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1.0 Introduction

A number of micro and macro-environmental factors have resulted in New Zealand dairy farmers facing serious farm staffing and skills shortages (Searle, 2003; Nolan, 2003; Callister & Tipple, 2010; Tipple, Trafford & Callister, 2010). This review will examine why the domestic labour force cannot meet farmers’ needs, and the scope and nature of the increasing employment of temporary migrant visa holders to meet the shortfall. Issues surrounding their employment will also be canvassed.

Dairying is New Zealand’s biggest single industry and its performance is critical to the New Zealand economy as it produces 26 per cent of its exports, and contributes 2.8 per cent to its Gross Domestic Product (Ferrier, 2011). Labour shortfalls have the potential to threaten the industry’s performance potential as they pose a constraint to productivity and may inhibit further growth in the industry (DairyNZ, 2009). Unsurprisingly, the industry is keen to find workable solutions to attracting and retaining a skilled workforce that meets farmers’ on - farm needs. This is consistent with Outcome 2 of The Strategy for New Zealand Dairy Farming 2009-2020 (p5), to ensure that “Talented and skilled people are attracted to and retained by the industry”. Options include the increased use of migrant workers (DairyNZ, 2009), a number of whom already work on dairy farms. The industry good group DairyNZ keeps dialogue open with government to facilitate this (Ibid).

Agricultural labour shortfalls are nothing new; a mismatch of the rural labour force with the needs of farmers has been an enduring theme in New Zealand agriculture since colonial times (Tipple & Morriss, 2002; Murray, 2006). By 2001, it was apparent that there was not enough skilled labour in the dairy industry to meet its current and projected growth needs (Wharton, 2001) with Tipple & Morris signalling an impending farm labour crisis in 2002. By 2004, labour supply problems were considered so persistent that it had become an engrained feature of the dairy farming industry (Tipple & Lucock, 2004). Since then, the dairy labour problem has yet to be fully resolved. In 2010, a Federated Farmers’ survey found that almost 70% of dairy farmers were finding it hard to fill job vacancies, with them and recruitment agencies estimating a shortfall of at least 2,000 skilled dairy staff (Career Services, 2010).

As Figure 1 shows, there have been periods of less than full employment over the last decade. In the March 2011 quarter, New Zealand had a general labour force participation rate of 68.2%, a youth unemployment rate of at about 17.8% and a national, general adult unemployment rate of 6.3% (150,000 people) (Department of Labour, 2012 ). It therefore seems incongruent with national employment trends, that dairy farming cannot attract and retain an adequate workforce to meet its needs and is increasingly resorting to hiring foreign workers to milk and manage its cows (Callister & Tipple, 2010; Tipple, Trafford & Callister, 2010). This begs the following questions; why do farmers struggle to find and keep suitably qualified staff, what options do they have and what if any role does migrant labour play in overcoming staffing challenges in the industry? While the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families defines migrant workers as persons who are to be engaged, are engaged, or have been engaged in a remunerated activity in a State of which they are not nationals (New Zealand Human Rights Commission, n.d.) for the purposes of this review, migrant dairy workers are foreign - born people who have secured employment on farms as temporarily contracted workers, to provide ‘Essential’ labour that the domestic workforce cannot supply.
2.0 Rationale for this review

This review examines a range of available literature to determine:

- why dairy farmers employ migrants in lieu of domestic workers,
- the extent and nature of migrant dairy employment in the dairy industry,
- the issues that impact on the viability of temporary migrant employment in the industry.

Early in this review, it was apparent that while people are critical to the success of farm enterprises (DairyNZ, 2009), traditionally little scholarly emphasis has been given to the 'people side' of New Zealand dairy farming. There is even less on the employment of migrant labour, although migrants e.g. the Dutch have been working in the industry since after World War Two (Te Ara, 2012). Research appears to have primarily focussed on the dairy cow as 'the engine of the New Zealand dairy industry' (DairyNZ, 2009, p18). As a result, there is a growing but still very small body of New Zealand scholarly literature about dairy labour supply and skills issues, and migrant workers in particular. Consequently, to build a picture of the factors that impact on the employment of migrant staff, this review was extended to include a wider range of material than was initially intended. It includes South Island Dairy Event (SIDE) conference papers, Nuffield Scholars’ reports, popular press articles, Government websites, stakeholder information and unpublished research. It intends to offer a broader but less academically rigorous perspective on the employment of migrant labour in dairying, exploring the factors that have created the need for migrant workers and the attendant issues surrounding their employment.
3.0 Factors impacting on dairy workforce shortfalls

The complex issues associated with attracting and retaining skilled staff in the dairy industry have been well publicised (Searle, 2003; Nolan, 2003; Bayly & Keeling, 2002; Tipples & Lucock, 2004; Tipples, Trafford & Callister, 2010; Tipples & Trafford, 2010). Factors include that the industry has experienced a period of significant expansion over the past thirty years but particularly over the last decade. This expansion; in size, nature and geographical location, has resulted in more cows being farmed, herd sizes growing, occurring mainly in non-traditional farming areas, remote from traditional dairy farming labour pools. In essence, there are more cows to be farmed in non-traditional dairy farming areas.

The national cow herd has grown substantially over the past decade (DairyNZ, 2009). Access to irrigation and tracts of land at cheaper prices relative to land use, has enabled many dairy farmers to relocate their businesses to growth areas, convert other land uses and/or increase the scale of their operation. On average 30-40 farms per year are being converted into dairy farming from other land (Pangborn, 2012, March 22). While the number of dairy cow herds declined between the 1980/81 and 2007/08 seasons and has only slowly increased since then, herd sizes are growing (DairyNZ, 2012). In 2001, the national average farm herd size was 286 cows, by the 2008-09 season, 366 cows (DairyNZ, 2009). The average farm has 376 cows [194 in the North Island, 319 in the South Island] (DairyNZ, 2010). While 69% of the cows are in the North Island, the main industry expansion is in the South Island. By 2009, South Island dairy cattle numbers were almost seven times larger than 20 years ago when there were 312,000 dairy cattle (Statistics New Zealand, 2010). Most of the large herds (700+ cows) are in the South Island (SIDDC, 2011). They make up approximately 8% of the national dairy herd and this is set to increase dramatically with the predicted doubling of the national herd within the next 5-7 years (Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry [MAF], 2010b).

The corollary of farm expansion has been the need for more farm staff with large farms particularly vulnerable to staffing shortages (Kyte, 2008). Future labour shortages appear inevitable. Currently there are approx. 24,000 workers in the industry (Taylor, 2011). A typical farm requires about one labour unit for every 150 cows (Woodford, Greer & Phillips, 2003) and as the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF) forecasts that in 2014 there will be 5.02 million cows in milk (MAF, 2010b), at least 33,467 workers will be needed to milk and manage them. The bulk of them will be required in the South Island where dairy expansion is most prevalent and continuing.

The large scale South Island landowner, Maori Iwi, Ngai Tahu, has signalled an intention to develop 35,000ha of their North Canterbury forestry landholdings, for agricultural development. Already the tribe’s property arm has begun developing three trial farms of 1000 cows each on 1200 hectares of land in Eyrewell, near Oxford. Its expectation is that a full-scale operation would convert the Balmoral and Eyrewell forests to 16,000 hectares of dairy operations (Radio New Zealand, 2011). While the Iwi has ascertained that dairying offers the best economic use for much of its land portfolio, and its development may not necessarily lead to all future development being in dairying, it illustrates the pressure that large scale expansion may put on an already pressured South Island dairy labour market. It begs the question of where a supply of suitably skilled farm staff will come from to meet theirs and the industry’s staffing needs now and into the future.

Unlike the smaller and generally North Island farms, which have historically used family labour (augmented with hired labour at peak times), the newer farms and larger conversions are highly dependent on large numbers of hired staff (Pangborn, 2012). This is reflected in the changing nature of the dairying labour force. The number of unpaid (owner/operators and their families) has dropped while the number of hired workers has increased (Wilson & Tipples, 2008; Taylor, van der Sande & Douglas, 2009). In 2009, more than 50% of staff were employed on wages compared with 29% in 1997 (DairyNZ, 2008). More hired workers are needed. Expansion and changing ownership structures e.g. corporates, equity partnerships, and multiple owner farms which have less access to family labour and need hired staff, in tandem with a demand for more staff to milk a growing national cow herd, places pressure on the domestic labour market (Tipples, Trafford & Callister, 2010). This is compounded by the trend for new and bigger dairy farm conversions to be developed in South Island areas e.g. Canterbury, North Otago, Southland and the West Coast, remote from traditional the dairying labour pools of Waikato, Taranaki and the Bay of Plenty (Tipples, Trafford & Callister, 2010).

When demand for workers is increasing, a number of macro-environmental factors mitigate against their availability. Traditionally the industry has depended on a high proportion of young, fit workers to do dairy farm work e.g. milk harvesting and move into management. Yet, increasingly, dairying’s traditional labour source is diminishing due to changing age and rural - urban demographics. This will reduce the numbers of young people available to enter the dairy farming workforce (Searle, 2003). Age demographics are predicted to alter significantly over the coming decades. According to National Labour Force Projections, New Zealand’s labour...
force is expected to peak at 2.39 million in the mid-2020s, before declining slightly to 2.38 million in 2051. Half the New Zealand labour force will be older than 42 years in 2012, compared with a median age of 39 years in 2001 and 36 years in 1991 (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, 2013). The numbers available in the youth segment of the labour force are declining and will continue to do so. The 18-24 year segment of the labour force on which the dairy industry has been so reliant for entry-level staff is expected to make up only 12 percent of the labour force in 2051, compared with 16 percent in 1996 (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, nd). This is compounded by outward migration flows. Increasingly people (often young people) are choosing to travel and find employment overseas, further reducing the potential pool of young workers. For example, in the year to November 2011, there was a net loss of 600 people (Department of Labour, 2011b). A diminishing labour pool is also exacerbated by rural - urban demographic shifts. New Zealand is increasingly becoming an urban country with steady, small but significant demographic movement away from rural areas. The population living in rural centres or rural areas comprises a slowly declining proportion of the population and most rural and remote areas are continuing to decline (Statistics New Zealand, n.d. a). A declining rural population has led to changes in community social support, declining opportunities for socialization through group activities, declining participation in schools and churches (Cameron, Barrett, Cochrane & McNeill, 2010). This is likely to reduce the attractiveness of rural living for dairy farm workers who are required to live on-farm (Pangborn, personal communication 2012, March 23), remote from the social activities urban workers want. Remote dairy farm employment can isolate workers from social activities and be so unattractive to young prospective employees, that it may be a contributing factor to the poor image of dairying which hampers recruitment and retention (Trafford, 2010). A lack of rural support networks has exacerbated the issue (Wilson & Tipples, 2008).

