

The Ideology of Integration: An examination of  
the New Zealand and Ireland case studies

By

Miran Milosevic

A thesis submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington in  
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in  
Political Science

Victoria University of Wellington

2014

## Contents

---

Acknowledgments.....	Page <b>3</b>
Abstract.....	Pages <b>4-5</b>
List of Tables and Figures.....	Page <b>6</b>
Chapter One: Introduction/Question overview.....	Page <b>7</b>
Chapter Two: Literature review/Methodology.....	Page <b>18</b>
Chapter Three: Case study: New Zealand.....	Page <b>48</b>
Chapter Four: Case study: Ireland.....	Page <b>85</b>
Chapter Five: Thesis Summary and Conclusions.....	Page <b>105</b>
Reference list.....	Page <b>111</b>

## **Acknowledgments**

I would not have been able to complete this work without the help, faith and support of a number of very important people.

To my supervisors, Dr Katherine McMillan and Dr Fiona Barker, thank you for your support, guidance and patience.

To Jess, thank you for your love and for believing in me.

To Igor, Hannah, and to my parents- thank you for your words of wisdom and for always being there for me.

## **Abstract**

The study of integration policy is of particular relevance in an increasingly globalised world, since integration policy was shown to be important to the maintenance of social cohesion of immigrant receiving host societies (Papillon 2002, p. iii, Schugurensky 2003, pp.11-12, Friessen 2003, pp.187-191). This thesis sought to examine the fit of two explanatory theoretical models in explaining integration policy outcomes in two case study states, Ireland and New Zealand, during the period 1995-2006. More specifically, the thesis tried to determine whether the influence of the model of national membership adopted in each study case (civic membership in the New Zealand case and ethno cultural membership in the case of the Republic of Ireland) was able to anticipate the correct outcomes with regard to integration policies adopted during the study period, or whether political party positioning on socio economic lines was more important in anticipating integration policy outcomes. This assessment was conducted in light of apparent 'fit' of the respective theoretical models in each study case to integration policies enacted during the study period, in order to determine whether the theories that seem to fit the best anticipate the correct outcomes in each study case.

This was a salient question in light of the dichotomy in integration policy approaches in the two study states. Notwithstanding that both New Zealand and Ireland were immigrant receiving states during the study period, there was a marked difference between New Zealand's approach to integration policy formulation and that of Ireland. New Zealand's approach to integration policy was well structured and became more developed, while Ireland did not have a cohesive integration policy during the study period, relying instead on a reactionary approach composed of a collection of policy statements and 'ad hoc', reactionary policies.

As noted briefly above, the two theoretical models that were assessed for fit against outcomes in integration policies in the study states were the Brubaker theory of membership and the theory of political party positioning along the socio-economic left/right axis. The Brubaker theory suggests that integration policies are the outcome of national

membership models (i.e. a civic or ethno cultural conception of national belonging), whilst the theory of party positioning along socio-economic lines suggests that integration policies are based on the influence of socio economic political party ideology. An investigation was made of the fit of the Brubaker membership models against that of the socio economic political ideology models in predicting integration policy outcomes in each respective case study. In addition, an examination of the interaction between the two explanatory theories was conducted, and an assessment made of whether this interaction had an impact on integration policy formulation. In exploring the interaction between two competing explanations for integration policy outcomes, this thesis aimed to facilitate a more comprehensive understanding for the reasons of the divergence in the approach to integration policy in the two case study states, and also a better understanding of the factors impacting on integration policy in general.

## **List of Tables and Figures**

Table 1 Structured Categorisation Matrix.....	<b>Pages 43-46</b>
Table 2: Fit of NZ National integration policies.....	<b>Pages 54-55</b>
Table 3: Co occurrence of ideological positions under National.....	<b>Page 55</b>
Table 4: Fit of Labour integration policies.....	<b>Page 67</b>
Table 5: Co occurrence of ideological positions under Labour.....	<b>Page 68</b>
Table 6: Fit of FF/FG integration policies.....	<b>Page 94</b>
Table 7: Co occurrence of ideological positions under FF/FG.....	<b>Page 94-95</b>
Figure 1: New Zealand Settlement Strategy Intermediate Goals.....	<b>Page 65</b>

Note:

FG= Fine Gael

FF= Fianna Fail

## Chapter 1- Introduction/Question Overview

Across the broad spectrum of immigrant receiving states, different countries have implemented different kinds of immigrant integration policies, and a number of different theoretical models have been developed to try and explain this variance. The study of integration policy is of increased importance in an increasingly globalised world, since studies have shown that integration policy is important to the maintenance of social cohesion of immigrant receiving host societies (Papillon, 2002,p.iii; Schugurensky, 2003, pp.11-12; Friessen, 2003, pp.187-191). Experience in European states, specifically older and well established Member States of the European Union, (notably France, Germany, the Netherlands and the Nordic countries) which house large populations of long term, established immigrants , indicates that poor immigrant integration may cause some serious problems, not only for the majority (host) society, but also for the broader society, i.e. including immigrants (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003; Papillon, 2002, p.iii; Schugurensky, 2003, pp. 11-12; Friessen, 2003, pp.187-191).

This thesis seeks to explore the role of ideology as a force in shaping the motivations and actions of policy makers within the immigrant integration policy field by testing whether theoretical models that appear to fit best within the study states anticipated the correct integration policy outcomes in Ireland and New Zealand during the study period. The two theoretical models are firstly, based on the Rogers Brubaker (1992) theory of membership, positing that immigrant integration policies are the outcome of national models of membership and secondly the influence of party positioning on the socio-economic left-right axis, manifesting itself in left/right political party divisions and impacting on integration policy outcomes. At the outset of the research, it was assumed that political party positioning would be determinative in the New Zealand case and that the Brubaker theory of membership would be more influential in the Irish case (please chapter 2 for an explanation as to why this is). In tandem with assessing the fit of the main theoretical models in explaining integration policy outcomes in the case studies, this thesis will also

examine other explanatory variables as potential explanations for integration policy, with a focus on the role of nationalism and convergence factors.

In addition to examining the explanatory fit of each main theoretical model on integration policy formulation within the study cases, the thesis also seeks to examine the interaction between the two models and the role this interaction plays in integration policy formulation in the case study states. During the study period (1995-2006) New Zealand and Ireland had a similar population size, and were economically growing, immigrant receiving states that developed very different approaches to immigrant integration policy. In examining the interaction between two competing explanations for integration policy formulation, this thesis aims to facilitate understanding the reasons behind this divergence in approach in the two case study states.

### **Importance of the research**

The relevance of the research being carried out is that the close and detailed examination of the interaction of two types of ideological influence on integration policy formulation in the two case study states furthers our understanding of the factors impacting on integration policy formulation. As noted above, integration policy research is of ever increasing importance in a globalised world, as successful integration is important to the social cohesion of immigrant receiving states. This research adds to the New Zealand literature addressing the factors impacting on integration policy. It does so by examining the factors impacting on integration policy in the two study cases through a novel, comparative methodology. In turn, this comparative examination facilitates a more holistic understanding of the factors impacting on integration policy formulation in New Zealand, and also Ireland, the second study case.

This thesis provides information about the role of ideology (relating to membership and relating to socio-economic positioning) as a potential explanatory variable for integration policy outcomes, which has applied utility for immigrant groups and migrant decision making. If it is shown that particular ideology corresponds to particular types of



policy (e.g. inclusive vs. exclusionary), then migrant groups may wish to research the ideology present in the chosen adopted states, to increase the probability that they would have access to the liberties they desire as new citizens. A caveat to this assertion is that the sample size of the current thesis is limited, and the findings would need to be replicated and expanded on to test their general application.

In addition, if this thesis were to show that political parties' ideologies impact on immigration integration policies in New Zealand and Ireland, and the influence of different factors were identified or isolated, this might facilitate knowledge of what ideological factors are potentially predictive of future integration policy changes. This then enables us to predict what similarly influenced politicians' impact might be on integration policies in the future in countries with similar political structures. However, due to the fact that only two case studies are being considered in the current research, a truly representative conclusion cannot be drawn and further research would need to be carried out in order to confirm the conclusions reached by this research. The primary importance of the research carried out is a comparative exploration of the fit and interaction of the two theoretical models in the two case study states and the addition to the understanding (and literature) on the subject that this represents.

### **Theoretical overview**

Immigrant integration (hereto referred to as integration) is a concept broadly used to describe the cultural, economic, political and social processes that take place upon the arrival of migrants in a receiving society (Martinello 2006, p. 4). Favell defines integration policy as a "series of provisions, policies and social interventions which together might be seen to add up to an 'integration policy'" (Favell 2001, p.1). Across immigrant receiving states integration policies differ quite markedly, in terms of the provisions, policies and interventions put in place to facilitate immigrant integration. Peace, Butcher, Spoonley and O'Neill (2005) refer to the different forms of integration policies implemented as either 'hard' or 'soft' versions depending on the role that multiculturalism plays in policy making. If

multiculturalism is accepted as a policy goal in a given state, the integration policy implemented may be of the 'soft' variety, which allows for a culturally heterogeneous society. If however, multiculturalism is not accepted as policy goal, the integration policy adopted may be more hard line, seeking to subsume cultural difference.

The first theoretical model that will be considered in explaining integration outcomes is based on Rogers Brubaker (1992) theory of membership, positing that integration policies are the outcome of national models of membership. Specifically, the Brubaker theory hinges on whether a country was established with an explicitly ethnic (also referred to as ethno cultural) conception of nationhood (*jus sanguinis*), or whether a civic conception of nationhood was implemented (*jus soli*). With regard to the two case studies, New Zealand was found to more closely subscribe to the civic conception of nationhood, while Ireland was more aligned with the ethno cultural mode of membership. If the Brubaker theory provides an explanation for integration policy formulation, a marked difference should exist between the integration policies of states that adopt an explicit ethnic conception of nationhood as opposed to states that have adopted civic forms of nationhood. Accordingly, the levels of integration possible under each respective view of membership (i.e. either ethnic or civic) will likewise vary markedly. Policy makers subscribing to the *jus sanguinis*/ethno cultural model would be expected to formulate integration policies that do not subsume difference between immigrants and naturally born citizens. These policies would likely be aimed at preserving the status quo and keeping immigrants from attaining the same rights as those enjoyed by natural-born citizens. It was therefore assumed that Irish integration policies would follow a restrictive pattern, designed to promulgate difference between immigrants and locally born citizens.

In contrast, policy makers subscribing to a *jus soli*/civic model would promote policies that promote more efficient integration, subsuming difference and endeavouring to naturalise immigrants until equilibrium with native citizens was achieved. Since New Zealand was considered to follow the civic model of membership, the integration policy outcomes during the study period were expected to illustrate a more inclusive approach.

The second theory to be considered, and positioned against the Brubaker theory, is the influence of party positioning on the socio-economic left-right axis (manifesting itself in left/right political party divisions) on integration policy formulation (Mouffe, 1992). The second explanation will be referred to within the thesis as the 'political ideology' explanation. This explanation posits that a political party's position on the left/right axis will determine its position on integration policy formulation. Political parties subscribing to the liberal or neo-liberal strain of thought, associated with the right side of the political spectrum would be expected to advocate a policy of minimalist state intervention in aspects of life considered to belong in the private sphere, and into which integration belongs (Clarke, 1997). This belief in minimalist intervention stems from the liberal concern that the rights of the individual may be undermined and eroded by undue interference by the state, but is also found in the liberal belief in individual self-sufficiency and autonomy. Political parties subscribing to the neoliberal theory could therefore be expected to be ideologically inclined to adopt a minimalist approach in integration, considering that integration is seen as something outside of the role of the state, and further, the emphasis on individual responsibility would dictate that a laissez faire approach to integration should be adopted (Clarke, 1997). Integration policies under this approach would therefore be minimal, and a greater emphasis would be made on encouraging self-reliance and autonomy of the individual in achieving integration.

In contrast, political parties found on the left side of the political spectrum would be expected to subscribe to the social democratic conception of citizenship (as outlined by Marshall in 1949); where true inclusive citizenship is viewed as best achieved through the facilitation of broad participation in society, and that the state has an active role in facilitating this participation (Delanty, 2002). In contrast to the liberal mode of thought, left wing political parties are more inclined to want to facilitate individual active participation in society to achieve these aims, and tend to be inherently more multicultural in their outlook as a result (Delanty, 2002). Ideologically, this theoretical model is more likely to view facilitation of integration as one of the crucial roles of the state. This has implications for immigrant integration policy, as the effective integration of new immigrants would be seen as crucial for active societal participation and therefore one of the key tasks of the state.

Integration policies under this approach would be expected to be more comprehensive, and inclusive. State assistance would be provided on an unfettered basis.

### **Results overview**

Deductive content analysis was used to code whether policies implemented in the study states during the study time period were representative of civic or ethno cultural models of membership and/or socio-democratic or neoliberal political ideology models. Accordingly, the 'fit' of the integration policy outcomes to the respective theoretical model was determined. In the New Zealand case study, it was found that the political ideology model was more useful than the Brubaker membership model in explaining the integration policies enacted under both the National and Labour political parties. In the Irish case study, a dominant influence of the Brubaker ethno cultural model of membership on integration policy was ascertained.

The exploratory analysis of the interaction between Brubaker's models of membership and the political ideology models revealed that policies coded as civic co-occurred with both neoliberal and social democratic policies in the New Zealand case study. Data coded in the Irish case study revealed limited co occurrence between the neoliberal ideological model and ethno cultural model of membership.

In both cases examined, extraneous factors were also considered in determining the fit of the theoretical models to integration policy outcomes. In the New Zealand case study, the neoliberal political context within policy making impacted on the social democratic ideological motivations of the New Zealand Labour party. Within the Irish case, interaction was noted between the Brubaker models of civic and ethnic citizenship (i.e. the *jus soli* legal model of citizenship was impacted on by the ethno cultural conception of membership). In both cases, the interplay between the various motivators influenced the policy that was, or was not enacted. In addition, other factors, such as Maori nationalism in the New Zealand case (see Chapter 3) and protective Irish nationalism in the Irish case (see Chapter 4) was found to be instrumental in the formulation of integration policy.

## Case Studies

The two states chosen as case studies to investigate whether theoretical models that seem to fit best anticipate the correct integration policy outcomes were New Zealand and Ireland. The time period for the study spanned from 1995-2006 for both New Zealand and Ireland. This time frame was chosen because during the study period both countries experienced changes of government, considered in terms of the ruling parties holding power in parliament. This in turn enabled a comparative examination of the integration policy framework in place during each administration. This time frame choice allowed for an examination of whether there was a significant change in integration policy when the ruling parties changed in governments' (including a change from a left wing government to a right wing one in New Zealand's case). In the event of continuity in integration policy between the different political parties, various explanatory factors (including ethnic or civic membership models), were considered as appropriate explanatory variables for this phenomenon. The timeframe 1995-2006 was also chosen because of the increased migration flows to both study cases during the study period, and a concordant (assumed) flow on effect on integration policy formulation and development.

During the study period, New Zealand underwent a change from a National-led coalition government, to a Labour-led coalition government elected in 1999; Labour remained in power until 2008 (two years following the end of the study period). In Ireland, the 1992 election was won by a coalition led by the Fine Gael and the Labour Party- which was in power at the start of the study period in Ireland (1995). This government was replaced in 1997 by a coalition composed of the Fianna Fail political party, in tandem with the Progressive Democrats and the Green Party, which remained in power throughout the remainder of the study period. This flux in political administrations for both case studies allowed for a more comprehensive comparative examination of the integration policies enacted.

These two countries were selected for comparison and analysis due to the significant number of similarities between them during the study periods, but also marked differences which were salient for the comparative aspect of the research questions. Economically, New Zealand and Ireland boasted similar sized economies and during the study period both states experienced significant economic growth. New Zealand's economy fluctuated from a 0.2 to 4.9 percent growth over the study period (Reserve Bank of New Zealand, 2014) while Ireland was experiencing stellar growth rates due to the Celtic Tiger growth period happening at the time, growing at a rate of 9.4 percent during the years 1995-2000 (Murphy, 2001). Economic growth was considered an important variable when identifying similarities between the two cases, because of the assumed correlation between positive economic growth in a country and an influx of new migrants.

In addition, there was a marked and significant difference in the integration policy framework that was adopted in each case study. Notwithstanding an influx of migrants in both study cases Irish social policies during the study period [including integration policy] "developed on a piecemeal basis with no comprehensive or integrated plan. The state responded to specific needs only in response to political pressures to do so, and reluctantly" (Kiely, 1999 p. 4). This ad hoc, piecemeal approach to integration policy in Ireland is well documented, and has drawn much academic criticism (Boucher, 2008). Immigrant integration outcomes in Ireland have suffered as a result (Boucher, 2008).

In contrast, the New Zealand integration policy framework followed a much more structured development path, with the integration policy framework in place by the end of the study period (The New Zealand Settlement Strategy, launched in 2004) a significantly more developed and comprehensive one than in Ireland. This substantial difference in integration policy approach stands in sharp contrast in an examination of the two study cases.

Another significant point of divergence within the two case study states was the political framework that was in place during the study period. In Ireland's case historical factors, especially divisive issues surrounding the 1916 declaration of Independence from

Britain, played an important role in defining Irish political identity and the establishment of the political framework within which the main Irish political parties developed (Bowman, 2010). This historically based approach also limited the development and influence of the classic left/right party distinctions that, on the other hand, defined the political scene in New Zealand. Lacking similar influences, New Zealand's political scene was demarcated by socio economic political differences, with the parties of the left and right vying for supremacy. History played a lesser role in the definition and development of New Zealand's political identities, and the flow on effect on integration policy development. However, the role of Maori nationalism should be considered as an explanatory variable in New Zealand's case. This is something that will be discussed in more detail in the New Zealand chapter.

This distinction in the political identity framework applicable in New Zealand and Ireland is significant. The Brubaker model of *jus soli/jus sanguinis* appears to correspond more strongly with Ireland's political situation, demarcated along ethnic and civic lines, while the political party ideology model is arguably more applicable to New Zealand, due to the emphasis on the classic left/right political demarcation in the political party structure. This enables a comparative investigation to be carried out, in addition to testing the fit of the most apparently appropriate model in each case. It also enables a comparative consideration of the interaction of the two models; specifically an examination of how a party's belief about the appropriate role of the state in the economy interacts with their view on national identity.

## **Research Questions**

In conducting the research I was guided by two primary questions:

- 1) To what extent does political party ideology, reflected in terms of socio/economic political ideology distinctions or different models of national membership- civic versus ethno cultural, explain integration policy formulation in Ireland and New Zealand?
- 2) What effect, if any, does the interaction between the two explanatory models have on integration policy outcomes in the two case study states?

The following section will outline how the thesis sought to answer the above research questions.

## **Thesis Overview**

Chapter Two will discuss the relevant literature on integration policy, as well as the theoretical models that will be assessed for best fit against the integration policies enacted in the two case study states. Chapter Two will also outline the content analysis methodology that will be used in carrying out the research. In brief, a deductive content analysis approach was used to test the application (fit) of the theoretical models as important explanatory variables for integration policies enacted in New Zealand and Ireland during the study period (1995- 2006). Categories of integration policies were pre-defined and represented in a structured categorisation matrix based on understandings of theoretical material canvassed in the literature review chapter as either representative of the Brubaker



civic or ethno cultural notion of membership or representative of left or right political ideology model. The occurrence of these categories was identified in the corpus, the fit of the integration policies to the theoretical models noted and tabulated in the results section (see tables 2 – 7) The findings were then discussed in light of other potential explanatory variables impacting on the integration policies enacted during the study period in New Zealand and Ireland, including factors such as the impact of Maori Nationalism, pragmatic policy continuity issues and policy convergence factors.

Chapter Three: *Case study: New Zealand* will present the results of the research within the New Zealand example, and will include a discussion of the findings as well as a consideration of other explanatory variables in making sense of the application of the theoretical models to the New Zealand data.

Chapter Four: *Case study: Ireland* will present the results of the research carried out in the Irish case, and will likewise include a discussion of the findings as well as a consideration of other relevant explanatory variables impacting on integration policy formulation in the Irish case.

Chapter 5: *Thesis Summary and Conclusions* will summarise the findings of the thesis and the discussion carried out, as well as listing the limitations of the research and will note potential scope for future research. The implications of the research findings will be considered.

## **Chapter 2 Literature Review and Methodology**

### **Literature Review**

#### **A definition of integration policy**

As noted earlier, Favell defines integration policy as a “series of provisions, policies and social interventions which together might be seen to add up to an ‘integration policy’” (Favell 2001, p.1). These provisions may cater to a wider range of disparate ‘spheres’ of integration, each focused on a different area of societal participation (e.g. social inclusion, education, employment/labour market access; see below for the range of provisions and what this may encompass). This thesis will assess the fit of the two theoretical models against the integration policies enacted in the two case study states, using the definition for integration policy provided above, in order to determine whether the theories that seem to fit best anticipate the correct outcomes in the two study cases.

**Examples of integration policies (based on the European Union Zaragoza Declaration indicators of integration and discussed by McGinnity, Quinn, O’Connell, & Donnelly, (2011)):**

#### **Employment/Labour market access**

- Policies intending to provide employment to new migrants, and to provide them with equal opportunities in the labour market.

#### **Education**

- Education facilitation, including language courses for migrants. Immigrant specific training courses.
- Educational qualification convergence- policies intended to make foreign degrees compatible with domestic degrees.

### **Social inclusion**

- Policies intended to alleviate poverty e.g. financial assistance policies.
- Policies intended to provide social and cultural related advice and assistance.
- Policies providing income assistance- e.g. social benefits.
- Home ownership policies- intended to assist with long term settlement of migrants.
- Policies designed to promote good health/lifestyle.
- Policies designed to alleviate discrimination.

### **Citizenship**

- Policies requiring/not requiring blood ties to immigrant receiving nation state.
- Policies requiring/not requiring language/citizenship tests.
- Policies facilitating the granting of long term residence/ citizenship within specific timeframes.
- Policies intended to give avenues of expression to immigrants within government/elected representation.

