



Libraries and Learning Services

University of Auckland Research Repository, ResearchSpace

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognize the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

“FOR ME IT WAS SUPER EASY, BUT FOR OTHER PEOPLE...”: INVESTIGATING
ASSISTED INCLUSION AND THE PRIVILEGE TO MOVE ‘FREELY’ BETWEEN NEW
ZEALAND AND AUSTRALIA.

Tom Bayliss
University of Auckland

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Science in Geography, The University of Auckland, 2019.

Abstract

Borders were never designed to stop everyone from moving, and free movement for the privileged continues to be enabled around the world by bilateral and multilateral agreements. A bilateral agreement between New Zealand and Australia (the Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement, 1973) allows citizens of these nations to perform ‘free movement migration’ between the two countries. Academic research has presented free movement migration as being based on the ability of governments to minimise the restraints and discriminatory behaviours that prevent or dissuade the movement of people between borders. Scholars have noted what constitutes idealised free movement migration, but fewer researchers have attempted to investigate and understand whether agreements that communicate free movement achieve their claims. This thesis engages with migrant populations living in New Zealand and Australia to evaluate the extent to which ‘free movement’ is actually realised by those moving between Australia and New Zealand under a free movement travel arrangement. This thesis provides a comparative account of free movement in both directions, to answer the following question: How do Australian and New Zealand migrants moving across the Tasman Sea experience and understand ‘free movement’ migration under the Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement? This thesis adopted a qualitative inductive approach to answer this question, and a total of 20 interviews were conducted with two migrant participant groups: Australian citizens living in Auckland, New Zealand, and New Zealand citizens living in Sydney, Australia. Findings from these interviews were that trans-Tasman migrants experienced ‘assisted inclusion’ in the way their settlement and inclusion in society was assisted by physical infrastructure and the rights they were accorded. In addition, participant narratives gave evidence of the construction of identities in the space of free movement. In particular, an apparent but often unnamed colonial settler identity was both naturalised in the trans-Tasman space and positioned as superior to other identity claims,

including that of indigenous peoples. This research suggests that wider social ideas about a shared colonial identity privileges movement both formally and informally for people who subscribe to this dominant and undisrupted identity. This research thus asserts that racism is embedded in the privilege to move freely between borders.

Keywords: Free Movement Migration, New Zealand, Australia, Race, Colonialism.

Acknowledgements

This masters project is the product of love and support from a great number of people.

I am indebted to my partner, family, friends and participants for their amazing contributions to this thesis, but firstly I would like to acknowledge my supervisors, Francis Collins and Tom Baker, I am forever grateful for your inspiration and wisdom. Thank you for guiding me through my many drafts and resubmitted sections (of up to 25,000 words at a time) ‘*which*’ have always contained plenty of mistakes, with a keen eye for detail and enthusiasm for my topic. You have both been extremely patient and understanding, and your involvement in the project has been nothing other than phenomenal, from the very beginning right up until the due date, despite both of your changes in circumstances. A new baby and a new role at another university has not stopped either of you from investing your precious time in giving extremely articulate and invaluable feedback on my project. This project truly could not have been done without you both.

I appreciate tremendously the love and support of my partner, Amber Kirk. Amber has been the glue that has kept me together throughout writing this thesis, especially during the last four months, which has been the loneliest time of life as I wrote this thesis in Bangkok, Thailand. This thesis has brought utter confusion, tears, and on one particular time, profuse swearing at inanimate objects after I deleted unsaved work that I was unable to recover. I cannot express how much of a difference your constant reassurance has made during these times. Your bubbiness is the only thing that has kept me sane while I spent whole days (and nights) working on this thesis, and I am incredibly lucky to have you in my life.

I am endlessly grateful for my incredible family. To my parents, I hope one day I can do as well as you have with raising kids. You have always encouraged me to do the best I

can, and it has only brought out the best in me. Dad, your dedication cheering me on through every weekend's soccer game from the age I could run has given me a self confidence in my own abilities that seems to have stuck. Mum, I think I was destined to return to the human sciences building ever since you led me down those corridors as a kid, with a liquorice strap in one hand and a new plan to climb our next volcano together. To my sister Lucy, you have had an amazing influence in shaping my views and my academic abilities, and I love you to bits. I am extremely worried about how I might have turned out had I not had such a wise sister who has shared such thoughtful advice with me about so many aspects of the world. I think that me being a feminist is something in particular that you can take complete credit for. Without your constant feedback on assignments (even when I sent them to you just hours before the deadline), I am certain my writing skills would never have been good enough for me to pursue academia beyond undergraduate level.

Finally, I would like to thank my wonderful participants who generously contributed their time to take part in the research. I hope that this research does justice to the effort you put into meeting with me, and I appreciate tremendously your openness in sharing your stories of migration.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Personal Prologue.....	3
Chapter 1: Introduction	6
Chapter 2: Freedom of Movement	10
2.1: Situating Freedom of Movement.....	10
<i>Borders as Regulators of Freedom of Movement</i>	11
<i>What Constitutes Freedom of Movement?</i>	16
<i>The Politics of Freedom of Movement</i>	20
2.2: Friction in Free Movement	24
<i>Friction of Identity and Belonging</i>	25
<i>Administrative Frictions</i>	30
2.3: Summary.....	33
Chapter 3: The New Zealand and Australian Context	35
3.1: Nation Formation and Identity	35
3.2: Colonial Immigration Policies and TTTA Free Movement	37
Chapter 4: Methodology.....	46
4.1: Methodological Approach	46
4.2: Participants and Recruitment.....	48
4.3: Data Collection	52
4.4: Data Analysis.....	55
4.5: Reflexivity in Research	56
Chapter 5: Experiencing Free Movement	58
5.1: Controls That Enable Movement.....	58
5.2: The Administration of Rights and Privileges	68
5.3: Chapter Summary	84
Chapter 6: The Construction of Identities	86

6.1: The Invisibility of Colonial Identities	87
6.2: The Visibility of ‘Other’ Identities	104
6.3: Chapter Summary	114
Chapter 7: Conclusion	116
7.1: Findings and Implications	116
7.2: Limitations and Future Directions	119
7.3: A Reflexive Conclusion.....	120
References	123
Appendices	151
Appendix A: Email Script	151
Appendix B: Questionnaire	152
Appendix C: Participant Consent Form.....	154
Appendix D: Participant Information Sheet:	155
Appendix E: Social Media Posts:	158
Appendix F: Vignettes	160
Appendix G: Qualtics Survey	161

Personal Prologue

In February 2017, as part of a previous project, I conducted an interview with a participant, Dalisay (pseudonym) who had experienced a series of awful and insufferable conditions working on a North Island Dairy Farm in New Zealand on a temporary work visa. Dalisay discussed experiencing expensive agency fees and arrived to one of the most isolated farms in the North Island where she experienced racism, abuse and was made to work in unsafe environments with unreasonable and unqualified pay deductions. Despite these conditions, Dalisay had persevered with life in New Zealand for nine years so she could meet the requirements of the points-based system to apply for permanent residency. Permanent residency would have given her the freedom to change from her current employers where she explained she was treated “like a slave”. After being invited to apply for the second stage in her residency application, her application was declined, and her situation remains bleak. This appalling treatment of someone on a temporary work visa was not an isolated case, as exploitative employment practices were discussed in more than a quarter of the interviews I conducted for this previous study. In these cases, government arrangements monitor and restrict the movements of people on temporary work visas promoting forms of precarity and employer dependency, with very little effort placed in monitoring working conditions or whether basic human rights are upheld. This migration pathway has also been promoted as a route to full inclusion, although this is never guaranteed for those attempting to prove their value to society. That research project opened my eyes to the ways that immigration controls and restrictive pathways to being included in society can have dire consequences for the wellbeing of the people who move overseas. The people I interviewed also had aspirations that I can partially relate to, having recently moved

overseas to Thailand to pursue a job opportunity with the International Labour Organisation; goals for self-improvement, adventure and better financial prospects. My experiences investigating people who live and work in New Zealand on temporary visas has been personally significant in shaping my identity as a researcher, my interest in investigating the inequalities embedded in migration regimes, and the values I bring to this thesis.

Highly restricted movement has become a popular immigration policy prescription in international migration forums (Gamlen, 2014a; Geiger & Pécoud, 2013), but it is not the only way of managing the migration of people moving between nations, or the only form of movement I consider to be important to conduct research on. My interest in researching supposedly ‘free movement’ migration in this thesis is to pose a valuable counter point to the way movement has been heavily restricted, and to expose and elaborate on the way that privileged migration pathways are experienced and understood. The Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement (hereafter TTTA) is an example of privileged and facilitated movement across borders (Hugo, 2015). As I began this research it became apparent that little was known about Australians living in New Zealand in particular, although the general consensus in popular media reports was that Australians’ experiences of moving to New Zealand were considered to be completely frictionless (Alves, 2017; Chess Moving, 2018; Rolfe, 2017). In this way, it appeared to me that investigating migration within the context of the TTTA would provide a valuable insight into the ordinary functioning of a privileged migration system that provides instant legal inclusion to foreign citizens.

To investigate the TTTA and free movement most effectively, I considered that it would be appropriate to conduct a comparative study that acknowledged that movement under the TTTA occurs in two directions, not just one. Migrating to Australia is an

extremely common migration pathway for New Zealanders, and it seems that most New Zealand families have at least one connection who has moved to Australia at least temporarily, if not permanently. My own family is no different, and in reaching out to my cousin (who lives in Melbourne) and other connections, I asked them questions about their experiences of moving to Australia. Our discussions painted a picture of New Zealanders who were alienated from utilising public health care services, children with Leukaemia who were unable to access treatment, and concerns about the deportation of New Zealand citizens from Australia. It was these early conversations that suggested to me that there were growing frustrations with Australia's new interpretation of the TTTA, where the rights of all New Zealanders in Australia have been eroded by consecutive policy changes since 1994, that go against the original and reciprocal rights promised in the TTTA. My early conversations with family members thus drew my attention to how these policy changes impacted the narratives of everyday New Zealanders living in Australia, and how there were valuable comparisons that could be drawn between the experiences of New Zealand and Australian citizens moving across the Tasman Sea under the TTTA. Armed with my theoretical perspectives and my experience researching the restrictions that people on temporary work visas face in New Zealand, I set out to uncover how trans-Tasman Migration is experienced, and how it has come to be understood by those who undertake this common migration pathway.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Borders exercise a double standard in producing mobility experiences that are soft for some, and hard for others (Hall, 2017). There has been increased attention on migration and borders in recent times, as is evident in the campaign around Brexit, growing numbers of border walls and Donald Trump's policy directions (Croucher, 2018). Controlling immigration and inciting hard border exclusions for particular migrants is a topic that has the power to dominate political discussions (Pécoud & Guchteneire, 2007). Migration has thus become highly politicised. In an age of more fluid migration patterns, a key focus in today's political environment is the development of new hard measures for policing and restricting movement (Pécoud & Guchteneire, 2007). This pressure for strongly asserted and defended borders has undermined the continuation of soft border controls that enable 'free movement migration' between neighbouring countries (Maas, 2013). Most notably, Britain's planned exit from the European Union is a clear example of public dissension about the provision of free movement access to the nation by non-citizens (Maas, 2013). The attention on illegal and unwanted forms of movement between borders has powered a trend towards defensive border stances, in some places, destabilizing arrangements that have previously allowed citizens to move freely across national borders (Mountz, 2010).

Despite research acknowledging the different ways nation states regulate their borders through immigration policy, academics have identified that there is little research on the way people negotiate bureaucratic hurdles to belonging, or how soft border immigration regimes impact the migrant experience (Mountz et al., 2002; Robertson 2011; Wright, 2004). Empirical transnational migration literature is largely divided into two contrasting foci; studies that have focused on the experiences and practices of

globetrotting professional elites, or by contrast, studies on the experiences of people who are disenfranchised and undocumented (Yeoh et al., 2003). This research has brought about understandings that mobile elites are largely able to circumvent and manipulate regulatory powers (Burawoy et al., 2000; Sklair, 2001), while asylum seekers and undocumented migrants experience high stake, high risk encounters with the state having full power in deciding whether to include or exclude these vulnerable migrants (Mountz et al., 2002; Johnston, 2008). The current study endeavours to take an alternative focus to understand the way soft borders and free movement migration operate, by looking at the ordinary functioning of this migration system through the lens of ‘ordinary’¹ peoples’ experiences and understandings.

The Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement (1973, hereafter TTTA) between New Zealand and Australia is a valuable case study to explore the way free movement migration is negotiated and experienced by ‘ordinary’ people. The TTTA claims to grant citizens the opportunity to move freely across the Tasman Sea despite the existence of the international border separating Australia and New Zealand (Hugo, 2015). Australians are granted an Australian residency visa on arrival in New Zealand, according them effectively the same rights as permanent residents (Immigration New Zealand, 2018). Australians moving to New Zealand under the TTTA have been completely unstudied in academic research, but news articles have presented Australians as experiencing very few restrictions when setting up new lives in New Zealand as a result of this facilitated pathway (Alves, 2017; Chess Moving, 2018; Rolfe, 2017). The dominant understanding of Australians in New Zealand is that they ‘have it easy’ (Ryan, 2016), experiencing a facilitated and privileged pathway to inclusion, although very little is known about how

¹ People who do not engender the stated class extremes (the hyper-mobile elite or the disenfranchised and undocumented).

this privilege operates or whether tensions exist in their experiences of supposedly free movement. New Zealanders moving to Australia under the TTTA free movement arrangement have garnered more attention both in the media and in academic research (see for example, McMillan, 2014). Since 2001, New Zealanders moving to Australia receive a special category visa that provides more (although still limited) entry rights to New Zealand migrants. Special category visas limit New Zealanders' access to permanent residency status, education opportunities, rights to certain government programmes, and promote border exclusions for New Zealanders who commit crimes in Australia (Stanley, 2018). The TTTA is thus a valuable case study to investigate experiences of free movement both in a highly facilitated pathway to inclusion for Australians moving to New Zealand, and through a pathway that is relatively soft but has been stripped back in significant ways for New Zealanders moving to Australia.

This study explores experiences of 'free movement' migration under the TTTA, and how people understand the palatability of supporting the arrival and inclusion of trans-Tasman neighbours. Twenty in-depth face-to-face interviews were conducted with Australian citizens living in Auckland, New Zealand ($n=10$) and New Zealanders living in Sydney, Australia ($n=10$). These interviews were transcribed and analysed using a thematic approach, and findings were informed by a social constructionist epistemology to critically examine experiences and understandings of trans-Tasman free movement migration. This thesis is organised across seven chapters, with each chapter fulfilling a specific purpose in developing the basis for this study and its overall contribution to the space of understanding free movement migration. Following this chapter, I present chapter two, where I trace literature that introduces free movement migration and articulates how studying free movement is important, and also how people might experience frictions whilst moving across borders under free movement arrangements.

Chapter three of this thesis establishes the contextual background necessary for understanding the TTTA and the findings this study presents. Chapter four outlines the methodological approach taken in this study. In chapters five and six, I present the findings from my thematic analysis of the interviews. Chapter five describes two themes that examine the way freedom of movement was constructed in relation to participants' physical movements between borders, and their experiences accessing administrative rights and privileges in their host nation. Chapter six focuses on the construction of identities in the space of free movement, and explores how these identities are normatively understood and experienced by those who move across the Tasman Sea. In chapter eight, I summarise the way this thesis builds an argument that people who move under the TTTA experience assisted inclusion, and that assisted inclusion rests on a white settler identity claim that is positioned as superior to other identity claims in the trans-Tasman space. I will also evaluate the potential strengths and weaknesses of this study and reflect on my own experiences of the research. In presenting these findings and reflecting on the research, this thesis contributes to theoretical understandings of free movement migration in asserting that identities matter in free movement, and by suggesting the importance of disrupting the assumed superiority of dominant and privileged identities within free movement migration.

Chapter 2: Freedom of Movement

There is great inequality in the way people move across international borders (Hall, 2017). National borders have become significant in the way movement has come to be defined and regulated (Pécoud & Guchteneire, 2007). National borders were once understood simply as the physical boundaries between sovereign states, but now national boundaries are everywhere (Mountz, 2010). Territories contain internal borders that separate citizens from the non-citizens, the permanent resident from the temporary worker, the refugee from the asylum seeker, the insider from the outsider (Balibar, 1990, cited in Hall, 2017). The dominance of these complicated boundaries of belonging and inclusion has meant that the freedom to move across borders as insiders is a freedom that is only provided to a minority of migrants (Pécoud & Guchteneire, 2007). For instance, free movement arrangements such as those established by the Treaty of Maastricht in the European Union have been the subject of considerable public attention in the way they redefine insiders and outsiders (Tryfonidou, 2017). This literature review will discuss the relationship between free movement, borders, and identity. I begin with a discussion that situates freedom of movement, before presenting material that demonstrates that certain exclusions and forms of friction are embedded within notions of ‘free movement’. In doing so, I will trace contemporary literature to arrive at the understanding that studying free movement is important, while also raising important questions about how free movement might be experienced and understood.

2.1: Situating Freedom of Movement

Freedom of movement migration pathways are an important topic of academic attention (Pécoud & Guchteneire, 2007). Free movement migration pathways have received increasing academic attention given their ability to encourage safe and facilitated access

across borders in a world where thousands of migrants die each year in their attempts to reach receiving destinations (Kovras & Robbins, 2016). This section aims to make sense of ‘freedom of movement’ by drawing together commonalities in the way freedom of movement has been understood by scholars and how migration arrangements adopting this concept are designed. Firstly, I will discuss the importance of borders as tools that are used to regulate freedom of movement. Secondly, I will discuss the various aspects that constitute freedom of movement and explore how prominent definitions of free movement then make nations accountable to provide citizens with freedom of movement opportunities. Finally, this section will examine the principals and geopolitical orientations that have underpinned the development of freedom of movement arrangements between nations.

Borders as Regulators of Freedom of Movement

Scholars have described how freedom of movement has been a global norm throughout human history. Migration and movement are not new phenomena; rather the history of *Homo sapiens* is a history of mobility (Lucassen & Lucassen, 2009; Nail, 2015).

Anthropologists assert that the success of *Homo sapiens* over the last 150,000 years has relied on freedom of movement, and nomadic lifestyles make up more than nine-tenths of our history, whereas living sedentary lifestyles are a relatively new invention in the context of human evolution (Pries, 2006). Although scholars have indicated that there have been numerous historic attempts to regulate the incomings of foreigners and the outgoings of ‘vagabonds’ before the existence of statehood (Gilroy, 2004; Stevens, 2004; Wilsher, 2012), the creation of nation states and bounded territories has had the most significant impact on restricting the freedom of movement in recent centuries (Anderson, 2013). It is therefore valuable to view mobility and freedom of movement historically, to

denaturalise the systems in place today, such as borders, that act to restrict global freedom of movement.

Freedom of movement arrangements can be understood by exploring the importance of borders as taken for granted formations that selectively facilitate or restrict free movement. Borders that demarcate nation states are fundamentally political and social constructions, yet they nonetheless have distinct outcomes for the freedom of movement of people attempting to move between them (Storey, 2012; Newman & Paasi, 1998). Many studies have brought attention to the way that physical borders are highly visible representations of the state, and how they are popularly taken for granted as being natural or eternal rather than geopolitical and historical artefacts (Storey, 2002; Paasi, 1996; 1997). It is also a pervasive assumption that strongly asserted and protected borders are fundamental to the sovereignty and order maintained within states (Torpey, 2000). Academics have recently challenged the largely unquestioned legitimacy and morality of restricting free movement based on classifications such as nationality, race, class, wealth, and education (for example, Anderson, 2013). Accordingly, a key academic debate that surrounds borders and free movement is the contention on the one hand, that borders should be ‘open’, allowing freedom of movement, or alternatively, that it is imperative that borders should be ‘closed’, to strictly regulate those who enter and exit nations (Barry & Goodin, 2015). A third position contends that the right balance can be found between these two counter positions (Barry & Goodin, 2015). This thesis does not address the normative claims of explaining or substantiating the ‘right answer’ to this quandary, but rather looks at borders to understand their role in limiting or facilitating freedom of movement.

Territories and bordering have been a primary way that the world has been divided and controlled politically since the establishment of permanent civilisations

(Elden, 2013). Athens' long walls, Hadrian's wall and the Great Wall of China are just a few of the notable ways that historical conquests and the marking of territory was done through the creation of visible and defensible borders (Vallet, 2016). Borders were also an important tool in colonial claiming of space. One of the most notable examples of when borders were used as an instrument to appropriate territory and exercise a power of control over a jurisdiction was the colonial "scramble" for Africa between 1840 and 1914 (Brooke-Smith, 1987; Johnston 1890). Whereas the precolonial territoriality of Africa was relatively fluid, the establishment of colonial borders arbitrarily separated peoples, linguistic entities, and cultural and political communities (Mbembé, & Rendall, 2000). This establishment of borders then obscured all other ways of imagining space and territory (Mbembé, & Rendall, 2000). These borders certainly privileged the powerful as the creation of colonies simultaneously allowed colonial powers greater freedom of movement, while closing down movement opportunities for local populations, resulting in numerous conflicts as a result of the imprecise nature of the boundaries inherited from colonialism (Mbembé, & Rendall, 2000). Other examples where colonialism facilitated free movement could be found in the right of British subjects to move between commonwealth colonies through fluid and 'open borders' until 1962 (Pécoud & Guchteneire, 2007). Much of the contemporary acceptance of borders thus stems from this colonial claiming of space, with the resulting borders giving colonial powers greater freedom of movement throughout the world while often limiting the mobility of 'outsiders' (Storey, 2012).

Borders remain sites for exercising power, as they are sites of exceptional forms of regulation that operate discriminately to limit freedom of movement (Jones, 2016). The current normalised policy prescription for dealing with global mobilities is 'migration management', where nation states attempt to order flows of migrants by

restricting the number of people moving across borders, and structuring the temporal and legal rights that migrants enter nations with (Geiger & Pécout 2013; Gamlen, 2014a; Global Commission on International Migration, 2005; International Labour Organisation, 2006). In this way, borders operate based on classifying people through markers of privilege such as class, wealth, nationality and race (Anderson, 2013). Shachar (2009) argues that borders work in the interests of wealthy nations and their operation maintains global inequalities, by restricting access and ordering migration based on the perceived desirability of potential migrants. Developed nations only allow the movement and potential inclusion of ‘the best and brightest’ under skilled migrant pathways, while people deemed less-skilled only receive labour market access with few opportunities to gain permanent residency rights (Simon-Kumar, 2015; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017). The selection of migrants also relies on strong border controls to prevent the arrival of those deemed undesirable in the eyes of the state, who may be exposed to the full force of restrictive immigration practices (Anderson, 2013; Mountz, 2010). Fine (2013) suggests that it is taken for granted that nation states have a right to control the entry and settlement of non-citizens into their territories without needing to morally justify the reasoning behind operating immigration practices (Bauder, 2016; Fine, 2013). As such, those who attempt to move outside of the terms of the nation state frameworks are made illegal in space, and can experience coercive, invasive and exceptional forms of security that detain and deport people in ways that are not consistent with notions of individual freedom and respect for human rights (Mountz, 2010).

A more recent focus on how nation-states restrict global movements indicates that there has been what academics describe as a reconfiguration of borders (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002; Morley & Robins, 1995). There is a growing recognition that

nations reach outwards and inwards from borders to define and regulate citizens and non-citizens (Collyer & King, 2015). The Australian government's establishment of detention centres on Christmas and Manus Islands, for example, are highly contentious examples of a government reaching beyond physical borders in order to form a pre-emptive border defence (Mountz, 2010). In the case of Christmas Island, the Australian government has rendered this territory legally outside the nation while still maintaining sovereign control (Coddington et al., 2012). In the case of Manus Island, Australia has engaged with the government of Papua New Guinea to enter into a formal relationship that sees the insertion of Australian government practices into another national territory (Hyndman & Mountz, 2008). As such, nations may reach outwards beyond territorial borders in a way that is inconsistent with classical views of citizenship and sovereignty (Gamlen, 2014b; Mountz, 2010; Ashutosh & Mountz, 2011). Of equal importance, nations look inwards from borders to regulate non-citizens and those who might be partially included (Mazzadra & Neilson, 2013). Internal regulation is achieved through the imposition of controls and restrictions to groups such as asylum seekers and guest workers (Anderson, 2013). These diverse practices illuminate how borders are complex and multifaceted constructions, that are actively constructed, reconfigured and defended by nations who attempt to regulate the character and movement of citizens and non-citizens in increasingly complex ways.

The global emphasis on restricting and regulating migration means that people moving 'freely' make up the minority of global migrants. The normalised global dominance of restrictive immigration practices is interrupted by bilateral arrangements that act as exceptions, by allowing so called 'free movement' to occur between borders. Examples of 'open' or free movement borders can be found between Australia and New Zealand (Hugo, 2015), Nepal and India (Kansaker, 2012), the Caribbean Community

(CARICOM) open border between central American Islands (Mohammed, 2008), and within the European Union (Tryfonidou, 2017). These member countries allow ‘free’ flows of citizens between each member state, although the actual experience of free movement varies considerably. They do however illustrate how the creation of borders does not necessarily result in universal restrictions on freedom of movement.

What Constitutes Freedom of Movement?

Freedom is a concept that can be expressed and experienced subjectively by individuals and described formally in international policy documents. Using a lay definition from the Oxford Dictionary (2018), freedom is most centrally the ability to do as one pleases, and the term freedom assumes a lack of restraints on actions, speech or thoughts. In a philosophical sense though, freedom can also be seen as something that needs to be bounded; to able to generate freedom one must be able to exercise power to limit those who would undermine freedoms (Foucault, 1982). To this end, freedom of speech, freedom of expression and freedom of thought have been formalised in universal human rights accords (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948). Freedom is also considered a founding ideology of libertarian values (Block, 1998) and notions of freedom resonate with certain national ideals, most prominently the United States of America, which makes a claim to be ‘the land of the free’ (Fischer, 2012). In this example, where American citizens are thought to have a strong emotional attachment to notions of freedom, freedom can be felt and expressed by individuals regardless of the actual constraints that may exist in society (Fischer, 2012). Freedom can also be read in relation to an emotive expression of leisure and happiness, and it has been identified that there is a common desire for ‘free time’ as an escape from the stresses of daily life (Mattingly & Sayer, 2006). Freedom is thus regarded as a positive and desirable state,

and it is globally aspirational that nations allow people to exercise fundamental freedoms of expression, speech and thought (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948).

Freedom of movement is also set out as a human right in international policy documents. It is established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) that “everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state”, a key principle that has guided the implementation of rights to internal movement within the borders of many nations (Maas, 2014). Despite such humanitarian accords, it’s important to note that these freedoms remain absent in some parts of the world, for example China’s *hukou* or household registration system is an overt discriminatory state system in which rural populations are restricted from being able to settle legally in cities (Chan, 2010; Cheng, & Selden, 1994). The *hukou* system represents a limit to freedom of movement, but it is also indicative of wider limits to freedom for rural people, such as exclusions from accessing most basic welfare and state-provided services that are enjoyed by urban residents (Chan, 2010). Policy documents that give effect to the international aspiration of allowing citizens the freedom to move outside of national borders can be witnessed in numerous nations and in supranational communities, including Germany’s Basic Law (1949), the African Charter of Human Rights (1981), and Russia’s Constitution (1993). It is also outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) that anyone should have the right to leave any country, including their own, and return to that country (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948). These statements of rights encourage member states to provide their people with exit options, protecting them from poor governance or authoritarian regimes (Maas, 2014; Pécoud & Guchteneire, 2007). Freedom of movement is thus framed as desirable in international human rights accords that makes nations accountable for providing citizens with some forms of free movement.

Freedom of movement between nation states is reliant on accessibility and bilateral or multilateral agreements that open up opportunities for people to move between borders unconditionally. The recently signed Global Compact Agreement indicates that migration is a basic human right, although it reserves the right of states to set their own border policies (United Nations, 2019). Thus, while states are guided by human rights principles to ensure that their citizens are entitled to leave the nation, there is no international mandate to ensure foreigners are welcomed without limits (Dowty, 1987). Consequently, even when freedom of exit opportunities exist, only a minority have the ability to enter destination countries whose immigration controls regulate foreigners to maintain national sovereignty (Weiner, 1996). Freedom of movement is thus impeded by the limited abilities for people to escape the ties of nation states, due to constrained access to alternative destination states (Maas, 2014). As such, the right to freedom of movement of citizens is only guaranteed if there are a number of potential states that provide ‘free entry’, and it is the responsibility of nation states to negotiate free movement arrangements to overcome restrictions on movement (Maas, 2014).