The opportunity for up-skilling and career development has been an attraction of the industry (Bayly & Keeling, 2002). However, with the increasing cost of cows and land, sharemilking progression is no longer seen as a reliable pathway leading to farm ownership and therefore dairying is a less attractive career option (Searle, 2003). The majority (62%) of estimated staff on farms are at the basic level (Farm Assistant) and by industry estimates, even if they should want to progress to higher positions there are limited opportunities. Without the same progression opportunities, fewer herd managers are moving through the system, causing a shortage of workers at the intermediate level (McFarlane, Ramos & von Randow, 2008). Only about five percent are likely to be promoted in any one year (Taylor, 2011). A lack of awareness of career pathways into the industry is compounded by having limited engagement between industry and schools, particularly in late primary and early high school years. This includes poor engagement with teachers and careers counsellors to provide them with knowledge of the industry and training prospects and to encourage student interest in agricultural careers (Greenhalgh, 2011).

Expansion, changes to employment and farm ownership patterns and demographic challenges have contributed to supply and skills shortages in the dairy industry but the industry is also a contributing factor. Poor employment practice; long and unattractive rosters, long hours worked for salary received, a lack of employment contracts, understaffing, and dangerous working conditions have plagued the industry. This has resulted in stress and fatigue and the industry having a poor reputation as an employer and a low rating as a career of choice (Searle, 2003; Nolan, 2003; Tipples & Trafford 2010; and Greenhalgh, 2011). The industry insists that it is a small minority who give the industry a bad name (Pangborn, 2012; Kyte, 2012), but some in the industry appear slow to change. Overall, dairying (and agriculture in general) has a poor image (Luxton, 2011) and negative perceptions of it have persistently hampered recruitment (Searle, 2003; Nolan, 2003).

While prejudice against agriculture often results from an ignorance of farming within the wider community (Casinader, 2010), for some time it has had the image that it neither looks after its workers, nor more importantly cares about the people it employs (Bodeker, 2000). The 2012 headline ‘Dairy farmers might make New Zealand rich, but an American survey has deemed that it is the second worst job in the world’ (Field, 2012), reinforces the perceptions of dairying as a career of last resort (Searle, 2003; Nolan, 2003). Dairy farming came in second worst in a list of 1748 jobs (Field, 2012). Peter McFarlane, from ex labour recruiter Greener Horizons, cited in Harding (2008, Sept 04) asserted in 2008 that a number of farmers have such poor reputations that they cannot attract staff because of the way they have treated their workers. Though there were some good farm employers, the industry had been slow to respond to reasonable employment practices and had “exhausted people off the industry”. Poor employment practice by some farmers appears ingrained. Dairying’s accident rate is high - third worst in terms of injuries per person employed, with 25-50 percent of workplace deaths occurring ‘on farm’ (Dairy InSight, 2007, pp 2-3 cited in Wilson & Tipples, 2008). Hours can be very long; workers get tired especially at peak periods of calving, breeding and pregnancy testing. Tiredness breeds mistakes and accidents can result (Trafford, G., personal communication, March 10, 2010). High levels of lower back pain, mental health and alcohol problems have been identified in farmers and workers (James, 2002). Bills (2003) suggested young dairy workers are particularly vulnerable to long hours, social isolation, stress, fatigue, poor eating habits, illness and injury. Bills, a rural GP, suggests a small number of
employers viewed their young employees as solely labour units rather than as people with basic human needs and rights, particularly when unwell (Ibid). This appears more likely to be true on larger properties where as a farm’s size grows, people management challenges follow suit (Fegan, 2009). Mycock (2010) noted that stress and fatigue are features of dairying, especially expansionary and larger scale dairying. He notes that they need very good managers but there was a tendency to burn them out quite quickly. Farmer participation in staff management training is poor, largely because farmers overestimate their management ability and often view the problem to be that of others, rather than reflecting on their own practices (Luxton, 2011; Kyte, personal communication, Invercargill, April 13th, 2012). Workloads and tiredness are also likely to be a factor in poor management training uptake (Greenhalgh, personal communication, 14th April 2012).

The industry not only has a problem finding staff but it has trouble keeping those it attracts. The type of work that employees are expected to carry out and the hours that they are expected to work are important factors affecting job satisfaction for dairy farm workers (Bayly & Keeling, 2002; Tipples, Hoogeveen & Gould, 2000). Farmers believe salaries and benefits should be attractive to prospective workers as most jobs come with benefits e.g. accommodation (Bodeker, 2000). However, dairy farming is seen by young people as hard, dirty, remote work with long unsociable hours (Wilson & Tipples, 2008). An analysis of 1996 Census data revealed that dairy farmers/dairy farm workers population work longer hours than the New Zealand working population. Altogether 40 percent of employees, 45 percent of employers and 49 percent of those self-employed without employees worked over 60 hours per week whereas only 10 percent of the total New Zealand working population worked more than 60 hours per week (Wilson & Tipples, 2008). Long hours, in unattractive rosters and perceptions of low pay for overall hours worked are seen as issues that erode the industry’s competitiveness and which are seen as needing urgent redress for farmers to be competitive (Taylor, van der Sande & Douglas, 2009).

In 2000, Bodeker delivered a paper at the South Island Dairy Event (SIDE) conference. He exhorted farmers to ‘Change Our Attitudes or We are out of Farming’. The attitudes of some have been slow to change. As a result of challenging dairying workplace environments, (churn): staff turnover is high. Staff that stay, carrying the burden of an extra workload, face its attendant fatigue, stress, long rosters, and lack of time for rest and repair (Kyte, 2008). Kyte has suggested that understaffing on farms, especially larger units of 600 cows or more, is compromising the New Zealand dairy industry (Ibid). Tables 1 and 2 show turnover in workers current roles and from the industry, is high. The entry-level positions are especially high with 52% of farm assistants staying in their current job less than one year and 46% less than three years. 30% of herd managers and 38% of assistant managers stay less than one year. Fifty percent of employees exit the industry within three years (Taylor, 2011). Turning over employees is expensive. Costs include; separation costs for former employees, recruiting costs for new employees, interviewing time; administrative work associated with a new hire, training and supervisory time and, overtime pay for employees who have to fill in for the departed employee. There is also a cost for lost production associated with getting a new employee up to speed with their new job. In financial terms, the cost is high. Sarah Smith, an organizational leadership supervisor specialist at United States’ Purdue University estimates a loss (2008 figure) of US$2,000 for each farm employee turned over (Marrison, 2009). A general rule of thumb is that for staff a member who leaves after 12–18 months, the cost to replace them and train a new recruit is 1.5 times their salary (Ison, 2007).
This picture does not compel young people to take up careers in dairy farming. However, this situation is not confined to New Zealand. Australian state Victoria’s dairying industry faces similar issues (Dairy Industry People Development Council, 2011, August 05). They have identified the design of jobs, worker engagement, reward, performance appraisal and teamwork are all important in setting up appealing work arrangements, but note many farmers are inexperienced employers and struggle to deliver the conditions workers desire. Their Dairy Industry People Development Council submission (2011) to the Parliamentary Inquiry on Farm Sector Workforce Capacity, found that working conditions on dairy farms must match those of other jobs on offer, or young people who start in dairy will not stay. There is evidence that it is not attraction, but retention of people that is the more persistent challenge (Nettle; Semmelroth, Ford, Zheng, & Ullah (2011).
Australian research by Nettle; Semmelroth, et al, (2011) examined how people are retained in their dairy industry. They concluded that four, broad factors impact on employee turnover: external market conditions, the characteristics of the individual business, the characteristics of the employee and employer strategies that promote: their retention e.g. employee engagement. They found that the most highly correlated factors with retention tend to be the employer strategies and there was a diversity of opinion about how key stakeholders influence retention.

Flexibility (in work hours and timing), personal growth and development (including career paths) and enjoyable work environments are reported as key conditions that employees valued alongside pay rates that are competitive for farming. The submission also saw the creation and maintenance of vibrant communities as an important factor in retaining a rural workforce. Opportunities for partners and family members often make or break the decision to stay. Access to hospitals, recreation facilities, casual and permanent employment off farm are all needed. Their submission noted that good working conditions are important for farm owners too but sometimes they traded these for wealth creation (Dairy Industry People Development Council submission (2011).

Labour supply, quality and cost, are areas of vulnerability for dairy farmers (IFCN, 2002 cited in Kingston & Claycomb, 2005). Farmers have sought to increase productivity and reduce their dependency on labour and so thwart skills and supply shortages. A number of potential solutions have been tried with varying degrees of success; increased technological innovation, increased promotion of the industry to attract and retain domestic workers into the industry, increasing labour productivity per worker unit and up-skilling senior farm staff to be more effective people managers. Rotary milking parlours, robotic milk harvesting and automatic cup removal have saved time yet have not overcome dairy farmers need for quality staff (Trafford, G., personal communication; Pangborn, 2011). Systems changes e.g. Once-a-Day dairying (Verwoerd & Tipples, 2007), employing more staff and changes to roster patterns (Kyte, 2008) have been suggested to address labour challenges, yet none seem to have been widely adopted (Tipples, Trafford, & Callister, 2010). The employment of migrant workers appears to offer a viable solution (Tipples & Callister, 2010; Tipples, Callister & Trafford, 2010). This is an option that other international dairy industries have resorted to for continued viability (Valentine, 2005). The industry good organisation DairyNZ sees it as an important issue to pursue and is liaising with the government to facilitate (DairyNZ, 2009).

4.0 Immigration as a solution to labour supply challenges

Immigration has historically been used as a tool to advance the government’s economic growth strategy, as per the Department of Labour’s Statement of Intent 2010/11-2013/14 (Department of Labour, 2010c). The 2012, Government’s integration of business, labour and immigration services into the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) signals even greater focus on migration as an economic driver for the country’s prosperity. Temporary and permanent migrants make up more than 25% of New Zealand’s workforce, bringing investment, skills, and international connections that generate growth in New Zealand’s economy (Department of Labour, 2010b). The Department of Labour contends that immigration is critical to lifting New Zealand’s overall level of productivity to produce the wealth needed to make sure it can sustain its standard of living. This is dependent on the skills of its workers and how businesses and industry support New Zealanders to work to their best potential. It sees this as one of the biggest long-term challenges facing New Zealand’s labour market and economy. One of its three strategic components is to ensure migrants are available to meet skill shortages to develop the economy. It expects that if New Zealand maintained its net overseas-born migration at the 2009 level of 40,000, there would be a significant impact by 2021, including an increase of real GDP per capita by 1.5%, growth in export earnings and capacity and capability in the workforce as the working age population would expand by 7.4% (Ibid).

