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Abstract

This research explored consequences of contemporary immigration to New Zealand from German-speaking Europe over time and across three generations through Nexus Analysis (Scollon & Scollon 2004), the methodological strategy of Mediated Discourse Studies. In this approach, *Engaging the Nexus of Practice* is the preparatory stage, *Navigating the Nexus of Practice* the analytical task; and *Changing the Nexus of Practice* suggests a new cycle of study and action. The method enabled contextualizing participants' actions and views within intersecting societal discourses from a social construction perspective in a qualitative study, and testing these findings in a quantitative survey. The study fills the need for research from the perspective of well-settled German speakers and their families in New Zealand.

The qualitative study involved a pilot, followed by a main section involving 32 participants across three generations in three families originally from Austria and Germany. In-depth interviews and observations of daily interactions and special occasions at intervals over nearly four years provided rich data. The data offered powerful and reliable insights into migration motives, expectations and experiences of social and institutional realities in New Zealand, and into transformations of intra- and intergenerational *Heimat* creation as well as participants' reflections on living in New Zealand for decades. The concept of *Heimat* stood out as a theme in participants' narrative accounts. It functioned as a benchmark for their sense of belonging and safety, cultural maintenance and change. Findings were corroborated in a questionnaire survey yielding 317 replies across three genealogical generations of originally German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand.

The study contributes to international lifestyle migration research through explaining long-term intra- and intergenerational consequences of such lifestyle migration for families. It is significant as the first investigation of this kind in New Zealand, hence contributing to New Zealand migration research and providing important information for New Zealand institutions involved with immigrants. The findings can benefit potential migrants who may not be fully aware of major consequences of such a move. The study is also of interest for European migration research because of the recent substantial increase in long-term skilled migrant arrivals in New Zealand especially from Germany.
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SECTION 1
ENGAGING THE NEXUS OF PRACTICE

Groundwork for the study
German-language publications about New Zealand as an interesting and desirable destination date back to father and son Reinhold and Georg Forster’s South Pacific voyage on Captain Cook’s ship and the resulting book, ‘Reise um die Welt’ [Journey around the world] (Forster 1778/2007). In the ensuing British colonial era, the New Zealand Company advertised New Zealand as a paradise to the British and to German-speaking Europe. Consequently, German speakers became the second-biggest immigrant group after the British in the 19th century (Bade 2012). More recently, New Zealand has again become a German speakers’ dream destination (Bönisch-Brednich 2005), which is reflected in a 465% increase in long-term arrivals from Germany in the first decade of this millennium (Statistics New Zealand 2010), making Germans the largest group of immigrants from continental Europe in the new millennium (Bade 2012). Work and permanent-residence visa granted to applicants from Austria, Germany and Switzerland rose considerably during the 1990s and 2000s (Immigration New Zealand 2014). Yet, contemporary German-speaking immigrants generally keep a low profile (Bönisch-Brednich 2002) and thus remain largely unknown to New Zealanders (Braund 1997).

Research on current migration from German-speaking Europe to New Zealand has focused on the migrants’ motives for migration (Bönisch-Brednich 2005; Gruber & Kraft 1991); on decisions about staying permanently or returning (Bürgelt, Morgan & Pernice 2008); on their psychosocial processes related to the move (Bürgelt 2010); their settlement experiences (Bönisch-Brednich 2005) and integration efforts (Diehl & Ochsmann 2000); their English language and integration (Halstead 2005); on language use by immigrant children (Walker 1996); and on transmigration as a lifestyle choice for ‘commuter migrants’ between Germany and New Zealand (Schellenberger 2011). Research into multigenerational consequences of permanent immigration from German-speaking Europe to New Zealand has previously been ignored, however.

Research aims and rationale

For this project, I use Nexus Analysis (Scollon & Scollon 2004) to reveal long-term consequences of contemporary migration from German-speaking Europe to New Zealand across three familial generations within intersecting wider discourses. Rather than from the perspective of the receiving society, the thesis reports consequences and evaluations of migration from the perspectives of well-settled permanent immigrants and New Zealand-born descendants as well as researcher observations of 35 qualitative-study participants. A survey developed from the qualitative-study results aimed at exploring if the findings could

---

1 Stays of 12 months and over
be corroborated in the wider community. The thesis also examines the 317 survey responses received.

Understanding consequences of migration is important for a number of reasons. For example, the high return-migration rate of German-speaking immigrants who had intended to stay but changed their mind incurs considerable costs for New Zealand as the receiving society trying to retain skilled immigrants (Bürgelt, Morgan, & Pernice 2008; Bürgelt 2010). Also, Bönisch-Brednich (2005) interviewed 102 German-speaking immigrants residing in the Wellington area and found that all had underestimated the consequences of migration, such as the differences of social practices and associated problems. She also found that none of the participants had clear insights into settlement-related difficulties for themselves and their children or had thoroughly prepared for the situation before migrating. This signals the importance of considering the trajectories emanating from migration in depth. My study will provide potential immigrants with factual, coherent, and believable stories of immigrant families’ integration strategies, and their experiences of settling in New Zealand as well as long-term consequences evident in everyday interactions of three successive generations. It gives established immigrants and their descendants a voice, allowing monolingual New Zealanders better insights into the experiences of contemporary German-speaking immigrants in their midst. In addition, the study balances migration research that focuses on immigrant integration problems from the receiving society’s perspective (e.g. Thomson & Crul 2007).

**Positioning the researcher**

As Gadamer (1960/2010) asserts, bias-free understanding does not exist and we must focus our determination for cognition on escaping the restrictions of our prejudices. A person’s paradigmatic underpinning determines the whole analytical perspective (Habermas 2001), but all people commonly “use a plurality of theories” (Feyerabend 1981:ix), so labeling a researcher’s position within a specific paradigm might be problematic. It is my full intention to remain vigilant and not to let my bias corrupt this study. Integrity demands that I declare my preconceptions, especially since as a German-speaking immigrant I am an insider researcher.

*Weltanschauung* (worldviews, perspectives of the world), and *Weltbild* (literally, world picture; received as well as actively constructed images of the world) are shaped by a person’s historical body, to use Nishida’s (1998) term for accumulated, lived and embodied experiences and thought. In a social constructionist manner, this notion not only considers the body as historical matter but also as co-creator of the world. My fundamental socialization and therefore my first and deeply forming contact with concepts occurred through the German language. This sociocultural conditioning not only explains my preference for the German terms *Weltanschauung* and *Weltbild*, which for me have more complex meanings than their English translations, but to a certain extent also my ongoing
thought processes and practices. *Weltanschauung* and *Weltbild* are inseparably intertwined and influence each other. That is to say, for example, that at the time immigrants arrive in New Zealand they filter their perceptions of society through the lenses of their prior beliefs, values and principles, creating and evaluating their *Weltbild*, or rather their New-Zealand-*Bild*, i.e., their image of New Zealand and New Zealanders, against these prior benchmarks. Whilst the current project is data-driven rather than theory-driven, how the data presents to me and how I actively interpret it and integrate this into my *Weltbild*, is nevertheless guided by my *Weltanschauung*. Declaring my *Weltanschauung* is therefore warranted.

*Weltanschauung* includes beliefs. I believe in reality as ongoing dynamic processes of cultural and social construction interlinked with nature, with all these aspects allowing as well as restricting personal agency. “Culture is the realm of values, cognitive frameworks, and accumulated knowledge. Social structure is the realm of interests, individual and collective, backed by different amounts of power” (Portes 2010: 1540). Doctrines as well as norms and practices are thus cultural and social constructs, are taught and agreed upon, contested and overthrown. We are born into social structures; and social forces underpinned by cultural values shape us and institutionalize us from birth (Berger & Luckmann 1966). Through moving into another society one becomes deeply aware of these cultural and social constructions of realities, at times through intense culture shock. An example of social construction and control is that a doctoral candidate is required to adhere to “institutional typifications” (Berger & Luckman 2002:42) and thus has to jump through the hoops of applications, reports and presentations embedded in institutional history and habituation. These requirements apply regardless of professional and other life experience before a candidate is accepted into the social ranks of the learned. Yet, from the moment of first self-awareness we also start using personal agency in shaping our world, enabled as well as restricted by socially constructed norms and rules. I am now able, for instance, to observe my grandchildren’s active co-creation of their social world, be that through patience-testing tantrums or emerging leadership skills.

*Weltanschauung* includes guiding principles and values. Instilled by a strictly enforced religious upbringing, my earliest guiding principles were formulated in commandments handed down by an all-controlling omniscient holy trinity encompassing sacrificing all-loving kindness as well as intolerance of deviance whilst promising eternal bliss and threatening purgatory or eternal damnation. Other early guiding principles were expressed in the inscription ‘*Ora et Labora*’ [pray and work] above the entrance to my school. I still adhere to

---

2 A local example for the interlinking of natural and social processes, which also impacts on a number of participants in this study, is evident in the consequences of the February 2011 tectonic movements on the city of Christchurch and the people of Canterbury in the New Zealand South Island. Had Christchurch buildings been constructed or reinforced in more earthquake-resistant ways and not on reclaimed swamp, or had the warnings of prior earthquake damage been heeded (cf. 1888 Canterbury earthquake www.teara.govt.nz/en/historic-earthquakes/4), the present social impact of the natural forces would probably have been different.
the ‘work’ guideline, while beliefs in male deity and related creeds started morphing through fledgling critical thinking in my teenage years into a humanist and social construction stance. Looking back, my core principles and values developed through experience and critical reflection still resemble early guidelines of ‘treat others as you wish to be treated’. This includes modern ethical principles as proposed by Kitchener and Kitchener (2009): beneficence (do good/benefit others); non-maleficence (inflict no harm on others); respect for others (regard for others’ autonomy); fidelity (loyalty, honesty and trustworthiness); and justice (fairness). Such ethics considerations concerning this study are part of the methodology section 1.3. For me, this translates into respect for participants, having sympathy for common immigrant problems and the wish to look for fair treatment of immigrants in the receiving society.

**Note on terminology**

- Terms that are marked in this thesis with an asterisk* are explained in the glossary (pp 318–322).

- As a long-term permanent resident in my chosen country and as a linguist, a commonly used term annoys me. It is the widespread use of ‘host country’ and ‘host society’ in relation to immigrants who have lived in the country for decades and in relation to descendants of immigrants (e.g. Bourhis, Montaruli, El-Geledi, Harvey & Barrette 2010; Esser 2004; Schlueter 2012). Like ‘guest’ or ‘guest worker’, ‘host’ implies temporality and therefore signals non-acceptance of immigrants as full permanent members of society. ‘Host’ also signals a hospitable reception, which should not be taken for granted. For these reasons I firmly reject ‘host’ society in relation to permanent-resident immigrants and their descendants and use ‘receiving’ or ‘recipient’ society instead.

- The thesis uses the following terms from Scollon and Scollon (2004): Research preparation is *Engaging the nexus of practice*; analysis and discussion form part of *Navigating the nexus of practice*; and suggestions arising from the research should bring about social change by *Changing the nexus of practice*. 
Outline of the thesis

I therefore divide this thesis into three main sections:

1. Engaging the Nexus of Practice
2. Navigating the Nexus of Practice
3. Changing the Nexus of Practice

The first section, Engaging the Nexus of Practice, contains the groundwork for the main tasks in this study. It informs about the researcher’s position, guides through the thesis with this outline, and presents a review of literature in the fields of international migration, migration processes, immigrant settlement and adaptation across generations as well as a glimpse at past migrations of German speakers. Next, it explains the underpinnings of the current study in social constructionism and mediated discourse studies and outlines nexus analysis, which is the strategic approach taken. This part also informs about the participants, place and time of the research and its processes. Engaging the Nexus of Practice then places the study within wider time-and-place discourses, i.e., the discourses that linked into participants’ migration decisions in their countries of origin and the pertinent discourses in New Zealand pre- and post-arrival.

Section two is Navigating the Nexus of Practice. It contains the stories of the pilot study participants, the pilot study analysis and my reflection on it. The main qualitative study follows, with the stories of the participating families and separate analyses for each genealogical generation followed by a summary of the qualitative-study findings. These findings were put to test in a survey. The outline of the survey results follows and survey findings are compared with the qualitative study. Section two then presents an overall summary of the study and the discussion of findings. Reflections on the strengths and potential weaknesses of the study are included as well.

The third section, Changing the Nexus of Practice, entails contributions the study makes, its implications and suggestions for further research. The thesis is completed with the list of references and a glossary explaining linguistics terms as well as German and Māori terms used. Appendices include participant consent sheets, interview topics, and survey questions.
1.2. Literature review

Migration* is a complex fundamental human phenomenon and an intricate, worldwide process (Benmayor & Skotnes 2005; cf. Forster 2004) that is closely linked to historical connections between countries (Rumbaut 2006). The German geographer Ernst Georg Ravenstein³ is considered “the undisputed founding father of the modern thinking about migration” (Arango 2000: 284). Ravenstein (1885; 1889) drew on census data from Britain, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy and the United States to develop ‘laws of migration’ which, amongst others, stated that causes of migration are predominantly economic; push-pull factors determine migration; and that families rarely migrate (see Grigg 1977 for a collation of Ravenstein’s ‘laws of migration’).

Times have changed since Ravenstein, and family migration has become a common phenomenon (Boyd 1989; Ivlevs & King 2012), hence the current research. Because I am a German-speaking immigrant in New Zealand, my study has focused on consequences of immigration* across three generations of German-speaking immigrant families in New Zealand. To comprehend such long-term consequences, migration decision-making and processes also need to be understood. The aim of this section is not to deliver an exhaustive review, but to explore selected migration theories, studies and debates that are relevant to the current study, and to identify gaps in research. Together with any aspects that are relevant to my study, the review will consider themes from these areas:

- International migration
  - Migration processes
  - Immigrant settlement
  - Long-term immigration consequences across generations
- German-speaking migrants
- Migration research methods

1.2.1. International migration

International migration refers to persons changing the country of their usual residence (United Nations 2002). According to the United Nations (2013), international migrant numbers, i.e. numbers of people moving between countries with the intention of staying 12 months or more, have risen to 232 million, accounting for nearly 11% of total populations in

³ Ravenstein was a German immigrant and naturalized British subject married to an English woman. Indicating differences between an immigrant’s self-identity and institutional identity and identity assigned by others, he identified as German (Ravenstein 1889: 243).
developed regions⁴. In New Zealand, immigrant numbers are much higher with 25.2% of the population in the 2013 census born overseas (Statistics New Zealand 2013). This part reviews theories and some studies that are pertinent to the current study in relation to migration processes, immigrant settlement and certain long-term consequences across generations.

**Migration processes**

Despite the wealth of scholarly texts, theoretical understanding of international migration determinants remains weak according to Massey, Arango, Jugo, Kouaouci and Taylor (1998). The authors point out that contemporary international migration theories combine the relationships of socioeconomic structures at the macro-level with household tactics and individual decision-making at the micro-level. Goldin, Cameron and Balarajan (2011) explain further that methods at the –

- Micro-level pay attention to individuals and families, their migration decisions and target motivation;
- Meso-level focus on social capital, on networks and systems that link potential migrants with opportunities in the destination country, and therefore transform micro-level decisions into actual migration;
- Macro-level concern demographic, political and economic circumstances at the origin and destination that function as push and pull factors. In Goldin, Cameron and Balarajan’s view, networks link these push and pull factors whereas differences between these factors generate the predisposition to move.

In contrast, Castles and Miller (2009) point out that micro-, meso- and macro-levels are intertwined in migration processes without clear divisions. In line with Castles and Miller’s argument, and as explained in the methodology section 1.4, the current study uses nexus analysis to consider these inextricable interconnections, that is, the nexus of practice into which actions are linked (Scollon 2001b).

**Predominantly economic explanations for migration**

Massey et al. (1998) explain that contemporary migration-process theories grew out of general discontent with the push-pull framework and neoclassic economic explanations. The push-pull framework considers migration as “a means of establishing equilibrium between regions of labor supply and demand” (Massey et al. 1998: 8). This view of push-

---

pull factors cannot explain recent migration of the highly skilled from the large labor markets of Europe to the smaller New Zealand labor market, where earnings are much lower in comparison (see e.g. OECD 2012). More useful for the current study, Dorigo and Tobler (1983) describe push factors as reasons for dissatisfaction with life situations at the original place, and pull factors as the appealing qualities of the destination, with geographical distance acting as a deterrent. However, this last point does not apply to migrations between German-speaking Europe and New Zealand. Indeed, German migration to the distant New Zealand more than quadrupled in the first decade of this century (Statistics New Zealand 2010) even though many return to Europe (Bürgelt, Morgan, Pernice 2008). Although inquiries into increasing German migration to the United States (Diehl & Dixon 2005a) and within Europe (Verwiebe, Mau, Seidel & Kathmann 2010) found employment reasons for these moves, no research has looked into recent exceptional German migration growth to New Zealand (see Statistics New Zealand 2013). The survey conducted as part of the current study also allows some insight into more recent motives and experiences.

The focus on economic migration motivations (King, Warnes & Williams 1998) leaves a gap of motivations that are evident in the current study. Yet, three aspects within economic explanations of migration are useful. One is that individual actors do not usually decide on migration in isolation (Massey et al. 1998). Two other relevant aspects are human capital and social capital. Broadly defined, human capital as investment increases the market or nonmarket productivity of human beings (Bedi 2001). A cost-benefit analysis to maximize economic returns on human capital through migration is assumed in economic migration theories (Castles & Miller 2009). This does not apply to the current study. Instead, human capital in the form of qualifications and health fulfills New Zealand immigration requirements and was key to being allowed entry into New Zealand in the current qualitative study.

The main feature of social capital is that, like human capital, it can be converted into other forms of capital such as monetary remuneration (Massey et al. 1998). This potential to earn a living at the destination is relevant for the migrating families. The concept of social capital is rooted in the intellectual thought of Max Weber and Emile Durkheim (Portes & Sensenbrenner 1993; see Durkheim 1933; Weber 1922/1947). Bourdieu (1980) defined social capital essentially as the sum of actual and potential resources accrued through an agent’s membership in enduring reciprocal utility networks and as used for social improvement. Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993: 1323) redefined social capital as “those expectations for action within a collectivity that affect the economic goals and goal-seeking behavior of its members, even if these expectations are not oriented toward the economic sphere”. This inclusion of intangible social capital is more useful for the current study. Theorists see social capital as having positive consequences (Massey et al. 1998). A contrasting argument is that bounded solidarity and enforceable trust, which are distinct types of social capital, can have positive as well as negative effects (Portes & Sensenbrenner 1993). Different types of social capital with positive and negative effects and network connections can explain certain findings in the current study (see e.g. p154ff).
Interdisciplinary explanations for migration

Questioning economics and capital as the all-determining factors of migration has led to interdisciplinary approaches, with migration networks theory and transnational theory (among others) emerging from such critiques (Castles & Miller 2009). In contrast to purely economics-oriented explanations of causes and consequences underlying migration, interdisciplinary approaches focus more on social and individual migration consequences.

Migration networks theory

One aspect of migration networks theory that is relevant for the current study is that migration microstructures include social networks created by migrants to cope with migration and settlement as well as their cultural and social capital (Castles & Miller 2009). Cultural capital comprises, for example, knowledge of the destination country, the means for organizing travel, capabilities for finding work and adjusting to a new environment. Social processes involve non-migrants as well as migrants and their families. For example, employers may gain and retain capable employees; migrant children develop bicultural or transcultural identities through peer relationships and schooling (Castles & Miller 2009). These points are relevant for this study. However, whilst considering consequences of immigration for immigrant children during and through schooling, the theory seems unconcerned with long-term consequences beyond settlement and across several generations.

Transnational theory

Transnational theory is similar in a number of ways to networks theory. Migrants’ transnationalism, i.e. their grass-root-level ties to countries of origin through social networks, economic and political structures, has always been recognized although transnational possibilities and research interest have increased with the rapid development of travel and communication technologies (Portes, Guarnizo & Landolt 1999; Vertovec 2001). Portes et al. (1999) proposed a new framework to examine the dynamics and potential implications of transnationalism and Portes (2003a) confirms that transnationalism represents a novel perspective on the old phenomenon of individual’s cross-border networks. Transnational theory maintains that migrants’ close transnational ties impact on their identities and have consequences for international politics (Castles & Miller 2009), potentially transforming “the normative assimilation story” with considerable implications for sending as well as receiving countries (Portes et al. 1999: 229). For example, Bartley and Spoonley (2008) found in their study involving 121 Asian senior-high school students, who were residents in New Zealand, that whilst these adolescents were motivated to achieve high educational qualifications they were “not destined to settle in New Zealand”, suggesting a new version of transnationalism (Bartley & Spoonley 2008: 80). This raises questions about the country’s return on educational investment as international non-
resident students pay much higher education fees than residents, and about availability of those trained in the system for New Zealand’s industry needs.

Bauböck (2010) points out that ties across countries include opportunities provided by political institutions, which are themselves transformed through transnational relations. The recent softening of German policies towards allowing dual citizenship with other European states is such an example (cf. Morehouse 2012). Glick-Schiller proposed the concept of ‘transnational social fields’, i.e., “networks of networks that link individuals directly or indirectly to institutions located in more than one nation-state”, which locates migrants in transnational territorial relationships (Glick-Schiller 2010: 112). A contrasting view is that such a third space divorced from the original and receiving society does not apply to immigrants’ transnational activities (Schunck 2011).

Although Portes et al. (1999) consider potential flow-on effects across generations, it seems that transnational theory is concerned with the migrants but not with subsequent generations. Although research noted transnationalism, for instance, in the Asian 1.5 generation (who immigrated up to the age of 18) in New Zealand (Bartley & Spoonley 2008; Ho, Yunn-Ya, Soon-Nam & Young 1996), the findings were about these immigrants’ settlement uncertainties and return migration rather than transnationalism in the sense of ongoing connections for immigrants who stay permanently.

**Migration of the highly skilled**

International migration of the highly skilled might be considered brain drain, that is, emigration of highly qualified workers, and brain gain, which refers to the human capital gain these highly skilled bring to their destination (Brückner, Bertoli, Facchini, Mayda & Peri 2012). Paradoxically, wastage of skilled permanent immigrants’ skills is symptomatic of operational problems with skilled-migrant policies in times of increasing international competition for their human capital (Cameron, Joyce, Wallace & Kell 2013). Operational problems occur, for instance, in matching the untapped potential of highly qualified, yet unemployed immigrant engineers with the dire need for mission-critical engineering and technical skills in various industries (Cameron et al. 2013). Similar issues are evident in New Zealand, where immigrants’ human capital shrinks on entry and migrants’ knowledge specific to their countries of origin becomes “obsolete” (Winkelmann & Winkelmann 1998: 18). This is incongruous as skilled immigrants are selected because of their skills and separation between place-specific and transferable skills is debatable. It does not warrant human capital wastage through un- or underemployment. Perhaps reflecting the increased globalization of New Zealand’s skills recruitment (Bedford, Bedford, Ho & Lidgard 2002), reported post-arrival problems related to language skills, credential and qualification legitimacy (Winkelmann & Winkelmann 1998). Such disadvantages are said to decrease over time because eventually “immigrants may be able to generate credible information about their skills” (Winkelmann & Winkelmann 1998: 18).
This sanctimonious position suggests generalizing distrust in immigrants’ self-representations, their countries’ education, and in government selection processes. Changed immigration procedures have been reported as resulting in better settlement outcomes as skilled immigrants “integrated immediately into the labor market” and maintained labor force participation “in excess of 90 percent” according to a large-scale longitudinal New Zealand government study (Masgoret, McLeod, Tausi, Ferguson, Plumridge & Duke 2012: ii). The same study described links between the immigrants’ jobs and their skills as “very positive for skilled migrants” (Merwood 2010: 5). Yet, individual experiences may not conform to statistical findings (Benmayor & Skotnes 2005) and labor market inclusion does not equate with efficient acceptance and use of immigrants’ skills. Indeed, in their review of several New Zealand studies on settlement outcomes, Benson-Rea and Rawlinson (2003) found a mismatch of skilled immigrants’ expectations and the reality of their labor market situations, which the authors relate to a lack of complete information readily available to migrants. These researchers stress that more insight into individual experiences of immigrants is needed to further elucidate large-scale statistical results. The current study contributes to this.

Considering that incomes are considerably higher in Austria, Germany and Switzerland than in New Zealand (see OECD 2012), the assumption of migrants seeking optimal financial returns on human capital investment does not apply to skilled immigrants from these countries. Of interest to the current study is, however, that organizations promote New Zealand as a lifestyle choice to attract highly skilled employees (Colmar Brunton 2000). Such business and government5 promotions give weight to Brettell and Hollifield’s (2000) argument that purely economic factors separated from social and cultural contexts cannot fully explain migration. The section below explores other possible factors impacting on migration from German-speaking Europe to New Zealand.

**Lifestyle migration, patchwork biographies and amenity migration**

Of fundamental interest for the current study is lifestyle migration, which has not yet been well understood (Benson & O’Reilly 2009; Torkington 2010). Lifestyle migration refers to a great range of people at different stages of life seeking idylls in diverse destinations for different reasons and varying time frames. For Benson and O’Reilly, the different lifestyles pursued have in common “re-negotiation of the work/life balance, quality of life, and freedom from prior constraints” (2009: 2). Quality of life is seen as having four dimensions:

- Livability of the environment, an external quality that refers to characteristics of the environment;

---

• Life-ability of the person, an inner quality that relates to how well a person is equipped to cope with life’s problems;
• Utility of life, a life outcome that refers to the usefulness of a person’s life from an external point of view; and
• Life appreciation, an inner life outcome (Veenhoven 2000: 6-7).

Patchwork biographies should also be included in considerations of lifestyle migration. As Fauth-Herkner (2001) explains, in patchwork biographies people do not follow the conventional predictable life pattern from school through work and family formation into retirement. Rather, people turn away from the archetypal (male) biography of fulltime work for 40 plus years and the associated separation and reciprocal exclusion of work and other life spheres. In patchwork biographies, the various life phases and spheres interweave with each other by chance or through careful planning. They are thought of as overlapping and permeating each other, with learning and working occurring at any time and any place but at changing intensities under thorough consideration of family and self (Fauth-Herkner 2001). The relevance of patchwork biographies to lifestyle migration is evident in Hoey’s (2008) explanations of lifestyle decisions. He suggests that lifestyle migrants seek “meaningful places of refuge that they can call home” and “a kind of moral re-orientation to questions about what gives meaning, fulfillment, dignity, and self-respect to a life” (Hoey 2008: 119).

Relevant for the current study is that lifestyle migration is about “escape from somewhere and something, while simultaneously an escape to self-fulfillment and a new life – a recreation, restoration or rediscovery of oneself, of personal potential or of one’s ‘true’ desires” (O’Reilly & Benson 2009: 3, italics in original). At pivotal points in their lives, “lifestyle migrants seek geographic places as personal refuges that they believe will resonate with idealized visions of self and family” (Hoey 2006: 350) and their move gives them a sense of regaining control through purposeful place attachment (Hoey 2009).

Lifestyle migration is the hunt for utopia “motivated by dreams and facilitated by at least comparative wealth” (O’Reilly 2009: 103). The quest for utopia implies of course that reality is highly unlikely to fulfill expectations. Lifestyle migration decisions are commonly influenced by travel (Kuentzel & Ramaswamy 2005). Therefore it is relevant that the anticipation involved in limited breaks from daily routines affects the tourist gaze (Urry & Larsen 2011). Based on Foucault’s explanation that gaze is constructed in social discourses, Urry and Larsen note that gaze is filtered by “ideas, skills, desires and expectations” (2011: 2). For example, Benson (2010b) found in her ethnographic study of British lifestyle immigrants’ emplacement in the landscapes of rural France that the immigrants intertwined their rural-idyll imaginings with the desire to integrate into the local community and their experiences of working with the landscape. The tension of experiences challenging their imagination became an ongoing source of ambivalence in their lives (Benson 2010b). Whilst Benson mentions that some of these immigrants have
children born in France, the study does not elaborate on the children’s experiences as part of the consequences of their parents’ migration choices.

Lifestyle migration has also attracted some interest in Australia (Buckley, Sander, Ollenburg & Warnken 2006) and New Zealand (Hall 2006). Whilst not focusing on lifestyle migration in her ethnographic study of German immigrants coming to New Zealand, Bönisch-Brednich (2002) refers to lifestyle choices for those arriving in the 1980s and 1990s. Bürgelt (2010) comments on the research gap relating to migrants from affluent countries searching for different opportunities and better lifestyles. Her two-year study involving 17 potential and actual German migrants to Australia and New Zealand found that migrant decisions harmonized with recent patchwork lifestyle trends towards personal growth, the realizations of dreams and living the desired life.

Amenity migration also considers the environment as important in migration decisions. Moss (2006) suggests that the desire to move to places perceived as having greater environmental qualities and differentiated cultures might be the most significant current migration force for many in industrialized countries. Rodríguez-Pose and Ketterer (2012) distinguish between natural amenities, and history- and culture-related amenities. Natural amenities such as pleasant landscapes, nature conservation areas, climate and access to the ocean influence in-migration (Partridge 2010; Rodríguez-Pose & Ketterer 2012) and Graves (1976; 1980) posits that favorable local amenities compensate for lower economic rewards. For some, lifestyle migration may even compare to religious conversion by leaving a modern hectic world dominated by the baubles of capitalism to live a more simple life (Hoey 2005; 2008).

Underpinned by patchwork biographies, lifestyle migration incorporates amenity migration in my view because the natural and cultural environments are essential parts of lifestyle decisions at critical points in life, about personal growth, realizing dreams and living the desired life. In line with life-long learning involved in patchwork biographies, lifestyle migration is “an ongoing learning process which only begins at the point of arrival and, in reality, has no end” for the immigrants (Kershen 2009: x).

Investigations into lifestyle migration tend to focus on the migrants (e.g., Benson & O’Reilly 2009; Hoey 2005; Sidebotham & Ahern 2011) whereas there is scant information on children who move with their lifestyle-migrant parents. O’Reilly’s (2009) study of experiences of 90 teenagers is an exception. Like their British lifestyle-migrant parents, these children lived an expatriate lifestyle separate from the Spanish community and attended a private, English-medium international high school. Reasons for this included the children’s struggle in Spanish schools due to their lack of Spanish language and experiences of bullying by Spanish peers. The study’s findings suggested that the teenagers’ migration to Spain was temporary rather than permanent. There is a need to consider further the wider consequences and impacts of lifestyle migration as permanent
migration (O’Reilly & Benson 2009), especially long-term consequences for families. The current study contributes to filling this gap.

**Immigrant settlement**

Migration processes are not completed of course when people arrive at their destination. Cultural balancing and socialization processes (Geisen 2012), or acculturation processes (Berry 1997) involve all aspects of life for immigrants and their families, and institutional and individual members of the receiving society. While experiences depend on life stages and vary for individuals, settlement is commonly seen as an early part of a longer integration process (Fletcher 1999). Settlement is “a process of complex renegotiation” (Burnett 1998: 1), during which immigrants “must come to terms with already existing schemes of understanding and of power relations” (Bottomley 1992:39). This involves not only the immigrants, but also the receiving society and government. The term renegotiation suggests concessions from all parties. Immigrants might therefore expect social and structural cooperation from the public and institutions especially in recipient countries that actively attract immigrants as New Zealand does. However, others focus on individual adaptation processes. Crosscultural adaptation is considered an immigrant’s personal journey towards “intercultural personhood”, an identity development that matures through challenges and inner crises and stretches the individual to achieve personal growth, intercultural empathy and competencies (Kim 2001: 194-195). This also emphasizes the transitory nature of adapting to life in a new country.

Terminology is perplexing in the vast but fragmented field of immigrant settlement across disciplines, across countries and their interests, and within different historical contexts. Terminology may not transfer well across languages either. For the current study, post-arrival processes and cultural tools used in these processes are important. Therefore, the meanings communicated through the terms acculturation and adaptation, assimilation and integration are relevant.

**Acculturation, adaptation and assimilation – issues with groups, ethnicity and culture**


Acculturation is the process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between cultural groups and their individual members. … It continues after initial contact in culturally plural societies, where ethnocultural communities maintain features of their heritage cultures. Adaptation to living in culture contact settings takes place over time. Occasionally it is stressful, but often it results in some form of accommodation.
Elsewhere, Berry sees acculturation and intergroup relations as two separate domains (Berry 2001) and cultural change relates to the changes in the cultural groups in contact (Berry 2005). Several difficulties emerge from the explanations.

The concept of group in categorizations of immigrants is problematic, not only because a group always creates outsiders. Reminiscent of immigrant exclusion is Berry’s categorization of immigrants as “ethnocultural groups” in contrast to the “larger society” (Berry 2001: 618). Through these terms, immigrants are marked and stigmatized, their ethnicity and culture considered shortcomings, in contrast to the ‘larger society’ which is unmarked as the ‘normals’ (cf. Goffman 1963/1986). Berry’s wording perpetuates the view of immigrants arriving as ‘ethnics’ (Waldinger 1993). New Zealand also disseminates the construct of ‘ethnic people’ as exotic and therefore as outgroup, which is bizarre since 25% of the total population were born overseas (Statistics New Zealand 2013). It also neglects that everyone including the ‘normals’ has ethnicity, that is, “a sense of group belonging, based on ideas of common origins, history, culture, experience and values” (Castles & Miller 2003: 35). For Bommes (2005), groups are unsuitable reference frames for settlement research. His rationale is that individual immigrants’ daily interactions are much more likely with individuals than with a cultural group. Immigrants need to find their way into society’s differentiated social systems, which have structural conditions and specific role expectations that need to be fulfilled – or assimilated to – to be successful (Bommes 2005). Bommes says that immigrants must acquire sociocultural competences for specific roles in particular circumstances like everyone else. Arguably, through achieving such essential competencies immigrants achieve group membership even though individuals differ in their ways of dealing with these requirements in daily life in their new social environments.

Contemporary German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand probably should not be considered a coherent cultural group despite certain public discourses implying cultural homogeneity within national borders (cf. Wessendorf 2008). Several European countries are home to native German speakers. These include heterogeneous configurations including diverging political and religious ideologies (cf. Bell 1993), as well as dialects unintelligible to one another even within Germany were it not for Schriftdeutsch [written German], that is, a common standard German understood by over 90 million people in Austria, Germany, Luxembourg and Switzerland, for example. In New Zealand, German speakers’ spatial dispersion, for instance, across the greater Auckland region (Holt 1999) raises doubts about German-speaker community formation in New Zealand.

For New Zealand statutory procedures, “Ethnicity is a measure of cultural affiliation, as opposed to race, ancestry, nationality or citizenship. Ethnicity is self perceived and people can belong to more than one ethnic group” (Statistics New Zealand 2011). Yet, the research discussed in this thesis illustrates the complexities of ancestry and ethnic classifications, as well as the problematics of culturalist discourses and biculturalism (see p82f) as it included participants who could claim Māori, German and Irish ancestry but in their cultural orientation conformed with the New Zealand English mainstream. Others, whose cultural orientation was similar, had Māori, Austrian and British ancestry, with details of the latter not known, whereas others had a German, and an English parent with Scottish ancestry but no Scottish cultural practices. In the families with Māori ancestry, Māori cultural practices were reserved for Māori family events such as a tangi (farewell and funeral) whereas Māori ethnicity was claimed for the children when seen as advantageous. For this thesis, ethnicity is used as declared by the qualitative-study participants and survey respondents.

Issues arise from the term culture even though the term is fashionable and used widely (e.g., acculturation, mono-, bi- and multiculturalism, cultural practices, cultural roots, cultural differences, culture shock, culture clashes etc.). There is no consensus on what culture entails (Jahoda 2012) although there seems to be agreement that culture is a social construct and includes patterns of meanings and behaviors learned through socialization; culture therefore has historical characteristics and is shared among a group of people (cf. Geertz 1973; Hofstede 1980; Triandis 1972). The term meanings here refers to people’s interpretations of the world, their beliefs and guiding values. With regard to immigrants in a neo-European sociocultural environment such as New Zealand it is significant that, “In the absence of immaculate perception, human beings interpret the world through culture-specific metaphors – particularly those aspects of the world that are not fully known to them” (Mühlhäusler 1995: 281). Schools of thought differ on the importance of culture for social life (Geisen & Bekerman 2012), with immigrants’ culture often seen as hindrance and consequently their acculturation an implied matter of submission to the national majority culture (Geisen 2012), whatever that might be. For young immigrants in particular, active work towards belonging is required in relation to both the values of their heritage culture and the national majority culture (Mecheril 2003). Values are “what we consider as important in life” (Boer & Fischer 2013: 1113). Rather than directly observable, values are an “invisible part” of cultures revealed in visible cultural behaviors and practices (Hofstede 1998: 482). Values are considered universal guiding principles of conduct, but priorities of value significance differ across cultures (Schwartz 1992).

Verschueren (2008: 26) suggests that, “the notion of culture, handled as if separable and distinct group-bound cultures exist, should be discredited as analytically useless”. Wessendorf’s (2008) research into second-generation Italian immigrants in Switzerland supports this argument through illustrating the intense intertwining of various Italian and Swiss cultural manifestations. From Verschueren’s linguistic-pragmatics perspective,
communicative competence including negotiation skills are the essential factors for successful discursive interactions within as well as across cultures. Yet, communicative competencies are culture-bound, which means that immigrants need to learn different culture-specific ways of communicating. German and Anglophone cultural communications tend to clash in terms of directness, for example, with German direct talk often considered impolite by English speakers (House 2006) whilst German speakers consider certain New Zealand conversational routines evasive (Bönisch-Brednich 2002; 2005). Such communicative competence issues arise as immigrants arrive at “the significatory boundaries of cultures, where meanings and values are (mis)read or signs are misappropriated” (Bhabha 1994: 50). Immigrant acculturation should therefore be considered in terms of negotiations in this interstitial context of fuzzy cultural thresholds.

In explanations and applications of acculturation in the literature, the distinction between the terms acculturation and adaptation is blurred. Adaptation is considered the outcome of acculturation (Sam & Berry 2010), yet acculturation is also “the meeting of cultures and the resulting changes” (Sam & Berry 2006: 1, italics added). Elsewhere, adaptation describes the process of acculturation as immigrants go through complex patterns of continuity and change in adapting psychologically, socioculturally and economically to the new context (Berry 1997). In these crosscultural transitions, psychological adaptation refers to changes of attitudes, values and behaviors in individuals through long-term crosscultural contact, and to feelings of wellbeing and satisfaction (Berry 1997; Graves 1967; Ward & Kennedy 1994), whereas sociocultural adaptation refers to cultural competencies, i.e., appropriate sociocultural skills to successfully negotiate interactions in a cultural environment (Searle & Ward 1990).

If acculturation is seen as mutual coming-closer and eventual merging of cultural meanings and behaviors between whole population groups within one place, as Berry’s (2004) definition suggests, it is unlikely to be completed during individual migrant settlement but rather across generations. Individual immigrants may well modify certain attitudinal and value aspects – as is likely for everyone going through life stages – but wholesale cultural changes are doubtful at least for immigrants who arrived as adults because of individuals’ deep-seated, embodied cultural experiences and practices. Life stages and generational differentiation are inseparable from the processes of adaptation and integration (Rumbaut 2004). As Berry (2005) argues, acculturation may take years, generations or even centuries. Because acculturation considered as an adaptation process between people from originally different cultures may take so long, I think the term acculturation is more suitable perhaps for a long-term view of cultural changes. Acknowledging that all learning is

Graves’ article suggests that whilst the three cultural groups (Anglos, Latinos, native American Indians) lived side by side for a long time in the community where the research was carried out, there was not much close contact between them.
cultural in some sense, I prefer the terms adaptation and integration when focusing on immigrants’ settlement actions in their adopted country. I will examine integration next.

**Integration and assimilation**

Integration is a term most frequently used in continental European immigration-related texts. Spencer defines integration as

> processes of interaction between migrants and the individuals and institutions of the receiving society that facilitate economic, social, cultural, and civic participation and an inclusive sense of belonging at the national and local level.  

(Spencer 2011: 203)

For Geissler (2004), integration is both an analytical and political normative concept that refers to the process of immigrant incorporation, the state of inclusion as the result of this process, and the desired goal of incorporation. Different understandings of integration have different political implications. That is, those who use integration synonymously with assimilation or acculturation illuminate different aspects of reality than others whose understanding of integration allows for cultural pluralism (Geissler 2004). Spencer (2011), Geissler (2004) and Esser (2001) distinguish between basic dimensions of systemic integration and social integration. Esser (2001) suggests that this differentiation eliminates the problem of understanding assimilation. Building on Gordon’s (1964) societal structures, Esser (2001) defines systemic integration as assimilation into the structures of society in the sense that society offers equality of education, income, professional prestige and political participation for all regardless of ethnicity.

This systemic assimilation can be seen as synonymous with ‘equal participation’. For Esser (2001), social integration immediately after arrival may be integration into the immigrants’ ethnic group to avoid marginalization, but this should not lead to ethnic group segmentation but rather to eventual social assimilation. Social assimilation is understood as mutual adjustment towards becoming a cohesive society (Esser 2001). On the path to societal cohesion, reaching normative integration concepts on a political level is imperative (Sezer 2010), and a nation’s self-perception with robust discussions of essential fundamental communal values is vital (Münz, Seifert & Ulrich 1999). Esser suggests that systemic integration requires secularization and individualization, with positions and recruitment based on merits rather than on ethnicity. He notes that social integration (in terms of social assimilation) usually lags behind systemic integration (in terms of systemic assimilation) and might take generations. This is an interesting point to consider for the current study. Also, as Latcheva and Herzog-Punzenberger (2011) point out, integration process structures are linked to particular points in time and circumstances. The authors explain that the dynamics of the integration process depend on individuals’ biographical events and life phases; on socialization contexts (which differ for each generation); on particular conditions of the country’s economy; and on opportunity structures (e.g., citizenship regulations).
There is no agreement on social policies to facilitate integration, but absorption emerges as the final goal, making it a gentler form of assimilation (Castles & Miller 2003). New Zealand institutional requirements for immigrants include levels of English skills, which can be seen as dominant English-speaker group assimilation demand that facilitates exclusion, for instance, from certain jobs. On the other hand, individual immigrants may choose selective assimilation to reach certain goals and be respected and therefore fully integrated as equals (Cook 2003). I see integration not as entirely synonymous with assimilation as Esser (2001) does, but – on the part of the receiving society – as offering equal participation, and – from an immigrant’s point of view – as adaptation to essential communal values, and to institutional and social role requirements to achieve inclusion. I take assimilation as submergence in the target culture. The following examines the ways immigrants are thought to adapt to the recipient society.

**Immigrants’ strategies and tools for integration into society**

Three notions regarding strategies and tools employed by immigrants and their descendants in migration literature are considered useful for the current study. Firstly, Berry’s acculturation strategies are seen as central to crosscultural research (Ward & Kus, 2012) although the framework has been criticized (e.g., Weinreich 2009). Another view of immigrant integration is Nayar’s (2009) theory of navigating cultural spaces. The third is the notion of cultural tool kits (Codde 2003).

Berry (1997) identified four acculturation strategies, namely integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization to deal with two dimensions of acculturation, i.e., maintenance of heritage culture, and relationships sought with/in another cultural group. According to Berry (1997), people assign values to either dimension, and choose acculturation strategies accordingly, given they are free to do so. Assimilation applies where individuals have no interest in maintaining their original cultural identity and pursue interaction with other cultures on a daily basis. Separation is the opposite. In this case, individuals avoid interaction with other cultures while valuing their original culture. Integration applies when individuals are interested in maintaining “some degree of cultural integrity” of their original culture whilst interacting daily with other groups (1997: 9). Marginalization is defined when individuals have little interest in or possibility for cultural maintenance as well as scant interest in having relations with other cultural groups.

According to Berry (1997; 2001), the most positive and least stressful strategy is integration, which requires mutual accommodation. He adds that integration requires immigrants to adopt the larger society’s basic values and, on the part of the receiving society, institutional adaptation to meet the needs of all groups in a multicultural society (Berry 1997; 2001). Berry (1997) does note that preference may vary depending on length of residence and on generational status, and that one strategy might be preferred in more private domains and another in public. Yet, his general assumption of an individual’s
preference for one of these acculturation strategies poses problems (Nayar 2009; Schütze 2003).

In her personal-networks study of young educated Russian-Jewish immigrants in Germany, for example, Schütze (2003) found that whilst all of Berry’s acculturation strategies were used, over a three-year period attitudes and strategies fluctuated in connection with occupational opportunities and social acceptance. From her study of Iranian women in Australia, Jamarani (2012) concluded that acculturation strategies depended on target-language proficiency and on acceptance of strategies by immigrants’ own and by mainstream ethnic groups. She therefore added target language proficiency as an important aspect into available acculturation strategy choices.

Nayar (2009) derived her theory of ‘navigating cultural spaces’ from research into daily occupations of Indian women immigrants in New Zealand. The core of this theory is that in creating a space for themselves and their families, immigrants move in and out of, and between the cultural ways of their original culture and the cultures they encounter in their new environment, or they choose the ‘best of both worlds’ in their daily occupations. Dimensional elements are private and public spaces, and different situational cultural ways and identifications depend on these dimensions.

In the context of consequences of immigration across generations, Codde’s (2003) translation studies idea of cultural tool kits is inviting. According to Codde (2003: 96), “people actively choose the ends they wish to achieve … and in order to arrive at those goals, they use culture as a ‘tool kit’ from which they select the most expedient means”. This bears similarity to Nayar’s theory. Understanding cultural meanings and behaviors in the social environment that immigrants move into is essential for integration success. Acquisition of these sociocultural competencies allows immigrants to move between their cultural repertoires and choose cultural tools that are appropriate to achieve situational objectives. Yet, as this study indicates, there are also significant emotional elements involved in migration and its consequences.

**Long-term consequences across generations**

Rumbaut (2006) calls for academics to advance knowledge in the interstices between theory, rhetoric and reality in the immensely complex field of long-term immigration consequences across the generations. To achieve valid insights into the integration of immigrant generations, studies are needed that consider individuals’ life stages and the dynamics of their social lives over time (de Valk, Windzio, Wingens & Aybek 2011). The current study contributes to achieving this end.
Learning from past immigration

Not surprisingly, given migration numbers and diversity, observations of earlier European mass immigration to the United States underpin understanding of assimilation. Portes and Rumbaut (2005: 985-986) see this past assimilation as one-sided cultural blending into a dominant American mainstream across three generations in that –

Children of immigrants learned English, gradually abandoned their parents’ language and culture … By the third generation, foreign languages were a distant memory and ethnic identities were social conveniences, displayed on selected occasions but subordinate to overwhelming American selves.

This straight-line assimilation portrayed by Portes and Rumbaut differs somewhat from the Hansen-Herberg three-generation hypothesis. Related to almost complete submergence or assimilation in the receiving society, Herberg (1955/1960) combined Hansen’s (1938: 9) “principle of third generation interest” in their forefathers’ culture, and Reeves Kennedy’s (1952) research findings to suggest that while the second generation turned away from their parents’ religion, the third generation returned to the religion of their grandparents. Hansen (1938) had claimed that the second generation turned away from their parents’ culture and actively aimed to be indistinguishable from natives in mainstream society. The third generation, however, was so curious about their ethnic origins that they could not help but explore their heritage (Hansen 1938). However, in Nahirny and Fishman’s (1965) view, the third generation’s interest is relative to the second generation discarding their ethnic roots. This means that the third generation appreciates their ethnic roots exactly because these aspects have become symbolic tokens weak enough not to be cultural restraints in any way.

In her study of marriage statistics, Reeves Kennedy (1952) found assimilation occurring through intermarriage between national-origin groups. Yet, at the same time intermarriage separated people into a ‘triple melting pot’ along religious lines. Herberg (1955/1960) suggested that for the first immigrant generation, social life revolved around their religious institutions, which were transformed in the process of accommodating members from different regions of origin. Handlin (1951/2007) argued that church attendance was not necessarily due to religiosity but religious communities were also helpful in material, economic ways for networking and social support. The second generation, according to Herberg (1955/1960), tended to discard religion altogether, identified with and assimilated into the Anglophone American mainstream. The third generation was linguistically and economically completely assimilated into this mainstream. Yet, they longed for differentiating self-identification within the mainstream, which could be satisfied by returning to the religion of their immigrant ancestors, leading to what Herberg, like Reeves Kennedy (1952), considered a tripartite social division of American society into Catholics, Protestants and Jews. This predicted social-religious division has not eventuated according to Gans (1997).
Current considerations of immigration consequences across generations

From the time when Gans (1992) questioned the traditionally assumed almost automatic social upward mobility and straight-line assimilation of immigrants’ descendants, investigations into long-term consequences of immigration across generations have generally focused on the second generation. This is because questions of immigrant descendants’ ethnic orientation, identity shifts, intercultural marriage, economic outcomes and societal stratification are decided in the second generation (Portes 1994).

Immigrant generations, belonging and identity

Yet, usage of the term generation is problematic in immigration research, with age factors and historical context often not acknowledged (Kertzer 1983). First generation may refer to instigators of immigration or to these adults and their immigrating children (i.e., immigrant children) (Perlmann & Waldinger 1997; Portes & Rivas 2011). The second-generation, according to Skrbiš, Baldassar and Poynting (2007), can be sorted into statistical, social and linguistic groups. For Skrbiš et al., the statistical second generation refers to children born in the receiving society to foreign-born parents; the social definition extends this category to include those born outside the country but who immigrated during early childhood; the linguistic distinction expands the social category to include children below the age of 13, as speech-sound habits become fixed during puberty (cf. Clyne 1972). This grouping relates to the critical period hypothesis, which states that implicit linguistic competence acquisition (i.e., acquisition of prosody*, phonological* and morphological* systems, and syntax*) has an upper age limit (Paradis 2004). It includes simultaneous bilinguals (i.e., children who have two first languages before 3 years of age) and sequential bilinguals (i.e., children whose first language has been fairly established before they learn a second language, e.g., when home and school languages differ) (Paradis 2010).

For others, second generation includes children of immigrants without any definition of where they were born (Perlmann & Waldinger 1997); or children of immigrants born in the receiving country (Dubuc 2012; Portes & Rivas 2011); or children born in another country who have lived in the receiving country for five years or more (Portes & Schauffler 1994); or immigrants’ children or children with one immigrant parent born in the receiving country (Portes & Hao 1998); children of immigrants born in the receiving country until they are granted citizenship, from which point they no longer are considered immigrants (Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault & Senécal 1997); children born in the receiving country or elsewhere as long as they attended school in the new country (Wessendorf 2008). Third generation is used to refer to children whose parents were also born in the receiving country (Alba, Logan, Lutz & Stults 2002; Karthick Ramakrishnan 2004), which does not fit with several definitions of the second generation.

Some scholars have tried to improve generational categorization to deal with cultural imprints. For example, those who immigrate under the age of 12 have been classified as
generation 2a, with 2b referring to those born in the country (Burnley 1986; Janse van Rensburg, Hatoss & Starks 2008). The 1.5 generation refers to foreign-born children who arrive before adolescence (Portes & Hao 1998) or “at an early age” (Portes & Rivas 2011: 220). According to Rumbaut and Ima (1988), this early arrival allows them to develop bicultural competence in the interstices of two societies and cultures. Others extend the 1.5 generation classification to those who immigrate between 6-18 years of age (Bartley & Spoonley 2008). The term 2.5 generation may refer to those with one foreign-born parent and one parent born in the receiving country (Karthick Ramakrishnan 2004).

Considerations of generation, belonging and identity can hardly be separated, as Skrbiš et al. (2007) assert. The authors point out that subjective definitions of generation depend on individual perceptions of identity and belonging as well as identity and belonging attributions by others. Parents’ experiences also impact on the next generation (Portes 2003b). Immigrants and subsequent generations may adopt multiple ethnic identities, or hybrid identities and they may use these strategically depending on the context (Skrbiš et al. 2007). Subjective generational definitions that foreground ethnicity, such as second-generation Greeks instead of first-generation Australian, also can serve as a form of ‘othering’, of exclusion (Skrbiš et al. 2007). Subjective ethnicity definitions are points of interest for the current study. Also, the current study uses generation in its genealogical sense whilst considering age at immigration and family circumstances in relation to cultural competencies.

Incorporation pathways across generations

There is no consensus on contemporary incorporation paths of the generations descending from the original immigrants, although understanding can be categorized into: assimilation across the generations on a classical linear path; a ‘bumpy-line’ version of assimilation with some upheavals along the way (Gans 1997); a blending of original and ‘new’ cultural aspects as in hybridity (Bhabha 1994); selective assimilation (Portes 2003b); strengthening of ethnocultural distance (Esser 2004; Waldinger & Perlmann 1998); or segmented assimilation into different segments of society (Esser 2004; Portes & Rumbaut 2006; Portes & Zhou 1993; Zhou 1997). Selective acculturation (Portes 2003b) resembles Berry’s (1997) integration strategy in achieving bicultural competencies with retention of original cultural aspects. For instance, immigrants may adapt to the ways of the receiving culture in their workplace but use their original ethnic ways in their own home (cf. Fischer, Harvey & Driscoll 2009; Nayar 2009). Intergenerational conflicts considered developmental phases in the recipient society may deepen when children of immigrants acquire disparate values relating to respect for elders and parental control (Phinney, Ong & Madden 2000). Portes and Zhou (1993) suggest that members of the contemporary second generation undergo segmented assimilation into different societal strata, that is, they integrate in one of three ways: into the mainstream middle class as in the conventional assimilation model; into marginal societal groups that lead to enduring poverty and perhaps criminal association; or
they achieve economic success within their own ethnic group. These points were made earlier by Gordon (1964) although he did not use the label ‘segmented assimilation’.

A number of factors are considered critical determinants of incorporation paths across the generations. Family structure, families’ human capital and their social reception are crucial (Portes & Fernández-Kelly 2008; Schittenhelm 2011). Experiences of social distance and discrimination may lead to immigrants and subsequent generations emphasizing their ethnic identities (Esser 2004; Portes & Rivas 2011). Portes and Rivas suggest that, “repeated incidents of discrimination are found to lower adolescent self-esteem” (Portes & Rivas 2011: 230). They also think that there may be a connection between low self-esteem and lower academic achievement. Human capital is an important element for the children’s educational and socioeconomic attainment (Söhn 2011). High parental and second-generation education supports selective acculturation evident in the use of hyphenated self-identities (Portes & Rivas 2011) such as German-Americans or Austrian-Kiwis. Individual agency and economic circumstances are also considered important for subsequent generations (Gans 1997; Rumbaut 1994).

Age and region of origin matter too. Empirical studies show that descendants of immigrants born in the country of immigration and those who came at a very young age are more likely to identify with the receiving society than immigrants who arrived in their youth (Portes & Rivas 2011). While region of origin and social distance to the mainstream society have considerable effects on educational and adult success, the age of eight is considered the watershed, with those who immigrate later having worse future prospects according to Beck, Corak and Tienda (2012). Using United States census statistics, Beck et al. (2012) show that child immigrants from non-English-speaking countries – in comparison with those from English-speaking countries – are much less likely to report very good English skills and are much less likely to marry an English speaker, with endogamous marriage much more likely. The authors suggest a cause-effect relationship between these factors. Without a doubt a common language plays a considerable role in forging relationships. In my view, however, language-origin demographics do not support cause-effect conclusions. That is, other cultural values and attitudes that are unlikely to show in a census may encourage or discourage in- or out-group marriages.

Portes and Rumbaut (2006) suggest that selective acculturation with retention of cultural elements including religion is a feature in today’s second generation that offers stabilizing and educational benefits. For Gans (1997), the third generation has almost completely assimilated. Yet, he cautions: “the opportunity for any but the most formal or superficial assimilation may not even become available until the third generation” (Gans 1997: 877). Gans also suggests that rather than genuine revived interest in secular and religious ethnic
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8 Kiwi – the name of a flightless indigenous New Zealand bird – is also a very common (self) identification of New Zealanders.
cultures that was suggested by the Hansen-Herberg hypothesis, members of the third generation re-embrace the ethnicity of their ancestors only in symbolic ways that do not interfere with their daily lives. Patterns adopted to express this nostalgic ‘symbolic ethnicity’ are, for instance, ethnic festivals and consumer goods such as food, and specific ethnic identification for children from intercultural liaisons. Since the third-generation children in the current study are all from intercultural relationships, this last point is of particular interest in the current study. While the visibility of symbolic ethnicity might suggest ethnic revival and return to the values discarded by the second generation, Gans sees it rather as a different form of acculturation.

**Language**

Two questions regarding language are relevant in the current study: What happens with German across three generations as a consequence of immigration into an English language environment? What are the circumstances and reasons?

As noted above, Portes and Rumbaut (2005) suggest that heritage languages were just memories by the third generation in previous immigration waves from Europe to America. Portes and Rumbaut overlook that at the beginning of the 20th century, 9 million German-Americans maintained their German language (Kloss 1966). Starting with WWI hostilities, however, German language was blocked through laws, humiliation and persecutions (Grosjean 1984), resulting in unprecedented, complete linguistic assimilation into Anglophone America (Kloss 1966). Experiences and attitudes linked to the National Socialist regime in their countries of origin and to hostilities between the countries impacted settlers' German language use, resulting in German language loss and shift to English for immigrants and refugees also in Australia (Clyne 2003). Such reasons for interruption of German language maintenance also applied to New Zealand's previously German-speaking communities (cf. Bade 1993b; Morris 1993; Wildfeuer & Eller 2009) although Salmons (2002) argues that the World Wars had a more indirect effect, with Anglophone educational institutionalization already well advanced in America resulting in gradual assimilation.

Portes and Rumbaut’s (2005) reference to ‘foreign languages’ in relation to immigrants’ community languages signals exclusion as well as persistent pressure for all immigrants to assimilate through English monolingualism. This is because language socialization includes acquisition of cultural principles and meanings systems, as well as social and situational norms (Ochs & Schieffelin 2011). Testing the three-generation model of linguistic assimilation, Lieberson and Curry’s (1971) study of historical United States census data suggests that despite first-generation immigrants maintaining their heritage languages, the shift to English was complete and final within a few generations. Exceptions to this with respect to German language are Sprachinseln [language islands] in fairly isolated colonies of German immigrants, for instance, in Brazil, Russia and the USA (Rosenberg 2003).
However, as Rosenberg points out, political pressure, persecution, and increased Russian language contact led to the demise of German language retention in these Russian communities. On the other hand, German still remains the language of church and community communication within the close-knit, faith-oriented Old Order Amish in Pennsylvania (see http://amishamerica.com/amish-online-encyclopedia/).

Alba, Logan, Lutz and Stults (2002) compared United States censuses from 1940 and 1970 for European immigrants and their descendants with 1990 statistics to determine the home languages of second- and third-generation children. They found that of all assimilatory changes, language was most impacted by generation, with three-generation Anglicization typical across ethnic groups. For instance, 68% of second-generation German children in the 1940 census and 97% of third-generation in the 1970 census had English as their mother tongue, with intermarriage accelerating language shift (Alba, Logan, Lutz & Stults 2002). Generational German and Dutch language shift is considered proceeding along similar time frames (Clyne 2003). For example, Hulse (2000), in her study of three generations of Dutch speakers in New Zealand found that across three generations English increasingly dominated and maintenance of Dutch decreased. Similarly, in Crezee’s (2008) study of old Dutch immigrants in New Zealand, immigrant grandparents could no longer speak Dutch with their English-speaking grandchildren, who had only retained very few Dutch key words related to food.

Bilinguals and multilinguals acquire linguistic multicompetence that is best seen as a continuum rather than as discrete states of development (Schmid 2011). Changes within this continuum start in the first immigrant generation. For example, in her study of language attrition in German-speaking Jewish emigrants after nearly 60 years in Anglophone countries, Schmid (2004: 252) found three categories along a line of decreasing L1 proficiency. Group 1 showed L1 preservation “to an astonishing degree”; group 2 could disguise their reduced lexical repertoire with avoidance strategies; group 3 displayed the highest rate of language loss. In her study of German immigrants in the United States, Badstübner (2011) found unsurprisingly that German-language teachers (time spent in the U.S. between 1.5 and 25 years) showed fewer differences such as L2 interference, grammatical errors, and lexical retrieval problems in their L1 speech than professionals in other areas (time spent in the U.S. between 1.4 and 24 years) when compared with a control group of monolingual German speakers in Germany.

In the 1996 Australian census, first-generation immigrant German speakers showed the highest rate of language shift in the home among all ethnic groups, with nearly 50% reporting English as their only home language (Clyne 2003). Clyne (2003) suggests that immigrants’ language shift to English represents a cultural-regional continuum, with shift to English increasing the further north and west – and thus increasingly closer to England – the immigrants’ region of origin is in German and Dutch-speaking Europe. Other reasons have also been identified. For instance, Australian statistics indicate exogamous marriages
at a very high rate for German speakers (Clyne 2003). Still, 1976 and 1986 census data showed German as one of the top-ten languages other than English (LOTE) spoken at home in each Australian state (Clyne 1991). German remained in the top-ten LOTE spoken at home in six Australian cities (Clyne, Hajek & Kipp 2008). In Melbourne and Sydney, Australia’s biggest centers, where German-speaking immigrants tend to live at the city fringes rather than congregate in one place, German was not among the most common LOTE (Clyne et al. 2008). This tendency of German-speaking immigrants to disperse was also found in New Zealand (Holt 1999).

The high population density of German speakers in South Australia corresponded with low language shift (Clyne 1991) whilst Hatoss (2006) reports high language shift despite their numerical strength in Queensland. This is of interest in the current study of families, considering the dispersion of German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand found by Holt (1999). Clyne concluded that restricting reasons for language maintenance and shift to language use in the home understates the significance of community languages. The primary network of the extended family is important too:

It is social communication within the extended family, not necessarily in the home that maintains the language. Two important variables in community language use are then the presence of an extended family – especially grandparents – within easy reach and the cohabitation of the extended family. (Clyne 1991: 113)

Clyne includes close friends in this primary network. Significantly, whilst German language use was found to be high among the 55-plus age groups, rapid decline of German as the home language for children throughout Australia was evident in census data (Clyne 1991). The 90% shift to English from German in the second generation was only superseded by the 95% shift from Dutch to English (Clyne 2003). A similar high Dutch to English shift rate was reported by Crezee (2008). Clyne suggested that the children appeared to instigate the shift from German to English in families. In contrast, Lieberson and Curry argue that “bilingual parents must pass on English as the mother-tongue of the next generation” for language shift to occur (1971: 126). Interestingly, Lieberson and Curry found that bilingual parents from groups with high levels of bilingualism were more likely to raise their children as English monolinguals. These are points of significance for the current study. Also, language and accent are markers that perpetuate immigrants’ outsider positions, their ‘otherness’, which in New Zealand settings resulted in immigrants home language shift so their children would not be seen as outsiders (Bönisch-Brednich 2002; 2005; Crezee 2012).

German language maintenance and shift to English across the generations have not been investigated in New Zealand. The current study contributes to filling this gap. Supporting Clyne’s findings of higher densities of speakers in communities supporting language maintenance and slowing down language loss, there are indications that German was still spoken, for example, in the 1960s in South Island settlements founded by German speakers in the early 19th century (Bade 1993b; Morris 1993). This may indicate that German speakers did not pass on their language to the next generation from the time of
hostilities between the countries. Residents of another originally German-speaking settlement made this point. The visiting German linguists Wildfeuer and Eller (2009) discovered German still being spoken by some elderly descendants about 150 years after their German-speaking Bohemian ancestors arrived in Puhoi9. The linguists were interested in features of the elderly speakers’ German dialects10, which had kept local-origin differences between families but included, for example, lexical and morphological blending with English and Māori. The current study touches on such codemixing.

Whilst German-language competence is at times mentioned in passing, for instance, by Watts and Trlin (2000) who report Dutch and German as the most prominent European LOTE in New Zealand government entities, only three small studies have focused on the languages of German-speaking immigrants or their descendants. One linguistic study focused on the role of social networks in the use and retention of German in immigrant children. In her case study of four German-born immigrant children living in New Zealand, Walker (1996) found the use of German and English fairly balanced. She concluded that social networks are crucial for language maintenance but wondered how the language situation would change once these children left home and English dominance increased in their daily lives. The current study explores such scenarios. In her study of German-speaking immigrants’ English, Halstead (2005) found that quality of interactions with New Zealanders correlated with English language competency and sense of belonging and affiliation with New Zealanders. She concluded that issues of identity are interwoven with language learning in the target language culture but did not elaborate. The current study, on the other hand, considers the nexus of language as a cultural tool and identity across three generations.

As this literature about German language retention and shift to English indicates, German speakers have migrated to destinations allover the globe. In the following, I touch on some of these migrations.

1.2.2. German speakers’ migrations

German speakers have migrated for many centuries to (and back from) destinations within Europe (‘German emigration from Russia’ 1979; ‘Rothschild’ 2001; Verwiebe, Mau, Seidel & Kathmann 2010) and around the globe. They moved, for example, to the Americas (Grant 2003; Ribeiro Hoffmann 2001; Thompson 2008; Wulffen 2010), to Africa (Armbruster 2010; Kossmat 1897; Weigend, 1985), to Asia and the Pacific Islands (Kahn & Wilke 2007; Schultz 2005; Schultz-Naumann 1985; Suren 2012), to Australia (Clyne 1972; Seitz & Foster 1985) and New Zealand (Bade 1993; 1998; Braund 1997; Harrison 2006). German speakers left

9 http://www.puhoihistoricalsociety.org.nz/
10 mp3 recording extract on http://www.deutschboehmisch.de/neuseeland/
their region of origin for many different reasons in different historical contexts. Historic reasons included political instability, adversities and persecutions, or economic deprivation (Wepman 2008). German speakers coming to the Pacific were traders, missionaries, or had colonial plans (McBryde 1993; Oettli 1993; Paulin 1993). They were drawn by a sense of adventure and opportunities (cf. Forster 1778/2007; Community Relations n/d), by promises of land availability, to German colonies (cf. Jacobs 1971; 1977), and not least attracted by ardent travelogues (e.g., Forster 1778/2007; von Chamisso 1822/2011).

The first large group of German-speaking migrants arriving in Australia, for example, was recorded in 1838 (Community Relations n/d), and in the United States in 1683 (Palatine Project n/d). About 50 million Americans claimed German ancestry in the 2009 census, making German Americans the biggest ancestry group ahead of Irish Americans, African Americans, and English Americans (‘German American’ 2013); and 898 674 (4.5% of respondents) recorded German ancestry in the 2011 Australian census, making German Australians the sixth most identified ancestry group behind Australian, English, Irish, Scottish and Italian (Community Relations n/d; ‘German Australian’ 2013).

German speakers’ migration to New Zealand

In his introduction to “The German Connection”, Bade (1993a) explains in detail the problems with defining the term ‘German’ due to past European political border shifts. Because language is the common cultural core, I follow Bade’s example in considering native German speakers (rather than German nationals) and their descendants as a basic participant criterion for the current study.

The first German speakers arrived in New Zealand with the British explorer James Cook in the 18th century (Bade 1993a; Forster 1778/2007; Stoffel, H-P. 1993). Assisted immigration drives by the New Zealand Company in the 1840s and by the New Zealand Government in the 1870s recruited immigrants from German-speaking Europe (Braund 1997; Burnley 1973). These settlers were thought to assimilate easily into the Anglo-Saxon colony and to be particularly suited for clearing forested areas, road building, railway construction and farm work (Minson 1993; Stoffel, H-P. 1993). Others pursued scientific exploration (Fisher 1993; Kermode 1993); were sought after as professionals (Mansfield Thomson 1993); or came as missionaries (Oettli 1993; Natush 1993; Sutherland 1993).

