Copyright Statement

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

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

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

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the Library Thesis Consent Form and Deposit Licence.
Indians in Aotearoa New Zealand:
A study of migrant social networks and integration through
an assemblage lens

Mary Geena Chakiamury Joseph

A thesis submitted in the fulfilment of requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology
The University of Auckland, 2017
Abstract

Social networks are central to current discussion around migrant settlement and integration. This thesis uses the case study of Indian migrants who have gained permanent residence or citizenship in New Zealand to examine the nuances of migrant network diversity, as well as the impact of such networks on their integration at four different levels: legal; economic; community; and societal.

Indian migrants constitute one of the most diverse groups of migrants moving to New Zealand, with cross-cutting layers of sub-regional, linguistic and religious identities that make it difficult to refer to just one ‘Indian’ ethnic identity. Given such diversity, this thesis draws upon data from forty-three interviews conducted with migrants from four ‘Indian’ communities – the Gujarati, Punjabi, Tamil and Keralites – to examine differences in, and the relative importance, of co-, intra- and inter-ethnic networks, particularly when it comes to gaining the legal status of permanent residence, employment and a sense of community and societal wellbeing and integration.

To help capture the complexities of Indian migrant communities and their integration outcomes, this study draws on DeLanda’s (2006) assemblage theory. This assemblage lens first reveals the centrality of migrant capacities in building the personal networks and inter-ethnic relationships that nurture belonging to wider New Zealand society. Of particular note, the findings reveal that some migrants, especially those coming from bigger multicultural cities in India, were more likely to maintain a cosmopolitan sociability (Schiller et al., 2011, p.402) or the ability to create inclusive and open relations that enable greater participation in inter-ethnic networks. Importantly, the depth and character of such networks was determined not by sub-regional ‘ethnicity’ alone, but rather by capacities linked to a migrant’s cultural capital, multi-cultural knowledge and upbringing in India. Second, an assemblage lens allows us to understand the fluidity and transient nature of migrant social networks. In some cases, co- intra- and inter-ethnic networks territorialise giving a sense of stability (that is, rebuild the same kind of associations and affiliations the migrants had in India) and in other cases they deterritorialise (that is, challenge ‘traditional’ or expected networks and relationships due to exploitation, status hierarchies or lack of acceptance). Overall, it is impossible to claim any one outcome for ‘Indian’ migrants as a whole because their networks and levels/types of integration shift and reshape depending on time and place.
Such findings have implications for our understanding of migrant integration within a host society, which cannot simply be determined by the size and quality of inter-ethnic networks. The thesis concludes that discussions about social integration must grapple with the complexity of both migrant networks and the fact that ‘integration’ occurs on at least four different levels. Thus, interventions to assist new migrants should not simply be targeted towards a particular ‘ethnic’ group without an understanding of the diverse capacities of individuals, as well as the pros and cons of migrant engagement in co-, intra- and inter-ethnic networks across differing levels of integration.
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Chapter One
Introduction

Why study Indian social networks?
As an Indian migrant living in Mito, Japan, I experienced first-hand the particularities of migrant social networks and their importance for new migrants. These social networks of other migrants living in Japan were the intimate personal support groups that helped me become culturally and linguistically acquainted to the Japanese way of life. As a gaijin [foreigner], I was a stranger in a society that had limited immigration and ethnic diversity. Yet, I was warmly welcomed into university communities, houses, weddings and other social gatherings without encountering the wariness a stranger might ordinarily have faced. Social networks also provided practical and professional support for those such as myself seeking part-time employment in the university, requiring interpreter services in the hospital, learning Japanese numerals for day-to-day financial transactions, and procuring information about Indian groceries in Tokyo. Ultimately these networks allowed Japan to feel like home, even though I could not speak the language. Thus began my education in the importance of social networks for migrant integration and my fascination with this topic of research.

Whilst the old adage, “it is not what you know but who you know” seemed relevant in Japan, I wanted to explore whether this was also true for Indian migrants in New Zealand, a country which is much more ethnically diverse than Japan. A high degree of interdependence, solidarity and mutuality within networks based on caste, religion, family, kinship and other associations are popular ways of getting things done in India (see Caplan, 1976; Chadda & Deb, 2013). I wanted to know the extent to which solidarity and trust fostered through networks remain a social norm for contemporary Indian migrants, especially for those who are skilled professionals, as well as the extent to which networks are impacted by sub-regional differences and interactions with the host society.

Skilled migrants arrive in New Zealand either individually or with their immediate families aspiring for jobs in the ‘skilled’ professions and ‘the best’ quality of life for their children (for example see Liu, Volcic & Gallois, 2014; Siar, 2012). As professionals, they often arrive with the objective of enhancing their capabilities and settling independently based on their skills and
qualifications. However, labour market uncertainties are among the prominent issues that challenge their independent settlements and aspirations. For instance, WINZ (Work and Income New Zealand, the government social security agency) identified six interrelated barriers to explain the employment difficulties constraining Indian and Chinese migrants in New Zealand labour market. These include a lack of New Zealand qualification or New Zealand work experience, English language proficiency, discrimination by employers and personnel recruitment agencies, a scarcity of positions in certain occupations and organisational deficiencies in the operation and regulation of work and income (Trlin & Watts, 2004). Many Indian migrants are thus reported to have become self-employed and entrepreneurs as a means to overcome downward occupational mobility in New Zealand labour market (de Vries, 2012; Lewin et al., 2011; Nandan, 1994). In the face of such uncertainties, social networks are considered by scholars to be the key form of migrant capital facilitating settlement. This is evident from a wide range of literature that is now available on migrant social networks (for a review see Ryan et al., 2015).

The main aim of this research is to investigate the relationship between the social networks of Indian migrants in New Zealand and migrant socio-economic wellbeing. Specifically, I seek to investigate the types of networks and support that Indian migrants draw on during settlement, labour market participation/mobility and wider inter-ethnic engagement as they become integrated into New Zealand society. As such, this study addresses the following questions:

1. How are Indian migrants’ social networks constituted?
   a. What differences and similarities in networks exist, with particular regard to density and homogeneity?
   b. How do similarities based on language/region, religion and gender influence the creation, functioning and utility of networks?
2. What factors impact on the organisation of migrant networks and why?
3. How do Indian migrants engage in inter-, intra- and co-ethnic networks, and what differing outcomes do these networks achieve?
4. How do social networks play a role in the economic wellbeing of migrants?
   a. What are the most effective networks for the labour market participation of Indian migrants?
   b. How important are social networks for both offshore and onshore Indian migrants?
5. In what ways do social networks facilitate and hinder economic and social integration?
6. How do social networks contribute to the wider integrative efforts of Indian migrants with New Zealand society?

**Indian diversity**

Social networks are often influenced by linguistic, religious and gender based identities. The multiplicity of various Indian identities and differences are also assumed to affect the formation of Indian networks. But Indians, like other migrant groups, are often assumed to be a single ethnic group and to behave in a standardised fashion (Bandyopadhyay, 2010; Khandelwal, 2002). For instance, in New Zealand, Indians are categorised as one ‘ethnic’ group, but it must be noted that diversity in Indian communities exists at multiple levels and attributing a singular national identity for Indians can be misleading. An ‘Indian’ identity comprises an amalgamation of different subsets of identities based on region, language, culture, caste, religion etc. Indian-ness also means having roots in differing histories of Indian civilisation, immigration and multiple conquests from across the globe (Ray & Singh, 2015). Such differences mean that Indian migrants do not necessarily identify with other Indians who do not come from the same region or who do not share the same language or religion. Furthermore, multiple group identities also imply in-group loyalties and rifts, even within an apparently ‘unified’ aggregate. These outstanding complexities within Indian communities make the study of Indians unique from other migrant communities and no simple generalisations are possible without carefully examining the structural organisation of their networks and the role ‘ethnicity’ plays in it.

In particular, India is home to many languages and religions as one of world’s oldest multilingual and multicultural countries. Officially the country recognises 22 languages, apart from which there are numerous other languages and dialects spoken by its population. Hindi is a widely spoken language in Northern India, whereas Dravidian languages such as Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Kannada are used in South India. The country’s social customs and traditions are aligned based on these regional linguistic differences. For much of its post-colonial history, India has not needed to address multilingualism, yet differences such as those based on the North-South and Hindi versus Tamil divides are pervasive (see for example, Pandian, 1996; Vorting, 2008).

Not only is India’s language and regional differences widely acknowledged, so is its religious diversity. Because of the dominance of Hinduism, India is widely recognised as a ‘Hindu
nated’, but the strong presence of the Christian church in South India is noteworthy as it dates back to two thousand years, even before the first Christian missionaries reached Europe (see Nesbitt, 2007). Nevertheless, it remains an ‘invisible’ community as there is widespread ignorance globally that one can be both an Indian and a Christian (see for example, Nesbitt, 2007).

Besides language and religion, the occupational profiles of Indians are also varied. This is evident from the strong presence of Indian professionals, academics, researchers and students worldwide. According to the Ministry of Overseas Affairs of India (2012), the total number of Indian migrants – representing both these skilled and low/unskilled – is estimated to be 25 million. These diversities of the Indian communities is considered ‘irreducible’ and has been manifested in countries where they have migrated.

In New Zealand today, such diversity in the Indian community is clearly evident. Migration from India to New Zealand began in the late 19th century when many early Indian settlers came from Gujarat and Punjab and they today constitute the most populous Indian communities in New Zealand. Although early Indian migration was most prominent from these two states, in the 1980s immigration policy changes saw New Zealand settle a more diverse group of Indian migrants. This newer wave of Indian migrants came from various regions in India such as Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh, as well as Gujarat and Punjab. They were different from the early settlers in language, culture, region of origin, religion, qualifications and employment skills (Bandyopadhyay, 2010).

Today the top linguistic group among Indians in New Zealand are the Hindi speakers followed by Gujarati, Punjabi, Tamil and others speaking Urdu, Bengali, Telugu, Marathi and Malayalam (Friesen, 2008b). The visible diversity of the Indian communities is also pronounced both spatially and culturally in Auckland, where many of them have settled. Within Auckland, the suburbs of Dannemora, Botany Downs, Sandringham, Mt. Roskill, Hillsborough, Manurewa and Papatoetoe stand out for their particularly dense Indian populations (see Friesen, 2015). Indian diversity is also exhibited through the various Indian associations such as the Kannada Koota, Auckland Malayali Samajam, Muthamil Sangham and Auckland Indian Association, which cater to particular linguistic and cultural groups from India (Leckie, 1995). The construction of the Mahatma Gandhi statue in Wellington and of temples and Gurdwaras (Sikh temples) also illustrates the demonstration of Indian identity in New Zealand. Their existence
indicates the complexities within the Indian community and led me to believe that Indian migrants most likely create separate networks based on their differing identities.

To overcome the paradox of collectively identifying migrants as one ‘ethnic’ group, I have classified Indian migrant networks into three types. *Inter-ethnic* networks refer to the networks and relationships of Indian migrants with friends from mainstream New Zealand society such as Pākehā, Māori and Pasifika peoples, and also those from other ethnic groups. *Intra-ethnic* networks constitute ties between various Indian communities. This distinction helps us to understand and compare the networks and the nature of relationships between various Indian ethnic groups, such as the Tamils, Keralites, Punjabis and Gujaratis examined in this thesis. Further, given sub-regional and linguistic differences, I use the term *co-ethnic* to denote networks that fall within similar linguistic or a regional group. Exploring networks within the co-ethnic group unfold the differences between Indian migrants in the ways they adhere to and identify with their ‘ethnic’ communities.

While co-ethnic networks and associations are a means of representing and reinforcing a collective identity (Snow, 2001), they can also lead to the *othering* of individuals from other ethnic groups. Moreover, while Indian migrants may be perceived as one homogenous group, migrants themselves are often unaware of or ignore internal differences within the host society (such as those between the Pākehā, Māori and Pasifika peoples). A lack of inter-ethnic relationships can lead to mutual ignorance and misunderstanding between migrants and members of the host society. The literature (for example see Hochman, 2010; McFarland & Pals, 2005) suggests that changes in the ethnic composition of friendship networks most likely motivates migrants to understand and identify with their friends from the host society. Therefore, using theories of homophily – that like attracts like – I examine the extent to which migrant networks are defined by regional, linguistic, religious and gender-based affiliations. Examining the nature of networks unfolds the nuances of not only their intra-group dynamics, but also relationships between the migrants and their host society that can significantly influence migrants’ participation in and sense of belonging to New Zealand society.

Empirical findings suggest Indian migrants both in New Zealand and elsewhere tend to be weakly integrated into wider society and insulated within their ethnic networks (for example, Lum, 2012; Meares & Gilbertson, 2013). This is most likely because Indian social life is seen as revolving around family and friends that are mostly Indian. Such interactions represent
important ways through which ethnicity is exhibited, but the internal diversity within Indian communities may also encourage a high level of inter-ethnic engagement in New Zealand. Indian migrant networks are likely to be more complex than we expect, there is no uniform pattern across Indian migrant communities, in their network formation and integration processes. This is because an acculturating individual may have multiple cultural identities (nationality, language or religion) and each of these identities have multiple components (see for example Berry et al., 2006; Ward, 2013). The majority of existing research based on social capital, transnationalism and other perspectives is thus not suitable for comprehending the complexities present in Indian communities in a meaningful way. Adopting DeLanda’s (2006) assemblage theory, which itself is drawn from Deleuze and Guattari (1987), and a social network approach, this thesis argues that migrants may hold multiple identities and irregular forms of networks. I also argue that the concept of assemblages helps make sense of the role of social networks in achieving social integration in today’s age of immigration and the resulting diversity of migrants from various linguistic, cultural and religious communities attempting to live within a ‘mainstream’ host population.

**Why study migrant social networks in New Zealand?**

Empirical evidence about network effects on migrant labour market relations is principally based on data from the United States (for a review see Giulietti, Schluter & Wahba, 2011), while network effects on inter-ethnic relations have interested European researchers (see Schaeffer, 2013). Through an assemblage lens, this research contributes to the development of a more informed theoretical framework for understanding the social networks of Indian migrants in the New Zealand context and aims to enrich empirical knowledge about their settlement and integration experiences.

Social integration and social cohesion are vital contemporary policy concepts in many migrant destinations such as Canada, Australia and Europe (Bartley, 2014). Although this study has been informed by the integration debates from these countries because they involve similar levels of social, cultural, racial, linguistic and religious diversity as found in New Zealand, it must be acknowledged that such experiences are not exactly the same. While Europe, United States and Australia have been the focus of terrorism and other forms of violence, New Zealand has not. In addition to this, New Zealand is different from other traditional immigrant receiving destinations because of its small size and because, although New Zealand has a multicultural
population, it has a bicultural political and policy framework (see Singham, 2006; Spoonley, 2012).

In the mid-2000s Berry et al. (2006) also noted that New Zealand’s level of ethnic diversity exceeds that of Australia, United Kingdom, Germany, France, Netherlands and Scandinavia. Auckland, in particular, is listed as one of the most ‘super-diverse’ cities in the world and is New Zealand’s prime destination for migrants (Bartley, 2014). This high level of diversity is a relatively recent phenomenon, correlated with changes in immigration policies that took place in 1986. Until this time, New Zealand’s immigration policies had a ‘preferred country of origin’ bias with migrants selected mostly from England, Scotland and Ireland. This was modified to incorporate migrants with ‘human capital’, determined by their skills, qualifications and work experience, age and English language competencies. As a result of ongoing immigration and natural increases in the migrant population in New Zealand, the ‘ethnic-migrant’ composition is dramatically increasing (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). For example, the Ministry of Social Development (2008) predict a ninety-five percent increase in the Asian population and an overall fall in the European population between 2006 and 2026. Statistics New Zealand (2013) expects that the Asian population, which is currently recorded as 0.54 million people to increase to 114 per cent by 2038 and exceed the number identifying with a Māori ethnicity from the mid-2020s. Amidst such projections about the increasing Asian ethnic composition, New Zealand’s ethnic communities have been lobbying for a Multiculturalism Act to facilitate full social and economic participation of ethnic minority communities (Sibley & Ward, 2013). There has also been growing attention to the role of Asia in New Zealand’s future (see, Johnson & Moloughney, 2006). Diversity is an irreversible facet of social life in New Zealand and this calls attention to the ways in which individuals cope with it and integrate into wider society. New Zealand thus provides a significant case study for examining the role of social networks as Indian migrants settle and attempt to integrate into a new country.

**How do social networks help us understand social integration?**

New Zealand’s multicultural population provides opportunities for Indian migrants to make connections beyond their co-ethnic (sub-regional and linguistic) networks. Influenced by the understandings articulated by my research participants, I define social integration at four different levels (legal, economic, community and societal) but in the most general sense, the term defines their self-perceived sense of inclusion and belonging in New Zealand society. Belonging is a multi-layered and multi-scalar emotional attachment to feeling at ‘home’ which
“becomes articulated, formally structured and politicised only when it is threatened in some way” (Yuval-Davis, 2011, p.10), such as through migration. Yuval-Davis (2011) notes that belonging can be associated with a social location, identification and attachment to a collective group and a set of ethical and political value systems with which people judge their own and others’ belonging within New Zealand. This thesis focuses particularly on inclusion and belonging that is achieved by participating in a broad range of relationships within neighbourhoods, workplaces, schools, family etc., so that individuals become members of society (Anthias et al., 2013). Yet, as mentioned earlier, participation is context dependent and a product of the actual interactions within and beyond one’s networks. For instance, the Ministry of Social Development (2008) notes that migrants at all stages of settlement may experience negative attitudes and discrimination, especially if they are visibly different from the mainstream population. Such experiences of exclusion and misrecognition could impact upon inter-ethnic differences and thereby migrant social integration if they remain unresolved.

Not surprisingly, then, the concepts of social integration and cohesion are much discussed in policy and academic circles, but these two terms are often mistakenly used interchangeably. To differentiate between these two concepts, I use the classifications provided by British scholars Saagar et al. (2012). They indicate that social integration is a theory or an idea about how the society is structured around differences based on race, ethnicity and religion and endeavours to understand how these differences can be resolved and reduced over time. On the other hand, social cohesion refers to integration in a particular place, as in the context of neighbourhood or the local community. According to these authors, we can call a person integrated, but we do not call a person cohesive. Yet, these experts do assert that integration and social cohesion involve common overlapping elements, as they are both a product of the ongoing interactions between migrants and host communities who may adapt to one another. Besides, social cohesion at the societal level may be derived from the quality of interactions at the local level; what happens in the neighbourhood, work, school and public is what shapes societal dispositions (Forest & Kearns, 2001). As such, the indicators for understanding social integration and social cohesion are overlapping and have come to be predominantly located around social relations and interactions.

Studies of social integration have adopted both objective and subjective indicators. As the concepts of social integration and cohesion have evolved in a context of socio-economic inequalities and deprivations, many indicators have been economically or politically focused,
such as how people allocate their time and money, how they vote and belong to organisations and their willingness to redistribute income etc. (for example, Costa & Kahn, 2003). However, some scholars (for example, Forest & Kearns, 2001; Duhaime et al., 2004) maintain that this underestimates the lived experiences of everyday life. They argue that while economic indicators are necessary, they do not sufficiently measure the functioning of society and its cohesiveness. For example, drawing on Turner (1991, p.18), Forest and Kearns (2001) argue that such assumptions undermine the role of ongoing ‘repair’ work in managing everyday social relations. Accordingly, social integration and cohesion is held to be more about everyday mundane life. As an everyday phenomenon, there is a willingness between individuals to cooperate and work together at various levels of society, maintain interactions, share a sense of morality, a common purpose and a sense of belonging within and across communities. As these factors determine the quality of relationships established, scholars today focus on varied dimensions of integration that include social networks, reception contexts of migrants including government policies, public opinions, presence, size and organisation of co-ethnic communities (see Marrow, 2005).

From another perspective, it may be argued that while economic exclusion in part determines growing inequalities and social, political and cultural cleavages, there is a need to understand how such inequalities and exclusions become translated into feelings of alienation and non-recognition among citizens (see Jeannotte, 2003). As feelings of alienation and exclusion restrain interactions and generate conflicts, scholars have come to emphasise the need to pay attention to conflict management. In this sense, social integration and cohesion spring not only from consensus between people, but also from the managing of conflicts around inequality and exclusion. Thus, while the idea of conflict tends to be downplayed, Jenson (1998) argues it needs more attention in debates about social cohesion and, correspondingly, conflict will be an important focus of chapters seven and eight of this thesis.

Whether aimed at generating consensus or reducing conflicts, it is clear from these observations that social networks are central to social cohesion and integration debates. Enhancing social solidarity through social networks is considered necessary for bridging inequalities and promoting participation (for a review see Leszczensky, 2013). Studies often consider behavioural and cognitive dimensions of social integration, such as participation and perception of social relationships, as key measures irrespective of whether integration is measured at a group or individual level and despite acknowledgement that social integration and cohesion are
multidimensional. According to Freidkin (2004), this is because interactions are one of the ways that people resolve issues of difference by developing attitudes and behaviours for consensus and cooperation. He posits that an individual’s attraction to a group is determined by the sum of the positive and negative experiences (rewards and punishments) with the significant others within the group. The composition of a person’s network may thus have an important influence on their attraction towards the group.

Forms of social integration centred on relationships are viewed as having many benefits for migrants and for society. Relationships are essential to psychological wellbeing, social competence and inter-cultural relations by producing low acculturative stress, greater subjective wellbeing, better health, lower identity conflicts, positive emotions, higher self-esteem, fewer socio-cultural adaptive problems, better inter-groups relations and so on (for a review see Ward, 2013). While these benefits are at an individual level, a socially cohesive society is important for attracting and retaining migrants in the face of a growing ageing population (Ministry of Social Development, 2008). Yet, in spite of its wider benefits, little is known about the dynamics of integration, especially in terms of how it is understood and experienced by migrants, and how it manifests over time necessitating a bottom-up approach and a fresh perspective (Ward, 2013).

Such a focus is especially needed in the context of the new wave of Indian migrants arriving in New Zealand as international students, seeking legal integration by acquiring permanent residence. The importance of networks to Indian migrants who were formerly international students emerged during the data collection of this study. The Graduate Job Search Policy in New Zealand, introduced in 2005 (Wilkinson et al., 2010), allows eligible students to hold relevant jobs after study for a limited period (usually between 1-5 years) and then seek skilled migration status by gaining permanent residence. This study to migration pathway is called “two-step migration” (Wilkinson et al., 2010). Indian and Chinese students have the highest transition rates to work (at 72 and 43 per cent respectively) through such ‘Study to Work’ policies (Wilkinson et al., 2010). While seen as a legitimate response to skill shortages, such policies also attract migrants who regard study as a stepping stone to gaining residence in New Zealand. The successful outcomes of these students and a large number of ongoing student applications from India have subsequently sparked political concerns1. However, given

---

1 For instance, New Zealand First Leader, Winston Peters opposes immigration particularly from Asia stating that: “Thousands of Indian students are coming to New Zealand to find work…Their goal is not to study” (TV3, 2015). Concerns about rising student numbers led to changes in the English language requirements, which was expected...
stringent immigration and labour market requirements for skilled migrant category applicants in New Zealand, it is crucial to understand what facilitates the quick transition of student applicants. Permanent residence requires an offer of skilled employment or employment with a minimum salary of NZ$55000 per annum\(^2\) and brings with it legal obligations on the part of employers who recruit offshore employees (for details of these requirements, see Immigration New Zealand, 2015). It is therefore vital to examine the networks by which students enter New Zealand’s labour market and gain permanent settlement after study. Understanding this transition provides insight into the significance of social networks for Indian onshore migrants who already live in New Zealand on temporary status, as well as those who arrive with permanent residence gained offshore. Yet research to date has primarily concentrated on either the work experiences of migrants or on the educational experiences of international students, rather than examining the working experiences of international students who are an important sector of the migrant workforce (Anderson et al., 2012c).

**Methods**

To gain detailed understanding of the integrative efforts of Indian migrants, a qualitative interviews were conducted with 43 Indian migrants who have migrated from India and now live in Auckland. Participants were purposely sampled from the Gujarati, Punjabi, Tamil and Keralite sub-regional communities to investigate patterns that could explain the differences from within and beyond ‘Indian’ communities. Auckland provided a suitable study site for the examination of migrant settlement, inter-ethnic engagement and the extent of co-ethnic embeddedness of Indian communities as the majority (68.5 per cent) of Indian migrants live there and it is where many new migrants tend to settle.

Semi-structured interviews conducted in 2014 focused on participants’ social networks, life and upbringing in India, the purpose of their migration to New Zealand, post-migration networks, experiences and support, inter-ethnic engagement and their sense of belonging and identity with New Zealand society. To visually map migrant networks and analyse differences within and between them, a pre-interview questionnaire was used and subjected to SNA (Social Network Analysis). SNA has been used widely in social sciences, but predominantly in quantitative

---

\(^2\) A job offer from an accredited employer for a minimum period of two years with a base salary of $55000 per annum (Immigration New Zealand, 2010).
studies (Ryan et al., 2015). Using SNA provides limited information about the kind of relations that migrants have, their value and the circumstances under which relations are developed, making in-depth qualitative interviews vital for making these visual maps meaningful and contextually relevant. The research design is discussed in detail in chapter three and it contributes to the significance of this study, which offers the first qualitative, sociological investigation of the social networks of Indian migrants to New Zealand. Analysing these findings through an assemblage lens also offers a unique way of understanding societal integration from a bottom-up perspective from the point of view of migrants themselves.

**Thesis structure**

With the aim of understanding the organisation, role and importance of social networks for contemporary Indian migrants in New Zealand, this thesis is organised into the following chapters:

*Chapter two* situates the thesis as conceptually located at the intersection of two bodies of literature: studies of social networks and assemblage theory. The chapter explores existing findings on the relevance of social networks for migrant labour market participation and their inter-ethnic integration. By critically commenting on the way social networks are conceptualised in migration literature and also considering the complexity of Indian migrant communities, I argue that DeLanda’s (2006) use of assemblage theory is the most appropriate theoretical framework to capture this complexity in its fullest sense and analyse Indian migrant networks in the New Zealand context. Introducing DeLanda’s (2006) notions of territorialisation, lines of flight and deterritorialisation, this chapter provides a conceptual basis for arguing that migrant ethnicity cannot be conceived through one all-encompassing concept. Also scholars such as Anthias (2007) point out that it is migrants who are often held ‘accountable’ to integrate. Assemblage theory in this context helps overcome the imposition of a single cause-effect relationship through a multidimensional lens that provides a nuanced picture of migrant networks and their integration experiences. This theory and how it complements social networks theory is thus discussed in chapter two.

*Chapter three* outlines the methodology and methods used in the study. Informed by assemblage theory, the methodological framework for this study is informed by a qualitative stance and uses semi-structured interviews and network analysis to examine in detail migrants’ social networks.
Chapter four highlights the complex structure of Indian migrant social networks and presents the network differences between the four Indian communities studied. In light of their previous upbringing and social networks in India, this chapter argues that it is not ethnicity alone, but a host of factors that determines the formation of Indian migrant social networks in New Zealand. Here, DeLanda’s (2006) notion that entities can possess capacities and can adjust even when plugged into a new assemblage is used to demonstrate the kind of skills and capacities that Indian migrants hold and can draw on while adjusting into their host society.

Understanding social integration at four levels in chapters five to eight

The four data analysis chapters (5-8) are organised around four key dimensions of integration and their findings. As one’s legal status, co-ethnic community, labour market participation and inter-ethnic engagement are fundamental ways in which migrants identify with and likely relate to their host society, (see Berry et al., 2006), this study investigates integration at four levels: legal, social, economic and societal. In the New Zealand policy context, the five indicators of social cohesion identified by Canadian scholar Jenson (1998) – belonging, inclusion, participation, recognition and legitimacy – have gained attention (see Spoonley et al., 2005; Ministry of Social Development, 2008; Meares et al., 2013). These dimensions can be explored to gain insights into the ways social networks enable migrant integration at the four levels indicated in figure 1.1.

Figure 1.1: Levels of integration attained by Indian migrants through networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Societal</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter-ethnic networks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intra- &amp; co-ethnic networks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Voluntary &amp; civic initiatives beyond co-ethnic networks</td>
<td>- Voluntary &amp; civic initiatives within and between co-ethnic communities from India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of safety</td>
<td>- Permeability and openness of community networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social identification with the host society</td>
<td>- Perception and response to community similarities and differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sense of inclusion and belonging</td>
<td>- Intra-community fissures and outlook differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Perception and response to inter-ethnic similarities and differences</td>
<td>- Sense of group identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self- and peer-assessment of inter-ethnic networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inter-ethnic trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comfort, respect and acceptance received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social, economic and moral support exchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Networks initiated through employment, children, education, religion and neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Migratory satisfaction and opinion formation within networks
- Social, economic, emotional, cultural and religious support exchanged
- Access to religious resources and networks
- Access to linguistic and cultural networks

**Economic**
- Adequate career and promotional opportunities
- Opportunities to make inter-ethnic ties at workplace
- Equal access and opportunities
- Monetary satisfaction
- Recognition of skills and qualifications

**Legal**
- Skilled employment and Permanent Residence
- Recognition of skills and qualifications
- Support with study in New Zealand

**Inter-, intra- and co-ethnic networks**
- Adequate career and promotional opportunities
- Opportunities to make inter-ethnic ties at workplace
- Equal access and opportunities
- Monetary satisfaction
- Recognition of skills and qualifications

First, this study examines how social networks aid migrants seeking the legal status of permanent residence, offering the ‘insider’ advantages and support needed to acquire the skills, qualifications and sponsorships desired by the New Zealand government. Yet, aspirations for permanent legal status can bring a sometimes troubling dependence on social networks in achieving the goal of legal integration. Therefore, *chapter five* sheds light not only on how social networks facilitate and structure opportunities for settlement of Indian migrants in New Zealand, but also the means by which networks provide support in migrant transitions from temporary to permanent status. Since social capital in the form of co-ethnic networks is often regarded as a panacea for various migrant problems, this chapter also highlights that international student experiences within their co-ethnic networks were not always positive and, indeed, at times were exploitative and discouraged inter-ethnic relations.

Second, recognition of skills and qualifications are central for a skilled migrant’s sense of inclusion and participation in the host society. Thus moving from legal to economic integration, *chapter six* examines how Indian migrants are incorporated into New Zealand’s labour market, especially in the face of the various challenges that were indicated in the earlier section of this chapter. It explores if and how networks aid labour market entry and economic mobility, how networks differ in their outcomes and how migrants perceive the support received from their networks. Presenting the empirical findings of these situations confronted by migrants, this chapter argues that lines of flight and deterritorialisation are not static. That is, despite the destabilisation experienced in inter-, intra- and co-ethnic networks, this chapter argues that these networks are still necessary and fundamental to the entry and mobility of migrants in the
New Zealand labour market. As such, this chapter shows how the process of reterritorialising migrant networks is actually innovative, context dependent and need-based.

A sense of identification and inclusion is further gained through co-ethnic communities. Opportunities to engage in one’s language, religion, culture, family and kinship are important for migrants to create a sense of ‘home’. Chapter seven thus extends the analysis from economic to the community integration considering the role of intra- and co-ethnic networks of Indian migrants more specifically. Examining how their linguistic and religious networks are reconstituted in New Zealand, this chapter explores how such networks produce stability by offering diverse forms of support needed during the settlement process. Yet, this chapter argues that co-ethnic networks pose not only opportunities for but also challenges to Indian migrants. By examining co- and intra-ethnic schisms, this chapter demonstrates how lines of flight, deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation do not merely characterise Indian migrants’ inter-ethnic relations, but are also phenomena that occur in the context of their own intra- and co-ethnic communities. Thus ‘ethnic embeddedness’ is not always a stable characteristic feature of migrant ethnic networks, as suggested in the previous literature.

Chapter eight broadly investigates the role of inter-ethnic networks and the societal level of integration of Indian migrant communities within New Zealand society. Extending discussion of the capacities that Indian migrants possess when engaging with their inter-ethnic networks identified in chapter four, this chapter examines how these capacities are deployed and the quality and depth of inter-ethnic relations. Here, two types of Indian migrants are differentiated based on their approaches to maintaining such relations. In so doing, the chapter relates the conditions of migrant networks to how well migrants relate inter-ethnically and integrate with wider New Zealand society. Despite identifying these capacities, this chapter shows how societal integration is both a sum of the characteristics of inter-ethnic networks, and their overall disposition to inter-ethnic interactions and the context of their reception. This leads to the argument that scholars and policy-makers need to understand social integration differently to best achieve governmental goals of social cohesion.

Finally, chapter nine synthesises the findings of chapters four to eight and concludes that migrant settlement can never remain unproblematic, but requires new ways of understanding these patterns. Migrant social networks and the process of social integration represent fluid and
emerging phenomena. However there is potential to harness the capacity of migrant networks to better ‘integrate’ Indian migrants on the four levels identified earlier.
Chapter Two

Migrant social networks: a case for assemblage theory

Introduction

This chapter explores the theoretical ideas used to capture the complexities of Indian communities, thus enabling me to investigate the ways in which social networks contribute to the integration of Indian migrants within New Zealand society. I first focus on literature that examines the formation of social networks, particularly migrant networks, and the role they play in facilitating integration into the host society. Discussion in the literature is often polarised between an assimilationist stance (that migrants ought to integrate) and a cultural-retentionist view (which values the retention of ethnic based networks) (Gans, 1997; Papastergiadis, 2001; for a review see Sanders, 2002). I argue that an intermediate and balanced approach is needed to understand the range of integrative practices prevalent among migrants in today’s increasingly complex and plural societies. Such an approach regards ethnic group cohesion and societal integration not as mutually exclusive stable processes but as fluid processes that are emerging, irregular and perhaps interwoven with each other.

This chapter is organised into three sections. In the opening discussion, I examine the literature on migrant networks, focusing in particular on evidence of the ways they generate desirable labour market outcomes for migrants in the host society and thus facilitate economic integration. Following this discussion, I examine migrant networks in the context of inter-ethnic integration, critiquing the way in which ethnicity is used in the migration literature, to argue that migrant networks may exist beyond ethnic based relations. Subsequently, I introduce DeLanda’s (2006) assemblage theory as a framework to understand the relationship between migrant networks and social integration as a phenomenon drawn from heterogeneous entities, each deserving attention from a diversity of perspectives to comprehend it.

Social networks and economic integration of migrants

A large body of literature on migrant integration has focused on the role of social networks (de Palo et al., 2006; Sanders, 2002). Social networks constitute a web of social relations that can be simultaneously personal and intimate, and distant and formal. According to Seeman (1996),
it is through networks and social relations that individual migrants get ‘integrated’ within broader society.

In the social sciences, interest in social networks has increasingly focused on outcomes, especially on the way networks can influence closeness between people and help to change attitudes and behaviours (Marsden & Freidkin, 1993). In addition to this, social networks (in the form of ties with family, friends and acquaintances) have been shown to act as a form of social capital. A wide range of desirable outcomes of social networks have been reported, such as school achievement (Coleman, 1987; 1988; 1982; Coleman & Hoffer, 1987), development and economic growth (Henly et al., 2005; Knack & Keefer, 1997; Grootaert, 2003; Moser 1996; Narayan & Cassidy, 2001), improved democratic and political participation (Krishna, 2002; Paxton, 2002; Pilati, 2012), civic engagement (Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Heck & Fowler, 2007), employment (Fernandez et al., 2000; Granovetter, 1974), income attainment (Boxman et al., 1991), status attainment (Lin, 1999; Lin & Dumin, 1986) career mobility (Burt, 1992; Burt, 1997; Seibert et al., 2001), ethnic entrepreneurship (Bailey & Waldinger, 1991; Geertz, 1963; Light, 1972; Portes, 1993) and improved health outcomes (Berkman et al., 2000; Kawachi & Berkman, 2000; Kawachi et al., 2008; Seeman, 1996).

Of these, labour market outcomes and participation are particularly noted as fundamental to migrant integration. The literature on migrant economic integration indicates that social networks are of considerable importance with regards to migrant employment, earnings and establishing entrepreneurial activities (see Bailey & Waldinger, 1991; Fafchamps & Minten, 2002; Granovetter, 1995; Lin, 1996; Mouw, 2003; Rauch & Trindade, 2002). This literature is concentrated in two main domains: the role of co-ethnic networks in migrant entrepreneurship and the role of co-ethnic networks in improving migrant employment and earnings.

Empirical studies on social networks and ethnic entrepreneurship can be traced to the seminal works of anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1963). Studying the ethnic entrepreneurs of Santri (a pious Muslim community) in the Indonesian islands of Java and Bali, he examined the cultural factors behind economic development. According to Geertz (1963), a well-defined and socially homogeneous group and socio-economic constraints are necessary preconditions to innovative economic entrepreneurship. Later studies of migrants to the United States (U.S) by Light (1972), Waldinger et al., (1990) and Portes (1995) also confirm that group characteristics and structural constraints are conditions which often steer individuals towards ethnic
entrepreneurship. The literature concerning group characteristics shows that migrant ties are linked to the ethnic language, customs, religion and the mores of the region from which migrants originate and that these subsequently are significant for their social organisation, ethnic entrepreneurship and social mobility. Various comparative studies in the U.S. on African Americans, Japanese and Chinese migrants (Light, 1972), Japanese Americans (Bonacich & Modell, 1980) and other ethnic communities (Ebaugh & Curry, 2000; Sowell, 1981) have also shown that such ties are not only essential for migrants in reinforcing cultural continuity and identity, but also in providing material socio-economic support and social mobility. Co-ethnic ties often act as a forerunner to the establishment of ethnic businesses (Janjuha-Jivraj, 2003) and ameliorate class disadvantage among migrants by effectively monopolising employment opportunities and identifying and hiring new workers from the same ethnic groups (Rumbaut & Portes, 2001; Shah et al., 2010).

Such discussions of co-ethnic relations and networks frequently refer to the notion of relational embeddedness. The idea of embeddedness originally comes from Polanyi’s (1957) insight that the economic organisation of primitive societies is embedded within their social structure. Granovetter (1985) argued that embedded forms of economic actions in social relations continue to prevail, even in the context of modern economies and that it is important to consider this economic rationality in social relationships. The idea of socially embedded economic rationality was later extended by Portes (1995, 2010) to understand the role of migrant social networks in the informal economy. Applications of this theory by Waldinger (1995) and many others find that embeddedness in co-ethnic networks and co-ethnic communities pays off in the cooperative and reciprocal exchanges between ethnic actors. Relational embeddedness is thus seen to play a significant role for migrants by encouraging ethnic solidarity and in facilitating migrant businesses. Studies of various migrant groups, for example, Italians (Glazer, 1954), Cubans (Wilson & Martin, 1982), Chinese (Cain & Spoonley, 2013; Meares et al., 2011; Portes & Zhou, 1992), Indians and Koreans (Cain & Spoonley, 2013), and Latinos and Colombians (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993) show the embedded character of migrant ethnic businesses.

Investigations of the role of co-ethnic networks in the economic integration of migrants have equally found such networks to be of importance to migrants in their job searches, in gaining wage increases and in the quality of employees hired. This is often because co-ethnic networks disseminate valuable job information (Damm, 2009; Marsden & Gorman, 2001). The literature repeatedly characterises migrant networks as comprised predominantly of co-ethnic linkages.
In the context of these findings, social network theory suggests that people have a tendency to self-select their groups based on the principle of homophily (that like attracts like), thus impacting upon the strength of the relationships between individuals. These two dimensions – homophily and strength – influence the formation of social networks and therefore should be examined in more detail.

**The role of homophily and strength of the ties in determining the formation of networks**

Homophily is defined as the tendency of actors in a network to form ties with individuals who are similar to themselves (DiMaggio & Garip, 2012). Sometimes networks are based on individuals having common social attributes which induce connections (Kadushin, 2004; Lazarsfeld & Merton, 1954). Self-selection into groups of similar individuals is said to bring the comfort of being with others who share similar views and values and can avoid potential conflicts (Fischer, 1982; Sherif, 1958). Personal preferences and structural constraints are other important forces behind the prevalence of homophilial ties (Katz et al., 2004; Fischer, 1982).

Sex, age, religion, race, ethnicity, native language, regional affiliation and marital status are factors that are claimed to influence homophilial networks (for a review see McPherson et al., 2001). Such factors are noted to generate a dense homogeneous network, which in turn influences an individual’s group memberships. Studies of associational memberships report membership as an outcome of dense homogeneous networks (see Glanville, 2004; Popielarz & McPherson, 1995; Wilson & Musick, 1998). For example, Glanville (2004) reports a relationship between homogeneous networks and voluntary associational membership and finds that persons with more extensive access to resources through their personal networks are more likely to participate in voluntary associations. In this sense, the theory of homophily suggests that “similarity breeds connection” (McPherson et al., 2001, p.415).

While homophily explains the formation of social networks, it may also strengthen the ties established. Studies (see Boase et al., 2006; Giles et al., 2005; Seeman et al., 1996) distinguish between two types of social networks based on their purported strengths. These include ties based on ‘strong’ relationships such as family and close friends and those relationships that are ‘weak’, such as ties with less intimate friends and acquaintances. Scholars (see Granovetter, 1983; Lin, 2000) often argue that differentiating such relationships is important, because not all relationships have the same value. For instance, Granovetter’s (1973) seminal work, the first to advance the notion that there are differences in the *strength* of social networks, defined the
strength of a tie in terms of intensity, the time spent in the network, intimacy, reciprocity and emotional support. He identified weak ties by their lack of overlapping connections. For example, networks of acquaintances are less likely to be socially involved with each other. These are ties that are less frequent, transitory or are random encounters between individuals who offer reliable and practical social support to their members (Burt, 1992; Henning & Lieberg, 1996; McFadyen & Cannella, 2004; Wahba & Zenou, 2005). In contrast, strong ties are defined as the intricate networks of close, cohesive and overlapping social bonds between individuals, such as family or kinship ties that are group or community centred. These are characterised as regular, frequent, intimate, personal and constraining networks (Burt, 1992; Henning & Lieberg, 1996).

Theories pertaining to homophily and the strength of ties propose that social networks vary based on their composition and strength. It is noted that similarity in the composition of a network determines the strength of social ties. Strong ties are claimed to be homophilous, since it is usually easy for individuals to pick and choose others who are similar to themselves (Granovetter, 1983). In effect, individuals with strong ties are likely to exhibit greater similarity than those with weak ties (Xiang et al., 2010). Given the similarities that influence the formation of networks, empirical studies have examined the implications of such network differences. For instance, Sandefur and Laumann (1998) identified four benefits – information, influence, control and social solidarity – that the two types of social networks may confer. Strong homophilial ties are often reported to be beneficial in their ability to maximise collective capacities for leveraging and mobilising resources by providing information to network members and developing group solidarity. Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993) and Portes and Zhou (1993) observed that group solidarity and obligatory trust fosters the development of social capital that can be used by group members. This in turn enhances group cooperation and reduces competitions from within (Coleman, 1988; McEvily et al., 2003).

By their very nature, strong ties are considered more influential than weak ties in the creation of entrepreneurial opportunity (Batjargal, 2004; Guo et al., 2010). This is because group closure may benefit members within the network, providing cost effective and reliable information making it less risky for people to trust each other (Coleman, 1988). For example, the Jewish wholesale diamond market in New York discussed by Coleman (1988) was closed both in terms of familial and ethnic ties. Closed ties through family, community and religion provided the insurance needed to facilitate easy transactions in the market. Co-ethnic solidarity and trust
enforced from within served as a social bond, not only facilitating the ethnic economy but also providing an important means of an upward ethnic mobility (see also, Bates, 1997; Kloosterman & Rath, 2003; Portes, 1995; 2010, Waldinger, 1990).

Those in urgent need of a job are also likely to turn to strong ties, because friends and family are more easily called on and are willing to help (Granovetter, 1983). Among migrants, this is particularly true for those with illegitimate statuses such as undocumented migrants (see for example, Amuedo-Dorantes & Mundra, 2007). Yet Levanon (2011) suggests that reliance on co-ethnic ties is associated with lower earnings for migrants. Battu, Seaman and Zenou’s (2011) comparison of five ethnic communities in the United Kingdom certainly showed that, while strong personal networks are popular methods of finding employment among migrants, foreign born migrant networks are not effective in determining the level of the job achieved. This is because when ties are overlapping and strongly connected, such as within families and with co-ethnics, they tend to provide similar information and restrict access to new information and better job outcomes (Burt, 2000).

In contrast, cross-group and weak ties are reported to facilitate access to better resources and better outcomes, especially for those from a disadvantaged group (Granovetter, 1973; Lin, 2000). This is because weak ties are thought to function as novel information channels (Burt, 1990; Granovetter, 1973), generating fresh thinking and unexpected insights (Levin et al., 2011). For instance, studies have shown that to attain better career outcomes when finding a job or in getting promoted, there is value in individuals having a large network and novel informational contacts (Morrison, 2002). Individuals benefit from new information by having access to a network of numerous people who are not highly interconnected (Morrison, 2002). For example, in the context of migration, Munshi (2003) shows that migrants are more likely to be employed and hold a high paying non-agricultural job when networks are outwardly larger. Also the findings of Lancee (2012) and Xue (2008) both show that it is bridging (between-group connections, such as inter-ethnic ties) and not bonding (within-group connections, such as with co-ethnics and families) social capital that helps migrants to make headway regarding employment, income and occupational status.

As such, large, less dense and diverse social ties with few overlapping connections are considered to provide better information channels than strong ties (Burt, 1992; Podolny & Baron, 1997). Aside from bringing better labour market and job opportunities (Lancee, 2012;
Lin, 1999; Xue, 2008), weak ties are considered valuable for the societal integration of migrants (Geys & Murdoch, 2010; Putnam, 2000). Given that networks work differently, they also have the potential to engender negative outcomes for individual migrants. The following section will examine this argument in detail.

**Negative effects of social networks**
While the literature on migrant economic integration largely points to the usefulness of strong ethnic ties in employment and entrepreneurship, this remains contentious amongst scholars. Co-ethnic networks with a high degree of relational embeddedness not only foster economic opportunities, but can also impede individual freedom and progress. In extreme cases, they can lead to exploitation of co-ethnic members (Verdaguer, 2009). Bonacich (1972; 1993) found that ethnic employees are sometimes pushed to sign contracts out of ignorance by ethnic employers attempting to evade state labour standards and prevent unionisation. Such findings are relevant today in the context of a neoliberal labour market that has resulted in various kinds of precarious working environments. Insecure employment, lack of control over wages and discrimination affect the lives of migrant workers, especially when their legal status is precarious (see Waite et al., 2015). This aggravates migrant dependence on social networks. For example, illegal and undocumented migrants are seen to become more dependent on networks than those with legal statuses because of their lack of status and security (see Bloch et al., 2015; Cobb et al., 2009; Gomberg-Muñoz, 2010; Mackenzie & Forde, 2009; Mutsindikwa, 2012; Nakhaie et al., 2009). Such forms of reliance likely lead the former to a more precarious and vulnerable position within their networks. Therefore, the degree to which a social network is useful will depend upon its context and the kinds of networks in which migrants become entangled.

Typically, ethnic networks are considered advantageous for both ethnic workers and ethnic employers. Using ethnic networks not only reduces the cost of finding jobs for migrants, but can also be a tool by which employers can hire workers who accept lower salaries (for a review, see Waite et al., 2015). Cranford’s (2005) ethnographic study of the exploitative networks of Mexican and Central American undocumented migrants in Los Angeles, for instance, finds that under decentralised employment relations and hostile immigration/labour legislation, recruitment was facilitated through social networks. She notes that during periods of labour shortage, generally job seekers and their networks have the upper hand. However, employers draw on workers’ networks in an effort to secure a vulnerable labour force during a recession. This helps the employers to decrease labour costs and gain a competitive advantage, securing a
cheaper and more compliant work force (McKenzie & Forde, 2009). In this context, the janitorial industry in Los Angeles was found to hire supervisors who drew on their networks to recruit undocumented Latina and Latino immigrant workers. The supervisors not only controlled the recruitment through their ethnic networks, but also exerted control at the workplace extracting more work from fewer workers (Cranford, 2005). This situation alerts us to the possibly serious negative consequences of ethnic networks and to the fact that social networks do not generate positive outcomes for all workers. Such networks of exploitation cannot be considered social capital.

Nevertheless, there is an overwhelming tendency in the migration literature to conflate ethnic ties with social capital (Anthias, 2007), suggesting that strong co-ethnic ties act as a social benefit for migrants (Cranford, 2005). Undoubtedly, co-ethnic ties are close and often characterised by tightly knit groups of mutual acquaintances, governed by norms and values enforcing compliance and possible obligations (Coleman, 1988; Portes, 1998). However, while their closure and cohesion positively guarantees reciprocity and effective sanctions, these attributes also enforces conformity to the group norms beyond individual will (Mutsinsinkwa, 2012). In this case, denoting co-ethnic ties only as a strong communal resource ignores the differential power relations and inhibitions on individual freedom for group members. Many authors (Anthias, 2007; Cranford, 2005; Mutsinsinkwa, 2012) now consider the nature and the context of such relations to be important. To understand if co-ethnic networks are instrumental thus requires one to look beyond such networks and instead consider how they are situated in a wider social context, such as in relation to other social networks (Cederberg, 2012). By doing so, a more balanced and nuanced understanding of co-ethnic ties as social capital can be attained, even taking into account negative outcomes.