Studying the integration policies that were enacted in New Zealand and Ireland during the study period reveals a large difference in the approach adopted in the two case

studies. New Zealand's integration policy framework over the case study period developed in a structured and expanding way as more provisions and social interventions became available for new migrants, coalescing into a structured National Settlement strategy launched in 2004 and further developed and augmented over the remainder of the study period (please see chapter 3 for a detailed consideration of the policies enacted in New Zealand during the study period). In contrast, in Ireland's case, this evolution in integration policy did not occur. Integration policy remained ad hoc, piece meal and reactive. The specific policies enacted within New Zealand and Ireland during the study period are considered more explicitly in the individual case study chapters.

### **The importance of integration policy**

The study of immigrant integration policy is an area of marked importance in an increasingly globalised world.

A number of authors have demonstrated that immigrants who fail to integrate, due to societal systemic reasons, faced a higher risk of being unemployed, had lower educational standards and fewer qualifications and received a lower income than integrated immigrants. They are also more dependent on social assistance and benefits (Papillon, 2002, p. iii, Schugurensky 2003, pp. 11-12, Friessen, 2003, pp. 187-191, Joppke, 2007). These characteristics mean that they are at a greater risk of living segregated lives, a characteristic that can pass onto the second generation, and their children might also encounter problems in integrating into society (Papillon, 2002, p. iii, Schugurensky, 2003 pp. 11-12, Friessen 2003, pp. 187-191, Joppke, 2007).

Accordingly, the study of immigrant integration policy, and an understanding of the underlying motivators which help shape it is highly relevant to ensuring the financial and social health of immigrant families. This thesis argues that it is these motivations (i.e. ideology) underlying the integration policy which ultimately determine the final

manifestation of the policy, which in turn shapes the destiny of thousands of new immigrants, and their future in the host state.

### **Definitions of integration**

To begin considering the fit of the theoretical models to immigrant integration policy outcomes, it is first necessary to arrive at an appropriate definition of integration. Immigrant integration is a concept broadly used to describe the cultural, economic, political and social processes that take place upon the arrival of migrants in a receiving society (Martinello, 2006, p. 4). The precise definition of integration has stimulated ample debate in academia over past decades and currently there still is no universally agreed understanding of the concept of integration (Peace, Butcher, Spoonley & O'Neill, 2005, p. 88).

Notwithstanding a lack of agreement on the meaning of integration, a starting definition may be borrowed from sociology. Entzinger and Biezeveld argue that “seen from a macro perspective, integration refers to a characteristic of a social system, e.g. a society” (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003, p. 6). According to this view point, the greater the level of integration within a society, the greater and more intense is the relationship between its constituent parts (individuals and/or groups). Lately, it has been ‘fashionable’ to utilise the term social cohesion “as an equivalent for integration as a characteristic of a society” (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003, p. 6).

A number of other definitions can also be found, each with a slightly different conceptual twist. For example, Spoonley et al (2005) argue that integration can be considered as an older incarnation of a social cohesion focus (Peace, Butcher, Spoonley & O'Neill, 2005, p. 96). According to Peace, Butcher, Spoonley & O'Neill (2005) “integration has been interpreted in different ways according to both historical period and location and, in its broadest form, includes assimilation, notions of a melting pot and various forms of

cultural pluralism. In its current usage, integration is seen to be distinct from the older discourses of assimilation or pluralism.” (Peace, Butcher, Spoonley & O’Neill 2005, p. 96).

This differing usage is reflective of the changing cultural, political and economic context present in all states. The difference in the conceptualisation of integration can therefore have an impact on the actual policies implemented, depending on the context that shapes the current definition in use. The historical, economic and political circumstances influencing the definition of integration in New Zealand and Ireland will therefore potentially have a formative effect on actual integration policies enacted by the policy makers in each country.

According to Peace, Butcher, Spoonley and O’Neill (2005, p. 96), the conceptualisation of integration recognises difference that is present in society, and it also recognises the reciprocal effect that various social groups within society have on each other. This effect creates a collective “national space” within which equal rights and civic unity is afforded to all participants, without sacrificing existing ethnic diversity (Peace, Butcher, Spoonley & O’Neill 2005, p. 96). This concept has gained popularity in a number of immigrant receiving countries.

Adrian Favell (2001) defines integration as: “a vague yet technical sounding term that encompasses a range of positions from more assimilatory policies through to more openly multicultural ones” (p.116). Favell argues that integration posits and realises practical steps in the migration settlement process and it achieves this “by projecting both social change and continuity between the past and some idealised end-point” (Favell, 2001, p. 116). He states that “integration measures cover an exhaustive list, including: basic legal and social protection, formal naturalisation rights, anti-discrimination laws, the redistribution of resources, policies on public housing, law and order, tolerance, language and multicultural education. Ultimately, integration policy aims for “the extremely difficult and improbable...construction of a successful, well-functioning, multi-cultural or multi-racial society” (Favell, 2001, p.118). Integration therefore is a multifaceted process, facilitating

immigrant settlement through a broad range of measures, with the final end goal of creating a cohesive multicultural society.

Yet another commentator, Alvaro Lima (2010) defines integration as a “socio-political process by which immigrants negotiate the terms of membership and belonging in their new countries” (P. 10). He argues “whether integration occurs as the outcome of a long process of settlement depends on the (social, economic, cultural, and political) structure of the receiving society. That is, if immigrants are afforded educational, occupational, and political opportunities, integration will reduce the social distance between immigrants and natives – they achieve parity in terms of life chances. If, on the other hand, immigrants are marginalized, social distances will increase” (Lima, 2010, p.8). Lima therefore associates opportunity of immigrant societal participation with an effective and multifaceted process of settlement, culminating in integration.

In considering the various positions described above, a number of similarities, as well as differences can be extrapolated. Commentators agree that integration is a socially grounded process, dependent on and influenced by, the conditions of the immigrant receiving state. The precise definition is inherently vague, and almost elusive. The manifestation of integration is likewise nuanced, and there is no singular form of it. Immigrant integration is seen as an idealised end point, a state of being where immigrants are in a state of equilibrium with the host society (Favell, 2001).

This nebulous conception of integration lends itself well to differing interpretations of necessary integration policies. In addition, there is a sense of inherent difficulty involved with the process of immigrant integration; both because of the constantly evolving context in which the integration process exists, and the complex/ multilayered nature of substantive integration.

This multi-layered nature of integration may also be defined as ‘different spheres of integration’, a concept based on Walzer’s Spheres of Justice (Walzer, 1970; Engbersen & Gabriëls, 1995). Entzinger & Biezeveld write that these ‘spheres’ or facets of integration

encompass different aspects of societal participation, such as socio economic integration, cultural integration, and legal and political integration (2003, p.44). These facets of integration can be approximately grouped into two categories, namely an incidence dimension, and an identity or a normative dimension (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003, p. 6). A salient point regarding the multifaceted nature of integration is that an immigrant well-integrated into one 'sphere' is not necessarily equally integrated (to the same or similar extent) into another sphere (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003, p. 8). Entzinger & Biezeveld use the example of an educated immigrant holding employment in a 'good' mainstream company, while simultaneously only having all of his social relationships with people stemming from his own ethnic community. In this example, they argue that "at the level of personal friendships this person is well integrated into his own community" (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003, p. 8).

Accordingly, if one adopts a multilayered/different spheres approach, immigrant integration policy needs to reflect this point by likewise facilitating a multi-layered approach to integration. It can be argued that a policy which only facilitates integration into one sphere is inherently insufficient, as certain other areas are ignored, leading to unsatisfactory integration outcomes.

### **Integration policy: the assimilatory or multicultural classification**

The above section leads into the consideration of the role of assimilation and multiculturalism within the context of integration. Stemming from an understanding of the appropriate approach toward immigrant integration, both assimilation and multiculturalism are touted by various proponents to be either 'paths' towards successful integration, or formulated alternatively, types of integration policy that stem from a particular state's understanding of a desired policy framework (Peace, Butcher, Spoonley & O'Neill, 2005). It is argued that a political party's socio-economic ideology, and their views on national membership are very significant in determining whether they take a multicultural or assimilationist approach to integration (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003, p. 23).



Assimilationist proponents urge the need for immigrants to share the host society's lifestyles and respect the established rules, while multiculturalists favour social cohesion through respecting differences of ethnical minorities (Entzinger & Biezeveld 2003, p. 14). The assimilationist viewpoint promotes social cohesion and the preservation of a national identity through integration policies that subsume difference, and encourage a 'melting pot' state. This approach can be linked to a powerful and overarching nationalistic desire to protect the theoretical identity and characteristics of citizens, an identity that may be threatened by an influx of immigrants who are inherently 'different'. Self preservation is therefore the driver underlying this approach (Vertovec, 2001).

In contrast, according to the multicultural viewpoint it is preferable for the state to grant immigrants formal social and political rights while contemporaneously allowing for continued expressions of the immigrants' own cultural identity (Entzinger & Biezeveld 2003, p. 23). In this way, immigration is seen as reinforcing the multicultural nature and characteristics of society. Means should therefore be provided for "each ethnic community (or minority) to preserve and further develop their cultural identity" (Entzinger & Biezeveld 2003, p. 14). This approach assumes that a "collaborative mutual understanding between the communities is a condition for a harmonious multicultural society" (Entzinger & Biezeveld 2003, p. 14). Multiculturalism therefore "represents a kind of correction to assimilationist approaches and policies surrounding the incorporation of immigrants" (Vertovec, 2001, p.3).

Once again, it is the underlying understanding of the appropriate role of the state in integration policy, and the desired relationship between immigrants and existing citizens that drives the direction of integration policy and implementation.

In practical terms, between the approaches outlined above, there is a wide variety of programmes and policies which are put in action to facilitate integration. Due to pragmatic considerations, in practice, most countries use support programmes which are 'half way' between one model and another (Martiniello, 2006). The type of integration model that is

used in a particular state is often dependant on local factors, including history and the perceived success and/or failure of integration policies that were/are being used. For instance, the French republican model, promoting the ideals of the French revolution, is arguably very strongly assimilationist, due to the focus on immigrants' adoption of French values in order to gain citizenship (Joppke, 2007). On the other hand the British model is far more multicultural in approach, predominantly due to the British conceptualisation of integration and the legislative history that introduced the programme. This multicultural approach was expressed at an early stage, when Roy Jenkins, home secretary in 1966 noted: "I do not think that we need in this country a melting pot.... I define integration therefore, not as a flattening process of assimilation but as equal opportunity, accompanied by cultural diversity, in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance" (Roy Jenkins, 1966, cited in Benton, 1985, p.71).

The utility in considering the assimilationist and multiculturalist approaches outlined above is that they provide an idealised end result, a template against which the realities of integration policy may be examined and compared. In doing so, a researcher finds both convergence and divergence with the theoretical model; thereby providing a better understanding of the various factors impacting on immigrant integration policy. Much like the idea of integration as the 'ideal end point', these approaches are useful because they bring into sharp relief the actualities inherent in integration policy formulation, through the comparison with an ideal model.

Additionally, the two approaches are also useful because of their sharp conceptual divide and the reasons behind this divide. In effect, the underlying motivators behind the two approaches are more useful than the approaches themselves, since in deconstructing the approaches we get themes and motivations which may usefully be applied to the present case study. For example, analysis of the New Zealand case might reveal a social democratic ideological driver of a multicultural approach to integration.

### **A critique of present integration discourse**

The present integration discourse, including the work of authors mentioned in previous sections, and its constituent definitions, is not without its critics. Some authors have argued that since integration is a “‘normative category’, the various existing models of integration available are inadequate in describing or explaining the process which takes place when migrants arrive into a new society (Martiniello, 2006, p. 4). They are idealized end points, the final goal of a process of policy making and implementation. Accordingly both the republican model, as utilized in France, and the multicultural conception of integration, as utilized in Britain, are idealistic pictures of the national society (Martiniello 2006, p. 5). In turn, these models are not useful to describe and explain how integration takes place in society on a regular basis in reality, because they are ideal conceptualisations which do not encompass the variety of other factors (e.g. historical attitudes towards particular migrant groups, or socio economic factors present in a given state) which might impact on integration (Martiniello, 2006, p. 5).

The above critique notwithstanding, the existing theoretical material is useful since it provides a context which may be used as a springboard to in-depth analysis of the theory underpinning integration policy. Two of the broad theoretical models encapsulating the integration theory discussed in the above section, will now be considered in greater depth in the next section of this paper.

## **Theoretical Models Explaining Integration**

### **The Brubaker Model-The Ethnic/Civic Distinction**

As noted earlier in this thesis, the two theoretical models to be tested for fit against enacted integration policies in the study cases are the Brubaker ethno cultural/civic models of national membership, and the socio-economic, political party ideology based approach. These models are based on differing ideological, social, historical or economic rationales. Because of these differences, the two models therefore have different impacts on the decision making processes of policy makers subscribing to it. In addition, the two models outlined each have a particular conceptual understanding of the idea of citizenship, which itself is predicated on social, historical or economic models prevalent within a particular state. While citizenship policy should not be conflated with integration policy, the two are related in that citizenship discourse can colour integration policy thinking. Isin & Turner frame this concept as follows:

Modern citizenship has systemically made certain groups strangers and outsiders. What determines the composition of citizens, strangers, and outsiders and their respective rights and obligations in a given nation-state depend on its historical trajectory” (Isin & Turner 2002, p.3).

The framework of citizenship is therefore important in the conceptualization of integration policy as it can define and delineate the desired outcomes of integration. Specifically, it is the impact of citizenship discourse on membership theory that influences integration policy formation. In addition, the “historical trajectory” mentioned by Isin & Turner (2002), being the present sum of historical, economic and socio political factors coming to shape a particular state’s political outlook, could therefore be highly influential in shaping the integration framework that comes to eventuate in a given state.

The Brubaker theory is premised around the concepts of *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis*, terms corresponding to definitions of membership either grounded in a territorial basis or a blood descent basis respectively (Brubaker, 1992, pp. 1-5). Brubaker illustrates these concepts by discussing the French territorially based membership model (*jus soli*) and contrasting and comparing it to the German conceptualisation of nationhood and membership that is premised on blood descent (*jus sanguinis*) (Brubaker, 1990, p 5). According to Brubaker, this distinction is rather crucial, as it has important implications for the rights and restrictions of the citizens of states subscribing to each respective theoretical model (Brubaker, 1992, pp. 1-4). For instance, immigrants arriving into a state subscribing to the *jus soli* territorial model (which according to Brubaker is more assimilative, and more accepting of the process of naturalisation) would have more ability to gradually integrate and gain equal citizenship rights as native born citizens (Brubaker, 1992, p. 5). Crucial themes underpinning the *jus soli* model include a focus on liberal citizenship and inclusivity as well as openness to naturalisation. Brubaker argues that the *jus sanguinis* model is restrictive towards naturalisation, emphasises difference to a greater extent than the *jus soli* model, and has an ethno-cultural mode of identification as opposed to *jus soli*'s state centred identification model (i.e. civic) (Brubaker, 1992, pp. 1-5). In addition, Brubaker posits that under a *jus sanguinis* model, the influence of socio- economic ideological influences will be muted, due to the over arching focus on ethnic divisions (Brubaker, 1992). Key themes under this model can be said to be a focus on ethnicity and blood line, and exclusivity with regard to foreign naturalisation. The two models under the Brubaker theory therefore each present different ways of understanding national identity, and therefore membership, which feeds into integration policy formulation discourse.

In reframing the Brubaker models of membership, Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakul posit that ethnic nationalism, fundamentally rooted in descent (and observed in Germany pre- 2000) is more exclusionary than the civic nationalism model (Brubaker, 1992, Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakul 2005, p. 158). This is because the latter approach champions a universalist, voluntary political membership which is argued to offer new migrants a greater opportunity for inclusion (Brubaker, 1992, Koopmans et al. 2005, as cited in Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakul, 2005, p. 158). This approach is stated to have applied

in France. In discussing the role of nationalism in integration policy, Bloemraad, Korteweg & Yurdakul argue that immigrants' membership is influenced by nationalism because of its "effect on structuring formal legal rules regarding the acquisition of citizenship and the discourses that shape citizenship as participation and belonging" (Brubaker 1992, Koopmans et al. 2005, p. 158). The 'legal rules' that shape participation and belonging are therefore drawn from an underlying conceptualisation, argued in this thesis to be a dominant theoretical model of membership. In turn, this model of membership influences policy makers in their decisions on formulating integration policy.

Further expanding on the above point, *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis* can be equated to ethnic nationalism, and civic nationalism. According to Bloemraad, Korteweg, and Yurdakule ethnic nationalism corresponds with the *jus sanguinis* formulation of citizenship and entails a more difficult naturalization process (Bloemraad, Korteweg & Yurdakule 2008, p. 158). They cite examples of countries employing this formulation as including Germany (pre-2000), Austria, Greece, and Switzerland (Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakule 2008, p. 158). In contrast, a civic concept (the *jus soli* model) of nationhood facilitates a greater ability to obtain "formal membership for immigrants and their descendants" (Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakule 2008, p. 158). The authors note that countries included in this category are Australia, Canada, France, and the United States (Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakule 2008, p. 158).

Having considered the theoretical underpinning of the Brubaker models of membership, it is now possible to consider the kinds of integration policies that are expected under the two Brubaker formulations of membership. It is argued that the focus of the policies enacted will be in line with the main theoretical underpinnings of the respective Brubaker models of membership. The following sections explore this in detail.

## **Integration Policies expected under the Brubaker models of membership**

**The Ethno Cultural model of membership:** The Brubaker models primarily concern variations of membership rules (i.e. access to citizenship), defined either in accordance with an ethnic (blood tie) basis or a civic basis. The variance in the ethno cultural conceptualisation of membership (which is inherently narrow) and the civic conceptualisation is expected to manifest in a different expression of naturalisation policies. Under previously outlined categories of integration, naturalisation policies are primarily covered within the social inclusion and citizenship categories of integration. Within an ethno cultural dominated system, policies with a focus on restricting naturalisation would be expected. Specifically, this could be expected to manifest in a long period of naturalisation. A hard line local language requirement could likewise be present, requiring the prospective immigrant to know the local language. The language requirement would likely manifest in a requirement to sit a local language test. Other policies in line with the ethno cultural model could include the requirement to sit a citizenship test, or the requirement to prove 'blood ties' to the immigrant receiving state. In addition, a restrictive naturalisation process under the ethno cultural model could be manifested in a lack of policies designed to assist with immigrant integration (a laissez faire approach), effectively providing a lack of help with integration. Few policies facilitating social inclusion would be expected under this approach.

**The Civic model of membership:** A state subscribing to a civic conception of membership would be expected to offer more lenient naturalization policies, in terms of the length of time an immigrant has to be present in order to gain access to citizenship. In line with the policies outlined above these policies will primarily relate to the citizenship category of integration. Restrictive integration policies relating to blood tie requirements to the migrant receiving state, and language, would not be expected to be present. A civic system

of membership would also be expected to offer policies facilitating 'active citizenship' i.e. policies facilitating political participation and representation. Under this model, ancillary policies facilitating active citizenship would also be expected; for instance policies facilitating education of migrants, and social inclusion of immigrants. To that end, there is arguably some overlap between the kinds of policies expected under a social democratic political ideology theory and the civic model of membership. A salient difference between the two is the prevailing focus of facilitating active citizenship in a political sense under the civic model of membership, whereas the social democratic political ideology model seeks to ameliorate social difference through the promotion of policies seeking to give new migrants equal social and economic rights to those enjoyed by citizens.

### **Issues with the deterministic perspective**

A problem with the Brubaker models discussed in the above sections is that they are based on an unchanging, stable view of societies; what Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakule term as a "deterministic view of societies as fettered in their response to immigration by long-standing cultural understandings and institutional arrangements" (Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakule 2008, p. 159). With regard to this static approach, Bloemraad et al. contend that future research will need to address the means through which countries' past processes alter when faced with the realities of immigration, adding that some commentators have discounted the "national models" approach as not relevant, considering that it "artificially elevates the nation-state as the unit of analysis" (Bloemraad et al., 2008, p. 159).

The above commentators canvassed in the research broadly agree on the fluid nature of the influence of the theoretical models, and the platitude of additional factors that need to be considered in tandem with the theoretical models. Integration policy, like other fields of policy, does not exist in a vacuum and the influences impacting on the formulation of said policy are therefore subject to continuous change, based on an ever changing policy context.



In line with this argument, Bloemraad et al.(2008) add that the approach in scholarship seems to be moving away from a “typology approach” and adopting a methodology that places emphasis on a number of different variables instead (Bloemraad et al.,2008, p. 159). In other words, countries are assessed on the ability of new migrants to engage and penetrate various “social boundaries” which might face immigrants on their arrival (Alba, 2005, Zolberg & Long 1999 as cited in Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakule 2008, p. 159). Other salient variables also include political party ideology, and a country’s citizenship history. Alternatively, an index might be utilized which exhibits the extent of a country displaying a particular characteristic salient to migration, such as assimilation or multiculturalism (Banting et al. 2006 as cited in Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakule 2008, p. 159). Accordingly, a variable-based approach (i.e. an approach that is attentive to wider systemic/cultural variables and circumstances, and that is not rigidly wedded to theory-based assumptions) appears to be more realistic, and pragmatic, in considering the multilayered nature of integration. This approach is also more in line with the multilayered nature of integration and appears more salient than adherence to a particular conceptual understanding, which may be deterministic and inherently rigid in its outlook.

Accordingly, the approach to be adopted in the examination of the case studies will be one that is cautiously guided by the theoretical models, since the broad theoretical framework of the models is still thought to be relevant. However, considering the limitations of using a pure typology, other salient variables (previously mentioned, see above) will also be considered as potentially better explanations for the integration policy that is formulated.

