Pacific People in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua:
Movement and Attachment

Bev James

Public Policy & Research

and

Margaret Southwick

Health Education and Social Science
Whitireia Community Polytechnic

1. Introduction

This paper reports on the findings of the Pacific panel, which is made up of 150 Pacific people who participated in the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua panel over three annual interviews conducted from 2004–2006. Cannons Creek and Waitangirua are two suburbs of Porirua City that are considered by residents to form a community.[1] Almost 13,000 people make Cannons Creek and Waitangirua their home.

The Pacific panel contributes to a developing information base on those who identify with a Pacific ethnicity, a growing group in New Zealand. In the 2006 Census, there were 265,974 people of Pacific ethnicity residing in New Zealand (6.9 percent of the total population). This was a 15 percent increase since the 2001 Census.[2]

New Zealand has been, and continues to be, a significant recipient of Pacific peoples as permanent and long term immigrants, in part because of the right of residence of Cook Islanders, Niueans and Tokelauans, as well as the demand for labour from Pacific countries.[3] Pacific people come to New Zealand for many reasons including education, work and as visitors (who stay mostly with relatives). Often, temporary forms of movement, for education and work, become pathways to permanent residence. Pacific movement to New Zealand has been gaining momentum since the early 1990s and, although the mix of contributing Pacific countries might change, Pacific migration is likely to continue to be significant. The interviews for this research project were conducted between the years of 2004–2006, years that coincide with research that shows this was a period of increasing net gains in migrants from Pacific states to New Zealand.[4]

An understanding of the data gathered on the movement and attachment of Pacific peoples within the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua area is enriched by some knowledge of the broader context of the mobility of Pacific populations. As Bedford has observed:

> "Circulation of population, as well as immigration and emigration, has been of considerable interest to Pacific researchers and policy analysts for many years — the linkages maintained by overseas populations of Samoans, Tongans, Niueans, Cook Islanders, Tokelauans, Fijians, Fiji Indians and, more recently, Tuvaluans are very important drivers of economic and social transformation in their 'home' countries. Transfers of money, commodities, knowledge and labour between home-based and the overseas based components of Pacific populations are at the heart of the debates about development in Polynesia ….. no economic analysis of island countries in the Pacific makes sense without reference to their diaspora".[5]

---

[1] The boundaries of the case study area were defined by a local research reference group before panel participants were selected. Those boundaries coincided with the following census area units relating to the two suburbs: Cannons Creek North, Cannons Creek South, Cannons Creek East and Waitangirua.

[2] Statistics New Zealand (2008a).

[3] For example, the current recruitment of labour from selected Pacific countries to meet seasonal labour shortages in New Zealand, through the Recognised Seasonal Employer (RSE) scheme.

[4] Bedford (2007).

[5] Bedford, (2007:50).

We can expand Bedford's admonition to argue that no analysis of Pacific peoples' movement and attachment patterns can make sense without an understanding of how and to what extent responding to this diaspora impacts on the decision making of Pacific peoples within the New Zealand context.

This paper presents the following information:

- Section 2 discusses the main characteristics of Pacific mobility in New Zealand.
- Section 3 describes the Pacific panel.
- Section 4 profiles the 150 panel participants.
- Section 5 discusses the past residential movement of panel participants and future intentions to move.
- Section 6 considers panel participants' attachment to and identification with Cannons Creek/Waitangirua and whether those factors affected decisions to move.
- Section 7 makes some concluding comments about understanding the patterns of mobility and attachment as informed by Pacific people's decision making and responses to their environment.

2. Pacific Mobility in New Zealand

Pacific peoples have been depicted as experiencing "astounding mobility" particularly in the last half of the 20th century, a mobility that has touched almost every person directly or indirectly through their families.

The post-World War II Pacific migration resulted in the largest migration of people from Oceania, due to rising demands for labour from states around the Pacific rim. The patterns of migration from the Pacific to New Zealand have reflected the cycles of boom and bust in the New Zealand economy. The downturn in the manufacturing industries in the late 1980s led to huge job losses amongst Māori and Pacific peoples and this in turn contributed to net losses of Pacific peoples from New Zealand returning to Pacific home States. By the turn of the century this trend was showing signs of reversal and by 2001 Pacific migration had recovered to levels found in the late 1980s as Pacific peoples found new pathways to residence in New Zealand. The more recent resurgence in Pacific migration to New Zealand is a result of the changes to immigration policy since the 1990s. These changes have made it easier for those seeking approval to live in New Zealand permanently to gain this permission while in the country either as visitor or while studying or on a temporary work permit.[6]

Although having arrived and settled in New Zealand, Pacific peoples do not stop moving. One study has shown that 60 percent of Pacific citizens have made at least one move out of New Zealand since taking up residence in this country. Pacific peoples resident in New Zealand are frequent travellers back to their Pacific home States and/or to Australia.[7] That mobility has been expressed as "a world of social networks" that stretch throughout Oceania from New Zealand and Australia, to the United States and

---

[6] Bedford, (2007:2, 27); Macpherson (2008).
[7] Bedford, (2007:23, 50–51).

Canada.[8]   Through those networks many Pacific families conduct "transnational lives".[9] The ongoing circulation of Pacific people to and from their former homes, with associated circulation of money, commodities, knowledge and labour, has been noted as a prominent dimension of Pacific movement.

Despite the movement of Pacific peoples demonstrated in many studies, there is another facet to Pacific people's lives in New Zealand, as long term and relatively stable residents. While the pattern of migration from the Pacific to New Zealand has been accelerating since the late 1990s, nevertheless the majority of Pacific peoples (60 percent) in New Zealand are New Zealand-born. Furthermore, most movement of Pacific peoples resident in New Zealand is related to internal migration. The 2006 census showed that 47 percent of New Zealand's Pacific residents had moved at least once within New Zealand in the previous five years. Only nine percent had arrived or returned from overseas. It cannot be taken for granted that internal movement is driven by the same sorts of factors as transnational migration. It is possible that different reasons for internal movement come into prominence.

Another aspect reflecting the stability of the Pacific population in this country is that Pacific peoples do not appear to be the most mobile group. Between the 2001 and 2006 censuses, 44 percent had not moved residence at all. Although 47 percent of Pacific people moved within New Zealand between 2001 and 2006, they have a lower proportion of movers in all age groups than the population as a whole (54.8 percent of New Zealand's usually resident population moved residence within the country between the 2001 and 2006 censuses). In particular, Pacific young adults are less likely to move than other young adults. This may reflect pressure to live at home and contribute to the household economy, at least until marriage. Also, those Pacific people who did not move between 2001 and 2006 tended to be parents in their middle adult years with children in secondary education. Pacific movement tends to be within the same region, rather than further afield.[10]

The diversity of any convergence of Pacific peoples within the New Zealand context then, is likely to consist of newly arrived migrants, permanent and long term residents along with cohorts of second and third generations of New Zealand born who self identify as Pacific. Part of their shared cultural experience, irrespective of nationality or ethnicity is their shared narratives around the Pacific diaspora. Indeed, Hau'ofa claims that "it is in their blood to be mobile" to make the point that there is a long history of movement and mobility in the Pacific.[11]

"Movement" then is a well understood strategy for managing one's personal, familial and financial opportunities and obligations; it is something that can be seen reflected in the patterns of movement of the Pacific people who participated in this research project. These diverse patterns of movement, within region as well as transnational, and lengthy residence in one place are all evident in the stories told by the Pacific panel participants.

---

[8] Hau'ofa, (2005).
[9] Bedford (2007:60); Macpherson (2008).
[10] Statistics New Zealand (2008b).
[11] Cited in Bedford (2007:5).

3. The Pacific Panel

The Pacific panel, consisting of 150 people, is a subset of the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua panel. Households were selected to be part of the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua panel to provide a mix of:
- Families with and without children
- Long term and more recent residents (living in the area less than five years)
- The variety of Pacific ethnicities in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua.