The immigrants were encouraged by those who had immigrated before (Baumer 2012); by connections between the countries at diplomatic levels and between institutions (Bade 1993c; Stoffel, G.M. 1993); and by travelogues and fiction (e.g. Forster 1778/2007; Grube 2012). Like in Australia, German speakers became the second-largest immigrant group in New Zealand after the British during the 19th century (Bade 2012; Leitner 2004) and they
settled throughout New Zealand (Morris 1993; Panny 1993; Rhys 1993). Like elsewhere, German speakers and those with a German name experienced hostilities and government sanctions in New Zealand during, between, and after the World Wars\(^\text{11}\) (cf. Bade 1993; Bönisch-Brednich 2002; King 1998; Thompson 2008), with all, including refugees from the National Socialist regime, classified as enemy aliens (Beaglehole 1998). Whilst contributing considerably to society (e.g. Bell 1993, 1998; Braund 1998; Laurs 1998; Paulin 1993), German-speaking immigrants became submerged into the New Zealand English culture, which in part is attributed to the periods of war in the first half of the 20\(^{th}\) century (Bade, 1998). Harrison (2006) notes a general tendency to forget about the early influx from German-speaking Europe linked to hostilities between the countries as well as to English monolingualism, which makes German language sources inaccessible.

According to Bade (2012), the recent influx of mainly upper-middle-class arrivals has made German speakers the largest immigrant group from continental Europe in the new millennium. Bade also estimates that some 200,000 New Zealanders may be descendants of German-speaking immigrants today. This number cannot be confirmed through census data because German speakers may be included in various self-selected ethnic classifications, such as the European or New Zealand category and their descendants may use identifications that do not connect them to this ancestry. In the 2013 census, 42,420 German speakers, including 12,810 permanent residents, reported German as their ethnicity (Statistics New Zealand 2013). An additional 8,211 ethnic Germans were recorded in this census without information about their visa or citizen status. These could include permanent residents, New Zealand passport holders, tourists, business travelers, those visiting family, temporary student, work, or working-holiday visa holders. Records of long-term\(^\text{12}\) arrivals indicate that long-term German-nationals’ immigration mushroomed by an astonishing 465% in the decade to 2009 (Statistics New Zealand, 2010). However, such numbers give indications of migration in terms of cross-border movements (Bedford, Callister & Didham 2010), but they need to be read with caution as they record arrivals including returning travelers with an intended stay of 12 months and more, rather than giving accurate numbers of actual immigrants\(^\text{13}\). Sorensen\(^\text{14}\) suggests that approved permits give a more accurate picture of immigrants despite an approved permit not guaranteeing that the person actually travelled to New Zealand. Approved work permit (WP) and permanent residence permit (PR) statistics were only available from 1997 and were obtained under the Official Information Act (Immigration New Zealand 2014). As Table

\(^{11}\) New Zealand instantly followed the United Kingdom’s declaration of war to Germany in both WWI and WWII. As enemy aliens, German men were interned for the duration of the conflicts (Bade 2010).

\(^{12}\) 12 months plus

\(^{13}\) For instance, when I travelled between New Zealand and Europe more than once in certain years, each time I returned I was counted as a long-term migrant arriving because I stated on the arrival card that I intended to stay for 12 months plus. In the past 30 years I have therefore been counted as a long-term arrival many times although I immigrated only once.

\(^{14}\) Personal email communication (December 2013) with Michael Sorensen (Business advisor, Operations Support, Immigration New Zealand)
1.2–1 (below) shows, the numbers of issued work and permanent residence permits show a strong recent influx of German speakers to New Zealand especially from Germany.

Table 1.2—1: Total work and permanent residence permits granted 1997 – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total permits granted</th>
<th>To Austrians WP</th>
<th>To Austrians PR</th>
<th>To Germans WP</th>
<th>To Germans PR</th>
<th>To Swiss WP</th>
<th>To Swiss PR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1997 – June Dec 2013</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>100,625</td>
<td>8,785</td>
<td>5,225</td>
<td>1,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.3. Migration research methods

Quantitative methods using censuses and institutional data sets such as educational completion or marriage registers, employment figures, or border crossing data have dominated migration research (e.g., Reeves Kennedy 1952; Portes 2003b). The need to more fully understand the complex post-immigration developments across generations has required a mix of research methods (cf. Graham 1999; Rumbaut & Ima 1988). To understand language behavior across generations through long-term studies, for example, large-scale surveys (e.g., Portes & Hao 1998; Wu, Schimmele & Hou 2012) or phone interviews at intervals using computer systems have been used (e.g., Rumbaut, Massey & Bean 2006), for example. Experimental studies have investigated attitudes to language and accent (e.g., Castelan Cargile & Giles 1997). Questionnaires have been used to compare acculturative attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Kosmitzki 1996).

Qualitative research methods have been recognized as useful tools for in-depth understanding of migration and its consequences. Qualitative studies have used narratives to focus on experiences of individual immigrants (e.g., Schütze 2003). Individual stories inform about the subjectively experienced patterned migration processes that are part of individual and collective biographies (Brettell 2003). Narratives, observation and video recordings have become powerful modes of capturing creative cultural practices and experiences. In her ethnographic study, for example, Thompson (2008) combined these methods to comprehend the family narratives of immigration and Americanization of second, third, and fourth generation German Americans. There are calls for these subjective stories to be considered within the nexus of the wider trajectories and forces that influence these experiences (Lamb 2001). This is what the current study does.

In New Zealand, the government’s longitudinal immigration survey (LisNZ) interviewed over 5000 immigrants approved for residence to evaluate their first three years in New Zealand. The study was conducted in three waves (when immigrants had been in New Zealand for 6 months, 18 months and 36 months) in order to fine-tune immigrant selection, settlement
policies, and services for migrants (Masgoret et al. 2012; MoBiE n/d). A qualitative ‘five years on’ follow-up study of principal immigration applicants used individual interviews to focus, for instance, on English language proficiency (Plumridge, McLeod, Ferguson & Zhao 2012). Computer-assisted interviews were also used in combination with data from LisNZ to investigate New Zealanders’ attitudes towards immigrants (Ward, Masgoret & Vauclair 2011). In addition, data from LisNZ were used for comparison between the labor market experiences of immigrants in New Zealand and Australia documented in comparable longitudinal surveys in the two countries (Hawthorne 2011).

Experiences of immigrant youth in New Zealand were investigated through questionnaires distributed through schools and personal migrant networks (Ward 2008). This survey involved 1,226 adolescents and young adults: 482 ‘native-born’ New Zealand European and Māori; and 744 immigrant youth (Ward 2008). Ward acknowledges the problematic arbitrariness of the term ‘native-born’, which in her study does not refer to New Zealand-born children of immigrants. For Ward, to be accepted as native-born, at the least one’s parents also need to be born in New Zealand.

Ward grouped her immigrant participants into three generations: those born overseas who immigrated after the age of 12 were classified as first generation; those who arrived by the age of 12 as generation 1.5; those born in New Zealand as generation 2. Ward found that all strongly connected with their ethnic heritage identities and their ethnic peers. Yet, heritage language use and proficiency declined across her generational categories while contact with New Zealand peers increased as did English use and proficiency. Integration in the sense of heritage culture maintenance combined with participation in the wider society remained “stable over generations” although – somewhat contradictory – assimilation, which Ward sees as societal participation at the expense of heritage culture maintenance, was more accepted by ‘generation 2’ (Ward 2008: 4). All immigrant participants reported more discrimination than the ‘native born’.

Ward’s findings are relevant for the current study. How she used the terms ‘over generations’ and ‘successive generations’ in her study is confusing because Ward actually considers age differences at initial New Zealand community exposure rather than generations of immigrants and their children. Ward calls for consideration of encouraging societal participation without threatening cultural maintenance, which she sees in line with government objectives. In my view, however, for government objectives to exclude threats to cultural maintenance, community language maintenance has to be supported. Indeed, Crezee (2012) asserts that community languages are taught. Yet, the languages that are electives in New Zealand’s high school curricula are taught as foreign languages from beginner level starting at age 13, thus not within or at the very end of the critical period of implicit language acquisition (cf. Paradis 2004). This means that the school subjects do not maintain community languages for the descendants of immigrants.
Smaller studies tend to use networks to recruit participants. For example, 38 immigrant parents and adolescents (from various African, Asian and Middle Eastern countries) participated in interviews focusing on intergenerational cultural-norm conflicts in the context of the families’ adjustment to New Zealand society (Stuart, Jose & Ward 2009). Interviews and narrative analysis have been used in ethnographic studies of first-generation German-speaking immigrants (Bönisch-Brednich 2002; 2005; Bürgelt 2010; Bürgelt, Morgan & Pernice 2008). One such study focused on middle-class “commuter migrants” between Germany and New Zealand, seasonal wanderers whose lifestyle choices maximise summers by moving each year between hemispheres (Schellenberger 2011: 10); another focused on immigrants aging in their adopted country (George & Fitzgerald 2012).

1.2.4. The research gap

Having reviewed the literature, the research gap can be summarized this way:

- There is a need for investigation into lifestyle migration across the globe in search of the life that migrants desire, which international lifestyle migration research has tended to overlook.

- Maximization of economic returns has generally been considered the main driver of migration of the skilled. It has not been investigated if this applies to migration from German-speaking Europe to New Zealand.

- Whilst a study (Bürgelt 2010) of potential and actual German migrants to New Zealand found that they pursued the realization of dreams and personal growth, long-term consequences of German speakers’ migration to New Zealand, or on children has not been considered.

- The experiences of teenagers as a consequence of their parents’ lifestyle migration have only been examined in a snapshot study focusing on 90 expatriate British teenagers in a private international school in Spain (O’Reilly 2009), with findings that the teenagers did not integrate into the recipient society and wanted to leave the country after secondary school. There is a need for investigation into the long-term impact of permanent lifestyle migration on generations within families.

- There is a need for valid insights into the integration of immigrant generations through considering the dynamics of their life stages and social lives over time (de Valk, Windzio, Wingens & Aybek 2011).

- German language maintenance and shift across contemporary immigrant generations have not been investigated in New Zealand.
The following research questions aimed at closing this research gap:

> ‘What are the consequences of migration for the first German-speaking immigrant generation and the two subsequent familial generations?’

This subset of questions further focused and organized this project:

a) In their narratives, what do participants recount as experienced and perceived consequences of migration and their responses to these?

b) What are their reflective explanations of these?

c) What consequences of migration are observable in participants’ everyday actions?

d) What are the similarities and differences of explanations, recounted experiences, perceptions and responses, and observable similarities and differences across generations?

The task complexity required an approach that had the power to investigate actions and relationships between individuals, groups and discourses. I chose nexus analysis, the analytical tool of mediated discourse studies, because the approach suits these requirements. The approach and its underlying principles are explained in the following methodology section.
1.3. Methodology

Methodology is “the logical study of the principles underlying the conduct of scientific inquiry ... including the starting premises as well as the full round of procedural steps...” (Blumer 1969: 24) and accounting for methodology in qualitative research is a process (Klopper 2008). My description of methodology therefore includes the relevant principles and the procedural processes of the study.

In my view, nexus analysis (Scollon & Scollon 2003; 2004), the primary strategic tool used in this study, is firmly based in social constructionism. Nexus analysis takes an individual’s mediated social action as its unit of analysis, following the semiotic cycles intersecting in the action, and linking these with relevant social and societal discourses. I adapted Scollon and Scollon’s (2004) graphics to illustrate the underpinnings of nexus analysis and the embeddedness of mediated actions in semiotic ecosystems, as well as the nexus of cycles that can be explored in analysis (see Figure 1.3–1), and further explain the various elements in this section.

**Figure 1.3—1 Nexus analysis – site of engagement**
1.3.1. Social constructionism

Human perspectives and behaviors are shaped through sociocultural contact of varying intensities, time frames, contexts and other affects. The move into another society inevitably involves social distance between the new arrivals and the receiving society, which makes social construction phenomena particularly obvious. As a German-speaking immigrant in New Zealand I therefore chose an approach that aligns with concepts of socially constructed realities.

Social constructionism is concerned with social phenomena in relation to social contexts. The purpose of localized social constructionist analysis is to raise consciousness about specific social aspects (Hacking 1999). Hacking’s assertion that broad social constructionist approaches have been overused is not valid for research into consequences of immigration across generations. Rather, a social constructionist approach is useful for the current project because it regards knowledge and social realities as mutually linked and specific to time and culture. The approach considers thought and language as inextricably entwined, and social worlds as including the material and the symbolic (that which is constructed, negotiated, sustained and changed by social processes). Also, as Edley (2001: 439) remarks, “the realms of the material and the symbolic are inextricably bound up with one another”. Given the processes of a long-term research project, a strength of the current study is that as a German-speaking immigrant with descendants in New Zealand I am an insider researcher familiar with relevant social phenomena and have a personal interest in finding answers.

The concept of *Heimat* harmonizes with social constructionism. This German term, which cannot literally be adequately translated into English, evolved as an important theme in my participants’ narrative accounts. Blickle (2002) links the concept of *Heimat* to Romanticism. This aspect of his opinion is valid in that most of my participants shared a romantic view of nature and sought to find its beauty and power in New Zealand. However, I disagree with Blickle’s view of *Heimat* as a backward-looking worldview merging Romanticism with anti-Enlightenment in an attempt to reconstruct traditional paternalistic orders, and rather see *Heimat* as a useful social construct. That is, *Heimat* as perception of life and space offering safety and belonging has to be created (Mitzscherlich 1997). *Heimat* relates to place and culture, to the individual and the community, taking into account everyday needs of social relations and security, and “conveys the struggles inherent in the creation of home, community and a sense of belonging” (Huber & O’Reilly, 2004: 330). The latter applies particularly to immigrants settling in another culture.

Drawing on various definitions of culture (e.g. Geertz 1973; Hall 1997; Hofstede 1980; Kluckhohn 1951; Triandis 1972), I see culture this way: Cultures are socially constructed and comprise meanings, values and behaviors learned and shared through social contact and expressed in worldviews, social practices and norms, in material objects, symbols and
interpretations. Cultures are dynamic and permeable to influences from other cultures. Whilst everyone is born into specific tangible and intangible sociocultural environments, an individual’s cultural learning evolves through life stages and is extended through experiences of other cultures. I draw on such concepts in approaching my study through nexus analysis.

**Mediated discourse studies and nexus analysis**

The sociolinguists Scollon and Scollon (2003; 2004) developed mediated discourse analysis and nexus analysis, explaining nexus analysis as the strategic analytical approach of mediated discourse analysis. Yet, the Scollons also collapse both terms into nexus analysis, declaring that mediated discourse analysis is encompassed throughout nexus analysis. A solution is to use the term discourse studies rather than discourse analysis because, as van Dijk (2007) points out, studies accommodate theoretical underpinning whereas analysis is restricted to methods of examination. I therefore use the terms mediated discourse studies (MDS) and nexus analysis (NA). To clarify the connections between underpinning notions and methods, I first outline relevant theoretical principles of mediated discourse studies and then tactics of nexus analysis as explained by the Scollons.

**1.3.2. Mediated discourse studies**

As a sociocultural methodology, MDS draws on interactional sociolinguistics, critical discourse analysis, and linguistic anthropology. Wertsch (2005) traces the origins of MDS ideas back to the work of Vygotsky (1934/1986) on mediation of human action. MDS aims to elucidate the complex relations between discourse and social action. Seeking to keep the complexity of a social situation intact, it balances social science inquiry which regards language as secondary and linguistic inquiry which regards social context as secondary (Scollon 2001b).

In MDS, discourse is not only understood as stretches of language but also in a wider sense, integrating Gee’s and Blommaert’s definitions. Gee’s Discourses (capital ‘D’) are “ways of being in the world; they are forms of life which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities”; therefore Discourse is an “identity kit” that projects a “particular role that others will recognize” (Gee 1989: 6f.). Discourse “comprises all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural and historical patterns and developments of use” (Blommaert 2005: 3). These concepts build on Foucault’s (1971) view of discourse as discrete events in ordered series subjected to various institutional and social power structures and characterized by chance, materiality, and discontinuity.
In agreement with social constructionist views, MDS aims to address problems of social change through trying to understand and through raising awareness of “how the broad discourses of our social life are engaged (or not) in the moment-by-moment social actions of social actors in real time activity” (Scollon 2001a: 140ff.). The consequences of immigration for German speakers and their descendants involve social and psychological changes, which makes MDS concepts useful for an investigation of these transformations.

**Mediated discourse studies – principles and concepts**

Scollon and Scollon do not explicitly position their work in social constructionism. However, their aim to raise awareness and to invoke change is inherent in most social constructionist research (cf. Hacking 1999) and I therefore see MDS as firmly positioned in social constructionism. MDS is based on three broad principles (Scollon 2001b: 6ff.), which are also intrinsic in social constructionism: social action, communication, and history. The following illuminates the advantages of the researcher in the current study being an insider.

Principle one, the principle of social action, stipulates discourse to be considered as a matter of social action (rather than a structural language system) to understand action in society and the role discourse plays in social action. This concurs with social constructionist thought (cf. e.g. Berger & Luckmann 1966: 155ff.; Gergen 1999: 63-89). Six corollaries emanate from the first principle: One, the appropriate unit of analysis is the mediated action (explained below). Two, it is implied that social action is based in normally subconscious practice (explained below). Three, social action is based on a person’s accrued experience of social actions. Four, social action is embedded within a linked-practices network, which explicitly or implicitly asserts identities and social belonging of all people involved, including those talked about and bystanders. Five, since social actions position individual participants, interactions effectively socialize them into groups through a network. Six, this socialization effectively produces outsiders.

Principle two is the principle of communication. The term ‘social’ in ‘social action’ implies a shared symbolic meaning system because an action has to be communicated to be social. Corollary one explains the term *mediational means* and the alternative term *cultural tools* as being used for semiotic objects that mediate the creation of shared meaning. Corollary two states that the various mediational means/cultural tools used in a social action are connected and organized in complex ways with each other and with this action under investigation in its place and its very moment in time.

Principle three is the principle of history. ‘Social’ means ‘historical’ in the sense that shared meaning derives from common history or common past. Scollon (2001b) relates three corollaries to this principle. The first is interdiscursivity, explained as the embedding of all communications in “multiple, overlapping, and even conflicting discourses” resulting from histories (2001b: 8). The second suggests intertextuality, that is, the recycling of other texts and communications, and in turn, usage in future discourses. The third, dialogicality or
practical inference states that all communications respond to and anticipate other communications.

Scollon (2001b) emphasizes that the second and third principles are just extended definitions of the first. The following five centrally important concepts are derived from and interconnected with all the above principles (Scollon 2001b; Scollon & Scollon 2004). I will explain each concept in turn:

- Mediated action
- Mediation means or cultural tools
- Site of engagement
- Practice
- Nexus of practice.

**Mediated action**

The unit of analysis in MDS is the mediated action, a term taken from Wertsch (1991). Mediated action is a unique moment in real time in which the social actor acts with mediational means in the sociocultural environment (Scollon & Scollon 2004). Norris and Jones (2005) distinguish between lower-level mediated actions (e.g. putting a pen on a table), higher-level mediated actions, which are chains of multiple lower-level actions and have an opening and closing (e.g. completing a degree), and frozen actions (i.e. ‘frozen’ in objects such as the metal work that has gone into creating a sculpture). On the other hand, Scollon explains that, “the focus is on social actors as they are acting because these are the moments in social life when the Discourses in which we are interested are instantiated in the social world as social action, not simply as material objects.” (2001b: 3). In accordance with the principle of social action and social constructionist thought, an action is always part of a social practice (Berger and Luckmann (1966) use the term pattern rather than practice). Social practice in turn is linked into other social practices. Within these links, a social action (re)creates social identities. For example, in this study immigrant participants planted sweet chestnut trees because it linked into their Austrian social practices of gathering, roasting and eating chestnuts, thus recreating their Austrian identity.

**Mediation means / cultural tools**

All actions are mediated or facilitated through mediational means, also called cultural tools, in interaction with the actor’s historical body and the sociocultural environment. Scollon and Scollon (2004) define mediational means as semiotic resources of mediation in every action. Mediational means can be embodied (e.g., gestures, language), material objects (e.g., room layout or floor surface facilitating dancing), and concepts (e.g., principle of beneficence in research). Whilst Scollon and Scollon prefer the term mediational means or semiotic resources over cultural tools, researchers use the terms interchangeably for semiotic resources used to accomplish an action (e.g. Lane 2009). I will forthwith use the
term cultural tools whenever I refer to mediational means or semiotic resources because even how we use our bodies in actions is socioculturally developed and understood (cf. Ohashi 2010; Triandis & Brislin 1984).

Multiple cultural tools are involved in social actions, carrying historical affordances and constraints (Scollon 2001a). I anticipate that the cultural tools that participants use will inform about their material belongings and express their feelings of belonging as well as their feelings of knowledge and competence. For example, one of the participants used a handmade wooden slicer with stainless steel blades imported for this purpose to shred cabbage for *Sauerkraut*, presenting tool and product to visitors and emphasizing that it was done the traditional Austrian way. Languages are cultural tools that play a role in this study. For example, what languages are spoken within the families, intra- and intergenerational, and why? What circumstances provoke the use of particular languages?

**Site of engagement**

A site of engagement is the real-time window that facilitates the occurrence of an action (Scollon 2001b). This window is opened through the intersection of social practices and cultural tools, through the social and political environment, a social actor’s stance towards time and space, and their historical body. For instance, one New Zealand site of engagement requires certain non-British immigrants already approved under the skilled migrant category to sit a professional competence test that is conducted in English.

**Practices**

Scollon (2001b) emphasizes that practices are socially distributed, are learned through repetition of social actions and internalized as habitual patterns. For continental Europeans moving to New Zealand, different social practices quickly become apparent. For example, New Zealand cultural tools such as instructions to ‘links fahren [drive on the left]/keep left’ on rental-car dashboards and on South Island country roads frequented by tourists remind of this local social practice in order to avoid potentially dire consequences of reverting to the continental Europeans’ practice of driving on the right.

**Nexus of practice**

No social action is possible without participating in social discourses (Scollon 2001b). While it usually is obvious where social discourses in Gee and Blommaert’s sense are referred to rather than discourse as a stretch of language, Scollon replaces social discourses with the term *nexus of practice* when clarification is needed. Nexus of practice relates to the point “at which historical trajectories of people, places, discourses, ideas, and objects come together to enable some action which in itself alters those historical trajectories in some way as those trajectories emanate from this moment of social action” (Scollon & Scollon 2004: viii). In my project for example, these trajectories are reflected in common push and
pull factors, both in the qualitative and the quantitative study. A nexus of practice is formed by a linkage of practices to other practices over time, and can be identified for one mediated action at a time. In other words, a nexus of practice is a repeated site of engagement where some kind of social action is made possible through a fairly consistent set of social processes. These nexuses of practices are commonly seen as context in sociolinguistic analysis but they are as important as language in an inquiry into the consequences of international migration.

Of interest for parts of the analysis is the “constellation of linked practices [and] the identities thus produced, not necessarily the specific practices and actions themselves” (Scollon 2001b: 5). For example, do the participants (report to) use a cluster of social practices in their home, workplace, or at school, that produce an integrated Kiwi identity or an outsider identity? Does this change at different times and for different occasions? An example of following trajectories of a nexus of practice could start from the action of giving a Weihnachtspyramide [Christmas pyramid] as a gift (see Figure 1.3–2 below). This nexus links four generations of one participating family with the tradition of woodcraft in the German Ore Mountains. The Christmas pyramid was a mother’s gift to G1 participants before the family moved to New Zealand (practice of gift giving at Christmas and of parent caring for children no matter what age). The pyramid carries emotional value for their G2 daughter because she was very fond of her late grandmother and she asked if she could have it (practice of remembering ancestors through material things). The original pyramid had suffered somewhat under regular use (practice of using symbolic items), so on a winter visit to Germany (practice of visiting family in Europe) her G1 mother and aunt went (practice of going shopping together) to the Christmas market (traditional Christmas practice) to buy the same pyramid for the G2 daughter and G3 grandchildren. The practice of using symbolic items that express German identity continued across generations (cf. Lane 2009).

1.3.3. Nexus analysis

The term ‘nexus’ denotes “a link between two different ideas or objects which links them in a series or network” (Scollon & Scollon 2004: viii), yet nexus analysis (NA) is not quite that simple. As the strategic analytical method of MDS, NA is a way of opening up the circumference around moments of human action, so that the lines of historical and social discourses coming together at such a moment become visible, as well as detecting the outcomes emanating from such a moment, such as transformations in those discourses,

---

15 see e.g. http://www.erzgebirgepalace.com/index.php?cat=97&filter_id=18
16 see http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4jAKyNxFe88&feature=endscreen
social actors, and cultural tools (Scollon 2002). Home language, i.e. the language used within the immediate family living together, for example, is a nexus in this study. This move beyond analyzing single events through addressing how social realities are created across time and space expands the scope of traditional discourse analysis (de Saint-Georges 2005). NA purposefully unifies the two traditionally different levels of discourse analysis, “the micro-analysis of unfolding moments of social interaction” and the “much broader socio-political-cultural analysis of the relationships among social groups and power interests in the society” (Scollon & Scollon 2004: 8). As Wortham (2006) notes, NA regards social life taking place through individual actions, which are possible and explicable only with respect to various potentially significant aspects of the context – from sociohistorical institutions and discourses, to places, objects, and individual histories. Each of these forms a cycle of discourse that intersects in the action; and Scollon and Scollon (2004) acknowledge that the challenge for the researcher is to determine which are relevant because many of these aspects could be key to the action under investigation.

Figure 1.3—2: An example of nexus analysis – the method

Investigating the discourse cycles intersecting in actions is the main concern of NA and the processes involve three steps:

- Engaging the nexus of practice
- Navigating the nexus of practice
- Changing the nexus of practice
As Scollon and Scollon point out, these tasks may overlap. Engaging the nexus of practice is a preparatory step that includes choosing the focus of study. Important in this phase is also how participants are positioned in relation to the analyst (see p15). Once this preparation is done, the main task of NA is navigating the nexus of practice. NA is considered social activism that intends to bring about positive changes, so the final step (which may lead back to the first task to open another cycle of NA) is changing the nexus of practice. For instance, this project might raise participants’ awareness of bilingual opportunities for the youngest generation.

**Navigating the nexus of practice**

In this study, navigating the nexus of practice involved mapping the semiotic cycles of people, places, discourses, and cultural tools that intersect in an action, looking for expectations and emanations, relationships and changes, but importantly also limiting the circumference of relevance around the nexus of practice that was navigated. The nexus of practice involved mapping the semiotic cycles intersecting what Scollon and Scollon (2004) call the micro-semiotic ecosystem. Figure 1.3–3 gives another example of such an ecosystem.

**Figure 1.3—3: Example of a semiotic ecosystem**

![Diagram of semiotic ecosystem]

The crucial social action in the micro-semiotic ecosystem in this example is the migration. The semiotic cycles of people, including the relevant aspects of their historical body, the semiotic cycles of places, discourses, and cultural tools intersecting in this action had to be mapped, looking for expectations and emanations, relationships and changes. Keeping all
these aspects separated in practice, however, is "very difficult and largely pointless" (Scollon & Scollon 2004:160), but NA terms are explained separately below. The mapping of semiotic cycles included the discourses in place in the immigrants' countries of origin (i.e. Austria and Germany) and in New Zealand at specific points in time as evident in the participants' narrative accounts, and how participants described these as impacting on their migration and on the consequences thereof. These are described in section 1.4.

**Semiotic cycles**

As Scollon and Scollon (2004) state, the historical body, the interaction order and the discourses in place that intersect in an action, all have a history that leads to this action and a future that leads away from it in semiotic cycles of change and transformation. To take an example from this study, the action of migrating to New Zealand is at the nexus of an immigrant’s historical body (e.g. prior New Zealand traveling experience), the interaction order (which in the case of an initial applicant may relate to shared environmental concerns and imaginations of an unspoiled land; and societal order that one group may see as desirable but others perceive as exclusion), and future cycles emanating from the immigration that in broad terms can be described as consequences of that migration. An action like migration therefore clearly provides fresh momentum into future cycles of change and transformation. Navigating and exploring the pertinent cycles was vital to assemble a comprehensive picture of the consequences of such action.

**Historical body**

The term ‘historical body’ is taken from Nishida (1998). It encompasses all the lived and therefore embodied experiences of a person. This study was not concerned with the full life stories of the people involved. Rather, I was interested in understanding how and why the action/practice and the cultural tools under scrutiny became part of the individual’s historical body. For example, when thinking about a child speaking English to his/her bilingual mother or father, how did this come about? How habitual or innovative was this action for that person? In other words, to what extent was it a practice? To which other practices was this linked for the individual? Also, what was the emotional impact on participants in this action?

**Interaction order**

NA takes the term interaction order from Goffman (1983). He explains interaction order as an abstraction, with social interactions being orderly and based on participants’ cognitive understanding of other participants’ knowledge and roles, with choices made from social and cultural conventions and norms (which can be flouted and changed). Therefore, interaction order is coupled with social structures, for example, individual relationships; societal status; political institutions that can impose specific interaction orders; and with doctrines or movements that can undermine social structures (Goffman 1983). In this study, an example of interaction order regulated by the New Zealand state is involved in gaining
permanent residency. An example of political agency in this interaction order is that once permanent residency has been granted and electronically recorded, the permanent resident must still pay for a new sticker in every new passport.

**Discourses in place**

As the Scollons point out, discourses in place usually are semiotic aggregates. The guiding question here aimed to discover what aspects of the place were crucial or foregrounded in relation to the action under investigation (Scollon & Scollon 2004). A place consists not only of built structures, furniture and other objects, but also of discourses such as conversations, social, commercial and/or political discourses. Overt discourses in place may be present as interaction order (such as publication of Chernobyl disaster facts forced by questions posed by radiation-monitoring institutions and governments), and as signs, music, texts, or other place discourses such as park trees, or road layout. Other discourses, however, may be hidden. The Scollons argue that separating the material aspects from other discourses only serves as analytical heuristic, which might lead some to the view that the physical aspects of concrete objects are denied. I do not see it this way. Rather, the reality of material objects linked into social actions is also filled with meanings to be discovered. One example of semiotic aggregates or discourses in place intersecting in the action of emigration of some first-generation migrant participants was the real, concrete fallout from the Chernobyl nuclear disaster as well as the discourses around it, all of which were very much foregrounded in their attention.

**Discourses internalized as practice**

Many discourses are hidden in an action because they have become internalized and submerged in practice; making such invisible discourses visible is a goal of NA (Scollon & Scollon 2004). Making them apparent is only possible through following the semiotic cycles back and forth from the action in focus. Some of these invisible discourses feeding into migration are made visible in the Discourses in Place section 1.2, such as the impact of low-flying planes or pesticide use. Following the Scollons’ suggestion, I also started by asking what discourses were foregrounded in order to make them habitual. For instance, did a participant call attention to an object so it could be talked about? How habituated were the actions? Habituated actions usually entail submerged discourses. If an action was not yet practice, was there an expectation that it would become practice in the future?

**Objects and concepts as cultural tools**

As mentioned above, in MDS/NA there is no meaningful distinction between the cultural tools that are objects and those that are concepts although the Scollons suggest that concepts take longer to be internalized than working with objects. In other words, it takes less time to internalize the mechanics of working with wood on a building site than it takes to comprehend the concepts underlying such construction. As a heuristic, however,
separating the cultural tools that are objects from those that are concepts might help understanding the trajectories intersecting in an action. For instance, for the participants, Christmas based on the ancient mid-winter celebration of the darkest time of year having passed may not easily translate into the New Zealand concept of Christmas at the beach in the middle of summer. Taking a picnic basket to the beach for the event, on the other hand, might easily become habitual action. Questions are about the histories of the concepts and the histories of the tools in the action. An example from my study for this was a pine felled, debarked and carved in the action of turning it into a maypole (see p167f). How did it come to be used, i.e., through whose agency, and why?

Questions about concepts as cultural tools were directed at aiding the understanding of trajectories in an action: Which conceptual tools were used? These could be language or other semiotic codes, such as the knowledge of how to conform to institutionalized ways of doing things or codes of behavior. For instance, school uniforms are uncommon in German-speaking Europe but the norm in New Zealand. Were these concepts internalized or not? When, where, and who with were they internalized? Was it the same or different for all participants? Was a concept shared among participants? For example, did participants of the second or third generation in my study share concepts of celebrating events in their lives with the first generation or not? An example of difference were G2’s marriage ceremonies held in gardens, as well as their graduation ceremonies. In Germany, marriages have to be signed in the Registry Office and university graduation does not involve the semiotic codes of academic gowns and mortar boards for ceremonial capping (cf. Bönisch-Brednich 2010).

**Anticipations and emanations**

To understand the situation of an action on a longer timescale, the action needs to be considered in terms of anticipation and emanation (Scollon & Scollon 2004). In other words, the action of digging a hole in the ground happens in anticipation of the tree planting, for instance, and the crop the tree would yield. Cleaning the gumboots afterwards emanates from the action of digging. However, the actions of digging and planting such a tree could be anticipation as well as emanation from prior actions and practices. Participants’ planting of chestnut trees in New Zealand not only was in anticipation of future crops, but also an emanation of the earlier practices using chestnuts back in Austria. They did not, for example, plant date palms, which can be seen as revealing the hidden discourse of cultural practice and awareness of horticultural growing regions.

**Transformation and resemiotisation**

Actions may transform or resemiotise one kind of discourse into another. For example, the New Zealand expression ‘number 8 wire’, the simple fencing material used by pioneer settlers to create various gadgets or perform all sorts of repairs has been resemiotised into a concept that praises New Zealanders’ ingenuity. To give another example from this
study, Austrian concepts and plans used as cultural tools were resemiotized into a wine cellar through brickwork, woodwork and other actions (see p161f)

**Procedural processes of navigating the nexus**

As mentioned earlier, procedural processes or methods are part of methodology. In the following, I will outline the procedural processes of NA and explain how I used these in my study to map semiotic cycles.

The list of ideas and options in the toolbox of NA for finding answers is somewhat intimidating and the challenge was how best to proceed. Scollon and Scollon (2004) do not provide a prescriptive recipe for research, but rather suggest roughly drafting the nexus of practice to begin with, and then selecting some cycles and following along their circumferences as outlined in the examples in Figures 1.3–2 and 1.3–3. Such a cycle could be a practice, the historical body, or a discourse that shows potential for answering the research questions. Once the main lines of an action of interest have been sketched, the Scollons suggest learning from the participants about their own cycles. Because anticipations might determine outcomes, anticipations linking into the action of migration were important. For instance, did a participant expect to stay permanently in New Zealand or only for a specific time? Also, was the motive for an action within the actor’s historical body; or through whose agency was the action happening? For example, did the children have any say in the action of immigration? NA is always a journey of discovery, in which the paths and detours invite exploration of discourses in the widest sense. The Scollons’ caution, that following the semiotic cycles will lead to finding other crucial nexuses of practice in the circumference, points to the importance of staying focused.

**Analysis of discourse as language or other semiotic systems**

NA regards the narrower concept of discourse, i.e., discourse as a stretch of language, also as important and present throughout NA in at least these six forms:

- Speech of participants in actions (foregrounded or backgrounded)
- Texts as cultural tools (foregrounded or backgrounded)
- Images and other semiotic systems used as cultural tools (e.g. manner of dressing; design of buildings and other places; artifacts)
- [Actions] habituated in the participants’ historical bodies and in their practices
- [Actions and cultural practice] submerged in the design of the built environment and objects
- The analyst’s speech, writing, or images in conducting the NA (which may be within or apart from the moment of the action

(Scollon & Scollon 2004: 173)

When analyzing these discourses, the Scollons suggest drawing on critical discourse analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, and linguistic anthropology.
Critical discourse analysis, as understood within NA, is concerned with social power interests produced in the discourse, and with the wider Discourses overtly or covertly present. Academic discourse inevitably exists in a PhD thesis, for instance. Asking about systemic and power relations is relevant, as is questioning what is avoided or not being said. The Scollons remind that a Discourse may be so obvious that it is invisible. Keeping this in mind is especially important for an insider researcher.

Interactional sociolinguistics focuses on interpersonal connections, on structures of participation, positioning, alignments, and identities. Rather than only concentrating on positions and alignments between participants and the Discourses they were involved with, however, participants’ positions and alignments with places and objects and to the cultural tools they used, as well as the actions they took with these were equally significant for this NA. Of interest was also how alignments were accomplished in actions, especially in moments of resemiotisation. Sociolinguistic alignment for participating German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand, for example, was using English when monolingual English speakers were present, while in the resemiotisation of verbal English to written notes, German or English, or a mix of both languages was used.

Linguistic anthropology is concerned with the relationships between language and culture as well as in their connections with thought. For NA, the central question is, “How are sociocultural or historical thought or cultural patterns in the language (or other semiotic systems such as images or gestures) and its genres and registers providing a temple for the actions of participants in the nexus of practice?” (Scollon & Scollon 2004: 175). Therefore, the question was what language was used in an action, if the language was different from the language of analysis, and if this made a difference in the templates used in analysis. Also, which cultural scripts and schemata were internalized as cultural tools?

**Motives**

Motive analysis is fully integrated in discourse analysis. It seeks to understand how participants and analyst are positioning themselves when explaining their actions. Rather than yielding a ‘true’ motive, one needs to keep in mind that the attribution of motive itself is a discursive strategy for positioning social actors in relation to the action taken.

**Changing the nexus of practice**

As mentioned above, NA is considered social activism, so the last task in NA is changing the nexus of practice. Changing the nexus of practice may involve actions motivated through and brought about during the nexus analysis, or bringing one’s analysis back into the semiotic system by identifying and making comprehensible the connections within the many trajectories of social life that can bring about change through and for the participants and/or the wider society. However, as Scollon and Scollon (2004) note, in NA the analyst is not in a privileged position to bring about social change unilaterally. One needs to consider,
though, that the researcher’s actions change the trajectories for the researcher and also for the others in the nexus of practice. In other words, whatever we do has consequences. In this study such change may be, for example, raising the third participant generation’s awareness of their German-speaking heritage during data collection, and/or contributing to building international migration theory through this thesis.

1.3.4. Procedural processes in my study

*Engaging the nexus of practice*

Engaging the nexus of practice is the first phase of researcher action in NA. It involves the decision about what to study. As a German-speaking immigrant with descendants in New Zealand I chose this project because it is close to my heart. Also, no published study focused on migration consequences over time and across three generations of originally German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand. My study consisted of three parts. Parts one (pilot study) and two (study of three generations in three families) were qualitative. Part three linked the findings to a greater number of German-speaking immigrants and descendants of German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand through an electronic survey.

NA sees research as cooperation between participants and researcher, making the researcher participant and participants co-researchers with a view to ameliorating their situation should it be required (Scollon & Scollon 2004). Compatible with the spirit of social constructionism and with my beliefs in the nonexistence of total human objectivity, the engaging-the-nexus phase therefore required positioning the researcher (see p15f). Following institutional practice for a project like this, in another preparatory step I identified and engaged PhD supervisors, wrote a preliminary research proposal for approval by the institution, gained ethics approval, and presented a full research proposal in written and oral form to institution representatives to achieve confirmation of candidature. Recruiting participants for the study, another process in engaging the nexus of practice, is described below. The preparatory phase also encompassed focusing the research through identifying the crucial moments in time through which the research questions might be answered and the most important cycles of discourses and historical bodies intersecting in the mediated actions in these moments. This is a cooperative task between participants and researcher and is crucial for data collection and selection. It illustrates also that there is an overlap between the phases of engaging and navigating the nexus of practice. I will further outline these processes in the following.
Research questions

The aim of this qualitative research was to build a comprehensive picture of the consequences of migration over time and across three generations. The overarching research question was:

- ‘What are the consequences of migration for the first German-speaking immigrant generation and the two subsequent generations?’

This subset of questions further focused and organized this project:

a) In their narratives, what do participants recount as experienced and perceived consequences of migration and their responses to these?

b) What are their reflective explanations of these?

c) What consequences of migration are observable in participants’ everyday actions?

d) What are the similarities and differences of explanations, recounted experiences, perceptions and responses, and observable similarities and differences across generations?

These questions were used as guide in gathering data through informal interviews and conversations, through observations and in analysis. Because the third generation in the study comprised children born in New Zealand and Australia, their actions were assumed to display consequences of their parents/grandparents’ immigration while only the older children and adult family members could rationalize such consequences. The quantitative study did involve adult G3 participants and may be seen as a useful addition to the findings of the qualitative study of younger G3 participants.

Hypotheses

Questions addressed these assumptions: Changes through migration affect culture(s) and language(s)\(^\text{17}\) and consequences therefore impact on construction of identities and may influence wellbeing. Consequences on a personal and social level encompass legal effects, interactions with and perceptions of New Zealand immigration and settlement policies and strategies, and interactions with and perceptions of the receiving society. Consequences are expected to be different for the first generation, for the children who came with them, and for the grandchildren, from expectations and hopes at the time of migration decision-making to the realities of immigrant lives and that of their descendants. Consequences include widening family ties, like those of the second generation with their spouses’ families and cultural practices.

\(^{17}\) While language is a deep-seated and vital part of culture, I follow common practice in mentioning it separately, especially since it is so important when moving from one language environment into another.
Since this study covered three generations of originally German-speaking immigrants, I expected it to test Herberg’s (1960) three-generation hypothesis (see p33). My own assumption was that by the third generation the metamorphoses from the migrants’ original language and culture to the mainstream New Zealand Pākehā culture would be complete. On the basis of common public discourses predicting the death of Māori language (see e.g. Ka’ai-Mahuta 2011), I assumed that this would happen despite Māori influences in the second and third generation in two of the three participating families.

The predictions indicate the individual and social significance of migration consequences for the participants, which without methodical inquiry are available only in anecdotes. The predictions point to the wider social significance of this study. One expected outcome is information about long-term consequences for people considering emigration to a society with another language and culture. Another is insight into the experiences of immigrants from one language background and their descendants, for example, for New Zealand institutions that deal with community languages, and for New Zealand society.

**Participants and locations of the study**

This section outlines how participants were recruited, their characteristics, the rationale for their selection, and locations of the study.

**Participant recruitment and selection**

Participants for the qualitative study were recruited using a snowball system. I first informed two adult German-speaking immigrants from my personal networks about my project and gave them participant information sheets. These initial contacts then informed others, asking people interested in taking part in the study if they could pass on their contact details to me. Potential participants were fully informed about the study and the safeguards for participants (see appendices for more details).

**Participant characteristics**

I invited German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand and their descendants to take part. Of the first-generation and follower-generation participants in the qualitative study (three in the pilot and six in the main study; generations explained below), one came from East Prussia; four were Bavarian; four were from Austria (one of these was born in Germany to an Austrian and German parent).

Three generations of three families took part in the main study. Jamieson, Simpson and Lewis (2011) outline the challenges involved in recruiting and working with families for research. I count myself fortunate that I was able to recruit three families with three generations in New Zealand to contribute to my research. This indicates the strong interest in the topic of this study. Indeed, Bott (1957/1968) found that families participating in
research did so because they wanted to assist the research but, more generally, wanted to compare themselves with other families.

In this study, I use generation in its genealogical sense: the first generation (G1) are the participating immigrants and their partners, all qualitative study G1 participants were born in the 1940s and were in their thirties and forties at arrival in New Zealand; their children are the second generation (G2) and were all born overseas; and their children, the third generation (G3) were all born in New Zealand. The retired mother who came to New Zealand in her late sixties to join her son and took part in my pilot study as an octogenarian belongs to what I would call a late-in-life ‘follower generation’ of immigrants. This follower generation could be further focused on in another study.

True to MDS principles and NA guidelines, participants provided the most important input into the research by allowing me access to their lives, and by constructing their narratives reflecting on their migration and life in New Zealand. G1 and G2 narratives can be seen as Verarbeitungsdiskurs*, that is, discourse of overcoming and coping processes (Dittmar & Bredel 1999). In a sense this applies also to my PhD project. As Dittmar and Bredel explain, such discourses typically have in common:

- Coming to terms with individual, social and/or professional upheaval experiences
- Participants’ common knowledge about such situations and their affective impact
- Belonging to the same social group
- Agreement regarding social norms, communicative practice, and sites/spaces of experience.

Partnership and participation were therefore fundamental in this investigation, as was my in-group position. Using fictitious names for participants in the qualitative study expresses this importance of participants’ importance as persons rather than mere research subjects while respecting their anonymity.

**Participants in the pilot study**

The pilot study involved three participants: a couple who had immigrated to New Zealand with their children (Hanni and Gangolf), and a retired woman who had followed her son (Claudia). The three came to New Zealand on holiday and subsequently immigrated to New Zealand in the early 1990s.

**Participants in the main study**

From the pilot study findings it became obvious that the consequences of immigration should be investigated across generations, so I decided to concentrate on immigrant families with three successive generations for my main project. This allows a more holistic and informative study of migration consequences because some of these consequences might only become apparent in consecutive generations. I could not recruit the pilot study
participants’ families. I aimed to focus on immigrant families living in New Zealand, but people’s lives do not necessarily fit into neat research categories, and one of three G2 participants in one of the recruited families moved to Australia. Because his move was a consequence of his parents moving to New Zealand I also included him and his children. Despite this trans-Tasman move, three families with three generations in New Zealand took part in the main qualitative study as summarized in Table 1.3–1 below. Data, especially observation and recording of children’s language, were collected at intervals and when it suited the families, which explains the varying ages of the children in different data excerpts.

Table 1.3—1: Participants in the main qualitative study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants in the qualitative study (pseudonyms)</th>
<th>Number (n)</th>
<th>Age at time of migration</th>
<th>Age at start of data collection</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} generation immigrants (G1) (Gabi; Max; Sophie; Lukas; Gundi; Axel)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36 – 43</td>
<td>61 – 70</td>
<td></td>
<td>3f; 3m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} generation (G2) = children of G1 born outside NZ (Lisa; Matthias; Anna; Heinz; Robert; Sarah; Connie)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5, 12, 13, 14, 16, 21, 28\textsuperscript{18}</td>
<td>30 – 43</td>
<td></td>
<td>4f; 3m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} generation (G3) = New Zealand (Australian) – born children of G2 (Christian; Maya; Leon; Tristan; Harry; Andreas; Natalie; Alfons; Konrad; Angela; Thomas; Georg; Felix; Ben; Julian; Tina; David; Bella; Ryan)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16 months – 12 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>5f; 14m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in main qualitative study</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12f;</td>
<td>20m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research locations – qualitative study

I aimed to recruit participants I could easily get to. Yet the families were spread around the greater Auckland region in the North Island, Canterbury in the South Island, and Melbourne. This still allowed me to visit participants by car and on cheap flights, and communicating on Skype or by phone for follow-up questions and the like.

\textsuperscript{18} Migrated to New Zealand years later than his parents
Data and timeline

The scope of my qualitative study covered a time frame from the 1980s through to 2013 presented through participants’ narratives underpinned by their documents and photos, and researcher observations of interactions. Qualitative data was collected between 2009 and 2013. This included observation of ongoing processes such as children’s language development and other cultural practices at occasions and intervals that suited the families. The online survey developed from findings in the qualitative study and was distributed in 2013.

Raw data consisted of video-recorded and audio-recorded informal interviews and conversations focusing on migration and settlement experiences with G1 and G2 and between participants; video-recorded and audio-recorded natural interactions by participants and/or researcher to capture cultural practices including language use; photos and other documents supplied by participants; my notes of phone conversations and other interactions, and of special events. The reason for this varied data is that “meanings are created in texts and interactions in a complex interplay of semiosis across multiple modes which include but are not limited to written and spoken language” (Bhatia, Flowerdew & Jones, 2008:129). I also went back to the participants via email and phone when additional questions surfaced during analysis of their data. I interviewed the older G3 children and tried to elicit German utterances, attended school events and birthdays, trotted along to the zoo and museum, observed G3 playing, their interactions in and around their home with siblings, parents, grandparents, playmates and adults not belonging to family, and audio-recorded many hours of interactions at intervals of about six to eight months.

Raw data was protected in that only my PhD supervisors and I had access to participants’ raw data and transcriptions, with all bound by confidentiality agreements. Exceptions were data excerpts, either anonymous or linked to fictitious names, including photographic material released for analytical purposes with fellow researchers and for academic publication. Individual participants had access to their own data and could keep it if they wished. Otherwise, raw data has been kept secure to be destroyed six years after completion of the study at the latest.

Data transcription

For transcription, I drew on conventions laid out in GAT 2 (Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2) (Selting et al. 2009). Such conventions in this orthographic transcription system are that punctuation does not reflect grammar; square brackets indicate overlaps; dots indicate hesitations and pauses; laughter or crying are noted in brackets in the transcripts. Small letters were used, with capital letters reserved for emphasis of words or syllables, for German nouns and proper names. To reflect spoken language rather than an idealized written orthography, my transcripts included the reproduction of omissions (e.g. nen instead of einen [one]), assimilations (e.g. ham instead
of haben [have]), word combinations (e.g. hammer instead of haben wir [we have], and regional variations\(^\text{19}\) (e.g. Swabian woisch or Bavarian woaschd/woasd instead of weisst du [you know]). I did this to document the use of spoken language and dialects as cultural tool and read my transcript out aloud to hear if it sounded like the original data. Codeswitching from one language to the other was marked by underlining the switches.

Such transcription was useful for close analysis of discourse as a stretch of language, for instance, to identify which language parents used to their children and how children answered, or the occurrence of codeswitching. However, close analysis of language as cultural tool formed only part of this study, while finding answers to consequences of immigration importantly focused on the actions and Discourses in these actions in the wider sense, i.e., discourses as nexus of practice as explained above. A complication was that most of my raw data was in German but I wanted to make the participants’ stories available to readers of this English text. Therefore, I added English translations in square brackets.

**Overlaps between engaging and navigating the nexus**

The preparatory processes described above were part of engaging the nexus of practice, which overlapped with the next phase of navigating the nexus of practice and vice versa. Data transcription of audio and video recordings is a first analytical step because “transcripts are by their very nature translations – they are always partial and selective textual representation” (Rapley 2007: 50), not least because the non-verbal richness of communication is largely lost even if descriptions are added. In my study, this selective analytical step involved three translations: one, selecting and transcribing pertinent parts of recordings; and two, translating the selections into English, and combining them into coherent participant stories in English.

True to the principles of participation and partnership between researcher and participants inherent in NA and in the AUT Ethics Committee guidelines, I submitted the stories to the participants for inspection, amending and resubmitting the stories if participants wanted to supplement or change them. For instance, the couple taking part in the pilot study realized from this that they – in their view – had been too negative in recounting their experiences and therefore added more positive information. I also consulted with participants about my analysis of their data in case I had misunderstood anything, or went back to the participants to get a clearer picture of specific aspects in the data. For instance, I asked the G1 participants to indicate the importance of the various push and pull factors mentioned in the narratives on a 0–10 Likert-like scale, with 10 being the strongest concern or attraction.

\(^{19}\) In the German and Austrian regions that participants originated from dialects are not considered less prestigious than standard German.
Navigating the nexus of practice in my study

Pilot study

The pilot study aimed at focusing and refining research direction and scope, as well as data collection methods, coding and analysis. It covered these points and became a steep learning curve.

Originally I planned only video recording because “the exploration of various ways in which belonging is lived and experienced often resembles a journey into the semiotics of images, gestures and practices” (Skrbiš, Baldassar, & Poynting 2007:262). Yet, video requires a huge amount of computer space and storing data elsewhere and reloading it every time I needed to look at it again proved frustrating and overly time consuming. Closely examining video on the small camera screen proved a strain on the eyes. Also, presenting stills from video on paper would have involved an ongoing need to choose stills over a myriad of others on minute criteria not particularly adding value to this study. I therefore decided on using mainly audio recording, observation and photos to support specific aspects.

Around the time I started my pilot study, I heard of NVivo as a data organization/retrieving tool and underwent basic training. Yet, I found it difficult to immediately transfer this well into practice on my own. Because I was not able to use the program to its full capacity and because my data was so diverse, I abandoned NVivo again.

Quantitative survey

The aim of the survey was to see if it would corroborate findings from my qualitative study. German-speaking immigrants who arrived as adults and as children, and subsequent New Zealand-born generations were therefore targeted with an anonymous online survey generated with Survey Monkey20.

The survey included a cover page with information about the study and contact details. This and the questions were in English and in German (see appendices for details). In hindsight, the survey could have been in English only because German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand have English as another language. An advantage of Survey Monkey is that one can add question logic. For instance, if the answer was ‘yes’ to ‘born in New Zealand’, the survey omitted questions related to settlement. Only answers to qualifying questions (Q1 and Q3) were compulsory, so the number of responses varied from question to question. The survey was pretested by my supervisors, one G1 and two G2 German-speaking immigrants, who used a think-aloud method while completing it. I changed questions or answer choices they found confusing, and deleted their responses.

The survey link was circulated throughout New Zealand via work and personal contacts, electronic newsletters of organizations such as the German Society, Austrian and Swiss Clubs, businesses and a New Zealand newspaper (online) with an average daily readership of 817,000\textsuperscript{21}. Online surveys are convenient as they can be quickly distributed to many\textsuperscript{22} but they also have drawbacks. Because the survey link was distributed through a digital snowball system I do not know how many people actually saw the link, or how representative the responses were of New Zealand’s population of German speakers and their descendants and therefore cannot judge the response rate or generalize for this segment of the country’s population from the survey responses.

Within weeks from the first emailed request to complete and distribute the survey, 317 completed replies were received from a resident population of 12,810 German speakers (Statistics New Zealand 2013). Indeed, after I had closed the survey because I needed to complete my study for work reasons, I received emails from German speakers wanting to take part, suggesting that target group members were keen to share their experiences.

**Ethics considerations**

The Austrian Ludwig Wittgenstein, considered one of the great philosophers of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, defines ethics this way\textsuperscript{23}:

\begin{quote}
Der Mensch hat den Trieb, gegen die Grenzen der Sprache anzurennen. ... Dieses Anrennen gegen die Grenze der Sprache ist die Ethik. ... In der Ethik macht man immer den Versuch, etwas zu sagen, was das Wesen der Sache nicht betrifft und nie betreffen kann.

Man [!] has the urge to thrust against the limits of language. ... This thrust against the limits of language is ethics. ... In ethics, one constantly tries to say something that does not concern and can never concern the essence of the matter.
\end{quote}

(Waismann 1965: 12f, translated by Max Black)

In my view, Wittgenstein expresses that ethical essence should not be *zerredet* [talked over and over / flogged to death] because this only causes confusion; but that attempts to understand the nature of morals should nevertheless be respected. Also, I wonder if this originally was not rather, ‘... gegen die Grenze der Sprache bezieht sich auf die Ethik’ [... against the limits of language relates to ethics]. By describing ethical discussions as the often painful (as implied in ‘thrust against’ [*Anrennen gegen*]) urge, inclination, desire or instinct [all these are possible translations of *Trieb*] that people have to push the boundaries of possible linguistic expression without ever being able to pinpoint the essence of the matter, Wittgenstein identifies an unsolvable dilemma. He likens explanations of ethics to

\textsuperscript{21} see ‘Herald readership on the rise again’ (2013, Feb 9) http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1\&objectid=10864304  
\textsuperscript{22} Amongst a population of 4.405 million in 2011 (www.stats.govt.nz/PopulationPyramid 2011), New Zealand had almost 1.5 million broadband subscribers (Internet Service Provider Survey. Statistics New Zealand 2011).  
\textsuperscript{23} Published posthumously from Waismann’s notes.
the attempt of creating a typical face through superimposing multiple face images (Wittgenstein 1965). With respect to this research, these layers included institutional ethics permission as prerequisite for working with human participants, with supplementary submission of amendments and survey questions (AUT Ethics Committee application No. 08/229). The required ethical principles addressed in the submissions were: informed and voluntary consent; respect for rights of privacy and confidentiality; risk minimization; truthfulness and limitation of deception; adequacy of research; avoidance of a conflict of interest; as well as social and cultural sensitivity, which in the New Zealand context includes commitment to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. In this research, this commitment translates into protection of participants, partnership with participants, and participation by participants. These considerations are elaborated in the following.

The German sociologist Max Weber comments,


We want to understand the reality of life that surrounds us and which we are placed into in its specific characteristics. (My translation)

Prerequisites to this interpretative understanding are recognition of the assumptions and preconditions everyone brings to reconstructing interactions as well as the researcher’s efforts to preserve considerable objectivity by achieving distance for understanding in this research capacity (Soeffner 2013). In this expanded sociolinguistic inquiry I aimed to understand the realities of families of originally German-speaking immigrants to New Zealand, an experience I share. Habermas asserts that “The first-person reference, and hence the relationship to the identity of a group (or an individual) is grammatically inscribed in ethical questions” (Habermas 1994: 123). My reading of this is that researchers (as the syntactic subject) cannot remove themselves from ethical problems in their research (the syntactic object in such questions). A researcher’s insider position has even been likened to the biblical original sin of eating the forbidden fruits of knowledge, increasing the necessity for distancing and raising ethical concerns and questions about how to alleviate these (Moore 2007). The main ethics concerns with insider research such as the current study are power relations and their potential abuse.

In addition, the study involved families. Such research also needs to be situated within relationship ethics (Cram & Kennedy 2010). This includes accommodating the pace at which a family wants to proceed, their decisions about their stories, and their decisions to move in and out of the research as they wish. To ensure voluntary consent and elimination of coercion, all potential participants in my qualitative study were fully informed about the research verbally and in writing (see appendices for more details). An option for participants was to withdraw all or part of their data from the research at any time before inclusion in the thesis. I also notified participants about the independent and confidential support services offered by the institution should any issues and concerns arise from the research. Consent covered the possibility of using data including video and photos in academic publications.
This poses risks to participants’ rights to anonymity. Therefore, participants were given the choice to have their faces digitally obscured in publications, or have only audio-recorded data used.

Risks to anonymity were also mitigated through using fictitious names. To allow participants to frankly voice discontent with societal issues, specific sensitive language transcripts of data and/or data evaluation of the qualitative study were not assigned to names. In accordance with the cooperative nature of NA mentioned above, individual data, transcripts and analysis in the qualitative study were scrutinized by individual participants or in the case of minors also by their parents, giving them the option of withdrawal, editing and censorship before data and subsequent analysis were included in this thesis. Indicating the unsolvable dilemma of ethics that Wittgenstein refers to, however, parents made the ultimate decision about their minors’ participation if the latter were too young to fully comprehend what was being asked of them.

I acknowledge the vulnerability of the participating children because of a power imbalance between children and an adult researcher. Therefore, I took great care in interactions with these young participants to empower them and make them feel comfortable. Children who were involved in the study knew me from social gatherings, and their assent/information sheet included my photo, so they knew who was doing the project. I tended to sit on the floor when collecting data to be at the eye level of the youngest children. As an alternative, I asked parents if they wanted to record their children’s interactions, with me not being present. In addition to checking with parents if inclusion of collected data and analysis were appropriate, I asked the children if they wanted to see and/or hear my recordings of them, asking if they liked me to use it in my homework (because for the younger children the idea of research was too abstract). The outcomes of this research are in the children’s interest as they might benefit, for example, from their parents’ greater awareness through evaluation of their languages and potential changes in language usage resulting from this study.

Summary

The methodology section has explained NA as the chosen approach. It also outlined the underlying MDS principles and presented my rationale for linking these into social constructionism. Participants, places, duration and processes of the study were introduced. The study separation into pilot and main qualitative study, and the addition of the quantitative survey and its design were also rationalized. In addition, this section declared ethical considerations and linked these to philosophical thoughts about ethics. In the following, I background the time-and-place discourses in the participants’ countries of origin and destination that were pertinent for this study.
1.4. Discourses in place

Discourses in place (Scollon & Scollon 2003; 2004) provide time-and-place background and connections for a study. Thus, this overview of discourses in Europe and New Zealand outlines the time-and-place discourse trajectories that I tracked from the narrated expectations leading to G1 participants’ migration decisions, and expectations meeting experienced post-migration realities. In this study, discourses are considered in Gee’s (1989) sense as linguistic as well as non-linguistic embedded symbol systems, ideologies and power relationships. Push and pull factors narrated by the first-generation migrant participants (participant details p64f) are discourses that therefore linked into historical paths and places, ideas and objects, and interconnected with the participants’ embodied experiences to facilitate their migration decisions. The push and pull factors indicated that in New Zealand participants expected to find the positive opposites of aspects they had considered wanting in Europe. Discourses intersecting in their post-migration experiences exemplified the differences between their expectations and New Zealand realities.

Figure 1.4—1: Push and pull factors – G1

[Image of a world map with push and pull factors marked.]
1.4.1. Discourses linked to emigration

Work-related discourses such as stress and age, family detachment and perceptions of common Übermenschen attitudes were mentioned as contributing push factors towards a change of lifestyle and place:

*immer dieser Druck. immer die Überstundn* (Gangolf, G1)
[always this pressure. always the overtime]

*kaum bist vierzig dann bist zu alt* (Axel, G1)
[hardly forty and you’re too old]

*immer des ‘mir san die bestn. mir ham die beste Technik. die bestn Autos’ und so weiter. so ‘am deutschn Wesen soll die Welt genesn’* (Gangolf)
[always that ‘we’re the best. we’ve got the best technology. the best cars and so on. like ‘the German spirit shall heal the world’]

However, accumulated wider environmental issues dominated as push factors for the participants’ migration. They left Europe to migrate to New Zealand in the 1980s and early 1990s, and their leading push factors related to experiences of the Cold War; the weather affecting health and wellbeing; to pesticides and other pollutants; and the Chernobyl nuclear meltdown. These issues are detailed in the following.

Cold War

Post-war Germany presented difficulties for young people, who felt alienated by the unstable political situation and by occupying powers controlling the country (Bönisch-Brednich 2005). The current study also indicated Cold War push factors. They ranged from military flight nuisance; the nuclear arms race and its impact on Europe; and the lack of agency in these situations. Four of the qualitative study G1 participants from Austria and Germany were born during WWII and all experienced the Cold War era. However, only Germans mentioned Cold War aspects as relevant to their migration decisions. The survey brought similar results, suggesting that this is related to prevalent public and political discourses as in contrast to Austria such issues remained pervasive in Germany well into the 1980s as explained below.

The two German states (*Bundesrepublik Deutschland*/BRD [Federal Republic of Germany/FRG] and *Deutsche Demokratische Republik/DDR* [German Democratic Republic/GDR]), established in 1949 yet never autonomous from Western and Eastern power blocs respectively, were frontline in the Cold War. The Berlin Wall and the Iron

---

24 Originally ‘Und es mag am deutschen Wesen einmal noch die Welt genesen’ [and the German spirit might once heal the world] from ‘Deutschlands Beruf’ [Germany’s calling] by Emanuel Geibel (1861, cited in Conrady 2003: 493). The 19th century poem called for a warrior-emperor to unite Germany and reassert its status in Europe against French superiority, Russian power, and papal influence. The Nazis used the poem for their ends, and the cited last two lines are still used to refer to a craving for status.
Curtain, the most sensitive interface between the Western and Warsaw power blocs, ran right through Germany and Berlin (Janssen 1980) and massive presences of occupation troops were constant Cold War reminders. Indicating that the presence of these troops had become normalized rather than being felt as threatening discourse, participants clarified that the troops per se were not the real problem but their weapon stockpiles were. “Du bisch der allweib vorkomm a wia d’Wurscht in der Semml” [you always felt like the sausage in the bread roll (meat in the sandwich)] (Gundi) related the lack of agency in being wedged in this interface between the power blocks. The presence of nuclear weapons since 1953 was kept in public discourses through political campaigns and protests by leading scientists (e.g. Bopp et al. 1957; Lipp, Lütgemeier-Davin & Nehring 2010), through media following military politics (e.g., ‘Der kleine General’ 1957; Chauffeure der Bombe 1967; ‘USA wollen Nuklearwaffen in Deutschland aufrüsten’ 2013), and through public mass demonstrations of a growing peace movement (LeMO n/d). Radio, TV and print media reported on Cold War issues and détente efforts and such discourses became more prominent as the nuclear arms race accelerated to extremes in the 1980s (see e.g. Bässler 2012; von Bittorf 1983; von Lederer 1983) before stockpiles were reduced. Such public discourses contributed to participants’ viewpoints. Several survey respondents commented also that they participated in protests against nuclear weapons and nuclear power. These issues combined in public discourse, have motivated mass protests (e.g. Figure 1.4–2; Heck 2008; Otto 2005) and keep raising concerns (US-Militär 2013).

Figure 1.4—2: Mass protests against the nuclear arms race

Frequent low-altitude flights over the FRG were part of Cold War strategies and FRG governments were keen to take part. From 1959, the German Air Force was equipped with Lockheed F-104 ‘Starfighters’ to have fast and far-reaching nuclear bombers (‘Bundeswehr/Starfighter: Kauf von Schrott’ 1969). The fighter jets, known as widow makers and flying coffins in public discourses because every third crashed (Christiansen 2011), were only one of several Allied and German military jet types. With the exception of big-city air spaces, these jets kept sweeping in extremely low-altitude ‘razor flights’ over West Germany. If all these flights over one cloudless day had been drawn onto a map of West Germany, the map would have been black (‘Tiefflieger: Beinahe wie im Krieg’ 1984). This illustrates these flights as a countrywide menace terrorizing people with their sudden screaming noise and shockwaves. One participating mother recalled fly-overs endangering the children as their spooked horses took off into traffic. Another, who had just returned to Germany from years abroad, recalled her infant clinging to her trembling with shock every time a plane flew over: “am End hab i einfach d’Schnauzn voll ghabt” [in the end I was simply fed up to the back teeth] (Gundi). An aggravating factor for Gundi was that they had built their dream home in the countryside only to realize on their return from their long sojourn that the place was all but idyllic. The following caricature (Figure 1.4–3) with its sarcastic caption, ‘What a comforting feeling to know that they protect us’ illustrates related common opinion and the loss of people’s agency.

Figure 1.4—3: Low-altitude flight terror

„Welch ein beruhigendes Gefühl zu wissen, daß sie uns beschützen“

Source: ‘Tiefflieger’ (1984:60)
Nuclear pollution

‘Post-Chernobyl’ immigrants in the qualitative study (n=6) emphasized the meltdown in the Ukrainian nuclear power plant on the 26th of April 1986 and its consequences for their places of residence as a major push factor. Following the disaster, public discourses in German-speaking Europe were dominated by the Super-GAU\(^{27}\) with its immense fallout expanse and intensity, the potential of comparable catastrophes in regions covered by nuclear power stations and nuclear weapons, and the delusion of unlimited technological power (cf. ‘Du Perle im Sternbild des Atoms’ 1986; Alt 2008; Moore 2008; Pausewang 1987). Surveys captured strong anti-nuclear feelings (Eiser, Hannover, Mann, Morin, van der Plight & Webley 1990). Reactions correlated with recorded fallout quantity (Verplanken 1991) despite immediate government assurances that German nuclear power generators were most secure (e.g. Dregger, Waigel & CDU/CSU, Mischnick & FDP 1986). Thousands of young families migrated to keep their children safe from the nuclear fallout (Bruhns & Theile 2006). People intuitively grasped the impossibility of limiting the circumferences of the catastrophe, which transcended borders and continues into the future (Rosenkranz 1998; cf. ‘Die Spätfolgen von Tschernobyl’ 2011), a scenario described by participants as terrible.

Figure 1.4—4: Distribution of radioactive clouds from 27 April to 6 May 1986

![Distribution of radioactive clouds from 27 April to 6 May 1986](image)

Source: Bundesamt für Strahlenschutz

\(^{27}\) GAU, i.e. grösster anzunehmender Unfall [biggest assumable accident]
The physicists Hohenemser and Renn observed that “the total release of radioactivity was equivalent to the fallout from several dozen Hiroshima bombs” (1988:5). Due to wind direction and precipitation, the nuclear fallout (see Figure 1.4–4) made specific pre-alpine regions across Austria and Germany some of Europe’s most contaminated hotspots (Erlinger, Lettner, Hubmer, Hofmann & Steinhäusler 2008) and affected participating families, who felt powerless. Among the most affected Austrian areas was Styria (Strübler 2011):

*und dann is Tschernobyl bassier. Ende April a langs Wochenende mitm Maifeierdog … und dann hods im Radio ghossn du derfst koan Salod mehr essn vom Gardn und die Kinder derfn net draussn spüln. des wor für uns sehr deprimierend muss i sogn. weil die Kinder sin gern drauss herumglaufn und dann hod’s gheissen sie dürfen net hinaus. und im Gortn des Gemüse wor grad schön im Frühjahr. darfst net essn den Salod und so weiter des wor eigentlich schon sehr deprimierend (Gabi)*

[and then Chernobyl happened. end of April a long weekend with May Day … and then they said on the radio you’re not allowed to eat lettuce from the garden and the kids are not allowed to play outside. that was very depressing for us I have to say. because the kids liked to run around outside and then it said they’re not allowed outside. and in the garden the vegetable was just nice in the spring. you’re not allowed to eat the lettuce and so on that was actually very depressing].