Migrants are an established part of the fabric of New Zealand society. In 2006, 23 percent of people usually living in New Zealand (879,543 people) had been born overseas compared with 20 percent in 2001 and 18 percent in 1996 (Department of Labour, 2011a). Migrant inflows have been involved in agriculture and dairying for a long time. For example, Dutch migrants have played a significant and successful role in the New Zealand dairy industry. In 1950 the New Zealand government approached the Dutch government in The Hague, urgently seeking 2,000 skilled migrants; carpenters, skilled labourers, and farm and domestic workers. Even before the immigration agreement was signed in October 1950, 55 Dutch dairy workers were selected and arrived in New Zealand in time for the peak of the dairy season (Te Ara, 2012).
Since the mid 2000’s, migration policy appears to have moved from solely traditional patterns based on residency to include more flexible, temporary patterns to meet labour market needs. The latter includes visitor visas and longer term work contracts. To provide some sense of scale for this trend, in New Zealand, in the 2010-11 year:

- 74,872 international students were approved to study in New Zealand. Of these, 52 percent (38,375 people) were new international students.
- 137,011 people were granted a work visa, up 5 percent from 2009/10. The United Kingdom was the largest source country, followed by India.
- 22,342 people were approved to work in New Zealand under the Essential Skills Policy, down 3 percent from 2009/10.
- 43,265 people were approved under 34 Working Holiday Schemes, up 8 percent from 2009/10.
- 8,236 people were granted a Graduate Job Search visa, up 7 percent from 2009/10 (Department of Labour, 2011c).

Figure 2 shows that over time the trend to temporary migration has been steadily increasing.

![Figure 2: Number of approved general temporary work visas 2001/2 to 2010/11. Source: Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) (2012).](image)

As Table 3 shows, this trend is common in other OECD countries too. However, as temporary worker migration “is the component of migration flows which reacts most strongly to economic conditions” deteriorating international economic conditions have resulted in sharp drops in temporary migration internationally and in New Zealand post 2008 (OECD, 2012: p35).
New Zealand’s temporary visas are designed to enable employers to access the skills they need to fill gaps in their workforces, yet ensure that New Zealanders seeking employment are not disadvantaged, nor displaced from employment opportunities, and that improvements to wages and working conditions are not hindered (Immigration New Zealand, 2013). Immigration practice is highly regulated. Migrant farm staff can apply for permanent migration where they meet the criteria but most are recruited via the Essential Skills policy where there are shortages of domestic workers available to service an industry. The policy is not designed for lower-skilled or seasonal labour shortages, or to cover shortages caused by recruitment and retention problems.

Generally, under this policy, potential migrant candidate will need a job offer before applying for a work visa, though some migrants already hold an ‘open’ work visa to work for any employer. Having tried to recruit New Zealanders for a short-term position, but having been unable to find a suitably qualified or experienced candidate, dairy farmers have several options. If the job vacancy is on one of two Essential Skills in Demand Lists and a migrant candidate has the qualifications and experience as specified on the list, they can apply for an Essential Skills work visa. Farmers are not required to furnish evidence of attempting to recruit New Zealanders because Immigration New Zealand (INZ) reviews the lists regularly and has concluded that employers are unable to find enough people with these skills, qualifications, and experience in New Zealand (Immigration New Zealand, 2012a). As a result of dairying worker supply challenges, several dairy farming skilled positions are listed on the Immediate Skill Shortage List (ISSL). See Table 4 below.
Table 4: Skilled dairy positions on the Immediate Skill Shortage List (ISSL). Source: Immigration New Zealand, 2012a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Herd Manager (121313)</strong></td>
<td>National Certificate in Agriculture (Level 2) or above AND/OR two or more years’ relevant experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dairy Herd Manager (121313)</strong></td>
<td>National Certificate in Agriculture (Level 2) or above AND two or more years’ relevant experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Farm Manager (121313)</strong></td>
<td>National Certificate in Agriculture Level 3 AND three years’ relevant experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dairy farm manager (121313)</strong></td>
<td>National Certificate in Agriculture Level 4 AND a minimum of three years’ relevant experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The list is for occupations that have an immediate shortage of skilled workers. If an applicant produces an offer of employment in an occupation that is included on the current ISSL, visa and immigration officers will accept that no suitably qualified New Zealand citizens or residents are available. The ISSL is not used for migrants hoping to obtain permanent residency in New Zealand (Immigration New Zealand, 2010a). However, while highly skilled workers entering New Zealand on temporary visas can transition through the workforce to gain permanent residence status as skilled workers as per Skilled Migrant Category or the Work to Residence policy, this opportunity is not available to most migrant dairy workers. (G. Habens, personal communication, 15th December 2012).

Alternatively, employers wanting to employ migrants have to prove that there are no suitable New Zealanders to fill the position required. Immigration New Zealand and Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ) must be satisfied that genuine attempts have been made to find New Zealanders. These agencies will take into consideration the amount of advertising undertaken, location of the job and labour market in the area (Immigration New Zealand; Information for workers, 2011, cited in Rawlinson and Tipples, 2012). Employers must produce supplementary information outlining their employment history and why employees have left in the last 12 months. Once a migrant’s work visa is approved, they can commence working in New Zealand and visas will typically be approved for one year.

Farmers assert that the positions they find hardest to find and keep staff for is at entry level e.g. farm assistant, however immigration policy excludes this category. This may be due to the Ministry of Immigration conducting labour market tests to determine whether suitably qualified New Zealand workers are available, or could be easily trained to do the work and should be offered the employment rather than an overseas temporary worker. The test involves seeking advice from industry representatives and the appropriate New Zealand government agencies to determine current skill shortages (Immigration New Zealand, 2012a). It is possible INZ excludes this category because it does not deem milk harvesting to be sufficiently skilled to be included. Farmer lobby group, Federated Farmers, claims that the ISSL list is too restrictive and so does not meet industry needs. It believes the role is excluded because immigration officials do not appreciate that at all levels (including farm assistant position); farming is actually a skilled occupation. While it has asked government to review the way agricultural positions are currently classified by Immigration New Zealand so that skills categorisation is more reflective of the skills required on modern dairy farms and so they can access suitably skilled migrants for all levels of dairy enterprises, no change has been forthcoming. This frustrates the industry. (Federated Farmers, DairyNZ & Fegan, 2010, March).
5.0 The extent and nature of foreign worker employment

Table 5, shows, since the mid 2000’s there has been a significant increase in the number of temporary migrant workers visas in the dairy sector, due primarily to the sector undergoing significant expansion and transformation (Habens, 2012a).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visas</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>1770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DairyNZ statistics indicate that 4,600 staff working on farms are of non-New Zealand origin and that since the 2007/08 season, the majority of migrant workers have located to Canterbury (38%), Southland (23%), Waikato (13%) and Otago (8%). This is consistent with the expansion of dairying in New Zealand. However, the extent to which these figures relate to Essential visa holders is unclear. Working holiday makers also work on farms and Immigration New Zealand are unsure of the duration of that employment. Family members of Essential visa holders with open work visas may also work on farms, making it hard to determine the extent to which migrant labour is actually used on dairy farms (Habens, 2012a).

Migrants from over 57 different countries have been granted work visas to work in the dairy industry (McFarlane, Ramos & von Randow, 2010). Table 6 shows the breakdown by nationality of the majority of temporary visa holders. Of note here, is that the number relates to visa application approvals and not the number of people (i.e. it does not reflect the number of people attached to the visa e.g. principal applicant and family members (Settling In, 2012). This could account for Philippine Ambassador to New Zealand, Virginia Benavidez’s assertion in an April 2012 Canterbury farming paper, that 6-8,000 Filipino dairy workers work in the New Zealand dairy industry (Alcala, 2012). Essential visa holders however are likely to be around 1600 workers [eight percent of migrants] (Habens, Ministry of Immigration 2012a).
Table 6: Nationalities of dairy workers issued with temporary work permits (2003/04 to 2010/11).
Source: Callister and Tipple, 2010 & Habens, 2012(a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>1770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data on the ages, genders, lengths of employment in the industry, regional destination, job turnover, and roles of temporary dairy migrants is held in Ministry of Immigration datasets (G. Habens, personal communication, 15th December 2012) but limited research seems to have been done on this data as yet to build a full picture of their employment. With the implementation of a new Ministry of Immigration IT system, the quality of immigration data should improve in the coming years (G. Habens, personal communication, 15th December 2012). Integrating Government statistics with other industry data e.g. DairyNZ, AgITO would be useful. For example AgITO has statistics on training outcomes and injury and health statistics for the migrants who use their services (G. Habens, personal communication, 15th December 2012. This would help build a fuller picture of temporary migrant employment at national and regional level.
6.0 Farmer perspectives on migrant workers

Table six shows that a range of foreign workers are employed in the dairy industry. Some literature suggests, they offer a more attractive option to the domestic labour pool. A 2012, Southland Times article 'Immigrants top pick for farm work ' suggests low skill levels, criminality, drug and alcohol issues, and an inability to meet their farming routines and be reliable, make dairy farmers resistant to employing domestic labour. The ‘dysfunctional’ unemployed (the unemployable unemployed) are viewed as unsuitable because they do not have the required skills and because farmers have neither the interest, energy nor the inclination to resolve their attendant social issues (McAvinue, 2012).

One section of the youth unemployed (Youth not in employment, education or training, or NEETs) is increasing (Department of Labour, 2011e). Researcher Paul Callister sees these disaffected NEETs as ‘a social time bomb’ that needs positive support to enter the labour market. (Jobs fault line: the social time bomb, 2011, February 13). He suggests that New Zealand has been taking the easy option on dealing with them, bypassing them where there have been labour gaps, instead filling the vacancies with foreign workers on short-term contracts. He asserts that Canterbury dairy farms, for example, have been hiring Filipinos. "But if you had tough policies perhaps, some of those NEET youth would be off the unemployment benefits and they’d be doing apple picking or grape pruning or whatever” (Ibid). Anecdotally, farmers say the quality of applicants offered by Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ) for job vacancies is poor. "In contrast, migrant workers come in to work, make money, pay money back to their relatives and they are highly motivated” (Farmers prefer immigrants, 2012, May 02). For some farmers, hiring migrants on short term contract is preferable to hiring workers who they believe are entirely unsuitable for their on farm needs. Whether and what extent this is true is worthy of further research.