All household members aged 16 and older in the selected households were interviewed. Face-to-face interviews were conducted between September and January in 2004/05, and the same months in 2005/06 and 2006/07. The long interviewing time frame enabled more panel participants to be followed up and fitted in with participants' and local interviewers' busy lives.

The panel interviews collected data on past and intended movement, reasons for that movement, people's experiences of living in their communities and their attachment to those communities. Data was also collected on the composition of households in which they lived, personal demographic details and dwelling characteristics.

The four census area units that cover the same area as the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua case study community comprise the largest proportions of Pacific peoples in Porirua City. Accordingly, the large majority of those interviewed in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua were of Pacific ethnicity.[12]

Over the three years of interviews, the Pacific panel grew from 112 people to 161 people. A small number, 11, were not able to be interviewed at the first interview, and basic demographic information about them was completed on their behalf by another adult in their household. These 11 are not included in this discussion of the Pacific panel because insufficient information is available about them.

Over three quarters of the 150 panel participants that this paper focuses on were interviewed more than once. Just over half of the panel (80 people) were interviewed three times, and 37 were interviewed twice. Most still lived in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua at the end of the three year period.

For each year, we returned to the same households and interviewed people again. The Pacific panel started off in 2004 with 112 people living in 38 households in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua. The panel both lost and gained people when we repeated the interviews in 2005 and 2006. These changes were largely due to people moving in and out of the households.

In 2005, 121 Pacific people were interviewed. As well as interviewing those people we interviewed in 2004, we also interviewed anyone 16 years or over who had come to live in a panel household, or who was already living in the household and turned 16. Furthermore, we tried to follow up anyone who had moved out of those households and interviewed them at their new residence. Those 121 people lived in 42 households, as some had formed their own households or gone to live in someone else's household. In

---

[12] The census area units are: Cannons Creek North, Cannons Creek South, Cannons Creek East and Waitangirua. See Porirua City Council (2008).

that year, we also added nine households (19 interviewees) to the panel to widen the representation of Pacific ethnic groups participating in the panel.

In 2006, all panel members in 2004 and 2005 were followed up. The number interviewed was 125, living in 44 households.

4. Profiles of the Pacific Panel Participants

The following description of the Pacific panel participants in based on the 150 people for which there is detailed information. In their first interviews, all were asked for basic demographic details. These details were not asked for in subsequent interviews. However, in every interview, participants were asked about their involvement in education, training and employment and about any changes in income.

Age and sex profiles

Eighty-five women and 65 men participated in the Pacific panel over the three years.

The largest proportion of panel participants was in the 16–24 age group, which made up almost 30 percent of the panel (Table 1). This was expected, due to the youthful age structure of the Pacific population, with a median age of 21.1 years.[13] The second largest group was the 30–39 year age group. They made up 26 percent of the panel. Together the 16–39 year olds made up two thirds of the panel. The median age of panel participants was 35 years. Those aged 65 and over made up just over 4 percent of the panel, and the oldest interviewee was 74 years.[14]

---

[13] Statistics New Zealand (2008a).

[14] The panel's age distribution is not compared with the age distribution of the total Pacific population because the panel only includes participants 16 years of age and over.

Table 1: Age distribution of panel participants*

Age Group	Number	Percent
16–19	30	21.1
20–24	12	8.5
25–29	15	10.6
30–34	11	7.7
35–39	26	18.3
40–44	14	9.9
45–49	5	3.5
50–54	7	4.9
55–59	9	6.3
60–64	7	4.9
65+	6	4.2
Total	**142**	**100**

* Based on age at first interview. N = 142; 5 refused and 3 missing data

Pacific ethnicities

New Zealand's 2006 census shows that the seven largest Pacific groups in New Zealand are made up of Samoans (49 percent), Cook Island Māori (22 percent), Tongans (19 percent), Niueans (8 percent), Fijians (4 percent), Tokelauans (3 percent) and Tuvaluans (1 percent).[15]

Porirua City has a much higher proportion of Pacific peoples than most other territorial authorities. In 2006, it was 26.6 percent compared to 6.9 percent for New Zealand as a whole. Within Porirua City, Pacific people live mainly in Eastern Porirua, which includes Cannons Creek and Waitangirua.

The four Pacific ethnic groups represented in the panel were Samoan, which made up 69 percent of participants (104), Tokelauan 12 percent (18), Cook Island Māori 7 percent (11) and Tuvaluan 3 percent (5). Thirteen people (8 percent) identified with a combination of ethnic groups, including a mix of Pacific ethnic groups, a Pacific ethnicity and Māori, and a Pacific ethnicity and European.

Samoan people make up the largest Pacific group in New Zealand and in Porirua City. The largest concentration of Tokelauans in New Zealand is in Porirua City. As a result of a major storm in 1966, almost all of the Tokelauan population was resettled in

---

[15] Statistics New Zealand (2007e); Statistics New Zealand (2007a).

New Zealand. By 2001 one third of New Zealand's Tokelauan population lived in Porirua, and in the 2006 Census the proportion in the city was 29 percent.[16]

Birthplace

The 2006 Census shows that 60 percent of Pacific people are New Zealand born. However, the proportions vary across the Pacific ethnic groups. The majority of Samoan (60 percent), Tongan (56 percent), Cook Island Māori (73 percent) and Tokelauan (69 percent) residents are born in New Zealand. In contrast, only 37 percent of Tuvaluan people living in New Zealand were born in New Zealand.[17]

In the Pacific panel, 47 people (31 percent) were born in New Zealand.[18] The remainder were born in Samoa (74), Tokelau (13), Tuvalu (6), Cook Islands (4), American Samoa (2) and Gilbert Island (1).[19] The 16–19 age group was the group most likely to have been born in New Zealand. None of those panel participants aged 50 and older were born in New Zealand.

Household profiles

Panel participants tend to live in larger than average households. At the 2006 census, the average household size in New Zealand was 2.7 people and in Porirua City it was 3.1 people.

Panel participants were asked for information on the number of people living in their household. The average panel household size was bigger than the Porirua average, at 4.8 for 2004, 5.1 for 2005 and 4.9 for 2006. In the first round of interviews in 2004, 40.8 percent of panel participants lived in a household of five or more people. In 2005, it was 54.4 percent and in 2006 it was 45 percent. The largest number of people in a household was 11, in 2004. In both 2005 and 2006, household numbers were up to nine.

The larger than average households are due to the tendency for Pacific peoples to live with other family members. In the 2006 Census, 86 percent of Pacific people lived in a family, compared to 79 percent of the total New Zealand population. A much higher proportion of Pacific peoples (41 percent) live in an extended family,[20] than the total population (14 percent). Just 8 percent of Pacific families consist of a couple without children. Multi-family households (made up of two or more families) are more common for Pacific people than for the rest of New Zealand's population, at 13 percent of Pacific households, compared to 3 percent for the total population. In contrast, only 6 percent of Pacific people live by themselves, compared to 23 percent of the total population.

Looking at the composition of households that panel participants were living in, it is apparent that living with family members, including extended family, is typical. In

---

[16] Walrond (2007); Statistics New Zealand (2008a); Cook et al.(1999).

[17] Statistics New Zealand (2008b); Statistics New Zealand (2007b); Statistics New Zealand (2007c).

[18] This is a smaller proportion than for the Pacific population in New Zealand as a whole because it only includes people aged 16 and over who were in the panel.

[19] Three people did not provide information on their birth country.

[20] Defined by Statistics New Zealand as a group of related persons who live together. It may consist of a family as well and one or more related persons, or two or more related families, with or without related persons.

all panel interview rounds, the largest proportion of households was "couple with children" households (Table 2). This was followed by extended family households (one family plus others, or two or more families). One parent with children made up a small proportion of households in each round, while there were few couple only households. Across all rounds, there was only one single person household.