Portes (2010) recognises that, although social capital is an outcome stemming from the relations between actors, the literature on social capital mainly discusses its positive consequences. He nonetheless observes that it is a sociological bias to see only good things emerging from strong informal relationships between individuals. His review of the literature identified four negative consequences of bonding social capital: the exclusion of outsiders; excessive claims on group members for favours and benefits; restrictions on individual freedom; and downward levelling norms that keep the members of the downtrodden group in place.
For instance, although social capital may enhance trust, conformity and loyalty within group, it can also create a strong out-group antagonism (Miyata et al., 2008; Putnam, 2000). This is because, as mentioned earlier, ‘closure’ is an important attribute of dense and strong bonding social capital (Arregle et al., 2007; Coleman, 1988). Where cohesive, intimate and personal contacts remain closed and provide exclusive access to resources only for members, there is an ‘us’ and ‘them’ distinction between members and non-members (Etzioni, 1996). While closure may benefit members from within the network, it also prevents the entry of people from outside the group (Coleman, 1988). Sometimes, even for those from within, a violation of group trust or norms results in one losing those ties.

Nonetheless, exclusion of outsiders may have certain consequences for wider societal integration and inter-ethnic relationships. The literature contends that migrant labour market participation increases when there are higher levels of inter-ethnic group interaction (for example, see Sanders, 2002). Contrarily, if migrants only remain embedded in strong co-ethnic ties, then it hinders their economic and inter-ethnic integration. This occurs especially if they do not acquire the host society’s language or adapt to its cultural norms (see Chiswick, 1991; Damm, 2009; Lazear, 2007; Sumption, 2009). Thus, given networks shape social integration opportunities, more discussion on this topic is central to deriving a relevant theoretical framework.

**Social networks and inter-ethnic integration**

The literature on ethnic diversity argues that inter-ethnic networks are necessary to generate positive identity among migrants within the host society (Huntington, 2004; Verkuyten & Martinovec, 2012). This is considered fundamental to their social integration. In the context of understanding civic participation and social integration, Putnam (2007) argues that inward-looking ties may hamper trust between groups. Arguing that in-group trust and out-group trust are negatively correlated, he sees immigration and ethnic diversity as reducing social solidarity and social capital by lowering trust, altruism, community cooperation and friendship between the migrant and the dominant population.

Other studies (for example, see Alesina & La Ferrera, 2000; Anderson & Paskeviciute, 2006; Costa & Kahn, 2003; Goodhart, 2004) have certainly found a negative relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital, subsequently confirming the importance of strengthening bridging social capital to enhance migrant participation and integration. Lancee and Dronkers’
(2008) study in the Netherlands also confirms Putnam’s (2007) claim that neighbourhood ethnic diversity reduces individual trust for both immigrants and local residents. Studies in the U.S. document that civic engagement, group participation and spending on local welfare – such as public expenditure on education, roads, libraries, sewers and trash pickup – is lower in heterogeneous communities especially when ethnic, racial and income fragmentations are high (Alesina & La Ferrara, 1999; Alesina et al., 1997; Costa & Kahn, 2003). On the other hand, the level of trust and support for welfare spending is reported to be higher for those sharing the same racial group (Glaeser et al., 2000; Luttmer, 2001). In addition, there are concerns about the formation of parallel societies in the host country further limiting the chance of societal integration (Josifides, 2013).

Investigations of ethnic diversity, inter-group contact and integration of migrants within the host society often trace problems to cultural differences between groups, anxieties about negative stereotypes towards outgroup members and their cultural and historical contexts. For example, Stephan et al. (1998, p.570) used integrated threat theory to explain the threats between migrants and host society by examining the attitudes of Spanish citizens towards Moroccan immigrants and the attitudes of Israelis towards Russian and Ethiopian migrants. They defined the concept of ‘integrated threat’ by exploring four variables: ‘symbolic threat’ which denotes inter-group value differences; ‘realistic threat’ that undermined the actual existence of in-group members due to competition for scarce resources; ‘anxieties’ concerning interaction with out-group members; and ‘negative stereotypes’ of out-group members. Of the four variables, findings suggest that inter-group anxiety and negative stereotypes are the strongest and most consistent predictors of prejudice against all three immigrant groups (Stephan et al. 1998).

Based on such findings, scholars agree that inter-ethnic bridging between groups is necessary for overcoming in-group and out-group differences promoting social integration. Putnam (2000) says that successful immigrant-receiving societies have overcome such fragmentation by creating new and cross-cutting forms of social solidarity with more encompassing identities. These types of networks that generate broader identities and reciprocities are called bridging social capital, while bonding social capital are networks within the group which only bolster narrow and inward-looking selves (Putnam, 2000). Using this bonding and bridging framework to study the implications of racial and ethnic diversity, Nannestad et al.’s, (2008) study of the integration of non-Western migrants into Denmark defined bonding social capital as trust in
those who are already known, while bridging social capital emerged from trust developing between strangers. They argue that the latter type of relations are necessary “to transcend group cleavages” (Nannestad et al., 2008, p.610; Sanders, 2002). Although dense ethnic networks provide social and psychological support for less fortunate members by furnishing start-up finances and providing reliable labour for local entrepreneurs, bridging social capital provides better linkages to external sources of information diffusion (Putnam, 2000). As noted in the previous section, a diversity of contacts across separate groups indicates a high volume of information with little redundant information (Burt, 2000). On the other hand, a closed, bounded network does not yield new knowledge, as it is likely that information gained from one counterpart has also been received by another in the same network (Anderson & Miller, 2003). Since wider links to the outside community are resource driven, Putnam (2000, p.23) thus sees bonding social capital as a necessary condition for “getting by”, whereas weak bridging social capital is crucial for “getting ahead”.

As such, debates concerning migrants and their ability to integrate and participate within the host society often regard inter-ethnic contacts as optimal. Allport (1979) observes four favourable conditions that optimise such contacts: equal group status; common goals; intergroup cooperation; and institutional support. Similarly, Philips et al. (2014), explored people’s fears and hopes for neighbourhood and community cohesion in the United Kingdom (U.K) and found that an intercultural exchange of ideas is necessary to confront group differences. Such an exchange is believed to facilitate mutual learning by challenging the emotions and stereotypes that underpin everyday animosities between the new and settled residents. In addition to this, these exchanges help to negotiate the socially constructed group boundaries of ‘self’ and ‘other’, consequently reducing negative out-group evaluations and fostering tolerance (Allport, 1979; Hewstone, 2009; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). In particular, the development of inter-group networks with members of the host society is reported to have positive outcomes for both migrants and the host society in terms of less stress, enhanced feelings of acceptance, greater opportunities to develop friendships and better connectedness between individuals (Kim & Semmler, 2013; Miller, 1987; Pettigrew, 1998). Heterogeneous or inter-ethnic networks are therefore argued to enhance the bridging capabilities of social capital.

Despite the significance of bridging social capital in enhancing inter-ethnic relationships and social cohesion, Putnam’s (2000) analyses of bonding and bridging social capital have been the
subject of much controversy among researchers (Chiu, 2011). Although some have raised concerns about ethnic diversity leading to a decline in social capital, others recognise that diversity is only one of the many factors that accounts for variations in social capital (Fieldhouse, 2010). Poverty and deprivation (Becares et al., 2011; Laurence & Heath, 2008), age (Stolle & Harell, 2012; Sturgis et al., 2014), racial inequality (Rothwell, 2012), residential segregation (Rothwell, 2012; Uslaner, 2011), and power and status hierarchies (Blumer, 1958; Levine & Campbell, 1972; Sherif, 1966) are some of the other factors responsible for undermining inter-ethnic relations and social cohesion. Thus, Uslaner (2011) argues that diversity and migrant segregation are not the same thing. He states that segregation, more than diversity, leads to a decline in trust and equality.

Bolt et al. (2010) further contend that integration is not only dependent on the characteristics of migrant communities, but also on the reactions of the institutions and the population of the receiving society. For example, in Wise’s (2005, p.174) study of the town of Ashfield in Australia, ‘local’ participants – especially Anglo-Celtic elderly people – often resented the changing ethnic landscape of Ashfield. Feelings of alienation, deep-seated sense of displacement and disorientation encouraged negative sentiments towards new migrants. These participants often believed that a lack of neighbourhood relations were due to increasing immigration-based ethnic diversity (Wise, 2005). Yet, despite these negative sentiments, Wise (2005) observed there was hope for inter-ethnic exchanges because several positive exchanges were initiated by new Chinese migrants with their neighbours. The recognition, care, reciprocity and help offered by the new Chinese migrants, irrespective of their English language inadequacies, provided potential for inter-ethnic networks and appreciation that bridged diversity.

Similar findings were also reported by Saggar et al. (2012), who contend that migrants scored more highly than local born Britons in the same neighbourhood on certain measures of integration such as a sense of belonging to Britain and trust in the political institutions. In their report on the impact of migration and diversity on social cohesion and integration in a local neighbourhood in Britain, they note the complexity of people’s perceptions of cohesion was determined by the way in which migrant groups ‘perform’ in terms of integration and by the way citizens from the white majority worried about the national identity. Saggar et al. (2012) argued that people’s views of cohesion and anxiety towards it were actually influenced by political debates on migration. Thus, their recommendation to policy makers wishing to
understand integration and cohesion was to focus on the existing socio-economic deprivation of individuals, groups and area, rather than migration.

These findings and arguments raise important questions around how migrants, especially those who are culturally and visibly different from the mainstream host society, should be held accountable for integration (Anthias, 2013b). Integration is believed to be an interactive, two-way process (see Spoonley, 2005). Yet, like Wise’s (2010) participants who linked a lack of neighbourhood contact to increasing ethnic diversity, scholars sometimes uncritically assume associations between increasing ethnic diversity and declining social cohesion (for example, see Brubaker, 2004).

This is likely because migration scholars tend to be aligned either with an assimilationist stance or a pluralist perspective. Earlier studies conducted by out-group members tended to be influenced by assimilationist values, while many contemporary scholars are in-group members and are influenced by cultural-retentionist values (for a review see Sanders, 2002). Although a middle approach between the assimilationist and separationist stances has emerged, it poses a problem in the sense that both the host society and ethnic heritage groups are viewed as interdependent and it fails to determine individuals who strongly identified with both cultures and those who do not (Oudenhoven et al., 2006). However, I argue that looking at migrant social integration through a binary lens, with classifications such as bonding and bridging, in-group and out-group, ethnic versus host society, tends to ignore a host of factors that complicate how people relate and integrate in a given social setting. It is possible that individuals do not need to fully engage in one of these two groups to impact their integration outcomes. In an increasingly fragmented world, we relate to others in a variety of social roles in differing contexts. Neighbours, co-workers, church mates, children’s and spousal networks, communities of affiliation may or may not be interrelated. As a result, when we encounter conflict or discrepancies in relationships, it is easier for us to break away and move into an entirely different or new line of interactions. These twists and turns, in Deleuze-Guattarian (1988) terms, are called the lines of flight and deterritorialisation. Acknowledging both fragmentation and stability helps us understand the complex belongings of migrants to different groups (cf. Butcher, 2010; Oudenhoven et al., 2006). Thus, this thesis moves beyond binary classification and groupist approaches that suggest unilinear cause-effect associations between migrant ethnicity and integration. Before going into the theoretical framework that supports this argument, the following section offers some critical insights into the groupist approaches that
informed my choice of theoretical framework for the study of Indian migrants and their social integration processes.

Critique of ‘ethnic’ and ‘groupist’ approaches

It is clear from the above review of literature that studies on migrant social networks are inclined either towards an ethnic or nationality focus, showing that migrants are embedded in ethnic circles (see Crul & Schneider, 2010; Faist, 2000; Garip et al., 2012; Guarnizo et al., 2003; Meeteren & Pereira, 2013; Morosanu, 2010; Pries, 2001; Rindoks et al., 2006; Ryan et al., 2008; Vertovec, 2004). Although ethnicity and nationality are two separate identities based on culture and country of origin, they are often used interchangeably on the assumption that people from a geographical region or country share a common culture. For example, the notion of ethnic social capital is often used in studies engaging with social capital and migration. The term ethnic social capital is, in most cases, is defined only from the perspective of co-ethnic networks. Light and Gold (2000, p.20, emphasis added), for instance, refer to the concept as the “attributes of particular worldviews, skills and pattern of in-group interaction among an ethnic group”, while Shah et al. (2010, emphasis added) see it as the shared values and norms amongst ethnic families. Brettell (2005, emphasis added) further defines ethnic social capital by differentiating it from cross-cultural social capital, suggesting that the former is embedded within ethnic associations, while cross-cultural capital is embedded within mixed ethnic and mainstream organisations. Such definitions regard ethnicity as the common unit of analysis.

However, from the perspective of understanding migrant integration, such an approach can be seen as narrow and one dimensional. An over emphasis on origin related ties or common culture tends to overlook the individual agency and the multiple identities migrants possess and are needed to initiate and build cross cultural connections with members of the host society and with other ethnic groups (Morosanu, 2010; Verkuyten, 2014). Consequently, members of different ethnic groups are perceived to lead separate lives from each other and their inter-ethnic interactions are under-examined (Brubaker, 2004; Wessendorf, 2013). Moreover, this leads to the common assumption that ethnic ties are readily available for ethnic members, overlooking the frictions within these networks that may hinder the availability of the required support. This thesis maintains that an overwhelming focus on the resourcefulness of ethnic ties has limitations for understanding the wider societal integration of migrants.
Critiquing such approaches in contemporary debates about ethnicity, migration and statehood, Brubaker’s (2004) aptly titled book *Ethnicity Without Groups* argues that ethnic groups should not be considered as internally homogenous, externally bounded groups. They are not unitary collective actors with a common purpose. His critique targets two main aspects of such approaches: “groupism”, which he defines as a tendency to take bounded groups as the unit of analysis; and constructivist theorising in the social sciences that uses groupist language and treats ethnic groups as bounded groups. Brubaker (2004) argues that ethnicity is produced and reproduced as a basic category of analysis through political and cultural articulations in everyday life (also see Nagel, 1994). This, however, has consequences for persons who are ascribed with ‘ethnic’ identities, who otherwise are likely to identify and define themselves in other ways. Such identities can powerfully shape the way people perceive and experience everyday life and their political interests. According to Brubaker (2004), ‘groupism’ is variable and not a constant characteristic from within or across the groups; and can be studied in various ways, as events or in relation to other existing conditions. His argument is relevant in the context of this study of Indian migrants where ethnicity and groupism are contested by virtue of the internal regional, linguistic, religious and class divisions found within ‘Indian’ communities.

Eriksen (2007) has a similar view, arguing that whether an ethnic group exists is a fundamental outcome of the perspective that is applied, rather than the actual existence of the group. That is to say, groups exist from one point of view but, from another, they disappear. He notes the importance of examining the differences that may exist between even individual migrants, as social groups are closed and open in different ways and the degree of group incorporation varies even from within. Making sense of integration thus requires consideration of the different criteria that includes and excludes individuals in a given social environment. In addition, the larger processes and practices that may exclude and obstruct migrants, such as the institutional arrangements, legislation and socio-political context, as well as intra-community dynamics need to be explored (Crul & Schneider, 2010; Eriksen, 2007).

Among the scholars who pay attention to the complex contexts defining inter-ethnic interactions are some who focus particularly on the growing diversity that affects everyday interactions in many migrant-receiving destinations. Here, the role of culture as a shared system of meaning between individuals offers an important means for understanding inter-ethnic interactions and relationships. Swedish anthropologist, Hannerz (1992) highlights that there is an increasing tendency among social scientists to study culture as a uniformly coherent entity where culture
entirely depends on ongoing processes. For instance, as people come into contact with each other or initiate a new interaction, this may produce more or less similar contextually relevant meanings. The greater the shared sense of meanings and symmetry between individuals, the more effortlessly the meanings are constructed and communicated. According to Hannerz (1992), these relevant baselines in interaction thus need to be explored and negotiated rather than simply taken for granted.

By paying attention to the relevant baselines in interactions and moving away from groupist approaches, scholars have come to focus more on diverse multicultural contexts (Anderson, 2004; Bourdieu, 1977; Butcher & Harris, 2010; de Finney, 2010; Hannerz, 1996; Onyx et al., 2011; Rampton, 1995; Vertovec, 2009; Wessendorf, 2014; Wise & Velayutham, 2009). Studies highlight that ‘everyday multiculturalism’ – that is, how cultural diversity is experienced and negotiated in everyday situations (see Wise & Velayutham, 2009) – encourages people to internalise and deploy certain sets of skills when seeking inclusion and generates a positive attitude towards diversity. This is not only reflected in the general acceptance of diversity, but also in seeing diversity as ordinary (Wessendorf, 2013). A heterogeneous multicultural environment provides neutral ground for people who are ‘diverse’ to act in a familiar way without being estranged and also serves as a cosmopolitan canopy for people to treat others with a certain level of civility. It provides opportunities to come together, observe and mix by becoming acquainted and developing the social intelligence to handle differences (Anderson, 2004).

A set of skills are said to be enabled during such interactions. Schiller et al. (2012) regard these skills as constituting a cosmopolitan sociability consisting of forms of competence and communication skills that are based on the capacity to create social relations of inclusiveness and openness to the world. Fundamental to this cosmopolitan sociability is also the idea of a multicultural mind, where individuals flexibly make use of cultural knowledge as a tool to navigate the social world (Hong & Khei, 2014). For instance, drawing on Bourdieu’s (1977) notions of habitus, Vertovec (2009, p.7) points out that culture is a “tool kit” from which individuals draw various attributes throughout their lifetime. It enables them to undergo a process of cognitive unfreezing in which existing beliefs are questioned and stimulates elaborate thinking and openness (Verkyuten, 2014).
Yet there has been a tendency within the literature to analyse cosmopolitanism and ethnicity separately. Against this tendency, Schiller et al. (2011) and Schiller and Salazar (2013) argue that rootedness and openness cannot be viewed in oppositional terms. Critiquing the binary definition of cosmopolitanism as a rejection of ethnic separateness and openness to difference, Schiller et al. (2011) view cosmopolitanism as a simultaneous rootedness and openness to shared human emotions, experiences and aspirations, constituting creative ways through which migrants construct their sense of home in the new environment. Thus, it is necessary to explore how people use their diverse cultural or religious backgrounds to build relationships and identities of openness (Schiller & Salazar, 2013). In so doing, cosmopolitanism can be seen to arise from social relationships that do not negate cultural or gendered differences because such relationships are capable of experiencing commonalities across differences (Schiller et al., 2011). Given the diverse context of Indians and Auckland as a popular migrant destination, it is not surprising that this study found cosmopolitanism to be a key aspect of some migrants that influenced their social networks.

There is a need to challenge a groupist orientation to understanding migrant interactions and societal integration that views ethnic groups as cultural groups with similar cultural traits (Verkuyten, 2014). The above arguments have emphasised and offered some ways of doing this to understand social integration as a multi-dimensional and contextual process that requires diverse perspectives for analysis. It is here that I put forward DeLanda’s (2006) theory of assemblage as a relevant framework to study ‘Indian’ migrants and their networks in the context of New Zealand as a migrant destination and therefore as a unique contribution to the literature.

**Theoretical approach to the study of social integration of Indian migrants**

Understanding integration as an assemblage helps overcome the essentialist ontology that characterises migrants from a particular country as having inherent and predetermined characteristics. Further, assemblage theory helps to contextualise migrant networks and analyse the integration experiences of trust, belonging and participation with the host society. Derived from Deleuze and Guattari (1988), DeLanda’s (2006) understanding of assemblage theory offers a realist view of the social world as consisting of various entities varying across time and space. Anything can be conceptualised as an assemblage, which may include a range of aggregates such as individuals, populations, friendships, interpersonal networks, cities and territorial states.
DeLanda (2006) visualises an assemblage as characterised by its \textit{relations of exteriority}, where relations are determined by the capacities of the components that interact with each other. This idea of relations of exteriority emerged as a critique and alternative to 19th century notions of relations of interiority, which imply that component parts are constituted by the very relations they have to the other parts of the whole and that a part detached from the whole ceases to exist. Challenging this structuralist notion, DeLanda (2006) contends that there is no way of telling in advance how the entity affects or will be affected by other entities and that it has an \textit{independent} existence. Interactions between the entities are thus complex and capturing this complexity is crucial to understanding the phenomena of \textit{emergence} that can help grasp change and novelty in interactions as it takes place. On the other hand, this possibility of understanding emergence ceases when the parts are fused together as a continuous whole as in relations of interiority. Emergence is thus an important property of assemblage. It refers to a process whereby larger entities or social behaviours results from the actions and interactions between individual agents (Sawyer, 2005). Social networks and social integration in this sense can be seen as an emerging phenomena being shaped by the actions of and interactions between individual entities.

Although drawn from Deleuze and Guattari (1987), DeLanda’s (2006) interpretation of assemblage theory has been reconstructed independently. Yet, in order to understand DeLanda’s assemblage theory, I start by identifying the key principles of Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) rhizomatic analysis that is inherent to assemblage thinking. The key principles governing a rhizome are its connections, heterogeneity and multiplicity. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) urge us to conceive of rhizomes as having no points or positions but lines of articulation, segmentarity and territory, as well as of deterritorialisation and destratification. In their view, a mapping of these connections will help in understanding the ‘lines of flight’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), which are the lines of departure when two entities come into contact. In the context of my study, observing the lines of flight involves mapping a migrant’s social relationships with members of their linguistic-regional co-ethnic communities, with members of their national (Indian) intra-ethnic community and with members of the mainstream New Zealand community or other ethnic, non-Indian communities. Indian communities themselves are made up of variously-formed linguistic, regional and religious multiplicities and thus constitute an assemblage. It is therefore important to understand the lines of articulation, segmentarity, territories and lines of flight within the Indian community before understanding the lines of connections with other multiplicities such as the host society. All of these
connections (or multiplicities) constitute an assemblage and are rhizomatic in nature. As an assemblage changes its nature and expands in connections from such lines of flight, so do migrants and their host societies.

Using these ideas, DeLanda (2006) conceives of assemblages as consisting of heterogeneous parts where social actors are constituted and defined by their unique capabilities. Unlike the relations of interiority which assert that parts emerge from the whole, DeLanda (2006) views the components as self-sufficient and capable of being detached and even connected to new assemblages in which interactions may differ. DeLanda (2006) notes that, when plugged into a new assemblage, the relations may change without changing their *terms*, because the properties or characteristics of the components can never explain the relations that constitute the whole, particularly in the context of new assemblages. In giving credence to the *capacities* of the components, the whole can be seen as a product of the component’s capacities. In this sense, social relations cannot be pre-determined, but are learned from experience in a more flexible way, under conditions of uncertainty that contribute to the development and exhibition of the one’s capacities. The capacities of the interacting entities thus become a significant feature of integration assemblages.

DeLanda (2006) differentiates capacities from the properties of a given entity. *Properties* are defined as a pre-given, known and finite list of characteristics inherent to an entity, whereas the capacities are the actual abilities that are undetermined, relational and open to change depending on the context. According to DeLandian interpretation then, properties of the entities may include the migrant’s nationality, sub-regional ethnicity, language, religion and gender whereas cultural capital and cosmopolitanism comprise their capacities. The capacities may go unexercised in the absence of interactions. Although capacities are likely to depend on the properties of the component and the properties of other interacting components, being part of the whole involves an exercise of its capacities rather than its constituent properties. Conceptualising social integration as an assemblage encourages a multifaceted understanding of the phenomena as not merely tied to migrant properties, such as ethnicity and nationality. Instead it is their capabilities to forge inter-ethnic networks, and to socially mingle, creating rapport, trust and inclusivity that could explain integration outcomes.

With this in mind, conflicts amongst migrants necessitate the development of various competences and multiple skills for maintaining everyday interactions. While migrant groups
are often considered to be unitary, possessing some unique cultural properties acquired as a result of their previous socialisation in their regions of origin, Lacroix (2014) observes that migrants cannot be perceived as unitary actors. This is because they are socialised in to a variety of contexts and possess multiple roles and identities. It is therefore compelling to examine the wide range of identities and loyalties which they foster from complex interactions. Indian migrants, as noted in the introduction chapter, are religiously, linguistically and regionally socialised in different ways and belong to various groups, coming from diverse linguistic regions which in the pre-British colonial period existed as different kingdoms. Socialisation in such regionally, linguistically and religiously different sub-groups and upbringing demands loyalties to various identities and communities both in India and abroad. It also means a simultaneous agreement and disagreement of certain norms, identities and worldviews. A national Indian identity is thus only one of many multiple identities which may be important.

Capacities arise when they are in interaction with other entities in an assemblage. Unlike the macro and micro approaches found in organismic analogies and rational choice theories that assume individuals are constituted by their relation to the whole and vice versa, DeLanda (2006) views the components of assemblages as having certain autonomy. DeLanda (2006) challenges the macro- and micro-reductionism of the social sciences. For instance, while micro approaches understand society as a mere aggregation of individuals, they avoid looking at the emergent property of the whole. Similarly, macro approaches are reductionist in trying to understand individuals as merely constituted through their socialisation in institutions such as family and school that subsequently interprets them based on their internalised traditional values and norms. While such approaches take either the individual or the society as absolute referents, DeLanda (2006) proposes a multi-scaled social reality constituted by networks and interactions where new scales of interpersonal networks, institutional organisations and territorial entities emerge from interactions between the populations of individuals on various levels. An assemblage thus emerges as a “harlequin’s jacket or patchwork” (Delueze & Parnet 1977, p.55) of different bodies which can never be identified as a whole in itself, nor be reduced to its constituent parts. Thus, it is my view that as an assemblage is made up of a multiplicity of heterogeneous parts, the relations are temporary, and an assemblage therefore operates as a provisional holding of a group of entities across differences. It is in a continuous process of movement and transformations as these relations change. A change in relation, no matter how small, changes the things that are linked with it (Anderson et al., 2012b). Individuals and their networks are thus constantly shaped by these relations. The relation of exteriority as the
defining characteristic of an assemblage also characterises the relation between these entities. This is why this study looks at migrant integration at the micro (legal and economic), meso (intra- and co-ethnic community) and macro (inter-ethnic) levels.

DeLanda’s (2006) notions of territorialisation and deterritorialisation also help capture the changing character of relations as either stabilised or destabilised. Through expressive aspects - such as conversations, facial gestures, dress, choice of subject matter and deployment of skills - and material features - such as the use of material technology - identities and interactions are synchronised and consolidated. When interactions and relations between the same populations become synchronised over time, new entities emerge. This process of synchronisation or stabilisation, which increases the homogeneity of assemblages, is what DeLanda (2006) calls territorialisation. To understand territorialisation, DeLanda advocates the use of network theory to offer useful insights into the nature of networks. He argues that various aspects of networks – such as strength of relationships, frequency of interactions, emotional content, and the number of relationships – all contribute to the territorialisation of assemblages, because a sense of familiarity, inclusion, comfort, warmth and safety determines stability in relationships. The contrary processes that destabilise assemblages – decreasing density, promoting geographical dispersion and reducing solidarity – are considered to be deterritorialising. According to DeLanda (2006), territorialisation and deterritorialisation are thus processes that define and sharpen the boundaries of an assemblage. These processes of territorialisation and the lines of flight or deterritorialisation of Indian migrants within New Zealand society and within their own communities will be explored in chapters five, six, seven and eight of this thesis.

However, the two processes cannot be seen in isolation, standing separate or as binary categories distant from the other. Rather, they are relational and needed to be placed on a continuum or as an aggregate characterising both stability and change. For instance, migrants and their children may adapt to their host society but that society, in turn, also changes and accommodates the new migrants. Deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation then simultaneously takes place as these entities mutually influence each other and undergo change (for example in the context of colonisation, see Sutton & Martin-Jones, 2008). DeLanda (2006) thus observes that this may both stabilise and change the identities of assemblages, as well as their constituent entities. In light of these views, terms such as ethnic precincts, ethnic suburbs, ethnic segregation, closed, avoidance, and contrarily, terms like conviviality (Wessendorf,
2014) or cosmopolitan sociability (Schiller et al., 2011) can be conceived not as binary positive and negative aspects of integration, but processes of migrants becoming part of their host society. For both migrants and their host society, this results from their varying capacities to integrate and become the other. In this sense, integration is inevitably a two-way process, where migrants, non-migrants, host institutions and global and local processes all interact and influence each other. Such interactions and adjustments define and redefine the entities and its assemblage, because when individuals interact in diverse social settings, they create patterns in which they selectively absorb some of their identities altering themselves and other components.

Most importantly, assemblage theory counters assumptions of a linear causality of social phenomenon. Instead of assuming a mechanical causality, assemblage theory entails a focus not only on how agency produces effects but also on how the agency of both the assemblage and its constituent parts modify each other. This causality is not a pre-given phenomenon, but a non-deterministic and interactive process of assembly through which causality operates in a non-linear fashion (Anderson et al., 2012b). For example, examining the claim that smoking cigarettes causes cancer, De Landa (2006) notes that not everyone who smokes cigarettes develops cancer and that not all who develop lung cancer have smoked cigarettes. Cigarettes smoking therefore can be visualised only as a catalyst (Harman, 2008) and not the sole cause of the problem. The causes can be multiple and different causes can lead to one and same effect. As a catalyst, a causal relation can be viewed as productive but not as simply implying it; a cause may just be a catalyst for something without unleashing it (Harman, 2008). Conceptualising cause in this way thus enables a visualisation of the multiple and complex factors which may all explain the formation of migrant social networks and integration. For DeLanda (2006), we are all prey to chances that give rise to capacities as we encounter random events.

Rethinking social integration in terms of the capacities that migrants possess opens up discussion about their autonomy and agency which may be differentially positioned as non-linear and relational to the whole. As such, assemblage theory provides a “less than coherent” (McGuirk & Dowling, 2009, p.178) and distinct way of conceptualising relations between the entity and its parts (Anderson et al., 2012b). As an assemblage, social integration may be determined by multiple factors and not reducible to a single logic. For example, in the context of urban studies, McGuirk and Dowling (2009) applied assemblage theory to study the newly
emergent forms of urban residential environments, such as master planned residential estates. They emphasised that these were less-than-coherent assemblages emerging from diverse practices and projects and could not be merely explained or interpreted through a traditional neoliberal lens. In this way, assemblage thinking has benefitted geography and urban studies. This thesis argues that assemblage thinking will also benefit migration studies by shifting understanding of social integration away from a rather unidimensional view of what this entails.

The concept of assemblage further enables us to overcome the shortcomings of previous approaches that postulate the world as a seamless web of reciprocal actions or perceive it as an integrated totality of functional interdependencies (DeLanda, 2006). Traditional approaches that conceptualise migrant communities in this way have often resorted to viewing them as embedded communities, glued together based on ethnically distinct identifiers. Hence understanding social integration as an assemblage replaces a totalistic view of migrant communities, unveiling the complex mechanisms behind its synthesis and divisions that is critical to improving on earlier models. Figure 2.1 uses assemblage theory to conceptualise social integration between Indian migrants and New Zealand society, highlighting the complexity and lack of coherence inherent in the process. It views social integration as a holistic, contextual and a transient process. However, I acknowledge that I cannot discuss all of the entities involved in this particular research endeavour. Only migrants are being studied, and within a New Zealand context, as portrayed in figure 2.1 which depicts migrant communities as an entity possessing and altering its unique capacities in the process of its adjustment and negotiation with the host society.
DeLanda’s (2006) interpretation of assemblage theory is relatively recent but has been widely applied in urban studies and geography (see for example, Acuto & Curtis, 2014; Anderson & McFarlane, 2011; Brenner et al., 2011) and is increasingly being applied in the social sciences. Some authors in migration studies have even come to adopt Deleuzian ideas to overcome the binary and segmented ways of understanding migrants and ethnicity (Schiller & Salazar, 2012). The lines of flight and the processes of deterritorialisation provide a good starting point for understanding inter-personal ties with a view that these are not confined to ethnic groups alone. As an anti-structuralist concept, assemblage provides researchers with an emergent, heterogeneous, decentred and ephemeral visualisation of social phenomena that contrasts with the structured and systematic conceptualisation of social life (Marcus & Saka, 2006). I agree with Legg (2011) that moving beyond bordered thinking offers a renewed and powerful foundation for grasping social integration in its full complexity.

Summary
A review of literature has shown that social networks are important for migrant settlement. Yet, existing studies of migrant networks have paid significant attention mainly to co-ethnic
networks. Studies of migrant entrepreneurship and employment, in particular, have placed considerable emphasis on ethno-cultural characteristics and on processes of ethno-cultural incorporation (Marger, 2001; Levanon, 2011; Rath & Kloosterman, 2000). Even discussion of migrant integration within host societies has often understood ethnicity in a simplistic fashion. However, processes of identifying, affiliating and belonging are complex and vary within and between groups (Philips et al., 2013). In this context, migrant networks are not limited to ‘ethnicity’ in the conventional sense, but may incorporate resources from a wider community.

This study opens up the possibility of discussing social integration as an interactive process that can be understood from varied angles. The two key concepts – social networks and assemblages – adopted in this thesis are interwoven to provide a unique and theoretically robust understanding of migrant networks and social integration. A network approach helps to clarify the nature of what is already assembled. It helps us to understand the process of assemblage by disclosing the nature and type of network members, who may be from one’s own co-ethnic groups or may actually differ. While social network theory provides a conceptual apparatus to map and easily describe inter-personal ties, assemblage theory provides a useful framework for conceptualising network formation and interactions based on the premise of migrant social integration as processual and relational. According to McFarlane (2011), assemblage theory involves a conceptualisation of social life as being built from the capacities of its sub-elements. Therefore theorising social integration as an assemblage built not only from the capacities of migrants but also from other elements – such as the host society’s population, labour market conditions, its policies, rules and regulations – orients this thesis towards the multiple practices through which social integration may be attained.

In this way, assemblage thinking can shed light not only on the process of integration but also on its potential barriers. Applying the concepts of territorialisation and deterritorialisation, for instance, enables us to comprehend how migrants selectively become absorbed into certain networks stabilising their identities. According to DeLanda (2006), a population stabilised through selective absorption will exhibit the emergent properties of newly formed networks. We might therefore expect the characteristics of Indian migrant networks to inform how migrants identify themselves and their interpersonal relationships. As stated earlier, neither migrants nor the host society are binary opposites, as both groups change and are in a process of a “veritable becoming” of the other (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988, p.10). Therefore the focus of this thesis is not on who changes or who integrates, but on the process and the context of the
territorialisation, deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation of migrant networks. This offers insights into important aspects of integration such as participation, inclusion, trust and belonging, which will be discussed in chapters five, six, seven and eight.
Chapter Three
Research methodology and methods

Introduction
Chapter two explored current debates relating to migrant social networks, ethnicity and social integration then outlined a theoretical framework based on assemblage theory. The choice of methodology has been inspired by this theoretical framework. This chapter draws linkages between the nature of the object investigated, its theoretical conceptualisation, the research questions and design and the methods used to study social networks amongst Indian migrants. The first section of this chapter begins with an outline of the philosophical assumptions behind my use of a qualitative approach in the study of Indian migrants and their social networks. In this section, I also pinpoint the limits of existing quantitative approaches. The next subsection reviews the methods used, the semi-structured interviews and social network analysis, as well as sample recruitment. Subsequent discussion focuses on the interview procedures, key ethical concerns addressed in the study and data analysis. Embedded in these sections are reflections on my position as an Indian researcher and the impact this had on the research.

Methodological framework: positioning a qualitative inquiry
Research methodologies are the fundamental outcomes of our assumptions of how the world is (ontology) and how we come to know it (epistemology) (Bryman, 2015). The central questions that guided me to an appropriate methodology for this study were: how do Indian migrant networks exist and what makes the study of their social networks possible? In chapter two, I discussed in detail the way in which migrant networks can be a product of their capacities, while also acknowledging that social networks do not exist “as atoms outside a social context” (Granovetter, 1985, p. 487). They can be viewed as occupying a constant state of flux, shaping migrant outlooks and lives and, at the same time, networks can be modified by migrant experiences and by critical reflection on such experiences. Since there is an element of inseparability between networks and their context, both the migrant and society can be understood only in relational terms. Accordingly, Indian migrant networks are viewed here as emergent and processual. Guided by this epistemological premise as a starting point for a methodology, social network analysis was identified as enabling not only understanding of the
nature of existing network structures, but also helping to comprehend how they have come to be constituted in their present form and the conditions underlying their break-up and continuity.

My decision to undertake a qualitative inquiry was not only influenced by the above epistemological stance, but also by an evaluation of established methods and ongoing critiques in the migration literature. In particular, scholars (see Faist, 2012; Horner, 2012; Iosifides, 2013; Schiller et al., 2012) note the tendency to speak of identity in highly essentialising terms, for instance invoking notions that migrants are ‘invading’ a country (Horner, 2012). This often arises from methodologies that are nation-state centred, leading to what is called the problem of ‘methodological nationalism’. Methodological nationalism is the assumption or ideological orientation that the nation-state society is the natural social and political form of the modern world (Wimmer & Schiller, 2002). This positions migrants as if they are enclosed within the boundaries of nation-states of the society of origin based on shared characteristics (Schiller, 2012, p.185). Characterising them as culturally homogenous and as a coherent body, such methodologies lead to assumptions that all migrants act in the same way.

Such an essentialising of migrant communities has spurred calls among migration scholars for innovative and appropriate alternative methodologies to overcome this challenge of viewing migrants uniformly (see Faist, 2012). Attempting to overcome methodological nationalism and the tendency to take ethnic groups as the unit of analysis, studies have started to document “non-ethnic ties” and various modes of affiliation of migrants at their destination for instance to examine migrant political alliances, cross-ethnic ties and affiliations and religious networks (see Morosanu, 2012). This thesis examines ethnicity in the light of various sub-group differences based on region, language, religion. Further it examines the inter-ethnic networks such as ties with the members of the host society adopting a qualitative social network analysis. This helps in overcoming the ‘container model’ of methodological nationalism by directing attention to the individual migrants and their multiple pathways to establishing networks and ultimately the examination of networks that move beyond ‘nationality’ and ‘ethnicity’ in the usual sense.

It is notable that most studies which have adopted a social network approach have been quantitative. However, I believe that quantitative methods alone are not adequate to capture the complexity of Indian migrant networks that this thesis investigates. A quantitative focus on social network analysis guides researchers to answer what migrant networks exist, but has
limitations in explaining how and why networks and actions develop in the ways that they do (see Edwards, 2010; Gold, 2005). Such limitations arise because overly quantitative approaches map and measure networks, simplifying them to a set of numerical data, leaving out questions of crucial importance relating to content and meaning (see Edwards, 2005). For instance, quantitative studies of social networks have examined formal properties such as the frequency, strength, intensity and direction of social networks (Heath et al., 2009). Data based on these measures help in providing an outsider’s view of migrant networks; nevertheless, they are limited in understanding the processes that lead to the formation of these structures and how and why migrants are embedded in particular type of networks. Thus, this thesis bridges structural and interpretive understandings of migrant social networks by adopting a qualitative approach to social network analysis.

Researchers using qualitative approaches seek a “deeper” level of information than that sought through surveys and questionnaires (Johnson, 2002). Knowledge is claimed to exist at three levels – the actual, where activities happen without researcher’s intention or knowledge of them, the empirical where knowledge can be observed and experienced and a “deep” dimension where we come to acknowledge that ‘something is going on below the surface’ (Baskar, 1998, p.16; Danermark et al., 2002, p.20). In this context, qualitative methods such as in-depth interviews mediate these levels of knowledge by moving from knowing what is manifested to understanding the mechanisms that generate them. Participant reflections help uncover what is usually hidden from ordinary view, offering deeper understandings about the nature of their experiences (Johnson, 2002).

Thus qualitative approaches facilitate the understanding of issues relating to why and how social ties are constructed, reproduced and vary (see Edwards, 2010). Migrant networks and their socio-economic and cultural contexts are characterised by meaning-making processes (Iosifides, 2013). Non-measurable aspects, particularly questions around belonging and integration, are subjective concepts that engage a variety of interpretations. Qualitative methods, including semi-structured interviews, were considered to be most appropriate for interpreting these concepts and other sub-topics of social networks meaningfully. They also open our eyes to the “unexplored” aspects of Indian migrant networks.

A qualitative approach further helps to unpack divergent perspectives and nuances within a community (Dudwick et al., 2006; Packer, 2010). As groups within a community may have
overlapping or different experiences of social networks, qualitative methods help researchers explore the views of both the homogenous and diverse groups to which people belong. To acknowledge the fact that no two Indian communities are alike, interviews investigated how participants constructed their diverse linguistic, regional and religious identities, demonstrating that Indians are not an easily identifiable homogenous group. Meanings constructed from these interpretations enabled me to not only examine whether networks were important to each of the individuals and to sub-groups, but also to understand which Indian migrants were tied to a particular set of networks and why. Qualitative methods thus helped in exploring the lines of territorialisation, deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation of Indian migrant networks.

Closely related to understanding is context; it is important to know not only what people experience, but also how it is they experience it (Patton, 1990, p.71). This meant not only acknowledging the contexts in which participants were situated, but also endeavouring to empathetically understand their experiences. Empathy does not mean simply taking a subjective approach. It is rooted in the phenomenological doctrine of verstehen (understanding) and refers to the capacity of making sense of the world as experienced by the individual (Patton, 1990, p.56). Here, the meaning of human behaviour, the context of interactions, connections between mental states and behaviour, and empathetic understanding of personal experiences are central, and importance is given to the motivations and feelings of people in the given socio-cultural context (Patton, 1990). This allows the researcher to gather contextually and culturally relevant data enabling an empathetic understanding of people’s lives and relationships.

The researcher’s interpretation of meaning is also based on self-awareness and thinking about beliefs and concepts (Sayer, 1992). That is, the researcher’s positionality and subjectivity are important influences on how they come to know and understand reality. However, King and Horrocks (2010) argue that subjectivity should not to be treated as a problem that needs to be avoided. Rather, subjectivity has a critical place in informing and revealing knowledge and is therefore a resource that needs to be reflected upon to augment social research. Presuppositions thus become an important part of a study’s epistemology (see Reinharz, 1991, p.251). In chapter one, I explicated this by introducing how I was attracted to this field of research. My own views, perspectives and experiences as an Indian, and also as a Keralite, are coloured by many years of living in diverse Indian cities and by travel overseas. My personal interactions across cultures and socio-cultural awareness, both in India and elsewhere, provide a certain ‘insider’ knowledge to the study of Indian migrants. While this awareness has guided me to develop
some understanding of how Indian communities exists, the literature reviewed provided further insights into the interpretation of migrant networks and ethnicity needed for this study, and thereby guided investigation in the *empirical* world. Accordingly, when I began this research I adopted a social capital notion of Indian migrant networks. However engaging with the empirical data I collected, I soon learnt that social capital theories did not fully comprehend Indian network complexities. Seeking a convincing framework for interpretation led me to an assemblage perspective, as outlined in chapter two.

**Research method and design**

Underpinned by the above philosophical guidelines, this study’s primary method was one-on-one, semi-structured interviews. These offered the freedom to explore the specific contexts shaping the experiences of my participants, while also ensuring similar types of questions were asked of all of them. Interviews were complemented by a pre-interview questionnaire, social network analysis and other secondary data sources. The secondary data from Statistics New Zealand, Department of Labour, Immigration New Zealand, Ministry of Social Welfare, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, Auckland Council, press and online material complemented the primary data collection methods by providing important background material.

These different sources not only facilitated breadth in my analysis, but also enabled me to compare and evaluate the accuracy of the interview data (see Warren & Karner, 2005). For example, the transition from students to permanent residents described by many participants was supported by statistics from the Department of Labour (Wilkinson et al., 2010) and the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (2014), as demonstrated in chapter five. The secondary data sources listed above provided relevant background material on themes such as the ethnic population projection of New Zealand, comparable labour markets, skilled migration, international student transitions, social cohesion and migration policies and so on. During the data analysis stages, this literature helped me to investigate and validate the interview themes in the light of the latest and ongoing findings.

**Semi-structured interviews**

Patton (1990) argues that we may not be able to observe everything we may want to and therefore we interview people to find out about what life is like from their point of view when we are not there. Phenomena such as inter-ethnic engagement and labour market participation
constitute examples that may be amenable to direct observation, but take a considerable amount of time to be pragmatically and ethically implemented. As such, semi-structured interviews were designed to yield in-depth knowledge of people’s experiences through both structured and open ended ‘real’ conversations (Patton, 1990). The three different kinds of data gathered are explained below.

Pre-interview questionnaire data

Before conducting semi-structured interviews, I used pre-interview questionnaires requesting information about each participant’s socio-demographic data and social networks. This included eliciting twenty names of close and not so close acquaintances in their networks. The questionnaire collected data on the variables shown in the template below (see also appendix 4). A few participants did not want to reveal the names of people in their networks, so pseudonyms were noted instead. However, care was taken to ensure they identified and remembered who these people were while reporting and talking about them during the interview.

Table 3.1: Data gathered from pre-interview questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age, marital status, religion</th>
<th>Year of arrival in New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td>Residency status on arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernacular</td>
<td>Total number of years lived in New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses region of origin</td>
<td>First occupation in New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational history and institutions attended in India</td>
<td>Total years of work experience in New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qualification</td>
<td>Current occupation and annual income in New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation and years of work experience in India</td>
<td>Home ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-arrival networks in New Zealand</td>
<td>Names of twenty network members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memberships in ethnic associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memberships in religious organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Early analyses were made on the size and composition of migrant networks based on the absolute number of inter-, intra- and co-ethnic ties reported in the questionnaire, as indicated by the 20 names requested. Reviewing these responses provoked reflective comments by the participants and formed the basis for specific questions that were raised during the interviews.
In some cases, participants preferred to complete the questionnaire at the time of interview, which extended the stipulated duration of the actual interviews, and I had to return to complete the second half of the interview.

The semi-structured interviews were not ‘spontaneous conversations’ (Packer, 2010, p.48). A week or two after receiving the completed questionnaires, face-to-face interviews were scheduled over phone and via email with participants at a date and time that was convenient for them. Prior communication to the interviews was important to develop initial confidence and trust with the participant. In general, interviews were held during weekends in private spaces such as their houses lasting for an average of two to four hours. In many cases, participants were interviewed twice, as the majority of my participants were skilled migrants in the working age groups who had young children and could not devote two to four hours at any given time.

Interviews were also held twice for those who were business owners or self-employed. For these participants, interviews were often held on weekdays at their shops, in their offices or clinics. Given the nature of their work commitments, cancellation and postponement of interviews occurred frequently and interruptions during the interviews in their workplaces were also common whenever their customers, clients and patients arrived. However, I was able to ensure all questions were asked of participants over the course of the interview/s.

The narrative data

During the actual interview, I was mainly concerned with how mechanisms work, such as how social networks and the integration of Indian migrants into New Zealand society takes place. The interview guide was influenced by the literature review relating to social networks, migration, economic wellbeing and integration. Interview questions were kept open-ended to ensure the responses were as detailed as possible. A common criticism of closed-ended questions is that they do not allow the participants to express different perspectives and prevent the researcher from exploring what is relevant to them (Minichilello et al., 1990). In this context, McEvoy and Richards (2006, p.71) assert that the key strength of qualitative methods is that they are open-ended, allowing themes to emerge during the course of the interview, and also allowing alternative lines of inquiry.

All of the interviews were held in four stages. In order to have a sense of their background and the context of their current experiences, participants were first asked to talk about their family
and upbringing in India. This was important to enable comparisons and connections between how their social networks were previously constituted and the kind of support they received prior to their migration to New Zealand compared to now. Following this, interviews investigated the process of migration from India to New Zealand and what motivated them to migrate. Moving from a general exploration of participants’ previous backgrounds, questions then focused on their settlement and labour market experiences in New Zealand. Here, I explored the kind of networks in which Indian migrants engaged to find employment and why, and what aspects of this engagement they found challenging or valuable. Depending on the experiences of my participants, specific questions explored the kind of support they received from their networks and others, as well as their views and opinions about the quality of assistance. Network mapping, to explore the overlapping and often dense connections among the network members listed on the pre-interview questionnaire, was conducted at this point using paper and pencil. Participants were asked to put the names they listed in the questionnaire in figure 3.1 shown below and draw the lines to show relationships between them. Where participants had more than ten network members and had difficulty mapping the ties between network members in the given diagram, I undertook this task of mapping as they explained their interrelationships to me.