### **The second theoretical model: The political ideology divide**

The second theoretical model to be tested for fit is based on socio- economic grounds which broadly correspond to the distinctions between the left and the right sides of the political spectrum. This model examines and explains the differences in the conceptualisation of integration policy between political parties on the left side of the

political spectrum, and those on the right side of it; based on their subscription to either the liberal/neoliberal ideological model, or the social democratic model that underlies the left wing approach (Delanty, 2002).

Political parties subscribing to the liberal or neo-liberal strain of thought, associated with the right side of the political spectrum (and famously first championed by Locke and Mill in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries) advocate a policy of minimalist state intervention in aspects of life considered to belong in the private sphere. Integration is an individual process, and therefore belongs within the private sphere (though also has public implications; e.g. the maintenance of a unified public culture within a multicultural context). This belief in minimalist intervention stems from the liberal concern that the rights of the individual may be undermined and eroded by undue interference by the state, but is also found in the liberal belief in individual self-sufficiency and autonomy; the idea that individuals in society are self-interested market participants, for whom self-realisation is best achieved without the state having too big a role (Schuck, 2002). Hence, one would expect that liberal or neoliberal political parties would be ideologically inclined to adopt a minimalist approach to integration, considering that integration is seen as something outside of the role of the state, and further, the emphasis on individual responsibility would dictate that a laissez faire approach to integration should be adopted. Key themes underlying this approach are a focus on economic objectives, a hard division between the public and private spheres, self-reliance and self-sufficiency, and a promotion of free market principles and individualism (Delanty, 2002).

In contrast, political parties found on the left side of the political spectrum tend to subscribe to the social democratic conception of citizenship (as outlined by Marshall in 1949); where true inclusive citizenship is viewed as best achieved through the facilitation of broad participation in society, and that the state has an active role in facilitating this participation (Delanty, 2002). In contrast to the liberal mode of thought, left wing political parties are more inclined to want to facilitate individual active participation in society to achieve truly inclusive citizenship, and tend to be inherently more multicultural in their outlook as a result. Effective integration of new immigrants would be seen as crucial for

active societal participation and therefore one of the key tasks of the state, which has implications for integration policy (e.g. policies that encourage migrant participation in community activities, and interaction with native born citizens are likely to be implemented under this ideology). Key themes underlying this approach are an emphasis on an inclusive society, and government action within what might be considered the private sphere since the free market is not necessarily considered the best solution. Other themes include an emphasis on non-economic objectives, such as cultural promotion.

In discussing the above model, Isin & Turner argue that liberal, social democratic and corporatist states “each rest upon a different interpretation of citizenship” (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 3). Isin and Turner’s definition of citizenship in this case relates to the distribution of social and economic rights among citizens and non-citizens, and the difference between social democratic and neo-liberal modes of citizenship. This should be distinguished from the Brubaker models of membership, as membership is a subset of a broader citizenship discourse. According to Isin and Turner, liberal democratic states, such as Australia, Switzerland and the United States utilize market mechanisms to distribute social rights, and focuses on civil and political rights, which are elevated (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 3). In contrast, corporatist states such as Germany, France and Austria allocate greater emphasis on social rights, but the availability of such rights is restricted. Finally, social democratic states (e.g., Norway, Sweden, Netherlands and Denmark) allocate highest priority to social rights, which the state facilitates thorough the provision of services such as universal education, and healthcare (Isin & Turner 2002, p. 3). Accordingly, it could be postulated that states adhering to the social democratic ideal would be most comprehensive and inclusive in their integration policy formulation, in order to most effectively facilitate and promote social rights to all citizens.

Isin and Turner go on to argue that liberalism, republicanism and communitarianism have been strongly influenced by state development, and accordingly each political citizenship model corresponds to a particular type of state (Isin & Turner 2002, p. 3). Liberalism focused states place an emphasis on a universal application of individual liberties, whereas states favouring communitarianism have a greater focus on community, society or

the nation, and the underlying objective is an equitable and fair society (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 3). Thus, it would be expected that states favouring the communitarian model would be most likely to promote active, far reaching integration policies which strive towards equity and fairness in society through the equal promotion of rights to all citizens, including immigrants. Examples of such policies might be equitable naturalisation policies giving residence rights, or citizenship. Lastly, republican theories deal with both individual and group rights, and examine the “role of conflict and contest in the expansion or construction of such rights” (Isin & Turner 2002, p.3). Each of these models is founded on a particular ideological construct, and it is argued that it is this ideological foundation that drives membership discourse, which influences the formulation of integration policy.

The liberal theory advocates minimalism of resource provision with regard to citizenship and integration theory. It considers the role of the state to be limited to the protection of the freedoms of its citizens and that this is best achieved through the facilitation and expedience of free exchange between individuals in the market place. According to Isin & Turner, a liberal point of view contends that the “role of the state is utilitarian, namely to maximize the happiness of the majority, but this ‘happiness’ is most effectively and efficiently measured by their individual wealth” (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 7). It follows therefore that an interest in culture is outside the proper auspices of state interests (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 7).

In line with this argument, a state with a liberal focus is not notably concerned with the provision of comprehensive integration policies, since it is the role of the free market to facilitate this. As integration is seen to occur on a ‘private sphere’ level (as opposed to a public sphere dimension, where the state should properly operate) it is not appropriate for the state to intervene. Clarke (2004) states that the “neo-liberal strategy has been consistently hostile to the public realm” (p 30). According to his interpretation of the neoliberal theory, “strands of anti-welfarism are combined with anti-statism and conceptions of the public interest are challenged- the state should strive to replace them by the rule of private interests as co-ordinated by markets” (Clarke, 2004, p. 31). Clarke argues that “it has insisted that the ‘monopoly providers’ of public services be replaced by efficient

suppliers, disciplined by the competitive realities of the market. It has disintegrated conceptions of the public as a collective identity, attempting to substitute individualised and economised identities as taxpayers and consumers” (Clarke, 1997, as cited in Clarke, 2004, p.31). Clarke is effectively describing the conflict between the liberal and communitarian interpretation of the proper realms of the state; a communitarian approach to collective identity and inclusive citizenship, as opposed to a liberally based, individualistic and market orientated approach to integration touted by liberal proponents.

More crucial is what Clarke’s calls the “second form of privatisation” - namely the “shift of social responsibilities from the public sphere (where they formed part of the business of government) to the private sphere (where they become matters of individual, familial or household concern)” (Clarke, 2004, p. 33). Applying this to integration theory, the provision of integration services would transfer from the auspices of the state to private organisations facilitating integration. Once again, this approach can be explained by the fact that integration, as seen by liberal proponents, is something that occurs on a private level, outside the proper realm of state control.

Having outlined the theoretical basis for the two political ideology models, it is now possible to consider the kinds of integration policies that are expected under the social democratic and neoliberal models. It is argued that the focus of the policies enacted will be in line with the main theoretical underpinnings of the respective political party ideology models. The following sections explore this in detail.

### **Integration Theories Expected Under the Political Party Ideology Models**

**The Neoliberal model:** Integration policies expected under this model will likely allocate the responsibility for integration to individual migrants rather than the state, due to neoliberal emphasis on individual responsibility. Accordingly, funding for the integration policies is largely expected to be sourced from the migrants themselves. As integration occurs in the

private sphere of influence, government is therefore expected to stay away from active facilitation and heavy community involvement would be expected. Any policies that are enacted by a state subscribing to this model would be expected to focus on the employment category of integration and concordant labour market access. This is because immigration (and relatedly integration) is expected to be seen mostly as an economic gain for the immigrant receiving state. In order to maximize the economic efficiency of migrants, policies could also be expected under the education integration category, although such policies are expected to also have a neoliberal economic twist, where a 'user pays' type structure is used. Active citizenship policies, under the citizenship category of integration, are expected if they facilitate more efficient integration of economically viable migrants within the state. Due to the individual focus of the neoliberal methodology a heavy emphasis on the social inclusion policies is not expected; the migrants would be expected to integrate into the social sphere on their own devices.

**Social democratic model:** The social democratic ideology seeks to promote an inclusive society, where all members share in the same economic and social rights. This is a holistic phenomenon, and integration policies under this model are therefore expected to be comprehensive and varied. Because of the perceived state responsibility for achieving an inclusive society, it is expected that state funding will be provided for integration policies across a broad range of categories. The approach to executing the policies will also likely be varied, and a community partnership method might potentially be used. Policies would be expected under four areas of integration, namely employment provision, education, social inclusion and citizenship. In enacting these policies, comprehensive state assistance would likely be provided. Because of the emphasis on social justice and inclusive citizenship under a social democratic ideological model, policies under the social inclusion integration category would be expected to be particularly emphasised. The focus of the integration policies would extend beyond the economic rationale, and this will likely be reflected in the kinds of policies that are enacted.

### **A further critique of pure typologies**

As with the Brubaker models, a problem with the political ideology models discussed above is that there are many states that do not neatly fit into the models outlined. As mentioned earlier, pure typologies are rarely seen in practice, and hybrid models taking into account other factors are more common. For instance, Isin & Turner mention that Canada exhibits a combination of liberal focus on the individual together with a social democratic history of upholding social rights (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 4). They note that Britain follows a similar model, in the combination social democratic and liberal traditions (Isin & Turner, 2002, p.4).

Extrapolating on the problems these 'pure' theories pose, Isin & Turner state that typologies and theories are no longer able to represent contemporary citizenship (Isin & Turner 2002, p 4). The authors argue "that in the last two decades of the twentieth century, post modernization and globalization has toppled the nation-state's position as the only source of authority of citizenship and democracy" (Isin and Turner 2002, p. 4).

Accordingly, in carrying out this thesis the assumption is made that while these theories of integration provide a useful basis for an explanatory framework, the *jus sanguinis* and *jus soli* models of citizenship and the social/economic ideological model counterpart are not 'pure' explanatory models, and perfect 'fit' with these models will not be attainable. Other factors, such as societal or historical variables and policy convergence factors must also be brought into the equation. This is consistent with the argument mentioned previously; the assertion that within integration scholarship there has been a move away from a typology approach and increased emphasis on a variable oriented methodology (Bloemraad et al., 2008). In other words, the impact of a number of other variables on integration policy outcomes must also be considered.

Commentators such as Sainsbury acknowledge that later discourse has discredited this typology of 'pure' explanatory devices, since in reality actual immigration and

integration policies are amalgamations of various models and are "characterised by convergence", a factor which inherently undermines the usefulness of the models (Joppke and Morawska, 2003, cited in Sainsbury p. 220). Convergence has been defined as:

... any increase in the similarity between one or more characteristics of a certain policy (e.g. policy objectives, policy instruments, policy settings) across a given set of political jurisdictions (supranational institutions, states, regions, local authorities) over a given period of time. Policy convergence thus describes the end result of a process of policy change over time towards some common point, regardless of the causal processes (Knill, 2005, p.5, cited in Geddes, 2005).

Convergence is potentially a salient alternative explanatory variable in the present research, because it has been cited as an explanation for the increasing similarity in integration policies across the Western world, especially Western European countries (Joppke, 2007; Fanning, 2009). The issue of convergence will be explored in more depth later within the thesis (please see the New Zealand chapter for a discussion of convergence). In addition, Sainsbury mentions "an underlying dimension of variation: inclusion vs. exclusion" (Sainsbury, 2006, p 220). This dimension of variation, and its significance to the broader framework of the research, will also be considered when examining the fit of the most seemingly appropriate theoretical models in the two case study states.

The following section will outline the deductive content analysis methodology that will be used to carry out the research in the two case studies.



## Methodology

Content analysis is a research technique used across academic disciplines (Neundorf, 2002) to group themes or categories in data. It is considered a technique of qualitative analysis, although quantitative forms of content analysis are used as well (Neundorf, 2002). Typically it is used to analyse written texts, visual materials or speeches and interview data.

Content analysis can be either deductive or inductive, depending on the research question and how the data is being analysed. Inductive content analysis is carried out when themes or categories are identified (coded) within the data through reading, and re-reading, the corpus, and identifying re-occurring key themes, words or phrases (categories). These categories are then quantified, to determine their general relative importance or role in the subject area. Deductive content analysis is driven by pre-determined expectations of categories presumed to be in the data based on theory, and these categories are identified (coded) in the data set for the purpose of theory testing. Inductive methodology is a bottom-up approach (moving from the identification of specific instances to making general observations or statements), while a deductive methodology is top-down (moving from general statements driven by theory to the identification of specific instances that support or do not support theoretical expectations) (Elo & Kyngas, 2007).

The current study uses a deductive content analysis approach, as the aim is to test whether theoretical models that appear to be most appropriate in each of the case studies predict the correct integration policy outcomes in those states (i.e. Brubaker models of membership and the political party ideology models). Specific types of policies will be categorised according to predefined criteria based on theory, as either representative of the Brubaker civic or ethno centric notion of membership or representative of social democratic or neoliberal political ideology. This categorisation will be explained and discussed during the examination and consideration of policies enacted in the two case studies during the study period (please see Chapters 3 and 4). Specifically, policies within the data will be coded into the categories 'civic (conception of membership)', 'ethno cultural' (conception of

membership), 'social democratic' (political ideology) and 'neoliberal' (political ideology), according to pre-defined policy characteristics (see Table 1). The occurrence of these categories are tabled in the results section, as either demonstrating a fit with the identified theoretical models or not (see tables 2 – 7).

There are three phases in content analysis; the preparation phase, the organising phase and the results phase (Elo & Kyngas, 2007). Initially, the preparation phase involves the identification of the research question(s)/aim of the research and identifying the corpus to utilise to achieve this aim. The corpus needs to be representative of the phenomena under investigation (GAO, 1996). The current research corpus includes an array of government issued policy documents and academic articles that outline and discuss integration policies enacted in Ireland and New Zealand during the study period (1995 – 2006). However, all possible integration policies enacted within this time period may not have been included in the corpus, due to difficulties in accessing all integration policies enacted within this period in the study states. This being said, a large corpus of data has been collected, and it is believed that data saturation has been achieved (i.e. the data is representative of the types of policy making enacted during the study period for both study states).<sup>1</sup> Examples of documents used in the research include:

Department of Labour (2005) Settlement Support New Zealand: A Guide for Implementation, DOL: Wellington.

Department of Labour (2007) A Future Together: The New Zealand Settlement Strategy, Department of Labour: Wellington.

National Economic and Social Council, Managing Migration in Ireland: A Social and Economic Analysis, A Report by the International Organization for Migration for the National Economic and Social Council of Ireland, Dublin: National Economic and Social Development Office, 2006.

New Zealand Employment Service, Immigration Fact Pack, December 1998, Issue 10.

---

<sup>1</sup> The bibliography includes documents or online references from which policies were identified, these references are identified by an asterisks

New Zealand Immigration Service (2002), *The Evaluation of Settlement Services Pilots*, Wellington: New Zealand Immigration Service.

New Zealand Immigration Service (2003), *Immigration Fact Pack*, Issue 18, (January 2003), Wellington: New Zealand Immigration Service.

New Zealand Immigration Service (NZIS), *Migrants experiences of the English Language Bond*, 1998, Wellington.

New Zealand Immigration Service (NZIS), *New Zealand's Targeted Immigration Policies: Summary of October 1995 Policy Changes*, Wellington.

An explanation of the choice of study states as a means of answering the research questions is provided in earlier sections of the thesis (please see Chapter 1). After the preparation phase was completed, the organisation phase involved creating a structured categorisation matrix based on pre-defined theoretical understandings of the data (see Table 1). The category construction was analyst driven. Limitations of this methodology included a reliance on analyst interpretation, and an absence of a cross-checker review. A cross checker review would have been ideal to ensure that reliability of coding, but was not possible within the restrictions of this research (i.e. this research was conducted solely by the author). The data was then analysed and coded to determine the presence or absence of these predefined categories (see Chapters Three and Four for a tabulation of the presence of these categories (i.e. policies representing a particular theoretical position).

**Table 1 Structured Categorisation Matrix**

	Theoretical position characteristics			
Explanatory	Brubaker Civic	Brubaker Ethno	Neoliberal	Social Democratic

Models		Cultural		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on policies promoting inclusive membership</li> <li>• Tolerates ethnic diversity</li> <li>• Broader, liberal membership approach</li> <li>• More open to naturalisation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrowly construed membership</li> <li>• Less tolerant of ethnic diversity</li> <li>• Exclusive membership- not as open to naturalisation as civic model</li> <li>• Focus on blood ties/ancestral connection to receiving state</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary economic focus</li> <li>• Individual focused- limited state intervention</li> <li>• Promotes individual responsibility</li> <li>• Distinguishes between private/public sphere of interaction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeks to promote socially inclusive society</li> <li>• Less demarcation between public and private spheres</li> <li>• Partnership focused</li> <li>• Focus on cultural and social values in society</li> <li>• Aims to promote economic and social equality</li> </ul>
Categories				
Education	Ancillary to political membership equalisation- education policies expected that further political equality with citizens.	Focus on restrictive political membership- flow on effect on education policies for migrants	User pays focus to policies  Restrictive approach with economic rationale in mind	Broad range of education focused policies expected. Policies facilitate services that are easily, and broadly accessible. Social, cultural, rather than economic focus to policies.

Citizenship	Policies expected that facilitate political membership, participation and representation. Focus on providing equal access to citizenship/long term residence.	Policies expected that restrict naturalisation and political membership. For example long periods of naturalisation, strict, blood ties to host state, language test requirements.	Economically focused naturalisation policies. Focus on policies promoting economic benefit to host state. Expected if policies supportive of more efficient naturalisation	Broader social and cultural focus on citizenship. Holistic approach to active citizenship – rather than just economic benefit focused. Policies focused on social, cultural citizenship rights.
Employment	Ancillary to political membership goals-employment policies expected that further political equality with citizens.	Focus on restrictive political membership-flow on effect on employment policies for migrants is expected.	Economically focused employment policies. Focus on policies promoting economic benefit to host state. Individually focused.	Broad range of employment focused policies expected. Policies expected that facilitate employment services/mentoring that are easily and broadly accessible. Social, cultural participatory focus, rather than an economic one.
Social Inclusion	Ancillary to political membership goals-social inclusion policies expected that	Focus on restrictive political membership-flow on effect on social inclusion	Economically focused social inclusion policies, if any. Focus on policies promoting	Broad range of social inclusion policies expected. Policies expected that enhance societal

	further political equality with citizens.	policies for migrants. Very few, if any social inclusion policies expected.	economic benefit to host state	participation- a focus on advice provision, community interaction, alleviation of discrimination.
--	---	---	--------------------------------	---

The policies within the corpus were coded according to which theoretical position they exemplified. They were then tabulated (see tables 2-7), to demonstrate the occurrence of these theoretical positions in the data (and represent model fit). Traditionally, content analysis involved quantifying data by tallying the occurrence of categories. However, in some cases of content analysis, where quantifying does not add value to the research, it is acceptable to note the occurrence of categories but not quantify them (George, 1959). In the current research quantifying the categories was not deemed appropriate, as this was not necessary for answering the research questions. The aims of the research only required demonstrating fit between the theoretical models and the integration policy outcomes; hence demonstrating occurrence of the respective categories (ideology) was required, but it was not necessary to quantify this occurrence.

The New Zealand data was primarily examined in relation to the political ideology model (see earlier sections of this chapter for a rationale of this), whilst the Ireland data was primarily examined in relation to the Brubaker models of membership (see earlier sections of this chapter for the rationale behind this). However, the entire corpus (both New Zealand and Ireland policies) was coded for the presence of all theoretical positions under analysis (i.e. civic or ethno cultural notions of membership, social democratic or neoliberal political ideology). An exploratory investigation will be carried out to determine how positions on the Brubaker model of membership interact with the political ideology models.

In tandem with the above content analysis, additional external variables (e.g. historical factors, pragmatism, policy convergence, etc.) identified in the literature review section of

the thesis will also be considered as potential salient drivers of the integration policies enacted within the study cases.

## **Chapter 3: Case Study: New Zealand**

### **Chapter overview**

This chapter seeks to examine whether the political party ideology model, appearing to be most appropriate in the New Zealand case (see Chapter 2 for a description of this model) had significant predictive capacity in anticipating integration policy outcomes in New Zealand during the period 1995-2006. An interaction between the political party ideology model and the Brubaker model, as observed in the data (i.e. policies) from the study period, will also be explored, and the impact of this interaction on integration policy formulation will be discussed. This is of interest because a close examination of the interaction of two types of ideological influence on integration policy formulation in New Zealand furthers our understanding of the factors impacting on integration policy formulation and adds to the literature on this subject in New Zealand.

During the study period (1995-2006) the New Zealand Labour Party, a centre-left party with social democratic underpinnings, was predominantly in control of the New Zealand government. Labour gained power in the 1999 election, taking over from a coalition government dominated by the centre-right, and ideologically neoliberal, National Party. This chapter will primarily seek to explore the influence of Labour's social democratic ideology on its formulation of integration policies during the study period. Labour's policies will be compared against New Zealand National's in order to get a better perspective on the leading influences of integration policy formulation. It must be acknowledged (and will be explored later in this chapter) that a certain level of policy formulation continuity between the two administrations (National and Labour) was present, as changes in policy do not get enacted overnight- rather they change in a staged fashion, depending on political priorities.

Other factors such as policy convergence and the impact of Maori nationalism are also considered in this chapter as potential explanatory variables for the integration policy enacted in New Zealand during the study period.



### **New Zealand during the study period: Research questions and methodology**

Economically, during the study period New Zealand experienced significant economic growth. The economy fluctuated from a 0.2 to 4.9 per annum percent growth over the study period (Trading Economics, 2014). It is posited that this healthy economic growth, a liberalized immigration policy and a perception of a clean, stable and safe environment led to New Zealand being perceived as an attractive immigration option during the study period. New Zealand's political scene was demarcated by socio-economic political differences, with the parties of the left and right vying for supremacy; a result of the importation and evolution of post-industrial Western democratic political divisions.

In conducting this investigation in New Zealand's case, I will consider the following questions:

- 1) To what extent does party ideology, reflected in terms of socio/economic distinctions or different models of national membership- civic versus ethno cultural, explain integration policy formulation in New Zealand?
- 2) What is the interaction between the social/economic positioning of political parties and their attitudes towards inclusion/membership in society?
- 3) How does this interaction influence the formation of integration policies in New Zealand?