‘Restriction’ of mobility constitutes anything that discourages movement by making it less attractive or more burdensome (Andenas, Bekkedal, & Pantaleo, 2017). Restrictions that limit migration range from coercive forces of the state that detain and deport people attempting to move across borders, to the bureaucratic procedures of having a passport checked (Tryfonidou, 2017). There are, however, specific examples of governments who have endeavoured to facilitate free movement by attempting to minimise the restraints and discriminatory behaviours that prevent the movement of people between borders (Tryfonidou, 2017; Maas, 2008). Granting people physical access to other nation-states is a key way that restrictions on movement are minimised. For example, the removal of armed border posts and checkpoints on international

highways in the creation of the Economic Community of West African States formed a borderless region, that no longer ‘menaced’ the physical access and free movement of persons through forceful deterrence (Economic Community of West African States, 2003). Other strategies employed to open physical access between nations in the provision of free movement include the elimination of rigid border formalities (Adepoju, 2002) and the creation of supranational passports (Maas, 2014; Adepoju, 2007). The removal of restrictions to physical access is thus primary to the creation of any free movement arrangement.

Nation states have also employed a number of strategies they claim facilitate freedom of movement by minimising the restrictions acting on people after they have moved across borders. Such provisions include assurances that citizens may move across certain borders without temporal constraints (Pexioto, 2001). In the European Union, a main provision that substantiates a claim of facilitating ‘free movement’ is the provision that allows citizens moving between member states to stay permanently (Pexioto, 2001). Similarly, this is also a key foundation of the mutual travel arrangement between New Zealand and Australia (Hugo, 2015). In addition, it is posited by Van der Mei (2003) that another expectation of freedom of movement is that all members of society have equal rights to utilise public services while residing in other member states. This provision asserts that all members of society, bounded by free movement agreements, should be entitled to support that upholds an acceptable standard of living, and ensures people have food, shelter, and access to essential services such as education and medical care (Van der Mei, 2003). Scholars have also highlighted the importance of mutually recognised credentials and qualifications, and the absence of discrimination based on nationality, especially in relation to employment between signatories of free movement arrangements (Tryfonidou, 2017). Freedom of movement can thus be claimed when there are few

restrictions acting on both movement across borders and the provision of access to social services, indefinite residence periods, and equal opportunities to employment in the receiving nation.

The Politics of Freedom of Movement

In reality, nations do not provide free movement pathways for citizens of other states unless allocating rights to foreign citizens can be rationalised un-controversially (Skinner, 2016). Contemporary examples of bilateral or multilateral agreements that claim to provide freedom of movement between nations hinge primarily on economic motivations. Free movement migration has been most studied in the context of the European Union, where policies and agreements have aimed to provide the free circulation of individuals in an attempt to build a common European economic market (Peixoto, 2001). The European Union's establishment of free movement rights was granted not only to break down ethnic or political borders (Hart, 2009), but in order to facilitate the free pursuit of economic activities across nation state borders (Van der Mei, 2003). Other examples that rationalise freedom of movement based on the pursuit of economic development and an integration of economic markets can be found in the 'Economic' Community of West African States (2003), the CARICOM Caribbean community (Mohammad, 2008) and New Zealand and Australia's Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement (Hugo, 2015). In this way, although freedom of movement might be considered a human right, economic growth has been positioned as the primary motivation for free movement agreements rather than humanitarian provisions.

The economic rationality and political palatability of freedom of movement arrangements are reliant on similar levels of economic development and growth between nation states. Barry & Goodin (1992) argued that the opening of free movement borders

would lead to redistributions of wealth between ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ nations. This redistribution of wealth provokes a tension between giving effect to human rights by facilitating freedom of movement, and the perceived economic costs that developed nations might experience if they do not maintain global inequalities by preventing the arrival of ‘unwanted’ migrants (Barry & Goodin, 1992). This financial tension was exemplified in the events and responses associated with the expansion of the European Union in 2004 into Central and Eastern Europe (Johns, 2014). This expansion allocated membership to new nations who had previously been aligned with the Soviet Bloc, providing people new rights to freedom of movement within Europe (Johns, 2014; Maas, 2007). This opening of opportunities to countries with lower levels of economic development caused immediate concern among Western member states, who feared they would be ‘overrun’ with economic migrants, lowering wages and contributing to rising unemployment among local populations (McDowell, 2009). Similarly, negative attitudes about free movement migration and concerns about European Union expansion from less wealthy nations were considered to be influential in Britain’s vote to exit the European Union in 2016 (Portes, 2016). Freedom of movement agreements therefore might become controversial and politically unviable when implemented between nations of uneven economic affluence.

Freedom of movement migration programmes do not rest solely on economic rationalities, but are also influenced by constructions of race, shared histories, and linguistic and cultural familiarities between nations (Hugo, 2015). The importance of factors beyond economic rationality in the establishment and maintenance of free movement arrangements become clear by considering the works of Adepaju (2007), Maas (2008), McDowell (2009), and Hugo (2015). Adepaju (2007) described how free movement across borders throughout West Africa has long been facilitated by cultural

affinity; when those moving speak the same language and share the same customs as local populations, their movement is uncontroversial. Similarly, Maas (2008) gives evidence that EU citizenship was not solely an economic project, but significant focus was placed on developing a shared European identity, nationality and culture that inspired loyalty and devotion. This supranational European community provided rights that differentiated Europeans citizens from ‘other’ third country citizens, and effort was placed on safeguarding what was considered the ‘European values’ of life, freedom, dignity, social justice and, above all, peace (former French Prime Minister Guy Mollet, cited in Maas, 2007). McDowell (2009) also noted that whiteness was fundamental to original membership and freedom of movement opportunities in this supranational project to integrate European communities. She argues that whiteness is constituted as a marker of taken for granted assumptions of superiority and dominance, but also an identity that is invisible and framed as un-threatening as opposed to racialised ‘others’, that allowed an integrated community to be socially acceptable (McDowell 2009). Similarly, Hugo (2015) argues that the multilateral agreement between Australia and New Zealand is framed around a shared colonial identity, and narratives of ‘matehood’ are entrenched through traditional celebrations of commonwealth participation and unity in past battles. In these examples of freedom of movement arrangements, free entry and shared citizenship is not just a marker of economic hopes, but also a marker of a perceived shared identity.

The importance of national identities and race in free movement agreements becomes apparent when investigating the breakdown of mutual reciprocity of existing free movement agreements. Kansakar (2012) described how growing xenophobia against migrant workers and foreigners has compelled changes to the Nepal-India border, with calls to introduce greater regulation and restriction on border movements. The

importance of national identities and race is also evident in relation to Britain's anticipated withdrawal from the European Union, which has popularly been described as a response to immigration fears about the movement of asylum seekers and undocumented migrants through EU member states (Viskanic, 2017; Cap, 2017). These undocumented movements were condemned as a threat to British national identity, with scholars indicating how these immigration concerns were highly racialized (Viskanic, 2017). The 2001 breakdown of mutual reciprocity in the Freedom of Movement agreement between Australia and New Zealand has also been considered by scholars to be racially targeted (Stanley, 2018; Hamer, 2014). The restrictive policies introduced by Australia in 2001² were sanctioned under the argument that New Zealand was a 'backdoor' immigration pathway allowing 'unsophisticated and unsuited' New Zealand citizens born in Pacific Island nations to easily enter Australia, while other restrictions limiting access to welfare were targeted at New Zealand Māori who were portrayed in media as the Gold Coast 'dole bludgers' (Hamer, 2014; Stewart, 2013). These arguments suggest that freedom of movement arrangements are highly racialized, and the perceived entry of 'undesirable' migrants can and did lead to the breakdown of free movement agreements.

In sum, freedom of movement has been significantly constrained in modern times through the normalisation of national statehood and the taken for granted ability of states to apply restrictive immigration controls at borders. Although restricted mobility is the dominant experience of movement between borders, a minority of people move between borders under free movement arrangements. Free movement is a principal that has been held up in humanitarian accords as an international ideal, and refers to a desirable state

² As previously mentioned, these restrictions removed the right of New Zealand citizens to gain residency in Australia on arrival, simultaneously removing other entitlements to welfare, for example, for new New Zealand migrants.

of movement in which people experience minimal restrictions or discrimination both in having physical access to alternative nations, and being provided with indefinite rights to residency and welfare support, for example. It has been demonstrated that for freedom of movement arrangements to exist, they must be founded on claims that free movement promotes economic advancement, and the allowance of increased mobility does not overtly disrupt national identities or cultural and linguistic ideals. Where these promises have not rung true, tension has caused a breakdown in the mutual reciprocity of freedom of movement arrangements. These discussions provide a groundwork to investigate whether unimpeded mobility is actually realised by people who move between nations that make claims to facilitate 'freedom of movement'.

2.2: Friction in Free Movement

The term 'friction' has been applied by scholars to argue that movement is inherently intertwined with limits and restrictions (Tsing, 2005; Maas, 2008). Tsing (2005) contests even the existence of unimpeded or free movement instead using the term 'friction' to describe movement. She argues that popular stories of an imagined globalised era and the breakdown of national barriers and removal of protective state policies created an expectation that this would result in the pervasive and unimpeded flow of goods, ideas, money and people (Tsing, 2005). In reality, however, Tsing (2005) argues, that movement does not proceed this way at all, but insufficient funds, security searches and informal lines of segregation inflict friction, limiting opportunities to travel and experiences of free movement. Speaking of friction is thus a reminder that motion is socially informed, and acknowledging friction guides researchers to reflect on the importance of cultural form and agency in defining movement (Tsing, 2005). In the context of free movement arrangements between borders, Maas (2008) also uses the term

friction to understand the restrictions that operate on non-citizens who move under a free movement arrangement in the European Union. He argues that in Europe, “the relationship between common Union citizenship and the maintenance of the local hierarchies defended by the national citizenship of the member states reflects an enduring friction” (Maas, 2008 pp. 5). Citizenship thus remains a boundary that separates full members of the society, who are privileged, over ‘others’ (Maas 2007). This section adopts the term friction to navigate these boundaries and informal lines of segregation that non-citizens experience in the receiving nations within ‘free movement’ arrangements. I will discuss the notable ways that friction exists in free movement, by exploring frictions of identity and belonging, and administrative frictions.

Friction of Identity and Belonging

Feelings of belonging are important factors that partially account for the real freedom of movement opportunities experienced by people who move across borders. The willingness of people to move between borders and the comfort, wellbeing and likely duration of stay of people who have already moved are all dependant on whether people feel that they belong in the communities of receiving nation states (Kokanović & Božić-Vrbančić, 2015; Fortier, 2000). A sense of belonging cannot be defined objectively, but is expressed individually and subjectively based on how people reconcile habituated and familiar life worlds with features of new environments that can be foreign, daunting and frightening (Grønseth, 2013). A sense of belonging is also not a static emotion that is either obtained or fulfilled, but individual belonging is constantly reshaped by experiences of place and, social and cultural interactions (Grønseth, 2013). The importance and relevance of feelings of belonging in freedom of movement will be discussed by considering literature that explores belonging in relation to identity. While acknowledging that gender, religion and ableism (for example) all shape the way

identities are articulated, this section will discuss the way migrant identities are formed through nationality and race. The combination of these two dominant discourses will be discussed to present how migrants are ascribed migrant identities that either ‘belong’ in destination states, or are promoted as being foreign, or ‘other’. This discussion will identify that legal frameworks are not the only formations that either facilitate or constrain free movement, but I will indicate the importance of social and cultural agendas that influence whether individuals may feel as though they belong in receiving societies.

Nationality is a dominant discourse that structures the way migrant identities are understood or thought to belong in space (Storey 2001; 2002; 2012). National statehood is a central formulation for understanding space and territory, and forms common sense ways of describing and understanding the people who originate from, and reside in bordered communities (Storey, 2012). People commonly subscribe to discourses of nationalism to forge ethnically explicit framings of being ‘British’, ‘New Zealanders’, or ‘Americans’, for example, which mark out national subjects as opposed to the ‘aliens in our midst’: new migrants, non-patriots, or those otherwise un-invested in the enterprise of the nation-state (Turner, 2007). These national identities are not just achieved through self-identification, but people often subscribe to discourses of nationalism to impose assumptions and generalisations on what can be expected from other national subjects, constructing distinctions between national populations and foreign ‘others’ (Anderson, 2013). These assumptions of nationality can become established in communities and then be used to read into the expected performances of certain nationalities in employment and in wider society (Bayliss, 2017; MacKenzie & Forde, 2009; Vertovec, 2011). Nationalism discourses thus operate in society as socio-cultural determinations of who can legitimately be framed as potential citizens (Anderson, 2013). In this way,

people regularly subscribe to discourses of nationalism to demarcate the cultural self, that are then used to situate the identities of migrant ‘others’ in relation to their own identities (Vertovec, 2011).

Such articulations of nationhood are not inconsequential, but highly important for the realised outcomes of people moving between borders. Scholars have drawn attention to the way that migration politics and policies oscillate around dominant performances and articulations of nationalism (Doty 2003; Mavroudi 2010). For example, Bauder (2011) and Sharma (2006) explain that conceptions of national identity are central to shifting migration policies in Canada, and the selection of migrants who can then be accorded further rights to be full members of society. Other popular political outcomes such as Brexit and the crucial support Trump gained for his border securitisation policies resonated with nationalist agendas, which perceived immigration as a direct threat to nation identity and the social harmony and cohesion that is thought to exist in society (Rothwell & Diego-Rosell, 2016). In this way, subject positions that stem from discourses of nationalism, in asserting ‘foreign’ nationalities as being inferior, undeserving of support, and undeserving of inclusion in society, can be extremely powerful in generating political change (Goodman, 2007; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; Vertovec 2011). This literature demonstrates that nationalism discourses play a powerful role in defining who is included and excluded from national communities, and popular articulations of nationality have important outcomes for people moving across borders (Anderson, 2013; Mountz, 2010).

Race is also a dominant discourse that has great relevance to the way migrants might experience friction when moving across international borders as well as clearly intersecting with articulations of the nation. The way that race is normally understood is heavily influenced by the legacy of colonialism (Frankenburg, 1993). Scholars have

formed agreement around the idea that race was ‘invented’ by colonialism and Western scientists who classified and ordered races based on their perceived intellectual abilities in the 19th and 20th centuries (Hall, 1996; Stoler, 1989). These colonial understandings of race positioned the colonized subject as a reductive ‘other’ from the standpoint of a superior white ‘self’. This hierarchical understanding of race is a mode of knowing the world that enabled and rationalized colonial domination over other territories and populations, and produced ways of conceiving ‘other’ societies and cultures that endure into the present consciousness (Hall, 1996; Stoler, 1989). There is widespread agreement that colonial discourse has lasting effects today and has resulted in the production of an unmarked, apparently invisible white/Western self, in contrast with the marked racial ‘other’ (Ballhatchet, 1980; Frankenburg, 1993). More recently, the field of critical whiteness studies has dismantled whiteness as an identity that has been made invisible through privilege (Ahmed, 2007). Critical whiteness studies have established that whiteness is a location of structural advantage, or race privilege (Guðjónsdóttir, 2014) and that whiteness refers to a set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked and unnamed (Solomos & Back, 2000). Critical whiteness research asserts that naming whiteness displaces it from the unmarked, unnamed status that is itself an effect of its dominance, and instead acknowledges how race privilege translates into forms of social organization that shape daily life (Frankenburg 1993). Studies that have investigated the movement of white migrants into dominantly white societies have uncovered valuable insights into the way that white people construct belonging in their destination society through racialization, emphasising assumed visual, ancestral and cultural sameness with the majority population (Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Loftsdóttir, & Jensen, 2016). In receiving white migrants, dominantly white host nations have also been demonstrated to have understood migrant identities through racist and nationalistic discourses that exclude

‘other’ non-white migrants due to their assumed difference, while applying preferential treatment to white identities who were seen as the desirable migrants based on an assumed ‘sameness’ and expected characteristics such as productivity, cleanliness and an unthreatening disposition (Leinonen & Toivanen, 2014; McDowell, 2009). These discussions of race and racism are valuable in developing insight into the friction that might ensue with the migration of people across ‘free movement borders’.

In line with these notions of identity, race and nationality, academics have investigated the manner in which some migrants have been welcomed to new states and ascribed identities that ‘belong’ (Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017). In their 2017 paper, Guðjónsdóttir and Loftsdóttir demonstrated that for migrants moving from Iceland to Norway, belonging to a culture outside of one’s own nation state was made possible by maintaining a self-perception that they are racially and culturally homogeneous nations. The national identities of both states are framed around a white identity, and it is commonly understood that Icelandic populations and Norwegian populations are closely linked through ancestry, although this is not strongly supported in genetic evidence (Gullestad, 2006; McIntosh 2015; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017). Similarly, media constructions of migrants moving to Norway commonly hinged their discussions of migration around anxieties of who belongs and who does not belong in Norway (McIntosh 2015). In these constructions, Icelandic migrants were described within the narrative of “brothers returning home to their motherland after a thousand year visit to the volcano island” (Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; pp. 10). In this way, the presumed likeness of these migrants was emphasised in popular media while differences were either not mentioned or down played (Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017). This case study highlights the politics of belonging in mobility and the socially constructed notions of how certain identities are made to feel ‘at home’ in destination states.

The frictionless experiences of those who are welcomed and made to feel welcome and 'at home' based on their identities has been contrasted by research that has investigated people who have been alienated and discriminated against based on their national and racial identities. A great number of authors have brought attention to the way that certain groups who move between borders (especially asylum seekers and former refugees) are represented and portrayed by many nation states as outsiders who do not belong (Anderson, 2013; Mountz, 2010; Goodman, 2007). Geographies of belonging, or not belonging in place were discussed by Ingrid Pollard (1994) who drew attention to England's countryside and lake district as a landscape of social and cultural exclusion, by highlighting the dominantly perceived incongruity of the black body within the heart of the iconography of English landscape (Kinsman, 1994; 1995). Pollard's (1994) discussion of the appropriate culture of engagement with the landscape and the appropriate nature of an 'English' body that belongs to place indicates the pervasiveness of national and racial identities in popular portrayals of belonging (Tolia-Kelly, 2006). What these accounts suggest is that simply being in place does not constitute a sense of attachment to place, and a formal right to move is not sufficient to establish a freedom to move without experiencing friction in gaining a sense of belonging in destination societies.

Administrative Frictions

'Differential inclusion' is a useful term to help us to understand the administrative restrictions experienced by migrants in their reception to receiving nations under free movement arrangements. Differential inclusion is a term that has been applied by scholars to denote how inclusion in a society can involve various degrees of subordination, discrimination and segmentation (De Genova, Mezzadra, & Pickles, 2015). This term has primarily been used to describe the manner in which administered

restrictions such as temporary status create forms of differential inclusion in the form of workplace vulnerabilities but also the wider experience of migrants in host societies; migrants are included but ordinarily restricted to labour market participation with few opportunities for social engagement (Castles 1995; Cresswell 2009; Rajkumar et al. 2012; Walsh, 2011). Differential inclusion in migration has thus primarily materialised in the restricted rights imposed on people who move across borders with temporary work and study visas, who experience reduced access to healthcare, have a limited ability to sign employment and private contracts, and are often tied to specific employers (Morris, 2002; Taylor, Foster & Cambre, 2012). Differential inclusion is thus a product of a systematic denial of rights, holding some migrants to marginal positions in society and curtailing their prospects of betterment (Collins, 2017a; Anderson, 2010; Simon-Kumar, 2015; Rajkumar et al 2012). Robertson (2014) for example, gives evidence that by according migrants a temporary status, differential inclusion is promoted both in terms of workplace vulnerabilities, but also more widely in the way people's temporal trajectories and desires in life are disturbed by temporary visas and reoccurring status expiry dates. In this way, the descriptor 'differential inclusion' has been applied to acknowledge the lived experience of migrants, which can be intertwined with concerns about their unequal access to economic, social and cultural resources that accompany full inclusion (Scheel, 2013). Differential inclusion is thus a valuable term to denote experiences of legal stratification based on the way administrated rights are withheld from certain migrants (Morris, 2002).

Differential inclusion may also exist within freedom of movement arrangements. Van der Mei (2003) describes that a key requirement of freedom of movement arrangements is that those moving do not have to give up their rights to a basic standard of living: food, shelter and public healthcare. In line with this understanding, European

integration and the creation of a common status and common rights throughout the European Union (hereafter, EU) has been suggested to have largely been achieved by allowing citizens of EU member states to move freely between common territory, enjoying similar rights in each member nation (Maas, 2007). It has been identified that in reality there is significant tension within EU member states, with some national governments desiring to maintain some degree of preferential treatment towards their own citizens (Maas, 2014). Thus, although freedom of movement ideals are articulated, in reality the realisation of these free movement ideals can be resisted by national governments.

The EU acts as a valuable case study, demonstrating that those moving under free movement agreements can be differentially included in destination societies. Each member state in the EU has interpreted their responsibilities to accord social services to EU members in different ways (Ackers, 1998). The ability of EU citizens to then realise social entitlements such as health care, pensions, education and welfare in different member states has been associated with great spatial variability (Ackers & Dwyer, 2004). Ackers (1998) and Ackers and Dwyer (2004) have given evidence that this diversity in the way member states accord and restrict social welfare systems results in distinct social, economic and spatial inequalities in social support, to the effect that a pensioner who ‘chooses’ to retire within the European Union has the power to determine the level of care they will receive through public systems through their choice of location. The ability of pensioners to access support is also considered highly dependent on whether their residency was connected to employment, with significantly inferior social entitlements being accorded to residents with no employment history in host member states (Ackers & Dwyer, 2004). Studies have also highlighted that the complexity of bureaucratic systems that accord rights to EU citizens in each member

state contributes to significant confusion, and consequently many EU citizens do not know what their rights and entitlements are outside of their country of residence and are thus unwilling to pursue freedom of movement opportunities (Guild, 2004). Empirical papers that have investigated migrants' experiences of free movement are uncommon, but they suggest there might be a substantial gap between free movement ideals of according free passage and access to social services, and the actual ability of citizens within these agreements to realise these rights and entitlements without friction. This discussion of internal variabilities and bureaucratic confusion within the European Union indicates that differential inclusion can be experienced by citizens moving within free movement arrangements.

2.3: Summary

To summarise this chapter, freedom of movement migration is an important field of research given the significance of free movement arrangements to facilitate mobility across borders. Freedom of movement is defined as a lack of constraints on mobility, an ability to move free of discriminatory practices that curtail the ability of migrants to thrive in society, and also the ability to maintain access to important services. Free movement migration agreements are largely contingent on economic rationales that emphasise their value in opening up free trade opportunities and their ability to contribute to greater economic development in member states. Economic rationales are not the only justifications made for free movement though. The ability to maintain close relationships and free movement between nations is also influenced by popular constructions of racial similarities, shared histories, and linguistic and cultural familiarities between nations. Although free movement arrangements imply unrestrained mobility, I have shown here the way that movement is rarely experienced as free of constraints due to the friction that operates on so called 'free movement migration'.

These frictions were discussed in relation to friction of identity and belonging, and differential inclusion in the way migrants are withheld from accessing important administrative social services.

This literature review has drawn on a wealth of discursive work exploring the way nation states regulate borders through immigration policy. This discussion has explored free movement, friction in migration, and dominant discourses that structure the way identities become important for those who move between borders (for example, Maas, 2007). This literature review has also highlighted the importance of learning from the experiences of migrants themselves as they negotiate free movement, although there is very scarce empirical work that has been undertaken in this field (Robertson, 2011). The research that has been conducted with migrants themselves can largely be divided into two class extremes: the disenfranchised and undocumented, or the globetrotting professional elites (Yeoh et al., 2003). Less research has attempted to understand the ordinary functioning of immigration regimes, how migrants negotiate bureaucratic hurdles to belonging, and how policies actually impact on migrants' understandings and experiences of movement outside of these two class extremes (Mountz et al., 2002; Wright, 2004). This thesis seeks to contribute to this theoretical gap within broader academic literature regarding how we make sense of the negotiation of free movement migration regimes.

Chapter 3: The New Zealand and Australian Context

It is vital that discussions of migration situate the movement of people within the broader social settings that people move within (Braun & Clarke, 2013). Thus, to provide context to the free movement migration pathway that exists between New Zealand and Australia, and the findings that I present in this thesis, this chapter offers a review of the history of nation formation in New Zealand and Australia, dominant identity claims, and immigration policies (including those relating to the TTTA).

3.1: Nation Formation and Identity

It is pertinent to discuss nation formation and the competing notions of indigeneity that exist in Australia and New Zealand in order to understand dominant and marginalised identities in these settler colonial societies (Bell, 2009). Colonial claiming of space in both New Zealand and Australia rests on a history of violence and injustice (Bell, 2009; Moses, 2004). The arrival of European colonisers in New Zealand and Australia brought war, annexation of territory and subjugation of indigenous populations (Durie, 1998; Moses, 2004; Mutu, 2012; Walker, 2004; 1996; Watson, 2005). Despite various attempts to write these events off as ‘a thing of the past’ (Madley, 2008; Hamer, 2008), the significance of colonialism’s effects on current society have been well established (Durey, 2010; Watson, 2005).

Colonial identities are privileged within New Zealand and Australian societies. New Zealand and Australia’s colonial history and pioneering heritage has embedded whiteness and masculinity as a quintessential and privileged identity in these societies (Bannister, 2005; Cupples, Guyatt, and Pearce, 2007). In New Zealand, colonial settlement centred on English orientated migration, whereas in Australia, Irish Catholics made up a much greater proportion of migrants (Bannister, 2005). In both cases, colonial

settler identities were considered to be made ‘authentic’ in these new landscapes through pioneering hard work and physical toughness performed by rugged ‘blokes’, who had an ingenious ability to fix anything while keeping their emotions to themselves (Berg & Kearns, 1996; Braun, 2008; Crump, 1982). Settler national identities in Australia and New Zealand were thus built and developed through ‘blokeiness’, but also combined in performances of male comradery, where Australian and New Zealand pioneers could be united by a common physical struggle against the elements, in sporting clashes or on the battlefield, with successes being celebrated in the pub (Bannister, 2005). ‘Aussies’ and ‘Kiwis’ are thus terms that these settlers now identify with, and these identities convey an assumption of whiteness, while indigenous or non-white identities are not included in these simplified terms, but intentionally marked out as being ‘Māori’ or ‘Aboriginals’ in public discourse (James, 2012; Turner, 2007). Researchers have noted that white Australians and white New Zealanders seldom recognise their privileged social positions within society as members of the dominant majority, and the social advantages of white privilege remains largely unacknowledged (Augoustinos et al., 2005). In particular, there is a tendency in Australia to only acknowledge race privilege or complicity with colonialism in a ‘confessional’ manner, speaking of racism to then move on from it with very little substance given to addressing inequalities that exist in society (Riggs & Augoustinos, 2008). These representations of whiteness in the quintessential national identities of these settler nations is thus indicative of the wider (but often unspoken) privilege that is experienced by people of white European descent (particularly males) in New Zealand and Australian society (Borell et al., 2009; Tuffin, 2008).

Racial discrimination towards indigenous populations and other marginalised identities remains prevalent in Australian and New Zealand societies today. Scholars have verified that modern racism (McConahay, 1986) or new racism (Augoustinos et al.,

2005; Billig, 1991) remains prevalent in settler societies such as New Zealand and Australia where racism towards marginalised ethnicities persists, but is defined by its shift to more implicit forms (Simon-Kumar, 2015; Tuffin, 2008). Implicit forms of racism can be brought to attention in the context of this study by acknowledging how people 'do' prejudice by framing colonialism as being irrelevant to the distribution of resources and power in present day society (Augoustinos & Every, 2007; Cowie, 2017). These arguments then dictate that indigenous or marginalised groups are responsible for their failures to flourish through problematic family structures or cultural flaws (Cowie, 2017; Nairn & McCreanor, 1991). Racism towards indigenous Australians and non-white identities (for example Pasifika New Zealanders) has been documented across all domains of contemporary Australian society (Durey, 2010; George & Rodriguez, 2009). In New Zealand, the effect of modern racism manifests in a range of social and economic spheres, such as the education system, where Māori and Pacific Peoples are harmed significantly by the dominance of Pākehā attitudes to learning and racial stereotyping that significantly constrains the abilities of Māori and Pacific students to succeed in schooling (Pihama, 2001; Ministry of Education, 2006; Smith, 2003). The ongoing dissemination of racist ideas and practices thus further promotes inequalities between white colonisers and non-white identities in New Zealand and Australia.