**Figure 3.1: Network mapping during the interview**

![Network Mapping Diagram](image)

**Network data**

Network analyses are commonly conducted in two ways: either by studying the whole network or by studying ego (participant)-centred networks. While whole-network researchers collect data directly from other members in a participant’s network, ego-centred researchers commonly
collect data by asking respondents to list the people with whom they share a particular relation (Marin & Wellman, 2011). The participant thus reports their networks, the characteristics of their relations, and the ties between them.

This study involved an ego-centred analysis of the network data, not only for practical reasons but also because Indian communities are diverse and I wished to include participants from at least four communities. A whole network approach is likely to yield data collected from homogenous, co-ethnic and cohesive network members and may not be amenable to examining and comparing diverse connections. Hence, to visualise relevant co-ethnic and diverse network linkages, an ego-centric network data was most appropriate. Halgin and DeJordy (2008) note how many social network studies lend themselves to ego-centred or personal network approaches and that this method is widely used.

In this study, I found visual mapping techniques were useful in moving from mere description to detailed elaboration and theorisation (Emmel & Clark, 2009). Various physical dimensions of social networks can be examined using visual mapping techniques, but this study concentrated on examining the size, density, heterogeneity and quality of the social networks given the study objectives. These aspects of social networks were considered the most important and were thus discussed in detail during the interviews. Thus, a shift from the examination of the network structure to the processes and their contents was useful in moving from an outsider’s to insider’s view of their social networks (Edwards, 2010). Participants subsequently reported about their interactions with the twenty network members named on the questionnaires. Questions probed how and when participants met their network members, how long they had known each other, their degree of closeness between these individuals, the kind of support they had received and gave, and any interconnections between participants’ network members.

Despite its advantages, an ego-centred approach also has some limitations (Edwards, 2010). For example, unlike the whole network analysis where all the network members referred by a participant are interviewed, an ego-centred approach excludes the interviewing of network members reported by the participant. On one hand, this facilitates the anonymity of the members about whom participants may report. However, the data collected reflects only the views of the participant and not of the members of their network. As a result we cannot check the reliability of these responses through network members. Thus, the network data gathered provides an
interpretation of the network only through the eyes of the participant (see Halgin & Borgatti, 2012). Nevertheless, through detailed in-depth narratives, it was possible to check the reliability of the network data to some extent, as it offered opportunities to cross-reference and check whom the participants were talking about during interviews with the data presented in the pre-interview questionnaire (also see Lubbers et al., 2009). Since the network members’ names were requested in the pre-interview questionnaire, participants had sufficient time to recollect and report on members of their network during the actual interviews and to recall any unreported members in their network that had not been listed on the pre-interview questionnaire.

In the next section of the interview, specific questions relating to the participant’s ties with the intra-, inter- and co-ethnic networks were examined. Membership of co-ethnic, religious or other associations in New Zealand was examined by focusing on the benefits, problems or challenges they posed for both off-shore and onshore migrants. In the light of these facts, questions examined the context in which each of these kinds of networks became important, the frequency of interactions, the kinds of support exchanged and levels of inter-ethnic trust. The sequence of these questions did not always follow a standard arrangement as the aim was to allow flexibility and the emergence of themes for further examination. However, the final set of questions explored the participants’ identities and its relevance for integration into social settings with people outside Indian communities and their sense of belonging in New Zealand society.

The pre-interview questionnaire and the interview were piloted by four participants — two Punjabis and two Keralite participants — to detect potential misinterpretation of the questions, to estimate the time it would take to complete the questionnaire and to check if it was self-explanatory to the readers. The pilot was also useful for testing the pre-interview questionnaire that asked participants to list people in their networks and then place them on a diagram (see questionnaire in the appendix 4) and demonstrate the connections between them. Based on feedback from the participants, some questions were reworded to eliminate ambiguity.

**Sample**

The goal of a particular research project is critical to determining the sample design (Gilbert, 2001). The aim of this study was to capture the different network experiences of Indian migrants and their variations based on language/region, religion and gender, as well as different levels
of integration with New Zealand. A small sample from different sub-sets of Indian communities was considered optimal for capturing the widest possible variations in participant responses. Therefore a purposive sample was the basis for this study.

**Purposive sampling**

Sayer (1992) observes that to attain adequate knowledge about reality, one must take account of its differences. In the context of this study, one of the main objectives was to depict the experiences of diverse Indian communities. To achieve this, all of the participants were selected using purposive or targeted sampling techniques from four Indian communities. The rationale for choosing “varied cases” is described by Dannermark (2002, p.170) as follows: “to attain information about the importance of various conditions for producing the particular phenomenon under investigation…analyse how mechanisms operate under different conditions”. Accordingly, in order to gauge the varying conditions of inter-ethnic networks of Indian communities and to understand the intra- and inter-community dynamics of such engagement, I selected four Indian communities upon which to focus research attention.

**Different types of ‘Indian’ communities**

The four selected communities were the Punjabis, Gujaratis, Tamils and Keralites. The inclusion of these four communities provided the “breadth and layered depth of understanding” around the outcomes and contexts of Indian migrant networks needed to answer my research questions (Livock, 2009, p.79). My decision to sample Indian migrants from these specific communities was based on secondary data. The four groups are the dominant Indian linguistic groups in New Zealand and worldwide (see Friesen, 2008b; Kurien, 2001; Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs, 2012). A review of literature concerning Indian migrants in New Zealand also found some studies concerning the Punjabi and Gujarati communities but nothing about Indian migrants from the southern part of India. Figure 3.2 shows the geographical location of these regions in India. When talking about ‘ethnicity’ to Indian migrants there is a tendency to refer to identities such as ‘North Indian’ and ‘South Indian’ (Vorting, 2008). This North and South Indian paradigm is based on differences in geography, cuisine, leisure, history, religion industrial growth and the like.
As my study investigates the social and economic life of ‘Indian’ migrants in New Zealand, it was important to have a sample that reflected the diversity of this group. As mentioned in chapter one, Indian migrants in New Zealand today come from a variety of linguistic, regional, and occupational groups. Therefore calling someone ‘Indian’ draws equivalences between and makes generalisations across different sub-groups such as ‘Punjabis’, ‘Tamils’, ‘Gujaratis’ and ‘Keralites’ (cf. Horner, 2012). In contrast, this study has paid attention to the experiences that were both shared and different across the groups.

Differences between the North and South are also widely manifested today in the form of the geographical distribution of industries (Vorting, 2008). Software industries, in particular, are widespread across the country but the most prestigious ones (such as the Infosys, Wipro and other organisations) are found in South India. In this context, Vorting (2008) observes that South India has the majority of management jobs, with Bangalore being the ‘Silicon Valley of India’, Chennai the engineering hub, Mumbai the financial capital and Hyderabad a further software hub. Given these regional trends, migrants coming from India often have professional affiliations associated with their regions. For example, Lum (2012) finds the occupational profiles of Indian migrants in Italy were segmented on ethnic lines. Indian Punjabis in Italy were more likely to be employed in the agricultural sector, particularly in the dairy industry, whereas Malayalis from the southern state of Kerala were found in the domestic, elderly and health care sector. Indeed, Kerala is recognised as the Indian state that exports the largest
number of nurses overseas (Kodoth & Jacob, 2013), while the highest number of software professionals emigrate from south Indian states such as Tamil Nadu and Bangalore. Kerala and Tamil Nadu also have highest number of graduates (Khadria, 2008). To counteract a ‘bias’ in the New Zealand research literature towards already established and dominant Indian migrants such as Gujaratis and Punjabis, it was thus also important to study those who were migrating from the southern part of India who might have different occupational and network profiles. Although not a key criteria at the time of recruitment, the final sample included participants who were trained and/or working as Information Technology (IT) professionals, engineers, doctors, nurses, teachers, accountants, social workers, human resource professionals, hospitality, business and management professionals. There was also one geologist and correction officer.

Regional-linguistic and religious variations

Studying Gujarati and Punjabi participants from Northern India and Tamils and Keralites from Southern India also meant taking account of differences in language and religion. As indicated in chapter one, while Hindus constitute the majority (80 per cent approx.) of the Indian population Sikhs, Jains and Christians are the religious minorities in India. A significant majority of Sikhs come from the state of Punjab, whereas Jains are represented significantly from certain states including Gujarat and South Indian Christians, especially in Kerala (see Census India, 2011). Thus it was possible to gain religious diversity within the sample by purposively sampling from the four identified communities. Given there may have been a tendency among participants from certain communities to affiliate with me more closely because of my insider status as a Keralite, Catholic and being born in Chennai (South India), recruiting people different from me was useful for checking interpretations and ensuring that I was not assuming any implicit knowledge when interviewing participants who shared similar characteristics to me.

Gender

Given that gender has been considered a significant influence on migrant networks and assimilation (Curran & Rivero-Fuentes, 2003), the sample aimed to also take into account how gender shapes Indian migrant network differences. A relatively balanced sample of 21 men and 22 women in the study was thus recruited to gauge differences in motivation and the ways that men and women experience networks differently. As later chapters will demonstrate, however,
gender was not the dominant variable in understanding Indian social networks and thus receded in importance when explaining how and why social networks shape Indian migrant lives.

Sample criteria
In addition to recruiting a diverse group of Indian migrants based on the research focus, the sampling process also took into account four broad criteria that shaped my participants’ experiences: migration history, residency status, place of residence and age.

Migration history
Only individuals who had directly migrated from India were recruited to minimise too many identity variations based on language, region of origin or migratory history in the sample. Thus ‘twice migrants’, those who had migrated from India via another country, were not included. This criterion was necessary, in particular, because there are a considerable number of Indian migrants from Fiji living in New Zealand but, given the socio-cultural and political differences between this group and Indians from India, their migration experiences were expected to be quite different.

Residency status
Participants were either New Zealand permanent residents or citizens who had lived in New Zealand for three years or more. Those who were on temporary visas (e.g. student visas) and those with work permits or a visitor’s visa in New Zealand were excluded from participation. The experiences narrated are therefore representative of a particular group of permanent migrants and cannot be generalised to the experiences of other migrants. However, 18 of my participants had initially migrated as international students and transitioned to permanent residence in New Zealand, so some insights were possible.

Place of residence
The study recruited participants exclusively living within the Auckland region. Auckland is identified as a super-diverse region which has experienced more pronounced ethnic and demographic changes than the rest of New Zealand (Friesen, 2008b). Auckland is also reported to have the highest concentration of Indian migrants in New Zealand. According to Lewin et al. (2011), at the time of the 2006 Census over two thirds of the Indians in New Zealand lived in Auckland. In 2013, Auckland also recorded the highest growth rate of the Asian population, with about two-thirds (65.1 per cent) of the population in Auckland identifying with the Asian
ethnic group. As a highly diverse city and with a high percentage of Indian inhabitants, Auckland was the ideal study setting for the recruitment of Indian participants from various communities. Moreover, the ethnic diversity found in Auckland city rendered the study setting conducive to understanding people’s inter-ethnic interactions and their perceptions about those interactions.

*Age*

All participants were aged above 18 years, as most Indian migrants who migrate for the purpose of education and employment are usually of working age. The original sampling strategy was designed to include Indian migrants of the working age group below 60 years. Due to a general difficulty in the recruitment of participants (particularly from the Gujarati community) these boundaries had to be re-negotiated. Participant ages ranged from 22 to 72 years, with two participants being more than 60 years old.

**Sample size and characteristics**

Upon deciding the four communities to be studied, I estimated that a sample size of at least ten participants from each of the four linguistic groups would be sufficient to enable data comparison and analysis. This proved a suitable number since I began to notice an overlap in the stories and recurring themes narrated across each of the communities which indicated sample saturation. In addition to 40 participants from the four Indian communities identified in my sampling strategy, I also interviewed two people from the Marathi Kannadiga community. These participants expressed their interest to participate when the study was first advertised and were asked to participate in interviews late in the research project when there was some difficulty recruiting participants from the Gujarati community. For similar reasons, I ended up interviewing 11 (not 10, as planned) Tamil participants. Table 3.2 summarises the number of participants from each community, noting several other variables of interest such as visa status and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Total number (43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic identification (regional/linguistic)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keralite</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Marathi &amp; Kannadiga)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories based on visa status on arrival</th>
<th>Total number (43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-shore migrants (skilled &amp; family reunification)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-shore migrants (international students)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender

Male 21
Female 22

Personal Annual income (NZS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50,000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-80,000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, this study draws on a sample that allows the widest possible variation of Indian communities to facilitate the collection of rich and in-depth data. The 43 participants recruited through purposive sampling enabled me to account for religious, linguistic, and regional, occupational and gender differences within Indian communities. To ensure the sample was not too diverse to draw any valid conclusions, a particular focus was placed on permanent migrants who lived in Auckland.

Interview procedures

Recruiting appropriate participants for this study required me to contact and access four different Indian communities. How I gained access and familiarity in the field identifying potential participants is discussed in the latter part of this section but first I examine how I addressed ethical issues around confidentiality, anonymity and informed consent to ensure they felt comfortable enough to engage in the detailed in-depth conversations that interviews involved.

As my study involved human participants, it required approval by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, which was granted in June 2013. Like most studies engaging qualitative interviews, the three main ethical issues in this study were confidentiality, informed consent and anonymity. Efforts were taken to ensure that the confidentiality rights of the participants were not violated. For instance, the participant information sheet assured them that the data would be transcribed by the researcher and viewed only by herself and her supervisors. They were also assured of the security of the data and that all the digital data files were stored on a password protected computer and hard copies stored in a locked cabinet at the University.

Furthermore, I took care to ensure participants offered informed consent by explaining in detail the research process and what kind of data would be collected. Participants were also informed that participation was voluntary and they had the right to withdraw their participation from the
study at any time or refuse to answer any question that was asked without any explanation. King and Horrocks (2010) argue that the researcher’s interpretation often filters out the voice of the participants. Interested participants were thus also given opportunities to receive and review the transcript of their interview and summary of the findings. There were 28 participants who requested the transcripts but only one requested changes to his transcript. Another 11 participants requested the summary of the findings.

Anonymity was another concern, as the study involved social network analysis and participants were asked to list and talk about people in their networks. Social network data is meaningful only when the researcher knows who the participant is and records a link between the participant and their networks. The pre-interview questionnaire included questions relating to participant social networks, asking them to report their relationships with people to whom they were closely affiliated. At this stage, it was important to retain these names for the interview because participants were asked about these specific people and the supports exchanged between them. However, the names of all participants and people reported in their networks were later removed and pseudonyms were given to reduce the possibility of such individuals being identified in the final thesis or other publications. Real names were kept confidential in a locked filing cabinet. Also, since the study adopts a personal network research design (PNRD), network data was collected only from participants who were unlikely to be network members of other participants. Issues of anonymity and confidentiality were thus less of an issue when compared to a whole network analysis, which involves including all the network members as participants.

However, given the small size of the Indian communities studied and the ways in which they were recruited (see below) there is some possibility that participants can be identified. I also found that some participants discussed the study at community get-togethers, making it difficult to guarantee full anonymity (see Seidman, 1991). As such, all of the participants signed a consent form acknowledging that if the information they provided was reported or published, it would be done so in a way that would not identify them as its source, while highlighting that confidentiality could not be fully guaranteed. In many cases where identification may have been possible due to naming a specific occupation, place or story, I have reported information in a generalised way, reducing the possibility of identification. For those who feared they may be identified because of their professional identities, I offered pseudo-occupational identities. There was only one participant who requested such a change in the occupation reported.
Because the study entailed network mapping that required participants report on their network members, there was a tendency among a few of them to check if I knew the person whom they were talking about and whether they have participated in this study. In such situations, I informed the participants that I am not allowed to reveal any details about who participated in this study.

**Recruitment**

Field work was undertaken in 2014. In order to facilitate recruitment, I contacted various relevant organisations, such as the Auckland Indian Association and the Bharatiya Samaj, Auckland Malayali Samajam and Muthamil Sangam associations, to recruit participants from the Gujarati, Punjabi, Keralite/Malayali and Tamil communities respectively. Contact with these regional Indian associations was established in January 2014 via email and appointments with organisation leaders. They asked that I participate in various cultural events to build face-to-face rapport with members. Thus I attended events organised for Indian republic day, regional New Year festivals, annual day celebrations as well as meetings for older community members that were organised by the ethnic associations. Because many Indian migrants buy regional-ethnic foods and groceries, I also contacted regional Indian retail shops to ask if they would help in the recruitment of participants from the four communities. Blumer (1969, p.39) aptly argues that first-hand acquaintance with the empirical social world one is researching requires lifting the veil that covers it. Accordingly, I became familiar with what was actually going on in the sphere of Indian social life in New Zealand, getting to know the institutions and organisation migrants attended. Study advertisements were then emailed to the organisations to be displayed on notice boards or advertised by email lists and delivered in person to retailers willing to display my advertisement. Those who were interested in participating thus contacted me.

Advertisements were also placed on my personal Facebook page and was subsequently reposted by several members of my personal network on their respective Facebook pages. The advertisement was also posted on the Facebook pages of online Indian associations. There were several responses from the advertisements on Facebook but most were from individuals who held work permits, were second generation Indians, Fijian Indians, or Australian citizens who did not meet the basic selection criteria. They were thus excluded from participation.
Indeed, many of those who wanted to participate did not meet the selection criteria, so there was some difficulty recruiting participants from the four communities in the initial stages of the research. However, through some ‘insider assistance’ (King & Horrocks, 2010, p.31) from casual acquaintances at the churches, temples and Indian retail stores who passed on the study information, more participants were found. On receiving a confirmation of interest from these individuals to be part of the study, study invitations, participant information sheets and pre-interview questionnaires were then emailed. Table 3.3 outlines the methods of recruitment and the number of participants recruited through each method.

Table 3.3: Method of recruitment for the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Method of recruitment</th>
<th>No of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ethnic association</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Indian retail stores (catering to North Indians, Tamils &amp; Keralites)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Study advertisement circulated through acquaintances</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Snowballing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kleinmann and Copp (1993) observe that the researcher’s familiarity with the sample facilitates recruitment in a new environment. It is true that my insider status was crucial to the recruitment process; however, it did not eliminate my anxiety about carrying out research with the four different Indian linguistic communities, especially given apprehension about the North-South that is often prevalent among Indians. Acquaintance with the Malayalam, Hindi and Tamil languages helped in the recruitment of participants from the Tamil, Keralite and Punjabi communities. However, since all interviews were conducted in English, this posed some difficulty in the recruitment of participants, because some prospective participants were not proficient in English. This was particularly observed in the context of recruiting Gujarati women who were homemakers and did not feel confident carrying out an interview in English. In some cases where such women showed interest in volunteering, I suggested we conduct the interview in Hindi, but they subsequently declined participation. Due to a general difficulty in the recruitment of participants from this community, I recruited two participants above the age of 60 years, although originally the study aimed to recruit working-age participants below 60 years.

3 The retirement age in India is 60 years (Times of India 2014) (see http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/BJP-rolls-back-Hooda-governments-decision-on-retirement-
Although my position as an Indian researcher was significant in facilitating rapport with the Indian communities, these experiences support arguments that I was both simultaneously an ‘insider’ and an ‘outsider’ (see Thapar-Björkert & Henry, 2004). The ability to speak local languages like Punjabi and Gujarati facilitated some aspects of the recruitment process yet, it was not language alone that affected recruitment. A gamut of factors – such as my marital and residency statuses, institutional affiliation, previous occupation, my spouse’s ethnicity and his occupation – were often invoked by participants to gain assurance and trust. Thus, although New Zealanders might consider me an ‘insider’ this was not necessarily always the case in recruiting participants from diverse Indian communities.

**Establishing rapport**

Given the linguistic diversity of Indian communities, English was used as the medium of conversation for all interviews so that neither interpreters nor translation were required. Although I have noted that this meant a small number of participants chose not to participate, this decision was appropriate because most Indian migrants are skilled professionals with some proficiency in English, given they are only permitted to enter New Zealand if they have a minimum International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score. For example, Immigration New Zealand demands a ‘minimum standard of English’ with an overall band score of 6.5 for principal applicants under the skilled migrant category and accompanying family members must have a minimum score of 5 (Immigration New Zealand, 2014). Nevertheless, precautions were taken to ensure participants understood and felt comfortable responding in English. Many participants were also inclined to quote or state something in their local language: Tamil, Malayalam (among Tamil and Keralite participants) or in Hindi (for the Punjabi, Gujarati and Marathi speakers). It was very natural for them to convey their thoughts this way, in addition to using English. These words and their translations are included in the interview excerpts presented in this thesis (as are any grammatical or other linguistic peculiarities made in English by participants, since New Zealand English and Indian English are not exactly the same thing!) My position as an Indian researcher acquainted with the three languages aided in understanding of these phrases and quotes used during the interviews. Being an insider therefore facilitated breaking the linguistic and cultural barriers of differences.

---

[age/articleshow/45277687.cms](http://www.workandincome.govt.nz/products/a-z-benefits/nz-superannuation.html#mul). New Zealand does not have an official retirement age, but according to Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ) those 65 and above are eligible for superannuation (see [http://www.workandincome.govt.nz/products/a-z-benefits/nz-superannuation.html#mul](http://www.workandincome.govt.nz/products/a-z-benefits/nz-superannuation.html#mul)).
King and Horrocks (2010) observe that silence in interviews sometimes conveys more meaning than what is said or explicated. Moments of silence certainly occurred during some of my interviews, particularly where participants expressed difficulty talking about their integration experiences. In such moments, I set aside my expectations based on what was said in previous interviews and my knowledge as an insider. A delicate balance was needed to avoid being intrusive, yet to also avoid making assumptions about what was not said. Because of my position as an Indian and a migrant, participants often assumed that I was aware of their situation. It was important to ensure our commonalities did not lead to misunderstandings or any false assumptions. Given that the sample was diverse in terms of gender, language and religion, I was also aware of how these differences could shape participant experiences and responses. Thus I sought clarity by adopting an outsider’s point of view, raising questions such as “what happened? Could you give an example if you don’t mind sharing?” etc. Such prompts allowed participants to identify and articulate their concerns, uninfluenced by my restrictions and assumptions (see Dudwick et al., 2006). As noted, interview transcripts and study summaries were also made available to participants to ensure the data was free from any misunderstanding or false assumptions.

Methods of data analysis
Guided by a qualitative approach to social network analysis, this study endeavoured to place the experiences and views of participants in relation to their contexts and the existing literature. A realistic picture of individuals’ behaviour cannot be merely based upon their experiences but should be informed by a critical analysis of a given context that enables and restrains their behaviours (Hans & Davies, 2006). For this purpose, all 43 interviews were transcribed in full for analysis by myself. This was useful in gaining familiarity with the data and in simultaneously becoming mindful of the data analysis.

Network data analysis
After full transcription, the relational data from the questionnaire and interviews was converted into a matrix using excel spreadsheets where the ties between the actors were recorded as present (1) or absent (0). To illustrate, Table 3.4 shows the data matrix of a Tamil participant, Florien, and her network that was inputted into an excel spreadsheet then uploaded into the NetDraw software. According to Hanneman and Riddle (2005), network structures can immediately suggest important features such as: the interconnections between the actors; whether there are many or few ties between the actors; how a particular person is “embedded”
(having ties to ethnic group members who are in turn connected with one another) and so on. To describe the social structure generating this information, the network data was converted into visual maps using NetDraw (see Borgatti, 2002), a free downloadable program for drawing social networks. The network diagrams were then generated and their nodes allocated different colours and shapes based on the gender and ethnic attributes of the network members (as for instance, red representing co-ethnic ties, circles for women and triangles representing men). Figure 3.3 illustrates the network generated from Florien’s data which was then saved as a jpeg document.

Table 3.4: Illustration of Florien’s data matrix on excel spreadsheet

![Table 3.4: Illustration of Florien’s data matrix on excel spreadsheet](image)

Figure 3.3: Illustration of Florien’s network visualisation with the help of NETDRAW

Often the network structure depended on the attributes of the actors embedded within it and allowed identification of the patterns and the nature of the social processes that generated the tie structure (Hanneman & Riddle, 2005). Figure 3.3 thus shows how Florien, a Tamil software engineer,...
engineer, belonged to different groups including the Tamil community, colleagues in the same profession from other ethnic backgrounds, and close friends on whom she was dependent for everyday support.

Network differences based on size, density (overlapping ties), gender and ethnic composition were then calculated and analysed. In light of these differences, further analyses and linkages to labour market outcomes and perceptions of identity and integration discussed in interviews were examined. These are outlined in chapters four to eight. There are numerous statistical procedures and calculations possible with the help of social network software for large sample numbers and the intricate number of relations between them but, as mentioned earlier, the relatively small sample size involved in this qualitative study did not require such detailed quantitative techniques of SNA (Social Network Analysis). SNA was used for a visual representation and simple calculation of the participants’ network composition and density. The network diagrams of all participants are given in appendices 6-10.

Examining patterns across the structural dimensions of migrant networks and aggregating such patterns across the four Indian communities drew attention to overall differences and similarities in networks. However, care was taken not to draw immediate conclusions from the patterns that evolved from participants’ social networks, without reference to their interview data. This ensured that the analysis was not led by any predetermined assumptions and networks were not simply understood at ‘face value’.

**Narrative analysis**

Analysing the content of these networks in the light of the interview material was important for unlocking the dynamics behind and within the network structures. Arriving at this deeper level of analysis, however, was a slow task. First, interview transcripts were analysed thematically drawing upon the key research questions, to identify and interpret patterns across the vast data set. In order to preserve the holistic nature of the accounts of each participant, every transcript was read and marked according to themes that were based on the theoretical framework, related literature, research questions and those that emerged from the data itself. An initial template of 22 themes were constructed and applied to subsequent transcripts to identify those that were recurring and those that were newly emerging. The phenomenon of *emergence* was thus empirically captured in the data collected. According to Patton (1990), the task is to identify invariant themes to perform an imaginative variation of each theme to see the same
phenomenon from varying angles. Through this, the researcher develops an enhanced and an expanded version of the themes that are generated. This requires a description of each theme with some illustration in order to examine across the different experiences of participants and subsequently portray them.

The themes that emerged from the interviews also enabled them to be linked back to the patterns that emerged from the network data. For instance, I was particularly concerned with the following key questions looking at the network patterns: 1) Why are some patterns consistent among certain Indian migrants? 2) How and why do others differ from these patterns? 3) Can Indian migrant networks exist devoid of these patterns? 4) What is it about these patterns that facilitate migrant integration? The complexity of Indian migrant networks was therefore approached with such questions in mind and thereafter by making generalisations on an abstract level. As indicated earlier, although a social capital framework was used at the beginning, the complexity of the data required a different theoretical framework and thus assemblage theory subsequently guided my analysis with capacities, territorialisation and deterritorialisation emerging as key concepts that enabled me to understand such complexity.

More specifically, assemblage theory increased my ability to interpret and make generalisations from the study findings across the different Indian communities. In the field of consumer research, Price and Epp (2015) identify one of the key properties of assemblage theory as *unity across difference*. Identifying emerging patterns and examining them in the light of the questions I have just mentioned opened up other parameters for analysis than ethnicity, which I have noted is a common focus in migration studies. For example, this study endeavours to understand the phenomena of co-ethnic embeddedness (migrants confined to their co-ethnic based networks). Discussion in chapter seven highlights that my data establishes that co-ethnic embeddedness does exist, but interact with other conditions. The complexity of this phenomenon is therefore acknowledged and methodological nationalism overcome by examining how the heterogeneous parts of networks are assembled and held together across and through differences (Anderson et al., 2012b; Figueiredo, 2016).

**Summary**

Given there has been a widespread call in migration studies for an innovative approach overcoming the problem of methodological nationalism, this chapter has explained why a qualitative approach using semi-structured interviews and social network analyses was adopted.
Combining three different kinds of data from a pre-interview questionnaire, social network analysis and detailed in-depth narratives has enabled me to bridge the structural and interpretative understanding of migrant networks.

This chapter has shown how my choice of research methods was informed by my key research questions and seeks to explore the possible variations in the experiences of Indian migrants in New Zealand. A purposive sample of 43 Indian migrants from the Punjabi, Gujarati, Keralite and Tamil communities were recruited to analyse the religious, linguistic and gender differences between Indian migrant networks at various levels of their integration. These findings are explored in the data analysis chapters five to eight. In the following chapter, however, I first discuss the general differences in participants’ networks as a backdrop to more detailed discussion in the subsequent chapters.
Chapter Four

Differences in the structure of Indian migrant networks and capacities

Introduction

In chapter two, I conceptualised migrant networks as assemblages, arguing that migrants possess capacities and skills through which they plug into new and unfamiliar networks. I also argued in chapter one that Indian migrant networks can be influenced in multifarious ways, depending on migrant allegiances to diverse sub-national groups. The aim of this chapter, therefore, is to understand how Indian migrant networks are assembled in order to determine the kinds of capacities that Indian migrants deploy while building their networks.

DeLanda (2006, p.7) defines capacities as what individuals are capable of doing when they interact with other entities. Through the process of interaction, capacities become relational to other entities. DeLanda’s (2006) notion of capacities is primarily aimed at overcoming the problem of essentialism in science. Essentialism arises when a group of entities are classified together, labelled the same and considered to be natural, sharing similar features with a lasting identity. Such conceptualisations hide the processes and differences inherent in grouped or homogenised materials leading to what he calls an ‘objective illusion’ (DeLanda, 2002, p.65). To eliminate essentialism, DeLanda (2002, p.46) urges us to view entities not as species or categories, but as singular individuals, with unique capacities. In this sense, Indian migrants should not be viewed as ‘kinds’ of migrants, or as a homogenous ‘Indian’ group, but as individuals who have unique capacities to network and integrate on different levels. In order to enable a detailed understanding of how capacities operate, this chapter first introduces the capacities present in Indian migrants and how the presence of these capacities influences their network patterns. To this end, it asks: how are Indian migrant networks structured? What propels network diversity, especially in intra- and inter-ethnic networks? What accounts for the overall network differences or recurring patterns of these networks?

Dividing this chapter into two main sections, I first examine the participants’ upbringing in India and investigate the factors that influence their network diversity. Based on the network differences discovered, I then introduce two categories of Indian migrants whom I refer to as
cosmopolitans (n=32/43), whose networks are heterogeneous and diverse, and transitioners (n=11/43) whose networks are dense and homogenous. While cosmopolitans explicitly demonstrated a sense of affective inter-ethnic integration, I have used the term transitioners to describe those participants that expressed some interest in developing inter-ethnic relations in the future they had not yet managed to put this desire into practice. In this sense I have framed them as transitioning towards cosmopolitan behaviour, rather than as rejecting the idea of inter-ethnic relations outright. This will be explored in chapter eight. Yet neither upbringing in India nor cosmopolitanism alone completely explains differences in Indian migrant networks. These differences also arise from the capacities related to gender, religion, region and occupation. As such, in the second half of this chapter, I discuss how variations in Indian migrant networks are produced along these lines. Accordingly, this chapter acts as a prelude to the following data analysis chapters that explore how the network dynamics of Indian migrants impact their legal, economic, community and societal integration.

**Why network diversity in Indian communities?**

To DeLanda (2006, p.35 & 56), density and homogeneity are important properties of interpersonal networks that help in the territorialisation of assemblages, a process that consolidates the identities of entities. Density and homogeneity also constitute measures that can inform us of the level of diversity present in an interpersonal network. However, DeLanda (2002, p.45-46, in the context of thermodynamics) asserts that an entity is not only defined by its extensive aspects, but more importantly by its intensive properties. The former refers to divisible aspects such as lengths and volumes, while the latter is more qualitative, relating to aspects that are continuous and relatively indivisible and often lie behind the extensive aspects. To illustrate this point, I discuss differences in the network structures of Indian migrants based on extensive properties such as size, density and composition and also the qualitative processes behind these structures that define migrant network capacities. Qualitative aspects, such as participants’ membership in co-ethnic associations, previous networks and interactions based on their upbringing in India, are further examined to understand migrant capacities for network diversity. To begin, I provide an analysis of the network profile of my participants.

**Network profile**

Traditionally, family, kinship, religion and caste are considered integral to the organisation of Indian social networks. In a migration context, recent literature (for example, Ryan, 2011; Ryan et al., 2008) stresses the importance of understanding the complexity, diversity and dynamism
of such networks. In order to unpack these nuances for analysis in later chapters, this section will first compare the structural constitution of participants’ co-ethnic and diverse (intra- and inter-ethnic) networks. Memberships in regional-linguistic associations and the co-ethnic composition of networks are used to understand community differences in the nature and characteristics of participants’ networks.

Co-ethnic association memberships are one of the ways of measuring embeddedness and organisation of ethnic communities (see Fennema, 2004). Participants, in this context, from all four communities studied indicated they were members of Indian regional-linguistic associations in Auckland. However, compared to the Keralites, where all ten participants indicated they were members of their regional-linguistic association in Auckland, the Punjabis, Tamils and Gujaratis reported a lower number of co-ethnic association memberships. Participants also belonged to a host of religious organisations based on their identities as Jains, Sikhs, Christians and Hindus. All Christians, irrespective of their denomination, were from the South Indian Tamil and Keralite groups, while Jains and Sikhs were from the Gujarati and Punjabi communities respectively. Participants’ co-ethnic memberships and religious affiliations are presented in Table 4.1 below. The table also contains an analysis of the community based network diversity (intra- and inter-ethnic ties) of individual participants and also an aggregated average of network density for each community. The arrows indicate an inverse relationship between co-ethnic associational membership, network density and diversity. In general terms, the table indicates that communities with a higher level of network density and higher level of co-ethnic associational memberships have fewer inter- and intra-ethnic linkages. The implications of these networks is discussed in detail in chapters seven and eight.

Table 4.1: Network profile of participants from four Indian communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>No. of ethnic* association memberships</th>
<th>Average network density</th>
<th>No. of participants with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diverse inter-ethnic ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi (10)</td>
<td>Sikh, Hindus (7)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindu (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil (11)</td>
<td>Hindu (5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christians (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati (10)</td>
<td>Hindu, Jains (8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keralite (10)</td>
<td>Hindu, Christians (3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (2)</td>
<td>Hindu (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes total number of memberships in linguistic and regional associations for each of the four communities
Benefits of associational membership

All participants belonging to regional-linguistic associations acknowledged that these were important spaces where they could connect with co-ethnics and establish new linkages in Auckland. Indian ethnic organisations are primarily built upon the common ties that bind sub-groups within a broader community (Brettell, 2005). The regional-linguistic identities, such as “Gujarati”, “Punjabi”, “Tamil” and “Malayali”, fostered through the associations enabled participants to connect and engage with migrants from the same region of origin speaking the same or a similar language. This brought a sense of familiarity and companionship, while nurturing regional-cultural linkages. As a Keralite participant, Naren,4 expressed:

You walk through the door, you see thousands of people [from other ethnic groups in New Zealand] you don’t know them, there is nothing to relate to. So these are the people [co-ethnics] I go to. In the Malayali association programmes you can meet a lot of people with whom you can relate to. It helps to fill up the gap of not having friends and families here, and that you miss India.

By attending cultural festivals and meeting with migrants from their regions in these associations, participants felt they were ‘at home’ in New Zealand.

Co-ethnic associations are considered a means for holding on to and linking back to places of origin, both physically and metaphorically (Friesen, 2008a). Such linkages take place in a number of ways. Many participants said that the annual activities of their associations are often aligned with cultural and regional festivals in India. These events necessitate an active involvement – from booking halls to decorating the stage to motivating community members to partake in these events – that maintained and transmitted regional languages and cultures, which was considered especially important for children. A Tamil participant, Leema, said:

It just makes me feel at home and also makes my kids not to forget their roots where they come from, because here you don’t get to celebrate your functions which is part of your culture, so we try and duplicate it here in New Zealand. Celebrate Pongal [Tamil harvest festival] […] , so children will sort of know why Pongal is celebrated… it is a harvest festival. Although the seasons are different from India, we sort of do it on the same dates. For children, Muthamil Sangam [a Tamil association] sort of runs Tamil schools. So my kids went and learnt Tamil.

Participants also viewed co-ethnic associations as an opportunity for initiating businesses and charity activities. A few were proactive in taking up major leadership roles, while others – particularly those who were self-employed and owned businesses in Auckland – played smaller roles and held multiple memberships in various Indian regional associations simultaneously. Business owners also regularly sponsored activities and events run by their associations, which

---

4 For the reason of anonymity, all names of the participants are pseudonyms, but the pseudonyms used are typical ethno-religious Indian names pertaining to the four communities studied.
in turn procured them contacts and publicity for running their businesses. Participation in such associations further enabled charitable activities, such as fund raising for terminally ill patients, and support for international students from the communities. These observations about co-ethnic associations are consistent with the migration literature that commonly notes the important role of co-ethnic networks and associations (see Brettell, 2005).

**Possible downside to co-ethnic associational memberships**

Despite these perceived benefits, membership in co-ethnic association was inversely related to the network diversity reported by participants. Those belonging to communities with high levels of co-ethnic association membership had less diverse networks than other participants, not only with non-Indian groups, but with other Indians (see table 4.1). For instance, all of the participants who belonged to a Keralite association had a limited number of networks outside their own co-ethnic community. Overall, the network structure of the ten Keralite participants, followed by the ten Gujarati participants, was homogeneous and dense when compared with the Tamil and Punjabi participants. Density here refers to the number of overlapping interconnections between network members. Using the software NetDraw (Borgatti, 2002), figure 4.1 visually represents the network structures of three of my participants, demonstrating a range from the most dense to the most diverse networks. Lijomon’s network (depicted below) exemplifies a highly dense and co-ethnically embedded network in comparison to that of Jason and Kamaljit. This density measure has been obtained by calculating the sum of existing overlapping connections between the network members and dividing this by the total number of possible connections between them. A community based aggregate shows the average density of ties for Keralites (.79), Gujaratis (.67), Tamils (.56) and Punjabis (.46) respectively (see Table 4.1). A higher aggregate number here indicates higher density.

*Figure 4.1: The density and diversity of participants’ network structures*
When examining the diverse networks among Keralites in more detail, only three of ten participants had relatively heterogeneous inter-ethnic networks, that is, at least one tie outside intra- and co-ethnic circles (see appendix 8) while four participants had intra-ethnic networks (at least one tie outside of their co-ethnic community but within the Indian community). A similar pattern was also observed for the Gujaratis, where three of ten participants indicated inter-ethnic ties while five had intra-ethnic ties in their networks. The co-ethnic networks of both of these groups generally consisted of participants’ families, relatives and friends who were all interconnected and were members of similar regional-linguistic and religious associations. In contrast, all of the Punjabi and Tamil participants’ networks were diverse featuring other types of Indians, but also other ethnic groups such as New Zealand Europeans, Māori, Pasifika and other nationalities. They were thus comparatively less dense than the networks of Keralites and Gujaratis.

Taking note of these differences, my analysis was primarily directed by three questions: what generated co-ethnic associational membership among all the ten Keralite participants?
generated a relatively high density within the Keralite and Gujarati communities? What induced higher inter-ethnic interactions among the Tamils and Punjabis than the Keralites and Gujaratis? To answer these questions, the analysis focused on the four participants in the Keralite group and five in the Gujarati community who had diverse linkages and differed from their co-ethnic friends. The patterns reveal overall similarities between the four Keralite and five Gujarati participants who had diverse networks with all the Punjabi and Tamil participants, suggesting that a participant’s upbringing in India has an impact on the diversity of their networks post-migration. This is discussed in the following section. Hereafter, I refer Indian migrants whose networks are heterogeneous and diverse as cosmopolitans and those whose networks are dense and homogenous as transitioners. Table 4.2 below indicates the number of transitioners and cosmopolitans in each of the four Indian communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Keralites</th>
<th>Gujaratis</th>
<th>Tamils</th>
<th>Punjabis</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitioners</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitans</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What propels intra- and inter-ethnic networks?**
According to DeLanda (2002, p.49) organisms from two different communities are said to vary depending on the availability of a particular resource. For example, in the context of biological organisms, resources might refer to sunlight or the availability of a particular nutrient. These differences in the environment determine the ultimate outcome and representation of an organism and might render one organism slightly different to another of the same species (DeLanda, 2002, p.48). Thus, turning attention to that which propels diverse networks, it is clear from this study that inter-ethnic networks are facilitated by ‘cosmopolitan’ capacities that participants acquired during their upbringing and in a particular environment in India. Cultural differences are claimed to challenge inter-ethnic and cross-cultural interactions, but recent studies (e.g. Schiller et al., 2011; Wessendorf, 2013; Wise, 2005) have shown that an individual’s exposure to a multicultural population often stimulates a new form of sociability, facilitating inter-ethnic interactions. Studies have found this to be a characteristic of migrants visiting or living in destinations that are super-diverse, where there is a dynamic interplay of factors not only based on ethnicity but also immigration status, divergent labour markets and discrete gender, age and socioeconomic profiles (see Vertovec, 2007). This study, however,
finds this form of sociability to also be influenced by the migrant’s origins, demonstrating that cosmopolitan capacities planted earlier in life can help migrants to adapt to new societies (Anderson, 2004).

**Cosmopolitans**

This section explores how multi-ethnic, multi-lingual backgrounds can often account for a migrant’s *cosmopolitan sociability* and their inter-ethnic interactions in New Zealand. For instance, the cosmopolitan outlook and cultural capital gained through education in English-speaking Anglo-Indian Catholic institutions or boarding schools and internal migration to larger and more diverse metropolitan cities in India enables multi-cultural exposure. The major cities of Mumbai, Calcutta, Madras and Delhi were built by the British and were important centres of trade and commerce (Cranes, 1955) and today represent the most complex multicultural cities in India. Urban residence and education in these cities arguably undermine family and kinship networks and the co-ethnic bonding with others from one’s region (see Vanneman et al., 2006).

This was the case with the four Keralite and five Gujarati cosmopolitans who were raised outside of Kerala and Gujarat. Such an upbringing contributes to explaining the network variations between the cosmopolitans and transitioners. Grishma, a Kannadiga-Marathi participant who was raised in Mumbai with both a Catholic and a Hindu upbringing, described how her multi-ethnic and multi-religious experiences contributed to her successfully navigating diverse socio-cultural spaces in India and New Zealand:

I was born in South India, but I grew up in Mumbai [in Central India]. So culturally and bilingually, I grew up with two languages – Kannada and Marathi. Kannada is my mother tongue and Marathi being the state language [of Maharashtra], it is bilingual. Also my mother [a Kannadiga] is married to a Maharashtrian. So they speak both languages. I grew up in an urban environment, went to a Catholic school. So it was quite a city upbringing and we were a family of girls brought up in a traditional Indian way, but we were all encouraged to study. All three of us had our postgraduate degrees in India. I did my schooling in Jesus St. Mary’s and we have always been encouraged to be secular. My parents never stopped me from going to church sermon on Wednesdays with my friends and when school took us, or from bringing Bible home. The school had a lot of people from all over [India]. So growing up, I had really good friends from different communities. This helped me a lot later on when I got into work and travel, to be open and acceptable.

The above narrative specifically points out how multi-lingual skills and multi-cultural exposure in India made Grishma open to inter-ethnic interactions. Typically, cosmopolitan participants said that such a socialisation in a multi-ethnic environment in India contributed to their acquisition of English language abilities and of a secular outlook that was much needed when building diverse networks in New Zealand.
English language and multi-lingual capacities

The English language skills acquired through education and multi-lingual interactions in India contributed to the cultural capital and sociability skills of all participants. However, this was more true of cosmopolitans (n=32/43) who came from the bigger cities such as Mumbai, Delhi, Madras and Calcutta which are linguistically, ethnically and religiously more heterogeneous than other Indian cities. Due to their extremely diverse linguistic populations, English is widely used as a common medium of communication in such cities. Coming from such an environment, and also given India was a former British colony, most cosmopolitans reported that English was spoken at home and in school and some participants even reported that they had lost familiarity with their local languages because they had placed such an emphasis on acquiring English language skills. A Keralite participant, Priya, observed this in her husband:

…my husband he has been born and brought up in Chennai, he can speak Malayalam very well, but ask him to do a speech in Malayalam he can’t, ask him to read and write he can’t. He may be more comfortable in English. Even people from Bombay, they may be Malayalis, but they may be comfortable talking in English.

Such views most often came from cosmopolitans in the Gujarati (n=5/10) and Keralite (n=4/10) communities who were raised outside of Gujarat and Kerala and all the Tamil and Punjabi participants who came from bigger, more multicultural cities in India. A Tamil participant, Mala, described her networks in New Zealand and India as follows:

Most of them [diverse intra-ethnic friends] are Indians but nobody talks Hindi, everybody speaks in English. Although we are South Indians, we won’t speak Tamil or Hindi that much. We are ashamed but we end up speaking more English, because even in India we tended to do that, I went to boarding school. So English sort of became my first language […] the typical cosmopolitan Indian. So most people would talk in English, just like how we are talking now.

Socialisation in a different language thus enabled such participants to connect more broadly across different Indian and inter-ethnic communities. Many narratives such as the above illustrate the optimism and confidence among participants about using English as a medium of conversation. Proficiency in the host society’s language is documented as being vital to the integration of migrants within mainstream society, in terms of labour market participation and ability to make inter-ethnic friends (e.g. Chiswick & Miller, 2001; Espinosa & Massey, 1997; Lazear, 2007; Ryan, 2011). It is not surprising, therefore, that cosmopolitan participants appeared to be more confident and competent in these areas and did not perceive any language barriers in building intra- and inter-ethnic relationships when compared to the transitioners who migrated from regions that were less diverse, such as Kerala and Gujarat.
Some cosmopolitans even spoke of creatively blending more than one language in the same conversation. For example, some blended two or more languages such as Punjabi, Hindi and English or Marathi, Hindi and English or just English with their vernacular. Overall, the findings support Koehn and Rosenau’s (2002, p.110) view that, amongst other skills and competencies required to engage inter-culturally, the ability to use multiple languages and participate in meaningful conversation is important. Given such skills, participant knowledge of languages such as Hindi and Tamil enabled them to form relationships not only with other people from India, but also with Indian migrants from other parts of the world, such as with Indians from Fiji and Tamils from Sri Lanka and Malaysia.

*Cultural capital as capacities*

Yet Jason, a Tamil participant, indicated that it was not the English language or multi-linguistic abilities alone that actually facilitated the construction of inter-ethnic relationships. Observing the confidence level of Indian migrants engaging in inter-ethnic interactions overseas, he said:

…but it is not just language. That can be disproved, because I have met Indians who have full network circles with Kiwis or people all over in the US, America…they have full connections and their language is crap. The grammar is the Indian grammar, you know. Still you can walk past the weird language, poor pronunciation and the bad grammar, it’s all the thought process that shows. You can say something at first and if it does not show the way you wanted to and you know that, so that person will revisit the idea and explain it in four different ways. You can’t really go wrong with stuff like that. They are willing to listen. Those people get along fine, their English is bad, but still get along fine. So the barrier is not in the language alone, but it is the thought process the way you think is what. The fluidity, of what you think right and wrong, the way you hold equality between the sexes, and the way you actually show it. It is issues like that people see. That’s the barrier.

Being raised in culturally diverse cities, the cosmopolitans embodied a certain set of subjective values and predispositions that was demonstrated in their behaviour and thought processes. It helped them enter inter-ethnic interactions more comfortably without being estranged, even amongst those who were unfamiliar, in both India and New Zealand. According to Bourdieu (1986), such cultural skills and knowledge become an integral part of a person and constitutes part of their ‘cultural capital’, shaping perceptions, actions and the ability to organise everyday life through informal networks.

These acquired cultural tastes and preferences subsequently influenced participant friendship preferences in New Zealand. A Gujarati participant, Sonal, discussed her networks and noted a preference for a “Bombayite” way of life that determined her intra-community networks in New Zealand:
We realise that we don’t want to spend our time with Baroda people or with Ahmadabad people [from Gujarat]. We enjoy our time with Bombay people, Bombayites who in terms of the lifestyle and thinking are very different. People from Bombay are very broad minded and people from the Ahmadabad are very shrewd. Bombay people are bindas (have a showy lifestyle). When you meet a Gujarati then, it’s like ‘where are you from?’, ‘I am from Ahmadabad’ […], but I am more keen to talk to a person from Bombay. For example, Nirupama’s son and my son are in the same class. They had to go for a birthday party somewhere and she wanted to drop them off. So when she came to pick up my son, I asked her, ‘where are you from?’ She said Bombay, and I was like, ‘okay our hearts connected’. Sort of Bombay people gel alike normally, because they think alike. She was a lovely person – very friendly, very outgoing.

Adding to such observations, Badal distinguished between the lifestyle variations between Gujaratis who migrated to Bombay and the Gujaratis who remained in Gujarat. She did this by recalling her experience when she had to move back to Gujarat:

I got married and I moved from Mumbai to Ahmadabad [in Gujarat], so in my case, the lifestyle totally changed. So I had to struggle. Mumbai is faster like Auckland, whereas Ahmadabad had totally different culture, different mentality. Mumbai people were broad minded. I am a Jain, but I go to other temples and churches in Mumbai. My parents never stopped me saying, ‘no don’t go’. I had friends who were not Jains – Christian and Brahmin friends, and who went to different temples […] but in Ahmadabad they would ask me to go only to our own temple and no other temples.