In order to answer these questions I undertook a deductive content analysis approach, to test the fit/application of theoretical models appearing to be the most appropriate in each case study in anticipating correct integration policy outcomes in that case study. Categories of integration policies were pre-defined and represented in a structured categorisation matrix based on understandings of theoretical material canvassed

in the literature review chapter as either representative of the Brubaker civic or ethno cultural notion of membership or representative of left or right political ideology. The occurrence of these categories was identified in the corpus, and tabled in the results section (see tables 2 – 7). See the methodology section for a more extension discussion of the analysis approach undertaken.

In sections below the findings are discussed in light of other potential explanatory variables impacting on the integration policies enacted during the study period in New Zealand. These include the impact of Māori Nationalism, pragmatic policy continuity issues and policy convergence factors.

### **1995-1999 Integration Policies under New Zealand National**

During the beginning of the study period, in 1995, the centre right and neoliberal New Zealand National Party was in government. The winners of the 1996 New Zealand general election, New Zealand National was serving its third term in government, having established a coalition with the likewise right wing New Zealand First Party. Policy making at this time was very much informed by the neoliberal framework in place since the significant, and formative transformations of the ‘Rogernomics’ era (Skilling, 2008). The integration policies instituted by the National Party following their 1996 election win were largely in line with the earlier Immigration Policy adjustments carried out in 1995, which sought to stimulate economic growth in tandem with social cohesion. National’s strategic objectives were to “build New Zealand’s human capital, strengthen international linkages, encourage enterprise and innovations and to maintain the society’s high level of social cohesion” (NZIS, 1995 p.4, cited in Trlin and Watts 2004, p. 112).

New Zealand National sought to maintain a high level of social cohesion within New Zealand society through the attraction of a ‘higher quality’ kind of immigrant to further the economic goals ascribed to immigration (Trlin & Watts, 2004, p. 113). The 1995 changes to

the Immigrant Policy sought to deal with some of the unwanted issues arising from the changes instituted to the Immigration Policy in 1991, specifically relating to the institution of the points system and a 'targeted' immigration policy (New Zealand Immigration Service (NZIS), New Zealand's Targeted Immigration Policies: Summary of October 1995 Policy Changes, p.3.) The points system assessed factors such as immigrant education, qualifications, work experience, age, offers of skilled employment, and personal funds for settlement (McMillan, 2001 p. 164). Once an immigrant met the criteria for immigration to New Zealand, the assumption was made that their skill set and characteristics would enable them to integrate smoothly into New Zealand society, and would remove the need for any post migration settlement assistance (Trlin & Watts, 2004 p. 112. See also Lockhart 2002:94-95).

Immigrant integration was assumed by the National government to occur as a matter of course, the role of the government restricted to the attraction of the 'right' kind of immigrant, namely one who is able to integrate into New Zealand society in an organic, largely unassisted manner. The points selection system was used as a screening mechanism thought to eliminate the need for a comprehensive integration policy (Trlin & Watts, 2004 p. 112). Motivated by economic rationalism, and based on a desire to secure more human capital, investment funds and information links seen as necessary for New Zealand's economic growth, the National Government instituted "'promotional entry rules', under which the government and its agents.... [sought].... to actively attract desirable and valuable migrants, or human capital" (Skilling, 2008 p. 220. See also Trlin, 1997, pp.1,2).

Whilst still guided by the desire to attract a high number of skilled migrants to New Zealand, in 1995 the National government enacted policies that included changes to the quota management system, which allowed for greater control over the numbers (and kinds) of migrants granted residency approval (Trlin & Watts 2004, p.112). In addition, settlement factors, previously afforded five out of 13 points assessed under the points selection system, were now modified for the award of seven out of nine points considered for: a) settlement funds for housing etc; b) partner's qualifications; c) New Zealand work and business experience; and d) close family sponsorship (NZIS, 1995;14 cited in Trlin & Watts 2004, p. 113).

A significant issue encountered by professionals entering New Zealand on the points selection system was the inability to gain work due to the non-recognition of their qualifications, gained outside of New Zealand (Trlin & Watts, 2004). The 1995 changes attempted to deal with this by putting in place a policy requiring specialists to get registration from the responsible statutory authority governing standards in their field prior to coming to New Zealand. The statutory professional registration measure tackled the well publicised difficulties encountered by professionals arriving in New Zealand, who were unable to work in their field (Trlin & Watts, 2004 p. 113).

Additional measures instituted by National in the mid 1990s included a heavier emphasis on English language proficiency (Trlin & Watts, 2004). In line with the neoliberal focus on mitigating costs associated with migration, an English 'language bond' was introduced in October 1995, alongside the use of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) for assessing English language ability. Under the policy, applicants seeking entry under both the General Skills and Business Investor Categories were obliged to either "provide evidence of having an English language background or pass level 5 of the IELTS test (level 4 for Business Investor migrants)" (NZIS, 1998, p.5). Non principal applicants who were unable to attain the requisite level of language proficiency could instead pay a \$20,000 bond (NZIS, 1998, p.5). This bond was refundable in full if the prescribed level of English was attained in 3 months and was 70% refundable if the level was achieved in 12 months (NZIS, 1998, p.5).

Structured in accordance with a neoliberal underpinning, the English bond was a solution designed to address financial costs arising from immigration (Trlin & Watts, 2004). It was intended to pay for the unanticipated costs arising from language related employment difficulties faced by new migrants, and the additional financial pressure placed on schools due to the need for increased ESOL funding (Trlin & Watts, 2004 p. 114). McMillan argues that because the English bond was not a classic 'user pays' measure (payment was provided, but no specific service was provided as a result) it is better categorised as a 'punitive measure', intended to penalise the migrants who failed to achieve

the requisite levels of language ability in the prescribed timeframes (McMillan, 2001, p. 182).

In addition, National introduced a policy in 1995 requiring economic migrants to pay a Settlement Service fee of \$200 per person, up to \$800 per family. Once again stemming from a neoliberal underpinning of 'user pays', the settlement service fee was utilised to fund brochures for new migrants containing New Zealand information perceived helpful (McMillan, 2001, p. 184). In addition, the settlement service fee funded the Ministry of Education's costs in ESOL tuition within the compulsory school sector, and a portion of the fee went to funding migration research (McMillan 2001, p. 184).

The use of the Language Bond was subsequently abandoned in 1998 and replaced with a pre-purchase scheme for English language tuition, completed as a part of the application process based on performance in language tests (New Zealand Employment Service, *Immigration Fact Pack*, December 1998, Issue 10, p.2 cited in McMillan, 2001 p.192). This policy, focusing on English language proficiency, was funded by the migrants themselves and the cost of which was dependant on individual performance in testing. The adoption of the pre-purchase language scheme was accompanied by additional settlement policies (enacted in October 1998) focusing on achieving a closer alignment of immigrant qualifications with qualifications recognised by New Zealand's National Qualifications Framework (Trlin & Watts 2004, p. 114).

In considering the above changes, both enacted in 1998, it is argued that there is a linear neoliberal continuity between the pre-purchase scheme and the language bond. Both were immigrant funded and both sought to encourage individual responsibility for language proficiency. Both of these characteristics are consistent with the neoliberal doctrine promoting individual responsibility.

Trlin and Watts put forward a similar argument, in that the 1995 changes to integration policy demonstrated a "continuing commitment to the neoliberal economic philosophy that informed the previous policy" (Trlin & Watts, 2004 p. 115). As argued earlier, National's approach in enacting the 1995 changes to integration policy relied on the feasibility of a filtered selection process muting the need for a comprehensive integration policy. Trlin and Watts argue that the 1995 changes were not accompanied by required

measures addressing the “underlying causes of settlement difficulties”, for example prejudice encountered by new migrants, or negative public attitudes (Trlin & Watts, 2004, p. 115). In that sense, National’s measures were incomplete, being solely focused on the economic rationales and mechanisms of migration and settlement, but lacking mechanisms to deal with the social and cultural outcomes of incoming migration.

### **Tabulating the fit: policies under NZ National**

The above discussion offers examples of the integration policies implemented by the National led government in the period 1995-1999. In summary, the policies enacted were economically driven and structured along a user-pays methodology. As noted earlier, in the content analysis carried out, the integration policies enacted were coded for the categories of theoretical position (civic, ethno cultural, neoliberal and social democratic), as outlined in the methodology section of this thesis. This coding establishes whether these categories were represented in the policy corpus. The above sections provide a consideration of the policies enacted and give the rationale for the coding. Table 2 below presents the occurrence of the theoretical positions (these positions were found to ‘fit’ when the categories were identified within the policies), and Table 3 presents the co-occurrence of the ideological positions within the corpus.

**Table 2: Mapping the fit of the integration policies enacted by NZ National 1995-1999 to the theoretical models considered**

	Theoretical position			
	Civic	Ethno cultural	Neoliberal	Social Democratic
<b>Integration Category</b>				
Education	Not present	Not present	Fit	Not present
Citizenship	Some fit	Not present	Fit	Not present

Employment	Some fit	Not present	Fit	Not present
Social Inclusion	Not present	Not present	Fit	Not present

**Table 3: Table noting co-occurrence of theoretical positions reflected in integration policies enacted by NZ National in the period 1995-1999**

	Social Democratic	Neoliberal	Civic	Ethno-cultural
Social democratic	NA	No co-occurrence	No co-occurrence	No co-occurrence
Neoliberal	No co-occurrence	NA	Co occurrence noted	No co-occurrence
Civic	No co-occurrence	Co occurrence noted	NA	No co-occurrence
Ethno-cultural	No co-occurrence	No co-occurrence	No co-occurrence	NA

### Summary of tabulated results

The above tabulated results indicate that National's integration policies, enacted in the period 1995-1999 were motivated by a neoliberal ideological model. National's acceptance of economically beneficial migrants and the concordant tacit acceptance of a multicultural social fabric potentially indicates support for a Brubaker civic notion of membership, in tandem with a neoliberal ideological position. This is consistent with the assumption made earlier in the thesis, namely that the political ideology model would be more appropriate in New Zealand's case, and would be more useful in anticipating correct integration policy outcomes.

### **The influence of Māori nationalism on National's integration policies**

Impacting on and interacting with the neoliberally motivated policies of the National Party in the 1990s was a surge in Māori nationalism. Alarmed by high migrant flows from a diverse range of source countries, some Māori felt that their treaty of Waitangi afforded equal status as partner to the Pakeha was being diminished. Dr Ranginui Walker, Head of Māori Studies Department at Auckland University and an advocate of this view, held that the crown had made unilateral changes to the immigration policy, without the requisite consultation with Māori as required by the treaty of Waitangi (Walker, 'Immigration and the Political Economy of New Zealand', p.301. See also McMillan 2001, p. 190 and Skilling 2008). Dr Walker also argued that increased numbers of immigrants would harm Māori status in New Zealand's constitutional agreements, thereby hurting the premise of New Zealand as a bilateral partnership (Skilling, 2008, p.221. See also McMillan, 2001, p. 190).

Skilling argues that the culmination of "two sources of disquiet", specifically the worry that liberal immigration policies damaged social cohesion and national identity in tandem with the concern for the status and rights of the Māori, created a political movement combining the "traditionally liberal concern for indigenous rights" with a "conservative or anti liberal resistance to immigration" (Skilling, 2008, p.221). This movement culminated in the rise of the vocally anti-immigration New Zealand First party, which formed a coalition government with the New Zealand National party in the 1996 election. New Zealand First won 14.4 percent of the nationwide vote in the 1996 election, including a high proportion of Māori support (Electoral Commission, The New Zealand Electoral Compendium, 1997 cited in McMillan 2001, p. 191).

New Zealand First's well publicised anti-immigration attitudes (see McMillan, 2001), ostensibly the basis of founder and leader's Winston Peters election platform, would have arguably impacted and influenced the neoliberal and restrictive integration policies enacted



in the period 1996-1999 by the National Party. The desire to maintain a bicultural formulation of New Zealand identity at this stage could have impeded any expansion in the philosophy driving integration policies under NZ National.

### **National's integration policies in light of the neoliberal ideological theoretical model**

The National integration policies discussed in the above sections are consistent with the neoliberal theory advocating minimalism of resource provision within what is regarded as the private sphere of influence.

The reader will remember that this approach considers the role of the state to be limited to the protection of the freedoms of its citizens, and that this is best achieved through the facilitation and expedience of free market exchange between individuals. As outlined by Isin & Turner, a liberal point of view contends that the "role of the state is utilitarian, namely to maximize the happiness of the majority, but this 'happiness' is most effectively and efficiently measured by their individual wealth" (Isin & Turner 2002, p. 7). It follows therefore that an interest in culture is outside the proper auspices of state interests (Isin & Turner, 2002). The National government's integration policies were in line with this approach.

As discussed in the theory section, policies expected under the neo-liberal model would likely allocate the responsibility for integration to individual migrants rather than the state, due to neoliberal emphasis on individual responsibility. Under the New Zealand National government a 'gate keeper' selection process was utilised, meant to ensure that high quality migrants not requiring extensive settlement assistance were attracted to New Zealand's shores (Trlin & Watts 2004, p. 112).

The policies that were enacted by National during the period 1995-1999 had a heavy 'user pays' underpinning. This is because immigration (and relatedly integration) was perceived through an economic lens; it was a measure of attaining economic prosperity for New Zealand. Any concordant costs associated with migration had to be covered by the migrants themselves. National's integration policies ensured that any (un)anticipated costs

(e.g. ESOL funding) were covered by immigrants themselves through compulsory payments (e.g. a migrant levy fee), or payments that were mandatory under certain circumstances (e.g. when a migrant had low language proficiency). National's restrictive approach towards integration policies is exemplified by the continued focus on policies facilitating language skills, including the English Bond and the subsequent replacement policy of the pre-purchase scheme for language tuition. The focus on language skills could be interpreted as an ethno cultural motivated strategy of exclusion, but in National's case the nature of the policy (i.e. a user pays focus) indicated the underlying neoliberal focus of the policy.

During the period 1995-1999, policies focusing on the social inclusion integration category were not in evidence, as noted by Trlin & Watts (2004 p. 113). As postulated earlier, the individual focus of the neoliberal ideology was likely instrumental to this. However, the role of Māori nationalism should also be factored in when considering the shape and form of National's integration policies during the years 1995- 1999, and muting effect it might have played in the formulation of any integration policies seen as promoting multiculturalism, in the face of New Zealand's extant bi cultural identity.

### **A change in approach to integration policy**

National's restricted stance on integration policy was gradually eroded by the realities of poor settlement outcomes for unassisted migrants, and in 1998 the National led coalition government decided that treating migration as a purely economic policy, without the support of a structured and coordinated resettlement policy, was not leading to optimum integration outcomes (McMillan 2001, p.193 ). Motivations of "efficiency and cost effectiveness" led to the belief that government support could be provided for integration, in such a way as to benefit the state without the concordant social costs that increased diversity might bring (McMillan, 2001, p. 193).

A more coherent and structured approach to integration policy in New Zealand could be traced to 1998, when the New Zealand Immigration Service(NZIS) expressed a desire for a more cohesive and stronger settlement programme and services.

The NZIS argued:

An effective settlement process can enable New Zealand to more effectively recoup the benefits associated with immigration. Positive settlement experiences and outcomes are also of benefit for the migrant and the community. Successful settlement also has an impact on the extent to which a migrant may require services from Government agencies such as those in the employment, welfare, education and health sectors (Research Proposal for a Longitudinal Survey of Migrants to New Zealand, 1999 cited in McMillan 2001, p. 193).

This view was supported by academic research at the time, also sponsored by the New Zealand Immigration service. This research included Forsythe Research (1998a, 1998b) and Winkelmann and Winkelmann (1998, Fletcher (1999 Ho et al. (2000), as cited in McMillan 2001). A more structured, and coherent approach informed by academic research would therefore be inherited by the fifth Labour government, which came into power after winning the 1999 general election.

### **Integration Policies under the fifth Labour Government 1999-2006**

Before entering into an examination of the specific Labour integration policies enacted during the remainder of the study period (1999-2006), the political contextual framework in place in New Zealand during this time period needs to be briefly outlined. The fifth Labour government was enacting its integration policies during a time when increased diversity was a “brute fact” of New Zealand’s ethnic landscape (Skilling 2008, p. 224). This multicultural reality was a radical departure from a previously entrenched homogenous ‘white’ immigrant policy heavily reliant on national origin as a relevant selection factor (Bedford, 2004).

Skilling argues the fifth Labour government repackaged this multi ethnic reality into a version of national unity “centred around new nodes of exemplarity” (Skilling 2008, p. 229). According to Skilling, the fifth Labour’s emphasis on a wider pool of talent, sourced from a wider pool of source countries meant that skilful migrants “became new New Zealanders”(Skilling 2008, p. 229). According to this approach, diversity became an integral part of the New Zealand identity (Skilling, 2008 p. 228).

The acceptance of an enriched New Zealand ‘social fabric’ composed of a number of ethnicities has been argued by some commentators to be an example of ‘crude economic reductionism’, where the new emphasis on diversity was simply a means to enhance New Zealand’s economic competitiveness (Johnson 2000, pp.31-32 cited in Skilling, 2008, p 219). It is argued that this description is overly simplistic. In tandem with economic and pragmatic factors, underlying the fifth Labour government’s approach to immigration and integration policy was also an ideologically motivated drive to make a change from the exclusively neoliberally driven laissez faire approach to integration policy, towards a more socially-inclusive position representative of the fifth Labour government’s social democratic underpinnings. As will be seen in subsequent sections, evidence for this proposition can be found in the kinds of integration policies that were enacted by the fifth Labour government. The socially inclusive, comprehensive and partnership focused approach is consistent with a social democratic ideological underpinning, as outlined in the theory chapter. A number of policies enacted during the period 1999-2006 varied substantially from those of the earlier National administration, both in their underlying drivers and the scope that they adopted in facilitating active integration. The next sections explore the integration policies enacted by the fifth Labour government in the period 1999-2006.

### **Labour Party Integration Policies 1999-2006**

The claim that 1999, coinciding with the election of the fifth Labour government, marked a watershed for New Zealand integration policy is something that is touted by a number of commentators. For instance, Bedford (2004) argues that the beginning of a

“revolution in integration policy” occurred under the 1999 Labour government (Bedford 2004, p.58). According to him, the focus moved away “from a concentration on targets for residence approvals to a skill mix in immigrant flow”, and more importantly for the topic under consideration, “settlement mechanisms for migrants” (Bedford, 2004, p 58). Leanne Dalziel’s terms as Minister of Immigration, spanning from 1999-2004, saw her oversee more than 33 changes in immigration policy, including a number of reviews of the points selection system (Bedford 2004, p.58). Dalziel’s focus also included a heavy emphasis on improved settlement outcomes (i.e. better immigrant integration) (Bedford 2004, p. 58). This is exemplified by the fact that in 2003 Dalziel stated:

The only true measure of success of any skilled immigration policy is the successful settlement of the migrant, who is able to ‘hit the ground running’ and make a successful contribution to social and economic well being (Dalziel, 2003).

While a much broader approach was adopted by the Labour-Alliance coalition government elected in 1999, initial policies enacted by the new administration followed the familiar, well trodden neoliberal framework. In March 2000 prospective migrants who met all of the General Skills Category (GSC) requirements, but did not have an offer of employment, were granted entry on a provisional six month Job Search Visa to seek employment and begin work, assuming that their residence applications were approved (NZIS, 2003:3 cited in Trlin & Watts 2004, p. 124).

So called Work-to-Residence policies were enacted in 2002, providing that immigrants qualified for residence after two years time, subject to an ongoing offer of employment (NZIS, 2003:3 cited in Trlin & Watts 2004, p. 124). The initial approach of the Labour/Alliance coalition therefore followed the same ‘gate keeper’ methodology adopted by the previous National administration. Trlin and Watts argue that the Work-to-Residence policies were indicative of the “neoliberal economic philosophy” that was still evidenced. (Trlin &Watts, 2004 p. 125).

However, in tandem with the gate keeper philosophy still in play at the turn of the millennium, the Labour led administration was putting in place a range of initiatives directly intended to facilitate a co-ordinated and effective integration/settlement strategy. For example, seven initial national settlement pilot programmes for new migrants were carried out in 2001 and included provisions of services relating to counselling, immigrant orientation, English language skills, employment seminars, the training of employment mentors and business set up skills (NZIS 2002, p.6). Nineteen separate projects were run in a variety of locations across the country including Auckland, Hamilton, Palmerston North, Wellington and Christchurch. A central purpose of the piloting programmes was to inform the nature of future settlement services (NZIS, 2002, p.6). With these support level programmes, the fifth Labour government was casting a much 'wider net' in its efforts to facilitate effective integration outcomes, and engaging a much broader range of organisations in the private sector to affect settlement outcomes.

In turn, this led to the implementation of several initiatives with the purpose of better readying new migrants, and providing them with more concrete connections to local communities (Bedford 2004, p. 58). These initiatives marked a clear difference in approach from the previous National instigated policies, and follow a much more structured, research informed methodology than the laissez faire approach adopted earlier. Pragmatism, and a community based approach is also much more apparent in these strategies.

In the implementation of these policies, Bedford (2004) argues that Lianne Dalziel's most crucial role as Minister of Immigration was to establish an "outcome-focused policy, as distinct from a policy that was driven by a requirement to achieve a particular number of residence approvals", a strategy formally adopted before the outcome based approach (Bedford 2004, p.52). This outcome based approach can be reconciled with the pragmatic focus of third way politics (please see later sections for a discussion of 3<sup>rd</sup> way politics); in addition to being informed by substantive ongoing research on settlement outcomes.