Table 2: Household type

Household type	Round 1		Round 2		Round 3	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Single person	0	0	1	2.4	0	0
Couple only	3	7.9	3	7.1	2	4.5
One parent with children	6	15.8	2	4.8	5	11.4
Couple with children	15	39.5	19	45.2	19	43.2
One family plus others	8	21.1	14	33.3	14	31.8
Two or more families with or without others	6	15.8	3	7.1	4	9.1
Total	**38**	**100**	**42**	**100**	**44**	**100**

The extended family households in Table 2 include those with three or more generations. Table 3 shows that around one fifth of panel households were three or more generation households for each interview round. Across the three rounds of interviews there were 14 such households, including one four generation household (nine percent). The numbers changed for each round as household composition changed from two to three generations. This type of household is more common in Pacific communities due to obligations to care for parents and other older relatives. They are also common because of young adults with children staying with their middle aged parents, often to access financial resources and childcare, or because of difficulties in finding suitable accommodation.

Table 3: Three or more generation households

	Round 1		Round 2		Round 3	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Three or more generation household	8	21.1	9	21.4	9	20.4

Involvement in education and employment

Table 4 shows that, in each interview round, more people were not in the labour force (engaged in household duties, retired, beneficiary or sick) than employed, or in education (secondary or tertiary). Across the three interviews, between 38 and 43 percent were employed, between 22 and 27 percent were involved in education and between 47 and 50 percent were not in the labour force. Only a small proportion was seeking work, between 9 and 11 percent.

Table 4: Labour force status

	Education	**Work**	**Seeking work**	**Not in labour force***
Round 1 (n = 107)	29	41	12	54
Round 2 (n = 109)	26	47	10	52
Round 3 (n = 105)	20	43	12	50

* Household duties, beneficiary, retired, sick
  Multiple response — some people are engaged in education as well as in work, seeking work or not in the labour force.

Education

There has been an increase in Pacific peoples with a post-school qualification between 2001 and 2006. Now 22 percent of Pacific peoples have a post-school qualification. Pacific women are more likely to have a formal qualification (school and post-school) than are Pacific men. Post-school qualifications are most common in the 25–29 age group; with 32 percent of Pacific people in this age group having a post-school qualification.[21]

The proportion of panel participants involved in education was substantial. Across the three interviews, between 22 and 27 percent were involved in education. Sometimes this was combined with employment. In the first interview, four people were involved in both education and work. In the second interview, six people were and in the third interview, three people were.

Younger age groups were more likely to be involved in education, with two thirds of those in the 16–19 age group involved in secondary or post-school education at the time they were first interviewed. However, people up to their 40s reported involvement in education, mostly post-school, although two in their 40s were doing secondary school courses. One quarter of those in the 30–49 age group reported involvement in post-school education.

By the 2006 interview, one quarter of the panel reported that their highest qualification was a certificate or diploma, while almost seven percent reported attaining a Bachelors degree. The range of educational qualifications mostly covered certificates and diplomas in areas such as nursing, care giving, tourism and travel, mental health

---

[21] Statistics New Zealand (2008a:11).

support work, business administration, security, computing, electronics, automotive, construction and theology. Bachelors degrees covered teaching, nursing, human resources and counselling.

This involvement in education may indicate a growing core of Pacific residents in the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua community that can contribute to a climate of high expectations about Pacific tertiary participation and achievement. Some research suggests that Pacific participation in tertiary education is more likely to occur when individuals have direct experience within their social networks of other members of their families and communities attending and succeeding in tertiary education.[22]

Labour force participation

In 2006, 65 percent of Pacific people aged 15 years and over were in the labour force. Men were more likely to be in the labour force than women, at 71 percent compared to 59 percent.[23]

A smaller proportion of panel participants were in the labour force than for the Pacific population as a whole. Over the three interviews between 38 and 43 percent were employed and around 10 percent were seeking work. This may be due to the characteristics of our panel, many of whom were themselves engaged in tertiary education.

Most panel participants did not change their labour force status between 2004 and 2006. Eighty-two people were interviewed in both 2004 and 2005. Between the first and second round of interviews, over two thirds had no change in their labour force status. Of the 26 who did have a change in labour force status, most had a change in their work or entered employment. Eight changed jobs and seven got jobs. One moved from part-time to full-time work, and one started work after a period on parental leave. The rest left jobs for reasons of sickness, being laid off or leaving work to go on parental leave. One person was looking for work.

Ninety-six people were interviewed in both 2005 and 2006. Three quarters had no change in their labour force status. Over half of the 24 who had a change were employed. Most had either got a job, or changed job. One person had picked up a second job and another person had moved from a temporary to a permanent position. Seven people left their jobs for reasons including sickness, needing to care for a family member, and going on parental leave.

The range of jobs across the three years included workers in the finance and insurance sector, retail, office administration and management, tourism and travel, hospitality, church minister, trades (carpenter, mechanic), cleaning, labouring, mental health support workers, teachers, security jobs, counselling, care giving and seasonal work.

---

[22] Anae et al. (2002:57-59).
[23] Statistics New Zealand (2008a:12).

Income

Pacific people experienced an increase in their personal incomes between 2001 and 2006, although the median annual income for Pacific people aged 15 and over ($20,500) was lower than the median annual income for New Zealand ($24,400). In part this is because the Pacific ethnic group has a higher proportion of people in the younger age groups than the overall New Zealand population, and younger people tend to have lower incomes.[24]

Across the three interviews, up to half of the panel earned $20,000 or less per annum (Table 5). In 2004 the proportion was 50.4 percent; in 2005 it was 38 percent and in 2006, it was 45.3 percent.

Some explanation is necessary concerning this data. Income may be underestimated, because of cultural obligations for gifting, such as mealofa. The high proportion of refusals in each round of interviews (between 16 and 29 percent) may be due to participants considering information about income to be private, family business. It may in part reflect not wanting to report earnings from the informal economy. It may also relate to the practice of gift giving. Individuals may not wish to divulge details of their income if they perceive that divulging such information may make them vulnerable to requests for mealofa. De Raad and Walton report that a large majority of the Pacific population in New Zealand provides remittances and gifting. They cite some evidence that remittances increase with income.[25]

---

[24] Statistics New Zealand (2008a:14).
[25] De Raad and Walton (2007:26–27).

Table 5: Income

Income	Round 1		Round 2		Round 3	
	Number	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Loss	2	1.9	0	0	0	0
Zero	10	9.3	9	7.9	7	5.9
$1–$5,000	8	7.5	14	12.4	17	14.3
$5,001–$10,000	5	4.7	6	5.3	17	14.3
$10,001–$15,000	12	11.2	6	5.3	6	5.0
$15,001–$20,000	17	15.9	8	7.1	7	5.9
$20,001–$25,000	7	6.5	8	7.1	5	4.2
$25,001–$30,000	10	9.3	17	15.0	7	5.9
$30,001–$40,000	5	4.7	4	3.5	6	5.0
$40,001–$50,000	1	0.9	3	2.6	3	2.5
$50,001–$70,000	1	0.9	1	0.9	1	0.8
$70,001–$100,000	1	0.9	0	0	0	0
Unknown	8	7.5	3	2.6	5	4.2
Refusal	17	15.8	33	29.2	33	27.7
Missing	3	2.8	1	0.9	5	4.2
Total	**107**		**113**		**119**	

5. Pacific People's Movement

This section identifies patterns of movement in relation to:

- Pacific panel participants' length of residence in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua
- Movement during the panel interviews between 2004–2006
- Moves between 2001–2006
- Movement in childhood.

Following on from consideration of patterns of movement, reasons for residential movement and who was involved in decisions about moving are examined. Finally, this section looks at people's intention to move or to stay in their current home.

Length of residence in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua

Because some people have moved away from the area and then returned, two measures of length of residence were taken:

- Length of most recent residence in the area. Some people have lived for a period in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua, moved away and then returned to live there again. This included a number of people who returned to live in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua sometime during 2004–2006.
- Length of residence from first time of residence (including from birth).

Both those measures showed that, on average, panel participants have lived in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua for a considerable length of time. The average residence, based on the length of most recent residence in the area, was 10.8 years, and the average residence based on the first time of residence was 13.2 years.