Even decades later, recalling how they spent a long holiday weekend outside before learning about the danger they had been exposed to, the participant’s frustration and feelings of helplessness were still evident. The impact of that event with its resulting loss of agency was highlighted by repetition of the disheartening feelings. Nonverbal cues may communicate emotions even more efficiently than words (de Paulo 1992) and Gabi expressed her irritation through increased speech pace, increased high-pitch word stress, her facial expression and her face even turning reddish signaling anger and frustration.

**Weather and climate**

Weather was among the push factors. It is defined as the instantaneous state or sequence of atmospheric states measureable in physical units whilst climate usually is seen as the sum of all atmospheric circumstances at a specific place over a long period of time (Szalai 2007). In the vernacular, weather is used for both.

Winter temperatures were one main aspect contributing to migration decisions. Austria and Germany usually have had cold winters with snow (Klima n/d; ‘Nie wieder Schnee?’ 2000). In 1978/1979, for example, temperatures reached minus 25°C and snow piled up to four meters (Vollmer 1998). Extreme low temperatures accompany high-pressure zones

---

28 Austria has no nuclear power and is nuclear-free by law like New Zealand: 149. See Bundesverfassungsgesetz für ein atomfreies Österreich [149th Federal Constitutional Law for a nuclear-free Austria] (1999, August 13) Bundesgesetzblatt für die Republik Österreich. [http://www.salzburg.gv.at/1999a149.pdf Accessed November 2011].
29 cf. [http://www.spiegel.de/flash/flash-25703.html](http://www.spiegel.de/flash/flash-25703.html)
expanding from Arctic areas southwest into central and western parts of Europe (König 2007) in so-called Siberian winters. In such conditions, temperatures fall below minus 20°C and have reached record lows down to minus 45.9°C (Deutscher Wetterdienst n/d; ‘Extremster Kälteeinbruch in Deutschland seit 1986’ 2012; ‘Winterwetter bringt weiteren Kälterekord’ 2009). People think that sudden cold snaps impact on health conditions (Braunmiller 2008). Axel said he moved because it was so cold that “nicht mal der Hund ging raus” [not even the dog went outside]. This utterance links to the idiom ‘Hundewetter’ [foul weather; literally: dog weather], which indicates that one would not even chase a dog outside in such circumstances. Gundi’s comment, “i krieg schon Kreuzweh wenn i bloss ans Schneeschaufeln denk” [the mere thought of shoveling snow gives me a backache] pointed to homeowners’ winter responsibilities to clear footpaths. Both acknowledged that the cold affected them more because they had lived in warmer climates for a long time. Finding an escape from such temperatures, all but one family settled in New Zealand’s ‘winterless north’, where frost temperatures are localized and fleeting and precipitation only very occasionally falls as hail, where snow makes headline news yet melts on touching the ground.

Headaches attributed to common weather conditions were also a key factor contributing to migration decisions. The frequency of such complaints manifests in expressions such as ‘wetterfähig’ [weather-sensitive] and Föhnnkrankheit [föhn sickness]. A survey of 1000 people in Germany found, for example, that 19.2% thought weather strongly affected their health and 35.3% reported that weather had some influence on their health, with headaches/migraine the most frequent symptoms (von Mackensen, Hörpe, Maaruf, Tourigny & Nowak 2005; cf. Ferrari, Exner, Wanka, Bergemann, Meyer-Arnek, Hildenbrand, Tufman, Heumann, Huber, Bittner & Fischer 2012; Schulte von Drach 2008). Two participants blamed föhn, a common weather condition on northern European alpine slopes (Austrian Arena n/d), for frequent headaches. Sophie said she told Lukas that she had no migraines while on a visit in New Zealand: “hab mer denkt WOW KEIN Kopfweh. gibts ja gar net. da möcht i lebn” [I thought WOW NO headaches. that’s not possible. I’d like to live here]. Labeling the absence of weather-related headaches as inconceivable expressed Sophie’s extreme surprise. It is thought that föhn-related air pressure fluctuations impact on the autonomic nervous system, and that people who have pre-existing conditions or injuries feel these fluctuations in particular (Schulte von Drach 2008). Lukas, who had never been to New Zealand, saw migration as an escape from the agonizing effects of an earlier accident: “do hob I gsogt glaubst dass des für mich auch was wär? dass mein Kopfweh auch weggeht?” [then I said do you believe that this would be

31 The German term föhn is used as a loan word in English. The phenomenon is not unique to the European Alps. It occurs where an alpine ridge is high enough to block moist air masses. For example, in Canterbury, New Zealand, föhn is called Nor’wester because the wind falls down the eastern leeward side of the Southern Alps from a northwest direction. See http://www.weatheronline.co.nz/reports/wxfacts/The-Foehn-foehn-wind.htm
something for me too? that my headaches also disappear?). Sophie’s assumption, “wenns bei mir weg is wieso net?” [if mine disappear why not?] was followed by Lukas’ recalling his immediate migration decision: “dann gemma” [then let’s go]. Their co-constructed recount of health-problem resolution through migration illustrated migration decision-making based on a hunch. They saw migrating as regaining agency over their health. In any case, scientifically proven interactions between climatic and biological processes might not have been as important for the nexus intersecting in participants’ migration decisions as their feelings and beliefs.

**Agricultural pesticides**

The impact of pesticides on health was among push factors for participants who lived surrounded by the Hallertau hop fields in Bavaria, the biggest connected hop-growing area in the world (Kopetzky 2011). Two participants grew up in the area. Two others moved there from the city, realizing their lifestyle dream of their own house “im Grünen” [in the countryside]. Then they became aware of their ongoing exposure to pesticides as permanent hop monocultures are particularly prone to pests and therefore require very frequent pesticide treatment from budburst to flowering³² (Maurin 2008; Seigner, Seefelder, Haugg, Engelhard, Hasyn & Felsenstein 2003). Pesticides have high biotic effect potentials (Lahl 2006) and studies of patients with pre-senile dementia, Parkinson’s syndrome and associated depression have demonstrated correlations with premorbid pesticide exposure (Vieregge 2002; Laske, Wormstall, Einsiedler & Buchkremer 2004).

**Figure 1.4—5: Mature hop vines in the Hallertau**

The saying ‘hop wants to see its master every day’ points to the ongoing work required in hop fields.

³² The mature flowers are harvested and dried for beer brewing.

The caption in Figure 1.2—5 reads: Midsummer is Verena Kuffer’s favorite time of year. The hops are in full bloom, with vines climbing up to 8 meters on the wire frames. Verena’s favorite hop variety is Hallertauer Mittelfrüh [medium—early]; her favorite beer Augustiner Hell [= Lager. Hallertauer relates to the hop growing area and Augustiner is the trademark of the Munich brewery Augustiner Bräu].
Hanni reported that she used to help family in the hop fields but always experienced illness afterwards: “do simmer ollwei d’Arm ogschwollin und an Ausschlag hob i griagt” [my arms always swelled up and I got a rash]. Consequently, she became extremely concerned about the pesticide impact on her family.

**General Umweltvergiftung**

Apart from localized Umweltvergiftung (literally: poisoning of the environment; the translation ‘environmental pollution’ is an understatement in comparison) through agricultural chemicals, ubiquitous environmental poisons and their impact on people’s health and the environment were considerable push factors. Slogans such as Umweltvergiftung, Waldsterben [forest death/forest dieback] and saurer Regen [acid rain] focused people on environmental contamination through commonly used materials, and through airborne pollution particles that affect human health (cf. Heal, Kumar & Harrison 2012). Chemical terms became part of lay vocabulary because of experienced and publicized effects on the environment and on people (e.g. Carson 1963). Among others, these chemicals surfaced in participants’ discussions of environmental push factors: Persistent organic pollutants [POPs] (see UNIDO n/d) such as DDT; Dieldrin; dioxins; Lindane; PCBs and PCPs; all of which have become part of an ubiquitous background load\(^3\) of harmful substances negatively affecting the environment and human health (BGVV 2002; cf. Diehl 2002). Yet, hinting at push factors not necessarily being offset by their positive opposites in New Zealand, participants commented that before being allowed on New Zealand soil they were doused in insecticide spray in the airplane by New Zealand MAF\(^4\) staff. There is irony in this loss of agency on arrival because loss of agency in their exposure to environmental poisons was such a strong push factor towards their migration. Whilst such spraying ceased some years ago, aircraft disinsection (that is, treatment of the aircraft interior with insecticides) has replaced it\(^5\) but participants did not consider the resulting exposure necessarily less harmful than the spray applied directly on them.

Waldsterben was included in the push factors expressed by participants as a symptom of ubiquitous environmental toxins. Forests cover 31% of Germany and the forestry industry is of economic significance (BMVEL 2003). Hence, the highly visible Waldsterben has caused great concern for government, industry and the public: “Mei do worn sovui Baam kaputt im Wold” [so many trees were dead in the forest” (Hanni). The German government started countrywide inquiries into forest conditions in 1984 (Künast 2004). Forest dieback is

\(^3\)Natural background load refers, for instance, to water quality that has received no pollutants from agricultural or industrial activities. On the other hand, soil still carries a heavy introduced background load from DDT among other pollutants. This background load affects, for instance, breastmilk (see e.g. [http://www.nrdc.org/breastmilk/ddt.asp](http://www.nrdc.org/breastmilk/ddt.asp))


considered a multiple stress disorder indicative of environmental problems, with complex potential effect chains resulting from interactions of air pollutant concentrations (SO₂, NOx, ozone), soil contaminants, organisms, climate, genotype, type of silviculture, and trigger events such as extreme weather conditions as well as the recovery ability of trees (Altenmüller 1984). Ozone created in photochemical processes mainly from pollutants such as nitric oxide and hydrocarbon compounds contributes to tree damage and prevention of growth (Paffrath & Peters 1988). Figure 1.4–6 shows the extent of forest damage.

Figure 1.4—6: Waldsterben

Summary

In evaluating participants’ push factors through the lens of nexus analysis (see methodology section 1.3), the perceptions of loss of agency stood out as a major theme. Environmental discourses in place pointing to such loss of agency and the relevance for the participants' decisions to emigrate can be summed up as political tensions, pollution impacts, experiences of and beliefs about climatic influences on health. Most such aspects had built up over time. With various main foci at different times, the aspects had also been part of media and public discourses and contributed to German emigration across all social strata, for instance, in the 1980s (‘Weg von hier – um jeden Preis’ 1982:84).
1.4.2. New Zealand Discourses and immigration

**Past migration**

To understand current New Zealand immigration discourses and New Zealand pull factors, one has to briefly go back in history. Māori*, the first people known to settle in New Zealand from approximately 800 years ago, show genetic signatures indicating historical migrations of early seafaring people: indigenous Taiwanese, Polynesians, Melanesians, and Europeans (Callister & Didham 2009; Underhill, Passarino, Lin, Marzuki, Oefner, Cavalli-Sforza & Chambers 2001). The earliest known European immigrants in the 18th century “took Māori wives, begat Māori offspring”, assimilated completely, sharing their knowledge of farming and acting as translators and intermediaries with traders, explorers and missionaries (King 2003: 117). With British colonial annexation in 1840 and the resulting rapidly increasing immigrant numbers, the mutual benefit from assimilation of early European immigrants into Māori society turned into enduring British dominance. Immigrants were selected on their assumed capacity to assimilate into the British settler society (Phillips 2013) and early German-speaking settlers proved they could do this (Braund 1997).

**The Treaty of Waitangi**

The Treaty of Waitangi, signed in 1840 by Māori tribal elders and representatives of the British government, is relevant to immigration and for the current study in several ways. A government introduction to the Treaty for immigrants describes it as permeating all aspects of life and therefore as important for immigrants (Immigration New Zealand n/d).

The historical purpose of the Treaty was “to proclaim British sovereignty over the country ... Whether the Treaty meant more than this at the time is debatable” (King 2003: 165, italics in original) and continues to be debated. Confrontational discourses surfaced from conflicting collective memories revolving around diverging meanings conveyed in the original English and Māori texts; around land confiscations and wealth distribution; the political standing of Māori; the current relevance of the Treaty; and immigration.

In contemporary political discourses, the historical contract between Pākehā* and Māori is considered a Bill of Rights for both Māori and Pākehā (Immigration New Zealand n/d) and New Zealand’s founding document (e.g. MCH 2011). This understanding of the Treaty is central to New Zealand’s official biculturalism, i.e., one nation, two peoples and their

---

36 European immigrants introduced farm animals (and many other species detrimental to the local flora and fauna). Before European contact, New Zealand had no land mammals apart from one small indigenous bat. Earlier Polynesian migrants brought kiore (rattus exulans; see [http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/kiore-pacific-rats/page-3](http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/kiore-pacific-rats/page-3)).

partnership. The Treaty is seen as protecting the rights of Māori, who are discursively constructed as indigenous guardians of the land (Munford & Walsh-Tapiata 2006), and as protecting the rights of Pākehā (Barrett & Strongman 2013). Yet, the usage of the Māori term Pākehā remains controversial in the light of intermarriages between Māori and later arrivals since the 18th century (King 2003). At the time of the Treaty, the British were seen as Pākehā (cf. Moorfield 2011). Racial classification saw Pākehā as ‘White’ Europeans and Americans (Baker 1945). Pākehā also refers to European New Zealanders (Te Huia & Liu 2012), but European means British in New Zealand (Braund 1997); or to everyone who landed in New Zealand at any time after Māori (Smith 2012); and to Tauwi (Stuart 1996). The latter accumulates problems as the Māori term Tauwi translates as foreigner(s) (Te Huia & Liu 2012). Nevertheless it is used synonymously with Pākehā to classify non-Māori New Zealanders (McCreanor & Nairn 2002; Munford & Walsh-Tapiata 2006) and immigrants who arrived after Māori (Naumann 2009).

Such conflicting classifications seriously challenge people’s sense of belonging (Hill 2010) especially in the light of ongoing immigration, which has made New Zealand a multicultural society in paradoxical contrast to the official biculturalism. This translates into confusion for immigrants from non-British origins (Ip & Pang 2005). The notion of two peoples in New Zealand adds issues of acceptance and belonging and leads to immigrants questioning their place in New Zealand (Nayar 2009). Participants in the current study mentioned this too. Whilst discourses of Māori and Pākehā as “impermeable binary groups may be useful for political purposes, they disguise the true complexity of New Zealand society” (Callister 2004: 135).

Biculturalism and associated shifting discourses remain as controversial as the original Māori and English Treaty texts and the differences between them (Rata 2011; cf. Jones & Creed 2011). Culturalist discourses merge the social notion of culture with ethnicity, which according to Rata has a strong biological content, assume a causal relationship between the two concepts and politicize an ethnic group’s interest (Rata 2005). The culturalist division between Māori and Pākehā is contested by the prevalence of mixed heritages, which illustrate the permeability of groups (Callister 2003; Callister, Didham & Potter 2005; Kukutai 2007). Indeed, after about 200 years of widespread intermarriage, all Māori have some form of other ancestry (Butterworth & Mako 1989, cf. Kukutai 2004). Several participants in the current study exemplify this (see e.g. p136; 144 & p264).

**Recent migration and settlement**

Migration as an ongoing major force in population change (van Oudenhoven & Ward 2013) is especially obvious in New Zealand. The 2013 census recorded 25.2% of the total New Zealand population of over 4.2 million as born overseas. Overlapping self-defined ethnic

---

groups were: European 74%; Māori 14.9%; Pacific peoples 7.4%; Asian 11.8%; Middle Eastern, Latin American and African 1.2%; and other ethnicities 1.7% (Statistics New Zealand 2013). In comparison, 94% of the New Zealand population of around 2.3 million in the mid-20th century were considered mainly of British ancestry (Grbic, Ishizawa & Grothers 2010). British settlers and their descendants have most clearly shaped New Zealand’s mainstream culture to date. Successful settlement meant immigrants’ achievement of cultural invisibility through the immigrants’ own efforts towards total assimilation at linguistic and other cultural levels to ‘normal’ cultural practices of the dominant British group (Fletcher 1999).

Institutionally, New Zealand is still considered mainly monocultural by many commentators (see, e.g., Allen 1997; Liu 2005). This view may no longer be fully defendable, however, since the introduction of Māori immersion schools (cf. Hill 2009; Jones & Creed 2011), or Language Line, a free phone service that provides professional interpreting into/from 44 languages for core government services39, for example. Also, the Mixed-Member-Proportional (MMP) electoral system derived from the German system, with the addition of long-established Māori seats, has resulted in Parliament reflecting the cultural mix of the population40. Yet, as explained in the analysis section 2.2.2, the current study demonstrated that institutional monoculturalism is still present in professional associations.

Recognizing the challenges that new immigrants face as well as the difficulties within the local community to understand and accept immigrants, the New Zealand government strives for social cohesion (Spoonley, Peace, Butcher & O’Neill 2005). Smith (2012) sees assertion of social cohesion as a global branding exercise in national identity, whilst Spoonley et al. suggest that social cohesion aims for belonging and full participation for all, as well as providing conditions for recognition and institutional responsiveness, and inclusion through equitable opportunities in the labor market. The New Zealand definition of social cohesion as “a society where different groups knit together effectively as a nation despite differences” (Canadian Senate 1999) also indicates an ongoing process. Here, social cohesion is seen as supporting social cooperation notwithstanding dissimilar needs and based on these conditions:

- Individual opportunities, including education, jobs, health
- Family wellbeing, including parental responsibility
- Strong communities, including safe and reliant communities
- National identity, including history, heritage, culture and rights and entitlements of citizenship

(Canadian Senate 1999)

Arguably, this differs from Esser’s (2001) understanding of social cohesion as mutual adjustment through assimilation, because New Zealand’s ‘knitting together’ metaphor

allows disparities reminiscent of Witi Ihemaera’s (2005: 1) ‘Rope of Man’, which refers to past, current and future New Zealand fusions:

... It's also fiercely twisted and soldered together by many different histories as Māori, Pākehā, Polynesian, Asian, American began to fall in love, marry and have children together. The Rope continues its journey, spinning, singing, weaving, sparkling, charting its way through Time. ...

Strong outside forces implicit in the metaphors ‘fiercely twisted and soldered’ signal that the cooperation towards a cohesive society is not without challenges (see also integration and assimilation on pp57f). Ihemaera’s notion focuses on social cohesion through genetic mixing, whereas the official social cohesion notion emphasizes individual and family responsibilities and equal rights to services and citizenship. Both are relevant for the current study. Yet, the officially promoted tolerance may not necessarily be reflected in New Zealand’s reality (cf. Collins & Friesen 2011; Dürr 2011; Murphy, Friesen & Kearns 2003; Roscoe 2000).

**New Zealand images in German-speaking Europe – historical roots**

German speakers’ interest in New Zealand has been linked to enduring “deeply embedded” idolized romantic discourses of the South Seas (i.e., South Pacific) where people live in harmony with nature (Kahn & Wilke 2007: 297). Such beliefs are said to have developed from *Nouvelle-Cythère* notes (cf. Leary 1991; Festa 2007) although Holfter (1998) does not see it this way. Forster’s (1778/2007) widely read first-hand travelogue of Cook’s second South Pacific voyage 1772-1775 reads like an adventure story but is neither romantic nor idolized. Still popular more than 200 years after first publication (cf. ‘60 Fässer Sauerkraut an Bord’ 2007; Perlentaucher 2007; Oberlies 2007), Forster’s book presents analytical accounts of landscapes, flora, fauna, and Māori cultural practices and interactions with Cook’s Resolution crew. Bödeker (1999) describes the travelogue as enlightened ethnological participatory observation based on theoretical knowledge and problem awareness not attained previously. Forster described New Zealand’s landscapes as diverse and beautiful, from majestic mountains to fertile plateaus and coastal regions with plentiful clean water resources, its coastal waters teeming with fish (Forster 1778/2007).

**Modern New Zealand images, advertising, and news in German media**

New Zealand’s landscapes are prominent in official advertising, where they operate as communicative tools towards the goal of increasing the country’s income. This reminds of

---

41 i.e., New Cythera - from Greek mythology, which sees the island Kythera as the home of Aphrodite, the goddess of love.

42 Forster, Georg: *Reise um die Welt* published in 1778; 1784; and indicating its enduring appeal also published e.g. in 1983; 1989 & 2007, as well as in English as *A Voyage round the world* 1777 and, e.g. 2000.

43 See, e.g., http://www.newzealand.com
Duncan’s (1990) view of landscapes as political texts. Also, “The myth of paradise remains an important factor in the marketing of destinations” (Waldren 2010: 94), which partly explains that New Zealand’s spectacular scenery and diverse landscapes have been exciting German-speaking travelers for centuries (cf. Holfter 1998). Despite changed times and circumstances, this was true also for participants in the current study. Contemporary images, for instance in the German edition of *The Lonely Planet* travel guide, present the New Zealand’s astonishing diversity from mighty mountains and rugged valleys; huge sounds and amazing fjords; breath-taking national parks; rugged volcanic craters; to seemingly endless spectacular beaches with pristine sands (Bain, Dunford, Miller, O’Brien & Rawlings-Way et al. 2007). The authors describe wild coasts; perfect surf waves as well as safe swimming beaches; secluded sunny beaches and dark foggy wilderness; hot springs for relaxation; white or black water adventures for adrenalin bursts etc. They also praise the cordiality, tolerance and warm-heartedness of New Zealand’s people. The guide also reflects that with a current population of just over 4.2 million, of which about one third live in Auckland, most landscapes appear devoid of people.

German-speaking media tend to refer to New Zealand’s dream landscapes, for instance, in television documentaries, focusing on superficial images of the most beautiful world’s end (e.g. ‘Der Traum vom Auswandern’ 2011; Wemmer 2008). Suggesting rather one-directional interest perhaps due to New Zealand’s media mainly monolingual lenses, German-language TV seems to broadcast about New Zealand more frequently than New Zealand TV about German-speaking Europe. In Germany, emigration advice books also sell well (e.g. Esser-Hall & Melchior 2006) and the Internet contributes to travel information and news exchanges. New Zealand landscapes were strong pull factors for participants, but this did not reflect any dislike of European landscapes. Rather, participants expected to find uncontaminated New Zealand landscapes in their attempt to gain agency in environmental matters. For Gabi, embodied experiences involved her long-held dream of an ideal world untainted by environmental pollution and free of racial tensions. She identified this perfect world in the New Zealand picture drawn in an Austrian newspaper article (Nöhrer 1984), which she used to convince her husband to travel to New Zealand on holiday although “am liebstn wär i sofort ausgewandert” [I would have much preferred emigrating immediately]. Indicating its importance, she has kept this article. Enticed by media images, most participants visited New Zealand. Their holiday impressions matched

---


45 See also, e.g.: [http://info.zdf.de/ZDFde/inhalt/20/0,1872,8419956,00.html](http://info.zdf.de/ZDFde/inhalt/20/0,1872,8419956,00.html); [http://www.umdiewelt.de](http://www.umdiewelt.de); [http://www.theglobetrotter.de/neuseeland/reisebericht](http://www.theglobetrotter.de/neuseeland/reisebericht) Accessed October 2013

46 See e.g. [http://www.zdf.de/ZDFmediathek#/suche/neuseeland](http://www.zdf.de/ZDFmediathek#/suche/neuseeland); [http://www.daserste.de/suche/daserste_dyn~start,1~perPage,10~summary,yes~sort,rank~search,neuseeland~cm.asp](http://www.daserste.de/suche/daserste_dyn~start,1~perPage,10~summary,yes~sort,rank~search,neuseeland~cm.asp) Accessed October 2013

the imageries and in turn fed into their immigration. Figure 1.4–8 (p88) illustrates the pull factors that the first-generation immigrants in the qualitative study mentioned in their narrative accounts and which I then ask them to rank on a scale from 1 to 10 (10 = strongest). These rankings suggest that positive media discourses were reflected in participants’ pull factors.

**Pull factors and post-immigration realities**

Regarding New Zealand discourses relevant to participants’ immigration and its consequences, data suggest two time frames, i.e., pre-immigration, and post-immigration. As Figure 1.4–7 below indicates and as elaborated in the following, pull factors fall within the first time frame, and post-immigration experiences of New Zealand discourses in place fall within the second time frame.

**Figure 1.4—7: Participants explanations of New Zealand discourses in place**

Pre-immigration, New Zealand’s landscapes were understood as natural and unpolluted and attracted most G1 participants in the qualitative study. Most G1 participants had read about and/or seen images that enticed them to travel to New Zealand landscapes before they immigrated. The climate, people’s welcoming friendliness, the country’s remoteness, political structure, its remoteness from Cold War factors and its steadfast antinuclear stance
also played considerable pull roles in their search for regaining agency in a safe and untainted natural place as shown in Figure 1.4–8 below.

Figure 1.4—8: Pull factor details – G1

New Zealand competes for visitors and immigrants. The brand ‘clean green New Zealand’ and ‘100% pure New Zealand’ underpins the notion of the nation state as a natural creation that “offers the world a unified version of place” and a feeling devoid of any environmental, social and political issues (Bell 2005/2006: 15ff). German-speaking visitors equate New Zealand’s purity with their own individual interpretations of idealized interactions with the environment, expecting “a deep experience with ‘nature’ in the sense of their understanding of nature as a positive and strong inspirational power or life-force” (Dürr 2007: 11).

Interestingly, over the course of this study, New Zealand advertising discourses have shifted. Instead of driving the increasingly controversial ‘clean and green’ national identity frame (Egoz 2000; O’Brien 2012; Tucker 2011), film advertising now frames New Zealand as a destination ‘where unspoiled islands are never far away’, suggesting environmental protection by ‘guardians of the earth’. German-speaking tourists are sought after because

---


49 e.g., Lord of the Rings; The Hobbit

they are the second-biggest visitor group from Europe, stay longer and spend more than other tourist groups\textsuperscript{51}. As the visitor arrivals in Figure 1.4–9 illustrate, publicity seems to work well\textsuperscript{52}. German unification in 1989 also offered many more German speakers increased freedom to travel, which most likely is reflected in the massive visitor-number increases into the early 1990s. The decline in visitor numbers between 1995 and 2000 reflects an economic crisis in Europe (cf. ‘Pleitewelle auf Rekordhoch’ 1996).

**Figure 1.4—9: Visitors to New Zealand from German-speaking Europe**

![Graph showing visitor numbers from Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and total visits to New Zealand from German-speaking Europe.](Figure 1.4—9)

*Source: Statistics New Zealand (2013)*

Escapism lies at the core of tourism and labels of potential destinations are intended to fulfill global consumer fantasies, which are satisfied through superficial discoveries and through memories of what the consumers wanted to see (Bell & Lyall 2002). At the time of their immigration, participants in the current study had superficial tourist experiences and/or expectations and similar vague feelings about New Zealand as a place. All but one of the participants in the qualitative part of my study came from landlocked pre-alpine or alpine areas, which might explain their preference for the coast. Indicating the symbolic power of landscape, photos were saved as participants’ computer screen backgrounds (e.g. Figure 1.4–10 below). Numerous beaches are within Auckland city limits. Yet, they are never as crowded as beaches in Europe, with the rare exception of organized protests, for example, against deep sea oil drilling (see Dougan 2013), in which some participants in the current study also took part recently.


\textsuperscript{52} Numbers supplied by Statistics New Zealand on request (November 2013). Visitor arrivals are overseas residents who arrive for less than 12 months. Cf. also Google search “Neuseeland” brings up 28,000,000 results (31 October 2013).
Figure 1.4—10: One of many bays within Auckland city limits

Nuclear-free New Zealand

Linked to the push factors associated with nuclear-weapon stockpiles and the Chernobyl accident, New Zealand’s explicit anti-nuclear position added to the country’s pull factors for participants. New Zealand’s anti-nuclear movement started with, was sustained by, and succeeded through strong grassroots movements (Robie 1986). The public movement resulted in the New Zealand government’s condemnation of nuclear testing from the 1950s (Dewes 2008) and New Zealand’s nuclear-free status was cemented into law in 1987.53 This nuclear-free legislation was “an outstanding example of public action leading to political change” (Hager 1997: 1). In his eloquent 1985 Oxford Union speech, David Lange54, Prime Minister at the time, declared New Zealand’s “genuine long-term affirmation of this proposition: that nuclear weapons are morally indefensible”, and that New Zealand neither wanted to be host to nor be defended by nuclear weapons despite US sanctions. His message to Washington was clear: “to compel an ally to accept nuclear weapons against the wishes of that ally is to take the moral position of totalitarianism, which allows for no self-determination, and which is exactly the evil that we are supposed to be fighting against” (Lange 1985 audio file).

53 New Zealand Nuclear Free Zone, Disarmament, and Arms Control Act 1987
54 Indicating perhaps a kind of kinship pride, German participants pointed out that David Lange was a descendant of a German immigrant.
This David versus Goliath refusal to allow nuclear-propelled and nuclear-armed ships into New Zealand harbors was widely publicized in the German press (e.g., ‘Anti-nuke in der Südsee’ 1985; ‘Kiwi Krankheit’ 1985) and particularly impressed participants. Contamination continues from nuclear testing, waste dumps and atoll fractures (cf. Whiteford 1994) and all adult participants in this study agreed that New Zealand’s anti-nuclear steadfastness was an attempt to start a saner future, but that it did not clear the Pacific of nuclear waste and weapons or of nuclear-propelled ships. Indeed, over half the United States Navy is based in the Pacific (‘A nuclear free Pacific’ 1988, clip 2) as the economic and strategic importance of the Pacific Rim keeps increasing due to China’s economic and nuclear efforts. Realistically, New Zealand’s and other Pacific nations’ declaration of nuclear-free zones therefore achieve very little strategically (cf. Whiteford 1994). Nevertheless, the major political parties have affirmed their commitment to the 1987 New Zealand Nuclear Free Zone, Disarmament, and Arms Control Act, which not only covers nuclear weapons and nuclear disarmament, but also nuclear energy generation (‘Motions – nuclear-free legislation – 20th anniversary’ 2007).

Post-immigration – New Zealand environmental reality

Most participants were attracted to New Zealand by dreams, but experienced different realities (Figure 1.4–7 p86). They kept valuing New Zealand’s landscapes and climate, its democratic political structure, friendly people and new career opportunities. Yet, as explained in section 2.2.2, they discovered that their initial gazes had concealed flaws. Another aspect that changed from positive to negative after moving was New Zealand’s remoteness, which made seeing family and friends in Europe problematic. Other experienced imperfections can be categorized into those relating to people’s impact on landscapes and indirectly impacting on participants, and into experiences with people and institutions more directly challenging participants.

New Zealand – green, pure, untouched?

Participants’ conversations referred to conflicting discourses about 100% pure and clean green New Zealand. For example, conventional farming sees green and clean as neat and tidy production areas ordered through mechanistic trimming and chemicals, whereas the organic farming movement evolving in the 1980s adopted clean, green but messy practices without harmful chemicals, with the 1990s corporate move into organic farming adding yet another ideology of green clean agriculture (Egoz 2000). Others have condemned green, clean, and pure New Zealand as fantasy marketing myths (Coyle & Fairweather 2005; Cumming 2010; Preston 2012; Seymour 2013) in the face of increasing environmental...
problems\(^{56}\) (e.g., Dew 1999) and a poisoned paradise (Graf & Graf 2009\(^{57}\)). Confronted with these discourses, the New Zealand Tourism Board changed its 1980s ‘clean green New Zealand’ and ‘New Zealand 100% Pure’ slogans to an ambiguous ‘Pure New Zealand’, and ‘New Zealand 100% Pure You’, which focuses on the visitor whilst advertising the country’s landscapes and tourist activities (Pure New Zealand 2011). Such linguistic stratagems eliminate potential false-advertising claims.

New Zealand’s agronomy and settlement turned the country from “a land of forests and shade” into “a land of open pastures and towns” (Ministry for the Environment 1997:10.2). Now proudly “the world’s biggest farm” (AA Tourism 2012), New Zealand processes over 14 billion liters of milk and 1.2 billion kilograms of milk solids and exports 95% of production (Farming Recruitment New Zealand/FRENZ n/d). Still, the ‘clean green’ and ‘100% Pure New Zealand’ labels used to promote food exports and other industries (e.g. Auswärtiges Amt n/d; Clemens & Babcock 2004; Lonsdale 1996) have been suggestive of untouched nature. Attracted by New Zealand’s seemingly unspoilt environment, G1 immigrants and one family in particular (see pilot study) tried to work their land in harmony with nature. The country’s change into ‘the world’s biggest farm’ over the past decades, however, saw three of the New-Zealand-educated second generation participants involved in primary industries and/or processing and/or product promotion overseas.

As participants pointed out, increasingly intensive industrialized farming practices and industrial toxins damage land and waterways (cf. Green Party 2011; Greenpeace New Zealand n/d; Szabo 1993) and beyond a superficial glance, New Zealand’s nature is anything but untouched. Participants’ belief in New Zealand’s purity was abruptly shattered by aerial pesticide application. Aerial applications on crops are common in New Zealand\(^{58}\) and, as participants living in the Auckland area pointed out, not limited to rural areas but have also been carried out over the city (cf. ‘Anderton rejects watchdog’s aerial spray advice’ 2007; Gregory 2007; Perry 2007). A participant’s sarcastic comment about New Zealand being thought of as clean and pristine, “ja, hammer gedacht” [yes, so we thought] reflects the participants’ disillusionment with the country’s environmental realities.

Environmental issues are manifold and come to public attention through public media (e.g. Bennett 2011), New Zealand’s conservation movement, protests and scientific research (e.g. Cornelison, Gillespie, Kirs, Young, Forrest, Barter, Knight & Harwood 2011; Green 2004)) as well as private initiatives (e.g. Winters 2009; Graf & Graf 2009). An example of the latter is the Graf brothers’ video\(^{59}\), shown to me by participants shocked by its content. It deals with the widespread aerial poison drops for possum, rodent, and mustelid control.


\(^{57}\) see http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mtprJRaSHN8


\(^{59}\) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mtprJRaSHN8
The video shows the agonizing impact of the 1080 compound (sodium fluoroacetate) on non-target species including rare native birds and domestic animals (Easton 2008). New Zealand government bodies import and use approximately 80% of the world’s 1080 compound production, that is, 2,300 kilograms a year (Department of Conservation n/d) “to protect native species form the impacts of introduced pests” (Eason, Miller, Ogilvie & Fairweather 2011:13). Participants agreed with each other that instead of continued poisoning, targeted training and incentives could make trapping part of a conservation job-training package that would benefit the environment (cf. New Zealand Possum Busters 2009; Puketi Forest Trust 2010) as well as New Zealand’s 18.8% unemployed youth (Hannan 2011; ‘Jobs fault line’ 2011). Instead, the Department of Conservation cut jobs (Cooke 2011). Interestingly, pointing to unrelenting pressure on the economy and environment from pests and to shortcomings in cooperation between agencies, the Royal Society of New Zealand (2014) calls for intense research into fundamental biological understanding of pest life-cycles and population processes, refinement of control methods, and for more trained staff to improve pest-management efficacy.

Ministry for the Environment reports (1997, 2001 & 2007) focus on aspects of the environment under pressure and requiring urgent attention. The 2007 report includes: from a New Zealand population of approximately 4 million, an estimated 1,100 people die prematurely due to air pollution each year; PM$_{10}$ particulates due to home heating has decreased in recent years, but traffic is a major culprit with PM$_{10}$ particulates concentrations in cities made worse by the prevalence of old and poorly tuned vehicles. This often very visible pollution concerned all adult participants in the qualitative study. A report also found: whilst greenhouse gas emissions are small in comparison with other countries, per capita New Zealand ranks 12th, with about 50% of these emissions from agriculture; soil erosion is a serious problem due to deforestation and marginal land use for pastoral farming; of 1,238 voluntarily reported sites contaminated with toxic chemicals, 545 have been cleaned up and 301 are ‘actively managed’ (Ministry of the Environment 2007:249). One of these treated sites near Nelson “was heavily contaminated by a range of toxic pesticides such as DDT, aldrin, lindane, and dieldrin” (Ministry of the Environment 2007: 250). Contamination is not limited to such sites. Timber soaked in copper, chrome and arsenic solutions (CCA treated timber) is used for buildings, retaining walls, fences, but also playground equipment.

One participant, whose push factors included misinformation about wood preservatives, recalled complaining to her children's primary school principal after noticing that such treated timber was used unsealed extensively in the new school playground. Timber treated with such preservatives is not permitted in playgrounds in Germany (Industrievertretung Thielsh n/d). She explained being shocked that children played on this equipment whilst eating their lunches and that this neither worried the school nor other parents in the least.

---

$^{60}$ PM$_{10}$ particulates are solid or liquid particles or particulate matter of 10 micrometers or less in size. These minute particles in the air cause major health concerns (‘Airtrends Summary’ (1995)).
This concern was an expression of a lack of agency, and of environmental expectations not met. Her apprehension is understandable given that arsenic is a carcinogen (Waalkes, Liu, Ward & Diwan 2003) and research has shown high water-soluble arsenic on children’s hands on playgrounds with CCA treated timber (Kwon, Zhang, Wang, Jhangri, Lu, Fok, Gabos, Li & Le 2004).

Participants described New Zealand environmental issues as evidence of New Zealanders’ naivety and disinterest in their natural environment. Whilst participants left Europe partly because of pollution, as time progressed they discovered similar, at times even worse New Zealand realities even though local mass media appear to avoid publication of less palatable facts. Participants said they realized, discussed and condemned New Zealand’s environmental problems, for instance, in signing campaigns, supporting the Green Party and/or Greenpeace. However, as they came to terms with challenging realities of New Zealand life, ongoing provision for family and later for retirement became more imperative concerns. Also, “des reibt oin auf” [that wears you down] (Hanni) points to the depressing bleakness of keeping focused on environmental transgressions. It signals resignation that might also be related to G1 participants’ ages and life stages. G2 were aware of environmental issues. Some supported Greenpeace and the Green Party and one took G3 participants to protest actions against deep-sea drilling for oil.

**Transnational discourses**

Several discourses connected participants’ countries of origin and New Zealand. Such discourses included (non)acceptance of qualifications, pensions, exchange rates, citizenships, and historical shadows.

**New Zealand institutions and overseas professions**

After the participants in this study moved to New Zealand, immigration procedures were amended a number of times, not least because professional regulations did not correspond to immigration requirements and severely impacted on immigrant employability (cf. INZ Operational Manual 2012: 42-1). Countries’ different educational structures, professional association regulations, and lack of coordination between government and professional associations continue to pose problems for immigrants. Analysis (pp154ff) details hurdles and their impact on G1 participants in this study.

**New Zealand and overseas pensions**

By the end of this study, all G1 participants had reached retirement age and since they all had contributed to German or Austrian pension schemes but also had spent paying taxes for almost three decades in New Zealand, the conflicting discourses and consequences of
migration on retirement provisions were discussed extensively. The legislation regarding New Zealand Superannuation (NZS), its interpretation and its implementation by the New Zealand Ministry of Social Development (MSD) are contradictory and the resulting treatment of overseas pensions remains contested (e.g., Collins 2008). This directly affected all G1 participants. The New Zealand Superannuation Act 2001 stipulates that “every person is entitled to receive New Zealand Superannuation who attains the age of 65 years” (Part 1,7,1) provided these residence requirements are met: resident in New Zealand for at least 10 years since age 20, with at least five of these years over the age of 50, and resident at date of application for NZS (Part 1,8). The “universal entitlement” for this group is confirmed in a MSD review (MSD 2008a: 3). Considering the generally accepted meaning of ‘universal’, full NZS payments should apply to all in this specified group of people.

Interestingly, New Zealand government discourses have changed over the course of this study amidst countrywide protests against overseas-pension deductions from the universal NZS. That is, the term ‘universal’ started to be removed and has all but disappeared from official NZS documentation (although there were exceptions: e.g. Law 2013). The G1 immigrants in this study are part of the 10% of New Zealand superannuitants affected by the direct deduction policy (DDP) of foreign government pensions set out in section 70 of the Social Security Act 1964 (MSD 2008a), which has been rigorously implemented for all such pensions from the early 1990s. This legislation authorizes dollar-for-dollar abatement of NZS against overseas government pensions if that overseas payment is, “in the opinion of the [MSD] chief executive” “in the nature” of NZS payments (Section 70,1b Social Security Act 1964). The chief executive’s opinion does not appear based on solid understanding of varying notions of government pensions in different systems.

The main difference between the German and Austrian retirement annuity systems and the NZS system is that the former are Bismarck systems but the latter has a Beveridge orientation. Yet, the participants had dollar for dollar of their Rentenversicherung [pension insurance] deducted. Whilst Germany and Austria also have a Beveridge-oriented system (see Sozialgesetzbuch XII, paragraph 41; e.g. Steiermärkisches Sozialhilfegesetz), this system did not apply for the participants. Their pension insurance was part of a Bismarck system, which functions as insurance in that the community of the insured assures the financing of payments (Deutsche Rentenversicherung 2010c), whilst a Beveridge system is built on the idea that everyone is entitled to social services paid through general taxation (Ribhegge 2002). The problems with bringing together such fundamentally incompatible systems are acknowledged by MSD (Lazonby 2007) but not solved. A 2008 MSD review

61 Named after Otto von Bismarck: In 1889, the German government under chancellor Bismarck introduced this compulsory old-age pension system, for which employer and employee each pay half of the ongoing contributions.

62 In Austria, each state has its own version of this minimum social security law.

63 only ultimately bailed out by the state if the system fails
admits that the NZS system “contrasts with the contributory systems operating in most other Western countries” (MSD 2008a: 3), where individual workers and employers pay towards individual pensions. The review also concedes that pension “decisions made by MSD officials are highly contestable” (MSD 2008a: 8). Nevertheless, the review concluded that the treatment of overseas pensions policy is fundamentally sound and equitable.

This conclusion is erroneous because a policy is not sound and equitable if it discriminates against one out of ten. MSD’s ‘fundamentally sound and equitable’ conclusion was based on the principle that only one pension should be available for one contribution. Regarding this erroneous ‘double-dipping’ argument, participants emphasized that they had contributed to NZS through work and taxes for decades beyond the basic requirements, in contrast to certain NZS recipients who have never contributed to New Zealand society through work but still receive NZS. They also agreed with this warning: “wart na bis se dir an Kiwi Saver genga” [just wait until they take your Kiwi Saver] (Hanni). This recently introduced New Zealand retirement savings system, which some G1 and G2 participants joined, is in some respects similar to the Bismarck system in that employer and employee pay into it. It differs in that the New Zealand government subsidizes contributions and that the savings can eventually be withdrawn as a lump sum. Other points of difference are that the government does not guarantee the investment should the Kiwi Saver investment company fail; and payouts do not affect NZS to date.

Social science researchers suggested urgent changes and reform options for overseas pensions in relation to NZS (e.g. Dale, St John & Littlewood 2009; Dale & St John 2012) and in 2008, the then Labor government accepted certain changes: “Removing from the scope of section 70 of the Social Security Act 1964 foreign state pensions built up by voluntary contributions” and “discontinuing the policy of deducting a person’s overseas pension from partner’s NZS entitlement”. However, the proviso that these changes would take effect “when funding is secured” (MSD 2008b: 1-2) led to failure of the proposal because funding was not secured64. Whilst the spouse excess clause continues to apply, the first recommendation was implemented in 2013 in response to pensioner complaints to the Social Security Appeal Authority. For some G1 participants, this decision translated into some financial benefit because parts of their contributions to the European pension scheme had been voluntary. Yet, the current explanation that “the Ministry can … defer the deduction of the portion of the pension funded from voluntary contributions” (65 italics added) does not assure permanence due to the ambiguity of ‘defer’.

---

64 Letter (dated 19 February 2013) from Hon Jo Goodhew, Minister for Senior Citizens, answering my request for clarification.
65 Letter (dated 19 February 2013) from Hon Jo Goodhew, Minister for Senior Citizens, answering my request for clarification.
New Zealand economy and transnational implications

Although immigrants participating in the current study came as skilled migrants, who are categorized by Poot (1993:123) as “economic migrants”, economic reasons for their migration to New Zealand could firmly be ruled out (the survey reply, “we didn’t come for the money” was typical also for the qualitative study). The 1984 Labour government led by David Lange tried to pull New Zealand out of its dire economic situation of the early 1980s by introducing radical free-market reforms. One was to devalue the dollar (NZ$) by 20% in 1984 and float it from 1985 (Bollard & Mayes 1993). Relevant for the time frame when these qualitative study participants immigrated, 1 Deutschmark bought approximately 2 NZ$ before the NZ$ devaluation in 1984; in early 1985 it bought 1.5 NZ$; and the exchange rate was 1:1 in 1987. In October 2013, the conversion rate was 1 NZ$ to 0.6 Euro. Such exchange-rate fluctuations impacted G1 participants when they brought their financial assets into the country and continue impacting through their European pensions.

When comparing living costs and incomes, New Zealand fails to impress. Incomes in professional jobs tend to be higher in German-speaking Europe than in New Zealand (cf. Step Stone 2010; ‘Gehaltscheck’ 2010; New Zealand salaries n/d). In addition, real wage rates in New Zealand fell by 9% between 1984 and 2000 through inflation (Kay 2000). Living costs including rents are at the same level as or higher than those in comparable locations in German-speaking Europe and higher grocery costs in New Zealand are attributed to exports and the lack of competition in the retail sector (AA Education Network n/d).

Transnational discourses - citizenships

Citizenships are legal ties between individuals and nation states. Regulations governing citizenships differ between the countries concerned in the current study. The requirements for New Zealand citizenship are generous (DIA 2012). Dual/multiple citizenships are permitted. Permanent residents who have lived in New Zealand for at least five years and intend to stay in New Zealand may be granted citizenship on application if they fulfill certain character requirements established through a police background check; speak enough English to cope with everyday situations independently; and understand the rights and privileges of New Zealand citizenship. Citizenship is established in a public ceremony, where applicants swear allegiance. Children born in New Zealand territories to permanent residents or to a New Zealand citizen automatically acquire New Zealand citizenship at birth. This applies to G3 participants in the current qualitative study.

66 See Bollard & Mayes (1993) for reasons and description of reforms
67 31 October 2013
68 Information from Department of Internal Affairs (http://www.dia.govt.nz).
Both Austrian and German citizenship through descent is automatic at birth, yet with requirements for paternity documentation if only the father has the citizenship (Staatsangehörigkeitsgesetz n/d; Staatsbürgerschaftsgesetz 1985). Immigrants to New Zealand or Australia who wish to acquire dual citizenship have to be granted permission by the relevant Austrian and German authorities for retention of their citizenship before applying for another. All G1, but not all G2 Austrian participants in my qualitative study had dual citizenship, with two of the five Austrian G2 participants only holding New Zealand passports and their children therefore not having automatic Austrian citizenship. All German descendants in the qualitative study automatically acquired New Zealand citizenship at birth, with four also entitled to British citizenship through their father. My study suggests that Austrian states are more generous with dual citizenships than German states although in Germany a request for retention is no longer necessary for citizenship acquisition in another EU country or Switzerland, where Germany allows dual citizenship as of right (Bundesverwaltungsamt n/d).

The Austrian participants with dual citizenship received their full Austrian pension entitlement. With regards to German pensions, acquiring another citizenship translates into pension reduction (Deutsche Rentenversicherung 2010a). On the other hand, non-German passport holders can have their own compulsory and voluntary pension contributions refunded two years after relinquishing German citizenship if living outside the European Union. Because this extinguishes the right to a German pension (Deutsche Rentenversicherung 2010b), it results in full payment of NZS.

**Shadows of history**

Not all connections between New Zealand and German-speaking Europe have been amicable and the current study shows that certain New Zealanders’ attitudes to German speakers may still reflect the countries’ historical conflicts (see e.g. pp177f; 258f). Following Britain, New Zealand declared war on Germany twice, in 1914 and in 1939, and consequently the two countries spent about a decade at war in the first half of the 20th century (McGibbon 1998). New Zealand’s reasons included loyalty to the colony’s motherland, but foremost the country’s economic and defense dependence on Britain (Braund 1997). The Auckland War Memorial Museum is testament to “New Zealand’s emergence as a nation through the loss and suffering of war”

---

69 Centuries of repeated battles for power and expansion, including colonies, escalated massively in WWI through amassment and industrialization of armament on all sides. Germany then refers to the German empire under the last German emperor. Austria was part of Germany from 1938 to the end of WWII in 1945 (cf. http://www.hdg.de/lemo/home.html; http://www.vorkriegsgeschichte.de/content/view/20/36/ & http://einstages.spiegel.de/static/topicalbumbackground/3131/atempause_fuer_den_weltuntergang.html)

The result of these historical conflicts was that “for a generation of New Zealanders, war and Germans were almost synonymous” (McGibbon 1998: 5). Braund (1997) lists three main stereotypical New Zealand views of Germans: 1) the Forgotten Germans, who settled in New Zealand in the second half of the 19th century and were then highly regarded but ignored after hostilities; 2) the Ugly Germans in the first half of the 20th century, who were the enemy; and 3) the Unknown Germans, that is, post-war Germans whom New Zealanders know little about. The Ugly-German shadows linger. In the years 2006 to 2008, for instance, Resch (2008) found National Socialism (\textit{Nationalsozialismus} = Nazi) as the most common topic relating to Germany in the New Zealand press. My online search of the few mainstream New Zealand media websites\textsuperscript{71} confirmed this high frequency of collocation by instantly yielding more than 1,300 news results for the keyword combination ‘German’ and ‘Nazi’. Before settling in New Zealand, participants in the current study were not aware of the persistence of such associative discourses. In New Zealand, however, related personal attacks impacted on participants in the qualitative study and in the survey (see pp177 & 234).

**Summary – European and New Zealand discourses**

What emerged from these European and New Zealand discourses was the expression of a powerful loss of agency for G1 participants around effects of environmental dismay and protecting one’s self and family. This evolved into complex push factors to find a safe haven and regain agency. Participants were drawn to New Zealand by images and glances at its apparently pure landscapes and oceans. They were enchanted by welcoming people, and appeased by the country’s political steadfastness and democratic system. Yet, as the participants came to terms with living in New Zealand and as time passed, the realities did not translate completely into the expected positive opposites participants had hoped to find. Indeed, some consequences of migration ironically brought a loss of agency similar to their original push factors, for example, in terms of having no influence on aerial pesticide spraying. Another such negative consequence of migration was having their retirement provisions considerably reduced by unfair pension regulations.

This section has described the preparatory steps of this research as \textit{Engaging the Nexus of Practice}. It included a brief overview of relevant scholarly texts and identified the research gap that the study aims to fill. The preparatory steps also included declaring my position as a researcher and my rationale for electing to use MDS and NA. I have linked this approach into social constructionism and the concept of \textit{Heimat*}, a theme raised as important by participants. I have also explained philosophical considerations related to MDS, NA and the

\textsuperscript{71} \url{http://www.stuff.co.nz} (when searching The Press, Christchurch, and The Dominion Post, Wellington – and other newspapers – this company website appears with the search results. This shows that one source feeds a number of newspapers) \url{http://www.nzherald.co.nz} Accessed 04 December 2013
ethics of this research. The preparatory steps also explained the intersecting discourses in participants’ countries of origin and destination that they identified as relevant for their migration decisions and consequences. The next section will deal with the analytical part of the study, which NA sees as *Navigating the Nexus of Practice*.
SECTION 2
NAVIGATING THE
NEXUS OF PRACTICE

Analysis
2.1. Pilot

I conducted a qualitative pilot study to test my methodological approach. This section introduces the participants through their stories, which I compiled from raw data, i.e., recordings and observations of interactions. German as well as English was spoken in such interactions. As explicated in the methodology section 1.3, creating stories from raw data is a selective analytical and translation process and therefore part of navigating the nexus of practice. In-depth analysis follows the stories. Lastly, I reflect on what I learned from the pilot study for the core qualitative study.

2.1.1. The stories

Claudia

Claudia lived alone in her New Zealand home, which she called her Wolkenkuckucksheim [literally cloud cuckoo home (cloud cuckoo land); she restricted the term to her home]. Three intertwined themes associated with place, people in the place, and aging dominated her narrative accounts.

Links between place and people were evident in the lead-up to Claudia’s migration as she referred to a book by Mary Scott\(^{72}\) that inspired her in her early thirties with peaceful pastoral descriptions of New Zealand. Her interest in the place was rekindled when her only son immigrated to New Zealand with his wife, creating a family relationship with people in the place. Claudia visited and became passionate about New Zealand’s landscapes, whereas her city-dweller husband considered New Zealand boring. Describing her husband’s death as “Befreiung” [liberation], Claudia (aged 69) immediately traveled to New Zealand and within a week bought a house with a mortgage from the local bank made possible by her considerable retirement income. Returning to Germany, she had her belongings loaded in a container and flew to New Zealand within weeks.

Creating a place where she felt at home took several years. Claudia applied her DIY skills in the renovation of her house and attempted to make herself at home with personal belongings. Yet, she was not happy with the exact location. She sold and purchased another house with stunning sea views. This property needed extensive repairs, so she employed local tradesmen.

---

\(^{72}\) Mary Scott’s humorous novels about simple backblock-farming life in New Zealand were translated into German, turned into bestsellers and are still reprinted. The earliest translation (Frühstück um sechs [Breakfast at six]. Munich: Goldmann) dates back to 1957.
Claudia aimed to integrate into the community. She learned English at the local Community Center and through distance learning. Her English learning progressed quickly. She also attended painting classes. Up to the age of about 84, she used to invite or go out with friends from her classes and visit German speakers. These immigrants phoned and visited her and she knew she could call on them for assistance. Yet, she would have liked more contact with her son. Asked about her grandson, she commented that phone calls increased before birthdays and Christmas, but otherwise everyone was very busy. Her son had suggested she should move into her own flat in their house. She would have moved in with her son but not with her daughter-in-law, whom Claudia did not hold in high regard.

Her relationships with New Zealanders were problematic. She mentioned how friendly New Zealanders were but that this was only façade. Claudia repeatedly stressed that she was “NEVER” invited into a New Zealander’s home although she hosted many over the years. She did, however, initiate a romantic relationship with a New Zealander who worked on her house. Yet, he lost his battle with cancer a few years later. Going into his home was something different, Claudia pointed out, as she invited herself after they had been involved for some time.

Claudia kept as independent as possible whilst getting help as needed. She occasionally cooked her own meals in the style she was used to and froze portions for later. She watched films from her extensive collection of German movies as in her view there was mostly rubbish on TV. Claudia repeatedly read German poetry and novels, books with content as she explained, not meaningless modern drivel. She liked classical music and played solitaire and chess on her laptop. From the age of 83, Claudia employed home help, and services for the aged from age 85. At the start of this project, Claudia frequently went shopping, visited friends or the beach. Then she used a mobility scooter to get to her car and a mobility car park. Later she disposed of her car, no longer left the house and eventually spent all her time in bed. Whilst Claudia experienced her early stages of settlement in New Zealand through the “rosarote Brille” [pink glasses] of her excitement with new experiences in a new environment, her new Heimat remained fragmented. Increasingly, issues relating to end-of-life stages and her disappointment about lack of reciprocity in social interactions accumulated to a progressive reduction of Heimat to her home.

**Hanni and Gangolf**

Sitting around the dinner table, sharing German food and beer with German-speaking friends, Hanni evaluates their two decades in New Zealand: “Mir san froh dass mer in
Neuseeland san und mir hams ehrlich gsagt nie bereut” [we are glad that we are in New Zealand and we’ve honestly never regretted it]. Gangolf agrees.

Hanni and Gangolf moved to New Zealand with three sons then aged between six and fifteen. Gangolf describes the migration decision as evolving from a slide show of New Zealand that impressed him at school. A contributory factor, says Gangolf, was having “d’ Schnauzn voll von” [being fed up to the back teeth by] the prevailing arrogance that sees German attitudes, knowledge, expertise, work ethics and products as the best of the best and as recipes for the world to follow.

While Hanni explains that the rigid bureaucracy surrounding Gangolf’s job placed a burden on their family, environmental factors played a considerable role in their decision to emigrate. Indeed, Hanni’s main reason to push for the move to New Zealand was environmental dismay. On addition to Gangolf’s and Hanni’s own responsibilities, there also was great demand from both their families to help in their hop-gardens. Working with the hop vines coated in pesticides (see p79), however, caused Hanni health problems. Adding to this dis-ease were other environmental concerns and tensions within wider family.

Hearing about Gangolf’s long-held dream of traveling to New Zealand only when he faced his midlife crisis, Hanni says she was instantly inspired. In 1988, they went on a five-week holiday to New Zealand, traveling the length and breadth of New Zealand. Enthralled by the beautiful landscapes, they started networking with German-speaking immigrants regarding immigration possibilities.

Their migration process proved difficult. They waited for their oldest to complete school before leaving for New Zealand. They recalled that their two younger sons settled well into school and quickly made friends, yet their oldest did not. Unable to cope with ethnic slurs directed at him at senior high school, he protested against being forced to live in a country where he was not welcome.

Gangolf was offered a job in New Zealand and worked for a short while, but then they decided on other means of creating an income. Hanni, who had previously sold paintings through galleries in Germany, took up painting again and Gangolf framed her paintings. Airfreighting the packages, they kept selling Hanni’s work through several channels in Germany. Eventually they started farming a smallholding in New Zealand’s South Island.

Their New Zealand experiences include struggles to gain agency and disappointments about lost agency. Hanni explains that they had thought it would be so much easier to grow organically pure vegetables in “clean, green New Zealand” where the ground would not be as poisoned by pesticides as in Germany. She adds in a sarcastic tone, “ja, hammer
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gedacht“ [yes, so we thought]. New Zealand did not turn out quite as natural as they had anticipated and getting organic certification proved much more difficult than they had imagined: “und dann sin scho die BÜROKRATEN aufgetaucht, ham uns des Leben SCHWER gmocht“ [and then the BUREAUCRATS turned up, making our life DIFFICULT]. One of the conditions for organic certification was repeatedly turning the soil to rid it from thistles and other weeds: “ZWANZIG mol, SANDY soil, überleg amol“ [TWENTY times, SANDY soil, think about it]. Gangolf and Hanni strongly disapproved because repeated deep soil turning brings up the many stones, which damage grubber blades and beam. The stones heat up in the sun, adding to plant stress. Overtilling leads to wind erosion and failure of new crops in the marginal rainfall of the Canterbury Plains. Their solution to the rigid soil turning system imposed by the bureaucrats was to ignore it after first disastrous results and to follow neighbors’ advice. They shallow-disk harrowed only once, sowing immediately to take advantage of the moisture in the soil. Their initial reluctance to bend the rules was brushed aside by a New Zealand neighbor: “just tell them, ‘I did not quite UNDERSHDAND’. do sigscht wia dia uns guad verstandn ham” [there you see how well they understood us]. Another condition for organic certification was to plant only native plants in shelterbelts, but these died without wind protection. Hanni concludes that at the time the bureaucrats did not really know what they were doing because commercial organic farming had not been well established in New Zealand. Conventional New Zealand farming practices created additional obstacles.

The braided rivers of the South Island pose significant threats to surrounding land. After rainfall in the Southern Alps, these shallow rivers shift channels quickly into one huge torrent. The farm lost acres to the river before they used discarded, stone-filled chicken cages as effective riverbank reinforcements. Silt settled in between the stones, letting willow twigs and other plants grow into the cages. They were happy about the willows taking hold even though they are considered unwanted plants in New Zealand. Later, neighbors and the local Council applied similar methods up and down the river. This suggests Hanni and Gangolf contributed to positive change in their new country.

Early on, Hanni and Gangolf planted many stone-fruit and nut trees along the river bordering their farm. They grew acres of vegetables for a processing plant, linseed for an oil manufacturer, and a range of flowers for the wholesale and retail market. Such fieldwork was very labor-intensive and dependent on precipitation and their emergency water right from the river. They did all the farm work, helped by the boys as long as they lived at home. Hanni recalls getting up regularly at 3 a.m. to cut flowers and deliver them by 6 a.m. to
Christchurch. They also purchased calves from dairy farms, raising a hundred at a time. They raised free-range organic chickens outdoors and sold free-range eggs but gave up when the kahu, the protected New Zealand hawk, found their free-running chickens a reliable food source. Recently, the local Council did not renew their permit to draw water from the river (permits have to be sought annually and are allocated on a first-come-first-served basis), leaving them to depend entirely on the unreliable precipitation of the plains.

Now at retirement age, they reflect on their working life in New Zealand as well as considering options for the future. Looking back, Hanni asks, "ob all der Stress es wert ist um ein Einkommen zu ham?" [if all the stress is worth it to create an income?]. Demonstrating codeswitching, which in her words has become “natural” (cf. Myers-Scotton 2006), she answers by declaring independence from state welfare part of their historical body, "aber das ist halt Teil of who we are, you don't want to be dependent on any welfare system" [but that is just part of who…]. Hanni and Gangolf gave up farming on a commercial scale some years back, but still raise calves and keep chickens for their own needs. Half their land and all but one of their investment properties are sold and most of the rest is leased out. Gangolf still plays tennis and goes skiing and is contented where they live. Yet, Hanni no longer can participate in these sports after a serious skiing accident and now feels somewhat isolated in the rural area they live in partly because surrounding farmers they were friends with moved away. As agricultural smallholders "san mir eignlich Dinosaurier do" [we actually are dinosaurs here].

Hanni says that they have not changed their cultural practices although they integrated into New Zealand. Their traditional farming practices have been praised for producing better quality and taste than crops treated with synthetic chemicals. They cook as they have always done, introducing German specialties as a treat for guests, including homemade Sauerkraut with Weisswurst [Bavarian veal and pork sausage in natural casing, served hot] and Bauernbrot [farmer’s sour dough bread from mixed rye and wheat flour] sourced from German businesses in the area. Hanni says she likes the more light-hearted New Zealand approach to Christmas celebrations and the New Zealand practice of a free ‘Christmas in the Park’ celebrations for families with familiar Christmas songs, even if the lyrics are in English. Hanni and Gangolf recall that in the beginning they had some trouble communicating in English because their school days had long passed, but they learned quickly and found their English sufficient for work and socializing.

Hanni emailed recently, “mia san halb zrissen” [we are half torn]. While they achieved everything they ever wanted, their sons do not wish to keep the land holding, so they are looking at a number of options. Hanni, who has traveled back to Germany only once since their immigration more than twenty years ago and hates flying, considers having permanent summers through spending time each year in Bavaria where their youngest now lives with his German wife, whom he met at university in New Zealand, and with their son. Yet, Hanni
and Gangolf also say they have made New Zealand their *Heimat* and their only regret is not immigrating ten years sooner.

**Summarizing the stories**

The strong influence of social connections on *Heimat* perceptions was prominent in the narrative accounts of the three pilot-study participants. They all proclaimed that New Zealand had developed into their *Heimat*. This perception appeared heartfelt and firm, yet conflicted at the same time. Due to accumulating issues with social integration and end-of-life stages, the octogenarian’s New Zealand *Heimat* became less satisfactory and more troubled, with her focus on *Heimat* as a place shrinking to her immediate home environment as time passed.

### 2.1.2 Exploring the nexuses

I subscribe to Scollon and Scollon’s (2004) view that one must also consider anticipations of actions. Migration motives and expectations may therefore clarify consequences. This analysis widened the circumference of specific aspects of the pilot participants’ stories by mapping mediated actions as units of analysis. As actions are embedded in networks of practices that assert identities and belonging, the intersecting nexuses illustrated the creation of the participants’ new *Heimat*. Comparison of similarities and differences between participants’ experiences follows. Last are my reflections on the pilot study and what to take forward into the main study.

**Themes emerging in the pilot study were:**

- Realizing dreams through migration
- Professional qualification as key to entry into New Zealand whether or not continued in New Zealand
- Family reunion immigration
- Creating a new *Heimat* and connections to the old *Heimat*
- Social relationships – within families and with New Zealanders
- New Zealand landscapes – images and reality
- Land and home ownership
- Everyday occupations and cultural practices
- Bureaucracy in original and new *Heimat*
- Languages
- Cultural connections
- Finances
- Retirement
Claudia – the nexuses

Insider researcher and analysis

83-year-old Claudia enthusiastically volunteered to participate as soon as I mentioned my intention to explore the consequences of immigration. However, as summarized in the Pilot Study Reflections section (p133), working with Claudia as an insider researcher created a sense of obligation that proved as emotionally demanding as difficult to fulfill. Such relations and reactions interfered with my analytical processes. Like Kanuha (2000: 442), I found distancing the insider researcher from natural connections “the most profound methodological process I had to learn”.

Age and dependency

As an aging immigrant, Claudia took on an identity at “the new nexus of migration and gerontology” (Warnes & Williams 2006: 1259). Such immigrants are constructed and generalized as a separate social category with even more special needs than other elderly (Schopf & Nägele 2005; Torres 2006). The increasing association of an aging population with stress on public finances brought intense focus on older people (King, Warnes & Williams 1998). Although the terms ‘old’ and ‘elderly’ have no clear definition, they are commonly used in relation to needs, problems, and care (Bachrach 1980; Sorkin, Rook & Lu 2002). The terms cover everyone from 65 to over 100, suggesting a uniform fixed ‘old’ identity in need of special care and resources and therefore burdening society, while older people disagree with these negative associations of old age (Cruikshank 2008). In fact, wealthy migrating retirees stimulate southern Europe’s regional economies, for example (Warnes & Williams 2006). Another perspective constructs immigrants aged 50 and over coming to New Zealand under the Family Reunion category as elderly and dependent (Selvarajah 2004). The publications suggest that the perspectives relate to cultural experiences, role and age of commentators. Working fulltime whilst completing this thesis at the age of 67, I associate the terms ‘dependent elderly’ with frail aged people, whose health has deteriorated to an extent that they no longer are able to undertake normal daily physical and/or mental activities and therefore require help whilst not necessarily being financially dependent.

Claudia – elderly and dependent?

Claudia’s decline from the independent inquisitive vigor of an active retiree to a final life stage of dependency and loneliness partly resulted from immigration. Claudia arrived in New Zealand as late-in-life immigrant under the Family Reunion category, but the labels ‘elderly’ and ‘dependent’ would have seemed inappropriate until she reached her mid-eighties. For many years she was instantly prepared to travel wherever someone would come with her. In her late sixties and early seventies, she rolled down the hill with her
grandchild, parasailed behind a boat, and took up DIY renovations. Observed enthusiasm and joy in these activities were also related in her narrative accounts. However, her attempts to widen her networks to include New Zealanders were not successful. Her interest in new experiences might have played a role in her keenness to take part in this study or could have served as a strategy against loneliness.

There is a tension between her past eager participation in social actions and her repeated declaration that she preferred to be alone. Comparing Claudia’s public and private discourses is informative:

**Figure 2.1—1: Claudia’s public and private discourses about her situation**

Claudia concealed negative feelings when performing a more public social role. Public and private social roles are located along a spectrum, with private aspects more prominent in what is perceived as private role (e.g. sibling, close friend) and may vary depending on the situation (Jones 1984). In Claudia’s discourse, contradictions existed between more public statements to acquaintances and more private statements to close friends, with emotional longing for family contact by her own admission not even acknowledged to family. Her decision not to live with her family because she did not like her daughter-in-law was not a consequence of migration as she said she would have acted in the same way in Germany. Her more public roles seemed to reflect a more independent and contented identity. Later private role performances reflected a dying-person identity.

Legal connections to Claudia’s original Heimat placed her outside discourses about the increasing economic burden that immigrants and an aging population place on society (cf. Büchel & Frick 2004; Zimmerer 2010). Such legal connections were maintained through Claudia’s nationality and retirement income. The latter enabled her to purchase a property and clear the mortgage within fifteen years without impeding her lifestyle. However, German pensioners must file tax returns in Germany and leaving Germany may impact on
pensions (Deutsche Rentenversicherung 2010c). For many years, Claudia avoided dealing with this. In positioning the authorities as the other (’sie’/they) and admitting her fear of retribution, she acknowledged her outsider and non-compliance role in this power relationship: “ne mitm Pass und so da hab ich n bisschen Angst dass sie da an meine Renten rankommen” [no with the passport and so I fear a bit that they get to my pension]. Only when her octogenarian friend in Germany could no longer deal with Claudia’s delegated power of attorney, Claudia informed authorities of her permanent move to New Zealand and faced the long-ignored accrued taxation consequences.

