canadian A.S.W.P. points system (Ruhs 2006).

This research recommends that the New Zealand government considers adjusting policies within the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme to include a points system that allows workers to apply for permanent residency. By doing so, the New Zealand government will be able to control a limited and conditional points system for Recognised Seasonal Employer workers (Ruhs 2006). Conditions could include labour and criminal record checks among others (United Nations 2009). Consequently, this would mean that the New Zealand government may not have to deal with potentially jeopardising the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. A points system could also provide an opportunity for the
government to strengthen industries and the economy while providing increased opportunities for Recognised Seasonal Employer workers. Ruhs (2006) would argue that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme will have to allow for some workers to become permanent residents, therefore, mirroring his assertion that “there is nothing more permanent than temporary foreign workers” (Ruhs 2006).

### 7.5 Key implications of the Research

In relation to the first and second objectives of this research, the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers have been identified and appraised. The third objective of the research has also been subjected to such analytical explanation while seeking to clarify how the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme could be managed in more effective and efficient ways.

The research has established that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is in general, being successfully implemented, and those that experience it, namely the Ni-Vanuatu, do so in a positive manner in Te Puke. However, the research raises concerns surrounding the day-to-day implementation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, and broader policy issues that are likely to place pressures on the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in years to come. Accordingly, the research provides a number of propositions that may provide useful advice for workers, notably Ni-Vanuatu, employers, service providers, horticulture industry representatives, local government, and the respective New Zealand and Vanuatu governments that deal with the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme.

Subsequently, the next chapter of the research, detailing conclusions and recommendations, will highlight ways in which the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme can reach greater results and experiences through its implementation. It will also suggest methods to counter-
act potential future challenges that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is likely to face.
8 Conclusion and Recommendations

8.1 Introduction
This chapter will conclude the study and further fulfil the requirements of the third objective of this research by presenting recommendations. The content of the all the previous chapters will be detailed before drawing on potential future research, and concluding comments.

8.2 The Experiences of Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and Ni-Vanuatu Temporary Workers in Te Puke, New Zealand
The research aimed to assess the efficacy of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme with respect to the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in Te Puke, New Zealand. In order to achieve this aim, three research objectives were developed. Objectives one and two were set out to identify and appraise the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers working with the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in Te Puke. The third objective of the research was directed at assessing the New Zealand government’s departments’ facilitation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme while providing recommendations for the New Zealand and Vanuatu governments.

The research reviewed and analysed the relevant literature regarding temporary migration programmes for the purpose of work. It provided a background of the wider theoretical
forces that influence temporary migration in today’s world by highlighting the fundamental problems that face temporary worker programmes. It suggested that temporary worker programmes are influenced by a number of global forces and are flawed in their policy design. It also critiqued the literature on other related themes including workers rights, feminisation of migration, social exclusion, and planning. As a result, it identified themes, issues, and gaps within the literature which further authenticated the research.

The research outlined the contextual framework of the research by presenting an overview of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, and the relevance of Vanuatu and Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers to the research. It also detailed the case study of the research, Te Puke.

The research utilised a qualitative methodological approach to gather primary data through semi-structured interviews with key informants and the Ni-Vanuatu focus groups. Therefore, triangulation was a tactic that naturally eventuated and was used to complement the results. Several data analysis techniques were employed which allowed for conclusions to be drawn, and limitations were also outlined.

It was found that the day-to-day experiences of the Ni-Vanuatu workers, horticulture industry representatives, and service providers working in Te Puke under the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme had some issues. Although workers settled in Te Puke with little difficulty, there were a number of complications for the workers in terms of the accommodation and transportation provided. The workers also struggled with adapting to New Zealand’s cultural environment and this indirectly affected their behaviour and is causing repercussions for their future employment in Te Puke.
Further results found that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, has thus far, been a positive policy experience for the horticulture industry; however, there are issues with the recruitment process, employment law, and government’s involvement with the horticulture industry. It also found that the government has future plans to expand the Recognised Seasonal Employment scheme, and revealed potential challenges.