3.2: Colonial Immigration Policies and TTTA Free Movement

The immigration policies that have been applied in the history of Australia and New Zealand have regularly been developed around a white colonial identity. Australian and New Zealand immigration policies have both historically emphasised attracting the permanent settlement of white migrants in immigration policy (Hugo, 2004; Jupp, 2002;

Simon-Kumar, 2015). Australia had a legislated ‘White Australia’ policy (in place from 1901-1973) that was unambiguous in only permitting entry for white settlers (Hamer, 2014), while New Zealand too had immigration policies that were strongly preferential towards white settlers from British countries until 1974 (Simon-Kumar, 2015). In spite of the principles of the White Australia policy, Australia was forced to allow the movement of non-white Māori across the Tasman throughout the early 1900s in largely the same way as Pākehā New Zealanders (Hamer, 2014). Australia was willing to accept this conflict with upholding a ‘white Australia’ in an effort to maintain healthy trans-Tasman diplomatic relations, and over time this relationship was formally strengthened through integration of New Zealand and Australian economies with free trade agreements such as the New Zealand Closer Economic Relations Agreement, 1983 and the TTTA (McMillan, 2014). These closer ties were consistent with emerging political-economic norms of free trade and global economic integration, but the creation of closer ties was also founded on a shared colonial identity. This colonial identity expressed the existence of mateship between settlers, based on their shared experiences in the ANZAC army corps, where the narratives of those who fought and died side by side during the first and second world wars remains a tradition celebrated to this day (Ely, 1985; Hugo, 2004; 2015; King, 2003; Nolan, 2015; Stanley, 2018). In contrast to these articulations of comradeship, many efforts were made throughout the 20th century by Australia, and to a lesser extent New Zealand, to ensure that migrants from other geographically close, but racially dissimilar nations in the Pacific Islands did not have freedom of movement to enter these colonial settler societies (Hamer, 2007; 2014). The TTTA is thus the result of racialised immigration policies that saw the movement of ‘British subjects’ between New Zealand and Australia to be valuable, while non-white people living in the same

geographical area were considered ‘unsophisticated and unsuited’ until the late 20th century (Dobell, 2003).

The TTTA is an agreement that is presented as allowing free movement and equal rights for New Zealanders and Australians to live and work in each other’s country. The TTTA is an unofficial treaty between Australia and New Zealand (McMillan, 2014). The rights accorded by the treaty are not legally binding, but rather are a series of immigration procedures applied by each state underpinned by joint political support (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2010). As a result, they can be amended by either partner at any time (McMillan, 2014). Sitting alongside the immigration procedures in the TTTA, are a range of other ‘behind the border’ bilateral policy agreements that cover issues such as social security, emergency medical assistance provision and mutual recognition of qualifications (Leslie & Elijah 2012). Under the Social Security Agreement (1995) for example, both countries were responsible for compensating the other nation for the cost of providing migrants some benefits, for example old age, veterans’, and single parent benefits (McMillan, 2014). The accordance of a wide range of other agreements regarding data sharing, tax, student loan repayments and child support payments have also formed a range of mobility controls that operate between the two integrated nations (Australia-New Zealand Double Tax Agreement, 2009; Inland Revenue, 2019; Leslie & Elijah, 2012; McMillan, 2014). The establishment of the TTTA and auxiliary agreements has thus created national integration to a degree that has not been seen anywhere outside of the EU (Leslie & Elijah, 2012).

Under the TTTA there has been strong movement of migrants between New Zealand and Australia (Hugo, 2004). New Zealanders’ and Australians’ right to live and work in each other’s country has only formally been in place since the creation of the

TTTA in 1973 (Poot, 2010). Before this point, free movement migration had been operating informally since colonial times, and the exchange of people between Australia and New Zealand was balanced for about a century until the late 1960s (Carmichael, 1993). During the late 1960s, New Zealand underwent its first major post WWII recession leading to more New Zealanders choosing to move to Australia than vice-versa (Gould, 1984). Net losses of New Zealanders (sometimes referred to as the ‘brain drain’; see for example Carr, Inkson & Thorn, 2005) have since been a key phenomenon of trans-Tasman migration, with losses peaking throughout times of economic buoyancy in Australia (Hugo, 2004). In 2006, Australia’s Bureau of Statistics concluded that there were approximately 476,000 New Zealanders living in Australia, of whom 92,911 identified as Māori (19.5%; ABS, 2006). This same census recorded 72,082 Pacific Islanders of Samoan, Tongan, Niuean and Cook Islander descent living in Australia, including both people who arrive in Australia directly from Pacific Islands, and those who arrived as New Zealand citizens (ABS, 2006). As of 2012, the number of New Zealand citizens who have moved ‘across the ditch³’ from New Zealand to Australia reached almost 650,000, which as McMillan (2014) points out, is significantly more than the population of New Zealand’s capital city. Now New Zealanders make up 2.5% of Australia’s total population, although in certain areas such as Australia’s Gold Coast, New Zealand citizens now make up as much as 20% of the local population (Chenery, 2016). Statistics from Australia thus provide insight into the sheer number of New Zealanders who have moved across the Tasman since the establishment of the TTTA.

The number of Australians living in New Zealand is relatively small compared to the number of New Zealanders who have chosen to live in Australia (McMillan, 2014). The number of Australian citizens residing in New Zealand has been fairly constant over

³ ‘The ditch’ is a colloquial term that refers to the Tasman Sea.

the last two censuses, with 62,742 recorded in 2006 (Statistics New Zealand, 2006) and 62,712 recorded in 2013 (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). More recent data has shown that 2015 was the first year since 1991 when more Australian citizens moved to New Zealand than New Zealanders leaving for Australia, with 769 more Australians moving to New Zealand than vice versa in that year (Alves, 2017). In the following year, 2016, more than 3500 Australians moved to New Zealand, setting a new record (Petrie; 2017). Despite lower overall numbers living in New Zealand, Australians continue to utilise the TTTA in significant numbers, and the TTTA and former freedom of movement between New Zealand and Australia has resulted in significant Australian and New Zealand populations residing as trans-Tasman migrants.

Australia's commitment to upholding the TTTA has oscillated around the racial identities of those who have moved between borders. Australia has been termed 'the reluctant Pacific nation' (Dobell, 2003) due to its history of excluding immigration from Pacific Island nations as previously discussed (Hamer, 2008). Throughout the history of the trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement, successive Australian governments have expressed that they have had no problem with white New Zealanders settling in Australia, but the notion that Māori and Polynesians were allowed free access has been considered to represent a significant problem to the country (Hamer, 2008; 2015; Nolan, 2015; Tazreiter et al., 2016). These tensions, particularly with Pacific Islanders moving to Australia, became apparent as New Zealand embraced closer ties with the Pacific⁴, and allowed the immigration of thousands of Pacific Islanders from the 1960s onwards (Hamer, 2008). In particular, Australia has protested New Zealand's Samoan quota and Pacific Access Category, which were believed to damage the quality of the trans-Tasman

⁴ It is important to recognise that the term Pacific is a pan-ethnic construct that obscures the diversity and distinctiveness of each Pacific nation (Hamer, 2008).

Arrangement and this new access for Pacific Islanders to enter New Zealand was deemed to ‘degrade the common border’ (Hamer, 2008). The failure of the New Zealand government to bring its immigration policies ‘in harmony’ with Australia’s, was considered to produce a back-door migration pathway (Bitu, 2013; Hugo, 2004). Top Australian government officials claimed that tens of thousands of South Pacific migrants were using New Zealand as a back-door to circumnavigate Australia's tough migration controls (Stanley, 2018). Simultaneously, stigmatising discourse emerged throughout public media in Australia that New Zealanders (particularly Māori and Pacific Island New Zealanders) were “dole bludgers, soaking up the sun on Bondi beach” (Nolan, 2015, p. 262). These racialised understandings of those who move between borders has been extremely consequential, and in the last four decades since Pacific migration into New Zealand has become apparent, Australia has progressively curtailed the rights of New Zealand migrants entering Australia (Hamer, 2008; Nolan, 2015). The curtailment of rights was articulated around this supposed back-door migration of people of Pacific Island descent into Australia (Hamer, 2008). Immigration policies in Australia and New Zealand, including the TTTA, have thus been shaped heavily by racialised understandings of the perceived value of migrants to workplaces and society.

The curtailment of New Zealanders rights under the TTTA has gradually been applied by Australia since the 1980s, with significant implications for New Zealanders moving across the Tasman. Historically, the TTTA granted New Zealand citizens the right to work, study and receive benefits in Australia, rights that are normally expected by residents (McMillan, 2014). These rights are still accorded to Australian migrants moving to New Zealand with the Australia resident visa, which is granted upon arrival so

long as Australian citizens meet the ‘good character test’⁵ (Immigration, 2018). In 1981, New Zealanders were required to have lived in Australia for at least six months before they were able to access social security benefits, although by 1995 this was extended to two years (McMillan, 2014; Nolan, 2015). These changes were followed by new policy changes that were introduced in 2001, which restricted New Zealanders access to multiple benefits including the unemployment benefit, sickness allowances, funded study, disability insurance (NDIS), parenting payments and youth and widow benefits (Hugo, 2015). Furthermore, the last decade has seen further attempts at restricting the rights of New Zealand citizens in Australia, with the Australian government announcing that New Zealanders would no longer receive subsidised university fees in 2017, although the government later backed down from implementing this proposal (Walters, 2017). Australian policy changes have also constrained opportunities for New Zealanders to gain permanent status in Australia, whereby New Zealanders are required to have an Australian partner, work in a skill-shortage industry or meet income thresholds over consecutive years to meet permanent residency criteria, making the pathway to full inclusion difficult (Stanley, 2018). In complicating avenues for permanent inclusion, it is estimated that less than 10% of New Zealanders who arrived in Australia between 2006 and 2012 have gained permanent residency (Tazreiter et al., 2016). As a result, thousands of New Zealanders now live in Australia in a state of ‘limbo’ with diminishing access to welfare supports and routes to citizenship (Nolan, 2015). Recent amendments in Australia to their Migration Act has also instigated a wave of detainment and deportations for New Zealand citizens living there (Stanley, 2018; Grewcock, 2014). The

⁵ The ‘good character’ test excludes Australian citizens from entering New Zealand who are registered sex offenders and those who have spent 12 months or longer in prison during the last ten years for example (Immigration New Zealand, 2018).

‘erosion of rights’ for New Zealanders in Australia has thus become a topic of concern among citizens and social scientists.

Studies have attempted to explore the impacts of these policy changes (George & Rodriguez, 2009; Hugo, 2015; Stanley, 2018). Research has asserted that the deportation of hundreds of New Zealand citizens from Australia has symbolically devalued a population who historically felt they had almost full membership within Australia, alienating New Zealanders from the position of ‘mate’ to precarious other (Hugo, 2015). Stanley (2018) suggests that these deportations serve as a harsh reminder of the precarious place non-citizens occupy in Australian society. Research has also questioned the disproportionate detainment and deportation of Māori and Pacific Island New Zealanders, and studies have begun to illustrate the extent to which marginalised identities have been detrimentally affected by these policy changes (George & Rodriguez, 2009; Hugo, 2015; Stanley, 2018). While many Māori attempted to move to Australia to escape persistent racism in New Zealand, both Māori and Pacific communities have experienced racism in Australia and have expressed concerns about escalating financial pressures, rising unemployment, family breakdown and challenges around alcohol consumption and crime within their communities (George & Rodriguez, 2009). The Australian government has given little consideration to supporting or acknowledging the cultural identity of Māori, with Australian Māori lacking culturally appropriate assistance alongside an absence of cultural facilities such as marae where young people have traditionally found role models and mentors (George & Rodriguez, 2009). These discussions suggest that Australia’s policy restrictions have been significant for the experience of moving to Australia as a New Zealand citizen, although the effects of ‘eroding rights’ are not uniform across all New Zealand citizens.

By comparison, the situation of Australians in New Zealand is largely unknown, although the dominant assumption is that they experience few restrictions when setting up their lives in New Zealand (Ryan, 2016). A thorough search attempting to find research on an Australian population group was unsuccessful, thus it appears that Australians living in New Zealand have been unacknowledged in academic studies. A small number of media reports have indicated that Australians experience few bureaucratic difficulties both moving to, and living in New Zealand (Alves, 2017; Chess Moving, 2018; Jones, 2017; Rolfe, 2017). For example, Australian news reports have indicated that some Australians have been able to find their own ‘slice of heaven’ in New Zealand with no mention of significant hardships endured by families uprooting from Australia to live in New Zealand (Alves, 2017; Rolfe, 2017). One publicised case of an Australian expressing difficulties with living in New Zealand as a non-citizen was presented by Radio New Zealand (Hill; 2018), where an Australian woman reported New Zealand’s more expensive hut passes for non-citizens on popular tramping routes, to the Human Rights Commission (she paid \$130 a night on the Routeburn Track instead of \$65). Comments about this post were strongly in favour of the position that Australian citizens ‘have it easy’ when compared to New Zealanders moving to Australia, and the general consensus was that this referral to the Human Rights Commission was over entitled and unjustified (Hill, 2018). These scattered media reports do not give a clear picture of the situation of Australian citizens living in New Zealand, but they suggest that there are few restrictions that have a meaningful impact on the lives of Australians in New Zealand.

Summary

This chapter has provided a context for this thesis within academic understandings of the TTTA and the rights it provides those moving across the Tasman. I have also

navigated the histories of Australia and New Zealand that have promoted dominant and marginalised identities to become a significant feature of these modern societies. These discussions inform this thesis and allow interview material to be read in meaningful ways, also allowing new understandings of this trans-Tasman space to be drawn from the experiences of people who moved between New Zealand and Australia in this study.

Chapter 4: Methodology

This research used a qualitative interview methodology to gather information from ten Australian citizens who had moved to Auckland, New Zealand, and ten New Zealand citizens who had moved to Sydney, Australia. This study was approved by the University of Auckland Ethics Committee on the 1st of June 2018 (reference number: 021269). This chapter will begin by discussing the methodological approach in this thesis and the value of a qualitative case study. I will then discuss the procedural elements of the research methodology by detailing participant recruitment, data collection, and data analysis. Finally, I will establish the importance of being reflexive in qualitative research and discuss the strategies I have employed to consider my own subjectivity in this research and its impact on my approach.

4.1: Methodological Approach

This thesis was designed around a qualitative research methodology that sought to examine participants experiences and understandings of real life (Braun & Clarke, 2013). Real life data and the analysis of words that are not reducible to numbers allows researchers to reveal versions of reality that are closely linked to the context they occur in (Silverman, 2006). Qualitative research that takes a social constructionist epistemology rejects the existence of a singular, universal reality but instead theorises that people operate within a subjective and interpreted world (Braun & Clarke, 2013).

Through analysis of the different manners in which the world is interpreted, scholars have been able to uncover the way people's subjective worlds and meanings are influenced by their gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, and culture in ways that are invisible under 'traditional' scientific experiments (Burr, 2003). The development of qualitative methods was thus crucial for identifying and theorising different constructed versions of reality, and the ways people are both constructed by, and constructors of reality (Braun & Clarke, 2013). Qualitative approaches thus allow knowledge generation that is appropriate for the objectives of this thesis, and my aim to critically examine the experiences and understandings of free movement migration in the contexts of New Zealand and Australia.

This thesis also makes use of a social constructionist epistemology that critically examines taken for granted knowledge of the power structures that operate in society (Foucault, 1979). Social constructionist research does not look to find objective truths, but rather it investigates how knowledge is formed and reproduced in light of social and political histories that shape the views of people (Gergen, 1985; 1999). Key organising frameworks, or discourses, structure the ideas held in society by providing socially understood ways, statements or rules for talking about something or acting in relation to it (Gavey, 2005). For example, when we talk about 'good migrants' as opposed to 'bad migrants', and whether free movement should exist between borders, we do not present our own individual, impartial knowledge about what it means to be a good migrant, but we instead situate our ideas through the cultural discourses that are available to frame our position (Burr, 2003). Multiple and conflicting discourses often exist, and people are conditioned by, and may negotiate discourses and the perspective they offer in understanding phenomena, topics, objects, and people for instance (Gavey, 2005). In this way, discourses allow for 'subject positions', or the possible integration of individual

identities and behaviours that are imprinted in our understandings of shared cultural ideals (Burr, 2003; Gergen, 1999).

Discourses vary in social power, limiting the actual ability of people to negotiate discourses presented to them. Dominant discourses operate invisibly as they align with common-sense or taken-for-granted ideas within society, with few alternative or competing discourses available (Burr, 2003). For example, the neoliberal discourse is a dominant discourse, and there are few competing discourses available to challenge the pervasiveness of rationality and individual self-improvement in the contemporary world (Davies & Bansel, 2007). Social constructionist research explores the narratives of people and the ways that they are constrained by the discourses in society that condition the different ways that we talk about realities (Foucault, 1979). A qualitative case study under a social constructionist epistemology has been an accepted and effective methodology in human geography and other social sciences (Braun & Clarke, 2013). This methodology enables valuable theoretical contributions to be made to the field of migration and important practical contributions to wider society (Burr, 2003; Hay, 2000).

4.2: Participants and Recruitment

I aimed to interview a range of participants from New Zealand and Australia who had moved across the Tasman under the TTTA. As a means of ensuring a conceptually-coherent and robust project, a set of criteria for participation were deployed. Firstly, people who participated in this study had to either be New Zealand citizens living in Sydney, Australia, or Australian citizens living in Auckland, New Zealand. These national citizenship ties were required to capture responses from people who had moved in accordance with the Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement. Participants did not need to

be born in these countries. Two participants from this study were born in Hong Kong and one participant was born in India while all other participants were born in either New Zealand or Australia. Of the 17 New Zealand and Australian born participants, 16 participants identified as being white European descendants, and one participant identified as Māori. Auckland was the chosen study location for interviews in New Zealand as the primary researcher and supervisors were based in Auckland, and it is the largest city in New Zealand with the biggest populations of Australian citizens. Sydney was selected for similar reasons, being the largest city in Australia with significant populations of New Zealand residents, while still being accessible for the researcher with flights available that fitted within the temporal and financial constraints of a masters project.

Secondly, participants were required to have arrived in their destination country between two and twelve years ago. It was desirable that participants in this study had been in their country of settlement for at least two years. This measure aimed to ensure that enough time had passed for participants to be able to reflect on their experiences of movement, their inclusion in society, and their rights to access important public services. It was also deemed important in this study that participants had been in their destination country for a maximum of ten years, although I included interviews with two participants who had been in their destination for twelve years due to the time constraints of recruitment in Australia. This threshold was intended to capture participants who were still able to remember and articulate their move in detail. This study also hoped to hear from participants who had moved following the 2001 policy changes (special category visa holders) and people who moved during periods when the eroding rights of New Zealanders in Australia had been a publicised feature of the Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement.

Participants had to be aged between 20 and 35 years old. These age parameters were formulated to narrow the focus of this study to young professionals. The lower age threshold of interviewing participants who were at least 20 years old was intended to avoid interviewing dependants. Instead, I intended to interview people in the workforce who moved under their own intent or people who are old enough to be able to move back to their country of birth independently if they chose to. The upper age threshold of 35 years was implemented in the recruitment under the intent of narrowing the scope of the research, to focus on the experiences of people who were in a specific life stage. This narrowed focus allowed commonalities to be drawn across participants' experiences of migration in a way that might have been compromised if the age and life stage of those interviewed ranged dramatically. Research has drawn attention to the manner in which age and life stage have become central to the way experiences of migration are normalised and constructed (Angel & Angel, 1992; Wilson, Fisher, & Moore, 2009). This study therefore negotiates some of this variability by narrowing the age profile of participants.

Facebook advertising proved to be an effective recruitment method in this study. Interviewees were recruited through Facebook advertisements that can be seen in appendix E. Facebook advertising relied on potential participants following a URL link that brought them to a landing page setup within the Qualtrics survey platform (appendix G). Facebook advertisements were targeted at the specific populations of interest, where the audience was focused towards the intended expatriate populations within the specified location and age dimensions. The Facebook advertisement targeting New Zealand citizens in Australia generated 18 Qualtrics survey responses in the first week, at which point I put the survey and advertisement on hold. The recruitment was then reactivated for an additional 5 days one week prior to the date I travelled to Sydney to

carry out the interviews, generating the final 12 responses. A total of 28 out of the 30 people who left responses met the required criteria to participate in this study. The recruitment targeted at Australian citizens in Auckland was less responsive, as is consistent with the smaller population size of Australian citizens living in Auckland. The Facebook recruitment for the Auckland case study ran for 24 days, generating 18 responses over this period, with 16 people meeting the study criteria. These 48 Qualtrics survey responses from both New Zealand and Australia were sufficient in providing enough potential participants to carry out the required 20 interviews for this study. A total of 24 people out of the 44 eligible people who responded to Qualtrics surveys were either unreachable, discontinued contact, declined participating or were unable to participate due to the time constraints of the study.

Efforts were made to ensure interviewees were fully informed before deciding to participate in this study. Potential participants who were redirected to the Qualtrics survey (appendix F) were given a brief account of the study and given access to the participant information sheet. Potential participants were then requested to supply demographic information (name, age, and gender) and contact details allowing me to make further contact. Firstly, I would ring potential participants on the phone numbers they had provided. Over the phone I would explain to potential participants what their involvement in the study would entail, and I then confirmed with participants whether or not they would like to participate in the study. Those who were interested were then sent an email to confirm a time and location for the interview. All potential participants were given the opportunity to ask further questions via phone, email or face to face before the interviews were conducted. Throughout the recruitment process I adopted a gender inclusive approach. In the recruitment survey I used gender neutral language, and participants were asked to self-identify their genders. This information was used in an

effort to select an equal number of participants who were men and women, to better reflect the demographics in society. Despite these efforts there was still a slight skew towards interviewing men in this study, where 8 participants identified as being women and 12 participants identified as being men. This skew was the result of the overall gender dynamics of those who responded to the online survey (only 9 out of 30 responses in the Australia case study were from women). As it was not my specific intention to explore different gender identities in this context, I did not make a concerted effort to capture gender diverse participants.

4.3: Data Collection

Individual face to face interviews are recognised as being the conventional methodology for gaining in-depth narratives (Horschelman, 2011; Braun & Clarke, 2013; DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006) and are a personal setting where the researcher can effectively manage participant confidentiality (Farnsworth & Boon, 2010; Wilkinson, 1998). As described by Deakin and Wakefield (2013), researchers developing interview schedules typically aim to generate data around key subjects related to their research question, but it is valuable if researchers can remain flexible to rearrange questions or improvise according to the experiences of participants. Semi-structured interviews achieve this flexibility allowing dialogue between the participant and the researcher to progress naturally, and giving space for the interviewer to follow new lines of questioning and unpredicted subjects as they arise (Hay, 2013; Rubin & Rubin, 2011). Data in this study were collected through individual, face to face semi-structured interviews. Interviews took place at public locations that were convenient for participants, including cafes, shared office spaces and at the University of Auckland. Participants were informed that

the interview would last for approximately one hour, and interviews ranged in length between 30 and 90 minutes long (on average 60 minutes). Before interviewing participants, I provided a brief introduction of myself and my rationales for doing the research, which was important for building rapport (Reinharz, 1993). Participants were then required to read the participant information sheet (appendix D), and once all of their concerns and questions had been answered interviewees were required to sign a consent form (appendix C) to ensure participants gave informed consent (Hay, 2000). If interviews began to exceed one hour, I would confirm that participants were comfortable to continue and then gave space for participants to continue to share their experiences when time permitted.

In line with contemporary research into migration, my interview schedule was designed to obtain personal accounts of migration that went beyond obtaining narratives of movement as a result of economic rationalities (Collins, 2017a). My interview guide (appendix B) was divided into nine topic areas and an effort was made to manage the assumptions that were present in the questions. I thus tried to refrain from manipulating the questions to direct certain answers (Braun & Clarke, 2013). A short amount of time was usually spent covering the first introductory section where participants would explain their background, including where they were born and raised, and the make-up of their family. This section was designed to ask questions that were not difficult to answer, but allowed participants to retell lines that were familiar to them, to help participants feel comfortable. In sections two and three, participants were asked to reflect on their motivations for moving and how much they knew about the place they moved to before migrating overseas. Section four of the interview guide asked questions about the process and experience of moving overseas while sections five, six and seven asked questions about whether participants have faced any restrictions while moving overseas. During

section seven, I would refer participants to the vignettes (appendix F) that were useful prompts to open dialogue surrounding key issues relating to the Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement. Questions about the vignettes were unstructured, although I employed a number of prompts to facilitate the discussions about each scenario and statement. For instance, I would regularly ask people what they thought of the scenario, what their opinions were or how they might respond to being in the same position as those who were discussed in the scenario. Finally, in sections eight and nine I asked questions that explored what participants planned for their future and how peoples' identities might have changed or been reworked by their experience of migration.

Measures were taken during the data collection to ensure participants understood how their data would be used and the rights they had to withdraw from the study. Participants had the ability to not answer questions during the interview if they did not wish to. Participants could also elect to receive a copy of the written transcript when filling out the consent form, which the majority of participants chose to do. Participants who chose not to receive a copy of their written transcript were informed that they had two weeks following the interview to withdraw their participation in the study without giving a reason. Participants who chose to get their transcript were informed they had up to two weeks from the time they received their transcript to make any changes. Only one participant chose to edit their written transcript to remove certain information from being included in this study. These participants were also told they could withdraw completely during the two weeks after receiving their transcript without giving a reason. This ensured that participants were given a chance to reflect on the conversation and given a second opportunity to make a decision regarding whether they wanted to participate in the research. No participants chose to withdraw their participation from the study. 18 out of 20 participants requested to see a summary of the research findings in the consent

form. Interviews were double recorded using a digital recorder and my cell phone, and all interviews were transcribed by myself. Quotations included in this thesis include additional clarifying material in square parenthesis to aid the reader when the meaning of the excerpt may be unclear, without altering the original meaning.

4.4: Data Analysis

Interviews were analysed using a thematic approach (Braun & Clarke, 2016). Thematic analysis examines key themes that can be extracted from the data and meaningful connections that appear across interviews that confront the research question (Braun & Clarke, 2013; Joffe, 2011). Thematic analysis followed an inductive approach where theme development and coding occurred after the data was collected, rather than applying pre-determined themes (Burnard, 1991). I analysed the data firstly by familiarising myself with interview material during transcribing, which also allowed me to think about interesting responses that could later be analysed. I then read and re-read the interviews to critically engage with the content (Burnard, 1991). The data were coded at both semantic (surface) and latent (implicit) levels to allow a robust engagement with patterns I identified in the data. The data were originally grouped in pattern clusters separately based on the case study (Auckland and Sydney), forming an initial set of coded themes. These initial themes were then reviewed and reworked multiple times to combine material from both case studies, in order to form candidate themes that were cohesive and enabled me to clearly articulate my analysis of the participants' experiences and understandings of free movement migration in the trans-Tasman context. Ultimately, two key distinct but complementary analysis chapters were developed; 'Experiencing Free Movement' and 'The Construction of Identities'. During analysis I communicate

themes and arguments through partially-examined surface level discussions in some places, while in other cases I analyse the underlying assumptions behind participants' statements.

In order to maintain confidentiality, participants' identities were and will not be known to anyone outside of the research team. Potential participant identification is a significant ethical concern for research conducted with small population groups (Tolich & Davidson, 2003). This ethical concern becomes more pronounced when researchers look into smaller subpopulations within countries such as New Zealand as I have done, where there are higher risks of participants being identified or mis-identified in thesis presentations and publications (Tolich & Davidson, 2003). In acknowledging these risks, a number of measures have been taken. All information has been stored on a secure, password protected computer at the University of Auckland and will be kept for a period of six years. After this period of time, all data will be permanently destroyed. Participants' names were recorded separately from audio recordings and transcriptions are stored in an encrypted file. Only the research team have access to the recordings. The confidentiality of participant identities has been protected through the use of pseudonyms, and all material in interviews that could lead to the potential identification (or mis-identification) of participants, such as names and places, has been altered or omitted.