Farmers report that they find migrant workers stable, hardworking, resourceful, and cheerful; offering positive skills and attributes that farmers no longer see in young New Zealand workers. They appear generally tolerant of conditions that domestic workers would balk at. They tend to have:

- Strong work ethics
- Conscientious nature
- Be respectful
- Smart and humble
- Motivated and happy
- Loyal and reliable
- Willing to work


A May 2nd 2012, article entitled 'Foreign workers preferred’ suggests migrant dairy workers are highly motivated Philippines Ambassador to New Zealand, Virginia Benavidez said that Filipino migrants in Southland, at least, provided a ‘win-win’ arrangement for farmers and migrants “They came here for a reason- to do a job, to see a country and work hard” (P2). However, that migrants face the same difficult working conditions as domestic dairy workers is hinted at by Benavidez’s comments. "Filipino’s don’t mind the long hours, because the idea of going home to their family keeps them going” (Ibid). One of their advertised and admired qualities appears to be their tolerant dispositions; described in an online job advertisement as ‘pleasing personalities’ (Trovit, 2012). Migrants tend to find dairy farm working conditions very hard, especially on arrival. Long days, an endless stream of jobs to be completed with little free time, complex farm systems and machinery, and unpleasant working conditions (wet and cold) were often very foreign to them (Trafford, 2010). Their reluctance to overtly challenge their employers suggests a willingness to accept conditions and behaviours that New Zealanders and other nationalities might not (Kyte, personal communication Invercargill, 13th April 2012).

A Southland newspaper article about poor working conditions triggered by a young Filipino worker received condemnation from other local Filipinos because it highlighted serious issues about employment practice (Kyte, personal communication, 22rd March, 2012). Not all migrant workers are tolerant of New Zealand working conditions. Greenhalgh (2011) compared Filipino and Irish migrant’s workers perceptions of dairy employment conditions. She found the Irish workers perceived the work conditions on farms to be inferior to those in Ireland compared to New Zealanders’ or to the Filipinos she studied, and they had a less positive attitude to the industry. However, they were students on a short summer experience so were possibly frustrated when they did not achieve the degree of responsibility they felt they were capable of, or deserved. This may have negatively affected their responses. It does beg the question though- will the as - yet unresolved employment
practices that turn domestic and some migrant workers off working in the industry, eventually drive most migrant workers from the industry? There is a lack of concrete research as yet to answer this question.

A 2010 article entitled Muddy Waters by journalist Amanda Cropp, explored Canterbury dairy migrant issues. It highlighted that the migrant experience is not always positive. She framed the article as “Filipino, Romanian and South American faces have become as common as muck in our cowsheds - and that’s exactly how some of them have been treated”. She highlighted that migrant workers are particularly vulnerable to exploitation from recruitment agencies even before they enter the country and that the poor employment practice that turns domestic workers off the industry is meted out to migrants too. She cited a North Otago recruiter who advertised in newspapers and on television that the migrant staff he hired would “receive a warm welcome, at least two weeks orientation and continued support from his agency” (Cropp, 2010, p. 14). After paying substantial fees for placements, workers found themselves expecting to work for one farmer only to find they were working for another on a new contract paying less than the one they had signed in the Philippines. He falsified documents and was successfully prosecuted. It is usual for migrants to be charged by recruiters in their country of origin to process a job application and arrange the formalities that accompany it e.g. having a phone interview with a perspective employer and charges for documents. Examples of exploitative payment practices appear common (Farmers’ licences suspended in labour row, 2003 ). One includes the case of an unregistered Russian doctor Vladislav Nikolenko, who recruited Ukrainians to work in Mid Canterbury. Nikolenko had been deducting $120 weekly from the bank accounts of migrant workers, initially a legitimate charge, but then continued as an act of greed. Media attention focussed on complaints of these Ukrainian workers related to the perceived substandard working conditions and working unreasonable hours. Subsequent investigations by Department of Labour, Human Rights Commission and Immigration New Zealand cleared the farmer of these allegations (Scott, 2003, cited in Rawlinson & Tipples, 2012). Some successful prosecutions have proceeded against recruitment companies involved with dairy farming. They have led to strong calls for the registration of recruitment agents via the Immigration Advisors Act, 2007 (Rawlinson, 2012). While the introduction of new immigration legislation was expected to stop recruitment agent mismanagement of migrant affairs, this is not the case. In 2011, a Waikato operator was convicted of forgery related to the recruitment of Fijian dairy workers (Boyes (2011) cited in Rawlinson & Tipples, 2012). Subsequently, the Immigration Advisors Authority website provides a list of accredited and credible immigration agents as well those who have been struck off and those with lapsed credentials for prospective migrants to avoid (Immigration Advisors Authority, 2011- cited in Rawlinson, 2012). This offers migrants and farmers a level of reassurance.

As per Table 4, to gain temporary visa’s, Essential dairy migrants must demonstrate qualifications and experience. Research by Tipples, Rawlinson et al (Op cit), showed that many successful applicants have university qualifications and international dairying experience. The value of this to farmers is expressed in a 2012 online article ‘Dairy farms turn to migrants’

“They’re also getting the benefit of experience, with many foreign workers, particularly from the Philippines, having worked in foreign markets.

A South Waikato farmer, who asked not to be named, said staff with Saudi experience were particularly sought after as they were familiar with working on huge operations using modern machinery and world-class standards.

He said efforts by Work and Income to place unemployed people with farmers seldom yielded results due to a lack of dairy-specific skills, while foreigners came trained and enthusiastic” (Krupp, 2013).

Despite some farmers’ positive view of migrant workers, their employment is not unproblematic. Anecdotally, some farmers see employing migrants as more trouble than they are worth as they struggle to deal with cultural differences. Stilwell (2009) cites former Federated Farmers dairy section chairman Dean McConnell who believes that migrant workers skills sets and job expectations can be problematic. For example, “Some migrant workers turn up to work on a dairy farm totally unprepared for the task ahead. There have been cases of farmers having to furnish houses, and provide clothing, whereas the New Zealand worker usually turns up with all those issues sorted”. This hints to unclear farmer - worker expectations causing tension and it is community groups who step in to help migrant workers resolve settling in and employment issues (Rennie, 2010). Dairy migrant management challenges involve language difficulties, low skill sets and experience (Stilwell, 2009; Trafford, 2010). Heather and Thwaite’s (2011) collaborative project with Agribusiness Training, English Language Partners, and the Agricultural Industry Training Organisation (AgITO) confirms that migrant workers from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB) are at a disadvantage in their initial work and training, even though they are literate in their own language. This can put their productivity, safety and employment relations at risk. Their initial investigation suggested that the main problems perceived by migrant
trainees on AgITO courses were the struggle with spoken New Zealand English, the terminology used in dairy farming, and aspects of farming in New Zealand. Some farmers have concerns that migrant workers are not competent around complex machinery. This is likely a training and communication issue as many migrants may be unfamiliar with the scale, intensity, range and complexity of demanding tasks on some farm enterprises (Kyte, personal communication, Invercargill, April 13th, 2012). The extent and nature of management challenges farmers face is worthy of further research effort.

For a proportion of farmers at least, relying on migrant labour is a symptom of poor employment practice rather than a solution to it. However, Tipples & Bewsell (2010) point out that the staff turnover can fall with the employment of migrant workers, which ironically helps poor dairy employers manage better. Verwoerd (2005) identified that amongst those who do employ migrants, a polarity exists; between those who have not had any trouble hiring domestic staff but do so to increase their access to the labour pool. Others with poor employment practice find migrants are their only option. Of concern, is that those poor employment practice and conditions that are intolerable to domestic workers, are likely to be unacceptable for migrant workers either and they will perpetually face staffing problems. Some more assertive migrants report that they will move on to a new farm with a better reputation if they are not treated well. They can either get a variation of agreement or find new employment when their visa expires (G. Habens, personal communication, 15th December 2012).

7.0 Motivations to migrate

The reasons why people migrate are complex and beyond the scope of this paper, however a number of theories exist. Microeconomic theories of migration for example neoclassical theory, posits that expected income gain is the main driver of international migration. In essence, an individual decides to emigrate when the expected stream of income to be earned abroad net of migration costs (monetary and non-pecuniary) is higher than the expected discounted value of income at home (Budnik, 2011). This approach to describe migration movements is often referred to as a human capital theory. The name reflects that within the framework, workers consider migration when they expect either to reap higher returns on their existing skills in a foreign country or on skills to be acquired abroad in a home country (e.g. via occupational upgrading), after a return.

The neoclassical macro-theories descend from the research on the sources of economic development (Harris and Todaro 1970), cited in Budnik, Ibid). They explicate a theory of rural-urban migration as a process leading to equilibration of regional labour markets. The same mechanism can be used to assess dynamics of international migration. In labour abundant countries, wages are low but they are high in labour scarce markets. This sets incentives for workers to move from regions with a labour supply glut to countries with a deficient labour supply. Migration balances labour demand and supply in both source and host countries so that the international wage differential reflects only the cost of international movements.

The dual labour market theory, pioneered by Piore (1979), focuses on the whole economy as a basic unit of the analysis. According to the theory, the primary reason for migration lies in segmentation of host countries’ labour markets. In developed economies, the primary sector offers stable employment, high wages and social prestige. Even though, access to these jobs may be rationed (for example by high educational requirements or longer apprenticeship periods), nationals strictly prefer employment in the primary than in secondary sector, offering opportunities for migrants in secondary labour markets. Businesses turn to foreigners who are willing to take jobs with lower prestige, income and lower security. As such, migration is a purely demand driven phenomenon tied to a limited supply of native workers in the secondary sector.

World System Theory (Wallerstein, 1974) perceives migration as a natural outcome of globalization. International integration of trade and production processes and technological progress facilitates the reduction of communication and transport costs and the development of a global culture – they all disturb traditional social norms, technologies, and create labour oversupply in developing countries. Simultaneously these processes facilitate entry of citizens of peripheral areas into labour markets of developed countries. The abundance of labour and the reduction of migration costs jointly trigger outflows of labour from catching-up regions (Budnik, 2011).