The discussion chapter provided an analytical synthesis of the findings with respect to the objectives and literature. The research found that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is in general, successfully implemented, and those that experience it do so in a positive manner. However, the research raises concerns surrounding the day-to-day implementation of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, and broader policy issues that are likely to place pressures on the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in years to come. The research proposes advice for workers, notably Ni-Vanuatu, employers, service providers, horticulture industry representatives, local government, and the respective New Zealand and Vanuatu governments that deal with the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. However, to pinpoint the proposals that the research concludes with, the following recommendations are provided.

### 8.3 Recommendations for the Future Management of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme

Although the research found that the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is working well, there are some concerns, and these are outlined in the recommendations. The recommendations presented reflect the research’s aim and objectives, and are largely directed at the New Zealand government. It is important to note that these recommendations are based upon a relatively short and specific piece of research. Thus, before these recommendations are given further credence it would be wise to undertake deeper research.
8.3.1 Planning with Expansion

The research revealed probable expansion of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme into other industries and employment sectors within New Zealand. This is a significant and important move by the government as it may bloat the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme, thus generating different results from what was initially intended. Immigrant sectors may emerge creating migrant under-classes in towns employing Recognised Seasonal Employer workers’ like Te Puke. This would have implications for other small communities and may create community impact and tensions. Consequently, all appropriate local governments could be made aware of the impending expansion so they can plan with foresight. The research also recommends that the Western Bay of Plenty District Council implements multi-cultural plans in the Long Term Plan in preparation.

8.3.2 Implementing a Permanent Residency Points System Policy

The research found that many temporary worker programmes implemented around the world have failed. The research suggests that they have failed because polices like the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme did not allow conditional upgrading into permanent residency. Therefore, the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme is likely to experience pressures for permanent settlement. The desires of Ni-Vanuatu workers can be regarded as the origins of such pressures and the potential failure for the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. Further such pressures are likely to be applied to the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme as it expands. The research clearly outlines the government’s options in the face of such pressure and would recommend implementing a well designed mechanism that allows for limited and conditional upgrading into permanent residency, similar to the Canadian A.S.W.P. points system. Adjusting policies within the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme would be necessary and a points system could include labour and criminal record checks among others.
Through the implementation of a points system it would mean that the New Zealand government may not have to deal with potentially jeopardising the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. It could provide New Zealand with an opportunity to strengthen industries, especially considering the likely expansion of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. It could also provide increased opportunities for Recognised Seasonal Employer workers and employers. Employers would have further security of a reliable and high calibre workforce. However, if a points system is put in place, the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme needs to ensure it continues its role as a form of aid to the Pacific by rotating workers, allowing new workers to apply, and ensuring remittances are maintained to an effective level. This is also likely to enable a more even distribution of capital throughout the Pacific Islands.

8.3.3 Understanding Culture

Culture became a prominent theme throughout the research, and for a significant reason. The Ni-Vanuatu workers were often unaware of the New Zealand culture and failed to understand what is regarded as appropriate cultural practice, and this influenced behavioural related issues. However, over time behavioural related incidents subsided and this can be directly related to a learning process. As the Ni-Vanuatu learnt about the New Zealand culture they gained a greater understanding of what is regarded as right and wrong within a New Zealand context. Consequently, the research recommends that consideration be given to a cultural educational element within current education methods. The people that deal with workers’ on a daily basis should also be educated on their respective cultural backgrounds. By doing so, this will enable behavioural issues to dissipate, allow for cultural exchanges, and help the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme further reach its potential.
8.3.4 Set up an Immigration Consultancy

For the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme to work to its full potential, the relationships between Recognised Seasonal Employers and sending nations needs to be better. Therefore, the New Zealand government could intervene by setting up immigration consultancies and mediating agents to allow for an easier recruitment process. This is likely to become increasingly important as the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme expands, thus compounding relationship issues between employers and Pacific nations. The government could rely on the horticulture industry to self-regulate this, but with expansion it would mean that other industries would also have to eventually self-regulate this process too. Therefore, it is likely that it would be easier for the government to set up an immigration consultancy within the auspices of the Department of Labour to regulate the flows of Recognised Seasonal Employer workers’.