4.5: Reflexivity in Research

Reflexivity is the ongoing process of acknowledging one's own role as the researcher in the production of knowledge (Bott, 2010; Finlay, 2002). A key element of qualitative research is the rejection of the notion of the objective and unbiased scientist, instead

recognising the subjectivities that researchers bring with them to the research process (Braun & Clarke, 2013; Silverman, 2006). The ability to acknowledge one's views, perspectives, politics, motivations and world view is thus seen as a strength in qualitative research rather than a weakness (Silverman, 2006). At the beginning and end of this thesis, I give an indication of the views and motivations I brought to this thesis. In addition, it is important for me to reflect on the ways my identity influenced the types of questions I asked, and the responses my participants offered. My identity as a Pākehā male researcher has shaped my own engagement with the research, but has also played a role in shaping participants' responses. As a visibly white 23 year old male, I shared a similar identity to the white males whom I interviewed, and who made up the largest group of participants. It is thus extremely likely that my identity shaped the recruitment process, and the people who felt comfortable to participate in the study.

My identity also shaped the way participants assumed I had a certain level of knowledge about the relationship between Australia and New Zealand and the social context of this investigation. This may have been unhelpful in the way participants felt they could make reference to aspects of trans-Tasman Migration, such as 'cultural similarities' and 'a brother sister relationship between New Zealand and Australia' for example, without fully explaining themselves. Through initial readings of 'cultural similarities', I originally passed over these statements as being insignificant to the key claims of this thesis. White privilege is often invisible in society (Frankenburg 1993), and I originally conformed with the pervasive notion of an unacknowledged white identity by reading into the data insufficiently. Through being reflexive about my own identity, I was able to re-examine my position and see the significance of a white identity in the space of trans-Tasman free movement. The significance of this reflection to the key argument of this thesis is significant, as will become apparent in the following

analysis chapters. My own identity as a researcher thus shaped my experience with this research, although by remaining reflexive about my identity I was able to engage critically with the interview material.

Chapter 5: Experiencing Free Movement

This chapter navigates participants' experiences of migration, to examine the ways free movement is constructed under the TTTA. I apply the term 'differential inclusion' to discuss the ways that participants experienced forms of friction within their experiences of migration, and how their participation in society involved varying degrees of subordination, discrimination, and segmentation (De Genova, Mezzadra, & Pickles, 2015). I also apply the term assisted inclusion to denote experiences that illustrate when the movement of participants was facilitated by arrangements that enabled simplified pathways to inclusion in society. In this sense, assisted inclusion can be regarded as one component of differential inclusion that serves to highlight the way the movement of participants was privileged in meaningful ways. This chapter divides these experiences of movement into two key sections, 'Controls That Enable Movement' and 'The Administration of Rights and Privileges'. The key narratives discussed in the current chapter are those related to assisted mobility in airport spaces, and assisted inclusion in society observed in the ability of participants to retain important social and political rights. These discussions will demonstrate how assisted inclusion in society contributed to the possibility of 'belonging' in the other country.

5.1: Controls That Enable Movement

Free movement is constructed by the TTTA, and the term free movement applies to the physical ability of people to move between borders without experiencing friction

(Adepoju, 2002; 2007; Maas, 2014). This section investigates how participants discussed their physical ability to move between Australia and New Zealand. In particular, I investigate the way that border controls and regulations facilitated or constrained the movement of people within the TTTA. I will briefly establish how the geographic positioning of New Zealand and Australia allows for affordable and efficient physical movement between the two countries. This will be followed by an examination of the significant role airports played in structuring participants' experiences of free movement. These discussions of experiences of physical movement across the Tasman will be valuable in examining whether the TTTA achieves its claim to provide 'free movement' while also providing new understandings of the way that the TTTA privileges particular kinds of movement.

Experiences of free and frictionless movement under the TTTA emerged in interviews in the way participants constructed the physical distance between New Zealand and Australia. Participants spoke of very few factors that restricted their physical access to move between New Zealand and Australia. The 4,100 kilometres between New Zealand and Australia were overcome effortlessly by flights that participants reported to be frequent, straightforward and affordable. Jack⁶, an Australian citizen who had been living in New Zealand for two and a half years, gives an indicative example of how movement between New Zealand and Australia was considered efficient and uncomplicated:

“So if I'm working and I wanna' go straight from work to the airport, I just book a ticket and just like get on a plane, it's quite easy... Sydney to Auckland is, with a good flight time it'd probably be just over two hours, it's quite quick.”

⁶ All names used are pseudonyms.

Here, Jack emphasises the ease of travelling across the Tasman, describing it almost like a typical work commute. Participants commonly described moving between Sydney and Auckland as easy and accessible, and often stated that moving between these cities was much easier than moving between domestic airports within Australia. As such, the physical movement between New Zealand and Australia was commonly constructed in a way that blurred the lines between domestic and international travel. Sarah, an Australian citizen who had been living in New Zealand for three years, also indicated how her experience of moving between New Zealand and Australia resembled domestic travel:

“There are moments where I have to remind myself when I go back home to take my passport. Because back home I would fly to Melbourne or Brisbane quite frequently or even Adelaide. And those flights are longer than what it is for me to go from Auckland to Sydney. I spend more time sitting in the terminals than what I actually do sitting on a flight. So it's a very interesting experience.”

This excerpt illustrates how flight times factored into discussions of trans-Tasman migration. Participants considered the achievability of commuting between Australia and New Zealand on a regular basis to be important, primarily for the reason that it enabled them to visit and host family regularly. For these frequent flyers, the geographic proximity of New Zealand and Australia and the affordability of air-travel clearly assisted the achievability of trans-Tasman travel.

Airports were commonly constructed by participants as being influential in their experience of ‘free’ trans-Tasman travel. Airports have been identified as crucial and influential nodes in the global migration regime (Salter, 2007). Airports have also been the subject of an array of literature, with academic interest in these sites bringing attention to how hyper surveillance, exceptional forms of security, and suspicion towards

abnormalities contribute to airports being places of self-regulation and discomfort, even for passengers with nothing to hide (Adey, 2004; 2009; Cresswell, 2010; Hannam, Sheller & Urry, 2006). In light of these arguments, we might expect similar discomfort to be experienced by participants in this study. Participants instead emphasised international travel as being free and easy, and airports in particular were constructed as being fluid and unproblematic, as discussed by Isaac, a New Zealand citizen living in Australia:

“Last time I came home I was off the plane and outside in the car within five minutes from touching down. It's really good having the, just being treated as an Australian when you come in through the gates. Sometimes if there's a lot of flights coming in there's people clogging up the international [lanes] and you can just go straight through”.

In this extract, Isaac compares his treatment to the way other international travellers had less favourable airport wait times. Isaac clearly expresses how priority lanes work in his favour to aid in a streamlined experience of the physical infrastructure at Sydney airport. This narrative depicts the value of the efforts made to build an integrated economic market between Australia and New Zealand, where information sharing permits passive monitoring approaches and unobstructed movement (McMillan, 2014). Isaac's account of airport mobilities resonates with Hannam, Sheller and Urry's (2006) construction of airports as sites of transition, seamlessly connecting global cities - particularly for the hypermobile elite. His claim of 'being treated as an Australian' highlights the way travel is assisted by the physical infrastructure at airports that privilege particular movements across the Tasman.

The seamless connection of participants across the Tasman was not just a function of priority lanes and ‘domestic travel times’, but also the result of airport security mechanisms that operate in these spaces. We see below from James, an Australian citizen living in New Zealand, that in his experience of moving through airports freely, he combines claims about physical efficiency with reports of security procedures that do not apply to him:

“The Auckland airport is the third largest in Australasia. It's pretty easy to get through, now we're scanning your passport, cruise on through. Yeah I've never had any issues at all. And I've never had to put my bags through the scanner ever. I've been through... 40 times, 50 times. The food thing I think's fair enough from a bio security point of view. Actually, even within Australian domestic ports you still have that provision as well”.

James frames airport security precautions as uncontentious, and their requests and procedures as reasonable and justified. Participants did not mention experiencing ‘random searches’ and insisted they were able to avoid invasive security measures that might normally accompany movement between international borders. It has been argued that airports reduce travellers from being people with complex identities and claims to home, into objects of danger or benefit (Salter, 2007), wherein participants have thus been understood in these spaces as trusted passengers based on their experiences (or lack of) with border security. Similar reports of experiencing minimal scrutiny at airports were also discussed by Harper, an Australian citizen who had lived in New Zealand for 6 years:

“All it cost me to get here was a one way ticket and ticking a form at the airport that I intend to live here. That's it, no questions asked. Went through a smart gate.

Never got questioned about it in the six years of commuting back and forth... No one stopped me for my student debt ever and no one's ever stopped me for any outstanding fine. I don't have any cause I'm a good person. I can book my ticket right now and jump on that 6.40 flight to Sydney. I'd probably get upgraded because they'd think it was a funeral, which happens a lot... It's pretty much free and easy to come in from any port. Coming through immigration I've never even had to go see an officer once. Smart gate let me through. Customs is the only issue which is usually do you have fruit? No. Alright. Through the green lane. Once in a while 'Oh your boots look muddy'. 'Really?' 'Hahaha [just joking] through the green lane'. They get a bit weird after 1am. But yeah no I'd say it's free and easy."

In elaborating on her experience of free movement, Harper repeats the common narrative that participants were able to move between New Zealand and Australia easily. Harper suggests that airports can be sites of scrutiny for others by constantly referring to the expectations of being stopped and questioned about her movements and intentions. Salter (2007) suggests that this pre-emptive or confessional role in expecting regulatory interference is commonly accompanied by people having niggling thoughts of self-doubt, such as "have I told the whole truth on my documents?" or "is my story believable?", although Harper explains that she has never been exposed to any scrutiny or the potentially accusatory words such as "please step over here". Harper also reports being able to travel across the Tasman with flights purchased on the same day as her travel. Salter (2007) asserts that border guards have normative ideas about acceptable travel behaviours, with suspicious travel plans usually marking out 'risk groups' who often buy plane tickets in cash or close to the departure time. For trans-Tasman migrants, however,

Harper's account suggests discord between suspicious travel behaviour, and the generous and light-hearted treatment that trans-Tasman migrants constructed within airports.

The experiences of people moving through airports is heavily influenced by 'traveller identities' (Salter, 2007). Harper constructs her ease of movement and lack of scrutiny to be closely tied to her identity as 'a good person'. Harper suggests that being 'a good person' can be demonstrated by having a clean police record and not having any outstanding fines, but it might also be articulated through her traveller identity. Research has highlighted that ethnicity and nationality 'risk calculations' made at airports both formally and informally privilege certain citizenships and identities over others (Adey 2008; Salter, 2007). Researchers have been highly critical of these 'risk calculations' that have been used to justify border security measures, and have demonstrated that border practices are in fact highly racialised (Anderson, 2013; 2016; Blackwood, Hopkins, & Reicher, 2013). For example, people of colour are disproportionately stopped and interrogated at borders in the United States regardless of whether they are domestic born citizens or not (Mountz, 2010). People of colour are exposed to scrutiny and assigned guilt when crossing borders, and these practices structure their overall experiences of movement (Mountz, 2010). Academics posit that in comparison, whiteness is legible in places such as airports as being unthreatening and un-concerning (Frankenburg, 1993). To this end, Harper points to her place of privilege as a white Australian citizen where her encounters with border security are light-hearted and 'weird', whereas other national, racial or religious identities encounter intense suspicion and invasive security measures (see for example Blackwood, Hopkins, & Reicher, 2013). These discussions suggest that trans-Tasman migrants experience forms of assisted inclusion, where the physical ease of access across the Tasman (both ways) is facilitated by participants' lack of exposure to exclusionary bordering practices. Assisted inclusion here serves as an appropriate term to

convey how, from the moment participants touch down in their destination country, they are often treated as though they belong in these spaces without needing to be questioned or interrogated at the border.

Some Australian participants were able to reflect on the way that nationality and identity play an influential role in determining how people are treated at the border. Participants occasionally reflected on their ease of movement into New Zealand by comparing their situation to people they knew who had moved to New Zealand from countries outside of the TTTA agreement. In the dialogue below, Harper again reflects on her experience of moving to New Zealand, this time indicating how her national identity impacted her experiences at the border:

“I do pretend I'm an immigrant but I don't have the hardships that they've gone through, it's like moving to another state. Everything was quite simple it was just a state with more red tape. But you look at everyone else who has to do all the forms, pass the medical, [it's] very invasive into their personal lives on the partnership visas. To which no one questioned [me] when I've got a Kiwi partner. 'Okay cool' that was it. No questions, no 'how long have you been together?'. 'Where's your shared bills, where's your information, what's your plan, when are you getting married, when are you doing this?'. That kind of thing where it's like... The Filipino people that I've worked with have to get the worst I feel because they get scrutinised at every tiny detail. Especially cause 'oh we've had bride that's run out on a partner from here before'.”

Having a partner from New Zealand, Harper is aware of the visa processes that might have been applicable to her in acquiring permanent residency had the TTTA not been in place. Her account challenges the intrusive lines of questioning that require people to

prove the authenticity of their relationship to be granted partnership visas. Harper also suggests how bureaucratic scrutiny may not be applied evenly across people from all nationalities. Instead, she posits that national identity is extremely important in determining the way people are viewed and the assumptions that are made about them (Anderson, 2013). New Zealand's national border is thus identified to operate discriminately, facilitating the movement of privileged groups who experience assisted inclusion so that their movements are constructed as being no different to domestic travellers, while undermining and resisting the movement of people of 'other' nationalities.

Borders were not constructed as being an obstacle for participants, but moving across an international border still had consequences for the way that important services were administered. Participants reported that movement between borders and airports was easy for them, but perhaps it was too easy, and some people requested more involvement of government officials to ensure New Zealanders and Australians had more information on what the border actually entailed for those crossing 'the ditch'. The following excerpt from Michael, a New Zealander living in Sydney demonstrates how fluid movement between borders could be confusing:

“[When I moved to Australia] I just ticked it (the entry card) differently so I don't know when I moved. Whatever I ticked there no one looked at me, I went through the still scanner, let me out and I think it says New Zealand resident you've been granted a visa. Nothing, yeah no issues at all. Funny those things because I don't know if every time I come back into the country I get a new visa. Or my visa started that first time I ticked yes, I'm here forever or whatever. But so there's no formal thing I've got anywhere. There's no paper in my hand that says my visa started that day. Nothing. So for me that means I last came into the country in

April. Does that mean I've [technically] only been here four months? I don't know.”

The ambiguity that Michael questions around his special category visa and its start date is a product of the informality of his experience of moving to Australia. Beyond filling in an entry card, he was not required to give any information about his intentions, and at the same time he wasn't given any information about what he was entitled to, when his visa began, or whether he is given a new visa every time he enters the country. In this instance, and in the instance of Sarah (an Australian living in New Zealand), the border is hardly an obstacle, but the outcomes of moving across that border are left uncertain by the passive and detached role of the state in their experiences of moving overseas:

“I would have loved it if when you come and you tick that box that you're leaving and you're moving here for the first time, that as you come through the airport there's a pack. And it says what's the medical situation, because the health systems over here were very different and it's all those little things like a dentist, even a driver's licence. As an Australian you're not told those things and it's not sitting there on a form when you walk into the hospital or you're walking to your doctor [that] if you're an Australian you get blah and blah reciprocal rights and all the rest of it. It's not something that I find Kiwis advertise that loudly.”

This statement illustrates how bureaucracies and social services operate differently on each side of the border, and how moving across borders as if you are a domestic citizen can be unhelpful for knowing what you are entitled to after leaving the airport. These dialogues from Sarah and Michael suggest that borders should not only be responsible for assisting free movement, but they should also educate those moving, on the rights they are entitled to under the free movement arrangement. Airports thus facilitated the

movement of participants in this study, but some participants had reservations with a free movement border on the grounds that it should be better at providing assisted inclusion.

In sum, the physical movement of participants across the Tasman was assisted in meaningful ways. Firstly, the geographic proximity of New Zealand and Australia allowed frequent commuting across the Tasman. Participants constructed airports to be of equal or greater importance to the physical distance between borders, and forms of assisted inclusion materialised in interviews based on the way airports were acknowledged as having a significant role in facilitating participants' movements across the Tasman. Findings demonstrate that the TTTA permitted physical free movement for study participants going both ways, and participants were only able to fault the operation of borders on their inability to do more to support their inclusion in society after they left the airport. The unquestioned appropriateness of participants in airport spaces was particularly notable when situated in relation to existing literature about wider border security practices and vis-à-vis the experiences of other national, racial, and religious identities (Blackwood, Hopkins, & Reicher, 2013; Salter, 2007). In acknowledging the way exclusionary border practices were expressed as a fundamental barrier to perceived outsiders, it was constructed that assisted inclusion at borders contributes to the possibility of (white) trans-Tasman migrants being able to 'belong' in another country. This section has thus begun to uncover the way assisted inclusion is a key feature of freedom of movement, but also how assisted inclusion operates in association with both legal policy provisions and understandings of identity.

5.2: The Administration of Rights and Privileges

Free movement migration does not solely rest on the ability of governments to overcome restrictions to physical movement between borders (Tryfonidou, 2017). Governments

communicating free movement must also ensure that those moving retain access to government administered social, cultural and political resources (Van der Mei, 2003). For freedom of movement to be attained, then, it would be expected that the TTTA ensures that trans-Tasman migrants can remain in their destination country without temporal constraints, without a dilution of their access to basic social services, and without being exposed to discrimination at the workplace for example (Tryfonidou, 2017). This section explores whether the TTTA achieves its claim to provide free movement under these terms, and I navigate how the rights, freedoms and obligations of trans-Tasman migrants are experienced in their destination countries.

Most participants from both Australia and New Zealand reported experiencing little friction when setting up their new lives in their destination country ‘across the ditch’. Participants indicated that moving across the Tasman Sea was associated with few compromises in how their rights, freedoms and access to important social services were administered. The ability to move across borders while retaining important rights was described by Charlotte, an Australian citizen who had lived in Auckland for two and a half years:

“It's something that we say about moving here that this move for us was just really easy. And it happened very quickly.... We could get jobs easily, we could get a place to rent easily, we could get a car easily. I guess it's immediate permanent residency is how it works, which makes it super easy for employment, healthcare. So your filling out the form at the hospital or whatever it's ‘are you a New Zealand citizen?’, no, ‘are you an Australian citizen?’ yes, basically.”

Charlotte explains how she had the freedom to sign off on rental leases, become a registered owner of a vehicle, and sign employment contracts in a foreign country as a

non-citizen without onerous bureaucratic involvement. She also identifies how New Zealand and Australian citizens are made distinct from all other nationalities and given equal access to the New Zealand public health care system. It was common for participants to speak in detail about how their ability to settle in New Zealand and Australia was made much easier through their citizenship ties, which held open opportunities to be employed on arrival for example. When Paige, a New Zealander living in Sydney was asked whether she faced any restrictions or barriers to settlement during her three years in Australia, she replied:

“Well I don't need a visa first of all, so that's one restriction for many people trying to get into here. Like, you ask people who try to get 457 visas⁷, Malcolm Turnbull took it all off. Like, they're in a limbo and I've got mates who just full on came all the way from Canada to try and get a work visa and it's just so hard. So first of all, the biggest restriction to work here is the working visa and I didn't have that issue.”

In being asked about restrictions, Paige was able to turn this question on its head by instead emphasising how her experience of migration was assisted by the TTTA. Paige is also aware of how obtaining and reapplying for employment specific visas can make life uncertain for migrants, especially during periods when government policy changes are introduced (Collins, 2017b). Gaining employment without requiring an employer sponsored visa was thus constructed unambiguously as a significant privilege that assisted participant's abilities to be successful in their host nation.

⁷ The 457 work visas were a subclass of temporary work visas that were issued to 'long stay' migrants in employer sponsored, skill shortage occupations in Australia (Australian Government Department of Home Affairs, 2018). On the 18th of April, 2018, the government announced that 457 visa's would be abolished and replaced with the Temporary Skill Shortage visa (Australian Government Department of Home Affairs, 2018).

Australian participants spoke about how their ability to vote in New Zealand was important for their overall sense of inclusion in society. Some Australian participants described their ability to vote as a valuable right that allowed them to be included in making decisions about how the country is governed, as outlined by Ava, an Australian citizen living in Auckland:

“I still have the vote [in Australia], but then I also voted here as well which is kinda weird because I don't really sort of feel like I'm a proper Kiwi. And all of a sudden I'm having all of these opinions on how Kiwis should live and who should be controlling them, so yeah it's quite a weird feeling, but yeah I have voted for both. I think it's important to have your thoughts heard. Even as someone who isn't necessarily a Kiwi I live here and I still have to experience living the way that the Kiwis do so whatever decisions that government make here it still applies to me and I still have to deal with those consequences. So I do think it's important to have your thought heard. Regardless of whether I'm technically a Kiwi or not.”

Voting in both Australian and New Zealand elections, Ava was simultaneously able to have her views represented in both democracies, and she clearly expresses the universal importance of being included in decision making regardless of whether people “are technically Kiwis” or not. In doing so, she does not distinguish between citizens and non-citizens or between the nationality, religion or values of those living in New Zealand. Instead, Ava posits that allowing new residents such as herself, to vote, is important for all members of society to have their voices heard. In advocating for her right to vote, she identifies an ideal political community that is defined by those with ‘affected interests’ rather than a shared membership based on citizenship (Bauböck 2005; Blais, Massicotte, and Yoshinaka 2001). Similarly, McMillan (2017) states that New Zealand’s unusually hospitable voting rights for non-citizens are valuable, as they add

vitality to democratic decisions that affect the lives of citizens and non-citizens alike. Despite any initial “weirdness” then, the ability to vote in elections was an important form of assisted inclusion that allowed participants from Australia to fully participate in society.

In contrast, the inability of New Zealanders to vote in Australia was constructed by some participants as a major friction with their experience of supposedly ‘free movement’. The TTTA is a valuable case study as it allows direct comparisons to be made between the different rights that New Zealanders and Australians are accorded. In the example of voting rights, New Zealanders living in Australia are excluded from participating in elections unless they become citizens (Stanley, 2018). McMillan (2014) points out that the inability of non-citizens to vote in Australia can be partially attributed to Australia’s compulsory voting system, which has consequences for the way *forcing* non-citizens to vote would be an unappealing prospect both politically and ethically, and would require significant changes to be made to entrenched constitutional legislation. The limited prospects for non-citizens (including New Zealanders) to be provided opportunities to vote in Australia has been compounded by ambiguous pathways for special category visa holders to be granted permanent residency and citizenship (McMillan, 2014), which will be discussed in more detail later in this section. Looking closely into the experiences of New Zealanders excluded from participating in Australian elections, participants outlined a number of repercussions of not being able to vote for their identity claims and sense of belonging. Some impacts of disenfranchisement are described by David, a New Zealander who had been living in Australia for five years:

“The fact that you can't vote, it's a whole part of society that you don't participate in. There's a lot of immigrants that live in Sydney, not just New Zealanders but our neighbourhood would be probably 70% non-Australians and a lot of them I

would think would be on visas rather than citizens. It's almost dystopian to have so many people living here who can't have a say, and if you don't feel invested in a society or in a place then I'm sure it's got some bad consequences. It's not the environment for best decision making when you know, when you've got politicians who are responsible to an electorate who maybe just think that we're stealing their jobs or something... So you do feel a little bit of an outsider because you're not involved politically when you're on the special category visa. We feel like we're bonded closely with immigrants a lot more than Australians.”

In this passage, David does not make an effort to draw apart the identity of New Zealanders from other migrants (“there’s a lot of immigrants in Sydney, not just New Zealanders”). David describes how being prevented from fully participating in society influences his sense of belonging in Australia and is partially responsible for his affinity with being a migrant in Australia, a term many other participants were able to dissociate themselves from based on their experiences of assisted inclusion. David voices his concern at the political environment that does not act with any accountability to people who live and work in Australia without citizenship. The lost voice in decision making is reported to impact people on work, study and special category visas whose status and long-term rights are made uncertain by anti-immigration views popularly held by the voting population of society. This comparison between participants’ experiences of inclusion and exclusion within civic participation demonstrates the difference between assisted inclusion and differential inclusion, and we see that this distinction is significant for participants’ overall experiences of free movement migration.

In addition to voting rights and employment being key rights discussed in interviews, the abilities of participants to retain access to important social services were

also framed as significant for their experiences of migration and sense of belonging in their destination societies. Almost all participants constructed their experiences with public healthcare providers as being as good as, or even better than their experiences with healthcare services at home, indicating the TTTA was able to fulfil this criteria of free movement migration for participants in this study (Tryfonidou, 2017). Emily, a New Zealand citizen living in Australia gives a good example of this:

“I thought things were easier here than being back in New Zealand. For example, before I left I was having a lot migraines and things like that, I didn't know why. They wanted me to do a scan but they wanted me to pay like \$700, even though I had insurance so being a 19-20 year old I couldn't really afford that. When I came to Australia, being a New Zealand citizen you can get Medicare and that scan was covered. So it turned out that I needed quite a big operation which was excellent that I managed to have the scan which I would have put off back home because I couldn't afford it. So for me the healthcare's heaps better.”

In describing being able to access a higher level of subsidisation on potentially life-saving medical treatment in Australia, Emily constructs her experiences with accessing healthcare treatment in Australia to be resoundingly superior to her experiences with healthcare providers in New Zealand. Although the rights of New Zealanders to some healthcare provisions such as the Australian National Disability Insurance Scheme have been withdrawn in policy changes since 2001, this dialogue suggests that these policy changes have not encroached on the ability of some (in this case, white) New Zealanders to receive subsidised medical treatment under the Medicare scheme, despite elective examinations on pre-existing conditions being a grey area in the Reciprocal Health Care Arrangement (McMillan, 2014; Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2018). This was not an

isolated case, with all participants in Australia indicating that the care provided in Australia might have been practiced differently, but the overall level of care was of an equal or even better standard than that in New Zealand. Similar attitudes were expressed by Australians such as Charlotte, who gave no indication of an inferior provision of healthcare services in New Zealand:

“I did end up in a hospital with appendicitis so I was able to access the free healthcare through the public system. I was in hospital for four days and I had some surgery so I did get a bill for like \$4,500 but it was easy enough just to call the number, say I'm an Australian, here's some more information and it was cleared immediately. And then now I'm actually pregnant and so to be able to access free pregnancy care and birth care, that's amazing. It's absolutely massive. I don't even think it would come free for me in Australia.”

Charlotte's explanation of being treated in hospital is simplified (“I had some surgery”) suggesting that her operation was performed without any significant complications or associated with any concerns about the quality of the medical practitioner, for example. As with Charlotte, participants were not hesitant about visiting doctors or hospitals if they thought that they required medical attention. Scholars have indicated that non-citizens who lack medical protection or government subsidies are significantly more tentative with accessing services (Ku & Matani, 2001; Magalhaes, Carrasco & Gastaldo, 2010), and we see in the case of Charlotte and Emily how treating an inflamed appendix or performing brain surgery at the earliest opportunity can drastically reduce the risk of death or permanent bodily harm. In this way, these statements illustrate how providing access to medical care is a form of assisted inclusion that was important for the wellbeing of trans-Tasman migrants in this study.

For Australian participants especially, the retention of rights to access healthcare and other important social services was suggested to be valuable for their overall sense of belonging in New Zealand. The impacts of having similar access to important rights and services in New Zealand, or the value of “being treated as part of the furniture from the day you arrive” (Sarah) was expressed commonly by Australian participants, in this case Charlotte:

“Being able to access everything as though I'm a New Zealander, that's huge. And so [moving to New Zealand] just felt like the right decision almost straight away. It felt very comfortable, yeah. The way that I've described it, is it feels like as much home as home can be when it's not. We really enjoyed Canada but we probably wouldn't have said that about Canada... And it's funny when I was in Canada and it was not so easy to move and as I said, we lived in this really crappy area, and it was maybe about after six months of living I heard my neighbourhood described as a high immigrant, low income neighbourhood. And that's when it clicked for me and I thought this is exactly what I am. I'm an immigrant with a low income. And as much as I felt like I didn't fit in there all of a sudden I was like, that's us to a tee.”