Other theorists see international migration from a more personal perspective with migrant preferences affecting migration decisions (Moody, 2006). Motivations can be economic and non-economic. The economic factors that encourage people to leave their country of origin fall into three main categories: demand-pull,
supply- push and networks (Martin, 2009, Dec). Martin contends that an economic migrant may be encouraged to move by employer recruitment of workers (demand-pull), while migrants moving may move to escape unemployment, failing crops or low wage informal recruitment (supply-push factors). Job and wage information flows e.g. fathers following sons, and recruitment networks provide other motivation. Non-economic demand pull factors may include family unification, moving to flee war, political unrest e.g. refugees and asylum seekers are supply-push factors. Communication networks, ease of transportation access, assistance from organisations and the desire for new experiences or adventures provide other motivations. Budnik (2011) suggests acquiring or enhancing prestige, risk management strategies (where families or individuals insure for an unanticipated household income shortfall) or loan agreements (payment for earlier involvement of a family into covering investments into the emigrant’s human capital, migration cost, and possibly initial costs in the destination country) effectively constitute a family contract and drive migration decisions. Migration can be expensive but is often considered an investment with costs now and benefits later. Migration is therefore usually a carefully considered individual or family decision (Martin, 2009).

Understanding migrant’s motivations is important to ensuring that farmers create conditions where mutual expectations are met as this may impact on the extent they stay in New Zealand and integrate into their local communities or leave. It may also impact on the quality of the on-farm working relationship. Limited scholarly information exists on why dairy migrants move to New Zealand at all or in preference to other countries. Unpublished research indicates that the Asian (dominantly Filipino) workers are economic migrants, motivated by the prospect of a better income from dairying than they could obtain in their home countries. Wages can be a 1/3 to 1/10th more than those in their home country (McFarlane, Ramos & von Randow, 2008). Subsidised accommodation can reduce their living expenses and allow them to save money for the future and/or to send remittances back to their families. However, Rennie (2010) found that many dairy migrants have unrealistic expectations about how much money they will be able to make and save while in New Zealand because costs are often higher than they expect. Some exploratory research in Canterbury revealed that migrants from different countries of origin tended to have different motivations. Filipino migrants tended to become temporary migrants for economic reasons, although building skill sets and gaining experience is also a factor. Migrants working overseas may be a policy of a sending country – such as the Philippines. Migration is also viewed as the way to get ahead and the status of people who take up opportunities overseas may be higher (G. Habens, personal communication, 15th December 2012). South African and Latin American workers tend to have less of an economic rationale, and were out to seek fun, adventure, experience, and training opportunities. Financial factors although important were less of a driver (Johnston, 2010; Trafford 2010).

Budnik (2011) suggests that distinguishing between permanent and temporary migration may help to explain not only the dynamics of the actual labour force movements but also to better describe their impact on source and host economies. This distinction focuses on their plans and intentions rather than just an account of their actual duration of a stay abroad or just their status. Migrants plans and intentions are likely to shape their behaviours when staying abroad, e.g. migrants planning to move only temporarily can be expected to maintain closer ties to the source country, family, friends, local labour and goods markets etc. than those who attempt to stay abroad permanently (Dustmann, 1996b, cited in Budnik, 2011). 2012 Lincoln University research on Southland migrant workers highlighted that many chose New Zealand to work in because they had contacts, the dairy industry was successful and well regarded, and they could learn skills that would benefit themselves and their communities (Rawlinson, Tipples, Greenhalgh & Trafford, 2012). High health and safety standards were also important (Ibid). New Zealander’s tolerance to racial differences (Rennie, 2010) lifestyle benefits, good quality education for a relatively low price, a good health system and good future prospects for children have also been identified as strong attractants for migrant workers (McFarlane, Ramos & von Randow, 2008). Research by Tipples & Lucock (2004) highlighted that some dairy migrants are drawn to New Zealand for the opportunity to earn higher salaries, create new lives for themselves and their families and gain practical working experience. New Zealand is viewed as offering a number of opportunities:

- for higher wages than in their home countries,
- to progress and build experience, skills and equity,
- to transition from temporary status to gain residency, lifestyle, good quality education for low price, a good health system and good future prospects for children (McFarlane, Ramos & von Randow, 2008).

Most of the Filipino migrants move to New Zealand on temporary visas but many hope to stay permanently and become residents (Henderson, 2011) because it is seen as a very attractive destination. Immigration New Zealand policies are supportive by allowing partners and children to join them (Henderson, 2011), providing they meet the health and character requirements and they can show that they are in a genuine and stable relationship.
Unpublished and exploratory research by Trafford (2010) and by Johnston (2010) suggested opportunities to send remittances home is a major reason and outcome for Filipino migration. Remittances are income transfers from migrants to their home country; be they transfers to family members or repatriated savings (Budnik, 2011). While access to higher wages and the opportunity for remittances more than any other factor may once have been the driver of temporary Filipino dairy migration (Jurado, 1997), many Filipino workers are keen to gain residence in New Zealand and to remain involved with and progress in dairy industry (Kyte, 2012). The opportunity to develop the skills which propel a worker into a higher skill category is attractive. This may form the basis to develop the qualifications, experience, skills and job positions that enable them to become a permanent resident, an opportunity that is not universally available for those in the dairy sector internationally (Kyte, 2012).

Filipinos are used to mobility. Forty years of continuously deploying overseas migrant workers has made international migration an enduring feature of Philippine development (Orbeta & Abrigo, 2011). It sends more workers abroad that any other Asian country. In 2009, According to the Philippine government, there were 83 million Filipinos at home and eight million abroad who remit over $1 billion a month, equivalent to 10 percent of the country’s Gross Domestic Product (Martin, 2009). Migration is sanctioned by the Philippines government. It has made temporary labour migration a foreign policy priority in both bilateral and regional trade negotiations (O’Neill, 2004).

As Table 7 shows, 1363 increasing numbers of Essential visa applicants, from four South American countries, have worked in New Zealand since 2003/4 season (Habens, 2012b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>03/04</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants from Chile and Brazil predominate however, why this is so is unclear. Christie (2012b) compared the motivations and experiences of Chilean and Filipino workers on Canterbury dairy farms and concluded that Filipinos are primarily motivated by being able to bring their families with them and the opportunity to generate a good income which supports their ability to send remittances home. In contrast, South American dairy workers want to learn about New Zealand pastoral farming systems, because there is some cross-comparability of climate and the scale of farming in their countries of origin. Unpublished research (Johnston, 2010), by a Brazilian dairy worker based in Canterbury suggests South American workers do not intend to stay permanently. She believed they tend to have better education levels, are keen to travel, experience new work situations, and up-skill themselves with the intention of using these in their home country. She describes them as cohesive, fun loving with strong social support networks. They are less tolerant of and more vocal about poor working conditions (Johnston, 2010). A 2008 Southland Times article on migrants in dairying quotes former Venture Southland Settlement Support Co-ordinator, Sue Morrison-Bailey, confirms Chileans at least tend to come for short-term job opportunities “they might do one year on a dairy contract and then they are leaving to go back, often working for New Zealand-operated dairy ventures in South America (Larkin,2008).

LatINZynergy, a recruitment company was formed by rural professionals from Chile and Uruguay working in the New Zealand dairy industry. Former Chief executive Natalia Benquet asserts that South American agricultural graduates can have difficulty finding work in their countries and most see New Zealand as a medium- to long-term opportunity. They go to New Zealand to learn more about grazing management so they can take that skill back home. She said there was no shortage of potential workers from Chile and Uruguay, all with tertiary qualifications in agriculture. In their home countries, they were seldom able to buy stock or aspire to farm ownership, but the investment by Kiwis in both countries had highlighted New Zealand. The more they found out, the better New Zealand dairying looked for tertiary qualified agricultural and veterinary graduates (Lee, 2008). The motivations, expectations and experiences of other predominant dairy migrant groups e.g.
Southern Africans, Northern Europeans, and Fijians and others remain under-researched. Understanding their motivations may help the industry target temporary workers in a competitive temporary migrant market (Christie, 2012).

The extent to which migrants want to progress through the dairy industry is not well understood. Kyte (personal communication, 22nd March 2012) suggests that New Zealand farmers have the perception that workers come to New Zealand only to send money home and are not interested in progression through the industry but he asserts that as with domestic workers, it is the 80:20 rule (i.e. 20 percent will progress through the industry) and Filipino workers could become even higher. He believes the second generation of migrants will be the future of dairying (2012). Former Southland Settlement Support coordinator Ms Morrison-Bailey also predicts that in the future dairy farms will be owned by migrants. She cites an Argentinian couple who started in Southland as milkers and have progressed to managers and are aiming to eventually own a farm. “Many Filipinos have businesses in their home country and sell up their piggery or poultry farm and come back to invest the money in cows” with aspirations of being permanently involved in the industry (Larkin, 2008). As yet migrant ownership of dairy farms appears relatively limited. Synovate data (cited in Taylor, 2011) details that 94% of Owner-Operators positions, 93% of 50/50 Sharemilkers and 89% of Variable Order Sharemilker positions are New Zealander owned. Of interest, would be to research just how many of those who have progressed through the industry are second generation migrants for example, second generation Dutch.

The Philippine government is giving strong signals that migrant participation in the New Zealand offers the opportunity to develop its own fledgling dairy industry and increase domestic milk production. It views “the involvement of Filipino dairy workers who have gained exposure, expertise and experience in advance (sic) dairy production techniques and technologies” as important to achieving this (Philippine Embassy, n.d.-c). However, whether they will do this by returning to the Philippines and working in the industry or from New Zealand is unclear.

There is no foreign policy link with the Philippines in terms of supplying workers to fill skill/ labour shortages. As part of the Australia-New Zealand-ASEAN Free Trade Agreement (AANZFTA) New Zealand agreed a small number of Philippines specific temporary work visa policies. These policies, set up in 2010, allow up to 20 farm managers from the Philippines to be granted work visas without a labour market test as long as they meet certain criteria. There are no other government-to-government arrangements covering the movement of workers from the Philippines to New Zealand. Dairy farmers are not restricted to recruiting workers from the Philippines. In fact since this policy began no farm managers have actually been approved. Most farm workers from the Philippines come to New Zealand under other policies such as Essential Skills. Under the Essential Skills policy farmers may be able use the assistant dairy herd manager listing on the Immediate Skill Shortage List and not be labour market tested. (Habens, 2012a).