Language builds or destroys bridges (Szymanski 1999) and accordingly, language skills are regarded as key elements controlling communication extent and quality between immigrants and the local community (King, Warnes & Williams 1998). In terms of English language skills, Claudia remained largely independent. Her reliance on family interpreters was restricted to a short period after arrival, and to events that required thorough understanding of complicated legal matters. Despite having only basic schooling, she had worked in cognitively demanding jobs for many years. On arrival in New Zealand, she was determined to learn English and documents showed her English skills comparable to general IELTS levels 5.574 within a year. This reflects the need for caution regarding age and second language learning relationships (cf. Marinova–Todd, Bradford Marshall & Snow 2000). I recorded her in conversation with an English-speaking immigrant, for instance. She talked about a variety of topics in personal stories, about books and current affairs, only occasionally asking for vocabulary. Her oral English showed grammatical flaws and, compared to my earlier observations of her communications, her English skills later declined. Yet, she exhibited a sharp mind until her death. Therefore, rather than relating this attrition to prior formal education levels and pre-immigration English skills as Crezee (2010) does in her study of elderly Dutch, I suggest that Claudia’s English language attrition related to restricted social opportunities rather than cognitive decline. Her English skills did not seem to have helped building enough bridges for social integration.

**Claudia – transformation of Heimat**

Feelings of belonging relate to social spaces and interactions and both have a number of dimensions. “Ich seh mich wohl als Deutsche, aber fühl mich zuhause und wohl in Neuseeland” [I regard myself as German, but I feel at home and happy in New Zealand]. The term ‘wohl’ has numerous possible meanings in English. Here, its first instance (wohl followed by aber [but]) indicates one side of an argument: German cultural and legal identity. In the second part of the sentence, wohl means comfortable, happy, or at ease. Claudia’s sentence structure gives prominence to her original cultural and national identity. Yet, signaling the intricacies of an immigrant’s feelings of belonging, meanings and values of wellbeing and protection that are integral to Heimat, she assigned these feelings to her
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chosen place and in particular to her home (zuhause [at home]). Indeed, Claudia’s New Zealand Heimat recreation developed as a German micro-Heimat in her home as explained below.

**Heimat and place**

New Zealand became her Heimat in terms of connections to place although Claudia was eventually restricted to her home. Her explanation of her home as a place where everything was perfect was, she acknowledged, unrealistic and showed that she was fully aware of her engagement with a fantasy world. Cumming (1963) points out that substitutions of earlier social actions with residual symbolic memories are steps on the path of disengagement in aging. For Claudia, Cumming’s statement needs to be further qualified. At first, Claudia recreated her familiar German cultural Heimat with her material belongings while reaching out to New Zealand society. Later, her reminiscing accounts had an air of longing for a younger age (for instance, talking about a picture, ‘ja, da war ich noch jung’ [yes, then I was still young], which supports Cumming’s claim. Her missing social connections were replaced by virtual social connections via her old German movies and books. Claudia, bar some exceptions, did not acquire New Zealand cultural practices and her home portrayed a slice of Germany filled with belongings that carried memories and symbolic values of bourgeois achievement. These were significant considering narrated deprivation and turmoil in Claudia’s early years: her father drowned, leaving her mother to bring up three children during the great depression. The family was displaced from East Prussia in WWII and Claudia recounted, for instance, searching for coal along bends in train tracks or stealing it from wagons to avoid freezing.

Figure 2.1–2 below shows Claudia in her home surrounded by belongings that had symbolic values related to her original Heimat (Old-German furniture, landscape prints and tapestry, lamp and curtains) and to her efforts to recreate a new Heimat in New Zealand (e.g. hand-painted crockery).
Although at the end of her life she experienced New Zealand scenery only from her windows, Claudia remained enchanted by the landscapes that played such a significant role in bringing her to the country. Yet, her attitude to New Zealand changed over time as her use of the past tense and ‘noch’ [still] in “…das war so im ersten oder zweiten Jahr. ich war noch so aufgewühlt von Neuseeland…” [that was in the first or second year. I was still so deeply moved by New Zealand], shows. On several occasions she said she was not surprised about Auckland’s bad air quality with all the badly tuned vehicles that Japan no longer wanted\textsuperscript{75}. In corroboration, the World Health Organization published alarming readings of pathogenic PM\textsubscript{10} for all five New Zealand centers\textsuperscript{76}, with Auckland’s pollution equal to that of Tokyo and worse than New York (Bennett 2011). Claudia maintained that it no longer concerned her, and this tension between realization and denial probably was partly a result of immigration and partly resignation. Her references to negative realities possibly justified her retreat into her imaginary world.

**Heimat – social aspects**

*Heimat* includes a multitude of social components including family connections. Claudia’s German cultural understanding reverberated “obligation and mutual support of family members” coexistent with individual “independent orientations” (Schwarz, Albert, Trommsdorff, Zheng, Shi, & Nelwan 2010:708). These cultural characteristics were present

\textsuperscript{75} New Zealand imports used vehicles from Japan, where much more stringent vehicle requirements support the car industry.

\textsuperscript{76} PM\textsubscript{10} is particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter; see http://www.mfe.govt.nz/environmental-reporting/air/air-quality/pm10/
in Claudia’s family but were not all positive. Claudia’s earlier choice of autonomy over family closeness negatively impacted on contact frequency due to spatial distance.

*Heimat* includes feelings of security, which link place aspects with social aspects. Claudia felt secure in her home even though an intruder had threatened her elderly neighbor with a knife. Her feeling of security rested on modifications to house access and lighting after this incident. Claudia’s sense of safety also depended on using New Zealand’s care systems such as Age Concern\(^{77}\), a non-profit organization that screens and recommends home maintenance personnel. Her medical alarm connected her to immediate ambulance services\(^{78}\). Her pacemaker and in-home public health care (cf. Ministry of Health 2011) added to her feeling of safety.

Claudia’s New Zealand *Heimat* contained a void of complex satisfied social relationships. With one exception, she only formed transactional and superficial social relationships with New Zealanders. Claudia recalled New Zealanders’ many polite conversations that included indications of future connections that were never followed up (e.g. we must get together some time). “Und dann war ich enttäuscht dass das alles gar nicht stimmt, dass ihre Freundlichkeit gar nicht wirklich gemeint ist, dass das nur ne leere Höflichkeit ist weil sie alle so aufgewachsen sind.” [And then I was disappointed that all that is not true, that their friendliness is not really meant, that it is actually only empty politeness because they all grew up that way.] The disappointment was coupled with awareness of cultural conditioning but nevertheless judged as insincere and deceitful. These culturally different understandings of honesty and consideration often lead to conflict, with Germans perceived as rude by New Zealanders and New Zealanders as dishonest by Germans (Bönisch-Brednich 2002). Claudia’s inability to solve such intercultural communication problems might have been partly due to her age at immigration. Her posture and demeanor might also have played a role. She was tall and before her health decline radiated self-confidence and assertiveness, which could have been interpreted as domineering. Her failed attempts to create social connections resulted in feelings of anger and exclusion, which overt denial could not always mask. One such declaration was that disappointment, being ‘ent-täuscht’ or ‘Ent-täuschung’ (the German prefix ent- corresponds with the English prefix de-) actually was positive since the ‘Täuschung’ [illusion; deception] was taken away and that she preferred to take it that way.

The social exclusion she experienced increased her feelings of loneliness and disintegration, which led to incomplete *Heimat* re-creation. Her comment on wearing pajamas and robe rather than getting dressed, “*es kommt ja doch keiner*” [no-one comes anyway] confirm her feelings of loneliness. Research shows a cycle of illness leading to depression and depression in turn leading to illness (Aneshensel, Frerichs & Huba 1984). Health

---

deterioration severely restricts social activity (Cavalli, Bickel & Lalive d’Epinay 2007) and leads to social isolation (Bachrach 1980). For Claudia, health deterioration amplified pre-existing social exclusion and led into a spiraling cycle of social isolation and mental and physical health problems. Her standard answer to questions about her wellbeing became, “ich lebe noch wenn man das ein Leben nennen kann” [I’m still alive if one can call that a life], communicating Claudia’s depressed and lonely end-stage-of-life identity. The emotional tone of voice and facial expression can be effectively combined and understood (de Gelder & Vroomen 2000; Ekman and Friesen 2003). Claudia’s decline from outgoing positivity to depression showed in her facial expression, flat tone of voice and her drooping posture. I trust my judgement of these signals because I knew Claudia for a long time, and because non-verbal messages are part of a multimodal culture-specific communication system understood by its members (Birdwhistell 1968; Kirch 1979).

**Summary of Claudia’s consequences of migration**

Figure 2.1–3 below summarizes the consequences of immigration for Claudia to age 85 at the time of completion of this part of my study. Positive experiences are marked above her age timeline, and negative experiences below that line. Font size and bold font indicate emphasis in her discourse. Mutual accommodation is necessary for successful integration (Berry 2008). Lack of reciprocity kept Claudia from fully integrating into New Zealand society and re-creating a successful Heimat.

**Figure 2.1—3: Highs and lows in consequences of migration**
This timeline reveals the interplay of consequences of immigration. Claudia’s predicament reflects circumstances that are both common and consequences of immigration. Growing old is associated with a life situation of withdrawal to the margins of events in the outside world (Cavalli, Bickel & Lalive d’Epinay 2007) and the loss of associates “to distance, illness, and death” (Hauerwas & Yordy 1998: 173). Claudia’s discourse indicated loss of life’s meaningfulness, and one consequence of immigration was regret that her dream of creating a socially rewarding Heimat did not happen.
After this part of my study had been completed, Claudia died alone in her home at the age of 87. It seems appropriate to close with a text excerpt by one of her favorite poets that she shared with me, adding that after her passing she would “winken von dort oben” [wave from above there]:

Wir wissen nichts von diesem Hingehn

Das nicht mit uns teilt …

…

Doch als du gingst, da brach in diese Bühne

Ein Streifen Wirklichkeit durch jenen Spalt

Durch den du hingingst …

…

‘Todeserfahrung’ (Rainer Maria Rilke, 1907)

We know nothing of this passing

Which does not share with us …

…

Though when you left, a ray of truth

Broke onto this stage through the crevice

That you departed through …

Death experience (Rilke 1907) (my translation)
**Gangolf and Hanni – the nexuses**

Figure 2.1–4 maps the related timescales reflecting Gangolf and Hanni’s discursive construction of actions and nexuses. The timescales span more than half a century from Gangolf’s chance viewing of New Zealand images at high school to their present life in New Zealand.

**Figure 2.1—4: Time scales for migration processes and consequences**

The curves reflect the swings and roundabouts of the material-physical and psychological cycles in Gangolf and Hanni’s discourse. Mediated actions, practices and nexuses of practice they emphasized are in bigger font size and capital letters.

**Mediated actions and intersecting cycles leading to immigration**

Mediated actions, the units of analysis in this study, always link into social practices and wider discourses or nexuses of practice, and create and recreate social identities (Scollon & Scollon 2004). Table 2.1–1 below lists the specific mediated actions from Gangolf and Hanni’s narrative accounts along the time cycles leading to their migration.
Table 2.1—1: Mediated actions in couple’s discourse – lead-up to migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Practice linked into</th>
<th>Identities created/recreated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watching New Zealand images</td>
<td>Multimedia learning; having dreams; travel planning</td>
<td>Attentive student; romantic dreamer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing university education</td>
<td>Farming families’ oldest son inherits farm</td>
<td>Not heir of farm; obedient son; educational achiever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working – electricity company</td>
<td>Working long hours as loyal employee; having little family time</td>
<td>German live-to-work; good provider; absent father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working – with hop</td>
<td>Helping family; horticulture; beer brewing; farmers’ pesticide use</td>
<td>Dutiful family member; farm worker; pesticide victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working – own house</td>
<td>DIY; maintaining house &amp; garden</td>
<td>Middle class; home owner; handyman; pursuing improvements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting New Zealand</td>
<td>Air travel; annual leave;</td>
<td>Long-distance tourist; well off middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering emigration</td>
<td>Disapproval of status quo; concerns about politics and environment; networking</td>
<td>Adventurer; disaffected; Greenie; disillusioned by old while having illusions of new; good at networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration to New Zealand</td>
<td>Patchwork biography; living one’s dream; gaining distance from wider family</td>
<td>Dropout; dreamer; good at networking; deciding own life course; parental decision maker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Watching images of New Zealand**

For Gangolf and his family, his early impressions of New Zealand images as seeds for their migration were far-reaching indeed. As cultural tools to teach adolescents about distant places, these pictures might have linked into the idealized discourses of a natural, untouched South Pacific outlined in section 1.2. These memories were resemiotized into Gangolf and Hanni’s dream of the ‘good life.’

**Completing university education**

The complex action of completing a university degree links into a number of practices that can be seen as conducive to their migration. For Gangolf, a farmer’s son, one is the Bavarian practice that the oldest son inherits the farm. Not being the oldest can therefore result in partial detachment from *Heimat*. Gangolf’s field of study, electrical engineering, was on New Zealand’s skills shortage list and his qualification allowed the family to
immigrate, demonstrating the differential aspects of agency that Scollon (2005) emphasizes.

**Working for electricity supply company**

Gangolf’s work for an electricity supplier involved repeated actions over many years that turned into a rut and limited Gangolf’s agency. But work created the identity of a conscientious worker and his extensive work experience also created the identity of a specialist in his professional field, which reinforced the desirable immigrant identity from New Zealand’s Immigration point of view. It is ironic that the qualification and skills that brought him into the country, were not applied where the need had been identified through his lifestyle choice.

**Working with hops**

Hanni emphasized the repeated action of working with hops and related discourses as affecting her and her family’s health. Pesticide use was her greatest concern not only because she reacted with health problems, but because there was no escape as “*olwei worn die Sprays in der Luft*” [the sprays were always in the air]. In the region where Gangolf and Hanni lived, intensive hop production supplies the Bavarian beer industry. Beer is checked for residual *Pflanzenschutzmittel* [plant protection medium], a euphemism that turns harmful pesticides into beneficial plant protection. Bavarian beer is proudly advertised as pure, clean and as upholding the *Reinheitsgebot* [purity decree] of anno 1516 (Bayrischer Brauerbund n/d). However, official food controls in 2008 found high total pesticide residues in hop far exceeding permissible levels, even though such residues had declined over the years (Jezussek 2008). This indicates preceding excessive pesticide use on hop plants and validates Hanni’s concerns about pesticide effects on their health (see p79)

Hanni expanded the circumference of environmental discourses from the effects of pesticides, linking their wish to emigrate to the Chernobyl nuclear fallout and a generally polluted environment: “*und dazua no des mit Tschernobyl und des olls*” [and adding that with Chernobyl and all that]. Using the expression, ‘*und des olls*’ [and all that] assumes that the listener shares knowledge of what ‘all that’ refers to. Probing questions revealed that ‘all that’ included their unease about the escalating armament race and Germany’s position between the military power blocs. Other worries were low-altitude flights impacts, and timber preservatives applied in their house and later found to be highly toxic to humans. As outlined in part 1.2.1), such concerns were common at the time and were justified (cf. Erlinger, Lettner, Hubmer, Hofmann & Steinhäusler 2008; Leuschner n/d; Schöndorf 1998; ‘Tiefflieger: Beinahe wie im Krieg’ 1984; Tomic 2008). For Gangolf and Hanni, their dismay with environmental issues also flowed into their initial understanding of New Zealand as desirable in terms of being clean, green and idyllic as well as nuclear free.
Working on their own house and garden

The practice of working on their house started with close involvement in their home creation in Germany and can be considered as tying Gangolf and Hanni to their Heimat and potentially working against their wish to emigrate. In Germany, where it is not unusual that generation after generation live in the same house, home ownership is generally connected with being autochthonous and staying for life. Owning one’s own house creates a desirable homeownership identity because most people rent (Mulder 1998). Mulder also mentions the conservative lending attitudes of German banks, which require a substantial deposit usually achieved through long-term saving. Such budgeting skills helped Gangolf and Hanni manage their fluctuating farm income in New Zealand.

Holidaying in New Zealand

Gangolf’s long-held dream was resemiotized into a five-week holiday in New Zealand. This complex action linked into the practice of networking with German-speaking immigrants. Touring the whole country, Gangolf and Hanni found their dream images of a clean green New Zealand confirmed. This supports Bell and Lyall’s claim of tourists collecting the “delightful view from the window, [which] obliterates other concerns” (2002: 155). Gangolf and Hanni’s holiday created a temporary independent and free traveler identity unburdened by work routines and stimulated their desire to move to New Zealand.

Considering emigration

The circumference of this complex action included the couple’s children, their house, work and wider family, who were strongly opposed to their proposed move. Expressing dissent with attitudes, escalating chemical pollution and armament placed Gangolf and Hanni in opposition with certain mainstream attitudes and practices. They were well aware of the huge step and challenges that required courage and consideration of their children’s future and feelings. Indeed, Gangolf’s pauses in narrating and his concerned facial expression emphasized the severity of the verbally expressed inner turmoil: “do KÄMPFST. länger wia a Johr kämpfst do. SOLLD mer des wogn? oder solld mer des NET mochn?” [there you BATTLE. for more than a year you battle. SHOULD we dare? or should we NOT do it?].

Migration to New Zealand

The mediated action of migration includes consideration of emigration from the place of departure, decisions about the destination to immigrate to, permits enabling the immigration, physical and material preparation, and the move itself, as well as settlement after arrival. Gangolf and Hanni’s decision to lock up their house rather than selling it at the time was influenced by a lull in the German housing market but perhaps more so by ongoing indecision regarding migration. Gangolf and Hanni’s move therefore can be seen as embedded in the practice of expressing disapproval with a situation by leaving but also
insuring for potential return migration. The process of uprooting from the old proved very complex indeed. The receiving country’s conditions of entry also had to be fulfilled.

Gangolf and Hanni’s immigration is an example of patchwork biographies (see p25). In leaving the rat race, which their families considered as undesirable and ungrateful, Gangolf created an Aussteiger [drop-out] identity. On the other hand, their immigration defined Gangolf and Hanni as people who had the courage to realize their dreams. This realization of dreams is one of the major themes found in Bürgelt’s (2010) study of the migration processes of German migrants to Australia and New Zealand.

**Nexus of practice – Heimat and migration**

The mediated actions above were Gangolf and Hanni’s discursive construction of trajectories leading to their immigration to New Zealand. Figure 2.1–5 maps the nexuses of practice of these charted trajectories.

**Figure 2.1—5: Semiotic cycles leading to migration**
This figure spans from 1960 to 1990, the year they migrated, and depicts the nexuses of practice prior to and intersecting in the mediated action of immigration. It integrates their historical bodies, the discourses in place at the time of their move, and interaction orders in the processes of their emigration, and represents participants’ anticipations in some ways.

**Attachment to place**

Detachment from place related to the participants’ disturbed sense of security in their country of origin. Negative environmental discourses and social tensions contributed strongly to this detachment, which included leaving their primarily self-built home. The timescale between emigration and finally selling this asset indicates the deep embedding of their own home as a cultural tool in their historical bodies. Yet, this detachment could be seen as incomplete. The contents of their house were stored in Germany for over twenty years, suggesting ambivalence regarding material aspects of *Heimat*. They chose to settle in an area that Gangolf described as reminiscent of Upper Bavaria. This similarity allowed them familiar uses, in particular working the fertile land and skiing. Their current ideas of spending some time in Bavaria each year indicate that their place detachment was not fully completed, although these plans may link more into their youngest son’s recent return migration and to people attachment, not an incomplete place detachment at the time of migration.

New Zealand promises awe-inspiring and seemingly unpolluted landscapes. The country promotes “sublime landscapes as sites of national achievement and as signifiers of national identity” (Bell & Lyall 2002:179). Duly, when Gangolf and Hanni immigrated they only saw beauty. A New Zealand contact recalled Hanni’s frequent expression of awe, “mei is des sche” [oh my is that beautiful] even in dense traffic on the northern motorway approach to Auckland. Hanni excluded rush hour traffic to focus on Auckland’s morning-sun-enhanced harbor and cityscape, confirming Bell and Lyall’s explanation of a restricted tourist gaze and extending it to new immigrants. Coupled with New Zealand’s isolation, its antinuclear stance offered apparent security from nuclear disasters. On the other hand, New Zealand’s political structures offered European familiarity, especially once MMP – a voting system modeled on the German system\(^{79}\) – was introduced in 1996. All these aspects fed into an attachment to the place strong enough to facilitate settlement.

**Attachment to people**

Gangolf and Hanni’s discourse suggests that detachment from certain people in their country of origin was liberating because spatial distance lessened emotional pressure and

---

\(^{79}\) Mixed-Member-Proportional voting system [*personalisierte Verhältniswahl*]. Cf: http://www.elections.org.nz/voting-system/mmp-voting-system; http://www.bundestagswahl-bw.de/wahlsystem1.html?tx_vgetagcloud_pi2%5Bpages%5D=1825%20&tx_vgetagcloud_pi2%5Bkeywor d%5D=Wahl system
removed demands from wider family and work. Gangolf and Hanni’s initial networking with other German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand to secure employment during the process of their migration can be seen as a means to an end to achieve a good start to their New Zealand life. However, their friendly openness laid the basis for later friendships, perhaps not least because they also followed norms of reciprocity in exchange interactions (cf. Tischler 2011). For instance, Hanni gave some of her paintings to the contacts who had helped them with their immigration procedures. Over time, Gangolf and Hanni have kept loosely in touch with family and friends through phone calls and two visits from Germany. Their youngest son’s return migration created a re-attachment to Bavaria, which might increase over time as he now has a child.

**Attachment to culture**

Gangolf and Hanni have not distanced themselves from their culture. They still speak the dialect that is typical for the area where they used to live. When they speak standard German, their origin is detectable in their articulation of vowels, word contractions and blends as well as endings. It is also evident in their English, for instance ‘s’ sounding like ‘shd’, leading to the neighbor’s joke, “just tell them, I did not quite UNDERSHDAND” (see p104). In Bavaria, dialect is commonly spoken in informal situations, for example, with family and friends (and in this study with the insider researcher), while standard German is usually reserved for formal situations or people who would not understand local dialect. Gangolf and Hanni spoke dialect to me, for instance, while they modified their pronunciation toward standard German when speaking to German speakers who would not understand “the vowel-gulping Bavarian dialect” (Markham 1985: 14). As outlined below, they also maintained other cultural practices.

**Summary**

From the above consideration of Heimat aspects, it is clear that migration is at the intersection of losing the old Heimat and not yet having established a new Heimat. Next I will follow the trajectories involved in Gangolf and Hanni’s processes of creating their new Heimat.

**Consequences of immigration – actions and links**

Gangolf and Hanni engaged with me as a researcher and as a friend. This signals the value of me being part of the in-group because as a researcher I understood their background. Talking about experiences of life in New Zealand over dinner, comparing memories of German social practices with those in New Zealand can be seen as a typical practice amongst immigrants (cf. Bönisch-Brednich 2002). The three-course sit-down dinner in summer indicates the retention of a cultural practice that contrasts with the New Zealand practice of eating and chatting around the barbeque. Table 2.1–2 below gives an overview
of the mediated actions pertinent as consequences of immigration in Gangolf and Hanni’s discourse, the cultural tools used in these actions, the social practices the actions relate to, and the identities they created:

Table 2.1—2: Consequences of the couple’s migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Cultural tools</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Identity created/recreated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sojourn vs. permanence consideration</td>
<td>Concepts: ‘good life’; parent &amp; children rights &amp; responsibilities</td>
<td>Patchwork biographies; overseas experience</td>
<td>Hesitater; being troubled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling house</td>
<td>German real estate agency</td>
<td>Asset liquidation</td>
<td>Decision-maker; having purchasing power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying farm &amp; rental</td>
<td>Financial assets; experience of small holding; climate concepts; rental investment</td>
<td>Owning land &amp; rental property; small holding; emotive buying; income creation; own business</td>
<td>Achiever having own farm; landlord;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising live stock in certified organic way</td>
<td>Assets, financial &amp; animals; approved fertilizer; water; tools for fencing etc.;</td>
<td>Organic certification; having a house cow; raising organic calves &amp; chickens; self-employment</td>
<td>Farming experience from a different place; Greenie pursuing organic &amp; sustainable farming; stubborn hard workers expecting children to help on farm; smart budget managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Cultural tools</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Identity created/recreated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing organically pure and sustainable</td>
<td>Holistic permaculture principles and asset management; networking; subcontractors; chicken cages &amp;</td>
<td>Bureaucratic approval; working own land; old-fashioned farming; putting down roots; determination;</td>
<td>Newcomer struggling due to assumptions about soil and climate; outsider; organic &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pure and sustainable produce</td>
<td>river stones</td>
<td>self-employment</td>
<td>sustainable farmer; obstinate regarding bureaucratic impositions; determined, stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hard workers expecting children to help on farm like in their German families; inventive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kiwi; smart budget managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making own Sauerkraut</td>
<td>Cabbage; cabbage shredder; fermenting crock pot; salt</td>
<td>Processing own products rather than purchasing imports</td>
<td>Bavarian old-fashioned farmer &amp; homemaker conscious of food miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating Advent &amp; Xmas</td>
<td>Pinus radiata branches; German Christmas decorations; candles; music</td>
<td>Northern hemisphere Xmas tradition combining with New Zealand practices; managing plant growth</td>
<td>Pragmatist; maintaining tradition &amp; accepting New Zealand practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting children's education</td>
<td>Bavarian language at home; New Zealand schools; networks; financial assets</td>
<td>Modifying life for children, bilingual home;</td>
<td>Supportive &amp; educated parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating move to New Zealand</td>
<td>German language; memory; network; taking part in research</td>
<td>Sharing &amp; comparing experiences with friends; reflecting on actions; planning for future</td>
<td>German well settled in NZ, keeping &amp; blending cultures; parental concerns; organic farmer;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taking on challenges and persisting; achiever; retiree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having dinner</td>
<td>NZ &amp; German food &amp; drink; German recipes, network; German dinner &amp; kitchenware; Bavarian dialect,</td>
<td>Visiting; talking about experiences around dinner table over food &amp; drinks</td>
<td>German-speaking group member; friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standard German &amp; English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The timescales between Gangolf and Hanni’s move to New Zealand and this study span more than twenty years. This might mean that many of the not so salient experiences have been forgotten. On the other hand, Gangolf and Hanni’s selection of narrated mediated actions might indicate the weight they have carried for them. After the couple read their story, Hanni called me to say that they should have talked about more positive aspects and told me more about their different farming activities, emphasizing that although income fluctuated due to the weather, they always made a good living from their farm. From these immigrants’ perspectives, their immigration story needed to include successes rather than merely the struggles in creating a new Heimat.

**Sojourn or permanent immigration?**

Consideration of sojourn or staying permanently is part of Gangolf and Hanni’s settlement process. Their main reason for swaying between temporary and permanent immigration was their oldest son’s rebellion against their emigration. As Hanni recalled, in fighting against being in New Zealand their oldest became hostile and inflicted intense psychological pressure on them. The complex and lengthy mediated action of considering whether to stay or to leave involved the conceptual cultural tools of parental responsibilities competing with those of living ‘the good life’. Gangolf and Hanni’s solution was to seek permanent New Zealand residency for the whole family, but also to allow their oldest to return to Germany twice, the second time to enroll in an apprenticeship. He did not complete it and eventually settled in New Zealand. Gangolf and Hanni explained the disruptive effects as sadly still reverberating in his feelings of failure in the light of his brothers’ professional successes.

**Selling house**

The sale of their house in Germany marked their decision to settle permanently in New Zealand. Their home ownership and the achieved sale price reflect Frick and Grabka’s assertion that in Germany home ownership is indicative of wealth (2009). The advantageous German property market, the roughly 1:1 DM to NZ$ exchange rate, and the buyer’s market for New Zealand farmland at the time (cf. Gouin, Jean & Fairweather 1994) gave them the means to purchase New Zealand properties of their choice. In NA terms, this mediated action involved the resemiotisation from the semiotic cycle of home ownership and wealth discourses into the discourses of exchange rates and immigrants contributing to New Zealand’s wealth.

---

80 I take this phrase from the British comedy series “The Good Life” (1975-1978 and available on UKTV), created by John Esmonde and Bob Larbey, in which Tom Good decides on his 40th birthday to drop out of the rat race and create a natural alternative, i.e. a self-sufficient farm in their suburban garden.
Buying rental property and farm

Gangolf and Hanni bought rental property, which they renovated and tenanted, and a Canterbury farm block they worked for many years, with a modest house they lived in. The action of buying these properties resemiotised financial means into farm ownership and landlord identities. The cycles emanating from buying rental property include the discourses of regular rent income and a financial security net.

Gangolf and Hanni bought their block of land because it bordered a river and gave them the right to draw irrigation water. Other reasons given for the farm purchase were the big idyllic pond in front of the house and that the land had not been subjected to chemical sprays for years because the seller could not afford them. This absence of certain agricultural chemicals in the soil improved their chances of gaining organic certification. It appears that they did not question why the seller did not make more money from the land. They also did not seem to know that the eastern parts of the South Island are susceptible to droughts. Whilst endowing them with the identity of farm owners, their land purchase could be seen as more emotion-based than reflecting due diligence. Their emotional connection to the landscape is evident also in their expressed sadness about losing the sparkling waters of their artesian-spring-fed pond and the associated wildlife. The recent earthquakes resulted in a water level drop exceeding 1.5 meters and cut off the spring, leaving only a small stagnant pond and exposed stone banks.

Growing organically pure and sustainable produce

Supporting the reputation of many Germans in New Zealand as ecologically minded and environmentally active immigrants (cf. Bade 2012), Gangolf and Hanni envisaged creating their holistic sustainable organic haven drawing on biodynamic principles (biodynamic principles cf. Turinek, Grobelnik-Mlakar, Bavek & Bavek 2009) and permaculture principles (cf. Mollison 1991). Rather than being one mediated action, achieving organic certification and growing organically pure produce in a sustainable way and in harmony with nature consists of series of many repeated actions and practices. Gangolf and Hanni’s organically certified agribusiness activities started with the purchase of their farm and ended with the sale of much their land and a neighbor leasing most of the rest. While Gangolf and Hanni’s increasing age and their children’s disinterest in continuing their farming enterprise played a role in their rationale, the main cause was the non-renewal of their water rights by the local Council. The practice of paid water right cycles and the Council’s apparently misdirected agency in refusing them renewal81 effectively terminated Gangolf and Hanni’s commercial organic produce farming. This and details in the following illustrate that as a consequence of their lifestyle migration, Gangolf and Hanni struggled to achieve agency through their

81 Water rights are allocated yearly on a ‘first-come-first-served’ basis. See, e.g., http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/water-resources/page-6
lifestyle choices. As explained in the following, their great achievements came at great cost to dreams of a pure Heimat. That is, as a consequence of their migration they had to come to terms with negative local practices, which they had hoped to leave behind in Europe.

Trade and general consumer acceptance of produce as organically pure requires certification. Gangolf and Hanni’s narrative accounts demonstrate that in the process of gaining organic certification, New Zealand confronted them with bureaucratic and environmental situations reminiscent of the social and environmental push factors that brought them to New Zealand. The multi-tilling condition they reported as imposed by New Zealand bureaucrats conflicted with their understanding of holistic farming. Considering the climatic conditions in Canterbury, their reasoning for the requirement’s unsuitability was well founded. Their neighbors and contractors agreed with them and supported them with advice on how to sidestep the rigid bureaucratic conditions. Given their push factors regarding poisons in the environment and expectations of New Zealand, the couple was absolutely shocked about their neighbor’s aerial application of agricultural chemicals. In a complete loss of agency, the application during the organic certifiers’ visit to their farm shattered their organic certification plans. This glimpse into the reality of New Zealand environmental practices destroyed their illusion of a pure New Zealand. Yet, rather than reacting by leaving, Gangolf and Hanni adapted their practices to cope with the bureaucracy and persevered in their endeavor to create an organically sustainable haven. Persisting for several years finally resulted in achieving organic certification.

They carried out their holistic farm plan, practicing traditional crop rotation. They planted thousands of trees, those with more water requirements closer to the river and so on. Everyone in the family worked together, initially using buckets to water the newly planted trees. This may illustrate a ‘good-life’ approach to farming involving intense labor. Compared to their neighbors’ irrigation practices, the bucket watering was an amateurish approach and created an outsider identity (“crazy Germans” Hanni). The involvement of the whole family in farm work continued their German family practices. In revealing a sizeable carbon sink, recent Google images of their property (Figure 2.1–6) confirm the success of their tree planting along the braided river. Illustrating their considerable impact on local practices and neighbors following their river bank planting practices, such planting now continues for many kilometers in both directions and on both banks, but mainly down river.
Such planting and the creation of an “edible landscape”\(^{82}\) (Dunmall 2009: 64) around their house links into public discourses about finding environmentally sound local solutions for the planet’s precarious situation. The stone-filled chicken cages Gangolf and Hanni used to protect their land from flood erosion were not part of their historical bodies at the time but resourceful new cultural tools, fitting into the Kiwi “number-8-wire” practice\(^{83}\). In their view, their riverbank work not only links into local political structures, but also into national ones. Hanni said that whilst they once supported the New Zealand Green Party, they no longer do because of the party’s hands-off attitude to such sensible river regulation and the party’s

\(^{82}\) An edible landscape contains only plants that provide food.

\(^{83}\) No 8 wire is a fencing wire gauge widely used in New Zealand and the no. 8 wire tradition has it that New Zealanders can create great things using a piece of this fencing wire, i.e., with very few ordinary resources. Cf. [http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/inventions-patents-and-trademarks/1](http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/inventions-patents-and-trademarks/1)
opposition to any water catchment options. Regarding water catchment and use, Gangolf suggested that the topography of the eastern South Island upper river regions would support the construction of several water reservoirs to regulate the rivers’ flows without major impact on populations. These structures could be used for power generation and irrigation instead of letting all of the river water from rain over the Alps disappear into the sea loaded with fertile soil whilst the eastern plains suffer drought conditions. Such schemes have been subject to ongoing public debate for years, especially with increasing conversion to dairy farming, and partially have been consented (cf. Kerr 2009).

**Raising livestock**

Gangolf and Hanni’s determination in raising several kinds of domestic animals creates identities of hard working environmentalists with a stubborn streak. Their relationship to their animals appears more caring compared to commercial New Zealand dairy farming. It is the norm on dairy farms to take calves away from the cows almost immediately after birth to secure colostrum sales and milk income. Whilst they purchased such calves to raise for slaughter or dairy heifers, Gangolf and Hanni’s own cows keep their calves while giving hand-milked supply for the household. The species that was a match for their persistence was the New Zealand hawk that discovered their free-running chickens as a reliable food source.

**German food traditions**

Imported sauerkraut is available in supermarkets throughout New Zealand, yet Gangolf and Hanni made their own. Like their practices of churning butter, producing yoghurt and quark, and baking bread, this practice is part of the self-sufficient lifestyle they chose. The European cultural tools used, i.e. a big manual cabbage shredder and a crockery fermenting pot, are available in New Zealand[^84], which indicates the presence of other such self-sufficient lifestylers. This traditional processing of own foods rather than purchasing imported products suggests identities of traditional farmers and homemakers. It links into the current public discourses about avoidance of food miles, which however concerns New Zealand mainly in terms of food exports (cf. Stancu & Smith 2006). Traditional German sausages and bread proudly served to other German immigrants as a special treat foreground the food’s symbolic value in signaling German identity.

**Traditional celebrations**

The site of engagement that enabled much of this view into Gangolf and Hanni’s story was a dinner they had with their friends one Advent Sunday. Once the dinner conversation turned to the date and how fast Christmas was approaching, talk revolved around German

[^84]: see e.g. [http://www.goldenfields.co.nz/sauerkraut_pot.php](http://www.goldenfields.co.nz/sauerkraut_pot.php)
and Austrian Advent traditions such as Advent songs, an Advent calendar for the children and an Advent wreath with four candles, one for each Sunday in Advent. Gangolf and Hanni had not continued these traditions for some years. As their children are adults and Gangolf and Hanni have been busy working on their farm, it is not clear if this discontinuation of northern Advent traditions truly is a consequence of having lived in New Zealand for a long time or rather is a consequence of no longer having children in the home. This conversation also involved comparisons of the contemplative German and Austrian mid-winter celebrations with the light-hearted New Zealand mid-summer Christmas celebrations, which Hanni likes and takes part in. This change of practice is a consequence of immigration.

**Having dinner with friends**

Talking about experiences over food and drinks is a widespread practice. However, in the mediated action analyzed here, the type of food served, the way it was prepared, the drinks and their origin, and the kitchenware coupled immigrants’ original cultural practices with New Zealand practices. None of these, by the way, were traditional Advent practices. The farmed New Zealand salmon hot-smoked on the deck was part of a New Zealand practice mixed with practices brought to New Zealand by the immigrants. For instance, imported German horseradish cream complemented the salmon. Potato dumplings reconstituted from imported dry ingredients added a food practice from Franconia to New Zealand pork roasted German style. Food or goods miles did not seem to matter for the host though, as German and Austrian beer and schnapps were served in German glasses and New Zealand wine in Austrian glasses. This indicates that whilst original food practices are highly valued, they are amalgamated with New Zealand practices in a process of hybridization.

**New Zealand Heimat nexus**

Gangolf and Hanni’s reflective evaluation strongly suggests that New Zealand has become their new Heimat whilst they have stayed attached to their old Heimat in a number of ways. Creating this new Heimat was simultaneously a fulfilling journey that gave them everything they ever wanted and a prolonged struggle marred by psychological disappointments, physical battles with nature, and bureaucratic challenges.

*Heimat* includes Scannell and Gifford’s (2010) dimensions of place attachment, that is, the people and the values and meanings they assign to a place; affective and cognitive processes in relation to the place; the nature of the place and actions taken there. Gangolf and Hanni’s narrative accounts foregrounded their connection to place, specifically their farm, which has connected them to the land over the past two decades. Positive connections to their family, friends, acquaintances and neighbors seemed more backgrounded in their narratives and at times needed prompting. Based on my
observations of positive connections with these people, I would argue that these relationships were seen as the norm and therefore not as interesting enough to be mentioned in their narratives. Experiences that infringed on their view of New Zealand as desirable and as Heimat appeared to carry more weight. Heimat, of course, is not a static concept and its complexities evolve and change over a lifetime. Whilst Gangolf and Hanni integrated in their daily lives certain aspects of the culture that surrounds them in New Zealand such as the English language, their Bavarian culture and passion for a sustainable lifestyle has remained dominant. Their initial naive and illusory admiration of pure clean green New Zealand waned and their feelings of safety were somewhat dented recently by ongoing tectonic tremors. Nevertheless, Gangolf and Hanni clearly identify New Zealand as Heimat.

The cycles in Figure 2.1–7 below form the semiotic ecosystem, to use Scollon and Scollon’s (2004) term, evolving from Gangolf and Hanni’s immigration. It could serve as a summary of their New Zealand Heimat creation, and therefore of the consequences of their immigration. It is not possible to unreservedly attribute all their discursively constructed actions and cultural tools to consequences of their immigration apart from the fact that they took place and were used in New Zealand. Some, like their hesitation about retirement choices may be due to personal characteristics irrespective of immigration.

Figure 2.1—7: Mapping a couple’s semiotic ecosystem emanating from immigration

![Diagram showing the semiotic ecosystem](image-url)
Immigration is a turning point that changes lives. For this reason, Bönisch-Brednich (2002) claims that stories about migration are often repeated and possibly reinvented, becoming ‘ready-mades’ that emphasize the positive, with negatives or failures unlikely to be told. Stories may be reinvented in this sense, but I did not find a positive spin reinvention of immigration stories substantiated in my pilot investigation. In contrast to Bönisch-Brednich’s assertion, Gangolf and Hanni at first overemphasized the struggles and negative consequences of immigration. Once they saw their story written down, they supplemented and balanced it. Bönisch-Brednich’s different perception might be due to her outsider position, the “gegenseitige Fremdheit” (Bönisch-Brednich 2002: 418), i.e. the mutual strangeness, between researcher and the researched, which means, as she points out, that certain things are not talked about.

Comparison of pilot-study participants’ immigration consequences

Similarities

There are a number of similarities in participants’ stories but with variations. One similarity was the use of social networks to ease migration and settlement processes. Experiencing New Zealand landscapes played a magnetic role for all three participants. Claudia as well as Gangolf reported an influence of New Zealand images early in their lives. While Gangolf remembered actual photos seen in high school, Claudia imagined idyllic New Zealand scenes from a book by Mary Scott she said she read in her youth. The earliest translation of Breakfast at six, i.e., Frühstück um sechs. Ich und Paul und 1000 Schafe [I and Paul and 1000 sheep] was published by Goldmann, Munich in 1957 when Claudia was in her early thirties. This indicates a distortion of calendar time or a different understanding of youth when reflecting from old age. The German success of these romantic novels seems to relate to the desire for living simple lives in harmony with nature and to the German fascination with the South Pacific. In the realization of their dream, this caring connection between humans, animals, plants and the earth materialized in Gangolf and Hanni’s organic farming in New Zealand. For Claudia, the dream of an independent life in picturesque landscapes eventually turned into a partially fictitious Wolkenkuckucksheim. At times, both female participants seemed to find it difficult to background the negative consequences of their immigration to New Zealand.

Economic independence from others was another aspect common for the participants. This allowed the fulfillment of their dreams, although the financial situations differed. Gangolf and Hanni brought substantial capital during settlement, enabling them to generate income in New Zealand from self-employment on their own farm. Claudia brought generous ongoing retirement income accrued through her and her husband’s contributions.
Intergenerational tension is another similarity, albeit with variations. For Gangolf and Hanni, the conflict with their oldest son about their move and the resulting psychological pressure for all involved clearly was a consequence of their immigration. Their youngest son’s return migration stressed the parents but eventually was accepted as a natural generational process. In Claudia’s case, tension may be one-sided as Claudia’s family may well not have been aware of her feelings; and perhaps rather than tension it was sadness about lack of contact with her descendants. This deficit may be due to different generational interests and commitments rather than being a consequence of immigration. It was not possible to involve the families in this study.

**Differences**

The differences in the pilot participants’ stories are partly due to their different stages in life. For example, Claudia could have not immigrated had her son as the center of her family and as sponsor not already lived in New Zealand. Gangolf and his family, on the other hand, could have gained entry solely based on his qualifications, experience, and financial means.

Independence was a common factor, but participants’ realization of independence differed. Rather than continuing a dependent employee situation related to Gangolf’s qualification, Gangolf and Hanni used their family farming experience and chose independence living the ‘good life’. Whilst the Canterbury earthquakes starting in 2010 impacted their lives, they cope like other Cantabrians. Gangolf and Hanni struggled at first to establish the basis for ongoing farming income, but over time fully integrated into New Zealand society whilst keeping much of their culture. Their current independence for future actions is primarily related to aging and retirement from farming rather than to immigration consequences. Claudia, on the other hand, started her New Zealand life on a high note, fulfilling her dream of independence. Yet with one exception, she was not able to overcome intercultural problems to form friendships with New Zealanders. Speaking and understanding English is a necessity for integration into New Zealand mainstream society. English communication was more challenging for Claudia as she started learning English only after immigrating to New Zealand at age 69. In contrast, Gangolf and Hanni had a working knowledge of English before their arrival, even though during settlement they found communication at times difficult, which they attribute mainly to the characteristic New Zealand accents and native speakers’ speech pace.
2.1.3 Reflection and implications for main study

This journey to pilot study completion has been stimulating but not without complications. It taught me about the importance of carefully choosing suitable supervisors. Working fulltime and interruption due to health problems caused delays. Yet, it was an interesting learning process from conception of the research idea through topic refinement, consideration of methodologies including worldviews and choice of research method, writing an initial proposal for enrolment, applying for ethics approval, creating a full proposal for confirmation of candidature and analytical trials to writing this section.

Separating research and private roles, gaining and maintaining the necessary distance for analysis have been problematic indeed. Most of all, witnessing and documenting Claudia’s demise in her final stages of life was sad and challenging. For research, it created ethical dilemmas beyond institutional concerns because of a dying person’s increasing vulnerability and dependency. Great care was taken to overcome these challenges.

Implications for main study

The narrative accounts of the effects of immigration on Gangolf and Hanni’s sons emphasized the need for looking at subsequent generations when investigating consequences of immigration. Therefore, I decided to explore the impact of migration decisions in my qualitative main study not just on the first immigrant generation, but across three genealogical generations. I elected to work with three families to investigate the consequences of immigration over time and generations, and compare the experiences across families. Because the data gathered was anticipated to be substantial, it was however not considered practical within the word limits of this thesis to present as many details as in this section. I also decided to undertake a survey to test the findings from the main study. The next section presents the family stories, followed by generational analyses.
2.2 Main study

2.2.1 Family stories

Family A

In 1987, Max (38) and Gabi (38) immigrated to New Zealand from Austria with their children Lisa (14) and Matthias (13). Now, their New Zealand family includes a Pākehā son-in-law, a Māori-Pākehā daughter-in-law and five grandchildren. All live within a ten-minute driving distance.

First generation – Max and Gabi

As a child, Max lived with his German mother in northern Germany. As a teenager, he moved to his Austrian father to the Austrian town, where Gabi grew up. Reminiscing on these different cultural environments, he identifies the Austrian culture as formative and dominant, and identifies as Austrian. Max and Gabi have always loved traveling and recall their local paper bringing an article about New Zealand with striking New Zealand landscape images. Gabi says the article showed a country that she had always dreamed of and she felt like immigrating immediately. Three months later they flew to New Zealand on a five-week holiday. They toured the country in a campervan and loved it. On their return flight to Europe Gabi sat next to a woman whose son was in the vision correction field like Max and Gabi started correspondence with him.

The Chernobyl nuclear disaster became a critical factor in their migration decision. Their New Zealand pen pal referred them to a company that was looking for an optician and they decided to move. Gabi sold her clothing business. They packed a container and left for New Zealand although Max kept the option open to return to his workplace in Austria. They both agree that they felt instantly at home in New Zealand and have made it their Heimat. Yet, their New Zealand Heimat creation took a number of years. At first, they rented a house close to an Auckland beach. Max had a work permit and commuted to work whilst Gabi stayed at home. The children were sent to the local high school. Some months later, the family received their permanent residency visas. Max and Gabi sold their house in Austria and bought one in the coastal area they had moved to. However, Max was not happy with his work because he was underemployed in terms of income and utilization of experience. Through their original New Zealand contact they found premises ideal for eyewear and vision correction close to their home and Max and Gabi decided to start their own business.
Their European work style was an immediate success but not without obstacles. Gabi dealt with procurement, sales and accounting whilst Max provided professional vision-care skills. Max recalls New Zealand vision-correction premises in the 1980s looking much like doctors’ rooms, with the fitting of lenses and repairs centralized at an off-site workshop not accessible to clients. Their European shop-style, complete vision-care service offered direct contact with a specialist for eye tests, exact fittings and on-site repairs. Some years later, they sold the business and rented out their house to live the ‘good life’ on a vacant block of land. While they enjoyed the relaxation, the ensuing tight financial situation foiled building plans. So, when the opportunity arose they bought their business back. Their business went from strength to strength, eventually employing ten people. They created the home and landscape they dreamed of and invested in more real estate. Max provided dispensing optician training for their daughter and they sold the business to her when they decided to retire. They now are “part-time grey nomads” (Gabi), spending time in their camper in New Zealand or Australia, and frequently traveling to Europe.

**Second generation – Lisa**

Lisa, aged 41, remembers that as a teenager she had no concept of New Zealand and did not want to leave Austria. So, in return for coming along she insisted on getting a horse. Convinced that she could not like New Zealand because her Heimat was Austria where all her friends were, she told everyone that she would return as soon as she turned 18 when her parents no longer could decide for her. Seeing immigration to New Zealand as a sojourn, says Lisa, probably allowed her to settle more easily.

Immediately after arriving she was placed into the same class as Sarah (Family C), the only other German-speaking immigrant at their high school at the time, and the two girls became close friends. Lisa recalls how the parents’ celebration of being in New Zealand for a year came as a surprise because time had passed so quickly and that neither she nor her brother any longer wanted to return to Austria even though they both struggled at school. She got engaged to Connor, a British New Zealander she had dated since high school. Lisa briefly visited Austria twice, after 5 years and again after 18 years in New Zealand. She keeps in contact with Austrian friends and cousins on Facebook, via email, and at times by phone. Lisa dreams of traveling to Austria for a white Christmas with Connor and their children, ideally in 2014 to celebrate their twentieth wedding anniversary, and before the children “zu olt sin” [are too old] to travel with their parents. She has absolutely no regrets about immigrating to New Zealand.

After high school, Lisa worked as a bank teller and completed a dispensing optician apprenticeship with her father. Working for her parents afforded her flexibility and support during maternity. When her parents retired, she bought their business and pays them rent for the shop. This business keeps her extremely busy. Lisa, Connor and their two children
live on five acres subdivided from Max and Gabi’s land. When Max and Gabi are home, the family often gets together.

Second generation – Matthias

Matthias, now aged 39, remembers that traveling to New Zealand at the age of 13 felt like a holiday adventure and he did not understand the permanency of the move. He first went to intermediate school with 12-year olds but was placed into high school after some months. It took Matthias some time to find occupational direction. He left school at age 16 to study mechanical engineering but admits that on the one hand he was a lazy student and found academic work difficult, whilst on the other hand he wanted to work to have money for his girlfriend. For some time, he worked as his father’s dispensing optician apprentice whilst going back to high school in an attempt to complete the subjects required. Yet, working with his father was not ideal and he started working on building sites. Working as a self-employed contract builder for the past two decades, he has built three dwellings for his parents. Now, he lives with his Māori-Pākehā wife Emma and their three children on an Auckland peninsula close to a safe swimming beach. Emma works part-time and Matthias shares childrearing duties.

Third generation – Lisa’s children

Lisa’s son Christian (1485) and daughter Maya (12) were born in New Zealand and hold dual Austrian and New Zealand citizenship. They attend a private school. They appreciate having their grandparents close and Gabi recalls how Christian once introduced them: “May I introduce our neighbors called Oma and Opa”. Christian plays basketball and is a keen skier. Maya has been involved in films and commercials as a child actor and plans to write a book. She is very fashion oriented, likes sewing and has her own sewing machine but also likes horse riding. Both love TV and computer games.

Asked about Austria, Maya thinks of Lipizzaner horses86, which she has seen on video, and food such as “Bretzn”**, “Fritatsuppe”**, and “gummy bears”87, whilst Christian focuses on Frankfurter* and Wiener Schnitzel*. Christian would like to visit Austria to go skiing. He understands more German than his sister. Lisa thinks this is because until he was three, she did not work that much and frequently was with her mother, so he heard German all day. He also watched German DVDs, but when she started working more and he went to kindergarten, English took over. As soon as he started responding in English, Lisa says, she also switched to English. Therefore, Maya has not had much German interaction at all.

85 Three years passed between the start and the end of data collection, and varying ages given for different excerpts reflect this.
86 Spanische Hofreitschule Wien [Spanish Riding School Vienna], see http://www.srs.at/de/ or http://www.srs.at/en/
87 see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gummi_bear
because her parents speak English with the children. Gabi, on the other hand, maintains that she and Max speak German with the grandchildren.

**Third generation – Matthias’ children**

Matthias and Emma have three boys who were born in New Zealand. Leon is 4 ½ years old; Tristan is 3 and Harry 2 years old. When Emma works, the boys go to kindergarten and daycare. Matthias says that the boys also love staying with Oma and Opa, where they can run around in the meadows and ‘fish’ in the ponds; and Gabi and Max consider the boys well behaved and easy to have. Leon and Thomas consider Lederhosen “cool shorts” and they actively take part in their family’s Austrian customs. For instance, Leon has tried to climb the Maypole (see pp167f) just like his father. On the other hand, Matthias does not pass his German language on to his children and offers several explanations. One is that they would not understand him. Another is that teaching them German would require the discipline to persist. And although Emma, a monolingual English speaker, encourages him to speak German with the children, she signals annoyance when she does not understand.

**Family B**

In 1991, Lukas and Sophie, both in their mid-forties at the time, moved from Austria to New Zealand with their 16-year-old son Robert. Their daughter Anna had already immigrated to New Zealand in 1987. Their adult son Heinz migrated to New Zealand in 1995 at the age of 28. Now, Lukas and Sophie live in a northern Auckland suburb at the east coast, where they share a house with Anna and her two children. Heinz lives a 30-minute drive away from his parents and sister. Robert lives in Australia with his Australian-born wife and their three children.

**First generation – Lukas and Sophie**

Lukas trained as a mechanic and is a Jack-of-all-trades. He used to work on contracts in English-speaking work environments before immigrating to New Zealand. After suffering a serious work accident that left him with excruciating headaches, he was not able to work and eventually took early retirement in Austria. He needed ongoing substantial pain medication and it was suggested that a climate change might help. Sophie also suffered frequent migraines, which she attributed to the Austrian weather.

Sophie visited their daughter in New Zealand. Enthralled by the green clean beauty of the country and its climate, she returned to Austria with “hundert dausend Dias” [hundred thousand slides] of the various shades of green that fascinated her so much, and told Lukas enthusiastically that she had not suffered any headaches in New Zealand. Encouraged by her excitement, Lukas opted for migration to New Zealand. They consulted
with their daughter and half a year after Sophie’s New Zealand visit and much to the
disbelief of their wider family in Austria, with some relatives accusing them of treason, they
left for New Zealand. Their residence permits were granted on the basis of family reunion
because their adult daughter and her husband in New Zealand sponsored them, they only
had one adult son in Austria and the son included in their visa application was not yet 17.

Looking back at more than two decades in New Zealand, Lukas and Sophie assert that
New Zealand has become their *Heimat*. They stayed for some months with their daughter
and her husband in the Waikato. Sophie started learning English. They made friends with
German-speaking immigrants and New Zealanders and are still in touch with some of these
early contacts. Later they moved to the coast, where they bought an old house with wide
sea views. Lukas worked as a self-employed contractor and was involved in tiling. At times,
they tried other ventures without much success. Although their New Zealand experiences
were mixed in terms of earnings, Lukas’ Austrian pension has given them a monetary
security base. Most importantly, New Zealand proved invaluable for their health with neither
Lukas nor Sophie suffering headaches from the moment they arrived in New Zealand. Both
insist that they are Austrians through and through, and feel completely at home in New
Zealand. Yet, if their daughter would move to Australia to advance her career, they would
move with her. Lukas and Sophie’s dual Austrian and New Zealand citizenship would make
this possible. They occasionally visit their son Robert and his family in Australia. Between
visits, they communicate and see each other on Skype. Lukas and Sophie are now retired
and Sophie receives New Zealand superannuation. Her entitlement is reduced because of
Lukas’ Austrian pension and the New Zealand practice that treats a retired couple as one
financial unit, allowing them less pension than two single pensioners.

**Second generation - Anna**

Anna, now in her forties, recalls first meeting her New Zealand husband in Syria when she
was 21. When he was injured in an accident shortly after, she accompanied him to New
Zealand, thinking that she could continue her translation and interpreting studies there for a
year. They married and she stayed.

Anna’s field of study was not offered in New Zealand at the time, so she started her
university studies all over again. She is successful in her career, having worked in
managerial positions for major New Zealand companies for nearly two decades. Yet, her
marriage ended years ago. Some time back, Anna and her parents pooled their resources
from the sales of their homes and had a house built for their extended family needs. Sophie
and Lukas look after Anna’s children when Anna works.

**Second generation – Heinz**

Heinz, Lukas’ and Sophie’s second-born, arrived in New Zealand in the early nineties as a
tourist. Aged 28 at the time and a trained chef, he first received a work permit, then
permanent residency. Some time later, he left New Zealand again, traveling through America and back to Europe before settling in New Zealand. He later gave up his Austrian passport to attain New Zealand citizenship. He still works part-time for his first employer. His other part-time job involves maintaining electronic jukeboxes in bars and taverns and music equipment for party hire. Having been interested in computers for a long time, he is studying towards a qualification in computer science and hopes to find fulltime work with a decent salary on completion of his studies.

Heinz entered into a de-facto\(^{88}\) relationship with Maria, a Filipina, and they have twin boys. They separated and Maria took their boys to Australia. Whilst Heinz expects them to eventually come back to New Zealand and hopes to rekindle their relationship, contact with the boys has been restricted to Skype. Heinz visits his parents for family events and Sophie says he occasionally just turns up.

Heinz explains that it has become easier for him to communicate in English than in German. He speaks German with his parents and usually with his siblings. Yet, he says that when he texts his sister or brother, he does it in English. Heinz is not interested in Austria or Austrian customs and feels that he has become a New Zealander who is completely at home in the country and does not want to leave again.

**Second generation – Robert**

Robert recalls his shock when hearing of the family’s plans to move to New Zealand. He did not want to leave Austria and all his friends. Aged 16 at the time, he had started an electrical engineering course at an Austrian vocational college\(^ {89}\). In New Zealand, he was placed into Year 12 of high school for some months before completing Year 13. As the content taught in these classes was fairly familiar to him, he found school easy and used the opportunity to make friends, to improve his English, and to play hockey. Robert says that it took him only about three months before it became clear that he did not want to return to Austria. Having played ice hockey in the Austrian top team, he wanted to play for New Zealand after switching to New Zealand citizenship but the Austrian ice hockey organization would not release him. So he played in-line roller hockey for New Zealand instead.

Robert studied computing and mathematical sciences in New Zealand and worked for an Auckland company for several years before buying a go-kart track with a friend. However, this venture did not work out. After a brief period of unemployment he found a job in Sydney, so he moved there in 2001. Later he moved to Melbourne, where he holds a

\(^{88}\) A de facto relationship is a relationship between two people who live together as a couple but are not married to one another. See, e.g., [http://www.justice.govt.nz: Definition of de facto parental relationships](http://www.justice.govt.nz).

managerial position and where he met his wife Sabine through ice hockey. Sabine has a G1 German father and G2 Indian mother and she is bilingual in English and German. Robert and Sabine live on the outskirts of Melbourne with their daughter and twin sons.

Robert has been back to Austria numerous times and he is in contact with some Austrian school friends and cousins on Facebook. Robert says that at one stage he approached the Austrian Club in Melbourne, but the reaction was unfriendly and they did not join. Yet, German/Austrian traditions are kept, for instance, in celebrations like Christmas and Easter, and Sophie marvels at her daughter-in-law’s German/Austrian cooking and baking skills.

**Third generation – Anna’s children**

Andreas (12) and Natalie (10) were both born in New Zealand. They are New Zealand citizens and are entitled to Austrian citizenship. Both attend a private school close to home. Andreas, who is in Year 8, likes algebra best and does Year 8 and Year 9 mathematics. He also learns Spanish. While Sophie reports that Andreas speaks German and will take German from next year, Andreas is unsure about learning German, as it is not offered at their school and would mean taking an additional subject by online correspondence. He says, “I understand everything or almost everything. like you can talk to me in German and I understand it but then I probably just respond in English.” Natalie understands simple German utterances related to daily tasks but speaks English apart from specific terms of address (e.g., *Oma*, Opa*), greetings (e.g. *gute Nacht* [good night]), and for food (e.g., *Fritatensuppe*).

The children’s favorite leisure time activities are computer games and watching TV. Natalie has a cat that she also plays with. In summer, Andreas and Natalie go swimming; and they get winter season passes for an Auckland indoor skiing facility, where they also learned skiing. Yet, Andreas prefers real slopes and sometimes Anna takes the children to New Zealand ski fields, which are either more than 4 hours’ drive or a flight to the South Island Alps away. Andreas’ eyes light up when he talks about the family’s skiing holiday in Austria in 2010 and would like to repeat the experience: “it’s great because it’s not just like up and straight away like 10 seconds later you’re down again. it’s actually like quite LONG.”

**Third generation – Heinz’ children**

Alfons and Konrad, Heinz and Maria’s 7-year-old twin boys, were born in New Zealand and Heinz announces proudly that they carry his surname and German first names. Alfons and Konrad have New Zealand passports. At this point in time, however, they live with their mother and their half-sisters in Sidney, where they also go to school. The children are monolingual English speakers. Heinz rationalizes, “es is komisch und schwierig wenn a Seite nur englisch red und d'andre deutsch” [it is odd and difficult if one side only speaks English and the other German] and the children “brauchn kein deutsch” [don't need
German]. Observations in New Zealand and of Skype interactions between Heinz and his sons confirmed that they speak English with one another.

**Third generation – Robert’s children**

Angela, who is 5 years old, and the 3-year-old twins Thomas and Georg were born in Australia and hold Australian passports like their mother Sabine. She speaks English with the children. Robert sees being bilingual as an advantage and says he persists in speaking German with the children. Robert says that having German-speaking friends helps and he encourages his parents to speak German with the children. Angela is aware of her heritage and can point to the various origins of her family on the globe. She just started learning German in the private school she started attending when she turned five but did not produce any German when observed for this study. The children love the safe beaches south of Melbourne, and their parents frequently take them there.

**Family C**

In the mid-1980s, Axel and Gundi immigrated to New Zealand from Germany with their daughters Sarah (12) and Connie (5). Their New Zealand family includes an English and Māori son-in-law and seven grandchildren. Gundi asserts that even though New Zealand friends occasionally refer to them tongue-in-cheek as ‘bloody foreigners’ they consider New Zealand their Heimat “au wenn die uns net als tangata whenua” sehn” [even though they don’t see us as people of the land].

**First generation – Axel and Gundi**

Axel and Gundi’s migration story starts long before their move to New Zealand. In the late sixties, they were offered overseas contracts with a German company and they embarked on a one-year sojourn. This turned into 15 years on several continents. Their long absences created a sense of detachment from their country of origin especially because return visits made them aware of the ongoing Cold War. As a mother, Gundi saw the political situation with more critical eyes. Other factors impacting their decisions were increasing pollution and weakened family relations. They decided to leave Germany permanently but it took them several more years to do so.

Axel, who remembered seeing a film about New Zealand in his youth, flew to New Zealand in 1984. He liked the landscapes and the people’s friendliness, although he had trouble understanding them (“they say mook not milk”). A German immigrant businessman responded to Axel’s job-seeking advertisement in an Auckland newspaper, offering him a job. So they packed their belongings. They knew next to nothing about the country apart from Axel’s tourist impressions that it was green and had beautiful beaches, that it had a
democratic European political system and was considered peaceful. Yet, having lived and worked in various cultures very dissimilar to their own under at times difficult circumstances, they were confident that they would adapt.

They love where they live. For instance, they like the beautiful landscapes, the mild climate, the beaches and parks, and they enjoy the fairly relaxed lifestyle. Other important reasons why they feel at home are that their children and grandchildren live in New Zealand and that they have good friends.

Their new *Heimat* creation, however, turned into a journey with many challenges, mostly related to work and different professional systems. They bought a bach\(^90\) near a safe beach and moved in together with the new puppy promised to the children. Both say that if they had not been that stubborn they would have given up during that first year. Instead, they acquired the promised horses for their children, created a comfortable home, and built their business. They found work as varied as electrical/electronic outfitting of luxury yachts, carwash plant installations and maintenance, and house wiring. Gundi did the paper work for the business. During the 1987 financial crisis when several of their customers went into receivership and left them with unpaid bills, it was time to reassess earning options. Following discussions within the family, Gundi enrolled at university, financing her studies with loans. Halfway through a master’s degree four years later, Gundi found casual work and a year later got work that involved helping immigrants into employment. Institutional decisions still impact on their lives, for instance, significantly reducing their expected retirement income.

Despite the challenges, Axel and Gundi feel that they have integrated very well into New Zealand society and were able to give their children a good foundation for life. Axel describes their family as “a New Zealand mix”, and they have close New Zealand and immigrant friends from various countries. Now aged 72, he enjoys cooking for family and friends, and keeps in touch with German friends and news from Germany on Skype and the Internet. They traveled and took their children to Germany as often as they felt like it and could afford to. Yet, since Axel’s parents passed away, he no longer returns. Gundi admits that she misses her siblings and their families now more than when she first left for New Zealand. Some have visited them in New Zealand. Gundi has returned a number of times to meet with them, and to travel through eastern Germany, which she had not seen before reunification. These spur-of-the-moment flights foreground also that at times she really misses European culture such as ambience, events and architecture.

\(^90\) A bach is “a weekend or holiday cottage or second residence, esp. at the beach” (Oxford dictionary of New Zealand English 1997). In parts of the South Island, a bach is called a crib.
Second generation – Sarah

Integration into New Zealand society was tough for Axel and Gundl’s older daughter Sarah, who reacted less assertively to challenges than her younger sister. Sarah was born in Asia Minor and lived with her parents in multicultural expatriate environments amongst Dutch, English, French and Swedish speakers as well as in Germany. She attended German schools in several countries and spoke German, English and French when she came to New Zealand at the age of 12. Because her mathematics skills were more advanced than those of her New Zealand classmates, she could concentrate on improving her English. In addition to mathematics and science subjects, French and English, she took German correspondence courses. Yet, she felt isolated. Having been around horses since making her first steps, she found solace in horse riding and participating in pony club activities.

After completing an agricultural science degree, Sarah went on her OE, traveling through Australia, Africa and Europe and working in Germany and England before returning to New Zealand a year later. She worked for an organization that markets New Zealand products and provides agricultural consulting services. Sarah was put in charge of organizing a New Zealand presence at major trade fairs in Germany, which allowed her to travel and to keep in touch with family there. When she had children, she changed to computer work from home, gradually reducing these commitments.

Sarah lives in the South Island with her English-born husband Andrew and their four children and is involved in her children’s schools and their various extracurricular activities. Andrew, partner in a consulting firm, oversees big construction projects. He and Sarah cooperate with childcare and home tasks. The wider family gets together as much as practical as Andrew’s family live in England and Australia. Sarah keeps in touch with a friend from her kindergarten time in Africa, and with friends from her New Zealand university days, but these contacts have become restricted to the Internet due to everyone’s commitments and spatial distances. She has made friends with neighbors, and with other mothers through Plunket coffee groups.

Sarah now feels completely at home in New Zealand despite loose ends. She comments for example, “we’re shaken not stirred” by the ongoing Canterbury earthquakes, yet says it would be good to move outside the earthquake zone if they could find an area with good schools for the children whilst not putting stress on her husband through commuting. Sarah is very unhappy about Germany’s strict dual-citizenship law as it complicates her family’s nationalities. Although during her childhood she did not live in Germany for long, she values the citizenship but also would like to have New Zealand nationality: “dann hätten wir wenigstens alle die gleiche citizenship” [at least we would then all have the same

91 Overseas experience (OE): an extended working holiday usually taken after completion of formal professional qualifications and considered a rite of passage (Wilson 2006)

92 see http://www.plunket.org.nz/
citizenship]. This demonstrates that she saw herself as an outsider in relation to her family's dual New Zealand and British citizenships.

Second generation – Connie

Connie was also born in Asia Minor and spent her earliest childhood in multicultural, multilingual communities. Asked what she remembers about settling in New Zealand at age 5, Connie says: “Not much. I remember that Mama and Speedy [the dog] were always waiting for me after school”. Like her sister, Connie took German correspondence courses in addition to the usual number of subjects taken in New Zealand’s high schools.

After completing high school, Connie went on holiday to Europe but returned “home” after four months in Germany and England, commenting that she did not like “the Germans” because they were unfriendly. Determined to have a career, Connie followed her sister’s advice and completed a food science degree. She holds a managerial position in a New Zealand food processing company.

Connie, her Māori husband Tom, and their three children live in an old villa in an inner Auckland suburb. Connie says she would not want to live “in the country” like her sister. Connie and Tom, who runs his own landscaping business, share household duties and childcare whilst Connie assists with business paper work. Work-related travel takes Connie to Australia at times, but she feels completely at home in New Zealand and in their neighborhood. Both Connie and Tom volunteer for school and day-care activities. Connie also keeps in touch with friends from her high school and university days, and she has made new friends through the children’s school and in their neighborhood.