These accounts capture the networks of participants who were neither exclusively tied to their homogeneous co-ethnic circles in India nor New Zealand. The networks they engaged in were influenced by their preferences and personalities that were shaped by their upbringing in India. Raised in varied traditions and in a secular environment they developed the unique ability to detach themselves from their own group, being able to critically evaluate them. Through such critical evaluation, they demonstrated expectations about the behaviour of network members and thus often made the decision to selectively engage in these relations. Anonymity, secularity, broad mindedness, outgoingness, freedom and lack of intrusion were the desired qualities often reflected in these accounts and reflect a cosmopolitan way of life. Their tastes and preferences, and the skills required to acquire the lifestyle they coveted, were enabled by the opportunities and diversities offered in certain parts of India. Participating in a similar context post-migration, in Auckland, they continued deploying such capacities to develop their preferred networks.

All of the Tamil and Punjabi participants engaged in some forms of intra- or inter-ethnic networks. Like the Keralites and Gujaratis raised in larger Indian cities, the Tamil and Punjabi participants came from cities that were diverse and multi-ethnic. A Tamil participant, Benjamin, reflected on how he had migrated during his childhood from a small town to Chennai, which had “more of a metropolitan lifestyle. It was like coming from the stream to a big ocean”.
Similarly, Sonia, a Punjabi participant raised in Chandigarh, said this city had “a multicultural society, I had lots of multicultural friends around me”.

**Transitioners**

In contrast, the eleven transitioners whose networks were homogeneous and dense, consisted mainly of five Gujaratis and six Keralites who had little or absolutely no exposure to diverse learning and living environments in India. These were participants who had a more traditional and communal upbringing than cosmopolitans, having been raised in an extended family setting with lots of relatives and friends from the community around them. Manish, a Gujarati participant from this group, recalled his upbringing in India:

We were a big family and people from our village – family members of relatives – they used to come to our house. We did not have a big house, but we were fortunate to have a big terrace that was a common terrace, because the building we were staying consisted of 40 rooms. Anybody who used to come, we used to accommodate them in the terrace because monsoon was only for three months so we could accommodate more people – free lodging and boarding. We didn’t mind, we wanted love and give love that is all. So people used to come and stay with us, they enjoy and we would also enjoy.

Similar to the above account, other Gujarati transitioners reiterated that they had always been surrounded by family and friends in India. Bahadur, for instance, spoke about the “joint” family arrangements and “family values” he was raised with: “we had a lot of values for family…we were emotionally and physically very attached. Whenever needed, we would be there if something happened. We have been living like that for more than 20-22 years”. It can be argued that, while family is important for transitioners and cosmopolitans alike, they demonstrate differences in the way these participants view the solidarity of their relations, especially with those beyond immediate family such as with relatives and community members. As made evident in the above narratives, transitioners viewed their ties and loyalties to one’s immediate and extended family more positively than the cosmopolitans.

Similar to the Gujaratis, Keralite transitioners whose networks were also homogeneous, said they were very “private”, “not very outgoing” and “preferred spending time with family”. For instance, Parvathy, who comes from a small town in Kerala, expressed: “I am a little bit private person, I am not keen to make friends, but once in a while we meet each other”. Further, when I questioned her about what hindered her interactions beyond the Keralite community, she said: “it was little bit hard to get adjusted to the environment here, lots of formalities. There in India, I was brought up in an informal atmosphere and I love that”. Priya also comes from a small town in Kerala and was raised in a “traditional set up”, “growing up with relatives and family
all around”, attending local schools and universities. She said: “I am an extremely private person for all the talk that I do. People come to talk to me, I talk to them, I have no issues, but I don’t go and talk to them”. Such participants expressed greater comfort within their own linguistic circles, actively seeking people from their own regions who spoke their language, than within networks that were different or unfamiliar.

Being raised in smaller towns that provided little exposure to diverse linguistic interactions, Gujarati and Keralite transitioners often said that English was a barrier to cross in inter-ethnic interactions in New Zealand. As a result, they struggled to settle in during the initial years after their arrival in New Zealand. Serine and Johnny, for example, were two Keralite participants who arrived in Auckland as students and therefore had more opportunities than many Keralites to build diverse networks outside their co-ethnic circles at their university and in their work places. But they remained relatively confined to friends from their regional-linguistic group. In this context, both participants expressed that “English was the main problem for me” and “I couldn’t literally understand their [Kiwi] jokes and jargons”. Due to language barriers, transitioners tended to rely dense co-ethnic networks with overlapping connections across members. This differentiated transitioners from cosmopolitans who were Gujarati or Keralite but raised outside these regions.

Accordingly, these differences between cosmopolitans and transitioners accounted for the network diversity of participants in New Zealand. The Tamil and Punjabi participants pointed out that their exposure to those different from them culturally and linguistically prepared them to make diverse networks in New Zealand. According to Binnie et al. (2006, p.8), people with a cosmopolitan sensibility are skilled at navigating and negotiating differences and overcome risks, not only by gathering knowledge of a particular society but by adopting a disposition and attitude that helps them adapt to new and different circumstances. Participant observations regarding the construction of inter-ethnic networks in New Zealand often revealed the dispositions and attitudes they gained from their previous multicultural experiences in India. Antony, a Tamil participant from Chennai, noticed his prior cultural knowledge and familiarity with people from other Indian states was instrumental in the New Zealand context: “we knew about other states. Having close interactions with them opened up lot more perspectives here. So it was very valuable inputs here”. A Punjabi cosmopolitan, Gurpreet, also reflected on how a multicultural upbringing in India gave her confidence in multi-ethnic interactions in New Zealand:
[...] so as an Indian you know how to tackle them [diverse people]. The same things over here, because they are from different countries, they are from different backgrounds, social life, economic life everything is a bit different. So to some extent you are confident. You don’t lose confidence thinking, ‘Oh this is different. Should I go ahead and speak?’

Having developed inter-ethnic networks with some confidence, cosmopolitans had different perceptions about the need to associate with their own people. For example, a Tamil participant, Dipika, said: “I was never a part of a big group or an association […] because they [her diverse Indian and other ethnic networks] were so nice to us, I have never felt the need to be a part of the Tamil group”. These accounts express why cosmopolitans were less embedded in their own communities.

Another point of contrast between the two migrant groups is that some transitioners noted how many members of their co-ethnic networks had migrated to Australia. When network mapping was undertaken, seven transitioners (in comparison to only one cosmopolitan) discussed how the number of relatives and friends they had in New Zealand was declining because they had all moved to Australia. Johnny, a Keralite participant, compared his networks a few years ago with his current networks and commented that: “almost 90 per cent of them have migrated to Australia. If this was two years back this list [of network members] would have been 40-50. In the past two years, almost 50-60 per cent I know for long have migrated to Australia”. Many other Keralite transitioners also had similar observations and comments. Still no such observations came from the Tamil and Punjabi participants. This seems likely because there is a larger number of Keralite Malayali communities in Australia than New Zealand (see Department of Immigration & Border Protection Govt. of Australia, 2014).

In short, it is clear from this section that a cosmopolitan capacity is what drives the network diversity of most Indian migrants studied and a sense of satisfaction with these networks is the reason that cosmopolitans express less desire for co-ethnic affiliations. As these capacities emanate from a multi-cultural environment and upbringing in India, this finding supports DeLanda’s (2002, p.48) view that differences that exist between entities of the same species or kind arise primarily from differences present in the environment.

**Religion, gender and co-ethnic-occupation as capacities**

Yet it was not cosmopolitanism alone that influenced the structure of Indian migrant networks. According to DeLanda (2006, p.16), the process of assembly through which social entities come into being can be conceptualised as recurrent; in other words, repeated occurrences of the same
processes. A recurrent pattern within the Indian migrant networks I studied emerged along the lines of gender, region-occupation and religion. While on the one hand, these properties enabled migrants to territorialise migrant networks, these were also capacities that affected the way in which migrants interacted with others. As such, this section explores how these factors are regarded as capacities that activate and structure migrant relationships.

Here it should be noted that entities have intrinsic properties of their own. Although capacities are not reducible to intrinsic properties, capacities nonetheless depend on them. DeLanda (2013, p.66) illustrates this by giving the example of an assemblage of a walking animal, a piece of ground and a gravitational field. In this interaction, a piece of ground has its own intrinsic properties: it may be horizontal, or slanted, firm or rigid. To be capable of offering support to the walking animal, these are not just intrinsic properties but capacities which may go unexercised if there are no animals around. While we may have an exhaustive knowledge of such properties, if we have not observed it in interaction with other entities we may not know anything about its capacities (DeLanda, 2013, p.66). In this sense, properties such as gender, occupation and religion should also to be treated as capacities that affect migrant relations and networks. Therefore, this section explores how these properties are connected to the structuring the networks of Indian migrants in New Zealand.

**Co-ethnic occupational linkages as a capacity**

Participant networks were generally structured along co-ethnic occupational linkages, but with some notable differences between the four Indian communities in regards to their occupational profile. In the context of Indian migrants in Italy, Lum (2012) observes an ethnic segmentation of occupational profiles. Similarly, particular Indian communities in this study were inclined towards certain occupations. For instance, most Gujarati participants had a high preference for business with eight out of ten holding Bachelor’s degrees in Commerce and with some noting an interest in running businesses. Business was considered to be in the “Gujarati blood”, as Badal remarked. She was a Gujarati participant whose husband, father and father-in-law all ran family businesses in India. Since business skills are prioritised and boys tend to take over their father’s businesses in the Gujarati community, Sonal also pointed out that a degree in Commerce was considered necessary for equipping children with the skills needed to maintain accounts.
On the other hand, participants from the Keralite community were slightly more diverse in their specialisations, tending to have qualifications in fields such as nursing, IT, social work and business management. Lum (2012) observes the tendency among Keralite communities to prefer occupations such as IT and nursing, because they are viewed as a means to acquire well paid jobs abroad. While nursing is the most recognised means of migrating overseas among Keralites (see Kodoth & Jacob, 2013; Percot & Rajan, 2007), other fields indicated in table 4.3 – such as IT, professional cookery and business management – are generic skills that are considered useful for gaining employment in migration to the Middle eastern Gulf and other countries seeking migrants (see Khadria, 2004; 2001).

In contrast to the Keralites and Gujaratis, participants from the Tamil and Punjabi communities had far more diverse qualifications across ten different fields, such as economics, geology, communication, law and physiotherapy, as well business, nursing, IT and cookery. Table 4.3 shows the diversity of qualifications from the four Indian communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields of specialisation</th>
<th>Gujaratis</th>
<th>Keralites</th>
<th>Tamils</th>
<th>Punjabi</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountancy/Commerce/Business</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chefs/Food &amp; Beverage Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT &amp; software professionals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/s</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geologist</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass communication specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ethnically-structured occupational preferences of Indian communities are also reflected in the configuration of their networks. For example, figure 4.2 shows the network diagrams of Dominic, a Tamil Physiotherapist, and Trosy, a Keralite nurse. These demonstrate a pattern in their networks showing linkages between professional and co-ethnic affiliations. The figures below indicates the number of close knit co-ethnic friends my participants have in same skilled professions as their own. It can be discerned from these patterns that Indian migrants and also those who intend to migrate to New Zealand view these linkages as opportunities for a safe
settlement and employment after arrival. But Govindswamy and Nambiar’s (2003) study of the Keralite community in Malaysia observe that a high range of occupations and level of education among them, bring less dependency and obligation within networks for social and economic needs. These authors conclude stating that the applicability of the network systems are less sustainable in today’s context that prioritises economic advancement. This point examining whether greater ‘skills’ and human capital brings less dependence on social networks will thus be explored in chapters five and six.

Figure 4.2: Networks of Dominic and Trosy

Twenty participants in this study had ties with members of their own co-ethnic communities who were in similar occupations and businesses. While dense co-ethnic networks commonly featured members in nursing, social work, business management and cookery, diverse networks included IT, medicine, finance, law and geology. Previous studies (Poros, 2001; Sassen, 1995) have shown that migrant networks determine labour market participation and vice versa. This interplay between migrant networks and their labour market outcomes and how such networks spawned start-up businesses and aided skilled migrants seeking employment will also be examined in chapters five and six. I also show how these overlapping dimensions of co-ethnic networks and occupation are a potential cause of tension, especially for the onshore migrants, in the next chapter.
Gender as a capacity

Participant networks were also gendered in certain ways. For instance, men tended to lead the migration process. Nineteen of the twenty-one men interviewed were principal applicants for permanent residence, while only nine of the twenty-two female participants had lodged principal applications. Most men arrived in New Zealand first and then brought their families later and only two cases of men had arrived accompanying their families. One was George, a Keralite participant who had immigrated with his wife, who was a nurse and was therefore the skilled applicant. The second was Manish, a 70 year old Gujarati participant who had arrived under family reunification. On the other hand, twenty-one of the twenty-two of the female participants had migrated to New Zealand, either alongside with their husband and families or to join friends already in New Zealand.

Although nine women indicated they were the principal applicants for permanent residence, only one female participant – a Keralite nurse, Trosy – migrated first and then brought her family upon getting residence. Even in this case, she had relatives who were also nurses in New Zealand. As noted by Percot and Rajan (2007) female emigration is culturally specific. Indian families discourage women from migrating alone and instead use marriage, family reunification or study as socially acceptable and respectable routes to settlement abroad (Lum, 2012). Nevertheless, there are some exceptions to such cultural norms. For instance, young Christian women from Kerala who have been trained as nurses are more likely to be granted permission by their families to migrate alone to countries perceived as relatively safe locations for their daughters, than young Hindu Keralite women (Lum, 2012). This observation appears valid for explaining why Trosy’s situation is different from other female participants in this study, and, more broadly, differences in the diverse composition of networks among men and women. Because although some women did acknowledge the importance of work based networks, more generally women’s networks were family and community driven with fewer number of co-workers and professional ties than men. As noted in chapter two, diverse and work related ties carry certain benefits such as access to better information and resources (see Bastani, 2007; Burt, 2001). Therefore how a lack of such diversity in the network impacts the differences in the labour market perceptions between men and women will be explored in chapter six.

Husband focused networks

Over half of the female participants in this study discussed how their networks were gained through their husband’s connections. Their networks often consisted of friends and
acquaintances of their husbands, with interactions often taking place as couples within their co-ethnic or larger Indian circles. For instance, Payal from the Gujarati community, observed: “Since I am with my husband, I have only his network and I don’t have my own networks, at the moment my networks are usually through my husband”.

Although many female participants said most of their networks were gained through their husbands, there are some differences in the way women from the cosmopolitan and transitioner groups interpreted these networks. Parvathy, for instance, pointed out that it was customary for Keralite women to have their husband’s friends and children’s parents in their networks, keeping their “own” networks separate. She indicated:

Actually they are my husband’s friends, so when we go there [to friends] we meet each other that is the policy of Malayalis – husband’s friends and children’s friend’s parents. My husband’s friends used to come here or we go there, but my friends, we usually keep that relationship at work only […]. In India also it is like that actually.

Participants who assumed that a woman’s network was largely mediated by her husband and children were the same participants who indicated that they were more “private”, “not very outgoing” or “family driven”, as mentioned in the previous section on transitioners. They did not see any problems with sharing common networks with their husbands. Unlike these women, however, many women in the cosmopolitan group who were raised in diverse, urban environments were shaped differently in their views and behaviours. A Tamil participant, Florien, noted that she was raised: “very very independent, very very confident and bold. I never had a fear, I never had that girl factor in me at all. I never used to depend on anyone”. In this context, she expressed her discomfort in being embedded into her husband’s network in New Zealand:

Here until this day, I don’t have friends of my own…they are my colleagues [inter-ethnic], whom I can say are my own friends. Other than that, any other person whom I meet is my husband’s friends, their wives and their children. That is how I know people here, it is not my circle, it is ‘his’ entire circle, I am bound to his circle right now. So my entire husband’s family they are here. So I am really scared.

Reflecting on why she felt being embedded in her husband’s network was problematic, she said:

Having your own friends is always good, meaning your own people who don’t know your husband, who knows you and are friends because of you. If you share ties to his circle, you will not be freely connected with them. They may be good people, but you may not want to share all that you want to share, like some emotional stress or something. You can’t always go and say everything. One reason is because, they are connected with my husband and other reason being you are going to give a bad image of your husband, which means tomorrow, you are going to have a bad image as well. It is going to affect your family values as well, okay they have this problem, and it will just spread like a virus in the community and everybody is going to disregard you for that particular reason. The other reason is because they are your husband’s friends, how much ever you are right or wrong, they will always tend to be more supportive towards him than
you. So it is always nice to have your own friends to rely on. It is not about having people on your side, but about having people who are not connected with your husband.

While these participants felt that having their own ties gave them comfort and security, a female participant, Grishma, pointed out that having networks independent of one’s husband was also important to channel any stress between couples. Grishma had school friends who migrated to New Zealand. These friends were the sources of support that she relied on:

All my school friends [from India] we meet, we chat, we talk about, ‘oh hubby is killing me, a tough time’, you know you can because you have grown up together. I have got that support group. So I can call them up and talk to them, ‘do you need time, do you need some girl time, should we go out’, you know. Like tomorrow we are planning to go to Farmers just three of us for the half-price sale. My husband does that too, because he works, he also has his boys’ networks. On Saturday he goes for a movie or for a drink with his friends. So we try and organise some activities or else it would be at each other’s throat that we are at times, after 26 years of marriage.

Women from the Punjabi and Tamil groups, and also Keralite and Gujarati women raised outside their regions, preferred wider independent connections that were not merely confined to their husband’s networks. As such, they had some exclusive networks that were not tied to their husband. The two female participants who left their families behind in India and lived in New Zealand by themselves, had more diverse networks, expressed greater confidence and more positive impressions about their support networks and overall life experiences in New Zealand than other participants.

**Gendered networks**

Network composition were also gendered. Seventeen participants, irrespective of their co-ethnic affiliations, had networks predominantly with individuals of the same gender. Figure 4.3 below shows network diagrams for two of my participants – Priya and George – illustrating this point. Ties with the opposite gender were largely through their spouse and children.

**Figure 4.3: Gender homophily of participants***

---

* Circles represents females and triangles represents males in the network.
Teter (2010), in her study of gender homophily of social networks in rural India, also observes a tendency for Indians to associate with the same gender due to homosocial norms reinforcing sex segregation, particularly in the context of marriage (Mehta & Strough, 2009). Generally, sex segregation and gendered socialisation is regarded an important aspect of human development that may prevail throughout one’s lifespan (for a review see Mehta & Strough, 2009). While this form of socialisation is based on cultural expectations and schooling system in India, interview and network data suggest it is carried forward by migrants in migration.

Gender is also an important factor that affects how migrants form networks with each other (see Erel, 2010; Kofman et al., 2000; Ryan, 2007), especially mothers who are more locally-focused and child-oriented than men (Ryan et al., 2015). Many female participants developed networks through their children, other parents and teachers. Of course, it should be acknowledged that children’s interactions at school are the basis for the networks of many New Zealand women’s networks as well. Nonetheless, school provided critical opportunities for Indian migrants, even those who were introverted, to interact with other parents. A Punjabi participant, Kaur, recalled: “I was not a person who talk so much actually, when I came to New Zealand, but the biggest thing which opens you to the world is parenting”. Further, pointing out how networks through children offer opportunities to diversify the women’s networks beyond their communities, Seema another Punjabi participant stated:

...because my son he has got different friends, I am meeting with other cultures. Now, when I am holding a birthday party in my house, I am inviting a Korean, a Chinese, Fiji Indian and UK born persons. So on his birthday, we have different communities in the house. So may be in near future, I may have more of Pākehā friends than Indians, I don’t know as children grow, also their parents.

The above narratives reveal that networks through children were an important means of establishing new and inter-ethnic linkages for Indian women in New Zealand. However, no men in this study made any statement about such networks gained through their children. Also these observations came only from the female cosmopolitans rather than women in the transtioner’s group.

**Religion as a capacity**

Stroope (2012) argues that embeddedness in social networks contributes to religious participation, which is certainly evident in this study. Participants believed religious networks were necessary for ensuring their children retain and imbibe religious beliefs and practices. The Christians (all seven Keralites and two of four Tamil Christians) were formally embedded in
co-ethnic church linkages. Participants from other religious groups, like the Sikhs and Jains, preferred to have separate family-based religious networks in addition to regular participation in the Gurdwaras and Jain temples. These networks were important for children to be raised in Sikh beliefs said Sonia, a Sikh participant:

…because you know, we Sikhs have to maintain those hair and pagadi [turban], we become a bit different from other people. So I was bit afraid, my kids when they grow up they may not take up [Sikh practices] getting a clean shave and a haircut and all those. So that was the time, I wanted them be in a community where they can interact more with Sikhs and are proud of being a Sikh. I am not a person who force my children to become a Sikh, but I wanted them to get convinced that this is the way you live and why. Parents alone are not enough, so if we can have a community…In 2004-5 we came across people [Sikhs] who had all young children and they were all thinking we should give [training in Sikh practices].

Yet not all participants were able to develop such networks successfully. Sonal, a Jain participant from the Gujarati community, pointed out the difficulty of incorporating children into Jain religious practices:

Children have blended so well into the Kiwi culture, they want their space, they don’t want to come for all that Guju talks and all that. So we started our cultural group where we meet and say all our prayers, because we didn’t want our kids to forget our religious chants and everything. So we started all that Hanuman chalisa and Gayatri mantar [hymns] and all that. Decided we will meet every Saturday, but gradually all the children started getting grumpy. So from every Saturday, we moved on to fortnightly, then moved on to once a month and finally it was only parents. Children would be like ‘we have exams and we have this’, so then gradually we stopped. We wanted to do it for the children, but then forcing and imposing something they don’t like, just doesn’t work.

These narratives show that it was important for participants to develop Sikh and Jain networks to receive moral support and sanctions for religious adherence from similar friends in the community. But such networks were less important to their children.

It is difficult to determine whether being embedded in religious networks facilitated or hindered network diversity. Findings revealed that religious restrictions do impact interactions outside co-ethnic circles, when participants believed other New Zealanders would not understand their religious needs and preferences. Sonia, reflecting on her inter-ethnic networks, expressed this saying: “We can’t be very comfortable with Kiwis, because we are vegetarians and secondly, we are non-alcoholics. Socially they would like to meet in bars and restaurants. So for us, those constraints make us and them uncomfortable”. Kaur, another Sikh parent, repeated how such restrictions hindered the building of “close” connections outside her community:

I just went to my daughter’s early childhood centre, they were celebrating their first birthday we went there, but as soon as they cut their cake we had to come out, otherwise my kids might have eaten something, and I cannot have food with them. It was also a feeling of how to make excuses, you cannot explain everything to everyone. People will feel unrespected, you know how hard it
is? It is very hard feeling, explaining to everyone I can’t have, I can’t have, [...] it is my religion which binds me out and does not give me that much freedom to be as close to my own community.

Such views often came from Sikhs and Jains who were vegetarians and teetotallers, but these views were notably expressed only by female participants in these religious groups. In the context of Hindu women living outside of India, scholars (for example Kurien, 1999; Gupta, 1997; Singh & Harisunker, 2010) observe that religion is always the defining factor in the relationships that women keep, the beliefs that they choose to indoctrinate in their children and the food they eat. While in India children are socialised into and internalise religious values on a daily basis (Fenton, 1988), migration takes them away from such religious routines. The task of trying to maintain religion and culture in the migration context often falls to women (see Kurien, 1999). Thus, Indian migrant women in New Zealand may thus be seen as the custodians of their culture, religion and rituals, a part of which involves constructing appropriate networks for the sake of children.

In these ways, occupation, religion and gender act as key capacities structuring Indian migrant networks. These capacities do not explain the structure of Indian migrant networks in its entirety, but draw attention to the possible differences between them. Equally the findings also suggest that no singular capacities can be attributed to a particular pattern of network. In many cases, the capacities are intermeshed with each other, as was the case in the above example where religion and gender worked hand in hand to shape networks among Indian migrant women. Understanding gender and cosmopolitan capacities also helps to explain differences in the way female participants were enculturated into networks of spouses and children.

Conclusion

This chapter aimed to understand the structure of Indian migrant networks by looking at the diversity and recurring patterns evident across participant networks. Using DeLanda’s (2006) notion of capacities, I have argued that to understand the processes and differences behind these networks, it is important not to group Indian migrants together as a homogenised group, but rather view them as singular entities with individual potentials. I have thus explored the differences in the properties of participants’ networks based on size, density and composition and also the qualitative processes behind these manifested structures. In most cases (n=32/43), some form of diversity through intra- and inter-ethnic networks was visible. This network diversity usually resulted from participants’ cosmopolitan capacity to relate and bridge inter-ethnic relations, often demonstrated via a participant’s language abilities or their capacity for
engaging inter-culturally as a result of broader world-views. As these capacities are associated with their upbringing in India, this chapter highlighted that it is important to recognise the pre-migration contexts that condition migrant sociability and allow the bridging of differences across groups. In addition, this chapter showed that the differences in Indian migrant networks also relate to the capacities of gender, religion and occupation. How these capacities help and hinder the legal, economic, community and societal integration of Indian migrants to New Zealand is examined in chapters five to eight.
Chapter Five

Journey to permanent residence: The role of co- and intra-ethnic networks in the acquisition of legal status for onshore Indian migrants in New Zealand

Introduction

Chapter four discussed the network structures of Indian migrants from the four communities. The current chapter moves from this discussion to examine the pros and cons of co-ethnic networks using DeLanda’s (2006, p.13) framework of territorialisation and deterritorialisation. Given that integration in this study is examined at multiscale levels such as legal, economic, community and societal, gaining the legal status of a Permanent Resident (PR) or citizen is basic to actualising the integration of migrants in the other realms of the host society. As I pointed out in the introduction of this thesis, New Zealand has seen a recent surge in Indian students. This study thus distinguishes between Indian migrants who arrived in New Zealand with permanent residence (offshore migrants) and those who were previously international students but have since transitioned to PR status (onshore migrants).

I have made this distinction because, among the various findings that emerged from the data, it was evident that the onshore migrants who arrived as international students had particularly strong co-ethnic social networks. Among the forty-three participants in this study, eighteen were onshore migrants in New Zealand and this chapter primarily explores their experiences and the ways in which their social networks aided their legal transition by bridging the study to residence pathway.

DeLanda (2006, p.13) uses the term territorialisation to refer to that which gives a sense of stability to an assemblage. Applying the term here in this chapter, I characterise territorialisation as a process that rendered stability to the onshore Indian migrants, enabling them to complete their studies and acquire PR status in New Zealand through their networks. In most cases, co-ethnic networks were critical to their accessing study, everyday support and the labour market, eventually facilitating their transition from study to work and residence. The first section of this chapter, which explores what it meant for participants to study in New Zealand and then
discusses how various forms of social networks – largely based on co-ethnic affiliations such as family, flatmates, friends, acquaintances, cricket affiliations and religious linkages – provided support for onshore Indian argues that family and close friends were like rhizomes that helped them attain their goal. Yet, despite their potential for stabilisation, co-and intra-ethnic networks could also be problematic as migrants transitioned from study to work and residence and this destabilised and deterritorialised their sense belonging in such networks. This challenges the common view in the migrant literature that social networks are conflated with social capital (see Anthias, 2007; Cranford, 2005). In exploring the negative implications of engaging in such networks, the second section argues that networks are not a form of social capital for all student migrants. As research to date has primarily concentrated either on the work experiences of migrants or on the educational experiences of international students, (Anderson et al., 2012c, p.2), this chapter thus addresses an important gap in the literature by examining the work experiences of international students who worked for Indian employers in New Zealand. This chapter therefore asks: what made onshore Indian migrants undertake study in New Zealand? What type of networks in India and New Zealand aided their efforts to study and then transition to work and permanent residence? What are the pros and cons of such a dependence on these networks?

**Territorialising networks for study, work and residence**

Negotiating the study-to-work-and-residence pathway, many onshore migrants relied on their networks for support. Of the eighteen participants who were initially international students, sixteen secured skilled employment through their co-ethnic networks and subsequently transitioned to permanent residence. This included two female participants who gained permanent residence via their spouse’s skilled employment status. All, irrespective of their field of study or gender, strongly believed that their social networks were central to securing ‘suitable’ skilled employment in New Zealand. While networks can be regarded territorialising, DeLanda (2006, p.19) argues that mechanisms in social assemblages are mediated by an element of subjectivity – beliefs, reasons and motives – that is important to make the entities act. That is, the choice of ends and actions are mediated by one’s passions for those things that are pleasurable and positively valued. As such, DeLanda (2006, p.49) urges us to understand the subject as a “pragmatic” being whose behaviour must be explained in the light of personal values and reasons that drives them. Therefore, before I discuss how co-ethnic networks were significant to territorialise onshore Indian migrants, I briefly introduce here how the inclination and ability to territorialise co-ethnic networks was patterned by participants’ expectations to
acquire residence by means of undertaking a study in New Zealand. Focusing on this leads to a clearer understanding of why onshore migrants highly valued their social networks.

**What does it mean to study in New Zealand and why depend on networks?**

International education is meant to upgrade one’s skills and knowledge, but the findings show that its benefits go well beyond this human capital focus. For most participants (n=17/18), study in New Zealand was motivated by the desire to gain New Zealand permanent residence. Jessy, an IT professional from Kerala, articulated what many similar participants also said:

> I wanted to go to Australia, but it was difficult at that time. So I studied about the New Zealand immigration processes; whether it was easy to get a PR, because I wanted to get a PR first, not just study and come back to India. I wanted a PR. So when I checked the procedures for getting PR, I found that IT was most easy way to get the visa, not very difficult.

The fact that most of my onshore participants undertook study seeking residence in New Zealand is notable for two reasons. First, they reported this was in response to unsatisfactory working conditions in India. Seventeen of the onshore migrants had previously worked in India, describing jobs that were underpaid, strenuous and lacked opportunities for mobility. Discontent with existing work conditions and aspirations for a better career and financial security often led them to migrate to New Zealand to undertake study. Second, this finding is in line with New Zealand immigration policies that aim to attract international students: while New Zealand Immigration allows for the recruitment of employees onshore (Wilkinson et al., 2010), many Indian migrants are not successful unless they have an offer of employment or are already in employment in New Zealand. This is because India is not considered to have a comparable labour market to New Zealand (see for example, Immigration New Zealand, n.d.), making work experience gained in India invalid under the point system used to assess the applications of those intending to migrate directly under the skilled migration category. However, ‘Study-to-Work’ policies enable international students to have a one year open job search visa after graduating to seek employment relevant to their qualifications. This offers migrants the advantage of gaining points through study for a relevant New Zealand qualification and through gaining New Zealand work experience, facilitating the transition to PR. As such, the courses studied were often chosen to enable relevant employment that facilitated PR, rather than because a participant had a particular educational or professional aspiration. Onshore participants undertook courses in the field of business management, cookery, Information Technology [IT], early childhood education and social work because these aligned with New Zealand’s skills shortage list. Many students who come to New Zealand do, of course, gain
useful qualifications and then return home, but these are most likely those who attend universities rather than the largely private providers my participants favoured.

According to DeLanda (2006, p.49 & 52) such individuals, who are driven by ideas and aspirations such as the desire to gain PR, have the right capacities to act pragmatically (matching means to ends), as well as to engage socially without even necessarily making a conscious decision. Certainly my participants pragmatically decided to study the courses that matched best the goal of PR. Although this goal was consciously decided, many of their social networks as indispensable means to find employment quickly after completing study were not intentionally established but emerged contingently as participants used their capacities to restore stability when this was needed, such as in making best use of the open job search visa.

For instance, Dominic, a Tamil participant, discussed the support he received when he held an open job search visa. After completing a graduate diploma in sports and exercise therapy, Dominic was working in a cleaning company. With only one month left on his visa, it was essential for him to seek relevant skilled employment to be able to stay in New Zealand. However, seeking further employment was problematic with only one month of visa remaining, leading to rejections wherever he applied. Like other onshore migrants, he underlined the value of his networks in such a critical situation:

I had no option than going to study [again], because I didn’t want to go to India. So I had a friend who referred me to his friend who was working in a college here. So I said, ‘okay I will do a course in business again, getting level 7 or level 6’. By doing this course, I could stay in New Zealand at least for another one year and see my luck and everything. So I came to Auckland to see that person, my friend’s friend. So he looked at all my papers, gave me all the information. I was about to pay the money, but then he was just looking at my papers and said, ‘okay I might get you a job, just wait for a day, I will have friends who might get you a job’. I didn’t pay the money, went back. He called me and said, ‘I have got an exercise therapist job for you, so why don’t you, rather than study, work?’ Arranged an interview in the same week and got this job.

---

5 Education New Zealand (2012) data shows that the majority (91 per cent) of Indian students are in private training and polytechnic institutes (64 and 27 per cent respectively) while only 9 per cent attend universities. Students from the public tertiary education institutions, particularly, in institutes of technology, polytechnics and private training establishments are more likely to migrate after study (Wilkinson et al., 2010). It is important to note that according to NZQA (New Zealand Qualifications Authority), New Zealand tertiary sectors includes private training establishments (PTEs), Institutes of Polytechnics (ITPs), universities etc., to flexibly meet the needs of adult learners. The difference between the three is that universities provide higher degree level educations which are academically oriented and research based are different from the vocational types. On the other hand, ITPs offer vocational degree level education which is more specific and applied, and PTEs offer specific vocational programs usually at the certificate and diploma level. Please see online NZQA: [http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/studying-in-new-zealand/tertiary-education/](http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/studying-in-new-zealand/tertiary-education/)

6 Completion of a qualification in New Zealand allows students to apply for an open job search visa for a maximum period of 12 months. On finding a job, they can apply for a further visa for up to two to three years under the ‘Study to Work’ category (Immigration New Zealand, 2013).
Dominic’s good luck, although serendipitous, illustrates how networks comprised of either immediate friends or acquaintances can act as a timely and favourable resource for onshore migrants in difficult situations. This was particularly the case for those participants (n=10/18) who pursued business management and cooking qualifications and sought employment in Indian retail businesses and restaurants.

**What form of support did co-ethnic networks provide onshore migrants?**
Onshore migrants displayed a unique capacity of being rhizomorphous in co-ethnic networks. To be rhizomorphous is to produce stems and filaments that acts as roots, or better yet connect co-ethnic members and allow them to put such networks to new uses (for example see Lee, 2008). My participants’ abilities to strive and reach their goals were determined by their capacities to expand the scope of networks and, importantly, in their capacities to evolve their networks as demanded in the situations they encountered. Such networks provided support with entering New Zealand for study, support for remaining here when they faced unexpected challenges, support for families in India and support in connecting with and proliferating their ties beyond their immediate circles. Nonetheless, according to DeLanda (2006, p.12) it is not merely support that territorialises, but by the way in which it is rendered that matters in progressively actualising territorialisation. This is explored below.

*Material* support are important means for territorialisation to take place (DeLanda, 2006). Family and peer networks both in India and in New Zealand were central for onshore migrants gaining the financial support needed to enter New Zealand for study. Onshore migrants believed that using study in New Zealand as a route to permanent residence brought more financial challenges than faced by those who enter New Zealand with permanent residence. International tertiary fees and the high cost of living means education in New Zealand is an expensive financial investment. For instance, international students who are studying 36 weeks or longer must demonstrate to Immigration New Zealand that they have at least $15,000 per year available to support themselves, in addition to their tuition fees (MBIE, 2014). All participants in this study were from middle and upper middle class families in India, yet they reported that gaining such funds required bank loans guaranteed by pledging or selling parental properties, personal loans from relatives and friends or the use of family savings. They highlighted the enormous psychological pressure they faced in organising such funds, enduring time-consuming and expensive visa processes and the stress of repaying these debts in India once they had successfully gained PR. Of all the problems confronted by those who arrived as
international students, financial difficulties were the most significant, a finding supported by other New Zealand research (for example, Anderson et al., 2012c). It is in this context that co-ethnic networks became an essential means of material support for most participants.

For those who arrived in New Zealand on a tourist visa and decided to stay by undertaking a course of study, co-ethnic networks were particularly essential for gaining the monetary support needed to fulfil their dreams of acquiring PR. For example, Naren, a Keralite participant, arrived in New Zealand for a temporary visit but decided to study to be able to permanently settle. He explained that he received monetary help from his Malayali friend when his visa expired:

...life came to a stop when our visas were getting over and we wanted to stay here. So I wanted to take a course here. We wanted around [NZ]$16-17000 for the course. I had money for the survival here, but I never had money for the course. So started calling friends, no one bothered, but one of them he borrowed money from his friends and gave it to us. It was a big help.

Close co-ethnic friends thus represented a bridge to acquaintances in the community who offered support to student migrants during such critical times, especially when their visas expired. Four other onshore participants spoke of similar experiences.

Moreover, onshore migrants who were married indicated that their families in India offered support with childcare. This was the case for Sonal, a Gujarati participant who had to leave behind her two children while studying in New Zealand. When asked about how her family supported her, she replied: “My mother and my sister-in-law made sure that all my children’s needs were attended. They were kept on a platter and well looked after. Even for my sons’ school fees, everything was paid by my brother”. Such pre-migration support from family and close friends was mentioned by all of the student participants.

Participants also still had financial responsibilities and commitments towards their families and social networks in India and co-ethnic friends in New Zealand often helped to meet these responsibilities. My participants reported that they had the responsibility to fund the education of their siblings and also arrange funds [in the form of dowries] for their marriages. However, being a student and earning minimal wages in New Zealand often hampered their ability to send home their earnings and offer the kind of support that was expected. Co-ethnic networks in this context offered support to the families of onshore migrants left behind in India. Dominic, a Tamil participant, remembered the help he received from his close friends in New Zealand at the time of his sister’s wedding:

Vikram and Maya, as I said, we are very good close friends and our families also know each other […] during my sister’ marriage, I was bankrupted and I didn’t have a good job at that time; I was
working as a cleaner then. I didn’t have good money and my sister’s marriage was suddenly arranged and they needed money. So she was the one who gave her credit card in India to purchase everything for at least 3 lakhs (NZ$6300 approx.).

Thus as onshore participants experienced a range of financial hardships, monetary support from co-ethnic networks became the most cited examples of the tangible material forms of assistance received.

Among other kinds of stressors that onshore participants experienced, culture shock, homesickness, lack of safety, discrimination, language difficulties, lack of appropriate accommodation and isolation were also commonly stated. These grievances are consistent with the findings of Khawaja and Stallman (2011) of international students in the Australian context. Again to counter such challenges, sixteen onshore participants actively sought out people from their respective regions, particularly those speaking their regional languages recognising these networks as their ‘comfort zones’. They joined the networks of their co-ethnic contacts through informal visits in each other’s residence, participating in co-ethnic churches and cricket clubs which later became more standardised socialising opportunities, and also opportunities to seek employment. Johnny, a Keralite social worker, expressed how his friend, a senior social worker from his home town, helped him gain skilled employment:

I met one guy from my home town, Kottayam [in Kerala]. He completed his studies before me. It was very fortunate to meet him. We met at a Malayali function, at a birthday party. We had a chat since we were from the same place and he was working with [employer]. So he was the one who informed me about the job vacancies. He literally introduced me to one of the staff members there and that helped me. Earlier when I applied for jobs, I hardly got called for interviews. My applications got rejected saying I didn’t have enough ‘New Zealand experience’; they did not prefer someone from overseas. Currently I can tell you, if you have pretty good network that is the only way to get into the job.

Such opportunities were not only valuable for onshore migrants, but also for the spouses who accompanied them. Jessy, a Keralite participant, highlighted the role of the Malayali church community played in helping her husband to connect with and seek job opportunities when he arrived in New Zealand. Jessy was an international student and subsequently found skilled employment in the IT field. Although she was the principal applicant and successfully transitioned to PR status, it was more difficult for her husband, a technician from Dubai, to find work. She noted the help he received from her church community:

We had this welcome from our church community when my husband came here. They introduced him in front of everyone, to every member in the church. They asked about his work experience, about his qualifications and they discussed and advanced each to find a job and help him. They were all ready to give reference for any kind of job.

Geena: How did he get the job?
Jessy: It was through a referral again, he received a lot of help from the church mates. It was a steel company, they weren’t recruiting anyone as such, because the company manager was a Malayali [...], this was again through the referral given by a church mate who gave the referral to this manager.

Community networks clearly constituted a source of capital for onshore migrants and their spouses seeking permanent settlement in New Zealand. Participants recognised this and thus proactively engaged in building networks within the community, participating in co-ethnic churches and ethnic associations that brought together migrants from similar regional and linguistic communities.

In addition to co-ethnic churches, Indian regional cricket clubs also provided onshore migrants with opportunities to meet and connect with co-ethnics. Cricket represents an important influence in the creation of a sense of identity and belonging among South Asian migrants (Walle, 2013). Overall six participants enjoyed cricket and took part in their local regional clubs. Cricket was thus a recurring theme in their interviews when they talked about co-ethnics and job-related networks in New Zealand. Lijomon, a Keralite participant who pointed out that he had “too many” co-ethnic friends in Auckland, explained how he built these networks:

It is a big community. I have too many friends here now; it is more than twenty, all Mallus [Malayalis]. We play cricket every Saturday and Sunday. I play for this club in New Lynn and there is a team for the Mallus itself. So I know many of these guys. After the play we will go to any one of their residence and drink there. It is like that.

Scholars (DeLanda, 2006; Hakim, 2012) note that proximity through habitual practices give a shared experience of the world and a sense of community. It is true that these participants by playing cricket on weekends with co-ethnic acquaintances provided a form of leisure and the emotional support needed to bridge isolation, ultimately creating a sense of home and community with friends of similar age groups. Eventually such co-ethnic cricket networks also became a source of insider-information regarding job vacancies. Both offshore and onshore migrants alike indicated this. An offshore Keralite participant, Priya, complained about the numerous employment rejections her husband had experienced, recollecting how he finally acquired employment in New Zealand via a cricket linkage:

…because I told you, he was cricket player. So our house owner he used to play in the fun league which is like Indian cricket team for Kerala, Bombay, Hyderabad and he knew someone in the Kerala cricket team. So he introduced him to a family, and surprisingly the person he met – his wife was my college mate back in St.Tresas [College in her hometown]. So there was a person living with them he was working in that company and he was leaving that company, and they couldn’t find any replacements. So he got in there for ten days as a temp. Then it went on to 20 days and then to two months and then to four months. Then they made him permanent.
Like Priya, other onshore participants also reported hearing of job opportunities through co-ethnic cricket linkages. However, unlike offshore migrants who came with PR, onshore participants who sought out employment through such linkages were sometimes asked to comply with social pressures from their prospective employers in return for the job that was promised. Illustrations for cases such as these will be provided in the last section of this chapter.

As stated earlier, it is the way in which the support is rendered that matters in progressively actualising territorialisation (DeLanda, 2006). In this sense, the family networks of my participants – even transnational networks – generated substantial benefits, providing not only information about the skills in demand in New Zealand and recommendations about migration agents but also, most important, financial resources during and after their education. For example, Lijomon, a Keralite participant who was unable to secure admission to study in Australia due to a low IELTS score, was advised by his sisters to undertake study in New Zealand and later migrate to Australia. After completing a diploma in business management, Lijomon worked for an Indian retailer in New Zealand who promised that he would support his PR application. However, Lijomon was not informed about his employer’s intention to sell his shop, leaving him in a vulnerable situation:

Then I talked with my sister and my brother in law [in Australia]. He planned to buy the business in New Zealand, he said, ‘Okay let’s go for that [buying the shop from the employer who was intending to sell]’. After that, I was a store manager so he was paying me after tax like $650. So I applied for PR. After nearly a year, about ten months or something, since he has other businesses in Australia, he said, ‘it is very hard to manage here [in NZ] and there’ [in Australia], so he sold the shop here. He bought the shop for $68 000 and sold it for $17 000. He lost so much money, more than $50 000.

In this case, Lijomon’s familial networks were crucial for acquiring PR status in New Zealand. Although it may be a rare case to come across family and kinship networks assisting in skilled employment in the same kind of way, Lijomon’s experience demonstrates that family members who can invest financially in businesses and recruit students after study may facilitate the process of acquiring skilled employment as demanded by Immigration New Zealand, allowing them to transition from study to work and residence. Lijomon’s position as a manager of his brother in law’s shop enabled him to meet this requirement. However many of my participants found that having a job in an appropriate sector is not enough to transition to permanent residence. There is a requirement for the work to be ‘skilled’ at a certain level according to Immigration New Zealand. A number of Indian migrants who apply for residence under the skilled migrant category are declined, because their type of work is not deemed appropriate or is not a “substantial match” to occupational shortages according to the Australia and New
Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO)\textsuperscript{7}. As such, the case for residence requires clear evidence of the job’s skill level being appropriate for the skilled migrant. While previous studies (for example, Sanders & Nee, 1996; Yamaguchi, 2010) have demonstrated that family and kinship networks are vital for migrants seeking to enter self-employment and start businesses, my findings suggests this holds true for international students with strong family ties and financial capital.

*Former co-ethnic international students as insiders*

Feelings of togetherness, involvement in the community, altruism and reciprocity are all needed to territorialise assemblages (DeLanda, 2006, p.57). Participants often indicated that these outcomes were often facilitated by co-ethnic friends who themselves had formerly arrived in New Zealand as an international student, thus providing an ‘insider’ advantage to new onshore migrants. According to Fischer et al. (1997), having an insider advantage in a new location is the primary factor why migrants choose to stay in a certain place. The longer people stay in one place and the more insider advantages they accumulate, the less likely they are to emigrate. In this study, former international students and permanently settled Indian migrants became ‘insiders’, distributing information about study in New Zealand that assisted new student arrivals from India.

A majority of onshore participants (n=13/18) claimed they either knew someone who studied in New Zealand or had family friends who were New Zealand citizens. Such pre-migration networks were sources of information and support for the new arrivals. Their inclination to study in New Zealand was even influenced by such networks. Friends from school and workplaces who had undertaken study in New Zealand oriented them towards New Zealand universities, courses, lifestyle and the labour market. For instance Serine, a Keralite, participant said: “we heard from our friends who came to do MBA and decided to do the same course”. Dipika, a Tamil participant who wanted to do her master’s degree in human resources and information technology, was able to solicit details about study from former school friends who had enrolled in the same course in New Zealand:

> We were like a group of three friends. All three of them were my very close friends right from school and college, been childhood friends. We started our [visa] processing together and three of them came before me. I even went there to send them off to the airport, and I was in constant touch with them through Gmail and phone. So once they came here, right from day one they were telling about everything. They also came for the same course, so they used to tell me about each

\textsuperscript{7} For evidence, see Ministry of Justice Immigration and Protection Tribunal decisions available online
https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/IPT/Residence/
and everything – about the city, about the university, about the course, every single detail of their stay. So I had pretty much idea how it is going to be.

The advantages secured by student migrants not only influenced their desire to migrate and enabled them to seek permanent settlement but were often reciprocated and paid forward to more recent arrivals, such as family and friends from India. Shaji, a Keralite, stated: “After I came here, I told my friends – around, three to four guys from the same college – [to come to New Zealand]. They have also got PR, all married and happy here. Right now my brother-in-law is here on student visa”. Being a source of inspiration to other student migrants from India, these participants became important information conduits about the New Zealand labour market, in particular. Jayanti, a Tamil participant, expressed how she was unable to sit back if she saw students struggling when seeking a job in New Zealand. Empathising with her fellow students, she helped them seek employment and PR; in one case she “gave a word in the company and helped him [a student friend] to crack the interview, because my husband was already working there and he knew how they put the questions and what is expected”. In this way, onshore migrants who had already successfully gained permanent residence acted as insiders, thus bridging the study to residence path in New Zealand for fellow student migrants.

This section has thus revealed that resource distribution never exists in a vacuum but in concrete social entities such as interpersonal networks (DeLanda 2006). Although international students ostensibly move to New Zealand to increase their human capital through education, it is the social capital acquired through their networks that progressively actualises their territorialisation. The personal networks of onshore migrants were largely composed of co-ethnic connections based on their regional and linguistic identities. More than expressive support, these co-ethnic networks provided the information about study in New Zealand, referrals in the labour market and even financial resources that ultimately helped bringing success in gaining PR.

What deterritorialised onshore migrants from co- and intra-ethnic networks?