8.3.5 Flexible Employee Contracts

The research has illustrated that the Ni-Vanuatu workers struggled to save as much money as they had envisaged because employers could not always guarantee six days work per week. This was an issue that was dictated by the restrictions of Recognised Seasonal Employer workers’ contracts. If the workers’ contracts enabled them to work for more than one employer it would mean that they could pick up supplementary work when their primary employer had none. This would ensure that the workers’ are more likely to have work for six days of the week. Consequently, they would not have out-going payments to make while they are laid off by their sole employer. Although six days of work per week is a lot, the workers are often eager to work for such periods; therefore, they should be given the option if available.

The Ni-Vanuatu workers also pointed out that they have to sign contracts when they are in Vanuatu. However, once they had worked in Te Puke for three months some workers had
to return to Vanuatu. This left some workers dissatisfied because they did not make as much money as they would have liked. Contracts should have a clause that enables the workers to apply for an extension. However, desires for contract extension should be at the discretion of employers. A limitation with this recommendation is that it would increase bureaucratic requirements.

### 8.3.6 Standardisation

The research found that Recognised Seasonal Employer workers face an array of costs and varying rules between accommodation providers in Te Puke. Therefore, the research recommends that the government, namely the Department of Labour, looks to set out some form of standardisation that accommodation providers could follow before accommodating workers. This could be covered under current requirements by the Department of Labour and could include the standardisation of accommodation costs and additional costs, such as transportation and amenity usage. Standardisation could also create blanket policies on alcohol and education. Such standardisation could enhance the workers experience, set greater rights equalities, and provide them with increased skills to take home. It would also ensure that accommodation providers are not charging unfair rates. However, a balance needs to be meet that reflects the workers’ desires and government’s capabilities to monitor such standardisation.

### 8.3.7 Concern for Vanuatu

The research has found that Ni-Vanuatu workers are regarded as a more difficult employee to work with and Vanuatu is a difficult country to recruit from. As Recognised Seasonal Employers experience issues with Ni-Vanuatu workers and the recruitment process in Vanuatu they are considering, and in some cases already actively, recruiting from other nations instead. This should be regarded as a word of warning for the Vanuatu government as changes need to be made to ensure that they continue to be a loyal labour supply for
New Zealand, especially considering the contributions remittances make to the Vanuatu economy.

### 8.4 Future Research

The research identified two topics that can be regarded as significantly important for future research. Firstly, Ni-Vanuatu workers experienced a cultural exchange while in Te Puke which is likely to influence cultural norms in Vanuatu. Although cultural changes may only be occurring slowly in Vanuatu, over time these changes will compound, thus increasing the effects on the Vanuatu culture. This highlights a potential future issue for Vanuatu, therefore, further research and energy needs to be allocated to this topic.

Secondly, the research noted that the Australian government has implemented a policy which essentially replicates the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. Thus, there could be competition for sources of labour coming from the Pacific Islands, especially if these policies expand together over the next few years. Consequently, considerable scope for future research in this area exists.

### 8.5 Concluding Comments

Taken as a whole, this research has addressed three objectives to address the overarching aim of this thesis: to assess the efficacy of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme with respect to the experiences of Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in Te Puke, New Zealand. Consequently, this research has primarily focused on the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and its implementation. The Ni-Vanuatu workers and the Te Puke case study were sub-focuses and essential elements that not only provided insights for those affected by the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme in Te Puke, but they also narrowed the focus on the
Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme. Subsequently, recommendations were outlined that have relevance for the Vanuatu government, but more importantly, for the New Zealand government as the facilitator and implementer of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme.
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The Experiences of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and Ni-Vanuatu Temporary Workers in Te Puke, New Zealand

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you of any kind and we thank you for considering our request.