Connie holds a German passport and says she might apply for dual German and New Zealand citizenship but does not see it as important. She has not traveled to Europe since starting university, yet plans to travel through Europe with the family once the children are old enough to appreciate the journey.

Third generation – Sarah’s children

Sarah’s children were born in New Zealand. Felix is 11, Ben 9, Julian 7, and Tina 4 years old. Felix catches the school bus to his intermediate school in Christchurch and Ben and Julian attend the local primary school. School uniforms are compulsory in both schools. All schooling is in English, with German language not offered at their schools. They take turns with chores at home. The boys play soccer and rugby, and learn karate, which Tina has started as well. Felix is learning guitar and piano and creates his own melodies on their keyboard, using its rhythms with enthusiasm. They all like reading and have their own
books and Kindle. The texts are in English. Computer use is regulated by Computer Time\textsuperscript{93} to avoid fights and complaints.

The children are entitled to German citizenship because their mother is German, and have British and New Zealand citizenship like their father. The older children have traveled to Europe with their parents and are aware of their parents’ origins, but do not give this much thought.

**Third generation – Connie’s children**

Connie’s children were also born in New Zealand. By the end of data collection, David was 8, Bella 6, and Ryan 3 years old. The older children go to school a few doors from their home and the youngest is in kindergarten. This primary school does not require a school uniform apart from a sunhat, and, in a typical New Zealand way, during summer the children tend to go to school barefoot. David’s favorite team sport is cricket, and he plays touch rugby and soccer. Bella plays soccer too. The whole family goes to David’s cricket games, with Tom coaching and Connie enthusiastically cheering the team on and commenting on play. The children have swimming lessons and in summer they spend time at the beach. Encouraged by family and school, they read their own books or library books every day, although it looked like David preferred computer games and all three would be glued to television given the choice.

Connie’s children have German and New Zealand citizenship. The older children are aware that their mother’s parents are German, but see their mother as a New Zealander. They identify as Māori and question being German despite their passports. The older children were keen to show on their world map where their mother was born and where she lived before coming to New Zealand.

**Summary of family stories**

All family members considered New Zealand (or Australia) their Heimat. Yet, attitudes, language, and perceptions of Heimat changed across the generations as did self-identities.

For G1, the creation of their second Heimat took considerable time and perseverance, and involved difficulties. These participants were bilingual or multilingual although their English skills varied. They identified as Austrian or German, even though those who held dual citizenship claimed it proudly.

For most G2 participants, New Zealand (Australia) became Heimat in a more complete way than for G1. All G2 participants entered intercultural relationships. They switched their

\textsuperscript{93} see http://www.softwaretime.com/computertime
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home language to English, with one exception. This participant, married to a bilingual English-German speaker in Australia, reported maintaining a one-parent-one-language system at home. The Austrian-born identified as Austrian and as Kiwi, and most had dual citizenship, whereas the German-born had only German passports.

The G3 participants who were old enough to understand, considered New Zealand or Australia their Heimat and identified along these lines, with three of the six participants with Māori ancestry also identifying as Māori. All G3 participants were monolingual English speakers. Those in the family with two home languages replied in English when spoken to in German. Two G3 participants had started learning German at school by the end of data collection but spontaneous German speech could not be observed.
2.2.2 Main study analysis – Families’ Heimat (re)creation

Und jedem Anfang wohnt ein Zauber inne
Der uns beschützt und der uns hilft zu leben
[And magic dwells in each beginning
Protecting us and helping us to live]

Hermann Hesse (1943/2012: 675)

This excerpt from Hermann Hesse’s life-stages poem Stufen [steps]94 was pointed out to me by one of the participants. The poem explicitly describes stepping over thresholds and implicitly suggests leaving and endings. It encapsulates G1 participants’ reported feelings of wonder and belief at arrival in the country whose landscapes, people and political steadfastness had captured their hearts. Inclusion expressed by a hospitable border-control officer, “so you’re new Kiwis. welcome to New Zealand” (Gundi) exemplified and strengthened these heartwarming feelings. This welcome also punctuated consequences of migration, namely leaving the original Heimat, and the need to create a new sense of belonging.

Consequences of immigration differed over time and between the generational cohorts. For G1 and G2, consequences included challenging phases of liminality. For G1 participants, these phases comprised transformation of dreams into experienced reality of place and social space as well as dissolution of status and struggles to recreate their lives in a new culture in terms of work, income and social connections. Other consequences were that G1 adopted New Zealand cultural practices whilst remaining very aware of their original culture and keeping such practices including language in a cultural duality. As consequences of immigration for most G2 participants, the initial phases of liminality included difficulties with language in schooling, and with social acceptance. As they overcame these phases, G2 participants matured into New Zealanders. English became their dominant language; and their original culture became backgrounded by all but two G2 participants. The cultural transformation of most G3 participants was almost entirely complete as consequence of their families’ immigration, their parents’ intercultural marriages and changes in family language. Only remnants of the original culture and language remained, although at the

94 See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_LaACP5GMUg Accessed Nov 2012. Hesse’s poem suggests that life is an ongoing process of transcendence, detachments and new beginnings. Suggesting that this is one of the most widely known German poems, I discovered that Bürgelt also happened to use (her translation of) the whole poem in the preface to her 2010 PhD thesis as expression of “the journey towards actualizing one’s authentic self” (Bürgelt 2010:10).
end of data collection for this study two G3 children started German language instruction at school.

This part presents my navigation through the nexuses of practice of consequences resulting from immigration across three generations for the three families who moved from Austria and Germany to New Zealand and who successfully settled ‘downunder’ (‘wir ham uns unsere Heimat hier aufgebaut’ [we have built our Heimat here] Gabi) whilst maintaining ties to family and friends in Austria and Germany. I focus on pertinent actions within participants’ New Zealand Heimat creation as highlighted in their narratives and evident intermittent observations over more than two years.

In line with Mitzscherlich (1997) and Huber and O’Reilly’s (2004) views of Heimat as a place and social space that has to be actively created and offers safety, security and belonging (see (see p48), I see Heimat creation as ongoing social actions. As this analysis of immigration consequences illustrates, this Heimat creation process was not stress-free, as new settlers in New Zealand face daunting roadblocks and great uncertainty (Cooke 2001). Because Heimat creation includes physical places as well as meaningful connections with these places, in investigating immigration consequences I will draw on Scannell and Gifford’s definition of place attachment as “the bonding that occurs between individuals and their meaningful environments” (2010:1) and their structuring of this attachment into three dimensions, i.e., actor, psychological process, and place:

1) Actor: Meanings that individuals and groups assign to a place

2) Process: Participants’ emotional, cognitive and behavioral manifestations of attachment

3) Place/object of attachment: Physical and social aspects of the place

The scope of a thesis approached through NA meant selecting social actions that stood out as crucial transformation or resemiotisation steps within the three generations’ Heimat creations. Figure 2.2–1 shows such steps evident in participants’ narrative accounts and in my observations.
Table 2.2—1 (continues on next pages) outlines the abovementioned three dimensions of place attachment (Scannell & Gifford 2010) in the transformational steps of immigration consequences across the generations in Figure 2.2—1 above:

**Table 2.2—1: Dimensions of place attachment across the generations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place attachment</th>
<th>Dimension 1:</th>
<th>Dimension 2:</th>
<th>Dimension 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actor(s) – meanings &amp; values assigned to place</td>
<td>Processes – affect, cognition, behavior</td>
<td>Place – physical &amp; social aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G1 social actions</strong></td>
<td>Building security</td>
<td>Ideal country offering personal and financial safety</td>
<td>Imagined dream place; practicality of building security for self &amp; family; overcoming obstacles; work investments; positive attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building own place</td>
<td>Family &amp; social networks; neighbors; council officials; security through ownership</td>
<td>NZ as dream &amp; reality; feelings, needs &amp; wants incl. work inclusion, social &amp; cultural belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place attachment</td>
<td>Dimension 1: Actor(s) – meanings &amp; values assigned to place</td>
<td>Dimension 2: Processes – affect, cognition, behavior</td>
<td>Dimension 3: Place – physical &amp; social aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tying social bonds</td>
<td>Participants; expanding family; people in networks; outsider / insider</td>
<td>Friendship/love; bonds crucial; work and private networking; visits; old/new practices</td>
<td>Home / town / country; family / friendship / community ties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G2 social actions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tying social bonds</th>
<th>Family, peers &amp; friends ‘anchors’ in new place; partners, children; work contacts</th>
<th>From outsider to insider; belonging &amp; identity; intercultural marriage; having children</th>
<th>Institutions, workplace; country;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand education &amp; work</td>
<td>Parents, teachers, peers; employers/customers;</td>
<td>Hated / liked; education as security; consider earnings &amp; work locations; family help; work &amp; earnings</td>
<td>Support; New Zealand &amp; Australia as one; linking career &amp; children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building own place</td>
<td>Parents, partners, friends; permanent home or investment; security through ownership</td>
<td>Imaginations, wants and needs; proximity to work &amp; schools; affordability; belonging / investment; DIY and having built</td>
<td>Home and surrounds; socioeconomic environment; new or old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having children</td>
<td>Participants, partners, caregivers; secure environment for children</td>
<td>Love; responsibilities; educating children for future success; play &amp; discipline</td>
<td>Urban / rural; family home; social network and cultural practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G3 social actions**

| Language acquisition | Parents, daycare, school, grandparents; English; German = language of grandparents; value of German? | Like English reading & writing; understand some German terms; learning German is work, seen as not needed | English (age-dependent) fluent; English also with German-speaking peers; reproduce some German terms; German as school subject? |
Table 2.2—2: Prominent themes in transformation steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Subtopics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>• Legal: visa / citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place attachment</td>
<td>• Landscapes &amp; dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Material cultural tools &amp; practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• People within places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sense of being outsider / insider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use</td>
<td>• At home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• With friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At work / school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These themes are useful organizers of immigration consequences, although as components of Heimat they overlap in the three dimensions of place attachment. For example, security plays a considerable part in the meanings people assign to place (e.g. most G1 participants considered New Zealand to be their ‘ideal’ and ‘safe’ dream.
destination). Yet security of course relates also to social processes as certain undesirable social elements may outweigh the physical appeal of a place (for example, Connie and her husband moved because drunks regularly congregated in the beach front reserve adjoining their property and the wheels were stolen from their car outside their door).

NA treats participants as co-researchers (Scollon & Scollon 2004; cf. Boylorn 2008), so I separated security from place attachment here also because participants pointed out that security transcended their attachment to a particular place. For instance, dealings with authorities regarding visa and citizenship reached across the globe. Also, language use could be included into the social aspects of a place and it connects people to places as G1 participants’ dialects conveyed in the transcripts show, for instance. As results of immigration, language(s) use played crucial roles in the *Heimat* creation of all three generations as cultural tools for communication, connecting people at home, school and work, and in projecting insider or outsider identities in their new *Heimat*. Since people’s languages are embodied, language use is not always bound to the same place. For all these reasons I use the themes security, place attachment and language use separately to concentrate on pertinent social actions of the first generation (G1), then the second generation (G2) and the third generation (G3) to map *Heimat* creation and changes across the generations.

**Consequences of immigration – G1 Heimat (re)creation**

Figure 2.2–2 below is the first semiotic ecosystem mapped for G1’s complex creation or recreation of *Heimat*. Narrated and observed mediated social actions in these ongoing processes are within the circumference of this study.

G1 participants anticipated that they could (re)create a new *Heimat* in this part of the world for their families. Permanency of residence and their reflective statements suggest that most anticipations became reality. Yet, data also illustrated misjudgments of settlement processes and the long-term consequences involved. Data further showed considerable elements of their ‘old’ *Heimat* in their homes and practices.

---

95 I use the prefix re- here in brackets because participants’ narrative accounts suggested that they expected a new beginning, not a resurrection of what they had in Europe.
When G1 participants recalled their experiences for this study, New Zealand Discourses or nexuses of practice and the social interaction orders had become embodied experiences. Reflecting on their Heimat creation in New Zealand, they narrated consequences and emanations as if it had been completed even though Heimat creation is an ongoing process.

Social actions in building security – G1

Achieving security in New Zealand was a prominent immigration consequence in G1 participants’ narrations. G1’s security priorities related to visas and citizenships for the family as legal guarantees for Heimat creation and continuation. This differed from Claudia, who had achieved security with measures and perceptions related to home and personal safety as effect of her age and financial status. Having to find work to secure a living and monetary independence was another immigration consequence. Consequences on their financial security in retirement became critical later. Although not entirely a consequence of immigration, investing strategically in G2’s education and home building was significant for G1 as safeguard for the next generation.
Right to stay through visa and citizenship

Resulting from immigration decisions, permanent residency linked New Zealand government institutional nexuses of practice with immigration interaction orders and did not present any problems for G1. As they fulfilled New Zealand requirements under the skilled migrant category (Axel, Gangolf, Max) or the family reunion category (Lukas), they and their dependents were issued permits affording them the legal security to stay and access services as foundation for their new Heimat.

Most G1 participants also acquired New Zealand citizenship, with participating G1 Austrians able to retain their Austrian citizenship. Motives to use citizenship as a cultural tool to strengthen their Heimat foundation arose from the desire for security and flexibility, not predominantly from feelings of belonging to New Zealand ("mitm Kiwi Pass könnt mer auch in Australien lebn" [with the Kiwi passport we could also live in Australia] Sophie). Others agreed. German G1 participants saw themselves principally as Germans rather than as German New Zealanders ("I just have a Kiwi passport" Axel). Taking on New Zealand citizenship seemed not necessarily well considered. For example, the loss of Axel's German citizenship resulted in a 30% reduction of his German Pension Insurance [Gesetzliche Rentenversicherung (GRV)].

Securing satisfying work to build security

One serious consequence of immigration was that the participants who immigrated on the basis of their qualifications, work experience and English skills did not necessarily find satisfying work comparable with their previous positions.

As Goffman explains, interaction orders function as “systems of enabling conventions” and practices (1983: 5). In the case of these skilled immigrants being admitted to New Zealand on the basis of their qualifications, conflicting convention systems imposed a disabling outsider status, a loss of agency as an unexpected consequence that was difficult to overcome. The conventions of gaining New Zealand residency under the skilled-migrant category enticed them into the country as professionals with experience. Once there, G1 participants encountered professional association conventions that barred them with “ridiculous impositions" (Gundi) from working in the very professions that had afforded them entry. The consequences for Max shall serve as an example.
Conflicting Discourses

Inspecting the cycle of discourses in Figure 2.2–3 opens a view into the consequences of conflicting New Zealand and Austrian/German nexuses of practice. Under the Skilled Immigrants category within New Zealand Immigration practices, Max was given permanent residence based on his Optiker* and Optikermeister* qualifications. In Germany and Austria, Optikermeister is synonymous with Optometrist (Cagnolati 2008). Prerequisites for this educational pathway are a successful three-year Optiker apprenticeship plus five years practical dispensing experience96. The two-year academic and professional development towards the qualification Optikermeister ends with theoretical and practical technical and clinical optometry examinations. Optikermeister deal with a combination of dispensing, refraction and prescribing vision correction as well as pathology screening (Cagnolati 2008).

One immigration consequence that hindered satisfactory transformation of Max’ human capital into mutually beneficial social capital resulted from the fact that New Zealand educational pathways and professional labels differ from continental European practices. New Zealand has two separate occupations with clear status separation in the field of

---

96 There are ongoing attempts to streamline educational pathways and occupations within Europe, and ensuing changes may mean that the case from the 1980/90s described here no longer applies.
vision-impairment examination and correction. One is the university-educated optometrist who deals with pathology screening, assessing vision and prescribing correction, i.e., “primary eye health care” (New Zealand Association of Optometrists 2011). It is considered a medical profession whilst dispensing optician is a trade with lower earning capacity. Dispensing opticians are educated through practical training with a dispensing optician in combination with a correspondence course (at a lower academic level than university courses) to deal with the tools for vision correction, such as fitting lenses and repairs.

**Social interaction order**

Figure 2.2–3 above shows consequences of miscommunication and G1 participants’ networking solutions. Social interaction orders are based on participants’ understanding of each other’s understanding and roles (Goffman 1983). Serious consequences were created by the lack of cooperation between New Zealand Immigration and the Optometrists and Dispensing Opticians Board. Different social and cultural conventions and norms were involved in recruiting immigrants from culturally different societies, yet the differences in these New Zealand social contract and consensus arrangements had not been clearly outlined during the immigration process. Max’ well-documented qualifications and experience were not sufficient for accessing satisfying work and income, with the Board requiring registration within vaguely worded parameters: “the Board may require the applicant to take and pass an examination or assessment” (www.odob.health.nz/registration_information n/d; italics added). These registration requirements enable arbitrary, non-transparent overseas-skills assessment practices and potentially could involve unaccountable discrimination.

Different New Zealand discourses and interaction orders had similar consequences for other G1 professionals, for example in the electrical engineering field (Axel & Gangolf) and nursing (Gundi). In consequence, participants complied (Axel) or left their professional field (Gangolf & Gundi). G1 participants evaluated these hurdles as power games (“closed-door policies weil sie halt können” [just because they can] Axel) rather than a necessity to screen professionals from Europe (“ols wärn deutsche und österreichische Ausbildung net guat gnua” [as if German and Austrian training wasn’t good enough] Hanni). A follow-on consequence was fortification of the professional outsider/insider division, which Mpofu’s calls “occupational apartheid” (2007: 95), and resulted in participants’ negative emotions and positioning orientation towards segments of the receiving society. Gundi’s comment

---


98 Information has been refined and now is available on the Internet. The point that occupational registration is necessary for certain occupations is clearly made, with lists of these occupations online (e.g. immigration.govt.nz/…/Occupationalregistration).
regarding barriers to nursing registration of German applicants in the mid 1980s. “da hab ich mer denkt die können mich mal” [so I thought they can kiss my ass] illustrates the frustration and alienation caused by professional barriers. The interaction orders of admission to professions disrupted immigration interaction orders when professional bodies counteracted government bodies, consequently damaging immigrant attitudes and undermining the effectiveness of immigration policies.

**Negative consequences**

Professional barriers resulted in unexpected negative consequences of migration. After suffering considerable loss of agency and status whilst being underemployed as dispensing optician, Max assumed that he could use his professional skills fully in his own business, but because the professional board did not accept his qualifications, assessing clients’ eyesight would have been considered professional misconduct. He had the choice to study again for three years to become a New Zealand-trained optometrist, or sit a dispensing optician examination and work as dispensing optician. The latter was a more instant and cost-effective solution. So a consequence of Max submitting to the institutional demands was a stripping of earned competency and potential income. Max worked as an overqualified dispensing optician whilst paying staff for work he was fully qualified and experienced to do.

Despite his qualifications and extensive experience in five countries Axel was allowed to do hands-on electrical work only ‘under supervision’. In practice, this meant employing a registered electrician to sign for his work until he had passed the registration examination. The consequences for Lukas were different because building-related trades that needed registration included electricians and plumbers but not builders or tilers. G1’s solution to overcome professional hurdles through creating their own businesses was problematic for most as success not only depends on trade-specific skills but also on demand, and the individual’s general business and networking skills. G1 participants did not migrate in order to start their own businesses but as a consequence of migration they did.

**Positive consequences**

Mostly as a consequence of immigrant interaction orders disruptions, establishing their own businesses became a way of finding satisfying occupations for G1. Within the first year, all G1 participants started their own business to be more independent. Axel’s first substantial contract evolved from network contacts Gundi had found through looking for French speakers: “I just wanted to speak French. so I put an ad in the paper and some people

---

99 In the past decades, professional admission has changed due to the increasing need for overseas nurses. For instance, registration for nurses from other countries is now possible under certain circumstances after a short course (see nursingcouncil.org.nz/.../New-Zealand-Registration 2008).

100 After immensely widespread and costly leaking-building disasters over the past decades a number of measures are under way to control construction better.
called. and the son of one couple had a friend who was a boat builder and Axel got that contract with him”. Max’ explanation documents the positive consequences resulting from their business:

Establishing a business in a foreign country is not entirely easy but we thought that our way of conducting business precisely the European way will be received well and that was a success. It was accepted very well and apparently the people liked how we conducted business and the way we dealt with them. through that we built a good customer base relatively quickly. well who cooperated and practically that word of mouth helped us (Max).

As a consequence of obtaining satisfying work, financial stability and commercial acceptance, an important process of resemiotisation occurred in Heimat creation. In a chain of transformation, businesses transformed into cultural tools in building financial security, which strengthened G1’s attachment to New Zealand.

Creating financial security

As a consequence of migrating with their families, G1 couples were forced to reconsider financial security and independence for their Heimat (re)creation.

**Figure 2.2—4: G1 – Semiotic cycles in creating financial security**

**Cultural tools involved in creating financial security**

Cultural tools are semiotic resources that mediate every action (Scollon & Scollon 2004). The cultural tools used by G1 participants in this social action of creating financial security linked into discourses at their places of origin and New Zealand. They included material
and embodied assets brought to New Zealand. One consequence of migration decisions was the conversion and transport of material assets. All G1 participants had sold property in Austria and Germany within one year of immigration to finance their New Zealand Heimat creation.

Material assets brought into New Zealand included monetary funds from property sales and included inheritance, chattels such as tools, vehicles and furniture. The timescales of European real estate market fluctuations and currency exchange rates imposed consequences on their initial resources. The 1984 German real estate market was depressed but had recovered well by 1990, giving divergent returns on comparable properties. After its float in 1985, the New Zealand dollar rose sharply and then fell considerably. These financial market fluctuations relevant for the times when participants immigrated had direct consequences for participants’ financial bases (cf. Easton 1989).

Financial acumen as an embodied asset included the ability to adopt New Zealand financial practices, judge the market and act accordingly. For instance, New Zealand does not have a capital gains tax, so investment in real estate is favored because gains (as long as gains realization is not conducted as business) are not taxed whilst expenses involved can be offset against this income. As a consequence of immigration, some G1 participants acquired this cultural practice to their advantage.

Another consequence of immigration was that most G1 participants realized that their retirement income would not meet their expectations. On timescales starting in their youth and reaching into old age, G1 had contributed to GRV funds through compulsory and voluntary employer and employee contributions, some even after coming to New Zealand. Lukas summarized the disappointment and anger that all G1 participants expressed about the dollar-for-dollar deduction of their overseas pension: “wir ham damit scho grechnet. dia hassns net umsonst Betrug” [we did calculate it in. they don’t call it a scam for nothing] (‘they’ refers to websites that express affected people’s anger about being cheated out of their New Zealand Superannuation). Changed New Zealand government interpretation of New Zealand Superannuation (NZS) and overseas entitlement schemes fell hard on G1. NZS was described as universal and available from the age of 65 for everyone who had lived in New Zealand for 10 or more years, with only similar overseas government pensions deducted. Participants did not expect to miss out because the overseas systems they had invested in are completely different (cf. Lazonby 2007; see section 1.4 pp94-96). Yet, as a consequence of immigration, participants’ retirement incomes were significantly reduced.

Not having the planned financial means in retirement impacted not only participants’ daily lives but also the affordability of contacts with family and friends, for example, in the South Island, in Australia, and in Europe.

101 http://nzpensionabuse.org; www.nzpensionprotest.com
Investing in education to establish security

Although difficult to measure, one possible consequence of immigration was increased competitiveness to succeed. Investing in education to establish security was one of G1’s complex social actions that contributed significantly to G2 Heimat creation as all G1 couples supported their children in tertiary study (see G2). Among G1 participants – apart from sitting the required exams to be able to work (Axel & Max) – only Sophie and Gundi enrolled in formal education. Sophie enrolled in foundation English classes to gain communicative independence. Bilingual from early childhood and deterred by the New Zealand institutional hurdles from reentering nursing, Gundi was determined to “beat them at their own game” after comments about her accent. This illustrates that identity assigned on the basis of accent was perceived as discriminatory exclusion. A consequence for Gundi was her determination to become accepted as an insider and to have even better qualifications than her critics. After gaining “several” New Zealand degrees Gundi gained this New Zealand insider position, secured work and financial security. This was a positive result of immigration because she had not completed senior high school and would not have been admitted to a German university without taking final high school examinations, whilst New Zealand allows admission for anyone aged 20 and over.

Place attachment – G1

A consequence of immigration was the necessity to create attachment to a new place. Their New Zealand place meant the home and surrounding landscape, expanding to the community, to the New Zealand islands and the nation state. Although the themes of security and language use are separated here, they intersect Scannell and Gifford’s (2010) three-dimensional categorization of place attachment in pertinent transformation points of participants’ New Zealand Heimat. One dimension connects people with place through values and meanings allocated to the place. At the time of this study, New Zealand meant Heimat for G1 participants in terms of social, security and certain cultural aspects. Another dimension includes the participants’ emotions, cognition and actions relating to the place. Participants valued belonging to their community: “do kennen mi d Leit” [the people know me there] (Gabi). The third dimension includes the physical and social nature of the place. Finding the right place to stay permanently was not that easy for three of the four G1 couples as indicated in the following.
Social action: Building own place

Table 2.2—3: Choosing a place to live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choosing a place</th>
<th>Max &amp; Gabi</th>
<th>Lukas &amp; Sophie</th>
<th>Axel &amp; Gundi</th>
<th>Gangolf &amp; Hanni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Island coast; then</td>
<td>North Island inland; then</td>
<td>North Island coast</td>
<td>North Island coast;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inland</td>
<td>coast</td>
<td></td>
<td>then inland, South Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Rent; then own house</td>
<td>With daughter (rent);</td>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>Rent; then own house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>then own house; then with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>daughter (own house)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choosing a place to live is central to building one’s own place within the development structure of a new Heimat. This immigration consequence for G1 involved the normal processes of home buying as well as the engagement with unknown building styles and unfamiliar landscapes. After moving to the country of their dreams, the immigrants began testing whether or not these dreams could be realized. Max' comment "since we're already in New Zealand then we should also live by the sea" sums up the ocean’s importance in the cognitive choices of residence and landscape. Although two of the four couples moved away from the sea, the appeal of the ocean contrasts with the land-locked areas of their first Heimat. Within weeks of arriving in New Zealand, Axel and Gundi bought property at the coast that combined their wishes for ocean and greenery. Nearly three decades later, they still lived in this environment close to a safe swimming beach. The three other G1 couples moved at least once during their first years in New Zealand. Pointing to emotional processes involved in their choice of location, Lukas and Sophie moved from their inland property to the coast after seeing a beachscape during a trip: “wia i in der Fruah den Vorhang aufgmacht hob do wor des Meer. do hob i gsogt do will i wohnen” [when I opened the curtain in the morning there was the sea. I said then I want to live here] (Lukas). Gangolf and Hanni and Max and Gabi first lived at the coast, and then moved inland. This was a decision that involved sentimental attachment to Austria and cognitive aspects (neighbors not as close as at the beach with the competition for views): “we’re country people. because we’re used to it” (Gabi). A number of other factors played crucial roles in G1 building their own places.
Historical bodies and the action of building own place

All G1 participants brought some experience with house construction from their properties in Austria or Germany. Yet, to save contingency funds most engaged more in DIY than they would have in Europe. Axel joked, “we nearly got divorced over the gib boards” [drywall boards]. Max and Gabi lived in the garage of a house rented by another immigrant family during construction. Once their house was weather-tight, they moved in and Max completed the interior on evenings and weekends. Networking among immigrants also was a consequence of immigration, with Max and Gabi involving Lukas for tiling and Axel for electrical work. G1 couples also had other immigrants living with them temporarily to help newcomers.

Material cultural tools

As a result of immigration, material goods acted as cultural tools in building G1 participants’ own place in two ways. First, the couples’ financial assets brought to and generated in New Zealand allowed transformation of money into a material base of Heimat through purchasing land and developing real estate. Home ownership was central for G1 as it reestablished permanence of place. Second, material goods brought to New Zealand and those developed in New Zealand from traditional concepts reproduced a familiar environment that carried semiotic meaning beyond everyday usage. Below are examples:
The Styrian cupboard (Figure 2.2–6, left) belonged to a participant’s grandmother. It carried symbolic meaning as a family heirloom and expressed the family’s Styrian identity. Traditional costumes were cultural tools brought in with chattels. Wearing traditional costume also expresses identity. In this case, shortly after arriving in New Zealand G1 wished G2 to express this identity, whereas the G2 participant later never wore such costumes. Axel and Gundi also had furniture shipped (Figure 2.2–6 right) including “that cupboard. I bought that especially. I wanted to have something Bavarian. look at the worm holes. it’s made of recycled roof trusses from the Regensburg Cathedral” (Gundi). This cupboard was used as a cultural tool, as a means of place and identity reconstruction. The action of purchasing and shipping was allocated a double symbolic meaning in these narrative decades later: Not only was it ‘something Bavarian’, which means that the place-related identity-carrying meaning of the chattel was foregrounded, but the cupboard was given additional semiotic value because it incorporated history of its place of origin.

The importance of symbolic cultural tools was also evident in Sophie’s anger about not having brought furniture:

Weil unser Hunter gsagt had wir können nirgends einen Container stehn lassen. Der wird dann aufbrochn und so. blass weil er zu faul war um zu suchn. und da hammer alle unsere möbel verkauft und verschenkt und ham blass unsere persönlichen Sachen. also unsere bilder und so mitbracht. I hab mi ja so gårgert. drei Tag nachdem mer ankommen sin hammers gsehn. fünf Minuten von der Anna hätt mern lagern können

[because our Hunter said we can’t leave a container anywhere, it would be broken into and so. just because he was too lazy to look. and so we sold all our furniture and gave it away and brought only our personal things. our pictures and so. I was so angry. three days after we arrived we saw it. five minutes from Anna we could have stored it]
Concepts transformed into cultural tools and practices

As a consequence of immigration, concepts and meanings as cultural tools crossed the border. G1’s concepts of preserving and cultivating their biosphere collided at times with concepts of New Zealand homeowners. Whilst all G1 participants planted trees, Gundi summarized G1 impressions of New Zealand neighbors: “kaum wechselt der Besitzer geht schon die Kettnsäge” [the chainsaw starts running as soon as the owner changes]. Others concurred: “do spritzns and spritzns statt dass es gorse raushan und mulchn” [they spray and spray instead of slashing and mulching the gorse] (Max; also see Gangolf & Hanni).

Most G1 participants foregrounded a caring treatment of the environment that probably linked to their environmental push and pull factors. Perhaps because the imagined pristine New Zealand environment had been such a great pull factor, a consequence of immigration was the highlighting of clashes with this imagined ideal.

Cultural concepts were transformed into practical objects that expressed Austrian / German identity. One example was a wine cellar. The traditional Austrian concept of a wine cellar with a vaulted roof covered in earth is shown in Figure 2.2–7 (next page) as resemiotisation of a concept in bricks and mortar and integrated into the utility area of participants’ lifestyle block:

\[ \text{wir ham uns vor einigen Jahren an richtigen Weinkeller gebaut. Mostkeller unter der Erde mit Ziegelgewölbe. und wir machn unsern eigenen Most. also des is eine Besonderheit. eine Art wie man traditionell in Österreich macht und es gfällt hier an jeden. auch Kiwis jedn gfällt die Art (Max)} \]

[some years ago we built a real wine cellar. underground cider cellar with brick vault. and we make our own cider. well that is a special feature. a way one traditionally makes it in Austria and everyone likes it here. Kiwis too everyone likes the type]

From this transcript it is not clear if “eine Besonderheit” refers to the cellar or the cider. Since the participants talked about their cellar whilst showing photos of the brick vault being constructed and tested with a four-wheel drive vehicle parked on it (top photo, Figure 2.2–7 below), “eine Besonderheit” clearly relates to the earth-covered wine cellar and, since underground cellars are common in Austrian / German buildings, most especially the brick vault (last photo). The English translation, ‘a special feature’ makes this clearer. The cellar’s symbolic value as an Austrian cultural tool in the participants’ Heimat recreation is emphasized in several ways: first, through confirmation of its authenticity (‘a real wine cellar’, i.e., the genuine article); second, it was created using traditional plans (‘a way one traditionally makes’); third, it is Austrian; fourth, its attractiveness for everyone including New Zealanders (‘Kiwis too’). With this expression, Max expresses a social consequence of immigration, that is, he distances himself from New Zealanders and identifies as Austrian although he has dual nationality. At the same time, he identifies as a handyman and as a person who has contributed an asset to his adopted country.
Figure 2.2—7: Cultural concept resemiotized in bricks and mortar
Another immigration consequence was the interlinking of tools and practices from participants’ old and new Heimat. Max engaged his son in using traditional plans to build this cellar. Building such an underground cellar was neither Max' nor Matthias' habitual practice, but Max took the initiative, sharing agency with Matthias. The concrete water tank (last photo, left with pipe) is a common New Zealand solution for water collection from roofs in rural areas and native groundcovers and climbers were planted over the earth-covered cellar roof and water tank. Embracing the social aspects of place attachment, the cellar served as a space for social wine/cider tastings as well as storage.

Another consequence of immigration is finding similar cultural concepts. G1 participants’ original religious orientations were similar to existing New Zealand ones. Max and Gabi joined a local church early on. Max explained their motives as a means to an end, as cultural tools for creating their place within the community and the district: “weil mer uns überhaupt net gut auskennt ham in der ganzen Gegend” [because we were not at all familiar with the whole area]. Gabi was quick to soften this utilitarian aspect by defining the church visits as traditional cultural practice: “mir sin immer ind Kirch gangen” [we’ve always gone to church] (Gabi). Both agreed that joining opened an excellent social network: “und dos war hat sich rausgestellt. dass das a sehr guter Weg war. viele Leute kennenzulernen” [and it turned out that it was a good way to get to know many people] (Max). Another example of combining New Zealand cultural practices with networking practice involved transforming the New Zealand concept of a working bee, i.e., a voluntary group doing work for charity or the community. Their working bee became gorse removing and tree planting (“des is doch auch für die community” [that’s also for the community] (Gabi) on Max and Gabi’s land with fellow churchgoers, Gangolf and Hanni, Axel and Gundi. As demonstrated in the pilot study, as a consequence of migration others also combined European practices with practices adopted in New Zealand and joined community activities.

**Social action – tying (and maintaining) social bonds**

When parents move with their children to another country, as was the case in this study, social networks are interrupted. As a consequence of ties severed through dislocation, (re)creating Heimat involves forming new social networks. As shown in Claudia’s case (pilot study), not being able to rebuild satisfying social bonds had a detrimental effect on the sense of inclusion and belonging. Figure 2.2–8 (below) illustrates the semiotic cycles involved for G1.
Figure 2.2—8: Semiotic cycles of tying and maintaining social connections

Historical bodies

The action of immigration exposes migrants’ capabilities and interests (or lack thereof) that can connect them socially in the new home. As the above examples show, many of these were embodied in G1 participants at the time of immigration. Earlier contacts with other cultures for example in sojourns (Axel, Gundi, Lukas, Sophie) or travel (Max & Gabi) and work-related social interactions (which all G1 participants had experienced) had given them the networking skills they could use as cultural tools in generating new social bonds. One consequence of migration can be that efforts to connect with new social groups can benefit the wider community. Sophie joined a patchwork and embroidery group that comes together regularly. Growing out of her initial interest in sewing, she got involved in community work “with my ladies” (Sophie). The group has been sewing heart cushions for breast cancer patients. This way of referring to her fellow group members indicates the social importance of the group for Sophie. As a demonstration of lasting social bonds, a number of the church contacts in Gabi’s early working bee still belong to Max and Gabi’s social networks. Last, but certainly not least, participants’ expanding families created more and deeper social ties across the generations: “dia Kloenan machn a so vui Freid” [the little ones bring so much joy] (Sophie); “mei woast wia liab dia san?” [well do you know how lovely they are?] (Gabi). Expanded family ties within a new country can also result in cultural discontent. Lukas and Sophie strongly expressed dissatisfaction about perceived cultural peculiarities of their son and daughter’s divorced and separated partners. Other G1 participants were content with the consequences of their children being in intercultural unions (“mir könntn keine bessern Schwiegersöhn ham” [we couldn’t have better sons-in-law] Gundi). Gundi added that one positive consequence of living in New Zealand was that...
skin color did not matter. Whilst also laid down in non-discrimination laws, objectively her impression might not necessarily be factual throughout society.

**Cultural tools in social bonding**

Traditional cultural practices were involved in the creation and maintenance of social ties, connecting the three participating generations with people of all ages from New Zealand and around the globe. The most active participants in bringing people together in customary celebrations with the Austrian Club were Max and Gabi. Axel and Gundi “tag along ’cause Gabi calls” (Gundi) but they occasionally brought their family along “weil mer Ehren-Österreicher sin” [because we’re honorary Austrians] (Axel). Whilst differentiating and distancing, this declaration of identity and cooperation also signals similarities between Austrian and Bavarian customs that might be of interest for succeeding generations.

Documenting the transfer of traditional social practices from one generation to the next, the top photo (Figure 2.2–9, p 166 top photo) shows G1 and G2 participants celebrating the task completion of felling and carving the pine destined as a maypole. Max initiated the action but, sharing agency, son Matthias was keen to participate. The middle photo shows the men who, following Max’ rhythmic commands, raised the maypole with poles tied together in twos, while it is secured in the hole in the ground. Raising the pole by hand is common practice in Austrian and Bavarian May celebrations 102, especially in rural communities. Participants’ narrative accounts suggested that for lasting transfer of such traditions into another society an enthusiastic leader is necessary and Max filled that role. Some of the men and members of the Austrian Dancers looking on wear traditional costumes as they do at special occasions. Occasions such as these offered participants opportunities for maintaining social connections.

The last photo in Figure 2.2–9 shows the Austrian Dancers practicing for their part in showcasing multicultural New Zealand at a major sports event. Wearing traditional costumes strongly displayed Austrian identities to observers, indicating origins from different parts in Austria for those informed about regional costume differences. However, such identity displays can be deceiving since some dance group members were actually New Zealanders or other nationals who had an Austrian partner or just enjoyed this kind of folk dancing. In this case the signaling of an adopted identity became an example of cultural transfer to the receiving society as a migration consequence. Again, Max and Gabi were initiators and teachers of traditional folk dancing. Although the other G1 participants took part in Mayfest celebrations, bringing along members of G2 and G3, none practiced folk dancing: “dos wor nie unser Ding” [that never was our thing] (Lukas). G1 participants’ peripheral participation and disinterest in actively pursuing such traditions shows that these specific social practices were an essential part of Heimat recreation for some but not for the

---

102 May 1st is a public holiday in Austria and Germany.
majority of the participants. Disconnecting from folk dancing traditions, the next generation was not interested and there was a lack of young dance group participants at the time of this study (Gabi: “we can't jump any longer and Max can't lift me any longer”). The limited interest and active dance group members’ ages suggest cessation of this social practice in Auckland unless someone younger revives it.

Figure 2.2—9: Traditional practices: Mayfest celebrations and Austrian dancing
Cultural tools in social bonding – food and beverages

Like for the pilot study participants, food and beverages functioned as cultural tools in (re)creating aspects of Heimat. Cooking in habitual ways created a sense of continuity (“ich koch halt so wie wirs gewohnt sind” [I cook the way we are accustomed to] Sophie). Examples of traditional dishes were Wiener Schnitzel [Viennese cutlets] with potato salad, or oven-roasted pork with Klöss [dumplings formed from raw-grated, or mixed raw-grated and boiled potato dough] and Blaukraut [red cabbage], Fritatensuppe or Flädlesuppe [Austrian and Swabian respectively for the same: thin cold pancakes cut into fine strips and served in clear beef broth with chopped chives] to name but a few. Foods and beverages as cultural tools played considerable roles in maintaining and strengthening social bonds. Frequent informal dinners in participants’ homes involved German speakers and friends from various backgrounds, with traditional Austrian and/or Bavarian and other dishes served.

G1 participants assured me that not all their shared dinners were lavish but the example depicted in Figure 2.2–10 below indicated generous hospitality. In a combination of ‘old’ and new practices, European and New Zealand foods and beverages were consumed. Hot-smoked New Zealand salmon with horseradish and local salads were the first course (shown in Figure 2.2–10 below); veal prepared in Swabian style with white wine and lemon juice served with Spätzle [home-made egg noodles] followed as mains, with a dessert of apple strudel and Irish coffee. In a common New Zealand practice, the farmed salmon was smoked on the deck. Participants had sourced the horseradish cream (left oval) at a delicatessen selling German foods.

Part of the global trade cycle, some drank beer imported from Austria and Germany (right oval) bought at the local supermarket. Others drank New Zealand wine (“die machn jetzt recht gutn Wein” [they now make quite good wine] Gabi) in Austrian glasses praised for their exquisite quality revealed in the European ritual of clinking glasses before drinking to wellbeing (“also. auf euer Wohl! die klingen so schön und do schmeckt der Wein viel besser” [well. to your health! they sound so nice and the wine tastes much better] Max). Tying in with Bönisch-Brednich’s (2002) findings in her study of German immigrants in New Zealand, food and drink were compared and discussed at length, and addresses of and commentaries on shops carrying European specialties were exchanged. Discussions

103 Traditionally, thin veal cutlets (but increasingly, cheaper pork cutlets) dipped in egg, crumbed and fried, served with a lemon wedge and potato salad. Showing immigrant influences in New Zealand, cuts for these Vienna cutlets are sold as Wiener schnitzel or misspelled Weiner schnitzel in local supermarkets.
during the main course favored European veal from milk-fed calves over the darker New Zealand veal. To produce original Spätzle, participants had Spätzlehobel [spaetzle maker; literally spaetzle slicer], in which dough (made of wheat flour, eggs, water and salt) is moved back and forth over holes in the base to form droplet-like egg noodles that fall into boiling salt water.

Figure 2.2—10: Maintaining social bonds

The terms strudel, schnitzel, pretzel and spaetzle are common loanwords in English\(^\text{104}\) (although schnitzel is pronounced /sntʃəl/ rather than /ʃnɛʃəl/ and pretzel usually means dry snacks). These loanwords are consequences of German-speaking migrants taking their recipes abroad. Indicating the importance of food and its traditional preparation in G1 participants' sense of Heimat, strudel also became a discussion topic, as the apple strudel had been prepared with original strudel dough not filo pastry as is common throughout New Zealand. Although Irish coffee using Scottish whiskey is paradoxical, this blend of cultural elements to complete dinner had long become practice for the G1 participants. Like the food and discussions surrounding it, shared tasks (including preparation, serving, clearing the table and tidying the kitchen) confirmed the friendship aspects of place attachment.

Expanding place attachment beyond home and the community to the country, the range of food on offer in New Zealand played a role in G1 participants' Heimat construction, with recent assortment changes supporting familiarity. Participants became customers at a German bakery and at a German and/or Swiss butcher early on because they disliked local products (“des lappige Brot do kannst ja net essn” [you can’t eat that limp bread here] (Sophie); “Kiwi bangers sin jo furchtbor” [Kiwi bangers\(^\text{105}\) are terrible] (Lukas); “des erste was der Axel gsucht hod war a gscheiter Metzger und Bäcker” [the first thing that Axel was

\(^{104}\) See, e.g., http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2013-01-30/features/sc-food-0125-prep-spaetzle-20130130_1_spaetzle-wheat-flour-batter

\(^{105}\) traditional New Zealand sausages
looking for was a decent butcher and baker] (Gundi). G1’s negative assessment of certain local foods and preference for specific kinds of traditional food such as sourdough rye bread, sausages and cold cuts ties in with Bönisch-Brednich’s (2002) findings. Findings of perceived changes in the range of foods offered over recent decades also were similar, signaling influences of increasing trade globalization and immigrant contributions to New Zealand food production and distribution: “damals hods drei Artn Käs gebn. mild Colby und tasty “[back then there were three kinds of cheese. mild Colby and tasty] (Gundi); “oba jetzt kriagst jo olls überoll” [but now you get everything everywhere] (Gabi).

Friendship and the meaning of family – emanations from social bonding

Not all social bonds revolved around business, celebrations or food. Friendship ties and group membership that helped create a sense of local belonging and of Heimat ran much deeper. As examples of such emanations from social bonding, Sophie and Lukas regularly looked after Claudia (see pilot study), helping her with cooked meals and other things. Axel and Gundi had reciprocal arrangements with New Zealand friends in case children needed to be cared for. Narrative accounts indicated also that participants supported each other through difficult phases in their lives. Indeed, creating Heimat in New Zealand changed participants’ understanding of family, with new strong bonds tied as a consequence of immigration and maintained:

a Familie muss net unbedingt a Verwandtschaft sein. ihr seids auch Familie und eure Kinder. des wor domals einfach Familie und is noch immer (Gabi speaking to Axel and Gundi)

[a family does not necessarily just have to be relatives. you and your children are also family. that simply was back then and still is]

Yet participants’ immediate family, their center of family gravity played a bigger role in place attachment than this expanded family:

dass unsere Kinder und Enkelkinder unmittelbar in the Nähe sin. also das allein bindet uns auch schon hier. also dass mer hier bleiben und garnet dran denkn irgendwo anders hin (Max)

[that our children and grandchildren are in the immediate vicinity. well that alone also binds us here. well that we stay and don’t even think about somewhere else]

Whilst not excluding other important ties, this indicates the strength and significance of strong familiar social ties in place attachment and therefore in Heimat creation. This importance of family ties was also evident in Lukas and Sophie’s assurance when their daughter was looking for work further afield earlier in the study: “wenn die Anna nach Australien geht geh mer mit. des is klar” [if Anna goes to Australia we’ll go with her. that is clear]. It confirms Heimat creation as ongoing process in people’s lives and the strength of family ties in the adage that ‘home is where the heart is’.
Language use – G1

Another prominent theme in participants’ Heimat creation was language use. Apart from Sophie, who learned English in New Zealand, G1 participants arrived in New Zealand with the embodied cultural tools of fluent English language skills. Their narrated social actions indicated that they used these cultural tools extensively to create new social bonds even though adapting to New Zealand English and developing confidence took time:

\[
\text{ich hab also etwa zwei bis drei Monate gebraucht bis ich mich unterhalten hab können mit jemand. praktisch eine Art Hemmschwelle überhaupt für mich zu sprechen (Max)}
\]

[It took me about two to three months until I could have a conversation with someone. in general practically a kind of inhibition for me to talk]

Transformational steps towards a sense of inclusion and belonging included getting used to the local language variety as “des Problem eigentlich war am Anfang den Akzent zu verstehen. sich einzuhören” [the problem at the beginning was to understand the accent. getting used to listen to it] (Gabi). These examples are indicative of participants’ recounted settlement experiences irrespective of their English language proficiency at arrival.

Over time, the nexus of practice involving language and social bonds became complex, involving consequences of immigration that some G1 participants had not considered. As Scollon and Scollon (2004) emphasize, it is important to understand the semiotic cycles leading to a social action to understand the situation of the action. Figure 2.2–11 shows G1 language use observed during this study. Following this figure, I will consider the cycles leading to G1’s language use in the different situations.
Figure 2.2—11: G1 – Observed language use

Figure 2.2–11 shows patterns of G1’s language use that suggest language choice was habitual social practice determined by situational changes. Clear, abrupt changes from speaking German with other German speakers to speaking English were a case in point. These changes occurred as soon as English speakers who were considered group members in that situation came within earshot. This differs slightly from Kuiper’s (2005) ‘earshot rule’, which relates to his study of Dutch in Christchurch only speaking Dutch when they could not be overheard by English speakers. In contrast, participants in my study kept speaking German with German speakers in public places no matter who could overhear them. Yet, in situations when an English speaker approached who was considered monolingual and participating in the situation, participants would switch to English.

Exceptions to these norms occurred when a German speaker asked another in German for clarification of what had been said either because they had not heard clearly or they had not grasped the meaning of what had been said in English. These switches from German to English as soon as non-German speakers joined the situation can be considered politeness strategies to avoid someone’s exclusion, a strategy that Crezee (2008) also found in her study of Dutch in New Zealand. Indeed, all G1 participants confirmed that it was impolite to speak a language that someone in the group did not understand. In line with this, speaking German to another German speaker in the presence of English speakers tended to be preceded by an apology to the English speakers.
Examples of such switches in language use occurred during a dinner I attended. The first arrivals were a couple of participants’ German-speaking friends and only German was spoken. Then a New Zealander with her French husband arrived. English immediately became lingua franca among all present. As the evening progressed, however, pairs or smaller groups interacted in separate conversations in German, in English, and in French. Whilst these in part louder and more intense conversations perhaps emerged in part from lowered self-monitoring through alcohol consumption, they came across as normal, accepted part of participants’ multilingual practices in the nexus of practice of friendships.

Switches from German to English described above also applied to situations when G1 spoke with G2. As long as G1 and their children and other German speakers were present, they spoke German. As soon as G2 partners were present, everyone spoke English. There were two exceptions to this. One, in Lukas, Sophie and Anna’s household, all adult German speakers spoke English as soon as Anna’s children were part of language exchange even though the adults assured that the children understood German. Two, when Axel and Gundi spoke with Connie whilst her husband and children were present they tended to speak more German than English. Gundi explained that although Tom, Connie’s husband, was an English speaker, he had shown over the years he lived with them that he understood German quite well (and he confirmed that he understood everyday key terms and therefore could roughly follow the conversation). Axel and Gundi also said that partners should learn each other’s language. This indicates an expectation of bilingualism being continued across generations.

In interactions within G1 and between G1 and G2, codeswitching from German to English was observed when no English speakers were present. Indicating changes in their language use over time, participants commented that they started codeswitching from German to English about a decade ago. The term codeswitch(ing) is used here for any kind of switches between participants’ languages (codes). At times the switch was corrected after some consideration as indicated by filler and hesitation devices such as “ah also” [ah well], backtracking and the repetition of “praktisch” [practically]: “praktisch des word of mouth die ah also praktisch die Mundwerbung” (Max). This hesitation points to a momentary lexical retrieval problem, with ‘word of mouth’ used as substitution perhaps because the term was used more frequently. At other times English single-word switches were not corrected in G1’s interactions: “aber net den ganzen commercial Kram do rundherum” [but not the whole commercial stuff all around] (Gabi); “die gehn in die daycare” [they go to daycare] (Gundi); “der Lachs is im smoker” [the salmon is in the smoker] (Axel); “na des wor a pine” [no that was a pine] (Hanni); “do schmeissns den rubbish einfach aus dem Autofenster” [they throw the rubbish simply out of the car window] (Gangolf); “die arms sin kaputt” [the arms are broken] (Sophie).

These switches can be attributed to what Grosjean calls bilingual mode. That is, in bilingual mode one base language (in these examples German) is selected and the other mode
(English in these examples) is activated along a “situational continuum” through choices “which language to use and how much of the other language is needed – from not at all to a lot” (Grosjean 2008:38). I would not use the term ‘needed’ for the above codeswitching examples. That is, despite ‘tip of the tongue’ phenomena displayed occasionally when G1 participants would ask for the German expression, frequency of use or habit might explain these switches because at other times, they demonstrated command of the relevant vocabulary in German. Other codeswitching and codemixing was rationalized with need: “do gibt’s ka deitschs Wort dofir” [there’s no German word for it]; “duast mer den Link forwarden” [will you forward me the link] (Gabi). Granted that the term Link has become a loanword in German for the connection to a website, yet the term ‘forwarden’ exemplifies codemixing in the added German ending.

When G1 spoke with G3, a split between German language use with the youngest grandchildren (aged 2 or under up to 4 years) and English with the older grandchildren was evident. All G1 participants behaved in the same way irrespective of their English skills and irrespective of frequency of their interaction with the grandchildren. In particular, the grandmothers reported that they spoke German with the grandchildren or at least tried to mainly speak German with them. Yet, I observed predominant English use with little codeswitching to German. When I put these observations to G1, they commented that their grandchildren did not understand German which was regrettable (“jo mei wenns mi net verstehn” [oh well if they don’t understand me] (Sophie). Indicated by frequent G1 requests for clarification (“was sagt er? ich brauch an Dolmetscher” [what does he say? I need an interpreter] Axel), this lack of understanding seemed reciprocal especially in interactions between G1 and younger G3 participants and more pronounced during phone conversations when compared with face-to-face interactions.

Consequences of immigration – G2 Heimat creation

With one exception (Anna), G2 immigration was a direct consequence of G1’s immigration as they would not have moved to New Zealand had their immediate family not done so. By the time of this study, the three main themes identified in G1’s New Zealand Heimat creation, namely security, place attachment and language use, had also become part of G2 participants’ historical bodies and featured prominently as a consequence of immigration in their transformative Heimat creation steps. Yet, G2 participants placed emphasis on different aspects of the themes. G2 framed their Heimat (re)creation first and foremost as integration into social spaces. Feelings and (lack of) agency experienced in migration processes as well as perceived reception by New Zealanders played a primary role for adolescent G2 participants during initial settlement in New Zealand. Over the course of more than 25 years, G2 almost completely assimilated into the New Zealand (Australian) mainstream. Time, institutional and social environments as well as their intercultural marriages played crucial roles, for instance, in language shift from German to English. Yet,
given their ages at the time of study (33-45 years), their downunder Heimat creation must be seen as an ongoing process, partially with uncertain future emanations.

Figure 2.2—12: Mapping G2’s semiotic ecosystem of New Zealand Heimat creation

Security – G2

For most G2 participants, the perceived security of their ‘old’ Heimat was disrupted by immigration to New Zealand. Narrated actions indicated that the different age groups within G2 had different priorities with regard to (re)building security in their new place of abode. For the adolescents (12–16 years old at immigration), this meant first and foremost the formation of a peer network. As the adolescents matured, cultural tools in the action of creating security included education and work affording ongoing income and home finance. For those who arrived as adults (Anna, Heinz), visa, education and work were essential tools in recreating security by permitting them to stay and earn a living. Consideration of security in terms of ongoing stability yields a slightly different picture. For some G2 participants, potential future relocations render their New Zealand Heimat creation confused or incomplete.

G2 adolescents establishing social bonds

During settlement, establishing social bonds provided G2 adolescents with security within peer groups and changed their status from outsiders to insiders. The action of social bonding in the nexus depicted in Figure 2.2–13 below should be seen as many separate
social actions, each at a specific real time and in its specific physical place and social space.

Figure 2.2—13: Semiotic cycles in G2 adolescents’ settlement

**Interaction order**

Interaction order refers to the constraints and empowerments of people through people in the particular moment in time an action is taken (Scollon & Scollon 2004). Because most G2 adolescents found integrating into their new social environment difficult, interaction order is of particular interest. These participants considered building a peer network crucial during settlement. Biological and psychosocial explanations help understand why: Mammalian neurochemical systems stimulate humans to seek and maintain social contact (Kendrick 2004) and “friendship ranks as one of the highest human values” (Jones 2001: 131). Also, adolescents’ changes such as puberty, school transitions and social role redefinitions in growing more autonomous can be problematic (Eccles, Midgley, Wigfield, Buchanan, Reuman, Flanagan & Maclver (1993) and moving into another country and culture adds stressors (Smith & Khawaja 2011). Finally, parents had deprived the adolescents of agency in this migration process.

In my view, all these factors were contributory reasons for G2 adolescents’ search for *Geborgenheit* *, which is best translated as safety and security in terms of being embraced within a strong social support network. Social support network refers to a personal social network that is restricted to the direct contacts providing sustenance in situations of need (cf. O’Reilly 1988). The families and G1 parents in particular provided such support for the G2 adolescents. However, considering relationships were strained through G2 adolescents’
lack of agency in the migration process, and common changes in child-parent relationships during adolescence (see Fuligni 1998), as a consequence of migration the tweens and teenagers had an increased need to regain agency and find Geborgenheit within a peer group. Also as a consequence of migration these peer groups had to be formed anew.

Historical body

Historical bodies are accumulated in social spaces (Blommaert & Huang 2009) and are subject to interaction order. This helps explain why Sarah (aged 12 at immigration) “absolutely hated” her first years in New Zealand. Immersion schooling is said to enhance social bonding (cf. Rothstein 1998) but such bonding has to be mutual as rejection and discrimination negatively affect adolescents’ health (Crengle, Robinson, Ameratunga, Clark & Raphael 2012; Harris, Tobias, Jeffreys, Waldegrave, Karlsen & Nazroo 2006). As the only German speaker at high school before Lisa and Matthias arrived, Sarah experienced psychosocial difficulties as her German surname and background were identity markers that led to ongoing harassment at school: “dass die mich immer Nazi gheissn ham hat mir schon schwer zu schaffen gmacht” [that they always called me Nazi was very difficult for me]. Gundi recalled: “she came home from school asking what a Nazi was. then she wanted another passport because she did not want to be German”. At a confusing life stage when adolescents are vulnerable (Eccles et al. 1993), Sarah’s dissociation from her national descent documented the added burden inflicted on her by peer behavior. Only when Lisa arrived in Sarah’s class, did Sarah’s social isolation in school end. In Sarah’s opinion, the girls’ friendship gave her a sense of security, belonging and confidence because she “konnt mit ihr über alles reden” [could talk with her about everything]. It reflects that being friends with a girl from the same language background combined with the influence of Lisa’s relative maturity allowed Sarah to move on in a positive way.

Despite being assigned one or two companions by the school to help them settle, the other G2 teenagers aged 13 to 15 at immigration shared Sarah’s experiences of problems with finding security in the sense of Geborgenheit in peer networks during settlement: “es wor schwer Freunde zu findn” [it was difficult to find friends] (Matthias). Perhaps illustrating both the time it took to form deeper friendships and persisting commonalities, Matthias added that he and his two school buddies still were friends. With the exception of Robert, G2 adolescents reported being harassed by other students due to their German language functioning as identity markers (“dia san olwei bei uns vorbeimarschiert mit am Hitlergruss” [they always marched past us with a Hitler salute] Matthias). When two more German speakers of similar ages arrived at the school, “des hod gholfn” [that helped] (Matthias), suggesting that G2 adolescents dealt with discrimination and struggles of being respected during settlement through safety in numbers.

106 Max’ and Gabi’s daughter (see Family A)
Robert (16 at immigration) who went to high school in a different town and had played in the Austrian national ice-hockey team reported no problems with forming social bonds. Tying in with the argument that sport strongly encourages friendship (Jones 2001) and that athletic skills correlate with popularity for boys (Daniels & Leaper 2006), his sport skills fostered integration as they helped by quickly tying social bonds:

*ich hab gleich angefangen Eishockey zu spielen. das war gut. da und in der Schule hab ich Freunde gefunden. es hat dann etwa zwei Monate gedauert dann wollt ich nicht mehr zurück*

[I started playing ice-hockey immediately. that was good. there and in school I found friends. it took me about two months then I didn’t want to go back].

The findings outlined about show that establishing social bonds enabled the G2 adolescents to accept migration transitions, with friendships becoming crucial empowerment aspects for their settlement.

**Social action – G2 adults establishing social bonds**

Different from adolescent participants’ priorities, for the young adults in G2 establishing social bonds did not primarily relate to creating a sense of security mainly because their move to New Zealand had not cut existing social bonds. To the contrary, for Anna (21 at immigration) the move intensified newly formed social bonds. She already was on a sojourn away from family and friends when she befriended Hunter. Coming to New Zealand on his invitation with the intention of a yearlong study sojourn, she settled quickly in a whirlwind romance: “*ja und fünf Monat später war mer verheiratet*” [yes and five months later we were married]. Her relationship placed her into a social support network that facilitated her settlement. For her brother Heinz (28 at immigration), moving to New Zealand meant reconnecting with his immediate family, who had already settled in New Zealand. As outlined in language use below, the young G2 adults had sufficient language skills for comfortably settling into English-speaking New Zealand society. In sum, the young adults among G2 participants had no trouble finding security through establishing social bonds during settlement.

**Social action – Building security through education and work**

Education and work were important in terms of building security in socioeconomic terms and not least to finance home ownership. With the exception of Heinz, G2 participants owned or co-owned their residence at the time of this study. G2 participants who arrived as young adults (Anna, Heinz) had to deal with education and work, and obtain the required visas. Heinz was a trained chef when he arrived. Illustrating intersection of a nexus, he found an employer who also became a long-term friend. Anna received her permanent residency permit just in time to study at a lower cost rather than paying higher international student fees. Changing her study focus to general business management was a
consequence of immigration inspired by her mother-in-law’s occupation. The change also
can be seen as integration into New Zealand society. Demonstrating adaptation to market
conditions that normalize insecurity of work and earning (see Beck 1999; Spoonley 2006)
but also indicating aptitude, Anna worked at a temporary job in a fruit processing company,
leading to her first management position.

For G2 participants who arrived as tweens or teenagers, financial security through
education and work only gained importance as they matured. With the exception of
Matthias, who found studying in English difficult (“it was hard. but to be honest I was really
lazy”) and eventually gave up studies for earning priorities (“I just wanted to have spending
money because I had a girlfriend”), they completed tertiary education. Lisa became a
dispensing optician. Sarah and Connie earned an agricultural science and food science
degree respectively, which signals professional integration into New Zealand, where
primary industries generate two thirds of goods export earnings (MPI 2013). Robert studied
computing and gained a master’s degree in business administration.

With the exception of Sarah, who was considering options of returning to employment when
all children would be attending school, at the time of this study G2 participants were
employed (Anna, Connie, Heinz, Robert); had taken over the family business (Lisa); or
were self-employed (Matthias). The MBA holders had been unemployed at some stage, but
as Matthias indicated, work security was also not guaranteed for others. This might have
contributed to some instability of G2’s Heimat perception.

The statements below illustrate the nexus of practice linking G2 participants’ cognitive and
affective processes to the economic conditions of places they have connections with. This
nexus illustrates the continuing nature of Heimat creation within people’s life cycles. Robert
said,

ich hab immer ein Auge auf Österreich gehabt. wir schliessen das nach wie
vor nicht aus. wenn es beruflich funktionieren würde. Österreich oder
Süddeutschland wäre für uns eine Möglichkeit

[I have always had an eye on Austria. we still do not exclude this. if it would
work professionally. Austria or southern Germany would be a possibility for
us].

This suggests uncertainty about staying in Australia over time (‘have always had an eye on
Austria’), suggesting that future career potential (‘if it would work professionally’) could
attract him and his family to Austria or southern Germany, where he and his wife had family
connections. Other G2 participants considered Australia a viable option for work because of
New Zealand’s small economy (“ja weil in Neuseeland is der Markt schon sehr begrenzt”
[yes because in New Zealand the market is very limited] Anna). A subdued housing market,
for example, caused financial security problems for Matthias, which might have contributed
to doubts about his Heimat and his place in it:
es is scho schwer im Moment weil vui los is mit building. I've often asked myself what would be if I had not come to New Zealand. would I be a builder? or would I be a bum?"

[it is difficult at the moment because not much is happening in building. I've often ...]

Lack of this security impacted on home financing, for which Matthias compensated by trading down to a smaller property.

**Place attachment – G2**

Connections with people sustained and reinforced G2 participants’ place attachment as social space within the process dimension of place attachment, which includes emotional, cognitive and behavioral manifestations (Scannell & Gifford 2010). Creating this social space entailed changing identifications and social connections and adoption of cultural practices. The other dimensions of place attachment identified by Scannell and Gifford, i.e., the meanings that G2 participants assigned to place, and the social and physical aspects of their objects of attachment such as dwellings and neighborhood also played vital roles in G2 participants’ Heimat creation and perception.

**Social action – building own social space**

For Sarah, social connections eventually moved her from an outsider position to that of an insider as her growing confidence helped her forge friendships with English speakers. By the time Sarah formed mature relationships, she had created her own social space, with social bonds in her age group being predominantly with English speakers. At the time of this study, she was embedded in a well-developed social network that included a solid personal support network. Her parents’ support aside, her mutual support network developed through study, work and socializing as well as through her marriage, and reinforcement through common experiences. Such networks were mirrored in the experiences of other G2 participants.

As a significant consequence of immigration and social integration, and with far-reaching emanations, all G2 participants entered into long-term intercultural personal relationships, which strengthened their sense of belonging to place and social space. These relationships were de-facto at first. A de-facto relationship is a “relationship between two persons who live together as a couple who are not married to each other” (Cabinet Policy Committee 2003). With the exception of Heinz, G2 participants then married their partner in secular ceremonies. Most G2 participants were Catholics (n=5) through baptism – which is linked to their places of origin where Catholicism was the prevailing religion – but did not usually go to church, or had not been inaugurated into any religious assembly (n=2). G2 narrative accounts suggested that religion did not play a role in partner choice, which was emotion-guided and facilitated by social aspects of New Zealand society. That is, intercultural
marriages and de-facto relationships are very common in New Zealand (Callister 2003; Woodfield, Simpson, Seber & McInerney 1986).

Table 2.2—4: G2 participants’ partners: reported ethnicity, language, education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant / Family / education / No. of children / status</th>
<th>Partners’ ethnic self-identification (based on father / mother)</th>
<th>Language (if bilingual, stronger language listed first)</th>
<th>Partner’s educational background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa / A / trade / 2 married</td>
<td>Pākehā*</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>no tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias / A / trade incomplete / 3 / married</td>
<td>Pākehā / Māori*</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>no tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz / B / tertiary / 2 / de-facto separated</td>
<td>Filipina (G1)</td>
<td>Tagalog &amp; English</td>
<td>no tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna / B / university degrees / 2 / divorced</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>university degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert / B / university degrees / 3 / married</td>
<td>German (G1) / Indian (G2)</td>
<td>English &amp; German</td>
<td>tertiary, not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah / C / university degree / 4 / married</td>
<td>English (G1)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>university degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie / C / university degree / 3 / married</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>trade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time of this study, five of the participants were married, one was divorced, and one was separated. Anna had custody over the children but Heinz did not. Even though Heinz expressed hope that his partner and children would return to New Zealand soon, not having custody and spatial remoteness from his children loosened their ties. Two of the four university-educated G2 participants had a university-educated spouse.

Exemplifying tensions embedded in the concept of ethnicity, G2 participants’ emotional and cognitive place attachment and commitment to social spaces changed over time as expressed through their self-identifications. For example, having discarded cultural identifiers such as their surname and despite holding German passports, Sarah and Connie
no longer claimed German identity. “ich sag niemand dass ich Deutsche bin. ich sag höchstens meine Eltern sind Deutsche” [I tell no-one that I am German. at best I say my parents are German] (Sarah). For Sarah, this distancing is connected to her experience of exclusion: “Deutsche sin hier Aussenseiter” [Germans are outsiders here]. The Austrians, on the other hand, identified as Austrians and as New Zealanders although their concepts of Heimat differed. Apart from cooking traditional food at times, Heinz and Lisa distanced themselves from Austrian cultural practices: “der ganze östreichische Schaass kammer gstoßn blabn” [to hell with all that Austrian shit] (Heinz). For Heinz, this included his Austrian passport, which he relinquished for New Zealand citizenship.

Matthias presented conflicted affinities. He identified so strongly as Austrian that he had the Austrian eagle emblem tattooed on his arm. Matthias has dual citizenship and felt he “definitely” was also a New Zealander, getting annoyed at ‘Born Here’ T-shirts, which he was tempted to counter with a ‘Moved Here’ label. Yet, he explains: “I miss a lot of things. I miss the mountains and the snow and the culture and the way people interact you know. everything. beer fest and the FOOD. mushroom picking and things like that. things you can’t do here”. By saying ‘you know’ Matthias defined me, the researcher, as insider who understands what he means. Here, Matthias expressed his longing for landscapes, social interactions with people whose culture he identifies with, and cultural practices that are directly connected with landscapes and seasons (mushroom picking), traditions (beer fest) and food. Specific favorite foods seemed the most retained connection to their original culture for all G2 participants. In sum, G2 identifications changed over time, with some identifications showing strong emotional components that can be seen as conflicting place attachments.