Despite the above discussion of territorialisation, onshore migrants faced many deterritorialising encounters within their co-ethnic networks. Assemblage theory assumes that life is precarious and transient; as such, it not only creates potential for territory but also to deterritorialise (Figueiredo, 2016; Taylor & Hugh, 2016). However, these processes of territorialisation and deterritorialisation are not dual or binary categories and the difference
between the two is qualitative. To distinguish these processes, DeLanda (2013, p.11 & 62) uses the example of water, which exists as a liquid under certain temperatures but has a tendency to become ice and steam with different properties under differing conditions. Similarly, while the last section noted how co-ethnic networks opened up linkages of territorialisation, solidifying migrant identities and belonging in ways that connected them to other spaces, the same linkages could also create a sense of vulnerability and alienation. These disrupted networks, from which participants wanted to escape, deterritorialised them because, while a dependence on co-ethnic networks encouraged participants to converge, stretch and harmonise their networks in co-ethnic circles, this same dependence equally placed many constraints on them. For instance, seven onshore migrants, compared to only one offshore participant, experienced misinformation from friends who were insiders, as well as deferred payment of wages or underpayment, long unpaid hours, and other forms of exploitation in the hands of co- and intra-ethnic employers. Such deterritorialisation is the focus of this section.

Although knowing an insider can be advantageous for new migrants, it is also important to acknowledge that relying on the ‘insider’ knowledge of Indian friends and acquaintances in New Zealand was not always complete or did not always bring positive outcomes. Dominic reflected on his first few weeks in New Zealand:

I saw like at least 60-70 Tamil guys within just one week. Everybody whom I saw was demotivating me saying, ‘Why you come here it’s just a waste of time. You never get time to do your part-time, they are going to drain out all your money’. Cancel this course, and I will get you another course. I got very frustrated and completely changed my course from business management to graduate diploma in sports and exercise science within 2-3 weeks, because they said, ‘if you study business, you wouldn’t survive, there is no scope here’, which I found later was not true. I believed them, because these were people I used to stay with.

This quote suggests that Indian migrants who have been in New Zealand longer may offer their opinions and so-called insider information but new arrivals need to be wary that their knowledge may be limited and inaccurate.

Sometimes a lack of willingness amongst friends, family and educational agents to speak honestly about labour market and living conditions in New Zealand generated false expectations and misinformation among new arrivals. Since overseas education and migration are regarded as a means of attaining upward social mobility in India, cultural expectations often mean former students who themselves struggled with gaining skilled employment and permanent residence were reluctant to be honest about the work and living conditions in New Zealand. This lack of
knowledge about the possibility of real hardships often led to unrealistic judgments about the reality of study in New Zealand. A Keralite participant, Serine, described this situation:

In the flight we were dreaming, ‘okay we are going to become big, big people - we are going to earn lots of money here’. So we were like calculating one person can at least earn $3000 [a month] and the other will also earn that much, so at least one person’s earning can be savings. So we were planning, okay we can start a café with that friend. Too much dreams was there, but when we came to the airport we were like, ‘oh my God!’ In my mind it was like too much, big buildings and everything, but when we came out we were only looking at the trees and everything and we were like, ‘what is this, what is this? This looks like Kerala only, what is the difference?’ Came to his [friend’s] flat and that was a studio apartment in the city, and I was like asking his wife, ‘where is the kitchen?’ She was like, ‘everything in this room only’, and I was trying to relate everything with Kerala house and kitchen. So I asked her again, ‘where is the kitchen? I can’t see anything’. ‘Yeah toilet is this, kitchen is this and bedroom is this’. Like this much only [showing with her hands]. Then I was like, ‘oh my God, do I have to stay and live like this’. That was one bedroom $275 and extra, extra everything and we had only $3000 with us, and we had to buy a laptop and some clothes so it was all finished. So we were expecting we will get a job very soon.

Luckily our friend, he started saying all the ‘real situations’. Even though he was highly educated and his wife also highly educated, he is washing dishes in the hotel. If he had told the truth only at that time, if only he would have told the truth before, we would never have come, we would have changed our decisions. His wife was a software engineer back in India, here she was finding it difficult to find a job and was going to day cares, like one day job. That was the situation, so we were like we will go for any job we are getting, because we didn’t have enough money with us.

Overseas education in India is valued as a means to a better way of life and becoming successful, providing one’s family with economic security and enhancing the social status of the entire household (Bhattacharya & Schoppelrey, 2004). The underlying belief is that children enhance family pride, and education is the way to advance one’s social class (Bhattacharya & Schoppelrey, 2004). In this context, it is difficult for those who migrate overseas, fulfilling parental expectations of upholding family status and pride, to disclose honest information about their struggles and hardships to family and friends in India. Dominic, a Tamil student, provided an example of such expectations. Coming from a middle class family, both his parents aspired for him to be educated overseas. Like other onshore migrants, he strived to improve his socio-economic status and career opportunities in New Zealand, but soon learnt the reality often stood in stark contrast to his expectations. After numerous rejections, he resorted to taking up a position as a toilet cleaner, which he felt was culturally humiliating and demeaning. He therefore refrained from disclosing this to his parents, explaining:

…it was hard, very, hard, because I didn’t have a place to stay, I mean I had only a little money with me, because I thought I am going to get a job here. I had four other roommates, we shared the rent and other expenses. We didn’t get any job in the first month we were struggling, wherever we went we were turned down. Like most Indians I got a cleaning job. It was very hard. I would have never done it back in India or would not have thought of doing back in India. I had to do it, because I had to survive. Till this day my dad and mom do not know that I had to do that kind of job, because back in India it is really discriminating if you are a cleaner.
The above quote illustrates why Indian migrants might conceal the hardships they face, which leads to inaccurate information being passed to those considering migration to New Zealand and to those who had newly arrived. In this sense, the social networks of my participants did not always bring insider knowledge or other benefits.

Compelled by limited funds, onshore migrants took any employment available including cleaning toilets, washing dishes and making sandwiches in cafes. Whereas it may be commonplace for students in New Zealand to take on such jobs while studying, the previous background of my participants meant that they viewed these jobs as demeaning and shameful. They were willing to tolerate such conditions, however, if they saw such jobs as a route to PR, even if this left them vulnerable to exploitation from Indian employers. Among those onshore migrants (seven of the ten) who worked under Indian employers, wages, below the legal minimum wage long working hours and false promises of full-time employment were common. When questioned about his wages, Nirmal replied:

They [the owners of Indian restaurant where he worked] try to exploit students and save money. To be frank, most of the Indians or the Indian restaurants and takeaways or the Chinese, even the kebab centres, they try to pay half of the minimum wages and save money. They make you work for 20 hours and pay only for 10 hours, cover it up showing you have worked for 10 hours. So if someone is going to work for 40 hours, they are just going to put it as 20. I have stood for 13 hours and they pay you around $85 which is almost like $6 to $7 per hour.

Not only were students working for less than the minimum wage and long hours, but participants also reported employers charging them for an offer of employment. While not all participants were willing to admit that such deals had taken place, Nirmal, the Tamil participant quoted above, went on to explain how he worked for a Gujarati employer for six months without pay, hoping to get his PR: “if they get to find a guy like me struggling [to get PR], they will charge $15000. If they are doing it for two people, they will charge $30000 easily. They make money”. Agitated by such experiences in the Indian community, he further reflected: “it is an exploitative community to be honest. They can’t exploit someone from here who knows the country and who knows the work”. Yet, these experiences remain largely invisible to authorities as employers go unreported due to the risk of the participants losing PR. Many simply accept exploitation at the hands of their employers as payment for the opportunities offered. Also it

---

8 The current adult minimum wage rate that apply for employees aged 16 or over in New Zealand is $15.25 an hour (MBIE, 2016 see [http://www.business.govt.nz/laws-and-regulations/employment-regulations/minimum-pay](http://www.business.govt.nz/laws-and-regulations/employment-regulations/minimum-pay)).

9 These experiences are not merely confined to onshore migrants alone, but also includes off shore Indian migrants who were new to New Zealand during their initial years of settlement. There was one such participant in this study.
is notable that many cases of such exploitation were by employers from sub-regional/linguistic/religious communities different than their own. This may be because employers would then engage in different co-ethnic networks than their workers, making it less likely their exploitation would diminish their social status within their own co-ethnic community.

Another reason for the exploitation of new migrants and, more specifically onshore migrants, is that many enter the retail and hospitality sectors of the labour market, where precarious work conditions and insecurity is common (see Janta et al., 2011; McDonald et al., 2007). Badkar and Tuya (2010, p.32) observe that a significant number of Asians work particularly in the retail sector, followed by other sectors such as restaurants and business services. This is because these sectors are relatively easy to enter, as there are fewer barriers in terms of qualification recognition, language and previous New Zealand work experience, and it is often possible to start your own small business. Having some networks in these sectors where many Indians work or have businesses thus represented a convenient pathway into the New Zealand workforce for many participants.

However, the study-work-community linkages that maximised job opportunities for onshore migrants also increased the possibility of exploitation. All cases of exploitation reported by onshore participants, were by those who had completed courses in business management and cookery and had subsequently been employed by Indian restaurants or other Indian employers. The courses that they enrolled in, the institutions they attended, the part time jobs they worked in and the student networks they were a part of were all intertwined. Although the educational institutions and part time work potentially represented spaces for onshore migrants to build and broaden their diverse inter-ethnic networks, some realised this was not possible when they entered the classroom. Bahadur, who had completed a diploma in level 5 professional cookery, spoke of the ethnic composition of students in his class: “We had 20 people in one batch. All these twenty people in the same batch were from India, mainly from Punjab, Hyderabad, Mumbai”. Another Gujarati participant, Pritvi, said of his level 7 business management classmates: “There were only Indians and Chinese, I was shocked. The agent told me it was good college, but when I entered there were only five to six rooms and there were all Indians and Punjabis”. In this way, participants were immediately – and in some cases restrictively – placed into co-ethnic circles. Below is figure 5.1, which depicts Pritvi’s network.
Being embedded in co-ethnic study-work-community zones not only fostered precarious working circumstances for onshore migrants, increasing the chance of exploitation, but their jobs constrained their ability to seek other resources and linkages. For example, Nirmal, reflected: “I think being an Indian chef, we don’t get a personal life to live. […] I start at ten in the morning and finish at ten in the evening after which I don’t have a chance to meet anyone”. As a result, they remained within limited co-ethnic circles that constrained their ability to move away from the migrant-dominated labour market.

Contradicting the widespread assumption in migration literature that co-ethnic networks are readily accessible for migrants to leverage opportunities, some of the onshore migrants also noted how they had to comply with the favours demanded by co-ethnic network members to be able to enter the labour market and gain other support. Pritvi said:

One of my roommates showed me the manager who can recruit. ‘But on what grounds?’ ‘You should do him some favours’. So I went to his home, he was living opposite to our house. He spoke about all his activities and asked me about cricket. I said, ‘I am a good player’ and he was like, ‘Oh are you a good player? Can you play for us?’ I said, ‘why not? But then, I have an exam tomorrow’ and he was like, ‘if you want a work you will have to play’. I told him I will play. He was happy and replied, ‘You come next week, we will follow the procedures’. Got the job, he really made use of me, night shifts, day shifts […]

Although this example is relatively harmless, it highlights that the support provided by co-ethnic networks was not free from costs, even for those not involved in exploitative networks. Many participants noted that favours received from relatives and community friends – often referred by Nirmal as “gods in New Zealand” – came with some expectations for reciprocation. Such participants reciprocated by making roti for the ‘baiyas’ (flatmates who are referred to as brothers), baby-sitting, cooking and caring for elders in return for the favours that was received.
Those who had received financial assistance from family and relatives when they were not in a position to immediately contribute, said they would reciprocate by investing in their nieces’ and nephews’ education in New Zealand or in their marriages in the future.

These experiences illustrate that many onshore migrant networks lacked diversity. In addition to reducing access to non-exploitative employment, being enclosed largely within co-ethnic networks meant fewer opportunities for participants to master English language or access diverse information. As such, homogenous networks limited their opportunities to gain access to varied resources that might have been useful in the migration and settlement process (Erickson, 2001).

Notably, the three onshore migrants who did not seek help from co-ethnic networks were students who pursued IT, geology and educational leadership. They had more diverse contacts (in terms of both intra- and inter-ethnic networks) than those who pursued business management and cookery. The former were able to seek skilled employment relevant to their study, either by means of direct formal application methods or by means of their diverse social contacts, avoiding the experience of exploitation in the hands of Indian employers. For instance, a Tamil participant, Jason, was more connected to friends from his university and neighbourhood than his intra- and co-ethnic community (see figure 5.2 below).

![Figure 5.2: Jason’s network](image)

With the help of these diverse and professional connections, he secured a skilled position as a geo-technician through his classmate, a Māori professional, who advised him to apply for employment in the business where he worked. With this support, Jason received a direct referral to his future employer and successfully gained skilled employment immediately after completing his studies. Being aware he had a relatively easy transition because of his friend’s help, he described:

I think my networks are my basis there, my ears to the ground. They are the immediate source for what is out there. Every now and then they put me through to meet this random person who is not connected with anybody else. New person, new source you know. You talk to that person he is
going to have…it’s almost like tree roots you know, comes in everywhere. To start somewhere, you have to be plugged in everywhere, to have the access.

Network diversity for onshore migrants was certainly an important means of acquiring new information and referrals, especially when seeking employment in the broader labour market. It is also noteworthy that participants who had been employed in professional jobs spoke fluent English and had the skills to successfully go beyond their co-ethnic networks, which in turn gave them the confidence to professionally succeed and integrate with New Zealand society.

In sum, being rooted in co- and intra-ethnic social networks brought many benefits to Indian migrants settling in New Zealand but this same circumstance also held the potential to destabilise their existence within such networks. Co- and intra-ethnic networks thus not only build social capital, as often experienced in the initial stages of migration, but could also lead to exploitation. Nonetheless, this was the price that the onshore migrants discussed in this chapter were willing to pay for the legal status of being a New Zealand resident.

**Conclusion**

Addressing the gap in the literature around the work experiences of international student migrants in New Zealand, this chapter explored the transition from study to skilled employment and finally to permanent residence amongst onshore Indian migrants who arrived as international students. As the migration literature suggests, this chapter shows that onshore migrants’ were embedded in predominantly co- and intra-ethnic social networks, typically through family, friends, schoolmates, former international students, networks in New Zealand and other transnational networks. This assisted them in both their labour market and immigration transitions providing them with the informational, financial and social resources. This territorialisation phase saw co-ethnic networks offer the shared experience of community and, ultimately, a means for stability and the achievement of achieving their PR goals. But this does not imply that there is an essential link between co- and intra-ethnic networks and positive gains. Networks that were once instrumental and positive can become exploitative and humiliating under some conditions, thus deterritorialising the co-ethnic networks of onshore migrants. Accounts of “PR fees”, unmet promises of skilled employment and expectations about favours being reciprocated raise questions about the advantages provided by co-ethnic social networks. Although co-ethnic insiders provided support for entering New Zealand and for making an entry in the labour market, the intensity of territorialisation often led to unexpected experiences and altered views amongst onshore migrants. Applying DeLanda’s
(2006) notion of assemblage thus makes it is possible to see that migrant communities are contingent and anti-essentialist, being subjected to varying experiences and conditions, even when we are only talking about co- and intra-ethnic networks. The next chapter explores what role these and other networks played for offshore migrants, including those who set up businesses or went into self-employment, as they entered the New Zealand labour market.
Chapter Six

Social networks as pathways to the economic integration of Indian migrants

Introduction

In chapter four, I argued that Indian migrant networks are based on migrant capacities to build relations and in chapter five I explored the pros and cons of the networks that were established using Delanda’s (2006) concepts territorialisation and deterritorialisation. Extending this analysis, this chapter argues that capacities are a necessary condition to developing the social networks important for securing positive employment outcomes.

Delanda (2006, p.10 & 29) regards capacities as a set of potentials that are open ended and cannot be determined in advance, but instead emerge from actual interactions between heterogeneous entities. Accordingly, this chapter explores how Indian migrant capacities to network emerge in new settings and among different groups, often being multidimensional in character. Although we might assume that, since many participants in this study are skilled migrants, networks may not be necessary to achieve positive labour market outcomes, they still encountered unexpected challenges in the labour market. This makes the scope of the network, including knowing whether networks are important and how, significant for participants. Building on this point, the chapter explores: what is the nature of the New Zealand labour market and why are social networks important for Indian migrants? What kinds of social networks aid in securing varied employment outcomes? Which members – based on region/language and gender – are most likely to use social networks to enhance their labour market participation?

My main argument in this chapter is that migrant networks are not static; rather, they emerge and are conditioned differently as demanded by the situation. Even when migrants are deterritorialised from certain type of networks, a reliance on them still remains necessary and there is a capacity to swing back to these networks, setting aside their discrepancies and challenges in these relationships. Thus, although I will be showing the problems within co- and inter-ethnic networks in chapters seven and eight, this chapter focuses on why Indian migrants do not give up on them: they remain critical to gaining access and mobility in the labour market.
The chapter first examines this by exploring the general labour market challenges encountered by Indian migrants. Then it proceeds to see how these challenges increase participants’ dependence on networks. In the remainder of the chapter, I explore the significance of intra- and co-ethnic networks for entry into employment, followed by discussion of how inter-ethnic networks are significant - despite the difficulties Indian migrants faced in initiating such ties - for breaking the glass ceiling and ensuring career mobility.

**Why are social networks vital for labour market participation?**

To demonstrate that capacities to network are needs-based, I begin by exploring the economic and labour market context of my participants. Discussion of the New Zealand experience demanded by employers is used to illustrate the argument that context and migrant capacities are inseparable.

Labour market outcomes generally include labour market participation, earnings, human capital accumulation, hours worked, wage rate and occupational status (Hum & Simpson, 2004, p.49). Social networks, particularly intra- and co-ethnic networks, were prominent influences on labour market outcomes among the Indian migrants interviewed in Auckland. Most participants in this study (n=33/43) relied on networks, especially intra- and co-ethnic ones, at some point to either enter the labour market and seek job promotions or to set up a business. For some, however, networks only provided initial support, from which participants successfully progressed to more skilled occupations by gaining the crucial New Zealand experience that was demanded by employers. Table 6.1 depicts the profile of the network support utilised by participants (offshore and onshore migrants) for entering the New Zealand labour market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gained intra- &amp; co-ethnic support for initial entry</th>
<th>Gained inter-ethnic support for initial entry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offshore migrants (n=25)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onshore migrants (student participants) (n=18)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, help from co-ethnic networks did not always lead to the kind of employment to which participants aspired. Among the twenty-five offshore migrants who arrived as permanent residents, seventeen sought employment with the help of co-ethnic networks. But, in most such
cases, the jobs they secured were unrelated to their qualifications and work experience in India. As evident in previous studies (for example, Cain & Spoonley, 2013; Masgoret et al., 2009; Meares et al., 2010; William, 2005), thirteen of the offshore migrants experienced downward occupational mobility, entering professions that did not match their qualifications and work experiences. Professionals who were previously bank managers, teachers, doctors, civil engineers or university professors in India, worked as till operators, pizza deliverers, fruit pickers and bus drivers respectively in New Zealand.

New Zealand’s Longitudinal Survey of Immigration (LisNZ, 2004) finds that most migrants come to New Zealand for the clean green environment, for the sake of their children and for lifestyle reasons, more than mere economic motivations. This was certainly true in the case of my participants, especially for those gaining residency offshore; seventeen of this group also claimed they moved to New Zealand for better career opportunities. None of them anticipated problems entering the labour market prior to their arrival. Yet, for many, seeking employment irrespective of the field of specialisation and its level became imperative for the survival of themselves and their families. A Punjabi participant, Kaur, indicated that her husband was previously a university professor. He accepted employment as a bus driver through a co-ethnic network referral after numerous job applications related to his field were rejected. Kaur narrated the circumstances through which it became necessary for him to take up whatever employment was available:

 […] we had nothing in the house. We slept on the floor and it was winter days. You can imagine that if the house is not insulated how hard it is to sleep without a carpeted floor. And for our kids we went to the Salvation Army and we bought, at a very nominal price, a cot, a bed with a good mattress to keep them warm. We had no other furniture in the house, it was only the clothing that I gathered from India. That’s all we had. Food, obviously we were buying. Like it was a budget every week; we had only that much we could spend on. I used to stand and cry with blood in my tears when my children used to say, ‘Mum we want to eat something, we want to have ice cream or something’. It was so heart breaking as a mum, because they were not brought up like this, they had everything whatever they demanded.

Almost all participants (n=42/43) were from middle and upper middle class families in India, which was not surprising as only such individuals can afford the cost of migration and the points system also favours them. Yet, despite funds brought from India to support living costs, covering expenses over a long period without an income left many uncertain about their futures. Leema, a Tamil participant, told how she lived on her savings for the first four years after arrival:

 […] I brought around NZ$ 80000 with me […] all my entire savings I brought it here, because I didn’t know what life is going to be here. First year we had spent all $48000, just to keep ourselves floating and second year we saw our bank balance has gone down to $30000 we got a bit nervous.
We were not making any money then. I went back to India, sold my most valuable assets and brought the money here [again].

While a few participants, like Leema, could afford to wait for a suitable employment, most did not have this option. Antony, another Tamil participant who was previously a bank manager in India, explained: “The money I brought was starting to drain out and I couldn’t go back, because I had resigned and took voluntary retirement from the bank. So ended up doing all sorts of menial jobs – pulling trolleys in the malls, working as night fill crew…”. Irrespective of the time it took to find suitable employment, all but four software engineers undertook semi- and un-skilled work that was unrelated to their previous occupations and qualifications.

Spoonley and Bedford (2012) observe that a migrant’s access to appropriate employment may be restricted by the reluctance of local employers and recruitment agencies to recognise overseas qualifications and experiences. This is because employers often seek training and work experience from the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries or onshore in New Zealand (Hawthorne, 2014). India is not on this list of countries that are considered comparable labour markets in New Zealand. While on the surface the favouring of migrants from comparable labour markets may improve the match between economic migrants moving to New Zealand and the jobs available, it has consequences for migrants seeking employment onshore. They were penalised because they also lacked the “New Zealand work experience” demanded by employers.

This presented difficulties for participants on three levels. First, migrants experienced difficulty accessing not only their desired skilled professions, but also semi- and un-skilled employment that could provide opportunities for gaining the New Zealand work experience needed to transition to skilled jobs. Second, as a consequence, they faced aggressive competition, even for entry level positions that were semi- and un-skilled. In these situations, participants relied on co-ethnic networks, which heightened the possibility of exploitation by Indian employers as discussed in the previous chapter. Third, participants who successfully gained entry to the labour market faced obstacles later, especially while seeking job promotion and career advancement. A glass ceiling effect occurred, preventing migrants accessing top level positions. Therefore, many participants strategically engaged with different networks that they believed would enhance their social mobility. These three phenomena, and the migrants’ use of networks in response, are examined in the following sections.
The importance of “New Zealand experience”

Among the range of factors that determined a participant’s capacity and initiative to network, the New Zealand work experience demanded by employers was discussed most often. Work experience gained in India, irrespective of the level, duration and the skills acquired, was usually considered irrelevant in the New Zealand context, leading to endless employment rejections. Although rejections were lower for IT and software professionals, even these technically qualified participants confronted recruiting agencies who demanded “New Zealand experience”. Priya, a Keralite software engineer who had previously worked in the United States, said:

…your experience back in India has a zero value here unless you are in IT, because IT is the same across. It is uniform, because your experiences in India as an IT professional is mostly international. But even then, when I wanted – I had agents calling me and say, ‘you don’t have a New Zealand experience’. Then I was like, ‘oh I didn’t know IT had a New Zealand in it. I didn’t know you could write software in New Zealand language’. They don’t like me.

Adding to her own experiences, Priya commented on the countless rejections that her husband encountered seeking commerce work in New Zealand:

He got his rejection letters piled up. I will save it up, and one day I am going to send this to John Key who said the economy is improving. […] He had about sixteen years of experience in India, no use. Not even the words ‘sixteen years’, that’s it. Absolutely no use…. ‘How long have you been working here? Oh, sorry!’

Challenged by this demand, many participants applied for entry level jobs and semi-skilled occupations as a means for gaining New Zealand experience. Despite making such compromises, they were still rejected by employers who perceived them to be “over-qualified” for such jobs. Receiving such responses from employers, participants reported they were in a vicious cycle: not being able to gain employment nor able to gain “New Zealand experience”. As Aditi, a Gujarati participant, said: “So it’s very straining that, until and unless you give us a job how are we going to gain that experience”. This left the migrants with no choice but to cluster in certain occupations and sectors of the economy or even to return to India. For example, Smita, a Maharashtrian social worker, today lives in Auckland by herself while her husband lives in India. Smita’s husband was a management professor in a reputed university in India. She highlighted why he had decided to return:

[He] realised it was very hard to get jobs, my husband was not at all keen on working at the petrol stations because he saw many Indians at the petrol stations, many Indians driving taxis. So he said, “I am not going to do this job, sorry. We are not going to disrupt our good lives in India”.

Like Smita, some participants compromised by not living to together in New Zealand for the sake of each other’s career aspirations. Where both husband and wife were skilled, three female participants returned with their children to India, leaving behind their husbands to continue
seeking employment in New Zealand. On the other hand, two female participants who found skilled employment in New Zealand sent their husbands back due to the lack of opportunities matching their skills and specialisation. Living apart, they took turns frequently visiting each other either in India or New Zealand. Ho (2002, p.12) in the context of Chinese migrants, calls these *astronaut households* because migrants maintain families in one destination and employment in another.

Importantly, such participants had developed sufficient New Zealand-based friendships from their communities and work places to help cope with the emotional strain of living apart. As a Keralite participant, Trosy, reported: “Even though my husband and children are not here, I am not sitting here thinking, ‘Oh I am not having my family here!’ It is because of my friends, I don’t feel lonely here”. Trosy was a nurse who had her colleagues and community as primary support systems in New Zealand.

Personal networks and support systems not only helped participants cope with emotional separations from friends and family in India but, as I indicated earlier, they were important for entering the labour market and economically supporting themselves. Among the various kinds of support received, participants indicated that assistance in writing a ‘New Zealand style’ curriculum vitae [CV], referrals and information about employers, interviews and workplace expectations were common. Yet participants frequently experienced job application rejections. Probing into these employment rejections, they learnt from their networks that the local recruiters and employers who demanded New Zealand experience were often less qualified than skilled migrants. Therefore, they believed their employment rejections were due to a fear among local employers and New Zealanders who perceived immigrants as a threat to their jobs. This view was articulated by Aditi, a Gujarati participant:

[…] we had heaps of rejections. Like if I would apply for a job in a company since they [company directors] have no degree, even a bachelor’s degree, they have the fear if we are taking this person then the company’s director might be over taken by this person. So here that is the main problem. People in the company who are in a good position they have no degree or have attended any university.

Even participants who received some help tailoring their CV pointed out that they were often advised by friends and family to remove their qualifications from the document. Benjamin, a Tamil social worker who aspired to a skilled job in his field in his initial years of settlement in New Zealand, faced numerous rejections until he accepted a lower-skilled job that was available. He recounted the advice he received from his co-ethnic peers: “don’t put your
educational qualifications, because your boss may not be as qualified as you are’. These were cultural shocks for us. We were quite apprehensive about what they were telling us, and then we found that whatever they told us was true’. In these ways, such guidance from co-ethnic friends, shaped the job search strategies of participants.

The question of comparable labour markets in New Zealand

Discussion of New Zealand work experience and employers’ qualifications was accompanied by reports of struggling with the New Zealand labour market structures. Some qualified skilled professionals tried to make sense of how the New Zealand labour market obstructed migrants from participation. In particular, they asked what are comparable labour markets? What kind of work experiences from here are held comparable? Why is the Indian labour market not considered comparable and what can be done to make it comparable? Asking such questions, they were critically conscious (see Braidotti, 2006 in the context of gender) of the list of national labour markets that were considered comparable by Immigration New Zealand. Often, these were rendered racist by participants such as Sonia, who argued “how is it [the New Zealand labour market] same as South Africa? Is it just because they have white skin?”

Others felt that not considering the Indian labour market comparable undermined the quality and sophistication of their work experiences and skills in certain specialised fields from India. Kamaljit felt that the system has let him down: “till now qualifications from India are not recognised straight away. So what is ‘comparable labour market’? UK, bla bla bla… So if you have worked in the cafes and restaurants over there that is comparable labour market and your experience is counted […]”. Along these lines, others argued more specifically that the training and skills that they had acquired in India, especially in the fields of banking and software, should be held as “world class” and “more versatile” than their New Zealand counterparts. For instance, Florien, a Tamil software engineer, described her success in New Zealand as due to her knowledge and experience from India. She narrated:

Here they say you have to be versatile, but if you are specific on one particular skill then it is hard for you to find a job. According to me, our people are more versatile than here. They are specific, but we can easily diversify ourselves. I was like that there; I had worked in multiple domain not just in one, so all those skills helped me here. If I was only into one domain and relaxed, I don’t think I would have been so knowledgeable.

Often the poor labour market outcomes of migrants are associated with an employer’s reluctance to recognise overseas qualifications and skills (see Schulze, 2013; Hawthorne, 2008; Poot, 1993; Reitz, 2001; Spoonley & Bedford, 2012). However, it appears that labour market structures and immigration policies based on comparable labour markets are mutually
constituted, reinforcing the inclination towards skills and favouring work experiences of migrants originating only from certain preferred countries. Many participants strongly felt that India was a comparable labour market, yet this remained unrecognised in New Zealand.

Experiencing significant employment barriers and competition, participants were often inclined to start new careers in New Zealand. Social networks in this context, predominantly constituted by co-ethnic acquaintances, offered the support needed to forge a path to new employment and business ventures by offering information and job referrals (Battu et al., 2011; Ioannides & Loury, 2004; Patacchini & Zenou, 2012; Topa, 2011). It may be noted that individuals today are framed as “custom designed”, meaning they are independent and capable of looking after themselves without having to be dependent on the state (Spoonley & Bedford, 2012, p.185). The prioritisation of skilled economic migrants is indeed a reflection of this logic that expects migrants to be self-reliant, adapt quickly and contribute to the economy (also see Root et al., 2014). The expectation that skilled migration should bring economic gains is reflected in New Zealand’s reluctance to invest in the settlement of skilled migrants (Spoonley, 2012). Therefore, migrant capacities, as exercised through social and cultural networks, may thus be seen as an expression of the labour market (Cain & Spoonley, 2013, p.7).

As such, participants exercised their individual capacity to network and structure relationships, seeking economic stability. Social networks – described by a Punjabi participant Seema as “peer luck” – became legitimate channels to overcome and bridge the various structural restraints that confronted them. Participants recognised this was the case. A Tamil participant, Mala, observed: “I think networking is one of the best ways to get the job, because when you know people you know things before itself […] by the time it is advertised and you apply, they would have taken their decisions”. A Tamil dairy owner, Prakash, complemented this when saying: “No matter wherever you go, here they need reference, reference, reference [referrals]. If you know someone inside, you will get to know about any vacancies immediately and it will

10 Previously migrants who come to New Zealand were dominant especially from England, Scotland and Ireland as they were held culturally similar to those already resident here (Spoonley & Bedford, 2012). Today, the immigration policies are aimed at bringing economic migrants that matches with the skills shortage in New Zealand. However, unlike Canada, persons applying to migrate to New Zealand under the point based skilled migration do not earn points for the work experience from India, unless this qualifies the skilled job or an offer of skilled job already in place in New Zealand. According to the Immigration New Zealand (n.d.), “If you do not have skilled employment or an offer of skilled employment, your work experience must have been gained in a comparable labour market in order for you to claim points” (see http://glossary.immigration.govt.nz/comparablelabourmarket.htm). This may be because the human capital and productivity level of migrants from less developed countries are held lower than the local born, under which case migrants are excessively priced out for minimum wages (Jean et al., 2010).
accelerate the process”. Notably, this study shows that migrants who had received help from social networks were also likely to reciprocate greater support to others once they were in the labour market. Overall, thirty three participants received help with employment and these participants were also the ones who said they later offered support in the form of information about migration and help with referrals in the labour market.

**Capacities as means for dealing with labour market problems**

In this context, capacities to build contacts and seek referrals were imperative for all participants to enter the labour market. Capacities to network once in the labour market were also essential but less uniform among all Indian migrants. In this section, I demonstrate that all participants had the capacities to use networks for desired labour market outcomes but whether they did so and how they did so was influenced by their occupational profile, social and community pressures, gender and socio-economic class status.

Scholars (for example Alba & Nee, 2009; Nee & Sanders, 2001; Levanon, 2011) argue that migrants arriving with low stocks of financial and human capital are most likely to seek employment in immigrant ‘ethnic’ sectors, whereas migrants with human-cultural capital that is acknowledged by the host society tend to gain employment in the broader mainstream economy. However, only four of my participants obtained their skilled jobs directly without seeking any help from networks. Three of these four participants were software professionals. The rest of the participants, irrespective of their qualifications, work experiences, cultural capital, financial position, or cosmopolitan background, all began their careers in the ethnic sector11, seeking co-ethnic ties to help them gain invaluable New Zealand work experience. As such, I begin the discussion here by exploring the capacities first by Indian migrant entrepreneurs and the self-employed, followed by those of employees in skilled employment. As I have already dealt with how Indian migrants accessed lower skilled work with the help of networks in the previous chapter, I will not be focussing on this group here.

**Co-ethnic capacities of employers and self-employed migrants**

Indian employers and self-employed business people often offered assistance to new arrivals. Aware of the labour market situation, they demonstrated a capacity to be open and support others. Given there was a subjective perception among participants that the inability to secure

---

11 In the context of this study, I refer to the ethnic sectors as sector of the economy where migrant minorities such as Indians and Chinese are highly concentrated.
employment meant the risk of returning to India as a failure, employers and self-employed migrants were significant members of their co-ethnic networks. Although the previous chapter illustrated cases where participants were exploited by co- and intra-ethnic employers, my participants who were employers indicated they did not engage in such practices. A self-employed Punjabi participant, Kamaljit, was familiar with the prevalence of exploitation and very critical:

You [we] get a lot of students and people on certain visas that have been here for a long time crying, ‘I have taken so much trouble and have so many loans to come here. But there are no jobs’. Then they get exploited because they have to pay their money to parents back home. So they are forced to work underhand without the legal system and all that in restaurants and get exploited by our own people. But it is our own people who will employ them and help them with their residence. We can see that a lot of times.

Seeking employment from an Indian employer certainly helped new migrants and others find entry level employment. However, in turn, those with businesses in Auckland found co-ethnic networks provided opportunities to procure Indian labour. As pointed out in chapter four, such businesses included dairies and real estate agencies, as well as self-employed professionals such as doctors, accountants and automotive engineers. Participants narrated how they were connected with the wider Indian community and what compelled them to recruit Indian employees in the following sections.

Multi-lingual skills and offer of “Indian factor”

Business owners often relied on networks that were not only from their own sub-regional communities but stemmed from the larger Indian community. Proficiency in multiple languages often aided these participants in creating rapport and building connections with Indians from India and Indian-origin clients from other countries. For example, as indicated in earlier chapters, participants from the north of India with knowledge of Hindi had a natural advantage in connecting with the wider Indian and Fiji Indian communities. On the other hand, participants who were acquainted not only with Hindi but other southern Indian languages were connected with Indians from India and Fiji, as well as with Indians from other parts of the world. Maintaining proficiency in multiple regional languages facilitated employers being able to proactively build their networks, both for professional and social reasons, via memberships in various Indian regional ethnic associations. Leema, a real estate agent in Auckland, noted that she was a member of various Indian regional associations and her clients came from these associations:

I am a part of Muthamil Sangam. Muthamil Sangam is basically for Tamils from India. I am also a part of Tamil Society, Malayali Samajam and Kannada koota. […] I can speak Malayalam as well. So quite a number of my clients are from Tamil and Malayalam coming to me.
A shared culture and command of Indian regional languages were considered essential for creating a symbolic affinity between Indian migrant entrepreneurs and their clients, as well as to tactically attract and retain them. Naren, a Keralite participant, expressed this principle thus: “You are an Indian, the Indian clients will expect an ‘Indian factor’ in it and this is what I offer”. When I asked him to elaborate on what he meant by an “Indian factor”, he defined it as the comfort, communication and confidence established by using the same regional language. He said:

You can talk to them in their language. I can handle it in Malayalam, Tamil, Hindi, Kannada, Telugu […] So this helps a lot. The languages help a lot. It’s always good to speak to someone in their own mother tongue that opens up communication right? So things like that.

By being proficient in multiple regional languages and having a flair for inter-cultural interactions, these participants were able to turn their professional contacts into more personal ones. A Tamil participant, Prakash, noted:

Say for instance, my customer is a Malayali, I have become a member in their family that is how I maintain my personal interaction with my customers. After making these connections, I would get linked eventually with your friends and family at various gatherings I get invited.

Becoming widely connected, these participants provided employment to students and other migrants in the community. Contrary to the general difficulty Indian migrants faced while seeking employment due to a lack of recognition of their work experience and skills, Indian employers in this study stated that they acknowledged Indian qualifications and previous work experiences and also understood the struggles migrants faced. By employing co-ethnic members they also catered to the needs of clients from the community. For instance, a Gujarati participant, Yogender, was an automotive engineer who owned a car yard in Auckland. He said:

One of them he is an employee here he had good work experience in India. He came as a visitor and after one month he liked this country and he wanted to stay here. At that time, since I started this business, he came to me seeking work. So I talked to him, he was from the same community, same language. And I had the same language customers here as well and I saw that he had very good experience, so I helped. He is here with me for three years on work visa. Soon he will be getting his permanent residence as well.

Before also, there was a lady mechanic she was struggling for work, she came from India as a student. She paid $22000 for her study in automotive [engineering], three years she paid $60,000. After that she struggled for work, because no one was willing to give because she was a lady. She was from my community, but heard from outside, and she said, ‘I am from your community I am studying this one, can you help me?’ I said, ‘I can, if you help business, business can help you, simple’. After that she started working here, she was very capable, she took care of the customers, even the physical work, discipline, health and safety. And then I helped her, within three months she got her residence. She struggled for one year, no one gave the job.

In addition to offering direct employment opportunities, employers helped newcomers connect with the established skilled migrants who were their customers. These contacts were important sources of information and referrals for jobs. Prakash, the Tamil dairy owner mentioned above,
said: “Many people come to the shop asking for jobs and they are from different fields like IT, civil engineering…I have got people jobs in different organisation like in Telecom, IT, in Vodafone. Somehow link these guys with someone from the organisation”. Indeed, such narratives demonstrate their potential as social brokers willing to offer support to new arrivals who were struggling in the initial phases of their settlement. Reciprocity was an important principle for exchanges between co-ethnic affiliates. By offering support to the community, Indian entrepreneurs manifested a capacity to mobilise their networks as it in turn gained them the community support and loyalty to their businesses. Prakash attributed his earnings in New Zealand to the support of Tamil community:

Now there are a lot of shops around and it is a competition, still the Tamil community supports me. Another thing if you see, those who come here by some means I would have helped them in some way. So people who pass this side they would for sure drop in. They can never skip this thought of why pay someone else let it go to Prakash. Some of my friends they have moved out to Botany and other places, but when they come this way they always have this feeling that they will buy something for at least [NZ] $25. In this way they support me.

The mere existence of social network is not held mobilisable, but only if they can offer assistance during times of need may be considered mobilisable and positively advantaged (Anthias, 2007; Kilduff & Tasai, 2003). In this sense, co-ethnic ties constituted a mobilisable social capital that worked to the advantage of Indian employers and those connected to them. Co-ethnic networks helped Indian employers and those in businesses economically advance their businesses in Auckland, which in turn made employers recognise such benefits and further strengthen their co-ethnic collaborations.

Yet there appeared to be a huge investment in fostering these relationships once established. Prakash described the community pressure which led him being over-committed and involved in too many associations. He narrated:

It is a huge pressure, because usually on Saturdays and Sundays the shop gets busy and I would be here in the shop. So then people come there to invite me for a birthday party or for some function in the association [Tamil], and it becomes a huge commitment. Because it makes a huge difference: in me staying in the shop and the boy in-charge running the shop. If he could make $300 in 4 hours, I make $500. So apart from giving sponsorships, going there in person for these many hours is a loss. So it is a very difficult situation to handle.

Some participants also pointed to the problem of free-riders. Portes and Landolt (2000) use this term to refer to those who freely take the services of self-employed professionals and other established migrants in the community. In this context, some participants decided to limit their interactions within their co-ethnic community. Kamaljit, a Punjabi doctor, described how network members from his community often wished to use his professional expertise for free:
That is one of the reasons why I try to keep distance as well. Where people would start to take advantage of your time… and they don’t understand the line between the profession and [personal]. Profession is about doing that work on time whatsoever. And at the same time, they would want free advice asking over the phone or even coming up, all that kind of things. So I try to keep a distance. So if there is a distance they don’t feel too easy and comfortable to come and sit inside, ‘okay can you advise me’.

These issues call attention to participants’ ambivalence and resentment about networking within the community and the demands for special treatment by co-ethnic customers. Indian migrants who were well established and those who were perceived to be established by newcomers and other co-ethnic members were often expected to offer special favours when needed. These expectations forced some participants to distance themselves from their co-ethnic members in order to avoid free riders and maintain a sense of equilibrium between their professional and personal co-ethnic networks. More discussion on what deterritorialised Indian migrants from co-ethnic members and why they distanced themselves from co-ethnic members follows in the next chapter.

While the above findings help us understand that intra- and co-ethnic networks can both aid and restrain migrant entrepreneurs, it is noteworthy that the Indian entrepreneurs in this study began their businesses via assistance mainly from their own co-ethnic networks. A specific configuration of networks is said to bring special outcomes for migrant labour market participation (Poros, 2001, Sassen, 1995). For instance, figure 6.1 demonstrates the network of Yogender, a Gujarati an automobile engineer who owns a car yard business in Auckland. His network was dense and embedded within co-ethnic circles who shared the same language and regional customers and were in regular contact because they needed his service.

Figure 6.1: Network characteristics of a self-employed business owner
As the Gujarati Jains are a small community in Auckland, all the members of Yogender’s network, including his family, were known to each other in his co-ethnic circle. This provided the solidarity and trust needed to run their businesses and seek economic mobility. Often the foundation and inspiration to start new businesses in Auckland, came from their linkages with former employers and contacts while working at dairies, stores and other companies. These contacts then later became sponsors, suppliers, employees and clients for their own businesses. Thus, while studies might show that immigrant entrepreneurship often results from downward occupational mobility, the influence of co-ethnic networks and the availability of support from them provides further impetus for entrepreneurial decisions (see Portes, 1995). Although linkages between co-ethnic support and migrant entrepreneurships are well established in the previous literature (for example, Bailey & Waldinger, 1991; Meares, Cain & Spoonley, 2011; Waldinger et al., 1990), my study finds that co-ethnic networks are also significant for seeking professional employment, as explored below.

**Co-ethnic capacities of skilled employees**

The capacities of skilled employees result from multiple factors, highlighting the conditions which were conducive to the emergence and deployment of migrant capacities to network. Sub-regional community, gender and class appeared to be the most significant reasons for differences between Indian migrants according to participant narratives. This is consistent with DeLanda’s (2006) views that capacities never exist in the abstract but emerge from such factors, thereby accounting for relative homogeneity among such skills and capacities. In observing variations between intra-ethnic communities, I examine how such capacities were rooted and shared among participants from similar linguistic and regional backgrounds. However, the data does not explain how these conditions prepared them psychologically to establish networks in the labour market. Neither are the conditions explained here exhaustive.

Scholars (for example, see Battu et al., 2011; Levanon, 2011; Sanders, Nee & Sernau, 2002) argue that a reliance on social ties only facilitates low skilled and low prestige jobs requiring low levels of human capital. This study demonstrates that co-ethnic ties not only enabled participants to enter low level positions but also enabled professionals such as nurses, physiotherapists, teachers and social workers to seek skilled work opportunities. Such networks were useful for migrants, their co-ethnic friends and family who were in need of information and assistance in a related field. For example, female peer networks were important for participants and their relatives working in the nursing profession. A Keralite nurse, Trosy,
illustrated how her nursing networks helped a relative (also a nurse) to secure a position in Auckland. Connected to eight co-ethnic and seven inter-ethnic friends who were nurses, she asserted that nursing networks helped to find relevant employment:

…because my sister in law is working in Whangarei. She is in a rest home and I am looking for her a job here (Auckland) in one of the DHB (District Health Board). So my friends sometimes say there is a vacancy in my ward, if you want to tell her, just ask her to apply here. I think that helps, even though it is all there in the internet but, still, if you know someone …

Social workers, relief teachers, early childhood educators and chefs had also gained information about new vacancies and job referrals through professional networks.

Examining the four Indian communities, table 6.2 shows that there were differences in economic outcomes. Most Keralites (n=8/10), for example, had the best economic success in seeking skilled employment relevant to their qualifications and work experiences, followed by Gujarati (n=5/10) and Punjabi (n=5/10) participants then Tamils (n=4/11). Indicators of economic wellbeing such as household labour market participation, home ownership and prior contacts in New Zealand were also significant among the Keralites.

| Table 6.2: Economic profile of participants in skilled professions and with prior contacts |
|---------------------------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|
|                                 | Keralites  | Tamils   | Gujaratis | Punjabis |
| Participants in relevant skilled employment | 8          | 4        | 5        | 5        |
| Household participation in labour market | 9          | 7        | 4        | 5        |
| Participants in businesses/self-employed | 1          | 2        | 2        | 2        |
| Ownership of house              | 7          | 4        | 5        | 4        |
| Prior contacts in NZ            | 9          | 3        | 8        | 5        |

The regional economic characteristics of Indian communities can be recognised as one significant factor that accounts for the variations between these communities and the way their capacities to network were deployed, especially among the Keralites. For instance, a culture of migration to countries in the Arabian Gulf and to the United States is common among Keralites. Studies (Prakash, 1998; Rajan, 2004; Zachariah et al., 2001) have reported the ongoing processes of migration from Kerala since the 1940s for both labour and skilled work. My Keralite participants were certainly more inclined to have first migrated overseas early in their lives, some in childhood. The courses and careers they elected to follow, such as nursing and social work, reflect this desire to travel overseas either as a permanent resident or for work. Keralite participants often made statements such as “actually my husband wanted to visit other
countries and work there”, “I wanted to do nursing\(^{12}\)” and “I specialised in medical and psychiatry only because of its opportunity overseas”. In this context, the courses studied in India and their pre-migration transnational networks facilitated their ability to settle overseas.

The inspiration to migrate among Keralites is also likely related to the fact that Keralites have the highest literacy rate in India, but only few economic opportunities are available locally. Due to this, many Keralites migrate either internally to bigger Indian metropolises or seek career opportunities abroad. Remittances from Keralite migrants, which are important to the state’s economy are widely reflected in the consumption and housing patterns of Keralites (see for example, Osella & Gardner, 2004).

This context reveals how migration represents an important means of fostering socio-economic mobility to some Indian migrants, often creating a nexus between education and migration, where a desire for migration leads to education and education in turn facilitates migration (The New York Times, 2007). Thus high status exhibition through housing and consumption leads to the acquisition of qualifications to serve the purpose of migration and vice versa: having such qualifications compels Keralites to seek more lucrative jobs and a better lifestyle overseas. It is no surprise then that Keralite participants settled in New Zealand expecting better opportunities and wages.

As a mobile community, with considerable interdependence between migrants abroad and at home, all Keralite participants but one had prior networks in New Zealand before arrival. Some of these prior co-ethnic linkages facilitated the move to New Zealand and provided referrals to skilled occupations after migration. Notably, participants from this group were more prepared, being qualified in fields that are in high demand overseas, and were less willing to face underemployment and deskilling than migrants from other Indian communities. As Keralites were embedded within co-ethnic linguistic circles, there was a high level of internal status competition reflected in a need to display their economic status that pushed participants to strive for better socio-economic mobility. Examples of competitiveness in terms of status are

\(^{12}\) There has been a demand for nurses and health care professionals overseas, and more so a demand for Keralite nurses. This is evident from Canada’s Minister for Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism Jason Kenney’s invitation to the Keralites as follows. “… In the past, most immigrants have been from Punjab. But we realise Canada can benefit from the South Indian community, considering their high levels of education. […] We just love to see the arrival of more Malayalis especially because of their level of education. So, hey Keralites, do think about coming to Canada” (The Hindu, 9th January 2013, [http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/tp-kerala/canada-looking-for-south-indian-migrants/article4289262.ece](http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/tp-kerala/canada-looking-for-south-indian-migrants/article4289262.ece)).
highlighted in chapter seven and this also partially explains why many Keralite networks migrated to Australia, as noted in chapter four. The socio-economic context of the region of origin, as in the case of the Keralite community, significantly influences the degree of interaction and involvement in the co-ethnic community overseas and their common cultural aspirations to economically succeed. Indeed these patterns shaped their capacities to seek skilled professions.