Who is undertaking this research?

This research is being undertaken by Andrew Williams in partial fulfilment for the degree of Master of Planning at the University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand. Associate Professor Michelle Thompson-Fawcett of the Department of Geography is supervising the research.

What is the Aim of the Project?

To assess the efficacy of the Recognised Seasonal Employment scheme while focusing on temporary workers from Vanuatu in the Western Bay of Plenty district. The research will seek to formulate recommendations for policy developers about possible approaches to enhance the experience of Ni-Vanuatu workers and their social and cultural interests while considering the existing rural communities in the Western Bay of Plenty region in which they inhabit.

What Type of Participants are being sought?

Ni-Vanuatu temporary workers in the Western Bay of Plenty are the researcher’s primary target participants. Professionals within the horticulture and Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and planning areas are the other significant participants. As a result, horticulture growers and representatives, planners and policy developers, and Ni-Vanuatu guest workers are the specific participants being sought.

What will Participants be Asked to Do?

Should you agree to take part in this project, you will either be asked to take part in a focus group session or key informant interview. The focus group session will be a semi-structured group discussion taking between 1 – 2 hours. Key informant interviews will be one-on-one and semi-structured, taking approximately 30 – 60 minutes. Both the focus group sessions and key informant interviews will be recorded using a dictaphone once permission has been attained by all participants. All participants’ anonymity will be maintained throughout the process of the research. However, participants may wish to disclose their name and position. Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the project without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

Can Participants Change their Mind and Withdraw from the Project?

You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind. Any participants can also refuse to answer any question if they feel they need to.

What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?
Qualitative data will be collected from participants through key informant interviews and focus group sessions with the use of a dictaphone to record the dialogue. These recordings will then be transcribed and coded and later used to aid the results and discussion chapters whilst answering the questions posed. The data collected will be held securely in locked cabinets on 5th floor Richardson Building throughout the duration of the research. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that required by the University's research policy and any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

Reasonable precautions will be taken to protect and destroy data gathered by email. However, the security of electronically transmitted information cannot be guaranteed. Caution is advised in the electronic transmission of sensitive material.

This project involves an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning includes experiences with respect to the Recognised Seasonal Employment scheme, Men and Women including their social relationships and cultural interpretations, also, Rights and Belonging. The precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the focus groups and interviews develop. Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used. In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve your anonymity.

You are most welcome to request a copy of the results of the project should you wish.

Any further questions?

If you have any further questions about the project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:

Andrew Williams  or  Associate Professor Michelle Thompson-Fawcett

Master of Planning Student  Project Supervisor
Department of Geography  Department of Geography
University of Otago  University of Otago
Ph: 027 7839 799  Ph: 03 479 8762

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
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Ol Eksperiens Mo Ting Ting Blong Ol Man Vanuatu We Oli Ko Long Te Puke Long Niu Sielan Blong Pikemap Ol Frut

INFOMESSEN SHEET BLONG OL MAN WE OLI TE PAT

Tank yu blong soem interest long projek ia . Plis ridim infomasen long pepa ia mo tingting gud bifo yu mekem tingting blong yu blong tek pat long projek ia. Sapos yu tek pat long hem, tank yu tumas mo sapos yu no tek pat long hem hemi oraet no mo tank yu tumas.

Who nao i stap mekem projek ia?

Research ia Andrew Williams hemi mekem blong fulfilim wan pat long Master degree long saed blong Planning long Otago University, Dunedin, New Zealand mo associate Professor blong hem Michelle Thompson-Fawcett long department blong Geography nao i supervisem.

Wanem nao hemi goal blong projek?