Social action – G2 building own place

G2 individuals assigned meanings to place, their processes related to place, and the physical and social aspects of their place. These intersect in G2’s complex social action of building their place. Although G2 participants appreciated New Zealand’s landscapes and most chose to live on outskirts of a town or city or in rural-residential areas, these land- and seascapes appeared to be taken for granted and did not evoke the strong admiration as in G1 participants. The semiotic cycles intersecting in G2’s complex social action of building their own place as part of their Heimat creation are outlined in Figure 2.2–14 below.
Figure 2.2–14 indicates the difficulties of separating semiotic cycles intersecting in social actions that Scollon and Scollon (2004) point out. The spatial dimensions of participants' own place increased from the dwelling and the land it was built on, to the neighborhood and to the wider urban or rural area. Whilst this is not a consequence of migration per se but rather relates to generally finding a home, the particular location with its specific material and social environment was. For instance, Connie and her husband first bought an old bungalow on a big section next to an Auckland seaside park with the intention of making it their permanent home. They renovated the building and redesigned the garden. Yet, the neighborhood chosen for its physical landscapes turned out to have unpleasant social aspects, which tied in with Pearson, Griffin, Davies and Kingham's (2012) statement that neighborhood social conditions can escalate stress. Not only did these conditions impact on sleep patterns (drunks), finances (theft) and general wellbeing through increased stress, but also on considerations of neighborhood suitability for their children. Connie and her husband sold and relocated to a more inner-city, middle-class suburb. This can be considered a consequence of living in New Zealand because in comparison, house purchases in Germany are much more long-term and therefore perhaps more considered. This long-term ownership applies not least because capital gains tax is due if one sells within ten years and makes a profit. New Zealand does not have any capital gains tax and many owners sell real estate for tax-free gains.

With the exception of Heinz, G2 participants had built or bought at least two different dwellings with their partners. Pointing to different cultural practices that he could not cope with the exception of Heinz, G2 participants had built or bought at least two different dwellings with their partners. Pointing to different cultural practices that he could not cope
with, Heinz explained that he moved out of the family home because his partner’s mother and other family members lived with them but did not contribute to household costs or chores.

Because urban boundaries are more limited in Europe than they are in New Zealand, greenbelt lifestyle-block choices can be considered consequences of migration. All G2 participants, with the exception of Connie and Heinz who preferred the city, lived in greenbelts at the outskirts of cities or towns. Lisa and her husband had moved from their first home into their newly built home on 5 acres subdivided from Max and Gabi’s block. Reminiscent of more European dwelling practices, Lisa and Connie considered their second and current home permanent and a core component of their Heimat (”na i zia no I won’t move again” Lisa; “mindestens für die nächsten zehn oder fünfzehn Jahre” [at least for the next 10 or 15 years] Connie).

The diverging attributes of Sarah’s place as family home and investment conflicted. Sarah felt at home in the Christchurch region but having lived on three different lifestyle blocks in the same area for the past 12 years, Sarah said they would probably move again within the next three years: “Andrew is halt a developer”. The term ‘halt’ here has the meaning of ‘eben’, translated best as ‘that’s just the way it is’ and, coupled with her tone of voice, expressed resignation about this focus on property development, which was encouraged by the absence of capital gains tax. Sarah and her husband designed each of their dwellings around their growing family’s needs but Sarah’s resignation related to starting again every time they built anew, which was a consequence of New Zealand tax laws and therefore a consequence of migration.

For Anna, one consequence of her and her parents’ immigration was the possibility to pool resources with her parents for their current family home. Investment also played a role, as did closeness to school and the ocean. The section overlooking a marina can perhaps be subdivided in the future and Anna and her parents expected to clear the mortgage from selling the subdivided portion of the section. I formed the impression that for Anna the advantages of living with her parents, such as the parents looking after her children while she worked and her mother doing most household chores, were not only paid for in financial terms through her servicing the mortgage on their shared home but also by a loss of her individual space. Any male friends, for example, underwent intense scrutiny by her mother in particular. Yet in contrast to her brother, Anna remains committed to living with parents and children.

Social action – having children

By the end of this study, G2 participants had 19 children aged 2–14 years and all agreed that having children had fundamentally changed their lives. Arguably, having children increases happiness and life satisfaction (Angeles 2010). Having children in New Zealand (and Australia) clearly was a consequence of immigration and can be seen as societal
integration. Yet, bringing up children in intercultural relationships might be fraught with difficulties due to culturally different understandings of childrearing (Cools 2009; Schäfer 2010). Participants reported no such difficulties and none could be observed that could be categorized as problems of intercultural relationships. Rather, my observations detected no other challenges of parenthood than those I have experienced or observed in other, intracultural relationships. This might indicate cultural closeness through earlier G2 adaptation processes, leading to the partners’ shared educational concepts and practices. And whilst G2 parents differed in tolerance to certain child behaviors, observation of the participants’ interactions with their children and partners did not show dissimilar child-rearing practices from those I have been familiar with in Europe. One migration consequence resulting from an intercultural relationship was that for an extended time during this study, Heinz’ children left New Zealand for Australia with their mother, which left him only with Skype video contact to his children for over a year while he stayed in New Zealand. This was a consequence of migration and family status in that in this de-facto relationship the mother had custody and New Zealand citizenship, which allowed her to take the children to Australia. Whilst such international moves have been well documented as problematic in case an intercultural relationship fails (Hegar & Greif 1994), participants whose relationship was intact or who had sole custody did not consider this a problem.

Figure 2.2—15: G2 – Semiotic cycles involved in having children

Obviously, Figure 2.2–15 is not a complete reflection of the semiotic ecosystem involved in having children. It reflects points raised in narrative accounts and evident in observations. G2 participants noted that having children in intercultural relationships probably brought similar problems to those in same-culture relationships. Their narrative accounts suggested that they and their partners shared responsibilities and applied similar cultural tools in childrearing. In parental practices, G2 participants’ own childhood experiences were
disregarded at times ("des war damals. wir machen des anders" [that was then. we do that differently] Connie; "jo mei so mochens halt die Mama und der Papa" [oh well that's how Mama and Papa do it] Lisa). With the exception of Sarah, male and female G2 participants were working fulltime when data was collected. Robert’s wife was a stay-at-home mother since their twins were born, and Matthias’ wife worked part-time. Such arrangements impact child contact times, which is important when considering language transference, for example. This is considered separately below.

**People involved in childrearing**

Consequences of immigration included G2 nurturing their children in a social environment that differed from the social environment of G1 and G2 experiences. Giving birth in New Zealand meant social and institutional inclusion into the New Zealand society for their children from birth. Plunket\(^{107}\), an organization looking after children from birth to age five, is one example of integration assistance. For Sarah, coffee groups organized by this institution helped her find friends among other mothers. The reduced income during maternity leave resulted in most mothers returning to work 6 months after giving birth. Lisa returned to paid work even earlier, although for different reasons as she was employed by her parents and shared childcare and business tasks with her mother. Matthias and his wife, and Connie and her husband sent their children to daycare from the age of 6 months so the mothers could return to paid work. Different from her sister but like their mother, Sarah stayed at home with her children, working at first from home and giving up paid employment with her fourth child. All couples sent their 3- to 5-year olds to kindergarten. As this German loanword indicates, kindergarten originated in German-speaking Europe. This overlap of cultures and the resulting familiarity with New Zealand pre-school options could be seen as a positive consequence of migration.

Lisa and her husband, and Anna sent their children to private schools, which can be seen as consequence of their immigration. That is, they had moved to the same area, knew and could confer with each other about these choices for their children. Rather than on religious considerations, their choices of a private Christian school were based on judgments of hearsay education quality and social class as they considered education there superior to state schools. Once they had made the choice to send their children to the same private primary school, they were conditioned to continue with private high schools, even though the children went on to different private high schools. This was made possible because there were several private schools in the vicinity where they lived. This is different to Austria and Germany, where private schools are marginal phenomena. What strikes me as a typical (English) New Zealand attitude is that the school one goes to is important and leads to ‘old-boys’ networks. Sending children to private schools can therefore be considered deliberate assimilation into a specific section of New Zealand middle class.

\(^{107}\) See [http://www.plunket.org.nz](http://www.plunket.org.nz)
G1 participants were involved with G2 participants’ children, which could suggest continuation of original cultural practices across the generations. Of all the grandparents, Lukas and Sophie were most involved as they lived under one roof and cared for Anna’s children every day when she worked. Max and Gabi, who live next door to Lisa and her family, had their grandchildren at many occasions stay for the day and over night. For example, they would pick up Lisa’s children from school and ferry them to leisure activities but this became less frequent with the children’s increasing age and independence. Gundi was called upon to care for the grandchildren one day a week or when the children became sick. Occasional observations over approximately two years showed that certain cultural practices were passed on whereas other practices might have been too similar to distinguish. One small yet visible example of an original cultural practice being passed on by Sophie, for instance, was the ‘continental’ method of knitting, which differs from the English knitting practice common in New Zealand\textsuperscript{108}.

When looking at the cycle indicating all the people involved in the complex action of rearing children (Figure 2.2 –15, above), different perspectives do not come as a surprise. For example, some G1 participants did not agree with child-rearing practices leading to G3 behavior. Subjective perceptions of cross-cultural differences might have deepened intergenerational disagreements (“ganz wie der Vadder. immer bloss am Computer. typisch Kiwi” [just like the father. always only at the computer. typically Kiwi] Gabi). This points to the complexities and tensions involved when grandparents are contributing to childcare: “beim daddy do dürfns des natürlich” [of course they are allowed to do that at daddy’s] (Sophie). Despite the generalizing national (Kiwi) attribution of behavior, which indicates G1 otherness positioning, these different perspectives can be seen as generational rather than intercultural. Nevertheless, subjective perceptions of cultural differences arguably are consequences of immigration. Objectively, language use was the most clearly evident consequence of immigration.

**Language use – G2**

Scollon (1998; 1999) categorizes the relationships between language, people, objects and space as mediated discourse; and social interaction in the sense of discourse as co-constructed language use is a core focus of NA. Language use informs not only about a linguistic community of practice and the actors’ social belonging and identification, but also about society’s expectations. Immigration from German-speaking Europe to New Zealand involves moving from one linguistic community of practice into another. Therefore, language use predictably stood out as a major theme in G2 participants’ narrative accounts as well as in observations.

\textsuperscript{108} See \url{http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_Iu_6gxt7t0} for differences between continental and English methods.
German – English: during settlement

For G2 participants, language use and language attitudes as consequences of their immigration evolved from their English language skills acquired before arrival, from their settlement and education experiences, and from their professional and social involvement in New Zealand society.

English is a compulsory school subject in Austrian and German\textsuperscript{109} schools, starting from age 9 to 10. Therefore, at the time of their immigration to New Zealand, G2 participants were bilingual in German and English, even though their skill levels depended on their ages and attitudes to English, and perhaps on their agency and resulting attitudes to migration. Some were multilingual by choice (Anna: German, English, Arabic) or through the circumstances of their living environments (Sarah: German, English, French). The exception was 5-year-old Connie, whose English production was limited to some words although she understood simple exchanges.

The G2 participants aged 16 and over at immigration had extended compulsory and in Anna’s case further optional English language training (translation & interpreting studies) prior to immigration. They reported no language problems in their new English-speaking environment.

As a consequence of immigration, however, language became a problem for the younger G2 participants in several respects. As noted above, their German language functioned as a marker of exclusion leading to discrimination during settlement. Their English skills and attitudes at arrival varied and in the first years they had to work hard to adapt to English as the only language of instruction. Both Lisa and Matthias had “hated” English as a subject in Austria and had bad grades. Such attitude and skill levels in combination with being coaxed into an English linguistic community probably did not help their adaptation to English as language of instruction. Their failure to express themselves satisfactorily in English kept impeding their schoolwork: “I konnt mi zwar vorstölln wie I hass und so. oba wia solln I DES schreibn?” [I mean I could introduce myself say my name and so. but how should I write THAT?] (Matthias). His frustration was still evident in his tone of voice when narrating this experience with English composition.

Lisa was able to rely on Sarah for interpretation so she could at least understand what was required of her. Only in New Zealand was Sarah made aware of monolingualism and the outsider position this put her in: “das war das ERSTE Mal dass mir bewusst wurde dass alle NUR englisch sprechn” [that was the FIRST time that I realized that everyone ONLY speaks English]. One could consider this consequence of migration her realization of a

\textsuperscript{109} This applies to the former Federal Republic of Germany and to today's united Germany, whereas Russian was compulsory in the former German Democratic Republic (personal communication).
more narrow world perspective. She found understanding teachers and academic texts “anfangs UNHEIMLICH schwer. ich musst ANDAUERND im Wörterbuch nachschauen” [INCREDIBLY difficult at first. I ALWAYS had to check in the dictionary] even though English had been a normal part of her life in the multilingual communities she had lived in for 12 years. Connie, who entered school almost immediately after arriving in New Zealand at age 5, could not recall language problems but her sister and mother reported that they were called on to assist in situations of communication breakdown.

G2 – Language: Attitudes, identifications and language use over time

By the time of this study, G2 participants had completely assimilated into the English-speaking environment. All voiced a positive attitude to English and all but Matthias reported feeling fully comfortable and competent speaking English with anyone in any situation. He said that even though he felt confident when speaking English with people close to him, after more than 25 years he still felt too self-conscious to fully contribute his views in conversations. He felt that it still took him too much time to think about what people were actually saying. These problems escalated when he felt tired. Yet, having observed him in various interactions and at various occasions including late-night sessions, I could not find any evidence of hesitations or lack of contributions to conversation.

More or less strong accents were evident in G2 English speech. An Austrian accent was prominent in Lisa’s English, detectable in Anna’s speech, and to a lesser degree in Anna’s brothers’ pronunciation. Lisa linked her Austrian accent to not having a musical ear, but she was not concerned about it. Her brother’s English, on the other hand, displayed only the slightest hint of English not being his first language. That is, over several hours, I noticed only twice that he confused /θ/ and /z/. Other than that, he sounded like an educated Aucklander.110 Connie’s accent was not discernible from an educated Aucklander’s English, and Sarah spoke ‘BBC English’ (Roach 2004) like her partner of 18 years.

There were consequences of immigration for G2’s German language. One was uneasiness about competence. German language weaknesses were Connie’s reason for avoidance of identification as German: “weil wenn ich sag ich bin deutsch und red mit Deutschn und mach Fehler des is so embarrassing” [because if I say I’m German and speak with Germans and make mistakes that is so embarrassing]. By the time of this study, English had become the most used language of daily life for all G2 participants both in- and outside their homes. G2 participants who were under 16 at the time of immigration also commented about their lack of German language development since that age (e.g., “ich hab ja mein Deutsch nicht mehr weiter entwickelt” [I haven’t developed my German any further] Sarah;

---

“I missed a whole section of language between 13 and now” Matthias; “mir fehln die Wörter” [I don’t know the words] Connie. Connie’s stance seemed justified by indicators that English was her stronger language. One is the lack of key terms as indicated in codeswitching (embarrassing) when she could not replace with a German term when asked. The other is grammatical, for instance, the use of the adjective ‘deutsch’ instead of the noun ‘Deutsche’ (female form). Weaknesses included indications of predominant English thought processes. Examples were literal but inappropriate German translations whilst using the correct German syllable order as in ‘einschlafen’ [which means fall asleep] for her intended meaning ‘ausschlafen’ [sleep in]: “kömmer des n ander Mal machn weil ich mal einschlafn möcht” [can we do this another time because for once I’d like to fall asleep]. Matthias’ German, on the other hand, flew effortlessly in casual conversation. It rarely was interspersed with English terms. He came across as a native German and as a native-like English speaker. Yet, feeling that he had not fully developed his German and feeling deficient as a member of an English-speaking group left him in a psychological quandary.

G2 reports and observation during the course of this study demonstrate that more than 25 years after immigrating, English had become G2’s dominant language. They read German only occasionally and rarely wrote German (only in mail/email to parents, or to family in Europe). Figure 2.2–16 illustrates their use of oral English and German as observed during this study.
G2 learned very adaptive ways of language processing as a consequence of early bilingualism and of migration. These acquired communication flexibility processes relate to complex neurolinguistic joint activations of the two languages for bilinguals (Bialystok 2011) that appeared to diminish for some over the decades in New Zealand. For example, G2 reported speaking German without codeswitching ("jednfalls probier i’s" [at least I try it] Lisa) only with monolingual German-speaking visitors; and observation during such occasions showed searching for German terms (e.g., "wie sagt man d... gleich wieder auf deutsch?" [how does one say that again in German?] Anna). When speaking with G1, G2 participants would speak German but frequently insert English key words (e.g., Connie: "sollens ihre scooters mitbringen?" [should they bring their scooters?], "und dann haste keine uniformity, weisste wie’s ausschaut in den stores" [and then you have no uniformity, you know what it looks like in the stores]; Lisa: "aber es war auch net mehr priority" [but it no longer was priority], "dass mer messages und so schreiben" [that we write messages and so]) or modify English words with German suffixes (Sarah: "hast du’s schon geordert?" [have you ordered it yet?]). Here, the English verb ‘order’ replaces the German ‘bestellt’, but is completed with the common German past-participle affixes ge- and -t (as in getönt) from tönen [sound; color hair with semi-permanent dye].

Whilst speaking principally German with G1, G2 would use English frequently with their siblings ("wenn i die text dann nur in englisch" [when I text them then only in English])
Heinz). Like the adjective ‘gestresst’ in point 6 of the extract below, ‘text’ as a verb has become common in German (base form: texten). One could argue that G2’s habit of speaking English with their siblings and their frequent mixing of languages somewhat dissolved the boundaries between their languages as in the following extract from one of Sarah (S) and Connie’s (C) interactions, during which their mother (G) phones and Connie’s husband Tom (T) enters the room:

1) C (to S) do we have to get Coke? they won’t sleep
2) S (to C) no we can choose what to get
3) C so can we get Sprite? that’s just sugar (laughs)
4) T (phone rings) is that your mother’s phone?
5) S (answers phone) hello? oh hallo.. ja.. wir sind jetzt bei Pizza ordern.. ja aber es hat n bisschen lang gedauert [I think so I don’t know. where’s the phone?]
6) S (answering on the phone with G) ich glaub schon ich weiss nich. wo ist das Telefon? [hello? oh hello.. yes.. we’re just ordering pizza.. yes but it took a little long]
7) S (speaking on the phone to G) ne ich mein des facial hat n bisschen lang gedauert ja. ne es war gut aber es die Frau war alleine und war n bisschen gestresst .. ja ja aber es war ok [to G on the phone] no I mean the facial took a bit long yes. no it was good but the woman was alone and was a bit stressed .. yes yes but it was ok]
8) C krieg ein garlic [get a garlic]
9) S (to G) mh ja. ach ne ganz gut. hat Spass gemacht. war sehr relaxing bis auf den aftershock gell Connie? (laughs) [mh yes. no quite good. was fun. was very relaxing except for the aftershock don’t you think Connie?]
10) C (to S) des war eigentlich sehr ruhig (laughs) [actually that was very quiet]
11) S (to G) aber es war sehr ruhig. war nur ein kleiner Roller (laughs) [but it was very quiet. was only a small roller]

In lines 1 to 3 of this extract, the sisters speak English with each other. Then, in 5, Sarah answers Tom in German. Tom understands but does not speak German. Perhaps Sarah’s switch from English to German was triggered by the distinctive ring tone of her mother’s call or by Tom mentioning her mother, who Sarah tends to speak German with. When asked, she could not determine the reason. On the phone, Sarah first answers with English ‘hello’ followed by German ‘hallo’ when realizing she is talking to her mother. She then speaks German interspersed with English key terms that are either modified with a German ending (underlined in 6 above), or are left unchanged (underlined in 7, 9 & 11). In 11, her pronunciation of ‘Roller’ is German /rolə/, not English /rələ/. The German term translates as ‘scooter’, or – much less common – ‘rolling breaker’. Though Sarah said she used the English term, the German term could be used for a rolling earth tremor although then ‘ein Rollen’ would be more likely. In lines 10 and 11, a certain ‘infectiousness’ of terms is indicated as Sarah repeats ‘ruhig’ used by Connie whilst in German one would probably rather use ‘schwach’ or ‘klein’ [slight or small] instead of ‘ruhig’ [quiet] to describe the weak aftershock. Connie also mixes languages (underlined in 8). Speaking English with each other and using English key terms in German indicate that English had become the sisters’ dominant language, with German translations not always optimal.
G2 – language use in their family home

One consequence of migration for G2 was that German-language transmission to G3 was abandoned. As Anna said, she had spoken only English with her husband and continued to do so when the children were born. This time together before G2 had children, with English as the couples’ only language, played a significant role in the awkwardness that G2 felt in speaking German with their children: “ich hab’s versucht aber es war irgendwie wie schizophren mit die Kinder eine Sprache und mit Andrew ne andre” [I've tried but it was somehow like schizophrenic one language with the children and another with Andrew] (Sarah); “irgendwia komm i mer a blöd vor. und mit deutsch do muasst a Disziplinregime hobn” [somehow I also feel stupid. and with German you must have a discipline regime] (Matthias). Robert, on the other hand, claimed to speak solely German with his children.

Institutional environments in society also played a role in G2 family language choice. Lisa’s example of abandoning German, “wia der Christian in Kindergarten ganga is und mir auf englisch ganswerdet hod, hob i’s aufgeben” [when Christian went to kindergarten and answered me in English, I gave it up] also applied to Anna, Sarah and Connie’s interactions with their oldest children whilst Heinz had always spoken English with his sons. German children’s books still were on bookshelves in some households, but since the younger children asked to have them read in English instead of German, the books “really just gather dust” (Connie).

Summary

As this section shows, G2’s New Zealand Heimat creation meant assimilation into the receiving society culture. Over time, G2’s social environments and institutional environments, including their intercultural marriages played a major role in this assimilation. As part of this acculturative shift, English became G2’s dominant language and for most was the only language they used in their own homes, which impacted on their children. In the following, I explain the consequences of their families’ migration on G3.
Consequences of immigration – G3 Heimat creation

One corollary of the MDS principle of social action is that social actors claim identities in interactions by positioning themselves in relation to others (Scollon 2001b). As a consequence of immigration and their parents’ resultant social networks and intercultural marriages, G3 members were born into cultural domains different from those of their elders’ childhoods. Domains refer to institutional spheres, such as family, home, school and neighborhood (Clyne 2003). The most prominent nexus during observations (as indicated in the order of embodied experiences, i.e., historical bodies in Figure 2.2–17) evolving from these consequences was that English was the dominant or only home language for G3 participants. Home language refers to the language that parents speak with their children from birth. Growing up with the same language as those in the mainstream of the society they were born into positioned G3 participants as insiders. Those who were old enough to understand identified as New Zealanders.

Figure 2.2—17: Mapping G3’s semiotic ecosystem of New Zealand Heimat creation

During the time of data collection, the three Australian G3 participants appeared too young to demonstrate understanding.
Language – learning and usage

Language is central in children’s social lives, with acquisition resulting from social interactions, which convey conventions, attitudes and worldviews (Clark 2009). These cultural fundamentals involved in the nexus of language learning and usage indicate the importance of G3 participants’ ages, life stages and social domains (Table 2.2–5) in focusing on language in their Heimat creation. G3 had not experienced living in a German-speaking society and with the exception of Anna’s children they had not visited German-speaking Europe.

Table 2.2—5: G3 participants’ life stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G2 parent (Family A, B, C)</th>
<th>G3 born during this study</th>
<th>G3 started talking during study</th>
<th>G3 daycare or kindergarten</th>
<th>G3 primary school</th>
<th>G3 started intermediate / high school</th>
<th>G3 (approx. age at end of data collection)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Christian (~ 15) Maya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias (A)</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>Tristan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leon (~ 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alfons</td>
<td>Konrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alfons (~ 6) Konrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Andreas</td>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andreas (~ 15) Natalie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert (B)</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td></td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Thomas (~ 5) Georg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah (C)</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Julian</td>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>Julian (~ 9) Ben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie (C)</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Bella (~ 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three youngest G3 members stayed at home with their mothers, who spoke English with them. The other children were in daycare and kindergarten (Ryan, full-time from 6 months; Leon, Tristan, Tina, all part-time) and school (Monday – Friday, 9am – 3pm).
G3 – language in interaction domains

English was the medium of communication in daycare, kindergarten and school, although Māori language and cultural performances are also included in New Zealand school curricula. Two G3 participants had started learning German as a school subject at high school (Christian, 14, correspondence course) and in private primary school (Angela, 5). At completion of my data collection, Christian had just received his first lesson. English was the medium of communication in the children’s after-school activities such as sports or music. Privately organized German playgroups were not utilized due to parents’ work commitments and distances from home, lack of interest, or G3 resistance (“I’m not going back there, it’s like school but I don’t even understand what they’re saying” David, 7). English was the language of communication in the neighborhoods in which G2 and G3 lived, although other German-speaking immigrants lived in close proximity to Connie’s family, for instance. I observed G3 participants speaking only English with playmates and peers including the peers with German heritage language.

Figure 2.2—18: G3 - observed language production

---

113 The numbers indicate participants’ age at the time of the relevant recordings/observations.
With the exception of food items, address terms, and certain cultural aspects kept by their grandparents, G3 participants were fully immersed in a New Zealand cultural environment. One consequence of G1 migration was G3’s ongoing interaction with G1 participants, who made some efforts to teach German to G3. G2 made more ambivalent and fleeting efforts to teach German to G3 to keep connected with G1.

During several observations spanning over two years, there was no unprompted G3 German language production apart from addressing parents and grandparents, key food terms, and occasional song fragments ("oh Tannenbaum oh Tannenbaum" [oh Christmas tree] David, 6½ and 8). This song in particular demonstrated a change from German cultural tools to – in this case – American cultural tools: in an early observation, David sang parts of this Christmas song in German with the help of a CD ("oh Tannenbaum oh Tannenbaum wie grün sind deine Blätter" [oh Christmas tree how green are your leaves])\textsuperscript{114}). The song carries a message of dependability and loyalty. In a later observation it became the ‘Snoopy versus the Red Baron’ song\textsuperscript{115}. The Snoopy song on a CD was preceded by sounds of exploding bombs and included the message that WWI fighting was stopped for Christmas. It was proudly performed for the researcher including the explosion sounds. It did not seem that at the age of eight the message of war between his ancestors (of which he had heard) affected the boy’s excitement about and performance of explosion sounds and dance rhythms to the song. Although there were exceptions (Christian’s recital of numbers, below), G3’s phonological representation of German terms was that of native speakers, including their (grand-)parents’ dialect peculiarities. For example:

\begin{quote}
I love Apfstrudl [apple strudel], actually all Kuchen [cakes], and I like Fritatnsuppe [pancake soup: thinly cut pancake in clear broth] and Schnitzl and Frankfurter (Andreas, 13½)

Oma could I have a Butterbrezn [buttered pretzel] (Maya, 9)

Mama can we have Kässpätzle [cheese spaetzle/noodles] for dinner please? (Felix, 11).
\end{quote}

Apart from yielding platitudes such as, “Oma always says Hände waschen nicht vergessen” [don’t forget washing hands] (Maya, 10) and “she also says, Butterbrot macht Wangen rot” [literally: buttered bread gives red cheeks; i.e., it is wholesome and healthy] (Christian, 13), my attempts of eliciting German were unsuccessful: “I understand but I don’t like speaking it” (Andreas, 13½). This might reflect that children do not want to be different from their peers. And, “when Opa and Oma talk in German I understand a bit. but I can’t express myself in German” (Christian, 14). Other G3 children also understood as 2-year-old Harry signals:

\begin{quote}

\textsuperscript{114}https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bPvONIP9_iO
\textsuperscript{115}http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sh-J4GSPgAM Red Baron = Manfred von Richthofen, WWI German imperial fighter pilot (see http://history1900s.about.com/od/1910s/a/redbaron.htm)
Gabi: hast du gut geschlafen? [did you sleep well?]
Harry: yes

Some German language production emerged as younger children reproduced terms they heard. Here is an interaction between Bella (5), Ryan (2) and their grandmother at the zoo.

Child interlanguage sounds representing words/expressions are in phonetic symbols:

1. Gundi: wartet auf Oma  
   [wait for nana] (both children stop and wait)
2. guckt mal da is die Giraffe. guck Ryan! die Giraffe  
   [look there's the giraffe. look Ryan! the giraffe]
3. Bella: guck Ryan! die Giraffe  
   [look Ryan! the giraffe]
4. Ryan: /iː/ Oma (excitedly pointing)
5. Gundi: ja. schau die blaue Zunge an. wie lang die is. guck Ryan eine lange blaue Zunge  
   [look at the blue tongue. how long it is. look Ryan a long blue tongue]
6. Bella: guck Ryan lange blaue Zunge  
   [look Ryan long blue tongue]
7. Gundi: was macht denn die Giraffe da?  
   [what is the giraffe doing there?]
8. Bella: she’s eating leaves
9. Ryan: Oma /ɪ/ eat dinner! bottle sit eat dinner (searching for his water bottle; then climbing into his pram)
10. Gundi: OK magst a Sandwich?  
    [would you like a sandwich?]  
11. Ryan: sandwich pease ('l' in please not articulated; nodding, stretching out his hand to take his sandwich)
12. Bella: me too please
13. Gundi: (to Bella) setz mer uns da vorn hin  
    [let’s sit over there]
14. Bella: OK (walking ahead towards the tables and chairs)

Gundi’s call (line 1) achieved the desired result as the children stopped and waited for her, so it can be assumed that they understood at least the combination of words and tone of voice in relation to the increasing distance from their grandmother. In line 3, Bella slowly and carefully repeated the German utterance, addressing her brother. Arguably, the fairly similar sounds in ‘guck’ (/ɡʊk/) and ‘look’ (/lʊk/), ‘Giraffe’ (/ɡɪˈrɑːfə/) and ‘giraffe’ (/dʒɪˈrɑːfə/) in combination with Gundi’s pointing gesture and the presence of the animal helped comprehension and production. In comparison, the utterance in line 6 was more difficult, showing Bella’s ability and willingness to acquire German, as did Ryan’s utterance in line 4, which repeated part of the word /ɡɪˈrɑːfə/ in combination of excitement sounds (oh /iː/) and gesture. In answering, Bella showed that she understood the German utterance (lines 8 & 14). Although Gundi reported looking after Bella and Ryan one day a week and both children occasionally parroted some German words immediately after hearing them, they did not reproduce German terms spontaneously during other observations with few exceptions, for example:
Gundi: (to Ryan, 2 ½, eating) *gell des is lecker*
[that's delicious isn't it]
Ryan: (nodding and licking his fingers) *ja* [yes]
Tom: yes
Ryan: yes

Ryan's father Tom confirmed that he corrected Ryan because he wanted him to use *yes* instead of yeah *jɛəә*. This indicates a confusing language situation and might also point to differences in opinion about monolingual or bilingual upbringing. Ryan's readiness to learn from his father's modeling also shows the importance of continuing language input at this early age.

My observations and the following G2/G1 comments indicate that with progressing G3 ages, English displaced German language input as well as the occasional German G3 language production:

*so viel wie die Mama denkt verstehns net*
[they don't understand as much as mum thinks] (Lisa)

*i red englisch mit eana weils mi ja sonst net verstehn*
[I speak English with them because otherwise they don’t understand me] (Matthias)

*da hat sich der David umdreht und hat glacht und sagt ‘I have no idea what you just said’. mei. dann red i halt englisch*
[then David turned around and laughed and says 'I have … said'. well. then I simply speak English] (Gundi)

*antwortn duan’s ollwei in englisch*
[they always answer in English] (Lukas)

These conversations indicate the different roles of G1 and G2 in the change of languages. G1 expressed a certain resignation in the light of G3’s change to being monolingual English speakers despite the German language input they offered. In contrast, Anna reported that her children understood German well, offering Andreas laughing about a joke made in German as evidence. The following extract exemplifies that Andreas (at age 14) understood indeed. It also confirms Lukas’ comment (above) about G3 answering in English and seems to underpin Andreas’ earlier comment about his language preferences:

Researcher: (to Andreas and Christian sitting side by side with a laptop each) *was spielt ihr denn da?*
[what are you playing there?]
Andreas: it’s called Minecraft
Researcher: *spielt ihr miteinander oder gegeneinander?*
[do you play with or against one another?]
Andreas: with each other ‘cau'cause you have to cooperate to complete the task

Asked by his grandmother to demonstrate his German language skills to the researcher, Christian recited numbers he had just learned in his German course. His pronunciation was that of an English speaker learning German (e.g., *zwei* /tsvai/ [two] pronounced as /zwai/).
The following excerpt reflects attempts to elicit natural German from G3. The next excerpt is from a conversation at Max and Gabi's place, where the grandchildren stayed for some days.

1) Researcher: (Maya sits at the table with her head in her hands) 
   hast Kopfweg Maya? 
   [do you have a headache?]

2) Maya: what?

3) Researcher: d'you have a headache?

4) Maya: no I'm tired  ...

5) Gabi: und heute? was host heut gemacht? 
   [and today? what did you do today?]

6) Maya: I went to the stables

7) Researcher: und bist auch gerittin? 
   [and did you (go for a) ride too?]

8) Maya: pardon?

9) Researcher: warst auch reitn? 
   [did you go for a ride too?]

10) Maya: yes

11) Gabi: was host du gemacht Christian? 
    [what did you do?] 

12) Christian: long-boarding and basketball training

13) Researcher: long-boarding? was isn das? 
    [what's that?]

14) Christian: it's like a long board with wheels and stuff and you go down steep hills on it

15) Gabi: grünen Salat? Maya? 
    [green salad]

16) Maya: nein danke 
    [no thank you]

17) Gabi: Christian Nachspeise. komm 
    [come. dessert]

18) Christian: what?

19) Gabi: na komm her sgibt Nachspeise 
    [do come here there's dessert]

20) Christian: oh I didn't realize. danke 
    [thanks]

21) Researcher: und Sahne? 
    [and cream?]

22) Maya: ja bitte 
    [yes please]

23) Christian: nein danke 
    [no thanks]

24) Gabi: (she suffers some hearing loss) mogst auch a Krem Christian? 
    [would you also like cream?]

25) Christian: nein danke 
    [no thanks]

26) Gabi: (about one extra portion of pudding) tuts euch teiln. ihr könnt es aufteilen 
    [do share it. you can share it]

27) Maya: mhm (proceeds to carefully divide the chocolate pudding into two portions)

Line 3 shows that I switched language as soon as Maya signaled lack of understanding rather than perhaps persisting by repeating my German question. There were a number of cues other than language (e.g., food on the table and offered to G3) to help understanding (lines 15; 19; 21; 24 & 26) demonstrated by responses (lines 16; 20; 22; 23; 25 & 27).
Nevertheless, other familiar phrases were also understood (lines 5; 11 & 13). On the other hand, Maya indicated not understanding key words such as Kopfweh [headache] and geritten (past participle of reiten [ride]) (lines 2 & 8) which she had perhaps heard less frequently as she had taken up riding just some months prior, for example. When the base form reiten was used in rephrasing the question (line 9), Maya understood. This probably was due to the similar pronunciation of reiten (/rɑɪtən/) and riding (/rɑɪdɪŋ/). Christian and Maya's German language production was restricted to politeness phrases ja bitte [yes please], danke [thanks] and nein danke [no thanks]. They do not always apply these formulaic expressions correctly:

Gabi: Christian es is Zeit heimgehn
[Christian it's time to go home]
Christian: nein danke
[no thank you]

Since Christian had started learning German at school to prepare for his trip to Austria with his G2 mother at the end of 2014, it would be interesting to see if these consequences of migration will change the family language dynamics. However, that is outside the time frame for this study.

The exception – family languages English and German

G2 participants reported that their family language with G3 was English. There were two exceptions in family B. Anna lived with her parents Lukas and Sophie and her children. Their family language was a mix of German and English, with Anna speaking German with her parents and English with her children. During several observations, Lukas and Sophie mainly spoke English with their grandchildren even though they claimed mainly speaking German with them. Anna's brother Robert declared he exclusively spoke German with his children whilst his wife spoke English with them, and that he encouraged German friends and their children to speak German with his children. Because Robert and his family lived in Melbourne, I only observed one interaction when they were in New Zealand and some family Skype interactions. The following language uses were typical. For example, "sag der Oma wie deine Brille gebrochen is. was is passiert?" [tell Oma how your glasses broke. what happened?] (Robert). Showing comprehension of the German question as well as her evolving English grammar system, Angela (almost 4 at the time) responded: "I felled over from the car on the tiles".

At another occasion, the 20-months-old twins ate porridge. Answering Robert's repeated, "was esst ihr zum Frühstück? was habt ihr da?" [what are you eating for breakfast? what have you got there?] synchronized with illustrating gestures to their bowls, Thomas eventually uttered /paːwt/ , approximating the pronunciation of porridge. German terms for porridge (Haferbrei, Brei or Müсли) differ, suggesting that Thomas understood the
combination of gesture and German but answered with an evolving English one-word utterance. I could not observe if Robert’s children consistently received one language input from their father and another from their mother or if they could produce any German. Because Robert worked fulltime, it can be assumed that their mother’s language input dominated, which could relate to the English language production illustrated here. At the end of data collection and as a consequence of migration that suggests the wish to continue German as a heritage language, Angela started attending a private bilingual (German and English) school. Whilst beyond the time limits of this study, it would be interesting to see if this will change the patterns of home language.

Dimension one: social actors, meanings and values assigned to place

The second category in the cycle of G3 participants’ historical bodies within the semiotic ecosystem of their New Zealand Heimat creation was place attachment (see Figure 2.2–17 p148). Drawing on Scannell and Gifford’s (2010) three-dimensional place attachment model, I explore the meanings that G3 participants assigned to their places, procedural manifestations of their attachment and the physical and social aspects of their places (see Table 2.2–1, G3 social actions).

As a consequence of migration, G3 understood identity somewhat differently from their peers who have no recent immigrants in the family. For G3, the ‘who are you/who am I’ question offers multiple possibilities as illustrated in the G3 response below. Here is where G2 identity construction plays a role in supporting G3’s place attachment.

G3’s New Zealand Heimat creation started from birth. They never experienced being an outsider in their communities. The older children were aware of their grandparents being immigrants but did not categorize their immigrant parent as such, as David’s (7½) considerations of identities exemplifies:

David: (to his grandfather Axel) you’re German and Oma is German
Axel: your Mama is too
David: no (laughs) Mama isn’t German
Axel: so what’s Mama?
David: she’s a Kiwi
Axel: and you? you’re a Kiwi AND you’re German
David: no I’m a Kiwi and I’m Māori ‘cause Papa is Māori
Axel: aha (laughs)

David’s allocation of German identity to his grandparents whilst considering his mother being a New Zealander and assigning himself the Māori category illustrates awareness of his dual heritage and a shift in meanings assigned to places. This shift is typical for G3

116 Kiwi is a common term for New Zealanders
participants' expressions of belonging. The children, who were old enough to understand their heritage, all assigned Austrian or German identity to their grandparents. In contrast, they saw themselves and their parents as New Zealanders. Even though most G3 participants continued to use German address terms, their European roots faded into the background, with New Zealand considered their parents' and their own Heimat. This and their accent firmly identified them as mainstream society insiders.

Dimension two: processes, affect, cognition and behavior

Scannell and Gifford’s (2010) dimensions of place attachment overlap. For example, David’s explicit identity claims (conversation above) not only assign the meanings and values of Heimat to New Zealand (dimension one), but also are cognitive processes relating to place (dimension two).

David and his mother Connie expressed explicit understanding of New Zealand bicultural / multicultural forces. David’s Kiwi and Māori identity claims mirror common bicultural New Zealand representations. Support for the foregrounding of Māori identity also was evident, for example, in David’s soccer registration, in which Connie answered ‘Māori’ to the ethnicity question (cf. Kukutai 2007). Her argument, “being German is not useful”, echoes G2 avoidance of German identity declarations and underpins the change to G3 local identity claims.

New Zealand identities based on British cultural influences were observable in G3 participants’ actions and practices in a number of ways. For example, school uniforms are rare in Austria and Germany but compulsory in most New Zealand schools. Although these school identities are enforced, wearing the uniforms also claims New Zealand identities. Also, G3 claimed New Zealand identities in school sports (see participant stories p145). For example, physical education includes rugby although young children play it as non-contact sport or touch rugby. Cricket is another case in point. Clearly expressing New Zealand rather than Austrian or German identities, all school-age G3 children could explain cricket rules to me and at the age of 2, Ryan already knew how to set up the wickets. Demonstrating internalization of New Zealand practices through observational learning, he hit his ball into the wickets with his cricket bat, taking his play as seriously as the older children in their teams on the cricket grounds around him. All G3 participants also claimed New Zealand identities in cheering for their local team during international competitions such as the Rugby World Cup. G3 extracurricular activities such as basketball, guitar and piano playing, karate, soccer, and skiing do not claim distinct New Zealand identities in my view, as these are also common activities in German-speaking Europe.

Education was a priority for G3 and all G2 parents expressed plans for their children to study at university or learn a trade that would secure their future. The school children saw going to school as normal as parents going to work although enthusiasm seemed to wax and wane with age (“school is cool” Bella 5½; “well I wouldn’t say that I particularly LIKE
school. my math teacher is terrible” Felix, 10½; “it’s a private school and it’s good but I don’t always like school” Christian, 12; “it’s OK” Andreas, 13) and they preferred certain subjects over others (“I really like math and sciences but I don’t like languages that much” Andreas, 13½). Christian (14), who also liked math, replaced music with German in his second semester at high school because, as his mother said, “he is tone deaf like me and Mama”. Although likes and dislikes seemed reflected in performance through grades and comments received, G3 generally obtained favorable school reports.

Figure 2.2—19: G3 participants in heritage costumes, with Easter eggs

Continuations of original cultural practices into G3 were exceptions. These included that for special events Anna, Robert and Matthias clothed their children in traditional costumes such as Dirndl* and Lederhosen*. Matthias’ oldest described Lederhosen as “cool shorts”. On the other hand, attempts to clothe David and Bella in Lederhosen and Dirndl for Culture Day at school failed as they opted for New Zealand All Blacks and Māori garments instead.

Dimension three: physical and social aspects of place

For G3, the physical and social place aspects of Heimat extended outwards from the spatial and social core of the home they lived in with their parents. As awareness grew of spaces beyond their immediate neighborhood, G3 participants became aware of their extended place connection to New Zealand and only the tweens and teenagers among G3 realized that aspects of Heimat such as citizenship also extended to the countries of origin of their parents and grandparents.

Ryan (2½): (to his grandfather as he leaves his grandparents’ home) Opa come. sleep in my room.
Maya (10):  (asking if she could leave for her parents’ house next door)
Oma can I go home now?

David (7):  (to a classmate at the end of a school day)
are you coming to my house?

Whilst invited to share this spatial center, grandparents and friends were seen as not entirely belonging into this space, but rather into an extension that could be called neighborhood domain. Linking G3’s identity expressions evident in conversations as well as school and sport with identity allocations given to parents and grandparents, spatial dimensions of G3’s Heimat perceptions can be categorized as in Figure 2.2–20:

**Figure 2.2—20: Spatial dimensions of G3 Heimat**

This Figure indicates that the grandparents’ countries of origin were not included in G3’s consideration of Heimat. Similar to their G2 parents, G3 participants identified as New Zealanders. Their grandparents’ countries of origin were given the status of a holiday destination made easy through extended family connections. Christian’s mother Lisa talked about taking the children to Austria around Christmas for sentimental reasons (“I möcht scho nomal noch Österreich mit die Kinder bevor se z old sin mit uns zu fohrn weil weisse Weihnachten des is scho was bsonders” [I’d like to go to Austria again with the children before they’re too old to travel with us because white Christmas that’s something special]. By the end of data collection Christian was nearly 15 and Lisa had firm plans to travel with him to Austria in December 2014 “weil jetzt isser so old wie I wor wemmer nach Neuseeland kommen sin” [because now he is as old as I was when we came to New Zealand]. This rationale suggests a wish for her son to gain insights into liminal cultural experiences somewhat similar to her own youth, albeit in reverse. Yet, Christian appeared to see this opportunity to see his mother’s country of origin purely in terms of landscape and climate suitable for holiday. As Christian and Andreas were friends, this might indicate that Andreas’ descriptions of his Austrian skiing trip inspired Christian’s wish. Asked later why he decided to learn German, Christian reasoned, “so I can talk with the people when we go to Austria”. This suggests that for this G3 participant, the planned reconnection with G1 and G2’s country of origin triggered the choice of German as a second language. It would be
interesting to see if his trip has a lasting impact on his further German language development and motivation but this is outside the time frame of this study.

Security

Due to the young ages of G3, their parents provided security for them. G1 and G2 considered security for G3 in terms of having a safe environment and good future prospects. These aspects included G1 financial support for G2 choices of living and purchasing property in safe neighborhoods. Securing future prospects is evident in G2 sending G3 to schools that were perceived as providing excellent education and future networking opportunities. Also, most G3 participants had dual citizenships. G1 and G2 participants regarded having dual citizenships for G3 as an aspect of providing future flexibility and security because having both New Zealand and European citizenships allow living in and returning to those regions without restrictions.

Synthesis across the generations

The navigation through mapping the nexuses of practice in the main study revealed consequences of immigration for German-speaking immigrant families in New Zealand over time and across three generations. I had hypothesized that by the third generation the families’ assimilation from the immigrants’ original language and culture to the mainstream New Zealand Pākehā* culture would be complete. Analysis confirmed my hypotheses in most respects, with the most decisive cultural turns taking place in the second generation. Narrative accounts and numerous observations spanning several years showed also that over time changes occurred in every generation as well as across the generations.

Consequences of migration: Key changes over time within G1

Over time, G1 participants created their new Heimat in New Zealand. Producing patchwork biographies through globe-spanning intercontinental lifestyle migration, G1 left Europe with their children because of environmental concerns, for health reasons and due to midlife crises. They arrived in New Zealand with dreams of finding the images of an unspoiled environment they had gained as tourists confirmed but over time discovered discrepancies between dreams and reality. G1 prioritized finding the landscape most matching their dreams and achieving family security, and over time pushed the environmental problems they noticed in New Zealand into the background. G1 participants had to overcome professional barriers imposed by professional associations. As a consequence of this lack of recognition of their professional skills they could not find satisfying employment and therefore established their own businesses. Choosing from original and newly acquired cultural tools to suit, G1 participants adapted through selective assimilation into societal role expectations. They also realized symbolic meanings of their original culture through using original cultural tools in social actions in the places and social spaces of family, work
and leisure. Such symbolic meanings arose from acknowledged European quality work, and from using material objects and concepts brought to New Zealand. Legal integration varied although all G1 participants had permanent residence permits. The Austrians achieved dual citizenship, but the Germans either did not change their German citizenship or lost it through taking on New Zealand citizenship.

Over time, language changes occurred within G1. These included improvement in English understanding and articulation. While accents still identified all G1 participants as non-New Zealanders after more than 25 years in the English-speaking environment, there were indications of codeswitching and occasional searching for German key terms when speaking German. German remained the home language with G2 unless monolingual English speakers were present. For all but one balanced bilingual G1 participant, German remained the dominant language.

**Consequences of migration: Key changes over time within G2**

Over time, the most significant cultural changes took place within G2. In contrast to G1 who retained their language and most of their original culture in their private spheres, G2 did not. Settlement experiences and later intercultural relationships were the main reasons for G2 submergence into the mainstream culture of their new Heimat.

Settlement experiences differed for G2 children and adolescents, and for the adults among G2 participants. Children and adolescents lacked agency in the migration process and most resented the move to New Zealand. With one exception, G2 participants who migrated aged 12 to 16 experienced social exclusion and discrimination at a vulnerable time of their development. Their initial resentment evolved into increased efforts to assimilate and become invisible in the New Zealand mainstream culture. The youngest (aged 5 at immigration) remembered inclusion into peer groups and acquiring mainstream culture as normal aspects of childhood, rather than as efforts of acculturation. The two adult G2 participants moved into existing support networks, which eased their integration. All G2 participants gained New Zealand qualifications and 3 of 7 were employed in New Zealand-typical primary industries.

Self-identifications, legal transnational connections, and cultural practices changed. Signaling conflicted intersections of self-identity and insinuations in identity assigned by others, the German G2 participants hid their German identity but retained their citizenship. They would have acquired dual citizenship if possible but assigned dissimilar importance to this. Austrian G2 participants identified as Austrians and as New Zealanders although three Austrians had dual citizenship while two gave up their Austrian passport through receiving New Zealand citizenship. Whilst encultured into their parents’ original culture in their childhood homes, G2 participants increasingly adopted New Zealand cultural practices in their own homes. Over the course of more than 25 years, New Zealand cultural practices
replaced most of their original cultural practices. Retained and modified original practices were part of cuisine and family festivity traditions.

For all G2 participants, social connections within the wider New Zealand society developed into intercultural relationships, in which English was the language of communication. English in education, at work and at home meant it became the dominant language for those who immigrated as children and adolescents. They felt that they lacked opportunities to develop their German but they hardly ever read German. They kept speaking German to their parents and used both languages with their siblings. In such interactions, English key terms frequently replaced German terms at the time of this study. With one exception, G2 participants soon gave up or never started speaking German to their children. These findings show an ongoing query process around the appropriateness of using German language as a consequence of migration. G2’s investment in assimilation and interactions with their families created a tense language situation for G2, who as a consequence both resisted and complied. They were very conscious of G1’s hope for German language retention in G3 but the study revealed that G2 found this transfer of language too difficult a task.

**Consequences of migration: Key changes over time within G3**

Since G3 participants were all still children during this study (up to nearly 15 years of age at the end of the study) and were born in New Zealand or Australia, their experience of belonging extended from their home to daycare, kindergarten, or school to their immediate community. Only the older children were able to understand wider connections. School-aged children were aware of their parents’ origins. Yet, all G2 participants old enough to understand assigned their parents New Zealand identities and considered themselves New Zealanders rather than Austrians or Germans. Invited by grandparents and/or parents, some G3 participants joined in occasional heritage culture events.

With one exception, English was G3’s only enduring home language, even though G1 coaxed, encouraged, praised, or even forced awareness of German language onto G3. Yet, the (grand)parents ambivalent attempts of instilling German as another first language achieved very limited understanding and did not result in observable substantial language production. Consequently, G3 were English monolinguals with the exception of certain address- and food-related German terms. By the time this study ended, however, 2 of the 19 G3 participants had started learning German in a formal way, including the (almost) 15-year-old boy who was preparing to travel to Austria with his G2 mother. However, a definite consequence of migration for G3 was an awareness of German language and its value for G1 brought about by G1’s practice of working with G3 to produce German language. A

---

117 The Australian G3 participants could not give this information due to their young age.
related consequence for G3 was the older children’s recognition of ambivalences between G1 and G2 regarding the appropriateness and relevance of German language use.

**Consequences of migration: Key changes across the three generations**

Each generation considered New Zealand their *Heimat*, yet *Heimat* creation changed across the generations. G1 pragmatically integrated into the social roles of the Anglophone society but also kept dealing with contestations in the interstice of cultures. Their *Heimat* (re)creation included symbolic recreation of original *Heimat* aspects through social actions mediated with original material and conceptual cultural tools and newly acquired cultural competencies. *Heimat* creation in G2 resulted in almost complete assimilation for 5 of 7 G2 participants, as New Zealand became their unquestioned *Heimat*. The two others had ambiguous feelings of belonging. G3, whose ages translated into early stages of *Heimat* creation, had no doubts about entirely belonging to Anglophone New Zealand.

Cultural aspects changed markedly across the generations. G1, the decision-making German-speaking immigrants, had bilingual and other bicultural competencies whereas their deepest cultural understandings and practices remained those of their original culture. They identified as Austrian and German although most also had New Zealand citizenship. Most G2 participants had negligible agency in their parents’ migration decision-making, yet moved from initial resentment to integration and eventually to deliberate sociocultural assimilation. For the adolescents, this assimilation process seemed to be driven by initial experiences of discrimination. Personal networks assisted assimilation. Over time, most G2 participants adopted New Zealand mainstream cultural practices also in their private lives, moving most of their original cultural practices into the background. Austrian G2 identified as Austrian New Zealanders and as New Zealanders but Germans avoided identification as German. G3 participants showed evidence only of remnants of the original immigrants’ cultural practices. These were mainly related to food. Fully submerged into the mainstream society, G3 fully identified with New Zealand.

Languages showed the most directly obvious evidence of cultural changes. All but the oldest participants arrived in New Zealand with sufficient to very good bilingual competencies. Yet, German remained the dominant language for G1 with one exception. This changed in G2, for whom English became the dominant language over time. Intercultural marriages led to G2 passing on English as home language to their children, with one exception where one-parent – one-language was reported practice but English remained dominant. As a consequence, G3 participants were monolingual English speakers. Although some understood some German they did not freely produce German language apart from some address and food key words. These generational changes are comparable to Gordon’s (1964) observations of assimilation into mainstream society across three generations. The following graphic summary of findings illustrates the metamorphoses.
Adhering to the principles of Mediated Discourse Studies meant expanding the circumference of the research through testing the findings of this qualitative study in the wider community. The following section presents the results. The survey questions arose from results in this qualitative part of the study.
2.3 Navigating the circumference – A wider perspective

The rich qualitative information collected from the families of German-speaking residents in which a partner, parent or grandparents had migrated to New Zealand in the 1980s or 1990s has deepened the understanding of consequences of immigration for retention and shift of language skills, cultural practices, national identities and senses of inclusion in new home places. In order to assess whether some of the findings from the family and generation-specific, in-depth studies resonated with the experiences of other German-speaking immigrants and their descendants, I designed a survey to collect responses to a series of questions that could be administered online.

Inevitably the questions in such a survey have to be able to be answered either by ticking specified categories or by very brief comments. The survey thus collected quite superficial information by comparison with the in-depth interviews as there was no opportunity for clarification of questions or explanation of responses with the researcher. There is also no way of knowing how representative the responses provided are of German-speaking migrants and their descendants who live in New Zealand. Notwithstanding these limitations, the information provided by a much larger number of immigrants and their descendants from the target population to questions relating to migration and settlement experiences does assist in assessing the extent to which some of the findings from the qualitative research are likely to be reflective of experiences amongst the larger (originally) German-speaking population resident in New Zealand.

Profile of survey respondents

The on-line survey was designed to elicit responses from German-speaking immigrants and two subsequent generations in New Zealand. The questions covered the following four broad themes:

- Migration motivation and fulfillment of expectations
- Qualification, employment and budget matters
- Social acceptance, integration and multicultural families
- Cultural maintenance and shift

The design and administration of the survey is discussed in section 1.3. There were 317 responses, which were sorted to match generations in the qualitative study. The survey results were examined with reference to the four themes and the responses by members of the different generations were compared using a series of bar graphs. The numbers in each
generation, as explained below, were quite different, and this needs to be borne in mind when comparing the percentage distributions shown in the graphs.

As illustrated in Figure 2.3–1, 211 survey respondents were German-speaking G1 immigrants, whereas 55 G2 respondents arrived in New Zealand with their parent(s) during childhood or adolescence. Of the 46 New Zealand-born respondents, 30 were G2, that is, they were born to one or two German-speaking parents who immigrated as adults; and 16 were G3, that is, they had German-speaking immigrant grandparents and at least one immigrant parent. Thus, they were a similar type of G3 to the one in the qualitative study, but they were older. For this reason, they were able to add information that the former were unable to provide due to their young age.

**Figure 2.3—1: Survey respondents – generational groups**

The composition of G2 and G3 in the survey responses complicated comparisons with findings from the qualitative study. Four respondents migrated to New Zealand as adults but were born to German-speaking immigrant parents in other non-German-speaking countries (in the Americas and Africa); they grew up there and lived there as adults. One respondent with German-speaking grandparents migrated to New Zealand from the United States as an adult. Therefore, in terms of generational distance from the original German-speaking immigrants these 5 respondents fit into G2 and G3 respectively. Yet, because they migrated to New Zealand as adults, they were included with adult immigrants in this analysis. Qualitative study G2 participants were all born outside New Zealand while a
number of G2 survey respondents were born in New Zealand. G3 survey respondents were adults, whereas G3 participants in the qualitative study were children. Therefore, whilst G3 survey responses were worth noting, comparison with G3 in the qualitative study was only partially possible.

With these caveats about comparisons between findings discussed in detail in sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 for the three generations, and the summary information obtained from the online survey, the following contains a descriptive analysis of the data obtained from the survey with reference to the key themes outlined above. For the most part, the results from the survey confirmed findings obtained from the qualitative research. There were few instances where the quantitative data suggested the responses and experiences reported by the families interviewed in depth were aberrant.

*Motives for migration and fulfillment of expectations*

The survey respondents who had migrated to New Zealand arrived between the 1950s and 2012, with the majority (n=180) from Germany, followed by Austria (n=25) and Switzerland (n=6). Nearly three quarters of the G1 respondents arrived within the same time frame as the participants in the qualitative study (1980s and early 1990s). Their responses to questions relating to the timing of migration reflect political events relating to German reunification.

Rationalizations for immigration from the former GDR\(^\text{118}\) included: “*nichts wie weg – so weit wie möglich*” [just get away – as far as possible] and “*die DDR hörte auf zu existieren und die BRD war nicht meine Heimat*” [the GDR ceased to exist and the FRG was not my Heimat]. The first comment indicates that the new freedom of movement was met with concerns about continuity; the latter points to issues such as the submersion of eastern political, economic and social systems into the western ideologies of the united Germany (cf. Meyen 2013).

Political changes were also reflected in some countries of origin, currently referred to as Alto Adige in Italy, Alsace in France, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Luxembourg, Poland and Slovenia. These diverse sources for 12 respondents indicate the embedding of language in social practice rather than within political boundaries (cf. Blommaert & Rampton 2011; Gal & Irvine 1995).

---

\(^{118}\) GDR (German Democratic Republic) and DDR (Deutsche Demokratische Republik) stand for the former East Germany; BRD (Bundesrepublik Deutschland) and FRG (Federal Republic of Germany) stand for the former West Germany and for the united Germany.
**Push and pull factors**

Push and pull factors are central for migration decision-making and all survey respondents were asked to indicate the main reasons why they, their parents or their grandparents moved to New Zealand. Possibly indicating a lack of knowledge about family motives for moving, only 210 (nearly all G1) of 317 respondents answered this question, commonly including more than one reason for migration. Figure 2.3–2 below summarizes the main push and pull factor categories.

When year of immigration was considered alongside reasons for moving, it was clear that push and pull factors changed with the times and related public and political discourses. In the 1950s, longing for security and economic survival in the aftermath of WWII as well as a better lifestyle were main reasons for moving to New Zealand. In the 1960s and 1970s, the Cold War and gaining more security for the family were key drivers for migration. The Cold War still featured as a push factor for immigrants arriving in the 1980s, when environmental pollution, nuclear risks and pollution became more prominent. In the 1980s, a better lifestyle, and fulfilling a dream moved into the foreground of New Zealand pull factors and remained important for arrivals from the 1990s onwards.

**Figure 2.3—2: Survey – Main reasons for moving to New Zealand**

![Chart showing main push and pull factors](chart.png)

Personal intercultural liaisons prompted a number of respondents to move (e.g., “love”; “marriage”; “a woman”; “he met my mother and never left New Zealand”). Comments concerning intercultural partnerships included New Zealanders wanting to return home with their German-speaking partners and/or children (e.g., “Kiwi husband wanted our son brought up in New Zealand”; “my mother was unhappy and homesick”). Some comments suggested a profound spiritual calling (“a very deep soul (intuition) decision that I needed to come”) whilst others found a permanent haven traveling the world (“did not want to sail
back to Germany”) or stayed in New Zealand by chance (”bin hängen geblieben” [stuck around]; “just never went back”).

Most push and pull factors during corresponding immigration time frames corroborate those evident in the qualitative study. To get a more comprehensive picture of the survey respondents’ experiences of New Zealand, a number of questions (Q32 – 38) probed immigrant respondents’ perceptions of pull factors being met, their push factors being eliminated, and all survey respondents’ perception of New Zealand as Heimat.

**Pull factors realized?**

New Zealand lifestyle was the highest-ranked pull factor and responses indicate that most immigrant survey respondents considered their lifestyle excellent, good or relaxed, or a combination of these factors. (Figure 2.3–3). These responses corroborate the experiences of qualitative study participants. Less than a quarter of G1 and G2 respondents considered their lifestyle in need of a better balance (“hope to get better work/life balance in the future”), with fewer respondents describing their lifestyle as hectic. Yet, ‘hectic’ life was not necessarily considered negative (“hectic with children but more relaxed at the same time”).

The last comment shows that not all lifestyle factors were consequences of immigration.

**Figure 2.3—3: Survey – New Zealand lifestyle**

Disappointment with their New Zealand lifestyle was evident in comments such as “es ist hart in diesem Land auf einen grünen Zweig zu kommen” [it is hard to get anywhere in this country]; “hohe Miet- und Lebenshaltungskosten” [high rent and living costs]). Work stress
contributed to frustration (“I work 90 hours a week”). Such comments also reflect qualitative study participants’ settlement experiences.

There were pragmatic insights and conclusions in the survey responses that indicated that not all lifestyle components were considered consequences of immigration (“man muss viel arbeiten um was zu erreichen – ist wohl anderswo auch nicht anders” [one has to work a lot to achieve something – it’s probably not different elsewhere]). Other comments pointed to New Zealand life as character building and signaled potential future return migration (“Ich betrachte es als intensive Lebenserfahrung und ich weiß nun, was ich will bzw. nicht will und wo ich hinge höre” [I look at it as intensive life experience and know now what I want or don’t want respectively and where I belong]).

With regard to New Zealand being their dreamland, survey respondents revealed a range of feelings. G1 survey respondents presented the widest range of assessments from the most positive (“I think it could not be much better than this”) to quite negative feelings of disillusionment (Figure 2.3–4). More than a third of all respondents felt that New Zealand their dreamland. These ‘very true’ responses to the question were higher for the New Zealand-born, yet two thirds of G1 and G2 still felt it was ‘somewhat true’ that New Zealand was dreamland. For most, New Zealand landscapes and nature seemed to stay in the dreamland category: “lediglich in Bezug auf Landschaft, Strände, Natur!” [only in terms of landscapes, beaches, nature]. Some comments differentiated between dream and reality: “Es war einmal ein Traum, der sich durch die Realität ziemlich schnell in Luft aufgelöst hat” [it once was a dream that quickly dissolved into thin air through reality].

Many G1 respondents were critical of society and politics: “environmental approach haphazard, PC [political correctness] more important than solving issues properly”. Others were more conciliatory: “anywhere in the world there are always some issues”. For some, disillusionment resulted in planned return migration: “looking forward to moving back to Europe”. G2 comments also presented a range of feelings about New Zealand being their dreamland (“I have travelled a lot and still regard this as true”; “not Godzone but about as good as it gets”). There was appreciation (“Thankful that my parents took that step way back then”) but also negativity (“Have you seen the size of it? And how far away it is from everywhere else?”). The ‘very true’ and ‘somewhat true’ responses and related comments reflect most accurately the range of feelings reported by qualitative study participants (Figure 2.3–4 below).
Elimination of push factors?

Push factors relating to pollution and nuclear risks, which featured prominently in migrants’ reasons for moving to New Zealand (Figure 2.3–2), were not completely resolved by settlement in a country far from Europe. New Zealand’s pollution and the realization that the country is not free from nuclear risks negatively impacted on immigrants’ dreams and expectations. The responses shown in Figure 2.3–5 indicate that the immigrants were rather skeptical or even dismissive about the absence of pollution (“Really?? You think we are exempt from pollution in NZ? Think about your questions!” “ha ha – weit weg???” [ha ha – far away???]). Only one comment confirmed the perception of being far away from pollution (“Neuseeland kann sich glücklich schätzen, dass es ein relativ kleines, dünn besiedeltes Land fernab anderer Landmassen ist” [New Zealand can consider itself lucky to be a relatively small sparsely populated country far away from other land masses]. Ninety-one respondents used the opportunity of a question on pollution to comment on the situation in New Zealand. Comments such as: “I am shocked about the pollution here”; “pollution is relative and we have our own problems to deal with”. New Zealand’s ‘clean and green’ marketing strategies were strongly criticized: “Es dauert halt eine Weile bis man entdeckt dass das 100% pure Image eine ?gute? Werbestrategie ist” [it takes a while until one realizes that the 100% pure image is a ?good? marketing strategy].
Comments indicated how respondents were positioning themselves as New Zealand insiders or outsiders. For instance, ‘we have our own problems’ expresses solidarity with New Zealanders by seeing New Zealand’s pollution problem from an insider position. On the other hand, “New Zealand is not as ‘clean and green’ as they would like to portray it”; “environmentally poorly educated citizens” and “clean and green is a marketing gimmick we shouldn’t believe” distances commentators (“we”) from false advertising (although that “dauert halt eine Weile” [just takes a while]). These sentiments reflect those reported by G1 and G2 participants in the qualitative study.

The New Zealand-born G2 and G3 made no comments on the question relating to nuclear issues (Figure 2.3–6). Comments by the immigrants were mixed. Some indicated strong opposition to nuclear power (“Ich bin in Deutschland mit Wasserwerfern beschossen worden bei Demo gegen Atomkraft” [whilst demonstrating against nuclear power in Germany I was targeted by water cannons] whereas others showed a lack of concern (“nuclear power doesn’t bother me”).
On the one hand, comments expressed strong support for New Zealand antinuclear position (“fully support New Zealand’s stance on nuclear power and nuclear weapons”) but also concern about it (“this policy also excludes medical methods of examination and treatment”). This last concern is unfounded as New Zealand does have nuclear medicine centers (Beach 2006). Doubts about and disagreement with being far enough away from nuclear risks also were expressed: “one would have to leave Mother Earth to get away from it”; “fallout from Fukushima has already arrived”; “es fahren regelmässig Schiffe mit Atommüll in der Tasman Sea rum!!! Weiss gloss keiner” [ships with nuclear waste travel regularly through the Tasman Sea!!! Just that nobody knows it]. Although the last comment reflects similar ones made by qualitative study participants, the ‘very true’ and ‘somewhat true’ responses to the question about distance from nuclear power and weapons (Q35) corroborate other findings in the qualitative study.

New Zealand Heimat

Fulfillment of expectations is perhaps articulated best in relation to the extent to which the different generations regarded New Zealand as Heimat. It is hardly surprising that the New Zealand-born G2 and G3 were strongly of the view that New Zealand was their Heimat (Figure 2.3–7). However, it can be noted that some G3 respondents did not answer the question on Heimat – they commented that they did not know the meaning of this term. This points to significant changes in language as a cultural tool – an issue that is reviewed below in the section on language use across the generations.
Some of the respondents who did answer the question, and who offered comments in support of the response to the question shown in Figure 2.3–7, distinguished between home and Heimat (“NZ ist mein Zuhause. D ist meine Heimat” [NZ is my home. Germany is my Heimat] or suggested one can have two Heimaten (“Neuseeland ist meine 2. Heimat” [New Zealand is my 2nd Heimat]).

Social connections are an intrinsic part of Heimat and some comments confirmed their importance (“Kinder und Enkel sind dafür mehr Grund als das Land” [children and grandchildren are more reasons for this than the country]). Yet in general, having family in New Zealand did not seem to make a significant difference in perceptions of New Zealand as Heimat. The responses by G1 who had family in New Zealand at the time they migrated, or whose main motivation to immigrate was love/marriage, did not deviate significantly from other immigrant respondents’ answers. Therefore, one cannot conclude that there was a causal relationship between love and/or having family in New Zealand and respondents’ feelings of belonging and Heimat perception in general. Having lived in New Zealand for a long time (“Ich lebe hier 50 Jahre, so” [I've lived here for 50 years, so]; “cause this is where I lived most of my life”), being born and growing up in New Zealand, and immigrating at a very young age was strongly related to perception of New Zealand as Heimat. This points to a sense of belonging and Heimat evolving as long-term habituation to surroundings and social ties.
While there was inevitably more variability in the nature of responses to questions about motives for moving to New Zealand and the extent to which expectations linked to specific push and pull factors had been realized amongst the 317 survey respondents than the immigrants and their descendants who participated in the qualitative research, the general findings from the two studies are similar. For the most part, German-speaking immigrants chose to migrate to New Zealand predominantly for lifestyle reasons, and aimed to re-create Heimat in new physical and social environments. Achieving a real sense of Heimat in New Zealand generally proved more challenging than originally thought, partly because of unrealistic expectations about New Zealand as a ‘dreamland’, but also because of experiences linked with integration into the local society and economy. The following reviews some of these latter experiences with particular reference to effective use of human capital with reference to qualifications and employment; social connections and senses of belonging; maintenance of cultural objects and cultural practices including language use across the generations.