On the contrary, only four of the eleven Tamil participants managed to enter skilled professions relevant to their qualifications and skills and continued to remain in these jobs in New Zealand. Two of these participants were software engineers, while the third participant gained skilled employment through inter-ethnic networks. The fourth participant was the only Tamil interviewed who had entered an entry level position and slowly graduated to higher positions as she displayed her skills and competence in the organisation. In addition to these four, two Tamil onshore participants who arrived as students gained skilled employment and PR based on their qualifications but were working in other unrelated fields at the time of their interviews. Skilled employment was essential for students to gain PR, however the lack of career mobility and low wages resulted in them seeking work in other areas. The remaining Tamil participants went into occupations that were not aligned with their qualifications or previous work experiences. Overall, participants from the Tamil community proved to be more flexible and were less driven by strong economic motives, seeking mainly to be content with their current employment and earnings. Often they made comments such as that provided by Mala: “For me career, work and money was not very important at that time. For me, it was only my children and environment and giving my children the best”.

Although the Tamil participants strived to find jobs relevant to their skills, they were more tolerant of jobs that did not match their skills or qualifications. Some felt that their acquiescence to work in unrelated fields was because of a prolonged wait for work and constant employment rejections. Others attributed this to a lack of social pressure to succeed and display financial status among co-ethnic members, a view contrary to the experiences of Keralites, as Benjamin pointed out:

One thing that I learnt in New Zealand, as long as I do a job, a proper job that pays you well and not pushed around and troubled, it is good to take a job, take the money be happy and contented. Unlike in India where your neighbour, your father, your mother, your mother-in-law, your father-in-law, and your brother-in-law everyone puts their nose to see where you are working, what your salary is and what kind of job you are doing. Here there is absolutely no interference. Here as long as I am doing my job in an honest way, as long as I am not getting tired, I know that it is a
good place for me. I started learning to like the job I was given. Basically, yes I started developing
the skill of loving the job I was given to do.

These differences in the orientations between Tamils and Keralites account for the variations
in their capacities in seeking a highly-skilled job and also the ways in which migrants settled
within their communities. As made evident in the earlier chapters, all Tamils were
cosmopolitans who had different world views, perceiving co-ethnic linkages from the
transitioners in a distinct manner. In contrast, only four Keralites were cosmopolitans. Thus,
their labour market outcomes did not seem to be tied to their capacity for openness as discussed
in chapter four.

While the Punjabi networks were quite similar to those of the Tamils, Gujarati networks were
well established like those of the Keralites. As noted in table 6.2, eight Gujarati participants had
connections with New Zealand prior to their arrival. Often these were in the form of extended
family connections and friends. The networks of Gujarati participants show an interweaving of
family, community, work and businesses which is consistent with the findings of Poros (2001)
in his study of the Gujarati community in the United States. Five of my participants were in
skilled professions, including the two skilled entrepreneurs. Apart from the two who had
established businesses, the other three Gujarati participants were preparing to start their own
businesses in Auckland. Many Gujarati participants, like Badal, pointed out: “We have the
saying ‘in our blood a Gujarati does business and not job’. If you go anywhere in India or even
out of country, Gujaratis always do business”. As such, these participants were qualified in
business related fields such as commerce and accountancy. Notably, seven of the ten Gujarati
participants indicated that they had a Bachelor of Commerce degree.

Coming from a business culture and with a desire to start a business, Gujarati entrepreneurs
benefited from close community linkages in India and New Zealand. Family members and long
established friends in India often supported their business ventures. They contributed especially
by offering interest free loans. A Gujarati retailer, Paresh, noted that he started his business with
“zero investment”, importing temple and religious items from India. Having reliable and
trustworthy Gujarati friends in India acting as suppliers enabled him to take out interest-free
loans, arrange goods on credit basis, sell these in New Zealand and repay the loans gradually
without pressure. While Gujarati networks in India sponsored and supplied resources, those in
Auckland aided him more practically by running stalls during Diwali festivals and helping him
sell goods during peak times when more labour was needed. According to him, these networks,
helped “without second thoughts”. As mentioned in an earlier section, a closely knit group also meant participants benefited an equitable exchange relationship. Paresh explained that having common friends in the community made it easy for him to identify the defaulters who “misuse” relationships by borrowing money and not repaying it. These findings regarding the ways that Gujarati linkages aided entrepreneurial initiatives confirm earlier studies elsewhere (for example, Krivokapic-Skoko, 2007; Poros, 2001; Portes, 1995; Portes & Landolt, 2000).

Gender differences in the perception of social networks
Nevertheless, despite the fact that thirty-three of forty-three of all participants used their networks for employment purposes, social networks were not viewed as essential for everyone. As mentioned in chapter four, migrant capacities to network were often gendered and class based. Manpreet, a Punjabi female participant, said: “all that I got was through God’s grace or through my qualifications, so there is no social networks that actually helped me”. Another Keralite female participant, Priya, a software engineer who secured employment through direct application also denied networks were important: “I don’t think so […] they [co-ethnic ties] are in the same boat as anyone else”. These participants claimed, as many international studies do (see Alba & Nee, 2009; Govindasamy & Nambiar, 2003; Levanon, 2011; Nee & Sanders, 2001), that accessing employment via co-ethnic social networks only enabled entry into low level jobs and unskilled occupations. Aditi, a female Gujarati participant, said: “to get small jobs in Countdown, as a till operator etc., someone can refer you, but for specialised jobs which we are in today, I don’t think your referrals will work. That is your skill”. Comparing and aggregating such statements, it is evident that they most often came from female participants who viewed themselves as “less social”, having limited number of networks in New Zealand. These were participants who had young children and struggled to find balance between work and family. It was revealing that nine of the ten female participants who had young children made strong statements about the lack of usefulness of social networks in finding employment in New Zealand. The above quotes also draw attention to migrant aspirations in seeking assistance from networks, for ‘assistance’ may only be defined as such if it meets their aspirations. Without this, it may not be held as useful by migrants. As a result, even participants who accessed entry level positions with the help of networks may not perceive networks as useful.

In light of above findings, we can see that the demand for New Zealand work experience and other challenges required help from networks. Intra- and co-ethnic networks were shown in this
context to be vital in not only channelling migrants to entrepreneurship and to entry level employments but also for accessing professional skilled employments. However, the actual constitution of networks was shaped by the nature of embeddedness within people’s communities and their subjective assessments about who can offer support and the potential outcomes, as was evident from the responses by female participants who regarded success in gaining employment was based on their own merits. This finding thus reiterates the argument in chapter four that network capacities are often community driven and gendered.

Why are capacities important for inter-ethnic networks?

In this section, I conceptualise the deployment of inter-ethnic relations for labour market mobility as reterritorialised networks. Reterritorialisation is regarded as a process that is never complete but in constant oscillation between different states (Papastergiadis, 2000). This results from the processes of deterritorialisation and territorialisation occurring at the same time. That is, reterritorialisation happens when participants experience deterritorialisation through problematic inter-ethnic interactions and racial discrimination that created a sense of exclusion and marginalisation (this is explored in chapter eight). Yet, these experiences do not preclude participants from initiating inter-ethnic networks as they believe such networks are important for career mobility. Therefore I consider that initiating inter-ethnic ties for employment mobility requires special capacities that emerge innovatively from such conflicting situations (see Lacroix, 2014). Also, I regard these networks as reterritorialised because they result from a state of oscillation between participant subjective experiences (finding that these networks are important) and objective conditions (perceptions of racial discrimination and the glass ceiling).

Among those who were employed (n=34/43), six participants demonstrated occupational mobility by progressing from intermediate to higher level positions. These participants said that inter-ethnic ties, particularly those that were professional, were mandatory for career mobility. Mala, a Tamil participant who was a manager in a reputed electronics firm in New Zealand, stated: “now at this stage, I will be looking for only a certain level of positions which would mainly come from my work network [rather] than my personal [community]”. Even those female participants who earlier indicated that social networks were not useful for getting into the labour market thought differently when it came to inter-ethnic and professional networks for labour market mobility. Priya was one such participant who viewed inter-ethnic ties as different from community networks. She stated: “Getting to know a Kiwi, having a Kiwi friend
is quite useful, but your own community networks it is useful for emotional support you know, like you find common backgrounds, but for job I don’t think so”. Given that many participants perceived that there was discrimination and a glass ceiling in the New Zealand labour market, inter-ethnic networks were also considered vital to overcome these barriers and enable mobility. The following section offers some illustrations of the discrimination and racism that participants perceived to be occurring in the labour market which led them to feel they needed inter-ethnic support. In examining these examples, I recognise that these experiences are not only unique to Indian migrants in New Zealand but are experiences common among migrants in various other migrant destinations (for example, see Reitz, 2001 in the Canadian context).

Perceptions of discrimination and a glass ceiling

From an assemblage point of view, enunciators are signs that allow the elements within an assemblage to communicate with one another (see Chen, 2012). In the context of my participants, enunciators are experiences and signs of racism and glass ceiling that allowed migrants to initiate and seek inter-ethnic support. Therefore, this section addresses how Indian migrants perceived such networks as vital for their economic integration and for securing wage increases and promotions.

Participants discussed varied kinds of discrimination at different levels of the labour market. At the entry level, for instance, some Sikh and Hindu participants believed their names and appearances were significant barriers in the eyes of employers and recruiters. Seema, a Punjabi Sikh participant, said:

Especially our names, the moment the application goes in and if they read my name, ahh…they don’t even go through. As I said, the prejudice: “oh they are liars”, “they don’t know how to speak English”, they have negative feelings about us. Very rare…if you don’t have links inside you don’t get job when you need it.

Another Sikh participant, who had experienced a lot of job rejections initially, added: “Thousands of applications, all coming back with a standard letter, ‘we have found people with more skills’… lots of rejections. So then we have to change our names and then apply. At least you get a reply”. Discrimination based on ‘foreign’ names and on the Indian identities of migrants have been recorded in previous studies (see Kurian & Munshi, 2009; Middleton, 2005; Wilson et al., 2005). The impersonality of resume or application based screening provides little opportunity for the applicant to make an impression (Wilson et al., 2005). Missing the shortlist for interviews and being rejected based on one’s resume did not give migrants an opportunity to prove their skills and knowledge.
While the above participants experienced difficulty in trying to get a foothold in the labour market, others complained of discrimination when it came to promotions. Smita, a Maharashtrian social worker who was closely affiliated with friends from other ethnicities, firmly asserted that there was no racism in New Zealand. Yet she did believe ‘Indianness’ was a barrier when it came to promotions. She explained: “I still believe and I still see when you go for interviews your colour and your Indianness does come in a way. How you speak English and how you present yourself it does come in a way”. Participants offered numerous responses suggesting employers preferred ‘whites’.

Those who were previously in high positions in India were more conscious of the glass ceiling that they believed existed in New Zealand. Antony and Grishma, for example, both previously established as professionals in India, had migrated to New Zealand aspiring to further their careers. Antony, had 25 years of work experience as a bank manager in India with a Master’s degree in Economics, but was declined when he competed for the post of managing director in the company. He stated, “Indians are not to be given managerial positions here yet […] the new managing director comes from Australia”.

Similarly Grishma, who also held a Master’s degree in Economics and had a wide range of work experience in the administrative sector both in India and New Zealand, applied for a promotion to group services manager. She felt that she had the qualifications, work experience, skills and aptitude for the position she had applied for but received excuses such as the following: “because I was in the union, some people told me that I don’t have people handling skills, whereas I have handled quite a lot of people, and others have told that I am not strategic in my thinking”. Yet, in the event of an emergency, she was asked to take over this position when one of the group services managers had to go on leave at short notice. She commented: “I was fit to do that role then, because I was needed there. So yes you notice it. You will always be under somebody. They will give you short opportunities to lead a project or lead something, but it’s not something on a long term or a career path […] not big. So you will be in charge of the operations but the people’s side, it will be managed by another migrant from a Western country not from India, Sri Lanka or from Pakistan or Bangladesh. […] Unfortunately we are in stereotyped roles. […] Social responsibility or having equal opportunity for all is not there.

Despite her initial failures, Grishma was persistent in applying for the position whenever it was advertised: “I had applied again, and I said, ‘I didn’t get a chance an opportunity so let me apply’. Didn’t even get shortlisted for an interview after having been here. Who have they called, they have called someone from Adelaide”. Feeling deprived, she commented: “… they don’t mind a migrant from Britain or South Africa” and felt that it was Indian migrants who
were not favoured by employers. Studies often find evidence of discrimination and a mismatch between migrants’ qualifications and employment when compared with local born employees (see for example, Poot & Stillman, 2010). Antony’s and Grishma’s experiences while applying for promotions provide further evidence that there is preference for certain ‘kinds’ of migrants, such as those from Britain and Australia, for higher level positions over local and qualified skilled migrants who are already in place in New Zealand.

Much like Antony and Grishma, a Punjabi participant, Kamaljit, observed that there were no Indian migrant professionals in top level positions in his field13. For him, racism and discrimination were not acknowledged at higher levels: “One thing in general, what I have seen is on higher level the so called racism is not outspoken, you wouldn’t hear it, will be silent behind the doors, there is a matured way of dealing with it”. Viewing inter-ethnic ties as important for breaking the ceiling, Kamaljit asserted: “Otherwise you will get stagnated and it’s hard. When you are into a system you have to be somehow part of that system [being with mainstream New Zealanders]. I have come a long way […]. I see now different ceilings everywhere – old boy’s networks everywhere”. Having taken ten years to reach his current position, he narrated how he managed to attain this. Knowing people and creating familiarity within professional circles was a fundamental way participants reached their goals. He stated:

There was this vacancy in the organisation at one point in time and I knew I had all the skills and everything to do that. I was already excelling in that, I was getting prizes and all that stuff for that. But when it came to a vacancy a person from the mainstream [majority ethnic group] was given that job. I was interested and pretty good in that. Later on that person he could not perform in that role. I could see that he was not achieving those kind of results, and this happened a lot of times.

So this is the thing, first I applied for one where I was not accepted, and then a new role was created and then I was not accepted. Then after certain period I was able to get.

Geena: What helped you get it?
Kamaljit: It is what I said earlier that familiarity within, when you get to know more people within that [inter-ethnic group]. So if the person appointing you knows you and your references then it makes the difference. All the other things go on other side and the reference goes on the other side. I think it is the same in the university as well. Is it not?

As noted by Zell and Skop (2011), the instrumentality and the type of social networks that aid migrants differ, based on the context of the destination. Thus the belief that ‘inner circles’ and ‘old boy’s networks’ were vital to achieving labour market success and promotions was common among participants, as they saw these as the most pragmatic ways of succeeding in hiring and promotion processes. As a result, they believed migrant job promotions only occurred under two conditions: first, by building rapport and familiarity with relevant

13 The profession of the participant is not mentioned due to his concern about being identified as a renowned professional in the Indian community.
employers; and, second by being recruited in the absence of alternative locals who competed for such positions. This later point is evident from the following narrative from Seema:

See the promotion which I got now I could have got this job before also, but it was because my boss [a Pākehā New Zealander] was not very confident […] she doesn’t like to interact much with new people, because she says the known level is better than the unknown.

Also another factor, because there was another tutor [Pākehā New Zealander] who never wanted to do this job, I got it. It’s like a leftover kind of a thing. So if you say straight away, did she give me a job? No. She had somebody else in the mind, but that person said ‘no, I am not going to do it.’ So then gave it, she knows I am not going to say no. The first choice that’s not there that is always a problem you know.

In a recruitment system that relies on the selection of candidate from familiar circles, some rapport with the employer was often needed to gain entry. In this case, Seema was in constant touch with her Pākehā English language trainer after completing her course in ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) teaching. Familiarity developed through this contact helped her gain employment after a few years when the trainer became the centre manager and was seeking to recruit an English language teacher. Yet, as she pointed out, migrants would not be a “first choice” for promotions.

Inter-ethnic networks in the work place were also thought to be vital for gaining better pay. Florien, a Tamil software engineer, worked as software tester in a leading software company in Auckland. She noted that the average pay for software developers and testers ranged between NZ$60-120 000. When she first began work, she accepted a job offer for $75 000 to prove her skills in New Zealand. Having worked for five years in India and three years in New Zealand she was now aspiring for a better salary that reflected her qualifications, experience and the workload she undertook. However, she felt reluctant to ask her employers. In this context, she received constant support and encouragement from her inter-ethnic friends at work who said: “We should be rewarded for what we work, you have performed well, just go talk about your performance and demand what you have to get. Don’t ask, demand it”. Even when she was reluctant to demand pay for extra hours she had worked, her colleagues took the initiative: “I was reluctant to go and tell them, ‘I have put extra hours’, but my friends will do it. They will just send an email saying, ‘Florien and I have stayed long and done extra hours, can you account this as our overtime’”. Florien reported that now she is trying to secure a job on higher pay outside her company, and in so doing, she still receives the support of these friends who have moved to new work places. Meeting these friends frequently outside her workplace she stated:

They are rich information. There are people literally in the market for long time and they know what it is, more than me. They keep informing me this is what is happening, who is who, what is
what, we have these people there and they will be a support to you. We talk about work outside our office, outside elsewhere what is happening there and all that stuff.

Granovetter (1973; 1983) argued that weak bridging ties are useful for better labour market outcomes. In the context of migrant incorporation, bridging ties such as inter-ethnic ties are considered to bring better employment outcomes (Lancee, 2012). Florien’s inter-ethnic ties may be regarded as ‘weak’ according to Granovetter and Lancee’s interpretations yet were significantly strong for her occupational mobility and job satisfaction. These findings stand consistent with the literature that inter-ethnic ties facilitate migrant career advancements (see for example, Kanas et al., 2011; Morosanu, 2013; Lancee, 2012a).

Perceptions of labour market ceilings and racism were common amongst migrants who arrived with high aspirations, especially those who were from the upper and upper-middle classes and were previously well-established professionals, such as doctors, bank managers and university professors that migrated to further their career aspirations. In contrast to these participants, those who were from middle income groups appeared to be more successfully established and happier with their lives in New Zealand. The latter were critical of migrants who made such observations about racism and labour market ceilings in New Zealand. George, a Keralite participant, said: “There may be five percent in the family who may not like and complain about the members [of mainstream society], but it is the rest, ninety percent which is important”. Professional, financial and economic successes accomplished post-migration, usually outweighed these participants’ experiences of racism and labour market ceilings in New Zealand. It is also important to stress that such racism was debated by participants, with some noting that the Indian community was also exploitative and racist in its own right.

Given the above exchanges and experiences regarding inter-ethnic networks for career promotions, it is clear that migrant networks are dynamically constituted, with inter-ethnic ties that bridge migrants to different groups. As noted by Ryan and colleagues (2015), migrant networks are pragmatic and alter depending on their circumstances and life course. The individuals and friends who connected them to the labour market and to different aspects of social life were themselves members of various groups such as professional organisations, recreational pursuits and leisure clubs. Migrants shared the connections and characteristics of those friends and the groups in which they were members. Thus their networks were flexibly adapted and connected as demanded by the context and through a conscious reflection of their positive emotional and physical gains acquired. Such inter-ethnic interactions were necessary
in reterritorialising and stabilising a particular configuration of networks. Below figure 6.2 illustrates Kamaljit’s network because it shows how participants navigate between multiple networks for different purposes that may or may not intersect with each other. Kamaljit’s networks were also constituted by a number of inter-ethnic linkages.

**Figure 6.2: Network of Kamaljit a Punjabi professional**

Kamajit’s network was typical of many participants trying to balance between different groups and especially between co-ethnic and inter-ethnic ties. As he himself stated, this balance is necessary because if migrants do not get jobs in the mainstream then they can at least rely on their co-ethnic affiliates. Thus career and economic opportunities for most Indian migrants were intimately tied to their social networks.

**Conclusion**

In chapter four, I discussed how migrant networks are determined by migrant capacities. The relevance of the capacities is reflected further in this chapter’s analysis, which argued that capacities are needed for achieving positive employment outcomes. In exploring the New Zealand labour market experiences of Indian migrants, this chapter has shown they experienced deskilling, undervaluation of qualifications, skills and previous work experiences and a glass ceiling effect while seeking career mobility. In this context, it was indispensable for participants to win the sympathy of community members and gain access to the labour market via network contacts. These networks are arguably important ways in which the migrants self-settled. However, existing capacities are a *necessary condition* for the networks to take place. Indian
migrant capacities, such as the ability to immerse in any relations, to be less rigid, to be open and to render support to others in need, as well as the capacity to reterritorialise innovatively are important influences on the choice of networks they engaged with, as demanded by the context in which they lived.

This chapter thus has hinted at the possibility of migrants being re-rooted back into a given network. For example, examining the role of inter-ethnic networks in labour market participation highlights how necessary such networks were despite the fact that many participants said they had experienced racial discrimination. Capacities were thus necessary to enable reterritorialisation, making participants believe in and initiate the inter-ethnic networks they felt were necessary to counter the glass ceiling effect and gain employment mobility. These were not pre-conceived or a pre-planned initiatives, but were capacities that emerged when they encountered these circumstances. Therefore it can be concluded from this chapter that migrant networks are dynamic and a product of chance encounters (DeLanda 2006), and no a priori assumptions about such networks is possible without empirically examining their changing and fluid character.
Chapter Seven

Co-ethnic networks as pathways to community integration

Introduction

This thesis has focused on social integration at four different levels. Chapter five discussed the role of co-ethnic networks in assisting onshore migrants to gain the jobs that would lead to permanent residency. But these labour market experiences were not necessarily always positive. Chapter six focused on the economic integration of migrants both entering the labour market and seeking occupational mobility. Co-, intra- and inter-ethnic networks were all important for differing aspects of labour market outcomes. Having defined social integration as involving both community and societal belonging, this chapter now turns to examining how co-ethnic networks are particularly important in orientating Indian migrants to everyday community life.

The following chapter highlights that inter-ethnic networks – that is relationships between Indian migrants and people within mainstream New Zealand society such as Pākehā, Māori and other ethnic groups – are important to societal integration.

As discussed in past chapters, intra-ethnic networks constitute the ties between different sub-regional, religious and linguistic Indian communities, while co-ethnic networks denote the networks within similar groups. Intra- and co-ethnic networks are assumed to give a significant edge to the migrant settlement processes (see Hagan, 1998; Marger, 2001). This chapter highlights that co-ethnic networks, in particular, are critical for Indian migrants gaining a sense of belonging and inclusion in their day to day lives in local communities. There were only two examples of intra-ethnic network support, therefore the chapter largely focuses on co-ethnic networks with discussion organised around three questions: How are co-ethnic networks a means for achieving social integration? What are the internal community dynamics that shape migrant co-ethnic networks? How satisfactory are the co-ethnic networks available to Indian migrants?

In considering these questions, the first section documents the support gained by Indian migrants seeking stability during their settlement in New Zealand. Uprooted from their local connections and language, Indian migrants often reconstituted social, religious and linguistic
networks that were similar to those found at home in New Zealand. In that these networks largely mirror networks in India, I characterise this as territorialisation. Various aspects of networks – such as strength of relationships, frequency of interactions, emotional content, and reciprocity – all contribute to the territorialisation of assemblages, because a sense of familiarity, inclusion, comfort, warmth and safety determines stability in relationships (DeLanda, 2006, p.56). The focus in this chapter is mostly on the emotional and social outcomes of these networks. Subsequently, it sheds light on the phenomenon of *migrant embeddedness* in co-ethnic circles, which is frequently discussed in the migration literature, and is defined as a close-knit inward relation of migrants within their dense regional and linguistic networks.

Whether this stability in relationships is enduring or not is further examined in the second section of this chapter, which analyses co-ethnic networks in light of internal community tensions that undermine and shape such linkages on a long-term basis. The contrary processes that destabilise assemblages – decreasing density, lack of homophily, promoting geographical dispersion and reducing solidarity – are considered to be deterritorialising. These are discussed through examples that highlight that inclusion and belonging cannot be generalised to all types of co-ethnic and intra-ethnic networks. In the long-term, participants responded to such tensions and divisions by seeking solace within particular networks – usually religious groups – within their co-ethnic community. Therefore, I have referred to these networks as reterritorialised ones, as discussed in the final section of this chapter.

**How are co-ethnic networks a means for achieving social integration?**

Homophily based on language, region of origin and nationality is considered to be significant in the formation of co-ethnic networks (see Gilchrist & Kyprianou, 2011; Ryan, 2011). Chapter two noted that studies have shown that social capital manifested through such co-ethnic networks lowers the risks and costs associated with migration (Massey et al., 1990; Palloni et al., 2001). Social capital in the form of resources, such as access to information and material support, are found embedded in social networks and particularly in co-ethnic networks (Portes, 1998). From the point of view of assemblage theory, these benefits are territorialising entities within a given network. What stabilises relationships is not simply a friendly conversation but the exchange of physical aid, the giving of advice and emotional support etc. These are regarded as the *material* and *expressive* benefits that territorialises an assemblage, stabilising the trust and solidarity between its entities (see DeLanda, 2006, p.22 & 57).
Participants discussed a range of such material and expressive exchanges with co-ethnic associates and this section explores how they benefited Indian migrants in their settlement. Examples are used to illustrate such benefits to signify the territorialising phase of co-ethnic networks which consolidated their interdependence and solidarity. Some such networks existed prior to migration. Twenty-four of the forty-three participants in this study reported they had some form of prior linkages before arrival. For instance, Keralites (n=9/10), Gujaratis (n=8/10), Punjabis (n=4/10) and Tamils (n=3/11) had prior linkages in New Zealand before their arrival. Participants indicated that support from such networks are vital to settling in New Zealand, although other important co-ethnic networks developed after migration.

**Offers of guidance, subsidised accommodation and financial support**

Material examples of participant territorialisation include the detailed orientation and guidance that others in their co-ethnic networks provided as the newcomers sought stability in their new life in New Zealand. Often members within co-ethnic networks introduced new migrants to banks, the cheapest Indian grocery stores and oriented them to Auckland transport and other public amenities. Accommodation and financial support were also commonly provided to participants. For example, Sonal, who was advised to migrate to New Zealand by a Gujarati family friend who had settled in Auckland for more than ten years, received considerable guidance and support from him once she arrived: “People don’t have the time here, still they [her friend’s family] looked after me until I got my job saying, ‘you don’t have to pay that extra money outside, you will be eating your savings’”. Likewise Bahadur, another Gujarati participant, had his visa sponsored by relatives and a family business friend in New Zealand. Then, challenged by the labour market situation in the initial years after his arrival, Bahadur was given accommodation and financial assistance by his uncle who said: “‘why do you want to live by yourself? Come and stay here.’ […] I wanted money to buy a car for the job and uncle gave me the money right away, ‘you can pay me later’”.

**Household support**

Physical support from immediate family was another notable aspect of the territorialisation that restored stability to my participants following migration. Although immediate family may not immediately come to mind when thinking of co-ethnic networks, the literature on migration routinely includes family in this way (see Morosanu, 2012). Moreover, it is notable that a majority of married women (n=14/22) acknowledged the willingness of their husbands to offer household support so the women could pursue careers. This kind of support was not usually
provided by male spouses in India, where a gender specific division of household labour remains the norm and where paid domestic workers are common. This shift was demanded by the loss of extended family support and domestic help associated with migration.

Many participants, especially women with young children, talked of the challenges of learning to manage their lives in New Zealand with help only from immediate family, including their spouses and older children. For instance, Sonia, a Punjabi doctor, reported that in India she always had “more people around” her at home and in the clinic to support the household chores and in managing her work. She believed support from extended families was important, especially for working mothers trying to balance home and a profession. Although she found that New Zealand offered her an independent lifestyle, with the convenience of working from home, she missed this wider network of support after migrating. But Sonia noted several examples of the help she had received from her husband and sons:

I had a very cooperative husband, it was a big, big thing […] because there was a time when I used to work for eight hours then come home do my clinic and cooking. He was always there to help me out for washing, to put the clothes out and for cooking. My son used to help to clean the area. So I had a cooperative family and was never too burdened that I had to do a lot of work by myself.

Although female participants acknowledged that providing such assistance was a challenge for the men, they viewed this support from their husbands favourably. These participants highlighted this was because they came from middle and upper-middle class families in India where hired help was the norm as a Keralite participant, Priya, indicated:

Coming to New Zealand you will find that you will get challenged by everything, because in India you will get most of the things you want on a platter…someone to clean up your house, someone to dig up the garden. Coming to New Zealand you have to do everything yourselves. Yeah, it was quite challenging. Especially for my husband it was really, really challenging. […] he actually had a self-improvement [in becoming more self-reliant] after coming here.

Cooperation and making mutual adjustments to the traditional gender division of labour and expectations in India was integral to the careers and wellbeing of female participants. From the point of view of a male participant, Shaji, a Keralite, this transition is necessary for having a “happy family in New Zealand”. He noted:

[…] after coming here wife was not working, so she was taking care of everything all the household things and my kids and other things. But gradually when she got a job I adjusted myself, adjusted the shift timings, reducing some hours, sharing my wife’s work in taking care of my son, trying to help her in cooking and I took care of the shopping aspect and so this is the way things happen outside India. So I gradually adjusted with it. That is the only way we can have a happy family in New Zealand […] People in India may not like it.

In addition to such adjustments and cooperation between couples, the support of elderly parents in the household was also essential to the four participants who lived with extended family in
New Zealand. Among these, two older participants from the Gujarati community reported that they arrived in New Zealand to offer childcare support to their sons and daughters who were settled here. Mahima, a 64 year old Gujarati participant, stated: “When my daughter delivered a baby, and I came first and then he [her husband] came after me. […] I was taking care of the baby. I was taking care of the two children; it was a fulltime job”. There were two other participants who were skilled migrants that reported bringing their parents to New Zealand as they were the only children in the family.

These experiences suggest that many Indian households in New Zealand have dual earners. This is likely because most Indian migrants coming to New Zealand are skilled migrants where both spouses have careers. As some participants pointed out, this was necessary to have a decent standard of living in New Zealand. Grandparental support and alternative child rearing support from co-ethnic networks were thus coping strategies to balance and synchronise workplace and domestic responsibilities that territorialised new migrants by embedding them into co-ethnic communities.

**Emotional support**

A sense of emotional warmth and security was equally crucial to the territorialisation of participants in their co-ethnic networks, as this also stabilised their relationships after migration. Participants showed high levels of co-ethnic bonding especially after a death in the family in India or the hospitalisation of a spouse in New Zealand. This was exceptionally important for Indian migrants who lived by themselves. Co-ethnic networks became extensions of familial support systems for these participants. Grishma, a Kannadiga-Maharashtrian who initially migrated to New Zealand without her husband and parents, discussed the help she received from her husband’s friends – Gujaratis and Maharashtrians – who were in New Zealand at the time of her mother’s death in India. She narrated:

> When my mum died I was alone here, because my mum she actually died in Mumbai, my husband took care of her. She was going through her last two cycles of chemotherapy. I was alone when I heard the news. So my husband called his friends and made sure that someone was with me. When he called to say the news that mum is no more, my friends stayed with me few nights and I stayed with them for up to ten days, because I couldn’t go back to India, I was studying I was doing my PG Dip. I couldn’t just stopped doing everything, you know. On the thirteenth day, it was my friends who had the prayer meeting in their home and made the sweets so that I could have the sweet. So that’s how we have been like a family. It’s an extension of our support from India we tried to create successfully.

Later when her husband arrived, Grishma received similar support from friends on numerous occasions, including when he was hospitalised in New Zealand: “My friends took me to the
hospital and brought me back. Had access to our homes, to our clothes, did everything, I didn’t have to worry”.

Sometimes emotional attachments were based on regional traditions and rituals which facilitated the territorialisation of participants’ identities and networks. For example, the *raksha bandhan* (a tie of protection in Sanskrit) festival is, widely practiced among North Indian Hindus and Jains. It is a festival used to celebrate brother-sister relationships and often relationships between men and women who are not biologically related. Two Gujarati Hindu participants in this study reported such linkages, forming a *fictive kinship relation* with community friends that included even distant relatives and acquaintances. According to Ebaugh and Curry (2000), fictive kinship denotes a family-type relationship, not based on blood or marriage, but rather forged by religious rituals and based on close friendships. Gujarati pre-migration networks often included ties with distant relatives and acquaintances of friends and cousins from India, which their traditions and customs from home helped them to consolidate once they were in New Zealand. For instance, a Gujarati businessman called Paresh did not initially remember any pre-migration linkages in New Zealand when asked, but gradually recollected a list of contacts as follows:

I did not know anyone…My brother’s son he came six months ago and his wife’s sisters they were here. […] another person my friend, we met while going for IELTS exams [in India]. So he contacted me and I knew him. Another friend, he was my friend’s friend he was in Wellington and then he moved to Auckland. Another one is my sister’s best friend’s babhi [sister-in-law]. So when we came, she called me up and asked me where I live and I told her I will come there to take the *rakhi*[^14] [sacred thread]. So at that time I went there and she became my sister. So then I said, you tie me the *rakhi*.

As the above narrative demonstrates, bonding - even with distant friends and acquaintances - through local customs and traditions helped new migrants gain a sense of mutual responsibility and inter-dependence within co-ethnic communities in New Zealand.

Apart from traditional rituals, a *habitual repetition* of conversations and actions - such as church attendance - are also regarded important for the maintenance of traditional solidarity of entities in the territorialising process (see DeLanda, 2006, p.50 & 58). Religious co-ethnic affiliations helped new participants meet their day to day needs and gave them a sense of belonging through their co-ethnic community. Regional churches facilitated friendship networks especially among

[^14]: Rakhi denotes amulet tying, a sacred thread tied by a sister on her brother’s hand in return for gifts from him.
South Indian Christians. Auckland has different community churches catering to the various linguistic Christian denominations from India. As shown in chapter four, Christian participants in this study were from either the Keralite (n=7/10) and Tamil communities (n=6/11). However, while all seven Keralite participants were members of regional churches, only two Tamil participants reported they attended such churches in Auckland. The strong church affiliation of Keralite participants likely reflects the socio-demographic patterns and regional history of Christianity in the state of Kerala. Much as in India, church is an integral part of the Keralite Christian tradition in New Zealand. Local language and traditions in these churches is the highlight of such networks. The weekly Sunday Qurbanas [sermons] and prayers, for example, are held in the local language and tradition by Keralite priests. Participants indicated they regularly attended and participated in such sermons on Sundays with their family. Moreover, involvement in church activities and engagement with the clergy was sustained through Christian educational institutions and rites such as marriages, baptisms, house warming ceremonies, birthdays and other celebrations, integrating the church into almost every stage of the life cycle (Kurien, 2014). Not surprisingly, church networks emerged as significant in the narratives of participants, most notably among Keralite Christians who frequently indicated that their children studied in Catholic schools and actively participated in church activities.

Keralite participants were members of community churches, such as the Jacobite Syrian church, the Orthodox Christian church and Syro Malabar Catholic churches, all of which belong to the Syrian denomination among Kerala Christians. Jessy, a Keralite participant, was an Orthodox Marthomite Christian. Yet she preferred being in the Jacobite church community consisting of 150 Malayalis, having been introduced by her former college mate (a Malayali Jacobite in Auckland). Jessy received considerable support from the fellow parishioners and achen [priest] when she arrived. She narrated that it was a church custom to actively introduce a new member in front of the church community when they come into the church for the first time. Recollecting the church’s attempt to integrate new members in the community, she explained:

> We still follow the custom, the community will make him stand and introduce him in front of everyone and we have tea time after church sermon. During this tea time, everyone will go and meet this person and ask his history, background and everything […] just to give him the support and make him feel better saying, ‘we are here to help you’. Our achen [priest] is also very helpful, he gets the phone numbers of everyone and he calls occasionally enquiring about their current situation, and asking if they need any help, yeah things like that.

Such a welcome was strongly endorsed and appreciated, especially by the three onshore Keralite participants who arrived as students with their families to study and permanently settle.

---

15 Christianity in Kerala is dated back to the 1st century AD (Alexander 1971) and the proportion of the Christian population is significantly higher in Kerala than in India as a whole.
down in New Zealand. Through church, the Keralite participants reported access to larger community networks and gained better support than outside their church. Serine, another Keralite participant, reiterated this warmth and support stating:

For me, when I came as a student, I knew the priest so I was invited here but I got a warm welcome from the people who are settled here. The priest introduced me and my husband in the church. So whoever was settled here in New Zealand for 15-16 years they came and told us that if you need any help, approach us we will help and tried to find job for us by giving connections and all that. So they were asking, ‘have you got a proper house? Do you want any utensils?’ I have got lots of help like that settling. Moneywise also when I am struggling I can easily go and ask them.

Regardless of whether participants arrived onshore as students or offshore gained PR before they arrived, whether as singles or with families, they received a kind welcome from co-ethnic churches. These participants felt that introducing the newcomers in front of the whole church was important, especially when they were newly arrived in New Zealand, to help them connect with the settled co-ethnic community.

**How did these church networks contribute to the practical aspects of territorialisation?**

Strong homophilial ties are regarded as beneficial to maximise collective capacity to leverage and mobilise resources to network members and developing group solidarity. The significance and intensity of such networks based on language, region and religion was evident in the ways participants’ day to day lives benefited from the support offered by fellow members. Keralite participants were connected widely with others from their co-ethnic community partly because they wished to flat with and rent out their houses to similar Christian Keralite students and working nurses. Sharing common linguistic, religious and cultural traditions enabled them to collaborate in household activities such as household chores, cooking regional cuisines and arranging regular prayer meetings. Also it helped working parents fulfil day-to-day demands juggling children and work, because residing close to their church and church friends helped them to cope with the workload. Overall, nine participants in this study who had ethnic church ties lived near their friends and relatives from their communities. George, a Keralite participant, had relatives and friends who were also fellow parishioners located in the suburb of Henderson. He observed: “We decided to buy a house in Henderson, because we had lots of friends in Henderson so while I was working in Waitakere we bought this house and we shifted from Greenlane to Henderson”. Shaji, another Keralite participant, was located in New Lynn. He counted thirty-four family relatives and friends from the Malayali community close to his residence and another thirty-six in the Mt.Roskill area in Auckland. Below figure 7.1 illustrates that all members of Shaji’s co-ethnic network were reported to be from his church.
The pervasiveness of such highly dense co-ethnic networks especially among the Keralites, corroborates the argument in chapter two that people have a tendency to self-select their groups based on the principle of homophily: like attracts like, thus impacting the strength of the relationships between individuals. Such density is regarded as endowing a community with a high degree of stability and solidarity (see DeLanda, 2006, p.57). The networks of the Keralite Christians were larger and denser than the church-based co-ethnic networks of other participants (see networks of Tamil participants in appendix 9). The degree of access and command over resources for day to day needs embedded within these linguistic, regional and religious networks of Keralites and also some of the Gujaratis was quite different from other participants. Their dense networks, where friends of friends and all members knew each other, provided them with a sense of solidarity and high dependence often expressed in the form of personal invitations and sharing of household responsibilities with each other. Indeed, Keralite Christians who reported that ‘there is always someone to help out’ because they had ‘so many people [co-ethnic] around’ tended to indicate that they did not miss home.

Not only did co-ethnic networks support migrants in their early days of arrival, but they also often provided a springboard to a permanent life in New Zealand. In this context, co-ethnics emerged as *reference groups* (Gilchrist & Kaprianou, 2011, p.7), where the attitudes and achievements of the community members influenced newcomers by setting benchmarks for economic mobility. Many participants, especially the Keralites, observed the achievements of a close relative or a friend who was recognised as “well established” in New Zealand. Encouragement and persuasion from these relatives and friends was crucial in guiding them to attain material success and wellbeing. For instance, Shaji, the Keralite discussed above,
illustrated how his relatives and friends in New Zealand offered monetary assistance so he could invest in properties and establish himself in New Zealand. He was offered support by his wife’s maternal uncle who had been living in New Zealand for more than fifteen years. His uncle motivated and supported his buying of a house worth NZ$650 000 in Auckland as he explained:

Like for buying this house, we never thought of buying a house, but he [uncle] constantly kept telling [me] buy this house. He was behind us pushing us to do this. We were not bold enough to go for this house last year. We went for the auction, he came with us for inspecting this place. He also helped us in getting a loan. Today we are happy we bought this, it is now 150 [thousand] more, the value has gone up. […] I bought this property from an auction and I had to give 10 per cent deposit, around [NZ$] 40-50000. So I brought money from India and still was short of money. So he lent it to me and even after that when there was a shortage, relatives were always there to help us out. So money-wise we help each other.

For others it was more common to receive advice and suggestions, rather than direct monetary support, for buying a home and investing in properties in New Zealand.

Overall, co-ethnic networks based on region, language, religion and family connections were significant for all participants. Their desire to engage in such networks for emotional support and for day to day needs such as taking care of each other’s children, giving physical and emotional aid provided the systematic interdependence needed to territorialise such networks. Taking these findings into consideration, we might expect that ‘similarity breeds connection’ and most Indian migrants are embedded and territorialised in co-ethnic-based networks over the long-term. Nevertheless this assumption is contradicted in the discussion below.

**Deterritorialising co-ethnic networks and the question of embeddedness**

The literature suggests that embeddedness in co-ethnic networks and co-ethnic communities pays off in the cooperative and reciprocal exchanges between co-ethnic actors. Relational embeddedness is seen to play a significant role for migrants by encouraging ethnic solidarity and facilitating economic advantages. Such notions of migrant networks are caught up in the classical binary conceptualisation of bridging and bonding networks, with co-ethnic affiliations said to be strong and bonding. In this light, although the above section highlighted the value of being embedded within co-ethnic networks for migrants, Eve (2010) suggests that we cannot simply assume the concentration of such ties to be natural and involuntary. It is also important to understand the multiple types of relationships in which migrants are incorporated at the migration destination (see Morosanu, 2012). Therefore the current section closely examines the phenomena of co-ethnic embeddedness to reveal the complexity of participant embeddedness within intra- and co-ethnic networks, which does not always emanate from positive exchanges. This is likely because interpersonal relations are affected by two antithetical forces – centripetal
and centrifugal – acting against each other (DeLanda, 2006, p.57). Subjected to these forces, migrants do not always gain a sense of belonging among community members, but critically relate with their co-ethnics in complex ways. These lines of struggle within co-ethnic networks are indicated by their cautionary awareness of difficulties within such networks and a desire, at times, to withdraw, distance and detach. This stage, in DeLanda’s (2006, p.28) terms, marks the deterritorialisation of migrants from within their own co-ethnic communities, as individuals move away and reform their networks.

Drawing upon examples that demonstrate how intra-community schisms emerge when migrants confront internal status/class competition and differences in cultural tastes and preferences, I argue that dense co-ethnic networks amongst Indian migrants are not spontaneously created nor are they always inwardly focused. Although migrants initially seek to develop thick bonds within their homophilial co-ethnic community, such dense networks may also have negative implications – triggering internal competitions and fear of ridicule – because of their closed nature (see for example, Coleman, 1988; Portes, 1998). Therefore, while other studies focus on the benefits of migrant embeddedness in the co-ethnic networks for positive gains and economic mobility, the findings here are more ambivalent. That is, migrants chose such networks in the initial phases of settlement based on their linguistic and cultural similarities and based on shared migration trajectories. However, given the internal community tensions and variations in their outlook – as cosmopolitans or ethno-centred transitioners – they break away, or at least distance themselves from such co-ethnic networks at later stages, as these become inconsistent with their values and preferences. Thus I explore how migrant belonging and territorialisation are not uniformly embedded in co-ethnic associates. Figure 7.2 below briefly summarises these findings and suggests how co-ethnic networks are a potential mediating force by both embedding migrants in co-ethnic circles and pushing them away from these circles. This will be further explored with illustrations in the following section.
Figure 7.2: Dynamics of co-ethnic embeddedness
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A propensity to affiliate with intra-ethnic members was widely demonstrated by all participants in this study, who actively searched for friends when they were newly arrived in New Zealand. Participants often made statements similar to those expressed by Kaur - “when I came to New Zealand I always kept on looking, ‘can I find an Indian’” - and Gurpreet, who said “if you see an Indian face, you will be comfortable running to that person and giving a chat, it is a human nature”. Participants initially anticipated a sense of familiarity, warmth and confidence searching for intra-ethnic linkages by going to temples, Indian grocery stores and other places where they might meet other Indians. Later they established networks with members of their own sub-regional linguistic groups because of a desire to communicate in their respective local languages. Benjamin, a Tamil participant said: “…one thing that Indians like to do is to communicate with other people in the same language”. Finding some initial sub-regional-linguistic contacts, participants then later became widely linked through these contacts to
broader co-ethnic networks. For example, Lijomon, a Keralite participant who eagerly engaged with a Malayali network, narrated how he became connected to other Malayalis:

Once when I was coming from school I saw one guy talking on the phone in Malayalam. He was talking to his wife. Every day when he finished his job, before getting into the bus, he would call up his wife and say, ‘make the tea’. So when he reaches home he would get a hot tea. So this guy was calling and I looked at him and asked, ‘are you a Malayali and are you from Kerala?’ And he said, ‘Yeah, come and sit here and talk’. Then I had to get down at my place. So he went to the driver and extended the ticket and took me to his house and I had coffee, dinner and everything and he dropped me back to my place. Then after that he said, ‘If you want you can come and stay with me. There was a guy [a tenant] he left’, […] after that I moved here, and he took me to the Malayali Samajam and all that. He is really a social fellow. He knows a lot of families here, lots of Malayalis because he was here for seven years. […] he introduced me to everyone here; to all the Malayalis. The first family that I know was only through him. This was Thomas chetan [brother]. […] I used to go out with his family and meet the family friends, go to church with them every Sunday.

As stated in chapter four, a desire to find people from one’s regional-linguistic communities propelled participants to become members of their regional associations and religious organisations, and connect widely with fellow co-ethnics. Sometimes these coincidentally functioned as outlets that helped them to re-encounter former school friends, college mates and neighbours from India. Five participants in this study found childhood friends, school and college mates from India through co-ethnic associations. Benjamin, a Tamil participant who found his neighbour from India through Tamil prayer meetings said: “…during these meetings you will end up finding someone who was living just half a kilometre away from your house in India, ‘oh this is the guy’”.

Language certainly brought Indian migrants together in New Zealand. While regional languages represented an important means for forging co-ethnic linkages, multilingual abilities and knowledge of Hindi was vital in developing intra-ethnic networks, broadly connecting them to wider Indian communities than their own regional circles. Participants who engaged more often in mixed Indian gatherings conveyed a sense of relief in knowing Hindi. Bahadur, a Gujarati participant, commented that: “it was all multicultural environments, but I had the peace of mind that I knew Hindi. I would be more comfortable to give an answer to someone or ask help from someone either in Hindi or Gujarati”. Similarly, Grishma, a Kannadiga Maharashtrian, said: “…its instinct I guess, when I come across another Indian, I seem to talk in Hindi”. As Hindi is widely spoken in the northern part of India, almost all of the Punjabi and Gujarati participants declared that their ability to converse in Hindi helped them connect with intra-ethnic friends.
Hindi can be regarded here as a territorialising agent that binds and facilitates interactions between intra-ethnics, yet it was not indisputable for some participants. Some Tamil and Keralites felt their lack of Hindi skills undermined intra-ethnic relations. Such participants expressed that they had been treated with disrespect by the Hindi speakers in their intra-ethnic circles. Jayanti, a Tamil participant said:

So when I came and worked here, people [North Indian colleagues] started asking, ‘Don’t you know Hindi? Don’t you know Hindi? Don’t you feel ashamed? Don’t you feel ashamed?’ […] the way they treat us when we don’t know Hindi is really, really bad. The biggest racism I felt after coming to New Zealand was from Indians rather than from the Kiwis to be frank.

Jayanti’s narrative exemplifies the subtleties involved in the formation of intra-ethnic networks among Indian migrants. The narratives here suggest that although ethnicity based on language, region and nationality can embed Indian migrants in closely knit groups, this cannot be taken for granted. The next section discusses this in detail.