Stampa tingting blong project ia hemi blong finem out se policy blong Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme long saed blong culture mo laef blong ol man Vanuatu we i stap go wok long New Zealand, i save jenis mo kam antap o no. Projek bae hemi givim ol rekomendasen long ol polisi developer. Projek bae hemi luk luk mo long ol man Vanuatu we oli stap long Western Bay of Plenty eria mo ol local komunity long eria ia.

Oli wantem wanem kaen man blong tek pat long projek ia?

Target grup long projek ia hemi ol Ni-Vanuatu wok man long Western Bay of Plenty eria, ol professional wok man long horticulture mo ol polisi developers mo planners we oli wok long saed blong horticulture mo Recognised Seasonal Employer.

Sipose yu tek pat long projeck ia, bae oli askem yu blong mekem wanem nao?

Sipiose yu agri blong tekem pat long project ia, bae oli askem yu blong tekem pat long fokas grup tok tok mo interview. Fokas grup session bae hemi gat sam questen be i gat taem blong yu givem ting ting blong yu mo bae hemi tekem 1 o 2 hour. Interview hemi yu nomo wetem Andrew Williams mo bae hemi tekem 30-60minutes. Bae oli rekordem fokas grup mo interview sipose yu agri mo evri ting ting blong yu hemi sekrit nomo, be yu save telem nem mo wok blong yu sipose yu wantem. Sipose yu no wantem tak pat long projek ia, bae i oraet nomo.

Yu save aot long projek sipose yu wantem?

Yu fri blong nomo tak pat long interview o fokas grup eni taem mo sipose yu no wantem anserem eni questen, i oraet nomo.

Bae oli karem wanem kaen infomasen strett, mo wanem nao bae oli mekem wetem ol infomasen ia?

Ol infomasen we i kam aot long ol interview mo fokas grup bae i go long wan book blong helpem anserem ol questenblong projek ia. Ol informasen we i kam aot long ol interview mo fokas grup bae oli putum long wan cupboard wetem lock long 5th flor blong Richardson building kasem projek hemi finis. Afta projek hemi
finis bae oli sakem ol infomasen be bae oli keepim sam we University hemi needim blong karem, afta 5 yia, university bae hemi sakem.

Bae oli traem blong destroyem evri infomasen we i bin kam long email be oli no save promis from i hard blong karem aot evri samting taem hemi kam tru long email. Bae yu no mas sendem ol personal samting tru long email.

Projek ia i gat ol kaen questenwe i open mo yu save givem ting ting blong yu. Ol questen bae oli fokas mo long ol experience blong yu wetem Recognised Seasonal Worker Scheme, mo laef blong yu taem yu stap long New Zealand, olsem culture mo ol raet blong yu. Komity blong ethics long University of Otago, oli no save ol questen we bae yu answerem from ol questen oli depend long ol different fokas grup, be sipose i gat wan questen yu no likem, bae yu no mas answerem questen ia, mo yu save aot long project eni taem.

ol result blong projek ia, bae i go long University of Otago library (Dunedin, New Zealand), be nem blong yu bae i no kam aot. Sipose yu wantem, oli save givem wan copy long ol result long yu.

Yu gat eni questen?

Sipose yu gat eni questen long saed blong project ia, plis yu fri long kontaktem:

Andrew Williams or Associate Professor Michelle Thompson-Fawcett

Student blong Master long Planning
Depatment blong geography
University of Otago
Ph: 027 7839 799

Supervisor blong projek
Department blong Geography
University blong Otago
Ph: 03 479 8762

Olgeta long University of Otago Human Ethics Committee oli aprovim studi ia. Suppose yu kat eni consen long saed blong ol ethical kontak blo ol resej, yu save kontakem Committee tru long Human Ethics Committee Administrasen (Ph 03 479 8256). Ol narafala issue wei yu rasem bae oli tretim wetem confidence mo bae oli infomem yu long ol outkam.
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The Experiences of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and Ni-Vanuatu Temporary Workers in Te Puke, New Zealand – Consent Form
The Experiences of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and Ni-Vanuatu Temporary Workers in Te Puke, New Zealand