Fifteen panel participants (10 percent) were born in the area. Eight panel participants (5 percent) returned to live in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua between 2004 and 2006.

The largest proportion of the panel, 52.6 percent, has lived in the area for more than 10 years. The longest residence in the area is 40 years.

Looking at the length of residence for different age groups, the majority of young people in the panel as well as older adults have lived in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua a long time. Twenty eight of the 42 young people aged 16–24 have lived there for more than 10 years. Similarly, the majority of those aged 50 and over (19 of 29) have lived in the area for more than 10 years. The 25–40 age group were the ones most likely to have resided in the area between 1–10 years. The five people who had first moved to Cannons Creek/Waitangirua within a year of their first panel interview were spread across all ages from 20–64.

Movement between 2004–2006

Movement data between 2004–2006 was available for 149 people in the Pacific panel.[26] Over that time 42.3 percent (63 people) moved residence. This included people who moved within the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua area, people who moved beyond that area, and people who came to live in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua.

Over the three years, of the 63 people who moved, 53 moved once, eight moved twice and two people moved three times.

By the completion of interviews in 2006, 29 people were living outside of Cannons Creek/Waitangirua. They moved to elsewhere in Porirua City, to the Hutt Valley or Wellington.

Eleven panel participants moved within Cannons Creek/Waitangirua. Often this was a move just a few streets away from their previous residence. They were spread across all age groups, but most likely to be in the 30–39 age group.

Twelve people joined the panel by moving into a panel household. They covered all age groups, although they were most likely to be in the 20–29 age group. Only one person under 20 and one person over 60 joined a panel household. All except one who

---

[26] One person died during the panel period.

moved into a panel household in 2006 moved from outside the area, from elsewhere in Porirua City, Auckland or Samoa.

Twenty people in the panel moved but could not be traced for a follow-up interview. Their movement was the main reason for not being able to contact them. However, in some cases we were able to obtain information on where they had moved to. Those places included Marlborough, Auckland, Australia and Samoa.

Movement between 2001–2006

Further information on movement was built up by looking at movement histories between 2001 and 2006. Movement data was available for 131 people from 2001–2006.

The majority of panel participants had moved in the five year period. While 57 people (38 percent) had not moved over that time, 74 (62 percent) did move. This is a much higher proportion than census data shows. In comparison, 47 percent of Pacific people moved within New Zealand between 2001 and 2006 and nine percent arrived or returned from overseas.[27]

Most panel participants had moved between one and three times over 2001–2006, although 11 people moved four times or more. The most moves in the five years were made by one man in his 30s who shifted nine times. This person had circulated around relatives' homes, apart from stays of a few months in flatting arrangements. Movement was described by him as "a spontaneous decision", although one move involved helping to care for an elderly parent. Reasons for most of the moves related to wanting more privacy (because of living in crowded dwellings), wanting to reduce living costs and wanting to be closer to the polytechnic where he was studying. The most recent move, the third in 2006, was to a sibling's house, for cheaper board and to be closer to public transport. The participant expected to stay about six months there.

Panel participants' moves included elsewhere in Porirua City, the greater Wellington area, other places in the North and South Islands, and overseas.

Panel participants' comments on moving between 2001–2006:

Moved to Paraparaumu and then back to Cannons Creek.

Tawa, Wellington, Tawa, Cannons Creek, Tawa, Cannons Creek.

Porirua, Ashburton, Porirua, Auckland, Porirua.

We were staying with relatives when first moved from the island.

Waitangirua, Australia, Auckland, Waitangirua.

6–7 times. I like to move around. Do not like to stay in one house too long.

Lived in Wellington when we first came to NZ.

---

[27] Statistics New Zealand (2008b).

Moving in childhood

Reflecting on their movement as a child (up to age 16), 42 of the Pacific panel (28 percent) said they had shifted house by the time they were 16. The number of moves ranged from 1–7, however 28 people moved only 1–3 times. A lot of movement was within the same town or district, although for some the big move was migration from a Pacific island to New Zealand.

Panel participants' comments on moving in childhood:

I first moved away from my parents to stay with my grandparents.

We moved from a rental property into a mortgage property.

My parents' decision. Samoa to NZ.

Champion St to Fantame St, to Waitangirua, to Levant St, to Australia, to Auckland, to Levant St.

Had to move to a bigger house. Moving can be a bit unsettling.

From Tokelau to Samoa for schooling. My father was also a Minister.

Reasons for movement

Regardless of whether panel participants moved within or away from Cannons Creek/Waitangirua, the main reasons for people's moving were very much related to their housing circumstances, and to their family situation. People reported their main and most important reasons for moving were to be with family and to improve their housing conditions.

These reasons were similar to the reasons identified in a 2007 survey of New Zealanders' motivations for moving. This survey found that housing played a major part in people moving, with reasons including their dwelling being too small, lease or rental tenure expiring or notice being given by their landlord, and moving to more affordable housing. Family-related reasons were also important, including moving to set up one's own home, moving to live with a spouse or partner, and wanting to live closer to others.[28]

One of the key factors that relates to housing as a reason for panel participants moving is the high proportion living in rental accommodation (87.9 percent in 2004, 76.4 percent in 2005 and 85 percent in 2006). The majority of those lived in HNZC accommodation — 58 percent in 2004, 67 percent in 2005 and 60 percent in 2006. Although public housing provides security of tenure, participants cited issues with their accommodation. Several people mentioned they did not like living in a two storey house (because of stairs) or a multi-unit dwelling. They wanted to move to a single storey detached dwelling.

---

[28] Statistics New Zealand (2007d).

Another factor is household crowding, whatever the tenure of the dwelling. Over the three years of interviews, between 40 and 55 percent of the panel participants were living in households with five or more members. Several said they were looking for a bigger house, or considering a move to a house of their own.

Movement stories: Housing

We cannot wait for Housing New Zealand. There was no difference from HNZ[29] rent [in present accommodation]. The backyard is safe for children. I can do a lot of work in the backyard. I know the owner. He's a friend. We like this house, and neighbours are quiet people too (family moved within Cannons Creek/Waitangirua).

We were waiting for our applications to HNZ for a house. Before we moved to Cannons Creek, we put this application while we lived at Wellington. Now we got a house from HNZ, so we have to move. It's affordable. There's no other choice. We wanted a single house,[30] but don't know when, so better take the option we get. It's not far from where we were before (family moved within Cannons Creek/Waitangirua).

We need a big house and big playing area for kids (family moved within Cannons Creek/Waitangirua).

It was overcrowded in the last house and we are expecting a baby (moved away from Cannons Creek/Waitangirua in 2006).

It was a bigger house, more room. I didn't have to share a room with my younger brother (young person moved to Cannons Creek/Waitangirua in 2005 to live with relatives).

Family reasons for movement varied, but most invariably evoked familial responsibilities and connections. They included caring for children, caring for older adults, older people joining their children's families, and people of all ages wanting to live with family.

---

[29] People referred to HNZC as HNZ.
[30] People referred to a detached dwelling as a single house or "one" house. Many HNZC dwellings in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua are semi-detached or multi-units.

> **Movement stories: Family**
>
> *To look after parents, was a family decision* (single person, moved within Cannons Creek/Waitangirua).
>
> *I was flatting and moved back home* (single person in 20s, returned to Cannons Creek/Waitangirua).
>
> *Moved from Auckland to assist with the kids* (person in 60s moved to Cannons Creek/Waitangirua).
>
> *We ran away. Back home now. Realise I cannot afford living with friends. I had nowhere to go. I found out that only my sister and family truly love me. I was just being stubborn. This is the only place I find secure. But I still want to shift, to live independently* (young person moved three times in 2005 and then returned to Cannons Creek/Waitangirua).
>
> *We came home to look after my dad ... I got laid off ... once I was laid off from work I had already made my mind to move back to my family home ... I grew up and went to school in this area ... I want to move out of the area and take up employment* (two siblings returned to Cannons Creek/Waitangirua in the late 1990s).
>
> *Dad is very sick; I want to be near and look after my parents* (moved away from Cannons Creek/Waitangirua in 2005).
>
> *My wife wants to be near her mum. No choice, I have to move too* (moved away from Cannons Creek/Waitangirua in 2005).