**Qualifications, employment and incomes**

The survey indicated that the immigrants and their descendants possessed substantial human capital. Achieved qualifications depended on respondents’ ages (a number of respondents included each achieved educational level) (Figure 2.3–8). G1 university degrees were from their countries of origin or from New Zealand or both (in a range of fields including but not restricted to: agriculture; computing; economics; engineering; law; mathematics; medicine/health; pedagogy; translation) whereas the vocational or advanced vocational qualifications were gained in the countries of origin. With the exception of one G2 respondent, who reported returning to Germany for a practice nurse apprenticeship (which later was not accepted in New Zealand), G2 appear to have completed their education in New Zealand, as did G3.
Overall, survey responses showed that like their immigrant elders and those who migrated as children and adolescents, adult New Zealand-born descendants of German speakers were highly qualified. These survey results corroborate findings for G1 and G2 qualitative study participants whereas the New Zealand-born G3 participants in the qualitative study were too young to have completed their education.

The transformation of human capital into social capital as mutually beneficial contributions to society can be seen as a main aim of immigrant recruitment. New Zealand competes with other countries for highly skilled immigrants (Bürgelt 2010; Pernice, Trlin, Henderson & North 2000), but many highly qualified and experienced immigrants are underemployed (Benson-Rea, Haworth & Rawlinson 1998). This signals potential negative financial consequences of immigration for immigrants and the receiving society alike. Problems with workforce and social integration also present risks to the psychological wellbeing of immigrants and their families (Aycan & Berry 1996). This section examines these related indicators of social capital in the survey.

Human capital refers to “acquired skills, knowledge, or experience workers possess that they can exchange for income in open markets” (McNamee & Miller 2004:39) and social capital is defined as “relationships among actors (individuals, groups, and/or organizations) that create a capacity to act for mutual benefit or a common purpose” (Spellerberg 2001:9).
Finding satisfying work

At first glance, findings across the generational cohorts in Figure 2.3–9 suggest very good social capital results from the human capital that the immigrants and their descendants possessed. Some comments by immigrants who reported that finding satisfying work was ‘very true’ confirm the smoothness of transformation (“job offer organized through professional network while still living in Europe”). However, typical comments by the adult immigrant respondents who reported that ‘finding satisfying work easily’ was ‘somewhat’ or ‘not at all true’ signal problems with the positive statistical picture presented in Figure 2.3–9 and may in fact reveal a lengthy and difficult path towards finding satisfying work.

Figure 2.3—9: Survey – Satisfying work / immigrants and NZ-born respondents

The transformation of immigrants’ human capital into mutually beneficial social capital interlinks acceptance of qualifications (Q12) with finding satisfying work (Q26). The comparison in Figure 2.3–10 (below) demonstrates how these two aspects related to each other. This comparison is only relevant for adult immigrants as they entered New Zealand with overseas qualifications. Success and ease of finding satisfying work declined

---

120 Some respondents who answered Q12 but did not answer Q26 indicated that work was not sought (“haven’t had to look for work yet”; “looking after children”).
sharply from the ‘qualifications fully accepted’ group to the ‘qualifications somewhat accepted’ group and fell further in the ‘qualifications not at all accepted’ group. On the other hand, failure in ‘finding satisfying work easily’ rises steeply from the ‘qualifications fully accepted’ group to the ‘qualifications somewhat accepted’ group and again to the ‘qualifications not at all accepted’ group. These findings suggest a close relationship between having recognized qualifications and finding satisfying work.

Figure 2.3—10: Survey – Qualification acceptance and finding satisfying work

Difficulties with overseas qualifications arose with the New Zealand Qualification Authority (NZQA) and with professional bodies. Evaluation outcomes were considered unpredictable: “I was lucky. My NZQA assessor was Dutch and understood my German qualifications (incl. the teacher quals.) perfectly”. This comment, posted with ‘very true’ responses to Q12 and Q26, indicates that the Dutch were considered to be aware of the quality of their German neighbors’ education system while New Zealanders were not.

A fully qualified physiotherapist who had his own practice in Austria planned return migration because he was allowed only to work under supervision and was paid much less than a New Zealand-qualified physiotherapist. His extreme frustration was clear in his statement, “das sagt ja wohl alles” [that says it all]. A teacher commented, “My German
Zweites Staatsexamen [Second Ministerial Examination] was recognized as a BA”. This signals strong disapproval because prerequisites to the 2nd Staatsexamen (final teaching examination) are approximately 10 semesters university study with a successful 1st Staatsexamen, and completion of a postgraduate program. This postgraduate program includes written work equivalent to a Master’s dissertation and 2 years supervised teaching (Referendariat), and is assessed by state-appointed examiners in the 2nd Staatsexamen\textsuperscript{121}.

The comments about disappointing experiences with evaluation of overseas qualifications generally expressed distress and occasionally outrage: “Decisions are made in a very subjective way by incompetent NZQA people”. While such judgment seems harsh, it might also be justified and disagreement is understandable because German education in particular was reported not to be valued by NZQA and/or relevant professional associations. “Ich bin Dipl. Ingenieur und IPENZ [Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand] erkannte die deutsche Ausbildung nicht an” [I am Diplomingenieur and IPENZ did not accept the German training]\textsuperscript{122}. This comment signals strong disagreement with skewed assessment by the relevant New Zealand professional organization because German technical universities consider Diplomingenieur, an applied university engineering qualification at least equivalent to a Master’s degree in Engineering\textsuperscript{123}, as world-renowned proof of quality\textsuperscript{124}. German doctoral degrees, on the other hand, were readily accepted for employment in the tertiary education sector. Yet the examples of rejection in other fields were as typical for survey respondents’ comments as they were for the qualitative study participants. This points to a puzzling paradox.

The paradox is that goods and services from German-speaking countries are recognized for their outstanding quality in New Zealand\textsuperscript{125} while so many qualifications and references from the societies that produce these goods and services were not. Survey respondents saw hurdles raised by professional bodies as closed-door policies: “I gained residency due to my qualifications but they were not accepted”; “Registrierung als Diätassistentin wurde von vornherein abgelehnt (Beruf ist auf der long-term shortage list!)” [Registration as

\textsuperscript{121} See \url{http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Staatsexamen}
\textsuperscript{122} The problem seems to be based on a lack of content comparison and on a translation problem because in New Zealand a diploma (literal translation of Diplom) is a one-year qualification below a first degree. The German postgraduate Diplomingenieur, on the other hand, is only bettered by a doctorate.
\textsuperscript{123} MEng is not necessarily seen as the same high standard as Diplomingenieur (see \url{http://www.spiegel.de/unispiegel/studium/diplom-ingenieur-ein-markenzeichen-verschwindet-a-678009.html}).
\textsuperscript{124} see \url{http://www.tu9.de/studies/3626.php}
\textsuperscript{125} E.g., common brands in New Zealand are MAN, Mercedes, BMW and Audi (e.g., \url{http://www.omnibus.org.nz/buslocation/man/}); http://www.nzherald.co.nz/opinion/news/article.cfm?c_id=466&objectid=10707305); Kärcher cleaning systems (http://www.karcher.com/int/About_Kaercher/history.htm); Stihl and Bosch power tools as well as Bosch and Miele appliances (http://www.stihl.de; http://www.canstarblue.co.nz/appliances/dishwashers/; http://www.woolpremierpartner.com/programs/vacuum-coupons.html). Services readily accepted are, e.g., university exchanges (see \url{http://www.universitiesnz.ac.nz/scholarships/daad})
dietician was declined from the outset (profession is on the long-term shortage list!); “Radiographers, so needed, but my training not accepted: Bizarre!” Such experiences with professional bodies evident in the survey corroborate findings in the qualitative study.

Discrimination was reported as specifically directed against German qualifications: “My US qualification was accepted. German qualifications Magister [Master] and Diplomingenieur were not”; “mein französischer Abschluss ja, der deutsche nur teilweise” [my French qualification yes, the German only partially]; “glücklicherweise habe ich mein BA (Hons) und meine Lehrerausbildung in London absolviert. Deshalb wurden meine Ausbildungen ohne Problem akzeptiert” [luckily I completed my BA (Hons) and my teaching qualification in London. That’s why my education was accepted without problems]. These comments explicitly and implicitly express discontent about unfair treatment of German qualifications. In addition, the qualifications not recognized by relevant New Zealand professional bodies in the qualitative study included an Austrian qualification.

The comments point to counter-productive problems between the government bodies Immigration and NZQA, and between government and professional bodies. That is, while New Zealand competes for and accepts skilled immigrants from leading technological societies, a number of immigrant professionals from such societies considered NZQA incompetent and professional bodies inward looking, ignorant and discriminatory.

Figure 2.3–10 illustrates clear connections between declining qualification acceptance and decreasing chances of easily finding satisfying work. However, the ‘somewhat true’ responses to the question relating finding satisfying work (Q26) are not that dissimilar across the generation categories. Associated comments help interpret responses. Luck was considered part of success in job search: “hatte aber viel Glück!” [but had lots of luck]; “I was absolutely lucky because people we knew before we came helped us”. Corroborating findings for G1 in the qualitative study, many comments pointed to perseverance and flexibility: “embarked on new career after studying at local university”; “at the beginning not at all, after 15 years went into my own business and now it is VERY satisfying”; “es war einfach Arbeit zu finden, aber nicht einfach qualifizierte Arbeit zu finden, die einen stimuliert und ausfüllt” [it was easy to find work but not qualified work that stimulates and fulfills]; “takes a while to establish a NZ clientele”).

Comments in the ‘somewhat true’ and ‘not at all true’ categories in Figure 2.3–10 (above) were similar, for example: “I moved up via relationships as I was being known on my job, so most of my jobs were obtained mainly thanks to previous work experience in NZ. My foreign qualifications didn’t seem as encouraging”. Just as G1 participants in the qualitative study reported, numerous survey responses pointed to finding satisfying work only “once I had a NZ qualification”; or “connections from Australian employment finally got me a job”; and “worked for 2 years below my qualification”. Other comments in the ‘not at all true’ category expressed resignation (“6 months to find first job. Gave up looking for a second
job after 8 months”; “haven’t been able to get employed in my field [graphic design] for 6 years. I’ve done volunteering and odd jobs. Now I’m staying at home”). Like participants in the qualitative study, many survey respondents considered networking a necessity for finding employment (“knowing people from my course and talking to them made it easier”; “networking is really important in New Zealand”) but several branded the practice as cronyism (“it’s not what you know but who you know”).

Surprisingly, qualifications of those who considered finding satisfying work very easy and those who found it not at all easy were comparable and in the same academic fields (incl. engineering; health; informatics). Because all qualified G1 immigrants reported having ‘enough’ to ‘excellent’ English (see section on language below) at the time of immigration, other factors, not necessarily evident in the survey responses, may also have played a role in finding satisfying work. In my view, this could only be answered through frank comments from the declining potential employers, which was beyond the scope of the current study.

In summary, considering the educational qualifications that facilitated access to New Zealand, survey respondents, disgruntled about the difficulties finding satisfying work, might have justifiably linked this to bias. Such issues link into MDS principle three, that is, issues arising from multiple and conflicting discourses resulting from histories (see section 1.4). Specifically, these conflicting discourses arise from different histories of practice in the different educational systems, lack of familiarity in New Zealand with the education system in the German-speaking countries, or might reflect different political histories.

Setting up businesses, incomes and pensions

A significant number of G1 respondents reported that they and/or their partner/family had their own business. More than half of these respondents had indicated that ‘finding satisfying work’ (Q26) was ‘not at all’ or only ‘somewhat easy’. Comments by respondents who had lived in New Zealand for a long time signaled business success whereas other typically more recent arrivals suggested difficulties (“working on it, not easy”; “wieder aufgegeben” [given up again]). Some comments point to employment difficulties making their own business “the lesser evil”. That is, self-employment in contracting, consulting or freelancing were solutions born out of necessity at times to solve work-related immigration consequences. These might have been in “periods without employment” or because “nur durch eigenes Unternehmertum ist Erfolg gesichert” [only one’s own enterprise ensures success] in New Zealand. Qualitative study enterprise findings resonate in these survey responses.
The majority of G1 respondents reported that immigration had negative financial consequences (Figure 2.3–11). Some indicating that they were aware of the likelihood of this before leaving Germany: “Yes, but hey we didn’t come here to make money. We knew that the (material) standard of living would be much higher if we had stayed in Germany”. Yet, there were also unexpected immigration consequences in the form of currency fluctuation and conversion (“dollar was devalued just after we changed all our money”) and investment misfortune (“verloren die Hälfte unseres Geldes” [lost half of our money]). Another consequence was that settling costs including bridging initial no-work or low-income periods diminished resources brought into the country (“ich war das erste Jahr ohne job” [I was without a job for the first year]; “income too low – cost our savings”). Comments indicated that immigrants who arrived in recent decades experienced higher costs and more income reduction consequences than earlier arrivals. This might be due to generally rising costs; it might also be linked to assisted immigration in earlier decades (see Bönisch-Brednich 2005). Memory of settlement difficulties fading over time might have also played a role in recounting perceptions.
Reflecting recent OECD statistics of ‘better-life’ indexes\textsuperscript{126} and economies, which show New Zealand as a lower-wage economy than European German-speaking countries (OECD 2012), and assessment of New Zealand immigrant incomes (Nana & Sanderson 2008: Figure 5.8), survey respondents’ immigration to New Zealand resulted in economic decline for many arrivals in recent decades. Their move resulted in loss of income for 70% \((n=150)\) of those who answered the question about comparative incomes before and after immigration (Q14). By comparison, 1 of the 4 G1 couples in the qualitative study experienced temporary, and 2 couples permanent income decline.

Survey responses included: “\textit{etwa 40-45\% weniger Einkommen}” [about 40-45\% less income]; “I earn in 2013 what I earned in Germany in 1988”; “50\% weniger \textit{Einkommen bei vergleichbarer Stelle}” [50\% less income in comparable position]. Comments suggested also that relationships between earnings and living costs in New Zealand were unfavorable (“house prices are very high, living costs are extremely high and wages are disappointingly low”; “\textit{Lebenshaltungspreise sind exorbitant (Lebensmittel, Mieten etc.) Ich habe hier permanent das Gefühl über den Tisch gezogen zu werden}” [living costs are exorbitant (foods, rents etc.) Here I always have the feeling of being taken for a ride]). For 20\% \((n=43)\), however, less income in New Zealand was ‘not at all true’ with comments suggesting, for example, that they had lived in New Zealand for a long time and had a successful business, or – some more recent arrivals – were university-qualified in high-demand specialist fields (e.g., science, IT) and were recruited overseas.

\textsuperscript{126} see \url{http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/topics/income/}
With regard to old age pension income, the responses from survey participants mirrored those participating in the qualitative research. For the younger generations, born in New Zealand or who migrated as children with their parents, this was not an issue. For the G1 respondents, there was general disapproval of the New Zealand policy of deducting dollar for dollar the value of their German pension from the New Zealand government pension (Figure 2.3–13).

Figure 2.3—13: Survey – Deductions of overseas pensions

Typical comments explained respondents’ objections to the deduction: “especially as contributions to the pension are specific, i.e. like a private one. And why should the NZ state take a slice of that???” Formatting (capital letters), word choice and emoticons illustrated anger in families about New Zealand deducting overseas pensions accumulated through employer and employee contributions: “das REGT MEINE ELTERN IMMER NOCH AUF :(" [that STILL UPSETS MY PARENTS]; “that sucks for mum, it’s a right royal pain in the arse”. Respondents questioned the “strange” allocation of the “universal” New Zealand Superannuation to certain immigrants and New Zealanders who “never” or “only

127 The term ‘universal’ started disappearing from official publications a few years back following strong public disapproval of the dollar-for-dollar deduction of all overseas government pensions (see, e.g., [links removed]; http://www.stuff.co.nz/dominion-post/news/8898559/Net-widens-on-double-dip-pensioners) although some government units still use it (e.g., Treasury Working Papers described as ‘current’: [link removed]).
minimally” contributed to society through working, and its denial to those who worked and paid taxes in New Zealand for many years (“when we arrived more than three decades ago NZ Super was touted as universal. We paid taxes all these years and counted on it but we get nothing”). These opinions corroborate qualitative study findings.

**Social acceptance, integration and multicultural families**

Three questions in the survey sought information on the extent to which respondents felt accepted in New Zealand. The first related to how easy it was to make friends with New Zealanders (Q10), another sought their perception of the extent to which New Zealanders see German-speaking immigrants and their descendants as ‘outsiders’ (Q30), and a third question probed their experience of discrimination because of German-speaking backgrounds, names and so on (Q40). A small group of immigrants had chosen to come to New Zealand because of romantic attachments to people living here. Their experiences and the extent to which the immigrants and their descendants formed multicultural families are also examined in this section.

**Making friends with New Zealanders**

Survey respondents born outside New Zealand were asked how easy it was to make friends with New Zealanders. There were no major differences between G1 and G2 responses to this question – over a third in both groups found it easy with an additional 48 percent finding it was ‘somewhat true’ that it was easy to make friends with New Zealanders (Figure 2.3–14 below). A slightly higher percentage of adult immigrants signaled greater difficulties in this regard than child and adolescent immigrants (G2).
Comments suggested that age and cultural differences played a role. Generally, respondents who arrived in New Zealand at a very young age had no trouble making friends (“at 5 years of age it was easy to mix with classmates and natural to have new friends, being so young”). Older G2 respondents (aged 11-16 and 16-20) tended to find making friends more difficult (“had to learn English and the culture was different”; “at first it was hard but it got easier as the years passed”). These experiences are similar to those reported G2 participants in the qualitative study.

G1 comments indicated that at later life stages “finding new friends gets more difficult the older one gets” and there were “difficulties finding ways into existing friendship circles”. Respondents saw such impediments as a consequence of immigration. Echoing impressions by a pilot study participant, survey comments pointed to culturally different interpretations of friendship: “depends how ‘friends’ is understood. New Zealanders are superficially friendly but more difficult to find real reliable friends”. “In NZ, one can have a drink and a chat with basically everyone. However, finding true friends in NZ has been/is very hard!” In comparison with Europe, respondents also noticed greater mobility within the New Zealand population that tends to promote temporary connections as “a lot of people are coming and going”\(^{128}\). Social solutions offered included joining clubs, finding friends

\(^{128}\) New Zealand censuses of population and dwellings regularly report that around 50 percent of the usual residents are living at a different address than the one they were at the preceding five-yearly census. A comprehensive report on internal migration in New Zealand can be found at: [http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/Migration/internal-migration.aspx](http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/Migration/internal-migration.aspx) (accessed 11 May 2014).
among other Europeans, and community integration through active engagement and patience. These solutions corroborate actions taken by qualitative study participants.

**Outsiders, prejudice and discrimination**

The question (Q30) in the survey about whether Kiwis treat Germans/Austrians/Swiss as ‘outsiders’ was included because of some impressions of exclusion gained from interviews with G1 and G2 participants in the qualitative study. In fact, the survey results show that very small proportions (less than 5%) of G1 and G2 immigrants felt that it was ‘very true’ that they had been treated as outsiders (Figure 2.3–15). Slightly higher proportions (10-12%) of New Zealand-born G2 and G3 respondents gave this response.

**Figure 2.3—15: Survey – Generational perceptions of outsider treatment**

![Survey Results Chart]

Comments help understand the responses. As one of the overseas-born G2 comments explains, “As a teenager, very much true. I was bullied and felt very alone. As an adult, people are a lot more welcoming and curious rather than hostile”. Some comments indicated conflicting self-perceptions by New Zealand-born G2: “we are outsiders – silly phrasing of question”; “yes but so do I to a certain extent. This latter comment positions the writer as a New Zealander in-group member and German speakers as outsiders, whereas the former comment accepts German speakers’ and New Zealand-born G2’s outsider position as normal. Others pointed to the need of active immigrant engagement (“may depend on how you have established yourself socially”). Length of residence implying integration or perhaps assimilation resonated in immigrant respondents’ comments (“may depend on how long you have lived in New Zealand”). Immigrant respondents also
commented on xenophobic views, treating “everyone with a foreign accent or look” as outsider. Some stated that such views were not unique to New Zealand (“you can meet ignorant people everywhere”) and that “most people are open and friendly”. The range of circumstances and views that lead to outsider treatment in some ways reflect experiences by the qualitative study participants.

When the question (Q40) shifted to experience of prejudice or discrimination because of a German-speaking background or name only the overseas-born G2 immigrants had more than 50% saying ‘yes’ (Figure 2.3–16). The difference between the overseas-born and the New Zealand-born G2 cohorts might reflect the higher visibility of young immigrants due to English language skills and/or accent, which might make them easier targets of discrimination and prejudice, especially if they were attending schools in New Zealand soon after their family became residents.

**Figure 2.3—16: Survey – Experience of prejudice and discrimination**

Comments gave an insight into respondents’ experiences of prejudice and discrimination. Some G1 respondents reported positive prejudice (“I get credit for being German. People presume that I’m hard working, deliver on time and am honest”; “being teased about good German qualities in a friendly way”). Only two comments referred to discrimination in terms of qualification, employment and pension, perhaps because respondents had already commented on that in their answers to earlier questions.

Yet, more than a hundred responses across the generations referred to negative attitudes and treatment and indicate that discriminatory actions left strong impressions in families. These included G3 descendants of pre-WWI immigrants and Jewish refugees from the Nazi
regime recounting discrimination during and after WWII (“My mother writing letters to her mother had the letters opened by officials and on her return home was arrested as a spy”; “mother and her siblings treated cruelly during and after WWII because their mother was German”). Several gentile and Jewish respondents commented on surnames changed to avoid discrimination\(^{129}\) or avoiding discrimination because of English surnames acquired through marriage. Overwhelmingly, comments across the generational groups referred to “that typical Nazi rubbish” as “Menschen verbinden Deutschland oft sofort mit Hitler. Das ist schade” [people often connect Germany immediately with Hitler. That’s a pity]. Comments reported: “abused as Nazis at school”; “workmate asked if I had had my gasburger lately”. A respondent with a Dutch and a German parent who immigrated as a toddler in 1979 reported perceived discrimination coupled with abuse of power: “throughout my primary school years a teacher bullied me about being a Nazi”. Another response referred to a recent workplace complaint born out of ignorance: “I showed a documentary I made in India depicting a swastika (a Hindu religious symbol). The complaint stated that I would propagate Nazi material … (two things which are ideologically not related at all)”. Lack of information or misinformation and one-sided media/movies were blamed on perpetuating the discrimination (“growing up in South Auckland in the 1960s and 1970s, the only exposure my classmates there had to German culture was from war movies, so we grew up being called Nazis or baddies”). The comment of a recent young immigrant from former East Germany shows her bewilderment about war references and her reaction: “One question I heard frequently (not any longer) – ‘what do you think about the war?’ – strange! – my answer – ‘which one? Korean, Vietnam, Boer’?”. The assigned identities illustrate mediated discourses as materializing from misconstrued connections with fragments of a country’s history. The comments indicate that respondents felt aggrieved by these wrongly imposed identities. These findings corroborate G1 and G2 experiences in the qualitative study.

### Feeling at home in New Zealand

Social reception is inextricably linked to immigrants’ feelings of belonging. G1 and G2 immigrants were asked how long it took them to feel completely at home in New Zealand (Q11). A wide range of time-frames were reported starting at one extreme with feeling completely at home “the moment I stepped off the plane to longer than 5 years (‘other’ in Figure 2.3–17) including: “I have been here 10 years and feel like I belong neither here nor there”; “20 years”; “never really. I feel OK here but I am still a German in New Zealand”;

---

\(^{129}\) In the era of WWI and WWII, surname changes were common as a strategy to prevent alien treatment, for example, in New Zealand (where e.g. Wohlfahrt/Wohlfart became Wolfert, Hallenstein became Halstead) and in Britain (where royals changed names and religion to suit: e.g., Greek-Orthodox Prince Philip of Greece and Denmark became Anglican translating his grandparent’s surname Battenberg to Mountbatten; and the German Coburg-Sachsen-Gotha origin was camouflaged by the family name change to Windsor after the town of the royal residence Windsor Castle).
“maybe a life time!” Like the majority of survey respondents, most qualitative study participants who immigrated as adults reported feeling at home in New Zealand within 1 to 5 years.

**Figure 2.3—17: Survey – Time for immigrants to feel completely at home**

Seven G2 respondents, who felt completely at home in New Zealand, commented along the lines of “too young to remember” and “I was a baby”. However, some G2 respondents did not feel completely at home within 5 years. Two G2 respondents who arrived 20 years ago (ages at immigration: 6-10 years and 5 years) commented that they still did not feel entirely at home. Like for the G2 participant in the qualitative study who was very young at immigration, survey comments and ages at immigration suggest that most respondents who were very young when their parents brought them to New Zealand had no difficulties making New Zealand their home. For the older children and adolescents it was more difficult and took more time to gain a sense of belonging. This reflects the qualitative study findings of difficulties with a sense of belonging for G2 participants who were teens and tweens at immigration. Some comments also suggested potential return migration.

**Multicultural families**

One interesting measure of social inclusion was the extent to which immigrants and their descendants had married into cultures and ethnicities other than their own. A total of 279 out of 317 respondents answered a question about the presence of ethnic groups, other
than own, in their families. Almost half (48%) reported there were other ethnicities in the family (re. definitions and issues with ethnicity see sections 1.2 and 1.3) Just over 56% (n=134) of the immigrant respondents and 26% (n=11) of the New Zealand-born respondents did not list another ethnic group in their families. This might reflect immigration of families from the same background and that the New Zealand-born intermarried more readily. Yet, findings cannot be completely separated for the different generations because the question (Q21) asked about ethnic groups in the family.

Some of the ethnicities in Table 2.3–1 were options given in the survey; others were entered by respondents in the comment box. These ethnicities were self-defined, commonly using area/country of origin but also the New Zealand expression Pākehā*. Several respondents reported more than one of the listed ethnicities in their families. Table 2.3–1 indicates that other ethnicities in respondents’ families were mainly Pākehā, followed by English. Intercultural marriages with Māori were also common. The readiness to enter intercultural marriages evident in the survey corroborates findings for G2 in the qualitative study.

Table 2.3—1: Survey – Ethnicities (other than own) in families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity given</th>
<th>By number of survey respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander (not further specified)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslav</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maintenance of cultural artifacts and cultural practices, and language in particular

Most participants in the survey, and especially the G2 New Zealand-born, considered New Zealand to be their Heimat (Figure 2.3–7). However, their responses to questions about cultural traditions, the possession of material goods with strong cultural associations, and the retention of German as a language spoken across the generations did not seem to indicate strong connections with their perceptions of New Zealand as Heimat. In this section, maintenance of cultural traditions and possessions are examined briefly before a more detailed examination of language as the most significant component of cultural heritage.

Cultural traditions and possessions

Whilst the biggest percentage of G1 and G2 respondents answered ‘yes’ to the question (Q41) about maintaining their original culture (or the original culture of their immigrant parents or grandparents), clear evidence of cultural change can be seen across the three generations (Figure 2.3–18 below). This was explained with reference to the shared nature of culture: “I grew up with New Zealanders”, “no people from Germany here to have a get-together”. Religious traditions rationalized not retaining German culture (“retained the Jewish religion but not German culture”). Considering the horrific treatment of Jews by the Nazi regime that reverberates in the families of refugees, such mental separation is understandable although being Jewish is as much part of German culture as belonging to other state-sanctioned religions (cf. Gilman 1995; 2006). Religious traditions also explained cultural retention (“Advent”; “Heiligabend” [literally: Holy Evening: Christmas Eve]; “have a Weihnachtspyramide”\(^{130}\); “Samichlaustreffen” [St. Nicholas\(^{131}\) get-together]), but their celebration in reversed seasons was considered enigmatic (“Christmas in summer and Easter in autumn make it complicated”). The description of another religious German tradition, “Say ‘grace’ before tea in German”, is a cultural mélange not only because it is written in English but ‘tea’ meaning dinner or main meal is a New Zealand expression based on British colonial tradition.

\(^{130}\) Christmas pyramid; see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christmas_pyramid

Many comments mentioned traditional food as evidence of cultural retention ("deutsche Küche" [German cuisine]; “cook Swiss meals”; “like our German bread and beer”; “baking and cooking”; “grandma’s recipes”). Other cultural practices included music and passing traditions on to the next generation (“traditional Musik”; “Ostereier bemalen, Lieder singen” [paint Easter eggs, sing songs]; “play group with other German-speaking families to promote German language and customs”) as well as home interiors (“decorate my home in European style”). Apart from playgroups, which were considered too difficult to reach by G2 in the qualitative study, most traditions mentioned corroborate those maintained by most qualitative study participants.

Material cultural items clearly were valued as Figure 2.3–19 (below) shows. Few single men arriving in earlier decades and few singles arriving more recently brought furniture or other items that represented a sense of attachment to their European origins, whereas families and most single women immigrants did. Material cultural goods with symbolic value varied in kind and number, from “small things that could be packed in a suitcase”; “musical instruments”; “alte Truhe vom Urgrossvater” [great-grandfather’s old chest] to “furniture to make the house look similar to the one in Germany” and “multiple containers over the years”. With some exceptions (“furniture but I don’t care”), these material cultural tools carried strong symbolic values: “The few things that my grandmother and her family were able to bring from Germany in the late 1930s were very important. Other things made in Europe are treasured and are imbued with a greater sense of workmanship”; “great to have reminders for my mother of her Oma and childhood etc”.

Figure 2.3—18: Survey – Maintenance of original culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Do you maintain your original culture / culture of your parents or grandparents?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1 / adult immigrants (n=209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.08% (n=159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.92% (n=50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.3—19: Survey – Material possessions as cultural tools with symbolic value

Survey responses corroborated qualitative study findings that most adult immigrants brought furniture and other items with symbolic meaning. Whether G2 and G3 qualitative study participants will treasure symbolic cultural items brought to New Zealand cannot be compared at this point in time because most items are still in G1 possession.

Childhood family language and German language skills

NA sees interaction mediated through language as belonging into “the primary world of social practice” (Scollon 1999: 151). Two such primary worlds of social practice intersect when people immigrate into a different language environment. This intersection, i.e., this nexus of practice, is of interest. To detect transformations of such important social practices I focus here on language as cultural tool. Survey respondents were asked about knowledge and use of German and English. They were also asked to rank their languages from strongest to weakest and if they mixed languages.

To gauge German language transmission within the family and German language skills, several questions were asked about language skills including: had the respondent learnt German (Q42), family language in childhood (Q43) and their current German language

---

132 Exceptions: Claudia’s son kept her furniture after her death; one G2 participant kept her great-grandmother’s dresser.
skills (Q46). Responses to these questions were considered to build a picture of respondents’ grasp of German. Over 30 native German (Austrian/Swiss German) speakers reported that they had not learned German, arguing that “it’s my native language”; “Muttersprache” [mother tongue] although with one exception (family language in childhood: Polish), G1 respondents reported that the family language in their childhood was German (Figure 2.3–20).

Respondents who went to school in a German/Austrian/Swiss German language environment before migrating to New Zealand also would have had formal language instruction in German. Crosschecking German language responses showed that all G1 respondents considered their German skills ‘excellent’. Most G1 respondents reported speaking German with family and friends, and 13 informed that they spoke German at work. In subsequent generations, answers regarding German language transmission in the family, language skills and language use presented a changed picture as explained below.

**Figure 2.3—20: Survey – G2 and G3 family language in childhood**

The radical shift of family language during childhood between G2 immigrants and New Zealand-born G2 can partially be explained by having parents from different cultures “and my father never taught me German”. In G3, German was no longer reported as family language although some G3 respondents commented: “English with a tiny smattering of German”; “English; täglich ein bisschen deutsch” [daily a bit of German]; “grandparents and mother would speak German”. This last comment points to language transferal switch.
between G2 and G3. One G3 respondent reported (Q19), “My Oma immigrated to New Zealand from Berlin in 1938, as a direct consequence of Kristallnacht”. The use of the German address Oma [grandma] illustrates the descendant’s affectionate relationship with her grandmother whilst using the German term Kristallnacht [Night of Broken Glass] poignantly relates the conflicting relationships between German roots and this wave of violent National Socialist pogroms against Jews. The German key words in this comment were not marked, i.e., not italicized. This suggests that such key words were fully integrated into the respondent’s usual English vocabulary. The switch of family language to English for G3 and the use of some German key words of address and other relevant meanings incorporated into English corroborate findings in the qualitative study.

Bilinguals’ self-assessment of language skills has been found to be fairly accurate (Crezee 2008; Delgado, Guerrero, Goggin & Ellis 1999; Gollan, Weisberger, Runnqvist, Montoya & Cera 2012). Survey respondents were asked to assess their German and English language skills and to rank their languages from their strongest to weakest. Figure 2.3–21 illustrates the reported decline of German language skills across the generations.

Figure 2.3—21: Survey – Reported German language skills

---

Devastating Nazi rampage against Jews in Germany and Austria; see [http://history1900s.about.com/od/holocaust/a/Kristallnacht.htm](http://history1900s.about.com/od/holocaust/a/Kristallnacht.htm)
Multicultural families could explain the decline of excellent German language skills from the immigrant G2 cohort to those born in New Zealand by the concurrent rise of German assessed as ‘enough for everyday conversation’. It appears that learning German required other means than immediate family for these New Zealand-born G2 respondents (“I participated in a student exchange to Switzerland when I was 16 and learnt it then”; “went to school in Germany for 18 months”). For those in G3 interested in the language, German introduced through the family required additional effort (“grandmother, private tutors, correspondence school and now university”). Other G3 respondents who said they did not speak German seemed to have forgotten what they had learned (“learnt German at school and university”) although not using the language might have been due to other reasons not evident in the survey.

The radical shift from German to English language in the New Zealand-born cohorts is clearly evident in Figure 2.3–21. The immigrants (G1 and G2) also had very high proportions with self-reported excellent English language skills (Figure 2.3–22) in addition to retaining their German language. These results are similar to those found for participants in the qualitative study.

**Figure 2.3—22: Survey – Reported English language skills**

All G1 respondents were bilingual in German and English. Also reflecting qualitative findings, most ranked German as their strongest language while 3 (1 in the qualitative study) said they were balanced German/English bilinguals. Thirty-three G1 survey
respondents ranked English as strongest language (“habe mein ganzes Arbeitsleben im englisch-sprachigen Raum verbracht” [have spent my whole working life in English-speaking environment]). All G2 survey respondents considered English their strongest language. This corroborates qualitative study findings. Many indicated that they spoke languages other than German and English\textsuperscript{134} (Table 10.2 below), with some of the responses suggesting regions of origin or previous migration. In comparison with Table 2.3–1, p236), languages also reflected other ethnicities in families. Other languages, for example French or Latin, may reflect certain German school curricula that require learning two other languages.

### Table 2.3—2: Survey – Multilinguals' other languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages other than German and English</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Sign Language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparison, in addition to German and English some qualitative study participants reported being multilingual (Arabic; French), had not retained languages learned (French; Italian; Japanese; Latin; Māori) or remembered some language acquired while working in other language regions (Arabic).

\textsuperscript{134} Some listed Alsatian, Austrian, Luxembourgish, Swiss German or “dialect” as languages whereas others did not, so I included them in German. I did this probably also because having grown up in a Swabian dialect region in Bavaria I understand their peculiarities as related dialects.
The majority of G1 and G2 survey respondents reported mixing their languages ‘sometimes’, ‘often’ or ‘all the time’. This is similar to the situation found in the qualitative study where G1 and G2 participants mixed languages depending on the topic and whom they were speaking with. Pointing to (lack of) opportunity, the one G3 respondent who “never” mixed languages reported speaking German (Q48) only on holiday in Germany whereas the other reported speaking conversational German every day and mixing languages all the time (“we speak some German at home daily” and “throw a few dialect words into our everyday English for fun”).

Survey summary

The data collected from 317 German-speaking immigrants and their descendants in New Zealand has allowed for some quantitative expression of many of the findings from the in-depth qualitative research with the pilot-study participants and a small number of families that are reported in sections 2.1 and 2.2. While the on-line survey cannot be claimed to have produced results that represent the German-speaking population of New Zealand, it is clear from the discussion in this section that the data presented in Figures 2.3–2 to 2.3–22 and Tables 2.3–1 and 2.3–2 provide reinforcement for many of the conclusions drawn from the qualitative research. In this sense, ‘Navigating the Circumference’ has performed a very useful service in validating the findings in ‘Navigating the Nexus of Practice’. The final stage of the research is to draw the findings from these navigations together (section 2.4) and to articulate briefly how the nexus of practice is being changed (Section 3).
2.4 Discussion

2.4.1 Summary of the study

This study set out to answer questions about the consequences of immigration for German speakers in New Zealand across three familial generations as recounted by immigrants and their migrating children 25 to 28 years after moving, and as observed within and across the generations, including the New Zealand-born (grand)children. The principles of Mediated Discourse Studies (MDS) and its strategic method Nexus Analysis (NA) allowed the assembly and interrogation of a very rich set of qualitative data about the complex consequences of immigration from 35 participants. The approach proved useful for combining diverse data sets and understanding this evidence within intersecting sociocultural discourses. Responses from a survey of a further 317 German-speaking immigrants and New Zealand-born (grand)children subsequently corroborated the findings of the qualitative study. The in-depths interviews and observations, and the self-administered survey provide a sound empirical foundation for some generalizations about the consequences of moving to New Zealand in the late 20th and early 21st centuries for German-speaking immigrants.

My basic hypothesis was that personal and social consequences of immigration impact on wellbeing and identity construction as well as on the nature of interactions between the immigrants and their children on the one hand and the receiving society on the other. I also hypothesized that over the different generations linguistic and other cultural changes linked with residence in New Zealand would result in complete assimilation into the country’s Anglophone mainstream culture by the third generation. Indeed, very few language and other remnants from the European heritage culture were retained in G3. The assumption that intimate Māori and German or Māori and Austrian relationship and children with both of these identities would not change the trend towards Anglophone linguistic assimilation was also confirmed in the qualitative study. Despite effectively being English monolinguals, the G3 participants old enough to understand their Māori heritage identified as Māori and as New Zealanders, but not as German. As G3 participants in the qualitative study were only aged between approximately 2½ and 15 years by the end of data collection, revisiting them at an older age might reveal different findings.

135 The Austrian G3 participants with Māori heritage were too young to understand their complex heritage.
Key consequences within generations:

G1

- Pull factors and opinions shifted with dreams meeting systemic realities, which at times provoked strong emotional reactions, and with social networks changing over time
- Creating a new Heimat was accomplished through combining original cultural practices with practices from the New Zealand mainstream culture
- Social connections formed with immigrants from various origins and with New Zealanders
- Original ethnic self-identification was retained; all but one participant added New Zealand national identity through citizenship
- Language: G1 participants were bilingual; codemixing and codeswitching increased over the decades; reported language use with G3 differed from observed language use

G2

- Social connections predominantly with New Zealanders from various ethnic backgrounds; intercultural marriages the norm
- Adaptation led to a blended Heimat, in which few cultural-heritage practices were maintained and assimilation into New Zealand mainstream culture dominated
- Language: G2 participants were bilingual but English developed into their dominant language (i.e., the language in which they were most proficient) whilst German was generally not developed post-adolescence; codemixing common in interactions with G1 and siblings; most showed reduced L1 vocabulary; observed and reported language in their homes was English with one reported exception

G3

- Observed language: monolingual English production, with a few German food and address terms retained; few had very basic German comprehension
- Heimat fully was a New Zealand Heimat with New Zealand mainstream cultural practices throughout, with the exception of some European-heritage food preferences. Some G3 participants with Māori heritage displayed smattering of Māori cultural performance.
Key changes across three generations:

- Sense of belonging widened in G1 to include two Heimaten; most of G2 detached from original Heimat and identified as belonging to receiving society; G3 identified as New Zealanders
- Changing agency, cultural tools, strategies, and identifications from sociocultural role adaptation to sociocultural submergence
- Languages: bilingualism; changing dominant language; to English monolingualism

In the following, I discuss key findings and conclusions in relation to the literature and discourses in place. I then consider contributions that study makes, its strengths and limitations, and make some suggestions for future research.

2.4.2 Discussion of findings

The processes of migration evident in the current study did not align neatly with any of the common migration theories. Rather, specific aspects of several theories described in the literature review section were reflected in the participants' migration and settlement processes. The major drivers of this maximum-distance intercontinental lifestyle migration of the highly skilled and experienced professionals were accumulated unease and environmental concerns in Europe, and imaginations of and gazes on New Zealand perceived as a perfect idyll delivering contentment and safety for the family. Qualifications and experience were keys to entry into New Zealand under the skilled-immigration category whilst family in New Zealand enabled permanent residence for other participants. Settlement included overcoming institutional and social adversities in adaptation and integration processes. The relevant theoretical ideas that help explain this very long-distance lifestyle migration are:

- Push and pull factors (from classical migration process theory)
- Lifestyle decisions (lifestyle and amenity migration theories)
- Human and social capital (economic and skilled migration theories)
- Social networks (migration network theory)
- Transnational connections (transnational theory)
- Adaptation, integration, assimilation (settlement theories)

I review each of these below with reference to my findings.
**Push and pull factors**

Push and pull factors in the current study differed from the classical push-pull framework, which relates to work supply and demand and economic cost-benefit calculations (Massey et al. 1998). Push factors in the qualitative part of the study evolved from accumulating dissatisfaction with negative environmental impacts on participants’ quality of life. As illustrated in subsection 1.4.1 (pp73 – 81), Aufenvenne and Felgentreff’s (2013) argument that such negative environmental aspects as driving factors in migration are subjective linguistically and symbolically transmitted realities rather than actual physical-material reality is not supported. The environmental dismay factors particularly impacted two of the quality-of-life dimensions listed by Veenhoven (2000), namely livability of the environment and life appreciation.

Push factors in the current study resulted in a sense of lost agency. These push factors resembled those of British lifestyle migrants moving to France (Benson 2010a), and those of other German-speaking immigrants who migrated to New Zealand from the 1980s (Bönisch-Brednich 2005; Bürgelt 2010; Gruber & Kraft 1991). In contrast, Schellenberger (2011) did not identify any push factors for Germans migrating to New Zealand during the same period. Schellenberger’s observation might be due to his definition of push factors as *forcing* amelioration of life situations since he does not disentangle it. It could be argued that without push factors, that is, if every aspect of life and environment were perfect in a place and social space, people would not leave. Even the desire to see other places or experience other cultures possibly evolves from specific facets perceived as lacking in the place of origin or at the least from pull factors associated with the exotic in the destination.

In common with other studies of German speakers in New Zealand (Bell 2005/2006; Bönisch-Brednich 2005; Bürgelt 2003; Schellenberger 2011), pull factors in the current study emerged from gazes at New Zealand landscapes perceived as beautiful. Such landscape images have frequently been publicized in German-language media (cf. Fawcett 1989). As Bürgelt (2010) noted, these pull factors fed into migration motivation and realization of dreams. This also applied in the current study; with participants seeking an environmentally cleaner and safer home to regain the agency they lost in their perceived exposure to negative environmental factors in Europe.

**Perceptions of New Zealand realities**

Eventually, participants recognized that environmental reality differed from their dreams and the superficial impressions they gained while visiting (cf. Bell & Lyall 2002), which also reflects Bönisch-Brednich’s (2005) findings. However, landscape pull factors remained strong over the decades. Considering that agriculture and long-distance mass tourism are
two of New Zealand’s biggest industries that commoditize landscapes and therefore alter the environment\textsuperscript{136}, frictions between originally perceived natural purity and environmental realities are hardly surprising. For the qualitative-study participants, it seems that demands of everyday life and perhaps negative-focus fatigue resulted in backgrounding G1’s concerns about New Zealand’s environmental deterioration over time. Considering their push factors, these attitudinal changes were considerable and perhaps need to be seen in the context of G1 participants’ advancing ages and preoccupation with their growing New Zealand families.

It also appears that New Zealand media discourses, which tend to focus more on economic possibilities than on environmental concerns, influenced participant attitudes. Whilst official warnings based on environment assessments have aimed at stimulating New Zealanders’ conservation awareness (Ministry for the Environment 2007; Taylor, Smith, Cochrane, Stephenson & Gibbs 1997), such expert publications seem to be noted by environmental activists but appear neglected by mainstream media. Other, political environmental concerns raised in discussions by qualitative-study participants linked them to current public discourse concerns, for example, regarding deep-sea oil exploration (e.g. Maetzig 2011; Weir 2013), or government spying powers (e.g., Bennett 2012; Davison 2013). With respect to the latter, they expressed frustration, referring to discourses indicating that surveillance was probably not different from German-speaking Europe: “da dreh i die Hand net um” [it’s all the same]\textsuperscript{137} (see Fuchs, Goetz, Obermaier, Obermayer & Schultz 2013).

In comparison with the long-term-resident qualitative-study participants, survey respondents who arrived more recently voiced stronger criticisms of New Zealand’s environmental situations, with numerous comments pointing especially to German society applying more improved environmental awareness and care. Survey respondents’ comments also suggested that New Zealand’s overstatement of its purity and green principles, and problems gaining satisfying employment because German qualifications were not accepted played a role in considering future return migration. The relatively new two-stage immigration system (Bedford, Ho & Bedford 2010) and the flexibility of patchwork lifestyles in combination with disappointment voiced in the survey might help explain the relatively high return migration rate of Germans shown in Table 2.4–1 below.

\textsuperscript{136} see \url{http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/industry_sectors} Accessed December 2013
\textsuperscript{137} E.g., participants pointed me to \url{http://www.sueddeutsche.de/thema/Internet-Überwachung}; \url{http://derstandard.at/1392685440112/Buergerforum-zu-Sicherheit-und-Ueberwachung-in-Wien};
Table 2.4—1: Recent long-term arrivals and long-term departures from/to Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Zealand border crossings (Statistics NZ 2014)</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany-born - long-term arrivals</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>2,791</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>3,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany-born – long-term departures</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings and intersecting discourses support the following arguments: The momentum of quality-of-life re-evaluation to facilitate intercontinental lifestyle migration at critical moments in participants’ lives was fed by public discourses, superficial tourist gazes and strong intentions to seek agency for life matters. At the destination, environmental quality-of-life discourses in place raised G1 participants’ discontent and led, in some cases, to individual protest or political commitment. Overall, G2 participants were perhaps less concerned about environmental issues than G1 although one G2 participant took the children to a protest against deep-sea oil drilling off New Zealand138, for which prospecting has recently been authorized.

*International lifestyle migration of the highly skilled*

A mix of ideas from the lifestyle and amenity migration literature and aspects from literature on the migration of the highly skilled theory provides the best theoretical foundation for the current study. In contrast to lifestyle migration across open borders in Europe, access to New Zealand is restricted and involves geographical separation from Europe. Participants’ realization of intercontinental lifestyle migration was only possible because their human capital, which is central to mobility theories of the highly skilled, was the key to permanent entry. That is, New Zealand invites immigrants whose skills are needed and principal applicants gained entry for themselves and their families through qualifications, work experience and English speaking skills139.

In my view, the high qualifications of the majority of the migrants in the qualitative study and the survey respondents are not only of interest to NZ but also to those interested in emigration from German-speaking Europe. That is, the trend for German emigration has been increasing, with those with above average educational levels in their late twenties and early thirties most prepared to leave. They move predominantly to the United States of America and Australia (Übelmesser 2005), with the marked increase mainly due to temporary career migration (Diehl & Dixon 2005b).

---


New Zealand does not feature in reports on German out-migration. Yet these movements and the underlying motives should be of interest there for a number of reasons: Germany is New Zealand’s second-largest visitor market in Europe after Britain, with German visitor numbers up 14.5% in the year ending March 2014, with the well educated and financially prosperous especially from southern Germany most likely to travel to New Zealand (Tourism New Zealand 2014). Linking into this, the current study has shown that New Zealand holiday impressions were significant factors in migration decisions. Also, well over 100,000 work permits were issued to Germans between July 1997 and December 2013 (see section 1.3.2, p71; Immigration New Zealand 2014) and the current study has shown that work permits were important steps to permanent immigration even before New Zealand’s move to the two-stage system of first issuing temporary work visas and granting permanent residence permits later (see Bedford, Ho & Bedford 2010). Migration of the highly skilled to New Zealand should also be of interest in Germany because of the negative fiscal effects of such emigration on Germany, accumulating from publicly funded education and lost tax and social contributions to public funds (Holzner, Munz, Geis & Übelmesser 2009).

The motives for the increasing numbers of highly skilled, upper middle-class Germans migrating to New Zealand (see section 1.3.2, p70; Bade 2012) should be of interest to those concerned with quality of life in Europe. This is because the current study showed that the New Zealand environment promoted as pristine, and lifestyle choices were dominant reasons for immigration to New Zealand, which was possible because of qualifications. In contrast to the common socioeconomic explanations of migration, which understand migrants as seeking higher economic returns at their destination (Massey et al. 1998), German speakers participating in the qualitative study moved from a more affluent Europe to a geographically isolated, less prosperous antipodean society (see OECD 2013) because of environmental concerns. Contradicting Dorigo and Tobler’s (1983) assumption that geographical distance has a negative impact on moving, more than 18.000km did not dissuade these lifestyle migrants but in fact was initially considered a positive factor.

Prior to migration, they imagined the destination mainly as a bucolic idyll offering a less hectic lifestyle far removed from environmental pollution. The participants’ migration was based on quality-of-life reassessment and on attraction through tourist gazes at scenic amenities rather than on career advancement. In this respect, their moves reflect reasons for Germans moving from urban to rural Australia during the same time period (Hatoss 2006) and correspond with the quality-of-life decision-making in lifestyle migration (cf. Benson 2010a; O’Reilly & Benson 2009), which foregrounds the importance of natural amenities (Partridge 2010; Rodríguez-Pose & Ketterer 2012) and backgrounds economic factors (cf. Graves 1976; Hoey 2005; 2008). Such lifestyle migration of the relatively affluent is based particularly on the favorable material conditions and reflexivity typical for postmodernity in the developed world as well as on a more general ease of movement (Benson & O’Reilly 2009). In the current study, a critical determinant of these lifestyle
decisions was a financial basis that allowed family relocation from Europe to New Zealand and some economic bridging of lean times at the destination. Whilst G1 participants in the qualitative study brought capital from the sales of their homes in Europe, not all their New Zealand homes were mortgage-free for various reasons and all these participants had to work for a living. Some did so for financial reasons well into their late 60s and 70s whilst others were able to retire early.

The migration-decision-making participants in the current qualitative study, who migrated with their children and settled permanently in New Zealand, differed from young professionals who move in search of professional opportunities (Marcu 2011) and from “commuter migrants” whose transnational lifestyles included moving each year between Europe and New Zealand (see Bönisch-Brednich 2005: 143; Schellenberger 2011: 13). Bönisch-Brednich and Schellenberger report that these residential tourists (Huete & Mantecón 2012) extended the European practice of routine sojourning between two households in transnational residential tourism in north-south lifestyle mobility (Benson & O’Reilly 2009; Gustafson 2001; 2002; King, Warnes & Williams 1998; McWatters 2009; Torkington 2012) into globe-spanning routine lifestyle sojourns. Yet, such ongoing intercontinental sojourns depend on life stages and are unlikely to be sustained perpetually.

In contrast, G1 participants in the current study made the decision to move permanently with their children. By the end of this study the families had lived in New Zealand for somewhere between 25 and 28 years. All G1 and G2 participants had traveled back to Europe, some G1 participants very frequently. As Germans travel more often and for longer abroad than any other national group (Oppermann & Chon 1995), one could assume that this frequent travel was culture-specific for the Germans among the G1 participants. Yet, in this group frequent as well as very sporadic travelers were both from Germany and Austria.

Considering that New Zealand landscapes, lifestyle, perceived environmental safety and climate were by far the most prominent pull factors also for the more recent arrivals among the survey respondents, lifestyle migration from German-speaking Europe to New Zealand could be considered a growing phenomenon. Yet, as explained on pp70f, permanent immigration is difficult to quantify because of the ways immigration is framed in government statistics, and because permits issued do not necessarily equate with actual lasting residence. Perhaps languages spoken in New Zealand give some indication of migration growth despite the issues around census categories and figures described in section 1.3.2, p70f. Even though census figures and other statistics might not give a completely accurate picture of migration and settlement, they show a rising trend of arrivals from German-speaking Europe to New Zealand. Perhaps the findings in the current study of holidays and work permits leading to permanent residency reflect a growing trend to intercontinental lifestyle migration.
Arguably, the current study indicates certain ironies regarding global lifestyle migration decisions and quality of life. Integral to financial ability and immigration policies, agency played a considerable role in the migration decisions but was not equally shared. While three of the four G1 couples included safety of their children’s future in their decisions, the migrating dependents had no agency in these resolutions and the older ones expressed resentment. It is also somewhat ironic that the decision makers were seeking an unpolluted world to improve their quality of life but by and large their environmental concerns seemed to dissipate over time despite the realization that New Zealand had its own serious environmental problems. This raises the question to what extent public and media discourses in their places of origin and destination influenced their thoughts about the environment. Also, the impacts of frequent air-travel contribute to diminishing livability of the global environment but that did not constitute a problem for the travelers despite their other environmental concerns.

Consequences of intercontinental lifestyle migration across generations

Human and social capital – devaluation as consequence of immigration

Human capital is a central aspect in immigration of the highly skilled (Brückner, Bertoli, Facchini, Mayda & Peri 2012) and skilled immigration was the New Zealand immigration category that allowed G1 participants into the country. New Zealand research indicates conflicting discourses relating to immigrants’ human and social capital. In these discourses, the ‘all-is-well’ front suggests that immigrants are immediately well integrated into the labor market (e.g., Masgoret, McLeod, Tausi, Ferguson, Plumridge & Duke 2012; Merwood 2010) even though there are warnings that the real situation for immigrants is not quite as positive as statistics suggest (Benmayor & Skotnes 2005). Struggles in the current study to regain agency in professional fields confirmed this and mirrored other findings of skilled immigrants’ human capital not translating easily into social capital (e.g., Coates & Carr 2005; Daldy, Poot & Roskruge 2013).

The situations found in the current study did not always align with these prevailing New Zealand discourses. ‘Skeptics’ see mismatches between the country’s needs and immigrants’ skills (e.g. Benson-Rea & Rawlinson 2003). Others see ‘immigrant problems’ of a lack of language and transferable skills, and inferior or misleading credentials preventing employment integration (Winkelmann & Winkelmann 1998). In such discourses, language is synonymous with English while immigrants’ other languages are not considered assets despite New Zealand’s attempts to expand international trade. In the current study, immigrants’ skills and qualifications met similar reservations despite undergoing immigration scrutiny for professional qualifications, experience, and English language. An
unexpected consequence of migration was that participants’ qualifications deemed adequate by immigration authorities were rejected by professional associations. Such experiences of frustration were also reported by more recent immigrant survey respondents, who entered after the 2003 immigration policy amendments to a two-stage system (first temporary work visa, then permanent residence visa) to achieve better quality settlement outcomes (Bedford, Ho & Bedford 2010). This may well provide some explanation for the high return rate of German-speaking immigrants. Since immigrants invited into New Zealand under this system generally have undergone such screening, persisting difficulties with translating their institutionalized human capital, i.e., cultural competencies accepted through institutional sanction, into social capital through labor market integration should be considered a systemic New Zealand problem rather than an immigrant problem as outlined in the following.

The findings in the current study of the lack of acceptance of German professional qualifications align with Bauder’s assertion that “the regulation of educational and professional credentials excludes many skilled foreign-trained immigrants from high-status occupations” (Bauder 2003: 700). Whilst Bauder talks about immigrants from ‘non-traditional’, i.e., non-European regions having restricted occupational access in Canada, the current study illustrated that this exclusion applied also to credentials from Germany and Austria in New Zealand. Participants concluded that their occupational exclusion was “patch protection”. Such ‘soziale Schliessung’ or ‘social closure’ to protect against outsiders (Weber 1922: 23-25) has been considered “occupational apartheid” (Mpofu 2007: 95).

These points seem supported by Bauder’s observation that certification systems imposed by professional organizations favor individuals who have come through the local education system to the detriment of immigrants (Bauder 2003). Indeed, the professional social barriers or closure participants experienced linked to divergent educational and professional discourses disregarded the very human capital for which the participants were accepted into New Zealand. This caused immense frustration and considerably contributed to the struggles of Heimat creation for G1 during settlement. Arguably, these barriers are relics of immigration policies preferring British immigrants and might point to insular mindsets due to the country’s isolation or, as suggested by participants, to ignorance or even incompetence in certifying authorities. In disregard of New Zealand’s explicit need for immigrant skills, this bounded and therefore excluding professional solidarity is negative social capital (cf. Portes & Sensenbrenner 1993) and disallowed immigrants’ human capital to be translated into beneficial social capital. One could reason that New Zealand applied fewer restrictions for skilled German-speaking immigrants before the World Wars (see e.g. Fisher 1993; Kermode 1993; Mansfield Thomson 1993). Arguably, the contemporary opening of borders for skilled immigrants from non-British origins has neither been sufficiently coordinated with educational pathways in the countries of recruitment nor with New Zealand professional associations and industry. Survey responses suggest that the problems persist, although doctoral qualifications for academic positions at tertiary
institutions were accepted. With the recent two-tier changes to permanent residency, one could assume that recent lifestyle migrants only move to New Zealand if they have satisfactory jobs arranged at arrival. Yet, the survey illustrated that this was not necessarily the case. Further studies into the rates of and reasons for return for non-British cultural groups could prove to be enlightening.

**Social networks**

Two G1 participants in the qualitative study supported the migration of others, easing their settlement as described in migration networks theory (Castles & Miller 2009), but these networks did not amount to “herd and network effects” between the countries (Epstein 2008: 567) in the sense that many more immigrants would follow. The social networks that participants developed concentrated on their new *Heimat* creation and within it on the structural and social integration into the receiving society. G1 networking strategies showed similarities with G2 engagement in common interest groups within the New Zealand mainstream. Initial networking goals differed, however, with G1 using their networks primarily to gain financial security through work, with social aspects secondary whereas social connections were the main focus for G2. Over time, G1 social networks extended to include New Zealanders as well as other immigrants in personal social support networks.

For those G2 participants who were aged 12–15 years at immigration, first social networks established with other German-speaking immigrants became a coping resource in overcoming initial social exclusion by New Zealand peers based on language as an otherness marker. These same-language networks provided emotional stability in their struggles of *Heimat* creation during distressing settlement phases. Thus one consequence of migration for G2 was the formation of a bridging network that temporarily conveyed an outsider identity but ultimately assisted in developing an insider identity. As G2 adolescents developed bicultural competencies and expanded their social networks (cf. Castles & Miller 2009), these networks and cultural capabilities enabled friendships within the wider New Zealand society. In contrast to Beck, Corak and Tienda’s (2012) assertion that juvenile immigrants from a non-English-speaking country are likely to enter into endogamous marriages, exogamous marriages in the current study (100% in G2, with none attempting to find a partner from their original cultural group) even surpassed German speakers’ very high rate of intercultural marriages found in Australia (cf. Clyne 2003). Such intercultural partner choices are considered successful social integration (Haug 2003) and confirm Portes’ (1994) assertion that integration questions are decided in G2.

Once they had finished high school, G2 participants had the choice of moving out of their parents’ home, for instance, to study in a different city, or staying with parents or moving back in. Yet, giving opportunities to and supporting G2 in venturing out on their own in late adolescence or early adulthood does not mean that the participants did not embrace the notion of keeping family together, which Nayar (2009) sees as part of Indian collective
culture but not of western individualistic cultures. Despite their cultural notion of keeping family together, G1 accepted G2 participants’ need to move for study or work, and their choice to move with their partner. Different life stages meant that most G2 participants moved, some next door, or within the city, to another city or to Australia, and some returned to live with their parents either temporarily or permanently. Indeed, all adult children lived with their parents at some stage, with members of both generations remaining essential members of each other’s social support network.

**Transnational connections**

Transnational theory focuses on migrants’ connections with their countries of origin. By contrast with the perpetual wanderers in Schellenberger’s (2011) study, participants’ place attachment and social connections to New Zealand were stronger than to German-speaking Europe by the time the current study was conducted. The center of gravity of their lives had shifted to New Zealand over time.

Nevertheless, they maintained a range of transnational connections. These differed between individuals, for individuals over time, and between the generations. For example, using email, Skype and social-networking sites, which did not exist when participants immigrated, became their habitual practices to connect with family and friends in Europe and Australia for G1 and most G2 participants. Face-to-face transnational ties were aided, for example, by reduction of flight duration between New Zealand and Europe to approximately 26 hours, yet visits were reduced after the deaths of European relatives. These ties were also regulated by affordability, health conditions and willingness to travel. Social transnational ties therefore depended on participants’ and European family members’ life stages as well as on family and friendship ties prior to migration. Yet, without exception, G1 and G2 participants traveling to Europe expressed being glad about coming ‘back home’ to New Zealand. Reasons included their strong family and friendship networks as part of their New Zealand *Heimat* creation as a consequence of their migration.

Other continuing transnational ties for G1 were of a financial nature, for instance, through pension payments from Europe, which tied political institutions together (cf. Bauböck 2010). As outlined in sections 1.4 p94ff, and 2.2 138; 158 & 229f, this transnational connection impacted G1 participants’ entitlement to New Zealand retirement payments (NZS) and led to anger similar to that found by Crezee (2008) in her study of elderly Dutch in New Zealand. Considering the changing official information discourses, it can be assumed that protests against such impacts will cease with the increasing ages and deaths of the 10% of pensioners currently affected by the deduction of overseas pensions from their NZS entitlement. Legal transnational ties continued also through dual citizenship for individuals and their children, placing them in transnational territorial relationships (cf. Glick-Schiller 2010) and enabling potential future long-term residence in either country. Such
transnational connections can be maintained over successive generations provided political links between the countries remain amicable.

**Heimat creation and change**

*Heimat* aspects differed across the generations. Having lived in New Zealand for between 25 and 29 years meant that the immigrant participants in the qualitative study felt they had established their *Heimat* in New Zealand. Most G1 participants and especially the octogenarian participant in the pilot study *re*created their *Heimat* in the sense that their home and surroundings contained considerable material evidence of their original culture, in part brought from Europe and partially produced locally using original cultural concepts and methods. They also identified either exclusively or primarily with their original culture even though they had acquired New Zealand cultural competencies and/or passports. This implies that G1 participants were not alienated from their cultural roots but were reacting to push and pull factors such as a lifestyle in nature perceived as relatively untouched. G1 did not seek to create a strikingly different Heimat but a better version of Heimat in a safer, environmentally purer land.

Even though the German G2 participants had spent a considerable part of their childhood in various third countries, they neither reported ‘cultural homelessness’ said to evolve from growing up in multicultural situations (Navarette Vivero & Jenkins 1999) nor did they show a lack of inclination to settle down as suggested for such ‘third-culture kids’ (Selmer & Lam 2004). G2 participants’ yearning for *Heimat* (cf. Bota, Özlem & Pham 2012) translated – partially in response to discrimination – into quick assimilation. That is, they created their New Zealand *Heimat* within New Zealand’s mainstream, which is firmly rooted in British culture, and with very few cultural heritage aspects. The G2 participant who moved to Australia also appeared to create his *Heimat* there despite considering potentially moving back to German-speaking Europe with his family should the professional opportunity arise. This can be understood as indicating the dynamic nature of *Heimat* creation, which is not completed or static until final life stages preclude further changes.

For G3, New Zealand was *Heimat* without question although those old enough to understand knew of their ancestral origins. For the G3 participants who also had Māori ancestry, New Zealand mainstream culture dominated in their *Heimat* creation even though Māori culture was included through schools offering participation in kapa haka, which is a choreographed blend of traditional and modern popular Māori culture performances as a means of instilling Māori cultural identity (Mazer 2011). Several more recent arrivals’ comments in the survey suggested potential return migration, some commenting about problematic economic circumstances. This indicates that their New Zealand *Heimat* creation did not succeed, resonating a current trend of return migration for economic reasons (Wisdom 2013), or because migrants could not feel at home at their destination
(von Borstel 2012), missed their heritage culture, or to be with older family members (Nöth 2013).

**Adaptation, integration, assimilation and cultural tools**

The current study reflected Bönisch-Brednich’s findings of German-speaking immigrants “keeping a low profile” (2002: title page) in New Zealand. Adaptation, integration and assimilation aspects from settlement theories applied in different ways to the three generations who participated in the current study. Overall, processes aligned with Latcheva and Herzog-Punzenberger’s (2011) explanations that these dynamics are linked to specific times and circumstances, depend on various individual and societal aspects and differ for each generation. For most G1 participants, keeping a low profile attitude was related to systemic and social integration as defined by Esser (2001; see 1.3.1, p58f). Their adaptation to the New Zealand sociocultural environment presented challenges that could not be mastered by choosing just one of Berry’s (1997) acculturation strategies. Like in other studies (Nayar 2009; Schütze 2003; Jamarani 2012), Berry’s (1997) system in which settlement follows a particular acculturation strategy (assimilation, integration separation or marginalization) did not sufficiently explain how participants adapted to and were accommodated in the receiving society. Countering common assumptions of European and New Zealand cultural closeness and reflecting Bönisch-Brednich’s (2010) account of differences between German and New Zealand cultures and immigrants' wish to become invisible within the mainstream, the current study indicated turbulent phases during adaptation and societal integration into new sociocultural situations.

The study illustrated how other people's actions impacted immigrants' wellbeing and how participants reacted to facilitate acceptance in the wider society. Integration is a mutual process between immigrants and members of the local society. Immigrant participants encountered a mixed reception. Integration in the sense of inclusion and equal participation was offered into church and educational institutions, although the latter required adequate English language skills. Also, voting rights are given to permanent residents after one year in New Zealand, and acquiring citizenship was possible after three years (this changed to five years in 2007). However, considering the professional hurdles encountered by G1 participants in the qualitative study, and reported by more recent immigrants in the survey, systemic integration in the sense of equal professional participation and prestige (cf. Esser 2001) remains deficient.

Institutional integration was also perceived as lacking as participants in the qualitative study and survey respondents felt dispossessed of their entitlement to New Zealand retirement provision despite fulfilling the conditions. As noted in section 1.2, related changing political discourses over the course of this study were justifications of and amendments to intensely debated government decisions. These findings contrast with Esser’s (2001) assertion of systemic integration normally preceding social integration. While systemic integration
lagged behind and remained wanting in certain aspects, G1 participants built on their bicultural competencies to quickly create social networks within the wider society. These networks facilitated their professional and social establishment in the receiving culture even though distance remained in certain domains. Such distance was manifested in identification as German or Austrian, for instance, despite New Zealand passports. G2 participants who arrived as adults acted in similar ways, although G1 goals differed as they primarily aimed at creating a home and providing for dependent family members. G2 participants who arrived as children and teenagers were placed immediately into the school system. Arguably the system did not quite offer equal participation as – in contrast to current practice in response to a more recent large influx of Asian school children – no English language support was offered at the time. In this study, schools did offer social support by assigning a buddy to each new arrival. Different from G1’s experiences, but similar to Esser’s claim, social integration lagged behind G2 adolescents’ systemic integration as all but one initially found building social networks difficult, in part due to discrimination and despite the school-buddy system. Yet, over time G2 identified very strongly with New Zealand and its society and expressed that indisputably New Zealand was their Heimat.

In two extensive New Zealand surveys (n=12,500 & n=12,488), Europeans reported experiencing the least social discrimination of all the participating ‘ethnicities’: 29% of Māori had experienced discrimination; as did 23% of Pacific peoples; 35% of Asians; but only 13% of Europeans (Harris, Cormack, Tobias, Yeh, Talamaivao, Minster & Timutimu 2012). Yet, indicating that grouping Europeans together might camouflage differences, all but one of the adolescent German-speaking participants in the qualitative part and over a third of the survey respondents reported discrimination. Being targeted as a group of German speakers by ethnic prejudice that was unfounded at an individual level was an unexpected consequence of migration. Whilst Bade asserts that German speakers have come “Out of the shadows of war” (1998, book title), almost seven decades after the end of WWII the ‘Ugly German’ stereotype (Braund 1997) lingered for German-speaking immigrants participating in the current study: ‘For a ‘who-am-I’ party game they stuck a paper saying ‘Hitler’ to my head!! So disrespectful! I left. Not even my parents were alive at that time!!’140; “children abused as Nazis at school” (survey respondents’ comments). Study participants blamed ongoing discrimination through associating German speakers with National Socialists on media such as television: “Faulty Towers141 education” (survey response). Intersecting discourse cycles might include distortions of comprehension occurring through diverging historical discourses and the common English monolingualism restricting access to other perspectives (see Braund 1997).