**Co-ethnic schisms and deterritorialisation among Indian migrants**

Although territorialisation involved a coming together of Indian migrants by consolidating co-ethnic identities based on religion, regional and linguistic identities, this section argues that sharing an ‘ethnic’ identity does not necessarily imply a community held together by close social ties (Verrkuyten, 2014). The same density of networks that provide opportunities also constrains members (DeLanda, 2006, p.35). Co-ethnic membership in such a context can be regarded as an identity without a feeling of being bonded to the group (Brubaker, 2004). Differences and divisions were apparent in the Indian communities, particularly in the co-ethnic circles participants were involved in. In some cases, tensions were based on a general dislike of exhibiting a high class and occupational status that was widely prevalent in the Indian communities and in their traditions. Even in the New Zealand context, the choice of occupation and aspirations for mobility were considered primary determinants of participants’ standing within the Indian community. Serine, a Keralite participant, pointed this out by saying: “you know if you are in good job, you have the social reputation and everything, then, if you say something to others there is a value. They will consider. On the other hand, if you don’t have that good job then you are nothing”. Similarly reflecting that occupational success always plays an important role in the co-ethnic community, a Punjabi engineer called Arpit regarded himself today to be “successful” and accomplished in his community. He believed his professional status and class brought compliance and recognition among co-ethnic members whenever he was asked for an advice or support, stating: “I am lead person in my community, in my group of 100-200 people. Success always plays a big role, otherwise why would someone believe in
somebody else?” Given these expectations about attaining economic success, co-ethnic and religious organisations and other social occasions were perceived to be spaces for exhibiting one’s status and for making class comparisons between families and communities. As a result, some participants, especially cosmopolitans, refused to participate in any co-ethnic associations. Aditi, a Gujarati participant whom I categorised as a cosmopolitan, was reluctant to join a co-ethnic association because she felt there were too many divisions in the Gujarati community: “If we join, then people will say oh he is ‘that’ Gujarati. We don’t want to be ‘that’, we just want to be human beings”. Another participant from the Tamil community, Antony, claimed he did not want to belong to any co-ethnic associations because such comparisons narrowed his social circles. He explained:

…even looking at the experience of some friends who finally turned to show their true colours, always been petty minded in finding out how much he is earning and what she is doing, ‘oh you have bought this car, we haven’t bought’ and all that. So we have narrowed our social outreach. […] that is one of the main reasons why we detached ourselves from all these communities, because all these communities become a convenient point of measure of the other – of one’s financial and social status. Instead of really taking them into heart and supporting them intellectually and emotionally to integrate in this country […], mostly people are always talking behind, ‘see when they came they struggled, but now see they have bought their house and everything’. So we feel there is a bit of jealousy in them that they are doing better than us, instead of feeling happier and prouder that our own people have left home and everything, but live successfully. So that is the despicable thing.

While some cosmopolitans refused to partake in such co-ethnic networks, others preferred to simply keep a distance from such internal competitions and politics. In the first section, I demonstrated how co-ethnic homophily and shared experiences help to cement the material and expressive dimension of territorialisation when migrants newly arrive. In this context, while six participants claimed that their comfort within their intra- and co-ethnic networks resulted from having shared the “same journey” and “similar expectations”, the same participants felt such belonging and comfort were not durable in the long run. A Gujarati participant, Sonal, compared and evaluated the ‘bonding’ she felt with her co-ethnic friends with when she newly arrived and now:

So that bonding, Mittal and Neetu they are sort of my struggling friends, also Pranav and a couple of them. We know the struggles we had to survive. Just two plates, we didn’t mind if we had only two take away containers. But now these people have gone to a stage where they have different dinner sets when you have different groups or different people you don’t repeat those dinner sets. They have that bit of going now, because they came at the same time and now it is happening, that rat-race. I think it happens in all communities, but the Gujaratis are now being bitchy, and it’s getting to be bitter and dirty. So we are sort of watching, we don’t want to get into those politics. We feel such a shame, it was a lovely group.

These experiences shows that the bonding that is stabilised earlier may not be sustained in the long run. Unequal class tensions and frictions as migrants settle in New Zealand stimulate
competitions with each other and reluctance distancing from members, disengaging and limiting from further interactions. An individual’s sense of harmony and belonging in the community thus becomes affected.

Visa status was another factor that deterritorialised participants, especially onshore migrants. Five of the eighteen participants who were onshore migrants claimed that a social gap exists between permanent residents and those who are on temporary visas. Johnny, a Keralite participant, perceived a sense of hierarchy while networking within the community through co-ethnic associations. When I asked whether this hierarchy affected his interactions with his co-ethnic members, he agreed explaining:

Yes, it does because we can literally figure it out from their response to us. So if I say ‘hi’ to a student or to someone who is just doing a minimum wage, he will be so pleased to talk to me, but if I say ‘hi’ to a doctor or someone he wouldn’t mind who I am. I have felt it. […] After I got a job it was alright. Then I got phone calls etc. and they like to mingle with me, because I got a pretty secured job and got settled.

This narrative demonstrates that migrants do not have a ready access to co-ethnic networks that facilitates their settling process, as suggested in the literature (Morosanu, 2012; Ryan, 2011).

Johnny stressed that this hierarchy was prevalent “[e]specially in the Malayali community, there is a group which is like ‘I will mingle only with, okay you have BMW or Mercedes, you are manager and you have million dollar house and stuff”. I think it is happening with the Malayali community”. Another Keralite participant, Jessy, reflected: “I think it is more with Malayali people. I don’t know, I have seen it more with Malayali people. Other than that, my other Hindi and Telugu friends, even though they have money they are very down to earth”. Although Johnny and Jessy believed such class and status consciousness existed only in the context of their community, all participants who perceived internal divisions made similar observations that it was present solely within their own respective communities.

However, believing that Indian culture was too materialistic, other participants felt that migration to New Zealand brought some relief from comparisons and competitions between families and friends in India. Mala, a Tamil participant who had been living in New Zealand for fourteen years asserted: “you don’t feel that pressure or competition, you feel a lot more at peace”. The purported egalitarian character of New Zealand society and its relaxed lifestyle decreased the need to exhibit and show off wealth and financial status among participants, even if they attained better economic mobility and class positions. Mala, for instance, progressed gradually from being a sales assistant to a managerial position, yet she pointed out that even
today she has the same standard of living as she had fourteen years ago. Feeling relaxed about her financial position away from her co-ethnic community, she commented: “I feel there is more equality and there is no competition, there is no, ‘oh my God I need this posh car because my neighbour has this BMW and I need one’. You don’t feel that pressure or competition”.

Fear of gossip within community circles also deterrioralised participants from their co-ethnic networks. News about broken promises and any form of gossip “travel[s] fast” in such networks (DeLanda, 2006, p.35). This is because when networks are dense, they are likely to enforce conformity on its members to adhere to the collective expectations and norms (Portes, 1998). As an enforcement mechanism, violation of such expectations in networks may see non-conformists subject to ridicule and criticism. Fearing such consequences Kamaljit, a Punjabi participant, distanced himself from his community saying he was: “…not a member of any Indian associations. Just that I wanted to keep myself away from all the leg pulling and all the grinding of me […] I keep hiding from people; I am scared of being a topic of gossip”.

As indicated in chapter four, the differences between participants were often based on their cosmopolitan outlook and lifestyles. Sometimes cosmopolitans even expressed cultural shock when they interacted with co-ethnic associates who differed significantly in cultural tastes and preferences. For instance, Seema, a Punjabi participant, felt perplexed when she met her husband’s friends, who were equally surprised by her language skills and etiquette. She described her interaction with these friends:

In two months, my husband made a lot of friends so everybody was very kind to come and say ‘hello’ to me, it was very nice. Even in an unknown place I was being welcomed by everyone. Everybody was shocked because I could speak good English. It was quite funny because it was natural to me. ‘Oh she speaks good English’, and then I thought, ‘oh my God okay’, and then at that time I had short hair, I had a cutting. Then they said, ‘oh my God she wears pants okay’, these are my Indian friends telling me. So then I thought, ‘from a very corporate culture you’ve come into a rural culture’. That was a big shock for me. In Delhi, I would be wearing a backless blouse and here I need to cover myself all the more; it was my first culture shock – my own Indian people!

The above narrative illustrates that, although participants felt initially welcomed into community circles, they did not always identify with the behaviour and attitudes of their own co-ethnic members. As such, they moved into social circles that better matched their lifestyle, outlook, interests, career aspirations and educational backgrounds. Thus their networks were not merely confined to co-ethnic regional, linguistic, religious sub-groups, as the literature might suggest. Yet not all participants shared similar views. Some transitioners commented that they had not experienced such divisions and competitions, assuming it was because they were
better connected, having prior networks before they arrived. Others associated such experiences with onshore migrants who arrived as students thinking that they generally live in the central city and did not get a chance to meet with their co-ethnic associates who were permanent residents in New Zealand.

These findings question the idea of co-ethnic embeddedness in the migration literature, suggesting the need to decouple ‘ethnicity’ and embeddedness of migrants and to challenge the assumption that migrant embeddedness will bring positive gains. While co-ethnic networks may provide the material and expressive support needed to reconstitute ‘home’ for Indian migrants, such networks were not uniformly embraced nor were they always enduring in the long run. Uneven class and visa statuses and a lack of empathy and stability deterritorialised Indian migrants from their co-ethnic associates. These internal community tensions highlight the need for a nuanced exploration of membership and belonging in such networks.

**Reterritorialised co-ethnic networks**

When deterritorialised, participant networks were reterritorialised in some way by migrants seeking out other co-ethnic affiliations that provided them with the stability they needed. Religious networks were particularly important in this context, allowing some participants to regain stability through co-ethnic affiliations after having experienced divisions and discrepancies. As noted by a Keralite participant, Serine, religious networks helped bypass her hesitation about being involved in co-ethnic networks because of the community divisions based on years of residence, employment, socio-economic and visa status that were described above. As such, I describe these newly emerging co-ethnic networks as those that are reterritorialised.

Such reterritorialised networks were not always new, but at times became modified sufficiently to restore the stability that was lost. As mentioned earlier, frustrated by tensions within their existing co-ethnic networks, some participants searched for more specific networks, based on language, regional based and religious affiliations with the latter being particularly common. Sonal a Gujarati Jain, initially approached a Gujarati Hindu temple in Auckland to connect with co-ethnic associates from her regional linguistic group. She found there were other type of Gujaratis who attended this temple but was disenchanted by the dominance of one caste group within this circle whom she found to be close knit and not inclusive: “they would not believe in any one else and they always think little of the others”. However, she then found a Jain temple
and other Gujarati Jains through these initial connections. Although she initially felt satisfied finding the Gujarati Jain community, she later experienced a tension between Gujarati Jains from Ahmedabad and Baroda (in Gujarat) and Gujarati Jains from Bombay (in Maharashtra). She reflected upon the gaps between the two, stating:

… the temple is meant for Jains but the people who have built it is all from Baroda or from Ahmedabad so they have got the ownership so the trustees the decision making everything it involves only them. They are Jains but they are from Ahmadabad. So it is regional, if there is anything happening they would want to give a chance to another Ahmadabad and not to a Bombayite.

Moreover, not knowing the rituals in these temples – since she did not know the written Gujarati language – she stated: “we didn’t feel very welcomed and I stopped going”. But then: “I found a Bombay person who is also a Jain and then we started going [to the temple] together. That helped me feel more comfortable and then I started knowing people”. With the help of this new friend, she began regularly attending the temple and gained the acceptance of even those who came from Ahmedabad and Baroda, acknowledging that she may have misunderstood them because she has since “realised that they are all friendly and that they do become close”. In the realm of assemblage theory, interpersonal networks exist in populations and interactions among members of the populations leads to the formation of coalitions and alliances that increases the territorialising effects on interpersonal networks (DeLanda, 2006, p.59). This in effect was what Sonal did, creating an alliance with Gujarati Jain Bombayites that helped her correct her view of perceived frictions within the community. This also highlights that the process of territorialisation can result from “changes in the repertoire of contention”. (DeLanda, 2006, p.61). A switch from discontent towards more strategic, long term and enduring network relations brought emotional and psychological gains and this transformed and expanded Sonal’s networks.

Some participant networks were further reterritorialised through their children. For instance, some Sikh and Jain participants whom I identified as cosmopolitans had children who “have blended so well into the Kiwi culture” and were widely connected inter-ethnically. Realising they wished them to be exposed to a religious upbringing, the participants reterritorialised co-ethnic networks for the sake of children. As a Sikh participant, Kaur indicated: “My son has some Kiwi friends and now he is urging to cut his hair, which we can’t. So then we will need to make Indian friends who will not encourage him to cut his hair.” Others also felt that their children were not getting adequate exposure to traditional Sikh customs from existing networks and therefore deliberately searched for people who were religious to help children become aware of Sikh values and traditions. This did not represent a break away from their previous
networks but rather saw them constitute new, additional linkages. For example, participation in ethno-religious networks was considered important for sustaining a distinct Sikh identity and dietary restrictions. Participants eagerly described getting their children involved in the *gurdwaras* [Sikh temples] during the weekends and on special occasions, such as Guru Nanak’s birthday and in *Samagams* [fellowship camp-meeting], involving 20-30 families. As Sonia said: “I am confident that they have developed their base now”.

For some participants, reterritorialisation was a form of coping strategy that was necessary even when participants preferred to stay away from their co-ethnic communities. For instance, Benjamin, a Tamil Protestant, complained that his co-ethnic community had intervened too much in discussing his occupation and earnings, recalled a situation where he was offered support when his wife needed it:

> When my wife was diagnosed with terminal illness and had very little time to live they [church members] passed on the news to a lot of people and people started coming to my house to pray. The Tamil Christian fellowship started coming almost every day to pray. One day when my wife wanted to spend the last few days in India, and I was the only person working I didn’t have enough money to make the trip, because it was my daughter, my wife, my mother-in-law and I had no clue what to do. Plus, since we were living in a proper house we had to put everything in storage and everything involved money. That was the time I had moved from a temping role to a permanent role. So actually, I was making ends meet with the wages I got every week, but never asked them or never did I tell this to anybody. I was personally helped by one of my relatives so we booked the tickets and we were supposed to leave the next day. The previous night the Tamil Christian Fellowship people came; they wanted to come and say a prayer, that’s what we thought. End of the prayer, they handed a cover to my wife which had this cash in it.

As demonstrated in previous studies (for example Ebaugh & Chafetz, 2002; Leeuw, 2007), community church linkages can be critical in migration, not only offering much needed assistance but also a sense of belonging in New Zealand.

For others, reterritorialisation meant that they had regained their class status sufficiently that they now felt comfortable reconnecting with co-ethnic networks. A Keralite participant, Naren, said he was looked down upon as a cleaner by his community during his initial years of settlement in New Zealand. But he regained his social status after becoming an entrepreneur. Not only did he accumulate the prestige and recognition he wanted from co-ethnic associates but he also hired some of the people who had looked down upon him previously. In this context, he stated: “the people who looked down at you are working for you. I don’t think there is anything else that can pamper your ego better”.
A sense of stability thus meant different things for my participants; for some, class status
deterritorialised them from co-ethnics, for others it stimulated reterritorialisation. But they all
desired a restoration of the stability they lost when faced by tensions or divisions within their
networks. Participants in this way demonstrated a capacity to cope with frictions and to both
actively territorialise and reterritorialise networks when needed. What their networks thus
become in essence was based on a critical reflection of the present networks and of their
experiences within them. Or, as DeLanda (2006, p.10) argues, participants attempt to modify
that which “triggers attention, thought and behaviour” within their networks.

**Cosmopolitan sociability, civic engagement and wider reach through religious networks**

In chapter four, I noted that religion influences the capacities of migrants to participate in inter-
ethnic relations. Building on this, and also extending the discussion of how religious networks
helped Indian migrants to be reterritorialised, this section illustrates that religious based
engagement brought not only a sense of inclusion within their co-ethnic communities, but also
a broader connectivity to wider society. I draw on examples offered by cosmopolitans, since
they most commonly made such observations. This discussion provides further evidence that
challenges the commonly held notion that co-ethnic embeddedness is associated with less inter-
ethnic mingling and less integration into the host society (see for example Güngör et al., 2011;
Sumption, 2009). This may be because studies of migrant religious participation tend to focus
on ethnic based networks (see Cadgde & Ecukland, 2007) with inter-ethnic contact through
religion less explored (Malliepaard, 2012).

Participants provided different examples of the way religious organisations offered
opportunities for inter-ethnic interactions. Often in this context, Christian participants
acknowledged that they either attended mainstream English churches or that their co-ethnic
churches were bilingual. A Tamil participant, Leema, regularly attended a mainstream
Protestant church: “I am part of St. George’s church for the past 10 years, and I am probably
one of the few Indians who go there. I think it’s only one or two families who are Indians and
the rest all Kiwis”. Other Tamil participants pointed out that Tamil churches were bilingual,
making them more inclusive of other New Zealanders as well. Churches provided different
opportunities to train their members to perform various roles and participants felt: ‘that it is nice
to actually come together to not just worship, but to get to know people’. Benjamin, a Tamil
participant, indicated this saying: “I know mostly all of them [inter-ethnic friends] from the
church I have been going for 10 years”. Because the Tamil church services were held only once
a month, participants helped to organise the sermons and shared lunches following the sermons. Florien pointed out this collaborative effort in the Tamil church community where members from India, Sri Lanka, Fiji and Malaysia took responsibility for co-ordinating the church activities:

Not much of hard work is required, but just to ensure that on the particular day everything goes well. Everybody is there and take responsibility towards it. Everybody picks up one work. Someone will pick up the choir and someone will take care of the mails and communication…

Participants who had been living in Auckland for some years, by virtue of their years of settlement in New Zealand and educational and economic positions, thus noted how they had taken on various roles in initiating religious activities and support for the community. Apart from administrative works some volunteered by preparing communal lunches during the bible classes that were run by their churches. Leema illustrated this saying, “so let’s say if 60-70 people registered, dinner is served. So I just offered to cook for one week I just do the mains. The salads and the desserts the church will serve and they [inter-ethnic members] bring bread. So I make curry or whatever”.

Similar contributions and voluntary services were also mentioned by the Sikh participants. For Sikhs, Gurdwaras were not only important for satisfying their religious needs and building Sikh networks, but are also known to promote civic ideals and skills among migrants and their children (Thapan, 2013). Sikh tradition explicitly encourages the inclusion of all, Sikhs and non-Sikhs alike (Fleuret, 1974). This is partly achieved through the practice of a “24 hour free” community kitchen in the gurdwaras, popularly called langar. Participants donated money, communally cooked and served food at langars, to both fellow Sikhs in the community and others wishing to participate from outside the community. As Gurpreet explained: “It is an open kitchen where everything in the kitchen is donated and we serve anybody, irrespective of who the person is, because the survival is for food.” Baldev also noted that at a langar: “My kids we do a lot of seva [service], which is service as a part of our religion. Washing utensils, giving food […], even our white friends they come with us. So that is good”. Thus consistent with research on the Indian Sikh community in Italy (Thapan, 2013), Sikh participants in this study believed that gurdwaras encouraged not only participation and linkages within the Sikh community, but more broadly.

Religious networks also engaged participants in various other forms of voluntary work, such as teaching English to elderly migrants, coordinating art classes for kids and arranging special cultural programs for the elders and youth. Similar to the Sikh and Tamil cosmopolitans, other
participants from the cosmopolitan group were often involved in such civic responsibilities and voluntary initiatives. For example, Grishma said, “I always volunteer to go out and talk about survival cancer testing, I talk about mammograms. I am not shy about spreading the word and ensuring people come through”. Thus participants demonstrated a sense of moral responsibility for the wellbeing of all co-ethnic and wider inter-ethnic community members alike.

Weiner (1978) observes that it is ‘natural’ to want to live in a familiar locality where migrants can share the same language, culture, buy familiar food, read newspapers in their vernacular, attend temples and avoid the discomfort and hostility of an ‘alien’ culture. Co-ethnic networks did provide Indian migrants with this kind of familiarity and support. Still, in the midst of existing tensions in the community, these networks often became deterritorialised and some participants actively avoided members of their co-ethnic community, at least for some time. Ethno-religious networks in particular were used to reterritorialise co-ethnic networks by enabling Indian migrants to gain the assistance or sense of belonging they sought. Perhaps more surprisingly, such ethno-religious engagement also provided opportunities for wider civic engagement with the host society. Migrant social networks thus form a complex rhizome of multiple threads and irregular lines of articulation that together form a larger assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988, p.4–25).

**Summary**

The main aim of this chapter was to understand how co-ethnic networks are a means for social integration at the community level and what community dynamics prevail within co-ethnic networks. It is clear that migrant interpersonal networks are subject to a variety of centripetal and centrifugal forces that are the main sources of their territorialisation and deterritorialisation. Examining the co-ethnic networks that were integrative and that which territorialised migrants belonging in co-ethnic communities, it is evident that homophily based on region, language and religion impacts the creation and inclusion in co-ethnic networks. Solidarity was expressed though concerted action and mutual support, which in turn needed special capacities for territorialisation to happen. The salience of these capacities was demonstrated through the material and emotional support provided by co-ethnic networks. These were unavoidably homophilial and dense; although we might consider this to embed migrants into their co-ethnic circles, as the literature suggests, it is also evident that solidarity and territorialisation in these networks did not always prevail. Indian migrants were pulled in different directions as the
networks they engaged in produced conflicts in their interests and purposes. Co-ethnic networks thus opened and closed to co-ethnic associates in unpredictable ways.

Centrifugal forces – such as a lack of enduring stability in networks in the long run, internal status competitions, language tensions among intra-ethnic associates, a lack of permanent status, fear of gossip and dissimilarities within the co-ethnic community – deterritorialised Indian migrants from their co-ethnic networks. As such, this chapter suggests that studying migrant communities and ethnic embeddedness is not merely about representing their properties, but entails understanding the lines that articulate their territorialisation and deterritorialisation with each other. By this we can come to know the varying processes by which their networks synchronise and swerve while seeking integration within co-ethnic communities and broader New Zealand society.

Moreover, Indian migrants established newer networks and modified existing ones. I called this process reterritorialisation as it entailed maintaining a distance from some co-ethnic associates and bringing “changes in the repertoires of contention” (DeLanda, 2006, p.61). This needed innovative capacities to restore an individual’s sense of stability during times of crisis and when their status was undermined in the co-ethnic community. An important site of co-ethnic affiliation in this context were religious organisations, where divisions appeared to be less common. Analysis of religious networks also revealed that religious networks were not isolated and closed but often provided opportunities to responsively engage and integrate Indian migrants in the wider community and society (Thapan, 2013). The next chapter focuses on this process of societal integration among Indian migrants in more detail.
Chapter Eight

Inter-ethnic networks as pathways to societal integration

Introduction

While the last chapter focused on community integration, this chapter considers societal integration by examining the participation and belonging achieved via inter-ethnic networks. As noted in chapter four when mapping the network structures of participants from the four Indian communities, some Indian migrants demonstrate useful capacities when plugged into a new network. In particular, many Indian migrants possess an important capacity for cosmopolitan sociability that emerged from their experiences in India and propels network diversity in the migration context. Based on this capacity, discussion revealed two different types of migrants – those exposed to the multilingual and ethnic diversity in India (‘cosmopolitans’, n=32/43) and those who, coming from a more homogeneous background, lacked this exposure (‘transitioners’, n=11/43). The current chapter explores how this sociability helped participants engage in inter-ethnic networks in New Zealand and arguably gain a greater sense of belonging within society than the transitioners. Table 8.1 provides an overview of how cosmopolitans and transitioners differed from each other in their levels of interactions and inter-ethnic integration.

Table 8.1: A spectrum of integrative characteristics of Indian migrants in New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitioners (Passive Integrators)</th>
<th>Cosmopolitans (Active Integrators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants from small and less diverse towns and cities who remained largely in co-ethnic circles</td>
<td>Migrants from large and culturally diverse cities who held a sense of cosmopolitan sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessed generalised identities as “Indians” and “Kiwi-Indians” but tended to prioritise their sub-regional, religious linguistic identities etc.</td>
<td>Held mixed identities as Kiwi-Punjabi-Indian yet were vocal about their co-ethnic identities, holding strong loyalties to both their “mother country” and to their host society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledged a desire for integrative opportunities</td>
<td>Articulated individual accountability for integrative opportunities and were proactive in trying to move beyond co-ethnic communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Felt comfortable expressing their intra- and co-ethnic identities
Were open to change

Expressed cultural relativity and consciousness e.g. did not perceive that inter-ethnic differences matter in personal relationships

Were co-ethnocentric, withdrawn and comfort driven (co-ethnic community perceived as a comfort zone)

Initiated inter-ethnic interconnections unconsciously despite inter-ethnic stereotypes and labour market challenges

Being withdrawn, did not face as much inter-ethnic hostility as cosmopolitans

Adopted ways to cope with inter-cultural challenges encountering hostility or non-acceptance either by vocalising and addressing inter-ethnic issues or by selectively distancing and avoiding possible inter-ethnic clashes. Also held get-togethers and celebrations with inter- and intra-community members

Indicated some efforts to repair inter-ethnic relations

Held meaningful inter-ethnic networks which were non-instrumental and interdependent

Family and economic wellbeing were primary goals

Had broad world views. Co-ethnic identity was often expressed without articulating a need for in-group loyalty or boundaries

Distanced themselves from non-cosmopolitan co-ethnics and other dissimilar Indians

Appreciated multiculturalism

Accepted diversity and tolerance

Possessed multiple non-conflicting identities

Yuval-Davis (2011, p.12) notes that belonging can be constructed through: social locations (sex, race, class or nation); identifications and emotional attachments to various collectivities and groupings told through the narratives people tell about who they are; and the ethical and political value systems with which people judge their own and others’ belonging. All three domains are important but the focus here is largely on how inter-ethnic relationships facilitate migrant identification and attachment to a collective group (that is New Zealand or New Zealanders) and thus affect a migrant’s sense of belonging and identity in New Zealand. Interview questions asked participants about the nature and extent of their inter-ethnic networks, identifying where these networks were established and how they were used to exchange different types of support. Participants were also asked about their perceptions of such inter-ethnic exchanges, inter-ethnic trust and how both shaped their sense of identity and belonging in New Zealand (see figure 1.1 of chapter one). Moreover, they were asked what challenges they confronted and how they overcame such challenges in inter-ethnic networks.
Drawing on such data, the first section of this chapter considers the issue of identification, highlighting that a majority of both transitioners and cosmopolitans expressed a desire to be a ‘New Zealander’ and, in most cases, used this identity to describe themselves. DeLanda’s (2006, p.15) concept of territorialisation is again useful, for discussion highlights how some forms of engagement encourage positive inter-ethnic relations and encourage a New Zealand identity, while others do not and are thus considered deterritorialising. Importantly, cosmopolitans and transitioners responded differently to negative inter-ethnic relations, with the latter tending to withdraw rather than challenge misperceptions or misunderstandings as the cosmopolitans did. DeLanda (2006, p.51) discusses how capacities have the potential to be augmented through a combination of skills. Notably, the second half of this chapter illustrates how cosmopolitans are more open not only to a broader range of connections but also to the possibility of being affected, thus adjusting responses to better adapt to New Zealand culture and peoples as well as to positively affect inter-ethnic relations. However, the chapter argues that becoming integrated in inter-ethnic networks is not the product of migrant capacities alone. Migrants do not exist as “atoms outside a social context” (Granovetter, 1985, p.487) and host society views can both support and challenge migrant identities as New Zealanders.

**Who am I? Multiple identities in a post-migration context**

How individuals become members of a network is related to their sense of identity in relation to group members (DeLanda, 2006, p.93; Hogg et al., 1985). Identity, in turn, involves the narratives and the stories that people tell about themselves and others about who they are (Yuval-Davis, 2011). DeLanda (2006, p.15) regards these narratives or words as consolidating the effects of territorialisation. Loyalty to a group, being accepted as a member of a group, being proud of one’s group, feeling responsible for the activities of the group, involvement and being interested in the wellbeing of the group members are important indicators of such identity and belonging (Sackman et al., 2003). Thus participants were asked where they gained a sense of being ‘home’, whether they called themselves a ‘New Zealander’ (and, if so, why), how they were perceived by others (and whether this was the same within inter-ethnic networks compared to co-ethnic networks).

This section highlights that, not surprisingly, Indian migrants held multiple identities, with the importance of each shifting in different contexts. As noted, all participants (whether a cosmopolitan or a transitioner) perceived themselves as a New Zealander. They linked this to their citizenship status, years of residence in New Zealand and, notably, participation in inter-
ethnic networks. However, this New Zealander identity was more precarious for some participants. Half of all of the participants indicated that their primary identity was always ‘Indian’ and, although both transitioners and cosmopolitans were part of this group, there were significant differences as to why an Indian identity was so important to them.

Transitioners, such as Yogender said: “I am an Indian. A person outside looking at us will obviously think we are Indians”. George reinforced this point when noting “by seeing, anybody can say I am an Indian”, while Priya stated “[t]alking to another Kiwi, I would say, ‘I am an Indian’”, highlighting that in a co- or intra-ethnic context she might do otherwise. Thus their sense of Indianness was shaped by how others outside the Indian community tended to see them and this was most often based on their skin colour.

In contrast, cosmopolitans tended to embrace an Indian identity because they were not afraid of expressing a strong sub-regional, religious or linguistic identity, even in intra-ethnic contexts. Kamaljit, a Punjabi Sikh, indicated that, on balance, his primary identity: “is more of Indian, because if I was wearing my turban or something then it would be Punjabi, but I am liberal. I don’t wear turban and I eat meat”. Jessy, a Keralite, also referred to an Indian identity as allowing a kind of pan-Indian inclusiveness: “I like being known as an Indian, because I have other ethnic friends as well, Indians but from other states speaking Tamil, Hindi, Punjabi and Telugu. I am close with those friends”.

There were also significant differences in the way transitioners and cosmopolitans explained why they felt like a New Zealander. Transitioners tended to mention their legal status; for instance Manish referred to his New Zealand passport and the years he had resided in New Zealand. In contrast, cosmopolitans referred to hyphenated identities – “Indian in New Zealand”, “Indo-Kiwan”, “Indian-Kiwi”, “Kiwi-Punjabi-Indian” and “Marathi-Indian-Kiwi” – that suggested being a New Zealander was not their only identity but nonetheless a significant aspect of who they were. Kamaljit reflected on this, saying:

It is mixed now. I am a Kiwi-Punjabi-Indian, because you are not the same person when you came here. There are certain things that has now been embedded in me living in this society that, if I go back, I will not be able to adjust with the way things will be done there. Similarly, I am not fully into the things done here, because I have lived so many years there. So it is a mix and match kind of thing.

Grishma, who identified herself as a Marathi-Indian-Kiwi, also reflected on her identity as a “mixed breed” not fully belonging to any one group. She pondered:
I am on a cusp, I am on the border – I am not too traditional, since I didn’t have an arranged wedding. So culturally I am a mixed breed. I was a kind of half Gujarati, half South Indian, half Marathi mixture. So I don’t fully belong in to any of those groups, nor am I fully Western, in the sense that I don’t wear a skirt you know, I am not used to that kind. Intellectually and emotionally, I can, but culturally I am not that fully Western. If you know what I mean, so I am a mixed. I am not either this side or that side.

Closer analysis reveals that these hyphenated understandings of self were shaped to some degree by the cosmopolitans’ willingness to engage in inter-ethnic networks when compared to transitioners. For instance, when asked to rank which identity they considered to be most important, all transitioners named their sub-regional/linguistic identities first, often because – as Shaji notes – “there is not so much interaction with other ethnic community”. Network analysis supports the view that such identities were the most important to transitioners because they were reinforced through everyday co-ethnic activities and networks. Although some cosmopolitans named their sub-regional/linguistic identity first because this was extremely important to retain their roots, many others related more closely with New Zealand values. The following discussion indicates why this is the case and, since this phenomenon was apparent only within the cosmopolitan group, there is no similar discussion for transitioners.

**Affiliation with Kiwi values**

Five of the cosmopolitans did not want to identify as Indian because they felt strongly that they were “Kiwis” and closely connected to the “Kiwi way of life”. They defined this as being very open to multi-culturalism, non-judgemental, social, friendly, easy going, casual and “not too hung up”. For instance, Jason, a Tamil participant who had more Māori and Pākehā than Indian friends in his network, identified himself as being more Kiwi than Indian. He stated:

> I have always been an Indian, but there are lots of beliefs and there are lots an idealised Indian will do, but it is not the way I do it. So I don’t feel Indian in that way. I feel like an Indian person, but in my head and in my heart I do things more Kiwi, and that is only because I have come over here, and I have actually seen them doing things that’s more me. So as a person, I agree with that way of life and that sort of ethical look on life compared to all that I have seen all my life in India before.

> So attacking it from a different angle, I would say that I don’t connect with Indians, because I can’t connect with them on that sort of a level. That’s why I don’t have that many Indians in my network, because they either annoy me in some way or they are just hard to handle. Maybe because these people I don’t really look up to. When I am amongst my friend group, I am like an Indian on a jihad.

Another Tamil participant, Benjamin, also distanced himself from his Tamil and Indian community, claiming he was more Kiwi than Indian or Tamil. He stated: “I identify myself as a Kiwi, even though my skin colour is not Kiwi.” Thus unlike the transitioners above, he did not let host society views of his identity based on this skin colour shape his own view about
himself. Instead, as is common amongst migrants, he too selectively defined himself based on his experiences and the consistency of his personal values and beliefs with a reference group (Gilchrist & Kaprianou, 2011). In these cases, the Kiwi way of life was the frame of reference, and a New Zealand identity was preferred after unfavourable experiences and encounters in India and with Indians. Ignoring possible host society perceptions of him as Indian’ meant Benjamin experienced a sense of belonging to mainstream New Zealand society not shared by the transitioners.

**New Zealander identity not a substitute for Indian and co-ethnic identities**

While almost all participants in some ways felt their identities were changing and being redefined since their arrival in New Zealand, it is significant that cosmopolitans were also more likely to express stronger preferences for retaining their national, regional and religious identities than transitioners. In some cases this was because of the time spent living in India compared to New Zealand and sometimes because of the inherent importance of a linguistic or religious identity to the participant but, importantly, articulation and expression of these preferences did not affect their belonging to New Zealand. These findings are in line with Schiller et al. (2011) and Morosanu’s (2012) study of Romanians in the U.K. As noted in chapter two, cosmopolitanism and rootedness are not separate and cosmopolitan participants were able to fluidly shift between and endorse a strong sense of Indian, sub-regional/linguistic/religious and New Zealand identities. As noted by Eriksen (2012, p.5), strong sub-regional/linguistic/religious identities do not preclude cultural mixing. Cosmopolitan participants showed a willingness to grapple with their differing identities and an ability to belong to the multiple groups with which they identified themselves. This played out differently depending on the particular participant, but a sense that New Zealand was now ‘home’ was a common theme. For instance, Manpreet, who had previously identified herself as “very Indian”, clarified: “after saying so much about being Indian, I would still call New Zealand my home”. For Leema, a Tamil, this strong sense of belonging in New Zealand was tied to both positive experiences and the personal sense of commitment she had made to the country:

> Last ten years I have had various experiences, but I am proud to say, I call this home rather than my country back in India. I strongly disagree with anybody coming and telling me there is racism here. People here are just lovely, too good, I have picked up so many traits. I am proud to say my kids are more Kiwis than Indians. It’s not that I don’t like my mother country or anything like that. But it’s that I don’t see myself going back and settling down there in India. I rather die here, I will be happy to die here.

Gurpreet, a Punjabi Sikh participant who articulated a loyalty to both countries, summed up:
For me, I would respect my mother country where I was born. For my kids I am not very sure. I am a strong country woman. I can’t betray that mother where I was born and who nurtured me for so many years. And definitely, I would never like to betray my second mother who is nurturing me now.

These narratives illustrate the argument that cosmopolitans saw no problem in maintaining strong sub-regional/linguistic/religious or even Indian identities while also feeling integrated and as if they belonged in New Zealand. Participants embraced parallel and multiple identities, often unconsciously switching between them, because this enabled them to easily ‘fit in’ and connect with any network and positively adapt to the context in which they found themselves. This switching was facilitated by the openness to diversity and difference noted as a characteristic of cosmopolitans in chapter four. Manpreet, a Sikh early childhood teacher, for instance, said “[w]e are still learning more to be a Kiwi” yet:

I am working with people from different walks of life. I always celebrate Matariki [Māori New Year] at my centre and I was the first one who ever did it. I have learnt a lot of Māori songs. Many Kiwi16 ladies, they object to it saying ‘we don’t agree with it. You have to do it’, but I am very welcoming and I have no objections. Anybody’s language I am more than happy to learn if I can with whatever time I have.

Such openness and flexibility, however, did not mean that cosmopolitans had not faced any challenges while living in New Zealand. Labour market exclusion, which was discussed in chapter six, re-emerged as a topic during conversation about identities with participants noting a widespread perception among New Zealanders that migrants are “taking away their jobs” and this resulted in fear, anxiety, lack of openness and depth in inter-ethnic relationships. However, cosmopolitans were more likely than transitioners to depersonalise such perceptions and were often able to do so by drawing on experiences gained through their inter-ethnic networks. A Gujarati participant, Aditi, recalled a conversation with an older Pākehā Kiwi friend who explained why New Zealanders might feel threatened by migration:

…life suddenly changed, because before 2002 they [the friend] used to work in Countdown or some grocery store or petrol station. If the boss becomes too bossy, then they would say, ‘I am not coming from tomorrow onwards’. That was easy for them; they would find another job in Countdown, Pak n Save and so on, for the same $10 or $11 minimum wages. So she [friend] was telling me, ‘but now our positions have changed when you people have come to New Zealand. Today I can’t leave my job, because I am not certain I will get the same job. Nowadays I can’t tell my boss, I will not do this. If my boss wants me to stay back till six, I have to’. I was a new immigrant at that time and she was telling me, ‘this is our position, you people have changed our situation’.

---

16 Participants used the term “Kiwi” generally referring to the Pākehā New Zealanders or the NZ Europeans who constitute the majority (74 per cent) of the population in New Zealand (see for example, Statistics New Zealand 2013).
Nonetheless, it remains that almost all participants had heard statements about migrants “taking away jobs” and nearly fifty percent of the cosmopolitans voiced concerns about New Zealanders feeling insecure about new migrants. Gurpreet, who had faced numerous rejections for job applications, felt there was a lack of trust demonstrated towards migrants and that blocked labour market opportunities. In this context, she commented that “Kiwis take more time” to trust migrants than Indians take to trust New Zealanders. Their narratives demonstrated how a lack of reciprocity and distance affected them practically in their day-to-day life. There were accounts of neighbourhood attacks, religious intolerances and workplace harassments. Aditi, for instance, narrated how her Kiwi neighbours were unresponsive when she experienced a physical attack in the following way:

We were living not very far away from here. Around 11 o’clock we came home. My mother-in-law was here, and I just gave birth to the little one just eight days ago, so imagine my condition. We came back from our friend’s house we had our dinner there and my mother-in-law and elder one went inside the house. He [husband] and me we were sitting in the car talking about something and we saw a boy crossing by our drive way. This was the first house and the second house belonged to some other person, and in the middle was the car porch. So we parked the car and we saw this person going by. Then he was standing there, he didn’t know we were sitting in the car. Then my husband went to him and asked, ‘whom do you want?’ He replied, “I want Jeremy’. We know there is no Jeremy living there, but he [husband] knocked and asked, ‘is there any Jeremy living here? This man is looking for Jeremy’. And those Kiwis said, ‘there is no Jeremy’ and shut the door. Then it was a danger for us, because our house was the first one. So he asked him again, ‘there is no Jeremy, why are you here?’, and he started hitting him. He directly hit him on the face and he fell – he was on the ground. Then I started calling the police, and this man, he hit me. So my mobile actually went off and I started shouting calling out for my mother-in-law and elder one. So this man came to know that there is someone in the house and they will come out so he ran away, but the neighbours they were Kiwis; they were looking from the window, but no one came out.

Six participants reported some form of physical assault either personally experienced or that had occurred to friends. Two regarded Indian migrants, especially dairy owners and international students, as “soft targets” in Auckland for being robbed and vulnerable to physical assaults. These narratives indicates why embeddedness within co-ethnic networks was perceived as necessary by Indian migrants and why almost half of the cosmopolitans asserted that social integration needed to be a two-way process.

But, once again, they were able to also see the situation from the host society members’ perspective. Although participants noted that their initiative in inviting and conversing with their inter-ethnic neighbours to try and build relationships was not widely welcomed nor reciprocated, some pointed out that this may be because Pākehā New Zealanders have strong preferences to reside among their own group, just as many Indians do. Sonal noted:
This colony [neighbourhood] had so many Kiwis, but one after the other as Indians bought a house one Kiwi would leave. Indian bought a house, another Kiwi would go. So my colleague, Emily said [...] that ‘we don’t want to wake up and go to our balcony and watch an Indian or an Asian face. In the morning when we wake up, we want to see our own people. Green Bay, Little Huia, Titirangi that’s our area. This [Fruitvale] is all Asian area.’ So she suggested that when, one [daughter] was coming from Germany and she didn’t have an idea where to buy a house.

This awareness that preferences to reside in areas where homophilial affiliations exist are applicable universally to all groups, irrespective of migrant status, once again enabled cosmopolitans to depersonalise negative inter-ethnic experiences in New Zealand. Along with their greater ability to shift between multiple and fluid identities, this set them in contrast with the transitioners who tended to take any negative interactions with host society members more personally and thus retreat more within their co-ethnic communities. This is somewhat similar to Fozdra and Hartley’s (2013) Australian findings with refugees which suggest that notions of ethno-belonging (as opposed to civic-belonging) were associated with perceptions of how ‘mainstream’ Australians saw them. The following section examines in greater detail the multiple capacities drawn upon by cosmopolitans that enabled them to engage in inter-ethnic networks to a greater degree than transitioners and, as a result, feel more integrated within New Zealand society.

What territorialised the inter-ethnic networks of cosmopolitans?

As explained in earlier chapters, territorialisation is a process that binds Indian migrants within a given network. In exploring what territorialises Indian migrants in their inter-ethnic networks, I argue that cosmopolitan sociability – that is, forms of competence and skills to create social relations of inclusiveness and openness to the world (Schiller et al., 2011, p.402) – is central to this territorialisation process. To discuss the competence and skills of Indian migrants, I draw on a selection of examples of the different ways cosmopolitans and transitioners stabilised their networks. However, given cosmopolitans were really the only participants who engaged in inter-ethnic networks, this section largely focuses on them and how they put their capacity for cosmopolitan sociability into play to affect and repair the problems within inter-ethnic relations and thus gain a strong sense of belonging and integration within New Zealand.

Perceptions of societal integration

There were marked differences in the level of societal integration that cosmopolitans and transitioners felt they had achieved in New Zealand. Generally, all participants except four cosmopolitans from the Punjabi and Tamil communities, declared that they were “happy” in New Zealand, appreciating its “relaxed”, “safe”, “corruption-free”, “sparsely populated”,
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“crime-free”, “clean green environment” and its high levels of “equality”. Their current level of happiness was frequently ranked as nine on a scale of 1-10. Participants expressed: “I belong to New Zealand, I feel more attached to New Zealand”, “I am hundred percent happy” and “I don’t want to leave this country”. However, despite these positive impressions, when asked to rank their societal integration (that is, whether they felt a sense of belonging within inter-ethnic networks) through inter-ethnic networks on a scale from 1 to 10, all the eleven transitioners from the Keralite and Gujarati groups rated themselves as 3-7 compared to the 6-10 ratings given by Punjabi and Tamil cosmopolitans.

These differences are explained by the differing extent to which transitioners actually interacted with host society members. For instance, ranking societal integration through inter-ethnic networks on a scale of 10, Manish, a Gujarati participant, reported that: “I would give only four, because you know, we are Gujarati and we don’t tend to go everywhere. We usually go where there is any Gujarati gathering or a religious gathering” (see chapters four and six for further examples). The wider societal integration of transitioners thus tended to be confined to the workplace and to attending public festivals, such as Chinese festivals, Diwali and Christmas in the Park.

Breton (1964) and Damm (2009) argue that years of residence in a particular country improve the number of inter-ethnic linkages and migrant integration with the host society. Yet the transitioners remained ambivalent about such networks, despite most of them having lived in New Zealand for several years. For example, George had lived in New Zealand for ten years but reported that his integration with inter-ethnic networks was “still below average”. Explaining why inter-ethnic networks were not initiated he stated, “we don’t get to know their [inter-ethnic friends] families”, “we don’t talk about each other’s problems”, and “it is just a ‘hi’-‘bye’ relation”. As pointed out in chapter four, this lack of deep, meaningful inter-ethnic interactions was mainly due to lifestyle reasons: “we don’t have the habit of clubbing or of dining out” or “going to English churches”. Thus societal integration in New Zealand was achieved primarily through co-ethnic communities not through participation in broader, inter-ethnic networks.

Although the above views came largely from the transitioners, they were also expressed by some participants from the cosmopolitan group. For example, Antony, a Tamil participant, stated that his social life was very minimal in New Zealand compared to India due to a lack of
time. Nevertheless, despite the lack of time and all the religious and dietary restrictions indicated in chapter four, the cosmopolitans generally noted that they “still have very good friends” from the non-Indian communities. The following section explores this in detail and offers some explanations.

**Facets of cosmopolitan sociability and becoming a Kiwi**

Deleuze’s (1987) concept of ‘becoming’ denotes an affirmation of the positivity of difference, while being engaged in the process of transformation (Braidotti, 1994). Transitioners and cosmopolitans both revealed a desire for ‘becoming a Kiwi’ or transforming and integrating into New Zealand society. For instance, when asked to rate their inter-ethnic integration, transitioners such as Bahadur indicated: “Probably 4 now, but maybe in the future it will grow” or “if there are good people and if I have an opportunity to mix with them I am happy to mix”. However, cosmopolitans were more likely to engage in inter-ethnic networks because they did not just wait for opportunities to arise; instead their capacity for cosmopolitan sociability led them to believe they were *personally accountable* to integrate themselves and their children into New Zealand society, as the next section indicates.

**Personal accountability for integration**

Cosmopolitans said it was important for Indians to leave behind their “baggage” and the “Indian way” of doing things in order to effectively integrate with New Zealand, implying that some Indian migrants did not do this. Participants such as Smita and Mala stated ‘we have made our own choices to come here’ and ‘it is you who have to integrate’. Smita, a Marathi social worker who had lived in New Zealand with her two sons for thirteen years, was typical of the cosmopolitans in that she was enmeshed in a diverse set of networks, including inter-ethnic networks (see figure 8.1 below). In particular, she had close friends of Māori, Samoan and New Zealand European descent in her work place.

**Figure 8.1: Smita’s network**
Holding migrants responsible for their integration, she noted that it was up to them to engage with others without being held back by cultural or religious differences: “you may not drink alcohol, but go with them [host society work colleagues]... pubbing why not? You take your lemonade and sit there. Till you actually go there, they won’t know you and you won’t know them. I don’t drink alcohol, but I used to sit there.” Cosmopolitan participants felt that having inter-ethnic ties went beyond just knowing each other but being there for each other was needed to “really merge” into New Zealand society. They believed this required an understanding of the local culture, accent, context and jokes so that they could communicate effectively and avoid feeling isolated. Such views are supported by research finding a positive link between having inter-ethnic friends and the integrative spirit migrants felt towards their host society (see for example, Agirdag et al., 2011; Hochman, 2010; Sabatier, 2008; Ward & Masgoret, 2008).

Being rather thoughtful and reflexive, many cosmopolitans were aware that some Indian migrants might find it difficult to leave behind their ‘baggage’. They recognised that the process of integration would be different for Indian migrants from smaller towns and traditional settings who they believed were more likely to be confined to co-ethnic circles. Mala, a Tamil participant, perceived that “not being embedded” in traditions and co-ethnic circles enabled her to be more open to cultural differences in New Zealand but:

I think it will be different for people coming from different backgrounds in India. For example, people coming from a village background, I think integration will definitely be harder, because I have met so many people, been in touch with so many Indians, and I know certain things that other people experience or feel are totally different to my experience. All the reason for that may be because we come from a more cosmopolitan background, I have not been embedded in that sort of tradition, and I was always open to change. We have had people come from the smaller places who are more traditional, who are more housewives who want to bring up their kids, who want to exactly follow the same rules and do things that way. I find then, integration is far more difficult, because they are not able to leave the baggage behind. They still want and they come here, and then say, ‘What is this place? It is so horrible, and nobody has time for anyone, it is so lonely’. They really miss the community. Until they get into this community they cannot just adjust. They have not made friends.

However, not all cosmopolitans believed that strong sub-regional/linguistic/religious identities were a barrier to engaging with host society members. Those from the Tamil community, in particular, felt that being true to who they are facilitated such engagement. For example, Florien, who strongly identified as Tamil, highlighted that Indians are sometimes shy in expressing their own co-ethnic identities when compared with other groups. However, she felt that a genuine expression of one’s sub-regional/linguistic/religious or Indian identity, without concealing or tempering it, brought respect and acceptance from inter-ethnic friends: “As far as what I have seen, in my work place, they [host society friends] like Indians for being Indians”.

173
Like Florien, almost all of the cosmopolitan participants felt able to confidently articulate an Indian and a regional, religious or linguistic identity amongst multi-ethnic friends without feeling this hindered their relationships.

Yet, at the same time, their understanding of accountability meant cosmopolitans felt that sometimes it was inappropriate, for example, to speak their home language in the work place, where it might exclude host society members. As Grishma expressed: “we have come into another country and we have to accept the language of that country. You can speak your mother tongue in your private circles”. These examples suggest the capacity to read the context of inter-ethnic interactions and to react fluidly by shaping their own behaviours, thus putting into practice the view that integration is a two-way street.