A group of reasons for moving to Cannons Creek/Waitangirua, although less frequently mentioned, were nevertheless also important and often referred to in conjunction with the main reasons concerning family and housing. These reasons concerned the extensive and accessible range of facilities and services in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua, such as schools, shops, public transport, health services and churches, as well as the close proximity of Whitireia Community Polytechnic in Porirua.

> **Movement stories: Access to facilities and services**
>
> *Cheaper board and having access to transport* (young person, mover within Cannons Creek/Waitangirua).
>
> *I want to live with my parents ... I like the place, the house it suit for me closer to the road and shops ... close to school* (incomer from Samoa).
>
> *Can walk to school. Location, suitable site to establish a house; very quiet, like the dead-end street. More room for the children* (grandparent in 60s).
>
> *Our own home. Education — closer to school. A safe and quiet location* (parent in 50s).
>
> *Closer to shop facilities. Education for children, kindergarten. It was a comfortable and familiar location. Own privacy to do what we wanted* (parent in 20s).

Also mentioned as reasons for moving to Cannons Creek/Waitangirua were the local environment, particularly the physical appearance of the area with its trees and natural areas, the presence of a Pacific population and quiet neighbourhoods.

> **Movement stories: Local Environment**
>
> *I like Cannons Creek and most of my friends live here. This is the good area for Pacific people* (parent in 30s).
>
> *Because it's a private house, and that's exactly what we prayed for and also is the area, was beautiful it's close to school and the shops as well ... Very good neighbourhood, very quiet and peaceful, the place that we were before they make a lot of noise and also parties every week* (parent in 30s).
>
> *To be close to Tuvaluan community* (parent in 30s).

Making decisions about moving

Decisions about moving house clearly involve family members. All age groups reported that decisions about moving were shared, and that their move was often dependent on other family members deciding to move. Older people talked about their children being involved in the decision. Often, New Zealand born children help their parents find accommodation because they are more familiar with bureaucracy, have wider personal social networks and are not hampered by limited English language skills. Younger people also talked about parents having a say in their movement, indicating that parents preferred young people to stay in the family home and under their parents' influence at least until marriage.

In the first round of interviews, panel participants were asked who had been involved in the decision to move into the house they were living in at that time. A total of 57 percent said that they were involved in the decision about moving. Overall, 52 percent had a partner involved in the decision, while 27 percent had a parent involved and 25 percent a child involved in the decision. Twelve percent had friends involved and 11 percent had another relative (other than parent or child) involved. Nine percent had a range of others involved in helping them make the decision to move, including church members, employer and HNZC case manager.

In 2005 and 2006, those who moved were also asked about who was involved in the decision to move. In 2005 36 moved, and 23 of those reported that they were involved in the decision about moving. Twenty had a partner involved in the decision, while six had a parent involved and four had a child involved in the decision. In 2006, 23 moved, and 10 reported that they were involved in the decision about moving. Two had a partner involved in the decision, while 10 had a parent involved and three people had a child involved in the decision.

Who is involved in making decisions to move:

Parents come in handy, mum helped make decision (resident in 30s).

My children want to stay with me and look after me (older person living with adult children).

Support from families and friends encourage me to stay in Cannons Creek (parent in 50s).

My daughter who brought me over to NZ (older person).

I explained to my wife about the house that was available because we always do things together that's team work (parent in 30s).

My parents call me to come back, and I'm here. I really want to come back (young adult, returned to Cannons Creek/Waitangirua).

I think her mum pushed the decision (young couple moved away from Cannons Creek/Waitangirua in 2005).

Mother and sisters (single person moved away from Cannons Creek/Waitangirua in 2006).

Movement intentions

In each annual interview, participants were asked about their intentions to move. The large majority said they intended to move sometime in the future but were unsure about when they would move. Expressing uncertainty about moving was common to all age groups in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua. This uncertainty about movement differentiated the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua participants from panels in the other areas, where smaller proportions of participants were unsure about moving.

In 2004, only six of the 107 people interviewed had a specific time frame to move from their home, ranging from one year to twenty years. Nine people saw themselves staying in their house "for the foreseeable future". By far the largest proportion (86 percent) were not sure when they would move.

In 2005, 12 people wanted to move from their home in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua within a certain period (up to 10 years). Eight people were staying in their house "for the foreseeable future" and 81 percent (88 people) were not sure when they would move.

In 2006, four of those living in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua had a time frame for moving (up to two years), while eight were in their house "for the foreseeable future" and 89 percent (93 people) were not sure when they would move.

The close involvement of family members in decisions about moving may have been a factor in people's uncertainty about their own movement, which could occur at any time if family members needed them to move. Another factor contributing to the uncertainty of moving may have been rental accommodation, which might affect movement positively or negatively. Those in suitable accommodation with long term tenure security may be willing to stay where they are. However, renting can be uncertain if rents become too expensive or the landlord sells the house. As noted earlier, a high proportion of the panel was living in rental accommodation. Such accommodation is typical of the area. In the 2006 Census, 58 percent of households in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua were in rental accommodation.

Common reasons given for intending to move related to family reasons, housing circumstances and education and employment. They included:

- Wanting to buy a house.
- Moving to obtain cheaper rental accommodation.
- Moving to more suitable accommodation, e.g. a detached house or bigger house.
- Moving from the house of a relative to one's own accommodation.
- Finishing education or training and moving for work. This included individuals' own education, and the education of their children.
- Moving to live with relatives.

Why people intend to move:

Already got another house to move to in Cannons Creek. I'm sick of running up and down the stairs (parent in 30s).

Once I have my teaching degree I have plans to move out of Porirua or New Zealand. It's not a dream of a house. The children are growing up — we need more space (parent in 30s).

Depends on when we get more money, we buy a house (couple in 60s).

My wife wants to move to Auckland where most of her family are (parent in 40s).

It depends on the number of people in this house in the future (parent in 30s).

Depends on the increase of rent of the house — when we struggle for finance (parent in 30s).

Not very happy, because my daughter fell down the stairs three times. Would prefer a one-level house. There are several things or issues concerning this house. Leaky showers; the roof when it's raining. Although advised landlord, very little has been done about it (parent in 30s).

To get our own house, maybe around Ranui Heights. Depends on the cost (couple in their 20s, moved in with parents in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua in 2005).

We want to be closer to secondary school. We require a larger dwelling for family. The house is too small (couple in their 30s).

A lot of the young people (16–24 year olds) thought they would move. Most were living with other family members and the most common reasons given for their intended move were related to their family's movement intentions, such as their parents' jobs, or family desires to move to a more suitable house. A few wanted to move out of the parental home or to get a job elsewhere. Although the young people thought they would move, most had no time frame for moving. In actuality, the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua young people were the ones who moved least of all the young people in the four panel areas over 2004–2006.

6. Attachment to Cannons Creek/Waitangirua

Our research found that the Pacific panel had a higher proportion of movers than indicated in the census for Pacific people. Some researchers suggest that residential mobility undermines a person's attachment to and identification with a particular place. But other research suggests that mobility does not necessarily reduce people's attachment to where they presently live, or have lived in the past. Some people become

rapidly attached to the place where they live, and that attachment is related to a wide range of factors, not only length of residence.

We were interested in what the panel participants felt about living in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua. Did their past experiences of movement affect their attachment to or identification with the place where they lived, and did their feelings about the place figure in their decisions to move? The panel interviews explored these questions by asking residents about some key aspects that research has shown are related to attachment to place:

- Satisfaction with the place and its facilities
- Concerns about crime or safety
- Participation in local organisations and voluntary work
- Interactions with friends, relatives and neighbours.