According to Bedford, evidence of the Labour supported outcome-focus to policy (strongly supported at the time by the NZIS) is found in a series of major policy 'drives'

occurring between 1999 and 2004 (Bedford 2004). The first was an increase in government support for initiatives “by industry, local authorities and voluntary agencies to assist migrants to settle successfully in New Zealand” (Bedford 2004, p.52). As argued earlier, the willingness of the state to work alongside community organisations is consistent with a social democratic ideology. The second was a change in the visa/permit categories related to short term labour demands in New Zealand (Bedford 2004, p. 52). This ‘drive’ is more consistent with the pragmatic underpinnings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> way ideology. The third was a push towards a tailored “service approach to business within the NZIS - an approach that underpinned the major changes in the way immigrants were selected under the points system from December 2003” (Bedford 2004, p. 53). This is indicative of the pragmatic, flexible methodology adopted by 3<sup>rd</sup> way practitioners, but also the underlying focus on the economic outcomes of immigrant integration.

While some initial problems in the implementation of these settlement programmes were noted, government documentation states that the piloting process was demonstrated as an “effective way of establishing partnerships to provide a more coherent approach to service provision for new migrants” (NZIS 2002 p. 55). A holistic, community involved approach was a key hallmark of this new policy approach. Partnering directly with the immigrant community in the creation of these projects meant that there was an increased ability to make use of important volunteer time and pre-established networks that were not available to government agencies, much like the Home Tutor scheme was utilised in the mid 1990’s (NZIS 2002, p. 55). This community based partnership approach is also strongly in line with a social democratic ideological model, as canvassed in the theory chapter. It is argued that underpinning the social democratic approach was Labour’s view that immigrants were seen as the agents of the ‘ethnic and cultural diversity [that] enriches New Zealand society’ (Labour Party, ‘Ethnic Affairs Policy 2002’, cited in Skilling, 2008 p. 234).

Specific Labour government goals in the immigration field were also important in the evolution of the integration policies during this time. According to Bedford (2004) “the Government’s commitment to stimulating entrepreneurship and employment in the

“knowledge” industries (biotechnology, information and communications technology, creative industries) lent support to the concern for good migrant settlement outcomes” (Bedford 2004, p.54). In addition to enriching the fabric of New Zealand society, immigration was seen by NZ Labour as a key driver of economic growth, and it was logical that the integration policies sought to advance this aim. This linked in with the idea that “immigration of highly skilled labour was seen to be essential to delivering on the growth and innovation framework” (Bedford 2004, p. 54). Bedford argues that “these developments had a significant impact on the nature of the flows of both settlers and temporary migrants into New Zealand”, (Bedford 2004, p. 54) and led to the development of New Zealand Settlement Strategy (NZSS), initiated in 2003.

The NZSS was described in government reports as “an integrated framework that focuses on proactively supporting newcomers to New Zealand through the challenges of settlement so they can take up opportunities and make a positive economic and social contribution to New Zealand” (NZIS 2002, p. 55). Immigrant contribution is therefore nuanced as both economic and social.

The vision for the settlement strategy was expressed as:

New Zealand’s prosperity is underpinned by an inclusive society, in which the local and national integration of newcomers is supported by responsive services, a welcoming environment and a shared respect for diversity (Department of Labour 2007, p.9)

Diversity and inclusivity are highlighted as the outcomes for the strategy. However, an economic focus remains, as evidenced by one of the strategy’s high level goals, linking New Zealand’s economic transformation with the contribution of migrants:

New Zealand’s economic transformation is supported by the contributions of migrants and refugees and their ability to realise their personal aspirations by: accessing appropriate education and employment; utilising their skills, knowledge and qualifications; stimulating innovation and creativity in business; and



strengthening relationships between international and domestic markets  
(Department of Labour, 2007, p.9).

In terms of actual implementation, the intermediate level goals of the settlement strategy were listed as enabling migrants to:

**Figure 1- New Zealand Settlement Strategy Intermediate Goals**

1. Obtain employment appropriate to their qualifications and skills
2. Become confident using English in a New Zealand setting or be able to access appropriate language support
3. Access appropriate information and responsive services that are available to the wider community (for example housing, education and services for families)
4. Form supportive social networks and establish a sustainable community identity.
5. Feel safe expressing their ethnic identity and be accepted by and become part of the wider host community
6. Participate in civic, community and social activities (Department of Labour 2005,p.9)

In light of the adoption of the strategy in 2003 the Government financed a settlement package to advance some of the goals laid out in the strategy (Department of Labour 2005, p. 9). Specific actions in this included language based policies, such as increased funding for ESOL in the compulsory school sector; the establishment of a national network of Migrant Resource Services and the provision of adult ESOL. In addition, emphasis was placed on better qualification integration, with an assessment of refugee qualifications being provided by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. In tandem, general careers and job information, guidance and advice was provided to immigrants. Lastly, a national settlement structure was established and launched in 2003. This provided resources for a centralised secretariat to support a national settlement structure under the New Zealand Settlement Strategy (Department of Labour 2005 p. 9).

The community based partnership approach was evident in the further development and refinement of the strategy occurring in 2004 and 2005. The Labour government

undertook a process of consultation with migrant communities, leading to an action plan for settlement being created (Department of Labour, 2007, p. 17). Ongoing community input, and the importance of continued engaged with migrant communities was emphasised (Department of Labour, 2007, p. 17). This is in stark contrast to the laissez-faire approach evident in the National administration's policies. A refinement of the strategy occurred in 2005, when the of Department of Labour embarked on a further series of consultations seeking feedback from new migrants as well as pre-existing migrant and refugee communities and this feedback was incorporated into the existing strategy, further developing and consolidating it (Department of Labour, 2007, p. 17).

As a consequence of further research carried in 2006, and augmented by a further series of inter-agency consultations a Settlement National Action Plan was formulated as the basis for ongoing activity (Department of Labour, 2007, p.18). The Action Plan was published in several parts, and it espouses what the government planned to do on a national level to implement the Strategy. The plan "allocates responsibilities and provides timeframes for action" (Department of Labour, 2007, p.18). Within the report, it is stated that "Implementing the Action Plan will be an ongoing programme of work over several years. The emphasis is on achieving tangible and measurable results that respond to identified settlement challenges" (Department of Labour, 2007, p.18). The focus of the settlement strategy remained on the provision of services and assistance in a wide range of integration areas, as set out in the initial intermediate level goals. These included settlement strategies in the education, employment, and societal participation fields (Department of Labour, 2007, p.18). The strategy was to be funded partially from crown funds, and partially from a migrant levy. This is reminiscent of the neoliberal, user pays strategy utilised by the previous National administration.

#### **A tabulation of fit: Integration policies under the fifth Labour government 1999-2006**

The above discussion offers examples of the integration policies implemented by the Labour government in the study period. In summary, there were both socially inclusive, broad ranging policies representative of a social democratic position, and policies which

were economically driven and user-pays funded (i.e. neoliberally motivated). Thus, Labour policies demonstrate a '3<sup>rd</sup> way' political position representing a reformulation of the traditional left/right divide.

In the content analysis undertaken, the policies were coded for the categories of theoretical position (civic, ethno cultural, neoliberal and social democratic), as outlined in the methodology section of this thesis. This coding establishes whether these categories were represented in the policy corpus. The above sections provide a consideration of the policies enacted and give the rationale for the coding. Table 4 below presents the occurrence of the theoretical positions (these positions were found to 'fit' when the categories were identified within the policies), and Table 5 presents the co-occurrence of these positions within the policy documents.

**Table 4: Mapping the fit of the integration policies enacted by the fifth Labour government 1999-2006 to the theoretical models considered**

	Theoretical position			
	Civic	Ethno cultural	Neoliberal	Social Democratic
<b>Integration Category</b>				
Education	Fit	Not evident	Fit	Fit
Citizenship	Fit	Not evident	Fit	Fit
Employment	Fit	Not evident	Fit	Fit
Social Inclusion	Fit	Not evident	Fit	Fit

**Table 5: Table of co-occurrence of positions between and within the different ideological models reflected in policies enacted by NZ Labour in the period 1999-2006**

<b>Ideological Model</b>	<b>Whether co occurrence was noted</b>	
	<i>Co occurrence with:</i>	<i>No co occurrence with:</i>
<i>Social democratic</i>	Neoliberal Civic	Ethno cultural
<i>Neoliberal</i>	Social democratic Civic	Ethno cultural
<i>Civic</i>	Social democratic Neo liberal	Ethno cultural
<i>Ethno cultural</i>	None	Social democratic Neoliberal Civic

### **Summary of Tabulated Results:**

The tabulated results indicate firstly, that Labour's integration policies during the period 1999-2006 were motivated by both a neoliberal ideological model as well as a social democratic one. The policies enacted by Labour can be potentially explained through both ideological models.

Secondly, co-occurrence was noted between the ideological models, where both the social democratic and neoliberal positions co-occurred with Brubaker's civic conception of membership.

Due to the fact that Labour's integration strategies could be explained by both the neoliberal and social democratic models, a hybrid ideological model best explains the policy formation under the Labour government, 1999 – 2006. With regard to the co occurrence between the various theoretical models, it would seem that, at least within this case study period, left/right positioning can co-occur with civic conceptions of membership.



## Discussion

### **A Hybrid Social Democratic/Neoliberal ideological Explanation**

As illustrated by the tabulated data above, the NZ Labour data is best represented by a hybrid social democratic and neoliberal position. It appears that policy continuation factors necessitated that Labour's earlier integration policies had a neoliberal emphasis, due to the continuity effects of National implemented policies. In later years Labour was able to place more focus on policies motivated by a social democratic ideological position (backed up with research taken from service users) and implement this effectively, with less backlash from community and tax payers since their process had validity based on data collected following National's more economically driven and less reflective approach.

In addition, it is argued that underpinning the fifth Labour government approach to integration policy formulation was a continued, community partnership based approach. This is consistent with a social democratic ideological underpinning. A large portion of the integration policies enacted during the period 1999-2006 were also consistent with the social democratic ideological model outlined in the theory section. The reader will recall that the social democratic ideology seeks to promote an inclusive society. This is a holistic phenomenon, and integration policies under this model are therefore expected to be comprehensive and varied. Accordingly, a government influenced by this model would be expected to issues policies under the broad spectrum of the different areas of integration, including policies facilitating employment provision, education, social inclusion and citizenship. In instituting such policies, comprehensive state assistance would be expected. The policies enacted during the study period promoted access to employment, active citizenship, education and social inclusion. The mode of implementation was conducted through an inclusive partnership based approach- which sought to actively include the migrant communities in the development of the settlement strategy. This is indicative of the focus on social inclusion, which guided the fifth Labour government's approach to integration policies. In tandem with a social democratic underpinning, it is possible to argue

that Labour was motivated by a civic model of membership, which is likewise inclusive and open to immigrant naturalisation.

The reader will also recall the neoliberal underpinning to the Fifth Labour government's earlier settlement policies, enacted between 2000-2002 (e.g. the Work-to-Residence scheme). In addition, the Settlement Strategy was partially funded from an imposed migrant levy- harking back to the National government's neoliberal 'user pays' policies. It is suggested that the neoliberal underpinning of some of Labour's integration policies may be conflated to an extent with a social democratic approach, through the adoption of 3<sup>rd</sup> way political practices. The 3<sup>rd</sup> way approach will be explored in greater detail in the following sections.

### **3<sup>rd</sup> way Politics: The evolution of Labour Ideology**

The findings presented above (see Tables 4 and 5) suggest that the integration policies enacted under the fifth Labour government were influenced by both a social democratic and neoliberal ideology, and potentially a civic conception of membership. Considering the prevalence of the neoliberal strain of thought influencing policy making in New Zealand during the study period, the social democratic ideology would need to be reconciled with the dominant neoliberal approach. I argue that this was made possible through the adoption of the principles of 3<sup>rd</sup> way politics.

In marking a distinctive break from the fourth Labour government policies, the fifth Labour Government's policies under the leadership of Helen Clark were structured according to the rubric of '3<sup>rd</sup> Way' discourse, described by Stuart Hall as a "'politics without adversaries' within which all New Zealanders were called on to pull together and work for a putatively shared national purpose" (Skilling, 2010, p.39). This '3<sup>rd</sup> way approach' would suggest that pragmatic factors impacting on policy formulation were of greater importance than strict social democratic values.

In discussing the 3<sup>rd</sup> way approach, Skilling argues a level of hostility to what is considered the “‘dogmatism’ of both the ‘old’ Left and the ‘new’ Right” (Skilling, 2010, p.49). Pragmatism is placed before ideology. Skilling quotes leading Third Way theorist, Anthony Giddens, in espousing that the ‘Third Way’ can be thought of as “a ‘renewal’ of social democracy, or as the ‘restructuring [of] social democratic doctrines’ in response to a changing context marked by globalisation, the knowledge economy and rising individualism” (Skilling, 2010, p.50).

Skilling further notes that the Clark Government ministers did not make it clear whether they were part of the Third Way or not, but repeatedly emphasized that they were part of a “modernisation or renewal of social democratic practice” (Skilling, 2010, p.50). Consequently, the Third Way label remains a useful analytical device for shedding light on the novelty of the fifth Labour Government’s approach, and in relation to the nuanced approach taken towards integration policy. Whilst guided by a general desire to stay true to social democratic values which favour an inclusive society, and state sponsored integration assistance, these values were necessarily tempered by pragmatism. Skilling notes that Labour sought to “legitimate its deviations from traditional social democratic values through the argument that its policies offered the most ‘pragmatic’ response to the immutable external forces of economic globalisation” (Skilling, 2010, p. 50). Accordingly, the guiding ideological drivers, while still present as drivers of policy, and reflected in party rhetoric, now took on a more pragmatic tilt. This does not mean that the influence of ideology waned through this period; but that the underlying ideology underwent development and modification, driven by external economic factors.



## **Alternative explanations for the fifth Labour government's integration policy formulation**

In the preceding section, the fifth Labour Party's integration policies were explained through an ideological prism- an application of a modified social democratic ideological framework. The ideological explanation aside however, there are additional potential explanations, initially identified in the literature section, for the Labour party's integration policies. These will now be explored and compared with the ideological explanation covered in the previous section. Alternative explanations to be covered include pragmatic factors and policy convergence.

### **Pragmatism**

The role of pragmatism is not easily discounted in the integration policy formulation field. The Labour party's integration policies in the late 1990s and the early 2000s developed from very concrete, academically driven research. Outcome based policies, designed to facilitate more effective integration outcomes became the norm. Policies were formulated based on perceived market efficiency, which is a neoliberal device and is counter Labour's social democratic ideological drivers.

In addition, Labour had the advantage of building on a neoliberal integration model that was clearly not fulfilling its purpose in terms of facilitating adequate immigrant integration outcomes. In other words, Labour was able to learn from National's mistakes in creating a more effective, circumstance driven integration model, driven by sound research and a desire for continuous improvement.

However, it is argued that even this pragmatic approach can be linked back to ideological drivers; namely the 3<sup>rd</sup> way policies of the fifth Labour government. As mentioned before, the 3<sup>rd</sup> way approach "despises the dogmatism' of both the 'old' Left and the 'new' Right" (Skilling 2010, p.49). On a constitutional basis, pragmatism is placed before ideology so that the pragmatic drivers become entrenched within ideological foundations.

This approach is driven by a rapidly changing context marked by “globalisation, the knowledge economy and rising individualism” (Skilling 2010, p.50). The ideology therefore adapts, so that it may continue to exist, and influence, in an altered context. Labour’s strategy of being outcomes-driven, based on research, exemplifies this pragmatic, ‘knowledge economy’, and moves away from biased, exclusively ideologically driven, interpretations of policy needs.

### **Convergence with other western democratic integration models**

As an explanatory variable in integration policy formulation across Western democracies, convergence is cited in literature as a significant potential factor (see Fanning, 2009). Accordingly, an assessment should be made whether convergence factors, as identified by commentators studying other case study states, can be applied in the New Zealand case.

Convergence has been defined as:

... any increase in the similarity between one or more characteristics of a certain policy (e.g. policy objectives, policy instruments, policy settings) across a given set of political jurisdictions (supranational institutions, states, regions, local authorities) over a given period of time. Policy convergence thus describes the end result of a process of policy change over time towards some common point, regardless of the causal processes (Knill, 2005, p. 5 cited in Geddes, 2005).

The popularity of this concept in integration literature can be traced to the work of Christian Joppke, who in 2007 made a comparison of Germany, France, and the Netherlands positing that increasing convergence in the integration policy of the aforementioned states is occurring (Fanning, 2009, p. 33). Within Europe, a 30 year period of rejecting new labour based immigration saw a fundamental shift in the mid 2000’s when labour immigration was seen to present a “permanent, even desirable feature of European societies”(Fanning, 2009,

p. 33). The perceived utility arose out of the marked demographic decline in Europe, in addition to the desire to protect European competitiveness (Fanning 2009, p.33). Joppke claims that the convergence in European integration policy stems from “influential cosmopolitan elite consensus”, in addition to economic necessity (Fanning 2009, p. 33).

In discussing Joppke’s work, Fanning argues that the ‘Europeanisation of civic integration policy’ is facilitated via cultural standardisation in tandem with legal mandate (Fanning, 2009 p. 33). Fanning defines culture in accordance with the “bloodless language of policy-speak (‘the soft force of best-practice emulation’) in contrast with European histories of blood and soil nationalist identity politics (Joppke, 2007, p. 247, cited in Fanning 2009, p.33). This cultural standardisation is partially effected through the trivialisation of national difference in integration policy. Nation building identity politics are subsumed, and are suggested to be in decline in the face of “top down European harmonization”(Fanning, 2009, p. 33).

### **Convergence in Europe: mechanisms of integration policy convergence**

Mechanically, the European harmonisation is institutional, and is implemented along three vectors (Fanning, 2009, p. 33). Firstly, the 2000 EU Race Directive makes it a requirement that member states protect “against direct and indirect discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin” through legislative means (Fanning 2009, p. 33). Areas covered include “education, employment, social protection, health care and access to vital goods and services such as housing and private insurance” (Fanning 2009, p. 33). A second example of harmonisation in the EU is the 2003 directive extending free-movement rights of EU citizens to non-EU residents (Fanning 2009, p. 33). The third (and according to Fanning the most important) approach to a harmonised EU integration strategy (and one that will canvassed against the New Zealand situation) is the 2003 Council of the European Union agreed non-binding Common Basic Principles For Immigrant Integration in the European Union (Fanning 2009, p. 33).

The Common Basic Principles outline a ‘two way process’, where an emphasis on civic integration ensures that the individual is responsible for their own integration, with a parallel focus on ‘antidiscrimination’ (“the liberalism of equal rights”), achieved through legal means (Fanning 2009, p. 33).

From a practical sense, in the European sense integration is defined in terms of rights and responsibilities (Fanning 2009 p. 33). Integral to the definition is a two way and reciprocal process requirement of accommodation by both immigrants and residents of Member States (Fanning 2009, p. 33). The concept of social inclusion is central to the definition.

### **European similarities and differences with the New Zealand policies during the fifth Labour government’s term in government**

On balance, convergence cannot be said to be an explanatory variable for integration policy formulation in the New Zealand case under the fifth Labour government. On a very broad level, the European and the New Zealand systems share some common conceptualisations of integration, but the underlying drivers (and the mechanical means of implementation) differ quite markedly in the two cases. Convergence in the European case can be explained through certain shared experiences in terms of historico-political factors, as well as ethnographic changes affecting a number of different states simultaneously within the EU. Shared value systems within the EU also contribute to a narrowed integration policy formulation.

Empirically, New Zealand integration policies under the fifth Labour government share a number of similarities to the European case; namely the driving motivations underlying the integration policy formation. However, there are a number of crucial, structural distinctions as well. Most notably, integration in the New Zealand case is not driven through anti-discrimination legislation facilitating access to crucial services, or free movement rights. Convergence is not a significant explanatory variable for integration policy

formation in the New Zealand case (whilst it is in the European case), for several reasons which are outlined below.

While New Zealand and Europe share some similarities in the conceptualization of integration as social inclusion, the methodology used to implement this vision varies. The 'two way process' is utilized in both jurisdictions, with NZ Labour promoting the idea of assisted social inclusion alongside civic responsibility. However, in New Zealand's case there is a greater emphasis on communitarian involvement, and state facilitated integration policies. The European conceptualization is a fairly narrowly construed neoliberal vision of integration, where the responsibility for integration is passed onto the individual. The state assumes an overarching responsibility for ensuring that the playing field is level. In the New Zealand case, the state takes a more active role in assisting with integration, in line with communitarian philosophy rather than a strict neoliberal interpretation of integration.

The values driving a vision for integration as important to economic prosperity differ between the two systems, countering the idea New Zealand has converged with European policy formulation. Although both systems share the vision that integration is important for economic prosperity, in the European case, and not the New Zealand case, the desire for social inclusion and the desire to achieve the state of social inclusion takes precedence over the conceptualizing of rights and responsibilities gained through social inclusion as an inherent good.

New Zealand stands apart from the European case in all of the above mentioned categories, although certain surface similarities do exist, such as the timeliness of the reversal of attitudes toward economic based immigration, in turn leading to a differing attitude towards integration policies. The definition of integration states that "Policy convergence thus describes the end result of a process of policy change over time towards some common point, regardless of the causal processes" (Knill, 2005, 5, cited in Geddes, 2005). In comparing the New Zealand and EU policies, the 'common point' (i.e. an active communitarian motivated state assisted integration model in the New Zealand context vs the liberal, individually driven integration with overarching state monitoring in the European case) is sufficiently different that one can conclude that convergence has not occurred to the same extent as was seen in the European case.

## **What does the New Zealand case indicate about the explanations canvassed in literature?**

As noted earlier in the thesis, a social democratic ideological conception of citizenship (as discussed by Marshall in 1949); sees true inclusive citizenship as best achieved through the facilitation of broad participation in society. Within this vision, the state has an active role in facilitating citizen participation (Delanty, 2002). In line with a social democratic ideological position New Zealand Labour, through its integration policies, has demonstrated that it is more inclined to want to facilitate individual active participation in society, and tends to be inherently more multicultural in their outlook as a result. That being said, elements of the neoliberal paradigm motivating the previous National government could also be discerned in fifth Labour's policies. This appears to be driven by pragmatics, and supportive of a 3<sup>rd</sup> way ideological process, rather than policy making being exclusively driven by a social democratic or neoliberal position.