By making this comparison, Charlotte pointed to the way her attachment to place in New Zealand and Canada was influenced by the rights and privileges she was accorded, as rights became embedded in the way she conceptualised ‘home’. Academic attention to home making and the construction of identities in transnational migration asserts that different regulatory regimes influence the way a sense of home is articulated by migrants, particularly due to the way temporal restrictions and employment constraints can disrupt a sense of home (Arnold, 2016; Meijering, 2018; Rivlin & Moore, 2001; Sandu, 2013). In line with these discussions, in entering Canada on a working holiday

visa, being paid low wages and living in a low income suburb, Canada did not feel like home for Charlotte, and her life aligned with other people who were framed as migrants. Within her statement, Charlotte expresses some unease with whether she fits within the profile of being a migrant, which could be a result of the way migrant identities are commonly made apparent in public discourse in less than favourable ways (Anderson, 2010; 2013; May et al., 2006; Shelley, 2007). Scholars have identified that the term migrant has been made pejorative in dominant discourse, and the terms migrant, immigrant, illegal immigrant, refugee and asylum seeker are often used interchangeably and inaccurately in media (Anderson, 2013). Charlotte's statement thus points to how conceptualisations of being a migrant or resident, or an insider or an outsider is structured by regulatory regimes, and how home making and gaining a sense of belonging in place can be facilitated by assisted inclusion in society.

Participants were often able to conceptualise their insider status in society in this way, through their experiences of being administered the same rights that they would expect at home. To make a connection across both sections in this chapter, participants' experiences of both moving across borders, and their experiences accessing important services often enabled them to see themselves as 'domestic residents' rather than 'international migrants', as discussed by Sam, an Australian citizen living in Auckland:

"I've got mates that they're like Thai and stuff or pretty much any international student, they pay like four or five times higher fees. So just having those kind of rights makes access [to] like everyday stuff, education, health and that so much easier, even if you never use them it's something that you never have to worry about. So I just see myself as someone who like lives here you know same as everyone else, I never really see myself as a migrant or someone that's like you know moved overseas and now living in a place that's not their actual country of

birth. It's just really easy because it's already in place, everything I need. As I said it's like functioning like a New Zealander.”

Such statements were numerous in interviews, particularly with participants who moved from Australia to New Zealand. Australian citizens constructed their ability to settle in New Zealand under the TTTA as if they were moving domestically, and the rights they were accorded in the TTTA enabled them to identify themselves as residents rather than foreign others. This unique bordering example highlights the lived impact of investing in new residents and according migrants assisted inclusion, with regards to their access to study, work and ability to utilise important public services. These conceptualisations of being ‘at home’ and domestic residents also demonstrates the way assisted inclusion contributed to the possibility of participants ‘belonging’ in another country.

In contrast, some New Zealand participants drew attention to their positions and identities as ‘migrants’ in Australia based on the way their rights and entitlements had been restricted by the Australian government. Some participants living in Australia felt as though the policy changes that were introduced in 2001 bounded them more strongly to the identity of ‘migrant’, as described by David, a New Zealand citizen who had lived in Sydney for five years:

“Obviously [there’s] the safety net or the welfare system that you don't get despite you paying taxes and everything for many years... You also, it's feels more, rather than any sort of tangible thing that I felt I missed out on while I was on a special category visa, it was more the threat that it was not a permanent visa. It was an open-ended visa and it was really at the mercy of whatever they decided to make the law the next day. Which you know sometimes the politics around that are

quite stupid here. You know like one nation and all that sort of thing so you're sort of never quite sure how that's gonna' affect you."

After being asked about whether he has felt as though he's experienced free movement, David immediately identifies elements of the TTTA that conflict with his presumptions of what 'free movement' should provide. David's inability to access government supports such as unemployment benefits, and the uncertainty of the long term residency rights accorded to special category visa holders were considered important in undermining whether David feels as though the TTTA achieved free movement. David's expectations of free movement thus line up with the expectations of free movement defined by scholars (Tryfonidou, 2017; Van der Mei, 2003). Not having access to these financial safety nets was also seen as something that encouraged forms of precarity, as suggested by Ethan, a New Zealand citizen who had lived in Australia for seven years:

"There's one friend who was here working and you know happy with life, didn't ever wanna' go home and then he had a bad injury. And it was not only the family support, but not having any kind of income because he couldn't work, it just became the best decision for him to move home and live with family. So that was kind of a reminder of you know how things can change quite suddenly when something goes wrong and if you don't have that kind of ACC or that support we would get back home. That can really impact your life here."

This passage with Ethan acknowledges the unexpected realities and hardship that can face those moving to Australia, and by hollowing out avenues of support, some New Zealanders are forced to return home when they become unable to work. Australia thus encourages an attitude to migration where skilled and productive workers are valued, but investing in non-citizens and ensuring all members of society have a basic standard of

living is not valued. These findings are concerning for New Zealanders who do not, or cannot, pursue permanent residency and as a result can be at risk of falling through the cracks of society in Australia on special category visas. Kostakopoulou (2012) argues that there is a notable contradiction between belonging fully to a national community as a contributor, collaborator and burden sharer while at the same time not being deemed as fully belonging to society with respect to the enjoyment of certain benefits.

Kostakopoulou (2012) argues that this contradiction is unsustainable from a democratic point of view, however, McMillan (2014) suggests that the current situation suits Australians well – they get access to a pool of skilled and unskilled labour for whom they do not provide full social rights. Those who are affected are withheld from voting rights and do not constitute a significant voting bloc, thus incentives for change are limited (McMillan, 2014). As long as this situation pertains, New Zealanders holding special category visas bear the costs of the contradiction of being economically integrated in Australia, yet lacking forms of political and social integration. In this way, participants were differentially included in society, and they experienced friction within free movement migration that undermined their ability to succeed long term in Australia.

Of those who pursued Australian permanent status and the rights accorded therein, their abilities to navigate the bureaucratic process to succeed in their applications were highly variable. The process of applying for permanent residency in Australia privileged some participants while marginalising others. The documents that participants constructed as being the most important form of evidence to prove they deserved a stake in the country was their income reports and tax returns, as explained by Emily (a New Zealander living in Australia):

“My husband has his citizenship so both the children are Australian. I recently tried to apply and I thought that I would have no trouble being a successful

applicant, however I was declined cause I earnt under the temporary skilled migration income threshold (\$51,000 per annum). I was sure I had earned over that, but I was declined was because I took maternity leave. After my first child was born I was off for 8 months and then I went back really slowly... So even though my husband and my children are Australian and I've lived here for 12 years and earned 53,000 for most of those years... it's not that straight forward. Lots of tricky questions, you've got have lots of documentation. In hindsight I shouldn't have jumped into it but I wanna be on the same passport as my children and my husband you know.”

This story demonstrates how the immigration requirements for permanent residency marginalise women who perform gendered expectations of motherhood and childcare (Blair-Loy, 2001). This discussion also illustrates how New Zealanders moving to Australia after 2001 are subjected to complex and expensive bureaucratic procedures that means there is no longer a clear pathway for getting permanent residency. The permanent residency application was commonly considered to be extremely expensive and in addition to the imposed income threshold requirements, the physical costs of permanent residency applications were a significant barrier for participants in this study. Other participants also indicated that for the people who are working full time and wealthy enough to meet these financial criteria and costs, it was not considered worthwhile to gain citizenship as such people were considered unlikely to utilise financial safety nets or government supports. Interestingly, Emily also indicates how citizenship is not just a container of legal entitlements, but it is also emotionally important to her and the way she articulates her own belonging and identity. She uses the term Australian as a label to understand the national identities of her husband and children but expresses her frustration with not being legally recognised as an Australian

or being on the same passport as her family, despite having lived in and contributed to Australia for 12 years. Pathways to permanent residency in Australia were thus dictated by the ability of applicants to prove themselves valuable to the nation in financially measurable ways, and the inability to qualify under these measurements again emphasised the position of New Zealanders as outsiders and non-citizens. The ambiguity in attaining permanent status resulted in differential inclusion being a long term, persisting status for some participants, and a significant friction within their experience of free movement migration.

On the other hand, those who were able to retain complete access to full legal rights and entitlements in New Zealand constructed the accordence of such rights to be important for their long-term plans to remain in their destination country. Rebecca's long-term plans to remain in New Zealand were influenced heavily by the rights she was accorded:

“I would be heading back to Australia very soon [if my rights were eroded]. I think the fact that I've been here for as long as I have, even in the struggle to find community, it's been counter balanced by the fact that I've never struggled to access a service. Should any of that be taken away from me or restricted I wouldn't be here, because I know I've got full access to it back in Australia yeah. That would be a very easy decision to make.”

In this excerpt, assisted inclusion and providing new migrants with the rights that they would expect in their own country clearly influenced Rebecca's long term plans to remain in New Zealand. Assisted inclusion can thus be considered a way of anchoring people to remain in New Zealand long term. Similarly, Charlotte (an Australian living in

New Zealand) expresses the importance of assisted inclusion for her long-term plans, while also making claims about the value of assisted inclusion at a systematic level:

“There was a slim chance that we might be moving to America at one point and we looked into what it would cost us, something, thousands of dollars to have a baby over there so that kind of put it in perspective. So if that's (according free healthcare) a deliberate strategy and why they make it easier for Aussies to come in here, then yeah, it works. Because if it wasn't as easy maybe we wouldn't come. Maybe New Zealand would have to rely on their existing talent pool which might not be as internationally competitive.”

Charlotte clearly articulates how her healthcare provisions have been important in her long-term plans of raising a family in New Zealand, despite other employment opportunities abroad. The statement, “if it wasn't as easy maybe we wouldn't come” articulates that investing in people who move to New Zealand to live and work can be an effective method for retaining their skills and contributions to society. This excerpt then moves away from demonstrating the importance of assisted inclusion for the individual benefits she has experienced, as Charlotte looks to justify assisted inclusion at a systematic level. Charlotte's construction of assisted inclusion as a systematic arrangement moves away from an understanding that it is an expression of comradery, close national ties and a willingness to invest in new migrants, but it is instead constructed as an economic calculation that evolves with the economic buoyancies and international competitiveness of each nation's workforce. Support for assisted inclusion at a systematic level was thus given through an economically rational argument of international competitiveness and selecting and retaining 'quality migrants'. Quality migrants in this example are denoted by nationality, where Australian citizens were considered valuable migrants who contribute to a productive input of skills and

knowledge. This excerpt is a valuable pivot to transition away from exploring the value of the TTTA for individual experiences of movement, and to move towards uncovering the way the TTTA is justified centrally through settler identity claims and notions of being 'valuable migrants'. As such, the experiences of assisted inclusion were extremely significant for participants' experiences of migration and their constructions of whether free movement is achieved by the TTTA.

5.3: Chapter Summary

In sum, this chapter has navigated participants' experiences of moving under the TTTA within a 'free movement migration' regime. With reference to the role of airports, I explored how border security mechanisms and controls enable the efficient and unhindered movement of Australians and New Zealanders across the Tasman. Participants constructed their mobility between borders under the TTTA as free movement, through being enabled unrestricted access both ways between the New Zealand and Australian border. Participants' experiences with their retention of important rights in their destination country after their arrival then signalled a complicated junction between assisted inclusion and differential inclusion. Evidence from this study suggests that most participants had frictionless experiences applying for jobs and accessing healthcare in their destination countries. These benefits were expressed unambiguously for participants' overall senses of belonging and identity claims in being insiders or outsiders, or residents or migrants. Reservations with free movement were signalled by some New Zealanders living in Australia who experienced differential inclusion based on their exclusion from voting, accessing social welfare and gaining permanent status. The TTTA case study therefore is a unique example of borders where comparisons can be drawn to emphasise the significance of according migrants rights to full inclusion in society. Participants also expressed that administrative rights

were not just financially valuable, but they were also extremely positive for inclusion and belonging within their host society. This study highlights the ways that free movement is constructed by those moving under the TTTA, but also how experiencing free movement is undermined by new policy changes that limit access to important social services and pathways to permanent legal inclusion. These discussions assert that free movement is thus provided through assisted inclusion, a term that encompasses physical constraints to movement across borders and the ability to retain rights to important services administered by governments.

Chapter 6: The Construction of Identities

The preceding chapter discussed free movement migration through the lens of physical and administrative privileges and constraints that operate on movement. In doing so, the previous chapter argued that experiences of assisted inclusion contributed to the possibility of belonging in other countries. Following on from this argument, I now focus on the construction of identities within the trans-Tasman space of free movement. A number of academics have drawn attention to the way nationality and race become central to the way movement is privileged and restricted (Anderson & Blinder, 2011; 2013; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; MacKenzie & Forde, 2009; Mountz, 2010; Simon-Kumar, 2015). Similarly, participants' understandings of free movement were associated with identity claims and evaluations made about who should move freely, and whose movements need to be restricted. This section investigates the overall understandings participants had of movement and how their identity claims most commonly relied on an unacknowledged white colonial settler identity that is both naturalised in the trans-Tasman space and positioned as superior to other identity claims, including that of indigenous peoples. Settler identities became apparent in two related ways: in relation to the invisibility of colonial identities and the visibility of 'other' identities. These discussions will build an argument for the way that the identities constructed in the trans-Tasman space became central to the way free movement was understood and experienced.

6.1: The Invisibility of Colonial Identities

Colonial settler identities shape experiences of trans-Tasman free movement.

Throughout the nineteenth century there was an expectation that enjoyed widespread support among Western societies that every corner of the globe would eventually be embedded in an expanding network of colonial ties (Veracini, 2010). The movement of settlers around the world did not just occur through immigration, but settlements were created by conquest (Mamdani, 2001). Settler identities have since been maintained by legal and social distinctions made between settlers and ‘natives’, with such distinctions privileging (white) settlers and marginalising indigenous groups (Mamdani, 2001). The effects of colonialism are still embodied in modern society today, and both Australians and New Zealanders are still coming to terms with their post-colonial identity (Ahluwalia, 2001; Bell, 2009), which became apparent in this study. The trans-Tasman space illustrates the way that settler identities can be shared between nations, even as they have their own national exclusions. This section will ultimately argue that trans-Tasman migration takes place within, and plays a role in, reproducing settler national identities that work by asserting the centrality of a white identity. Corporeality and identity thus matter a great deal for experiences and understandings of free movement.

Participants’ understandings of migration resonated with the identity crafted by colonial pioneers, who established, naturalised and ‘earned’ their identity as settlers through notions of hard work and toughness (Bannister, 2005). Academics have substantiated how the ‘blokey’ masculine identity formation established by colonial pioneers has persisted in everyday interactions, and in the way people continue to express toughness by suppressing their emotions (Liepins, 2000; Berg & Kearns, 1996; Braun, 2008). In a study from Christchurch, New Zealand, “*Put on a jacket, you wuss*” (Cupples, Guyatt and Pearce, 2007), the authors demonstrate how South Island New

Zealanders have higher winter mortality rates than either Sweden or Siberia in spite of a far more temperate climate. This high mortality rate was based significantly on investments in particular national identity claims that are rooted in the masculine pioneering heritage established during the colonial period, that suggested that people who were not able to tolerate cold were weak, or ‘wussy’ (Cupples, Guyatt and Pearce, 2007). Participants in this study also echoed a pioneering colonial identity based on the way toughness and hard work were central to claims about successful settlement in their destination society. Paige (a New Zealander living in Sydney), for example, in her narrative, demonstrates how migrants need to first experience and overcome tough situations to earn their place in society:

“Sure we can bitch and complain about stuff, but to be in a country like Australia maybe we should have the approach where we should actually earn the right to be here. Like, I shouldn't be entitled to think that Australia has to give me X, Y and Z. Like, I would be happy to earn my way through to become an Australian... So I actually had my own unemployment period and obviously not having Centrelink access was a bit rough cause I had to use my savings. But when I was unemployed of a gap of three to four months last year though I didn't see that bothering me too much”.

Paige argues that new migrants should not to be entitled to rights such as welfare assistance without first earning their place in society. This subject position is counter intuitive to the logic of the TTTA, which provides assisted inclusion through according rights to trans-Tasman migrants upon arrival. Paige instead insists the need for settlers to work hard, stop complaining, and endure tough situations before they can be accorded the rights and benefits of citizens. Paige’s views could be a reflection of neoliberal

values such as the importance of individual success and hard work (Peterson, 2011), however, in this trans-Tasman space her narrative also calls upon a settler identity that is much older than the standard chronology of neoliberalism in articulating hard work and individual value to society (Bannister, 2005). Narratives of hard work were common throughout participants' notions of successful settlement, as demonstrated by an Australian participant, Derrick, and Peter, a New Zealander:

“(Derrick) If people are willing to work, they'll find work. If they put their head down and bum up they'll climb pretty quickly in this country”

“(Peter) Before I left New Zealand there was a big push saying ‘oh the rights of New Zealanders in Australia are being eroded’. The way it looks from the media over here is that the Kiwis are stamping their feet and you know shaking their arms around and they're just coming over this side of the ditch. They're coming across as a bit childish. You know, at the end of the day like as long as you keep your head down and your bum up then you'll be pretty safe I'd say, yeah.”

Like the tough ‘blokes’ of the colonial pioneering era (Braun, 2008), Peter and Derrick encouraged an attitude to settlement that conveys the importance of hard work and toughness, without any need for people to complain about their position or express their emotions. They also underplayed the importance of potential challenges that migrants might face in their host nation, and there was little sympathy towards people who did not fall on their feet when moving overseas. Within this support for people who work hard to earn success, participants insinuated that people who failed to thrive did so because of their own weaknesses. Therefore, there were cultural similarities in the way people latched on to common masculine discourses about hard work, and the childishness or weakness of complaining about the status quo within migration management.

Physical toughness was also embodied by some participants when articulating a colonial settler identity and their identities as migrants who can overcome adversity without requiring governmental support. Physical toughness is a central component of a pioneering settler identity, where the need to be tough and practical in a masculinised way competes with opportunities for people to express their true emotions or resentment towards unpleasant situations (Berg & Kearns, 1996; Crump, 1982). Again, Peter embodies masculinity and physical toughness in working through a difficult injury:

Peter: “I dislocated my shoulder quite badly, but because I don't wanna’ take 12 weeks off work for recovery I just keep working and every now again I pop it out. The last time I did it was about six months ago. But I can sorta’ pop it in myself, so it's not that bad.”

Tom: “It's not like there's the same safety net either if you take time off work.”

Peter: “Nah that's right. I sorta’ grinned and beared with it and I've dislocated it probably eight times since then. But yeah, I mean I can manage it.”

The emphasis Peter puts on “I can manage it”, alleviates any of the responsibility government policies have in applying financial pressure to migrants by excluding them from unemployment benefits. This dialogue is reminiscent of the popular New Zealand novels of Barry Crump's *A Good Keen Man* (1982) and John Mulgan's *Man Alone* (1949; cited in Berg & Kearns, 1996), where pain and weakness is rendered incompatible with the masculinised pioneer body. Thus, in this trans-Tasman space there was the presence of colonial pioneering identities and attitudes to migration, where quintessential notions of masculinity, hard work and physical toughness were embedded in understandings of appropriate settlement and successful settlers.

Subscriptions to a colonial identity within trans-Tasman free movement travel were also oriented around whiteness. A great volume of literature has identified how white identities have been privileged in colonial settler societies in almost all aspects of daily life (Case, 2012; Hastie & Rimmington, 2014). An array of literature has also demonstrated how whiteness plays a significant role in the visibility and acceptance of migrant identities within destination societies (Anderson, 2016; Guðjónsdóttir, & Loftsdóttir, 2017). Out of 16 interviews with white Australians and white New Zealanders (one participant was Māori, two participants were born in Hong Kong and one participant was born in India), five participants explicitly spoke about whiteness having an impact on their experiences of moving across the Tasman. Of these participants, only one person (Rebecca) clearly located how her experience of migration and her inclusion in society was privileged by her white identity. Rebecca explained “I’m white and I speak English so I can assimilate very easily into this situation”. This straightforward account of white privilege in moving between colonial settler societies resonates with academic understandings and current research (for example, Coombes, 2006). A very small minority of participants thus constructed their movement across the Tasman to be clearly and unquestioningly privileged by their white identities.

It was more common for participants to not discuss whiteness at all, or to discuss how being white might have influenced their experiences of movement with uncertainty. Scholars have asserted that a key feature of modern racism is ‘discursive deracialisation’, where people commonly downplay race in society (Augoustinos & Every, 2007; Billig, 1991; Reeves, 1983), to the extent that recognising race has itself been constructed as racist (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008; Hastie & Rimmington, 2014). The ‘awkwardness’ or potential racism seen in naming whiteness appeared to influence the narratives participants gave of movement in this study. For example, Mark, a New

Zealander who had lived in Australia for three years briefly located the importance of a white identity in Sydney, but expressed his opinion with significant uncertainty:

“I think New Zealanders are very accepted, yeah. I think there's also a racial thing. I think white New Zealanders are more accepted. It's my opinion, it could be wrong.”

Despite Mark suggesting how his white identity might have impacted his overall experience of migration, he immediately dissociates himself from giving this statement with strong conviction by the follow up statement “It’s my opinion, it could be wrong”. The effect of this statement is to frame Mark as not totally certain of whether white privilege exists in Australia. Some researchers have offered an alternative discourse, whereby in highlighting the experiences of Sudanese refugees in Melbourne for example, it is asserted that white identities are privileged in this post-colonial space (see for example, Karp, 2018). Similarly, Michael’s narrative indicated how naming racism could be a somewhat uncomfortable topic, when responding to being asked if he’s been discriminated against in Australia:

“Not white New Zealanders. I've been accepted as basically an Australian. I think there actually is a big difference between white New Zealanders and anyone else. I think that it would be interesting to talk to someone who's not a white New Zealander because I feel that yeah for me it's been super, super easy and there's not a lot of difference between me and a white Australian really. But I think if you are Māori or Pacific Islander that could be very interesting. I think if you were Māori and you came to live where I was living you might, I mean I don't know, I don't wanna' accuse them of potentially being discriminated against, I don't know. But I would say it's much more difficult.”

Michael expresses the privilege of how white New Zealanders are accepted as Australians, and how they might ‘melt’ into white Australian residential communities, while non-white New Zealanders may find it more difficult being accepted into the same neighbourhoods. Michael simultaneously expresses some tentativeness about naming racism or speaking on behalf of people with non-white identities, and his narrative suggests “that if you were Māori or Pacific Islander that could be very interesting” without stating people with such identities are discriminated against definitively. This passage starts to frame different outcomes for Māori and Pacific People who move to Australia (Hamer, 2008), and more attention will be paid to the ‘othering’ of Māori and Pacific Island People in the trans-Tasman space in the following section. These excerpts serve to illustrate that the settler identity was typically framed as very acceptable, and overtly a position taken up by people to assist their integration in society. However, naming the privilege that goes with whiteness was more problematic, and participants often considered that white privilege was not clear cut, well substantiated and hardly apparent from their experiences and understandings of migration.

To understand the hidden or unspeakable nature of white colonial settler identities, interview material needs to be brought into conversation with contemporary academic understandings of the privilege awarded to whiteness. As posited earlier, only five white participants out of 16 spoke about the importance of a white identity and how it might have influenced their experiences of moving across the Tasman. In the remaining interviews, whiteness was completely unacknowledged when questions about inclusion, belonging, identity and discrimination were posed. This confusion or apprehension related to naming white privilege can be brought into conversation with the work of Peggy McIntosh (1988), who defines white privilege as “an invisible package of unearned assets which I can count on cashing in each day, but about which I am meant to

remain oblivious” (p. 1). The unspoken race talk in interviews became apparent in the way most participants acknowledged a white settler identity in the trans-Tasman space without directly naming it. Ava (an Australian citizen living in Auckland) gives a good indication of the implicit nature of whiteness when she was asked about her perception of the relationship between New Zealand and Australia:

“Little brother, big brother. Our culture’s so similar, [when] you meet Kiwis it’s almost like being back home. The culture here is so similar to [where I’m from] so it’s not like oh I need to be with my own people, you know. Everyone’s like me anyway so it doesn’t feel like it’s segregated really. Yeah I barely see other Australians. And no one thinks I’m an Australian, yeah so most people think I’m Kiwi now. Because I just don’t sound Aussie. So yeah I mean I can pass off as either whenever I need to.”

Ava suggests that her New Zealand accent is a key feature of her identity that allows her to remain unrecognised as an Australian in New Zealand. The “little brother, big brother” construction of New Zealand and Australia occurred more than once, and this framing suggests (masculine) familial linkages between New Zealand and Australia. Rebecca’s statement “everyone’s like me anyway” suggests how her inclusion in society is also assisted by her performance of dominant corporeal identities and shared cultural norms between Australia and New Zealand, however, whiteness or white privilege remained un-acknowledged throughout the interview. This was common across interviews with both New Zealanders and Australians where people would state “People don’t realise I’m from Australia” (James) and “Australians are accepting of New Zealanders” (Isaac) with participants then situating their acceptance and invisibility through follow up statements such as “because my accent’s fairly neutral” (James) or “cause there’s such a close bond

between Australia and New Zealand” (Isaac). These justifications enabled participants to explain their inclusion in society without acknowledging the existence of racism, or the privilege of a white colonial identity in these spaces. The settlement of trans-Tasman migrants is thus assisted by their ability to become linguistically, culturally and corporeally indistinguishable from dominant identities in their destination societies, based on a shared but often unacknowledged white colonial settler identity.

Colonial identities also became implicit in the way participants constructed their identities as valuable migrants. Participants often narrated their migration experience as a productive movement that benefitted them individually while also benefitting their host nation, and participants would often emphasise their individual contributions to society. These claims of being valuable and contributing to society were often coupled with narratives that expressed the value of colonial identities. The value of colonial identities was expressed clearly by Charlotte (an Australian citizen living in Auckland):

“It's attractive to come into the New Zealand system because the job market is more flooded in, I'll use Australia and the UK because that's where most of the people involved in these discussions are. The education system here in [our field] is more limited and is not of the same quality as some other countries like Australia and the UK. So we also like to see it as a benefit to the organisation because we're bringing in expertise to New Zealand that was not available through the New Zealand population.”

In this excerpt, migration is promoted on the basis of what migrants are able to offer to their destination country, which is tied to specific claims about the quality of education in nations that constitute a dominant colonial settler identity. Migration from these countries is therefore constructed as being more valuable to New Zealand than receiving

migrants from other countries that are perceived as lacking distinguished academic institutions capable of producing ‘technical expertise’. In this way, constructions of valuable migration were embedded in notions of a colonial space where legitimate migrants come from. Participants were thus able to couple their reasons for moving with distinct justifications for their value in their destination country based on a colonial identity that could be positioned as superior to other identities.

Being valuable and preferred migrants was not an identity claim that participants made independently, but New Zealand migrants were also rendered valuable in public discourse. When tension with diversity or migration debates surfaced in New Zealand and Australia, participants considered that they were not the intended targets of anti-immigrant attitudes or the policy changes that looked to limit immigration numbers. David, for example, suggests how New Zealanders are publicly recognised as the preferred migrants in Australian society:

“I’ve never had any real sort of push back like go home or anything like that. Definitely when the immigration debate falls to the lows of the, you know race and that sort of thing then we’re preferred over Asians or Indian immigrants. I think even Peter Dutton, he had a comment like that he wanted more New Zealand immigration and less from other countries. It’s a little bit like Donald Trump’s give me more Norwegians, right?”

David’s narrative suggests that valuable migrants are not distinguished in Australia by their ability to contribute to society, but solely by their nationality (Indian) or in relation to particular racialised groups (Asian). David’s reference to “Trump’s give me more

Norwegians”⁸ shows that he is completely aware of the importance of whiteness, and he highlights the way nationality and race become embedded in claims about desirable migrants. This assertion concurs with migration research that has established whiteness plays a key role in structuring the expectations and assumed appropriateness of migrants to workplaces and society (Anderson, 2010; Guevarra, 2016; MacKenzie and Forde, 2009; Simon-Kumar, 2015). The desirability and expected traits of different migrant identities was also expressed by Ethan:

“If you look now, I think the stats of immigration and how long the wait periods are for people overseas, any time you look at a country like India or China their wait periods are longer than people from England or Europe or New Zealand. And I think that's an assumption that government probably makes that people who come from countries quote unquote ‘like us’ will integrate easily whereas the people who are ‘other’ won't. Which I think is bullshit.”