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:-

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;
2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;
3. All personal identifying information such as Dictaphone audio-tapes will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which they will be destroyed;
4. This project involves an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning includes experiences with respect to the Recognised Seasonal Employment scheme, Men and Women including their social relationships and cultural interpretations, also, Rights and Belonging. The precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops and that in the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.
5. The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve my anonymity.

I agree to take part in this project.

.................................................................................................................. ........................................
(Signature of participant) (Date)

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
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The Experiences of the Recognised Seasonal Employer scheme and Ni-Vanuatu Temporary Workers in Te Puke, New Zealand – Consent Form (Bislama Translation)
Ol Eksperiens Mo Ting Ting Blong Ol Man Vanuatu We Oli Ko Long Te Puke Long Niu Sielan Blong Pikemap Ol Frut

INFOMESEN BLONG OL MAN WE OLI TEK PAT

Ples readem form ia blong yu save ol rights blong yu.

Ridim toktok ia mo sipos yu agri wetem, yu signem nem blong yu daon:

Taem we mi readem infomesen pepa blng project ia mi understandem wanem risej ia i minim. Ol kwestin we mi bin answerem long fom, mi bin answerem gud evriwan. Mo tu mi save se sipos mi no kasem gszu ol kwestin long fom, mi save askem moa infomesen mo kwestin mo mi save askem any taem long projek.

Mi save se:-

1. Paticipatin blong mi hemi oслem wan volunteer (volantia), sipos mi nomo wantem participate i no kat man bae i fosem mi;
2. Mi save se i olret nomo sipos mi no wantem answerem evri kwestin o mi nomo wantem sta insaed long risej projek ia
3. Ol toktok blong yu hemi wan sikret. Sipos man we hem i askem ol kwestin long research ia hemi usem wan recorder o wan computer (komputa) we i recordem ol toktok blong mi long hem, bae hemi sakem long toti, tape (tep) mo ol narafala samting we toktok blong mi i stap long hem long taem we research ia i finis. Bae i no kat gat man we i save usem ol tape ia bakegen. Longsaed blong ol not mo ol kwestin mo sam infomesen we ol man oli raetem long wan pepa, bae ol pepa ia i stap long wan ples we hem i no kat man i save luk long pepa ia. Taem we faev yia i pas, bae oli sakem evri infomesen blong research ia.
4. Research ia hemi gat sam kwesten we yu save toktok mo storian ledelbet kaen kwesten ia hemi ol ‘opin kwestin.’ Risej ia i wantem save ol storian blong yu longsaed blong ol eksperiens mo filing blong ol man mo woman Vanuatu we oli wok long Nui Seland long saed blong pickem ap fruit blong ‘Recognised Seasonal Employment’ scheme. Sam long ol qwestin i askem yu blong storian longsaed blong relatinsip wetem ol narafala ma mo kustom mo kalja blong ol wokas mo raet blong ol woka we oli kam blong wok long Niu Silan.
5. Man we hemi askem ol kwesten (riserja) hemi no save yet evri kwesten we bae hemi askem long yu, bae hemi harem toktok blong yu festaem mo tinkbaot sam niufala kwestin blong askem long yu. Taem yu storian long saed blong ol qwestin sipos storian blong yu hemi big wan o storian i kam no
gud o yu harem no gud, yu save talem long man we hemi askem ol kwesten se yu wantem stopem ol qwestin mo storian, mo yu no wantem ansarem kwestin ia. Yu save talemaot se yu no moa wantem anserem ol qwestin.