We were also interested in looking at whether, for Pacific people attachments to place may mean attachments to multiple places because of cultural and family connections. As Macpherson notes, "some argue that the nation as a 'unit of analysis' is a poor reflection of Pacific reality"; instead Pacific people are part of "meta societies". Villages have extended boundaries that encompass former residents and those with family ties who live in other places.[31]

Place satisfaction

Eastern Porirua, which includes both Cannons Creek and Waitangirua, from where the Pacific panel participants were recruited, has been distinctively and diversely described as "multi-cultural, relaxed, friendly and spiritual" on the one hand and "unruly, untidy and bleak" on the other.[32] Whatever the views about the area, notably most of those in the Pacific panel had positive things to say about their home.

Across the three years of interviews, the large majority of participants commented on things they liked about Cannons Creek/Waitangirua. The main aspects appreciated were the close proximity of their residences to facilities and services, quiet surroundings, and living close to family and friends. Many mentioned the high proportion of Pacific residents in the community as something they liked about the place. All age groups identified similar things that they liked about Cannons Creek/Waitangirua.

These liked aspects were similar to findings of a 2005 survey of 968 Eastern Porirua residents, which identified that the most liked aspects of the area were: the people (mentioned by 23 percent), amenities and facilities (22 percent) and proximity to services (13 percent).[33]

---

[31] Macpherson (2008).
[32] Gallen (2005).
[33] Gallen (2005:10).

Views about living in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua:

Everything's at your doorstep, shops down the road, school close, parks close. All my friends are here (young person).

It feels like home because of the environment and Polynesian people (young person).

Good people, great city to live in. Grew up in Porirua (Cannons Creek) and can't see myself living anywhere else (parent, 30s)

I like to talk to Pacific people especially Samoan (resident, 50s).

Everything is very handy. Shops a couple of minutes away. Primary school, same street. All handy (parent, 40s).

Heaps of kids my age I can talk to. Happy with parks and shops (young person).

Variety of ethnic groups. Sense of community. People are pretty cool around; noticed the difference with the community where I used to live (resident, 30s).

People are friendly in my area and my family don't stay far from each other (parent, 30s)

Despite most liking their area, 62 said in their first interview that there were things they disliked about the place where they lived. They mainly identified their dislikes as noise, rubbish in public places and property crime, graffiti, youth misbehaviour and the presence of gangs in some parts of the area. Again, those views were similar to the 2005 survey of Eastern Porirua, which identified the main dislikes as environment/graffiti/rubbish/vandalism (mentioned by 33 percent), followed by youth issues (11 percent).[34]

---

[34] Gallen (2005:13).

> **Dislikes: Cannons Creek/Waitangirua**
>
> *Do not like graffiti around town, not happy with street kids ... a lot at night time and noisy* (couple, 50s).
>
> *Very dirty and untidy. People dumped their rubbish at the back of the shops. It's run down* (young person).
>
> *Teenagers, gangsters, really tick me off. Gives Cannons Creek a bad name. I don't think Cannons Creek is that bad; it's just them. Gang violence, kids running round, think they own the street* (young person).
>
> *There's noise, burglary, gangs, graffiti breakages, dogs messing up the front lawn. But none on this street that bothers us* (couple, 60s).
>
> *Bad publicity sometimes have not been reduced significantly in past few years. Lack of development at Cannons Creek shopping area* (parent, 50s).
>
> *The mindset of some people; home ownership is attainable, and a good standard of living. A lot of physical violence — to do with the standard of living; high unemployment ... Some of the environment is not healthy. Kids hanging around the streets after normal hours. Graffiti; bad image of Cannons Creek. Cannons Creek pond is polluted* (couple, 30s).
>
> *Parties in the street. Gangs. Burglary. Graffiti in the neighbourhood* (resident, 40s).

Crime and safety concerns

An individual's experience of crime or perception of crime in the area in which they live can affect the way they feel about the place and affect decisions about movement. However, there is mixed evidence whether high crime rates in an area, or personal experience of crime, influence decisions about moving house. Several researchers have suggested that crime rates or perceptions of crime and safety are possibly less important as factors influencing residential movement than other factors such as housing quality and housing density. Furthermore, individual factors such as age and family life cycle stage appear to be important influencers of movement.

Over the three years of panel interviews, participants were questioned about their perceptions of their community as a safe place to live, and whether their movement to or from the case study area was related to concerns about crime or safety. Information from the panel interviews suggests that concern about crime or personal safety is not a reason for people to move; they are most likely to move because of housing issues or for family reasons. Most panel participants said that their moves had not been prompted by concerns about crime and personal safety.

The general perception amongst the panel participants was that their community is a safe one in which to live, even if some crime and safety problems were identified. Crime is not seen as a major problem in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua. While some people commented about crime, overall the immediate surroundings where they live were perceived to be safe. Most responded to the issue of crime and safety on the basis of their personal experience. In general, if they felt personally safe, they considered

their community to be safe. Participants' attitudes to the area appeared to be shaped by the high level of social connectedness they reported.

The views of panel participants are echoed in the Porirua City Quality of Life Survey, which reported that residents have a high level of perceived safety in their own homes after dark, but feel less safe in their neighbourhoods and in the city centre.[35] Another survey of public perceptions of safety in Porirua in 2006 found that 32 percent said Porirua City is definitely a safe place to live and 58 percent said it is mostly a safe place to live. Pacific residents were more likely to rate Porirua as definitely a safe place.[36]

Positive comments about Cannons Creek/Waitangirua as a safe environment:

The area feels a lot safer, great neighbours on both sides ... there is good relationship amongst our neighbourhood, we look out for each other (parent, 40s).

It is a safe environment to bring up young children. The neighbours made us feel welcome on both sides (parent, 30s).

As section 6.1 above shows, the main aspects residents disliked about Cannons Creek/Waitangirua related to crime and feelings of safety their neighbourhoods. Across all age groups (including the young people), problems with antisocial behaviour of children and young people were identified as the main crime and safety concerns. Often this is not particularly crime-related, but expressed as youth nuisance or "hanging around" in public places such as shopping centres and recreation areas. Similar concerns were raised in the other case study areas.

Although most Pacific panel participants said that concerns about crime or personal safety was not a factor in their decisions about movement, for some it was clearly a factor. Twenty-one said that they had moved to their present home in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua because of a concern about crime or personal safety in the location where they had previously lived.

Reasons for moving from previous house:

Because my sister lives here and she's the only relative I can go to when I had trouble with my partner (moved to Cannons Creek/Waitangirua prior to 2004).

No choice because the Mongrel Mob was hanging around (young person moved to Cannons Creek/Waitangirua in 2006).

---

[35] Quality of Life Report.
[36] National Research Bureau (2006).

None of those who moved within Cannons Creek/Waitangirua between 2004 and 2005 identified any problems with crime or safety, and none had been prompted to move because of any concerns with their safety. Four of the eleven movers within the area between 2005 and 2006 did identify problems with crime or safety, however none had moved because of safety concerns.

Only one person who moved away from Cannons Creek/Waitangirua indicated they had moved because of safety concerns.

Reasons for moving away:

Environment — negative (unsupported), health issues (well-being). Environment and neighbours who live across the road made me feel very unsafe (moved away from Cannons Creek/Waitangirua in 2006).

Few people expressed any concern about crime or their personal safety that would prompt a future move from the house they were currently living in. Across the three interviews, 22 people did,[37] and the reasons they mentioned were: gang threats; home invasion; not safe for young people; burglary and noise.

Involvement in local organisations

Participation in local organisations and in voluntary work are generally regarded as indicators of attachment to a community. Previous surveys have shown that between one quarter and one third of Porirua City residents belong to local clubs and organisations. In the 2006 Quality of Life Survey, 34 percent of Porirua City residents belonged to a sports club, 25 percent belonged to a community or voluntary group and 36 percent belonged to a church or spiritual group.[38] Similarly, the 2006 National Research Bureau Survey found that 29 percent of Porirua residents belonged to a voluntary organisation.[39]

In contrast to those Porirua-wide figures, few in the Pacific panel reported belonging to a local club or organisation. Only nine percent said they belonged to a local club or organisation. None of those who had been living in the area for less than a year belonged to a local club or organisation. By far the most common organisations mentioned were churches, Pacific ethnic associations and sports clubs. Smaller proportions belonged to women's groups, kindergarten, Plunket and the RSA.