Ethan suggests that dominantly white nationalities are favoured within immigration procedures. Participants also expressed having “friendly” experiences with immigration and Michael stated “aside from the politics of it all the department that handles it, they're very respectful and I've never had any problems with dealing with them. I've heard good things about them you know”. These positive interactions with immigration contrast the experiences that have been described by student visa holders from India and China for example, who describe unfriendly and intolerant officials, extremely long wait periods, and little transparency in providing information or justifications for visa outcomes (Robertson, 2011). Although this study is not aiming to confirm or deny allegations of

⁸ During an Oval Office meeting, lawmakers were explaining to Donald Trump how immigration reforms would impact people from Haiti and Africa, for example, to which Trump responded “Why do we want these people from all these shithole countries here? We should have more people from places like Norway.” (Kirby, 2018).

preferential treatment within immigration procedures, these statements support participants' descriptions of the privilege experienced in Australia by New Zealanders and people from other countries viewed as white-majority. This privilege is asserted in the way other white people are considered to be 'like us', based on an assumed but unqualified expectation of visual, ancestral and cultural sameness (Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Loftsdóttir, & Jensen, 2016). Participants thus expressed privilege in being accepted uncontroversially, while other non-white migrants were considered to experience prejudice and discrimination when race debates and 'go home' attitudes surfaced in public discourse.

The privileged experienced by those with colonial settler identities became apparent in the space of free movement migration in discussions about political inclusion. Some participants gave an indication of what dominant or societally accepted values were, and through naming and norming certain beliefs they made claims about the existence of a shared colonial identity and a set of values that accompany this identity. Peter (a New Zealander in Australia) gives an example of how colonial identities have shaped expected shared values between New Zealand and Australia:

“New Zealand and Australian values, peoples' values and stuff are exactly the same. Basically, both cultures are based on English culture. We're all basically brought up on Christian values I guess. Not that I'm a Christian but that's where it's all sorta' stemmed from. I mean if I was to mix into different parts of the city it might be different because obviously there's Muslims and there's a big Indian contingent, so like I guess the values around that sorta' stuff might change”

Peter's excerpt strongly constructs elements of the self and other that establish a sense of the 'correct' national values that “are exactly the same” in New Zealand and Australia.

The colonial heritage of these two nations is determined to have led to similar values being accepted in both societies, and although Peter is not Christian, he explains how his views might be influenced by Christianity, a religion that colonisers brought with them, and one that missionaries often attempted to proselytise to indigenous communities in Australia and New Zealand as part of colonial settlement (Hamer, 2008; King, 2003).

The superiority of shared New Zealand and Australian values was expressed in no uncertain terms by Derrick (an Australian citizen living in Auckland):

Tom: “In New Zealand we've got quite open access to voting, which I think is quite good”.

Derrick: “It's good but it can also let them push their own agendas. It's like, if you get an influx of people from one nationality and they're not a resident, then they can start affecting how the culture of New Zealand is without actually having to do anything... New Zealand's still got the attitude that Aussie used to have where we're still quite direct about how they feel about things. I mean you're not getting rid of Christmas and things like that and [not] talking about Santa because the other cultures that are in the country. Whereas in Australia they're censoring it cause there's a lot of Islamic groups trying to push for the nations or sovereign area type of thing. Exclusions.”

In constituting a Western settler identity, Derrick argues that Christian traditions such as Christmas are held as being valuable, whereas ‘other’ values are deemed to be dangerous. More specifically, Islam is constructed as a religion that has no place in Australian or New Zealand society. The logic of this statement is that people who do not share the dominant expressions of a New Zealand identity should not have the

opportunity to participate in making national decisions. Despite being entitled to vote in New Zealand ‘without actually having to do anything’, Derrick clearly imposes the difference between his own vote and the vote of ‘others’. While his own ability to vote is constructed as being important and valuable for the country as he’s having his voice heard, the same act is constructed as pushing an agenda when performed by ‘others’. These discussions of the shared values between New Zealand and Australia assert the superiority and dominance of colonial identities in the trans-Tasman space.

The privileging of colonial shared values was also expressed by New Zealanders applying to become citizens in Australia. Participants stated that citizenship tests favoured New Zealand citizens over ‘other’ migrants. David explains how the citizenship test was a very minor hurdle for him while it could have been a significant barrier for other people sitting the test who did not affiliate with a Western colonial identity:

“[The citizenship test], it's very easy you know, if you're coming from a New Zealand background you won't have any trouble getting 100%. But then I think the pass is 80% or something like that but yeah there were people in the room that were failing but there's just different backgrounds so they don't know. So a lot of the questions centre around like, whether law is based on religion or stupid stuff like that yeah. So one of the questions was ‘is Australian law based on A. Sharia law. B. you know religion or whatever so stuff like that.’”

The citizenship test was considered to be extremely easy for New Zealanders while migrants from non-Western countries were considered to struggle with questions regarding laws and governance in Australia. Scholars have identified that there is an underlying motive to processes that ensure migrants are able to demonstrate advanced language skills, understand their civic involvement and recite cultural knowledge of the

host society (Löwenheim & Gazit, 2009). This underlying motive is immigration control, where states employ citizenship tests in response to popular, sometimes xenophobic nationalist sentiments that place pressure on the state to curb immigration from certain countries (Etzioni, 2007; Wright, 2008). In this way, citizenship tests can work in favour of ‘preferred migrants’, which in this case privileged a colonial identity and facilitated the permanent inclusion of New Zealanders in Australia.

Colonial identities were positioned as superior in the space of free movement migration, but informal lines of segregation between New Zealand and Australian national identities were also deployed within a shared trans-Tasman colonial identity. The portrayal of Australians in New Zealand public discourse often centres around making jokes at their expense, and some participants positioned this as light humour. James, for example, stated:

“I think it's in jest, but you do get like, I do see a bit of negativity around Australians in New Zealand. There is a bit of a negative connotation and even like there was a poll in the NZ Herald the other day and it had like what do you think is the best thing about New Zealand right? And they had like a whole [list], like a batch and all these outdoors and all sorts of things about New Zealand. And it said ‘and it's not Australia’, [which] was one of the options and that came second, and I'm just like seriously?”

James expressed being aware of negative opinions about Australians that are circulated publicly. Of the quintessential activities listed in the New Zealand Herald poll, ‘not being Australia’ was voted the second best thing about New Zealand, demonstrating how there might be a tendency to define a New Zealand national identity through negation of an Australian national identity (Jesson, 2001). Participants expressed that it is socially

acceptable in New Zealand to joke about an Australian national identity in negative ways, and many participants stated that negativity towards an Australian identity harmed their sense of belonging and inclusion in society. Rebecca, for example demonstrates the impact of national exclusions for her experience of being an Australian citizen living in Auckland:

“I've never had so many people since I've lived here be like ‘oh you're Australian’. I found myself where I'll say something along the lines of ‘I'm from Australia but don't hold that against me’. Like I try and pre-empt it, I've got this defence mechanism now. I didn't ever hear of many Aussies home sort of doing the ‘banter’ thing, like they were just our friends so we didn't talk about it that they were from New Zealand. But it is quite constant and it's just like it's genuinely not something I think about until I'm confronted with it. And I'm just like oh, okay here we are again. You're the outsider.”

Rebecca explains how national differences between New Zealanders and Australians are marked out by New Zealanders in Auckland, while Australians are presented as less invested in drawing attention to a New Zealand national identity. Rebecca also suggests that national exclusions within a trans-Tasman identity can be frequent and emotionally draining. It was common for Australian participants to suggest that the negative readings of an Australian national identity made them feel as though they were outsiders, despite feeling included in many other situations (“it’s genuinely not something I think about until...”). Participants thus indicated how national exclusions still exist for Australians in New Zealand, despite participants frequently subscribing to a shared dominant white settler identity.

In sum, colonial identities were privileged in the space of trans-Tasman free movement migration. Participants' understandings of migration often invoked the quintessential 'Kiwi and Aussie blokes', by establishing a sense of self through dominant performances of hard work and physical toughness to overcome adversity (Liepins, 2000; Berg & Kearns, 1996). There was only one occasion in interviews where a participant expressed a colonial identity through explicitly and unmistakably discussing the privilege of being white. It was far more common for the privilege of a colonial identity to take shape in implicit forms, in line with academic assertions about performances of modern racism (Augoustinos et al., 2005; Billig, 1991; McConahay, 1986). Participants expressed valuable migration primarily through asserting the value of migrants from specific nations, with these countries constructing colonial spaces (eg., the United Kingdom) as the source of legitimate migrants. White colonial identities were also constructed based on notions of 'shared values' that were rooted in a supposed shared ancestry, and an assumption that the same values were inherited based on the dominance of similar religious institutions in each nation, with these 'shared values' also being positioned as superior to 'other' values. Finally, the privilege of white identities surfaced in the way participants experienced and understood immigration procedures in Australia. These discussions have demonstrated the position of privilege of moving across the Tasman as a white Australian or New Zealand citizen, with this identity being considered appropriate and uncontroversial in both colonial settler societies. This argument refines existing understandings of modern colonial identities in migration (Simon-Kumar, 2015), by exposing how colonial identities still operate primarily based around a shared whiteness, with consequences for normative evaluations made about valuable migration and valuable migrants. Despite the construction of, and popular subscription to a dominant colonial settler identity, there were also national differences

in the way Australian participants living in New Zealand experienced discrimination based upon their national identities. This thesis therefore illustrates that shared national identities can take shape while also having certain national exclusions, indicating some complexity within intersections of identity and nationality. The following chapter continues to explore intersections within identity and nationality, through navigating the tendency of participants to orientate their own identities through referring to ‘other’ identities.

6.2: The Visibility of ‘Other’ Identities

This section demonstrates how settler identities operate, not only by asserting the centrality of a white identity in the settler colony, but also through denigrating others, including indigenous peoples. As whiteness is usually unmarked and unnamed as an identity, more attention has been paid to scrutinise and build knowledge about the movement of people with ‘other’ identities (Ahmed, 2007; Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Frankenburg 1993). Similarly, within this study participants subscribed to a dominant identity by speaking about, and giving reference to, ‘other’ identities that exist in the trans-Tasman space. This examination of the way participants articulate non-white identities will begin by considering the way participants gave reference to their own identities by referring to the reception of ‘other’ migrant identities in Australia. The different receptions experienced by white and non-white migrants initially became apparent in relation to the segregation that prevails between different ethnic communities. I will then discuss the attention paid to ‘other’ identities, who were deemed to be threatening to the presumed order that exists in Australia and New Zealand. Finally, I will examine the way that Māori and Pacific Island identities were constructed as being hyper visible in Australia based on racial differences and negative stereotypes relating to productivity and aggression, that were ultimately considered to be harmful to

their ability to thrive in Australia. These articulations of different, or other identities reinforce the dominance of a white settler identity.

The invisible identity of white participants was achieved by marking out and denoting visible migrant populations. Participants drew attention to how New Zealanders and Australians spread throughout local communities, while other migrants were considered to settle in distinct national pockets and segregated communities. This pattern was expressed by a number of participants. For example Ethan stated:

“What I felt like what I experienced [in Sydney] was a pretty divided culture in terms of race. Like it seems almost quite tribal, like different suburbs and parts of the city yeah sort of exclusively for these kinds of people or those kinds of people and there's a lot of comments that fly back and forth about different groups. There's a lot of families, like Kiwi families that have settled here but I think Kiwis are pretty well integrated or spread amongst the city.”

This dialogue suggests that Sydney is a mosaic of distinct areas that are identifiable through the major ethnic groups that are concentrated in each area. Participants suggested that (white) New Zealanders were more integrated in society than other migrant populations who remained in isolated pockets. This gives an indication of how some of the processes that form and define “segregated” enclaves among other migrant groups (see for example Johnston et al., 2008) are not recognised to operate for white migrants. Peter also discussed how race and nationality become central to segregation in Australia:

“You go to your different suburbs and you see different groups and like people will tell you oh don't go to that suburb. You're the wrong colour or you know it's

a bit, it is a bit more prominent here. (Tom: Is there any kind of friction with migration?). Yeah South beaches like I think it was 2012 or maybe 2011 they had the big Cronulla riots where there was basically white Australians and Lebanese had a big feud [whereas] we sorta just become the butt of all of the sheep jokes as opposed to actually being targeted I'd say yeah.”

This excerpt reveals clear notions about the dominance of a white culture within the national identity of Australia, and how the identities of some migrant minorities are ‘othered’. In giving reference to the friction with migration that exists in Sydney, Peter marks out another migrant population whose residence in Australia has been associated with prejudice, as evidenced by the Cronulla riots⁹. This comparison serves to point out how identities and the visibility of ‘other’ identities becomes important for New Zealanders when finding a community to settle in, abiding by normative ideas of the segregated communities where people of different ethnicities ‘belong’. The identities of marginalised groups were thus brought to attention during interviews, when participants gave reference to their own invisibility in Australia.

People with ‘other’ nationalities also became visible when participants articulated whose movement should be assisted and whose movement needs to be restricted. As Bridget Anderson (2013) notes, people make sense of themselves by defining who should be allowed to enter the nation and who should not, maintaining and reproducing pervasive distinctions between ‘us’ and ‘them’. Participants denigrated ‘them’ in their

⁹ The Cronulla riots refers to the outbreak of mob violence against the Lebanese community in response to a fight between Lebanese youths and Australian lifeguards on Cronulla beach (Poynting, 2006). The fight drew considerable attention and a series of assaults, stabbings and attacks against police by white Australians occurred during the riots that continued over the 11th and 12th of December, 2005 (Poynting, 2006).

understandings of migration, and how people with marginalised identities should be prevented from entering Australasia, as demonstrated by Ava:

“Terrorism's such an issue now. Australia hasn't had anything, we've had serious moments and I think the reason that there hasn't been anything serious happen yet, it's been foiled before it's come to fruition, is because our government are so strict about the people they let into the country. So to be honest I'm glad that they're so strict. I mean it's hard for the people who aren't doing anything wrong, but like it's for the best of the country and not just difficult for the sake of being difficult.”

Ava's account clearly marks out 'others' who are a danger to society. In this way, while borders did not feature as important constraints for participants in this study, participants still gave support for the existence of borders that are not open to all foreigners. The statement “it's hard for the people who aren't doing anything” implies how movement is restricted even for people who aren't a threat, but the overall logic here is that the benefits for domestic security outweigh the costs borne by those who are scrutinised, restricted and detained as a result of being misidentified at the border. Such events where people are mis-profiled were constructed as being accidental rather than targeted or malicious, and with the best intentions of keeping the country safe. The safety of movement and life within Australia and New Zealand was thus constructed as being dependant on the ability of nations to protect the country from undesirable 'others'. The suggestion was, that assisted inclusion experienced by participants can only be made possible by denigrating and drawing attention to 'them' and restricting the movement of 'others'.

Participants also made an effort to distinguish the movement of people with marginalised identities from others who move between Australia and New Zealand under the TTTA. Some participants suggested that the current ‘open border’ across the Tasman could be flawed in some aspects as it allows the movement of undesirable people within New Zealand and Australian national citizenship ties. This was expressed simply by Chris, a New Zealander who had lived in Australia for three years:

“You can come and go as you please, I mean both countries don't want undesirable people, which there are some. But so, and there have been cases recently of people getting deported from Australia back to New Zealand. Which is fair enough. I don't mind.”

In this statement, Chris begins to explore some of the caveats in using nationality to make assumptions about valuable migration and valuable migrants. Chris suggests that the New Zealand population is not homogenous and as a national community it still contains ‘undesirable people’. An open border is suggested to be an imperfect border, but failures can be managed by deporting ‘undesirable’ people back across borders. Research has suggested that the efforts made by the Australian government to deport New Zealand citizens has been racialised towards excluding people with marginalised identities (Hugo, 2015; Stanley, 2018). Of New Zealanders deported from Australia, reports show that 60% of deportees were of Māori or Pacific Island descent (O’Reagan, 2018) even though Māori and Pacific New Zealanders in Australia make up less than 35% of the populations of New Zealanders in Australia (Statistics Australia, 2014). More recently, a New Zealand citizen of Aboriginal Australian descent (born in New Zealand to an Aboriginal Australian mother) has joined the disproportionate number of people with marginalised identities who are set to be deported from Australia (Gower, 2016; Ensor, 2018). Through bringing Chris’ identification of sub-national difference within New

Zealand identities into conversation with recent statistics and critical research, we can begin to explore different identities present within being a New Zealand citizen, and how these identities shape different outcomes for those moving across the Tasman.

Participants in Australia had a different framing of what the term ‘Kiwi’ means as a marker of a national identity. In New Zealand, the term ‘Kiwi’ is used to denote a settler identity, while indigenous or non-white identities are intentionally marked out as being ‘Māori’ or ‘Pacific Islanders’ (James, 2012; Turner, 2007). In contrast, Australian people appear to apply the term ‘Kiwi’ to denote non-white New Zealanders, as explained by Ethan:

“I’ve heard a lot of people say that they’ve worked with Kiwis and usually when people say the word Kiwis they’re actually talking about Māori or Pacific Island people. Cause that’s how they’re identified them as Kiwis, as being different. I think a lot of white Kiwis probably just pass as being Aussies in a lot of cases.”

Ethan demonstrates how the term ‘Kiwi’ is rendered as a migrant identity in drawing apart ‘others’ who are different from the dominant Australian identity. This alternate framing of the term ‘Kiwi’s’ is different from the way Ethan then applies the term under his own understanding in the final sentence, where he suggests that “white Kiwis” are not marked as outsiders or even suspected of being born in another country. Mark also gave support for local awareness in Australia being skewed towards acknowledging a New Zealand identity through marking out Māori and Pacific Islands New Zealanders:

“You get a lot of people in Australia [that] think everyone from New Zealand’s like Polynesian and Māori and then there’s a small, you know [number of white people]. I think they don’t realise that actually you know most New Zealanders are European you know. Like maybe not in Auckland but I’m from Christchurch.

When you got to Queensland there's so many you know like Māoris and Polynesians and I think a lot of Australians just think, like 60% of New Zealand is like that. I think that's what a lot of Australians think.”

Mark suggests that Australians do not have a strong grasp on the population demographics of New Zealand, where it's popular for people in Australia to assume that Māori and Pacific Islanders make up the majority in New Zealand, while in reality those identifying as Māori and Pacific Islanders make up just over a quarter of the national population (Statistics New Zealand, 2018). Non-white New Zealanders were thus constructed as being a visible migrant population in Australia, while white New Zealanders were considered to be an invisible migrant population. These dialogues indicate how racialised identities are constructed in the space of free movement, and the privilege awarded to a white colonial settler identity in Australia.

In unpacking the visibility of 'other' New Zealand identities, it is important to explore how Māori and Pacific Island New Zealanders are made apparent in dominant discourse in Australia. The narratives of participants from Australia gave a good indication of how their perception of who 'Kiwi's' are, was influenced significantly by racialised assumptions made about the movement of non-white others. This was articulated most clearly by Harper:

“I remember something when I was in High school about stopping the Pacific people that came through New Zealand. Got their citizenship and then came to Australia for a higher benefit. Yeah 'a lot of them are you know, they go to Mt. Druit and they sit there and they get their benefit' you know that kinda thing. That was when I considered [The] Pacific part of New Zealand. I didn't even know

there was white New Zealanders till I was in Uni. Which is really bad. Really really bad. I still, yeah I didn't realise there was any white people living here.”

The lack of recognition that white people actually exist in New Zealand was discussed by Harper, an Australian woman who had been living in Auckland for six years. The lack of awareness to the existence of Pākehā New Zealanders demonstrates how migrant identities might be made apparent in public discourse when they are racialised in relation to a majority ethnic population and associated with negative behaviours, with negative stereotypes being a common trope applied to migrant populations in countries around the world (Anderson, 2013; 2016; MacKenzie & Forde, 2009; Vertovec, 2011). In this case, harmful stereotypes were circulated in Australian society about Pacific Island New Zealanders being financial burdens on society. The argument that Pacific Islanders were ‘exploiting’ the TTTA to commit benefit fraud was part of the rationale the Australian government referred to when reducing the rights of New Zealanders in Australian society in 2001 (Hamer, 2008; Stewart, 2013). These discussions illustrate the way non-white identities are hyper-visible and have become the subject of negative attention and racial prejudice.

Sub national differences in the reception of New Zealanders in Australia indicates that racism significantly impacts the success of Māori and Pacific Islands New Zealanders in Australia. Racism was performed in this study in the way some participants gave first-hand accounts that Indigenous or marginalised groups were considered to be responsible for their failures to flourish through problematic family structures or cultural flaws (Cowie, 2017; Nairn & McCreanor, 1991). The following dialogue with Ethan gives an example of how the cultural flaws of marginalised groups were articulated in this study:

“Any time there's a new story that comes out about some Kiwi guy that was in a road rage incident or whatever then you're gonna' have a whole bunch of Aussies saying oh they're aggressive louts and once were warriors¹⁰ and blah blah blah... I think there are some occasions where Māori and Pacific Island people are seen as being a bit aggressive. Yeah, I have heard a bit of that.”

Ethan's statement situates the victims of negative stereotypes that are circulated about New Zealanders in Australia, as often being Māori, with the reference to 'Once Were Warriors' (see footnote ten). Negative perceptions of New Zealanders can thus be seen to mark out Māori and Pacific Islands identities independently. These findings resonate with academic literature that has established how people of colour are popularly framed as being 'savage', 'animalistic', or having uncontrolled 'brute' strength that they inherit through genetics (Billings & Angelini, 2007). This racial stereotype resonates with the process of colonisation and the framings of a 'savage other' from the standpoint of a superior white 'self', a mode of knowing the world that rationalized colonial domination over other territories and populations (Hall, 1996; Stoler, 1989). These dialogues therefore indicate how colonial attitudes still influence current discourse, and the way a white colonial settler identity is positioned as superior, while Māori and Pacific Islanders are reported to experience racism. Whiteness thus provided assisted inclusion and allowed some New Zealanders to be highly accepted and 'invisible' within Australian communities, while Māori and Pacific Islanders might be considered differentially included in society, being marked out in public discourse and subjected to negative racial stereotypes.

¹⁰ *Once Were Warriors* (1994) is a film that follows a dis-functional Māori family hurting from the societal woes of colonisation and persisting racism. The film critiques the inequality within New Zealand society, but *Once Were Warriors* might also be read as promoting a view of Māori as being predisposed to violence.

The way New Zealand migrants of Māori and Pacific Island descent were marked as an aggressive population was determined to have consequences for their ability to succeed in Australian society. In the interview schedule I asked about participants' interactions with police. It has been demonstrated that police interactions with (black) African migrants in both New Zealand and Australia have been fraught with racial targeting and misconduct (Nakhid, 2017; 2018; Dawes, 2013), and police agencies are not neutral and unbiased in policing citizens, but have actively targeted Māori and Pacific Peoples throughout New Zealand history (Hill, 2008). The majority of white participants were surprised about being asked about their experiences with police and had thought very little about whether they might be in a more precarious position as non-citizens. Common responses from white participants were often very short, but conferred to the following idea:

Paige: “[Police are] just your average Aussies you know, they're just doing their jobs, right? Every single day there's a police officer outside of my work. I think police interactions, I think over here is probably not so much an issue for me on my end. There are probably a lot more of them compared to New Zealand which I find is probably a good thing because, people do generally feel safe with them so yeah.”

This dialogue presents Australian police extremely positively, and they are suggested to be average people who are just ‘doing their jobs’, and they help citizens to feel safe.

Police being “your average Aussies” implies they embody the dominant white identity in Australia, with the suggestion showing that indigenous or non-white police officers are a rarity. In fact, until very recently, no state police force nor the Australian Federal Police had adopted special procedures to recruit non-white Australians (Australian Law Reform

Commission, 2018). The dominant view of unbiased policing in Australia was contrasted by a conversation about deportations with Ethan, who identified as Māori:

“You might find that the true reason for people being sent back home may have less to do with their character, but you know I would worry whether they've come up on a radar for reasons that are outside of their control or that are a bit unfair. You know, like colour or you know whether they are contributing to society, paying taxes and all that kind of stuff. Yeah I would probably just be a bit sceptical as to whether the reasons for their deportation are genuine... about whether those 1023 people have been deported for the right reasons or not, [or if] there's certain amount of prejudice there. Well, they always seem to be brown.”

In this way, New Zealanders in Australia were divided in their perceptions regarding the impartiality of police officers to enforce the law without any bias towards race. The disproportionate numbers of Māori and Pacific Islanders deported from Australia (Gower, 2016) suggest that there are grounds to Ethan's suspicion that racism and stigmatisation about financial contributions to society play into the incarceration and deportation of New Zealand citizens of Māori and Pacific Island descent. Ethnic identities can thus be seen to influence the acceptance and success of New Zealand migrants in Australia.

6.3: Chapter Summary

In conclusion, the identities of those who migrated to Australia and New Zealand mattered for the understandings and experiences people had of movement. Trans-Tasman migration takes place within, and plays a role in reproducing, settler national identities that work by asserting the centrality of a white identity, with non-white identities being marginalised. The discussion of the binary between white and non-white identities

showed that whiteness is for the most part invisible, and associated with significant privilege by assisting the inclusion of white participants into their host society. By contrast, participants constructed non-white New Zealanders to experience differential inclusion as they were made visible in public discourse, largely through association with negative stereotypes that construct Māori and Pacific Islanders as being predisposed to violence and burdens on society. The privilege awarded to whiteness and insidious performances of racism were thus prevalent in articulations of the right to move freely between New Zealand and Australia.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

In this chapter, I reflect on the two key findings of the research, and I discuss the implications these findings have for theoretical understandings of migration, and practical social justice causes that look to disrupt privilege and marginalisation within society. Finally, I offer a reflection on my experiences conducting the research for this thesis, and the importance of studying free movement migration.

7.1: Findings and Implications

This thesis has explored privilege and marginalisation within a free movement migration arrangement. Borders and migration have become controversial topics of debate within academic research, politics and wider society (Hall, 2017). The popular focus of attention in recent times, has been on restricting the movement of perceived ‘outsiders’, with restrictive immigration policy developments garnering the lions share of academic research and media interest (Pécoud & Guchteneire, 2007). Analysing highly restricted movement and hard border experiences have thus been disproportionately represented within academic literature, and fewer efforts have been made to understand ‘free movement’ and privileged forms of mobility (Maas, 2013). This thesis demonstrates the vast inequalities in the way people move across borders by providing a counterpoint to highly restricted forms of movement. A key finding of this thesis is that free movement across borders is a form of privilege that is achieved by assisted inclusion. Assisted inclusion materialised firstly in the way participants claimed that their physical movement between borders was unobstructed, and moving overseas did not limit their access to education, high quality health care providers, job opportunities, or their ability to sign off on rental contracts for example. Assisted inclusion then encompasses the way that these legal rights accorded under free movement migration regimes are not simply

financially significant for participants, but they are extremely valuable for participants' wellbeing, inclusion in society and ability to 'belong' in a foreign country. This thesis thus demonstrates the significant (but financially intangible) value of supporting the integration of new migrants in society, in ways that have not been captured by previous research. This thesis has also demonstrated that free movement arrangements that make claims to provide 'freedom of movement' do not objectively provide mobility between borders without people experiencing internal frictions. Frictions in this study were experienced particularly by New Zealanders in Australia who failed to realise full inclusion in society, through being held apart from accessing important social services and from voting in elections. These experiences of differential inclusion within free movement agreements indicate that there are complexities and unfulfilled promises within the space of apparently 'free' movement migration, that are also deserving of academic attention. This thesis thus contributes to understandings of migration through disrupting privileged and less frequently acknowledged forms of movement, and indicating the ways migration is assisted and hindered by government policies and informal lines of segregation.