Another way cosmopolitans demonstrated accountability was by helping children to integrate. While transitioners also passively asserted a desire for children’s inter-ethnic relations, this was more often for pragmatic reasons. For instance, Shaji felt that inter-ethnic networks are important for children, because they need “to develop their [children’s] language skills, the standard of education and to keep the Christian values”. However, the transitioners’ lack of experience with inter-ethnic situations meant they were often hindered by insecurities about host society perceptions of them. Shaji explained that only a Malayali and a North Indian friend were invited to his son’s birthday, because although his son had a white friend “when he says he will invite him we are a bit reluctant, thinking whether they will allow him. We invited the other two friends for sleep over, but we are not sure if we could invite him, whether they will be interested”.

In contrast, cosmopolitans pushed past any such concerns because they explicitly articulated accountability for ensuring the cultural openness that they felt was necessary for their children’s integration. Manpreet observed: “I like that [his son] is growing up in a multicultural school, and he is growing up with kids from different walks of life. He will know more about New Zealand people”. Moreover, cosmopolitans conveyed a sense of appreciation for the support they received from inter-ethnic networks. A Punjabi Sikh participant, Baldev noted: “His [son’s] close friends are all whites. His friend’s father picks him up and takes him for soccer practice. What else do you need? You can’t expect that much even from [Indians]. They will get out [of obligations]”. In the context of this greater openness and accountability, cosmopolitans reported that their children’s networks included multiple inter-ethnic exchanges.
between families via birthday celebrations, sleepovers, play-groups and sports classes. Cosmopolitans also reported mutual reciprocity through child care and pick-ups/ drop offs of their children’s friends when needed. They also worried if their children were sufficiently integrated into New Zealand society. Leema, a Tamil participant, observed that the ethnic composition of her daughter’s networks reflected her own networks, being predominantly comprised of co-ethnics. Unconvinced this was a good thing, she reasoned:

… if you see the list I have given you, when I say ‘close associate’ they happen to be from my community, and I see that pattern with my girls. I don’t know if that is healthy or not. For instance, if my girls have friends, about sixty percent of them would be the ones who speak the same language. I don’t know if it is a pattern that is happening just like that, but it is a pattern that is not only happening with just my own kids, but a pattern that seems to be everywhere. So it’s like birds of a feather flock together. So they tend to associate more with their own community than with anybody else which in my opinion, I don’t think it is very healthy. But having said that, my girls come to church with me they are associated with the kids from the church who are predominantly Pākehā kids that is fine, but I don’t know if other kids from my community have this opportunity.

Such concerns meant that they were willing to reach out to host society members. For instance, three Sikh participants who actively participated in ethno-religious networks for the sake of their children, also went out of their way to ensure their children’s integration into New Zealand society was not hindered by religious differences. Sonia narrated:

Initially my eldest son would not go for the [school] camp, because he was like, how will he comb his hair in front of so many people because he had long hair. So we talked to his teacher. She was a Kiwi teacher – Pākehā – she was very understanding about it. She was like, ‘please don’t say that your son will not go. I will see to it that he gets a separate bathroom in the morning before everybody else. He could dress up there, do his kangha [comb] and everything, and then come out, so that they will see him the way he is and will not have any issues with that’.

Here Sonia took responsibility by initiating a discussion with the teacher. Her actions were supported by the level of cultural sensitivity and acceptance demonstrated by the teacher. Members of the host society are not always so open or understanding but the next section indicates that Sonia’s experience with the teacher was not necessarily just luck because, like other cosmopolitans, she demonstrated an ability to affect and repair inter-ethnic relations.

It must be acknowledged that transitioners’ reluctance to engage inter-ethnically is shaped by the deterritorialising experiences of racism, bullying and verbal harassment. However, these were reported most frequently by cosmopolitans, especially Sikhs who strictly observed food and clothing requirements. A Sikh cosmopolitan, Gurpreet, described her son’s experience with his school teacher:

She was like, when she asked all the students to pull their hats off and everybody did that, she repeated again. Nobody understood why she is repeating it again and again. And she pointed at
my son and tried pulling off his hat. That was his turban. One of the teachers tried explaining saying that it is religious, but she was rude. Some of his teachers also realised that it was not the right action she did.

Cosmopolitan participants believed these issues resulted due to a lack of awareness or sensitivity about the Sikh religion among the mainstream population about different religious groups. As a result, they made personal efforts, to talk with the concerned school authorities about such issues and endeavoured to educate their children’s classmates about bullying. Baldev, for example, was a Sikh community leader intensely engaged in mediating various Sikh school issues. He stated:

… if [there is] any problem, I gather people and solve it, that helps. Few cases where Sikhs were badly treated among college students; somebody’s turban got removed and handled by the principal. But again I had challenged the New Zealand police; they did not want to take it further. Again came on the media and I won the case. Got apology from the Principal and got compensation for the student.

Moreover, cosmopolitans took responsibility for their lives by making practical decisions about where to reside, often opting for Auckland since it is very multi-cultural and avoiding small towns in New Zealand where Seema said she was treated almost like a “tourist”. This is not to say that such participants did not see host society members as having any responsibility for their behaviours, but rather they did not see themselves purely as victims and saw themselves as accountable for doing what they could to make their lives in New Zealand as positive as possible.

**Capacity to affect and repair relations**

Both cosmopolitans and transitioners nonetheless revealed a number of tensions when interacting inter-ethnically, especially with Pākehā that shaped their conscious thinking and behaviour. Such tensions often reflected the participant’s own ambivalence about being different and about being a migrant, which they articulated as an issue of race, English language, class or culture. Drawing on Goffman (1967), DeLanda (2006, p.55) states that when the equilibrium in relations is threatened there is need to repair them. However, it was largely the cosmopolitans who demonstrated the capacity to pragmatically overcome tensions and restore the equilibrium in their established friendships. All but one example here comes from cosmopolitan participants demonstrating how they repaired such inter-ethnic inconsistencies.

One of the key tensions noted by participants (n=11/43) was a misperception by Pākehā New Zealanders that Indian migrants do not speak ‘good English’. Five cosmopolitans felt very competent in their English language abilities (given English is one of the official languages of
India and widely taught in the Indian education system) and therefore complained about inter-ethnic friends and co-workers who assumed that this would not be the case. As such, they expressed shock when they were credited as having “picked up” good English from living in New Zealand. Antony, a Tamil participant who was a train manager, said:

…you will be surprised to know that after a couple of years people [friends and customers] in the train asked me ‘how long have you been living in this country?’, and I said, ‘three and a half years’. They told me, ‘not bad, you have picked up good English from here’. This was really a shocking thing, blood started boiling and I used to reprimand them.

Similarly, many participants noted that New Zealanders assume all Indians are the same and lack understanding of the sub-regional/linguistic/religious diversity within India. Antony considered himself well-integrated (ranking himself 10 out of 10) and had Pākehā family friends regularly visiting him at his residence. Like most cosmopolitans, he was keen to learn about New Zealand but also saw cultural learning as a two-way process and took it upon himself to improve the knowledge and understanding of his host society friends by spending quality time with them. Noting that his “good [New Zealand] European friends …[were] all still thinking India is a land of elephants, snakes and butter chicken”, he stated that they “changed perspectives about India after becoming friends with us”. According to DeLanda (2006, p.61), a change in the sense of discontent is important in the territorialisation of entities. To bring about such a change, social networks need considerable investment of time and energy to transform circumstantial relationships into more long lasting ones (Bourdieu, 1986). It was only the cosmopolitan participants that deployed their social competence in this context, investing in and affecting inter-personal exchanges with inter-ethnic friends and colleagues, ultimately gaining the recognition they desired from them.

Although most examples of such an ability to affect and repair relationships came from the cosmopolitans there was one Keralite transitioner, Johnny, who had adopted a similar strategy. Johnny noted that he previously had problems in establishing rapport with fellow co-workers because he felt excluded by their preconceived notions about India. However, he felt able to change such stereotypes and gain acceptance after inviting his colleagues and co-workers to his son’s baptism. This enabled Johnny to begin participating in team events more comfortably than before. According to Goffman (1967), the degree of repair depends upon the persistence and intensity of the disruption, because humiliating events can bring disequilibrium. DeLanda (2006, p.20) refers to such a state as a critical threshold above or below which relationships ceases to exist without a capacity to re-establish a satisfactory state. In the case of Johnny, he
continued to extend personal invitations to share his life with host society members by showing photographs of his wedding in India. He described how:

[...] for them it’s a real wow to hear that 1000-2000 people attended wedding. What I felt is that, especially the NZ Europeans if they come to know that you are financially well off probably they will feel a bit more comfortable with you. For example, I had son’s baptism so almost 200-300 people attended the function, and I showed them all the photographs so it was actually then [...]. So they check with me first to be honest: ‘How well off are you financially? Why do you come to this country?’ Because they have a lot of negative impressions about India. They think India is a place full of slums. I have felt that kind of an approach from NZ Europeans, especially the females, because till my wedding, they weren’t interested in mingling with me. Once I got married and I came back, my team was going through all the photographs, then they were so shocked to see all the gold ornaments my wife was wearing as a part of our tradition, the cars and the people…more than 2000 people attended the wedding. So once they came to know we are not that kind of Indians they see in the movies they are exposed here, yeah, there was really a great change in their attitude towards me.

This anecdote from a transitioner indicates that, like cosmopolitans, they also possess the capacity to positively affect and repair inter-ethnic relationships caused by cross-cultural tensions or mis-perceptions. Most often the transitioners were held back by a lack of experience and insecurities about how they are perceived as ‘other’ by host society members but Johnny illustrates that building on opportunities as they present themselves may transition them into the cosmopolitan realm over time.

In addition to being assertive enough to challenge mis-perceptions and overcome tensions in cross-cultural relations, which enabled cosmopolitans to find greater social and emotional stability within inter-ethnic relations, these participants demonstrated an ability to reciprocate material support that was offered through inter-ethnic networks, thus building inter-dependency between themselves and host society members. They often told stories of host society members offering them free accommodation or rental concessions, rescue in times of crisis, English language and employment assistance, help with picking-up and dropping off children at their schools and support for buying and investing in properties in Auckland. In addition, cosmopolitans noted how neighbours monitored their properties during their absences from New Zealand, mowed their lawns or took care of women who were without families in New Zealand. Participants who had benefitted from such support described their host society friends as “pretty close”, “kind”, “fantastic”, “welcoming”, “supportive” and “sympathetic”. But, importantly, they noted these were reciprocal exchanges. Seema, a Punjabi-Sikh participant, described the support she had given to a British-New Zealand friend and a Pākehā colleague at times of need. Her son’s friend had just lost his father, so she invited his mother over and now “… she comes in and out my house, we have a cup of tea, we do talk, we have good relations with each other. And to Kris my friend [from work], she is very lonely at times so she comes
over, she stays with me, she speaks to my children, she has her food, I pack some food for her so I think it’s fantastic. So we have a strong and good bonding with each other”.

Such reciprocal exchanges encouraged close bonding, which was essential for participants wishing to cross linguistic-regional and national boundaries and create a sense of identification with each other. Participants reported that such inter-ethnic exchanges helped them to forget their colour and creed; Smita, a Marathi participant, stated: “I carry my Indianness, but while I am sitting with all my Māori and PI [Pasifika] colleagues, I don’t feel Indian, I am one of them. I don’t feel Indian; at least my colleagues don’t make me feel that way, which is great”. Thus, cosmopolitan participants were able to affect inter-ethnic relations not only through their own responses to both negative (e.g. racism) and positive (e.g. neighbourly help) but also by taking any opportunities they saw to overcome cross-cultural misperceptions or isolation.

**Capacity to be affected in adjusting to a new way of life**

While a capacity to affect relationships was necessary to repair misperceptions and gain acceptance among inter-ethnic friends, some cosmopolitans went further and relinquished some of their traditional practices to adopt a new ‘Kiwi’ lifestyle. Migration always, to some extent, involves adopting a new way of life in the host society thus transforming migrant identities in many ways (Pluss, 2002; 2005; Takenanka, 1999; Tsuda, 2000). But, overall, the cosmopolitans reflected a more positive, openness to change and to be affected by the migration experience when compared to the transitioners.

For example, Mala, a Tamil participant, actively followed the lead of Indian friends, who are connected with many Pākehā New Zealanders, by engaging in activities that are part of the ‘Kiwi lifestyle’:

Yeah because I have friends, and my friends are integrated as well. Everyone brings in from their own experiences different things into our cultural groups so we get more and more integrated. For example, we do the very Kiwi thing, we do the Tongariro road track crossing, or going for hikes, or going for a drive somewhere, or going exploring, or bush walking, that’s such a Kiwi thing. We do it so much now. So we have taken that as a part of our life, and that is because someone from the group is a part of another group who does all these things. A lot of Kiwis in that pitching tents, we learnt a lot of those things so definitely networks help a lot. Indians in India we don’t do such things.

Such willingness to try new things meant they not only came in contact with more host society members but also that they had gained a shared experience that could be discussed with work colleagues and friends. Other examples of ‘learning the Kiwi way’ included asking host society friends to show them how to do house painting, carpentry, plumbing and lawn mowing. Such
tasks are often outsourced in India. Doing such tasks on their own gave the migrants not only a sense of independence but also a sense of ‘fitting in’ in New Zealand. Engaging in such manual labour was sometimes a huge transition, particularly for men, but after their initial surprise some participants found they enjoyed it or appreciated the feeling of having done something themselves. The following excerpt discusses Antony’s interaction with his friend:

[… ] one of the few white friends who have become very good friends of ours, initially when they started coming home, I used to tell my wife to get me a glass of water. So immediately that friend said: “no Viola, why should you do it for him? If he wants, let him go and take it.” This was shocking for me. I mean in India nobody will say like that. So I can’t blame that person saying that because their culture is different: “you be yourself, you be independent”, that is what they teach you. Also the young kids here, “you go, you put the rubbish, you do tidy up your room. You do…” So they make the individual to become independent not depending on others. That is good. I think it is a very positive thing.

It is not the act of putting out the rubbish or mowing the lawn that is integrative here, but the cosmopolitans’ appreciation and willingness to change positively to fit in with New Zealand expectations and cultural norms. In contrast, as chapter seven highlighted, transitioners tended to see such changes as significant ‘challenges’. Readiness to unlearn old ways and relearn new values and behaviours was an important attribute of the cosmopolitans, no matter what their age. Antony was over 60 years of age yet still welcomed his friend’s suggestion!

Although such experiences were typical of cosmopolitans, one transitioner participant – George – did describe a similar willingness to be affected by the migration experience. George initially said his identity was Indian and explained that he did not have inter-ethnic networks because they are “not like our own community”. However, he later indicated that when he had been brave enough to go beyond the Indian community to join a rowing club. He found: “Almost all the people are Kiwis and I am the only Indian but I am very much welcomed here. I don’t feel any difference”. Once again, there is no inherent barrier to transitioners developing inter-ethnic networks once they get beyond their initial reluctance and fear and allow themselves to be positively affected by relations outside their co-ethnic networks.

**Conclusion**

Chapter four mapped the capacity of cosmopolitan sociability of Indian migrants as emerging prior to their arrival in New Zealand. In this chapter, I explored how these capacities enabled the territorialising of inter-ethnic networks amongst cosmopolitan Indian migrants in New Zealand. Societal integration was defined in regards to how the participants themselves perceived their sense of a New Zealand identity and belonging in New Zealand, which was heavily (although not entirely) linked to the extent and depth of inter-ethnic relations. Although
both transitioners and cosmopolitans identified as New Zealanders and appreciated New Zealand’s green environment, lifestyle and relaxed pace, transitioners were more preoccupied with how others viewed them and consequently were less secure in their New Zealand identity than cosmopolitans who were more experienced in fluidly shifting between different identities and were, ultimately, more assured that adopting ‘Kiwi’ values or ideas would not threaten their Indian, sub-regional/linguistic/religious identities.

This difference was both the cause and effect of having wider inter-ethnic networks than those reported by transitioners but this chapter has also identified that cosmopolitans engaged in varied behaviours that reinforced both inter-ethnic relationships and their sense of societal integration. Cosmopolitans all shared a sense of accountability for integrating themselves and their children into New Zealand society and their cosmopolitan sociability also lay behind their capacities to affect and be affected by inter-ethnic relations. This finding is particularly promising for understanding how we might better support migrants to overcome fears and insecurities that hinder their sense of societal integration. It is argued that such capacities can be learned and that, in the right environment, transitioners might also engage in inter-ethnic networks without fear of losing their Indian or sub-regional, linguistic or sub-regional identities. Of course, as the cosmopolitans are well-aware, integration is a two-way process and such a change will require changes within the host society and should not be considered a migrant’s responsibility alone. Indeed, this chapter has highlighted that racism, cross-cultural misperceptions and tensions can be deterritorialising and can reduce inter-ethnic trust. This requires host society members to also be accountable for their behaviours and, like the cosmopolitans, be willing to affect and be affected by the Indian migrants that have come to live in New Zealand.
Chapter Nine
Conclusions and future directions

Introduction
In this thesis, I have argued that social networks are important for the socio-economic wellbeing and belonging of Indian migrants but also that networks and integration processes can be complex. The starting point for investigating this complexity was the insight that ‘Indian’ reality is made up of multiple identities and experiences. To test whether these differences shaped networks and their utility in helping migrants achieve integration at four levels, this thesis examined four Indian communities and the co-, intra- and inter-ethnic networks in which members engaged. Assemblage theory provided a suitable theoretical framework for understanding the complexity of these networks, as well as their potential impact on integration. This chapter summarises how this is the case by reiterating key empirical and theoretical insights then concluding by considering future research possibilities and the policy implications of the research findings.

Research contributions
Based on interviews with 43 Indian migrants to New Zealand, this study makes an original contribution, both theoretically and empirically, to the study of migrant social networks and integration. As stated in chapter two, the literature on migrant networks generally highlights nationality and inter-ethnic differences as critical factors shaping the development of networks and their impact on integration. There is also an overwhelming tendency in the migration literature to conflate ethnic ties with social capital (see Anthias, 2007). This thesis has met the call for more nuanced conceptualisations and investigations of migrant social networks that surpass methodological nationalism and move beyond a narrowly conceived ‘ethnic’ lens (see Ryan, Erel & D’Angelo, 2015, p.16).

This was achieved firstly by adopting a qualitative methodology that disaggregated what it means to be ‘Indian’ by analysing four communities and asking the following questions:

1. How are Indian migrants’ social networks constituted?
   a. What are the network differences and similarities with regard to density and
homogeneity?

b. How do similarities based on language/region, religion and gender influence the creation, functioning and utility of networks?

2. What factors impact on the organisation of migrant networks and why?

3. How do Indian migrants engage in inter-, intra- and co-ethnic networks, and what differing outcomes do these networks achieve?

My analysis revealed two key groups whom I referred to as cosmopolitans (because they had diverse intra- and inter-ethnic networks) and transitioners (because their networks were more dense and homogeneous, often consisting of co-ethnic members only). Here the concept of cosmopolitan sociability was important for understanding why the experience of being raised in large, multicultural Indian cities appeared to shape networks and outcomes. Although the structure of Indian migrant networks was also shaped by gender, religion, region, language and occupation and these variables intersected with cosmopolitan sociability, it remains that cosmopolitans demonstrated particular capacities for intra- and inter-ethnic interactions in ways that transitioners did not. DeLanda’s (2006) assemblage theory helped me understand these findings, since he argues that the properties of entities, such as ethnicity or any single factor alone, can never explain the relations that constitute the whole.

This theoretical approach also enabled a more nuanced discussion of integration and belonging than is normally apparent in the literature. Here the thesis was focused on the following research questions:

4. How do social networks play a role in the economic wellbeing of migrants?
   a. What are the most effective networks for the labour market participation of Indian migrants?
   b. How important are social networks for both offshore and onshore Indian migrants?

5. In what ways do social networks facilitate and hinder economic and social integration?

6. How do social networks contribute to the wider integrative efforts of Indian migrants with New Zealand society?

I have shown that social networks and embeddedness are relative to the context and experiences of participants. For both cosmopolitans inclined towards wider inter-ethnic affiliations and transitioners inclined towards co-ethnic relations, social networks were central to Indian
migration adaptation to and settlement in New Zealand, not least because they enabled migrants to overcome the social and economic constraints associated with migration. Both ethnicity and cosmopolitanism worked together side-by-side and were co-constitutive of integration in its broadest sense. Thus, social integration cannot be tied to a fixed, single causal factor. Instead, as outlined in chapters five to eight, there was network irregularity amongst migrants depending on whether they were seeking legal, economic, community or societal integration. Social networks, organised as an assemblage, required a constant manoeuvring through the processes of territorialisation, deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation in the pursuit of stability. Although conflicts and deterritorialisation were necessary for reterritorialisation, I also argued that the ability to reterritorialise demanded that migrants deployed their capacities to handle crisis and gain a sense of ‘home’ among co-, intra- and inter-ethnic friends alike. In this sense, an assemblage theory lens helped overcome the tendency to analyse migrant networks as a key to either ‘successful’ or a ‘failed’ integration.

To highlight this point, the following sections briefly summarise the key ways in which social networks played a role in shaping integration outcomes at the four different levels studied. These should be read in relation to figure 9.1, which provides an overview of the key capacities of Indian migrants, at differing levels to highlight the specific skills and ideas that were present among them. The capacities listed for social and community integration tend to be associated with cosmopolitans, while those listed for economic and legal are generally applicable to all the participants in this study.

Figure 9.1: Integrative capacities of Indian migrants at different levels

**Inter-ethnic networks**

**Societal**
- Capacity to be open and place high value on moving beyond co-ethnic attachments and generating wider connections
- Capacity to hold and develop multiple identities simultaneously
- Capacity to clarify misperceptions and educate host society
- Capacity to learn, unlearn and relearn values irrespective of age
- Capacity to relate, clarify misperceptions and take actions to repair relationships
- Capacity to innovatively adapt in conflict situations

**Community**
- Capacity to give and receive everyday material and expressive support
- Capacity to empathise and support co-ethnic members in need
- Multilingual capacities for international intra- and co-ethnic connections
- Permeating capacities for co-ethnic networks to be inter-ethnically connected
- Capacity to pursue relations and tackle community schisms
- Capacity to be plugged in and connect in complex ways
Inter-, intra- and co-ethnic networks

**Economic**
- Capacity to use networks to break glass ceiling
- Capacity to critically reflect on existing arrangements and take actions
- Capacity to discern which networks are important and when
- Capacity to immerse in any relation and be flexible
- Capacity to be social brokers connecting people to others in need
- Capacity to mobilise resources from networks

**Legal**
- **Co-ethnic networks**
  - Capacity to handle crisis and restore stability when needed
  - Capacity to use networks and seek opportunities
  - Capacity to expand the scope of networks

**Acquisition of a legal status through co-ethnic networks**

For onshore migrants, gaining the legal status of a permanent resident was critical for being able to imagine and enact a long-term life in New Zealand. While offshore migrants also utilised co-ethnic networks for initial entry into the labour market, these networks were absolutely essential to onshore migrants being able to find a job that would enable them to gain permanent residence. But this desire for legal status also put them at risk of exploitation by employers, including Indian employers from the same sub-regional, linguistic and/or religious background. Ryan et al. (2011) highlight the importance of not simply reading this as exploitation but as a way of migrants utilising what little agency they had within a given situation to achieve the integrative outcome. Nonetheless, the capacities demonstrated here were limited and largely focused on an ability to tap into co-ethnic networks with all the risks and benefits that entailed.

**Economic integration through co-, intra- and inter-ethnic networks**

Most participants received permanent residence under the skilled migrant category and had high expectations for their career and a better quality of life. Yet onshore and offshore migrants alike faced the barrier of employer expectations regarding ‘New Zealand work experience’ and ‘comparable labour markets’ and those more established in their careers found a ‘glass ceiling’ shaped by discriminatory ideas about migrant skills and experiences. Social networks were significant tools for overcoming these barriers to labour market entry and progression. Studies (for example, Govindan & Nambiar, 2003; Hellerstein, 2008; Ioannides & Loury, 2004; Sumption, 2009) suggest that higher levels of human capital (such as level of education and English language usage) usually mean less reliance on networks but they were important to all migrants irrespective of their human capital accumulation. Moreover, I have demonstrated that a capacity to be adaptable in different kinds of networks enabled migrants to mobilise information and support as required. A capacity for discerning which networks were important in different contexts was important given diverse barriers while entering employment and
gaining career promotions. Based on critical reflection, participants engaged in co- and inter-ethnic networks either to gain the desired New Zealand experience or to break the glass ceiling and achieve positive employment outcomes. Indeed as suggested by Putnam (2000, p.23) wider links outside the community were resource driven and necessary for “getting ahead” in their careers. The economic integration of Indian migrants, however, was not merely confined to the fulfilment of one’s own economic needs and aspirations but also to others in need. The capacity of Indian migrants to be social brokers offering referrals and support to the new arrivals in the initial phases of settlement meant integration benefits could be passed onto the new migrants.

Integration at the community level through co-ethnic networks
Co-ethnics networks were not only important for gaining legal and economic integration but also insured both cosmopolitans and transitioners against isolation and uncertainty, providing vital sources of information and support particularly when migrants first arrived in New Zealand. But these ties required considerable amounts of time investment and reciprocity, while some participants also noted how co-ethnic networks deepened existing hierarchies and competition based on economic and professional successes. As such, the cosmopolitans engaged in co-ethnic ties to a lesser degree than transitioners. Moreover, those who had experienced conditions of exploitation and competition within co-ethnic networks tended to move away from their co-ethnic peers. This challenges the pervasive view in the literature that co-ethnic networks are always a form of social capital. Also this finding contradicts the narrow perspective in the literature that the inwardly nature of ‘ethnic’ communities undermines social integration. Although from the outside it might appear that cosmopolitans with co-ethnic affiliates were inwardly embedded like the transitioners, the findings here reveal that they were not and the capacities possessed by the two groups were not the same.

In the context of their co-ethnic networks, Indian migrants deployed capacities to gain material and emotional benefits for day to day needs. Transitioners notably displayed the qualities of being more engaged and committed in such networks offering support through fictive kinship relations, and also aspiring for high economic status among co-ethnic members. Cosmopolitans, on the other hand, deployed capacities to critically reflect on such expectations from their communities and overcome them. Critical reflection did not mean they always abandoned such networks, but instead remained plugged in and engaged more cautiously. In this process, they also manifested capacities to network beyond their co-ethnic friends from India. Through multilingual capacities they built intra- and co-ethnic connections not only with members from
India, but from other parts of the world. In addition, their co-ethnic engagement enabled them to inter-ethnically connect with the members of the host society through voluntary activities at religious centres.

Integration at the societal level through inter-ethnic networks

To consider integration at the broader level of New Zealand society, the study examined Indian migrants’ inter-ethnic networks and interactions and found the extent and quality of such relations are linked to their capacity for cosmopolitan sociability. Although all participants said they were happy and felt they belonged in New Zealand, only the cosmopolitans had developed the kind of inter-ethnic connections that we might regard as evidence of societal integration. Extending the sociability skills developed in specific multilingual and multicultural environments in India, cosmopolitans regularly engaged with New Zealanders from non-Indian backgrounds through work, neighbourhood and school. More importantly, they saw these interactions as reciprocal, demonstrating both a willingness and ability to be affected but also to affect others. But this did not mean they did not feel rooted in their specific sub-regional/linguistic/religious identities and communities, meaning cosmopolitan sociability – and ultimately societal integration – should not be viewed as a threat to these important aspects of migrant lives.

Moreover, the higher levels of insularity amongst transitioners should not be misinterpreted as rejecting inter-ethnic relationships in favour of homogenous and inwardly focused communities (see Lum, 2012; Meares et al., 2013). While neatly organised concepts such as bridging and bonding capital tell us something about the nature of networks (see Valluvan, 2016), they do not provide sufficient insight into the complexity of relationships between individuals. The transitioners all showed a willingness to engage in inter-ethnic networks but lacked the capacity to do so, partly because of their previous experiences in India and partly because they allowed concerns about host society perceptions of them to shape their own reality. Cosmopolitans on the other hand faced discrimination and other barriers to inter-ethnic interaction but tended to see themselves as accountable for their relationships with New Zealanders of all kinds and, ultimately, their societal integration. They also demonstrated greater capacities for coping in cultural conflict situations, such as employment or school discrimination (see Jenson, 1998; Ramadan, 2015 for discussion of the importance of such conflict and relationship management in complex and plural contexts). This is not to minimise the role of the host society in providing a safe, welcoming environment for new migrants but it does highlight why some migrants are
concentrated in co-ethnic networks while others are more open and receptive to inter-ethnic interactions.

Overall, this thesis has provided a more nuanced picture of integration than is frequently found in the literature, not least by bringing together different conceptual ideas - social integration, social networks, cosmopolitanism and assemblages – to analyse one topic: Indian migrants in New Zealand. Scholars such as Castles (2010) and Schiller et al. (2011) argue for the need to develop a broader theoretical framework in migration that is embedded in the context of contemporary society. They emphasise the need to capture the complexity, variability and contextual relevance in migration processes shaped by rapid global changes and seek understanding of how human agency responds to structural factors. This study has begun to fill this gap and aims to provoke further intellectual debate about the relevance of concepts such as cosmopolitan sociability and assemblages in the migration field by indicating three key findings:

- Migrant capacities for building personal networks and inter-ethnic relationships are shaped less by (national, sub-regional, linguistic, religious) identities and more by experiences prior to migration but, nonetheless, cosmopolitan sociability - or the ability to mediate and reterritorialise networks to seek stability in various contexts - may be nurtured in the post-migration context;
- Social networks in a migration context that is marked by plurality and uncertainty are fluid, as migrants territorialise, deterritorialise and reterritorialise as the situation and thus their needs change;
- Migrant integration and belonging in New Zealand needs to be understood at different levels and cannot simply be determined by the size and quality of inter-ethnic networks. It is possible to feel happy and integrated without necessarily having wide inter-ethnic networks, although a stable, secure sense of integration rests in part on the migrant’s capacity to exhibit cosmopolitan sociability at all levels of their integration.

**Future research and policy implications**

Although the mapping of migrant social networks through an assemblage lens presents a new way of understanding social integration, assemblage theory was used only in a general way by adopting DeLanda’s (2006) ideas around capacities, territorialisation and deterritorialisation. These key concepts need further application and refinement to ensure their broader applicability
to migration studies, particularly since this thesis was limited only to the network experiences of Indian migrants in New Zealand. As different entities may possess different sets of capacities, repetition in other contexts may reveal further differences and unified patterns, from which we can gain further understanding about networks, integration and the capacities that migrants hold and utilise in migration.

DeLanda (2006, p.34) argues that elucidating a full explanation of social processes requires not only taking heed of micro-macro mechanisms but also the macro-micro processes that may constrain or enable novel performances. While this study endeavoured to understand social networks at the individual level, greater understanding of the ways in which these produce large-scale social structures, and are in turn impacted by such structures, would reveal further insights. Is there anything intrinsic to the labour market system that makes networks such an important agent in seeking employment for migrants? Or are strong networks associated with the kind of job that migrants secure? Today, the ‘networking skills’ of job applicants are widely emphasised. In organised settings, it is crucial to understand what formalises the need for social networks. The economics of skilled migration operates on a human capital model, based on qualifications and English language requirements, but the findings here reveal that human capital alone is inadequate for labour market outcomes. Therefore, this thesis highlights the need for greater evaluation of the role of social networks in mediating the ‘skilled migrant’ workforce and its related labour market outcomes. This needs more attention at both the individual level and in the wider economy to understand the maximal skill utilisation and satisfaction.

To explicate macro-micro mechanisms, it would be useful to undertake comparative studies focusing on the varying structural contexts that stimulate cosmopolitan capacities. For example, are there differences in migration experience as a result of New Zealand’s bicultural framework compared to other multicultural societies? This would enable a philosophically and empirically richer explanation of the formation of such capacities. In addition, the fact that cosmopolitan sociability emerged as a condition prior to migration opens up the possibility of analysing similarities and differences in the qualities and the capacities of internal migrants in India compared to those who are internationally mobile. Cosmopolitanism as understood in this thesis was more common amongst Tamils and Punjabis and those from the Keralite and Gujarati community who came from big cities, such as Madras, Bombay, Delhi and Calcutta, that have long been open to international trading and intellectual thought. It would be interesting to
examine whether the capacity for cosmopolitan sociability is a result of multicultural and multi-ethnic characteristics of these cities, as implied by my interview data, or whether there is something more ingrained in the cultures of these places that supports cosmopolitan sociability.

Certainly, the mapping of migrant capacities from the past to the present and future can help take account of all peculiarities of cosmopolitan sociability in differing migration contexts. Yuval-Davis (2011, p.12) observes that an individual’s sense of belonging is not fixed as there can be manifold ways by which an individual identifies himself or herself. In today’s globalised economy where many immigrant-receiving countries are also facing significant emigration and countries traditionally associated with emigration are now receiving many immigrants, the role that identity plays in facilitating cosmopolitan sociability is also important to understand.

Castles (2014, p.292) observes that policies which deny the reality of migration encourage social marginalisation and racism. This is one reason there is such a focus on integration in the literature. Yet the focus has tended to be on the role of ascriptive factors such as the length of stay in the destination, education, region of origin, religion, class, age or gender of the migrant in shaping integration outcomes (see Hage, 2012). This thesis has highlighted another factor – cosmopolitan qualities and skills – that can assist both in adapting to a new place but can also encourage a sense of belonging that is founded on strong inter-ethnic relationships and understanding. Researchers and policy makers need to understand cosmopolitan sociability as a critical factor in migrant integration, requiring them to pay attention to the integrative capacities of migrants and devising strategies to harness or develop them.

Of course, migrants should not be the only focus for policy-makers. This thesis has highlighted that Indian migrants have commonly experienced misunderstanding, intolerance discrimination, racism and even physical assaults as they have attempted to adapt to their new home. Vertovec (2009) argues that cosmopolitan attributes should be taught, fostered or instilled in people who do not have a diasporic or transnational experience yet New Zealand places relatively little emphasis on trying to facilitate positive host society attitudes towards diversity (see the Human Rights Commission’s (2016) ‘That’s Us’ campaign for one attempt). Educational institutions and workplaces are sites where cosmopolitan capacities could be facilitated, possibly through diversity management and inter-cultural relations workshops. Such an awareness and training can equip members of the host society with a capacity to be liberal, permeable and receptive to ‘relations of openness’. As this thesis has highlighted, these qualities
are necessary to clarify and repair relationships between different groups, especially when they experience a friction. As such, my arguments are in line with growing international recognition that cosmopolitan perspectives are critical to policy discussions on integration (see Osler & Lybaek, 2014 for discussion of Norway; and Jakuboxicz, 2011 for discussion of Australia).

Finally, this thesis has highlighted the need for both scholars and policy-makers to critically explore key terms such as ethnicity, integration and even segregation, because their continued use in a homogenising way matters for those whose lives are governed and affected by these words and their underlying frameworks. My findings have indicated that it is not sufficient to view all ‘Indian’ migrants together as one ‘ethnic’ group, not only because that misses the sub-regional, linguistic and religious diversity that exists between them but also because it ignores differences in their capacities that are not shaped by ethnicity or nationality at all. Similarly, although co-ethnic networks have the potential to segregate Indian migrants from others, they also provide a sense of belonging and integration at the community level that should not be ignored or disparaged. Thus, this thesis has highlighted that integration needs to be understood at least at four different levels. Drawing on Deleuze, Taylor (2016, p.30) argues that it is imperative to understand the empirical “not as it appears for-us but as it is for-itself in its difference”, free from assumptions. I hope that this thesis examining Indian social networks as they are, not as I expected to find them, achieves this goal.
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Title: Social capital, socio-economic wellbeing and integration of Indians in Auckland, New Zealand

Participation Information Sheet

I am a PhD candidate at the Department of Sociology, University of Auckland. I would like to invite you to participate in this study through a one to one interview about your social networks in New Zealand. The broad aim of this research is to explore the pattern of social networks of Indian migrants in Auckland and their contributions to labour market outcomes, economic wellbeing and social integration in New Zealand. You may be asked about your own ethnic, religious and linguistic affiliations as well as those of your employer and other people in your social networks.

I am interested in studying Indian migrants who are New Zealand permanent residents/citizens, aged 18+, and migrated from India to live in Auckland not less than three years ago.

Interested participants

What you need to do?
Participation in this study will involve two phases. Phase I will require you to complete a pre-interview questionnaire that will be sent to you through email or by post. Completing this questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes. In phase II, you will be invited for an interview to discuss in detail your social networks, labour market experiences, ethnic identity and general migration experiences in New Zealand. The interview will take approximately 2 hours.

How and where?
The interview will be conducted in English and recorded using a digital voice recorder and hand written notes. Interviews can be conducted at your residence or a place convenient to you.

Protection, storage and deletion of the data
The data gathered will be accessed only by the researcher and her supervisors. The data will be transcribed by the researcher. To ensure the security of the data, all the digital data files will be stored on a password protected computer, while the hard copies will be stored in locked cabinet in the University of Auckland. The data will be protected and secured for a period of six years in the University of Auckland. After this period all the data files will be destroyed/deleted.
Your rights: Anonymity, confidentiality and withdrawal
As the study involves social network analysis, participants will be asked to list and talk about their networks. Social network data will be meaningful only when the researcher knows who the participant is and can record a link with other individuals in their network. I am interested in analysing the socio-demographic composition and the relationships constituting these networks. As such, there is a potential to identify the participant and the persons named by the participant. The names of the participant and people reported in their networks will be removed. Pseudonyms will be used to conceal the names and other identifying features of the participants and the persons in their networks. However, given the small size of Indian communities in New Zealand there is still a chance such people will be identified. As none of the information about participants and people in their networks is particularly sensitive this should not be a major issue. The conversation will be strictly kept confidential and will be used only for research purposes. The data collected in the interview will be used in my doctoral thesis as well as for any conference presentations and research publications. Data (e.g., name, address, email, etc.) provided will not be used to identify people in your network. Thus the concern over anonymity may not be significant. Also, during recording even if you agree to being recorded you may choose to have the recorder turned off at any time.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may decide to withdraw your participation from the research study at any time without explanation. If you are interested you will be given an opportunity to view the transcript of your interview. You have the right to ask that any specific data you have supplied to be withdrawn/deleted/modified within four weeks from the date of receipt of the transcript.

You have the right to omit or refuse to answer any question that is asked of you. If you agree to participate in the study you will be asked to sign a consent form this will include acknowledging that if the information you provide is reported/published, this will be done in a way that does not identify you as its source but confidentiality cannot be fully guaranteed because the small size of Indian communities means that there is a small possibility that you may be recognised. There is a small possibility that participants may report illegal behaviours or transactions (for instance working without paying tax) conducted by themselves or by people within their networks. All such information will remain confidential and will be reported in the thesis only in a generalised way so that identification is not possible.

There are no known benefits for participating in the study but a gift voucher worth $20 will be provided as a token of gratitude for your time and cooperation in the study.
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THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND
Mary Geena Chakiamury Joseph
PhD Candidate, Student ID-1348789
Department of Sociology
Human Sciences Building, 926
Telephone: 3737599 Ext: 82389

The University of Auckland
Private Bag- 92019
Auckland, New Zealand
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CONSENT FORM
THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS

Research Title: Social capital, socio-economic wellbeing and integration of Indians in Auckland, New Zealand.
Name(s) of Researcher(s): Mary Geena Chakiamury Joseph
I have read the Participant Information Sheet; I understand the nature of the research and why I have been selected. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

- I agree to take part in this research.
- I agree to be voice recorded.
- I wish / do not wish to view the transcripts of my interview.
- I understand that I am free to withdraw participation at any time, and to withdraw any data traceable to me up to a specified period of four weeks from receipt of transcript.
- I wish / do not wish to receive the summary of findings.
- I understand that data will be kept for 6 years, after which they will be destroyed.
- I wish / do not wish that data can be used for research publication and presentations.
- I understand that there is a small chance that I may be identified in research publications because of the small size of Indian communities but my name and other identifying information will be removed so as to reduce this possibility. I also acknowledge that if I provide any information about illegal behaviours or transactions (for instance working without paying tax) conducted by myself or by people within my networks that this may be reported in publications but this will be done in a generalised way so that identification is not possible.

Name ____________________________

Signature ________________________ Date ______________

Email ____________________________
(Provide only if you wish to receive the transcript of your interview)
Appendix 4: Pre-interview Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather basic information about you and your networks (i.e. your personal support networks e.g. family/friends etc. in New Zealand) in order to facilitate discussion in your one to one interview. The questionnaire is designed to take you about half an hour to fill out. Please answer all the questions thoroughly just as you would in a personal interview.

1. What is your year of birth? ...............................................
2. Where were you born? (region of origin in India) .......................................................
3. What is your vernacular/mother tongue? .......................................................
4. What is your religion? ........................................................
5. What is your marital status? ........................................................
6. What is your spouse’s country & region of origin? ...............................................
7. If married, how many children do you have? ...............................................
8. What is your highest level of education? ...............................................
9. What is your residency status in New Zealand? ...............................................
10. How many years have you lived in New Zealand? ...............................................
12. What is your current occupation? (choose from the options below)
    a) Employed
    b) Self–employed
    c) Working without pay for family-business
    d) No employment

If you answered a), b) or c) answer questions 13 -15 otherwise go to question 16.

13. What is the main activity of your employer/ business? ...............................................
14. What is your position in employment/business? ...............................................
15. How many years did you served in your current job? ...............................................

16. What was your previous job? ...............................................
17. How many years did you serve in your previous job? ...............................................
18. What is your personal annual income ($)  
    a) 0 – 20,000
    b) 21,000 – 50,000
    c) 51,000 – 80,000
    d) 81,000 – 100,000
    e) < 100,000

19. Do you or any member of your household belong to any ethnic association/s (e.g. Auckland Indian Association, Muthamil Sangam etc.): Yes / No. If yes, specify which: ...............................................
20. Do you or any member of your household belong to any religious organisation/s (e.g. church, mosque etc.): Yes / No. If yes, specify which: ...............................................


Participation in networks

1. I am now going to ask a few questions about your everyday social interactions:

   a. In the last month, how many times have you met with people in a public place either to talk or to have food or drinks? .................
   
   b. In the last month how many times have people visited you in your home? ..............
   
   c. In the last month, how many times have you visited people in their home? ..............
   
   d. In the last three months, how many times have you met with other people to play games, sports or other recreational activities? ..............
   
   e. Were the people you met and visited with mostly: (circle the option/s)

      i. from the same ethnic (Indian) group as you
      ii. from the same linguistic group as you
      iii. from the same gender as you
      iv. from the same religion as you
      v. from the same occupation as you
      vi. from the same economic status as you
      vii. others (specify)

2. How many persons of Indian ethnicity do you know in New Zealand? (I mean people you have some degree of personal interaction with on a regular basis).

Please mention the number of persons of Indian ethnicity in the boxes below and indicate what language they speak and where they live. If the categories may overlap (for instance your colleague may be your friend or an acquaintance & vice versa), state which according to you best describes your relationship with them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Speak your language</th>
<th>Speak a different Indian language (Give numbers and specify language they speak e.g. Marathi, Gujarati, Punjabi)</th>
<th>Location where they reside in NZ/Auckland</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(someone you know but not a close friend, nor intimate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How many persons of other ethnicity do you know in New Zealand? (I mean people you have some degree of personal interaction with on a regular basis). Please mention the number of persons in the boxes below and indicate their ethnicity and where they live. If the categories may overlap (for instance your colleague may be your friend or an acquaintance & vice versa), state which according to you best describes your relationship with them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Others (Give numbers and specify their ethnicity e.g. European/Pakeha, Chinese, etc.)</th>
<th>Location where they reside in NZ/Auckland</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintances</td>
<td>(someone you know but not a close friend, nor intimate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Of these people indicated in question 2 & 3, how many of them did you know before your arrival in New Zealand? ............... 

5. Identify and list any 20 people in your network with whom you think you are comfortable approaching, can confide anything and depend on in times of need or if you have a problem. State their relationship to you, their gender, ethnicity, language, occupation, the strength of the relationship you have with them and the frequency of your interaction. The strong ties are relationships that are intimate and can be more frequent. Weak ties are relationships that are less intimate and may be less frequent. 

**Note:** Kindly do include even their surnames. The names listed will not be used in the research, but will be replaced with pseudonyms. In the interview we will map these people as your social networks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Ethnicity &amp; Language</th>
<th>Strength of relationship (Strong/weak)</th>
<th>Frequency of interaction with this person per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong/weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your cooperation
Appendix 5: Interview Guide

Part I. Life story and experiences
Where you come from in India? What were you doing before you came to New Zealand?
How and why you arrived here in Auckland and what was it like coming to Auckland?
How happy do you consider yourself to be in the present job and earnings?
In general how happy would you consider yourself living in New Zealand?

Part III Employment/Labour market outcomes and feeling of economic wellbeing
[If the participant is employed]
How you were able to find a suitable employment when you arrived in New Zealand? What steps did you take to find your first job?
How long did it take to find your first employment?
Is this the same job that you had wanted? If not what processes did you go through to find suitable employment? Have you succeeded in finding an employment of your choice?

[If the participant is unemployed]
What process have you gone through to find suitable employment? Have you had any employment at all and what kind? What do you think are the impediments to finding employment?

[For employed or unemployed participants]
Do you believe personal networks are important sources of job information?
Did you receive any help from your networks with job search? Give examples.
Who are these people who provided you with support?
Are any of these people of your same ethnicity/linguistic/religious community?
How valuable was the assistance given? Have you reciprocated such assistance and how?

[If the participant is an entrepreneur]
What is your experience of doing this business in New Zealand?
How have you become an entrepreneur?
Do you believe personal networks are important sources of support for business?
Have you received any help from your networks in starting your business? Can you give examples?
Who are these people who provided you support?
Are any of these people of your same ethnicity/linguistic/religious community?
Part II. Social Networks: In the pre-interview questionnaire you were asked to name any 20 individuals with whom you can confide and seek assistance from. In order to understand the pattern of your network, I would like to place the 20 individuals you named in the circles given below. Each circle represents different levels of intimacy. The circles represent the degree of your closeness beginning with those intimate and close at the inner circle. I will also like to indicate (using lines) if there are any connections between different people in your networks. (For e.g. your co-worker is also connected to your family).

Have you actively tried to build your networks for e.g. to improve your job opportunity or start a business? If so, did you have difficulty in establishing these networks? If so what were these difficulties?

In your questionnaire you indicated you have [ ] closest friends. Are most of these people from same socio-economic status as you? (Are they middle class, well-educated etc.?) Are most of them men/women?

For how long have you known these individuals? How did you meet these persons?

What do you typically talk to them about?

How often do you interact with them through weekly visits, telephone, mobile messages, facebook etc.?

Are they members of any ethnic associations/religious associations you belong to?

Have you or your household received any assistance or access to any services from these individuals? If so of what kind of assistance (emotional, social, economic, and physical) did you get from them? How often do you take their assistance? Can you give some examples?
Part III. Associational networks

You said you are a member of ethnic associations/ religious organisations etc. How did you become a member of this group?

Are most of the members from a similar demographic group? (religion, gender, age, ethnic or linguistic group, occupation?)

How do you participate in these associations? How many times in the past 12 months did anyone in this household participate in the group’s activities?

What is the main benefit of joining this association/organisations/group etc.?

Does this group work with other groups outside the [co-ethnic/religious] community in which you have membership? Can you give an example of how the association/organisation engages with members from outside the group?

How often do people in [ ] group help each other out? And what kind of help do they give?

Part IV Weak diverse ties and feeling of integration

A. Co-ethnic networks

As mentioned earlier you come from [region] you speak [language] and you belong to [religious denomination]. Do you gain a sense of togetherness or closeness based on any/ some/ all these identities in Auckland? For e.g. do you feel like you are a part of the [ ] community? What gives you this sense of community?

There are often differences in characteristics between people in the same community. If yes what are these differences that characterise your group? For example, differences in language, wealth, income, social status, ethnic background, gender, religion, caste etc.

To what extent are such differences present in your community?

Do any of these differences cause problems? Are these differences sometimes useful? How?

B. Weak ties

Today where do you gain a sense of home?

In the questionnaire you said you knew [ ] people from other ethnic (non-Indian) backgrounds. Do you feel connected to them just as you do with members of your own ethnic group?

Do you perceive any gaps/problems in your relationships with people from other ethnic backgrounds. If so of what kind and why? Give example.

Do you receive or have you received any support or assistance from these individuals, if so, what kind of assistance? Give an example.

Have you given any assistance to people of different ethnic backgrounds? Give an example

How much do you trust your inter-ethnic friends and is this more or less than you trust people from the co-ethnic background? If yes why?
How happy are you with the level of social integration that you have with people of other ethnic backgrounds in New Zealand?

Finally, having indicated the support and assistances you receive from your social networks, how does your social network contribute to social integration in New Zealand? In what ways does your ethnic social relationships and relationships with other ethnic communities contribute to your sense of belonging to and being integrated with this society?
Appendix 6: Networks of Gujarati participants
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Appendix 8: Network diagrams of Keralite participants
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Appendix 9: Network diagrams of Tamil participants
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Appendix 10: Networks of other participants
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