Policies enacted by the fifth Labour government, and which were in line with the above argument, included the setting up of counselling services for new migrants and orientation and support courses. Through targeted interaction with community groups, Labour focused on the provision of language courses, including survival English and ESOL. Employment facilitation policies included the training of Employment Mentors, Business Set up training and employment seminars. These community focused, multicultural focused actions demonstrate that Labour was prepared to intervene within Waltzer's 'private sphere' of influence, rather than simply focusing on top down, strictly 'public sphere' actions. This is in contrast to the policy convergence within the European Union case studies, briefly considered earlier. Labour's attitude was in contrast to National's 'pure' neoliberal approach, which looked on integration as a field belonging to the private sphere, and therefore out of the rightful domain of the state.

As canvassed earlier, Isin and Turner argue that liberal, social democratic and corporatist states each rest upon a different interpretation of citizenship (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 3). Liberal democratic states utilize market mechanisms to distribute social rights, and focus on civil and political rights, which are elevated (Isin & Turner, 2002, p. 3). In contrast, states favouring communitarianism have a greater focus on community, society or the nation, and the underlying objective is an equitable and fair society (Isin & Turner, 2002,

p. 3). In New Zealand's case, the ongoing emphasis on broader society and immigration's 'society enrichment' role places it within the communitarian definition. In addition, Fanning's argument that the promotion of particular rights as an end in themselves (i.e. full immigrant participation in society), fall under "an entitlement of citizenship" under communitarian regimes (Fanning, 2009, p 33). Once again, this is consistent with Labour's rhetoric about the inherent value of immigrants to society (as instruments of society enrichment), and fits within a civic model of membership.

However, the New Zealand case is unique because of the pervasive influence of the neoliberal focus in policy making, and the concordant tension with classic social democratic ideological values. This thesis has argued that this ideological tension has been subsumed in the fifth Labour Party ideological viewpoint through the adoption of the 3<sup>rd</sup> way approach, effectively adopting pragmatic means over strict dogmatic principles, and in the process reinventing the underlying ideological principles driving policy. In accordance with this approach, immigration is viewed as an economic good, while at the same time the integration of immigrants is seen as a means in itself (not simply a means to an end) due to the positive conceptualization of the value of integrated immigrants, and the concordant effect this has on social cohesion.

Accordingly, a pure social democratic typology is not wholly useful in analyzing the Fifth Labour's government approach, but strands of it can be said to be relevant and applicable. The difference in New Zealand's case can be ascribed to the neoliberal approach to policy making that was partially adopted by the fifth Labour government for their immigration policies. This was not a pure neoliberal approach as noted in National's party policy making, but one tempered with social democratic principles, as reflected in the integration policies actually enacted and the approach adopted in enacting these policies. The fifth Labour government presents a dichotomy of approaches, with the inherent value of immigration partially viewed through a neoliberal prism, while the facilitation of integration itself reveals a social democratic approach, seemingly at odds with the neoliberal focus of the immigration policies.

## **The uniqueness of the New Zealand case**

As noted earlier, New Zealand's case is unique in light of the explanatory literature because the fifth Labour government's social democratic underpinnings need to be placed in the context of the neoliberal reforms that have coloured policy making since the late 1980's, and have also influenced the Labour government's immigration policies. It is this unique neoliberal overlay shrouding a social democratic value set that has influenced the fifth Labour government's approach. This is reflected in its immigration policies, which are framed in fairly classic neoliberal terms and which sought to advance economic gains for New Zealand. For instance, in 2002 the Prime Minister Helen Clark argued that "developing skills and talent for New Zealand ... requires the Government ... to keep adapting its immigration policies so that they assist, not hinder, New Zealand's search for specialist talent and skills" (Clark, on TVNZ, Holmes Election Special cited in Skilling, 2008, p. 233).

Immigration was therefore seen in a similar context to that promoted by National - a means by which to achieve an "economic transformation driven by highly educated and innovative people" within a "diverse and tolerant population" (Skilling, 2008 pg. 233). Skilling notes that Clark conceptualized immigrants as drivers of economic growth, "who will pay for our pensions" (Clark, cited in Skilling, 2008 pg. 233). In addition, however immigrants were seen as the agents of the 'ethnic and cultural diversity [that] enriches New Zealand society' (Labour Party, 'Ethnic Affairs Policy 2002', cited in Skilling, 2008 p. 234).

In considering the above discussion, it appears that the fifth Labour government's approach is best explained through a combination of the two different ideological positions, social democratic and neoliberal. The 3<sup>rd</sup> way approach, mentioned earlier, seemingly bridges the gap between the social democratic and neoliberal value sets retaining the social democratic focus while being flexible enough to adopt neoliberal mechanisms if they are deemed more pragmatic, or suitable for the achievement of particular aims. It is this interaction between the social democratic ideals surrounding national membership and



society, and how they relate to the neoliberal motivators behind immigration policy that make the New Zealand case unique among the states canvassed in literature.

This interaction is more clearly seen in New Zealand's case when one examines the structure of New Zealand National's immigration and settlement policies. Under the National government, a market liberal model of immigration and settlement was in operation. Immigrants were viewed as human capital, and the immigration policies were structured to attract the most qualified 'stock' in order to advance the economic wellbeing of New Zealand.

Multiculturalism as a concept was not present in National party rhetoric, as National did not see any need for it (McMillan, 2001, p. 166). It was assumed that immigrants who fitted the particular criteria of the immigration selection process would be able to assimilate neatly into New Zealand society. Immigration and settlement therefore were viewed from a single dimensional viewpoint (i.e. from an economic perspective). Likewise, integration policies were also structured along neoliberal lines, with the provision of targeted settlement services for particular migrant communities. New Zealand National's approach was largely assimilative, aimed at ameliorating difference. Improved settlement outcomes were equated with improved social cohesion, which itself was seen as necessary for an economically healthy environment. Accordingly, there was continuity in the neoliberal approach taken under National. In the late 1990s, after the resulting inadequate settlement outcomes of this approach forced National's hand in considering a more structured, and comprehensive integration policy, a change in tack was adopted. This was the policy framework that the fifth Labour government inherited, and expanded upon.

The demographic change brought about as a result of immigration was adopted as an enhancement to New Zealand society, in addition to the economic benefits that a multicultural society would bring. It is argued that underpinning Labour's approach was a social democratic ideology, in tandem with the pragmatic considerations that defined the 3<sup>rd</sup> way approach, which evidenced as neoliberal characteristics in the policies. However, commentators such as Skilling (2008) have argued that Labour's rhetorical emphasis on cultural diversity was simply a mechanism for propagating the idea of immigration as a tool for the advancement of a vital, economically driven nation (Skilling, 2008). According to

Skilling, any detractors of this view could have been attacked as holding back from 'progress' (Skilling, 2008). Skilling's view was that the fifth Labour government used the conception of New Zealand as a multicultural immigrant nation to 'sell' the concept of multicultural economic benefits to New Zealand society (Skilling, 2008). Accordingly, the concept of new multicultural nationhood was constructed to achieve confluence with the neoliberal approach that Skilling argues continued to underpin the fifth Labour government's approach in the immigration/integration policy fields. This paradigm was very much in line with promoting civic notions of membership. Adopting Skilling's (2008) view, the social democratic model of inclusive citizenship does not explain the fifth Labour government approach to integration policy formulation. The true motivator is simply a 're packaged' neoliberal approach, tailored to the reality of a multicultural society to which New Zealand must adapt in order to draw maximum economic utility.

On consideration, it is argued that this is not the case. It is posited that the fifth Labour's government approach can be adequately explained through the 3<sup>rd</sup> way ideological approach i.e. a reformulation of social democratic principles in tandem with pragmatic economic realities. The concerted drive on active, state sponsored settlement outcomes under the stewardship of Leanne Dalziel is more consistent with a social democratic approach than a neoliberal one. Effectively, the kinds of integration policies created, focusing on a variety of different 'spheres of interaction', gives credence to the multicultural rhetoric accompanying the policies. For example, community and school based strategies, with direct government support, are consistent with a desire for an 'enriched society'. Under a social democratic model citizenship is inclusive, defined by full and equal participation, making it necessary to facilitate participation in society and the breakdown of barriers to this participation. The fifth Labour's approach is consistent with this. The caveat to this is the presence of neoliberal characteristics, present due to pragmatics and the continuation of economically driven integration policy (exclusively neoliberal) introduced by the National party.

## **Conclusion: New Zealand Chapter**

This chapter has argued that the integration policies enacted under the fifth Labour government in the period 1999-2006 are best explained through a 3<sup>rd</sup> way theoretical understanding, as both social democratic and neoliberal characteristics were exemplified within the policies enacted. This finding is premised on the types of integration policies (i.e. inclusive and broad ranging, as well as economically driven and evidence of user-pays) enacted during the term of the fifth Labour government and the means of policy implementation (i.e. a community/partnership based approach). Labour integration policies and approach were compared and contrasted with those of the New Zealand National party during the preceding administration. National's immigrant integration policies were classically neoliberal in scope and approach, and therefore consistent with the neoliberal ideological model discussed in the theory section. In addition, these policies were likely impacted by the influence of Māori nationalism.

A good fit was found between the political party ideological models discussed in the theory section and the integration policies formulated by the National and Labour parties during the study period. This confirms the earlier assumption that the political party ideological model would be more useful in anticipating correct integration outcomes in the New Zealand case. In addition, the civic model of membership was also found to be useful in explaining integration outcomes in the New Zealand case.

However, the analysis within this chapter suggests that historical factors (e.g. an emphasis on a neoliberal thinking approach since the Rogernomics reforms of the 1980s) and pragmatism are important factors to consider when determining the relevance or impact of socio economic positioning. Theoretically opposing ideological positions (i.e. social democratic and neoliberal) can also exist alongside each other. This conclusion is supported by the cross appearance of neoliberal and social democratic policies in the tabled results.

This interaction between the neoliberal and social democratic ideological models is explained through the fifth Labour government's adoption of pragmatic '3<sup>rd</sup> Way' policies, where practicalities are favoured over strict dogmatic principles. It was also argued that the

Third Way approach constituted a reinvention of social democratic ideology. In addition, other explanatory variables, notably pragmatism, the shadow of previous policy implementation (i.e. National's re-invention of integration policy formulation following the poor outcomes of its initial policy making in the 1990s), and Māori Nationalism were also found to be important in explaining the New Zealand experience with regard to integration policy formulation during the study period.

## **Chapter 4: Case Study: Ireland**

### **Chapter overview**

This chapter seeks to examine whether the Brubaker national membership model, appearing to be most appropriate in the Irish case (see Chapter 2 for a description of this model) had significant predictive capacity in anticipating integration policy outcomes in Ireland during the period 1995-2006. As before, integration policy is defined as a “series of provisions, policies and social interventions which together might be seen to add up to an ‘integration policy’” (Favell, 2001, p.1). Past literature indicates that the integration policies in Ireland were developed ad-hoc as political factions deemed necessary, with little or no forward planning or cohesiveness to these policies (Kiely, 1999, p.4).

Rapid immigrant influx in the mid 1990s, owing to the Celtic Tiger boom period resulted in a corresponding period of legislative change following the enactment of the Refugee Act 1996 (Quinn 2007). Notwithstanding the boom in immigration legislation in the mid to late 1990s in Ireland (enacted as a result of the rapid increase in incoming migrants), specific integration policies and initiatives remained almost non-existent until the end of the study period. The few initiatives that were enacted focused on refugees and labour market integration, and lacked the coherence and structure seen in the New Zealand Settlement Strategy. A more thorough consideration of the Irish integration framework will follow in later sections.

In considering this situation in the Irish case, I will take into account the following questions:

- 1) To what extent does party ideology, reflected in terms of socio/economic political ideology distinctions or different models of national membership (civic versus ethno cultural; based on the Brubaker model (Brubaker 1992)), explain integration policy formulation in Ireland?
- 2) What is the interaction between the socio economic positioning of political parties and their attitudes towards inclusion in society (i.e. ethno cultural versus civic conception of membership)?
- 3) How does this interaction influence the formation of integration policies in Ireland?

A deductive content analysis approach was undertaken to answer these research questions (see methodology section for further details). Categories of integration policies were pre-defined and represented in a structured categorisation matrix based on understandings of theoretical material canvassed in the literature review chapter as either representative of the Brubaker civic or ethno cultural notion of membership or representative of the left or right political ideology (refer to categorisation matrix in methods section). The occurrence of these categories was identified in the corpus (policies), and the corresponding fit to the theoretical models tabled in the results section. The findings were then considered in light of other potential explanatory variables impacting on the integration policies enacted during the study period in Ireland, including the impact of policy continuity and protective Irish nationalism. Policy convergence was not examined as an explanatory variable in the Irish case due to the fact that Ireland largely opted out of most European Community instruments relating to immigration and integration (Bertozzi, 2007, p. 5). In consideration of the possible explanatory factors presented, conclusions were drawn regarding the most plausible explanatory variable(s) for the integration policy framework in Ireland's case.

In order to begin the analysis with a clear understanding of contributing factors for integration policy development in Ireland, the next sections of the thesis will outline the historical/ political context for the analysis of the Irish situation in the study period.

### **Introduction and the Irish Historical/Political Context**

During the chosen study period (1995-2006) Ireland was experiencing significant economic growth. The 'Celtic Tiger' boom period resulted in the Irish economy growing at a stellar 9.4 percent per annum on average between 1995 and 2000 (Murphy, 2001). The Irish economy continued to grow at an average 5.9 per cent per annum until 2008 (Economic and Social Research Institute, 2014). This boom in economic growth led to a corresponding influx of immigrants seeking to share in Ireland's burgeoning wealth. As an immigrant receiving state, Ireland ostensibly needed efficient policies to deal with the ever increasing number of newcomers. However, as noted earlier, no comprehensive integration policy framework was implemented during the study period.

In considering the whether the Brubaker model, appearing to be the most appropriate model in Ireland's case, correctly anticipated integration policy outcomes during the study period, important structural differences from the New Zealand political landscape must be acknowledged at the outset. There is consensus among a number of commentators (e.g. Bowman, Whyte, Carty & Sinnott) that due to historical-political factors, the Irish political scene was not, and is not, strongly demarcated according to left/right ideological divisions, as was the case in the New Zealand context during the study period. Ireland's political scene is based on historical factors instead. Bowman (2010) argues that "seminal events" occurring between 1918 and 1922 account for a 'freezing moment' in Irish politics, which in turn explains the lack of left wing political parties, and the lack of socio economic ideological politics in Ireland in general (Bowman, 2010 p.61). This in turn has an impact on applicability of the dominant explanatory theoretical models in Ireland's case, and on integration policy formulation in Ireland. Bowman's argument is that the crucial 1918 Irish general election, dealing with issues of national independence from Britain, had

the effect of replacing the extant political actors from the Irish Parliamentary Party with a new generation of politicians devoted to the so called 'National Question' (Bowman, 2010, p. 61). This change in priorities had the effect of depriving voters of deciding on class issues and focused their attentions to questions of nationalism. Bowman also mentions other theorists arguing the 'crystalisation approach', namely Carty (1981) Whyte (1974) and Sinnott (1995), and reiterates the contention that this 'freezing moment' in Irish politics has dictated the trajectory of Irish party politics ever since (Bowman 2010 p. 62). Bowman argues that it is the "chronology of Irish history, rather than the history itself which has shaped the development of Irish politics" (Bowman 2010 p. 62).

Bowman also states that the entrenched dynamic formed in the 1920s (namely the centrality of the 'National Question') was to remain salient and a dominating fixture in the Irish political system for almost 50 years (Bowman, 2010, p.63). He argues that the advent of a neoliberal 'world order' further eroded the possibility of the development of distinct ideological positions in Ireland, leading to a confluence between the policies of the major parties in the Irish parliament, namely the Fianna Fáil and Fine Gael (Bowman, 2010, p.63).

In accordance with the above arguments, it was the seminal events surrounding the issue of independence from Britain occurring in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century which moulded Ireland's political scene to one defined by nationalistic divisions, as opposed to a left/right defined political scene. This nationalistic driven political approach continued to dominate from that point onwards, and have a concordant effect on citizenship discourse (Bowman 2010). Based on the importance of nationalism in Irish citizenship discourse, it is theorised that the Brubaker explanatory models of ethnic and civic definitions of membership will have a more dominating role than the left/right ideological models in explaining integration policy formulation in Ireland in the study period.

The next sections will consider in more detail the integration policy framework in place during the study period in Ireland.



## **Integration Policies in Ireland (1995-2006)**

The year 1995 saw the beginning of a rapid period of Irish economic growth (labelled the Celtic Tiger boom period) that led to a large influx of migrants seeking to share in Ireland's expanding wealth (Mac Éinrí, 2001). The Irish government at this time was composed of the centre right Fine Gael political party, in coalition with the Labour party and the Democratic Left party. This government was replaced in 1997 by a coalition government composed of the Fianna Fail political party, in tandem with the Progressive Democrats party. As will be seen in the sections that follow, integration policy continuity existed between the two administrations.

Between 1995 and 2000, corresponding to the beginning of the study period, approximately 250,000 migrants arrived in Ireland. Of these, half were returning Irish expatriates (Mac Éinrí, 2001.) Notwithstanding this substantial influx of migrants, at this time Irish integration policy was not characterised by a coherent direction or drive. As noted earlier it was composed of a collection of piece meal, ad hoc policy statements (Boucher, 2008, p.6).

During the Celtic Tiger boom period (1995-2002, according to Boucher (2008)) Ireland did not use a quota-based immigration policy or (barring few exceptions) special category immigration visas (Boucher, 2008, p. 22). During this time, the admission of immigrants was largely market driven. Eugene Quinn (2007) argues that initial changes to the immigration policy in the mid 1990s were motivated by the increase in asylum applications, rather than broader migration trends. Prior to the enactment of the 1996 Refugee Act, the only existing legislative instrument applying to immigration or asylum was the 1935 Aliens Act (Quinn, 2007). At this time, integration policy was likewise laissez faire, and no national strategy was in place to facilitate migrant integration.

This incoherent, laissez faire, market driven approach was arguably functional to the Celtic Tiger boom stage of Irish integration policy because policy makers at the time assumed that the immigration influx would self-resolve once the boom ended, as the immigrants were expected to leave when the work dried up (Boucher, 2008, p. 22). According to this line of thought, there was no need to implement a coherent integration policy. The booming economic context was considered to be temporary, as was the influx of immigrants (Boucher, 2008, p.22).

Some limited efforts to promote integration were made, namely the establishment of the National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism (NCCRI) in 1998, as “an independent expert body focusing on racism and interculturalism” (NCCRI, 2014). The NCCRI’s primary functions were to provide advice and to work on programmes focused on combating racism, promote a more intercultural society, and work on the integration of minorities in Ireland (NCCRI, 2014). The practical influence of the NCCRI in assisting with immigrant integration was doubtful, as the predominant focus of the body appeared to be the combating of racist attitudes in Ireland through a consultative, inter departmental approach.

A seemingly significant step in the development of Ireland’s integration policy occurred in 1999, with the publishing of the report “Integration: A two Way Process”, penned by an unnamed Intra-Departmental Group on the Integration of Refugees (McGinnity, Quinn, O’Connell, & Donnelly, 2011, p. 12). This document considered the practicalities of problems faced by new migrants, but the dominant focus still remained on refugee policies. It suggested the creation of an organisation through which a coherent integration policy would be developed (McGinnity et al., 2011, p. 12). As a result, the Reception and Integration Agency was created. This organisation was predominantly focused on the service provision for asylum seekers, and consequently a comprehensive integration strategy did not eventuate (McGinnity et al., 2011, p. 12). The establishment of the Reception and Integration Agency did lead to some limited progress in the integration policy field, specifically relating to information provision to refugees in several languages, and a limited telephone interpretation service for medical professionals (Quinn, 2007).

However, services were still limited to information provision for refugees, as opposed to migrants, and no comprehensive policy framework was put in place.

Heavy immigration to Ireland continued post the initial rapid growth of the Celtic Tiger period, after 2002 (Boucher, 2008 p. 22). The end of the Celtic Tiger era necessitated a reworking of Ireland's immigration policies, especially considering the impending accession of additional European Union member states in 2004, and the flow-on effect on immigration to Ireland that this would have (Boucher, 2008, p. 22). Accordingly, in early 2003 the Irish government introduced a new immigration policy, underpinned by the Employment Permits Act (GOI, 2003). The main intent underlying the government's approach was that local employers would be able to utilize workforce from within the enlarged European Union, after 1 May 2004, to fill any vacancies in the labour market (Quinn, 2007). This policy change was necessitated by the almost 800% increase in work permits issued by the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment; from 6,000 to almost 48,000 (Quinn, 2007). In line with earlier immigration changes, these changes were not accompanied by concordant integration policies. Integration policy still lacked an overarching structure, was still *laissez faire* and individual based. Government responsibility for integration was vested solely in the Reception and Integration Agency, and as mentioned previously, the focus of this body was on the provision of services to refugees and asylum seekers.

In addition to immigration legislation change during the period 1996-2003, a significant change to Ireland's naturalisation law occurred in 2004; namely the passing of the Irish Nationality and Citizenship Act (Quinn, 2007). This legislative instrument replaced the principle of "automaticity," which previously granted Irish citizenship to children born in Ireland. Passed after a national referendum on the subject, the change meant that as of 2005, Irish citizenship at birth could only be acquired if the child is born to an Irish citizen, or if the parents are not Irish nationals then they must have resided in the country for a period of at least three years prior to the birth of the child (Quinn, 2007; see also Mac Éinrí, 2005). This change is arguably indicative of a nationalistic reaction against an influx of migrants, and is consistent with an ethno cultural protective measure aiming to 'safeguard' Irish nationality.