This thesis has also asserts that the privilege to move freely across borders is racialised. Facilitated movement across the Tasman and privileged routes to being included in society often occurred in this study through subscription to a colonial identity. A colonial identity was achieved through expressions of hard work and physical toughness, and embedded in participants' claims about cultural similarities and being able to become corporeally and linguistically indistinguishable in their host society. White colonial identities in this trans-Tasman space were privileged and positioned as superior, while often being invisible in public discourse and normative talk, which is in keeping with the way modern racism is performed (Augoustinos & Every, 2007). Racism

was also constructed as being insidious in relation to the way marginalised identities were constructed as being ‘other’ and exposed to harmful stereotypes. In particular, Māori and Pacific New Zealanders were constructed as being exposed to assumptions that they are predisposed to violence and burdens on society. These normalised understandings of race were then considered to be consequential for racialised policing regimes that were represented in the disproportionate deportation of New Zealanders of Māori and Pacific descent. The perceived value of identities constructed in this trans-Tasman space (a white colonial identity and an ‘other’ identity) to workplaces and society can also be brought into conversation with Australia’s immigration policies, that have looked to exclude Pacific Islanders from Australia throughout the last century (Hamer, 2008). These understandings validate previous research in this space that has investigated the way Māori and Pacific People are marginalised in New Zealand (Augoustinos & Every, 2007; Cowie, 2017) and Australian society (George & Rodriguez, 2009; Hamer, 2008). This thesis thus provides further voice to the calls academics have made for researchers to draw attention to, and trouble colonialism as a taken for granted identity that is rarely acknowledged in society (Ahmed, 2007). The prioritisation of free movement for those with white colonial identities thus fits with the wider socio-political context and pervasive ideas of ‘us’ and ‘them’ (Anderson, 2013), and these racialised discourses disrupt the equal treatment of people both in highly restricted border regimes (Collins, 2017a; Robertson, 2014; Morris, 2002), and in apparently ‘free movement’ migration border regimes.

7.2: Limitations and Future Directions

The people whose views were represented in this study were dissimilar in some ways to the general populations of both New Zealanders in Australia and Australians in New Zealand. Although a representative sample is not a critical component of most qualitative research (Braun & Clarke, 2013), the identities of my participants influenced the findings of this thesis. Recruitment in this study did not target any ethnic group in particular, but my sample was largely represented by participants of European descent. This influenced the way race and nationality was spoken about (or not spoken about) in interviews and directed the way emphasis was placed on a colonial identity in the space of free movement, while many participants expressed some tentativeness in speaking on behalf of other identity groups, for example Māori or Pacific Peoples. Research has suggested that non-white communities are often marginalised from participating in research, or tokenised in their participation (Barnes, McCreanor & Huakau, 2008). Research that focusses on the experiences of particular cultural groups in migrating between New Zealand and Australia would therefore allow more in-depth discussion to be generated about the intersection between migration and identity in the space of trans-Tasman free movement migration.

My sample was also dominantly represented by young professionals who were in full time employment, had completed tertiary studies and were earning above average salaries. Past research has indicated that middle-class individuals are more likely to have free time to participate in interviews, and are more likely to be available during hours that are easy to schedule participation around (Holt, Kingsley, Tink, & Scherer, 2011). As a result, research typically documents middleclass experiences (Sills, 2016), as my study has. Capturing participants with stable financial positions resulted in my study not adequately representing people who face the greatest social injustices. Evidence has

suggested that people in low-skilled or semi-employed situations are far more vulnerable to legal or economic exclusion within their receiving countries (Robertson, 2014).

Investigating the voices of people in more precarious financial positions would thus give a compelling and valuable insight into the experiences of people who would be most affected by Australia's legislative changes to the TTTA and the new deportation regime (Stanley, 2018). There is thus significant space to investigate 'free' movement experiences that were not adequately represented by the participants in this thesis.

However, it is important to note that this thesis specifically aimed to provide insights into the ordinary functioning of the trans-Tasman agreement from a dominant and privileged identity. The strength of this sample, is that it has allowed me to interrogate how privilege works in the space of free movement migration. A more diverse participant group may have made it more difficult to unpack significant themes when analysing experiences and understandings of movement. Capturing a representative sample would have also required a far larger population, and perhaps effort to capture responses over a longer timeframe. This was not possible due to the temporal and financial confines of a Masters thesis. This thesis therefore focussed on investigating the often invisible privilege experienced by white settlers moving 'freely' between these settler societies. It is important that future research builds on these ideas to further untangle the complex intersections between identities, privilege and friction in free movement migration.

7.3: A Reflexive Conclusion

Early migration to New Zealand and Australia centred on settlers pursuing opportunities to build a more prosperous future for themselves and their families, and these early

settlers (including my own ancestors) experienced transparent pathways to permanent status, with residency usually being granted on arrival (Collins, 2017b; Spoonley & Bedford 2012). In these settler societies, temporary migration has now become the new normal; new migrants often face limited rights to residence and limited access to social services (Collins, 2017b). As societies, we have thus come to expect that different people have different rights in the workplace, different levels of wellbeing, and different abilities to become part of the community (Collins, 2017b). In this thesis I was hoping to denaturalise this new normal, by examining experiences and understandings of one of the most holistic forms of free movement migration globally (Leslie & Elijah, 2012). When I began this study, I hoped that investigating free movement across borders in this trans-Tasman context would open up opportunities for participants to express the value of free movement, but also to express the value of free movement migration as a bordering strategy. In other words, I hoped people would use their positive experiences of free movement to advocate for more open borders in general. However, as I conducted interviews, I began to realise that this was an unrealistic expectation.

I found that people had no problem asserting the value of the TTTA in individual ways, but their experiences did not provide avenues to speak about supporting similar welcoming treatment for other migrants who had different identities. Unequal movement was considered a fact of life, and the existence of privileged and free movement alongside highly restricted movement received profound legitimacy among participants, and was rarely questioned. In this way, there seemed to be little appetite to expand or extend the rights accorded under the TTTA to people outside of Australian and New Zealand colonial settler identities, or to people who are currently experiencing the greatest frictions when migrating to New Zealand, such as people like Dalisay (whose story began this thesis) who continue to experience systematic hardships working in New

Zealand on temporary visas. I would like the claims in this thesis to provide an opportunity for white New Zealanders and Australians to reflect on the privilege in the way our movement is made easy in this trans-Tasman context. In seeing the value of being legally and socially welcomed into another nation, I hope we may then extend this hospitality to other people who move between borders to pursue prospects of betterment.

References

- Ackers, L. (2004). Citizenship, migration and the valuation of care in the European Union. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 30(2), 373-396.
- Ackers, L., & Dwyer, P. (2004). Fixed laws, fluid lives: the citizenship status of post-retirement migrants in the European Union. *Ageing & Society*, 24(3), 451-475.
- Adepoju, A. (2002). Fostering free movement of persons in West Africa: Achievements, constraints, and prospects for intraregional migration. *International migration*, 40(2), 3-28.
- Adepoju, A. (2007). Creating a borderless West Africa: constraints and prospects for intra-regional migration. *Migration without borders: essays on the free movement of people*, 161-174.
- Adey, P. (2004). Surveillance at the airport: surveilling mobility/mobilising surveillance. *Environment and Planning A*, 36(8), 1365-1380.
- Adey, P. (2008). Airports, mobility and the calculative architecture of affective control. *Geoforum*, 39(1), 438-451.
- Adey, P. (2009). *Mobility*. Routledge.
- Ahluwalia, P. (2001). When does a settler become a native? Citizenship and identity in a settler society. *Pretexts: literary and cultural studies*, 10(1), 63-73.
- Ahmed, S. (2007). A phenomenology of whiteness. *Feminist theory*, 8(2), 149-168.
- Alves, T. (2017). Here's Why More Australians Than Ever Are Moving to New Zealand. Retrieved from URL: <https://theculturetrip.com/pacific/new->

zealand/articles/heres-why-more-australians-than-ever-are-moving-to-new-zealand/.

Andenas, M., Bekkedal, T., & Pantaleo, L. (Eds.). (2017). *The Reach of Free Movement*. TMC Asser Press.

Anderson, B. (2010). Migration, immigration controls and the fashioning of precarious workers. *Work, employment and society*, 24(2), 300-317.

Anderson, B. (2013). *Us and them?: The dangerous politics of immigration control*. OUP Oxford.

Anderson, B. (2017). Towards a new politics of migration?. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(9), 1527-1537.

Anderson, B., & Blinder, S. (2011). *Who counts as a migrant? Definitions and their consequences*. Briefing, The Migration Observatory at the University of Oxford.

Angel, J., & Angel, R. J. (1992). Age at migration, social connections, and well-being among elderly Hispanics. *Journal of aging and health*, 4(4), 480-499.

Arnold, G. (2016). Place and space in home-making processes and the construction of identities in transnational migration. *Transnational Social Review*, 6(1-2), 160-177.

Ashutosh, I., & Mountz, A. (2011). Migration management for the benefit of whom? Interrogating the work of the International Organization for Migration. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(01), 21-38.

Augoustinos, M., Tuffin, K., & Every, D. (2005). New racism, meritocracy and individualism: Constraining affirmative action in education. *Discourse & Society*, 16(3), 315-340.

- Augoustinos, M., Tuffin, K., & Every, D. (2005). New racism, meritocracy and individualism: Constraining affirmative action in education. *Discourse & Society*, *16*(3), 315-340.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2006). Full table by Ancestry. Retrieved from URL: www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/.../af5129cb50e07099ca2570eb0082e462
- Australian Government: Department of Domestic Affairs. (2018). Temporary Work (Skilled) visa (subclass 457). Retrieved from URL: <https://immi.homeaffairs.gov.au/visas/getting-a-visa/visa-listing/repealed-visas/temporary-work-skilled-457>.
- Australian Law Reform Commission. (2018). 'Them' and 'Us'. Retrieved from URL: <https://www.alrc.gov.au/publications/32.%20Aborigines%20and%20the%20Police/aborigines-police-force>.
- Balibar, E. (1990). *The nation form: history and ideology*. Review (Fernand Braudel Center), 329-361.
- Ballhatchet, K. (1980). *Race, sex, and class under the Raj: Imperial attitudes and policies and their critics*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Bannister, M. (2005). Kiwi blokes: Recontextualising white New Zealand masculinities in a global setting. *Genders OnLine*, *42*.
- Barnes, H., McCreanor, T., & Huakau, J. (2008). Māori and the New Zealand values survey: The importance of research relationships. *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, *3*(2), 135-147.
- Barry, B., & Goodin, R. (1992). *Free Movement*. University Park.
- Barry, B., & Goodin, R. (2015). *Free movement (2)*. Routledge.

- Bauböck, R. (2005). Expansive citizenship—voting beyond territory and membership. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 38(4), 683-687.
- Bauder, H. (2011). *Immigration dialectic: Imagining community, economy, and nation*. University of Toronto Press.
- Bauder, H. (2016). *Migration borders freedom*. Routledge.
- Bayliss, T. (2017). *Constructing the Good Migrant: Nationalism and Temporary Migration on New Zealand Dairy Farms* (Unpublished Honours Thesis). The University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Bell, A. (2009). Dilemmas of settler belonging: Roots, routes and redemption in New Zealand national identity claims. *The Sociological Review*, 57(1), 145-162.
- Berg, L. D., & Kearns, R. A. (1996). Naming as norming: 'race', gender, and the identity politics of naming places in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Environment and Planning D. Society and Space*, 14(1), 99-122.
- Billig, M. (1991). *Ideology and opinions*. London, UK: Sage.
- Birrell, B. & Healy, E. (1997). Globalisation and Temporary Entry. *People and Place* 5(4), 43-52.
- Bitá, N. (2013). Kiwi layabouts are flooding in. Northern Territory Times. Retrieved from URL: <https://www.pressreader.com/kiwi-layabouts-flooding-in>.
- Blackwood, L., Hopkins, N., & Reicher, S. (2013). I know who I am, but who do they think I am? Muslim perspectives on encounters with airport authorities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(6), 1090-1108.

- Blair-Loy, M. (2001). Cultural constructions of family schemas: The case of women finance executives. *Gender & Society, 15*(5), 687-709.
- Blais, A., Massicotte, L., & Yoshinaka, A. (2001). Deciding who has the right to vote: a comparative analysis of election laws. *Electoral studies, 20*(1), 41-62.
- Block, W. (1998). A libertarian case for free immigration. In *Labor Economics from a Free Market Perspective: Employing the Unemployable*. World Scientific Publishing Co, Singapore.
- Borell, B, Gregory, A., McCreanor, T., Jensen, V., & Barnes, H. (2009). "It's Hard at the Top but It's a Whole Lot Easier than Being at the Bottom:" The Role of Privilege in Understanding Disparities in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Race/Ethnicity: multidisciplinary global contexts, 29-50*.
- Bott, E. (2010). Favourites and others: Reflexivity and the shaping of research subjectivities and data in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research, 10*, 159-173.
- Braun, V. (2008). "She'll be right"? National identity explanations for poor sexual health statistics in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Social Science & Medicine, 67*(11), 1817-1825.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. London: Sage.
- Brooke-Smith, R. (1987). The scramble for Africa. In *The Scramble for Africa* (pp. 1-4). Palgrave, London.
- Burawoy, M., Blum, J., George, S., Gille, Z., & Thayer, M. (2000). *Global ethnography: Forces, connections, and imaginations in a postmodern world*. University of California Press.

- Burnard, P. (1991). A method of analysing interview transcripts in qualitative research. *Nurse education today*, 11(6), 461-466.
- Burr, V. (2003). *Social Constructionism* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Cap, P. (2017). Immigration and Anti-migration Discourses: The Early Rhetoric of Brexit. In *The Language of Fear* (pp. 67-79). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Carmichael, G. A. (1993). A history of population movement between New Zealand and Australia. *International migration* 31(4), 513-560.
- Carr, S., Inkson, K., & Thorn, K. (2005). From global careers to talent flow: Reinterpreting 'brain drain'. *Journal of World Business*, 40(4), 386-398.
- Case, K. (2012). Discovering the privilege of whiteness: White women's reflections on anti-racist identity and ally behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(1), 78-96.
- Castles, S. (1995). How Nation-states Respond to Immigration and Ethnic Diversity. *New Community: The Journal of the European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations* 21(3), 293-308
- Chan, K. (2010). The household registration system and migrant labor in China: Notes on a debate. *Population and development review*, 36(2), 357-364.
- Chenery, S. (2016). New Zealanders in Australia are still treated like second-class citizens. Stuff News. Retrieved from <http://www.stuff.co.nz/world/australia/78998518/New-Zealanders-in-Australia-are-still-treated-like-second-class-citizens>.
- Cheng, T., & Selden, M. (1994). The origins and social consequences of China's hukou system. *The China Quarterly*, 139, 644-668.

- Chess Moving. (2018). More Australians are moving to New Zealand. Retrieved from URL: <https://www.chessmoving.com.au/blogs/chess-blog/more-australians-are-moving-to-new-zealand.html>.
- Coddington, K., Catania, R. T., Loyd, J., Mitchell-Eaton, E., & Mountz, A. (2012). Embodied possibilities, sovereign geographies, and island detention: negotiating the 'right to have rights' on Guam, Lampedusa, and Christmas Island. *Shima: the international journal of research into island cultures* 6(2), 27-48.
- Collins, F. (2017a). Anxious desires: Temporary status and future prospects in migrant lives. *Emotion, Space and Society* (1)1, 1-8.
- Collins, F. (2017b). Temporary Migration: Non-citizenship and a fair chance at the future 'in' Hall (Ed.). *Fair Borders?: Migration Policy in the Twenty-first Century* (Vol. 58). Bridget Williams Books.
- Collyer, M., & King, R. (2015). Producing transnational space: International migration and the extra-territorial reach of state power. *Progress in Human Geography*, 39(2), 185-204.
- Coombes, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Rethinking settler colonialism: history and memory in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa*. Manchester University Press.
- Cowie, L. (2017). "It's always best to sort of speak up, but..." *Exploring how students who support ethnic-specific equity programmes at university respond to anti-equity challenges* (Unpublished masters thesis). University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Cresswell, T. (2009). The Prosthetic Citizen: New Geographies of Citizenship. *Political power and social theory* 20, 259–273.

- Cresswell, T. (2010). Towards a politics of mobility. *Environment and planning D: society and space*, 28(1), 17-31.
- Croucher, S. (2018). *Globalization and belonging: The politics of identity in a changing world*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Crump, B. (1982). *A Good Keen Man*. Auckland. Firstlight Productions.
- Davies, B., & Bansel, P. (2007). Neoliberalism and education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20, 247-259.
- Dawes, G. (2013). Sudanese “Lost Boys” and Their Interactions with the Criminal Justice System in Queensland Australia. *International Journal of Social Inquiry*, 6(1).
- De Genova, N. (2004). The legal production of Mexican/migrant “illegality”. *Latino studies*, 2(2), 160-185.
- De Genova, N., Mezzadra, S., & Pickles, J. (2015). New keywords: Migration and borders. *Cultural studies*, 29(1), 55-87.
- Deakin, H., & Wakefield, K. (2013). Skype interviewing: Reflections of two PhD researchers. *Qualitative Research*, 14, 603-616.
- DiCicco- Bloom, B., & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education*, 40(4), 314-321.
- Oxford Dictionary (2018). Oxford English dictionary. Retrieved January, 1, 2018.
- Dobell, G. (2003). The Reluctant Pacific Nation: Policy Taboos, Popular Amnesia and Political Failure. *Quadrant*, 47(5), 16.

- Doty, R. (2003). *Anti-Immigrantism in Western Democracies: Statecraft, desire and the politics of exclusion*. Routledge.
- Dowty, A. (1989). *Closed borders: the contemporary assault on freedom of movement*. Yale University Press.
- Durey, A. (2010). Reducing racism in Aboriginal health care in Australia: where does cultural education fit?. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 34, 87-92.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Te mana, te kawanatanga: The politics of Māori self-determination*. Auckland, New Zealand. Oxford University Press.
- Elden, S. (2013). *The birth of territory*. University of Chicago Press.
- Ely, R. (1985). The first Anzac day: Invented or discovered?. *Journal of Australian Studies*, 9(17), 41-58.
- Ensor, J. (2018). Aboriginal man faces deportation to New Zealand. Newshub. Retrieved from URL: <https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/world/2018/12/aboriginal-man-faces-deportation-to-new-zealand.html>.
- Etzioni, A. (2007). Citizenship tests: A comparative, communitarian perspective. *The Political Quarterly*, 78(3), 353-363.
- Farnsworth, J., & Boon, B. (2010). Analysing group dynamics within the focus group. *Qualitative Research*, 10, 605-624.
- Fine, S. (2013). The Ethics of Immigration: Self- Determination and the Right to Exclude. *Philosophy Compass*, 8(3), 254-268.

- Finlay, L. (2002). "Outing" the researcher: The provenance, process, and practice of reflexivity. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12, 531-545.
- Fischer, D. (2012). *Fairness and freedom: A history of two open societies: New Zealand and the United States*. Oxford University Press.
- Fortier, A. (2000). *Migrant belongings: memory, space, identity*. Berg.
- Foucault, M. (1979). Authorship: what is an author?. *Screen*, 20(1), 13-34.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Frankenburg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Routledge.
- Gamlen, A. (2014a). The new migration and development pessimism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(4), 581-597.
- Gamlen, A. (2014b). Diaspora institutions and diaspora governance. *International Migration Review*, 48, 180-217.
- Gavey, N. (2005). *Just sex. The cultural scaffolding of rape*. Hove, Brighton: Routledge.
- Geiger, M., & Pécoud, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Disciplining the transnational mobility of people*. Springer.
- George, J., & Rodriguez, L. (2009). Hybrid youth identity in the Māori/Pacific Island diaspora in Australia: a study of young urban Polynesian men in Sydney. *New Zealand Sociology*, 24(1), 3.
- Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American psychologist*, 40, 266-275.
- Gergen, K. J. (1999). *An invitation to social construction*. London: Sage.

- Gilroy, P. (2004). *After empire: melancholia or convivial culture*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Global Commission on International Migration. (2005). *Migration in an interconnected world: new directions for action*. The Commission.
- Goodman, S. (2007). Constructing asylum seeking families. *Critical approaches to discourse analysis across disciplines*, 1(1), 36-50.
- Gould, J. D. (1984). New Zealand migration, 1949–1981: Some problems of measurement and interpretation. *New Zealand Economic Papers*, 18(1), 31-48.
- Gower, P. (2016). Deported criminals: The full breakdown. Newshub. Retrieved from URL: <https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/new-zealand/2016/03/deported-criminals-the-full-breakdown.html/>.
- Grewcock, M. (2014). Australian border policing: Regional ‘solutions’ and neocolonialism. *Race & Class*, 55(3), 71-78.
- Grønseth, A. (Ed.). (2013). *Being human, being migrant: Senses of self and well-being* (Vol. 23). Berghahn Books.
- Guðjónsdóttir, G. (2014). We Blend in with the Crowd but They Don't. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 4(4): 176-183.
- Guðjónsdóttir, G., & Loftsdóttir, K. (2017). Being a desirable migrant: perception and racialisation of Icelandic migrants in Norway. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 43(5), 791-808.
- Guild, E. (2004). *The legal elements of European identity: EU citizenship and migration law* (Vol. 1). Kluwer law international.

- Gullestad, M. (2006). *Plausible prejudice: Everyday experiences and social images of nation, culture, and race*. University Forlaget, Oslo.
- Hall, D. (Ed.). (2017). *Fair Borders?: Migration Policy in the Twenty-first Century*. Bridget Williams Books.
- Hall, S. (1996). Race, articulation, and societies structured in dominance. *Black British cultural studies: A reader*, 16-60.
- Hamer, P. (2007). *Māori in Australia*. Wellington, NZ.
- Hamer, P. (2008). Māori in Australia: voting rights and behaviour. *Policy Quarterly*, 4(3), 22-29.
- Hamer, P. (2014). 'Unsophisticated and unsuited' Australian barriers to Pacific Islander immigration from New Zealand. *Political Science*, 66(2), 93-118.
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). *Mobilities, immobilities and moorings*. *Mobilities*, 1(1), 1-22.
- Hart, B. (2009). Love Thy Neighbour: Family Reunification and the Rights of Insiders. *European Journal of Migration and Law* 11(3), 235-252.
- Hastie, B., & Rimmington, D. (2014). '200 years of white affirmative action': White privilege discourse in discussions of racial inequality. *Discourse & Society*, 25(2), 186-204
- Hay, I. (2000). *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography* (2). Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.

- Hill, R. (2008). Māori, police and coercion in New Zealand history (In) D. Keenan (Ed.), *Terror in our midst? Searching for terror in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Hill, R. (2018). Australian woman complains to UN over NZ's treatment of non-citizens. Radio New Zealand. Retrieved from URL: https://www.radionz.co.nz/news/national/379159/australian-woman-complains-to-un-over-nz-s-treatment-of-non-citizens?fbclid=IwAR2G6y-4zKQKFx9yxgXzbS2aZcbvj6Bpu_8zpAGAScSCti9qpLPx05VY4k0.
- Holt, N. L., Kingsley, B. C., Tink, L. N., & Scherer, J. (2011). Benefits and challenges associated with sport participation by children and parents from low-income families. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 12*, 490-499.
- Horschelmann, K. (2011). Theorising life transitions: geographical perspectives. *Area, 43*(4): 378-383.
- Hugo, G. (2004). New Zealanders in Australia in 2001. *New Zealand Population Review, 30*(1), 61-92.
- Hugo, G. (2015). The New Zealand-Australia Migration Corridor. *New Zealand Population Review, 41*(1), 21-44.
- Hyndman, J., & Mountz, A. (2008). Another Brick in the Wall? Neo-Refoulement and the Externalization of Asylum by Australia and Europe 1. *Government and Opposition, 43*(2), 249-269.
- Immigration New Zealand. (2018). Moving to New Zealand from Australia. Retrieved from URL: <https://www.newzealandnow.govt.nz/why-choose-nz/compare-new-zealand/australia>.

Inland Revenue. (2019). Reciprocal agreement with Australia for child support. Received from URL:

<https://www.ird.govt.nz/childsupport/international/australia/reciprocal/reciprocal-agreement-australia.html>.

International Labour Organization. (2006). *Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration. Non-Binding Principles and Guidelines for a Rights-Based Approach to Labour Migration*. Geneva: ILO.

James, T. (2012). National Party - Party principles. Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand. Retrieved from URL:

<http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/photograph/33891/iwikiwi-billboard>

Jesson, B. (2001). *To build a nation. New Zealand Government and Politics*. Melbourne, Oxford University Press.

Joffe, H. (2011). Thematic analysis. (In) D. Harper and A. R. Thompson (Eds.), *Qualitative research methods in mental health and psychotherapy: A guide for students and practitioners* (pp. 210-223). Chichester, UK: Wiley & Sons.

Johns, M. (2014). *The New Minorities of Europe: Social Cohesion in the European Union*. Lexington Books.

Johnston, A. M. (2008). Co-membership in immigration gatekeeping interviews: construction, ratification and refutation. *Discourse & Society*, 19(1), 21-41.

Johnston, C. (1890). The Scramble for Africa. *The Review of reviews*, 1(1), 41-41.

Jones, N. (2017). Australians to get free study in New Zealand. The New Zealand Herald. Retrieved from URL:

https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11946411.

- Jones, R. (2016). *Violent borders: Refugees and the right to move*. Verso Books.
- Jupp, J. (2002). *From white Australia to Woomera: The story of Australian immigration*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kansakar, V. (2012). *Nepal-India open border: prospects, problem and challenges*. Kathmandu, Tribhuvan University Press.
- King, M. (2003). *Penguin History of New Zealand*. Penguin UK.
- Kinsman, P. (1994). *Renegotiating the Boundaries of Race and Citizenship: The Black Environment Network and Environmental Conservation Bodies* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Nottingham, Nottingham.
- Kinsman, P. (1995). Landscape, race and national identity: the photography of Ingrid Pollard. *Area*, 300-310.
- Kirby, J. (2018). Trump wants fewer immigrants from “shithole countries” and more from places like Norway. Vox Media. Retrieved from URL: <https://www.vox.com/2018/1/11/16880750/trump-immigrants-shithole-countries-norway>.
- Kitzinger, C. (1987). *The social construction of lesbianism*. Bristol, UK: Sage.
- Kokanović, R., & Božić-Vrbančić, S. (2015). Being marked as different: The emotional politics of experiences of depression and migrant belongings. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 16, 130-137.
- Kostakopoulou, D. (2012). *The European Court of Justice, Member State Autonomy and European Union Citizenship*. Conjunctions and Disjunctions.

- Kovras, I., & Robins, S. (2016). Death as the border: Managing missing migrants and unidentified bodies at the EU's Mediterranean frontier. *Political Geography*, 55, 40-49.
- Ku, L., & Matani, S. (2001). Left out: immigrants' access to health care and insurance. *Health Affairs*, 20(1), 247-256.
- Leinonen, J., & Toivanen, M. (2014). Researching in/visibility in the Nordic context: theoretical and empirical views. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 4(4), 161-167.
- Leslie, J., & Elijah, A. (2012). Does N= 2? Trans- Tasman Economic Integration as a Comparator for the Single European Market. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50(6), 975-993.
- Liepins, R. (2000). Making men: the construction and representation of agriculture-based masculinities in Australia and New Zealand. *Rural sociology*, 65(4), 605-620.
- Loftsdóttir, K., & Jensen, L. (Eds.). (2016). *Whiteness and postcolonialism in the Nordic region: exceptionalism, migrant others and national identities*. Routledge.
- Loftsdóttir, K., & Jensen, L. (Eds.). (2016). *Whiteness and postcolonialism in the Nordic region: exceptionalism, migrant others and national identities*. Routledge.
- Löwenheim, O., & Gazit, O. (2009). Power and examination: A critique of citizenship tests. *Security dialogue*, 40(2), 145-167.
- Lucassen, J., & Lucassen, L. (2009). The mobility transition revisited, 1500–1900: what the case of Europe can offer to global history. *Journal of Global History*, 4(3), 347-377.

- Maas, W. (2007). *Creating European Citizens*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Maas, W. (2008). Migrants, states, and EU citizenship's unfulfilled promise. *Citizenship Studies*, 12(6), 583-596.
- Maas, W. (2013). Equality and the Free Movement of People: Citizenship and Internal Migration (In) *Democratic Citizenship and the Free Movement of People*. Brill Nijhoff.
- Maas, W. (2014). *European Union citizenship in retrospect and prospect: Routledge Handbook of Global Citizenship Studies*. London: Routledge.
- MacKenzie, R., & Forde, C. (2009). The rhetoric of the 'good worker' versus the realities of employers use and the experiences of migrant workers. *Work, employment and society*, 23(1), 142-159.
- Madley, B. (2008). From terror to genocide: Britain's Tasmanian penal colony and Australia's history wars. *Journal of British Studies*, 47(1), 77-106.
- Magalhaes, L., Carrasco, C., & Gastaldo, D. (2010). Undocumented migrants in Canada: a scope literature review on health, access to services, and working conditions. *Journal of immigrant and minority health*, 12(1), 132.
- Mamdani, M. (2001). Beyond settler and native as political identities: overcoming the political legacy of colonialism. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 43(4), 651-664.
- Mattingly, M., & Sayer, L. (2006). Under pressure: Gender differences in the relationship between free time and feeling rushed. *Journal of marriage and family*, 68(1), 205-221.