6. Taem we risej mo ol results blong research ia hem i finis, yu save luk luk buk ia long library blong University blong Otago. Man we hemi raetem buk ia i traem best blong hem blong hemi no talemaot nem blong yu sipos yu bin ansarem sam kwestin. Hemia i minim se bae ol man we oli ridim risej ia bae oli no save luk nem blong yu o save toktok we yu bin givim.

Mi agri blong tek part long risej ia:

________________________________________________________________________

(Sinem nem blong yu long ples ia)                      (Namba blong tudei (dei, manis mo yia))

Committee blong ‘Ethics’ blong University blong Otago oli approvem research ia finis. Sapose yu gat ol qwestin o konsen long research ia, ples yu save kontaktem Committee blong ‘Ethics’ Administrator long (03) 479 8256. Sipos yu gat sam issue o kwestin bae oli luk luk se wanem we i wrong mo traem best blong mekem evri samting i stret. Bae oli no talemaot concerns blong yu long ol narafala man – toktok blong yu bae hemi sikret.
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List of Key Informants
1. Recognised Seasonal Employer, and Human Resource Manager
2. Te Puke Church Representative
3. The Complex Accommodation Representative
4. Department of Labour – Representative and Recognised Seasonal Employer Relationships Manager
5. Senior Policy Analyst Resource Management – Western Bay of Plenty District Council
6. Recognised Seasonal Employer, Human Resource Manager, and a Horticulture Industry Representative
7. New Zealand Kiwifruit Growers Incorporated Executive Team Member
8. Policy Analyst Strategic – Western Bay of Plenty District Council
9. The Campsite Representative
10. Te Puke Ward Councillor
11. Te Puke Police Representative
12. Recognised Seasonal Employer, Human Resource Manager, and a Horticulture Industry Representative
Appendix F

List of Focus Groups
Focus Groups

Focus Group One:
- 4 males from Tanna
- 2 females from Espiritu Santo

Focus Group Two:
- 2 males from Tanna and 2 from Efate
- 4 females from Tanna

Focus Group Three:
- 5 females from Tanna
- 3 males from Efate

Focus Group Four:
- 3 males from Tanna
- 2 females from Espiritu Santo
Appendix G

List of Topics and Questions for Key Informants and Focus Groups
Topics and Questions for Key Informants and Focus Groups

The following topics and questions have been represented in a very broad manner to illustrate that discussions may lead into some of the areas listed.

Topics:
1. Temporary Worker Migration
2. Worker Programmes
3. New Zealand and Vanuatu Culture’s
4. Social Relations and Constructs
5. Rights
6. Hierarchies and Roles
7. Gender
8. Multiculturalism
9. Policy and Planning
10. Experience

Questions:
1. Temporary Worker Migration Questions:
History of temporary worker migration in a contemporary and historical context with specific links to New Zealand’s policies and the people of Vanuatu.

2. Worker Programmes Questions:
The participation of organisations and Ni-Vanuatu people in worker programmes, the effectiveness, related issues, and development.

3. New Zealand and Vanuatu Culture’s Questions:
The comparison of cultures, historical and contemporary links, and issues defining the cultures.

4. **Social Relations and Constructs Questions:**

Social relations between Ni-Vanuatu workers themselves, between employers and workers and the social constructs that makeup these relations.

5. **Rights Questions:**

Rights of Ni-Vanuatu workers and New Zealand employers, and the acquisition of rights.

6. **Hierarchies and Roles Questions:**

Hierarchies within both social and working environments and related roles.

7. **Gender Questions:**

Men and women’s social relationships, patriarchal issues, norms and related issues.

8. **Multiculturalism Questions:**

Multicultural makeup of society and its development with respect to Ni-Vanuatu people, related issues for Ni-Vanuatu people, working environments and communities.

9. **Policy and Planning Questions:**

Positive and negatives for policy and planning and recommended changes and maintenance.

10. **Experience Questions:**

The overall experiences of Ni-Vanuatu people and others exposed to their experiences.