The few policies relating to integration enacted during the end of the study period (2003-2006) related to trying to promote anti-discrimination measures. Effective anti-discrimination policy was touted to be “a fundamental prerequisite for integration policy which hinges on equitable access to services and implementation of policies” (McGinnity et al., 2011, p. 13). Within the Irish legislative framework a number of instruments seek to promote this aim. The Employment Equality Act 1998 and the Equal Status Act 2000 legislate against discrimination on nine specific grounds including gender, marital status, family status, age, disability, race, sexual orientation, religious belief and membership of the Traveller community (McGinnity et al., 2011, p. 13). The drive against discrimination in Ireland was augmented by the launch of the 2005 National Action Plan Against Racism (NPAR) in January of that year (Quinn, 2007). The plan aimed to promote “effective protection and redress against racism; economic inclusion and equality of opportunity; accommodating diversity in service provision; recognition and awareness of diversity; and full participation in Irish society” (Quinn, 2007). To assist with the plan, €250,000 in funding was provided to support forty-four projects throughout Ireland. In addition, in 2005 the government established the Irish Naturalisation and Immigration Service (INIS), intended to serve as a multi-function immigration and integration service provider (Quinn, 2007).

While the above developments were ostensibly positive, Ireland’s integration policy framework as at 2006 was considered broadly inadequate. Sarah Spencer of the Oxford Centre on Migration Policy and Society stated in a report published in 2006:

While some political priority has been given to tackling racism and discrimination, a significant barrier to migrant integration, the political momentum to develop a broader strategy for the integration of migrants has been lacking. Ireland has no system of support for new arrivals to assist in labour market and social integration nor a coherent strategy to dismantle the barriers migrants face, beyond discrimination (Sarah Spencer, *Migration and Integration: The Impact of NGOs on Future Policy Development in Ireland*, Oxford: Centre on Migration Policy and Society (COMPAS), University of Oxford, 2006, p. 18, cited in Quinn, 2007).

The NESC report criticized the Irish integration framework due to its exclusive focus on refugee service provision. It described Ireland's integration strategies as "quite rudimentary" and "shaped by a desire to maintain orderly labour markets, to offer protection to refugees and to prevent discrimination but were essentially reactive and accommodative"(National Economic and Social Council 2006, p. 168, cited in Quinn, 2007).

Within the report, NESC asserted that the structure of the integration/immigration policy framework in 2006 was composed of multiple departments and bodies involved in migrant and integration affairs, with no centralised body providing advice and services to migrants(NESC 2006: 215-216). Further critique is levelled at the 2005 National Action Plan on Racism due to the fact "that no broader strategies are being contemplated... [there is no]... bold vision for integrating immigration management with integration and with a larger set of high-level strategic objectives" (NESC, 2006, p. 168 cited in Quinn 2007).

The overall sense of Ireland's integration policy as at 2006 was a scattered collection of integration responsible bodies, policy statements, and objectives, largely restricted to a minimalistic provision of services to refugees. Boucher (2008) states that at this time, the "main emphasis in the policy discourse, and few policies on integration, has been on restricting the state's role in the integration process, and devolving responsibility for integration primarily to individual immigrants, their communities and NGOs" (Boucher, 2008, p. 18). Dispersed municipal efforts relating to integration services (for example, Dublin's creation of an Office for integration in 2006 and the concordant integration programmes run by it) were not guided by a broader national strategy.

The focus of immigration policy during the study period was the protection of the Irish labour market through the effective usage of migrants with the requisite skill sets required by the Irish economy (Boucher 2008, p. 22). Integration policy was purely ancillary to this aim. Demand for migrant skill sets was market driven, and an overarching integration policy was not in place to assist new migrants. This is in marked contrast to New Zealand's Settlement Strategy, launched in 2004 (please see chapter 3). Migrants to Ireland were effectively treated as temporary guest workers, there to serve a particular function and then expected to leave once their usefulness was at an end (Boucher, 2008, p. 22).The

Fianna Fail government's isolated focus on anti-discrimination/anti-racism measures stands in stark contrast to the lack of other integration policies aiming to facilitate settlement- giving credence to the assertion that Ireland's integration policy framework at the end of the study period was very fragmented.

#### **Tabulating fit: Integration policies enacted in the Irish case study 1995-2006**

The results for the qualitative content analysis are presented below. The above sections provide a consideration of the policies enacted and give the rationale for the coding. Table 6 presents the occurrence of theoretical positions within the Irish integration policies enacted in the study period ('fit' indicates occurrence of this theoretical position). Table 7 represents the co-occurrence of the different theoretical positions within the policies enacted in Ireland during the study period.

**Table 6: Mapping the fit of the integration policies enacted by Fine Gael and Fianna Fail led governments in the period 1995-2006 to the theoretical models considered**

	<b>Theoretical position</b>			
<b>Integration Category</b>	Civic	Ethno cultural	Neoliberal	Social Democratic
Education	No presence	No presence	No presence	No presence
Citizenship	No presence	Fit	No presence	No presence
Employment	No presence	Fit	Fit	No presence
Social Inclusion	Fit	No Presence	No presence	No presence

**Table 7: Co occurrence of ideological positions reflected in Fine Gael and Fianna Fail integration policies enacted in the period 1995-2006**

	<b>Whether co occurrence was noted</b>	
<b>Ideological Model</b>	<i>Co occurrence with:</i>	<i>No co occurrence with:</i>
<i>Social democratic</i>	None	Neoliberal Civic Ethno cultural
<i>Neoliberal</i>	Ethno cultural	Social democratic Civic

<i>Civic</i>	None	Social democratic Neoliberal Ethno cultural
<i>Ethno-cultural</i>	Neoliberal	Social democratic Civic

### **Summary of Tabulated Results:**

Table 6 illustrates that the few integration policies enacted in Ireland during the study period (1995-2006) were largely structured along neoliberal ideological lines. The amendment to the Constitution Act in 2004 revoking the principle of automaticity for the granting of Irish citizenship to children born in Ireland, in tandem with the ‘guest worker’ tilt to Ireland’s employment policies indicated an ethno cultural model of membership also being influential. Ireland’s integration policy framework followed a laissez faire, market facilitated approach with very little state sponsorship (with the exception of programmes aimed at refugees and asylum seekers). The state sponsored focused drive against discrimination/racism arguably fits under the civic social inclusion category, and was accordingly noted. However, this isolated policy focus stands in contrast to the laissez faire (arguably neoliberal) approach that underpinned the remainder of integration policies enacted during the study period.

Some co-occurrence of different ideological model theoretical positions was noted within the policies enacted (see Table 7). The dominant ideological motivator in Ireland’s case appears to be a neoliberal ideology, which co occurred with an ethno cultural model of membership. The lack of coherence in integration policy structure (and a dearth of integration policies generally) could also potentially explain the absence of further co-occurrence of ideological models. In essence, in Ireland’s case there is insufficient data (policies enacted) to infer meaningful correlation between the ideological models that may be influencing one another. The lack of policies enacted, and the effect this has on the analysis undertaken means that extraneous factors and the political context of the study period will need to be considered in greater detail as alternative drivers of integration policy formation (or rather the lack thereof) in the Irish case. The following sections will explore

the application of the Brubaker ethno cultural model of membership in correctly anticipating the integration policy outcomes in Ireland during the study period.

### **The Brubaker models of membership and an application to Ireland's case**

In this thesis, the framework of membership (as per the Brubaker civic and ethno cultural models) adopted within a given state is argued to be one of the variables that determine the integration policy that is enacted within that state. In addition, as identified in the theory section, a given state's "historical trajectory" (i.e. the present sum of historical, economic and socio political factors coming to shape a particular state's political outlook) is also highly influential in shaping the definition of citizenship that comes to eventuate.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the Brubaker theory of membership is premised around the concepts of *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis*; terms corresponding to definitions of membership either grounded in a civic conception or an ethnic basis (Brubaker, 1992, pp. 1-4). According to Brubaker, the distinction between the two models is rather crucial, as it has important implications for the rights and restrictions of the citizens of states subscribing to each respective theoretical model (Brubaker, 1992, pp. 1-4). Immigrants arriving into a state subscribing to the *jus soli* territorial model (which according to Brubaker is more assimilative, and more accepting of the process of naturalisation) would have more ability to gradually integrate and gain equal citizenship rights as native born citizens (Brubaker, 1992, pp.1-4). Key underlying themes for this concept are argued to be political openness, inclusivity, and liberal citizenship. In contrast, for immigrants arriving into a state that subscribes to the *jus sanguinis* model, the acquisition of citizenship (and concordant rights) is infinitely more difficult because the incident of birth, and their own racial descent is determinative of whether they will ultimately get to enjoy the rights afforded to citizens, or whether they are destined to remain on the sidelines (Brubaker, 1992). Brubaker argues that the *jus sanguinis* model is restrictive towards naturalisation, emphasises difference to a greater extent than the *jus soli* model, and has an ethno cultural mode of identification as opposed to *jus soli*'s state centred identification model (Brubaker, 1992, pp. 1-4). Key



themes underlying the *jus sanguinis* conception of membership include national cultural membership, differentiation, and cultural assimilation.

As noted in earlier sections of this chapter, the Irish political party framework was largely shaped by the issue of nationalism and independence from Britain. Central to the Irish conception of citizenship were ideas inherited from Britain's legal system, the ideology of republicanism as expressed in the state's founding documentation, and a territorial claim over Northern Ireland (Honohan, 2007 p. 9). Honohan asserts that these three issues were critical to the entrenchment of "centrality of *jus soli*" in the conceptualization of Irish citizenship (Honohan, 2007 p. 9). In the Irish case however, "the relatively open conception of citizenship afforded by *jus soli* had to compete with the more firmly bounded and exclusive ethno-cultural conception of the nation that prevailed in the public consciousness and influenced many areas of policy" (Honohan, 2007, p. 9). In other words, Irish citizenship discourse features a duality of focus; with a formal emphasis on *jus soli* that is influenced by ethno culturalism, which is a tenet more associated with *jus sanguinis*. Honohan argues that the ongoing and prevalent tension between the ethno cultural and civic conceptions of citizenship has continued to impact on the definition of citizenship in the Irish case (Honohan, 2007, p. 9).

Based on the prevalence of the *jus soli* legal model of citizenship during the study period (as demonstrated by the enactment of anti-discrimination legislation, suggesting prioritisation of social inclusion and acceptance), one would expect that a relatively open conception of membership was likewise in place, allowing for an easy naturalization process for new migrants. This is because policy makers subscribing to a *jus soli* model would seek to advance policies that promote efficient integration policies that subsume difference and aim at naturalising immigrants until equilibrium with native citizens was achieved. However, the results of the analysis indicate that this is not the case (i.e. an ethno cultural theoretical position was partially manifest in Irish policy data in the study period, which aligns with the *jus sanguinis* model).

In Ireland, the application and outcomes of the classic *jus soli* model needs to be tempered by the influence of the ethno cultural conception of membership, manifesting itself through a nationalistic influence on policy making. The presence of a protectionist, anti migrant Irish nationalism is extensively described by Boucher (2008). This appears to be confirmed by the results of the analysis carried out. Naturalisation, and immigrant integration was not facilitated (as shown by the lack of policies in place) because of the dominant effect of the ethno cultural conception of membership manifesting itself in a protective Irish nationalism. A reluctance to adopt a coherent integration programme in line with other neighbouring European states appears to be supported by the fact that Ireland largely opted out of most European Community instruments relating to integration policy convergence and standardisation (Bertozzi, 2007, p. 5).

Discussing the role of nationalism in integration policy, Bloemraad, Korteweg, and Yurdakul (2008) argue that immigrants' membership is influenced by nationalism because of its "effect on structuring formal legal rules regarding the acquisition of citizenship and the discourses that shape citizenship as participation and belonging" (Brubaker, 1992; Bloemraad et al., 2008, p. 158). The 'legal rules' that shape participation and belonging are therefore drawn from an underlying conceptualization of belonging, which is inherently deterministic. An ethno cultural conception of belonging is exclusionary in nature, and will therefore have a concordant impact on the integration policies enacted. Again, this is illustrated by the lack of integration policies enacted during the study period. Whilst Ireland theoretically subscribes to the *jus soli* model, ethno cultural factors are argued to have dominated social policies and the ideology of the policy makers. Within an ethno cultural dominated system, policies restricting naturalisation would be expected.

It is argued that Ireland's lack of integration policies, by default/passivity, served the same role as an actively implemented policy framework restricting naturalisation. While the ad hoc approach to integration policy may be interpreted as stemming from a *laissez faire*, neoliberal motivation to policy making, it is argued that the neoliberal mechanisms were simply used as a means of implementing an underlying ethno cultural driver. A narrow, ethno culturally defined conception of membership dominated the policy makers' thinking

during the study period, notwithstanding the supposed *jus soli*, civic conception of citizenship that Ireland officially subscribed to. This approach also corresponds well with Boucher's non-perception of discrimination argument, where an exclusionary approach became entrenched within Irish policy making to such an extent that it was simply not noticed by policy makers (Boucher, 2008, p. 10).

In considering other relevant factors canvassed earlier, it must be acknowledged that a number of institutional conditions helped facilitate the *laissez faire* approach to integration policy making. The *laissez faire* strategy worked very well during the early part of the Celtic Tiger boom period, because during the time of rampant growth a guest worker model was successfully applied to new migrants, as argued by Boucher (2008, p. 22). Assuming that the incoming migrants would depart Ireland once the boom had finished, there was therefore no material need for policy actors to develop a coherent integration strategy and no ideological motivation to institute one. Added to the fact that half of the migrants arriving into Ireland during this period were of Irish descent, at this time there was no policy impetus to make substantive change (Boucher, 2008).

The ethno cultural focus which drove the *laissez faire* approach to integration strategy formulation during this time was based on a form of nationalistic protectionism, which Boucher argues was instituted to protect the Irish "national interest from too many migrants, too many non-working migrants, and too many non-integrate-able migrants, particularly if they come from outside the EU/EEA. In particular, Irish national interest discourse claims to protect the Irish territory, economy and labour market, welfare state, culture and identity from the potential migrant threat to Irish society" (Boucher 2010, p. 1). Considering the focus on the national interest discourse was to keep the migrant populations from threatening the core of Irish society, neoliberal mechanisms provided an appropriate 'shield' which could be used to affect this.

The below sections will explore the influence of the neoliberal ideology on Irish integration policy making in more detail.

## **Alternate Reasons for Ireland's lack of Integration Policy**

### **Policy continuity: The right wing/neoliberal influence on Irish integration policy**

In addition to the ethno cultural membership explanation for the lack of Ireland's integration policies canvassed above, one of the potential explanatory variables that should be explored is a 'pure' neo-liberal motivated approach to immigrant integration. As was noted earlier in this chapter, due to the 'freezing moment' in Irish politics, socio economic political ideology was not instrumental in characterising the Irish political scene. The two main political parties, Fine Gael and Fianna Fail are both centre right political parties. On their official website Fine Gael states that it "encourages initiative, innovation, investment and self-reliance" (Fine Gael 2014). These are tenets illustrative of Fine Gael's right wing philosophy. Fianna Fail, also identifies with centre right principles (Fianna Fail, 2014).

Accordingly, an argument may be made that the underlying driver for the laissez faire integration policy continuity seen in the two administrations was a right wing political ideology- manifesting through a laissez faire, market driven approach. There is ample existing academic commentary that argues forcefully for a neo-liberally driven laissez faire underpinning to Ireland's lack of a coherent integration policy.

While not discounting the laissez faire approach to integration policy, this thesis argues, as discussed in sections above, that the driver for the neoliberal approach to integration policy was a restrictive ethno centric conception of membership. The neoliberal mechanisms were used as an effective means of implementation for the restrictive naturalisation of migrants to Ireland.

In commenting on the neoliberal explanation to Ireland's integration policy framework, Boucher (2008, p. 12) traces the origins of Ireland's Integration policy to the report, *Integration: A Two Way Process*, written by the Interdepartmental Working Group on the Integration of Refugees in Ireland. This report addresses the "assumptions underpinning the notion of integration"- namely the refugee's "willingness to adapt to the lifestyle of Irish society without abandoning or being expected to abandon one's own

cultural identity” and Irish society’s “willingness to accept refugees on the basis of equality and to take action to facilitate access to services, resources, and decision-making processes in parity with Irish nationals” (Gray, 2006, pp. 133-134, cited in Boucher 2008, p.12).

Boucher claims that it is this “double willingness” that forms the basis of the two-way process of Irish integration, as reflected within official government literature (Boucher, 2008, p. 12). Boucher notes that notwithstanding the multicultural framing of the approach, the approach is actually more in line with neo-liberal thinking. This is exemplified in the way that “individuals and groups are invited to be active and to take responsibility for their own integration” (Gray 2006, p. 133 as cited in Boucher, 2008 p.12). Phrasing it another way, integration policies’ primary purpose is to create autonomous, self-sufficient migrants capable and willing to contribute to Irish society and economy.

In reaching a conclusion about the DJER report, Boucher asserts that the underlying emphasis of the report is a legitimizing of the laissez faire strategy, through the application of “neoliberal modes of governance” to migrants, who are then expected to take individual responsibility for their integration, be it in the cultural, political, economic or social arena (Boucher, 2008, p. 12). Accordingly, he concludes that the motivation driving the laissez faire approach is a focus on neoliberalism.

In turn, this approach enables the Irish state to adopt a policy of civic stratification, entailing a differential granting of rights by the state depending on the immigration status of the individual in question (Morris, 2001, p. 388; see also, McLaughlin and Boucher, 2007). In line with the civic stratification argument Fanning argues that a growing distinction exists in Ireland between citizenship and actual social membership. Fanning also posits that individual rights are gradated according to the status of individuals in question- be they citizens, non-citizens, refugees, immigrant guest workers or illegal workers (Fanning, 2007, p. 240 cited in Boucher, 2008, p. 6).

Boucher’s arguments hinge on the self-sufficiency aspect of neoliberalism, in so far as it relates to the government having a limited role in what is perceived to be the private sphere of influence. A commentator who focuses more on the individual economic aspect

of neoliberalism is Breda Gray (2006). Exploring the influence of neoliberalism on Ireland's integration policy framework, Gray tracked neoliberal motivations in key government reports- the Report of the Task Force on Policy Regarding Emigrants – Ireland and the Irish Abroad (2002), the Report of the Interdepartmental Working Group on the Integration of Refugees in Ireland – Integration a two way process (2003), and the NESC Report - People, Productivity and Purpose (2005), which set out the principles and procedures in relation to immigrant integration policies(Gray, 2006, p. 4). Her work is useful because she considers the various motivating factors behind integration policy formulation as reflected in government reports.

Gray argues that underpinning all of the reports in question is a very discernible neoliberal motivation. She posits that crucial to the neoliberal formulation of integration policy is the concept of the 'deserving citizen'- which Gray illustrated by referring to the work of Aihwa Ong (Gray, 2006, p. 6). Ong herself states that this "regime entails making 'homo-economicus' is the standard against which all other citizens are measured and ranked" (Ong, 1999, p. 129 cited in Gray, 2006 p. 6). Accordingly, the effect of this approach is that the prevailing importance of the economy and the market penetrates all aspects of life to such an extent that everything is evaluated in economic terms, or through communal or personal progress (Gray, 2006, p. 6).

In support of the above view, Gray argues that boundaries between Irish state and civil society are being blurred through the increasing reliance on organizations, individuals and networks doing the work of government (Gray, 2006 p.6). She quotes Nikolas Rose (1999), in noting an increase in "governmental practices that attempt to promote choice, autonomy, efficiency and accountability by making individuals and specific communities responsible for their own behavior, goals and outcomes. Individuals are invited to be active in promoting their own empowerment and participation in decision making, for example, through 'active citizen' and community programmes" (Gray, 2006, p. 6). This is cornerstone of the classic neoliberal approach, advocating a separate community based approach, and a lack of government involvement into what is perceived to be the 'private sphere' (Delanty 2002). Gray also mentions O'Malley's arguments about the "particular attraction of 'the language of 'community' in neo-liberalism", which according to O'Malley "locates rule in the

everyday, voluntary interactions or commonalities of interest of private individuals” (O’Malley, 1998, p.158 as cited in Gray, 2006, p. 6).

It is argued that the combined approach of an ethno centric conception of membership, which manifested itself in the form of a protectionist nationalist interest discourse, and neoliberal implementation mechanisms acted like a self-reinforcing feedback loop in entrenching institutionalised stratification. This in turn meant that there was no drive within policy thinking to institute a coherent integration strategy. Boucher posits that in the event of the such an approach being “taken for granted part of Irish public culture, it can also be expected that stigmas and stereotypes related to non-national backgrounds will become both sources of discrimination against migrants and their descendants, and integral features of their identity to be struggled against and challenged, individually and collectively” (Song, 2003, cited in Boucher, 2010)

Accordingly, it can be stated that the relationship between Irish nationalism and selective neoliberalism was symbiotic in the case of integration policies. However, structural and local historical, political and economic factors were also instrumental in the implementation of the Irish ad hoc approach to immigrant integration policy.

### **Conclusion: Irish chapter**

Having considered the possible explanations for Ireland’s lack of a coherent integration policy during the study period, it can be concluded that an ethno centric conception of membership exerted a dominant influence on policy thinking in the integration policy field. This is consistent with the assumption made earlier in the thesis- namely that due to Ireland’s historically defined political scene a much greater influence was exerted by national membership considerations than was by left-right political divisions.

Having argued that a legal jus soli model of citizenship was in place in Ireland during the study period (see Honohan, 2007), a more appropriate explanatory model for the Irish

situation therefore is a hybrid model- where ethno cultural conceptions of membership interplayed with the existing legal systems of citizenship in place. Ideologically, ethno cultural drivers, manifesting themselves in a type of Irish nationalism and a concordant neoliberal approach to policy making have been found to be salient in anticipating integration policy outcomes in integration policy making in the Irish case. In Ireland's case however, there is a seeming dichotomy between the dominant conception of membership- which is based on jus sanguinis/ethno cultural grounds and the legal model of citizenship- which is based on civic/jus soli principles.