The high proportion of Filipinos working in New Zealand is probably due to Philippines and New Zealand recruitment agencies actively recruiting there. A review of several Philippine-based recruitment sites (Immigration Placement Services, 2011; Trovit, 2012) indicates they have placements for about 100 dairy farm staff. Applicant criteria include ‘pleasing personalities’, fluency in writing and speaking English. Recruitment agency Trovit require applicants to be aged between 25 and 40 years old, hold skills qualifications and have a minimum of two years’ work experience (Trovit, 2012). Immigration Placement Services (IPS) which opened a branch office in Manila, Philippines in early 2008 screens and checks each applicant individually before submitting them to potential employers. According to a recent press release, IPS believed the industry had become dependent on Filipino farm workers with demand very strong following the recovery in milk prices last year and so offer great placement prospects compared to other countries (Immigration Placement Services, 2011). Temporary Filipino dairy migrant workers tend to be male as recruiters tend to state this requirement in their advertisements (Trovit, 2012). Certainly, of 896 permits issued to Filipino workers in 2008/09, 831 were issued to men (Tipples, Trafford & Callister, 2010). This is in stark contrast to other streams of Filipino migration into New Zealand, for example, nurses and caregivers, who are overwhelmingly dominated by women (Badkar, Callister & Didham, 2009).

Historically, the Philippine government has been supportive of migration. In 1974, President Marcos issued Decree 442, the Philippines labour code to ensure the careful selection of Filipino workers for the overseas labour market so as to protect the reputation of the Philippines (Presidential Decree No. 442- The Labor Code of the Philippines, nd). It outlined the importance of strengthening worker recruitment for local and foreign jobs to serve national development objectives. Filipino migrants were often exploited abroad. In 1978, the Philippines Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) was created to again promote the migration of workers, but also to protect them during recruitment at home and abroad. POEA sends workers abroad, regulates private recruitment agencies, and checks the contracts that recruiters supply to prospective migrants (Martin, 2009). In recognition of the opportunities for recruiter exploitation, recruiters are highly scrutinised.
and Philippine law makes Filipino recruiters jointly liable with foreign employers to fulfil the terms of their contracts signed by a foreign employer (Ibid). The degree to which these contract are enforced remains undetermined and is worthy of further exploration.

The 2008-2010 Philippine Medium Term Development Plan (MTPDP) has as a strategic goal to continue to facilitate the deployment of one million Overseas Filipino Workers (OFWs) per year (Reyes, 2007). This appears to be a considered as a solution to the issue of poor job opportunities within the Philippines. From this, it can be taken that this policy fulfils the government’s mandate of employment generation and as means to poverty alleviation (Ibid). In the Philippines, it is widely acknowledged that remittances have helped to smooth income flows and to lower poverty levels. Remittances sent by Filipinos all over the world in the past several years have contributed to almost 10 percent of the Philippine’s annual gross domestic product (GDP). In 2009, remittances reached $17 billion predominantly from the industrial countries in North America, Australia and Europe. In December 2008, the total number of Filipinos living and working abroad was 8.187 million; 3.9 million were permanent immigrants while 3.6 million were temporary workers and the rest were undocumented workers (Liamzon, 2010). A number of theories are posited regarding remittances including; ‘tempered altruistic theory’ and ‘implicit co-insurance arrangement’ (Stark 1991 cited in Poirine, 1997). Remittances are believed to reduce poverty. Adams and Page (2005) cited in Martin (2009) found that a ten percent increase in the share of remittances in a country’s GDP is associated with 1.6 percent reduction in poverty. However, Yang (2008) asserts that Filipino remittances are primarily invested as insurance for future financial security or for consumption and while they can reduce inequality, Rodriguez (1998) found that most Filipino remittances accrue to wealthier households mitigating any effects on narrowing inequalities. These theories are now seen as less credible. Poirine (1997, pg 589) hypothesizes that remittances mainly consist of the repayment of an informal and implicit loan taken out by emigrants during their youth so they can secure a better education that makes them more productive in the modern sector. He identifies three waves of loans, loan repayments and savings to prepare for retirement, sent by emigrants to families at home, making up the remittance flow over time. The Philippines Government endorses the contribution migrant remittances make to the economy. The Commission on Filipinos (CFO) collects remittances through its LINKAPRIL program. LINKAPRIL translates into ‘service to fellow Filipinos’ (Frazer, 2011).

Temporary migrant workers are viewed as ‘heroes’ adding to their social status for individuals and families (Alvin, 2009 cited in Frazer, 2011). The Filipino President welcomes some migrants returning at Christmas in a "Pamasong Handog sa OFS (welcome home overseas foreign workers) ceremony (Martin, 2009). The migration expectation goes beyond the encouragement of the government; other institutions endorse migration; recruitment companies and a number of associations, ‘diaspora organisations’ for example churches, alumni associations, ethnic groupings that support and validate the migration ethos (Affiliated Network for Social Accountability [ANSA], 2010). However, Reyes (2007) believes Filipino migration comes at great cost. It results in a “loss of skills (‘brain drain’) within the Philippines that handicaps the country. She asserts that irreversible social impacts are left on the families left behind that are not appreciated at home or in receiving countries (Ibid). Her literature review into the nature of the impact of migration on Filipino children highlights that children left behind when their parents migrate as temporary migrants suffer negative effects; lower cognitive development, psychological and social difficulties due to the social- dislocation of the family. She does not believe that remittances make up for the negative aspects of parents long absences and she believes this transgresses their human right, yet this aspect of migration and remittancing is rarely highlighted. Anecdotal from migrant dairy employees in Southland by indicates that it is migrant’s preference is to have their families with them (Rawlinson et al, 2012).

Temporary migrants tend to do the ‘three-D jobs: dirty, degrading and dangerous work (Taran & Geronomi, 2002: 3 cited in Williams, 2009). New Zealand has been attempting to move to a high-skill, high-income economy, however, relatively low-skill workers remain a key part of many sectors of the economy. Migrants are employed as low skilled domestic workers, elder care workers, as well as agricultural workers (Ibid). While many of the jobs described as low- skill do require a range of capabilities, for most of them there are low barriers to entry and the jobs can often be filled by people with few formal qualifications. But perhaps more importantly these are jobs that are generally relatively low paid, sometimes near or at the minimum wage. In many overseas countries workers in these types of jobs are often new migrants, sometimes working illegally or, if working legally, often on temporary work permits. Reflecting a combination of migrant status and low pay, the somewhat euphemistic term ‘essential worker’ has developed in economies such as the United States (Callister & Tipple, 2010). ‘Essential’ means there is a perception that skills needed for dairying workers are actually low - skilled but actually the skills are not valued by society (Hyman, 1994- cited in Callister & Tipple, 2010). Federated Farmers would argue that the misvaluing of key skills at bottom of the dairy job hierarchy (dairy assistant) is an example of this (Federated Farmers of New Zealand, 2009).
8.0 Community support needs and responses

Historically, industry stakeholders and community organisations have called for action to support migrant dairy workers (Rennie, 2010). In 2008, John Fegan, rural recruiter and human resource consultant suggested developing a migrant dairy farm employee toolkit for employers and put the proposal to Dairy New Zealand (Cropp, 2010). In 2009, Rural Women New Zealand (2009, June 22) exhorted communities to support migrants in rural areas following concerns that not enough was being done to help them integrate into rural communities. "Migrants can struggle with feelings of isolation and loneliness when trying to establish themselves in an environment that can be so different from their homeland", then Rural Women New Zealand social issues spokeswoman Kerry Maw noted. RWNZ identified many issues: lack of transportation, social isolation, and unfamiliar social systems. Because of cultural and language differences, these migrants often may find accessing services and information difficult so they need support. Support for dairy migrants and other migrant workers has steadily gained traction. Some dairying areas where migrant labour has been employed, recognise that migrants have challenges to contend with from the moment they arrive in a community; and so have sought to identify and address the social needs of both the migrants and the communities that support them (Settling In, 2012). Eastern Southland’s Settling In initiative, has prepared a report to highlight the key issues for migrants who have settled in and "identify needs, gaps in services and suggestions for further action" (Page iii). This is an outcome of Immigration New Zealand’s Migrant Dairy Workers initiative. It has a joint-government – industry steering group (that includes Settling In) that is tasked to identify and develop interventions and strategies to assist migrants settle into local communities and to support their employers (Ibid).

According to Hon. Nathan Guy, Minister of Immigration as "The dairy industry is worth more than $13 billion in export value to New Zealand and is our largest single exporter.... It’s in everyone’s interest that migrant workers fit easily into rural communities”. There are a number of advocacy and support services for dairy and other migrants. Settlement Support Service (SSNZ) services often provide a point of contact for many new migrants and employers of new migrants. It provides links to local information and services that help migrants settle in to their local area and in the New Zealand workplace. SSNZ’s feedback on settlement issues helped to inform the approach INZ took with the Migrant Dairy Workers Initiative (G. Habens, personal communication, 15th December 2012). Rural women’s organizations offer support and advocacy to migrant dairy workers (Rennie, 2010). Rural Women New Zealand consider however, that because migrant labour seems to have grown in an ‘ad hoc’ way without adequate regulation, they have called for more structure and accountability in employment processes to protect migrant interests. Structures similar to those of the Recognised Seasonal Employment scheme have been suggested to ensure all parties are aware of their roles, responsibilities and accountabilities (Cropp, 2010: p16).

Dairy communities have taken up the cudgel. Stakeholder groups such as the Amuri Rural Women’s group, who developed the ‘Welcome to Amuri’ pack, a toolkit for all new employees but is particularly useful for migrants and employers with information related to migrant integration and employment. With a ‘philosophy of working in partnership’, the Amuri Dairy Employers Group (ADEC) developed newsletters, social events, and informal employment practice monitoring and support to drive changes in employment practice and support dairy staff including migrants (Amuri Dairy Employers Group [ADEC], 2011, Feb). The core principles of the group were espoused as:

- To promote the Amuri Dairy Employers Group as a positive career choice and an attractive employment option.
- To be high calibre employers and improve business performance
- To provide an exceptional dairy community network within the Amuri Area

By becoming a member of the Amuri Dairy Employers Group employers were required to be committed to being a good employer and promote the Amuri as a good place to work and live (Amuri Dairy Employers Group, 2010). Employer Groups such as the Amuri Dairy Employers group, and the Clydevale-Clinton group began to appear in about 2000 as a result of the problems of getting and keeping staff. They offered a novel employer- led, collective mechanism to lift the reputation of dairy farmers in the areas they were established, in order to better to recruit and retain staff (Edkins & Tipples, 2002; Tipples & Bewsell, 2010). They have had significant challenges staying viable.