However, church attendance is a major part of the Pacific panel's involvement in community life. The four census area units that cover the same area as the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua case study community reported the highest Christian religious affiliation of all areas in Porirua, at over 71 percent.[40] This figure was reflected in the Pacific panel, where 76 percent of panel participants reported attending a church in the

---

[37] This was 8.1 percent of all responses across the three interviews of those remaining in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua.

[38] Quality of Life Report.

[39] National Research Bureau (2006).

[40] Porirua City Council (2008).

last month. Living close to one's church was a reason given by some people for choosing to live in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua, although 59 percent of church goers reported that the church they attended was not in the area. Being close to church was nevertheless a supporting reason for moving to or staying in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua, related to the facilities they liked in the area and their ties to family and friends.

The church as a reason for living in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua:

Because of my sister and want to stay close to church ... We want to stay in Cannons Creek where all my families live close to church (resident, 50s).

Most church members live in the area (parent, 40s).

The area is handy for my son's school. Close to our church (parent, 20s).

Near to the centre, transport, dairy and church (parent, 30s).

Involvement in voluntary or unpaid work

Voluntary or unpaid work was defined in the panel interviews as helping out someone outside their own household, without payment. The interviewers carefully explained what was meant by voluntary and unpaid work and gave examples.

Panel participants were asked about their involvement in voluntary or unpaid work each year that interviews were done. In 2004, 9 percent were involved in voluntary work. In 2005, the proportion was higher at 31 percent. In 2006, 15 percent reported that they were involved in voluntary or unpaid work. The voluntary work that panel participants reported included:

- Church activities
- Organisation administration and fund raising, e.g. for Pacific ethnic groups and organisations
- Sports coaching
- Home, hospital and prison visiting
- Transporting older people to church, shopping, appointments etc.
- Youth work
- Traditional healing
- Caring for children and older people
- Lawn mowing and gardening
- Cooking
- Helping at homework centre.

By way of comparison, the 2006 Census reported that 18 percent of Pacific peoples looked after a child who was not residing in their household, while 9 percent helped a person who is ill or has a disability and does not live in their household. Almost 15 percent of Pacific peoples helped or did voluntary work through an organisation or

group.[41] In Porirua, 22.1 percent of Pacific people looked after a child who did not live in their household, 9.8 percent looked after a person who was ill or has a disability who did not live in their household and 16.2 percent did other helping or voluntary work through an organisation.[42]

The interviewers and local research reference group considered that there was relatively low reporting of voluntary work in the Pacific panel. It was considered this may be due to the concept of voluntary work not translating easily into a Pacific cultural context; in particular, Pacific people may not consider the help they give to others as voluntary work. They may feel it is an obligation or simply what is expected of them, rather than a "voluntary" activity. In contrast to the apparently low level of participation in voluntary work, most panel participants reported involvement in a church, while others reported participating in Pacific ethnic associations. These groups would include assistance and support for others.

A very high proportion (82 percent) of the panel participants reported contributing money to a local community organisation within the past year. Even those who have lived in the area for less than a year reported donating, although giving money was highest for those who have lived in the area for over 10 years (93 percent). The cultural tradition of mealofa, gift giving, would include giving money to assist others; accordingly, the practice of contributing money would be much more understood within a Pacific context than the concept of voluntary work.

Interactions with friends, relatives and neighbours

Regular contact with family, friends and neighbours is considered to be an indicator of connections to the community and availability of support. In the 2006 Quality of Life Survey, 63 percent of Porirua City residents belonged to a family network[43]. Active family networks were also apparent amongst the panel participants. Over half the panel participants (59 percent) reported that most of their relatives (living outside of their households) resided in Cannons Creek/Waitangirua. Sixty one percent of the panel reported meeting up with or visiting their relatives four times or more in a month. Relatives are an important reason for panel participants' move to the area, for staying in the area, and for liking the area. Relatives are very important in helping people shift and settle in.

---

[41] Statistics New Zealand (2007f).
[42] Porirua City Council (2008).
[43] Quality of Life Report.

> **Comments about relatives:**
>
> *The family. The safe familiarity and not wanting to move away from that* (parent, 30s).
>
> *Support from friends and relatives who helped us shifting* (resident, 40s).
>
> *Relatives provided everything for the house and to start our family with* (parent, 40s).
>
> *Support from my mother and aunt families close to us friends came and stay with me* (resident in 50s).
>
> *My daughter and her spouse live here and besides other relatives drop in to visit us here regularly* (grandparent, 60s).

Fifty nine percent of panel participants also reported that most of their friends live in the area, and that they have a lot of contact with them. Sixty five percent of the panel reported meeting up with or visiting their friends four times or more in a month. Friends are an important factor in people liking the area and wanting to stay there. Like relatives, friends are also important in helping people settle in to the area.

> **Comments about friends:**
>
> *Advice from my friends they said this area is very handy for children for school* (parent, 50s).
>
> *Good friendly people, good neighbours* (resident, 60s).
>
> *My wife wants to stay in Cannons Creek where all her friends and families live* (resident, 50s).
>
> *Friends support while we've been waiting for the house* (parent, 50s).
>
> *Friends from school are all around the area* (parent, 30s).
>
> *Most of the relatives and friends live around here* (young person).

Panel participants have less contact with their neighbours than with friends and relatives, nevertheless 47 percent reported meeting up with their neighbours once a week or more. Furthermore, neighbours are an important consideration in how people feel about their locality. Like having friends and relatives to call on for support, good neighbours are also important in helping people settle in and making the area a desirable place in which to live. Many panel participants associated having friendly neighbours with having a safe and pleasant living environment. Having noisy neighbours was one of the things they identified as a major dislike of living in their area. Panel participants of all ages, and New Zealand born as well as Island born,

commented on their preference for a quiet and orderly environment, suggesting some continuity with the older generation's valuing an organised and highly regulated village-type environment.

Comments about neighbours:

Area is good to live in. Friendly neighbours (young person).

The neighbours [made us feel settled]. They are all Pacific and Māori (parent, 40s).

Good neighbours ... Environment is good for children to play (parent, 20s).

Get to know the neighbours and feel at peace about it makes me settled (couple, 60s).

Neighbourhood look after each other (resident, 30s)

Good neighbours and they're quiet (parent, 40s).

Summary of attachment factors

Based on the indicators of attachment considered in this research, the panel participants showed multiple attachments to their communities. The large majority of panel participants expressed things they liked about the area; they used local facilities and services; they considered their community a safe one in which to live; they were closely connected to their communities through churches and had regular contact with family and friends. Although participation in organisations and voluntary work was not high, almost all had given money to a local community organisation in the past year.

7. Conclusion

In the introduction we made the claim that understanding the movement and attachment behaviour of Pacific peoples within the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua area would be enriched through an understanding of the broader context of Pacific populations' mobility patterns. Bedford's work (2007) was used to illustrate the major themes of this broader context. These themes indicate that:

- There has been nearly a hundred years of Pacific population movements associated with the boom and bust cycles of the New Zealand economy and changes to immigration policy that makes the process of migration to New Zealand more or less difficult for Pacific peoples.

- This history of movement between the Pacific and New Zealand has created an increasingly diverse population who may self-identify as "Pacific". This diversity related to distinctions between long time settler cohorts and recent migrants, between Pacific born and New Zealand born and increasing numbers of people who identify with more than one ethnic group.

- Despite this diversity there is a shared Pacific narrative of the diaspora. To repeat the words of Hau'ofa as cited by Bedford, "… it is in their blood to be mobile".