## Chapter 5: Thesis Summary and Conclusions

This thesis sought to examine the fit of two explanatory theoretical models in explaining integration policy outcomes in two case study states, Ireland and New Zealand, during the period 1995-2006. More specifically, the thesis tried to determine whether the influence of the model of national membership adopted in each study case (civic membership in the New Zealand case and ethno cultural membership in the case of the Republic of Ireland) was able to anticipate the correct outcomes with regard to integration policies adopted during the study period, or whether political party positioning on socio economic lines was more important in predicting integration policy outcomes. This assessment was conducted in light of apparent 'fit' of the respective theoretical models to integration policies enacted in each study case, in order to determine whether the theories that seem to fit the best anticipate the correct outcomes in each study case.

The thesis tested whether the theories that seem to fit best in each case study anticipated the correct outcomes in integration policy through a deductive content analysis of integration policies enacted during the study period, which was then used to identify theoretical models capable of explaining the integration policies that were enacted. Additional explanatory variables, such as Māori nationalism in New Zealand's case, and Irish nationalism in Ireland's case were also considered as potential explanatory variables for the integration policies that were enacted.

The first theoretical model considered was based on Rogers Brubaker (1992) theory of membership, positing that immigrant integration policies are the outcome of national membership models. The theory posits that an explicitly ethno cultural conception of membership (*jus sanguinis*), or a civic conception of membership (*jus soli*) will impact on the integration policies that are enacted. The theory postulates that a significant difference should exist between the immigrant integration policies of states that adopt an explicit ethno cultural conception of membership as opposed to states that have adopted civic forms of membership. The levels of integration possible under each respective view of membership (i.e. either ethno cultural or civic) would vary. Policy makers subscribing to the

jus sanguinis model would be expected to formulate integration policies that do not subsume difference between immigrants and naturally born citizens. These policies would likely be aimed at preserving the status quo- and keeping immigrants from attaining the same rights as those enjoyed by natural born citizens. In contrast, policy makers subscribing to a jus soli model would promulgate policies that promote more efficient integration, subsuming difference and aiming at naturalising immigrants until equilibrium with native citizens was achieved.

The second theory investigated was the influence of party positioning on the socio-economic left-right axis – manifesting itself in left/right political party divisions and how these impact on integration policy formulation (Mouffe, 1992). Within the thesis, this theory was referred to as the political party ideology explanation. It was argued that this explanation was driven by ideological foundations and reflected in political party ideology. Dependent on the positioning of a given political party on the left/right axis, the integration policies enacted could be expected to vary. A social democratic left wing party would be expected to favour policies that facilitate an inclusive society, and therefore would seek to promote policies that ensure as broad a participation of new migrants as possible. On the other side of the political spectrum, a right wing, neoliberally motivated political party would be expected to promote policies that encouraged self-sufficiency and independence, and would therefore relegate integration to the private sphere, limiting government involvement within this process.

### **The New Zealand chapter**

An examination of policies enacted under New Zealand National and the New Zealand Labour government's revealed a fit with the neoliberal and social democratic ideological/neoliberal hybrid positions respectively. These results were reflected in the coded data. The policies enacted by New Zealand National in the period 1995-1999 were consistent with a neoliberal ideological model as canvassed in the theory chapter, in tandem with Maori nationalism potentially exerting an influence on the integration policies that

were enacted. The policies enacted by the fifth Labour government in the period 1999-2006 were consistent with a social democratic ideological position, in tandem with a neoliberal overlay. Under Labour's approach, integration was viewed as a social and cultural good in addition to an economic one. In considering the policies enacted by the fifth Labour government, it was argued that the fifth Labour's government approach can be adequately explained through the 3<sup>rd</sup> way ideological approach consisting of a reformulation of social democratic principles in tandem with pragmatic economic realities. This approach explained the ongoing neoliberal influence underpinning some of the fifth Labour government's policies. The integration policies created by the fifth Labour government focused on a variety of different 'spheres of interaction', consistent with a social democratic explanatory model canvassed in the theory chapter. In addition, both the National and Labour party's approach with regard to the membership (i.e. a promotion of a multicultural New Zealand social fabric) indicated as subscription to the Brubaker civic model of membership.

The New Zealand chapter concluded that the political party ideology model, a model theorised to be useful in explaining integration policy outcomes in New Zealand earlier in the thesis, was indeed capable of anticipating correct integration policy outcomes in New Zealand during the study period. In making this conclusion, the influence of the social democratic ideology as a motivating factor was found to have been tempered by the neoliberal policy framework partially adopted by the fifth Labour government in its policy making. The fifth Labour government was shown to have adopted pragmatic '3<sup>rd</sup> way' policies- where economic practicalities were favoured over strict dogmatic principles. It was also argued that the 3<sup>rd</sup> way approach constituted a reinvention of social democratic ideology. In addition, other variables- notably Maori nationalism, pragmatism and a pre existing neoliberal policy making framework were also found to be important in explaining the New Zealand experience.

## **The Irish chapter**

The integration policies enacted in Ireland during the study period were found to have been predominately anticipated by the Brubaker *jus sanguinis* model of ethno cultural membership. This conclusion, consistent with an assumption made earlier in the thesis (namely that national membership models would be more relevant in Ireland than right/left political distinctions) was partially reflected in the coded findings, and was at odds with Ireland's supposed subscription to the legal *jus soli* model of citizenship- a model that was expected to be more open to immigrant naturalization. A *laissez faire*, fragmented approach to integration policy such as was adopted in Ireland during the study period was not consistent with the naturalisation friendly approach expected under a *jus soli* model. The thesis concluded that Ireland's approach to integration policy during the study period was partially facilitated by institutional conditions, namely the booming economic conditions of the Celtic Tiger boom. More important however was the pervasive ethno cultural conception of membership which influenced policy makers' thinking on integration. This ethno centric conception of membership manifested itself in a form of protective Irish nationalism, in turn driving the *laissez faire* approach to integration strategy formulation during the study period. Considering the focus on the national interest, policy was aimed at keeping the migrant populations from threatening the core of Irish society. Neoliberal mechanisms within the integration policy field provided an appropriate 'shield' which was used to accomplish these goals.

This thesis argued for an interaction between the ethno centric conception of membership, manifesting itself in the form of a protectionist nationalist interest discourse, and neoliberal implementation mechanisms. It was argued that the relationship between the nationalist ideology and the neoliberal implementation acted like a self-reinforcing feedback loop in entrenching institutionalised stratification. In turn, this meant that there was no impetus within policy thinking to institute a coherent integration strategy. The relationship between Irish nationalism and selective neoliberalism was argued to be symbiotic, and highly formative in influencing immigrant integration policies. The chapter

also concluded that local historical, political and economic factors were important in setting the context for the laissez-faire Irish approach.

An examination of the New Zealand and Irish case studies appears to support Brubaker's argument that within states subscribing to an ethno cultural conception of membership, left/right political party positioning is not as important a variable to citizenship discourse as it is in states subscribing to a civic model of membership.

The above findings expand our understanding of the factors impacting on integration policy formulation. As evidenced by the Irish case, ethno cultural definitions of membership are arguably more salient than legal models of citizenship implemented to the integration policy framework that is adopted in a given state. A consideration of the Irish and New Zealand cases also seems to indicate that, in line with Brubaker's theory, the influence of the socio economic ideology in states subscribing to a civic conception of citizenship might indicate that a more comprehensive integration policy framework is possible within these states, than in states subscribing to limiting models of ethno culturalism. As indicated by the present research, the ethno centric conceptualisation of membership appears to lead to restrictive policy formulation, which doesn't allow for social democratic practice and concordant impacts on integration policy formulation.

In both cases examined, interaction between the various explanatory models was noted. In the New Zealand case, the neoliberal framework within policy making impacted on the social democratic ideological motivations of the New Zealand Labour party. Within the Irish case, interaction was noted between the Brubaker model of ethno cultural membership, and a neoliberal implementation framework. In both cases, the interplay between the various motivators influenced the policy that was, or was not enacted.

### **Limitations**

The limitations of the research carried out should be noted as well. Considering the underlying focus was a narrowly construed theory driven approach, there is scope for

analyst driven bias. In addition, the category creation used in the categorisation matrix was also analyst driven, and in turn a level of subjective interpretation was present in the categorisation. This in turn potentially led to a degree of imprecision in the categorisation of the policies within the corpus. In order to confirm the validity of the coding process, it would have been optimum to have another researcher code the data in order to enable cross checking of the codes. Due to the focused nature of the research, a narrow sample size (two case studies) and a limited corpus of data was used for the analysis. Potentially, this has a limiting impact on the general application of the principles discussed in the findings of this thesis.

### **Future research**

In order to verify the results produced in this research, future work could expand on the findings and commentary of this thesis by investigating other case studies of interest. Other suggested case study states include: Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. European Union member states could also be potentially considered, but it is anticipated that findings across European states would be largely similar due to the European Union convergence in integration policy across member states.

All of the aforementioned suggested states fall under a similar cultural categorisation to that of New Zealand and Ireland- namely Western countries, sharing a Commonwealth cultural heritage. In that sense, they would make useful comparison 'test' cases to confirm the findings of this thesis. Their individual historical, social and political characteristics would need to be factored in to the experiment design.

It would also be interesting to see whether the findings of the thesis could be replicated in a non Western cultural model. For example, an examination might be made of the ideological influences impacting on integration policies in Islamic state study cases, or study cases located in Asia.

## Reference List

- Alba, R. (2005). Bright vs. blurred boundaries: Second-generation assimilation and exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28 (1): 20–4.
- Banting K, Johnston R, Kymlicka W, Soroka S. (2006). Do multiculturalism policies erode the welfare state? An empirical analysis. In *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State: Recognition and Redistribution in Contemporary Democracies*, ed. K Banting, W Kymlicka. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bauböck, R. (1994). *The Integration of Immigrants*. CMDG-Report, The Council of Europe, Strasbourg.
- \*Bedford, R.D. (2004). The quiet revolution: Transformation in migration policies, flows, and outcomes, 1999–2004, *New Zealand Geographer* 60(2), pp. 50–54.
- Benton, M. (1985). *Promoting Racial Harmony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bertozzi, S. (2007). *Integration: An Ever-Closer Challenge*, Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies [CEPS], CEPS Working Document No. 258/February 2007.
- Bisin, A., E. Patacchini, T. Verdier, and Y. Zenou (2009). *Ethnic identity, residential segregation, and labor-market outcomes of immigrants in Europe*, Unpublished manuscript, Stockholm University.
- Bloemraad, I., Korteweg, A. and Yurdakul, G. (2008). Citizenship and immigration: Multiculturalism, assimilation, and challenges to the nation-state. *Annual Review of Sociology* 34: pp. 153–179.
- \*Boucher, G. (2008). Ireland's Lack of a Coherent Integration Policy, *Translocations*, 3 (1), pp.1-24.
- \*Boucher, G. (2010). The Entrenchment of Ireland's Laissez Faire Integration Policy, *Translocations*, 6 (2).
- Bowman, D. (2010). Ideology in Ireland: An Investigative study, *Ireland & Europe*, pp. 61-68.
- Brubaker R. (1992). *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brubaker R. (2001). The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic Racial Studies* 24(4) pp.531–48.

Brubaker R. (2004). 'Civic' and 'ethnic' nationalism. In *Ethnicity Without Groups*, pp. 132–46. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carty, R.K., (1981). *Party and Parish Pump: Electoral Politics in Ireland*. Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Clark, H (2002). on TVNZ, Holmes Election Special.

Clarke, J. (1997). Capturing the customer? Consumerism and social welfare, *Self, Agency and Society*, 1: 1, pp.55–73.

Clarke, J. (2004). Dissolving the public realm?: The logics and limits of neo-liberalism. *Journal of Social Policy*, 33(01), pp. 27–48.

Dalziel L., 2003.

Delanty G. ( 2002). Communitarianism and citizenship. In: Isin E and Turner B (eds) *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 159-174.

\*Department of Labour (2005). Settlement Support New Zealand: A Guide for Implementation, DOL: Wellington.

\*Department of Labour (2007). A Future Together: The New Zealand Settlement Strategy, Department of Labour: Wellington.

Economic and Social Research Institute (2014). *Irish Economy*. Retrieved from [http://www.esri.ie/irish\\_economy/](http://www.esri.ie/irish_economy/).

\*Electoral Commission (1997). The New Zealand Electoral Compendium, Wellington, December 1997.

Elo, S., & Kyngas, H. (2007). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), pp. 107 – 115.

Engbersen, Godfried & René Gabriëls, Eds. (1995). *Sferen van integratie: Naar een gedifferentieerd allochtonenbeleid*; Amsterdam: Boom.

Entzinger H., and Biezeveld R. (2003). *Benchmarking in Immigrant Integration* (Report written for the European Commission under contract No. DG JAI-A-2/2002/006), European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations (ERCOMER), Rotterdam. Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/immigration/pdf/general/benchmarking\\_final\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/immigration/pdf/general/benchmarking_final_en.pdf).

Fanning, B. (2009). *The European Politics of Apolitical Integration: Policy harmonization, cultural convergence and the case of the Republic of Ireland*, University College Dublin Working Paper Series 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.ucd.ie/t4cms/wp6%2009%20fanning.pdf>.



Favell, A. (2001). Multicultural nation-building: 'integration' as public philosophy and research paradigm in Western Europe. *Swiss Political Science Review* Debate on 'Immigration Policy' special edition edited by Sandra Lavenex Vol.7, No.2 2001, pp.116-124.

Fianna Fail (2014). *Fianna Fail: Our Party*. Retrieved from <http://www.fiannafail.ie/content/pages/5095/>.

Fine Gael (2014). *Fine Gael: Values*. Retrieved from <http://www.finegael.ie/your-fine-gael/values/>.

Friessen, J. (2003). Communities and Economic Prosperity in L. Osberg (ed.) *The Economic Implications of Social Cohesion*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

GAO (1996). *Content Analysis: A Methodology for Structuring and Analyzing Written Material*. Program Evaluation and Methodology Division, United States General Accounting Office, Washington.

George, A. L. (1959). *Propaganda analysis*. Evanston, Ill.: Row Peterson.

\*Gray, B. (2006). Migrant Integration Policy: A Nationalist Fantasy of Management and Control?, *Translocations*, 13 (1), pp.121-141.

Honohan, I. (2007). Bounded citizenship and the meaning of citizenship laws: Ireland's ius soli referendum In: Nicholas Brown and Linda Cardinal (eds). *Managing Diversity: Practices of Citizenship*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Isin, E., and Turner, B. (2002). Citizenship Studies: An Introduction. In Isin, E., & Turner, B. (Eds), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, pp. 1-12. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Johnson, C. (2000). *Governing Change: Keating to Howard*. St. Lucia, University of Queensland Press.

Joppke C., Morawska E. (2003). eds. *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation- States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Joppke, C. (1999). *Immigration and the Nation-state. The United States, Germany and Great Britain*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kiely, G. (1999). Introduction: From Colonial Paternalism to National Partnership: An Overview of Irish Social Policy in Kiely, G., O'Donnell, A., Kennedy, P. and Quin, S. (eds), *Irish Social Policy in Context*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Knill, C. (2005). Cross-national policy convergence: concepts, approaches and explanatory factors. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 12:5, pp. 764-74.

Koopmans R., Statham P., Giugni M., Passy F. (2005). *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.

Lima, A. (2010). *Transnationalism: A New Mode of Immigrant Integration*, The Mauricio Gaston Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy, University of Massachusetts. Retrieved from <http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthority.org/getattachment/b5ea6e3a-e94e-451b-af08-ca9fcc3a1b5b/>.

\*Mac Éinrí, P. (2001). *Immigration into Ireland: Trends, Policy Responses, Outlook*. First part of research project for EU Commission Contract VS/2000/0312 February-December 2001 "Governance models and new migration patterns: local strategies to foster social cohesion in a changing labour market". Retrieved from <http://migration.ucc.ie/irelandfirstreport.htm>.

Marshall, T H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class: And Other Essays*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Martiniello, M. (2008). Towards a coherent approach to immigrant integration policy(ies) in the European Union. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dev/38295165.pdf>.

McGinnity, F., Quinn, E., O'Connell, P. and Donnelly, N. (2011). *Annual Monitoring Report on Integration 2010*. Dublin: Economic and Social Research Institute and The Integration Centre.

McMillan, K. (2001) *Citizenship under Neoliberalism: Immigrant Minorities in New Zealand 1990-1999*, (unpublished PhD thesis). University of Auckland, Auckland.

Morris, L. (2007). Stratified Rights and the Management of Migration, *European Societies*, 3 (4), pp.387-412.

Mouffe, C. (1992). Preface: Democratic Politics Today, in C. Mouffe (ed.), *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community*. London: Verso, pp. 1-14.

Murphy, A. (2000). *The Celtic Tiger: An Analysis of Ireland's Economic Performance*, European University Institute Working Paper, European University Institute. Retrieved from [http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/WP-Texts/00\\_16.pdf](http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/WP-Texts/00_16.pdf).

National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism (2008). *About the NCCRI*. Retrieved from <http://www.nccri.ie/nccri-about.html>.

\*National Economic and Social Council (2006). *Managing Migration in Ireland: A Social and Economic Analysis, A Report by the International Organization for Migration for the National Economic and Social Council of Ireland*. Dublin: National Economic and Social Development Office, 2006.

Neundorf, K. (2002). *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

\*New Zealand Employment Service (1998). Immigration Fact Pack, December 1998, Issue 10.

\*New Zealand Immigration Service (2002). The Evaluation of Settlement Services Pilots, Wellington: New Zealand Immigration Service.

\*New Zealand Immigration Service (2003). Immigration Fact Pack, Issue 18, January 2003, Wellington: New Zealand Immigration Service.

\*New Zealand Immigration Service (NZIS) (1998). Migrants experiences of the English Language Bond, 1998, Wellington.

\*New Zealand Immigration Service (NZIS) (1995). New Zealand's Targeted Immigration Policies: Summary of October 1995 Policy Changes, Wellington.

New Zealand Labour Party (2002). 'Ethnic Affairs Policy 2002'.

\*New Zealand Immigration Service (1999). Research Proposal for a Longitudinal Survey of Migrants to New Zealand, Wellington.

O'Malley, P. (1998). Indigenous Governance, in Mitchell Dean and Barry Hindness (ed.), *Governing Australia. Studies in Contemporary Rationalities of Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 156-72.

Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Papillon, M. (2002). *Immigration, Diversity and Social Inclusion in Canada's Cities*, Discussion Paper F/27, Family Network, Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc.

Peace, R., Spoonley, P., Butcher, A., & O'Neill, D. (2005). *Immigration and Social Cohesion: Developing an indicator framework for measuring the impact of settlement policies in New Zealand*. Centre for Social Research and Evaluation Working Paper 01/05: Wellington.

\*Quinn, E. (2007). Integration: A Challenge in Principle, In policy and In Practice. Retrieved from <http://workingnotes.ie/index.php/item/integration-a-challenge-in-principle-in-policy-and-in-practice>.

Reserve Bank of New Zealand (2014). *Real GBP*. Retrieved from [http://www.rbnz.govt.nz/statistics/key\\_graphs/real\\_gdp/](http://www.rbnz.govt.nz/statistics/key_graphs/real_gdp/).

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of Freedom. Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sainsbury, D. (2006). Immigrants' social rights in comparative perspective: welfare regimes, forms in immigration and immigration policy regimes *Journal of European Social Policy* 2006 16: pp. 229- 244.

Schuck, P. H. (2002). Liberal citizenship. In E. F. Isin, & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of citizenship studies* pp. 130-144, London, UK: Sage.

Schugurensky, D. (2003). *Civic Participation. On Active Citizenship, Social Capital and Public Policy, Canadian Diversity*, 2(1):10-12.

Sinnott, R. (1995). *Irish Voters Decide: Voting Behaviour in Elections and Referendums Since 1918*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Skilling, P. (2008). *Brave New Zealand: The Construction of a New Zealand Identity* (unpublished PhD thesis) University of Auckland, Auckland.

Skilling, P. (2010). New Zealand's fifth Labour Government (1999-2008): A New partnership with Business and Society? *Labour History*, 98; pp. 39-54.

Song, M. (2003). *Choosing Ethnic Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Spencer, S. (2006). *Migration and Integration: The Impact of NGOs on Future Policy Development in Ireland*, Oxford: Centre on Migration Policy and Society (COMPAS), University of Oxford.

Trading Economics (2014). *GDP Growth*. Retrieved from <http://www.tradingeconomics.com/new-zealand/gdp-growth>.

\*Trlin A. (1997). For the Promotion of Economic Growth and Prosperity: New Zealand's Immigration Policy, 1991-1995, in Andrew Trlin and Paul Spoonley (eds), *New Zealand and International Migration: A Digest and Bibliography* (Number 3). Palmerston North, Department of Sociology, Massey University, 1997, pp.1, 2.

\*Trlin, A. and Watts N. (2004). Immigration Policy and Immigrant Settlement: A Flawed Relationship at the turn of the millennium in Spoonley, P., Macpherson, C. & Pearson D. (eds.), *Tanagata Tangata: The Changing Ethnic Contours of New Zealand*, pp. 111-134, Melbourne Australia: Thomson Dunmore.

Vertovec, S. (2001). *Transnational Challenges to the 'New' Multiculturalism*. Paper presented to the ASA Conference held at the University of Sussex, 30 March-2 April 2001. Retrieved from <http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk/working%20papers/WPTC-2K-06%20Vertovec.pdf>.

Walker R., (1995). Immigration and the Political Economy of New Zealand, in Greif (ed), *Immigration and National Identity*, pp.282-302. Palmerston North NZ: Dunmore Press.

Walzer, M. (1970). *Spheres of Justice. A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*; New York: Basic.

Whyte, John H., (1974). Ireland: politics without social bases. In Richard Rose (ed.) *Electoral Behaviour: A Comparative Handbook*. New York: Free Press.