140 My translation

141 Fawlty Tower(s) is a highly praised 1970s British TV comedy series (repeatedly shown in New Zealand) with John Cleese, who as Basil Fawlty displays stereotypical racial attitudes. See Google Search ‘fawlty towers’ which brings up over 3 million results (January 2014)
Media contributed as TV sitcoms and dramatizations of Germany’s National Socialist era and WWII events keep war memories and commemorations of atrocities alive. Perhaps the history curriculum and its delivery in high school really is flawed in some respects as participants suspected. For instance, Taylor and Sheehan argue (2011: 156) that the history curriculum “seldom required students to prioritise … historical context, a respect for evidence, argument and historical significance”. All or some of the above aspects might have contributed to the Nazi-related discrimination in the current study. Other, interconnected worries were also evident: “I’m rather concerned about growing anti-Semitism in New Zealand”; “that idiot – she told me to go back to Germany and burn Jews! Our family has Jewish ancestors!!” (survey responses). These comments provoke the question if ongoing public discourses referring to the German National Socialist era might interlink with worrying Neo-Nazism developments in New Zealand (see van Leeuwen 2008).

As Nayar, Hocking and Wilson (2007) point out, occupation – in terms of people’s actions in their daily lives – impacts wellbeing, which is particularly relevant given that participants in the current study migrated to New Zealand based on quality-of-life reassessment. Supporting Nayar’s (2009) theory of navigating cultural spaces, G1 and G2 participants in the current study moved in and out of their cultural domains in daily actions to adapt to various New Zealand sociocultural requirements. Their choices of cultural tools depended on role expectations and circumstances, but also on their cultural competencies and on societal responses. The current study showed differences in such competencies and the use of cultural tools over time within and across generations.

**Language as a cultural tool**

During the course of the study, language was the cultural tool that stood out most through its dramatic changes across the generations, with heritage language loss practically complete in G3 (see Fishman 1978). Language expresses and symbolizes cultural realities and identities, as it is an integral, embodied part of us, permeating our thought processes and worldviews (Kramsch 1998). Therefore, languages can be considered as highly instrumental forces in forming people’s cultural perceptions and expressions. As the current study has illustrated and as discussed in the following, social influences also form language use and changes across the generations.

Interviews with G1 were mainly in German. With one exception, G1 participants reported that their German skills were excellent. They kept German as the home language for their children and spoke German unless English speakers were involved in the interactions and/or professional role expectations required English. Supporting the idea that language expresses cultural identities, they also foremost identified with their original culture and nationality. They reported increasing codeswitching over the decades and displayed codeswitching to English for certain key terms at times. Myers-Scotton (2006) explains
such codeswitching in her Matrix Language model as the dominant language being the Matrix Language with Embedded Language insertions from another language. Such codeswitches could still be replaced by the German equivalents even though at times hesitations were evident: “und im Krankenhaus hat der Vater an stroke ghabt, an an Schlaganfall” [and in hospital father had a stroke, a a stroke] (Max). Overall, data suggested that language attrition, i.e. a gradual skills deterioration in an individual’s first language over time (cf. Crezee 2008), did not play a detectable role for G1. Generally, German remained their dominant language. Yet, because of the subsequent generations’ progressive shift to English, and either lack of frequent enough contact with the grandchildren or their own lack of persistence of speaking German with G3, communication between G1 and G3 shifted to English as the grandchildren grew older.

Whilst all G2 participants were bilingual, over the decades English became their dominant language not only in their professional occupations (cf. Paradis 2010) but also at home with their English-speaking partners who could not communicate in German. This increasing English language dominance explains prevalent codeswitching from German to English in communicating with G1 as most G2 participants did not have specific key terms available in German. After having spent most of their lives in mainly monolingual New Zealand environments they did not command the full range of German vocabulary. English was the most used language between G2 siblings although languages were often switched in such interactions. Different from the assumption of dominant language grammar (here English) being applied, however, grammar in codeswitches varied, with German grammatical word endings applied in some cases and English endings applied in others (cf. p.185).

G2 intermarriages were reasons given for English becoming the home language for G3 (with one exception). This home language switch to English in exogamous marriages reflects Australian findings (e.g. Clyne & Kipp 1997). Yet, as G2 participants’ suggested and as Hinton (1999) found for Asian children and adolescents in the United States, wider social discourses also influenced language switches. In the current study for example, earlier experiences of discrimination and ridicule led to linguistic assimilation in order to be accepted: “I tried really hard not to sound any different from them” (Matthias). Related to these findings is that G1 and G2 primarily relegated the use of German to private settings.

G3 participants could only produce some German key terms for food and address, but otherwise spoke English (e.g., “Oma someone on the phone for you!”). This was also the case for the family in which three generations lived under the same roof. The youngest G3 participants who started speaking during the study showed understanding of German and beginnings of German production in interactions with grandparents, but further developing language production was only in English due to lack of frequent enough German-language input. These findings corroborate Alba, Logan, Lutz and Stults’ (2002) findings of descendants of German speakers having English as mother tongue in G3 and align with

As Kohnert (2008) points out, means, opportunity and motive are the interacting factors in language learning, with means as learner-internal resources. G2 and G3 participants demonstrated that they had the means to learn languages. Yet, opportunities to speak German diminished for G2 as they moved away from their parental home and German-speaking school friends into English-speaking workplaces, English-speaking friendship circles and marriages either with monolingual English speakers or where English functioned as lingua franca (cf. Stevens 1985). G3 had scant opportunities to learn German within the family as contacts with grandparents either were not frequent enough, or parents and grandparents had given up speaking German with them. This resonates Fishman’s (1991) argument of the close link between language maintenance and intergenerational transmission. An additional factor was G2’s difficulties of maintaining bilingual discipline in the home, and their lack of motivation to pass on German to their children despite their own bilingual skills (cf. Döpke 1988). This lack of motivation might partly be due to New Zealand society not valuing bilingualism enough, because of the scattering of German speakers, and in part a result of their experiences of exclusion due to their mother tongue. The shift may indicate that German language was not seen as a cultural core value to be preserved (cf. Smolicz, Secombe & Hudson 2001) and/or German speakers are too dispersed (cf. Holt 1999) to form significant speaker communities. One could also argue that since the time G2 participants were excluded from the migration decisions their parents made for them, agency had shifted to G2, who chose English as home language for their children. G1 participants saw the lack of German language transmission and resulting English monolingualism with sadness and as loss, a point also made by Crezee (2012) based on her study of Dutch immigrants in New Zealand.

German language maintenance – or in this case perhaps language revival since the preschool children involved did not show German language production during the study – could be expected in specific cases such as through the chosen private Australian bilingual school from age 5 in conjunction with the reported maintenance of German home language by one parent and ongoing German-language group interaction. In New Zealand, the curriculum framework had languages added as a new learning area (Ministry of Education 2007). The framework asserts its inclusiveness, with languages to be affirmed and language learning needs to be addressed. This looks encouraging, yet with rare privately initiated exceptions142 New Zealand schools start offering second-language learning too late as explained below, with current study results suggesting that levels offered were not suitable for those who started with a working knowledge of the language. For this reason the G2 participants who took German as a high school subject were bored, which does not encourage learning. Findings indicate also that the experiences of their heritage language

142 see, e.g., http://www.bilingualkids.co.nz/aboutus.aspx; http://www.en.frenzschool.org.nz
marking the youngsters as targets for discrimination influenced their cultural competencies developing in favor of New Zealand mainstream culture and English language to blend in. This, G2 intercultural marriages and their difficulties in maintaining a disciplined approach to remaining bilingual influenced their choice of English as the only home language for their children. Whether these G3 children will become interested enough in their heritage language to learn it eventually to significant communicative-competence levels remains an unanswered question in the current study.

As is the situation in other countries, immigrants’ heritage language maintenance during the most important language learning age is effectively left to immigrants’ abilities to offer private learning opportunities and how much they see language as a cultural core value. This indicates a clear institutional lack of appreciation of a wealth of resources as one would think that those who design national language curricula are aware of language learning research. Yet, either this is not the case or research insights are not acted on in New Zealand as the education system does not offer LOTE* education during the most crucial language-learning age (see Clyne 1972; Paradis 2004) but leaves it rather too late. That is, potentially starting to offer LOTE only from school year 7 (when pupils are about 11 to 12 years old) neglects maturational insights into language learning (see Komarova & Nowak 2001; Nadel 2005). This late starting age does not take advantage of community languages but rather offers LOTE (including German) as foreign languages143 from beginner level, and at many high schools only as correspondence courses. Not offering languages from a much younger age cannot be defended with logistics and cost arguments in the era of effective software design, the interactive Internet and virtual classrooms.

The late offering of LOTE operates as indirect assimilation pressure into the Anglophone mainstream. A consequence is that long-term Anglophone assimilation is practically guaranteed if immigrant language groups are not large, wealthy, concentrated and determined enough to provide ongoing language-use opportunities for subsequent generations. Given that over 180 languages are spoken in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand 2013), avoidance of early second language teaching may save taxpayer money. Yet, it wastes precious social capital, which could increase educational achievements and could be useful for international trade (Royal Society 2013). One could argue, however, that it does not affect trade with German-speaking Europe because second-language learning from an early age is compulsory there, with English the most taught second language. Arguably, Anglophone lack of action supports global English language and related cultural domination but closes the door to other rich cultural funds of knowledge.

143 In New Zealand, the terms are generally understood this way: community language is considered the language spoken by an immigrant group (immigrant community) whilst foreign language refers to teaching/learning a language not in community use in the country where it is taught.
Ethnic identities

Ethnic self-identification as the subjective and socially constructed sense of belonging to an ethnic group or culture (Phinney 1990) differed between generations and individuals, and between Austrians and Germans. In common with Eich-Krohm’s (2008) findings of German professionals in the United States, all G1 participants primarily identified with their original national group. This was the case even if they had lost their original citizenship through acquiring New Zealand citizenship. They also specified their ethnic group more distinctly referring to regions, for instance, as Styrian, East-Prussian or Bavarian, which seemed to reflect Pauwels (1988) distinction of speech communities. The Austrian G1 participants who held dual citizenships identified with both nationalities. However, in many ways New Zealanders stayed the cultural ‘Other’ for all G1 participants and the participating octogenarian in a ‘we’/’they’ separation, especially when a social practice was found wanting and was criticized. Arguably, for these participants one therefore could see a continuing consequence of immigration in a certain psychological isolation resulting from the physical separation from their cultural milieu while retaining a sense of identity with it.

Ethnic self-identification shifted in G2. Rather than rejecting identification with the receiving society because of experienced discrimination as research in Finland suggests (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Lieberkind & Solheim 2009), G2 participants aimed to blend into the New Zealand mainstream. These findings align with Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind and Vedder’s (2001: 494) suggestion that some immigrants may either downplay or reject their ethnic identity because they experienced hostility, and that

Ethnic and national identities and their role in adaptation can best be understood in terms of an interaction between the attitudes and characteristics of immigrants and the responses of the receiving society, moderated by the particular circumstances of the immigrant group within the new society.

Such complex integral connections of attitudes, characteristics and responses were found in the current study. For example, the German participants did not identify as German unless they had to for institutional purposes. Imperfect first-language competency and birth in a third country contributed to self-justification: “eigentlich bin ich bin ja net wirklich von Deutschland und ich bin ja in Neuseeland aufgewachsen” [actually I’m not really from Germany and I grew up in New Zealand] (Connie). Apart from corroborating Portes and Rivas’ (2011) claim that child immigrants tend to identify with the receiving society, this ethnicity-evading comment provides insight into a subcategory of the G2 dilemma, that is, not having an identity perfectly aligned with either a New Zealand or a German birthplace. It also points to issues in using immigrants’ birthplaces for population characteristics and identification of origins (e.g. cf. Statistics New Zealand 2002).

The ‘we’ category also depended on situation, place and time. For instance, participating Austrians did not necessarily include Germans in the ‘we’ group, Styrians not Viennese, Bavarians not Prussians or Austrians etc. and exclusion was not always entirely jocular.
School experience of discrimination through assigned association of German speakers with National Socialists was also a strong reason for not identifying as German. This shows a long-lasting effect of stigmatization of their first language, which is not unique to New Zealand (see e.g., Messer, Schroeder & Wodak 2012). All but one of the G2 children immigrants in the qualitative study reported experiencing such discrimination. Yet, the Austrian teenagers dismissed it outright (“dia worm sows von blöd” [they were such idiots] Lisa) and it did not affect their self-identification as Austrian. A reason for this might be found in how the families dealt with these experiences. In contrast to the Germans, the Austrian families reported that they never talked about National Socialism. It appears that this in turn linked into divergent post-WWII public discourses in the two countries. In relation to the countries’ common National Socialist past, political and public discourses in (West)Germany revolved around collective shame and guilt as well as restitution (Dierkes 2010; Doosje, Branscombe, Spears & Manstead 1998; Imhoff, Wohl & Erb 2013; Ludi 2006). In contrast, Austrian post-WWII politics and public discourses included “Austria’s vital lie” in proclaiming innocence in the National Socialist dictatorship’s barbarism whilst pretending to have been the first victim of the National Socialist regime and consenting to restitution only for reasons of benevolence (Schwarz 2004: 178; cf. Knight 2000; Rabinbach 1988; Timmerman 2002). Such discourses remain controversial although Austrian historians now suggest that two thirds of the Austrian population agreed to and/or applauded Austria’s unification with Nazi Germany and, like in Germany, there were the guilty, the innocent, the victims and rescuers of the innocent (Müllner n/d).

The G3 children who were born in Australia could not yet express which culture they identified with but the older G3 children were aware of their Austrian and German heritage. However, those aged between 12 and 14 years considered the countries just quaint, distant places, where old relatives lived who did not speak English, and where one could spend a nice skiing holiday. Others (4 to 8 years old) saw the areas on the world map and, not quite understanding the European country puzzle, as places that grandparents would fly to and return with ‘cool’ gifts, “Oma could you bring me a Barcelona goalkeeper T-shirt?” (David) and brothers happily donning a selection of European club wear from across the continent. The G3 children who were born in New Zealand and were old enough to see themselves in terms of ethnicity fully identified as New Zealanders. Explanations for this can be found in their European parent’s assimilation into New Zealand’s mainstream community and intercultural marriages; English as the resultant home language; their own institutional preschooling and schooling. These findings resonate also in comments by older G3 respondents to the survey.

English was the language in the two homes with a Māori and a part-Māori parent, who informed that they were monolingual. English monolingualism amongst Māori can be traced back to assimilationist pressures in previous generations when Māori language was suppressed in many ways (Ka’ai-Mahuta 2011; Wohlfart 2007). Because the families lived in the wider Auckland district away from original Māori tribal areas, the children were not
introduced to marae traditions. In one of the families, traces of Māori sometimes surfaced in a trilingual mix: “Mama look at my puku [belly]!” or in occasionally presenting fashionable haka\textsuperscript{145} performances learned at school. G3 children’s Māori ethnic identification included skin color as a distinguishing but unwanted feature (“I’d rather be white like Mama”). Sadly, this points to racial discrimination discourses in New Zealand society (e.g. Cormack 2010; Harris, Cormack, Tobias, Yeh, Talamaivao, Minster & Timutimu 2012; Harris, Tobias, Jeffreys, Waldegrave, Karlsen & Nazroo 2006).

**The Treaty of Waitangi and the current study**

According to the AUT University Ethics Committee (AUTEC), the Treaty of Waitangi is relevant for any research undertaken in New Zealand and therefore also for this study\textsuperscript{146}. Researcher commitment to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi is included in AUTEC’s social and cultural sensitivity principle\textsuperscript{147}. AUTEC rationalizes the ethical research principles of participation, protection and partnership as arising from the Treaty. Whilst I applied these ethics principles in this research, rather than being based on Treaty facts, this linkage of research ethics to the Treaty appears to be one of the “highly-charged social theorizations” of the Treaty that Ip (2005: 1) refers to.

As noted in section 2.1, contemporary New Zealand governments have validated the Treaty of Waitangi as permeating all aspects of life in New Zealand, and as being relevant for immigrants because it allows them access to the country (Immigration New Zealand n/d). Yet, qualitative study participants did not see themselves as directly affected by Treaty aspects. Rather, they saw the Treaty as a colonial annexation document used by representatives of the British Crown to, in their words, dupe Māori into accepting British governance whilst promising them retention of power over their country. Participants considered the Treaty becoming a partnership agreement between the New Zealand government and Māori only because of massive Māori protests in the second half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Participants acknowledged that colonization had inflicted injustices on Māori and welcomed that governments have agreed to reparation. With regard to their multiethnic families, however, participants agreed that culturalist discourses with ethnic divisions for political ends were potentially dangerous and expressed their hope that this would not become commonplace in New Zealand. Arguably, this stance evolved for the German participants in particular partially from a sense of collective guilt about German historical events but also can be considered a positive consequence of immigration to New Zealand.

\textsuperscript{145} Haka is derived from traditional Māori warrior challenges; see http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tdMCAV6Yd0Y Accessed December 2013.


\textsuperscript{147} For AUT ethical principles see http://www.aut.ac.nz/researchethics/guidelines-and-procedures/list-of-ethical-principles-2 Accessed December 2013.
2.5 Reflections

2.5.1 Potential weaknesses of the study

Potential weaknesses lie in the snowball-system of participant recruitment and the survey. Arguably, since the qualitative study participants knew each other, the study did not cover a representative population sample. Also, the very strength of looking for resonance of the qualitative-study findings in the wider community might be seen as a weakness by some critics, who might argue that the questions shaped by the qualitative-study findings were not adequate. Comment boxes aimed to ameliorate this. Indeed, questions could have been presented in many different ways. Whether different questions and changed question placement would have stimulated completion is uncertain, however, because survey participation is based on momentary factors (Haunberger 2011). On greater reflection, language-related questions could have been placed towards the beginning of the survey.

The survey itself could also be seen as including weaknesses. For instance, an online survey is self-administered, time-delayed interaction with the researcher. It therefore lacks the opportunity for further explanations (Fuchs 2003), which are possible in conversational surveys and are considered to improve data quality (Schober & Conrad 1997). Perhaps related to the lack of researcher–participant communication in the survey were 47 ‘window-shopper’ replies following the newspaper invitation to the survey. Thirty-eight of these only answered Q1 and Q3. This enabled to view the other questions, which some described as “silly” and old-fashioned (“like 50 years ago”). Nine of the 47 indicated they were descendants of German-speaking immigrants and were born in New Zealand. Their non-participation was unfortunate because German language maintenance or loss across generations was of great interest. These 47 replies were not included in the response count because they did not yield data for analysis.

A general problem with surveys is that the widespread assumption of a stable and comprehensible reality and truth underlying survey answers might just be a theoretical construction (Wikman 2006). Mistakes might have been a factor. For example, one respondent gave age at immigration and presently as 71-80, with year of immigration four decades ago. I excluded another highly incongruous response because I considered it to be a prank. This indicates that survey responses need to be considered with some caution.

148 see appendices
149 One personal email message expressing that a group of Germans felt this way.
Acknowledging this, my survey analysis reflects experiences, feelings, realities and truths reported by the respondents.

2.5.2 Strengths of the study

The methodological guidelines of Mediated Discourse Studies (MDS) and its analytical tool Nexus Analysis (NA) facilitated rigorous, credible in-depth inquiry into the discourses entailed in participants’ mediated actions and the larger discourses intersecting in these actions. A strength of the study lies in the diverse data, which included participants’ narrative accounts of their experiences and their reflexive evaluations, documents and material cultural manifestations, as well as my observations of participants’ natural interactions at intervals over a long period of time. This combination ensured rich data and the possibility to crosscheck between different kinds of data. Also, NA is participatory inquiry, i.e., participants are considered co-researchers and the researcher a participant and my insider position meant that I understood our shared language and other shared background. These aspects make the study strong. It gained strength thanks to participants not only allowing me access into their lives but also patiently giving me feedback on transcripts and interpretations of their data. Indeed, participants offered me much more time than I had asked for, which shows their intense engagement in this project.

Discussions with my supervisors ensured that I distinguished my assumptions from participants’ data and that I detailed and clarified my interpretations and reasoning. University-internal and conference-presentation feedback confirmed the strength of the research and wide interest in the findings (Wohlfart 2009; 2011; 2013). In addition to returning to the research participants with information from the in-depth qualitative study, the main findings were also confirmed in an online survey yielding 317 completed responses. The survey was distributed not only through emailing contacts with the request to distribute further, but also through a column in a New Zealand newspaper (in print and electronic media).
SECTION 3
CHANGING THE NEXUS OF PRACTICE

Opening a new cycle of study
3.1. Contributions and suggestions

In the spirit of MDS and NA as social activism (Scollon & Scollon 2004), I hope that the findings from this study trigger positive changes in the nexuses of practice involved. The potentials for such changes are outlined in this section.

3.1.1. Contributions the study makes

This study contributes to migration research and community knowledge in several ways. Within the broad category of migration consequences over three generations within families, the study contributes to a number of specific migration theories discussed in the literature review.

My participants, primarily G1, maintained close transnational ties and this study adds to the arguments in transnational theory that participants’ identities are affected and that their incorporation processes impact their receiving country.

The multitudes of factors that contribute to international lifestyle migration are not fully understood at this point. The study explains motives for intercontinental lifestyle and amenity migration from the northern to the southern hemisphere and addresses the consequences and impacts of permanent lifestyle migration across generations. This study also adds to the explication of highly skilled migrants’ permanent moves due to environmental concerns and migrants’ attraction to New Zealand by expectations of untainted natural amenities. The study is therefore relevant to theories describing lifestyle migration as an escape and a search for life-fulfilling conditions. This relates to participants’ agency, which is an important aspect of mediated discourse studies. Bürgelt’s (2010) comments on the research gap relating to migrants from affluent countries searching for non-financial lifestyle improvements are also addressed in this study.

Theories of acculturation and assimilation processes diverge. This study adds to the arguments that adaptations and integration might be better understood at an individual engagement level and that concepts of homogeneity among immigrants commonly considered a group may not always be helpful. The study contributes to discussions regarding immigrants’ systemic versus social integration processes as some of the findings support Esser’s (2001) argument that social assimilation lags behind systemic assimilation. Further, findings support arguments for a ‘bumpy-line’ integration (Gans 1997) and selective assimilation (Portes 2003b) in G1. The study supports Gans’ assertion that G3 becomes fully assimilated and may only use their grandparents’ ethnic tools when convenient. My study found some individual use of nostalgic ethnic tools in G2 and G3, with G3 demonstrating complete assimilation with scarce remnants of the immigrants’ original
culture. Due to the young age of G3, the study left the question open if G3 would eventually exert their agency to revive their migrating grandparents’ original culture as suggested by the Hansen-Herberg theory (Herberg 1955/1960).

The study increases the understanding of agency in lifestyle migration. In the context of Berry (1997), Nayar (2009) and Codde’s (2003) theories of strategies and tools, participants in this study exerted agency at many levels as part of meeting and coping with consequences of migration. Agency has been identified as important from the time participants dealt with push-pull factors up to the present time as the processes of retirement for G1, career and family for G2, and growth and development for G3 continue.

My study is important for New Zealand migration research as it relates detailed qualitative information about the adaptation processes of German-speaking immigrants and their descendants into New Zealand’s Anglophone society. The study adds insights into attitudes, adaptation, social integration and assimilation processes including intercultural marriage behavior, and offers acuities into work and educational achievements and community enrichments by contemporary German-speaking immigrants and their descendants. It also informs about the institutional and social reception of these immigrants and their children in New Zealand and the effects these have had on them.

Through detailed explanation of intersecting discourses, the study has the potential to enlighten policy decision makers who influence or even shape people’s livelihoods and life satisfaction. The study complements previous research into the return migration rate of German speakers from New Zealand (Bürgelt, Morgan & Pernice 2008). Survey responses suggest that unmet expectations, lack of qualification acceptance and cultural prejudice are among the reasons for the high return rate. The findings from my study can inform immigration decision-makers and professional associations about the necessity to coordinate their policies, and the effect of the lack of such cooperation on individuals and on social capital in the receiving society.

The study complements previous research conducted with German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand by including successive generations in in-depths qualitative inquiry and quantitative corroboration of findings. The study’s insider information about their experienced consequences of migration across three generations also enables monolingual New Zealanders to get acquainted with the contemporary ‘Unknown Germans’ (Braund 1997) in their midst.

As far as European migration research is concerned, the results add information about skilled German speakers’ emigration reasons and wider societal discourses intersecting in their migration decisions. This is relevant in the light of acknowledged problems with falling birth rates coupled with migration deficits, i.e., higher out-migration of highly skilled Germans than replacement by immigrants (Bonstein, Jung, Matthes & Repke 2006; ‘Emigration up, birthrate down’ 2010; Verwiebe, Mau, Seidel and Kathmann 2010). Given
that English is a main school subject in German-speaking Europe and bilingualism is the norm, this text potentially widens the pre-migration knowledge base for German speakers considering moving to New Zealand.

The study confirms the usefulness of nexus analysis for research into language shift and identity construction (see Lane 2009; 2010) by applying the approach to detailed research into migration decision-making and consequences. A novel contribution to research methodology is that I explicitly link MDS and NA with social constructionism because the essentials in these approaches align with each other.

3.1.2. Suggestions arising from the findings

Because I suspect that the pilot-study ‘follower’ participant’s experiences represent the experiences of many, one suggestion from the pilot is for further research into the experiences and integration of the elderly follower-generation, that is, parents who migrate late in life to be with their adult immigrant children. Policy changes and political debates in New Zealand have focused on this immigrant generation (Bedford & Liu 2013; Trevett 2012; 150) but very few studies have investigated this generational group (e.g., Park & Kim 2013 – Korean; Selvarajah 2004 – Chinese) and no other study has looked at this generation of German-speaking immigrants.

Because of the recent massive increases in temporary and permanent immigration of German speakers to New Zealand (Immigration New Zealand 2014), these latest arrivals’ reasons and consequences of migration and the wider discourses in place of origin and New Zealand intersecting in their migration and settlement should be further investigated. Given the overarching push and pull factors of environmental dismay and idealization of the New Zealand environment found in the current study, further study to elucidate similar or differing push and pull factors for more recent German-speaking immigrants should prove valuable.

Suggestions for further research include a survey specifically targeting second and third generation descendants of German-speaking immigrants to investigate their links to their heritage culture and language. Comparative studies could identify similarities and differences for descendants of immigrants from various language backgrounds. Other comparative studies could investigate similarities and differences between immigrants’ experiences in New Zealand and Europe.

The current study showed that immigrants, including recent arrivals, found official comparisons between their overseas and New Zealand qualifications wanting and the demand for additional examinations patronizing and unjustifiably excluding, denying them the respect they deserve as professionals. Given that immigrating professionals are enticed to New Zealand industry, there is room for improvement in professional associations’ attitudes to other scientifically and educationally advanced societies’ qualifications. There should be improvement in professional associations’ cooperation with Immigration New Zealand. It also seems that the New Zealand Qualifications Authority would benefit from increasing their knowledge about the education systems and qualifications of German-speaking countries, and improving translations\textsuperscript{151} thereof.

Some aspects of lifestyle migration to New Zealand should be further investigated as New Zealand government and other institutions use landscapes, lifestyle and quality of life persuasively to attract highly skilled immigrants and affluent investors. This advertising seems to be working not only for German speakers as lifestyle and natural amenities were the most common pull factors in a survey of over 7,000 new immigrants in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand 2008). Findings in the current study suggest that lifestyle migration involved a liberating detachment from emotional pressure and demands by wider family and work. There is anecdotal indication that this is also the case for immigrants from countries where filial duty is paramount. Its rejection and the consequences could be explored.

Another aspect is that the emotion-evoking charm of local amenities that attracts people may be considerably altered through ecological and economic changes brought about by immigration (see Loeffler & Steinitzke 2007; Partridge 2010). Benson and O’Reilly (2009), for instance, urge further research into the massive implications of lifestyle immigration such as escalating property prices and shift in capital and power due to the increasing numbers of lifestyle migrants. Although they refer to Spain, their counsel seems timely for New Zealand as escalating property prices are mostly due to increased demand, resulting in fast decreasing first-home affordability for New Zealanders (Pope 2013), whilst at the same time there are debates about intensifying immigration for economic reasons (‘Time to open New Zealand migration doors wider’ 2013) versus tighter immigration control to curb rising interest rates and house prices (Kirk 2014).

Given the proven advantages of bilingualism (see e.g. Bialystok 2011; Bialystok & Barac 2012) and the richness of the German language and literature, I urge immigrants to pass on the foundations of their heritage language to their children and to keep encouraging German language development. For the youngest this can be through German playgroups formed by immigrants in New Zealand. For the older children this can be through reading

\textsuperscript{151} For instance, a Diplom is a much higher educational achievement level than a diploma even if this ‘false friend’ suggests so to the uninitiated, and to a culturally inexperienced translator.
materials actively integrated into their daily lives, through the Internet, through films and so on. Recipient society attitudes more open to the advantages of linguistic diversity would also be beneficial.

Therefore, I strongly suggest that the Ministry of Education change their position regarding second-language learning and inclusion into New Zealand curricula. Given the solid research insights into second language acquisition and its close links to brain development (see e.g. Kuhl 2010; Kuniyoshi 2005; Paradis 2004 & 2010), second-language learning must be included earlier in primary school curricula as is the case in Australia (see e.g. Clyne 2005; Lo Bianco & Slaughter 2009). This move would not only assist community language maintenance but also expand bilingual competencies advantageously for the country’s international trade and science connections. This second-language-learning curriculum can take advantage of interactive online learning to translate into financial efficacy. For example, online German language learning is sponsored and promoted by the German government and other providers (e.g., [www.goethe.de](http://www.goethe.de); [www.busuu.com](http://www.busuu.com); [www.de.de/deutsch-lernen](http://www.de.de/deutsch-lernen)).
I would like to end with Heike van den Berg:

In welcher Sprache,
In welchem Gefühl spreche ich “fremd”?
Bin ich mir Fremde?
Ich verstumme:
Lausche in mein Inneres.
Höre zu
Den Menschen um mich herum.
Der Stimme in mir.
Sie antwortet:
Deine Muttersprache des Herzens
Ist die Liebe.
Deine Fremdsprache der Seele
Sind Hass, Neid und Gier und Angst.
Und die Sehnsucht deines Geistes
Sind:
Alle Sprachen in Frieden zugleich!
Alle Sprachen und Gefühle
Sind Heimat,
rie und keine sind dir fremd.
Dann bist du in dir
Und in der Welt
Zuhause.

In which language,
In which feeling do I speak “foreign”?
Am I foreign to me?
I fall silent:
Listen inwardly.
Pay attention
To the people around me.
The voice in me.
It answers:
Your heart’s mother tongue
Is love.
Your soul’s foreign languages
Are hate, envy and greed and fear.
And the longings of your spirit
Are:
All languages in peace at once!
All languages and feelings
Are Heimat,
And none are strange to you.
Then you are in yourself
And in the world
At home.

Aus: 'Fremd-SprecherIn'

From: 'Foreign Speaker'152
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### Glossary

**Terms related to language, migration and settlement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>complete submergence into the target culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codeswitching</td>
<td>code means language; codeswitching refers to using terms from another language either within an utterance; or changing the language used in an interaction; or changing back and forth between languages in an interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant language</td>
<td>the language in which the speaker is most proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home language</td>
<td>language between parents and children in the home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>On the part of the receiving society, integration offers equal participation; on the part of an immigrant, integration means adaptation to institutional and social role requirements to achieve inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language transmission</td>
<td>Process of teaching language to the next generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration, emigration, immigration</td>
<td><strong>Migration</strong> is the process of moving from one place to another. <strong>Emigration</strong> is the out-migration from a country. <strong>Immigration</strong> is the in-migration into a country. Therefore, a <strong>migrant</strong> is someone who moves from one place to another; an <strong>emigrant</strong> is someone who moves out of a country; and <strong>immigrant</strong> describes a person who moves/has moved into a country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>Study of linguistic meaning units such as morphemes, the smallest meaning units (e.g., word roots and affixes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mother tongue  As this study shows, mother tongue as the language that the mother speaks to the child from earliest childhood can be problematic as people may not pass on their own first language to their children. Rather than mother tongue, I therefore use L1, which stands for first language learned. A child learning two languages at once from earliest childhood has two L1s.

Phonology  Study of speech sounds

Prosody  Relates to language rhythm and speech style

Syntax  Is about the combination of words into phrases and sentences

German terms

Bretzel  (plural Bretzeln) also known as Breze (plural Brezen), or Pretzel. Most common is the Laugenbretzel: The dough is made of wheat flour, yeast, water and salt, and rested, then formed into a specific looped form twisted onto itself. After another proving, Bretzeln are quickly dipped into a NaOH solution, sprinkled with coarse salt and baked. Laugenbretzeln/Laugenbrezen are eaten fresh. Butterbrezen are spread with butter. See also http://bar.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brezn

Dirndl  (singular & plural, the latter also Dirndln) The word is a Bavarian/Swabian dialect term for Mädchen [girl] that is also used for traditional girls and women’s dresses, which nowadays are worn mainly in the gastronomy and tourist industries, but also in rural areas. Each area has a slightly different Dirndl style. Exquisite handcrafted Dirndl are worn at festive events. The dress consists of a blouse, a fitting bodice and full skirt with an apron, and traditionally is accessorized with shawl and necklace. See also http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dirndl

Fernweh  literally ‘ache for the distance / far-away places’. The term expresses a more intense longing for distant places than
Wanderlust (pleasure in / joy in wandern, i.e. hiking), which is a German loan word commonly used to translate Fernweh into English. Antonym: Heimweh [homesickness]

Frankfurter smoked pork sausages known as Frankfurter (i.e. from Frankfurt) in Austria are also be known as Wiener (that is, Viennese/from Vienna) in Germany although opinions vary on exact sizes and quality. Eaten hot, often with mustard, and fresh wheat-bread rolls. See also http://www.heck.co.nz/p_sausages.html

Fritatensuppe Austrian term for (German) pancake or Flädle (Swabian) soup, that is, clear beef broth with thinly sliced pancakes and served with finely chopped chives

Geborgenheit is best explained as safety and security in terms of being embraced within a strong social support network

Heimat I use Heimat as in Huber and O'Reilly's (2004) definition. They explain Heimat as relating to the ongoing processes in social space and place. That is, Heimat relates to the individual and community, a place and the people within that place, who an individual feels strongly emotionally connected with and has a strong sense of belonging to, as well as a sense of emotional security and community.

Lederhose (singular is used in German for a pair of trousers, i.e., Hose); plural: Lederhosen. Deer or goat leather breeches with legs that traditionally are short or end just below the knee; they have a drop-front flap, pockets, including a small pocket on the side for a (hunting) knife, and are worn with suspenders. Traditionally worn for outdoor work and leisure by boys and men, they are part of Tracht (plural Trachten), i.e., traditional costumes, and are now mainly worn at special occasions such as folk festivals. See http://www.lederhosen-aigner.de/html/lederhosen.html & http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tracht

Oma granny; nana

Opa granddad; poppa
Optiker/Optikermeister

Optiker translates as optician, and Optikermeister as master optician. In the German language, however, Optikermeister is synonymous with Optometrist. An Optikermeister has undergone a 3-year apprenticeship; after its completion has at least 5 years practical work experience and has passed another 2-year Meister [master] course at a Fachhochschule [University of Applied Sciences]. Due to the different systems in Austria/Germany and New Zealand, unlike an optician the Optikermeister not only fits lenses and glasses, but also conducts eye examinations to detect vision problems or signs of abnormal conditions, for which the client is referred to an ophthalmologist. So, the profession Optikermeister covers the scope of two different professions in New Zealand, namely dispensing optician and optometrist.

Sauerkraut

also used as loan word in English: shredded, salted and fermented white cabbage that usually is consumed hot with pork belly or Frankfurter, potatoes or noodles, but can also be served cold as salad.

Verarbeitungsdiskurs

is discourse about overcoming and coping processes. According to Dittmar and Bredel (1999), Verarbeitungsdiskurs typically has in common:

- Coming-to-terms with individual, social and/or professional upheaval experiences;
- Belonging to the same social group;
- Participants’ common knowledge about such situations and their affective impact;
- Agreement regarding social norms, communicative practice, and sites/spaces of experience

Wiener Schnitzel

used as loan word in English; translated: Viennese cutlet. Traditionally, thin boneless cutlets from the upper section of veal leg or shoulder, dusted with flour, dipped in beaten eggs, then covered in bread crumbs, and (deep)fried in vegetable oil mixed with lard or clarified butter until golden. Served with lemon slices and potato salad or parsley potatoes and green salad. Pork, whilst not traditional, is also used because it is cheaper.
Māori terms

Aotearoa  Land of the Long White Cloud; Māori name for New Zealand

Māori  Term generally refers to the first people to settle in New Zealand (see The Māori – New Zealand in history [http://history-nz.org/Māori.html]). Modern Māori Dictionary definitions: native, indigenous, belonging to Aotearoa/New Zealand; aboriginal inhabitant, indigenous person of Aotearoa/New Zealand (Moorfield 2011).

Marae  The area in front of a Māori meeting (community) house as well as this meeting house, and the whole complex with the meeting house.

Pākehā  Definitions and explanations for the term ‘Pākehā’ vary from ‘not Māori’, ‘European’ (Ryan 1989); to ‘New Zealander of British or European descent’ and ‘exotic – introduced from or originating in a foreign country’ (Moorfield 2011). It might even be transliteration of ‘bugger ya (you)’ (Wohlfart 2009). In modern everyday use, Pākehā refers to New Zealanders of British ancestry or to New Zealanders of any European descent, but is also used for anyone who is not Māori. See also: [http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Pākehā]

Tangata whenua  People of the land. The term is used as synonym for all Māori as indigenous people of New Zealand; or for a group of Māori who have ancestral ties to a specific geographic zone; or for a group of Māori who hold customary rights over such a specific area, although this aspect of authoritarian rights is controversial (Magellanes 2011).

Tangi  Traditional Māori funeral/wake rites held on a marae, usually lasting 3 days (with interment on the 3rd day)
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Participant Information Sheet

Project Title: Migration and its unfolding consequences:
Three generations of German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand

An Invitation

My name is Irmengard Wohlfart. I am also a German-speaking immigrant and I would appreciate very much if you could help me with my PhD project.

I think that when we immigrate into a country which has another culture and language, much of our original language and culture gets lost over time, but perhaps I am wrong. In this study I would like to find out how much and in what way immigrating to and living in New Zealand has changed / changes the language(s) and culture(s) of German-speaking immigrants and their descendants in New Zealand.

Your participation in my research is completely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time. This will not have any unpleasant consequences for you.

What is the purpose of this research?

I am doing this research for my PhD thesis and hope to be able to present at professional conferences and have academic articles published.

How was I chosen for this invitation?

I chose you because you are also a German-speaking immigrant and have been in New Zealand for some time, or have parents/grandparents who came to New Zealand from a German-speaking country some time ago.

What will happen in this research?

I will visit you in your home for some hours (one visit may be enough; maybe you would like me to come a couple of times; maximum 5 hours altogether) and I would like you to tell me about your immigration-related experiences before, during and after you came to New Zealand. I am interested in good and not so good experiences and how you felt and feel about your move to New Zealand; and the consequences your immigration has had for you/for your family.

I would like to audio-record what you say, so I also can study your German and English language. If your child/grandchild/parent also takes part in this study, it would be good to record some interaction between you. Allowing me also to do a video-recording would help me to understand not only your language, but also your culture and I am very interested in that. For example, you could show the furniture and/or pictures/decorations you have and talk about them. It is your choice if you would like to be audio-recorded and/or video-recorded.

The findings of the study including video clips and transcripts will be used in presentations and publications in an academic context in the future.

What are the discomforts and risks?

It is not foreseen that you will experience any discomfort or embarrassment.

How will these discomforts and risks be alleviated?

I will show you the transcripts and videos and you will have an opportunity to alter or delete them as you wish. You can decide to discontinue the project at any time you choose. You also can withdraw any data I have collected from you.

What are the benefits?

It would be interesting for you (and us as a group) to understand more fully any language and cultural changes that immigration has brought about. If you are a parent, you can
benefit from greater awareness of such changes in your child. You can tell your stories, which could be useful for other migrants. Also, the narratives of immigrants may foster intercultural understanding within the New Zealand society.

**How will my privacy be protected?**

I change all names in the study and use fictitious names instead. However, if you want me to use your name you can indicate this on your consent form. I am also carefully treating any part of your information, which could be considered too personal or could present any risks when linked to you, in a way that this part of the information remains anonymous. If you choose to be video-recorded, you can opt for your face to be blurred out. The signed consent forms will be securely stored for 6 years and then destroyed.

**What are the costs of participating in this research?**

A maximum of five hours of your time.

**What opportunity do I have to consider this invitation?**

Could you please let me know within two weeks from today that you would like to do it? You can leave me a message with your name and phone number on 09-921 9999 ext. 6125 and I will call you back ASAP. Thank you very much. I really look forward to doing this research with you.

**How do I agree to participate in this research?**

You will need to sign the Consent Form(s) which are attached and give them to me when I come to see you.

**Will I receive feedback on the results of this research?**

When it is completed, my PhD thesis will be in the AUT University Library, and available online. I would then also be happy to talk to you as a group about it.

**What do I do if I have concerns about this research?**

Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, Dr. Ineke Crezee, in the School of Languages and Social Sciences at AUT University. Her email is ICrezee@aut.ac.nz and her phone number is 09-921 9999 extension 6825.

Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary, AUTEC, Dr Rosemary Godbold, Email ethics@aut.ac.nz; Phone 09-921 9999 extension: 6902 .

Who do I contact for further information about this research?

**Researcher Contact Details:**

Irmengard Wohlfart, School of Languages and Social Sciences, AUT University; Email: irmengard.wohlfart@aut.ac.nz Phone: 09-921 9999 extension 6125.

**Project Supervisor Contact Details:**

Dr. Ineke Crezee, School of Languages and Social Sciences, AUT University ICrezee@aut.ac.nz ; 09-921 9999 extension 6825.

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 13 November 2008. AUTEC Reference number 08/229
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Consent Form

Project title: Migration and its unfolding consequences:
Three generations of German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand

Project Supervisor: Dr. Ineke Crezee
Researcher: Irmengard Wohlfart

☐ I have read and understood the information provided about this research project in the Information Sheet dated dd mmmm yyyy.

☐ I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered.

☐ I understand that notes may be taken during the interviews and focus groups and that they will be audio-taped and/or video-taped and transcribed.

☐ I understand that identity of my fellow participants and our discussions in focus groups is confidential to the group and I agree to keep this information confidential.

☐ I understand that I may withdraw myself or any information that I have provided for this project at any time, without being disadvantaged in any way.

☐ If I withdraw, I understand that while it may not be possible to destroy all records of the focus group discussion of which I was part, the relevant information about myself including recordings and transcripts, or parts thereof, will not be used.

☐ I agree to the use of video recording: Yes ☐ No ☐

☐ I agree to the future use of the data for academic purposes: Yes ☐ No ☐

☐ I wish to have my voice digitally obscured: Yes ☐ No ☐

☐ I wish to have my image in the videos digitally obscured: Yes ☐ No ☐

☐ I agree to take part in this research.

☐ I wish to receive a copy of the report from the research: Yes ☐ No ☐

Participant's signature:........................................................................................................................................................................

Participant's name:..................................................................................................................................................................................Date:

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 13 November 2008. AUTEC Reference number 08/229

Note: The Participant should retain a copy of this form.
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Consent and Release Form

Project title: Migration and its unfolding consequences: Three generations of German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand

Project Supervisor: Dr. Ineke Crezee
Researcher: Irmengard Wohlfart

☐ I have read and understood the information provided about this research project in the Information Sheet dated dd mmmm yyyy.

☐ I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered.

☐ I understand that I may withdraw myself, my image, or any other information that I have provided for this project at any time, without being disadvantaged in any way.

☐ If I withdraw, I understand that all relevant information will not be used.

☐ I permit the researcher to use the video-recordings that are part of this project and/or any reproductions or adaptations from them, either complete or in part, alone or in conjunction with any wording solely and exclusively for a) her research; and (b) examination purposes and academic presentation and discussion; and (c) all forms of media for lawful purposes as stated on the Information Sheet.

☐ I understand that the video recording will be used for academic purposes only.

☐ I understand that any copyright material created by the video sessions is deemed to be owned by the researcher and that I do not own copyright of any of the video images.

☐ I agree to the future use of the data for academic purposes: Yes ☐ No ☐

☐ I wish to have my image in the videos digitally obscured: Yes ☐ No ☐

☐ I wish to have my voice digitally obscured: Yes ☐ No ☐

☐ I agree to take part in this research.

Participant’s signature: .................................................................................................................................................................

Participant’s name: ...........................................................................................................................................................................

Date: ..............................................................................................................................................................................................

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 13 November 2008. AUTC Reference number 08/229

Note: The Participant should retain a copy of this form.
Parent/Guardian Consent Form

Project title: Migration and its unfolding consequences:
Three generations of German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand

Project Supervisor: Dr. Ineke Crezee
Researcher: Irmengard Wohlfart

I have read and understood the information provided about this research project in the Information Sheet dated dd mmmm yyyy.

I have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered.

I understand that notes will be taken during the interviews and that they will also be audio-taped and transcribed.

I understand that I may withdraw my child/children and/or myself or any information that we have provided for this project at any time without being disadvantaged in any way.

If my child/children and/or I withdraw, I understand that all relevant information including tapes and transcripts, or parts thereof, will be destroyed.

I agree to the use of video recording: Yes ☐ No ☐

I agree to the future use of the data for academic purposes: Yes ☐ No ☐

I wish to have my child’s voice digitally obscured: Yes ☐ No ☐

I wish to have my child’s image in the videos digitally obscured: Yes ☐ No ☐

I agree to take part in this research.

I wish to receive a copy of the report from the research: Yes ☐ No ☐

I wish to receive a copy of the report from the research: Yes ☐ No ☐

Child/children’s name/s:

...........................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................

Parent/Guardian’s signature:
...........................................................................................................

Parent/Guardian’s name:...............................................................

Date:

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 13 November 2008. AUTEC Reference number 08/229

Note: The Participant should retain a copy of this form.
Participant Information Sheet (10 – 16 year olds)

Project Title: Migration and its unfolding consequences:
Three generations of German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand

Project Supervisor: Dr. Ineke Crezee
Researcher: Irmengard Wohlfart

What is this project about and what will happen?

This project is for my studies. I would like to video-record you at home to find out if and how your language(s) and culture(s) have become different from your parents. I would like you to tell me about your life in New Zealand, and/or the good and not so good things you remember when you first came here. I’d like to know how you felt, and how you feel now about your family moving to New Zealand. If your parents/grandparents also take part in this study, it would be good to record some interaction between you.

I will use the results of my study, including some video clips and transcripts of the language, in academic presentation and publication, but I will not use your name.

It is completely up to you if you want to take part in my study; and you can change your mind and withdraw at any time. This will not have any unpleasant consequences for you.

Is it uncomfortable and are there any risks for me?

I don’t think that there is any discomfort or embarrassment for you, but to make sure I will show you the transcripts and videos and you will have an opportunity to alter or delete them as you wish. You can decide to discontinue the project at any time you choose. You also can withdraw any data I have collected from you before my data collection is complete.

Is it good for me?

It would be interesting for you (and for us as a group) to understand more fully any language and cultural changes that immigration has brought about. You can tell your stories, which could be useful for other migrants and their children. Also, the narratives of immigrants may foster intercultural understanding within the New Zealand society.

How will my privacy be protected?

I will change all names in the study and use fantasy names instead. If there is any part of your information, which could be too personal or could present any risks when linked to you, I will make sure that it stays totally unnamed. You can also choose to have your face blurred out in the video. The signed forms will be securely stored for 6 years and then destroyed.

Does it cost me anything?

Only some of your time.

Can I think about it?

Could you please let me know within two weeks from today that you would like to do it? You can leave me a message with your name and phone number on 09-921 9999 ext. 6125 and I will call you back as soon as I can. Thank you very much. I really look forward to doing this research with you.

What do I do if I want to take part?

You will need to sign the Assent Form which is attached and give it to me when I come to see you. Your parent(s) also need to sign a consent form for you taking part.

Will I get to know what the results are?

When it is completed, my PhD thesis will be in the AUT University Library, and available online. When it is finished, I would also be happy to talk to you as a group about it.

What can I do if I think there is a problem with this research?
Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, Dr. Ineke Crezee, in the School of Languages and Social Sciences at AUT University. Her email is ICrezee@aut.ac.nz, and her phone number is 09-921 9999 extension 6825.

Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary, AUTEIC, Dr Rosemary Godbold, Email ethics@aut.ac.nz; Phone 09-921 9999 extension: 6902.

Who do I contact for further information about this research?

Researcher contact details:
Irmengard Wohlfart, School of Languages and Social Sciences, AUT University;
Email: irmengard.wohlfart@aut.ac.nz Phone: 09-921 9999 extension 6125.

Project supervisor contact details:
Dr. Ineke Crezee, School of Languages and Social Sciences, AUT University.
ICrezee@aut.ac.nz; phone number 09-921 9999 extension 6825.

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 13 November 2008, AUTEIC Reference number 08/229.
Appendix 1

Assent Form (10 – 16 year olds)

Project Title: Migration and its unfolding consequences: Three generations of German-speaking immigrants in New Zealand

Project Supervisor: Dr. Ineke Crezee
Researcher: Irmengard Wohlfart

☐ I have read and understood the information sheet telling me what will happen in this study and why it is important.
☐ I have been able to ask questions and to have them answered.
☐ I understand that notes may be taken during the interviews and that they will also be audio- and video-taped and transcribed.
☐ I understand that while the information is being collected, I can stop being part of this study whenever I want and that it is perfectly ok for me to do this.
☐ If I stop being part of the study, I understand that all information about me, including the recordings or any part of them that include me, will not be used.
☐ I agree to the use of video recording: Yes ☐ No ☐
☐ I agree to the future use of the data for academic purposes: Yes ☐ No ☐
☐ I wish to have my voice digitally obscured: Yes ☐ No ☐
☐ I wish to have my image in the videos digitally obscured: Yes ☐ No ☐
☐ I agree to take part in this research.

Participant's signature: ..................................
..................................

Participant's name: ..................................
..................................

Date:

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 13 November 2008. AUTEC Reference number 08/229

Note: The Participant should retain a copy of this form.
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Thank you for completing this form – will you ask your parent/caregiver to sign here

(signature)

(Date)

if they feel that you understand what the project is about and give this form back to me please.

Researcher: Imengard Wohlfart

Parent consent form for children

What do I do if I have concerns about this research?

Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, Dr. Ineke Crezee, ICrezee@aut.ac.nz, 09-921 9999 ext. 6825.

Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary, AUTEC, Dr Rosemary Godbold, Email ethics@aut.ac.nz; Phone 09-921 9999 extension: 6902.

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 13 November 2008. AUTEC Reference number 08/229
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Information Sheet and Assent Form for Children

(parent/caregivers please read to children)

This form will be kept for a period of 6 years

Hello,

My name is Irmengard and I would like to spend time at your home and will come on some days for an hour or two.

You can ask me about my work whenever you want to. When I’m in your home I might use a tape recorder and video-camera. Let me know how you feel about this by coloring in one of these words -

Happy Fine
Not Sure Worried

If you are not sure or worried come and talk to me about it or ask one of your teachers or your parents about this.
I am finding out about your Austrian/German language and culture and your Kiwi language and culture – you might like to find out about this as well. I am not sure how to explain the word ‘culture’ to you.

Culture might be something you feel, it might be something you do or say. I am asking you to make a video so that I can listen to your language and see your culture. We will work together on this.

Please circle if you would like to take part in making the video.

Please circle if you do not want to do this.

Please circle if you are not sure. If you cannot decide that is fine because you can come along anytime and tell me or one of your teachers or your parents that you want to join in.

This is my photo.

I hope we can do this together. It will be great to meet you and you will know who I am because of my photograph.
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*Interview topics*

Emigration

Immigration

Life in New Zealand

Impact on self/family

Language

Culture

Ties to land of origin

Experiences and feelings
Survey

New Zealand: Consequences of German speakers' migration over time

My name is Irmengard Wohlfart. I teach at AUT University in Auckland, and this survey is part of my PhD research. I would very much appreciate if you were willing to share your experiences as a German-speaking immigrant or as a descendant of a German immigrant in New Zealand. Doing this survey will take approximately 10 to 20 minutes. Your answers will be completely anonymous and treated with complete confidentiality.

Please complete this questionnaire

if you are a German-speaking immigrant living in New Zealand

OR

live in New Zealand and immigrated as a child/teenager with your German-speaking parent(s)

OR

live in New Zealand AND have/had a parent whose first language is/was German

OR

live in New Zealand AND have/had a grandparent whose first language is/was German.

You must be over 16 years old to complete this survey. Should you be under 18, your parent/guardian agrees that you participate.

Mein Name ist Irmengard Wohlfart. Ich unterrichte an der AUT University in Auckland, und diese Umfrage ist Teil meiner PhD Forschung. Es würde mir sehr helfen wenn Sie bereit wären Ihre Erfahrungen als deutsch sprechender Immigrant/deutsch sprechende Immigrantin oder als Nachkomme eines(r) deutsch sprechenden Immigranten/Immigrantin mit mir zu teilen (in etwa 10 bis 20 Minuten). Ihre Antworten werden vollkommen anonym und absolut vertraulich behandelt.

Bitte nehmen Sie an dieser Umfrage teil falls Sie
deutschsprachige ImmigrantIn in Neuseeland sind

ODER

in Neuseeland leben und als Kind/Teenager mit Ihrem/Ihre deutsch-sprachigen Vater / Mutter eingewandert sind

ODER

in Neuseeland leben und einen Elternteil haben/hatten der/die Deutsch als erste Sprache haben/hatten

ODER

in Neuseeland leben und Grosseltern haben/hatten die Deutsch als erste Sprache haben/hatten.

Durch Beantwortung dieser Umfrage bestätigen Sie dass Sie an der Teilnahme zustimmen und dass Sie 16 Jahre oder alter sind und falls Sie minderjährig sind, erlaubt Ihr Erziehungsberechtigter dass Sie teilnehmen.

Who do I contact for further information about this research?

Researcher contact details:

Irmengard Wohlfart, School of Language and Culture, Faculty of Culture and Society, AUT University;
New Zealand: Consequences of German speakers’ migration over time

Project Supervisor Contact Details:

Dr. Ineke Crezee, School of Language and Culture, Faculty of Culture and Society, AUT University; icrezee@aut.ac.nz Phone 09-921 9999 extension 6825.

What do I do if I have concerns about this research?

Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, Dr. Ineke Crezee, in the School of Language and Culture at AUT University. Her email is ineke.crezee@aut.ac.nz and her phone number is 09-921 9999 extension 6825.

Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary, AUTEC, Dr. Rosemary Godbold, ethics@aut.ac.nz, 921 9999 ext 6902.

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee in November 2008, AUTEC Reference number 08/229.

1. I want to participate in this research.

Ich will an dieser Forschung teilnehmen.

☐ Yes
☐ No

2. What is your gender?

Ich will an dieser Forschung teilnehmen.

☐ male
☐ female

3. I live in New Zealand and either am a German-speaking immigrant or have German-speaking parent(s) or grandparent(s) / ancestor(s).

Ich lebe in Neuseeland und bin entweder deutschsprachige(r) Immigrant(in) oder habe eine deutschsprachige Mutter und/oder Vater oder deutschsprachige Grossmutter und/oder Grossvater / deutschsprachige Vorfahren.

☐ Yes
☐ No
New Zealand: Consequences of German speakers’ migration over time

4. Where are you from? If you were born in New Zealand, were did your parents / grandparents come from?

Aus welchem Land stammen Sie / Ihre Eltern / Ihre Grosseltern?

Please explain:

5. Were you born in New Zealand?

Sind Sie in Neuseeland geboren?

☐ Yes
☐ No

6. Where were you born?

Wo sind Sie geboren?

7. How old were you when you immigrated to New Zealand?

Wie alt waren Sie als Sie nach Neuseeland eingewandert sind?

☐ 5 years old or younger
☐ 6-10 years old
☐ 11-15 years old
☐ 16-20 years old
☐ 21-30 years old
☐ 31-40 years old
☐ 41-50 years old
☐ 51-60 years old
☐ 61-70 years old
☐ 71 years or older
☐ N/A

8. Did you make the decision to immigrate to New Zealand?

Haben Sie die Entscheidung getroffen nach Neuseeland einzuwandern?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If no - who did? / Falls nein - Wer hat die Entscheidung getroffen?

---

345
### New Zealand: Consequences of German speakers' migration over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>German Version</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. At the time of your immigration, were you happy about moving to New Zealand?</td>
<td>Als Sie eingewandert sind, waren Sie froh nach Neuseeland zu ziehen?</td>
<td>9. At the time of your immigration, were you happy about moving to New Zealand?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It was easy to make friends with New Zealanders.</td>
<td>Es war einfach neuseeländische Freunde zu finden.</td>
<td>10. It was easy to make friends with New Zealanders.</td>
<td>Not at all Stimmt überhaupt nicht</td>
<td>Somewhat true Stimmt einigermaßen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To feel completely at home in New Zealand, it took me -</td>
<td>Um mich vollkommen zuhause in Neuseeland zu fühlen hat es .. gedauert</td>
<td>11. To feel completely at home in New Zealand, it took me -</td>
<td>about 3 months</td>
<td>about 6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Zealand: Consequences of German speakers' migration over time

12. My Austrian / German / Swiss qualifications were accepted in New Zealand without any problems.

Meine österreichischen /deutschen/schweizer Qualifikationen wurden in Neuseeland ohne Probleme akzeptiert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true Stimmt überhaupt nicht</th>
<th>Somewhat true Stimmt einigermassen</th>
<th>Very true Stimmt vollkommen</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

13. New Zealand has cost us a lot of money.

Neuseeland hat uns viel Geld gekostet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true Stimmt überhaupt nicht</th>
<th>Somewhat true Stimmt einigermassen</th>
<th>Very true Stimmt vollkommen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

14. I have less income in New Zealand than I had overseas.

Ich habe weniger Einkommen in Neuseeland als ich anderswo hatte.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true Stimmt überhaupt nicht</th>
<th>Somewhat true Stimmt einigermassen</th>
<th>Very true Stimmt vollkommen</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

15. Citizenship and/or permanent resident (PR)

Staatsbürgerschaft und/oder Daueraufenthaltsgenehmigung

- [ ] New Zealand Citizen
- [ ] PR

Other citizenship (please specify):
### New Zealand: Consequences of German speakers' migration over time

#### 16. How old are you now?

**Wie alt sind Sie jetzt?**

- [ ] 16-20
- [ ] 21-30
- [ ] 31-40
- [ ] 41-50
- [ ] 51-60
- [ ] 61-70
- [ ] 71-80
- [ ] 81+

#### 17. Do you own a home?

**Sind Sie Haus/WohnungsbesitzerIn?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

#### 18. Do you live

**Wohnen Sie**

- [ ] in the city / in der Stadt
- [ ] at the ocean / am Meer
- [ ] in a town / in einer Kleinstadt
- [ ] outskirts of town / am Stadtrand
- [ ] on a lifestyle block / auf einem Lifestyle Grundstück
- [ ] on a farm / auf einer Farm

#### 19. Who in your family immigrated to New Zealand and when?

**Wer in Ihrer Familie ist nach Neuseeland eingewandert und wann?**

(e.g., my paternal grandfather / my mother / just me / my partner, me & our children / my son and I etc.)

#### 20. Year of immigration to New Zealand?

**Jahr der Immigration nach Neuseeland?**
New Zealand: Consequences of German speakers’ migration over time

21. Apart from Austrian/German/Swiss, we have these ethnic groups in our family:

Ausser österreichisch /deutsch/schweizer haben wir diese ethnischen Gruppen in unserer Familie:

- N/A
- English
- Filipino/Filipina
- Maori
- Pakeha
- Another ethnicity?

22. What were the main reasons for emigrating?

Was waren die Hauptgründe für die Auswanderung?

- For more family security / Um mehr Sicherheit für die Familie zu haben
- To get a better life style / Um einen besseren Lebensstil zu bekommen
- Pollution Umweltverschmutzung
- Nuclear power / weapons dangers Atomkraft /waffen Gefahr
- Other (please specify)

23. Who else in your wider family lives in New Zealand? (e.g., parents, children etc.)

Wer von Ihrer Familie/Großfamilie lebt in Neuseeland ausser Ihnen? (z.B. Eltern, Kinder usw.)

- Family problems
- Don’t know
- Cold War /der Kalte Krieg
- War
- Persecution
- Other (please specify)
24. Do you keep in contact with Austria / Germany / Switzerland / Europe?

Bleiben Sie in Kontakt mit Österreich / Deutschland / Schweiz / Europa?

- Not at all
- Sometimes
- Often
- By phone
- On Skype
- Visits to Europe
- Visits from Europe

Comment:

25. My qualifications:

Meine Qualifikationen:

- School certificate/Schulabschluss
- University entrance/Baccalaureate/Abitur
- Apprenticeship/Lehre
- University degree/Universitätsabschluss

Please specify which field (e.g., electrical engineering; teaching)

26. Finding satisfying work in New Zealand was easy.

Es war einfach zufriedenstellende Arbeit in Neuseeland zu finden.

Not at all / Stimmt überhaupt nicht
Somewhat true / Stimmt einigermaßen
Very true / Stimmt vollkommen
N/A

Comment:
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27. I/We have (had) my/our own business in New Zealand.

Ich/Wir habe(n) /hatte(n) mein/unser eigenes Geschäft in Neuseeland.

- [ ] No
- [ ] Yes

Comment:

28. It's unfair that overseas pensions are deducted from New Zealand Superannuation.

Es ist unfair dass Renten aus andern Ländern von der New Zealand Superannuation abgezogen werden.

Not at all Stimmt überhaupt nicht
Somewhat Stimmt einigermassen
Very true Stimmt vollkommen

Comment:

29. I am proud of my Austrian/German/Swiss background.

Ich bin stolz auf meine österreichische/deutsche/schweizer Herkunft.

Comment:

30. Kiwis treat Germans/Austrians/Swiss as outsiders.

Kiwis behandeln Deutsche/Österreicher/Schweizer als Aussenseiter.

Comment:
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31. I miss my family in Europe.

Ich vermissene meine Familie in Europa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true Stimmt überhaupt nicht</th>
<th>Somewhat true Stimmt einigermassen</th>
<th>Very true Stimmt vollkommen</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. New Zealand is my dreamland.

Neuseeland ist mein Traumland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true Stimmt überhaupt nicht</th>
<th>Somewhat true Stimmt einigermassen</th>
<th>Very true Stimmt vollkommen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

33. New Zealand is my Heimat.

Neuseeland ist meine Heimat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true Stimmt überhaupt nicht</th>
<th>Somewhat true Stimmt einigermassen</th>
<th>Very true Stimmt vollkommen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

34. I’m glad that I’m far away from pollution.

Ich bin froh dass ich weit weg bin von Umweltverschmutzung.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true Stimmt überhaupt nicht</th>
<th>Somewhat true Stimmt einigermassen</th>
<th>Very true Stimmt vollkommen</th>
<th>Don’t care Ist mir egal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
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35. I'm glad that I'm far away from nuclear power and nuclear weapons.

Ich bin froh dass ich weit weg bin von Atomkraft und Atomwaffen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Somewhat true</th>
<th>Very true</th>
<th>Don't care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimmt überhaupt nicht</td>
<td>Stimmt einigermassen</td>
<td>Stimmt vollkommen</td>
<td>Ist mir egal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

36. I need lots of green space around my home.

Ich brauche jede Menge Grünraum um mein Heim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Somewhat true</th>
<th>Very true</th>
<th>Don't care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimmt überhaupt nicht</td>
<td>Stimmt einigermassen</td>
<td>Stimmt vollkommen</td>
<td>Ist mir egal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

37. I don't like neighbours closeby.

Ich mag Nachbarn nicht so nah da haben.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Somewhat true</th>
<th>Very true</th>
<th>Don't care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimmt überhaupt nicht</td>
<td>Stimmt einigermassen</td>
<td>Stimmt vollkommen</td>
<td>Ist mir egal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

38. My lifestyle is -

Mein Lebensstil ist -

- Excellent / ausgezeichnet
- Relaxed / entspannt
- Good / gut
- Could be more balanced / könnte mehr ausgewogen sein
- Hectic / hektisch

Comment:
39. Did you/your family bring possessions like furniture, household items, or other things that provided you with a sense of attachment to your European culture?

Haben Sie/Ihre Familie persönliche Effekten – e.g. Möbel, Haushaltgegenstände oder anderes – mitgebracht welche Ihnen/Ihrer Familie ein Gefühl der Binding an Ihre europäische Kultur gibt/gab?

- No
- Yes

Please explain:

40. Have you ever faced any prejudice or discrimination because of your German-speaking background/name etc.?

Haben Sie je Vorurteile oder Diskriminierung wegen Ihrer deutschsprachigen Herkunft / Ihres deutschen Namens / deutschen Sprache usw. erfahren?

- No
- Yes

What happened?
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41. Do you maintain your original culture / the culture of your parents or grandparents?

Pflegen Sie Ihre ursprüngliche Kultur oder die Ihrer Eltern oder Grosseltern?

- No
- Yes

Please explain why not or what you do:

42. Have you learnt German / Austrian / Swiss German?

Haben Sie Deutsch / Österreichisch / Schwyzerdütsch gelernt?

- No
- Yes

Comment:

43. In your childhood, which language was the family language?

Welche Sprache(n) war die Familiensprache in Ihrer Kindheit?
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44. If you learnt German / Austrian / Swiss German, how did you learn it?

Falls Sie Deutsch / Österreichisch / Schwyzerdütsch gelernt haben, wie haben Sie es gelernt?

☐ From my family
☐ At school
☐ Later in life

Please explain:

45. Do you speak German?

Sprechen Sie deutsch?

☐ No
☐ Yes

46. How would you describe your German language skills?

Wie würden Sie Ihre Deutschkenntnisse beschreiben?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Enough for everyday conversations</th>
<th>Not that good</th>
<th>Some words only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. How often do you speak German?

Wie oft sprechen Sie deutsch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. Who do you speak German with?

Mit wen sprechen Sie deutsch?

[Text Box]
49. Do you read German?

Lesen Sie deutsch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Hardly ever</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

50. I was terrified of making mistakes in English.

Ich hatte richtig Angst Fehler im Englischen zu machen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Stimmt überhaupt nicht</th>
<th>Somewhat true Stimmt einigermassen</th>
<th>Very true Stimmt vollkommen</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

51. Do you have trouble understanding English-speaking members of your family?

Haben Sie Schwierigkeiten englisch-sprechende Familienmitglieder zu verstehen?

- No
- Yes

Please explain:

52. Do you have trouble understanding German speakers in your wider family?

Haben Sie Probleme deutsch sprechende Familienmitglieder zu verstehen?

- No
- Yes

If you answered yes, please explain:

53. How would you describe your English skills at the time of immigration?

Wie würden Sie Ihre englischen Kenntnisse zur Zeit Ihrer Immigration beschreiben?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Enough for work / school</th>
<th>Not good</th>
<th>No English</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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54. How would you describe your current English skills?

Wie würden Sie Ihre jetzigen englischen Kenntnisse beschreiben?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Not so good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. Which is your strongest language?

Welche ist Ihre stärkste Sprache?

(please rank from 1 = strongest to weakest / bitte sortieren Sie von 1 = stärkste bis schwächste Sprache)

56. Do you mix languages when speaking with your family and friends?

Vermischen Sie Sprachen wenn Sie mit Ihrer Familie oder Freunden sprechen?

- Never mix languages / Mische nie Sprachen
- Sometimes mix languages / Vermische manchmal Sprachen
- Often mix languages / Vermische oft Sprachen
- Mix languages all the time / Vermische Sprachen andauernd