Examples of support services to all migrants (but accessible to Essential visa holders) include:

- Immigration New Zealand’s initiative to inform migrant workers of their remunerative rights. It developed an information sheet that outlines the salaries that employees should expect to be paid and
a job description of each position. These figures are based on Federated Farmers surveys of dairy farm employers and their annual rates of pay (2010).

- In recognition of efforts to successfully integrate migrants into the dairy industry and to foster good employment relationships, on the 22nd March 2012, the Minister of Immigration, Nathan Guy, launched two new guides. The guides were developed in collaboration with sector organisations (DairyNZ, Federated Farmers and Rural Women) and offer practical advice, outline expectations and legal requirements to migrants and their employers. The guide for migrants has also been translated into Tagalog and Spanish. The guides have been widely distributed through Immigration New Zealand’s channels, through the industry organisations and through community networks. A translation service is available for migrants to ensure they can access key material and understand their rights. All government departments have access to an interpretation service for telephone clients. Minimum employment rights factsheets for temporary migrants that have been translated in a number of languages.

- The Ministry of Social Development (MSD) is also quite active in this space through its Settling In initiative (Gemma Habens, personal communication, 15th December 2012). Settling In was introduced in 2004 in response to “increasing ethnic diversity within the New Zealand population and a growing awareness that intervention was required to maximise settlement outcomes for refugee and migrant groups seeking new lives in New Zealand” (Ministry of Social Development n.d (b)).

There has been considerable international debate about how to understand and measure successful migrant settlement and social inclusion (Spoonley, Peace, Butcher and O’Neill (2005). New Zealand goals for migrants, refugees and their families are articulated in the New Zealand Settlement Strategy (NZSS) (Immigration New Zealand (2012). It outlines the goals for successful migrant settlement as:

- To feel welcomed and connected
- To get the right job and contribute to future prosperity
- To speak and understand New Zealand English
- To know how to access information and services
- To feel proud and confident
- To feel safe
- To understand and contribute to New Zealand society.

However, these only relate to permanent migrants and it is not clear what the country’s expectation is of the integration of temporary migrants

Temporary migrant employment appears to be a mixed blessing. Research highlights the largely positive experiences of migrants coming to live and work in New Zealand. They work on hard in jobs where domestic labour supply is often inadequate, they revitalise rural communities, bring ethnic diversity and a number of temporary migrant dairy worker’s family members are employed in the retail and service sector (Rawlinson, Tipples, et al., 2012). Yet, communities also see some challenges to overcome in having migrants working and living in their communities, especially those en masse. Dairying communities (Ashburton and Winton Filipino communities) are currently being researched. It has been hypothesised that despite their being critical to many dairy farm enterprises, dairy migrants may struggle to integrate into ethnically homogenous rural communities with less experience with cultural diversity and limited support services. A preliminary, 2012 Southland migrant research project indicated that tensions can exist between groups in the host dairying community and migrant workers and their families. Southland community groups were welcoming to dairy migrants and offered services and practical support but indicated they felt exploited at times and perceived that some migrants groups did not reciprocate adequately. Farmers also indicated where large numbers of one nationality were employed on -farm, they were cohesive, did not mix socially and placed stress on resources. Some rural schools are finding the number of migrant children is growing as migrants bring their children with less experience with cultural diversity and limited support services. A preliminary, 2012 Southland migrant research project indicated that tensions can exist between groups in the host dairying community and migrant workers and their families. Southland community groups were welcoming to dairy migrants and offered services and practical support but indicated they felt exploited at times and perceived that some migrants groups did not reciprocate adequately. Farmers also indicated where large numbers of one nationality were employed on -farm, they were cohesive, did not mix socially and placed stress on resources. Some rural schools are finding the number of migrant children is growing as migrant men who work on dairy farms have their families join them. It is common for fathers or parents to migrate into the dairy industry without their children and then bring them to New Zealand when they have settled in. St Thomas Aquinas School in Winton and Lumsden Primary School in Gore in Southland have had increasing numbers of students attending. In May 2010, eight percent of St Thomas Aquinas’ and ten percent of Lumsden Primary School pupils were from migrant families (McKay, 2010).

Farmers and migrants interviewed indicate they need immigration policy and practice to support their needs better. This includes broadening the Essential Skills List to include the Farm Assistant category for which there is the greatest demand. They also indicate that the Visa renewal process is onerous and expensive (in cost and time) and needs to be modified (Tipples, Rawlinson et al (2012).Of note, is the Philippines Embassy has initiated mobile visa clinics to expedite the process and reduce the stress on all parties (Philippines Embassy (n.d.-a)).
Tipples & Lucock (2004) identified a number of settling in issues faced by dairy migrants and their employers, including language challenges. They raised the importance of access to and affordability of English lessons. Child and adult education including language skills provides a valuable tool for migrant family integration onto farms, into the workplace and community. To ensure they have the best opportunity to settle successfully into work and life in New Zealand immigration requires migrants to have a ‘reasonable standard of English; The ability to understand and speak English. Language competency requirements apply differently depending on whether they are the principal applicant – the person completing a visa application form – or a non-principal applicant. Non-principal applicants include the partner and/or dependent children of the person completing the form. Farmers, community organisations and dairy migrants indicate that language challenges cause problems for all parties. Some relate to workplace communication but some relate to family members having poor language skills isolating them from the community. New Zealanders’ use of slang and accent differences, cause misunderstandings (Tipples, Rawlinson, et. al. (2012). Their research indicated that many Filipino workers especially, want to work in clusters and this could exacerbate language problems as it was easier for them to speak their own language, and “not go the extra mile to fit into the Kiwi language” (p: 17). Some farmers interviewed employed migrants from different countries. “Our policy is such that you learn English on the job. Part of what encourages them is we don’t have immigrants from all the same country” (p: 17).

Migrant workers are keen to learn English. Community services have responded to these challenges. For example, in 2011 Eastern Southland English Language Partners (ELP) provided services to 35 learners from 10 different nationalities (Brazilian, Argentinian, Chilean, Czech, Indian, Fijian, Nepali, Russian, Filipino and Thai). The demand for their language support programme has increased since 2006 (11 learners; 4 men and 7 women, including two couples, all with home tutors) from Romania, Poland, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Philippines and Japan. The majority of learners in 2011 were from the Philippines. 80 percent of the 2011 learners in Eastern Southland were working on dairy farms and were on work visas (Settling In, 2012). The issue of access to and the cost of language classes identified by Tipples & Lucock in 2004, remains. Temporary migrants have no right to free English lessons; they are dependent on their employers to fund them. It is not until and if these workers gain Permanent Resident (PR) visas, that the government funds English lessons (Tipples, Rawlinson et al., 2012). This is an area of vulnerability for migrants and farmers that stakeholders need to address as is the degree support services provided by government and the communities for migrants working in the dairy sector actually are accessed, what gaps exist in information and support. This is not fully evident in the literature and warrants further study.

9.0 The international experience

Internationally, the use of migrant labour is common place in dairying. Many intensive dairy farming areas internationally, including the United States of America (Vermont, Wisconsin and Ohio) (Valentine, 2005) are dependent on migrant labour. More than 40% of all hired dairy employees on Wisconsin Dairy Farms are immigrants (Prabst, 2009). Intensive American dairying areas, Vermont, Wisconsin and Ohio are dependent on migrant labour and lessons can be learned from their experiences integrating workers on farm and in the community (Valentine, 2005). The 2008 United States Economic Research Service National Survey of 5,005 Dairy Farms, with responses from 47 States found that migrants are critical to dairy enterprises there. 50 percent of surveyed farms used migrant labour, producing 62 percent of the nation’s milk supply. Dairy farms employed an estimated 138,000 Full-Time Equivalent workers in 2008: 41 percent or 57,000 of them were estimated to be of foreign origin, primarily from one source, Mexico. This study was a response to political pressure to remove undocumented labour from United States (US) farms. It estimated that the loss to the dairy industry and the United States economy of a withdrawal of access to migrant workers as substantial. It would reduce the US dairy herd by 1.34 Million head, milk production would drop by 29.5 billion pounds, and the number of farms would drop by 4,532. It was determined that retail milk prices would increase by an estimated 61 percent. Losing migrant labour was determined to reduce U.S. economic output by $22 Billion and 133,000 Workers, and both immigrant and native-born, would lose their jobs (Rosson, Adcock, Susanto & Anderson, 2009). This highlights the significant losses to the industry of a lack of access to migrant labour.

Dairying’s need to make migrant labour work has resulted in considerable research into the factors that enhance and impede its effective and sustainable use (Valentine, 2005; Mugera, 2004; Maloney, 1999). It shows that the use of migrant labour is both a blessing and a problem for dairy farmers, and indicates meaningful ways to productively integrate migrant labour onto dairy farms and into their local receiving communities to maximise the relationship and enhance the chance of retaining the worker. These can be summarised into three major themes: The first involves the recruitment of capable and skilled employees (Valentine, 2005). The second is the ability of farm management to be sensitive to, understand and resolve
cross-cultural and relationship issues (Ibid). The third is workplace (Wilber, Hadley and Miller, 2005) and community’s acceptance (Valentine, op cit.), support of migrants and their ability to integrate into community life (Ibid). Dairy farms are part of communities. Workers send their children to school, shop, and socialise in those communities (Ibid). The impact of migrant workers on these communities has also yet to be determined. Questions need to be asked about how communities with little ethnic diversity experience can support migrant workers and integrate them. International research indicates that as dairying expands into non-traditional dairy farming areas and migrant worker numbers grow, previously ethnically homogenous communities struggle with the changes to their social landscape and resentments, tensions and discrimination can occur. These may impact on dairy farm retention. Factors that enhance and hinder integration are also necessary. Discrimination can occur that isolated workers and impeded integration. This has implications for community harmony and the acceptance of cultural diversity and highlights the need for support and responsive local services (Ibid). In the United States where the employment of migrants (both temporary and permanent) in dairying is common, similar challenges of their productive integration has been well studied (Valentine, 2005; Mugera, 2004; Maloney, 1999).