- Mavroudi, E. (2010). Nationalism, the nation and migration: Searching for purity and diversity. *Space and Polity*, 14(3), 219-233.
- May, J., Wills, J., Kavita, D., Yara, E., Herbert, J. and McIlwaine, C. (2006). *The British State and London's Migrant Division of Labour*. London: Queen Mary, University of London.
- Mbembé, J., & Rendall, S. (2000). At the edge of the world: Boundaries, territoriality, and sovereignty in Africa. *Public culture*, 12(1), 259-284.
- McConahay, J.B. (1986) 'Modern Racism, Ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale', (In) J.F. Dovidio and S.L. Gaertner (Eds.) *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism*, pp. 91–125. New York: Academic Press.
- McDowell, L. (2009). Old and new European economic migrants: Whiteness and managed migration policies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(1), 19-36.
- McIntosh, L. (2015). Impossible presence: race, nation and the cultural politics of 'being Norwegian'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(2), 309-325.
- McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies*. Massachusetts, Wellesley Centers for Women.
- McMillan, K. (2014). Political and social rights for second country nationals: Freedom of movement and citizenship in Australasia. *Citizenship Studies* 18(3–4): 349–364.
- McMillan, K. (2017). Fairness and the borders around political community 'in' Hall (Ed.). *Fair Borders?: Migration Policy in the Twenty-first Century* (Vol. 58). Bridget Williams Books.

- Meijering, L. (2018). Migration and the search for home. Mapping domestic space in migrants' everyday lives. *Household Studies* 33(6), 2-1.
- Mezzadra, S., & Neilson, B. (2013). *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Duke University Press.
- Mohammed, D. (2008). Size and competitiveness: An examination of the CARICOM Single Market and Economy (CSME). *The Round Table*, 97(395), 287-303.
- Morley, D. (2000). *Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity*. Routledge, London.
- Morley, D., & Robins, K. (1995). *Spaces of identity*. Taylor & Francis.
- Morris, L. (2002). *Managing Migration: Civic stratification and migrants' rights*. Psychology Press.
- Moses, A. D. (Ed.). (2004). *Genocide and settler society: Frontier violence and stolen indigenous children in Australian history* (Vol. 6). Berghahn Books.
- Mountz, A. (2010). *Seeking asylum: Human smuggling and bureaucracy at the border*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Mountz, A., Wright, R., Miyares, I., & Bailey, A. J. (2002). Lives in limbo: Temporary protected status and immigrant identities. *Global Networks*, 2(4), 335-356.
- Mulgan, J. (1949). *Man Alone*. Hamilton, Paul's Book Arcade.
- Mutu, M. (2012). Musket wars, migrations, new tribal alignments 'In' D. Keenan (Ed.), *Huia Histories of Māori: Ngā Tāhuhu Kōrero*. Wellington: Huia Press.
- Nail, T. (2015). *The figure of the migrant*. Stanford University Press.

- Nairn, R., & McCreanor, T. (1991). Race talk and common sense: Patterns in Pakeha discourse on Māori/Pakeha relations in New Zealand. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 10*(4), 245-262.
- Nakhid, C. (2017). Police encounters with African youth in New Zealand—the impact on the youth, family, and community. *Safer Communities, 16*(2), 64-76.
- Nakhid, C. (2018). The coping strategies and responses of African youth in New Zealand to their encounters with the police. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice, 16*(1), 40-56.
- New Zealand– Australia Double Tax Agreement. (2009). Convention between Australia and New Zealand for the Avoidance of Double Taxation on Income and Fringe Benefits and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion. Retrieved from URL: <https://taxpolicy.ird.govt.nz/sites/default/files/tax-treaties/2009-dta-nz-australia.pdf>.
- New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (2010). The Australia New Zealand Social Security Agreement. Retrieved from URL: <http://www.mfat.govt.nz/Foreign-Relations/Australia/0-social-securityarrangement.php>.
- Newman, D., & Paasi, A. (1998). Fences and neighbours in the postmodern world: boundary narratives in political geography. *Progress in human geography, 22*(2), 186-207.
- Nolan, M. (2015). Welfare limbo? Social welfare and citizenship debates about New Zealanders living in Australia. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics, 53*(3), 253-273.

- O'Regan, S. (2018). Why New Zealand is Furious about Australia's Deportation Policy. New York Times. Retrieved from URL:
<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/03/world/asia/new-zealand-australia-deportations.html>.
- Paasi, A. (1996). *Territories, boundaries, and consciousness: The changing geographies of the Finnish-Russian boundary*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Paasi, A. (1997). Geographical perspectives on Finnish national identity. *GeoJournal*, 43(1), 41-50.
- Pécoud, A., & Guchteneire, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Migration without borders: essays on the free movement of people*. Berghahn Books.
- Peixoto, J. (2001). Migration and policies in the European Union: highly skilled mobility, free movement of labour and recognition of diplomas. *International Migration*, 39(1), 33-61.
- Peterson, D. (2011). Neoliberal homophobic discourse: Heteronormative human capital and the exclusion of queer citizens. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 58, 742-757.
- Petrie, D. (2017). New Zealanders continue to return home in strong numbers from Australia. The New Zealand Herald. Retrieved from URL:
https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11934321.
- Pihama, L. (2001). *Tīhei mauri ora: honouring our voices: mana wahine as a kaupapa Māori: theoretical framework*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis), University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Pollard, I. (1994). Hidden Histories: Heritage Stories: Photographic Work by Ingrid Pollard exhibition catalogue. Lee Valley Park, Enfield, Middx.

- Poot, J. (2010). Trans-Tasman migration, transnationalism and economic development in Australasia. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 19(3), 319-342.
- Portes, J. (2016). Immigration, free movement and the EU referendum. *National Institute Economic Review*, 236(1), 14-22.
- Poynting, S. (2006). What caused the Cronulla riot?. *Race & Class*, 48(1), 85-92.
- Pries, L. (2006). Transnational migration: New challenges for nation states and new opportunities for regional and global development. *Transnational migration—dilemmas* 1(6), 9-28.
- Rajkumar, D., Berkowitz, L., Vosko, V., Preston, V., and Latham, R. (2012). At the Temporary permanent Divide: How Canada Produces Temporariness and Makes Citizens through its Security, Work, and Settlement Policies. *Citizenship Studies* 16(3–4), 483–510.
- Reinharz, S. (1993). Neglected voices and excessive demands in feminist research. *Qualitative Sociology*, 16(1), 69-76.
- Riggs, D., & Augoustinos, M. (2008). ‘The fine line between compensation and taking advantage’: A discursive analysis of race privilege (In) R. Ranzijn, K. McConnochie, & W. Nolan (Eds.) *Psychology and Indigenous Australians: Effective teaching and practice*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Rivlin, L. G., & Moore, J. (2001). Home-making: Supports and barriers to the process of home. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 10(4), 323-336.
- Robertson, S. (2011). Student switchers and the regulation of residency: the interface of the individual and Australia's immigration regime. *Population, Space and Place*, 17(1), 103-115.

- Robertson, S. (2014). Time and temporary migration: The case of temporary graduate workers and working holiday makers in Australia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(12), 1915-1933.
- Rolfe, B. (2017). Australians are moving to New Zealand in droves. 9 News. Retrieved from URL: <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4936492/Australians-migrating-New-Zealand-droves.html>.
- Rothwell, J., & Diego-Rosell, P. (2016). Explaining nationalist political views: The case of Donald Trump. Draft working paper. Retrieved from URL: http://polpsyca.netfirms.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Rothwell_Trump.pdf.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2011). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. London, UK: Sage.
- Ryan, S. (2016). Why are so many Australians moving to NZ? The New Zealand Herald. Retrieved from URL: https://www.nzherald.co.nz/business/news/article.cfm?c_id=3&objectid=11583862
- Salter, M. (2007). Governmentalities of an airport: heterotopia and confession. *International political sociology*, 1(1), 49-66.
- Sandu, A. (2013). Transnational homemaking practices: Identity, belonging and informal learning. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 21(4), 496-512.
- Scheel, S. (2013). Studying embodied encounters: autonomy of migration beyond its romanticization. *Postcolonial Studies*, 16(3), 279-288.
- Shachar, A. (2009). *The birthright lottery: Citizenship and global inequality*. Harvard University Press.

- Sharma, N. (2006). *Home economics: nationalism and the making of 'migrant workers' in Canada*. University of Toronto Press.
- Shelley, T. (2007). *Exploited: migrant labour in the new global economy*. Zed Books.
- Sills, S. (2016). *Queer Athletes on Heterosexism in Women's Competitive Team Sport* (Unpublished masters thesis). University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction*. Sage.
- Simon-Kumar, R. (2015). Neoliberalism and the new race politics of migration policy: Changing profiles of the desirable migrant in New Zealand. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(7), 1172-1191.
- Skinner, J. (2016). Why CANZUK? CANZUK International. Retrieved from URL: <http://www.canzukinternational.com/why-canzuk>.
- Sklair, L. (2001). *The transnational capitalist class* (Vol. 306). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smith, G. (2003). Indigenous struggle for the transformation of education and schooling. Transforming Institutions. *Reclaiming Education and Schooling for Indigenous Peoples*, 1-14.
- Solomos, J., & Back, L. (Eds.). (2000). *Theories of Race and Racism: A reader*. Routledge.
- Stanley, E. (2018). Expanding crimmigration: The detention and deportation of New Zealanders from Australia. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 51(4), 519-536.

- Statistics New Zealand (2006). Census QuickStats about national highlights. Retrieved from URL: <http://archive.stats.govt.nz/Census/2006-census.aspx>.
- Statistics New Zealand (2013). Census QuickStats about national highlights. Retrieved from URL: <http://archive.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census.aspx>.
- Stevens, D. (2005). UK asylum law and policy: historical and contemporary perspectives. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 24(4).
- Stewart, M. (2013). 'Racist' label angers Kiwis in Australia. Retrieved from URL: <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/9564968/Racist-label-angers-Kiwis-in-Australia>
- Stoler, A. (1989). Making empire respectable: The politics of race and sexual morality in 20th- century colonial cultures. *American ethnologist*, 16(4), 634-660.
- Storey, D. (2001). *Territory: The Claiming of Space* (1). Essex, England. Pearson Education Limited.
- Storey, D. (2002). Territory and national identity: examples from the former Yugoslavia. *Geography*, 108-115.
- Storey, D. (2012). *Territories: The Claiming of Space* (2). Oxford, England. Routledge.
- Taylor, A., Foster, J., & Cambre, C. (2012). Training 'expendable' workers: temporary foreign workers in nursing. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 10(1), 95-117.
- Tazreiter, C., Weber, L., Pickering, S., Segrave, M., & McKernan, H. (2016). *Fluid security in the Asia Pacific: Transnational lives, human rights and state control*. Springer.

- Tolia-Kelly, D. (2006). Mobility/stability: British Asian cultures of 'landscape and Englishness'. *Environment and planning A*, 38(2), 341-358.
- Tolich, M. & Davidson, C. (2003). Collecting the data. (In) C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social science research in New Zealand* (2nd ed., pp. 121-153). Auckland: Pearson Education.
- Torpey, J. (2000). *The invention of the passport: surveillance, citizenship and the state*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tryfonidou, A. (2017). Free Movement of Persons Through the Lenses of 'Discrimination' and 'Restriction'. (In) *The Reach of Free Movement* (pp. 57-83). TMC Asser Press, The Hague.
- Tsing, A. L. (2005). *Friction: An ethnography of global connection*. Princeton University Press.
- Tuffin, K. (2008). Racist discourse in New Zealand and Australia: Reviewing the last 20 years. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(2), 591-607.
- Turner, S. (2007). 'Inclusive Exclusion': Managing Identity for the Nation's Sake in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Arena journal*, (28), 87.
- United Nations General Assembly (1948). *Universal declaration of human rights*.
- United Nations. (2019). *Global Compact Agreement*. Retrieved from URL: <https://refugeesmigrants.un.org/migration-compact>.
- Vallet, E. (2016). *Borders, fences and walls: State of insecurity?*. Routledge.
- Van der Mei, A. (2003). *Free movement of persons within the European Community: cross-border access to public benefits* (Vol. 30). Hart Publishing.

- Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler colonialism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vertovec, S. (2011). The cultural politics of nation and migration. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 40, 241-256.
- Viskanic, M. (2017). *Fear and loathing on the campaign trail: did immigration cause Brexit?*. Center of Excellence for Migration Research.
- Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end* (2nd ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Walker, S. (1996). *Kia tau te Rangimarie: Kaupapa Māori theory as a resistance against the construction of Māori as the 'other'* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Walsh, J. (2011). Quantifying Citizens: Neoliberal Restructuring and Immigrant Selection in Canada and Australia. *Citizenship Studies* 15(6-7), 861-879.
- Walters, L. (2017). Australia backs down on plans to charge Kiwi students higher fees. *Stuff.co.nz*. Retrieved from URL:
<https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/politics/99967004/australia-backs-down-on-plans-to-charge-kiwi-students-higher-fees>.
- Watson, I. (2005). Illusionists and hunters: Being Aboriginal in this occupied space. *Australian Feminist Law Journal*, 22(1), 15-28.
- Weiner, M. (1996). Ethics, national sovereignty and the control of immigration. *International Migration Review*, 171-197.
- Wilkinson, S (1988). The role of reflexivity in feminist psychology. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 11, 493-502.

- Wilsher, D. (2011). *Immigration detention: law, history, politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, J., Fisher, D., & Moore, K. (2009). The OE goes 'home': Cultural aspects of a working holiday experience. *Tourist Studies*, 9(1), 3-21.
- Wimmer, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation–state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global networks*, 2(4), 301-334.
- Wright, R. (2004). Operations on the boundary: The state, the border and marginalized identities. *Antipode*, 36(1), 138-141.
- Wright, S. (2008). Citizenship tests in Europe-editorial introduction. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 10(1), 1-9.
- Yeoh, B., Willis, K., & Fakhri, S. (2003). Introduction: Transnationalism and its edges. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 26(2), 207-217.

Appendices

Appendix A: Email Script

Re: Experiences of Trans-Tasman Migration

Hi [name],

Thank you for your interest in this study of Trans-Tasman migration. The study focuses on peoples' experiences of migrating between Australia and New Zealand. Your participation would involve an interview lasting about one hour.

To participate in this study you need to:

- Be a citizen of [Australian/New Zealand] currently living in [Sydney/Auckland] AND
- Be between 20 and 35 years old AND
- Have arrived in [New Zealand/Australia] between 2 and 10 years ago.

This interview can take place in a location suitable for you, and you will be offered a \$25 gift or fuel voucher at the end of the interview as a token of appreciation.

I have attached a Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form here for you to have a look at before deciding if you would like to participate. The details of the project would also be discussed with you in person before the interview begins, if you choose to take part.

Let me know if you have any questions, and we can organise a time for the interview from there.

Kind regards,

Tom

Approved by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 01/06/18 for three years. Reference Number: 021269

Appendix B: Questionnaire

Interview guide: Experiences of Trans-Tasman Migration

- 1) Personal and familial background
 - a. Tell me a little bit about yourself before you came to New Zealand.
 - b. Where did you grow up in Australia/New Zealand? Where did you do your schooling? Tertiary/university study?
 - c. What were you doing before you came to [the place you are living]?
- 2) Early ideas about New Zealand/Australia and Sydney/Auckland
 - a. What did you know about Auckland/Sydney before coming here? What did you think it would be like as a place to live and work? Where did those ideas come from? Did you know about anywhere else in New Zealand/Australia?
 - b. What were your ideas of the relationship between Australia and New Zealand before you left? Who/what influenced these ideas?
- 3) Early experiences of migration or mobility
 - a. When did you first think about migrating overseas or work? How did you come across this idea?
 - b. When did you first think about [the place you are living]? What is the image of [the place you are living] in your country/city/town etc? Where did this image come from – friends, family, etc.?
 - c. Before you came to Australia/New Zealand, how long did you think you would stay here? What did you want to achieve by coming here?
 - d. Have you met many other people from New Zealand/Australia since you've been in Australia/New Zealand?
- 4) Process of migrating to New Zealand
 - a. How did you go about coming to [the place you are living]?
 - b. Tell me about the first week that you arrived. What did you think of [the place you are living] when you first got here? Was it what you expected?
 - c. What happened when you first arrived – How did you feel in that first week of arrival?
- 5) Family
 - a. Are you married and do you have children? Where are they now? How did they feel about (you) coming here?
 - b. Is it possible to make a home for your family in [the place you are living]?
- 6) Visas and regulation

- a. What is your official status in [the place you are living]? Are you a permanent resident?
- b. Some people say that there are no restrictions on migration between Australia and New Zealand – what do you think about this?
- c. We are interested in how migration rules might influence what people do. Has there been any restrictions during your experience of migration which have influenced what you have done in [the place you are living]?
- d. Have you ever been discriminated against?
- e. Does being an Australian/ New Zealand citizen affect whether you might comfortable receiving a welfare benefit or other financial support in [the place you are living]?
- f. Have you ever utilized the health care sector since arriving in [the place you are living]? Was there any friction with realizing your legal entitlements?
- g. Do you have a plan for what happens next? Do you plan on getting citizenship in [the place you are living]?
- h. Refer to vignettes one and two. How might you respond to the opinions expressed in these scenarios? Would you be sympathetic towards Jack’s position? What advice would you offer him?

7) Politics

- a. Are you registered to vote? Have you ever voted in an election?
- b. Do you feel comfortable discussing politics in [the place you are living]?
- c. Do you think it's important to vote?
- d. Do you feel like you are included in society? What has influenced your inclusion in society?
- e. Refer to Vignette three. How might you respond to the opinions expressed in these social media comments?

8) Future aspirations: settlement or onward migration

- a. Tell me about your plans for the future? Where do you see yourself in ten years?
- b. Have your aspirations for yourself changed since you have been in [the place you are living]? How and in what way?
- c. Where will you be in the next few years? Do you envisage staying in [the place you are living]? Migrating elsewhere?

9) Identity and self-transformation

- a. How do you think [nationality] are viewed in [the place you are living]? Do you think the media plays a role in this?
- b. What are some everyday encounters that have influenced whether you feel like you belong in [the place you are living]?
- c. Do you feel like you have changed during your time in [the place you are living]? What has caused this?
- d. Do you consider yourself a migrant? Why or why not?
- e. Do you consider [the place you are living] to be your home? Do you have a greater sense of belonging in New Zealand or Australia or both?

10) Do you have any other things to add or do you have any questions about what we are doing?

Approved by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 01/06/2018 for three years. Reference Number 021269.

Appendix C: Participant Consent Form



SCIENCE
SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENT

Science Centre,
6th Floor, Building 302,
23 Symonds Street
Auckland, New Zealand
T +64 9 373 7599
ext 88465
env.auckland.ac.nz
The University of Auckland

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Project Title: Experiences of Trans-Tasman Migration

Name of researchers: Tom Bayliss, Dr Francis Collins and Dr Tom Baker

Private Bag 92019
Auckland 1142 New
Zealand

I have read the Participant Information Sheet, have understood the nature of the research and why I have been selected. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction.

- I agree to take part in this research
- I understand that it is my choice to participate or not participate in this study
- I agree to participate in one semi-structured interview focused on my migration experiences
- I understand that the interview will be recorded on a digital voice recorder and transcribed by the researcher or a third party who has signed a confidentiality agreement
- I understand that I can choose not to answer any questions and can leave the interview at any time
- I understand that any identifiable information I provide in this research will not be shared with any other individual or organisation
- I understand that I can receive a copy of my transcript and that I will have two weeks after receiving this transcript to make any changes to it or withdraw any data I provide
- I understand that if I choose not to receive a copy of my transcript I will have two weeks from the interview to withdraw any data I provide
- I understand that data will be kept for six years in a locked cabinet and a password protected computer at the University of Auckland, after which it will be destroyed
- I understand that I can choose to receive a summary of the findings of the research

I would like to receive a copy of my transcript Yes No

I would like to receive a summary of the findings Yes No

If 'yes' is selected above, please provide an email address or postal address:

Name _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Approved by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 01/06/18 for three years. Reference Number 021269

Appendix D: Participant Information Sheet:



SCIENCE

SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENT

Science Centre,
6th Floor, Building 302,
23 Symonds Street
Auckland, New Zealand
T +64 9 373 7599
ext 88465
env.auckland.ac.nz
The University of Auckland

Private Bag 92019
Auckland 1142
New Zealand

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET
for the project titled
Experiences of Trans-Tasman Migration

Name of Researchers: Tom Bayliss, Dr. Francis Collins and Dr. Tom Baker

Introduction

My name is Tom Bayliss and I am a Masters student in Human Geography in the School of Environment at the University of Auckland. I am conducting a research project under the supervision of Dr Francis Collins and Dr Tom Baker. The purpose of this letter is to inform you of a research study on migration between Australia and New Zealand and to invite you to consider being a participant in an interview as part of this project.

The Study

The study will investigate experiences of migration between New Zealand and Australia. New Zealand and Australia have long-standing links, including

a migration pathway that has allowed New Zealand and Australian citizens to move freely between the two countries. This study aims to investigate how people experienced free movement migration, and explore what barriers to settlement people moving across the Tasman might have encountered. I am aiming to recruit 20 participants for this project. The project is funded by a scholarship from the University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Eligibility

To participate in this research you must be an Australian citizen living in Auckland, New Zealand or a New Zealand citizen living in Sydney, Australia. Participants must be aged between 20 and 35 years, and have migrated to New Zealand or Australia between 2 and 10 years ago.

Participation

Participation involves taking part in a one-hour interview that focuses on your personal background, migration history, experiences of migration and future aspirations.

The interview can be organised in a location that is suitable for you and at a time that is convenient. The interviews will be audio recorded. The interview will be undertaken and later transcribed by me, or a third party who has signed a confidentiality agreement. You may ask for the audio recorder to be turned off at any point and you may also decline to answer any questions.

You will be provided with a \$25 shopping or fuel voucher after the interview as a token of appreciation.

Information Use and Storage and Right to Withdraw from Participation

You can elect to receive a copy of the written transcript in the consent form. Once you receive your written transcript, you will have up to two weeks to make any changes or withdraw your data from the study. If you choose not to receive a written copy of your transcript, you will have two weeks following the interview to withdraw your data from the study. If you choose to withdraw from the study all electronic and hard copy data will be permanently destroyed. You can withdraw your data from the study during the two week period without giving any reason for your withdrawal. After this period, your information cannot be removed from the study. All information will be stored on a secure, password protected computer at the University of Auckland and will be kept for a period of six years. After this period of time, all data will be permanently destroyed. You may request to

see a summary of the research findings in the consent form should you choose to participate in this study.

Anonymity and Confidentiality

The information obtained from the interviews will be confidential. Your identity will not be known to anyone outside of the research team. Your name will be recorded separate from audio recordings and transcriptions will remain in an encrypted file. Only my supervisors and I will have access to the recordings, or a third party transcriber who will have signed a confidentiality agreement. The confidentiality of participant identities will be protected in any research outputs through the use of pseudonyms.

It is your choice to take part in this research. If you wish to participate please complete the attached consent form. If you have any queries or wish to receive further information about this research project, please use the contact details below:

Tom Bayliss	Dr. Tom Baker
Masters Student	Lecturer
School of Environment	School of Environment
University of Auckland	University of Auckland
Private bag 92019	Private bag 92019
Phone: 0212602523	Phone: (09) 923 8554
tbay454@aucklanduni.ac.nz	t.baker@auckland.ac.nz
Dr. Francis Collins	Prof. Paul Kench
Senior Lecturer	Head of School
School of Environment	School of Environment
University of Auckland	University of Auckland
Private bag 92019	Private bag 92019
Phone: (09) 923 3129	Phone (09) 923 8440
f.collins@auckland.ac.nz	<u>p.kench@auckland.ac.nz</u>

For any concerns regarding ethical issues you may contact:

The Chair: The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee
Private Bag 92019, Auckland, 1142
Telephone (09) 373-7599 extn. 83711
Email: ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz

Approved by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee
on 01/06/18 for three years. Reference Number 02126.

Appendix E: Social Media Posts:



Are you an **AUSTRALIAN CITIZEN** living in **AUCKLAND**?

Are you interested in sharing your experiences and thoughts about migrating and living in New Zealand?

This is an opportunity to participate in research about the experience of Trans-Tasman migration and the place of Australian migrants in New Zealand.

A \$25 voucher will be offered to participants as a token of appreciation.

If you are interested provide your details here: <https://auckland.au1.qualtrics.com/SE/...> or email tbay454@aucklanduni.ac.nz

You are invited to participate in this project if you:

- Are an Australian citizen AND
- Aged 20-35 years old AND
- Have arrived in New Zealand between 2 and 10 years ago



Are you a **NEW ZEALAND CITIZEN** living in **SYDNEY**?

Are you interested in sharing your experiences and thoughts about migrating and living in Australia?

This is an opportunity to participate in research about the experience of Trans-Tasman migration and the place of New Zealand migrants in Australia.

A \$25 voucher will be offered to participants as a token of appreciation.

If you are interested provide your details here: <https://auckland.au1.qualtrics.com/SE/...> or email tbay454@aucklanduni.ac.nz

You are invited to participate in this project if you:

- Are a New Zealand citizen AND
- Aged 20-35 years old AND
- Have arrived in Australia between 2 and 10 years ago

Approved by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 01/06/18 for three years. Reference Number 021269

Appendix F: Vignettes

Vignette One:

David, a New Zealand born citizen receives a medical bill in the mail and is complaining to his Australian flatmates about how unfair it is that he doesn't have the same rights as them, even though he's been living in Australia for 10 years. His flatmates respond:

Ashley:

"Well the government needed to do something. Heaps of people were getting an easy ride into Australia through the Trans-Tasman agreement who weren't even born in New Zealand."

Sam:

"Australia owes NZ nothing and is fully entitled to create its laws in any way it sees fit. Why should New Zealanders get special access over people from other places like the UK for example."

Vignette two:

Your friend Jack (an Australian born citizen) has been living in New Zealand for 8 years but hasn't applied to get citizenship yet. Recently Jack was made redundant from his office job and is struggling to make ends meet. Jack's Mum has been sending him money for the last two weeks but he is considering going to Work and Income (WINZ) to get assistance from the New Zealand government until he finds another job, so that he is not a burden on his family. Jack feels a bit uncomfortable about his situation and calls you to ask for advice on what he should do.

Vignette three:

You're scrolling through Facebook when you come across a post that says "New Zealand deports 8 Australian crims across the Tasman, compared to the 1023 New Zealanders deported from Australia in the same period". You do not read the article but look at the top comments on the post. They read:

"Australia have it spot on, New Zealand needs to do the same. Residence is a privilege, not a right. If migrants commit a crime their residency should be stripped away and they should be deported."

"It's about time we started to treat the Aussies the way they treat us! Next take the benefits off them too as they did to us, no medical cover etc. etc. Two can play at that game!"

Approved by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 01/06/2018 for three years. Reference Number: 021269

Appendix G: Qualtics Survey



NATION & MIGRATION

Thank you for your interest in this research project looking at the experiences of **New Zealand citizens migrating to Australia**. To participate in this study you must be a New Zealand citizen **aged between 20-35, living in Sydney, and have moved to Australia between 2-10 years ago**.

Your participation would involve one **~60 minute interview** at a location of your choice. As a token of appreciation you will be offered a **\$25 supermarket voucher** following the interview. The research is **voluntary** and your participation is **confidential**.

The project is led by Tom Bayliss, a masters student at the **University of Auckland**, and supervised by Dr. Tom Baker and Dr. Francis Collins. This **masters research project** is funded by a University of Auckland scholarship. Further information on the project and your involvement is available here: [Participant information sheet](#)

If you would like to participate in an interview as part of this project **please complete the form below** and we will contact you shortly. If you have any questions please contact Tom Bayliss: tbay454@aucklanduni.ac.nz.

Select Gender

- Male
- Female
- Non binary

How many years have you lived in Australia?

How old are you?

- 19 years or younger
- 20-25
- 26-30
- 31-35
- 36 years or older

Please provide your contact details:

Name	<input type="text"/>
Phone number	<input type="text"/>
Email address	<input type="text"/>



Powered by Qualtrics