1) The recruitment of capable and skilled employees (Valentine, 2005),

2) The need for farm management to be sensitive to, understand and resolve cross-cultural and relationship issues (Ibid) and,

3) Workplace and community acceptance and support of migrants and their ability to integrate into community life (Wilber, Gregg & Miller, 2005; Valentine, 2005). Quality employer initiatives like the Amuri Dairy Employers Group based around Culverden are critical for the sustainable employment of migrants (Edkins, 2003; Hannah, 2009; Tipples and Bewsell, 2010)

### 10.0 Dairy migrant solidarity

Worker’s conditions of employment are protected in law in New Zealand. Dairy workers have traditionally had little formal, sustained and effective representation to address their employment related issues (Callister & Tipples, 2010). Requests to establish formal structures such as the Recognised Seasonal Employer Scheme which developed to ensure labour was available for the horticultural industry and so offer a model to ensure transparent employment practice and support have not been realised. However, the Filipino dairying community in Canterbury has developed a worker advocacy and support structure; the Filipino Dairy Workers in New Zealand Inc. which has operated in Ashburton since 2006 (Cropp, 2010, p.14). It initially developed to meet the social needs of Filipino workers but has developed as a vehicle to resolve complaints relating to poor working conditions, treatment by employers and recruitment agencies’ problems. While it does not consider itself a union, it provides a strong degree of advocacy, support and empowerment for its members and their families. Sheer weight of numbers gives it some clout-membership has increased from the 15 founding members in 2007, to over 400 (Rawlinson, 2012). An example of its efforts is the instigation of Philippine Embassy mobile passport clinics for Filipino residents in Ashburton. On 18-20 November 2011, the Philippine Embassy in Wellington conducted its second mobile consular service. This is part of the Embassy’s drive to “give priority and render service to Filipinos who are employed in the dairy farms and other service sectors as they and their families will find it too costly and difficult to travel to Wellington for the renewal or application of new passports and other consular needs”. Two hundred and ninety-nine Filipinos received consular services (Philippine Embassy, nd-a). It highlights difficulties migrant workers may have with immigration issues.

An issue that has not been previously evident in the literature was canvassed in a meeting between Philippine Ambassador to New Zealand Virginia Benavidez and officers of the Dairy Confederation of the Philippines (DAIRYCON) and members of the Filipino Dairy Workers of New Zealand (FDWNZ) on 14 February 2012 in Ashburton (Philippine Embassy, 2012b). There, Sam Bruzo, President of the FDWNZ, thanked DAIRYCON for their commitment to help interested Filipino dairy workers who are injured and have to go back to the Philippines (Philippine Embassy, 2012b). Research into the extent to which migrant workers are injured or suffer ill-health on New Zealand dairy farms and need repatriating, and what repercussions this has on their future work opportunities, in either countries, appears un-researched.
11.0 Threats to a sustainable supply of migrants

The industry sees temporary migrant labour as critical to the industry. However there are a number of potential threats to their continued employment and the reemployment cannot be taken for granted. Access to migrant workers is politically driven through government policy. Immigration is an important strategy for addressing the labour and skill needs of the agriculture industry, however, importing temporary labour is generally perceived in terms of employer demand, with migration policies effectively regulating a tap that can be turned on or off according to the requirements of national labour markets (Williams, 2009, July). Government’s positive response to skill shortages is demonstrated by the need for reconstruction workers in Canterbury following the 2010-2011 earthquakes. It is predicted that for the next 20 years up to 23,000 construction workers alone are needed for the rebuild and these are likely to come from migrant sources (Roberts & Rossouw, 2012). Government has developed processes to speed up the migrant influx. Both workers and prospective employees can have the paperwork processed more quickly than has been the practice and work visa holders can apply for residence after 24 months with an accredited employer. The rationale is that this will save time and money for all parties and give employees processing priority.

However, temporary migrant inflows are also vulnerable to changes in Government policy. Dairying’s access to temporary foreign workers is a driven by policy decisions that may change as a result of pressure from rising unemployment or advocacy group intervention. Raising entry standards or stopping temporary migration temporarily or permanently is a possibility. In 2009, New Zealand Unions urged the Government to close borders and to terminate migrant workers before permanent workers were too badly affected by the negative impact of the worldwide economic recession in the workforce. While unions cited non-dairying examples (for example, CFWilton decided to make 24 permanent, domestic staff redundant while retaining 24 contracted temporary migrant staff), the employment of migrant workers can be a sensitive issue (Get rid of migrant workers first: unions, 2009) To placate lobbyists, former Immigraiton Minister, Jonathon Coleman said he considered temporary visas to be “a tap that can be turned on and off” (Ibid). Wickramesekara (2011) describes the concepts of flexible markets and ‘flexicurity’(the idea that temporary migrants have to leave or not arrive when there is a slackening of labour demand in the destination country) as problematic, as it is disruptive to workers and employers and can result in the countries of origin having to shoulder the burden of reintegration issues. She believes that all temporary migration should achieve a triple - win for all parties involved; the country of destination, workers and country of origin. However, policy can change in response to pressure and be viewed as disadvantageous for parties. In 2008, the Department of Labour changed dairy worker visa processing requirements in Manila to ensure the practical experience of applicants was relevant to working on a dairy farm in New Zealand. This led to the requirements for Filipino workers to demonstrate a higher level of skills. While, the Department of Labour said there had been no change in the policy on recruiting dairy farm workers from the Philippines, Federated Farmers was incensed that it raised the bar for migrant applicants and so was likely to restrict workers access to dairy farmers (Southland Times, 2008). In June 2009, Federated Farmers noted that the dairy farming positions ‘Assistant Herd Manager’, ‘Herd Manager’, ‘Assistant Farm Manager’ and ‘Farm Manager’ were being reviewed and categories withdrawn. They successfully lobbied to keep the status quo (Federated Farmers of New Zealand, 2009).

The employment of foreign dairy workers appears essential to the industry. However, temporary migration, while a valid and vital short to medium term measure, is problematic in that it means that the skills base within the domestic labour market is not being built and does not address long-term skills and labour shortages. Moody (2006) asserts that migration is only appropriate as a short-term intervention caused by skill gaps while training and education initiatives are underway to resolve the shortages. Conversely, permanent migration provides an opportunity for addressing long term shortages, particularly given the ageing workforce (Moody, 2006). If migrants are to be a long term solution to dairy labour challenges, then permanent migration might be considered as a better long- term option if dairying wishes to secure a sustainable workforce.

Changing age demographics will result in increased competition for younger workers in the world labour market. While migrants from developing countries may be are willing to put up with conditions New Zealanders would not, due to the chance of a better life, this will do little to enhance the dairy industry’s reputation. International competition for workers in other industries and other countries may tighten migrant worker supply as they chose to work in more attractive industries or in more supportive countries. It is therefore critical that employment issues that beset some dairy employers are addressed to ensure a supply of workers. Competition is likely to increase for young workers including migrants as pressures from population ageing begin to bite across developed countries and the demand for skilled labour increases (Moody, 2006; Christie, 2012). The world is experiencing an unprecedented phenomenon in terms of aging. Older age cohorts are beginning to account for a substantial proportion of the total world population. Indeed, all countries are
12.0 Conclusions

- Factors beyond the industry’s control and within it have created a situation where temporary foreign workers have become increasingly indispensable to the New Zealand dairy industry especially in the South Island where worker demand exceeds supply and the domestic workforce does not engage in a viable way.
- The industry needs workers and migrant workers seem keen to oblige. Increasing numbers of temporary visas have been approved annually since 2003/04, as the industry expands.
- Filipino migrants predominate and there is a significant South American presence in the industry. Temporary dairy migrants have differing motivations to work in New Zealand—some economic, some educational and skills based. Research into understanding migration drivers may assist in finding ways to address actual and psychological contracts and enhance job satisfaction and productivity.
- Temporary migrant workers are a mixed blessing for farmers and communities. Migrants and their families add new cultural dimensions to rural communities but can place stresses on rural communities and community services e.g. schools. Migrant workers are indispensable to many farms but overall their impact on rural communities and individual farms remains under researched.
- Employers and migrants need training and support to productively integrate foreign workers into their farm systems.
- Quality English language and other support services and networks are essential to support migrants and their employers. These need to be extended to those on temporary visas not just to permanent residents.
- Migration policy and practice can be frustrating for migrants and employers alike. Farmers would like the Essential Skills List expanded to include a Farm Assistant category, the category of farm positions hardest to fill and a feeder category for more skilled categories.
- Migrants and employers want immigration processes to be less onerous and expensive.
- Little research is evident on why some farmers employ migrants and some do not and with what effect.
- Limited research exists on the kinds of farm enterprises utilising temporary workers e.g. farm size, cow/worker ratios, geographical location, farming systems.
- Limited research exists on the dairy migrant experience in New Zealand.
- Virtually no research exists on the impact of migrant staff on farm systems, e.g. training and support needs, productivity, health and safety issues.
- Limited research exists on the impact of migrant labour on the communities they work and live in.
- There is no research available on the short and longer term consequences (e.g. health, integration, future employment) of temporary migrants returning to the sending communities.
- Overall, the picture of migrant employment on dairy farms and in communities is superficial. The literature reveals that while a picture of migrant dairy labour employment is developing, and statistical data is accruing, it is not one of any real depth.
13.0 Recommendations

Further research is needed to:

- Quantify the size and nature of migrant labour usage in the dairy industry.
- Examine regional differences in migrant employment as limited regional comparisons are available.
- Examine the motivations and support needs of different migrant groups.
- Determine on-farm attitudes, perceptions and preferences towards foreign labour versus domestic labour.
- Explore the impact of migrant labour on farm productivity.
- Develop case studies on the employment practices of farms that employ migrant staff that give voice to farmer expectations, issues and experiences.
- Explore the social impact of migrant labour on communities; tolerances, threats to social integration and support needs.
- Develop case studies that give voice to migrant workers ambitions, expectations, needs and experiences.
- Examine how labour market and immigration policy and practice facilitates or hinders dairy migrant employment.
- Identify what management practices facilitate the productive use of a multicultural workforce.
- Examine international best practice to develop guidelines and extension opportunities for how farmers and migrants can maximise their working relationships.
- Determine migrant labour training and skill needs and management challenges.
- Identify the training and support needs of senior dairy farm staff to facilitate the management of an ethnically diverse workforce.
- Identify what works and what does not for all parties concerned and highlight points of intervention and support to sustain the interrelationships.
- Investigate the application of formal support and accountability structures i.e. the RSE scheme, to migrant dairy employment.
- Explore the consequences for migrants of working in the New Zealand industry, having returned home.
- Identify what works and what does not for all parties concerned and highlight points of intervention and support to sustain the interrelationships.

This is consistent with Outcome 2 of The Strategy for New Zealand Dairy Farming 2009-2020 (p7), to ensure that stewardship and social responsibility are promoted as well as to “promote and support research, farming practices and activities that will instil pride in dairy farming, advance people and society…” (DairyNZ, 2009, p.7).
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