This study followed 150 Pacific people over a period of three years. Over half were interviewed three times, approximately one quarter were interviewed twice and a final quarter interviewed once. The following discussion highlights some of the significant findings from these interviews.

a) Participants tended to live in larger than average households. The 2006 Census records the average household size as 2.7 people and in Porirua City the average was 3.1. Over the three years of this project the average household size was larger than the Porirua average, at 4.9 for 2004, 5.3 for 2005 and 5 for 2006. During the study over half the households consisted of 4–6 people. The explanation for the larger than average households is the tendency for Pacific people to live with other family members, in an extended family situation or in multi-family households.

b) Over the three years the study tracked the level of involvement in paid employment in the households. In each of the interview rounds, between 38 and 43 percent of panel participants were employed. In contrast, in each round, between 47 and 50 percent were not in the labour force. The point to be drawn from this is that some members of these households are on limited or fixed incomes, and the possible dependence of some household members on others for resources.

c) The dynamics of sharing of household income is further informed by the data on personal incomes. The median annual income of $20,500 for Pacific peoples aged 15 years and over is lower than the median annual personal income of $24,000 for the total population. In the data collected across the three interviews, between 38 and 50 percent of panel participants were earning below the Pacific annual median income. Individual incomes have been reported. This could hide benefits accruing to individuals derived from pooled household incomes. Small, intermittent individual incomes may be offset by larger and more secure household incomes. Also of note was the high proportion of refusals for the income question in each round of interviews. This means that the data must be treated with some caution. Anecdotally, Pacific people have a tendency to be guarded in discussing their household's and family's financial status and we can speculate that there may be a number of reasons for this behaviour. There may be, for example, a reluctance to divulge any information that may bring unwelcomed attention from government agencies. Furthermore, given that there are still strong cultural expectations within many Pacific communities involving tithing for their church or contributing mealofa for extended family celebrations, households hesitate to publicise their assets to avoid increasing community expectations around appropriate levels of contributions. Despite the gaps in the income data we can with reasonable confidence suggest that Pacific households appear to make rational decisions about where they live and with whom they live on the basis of balancing financial limitations and resources against household needs and demands, taking into account the contingencies of lifespan changes within families.

d) The movement data for the 149 people in the Pacific panel between 2004 and 2006 shows that 42.3 percent (63 people) moved residence. Over the five years from 2001–2006, almost two thirds had moved house. These results are higher than what

would be expected, given Pacific levels of movement reported in recent censuses. The main reasons given for people moving were very much related to their family and household circumstances. People reported the three main and most important reasons for moving were to look after other family members, to be with family and to improve their housing conditions. For Pacific people, mobility is closely intertwined with family relationships and commitments.

e) The influence of family is also shown in the very high involvement of Pacific family members with decisions about moving; shifting house is not something that individuals decided on their own. All age groups reported that decisions about moving were shared, and that their move was often contingent on other family members deciding to move. What is not clear from this research is whether the internal movements of Pacific people, particularly those New Zealand born, are for reasons quite different to transnational migration, which is often driven by traditional obligations and economic reasons, or if internal movements are for very similar reasons. Exploring different drivers of internal and transnational migration may be a useful topic for further research.

f) There appeared to be a high degree of uncertainty about future movement intentions amongst panel participants. It was noted that this was much higher than in the panels in the other case study areas. Over the three interviews, high proportions (between 81 and 89 percent) were unsure if and when they would move in future. This may have been due to the close involvement of family in decisions about moving, and the high proportion living in rental accommodation.

g) There was no evidence from the data to support the claim that residential mobility undermines a person's attachment to place and that high rates of mobility may be inversely related to identification with a particular place. On the contrary, many of the participants, even when there was a history of movement indicated that people were attached to geographic spaces where the community and cultural advantages could continue to be experienced. From the data we can reasonably argue that the notion of attachment may in the case of Pacific communities, indicate multiple attachments and movement patterns that reflect changing household lifespan demands. The notion of multiple attachments can be seen in the way Pacific people may move, but choose to do so whenever possible within a geographic area that retains their access to their Church communities, ethnic and cultural affiliations and extended family connections. This kind of behaviour would suggest that the reported dislocations that can be associated with high mobility are minimised through the ability to build community affiliations and support. The mobility patterns that reflect changing household lifespan demands are the other side of the same coin. Retaining geographical connections provide support and insulate people from the isolation that can arise from high mobility. This does tie people into reciprocal obligations at the same time. So for example, the more frequent instances of three generational families may indicate adult children fulfilling their obligations to aging parents and relatives.

h) Despite the pervasiveness of movement reported and the uncertainty surrounding movement, it was also clear that Pacific people have long and enduring ties to the Cannons Creek/Waitangirua community, with the average residence of panel members being over 10 years.

i) The final conclusion to be drawn from the data is that decision making by Pacific people about household structure and mobility are not irrational or idiosyncratic. They are evidence of economically marginalised households maximising their resources within the framework of cultural obligations, duties and responsibilities.

Bibliography

Anae, M., Anderson, H., Benseman, J. and Coxon, E., 2002, *Pacific Peoples and Tertiary Education: Issues of Participation*, Final Report prepared for the Ministry of Education, Wellington by Auckland Uniservices Ltd., The University of Auckland, Auckland.

Bedford, R., 2007, *Pasifika Mobility: Pathways, Circuits and Challenges in the 21st Century*, Report for the Pasifika Project, Institute of Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.

Cook, L., Didham, R. and Khawaja, M., 1999, *On the demography of Pacific people in New Zealand*. An expanded version of a keynote address by the Government Statistician, Len Cook, at the Pacific Vision Conference, Auckland 27–30 July 1999.

de Raad, J., and Walton, M., 2007, *Pacific People in the New Zealand Economy Understanding linkages and trends*, New Zealand Institute of Economic Research, Wellington.

Gallen, R., 2005, *Map to the Future Community Planning Eastern Porirua '05 Final Report*

Hau'ofa, E., 2005, "The Ocean in Us", 32–43 in Hooper, A. (ed) *Culture and Sustainable Development in the Pacific* Asia Pacific Press, Canberra ANU E Press.

Macpherson, C., 2008, "Migration and Social Transformation in the Contemporary Pacific" *New Zealand Sociology*, 23:1, 30–40.

National Research Bureau, 2006, *Communitrak Survey Public Perceptions and Interpretations of Council Services and Representation.* Prepared as part of the public feedback programme for Porirua City Council.

Porirua City Council, 2008, *Porirua City Profile* www.pcc.govt.nz

Quality of Life Report 07 in Twelve of New Zealand's Cities. www.qualityoflifeproject.govt.nz

Statistics New Zealand, 2008a, *Quick Stats about Pacific Peoples* Statistics New Zealand, Wellington. http://www.stats.govt.nz/NR/rdonlyres/45BED0E7-E709-4DCE-9B01-0C715EC050AE/0/quickstatsaboutpacificpeoples.pdf

Statistics New Zealand, 2008b, *Pacific Mobility in New Zealand*, Statistics New Zealand, Wellington. http://www.stats.govt.nz/NR/rdonlyres/77A76C8B-C052-4D51-A35B-B811AA600672/0/pacificmobilityinnewzealand.pdf

Statistics New Zealand, 2007a, *Samoan People in New Zealand: 2006* Statistics New Zealand, Wellington. www.stats.govt.nz

Statistics New Zealand, 2007b, *Tokelauan People in New Zealand: 2006* Statistics New Zealand, Wellington. www.stats.govt.nz

Statistics New Zealand, 2007c, *Tuvaluan People in New Zealand: 2006* Statistics New Zealand, Wellington. www.stats.govt.nz

Statistics New Zealand, 2007d, *Survey of Dynamics and Motivation for Migration in New Zealand: March 2007 quarter*, Hot Off the Press, Statistics New Zealand, Wellington ISSN 1178-072X. www.stats.govt.nz

Statistics New Zealand, 2007e, *Who are New Zealand's Pacific people*? Media release 31 August 2007. www.stats.govt.nz

Statistics New Zealand, 2007f, *QuickStats About Unpaid Work* Statistics New Zealand, Wellington   http://www.stats.govt.nz/NR/rdonlyres/8783B6EF-B8A4-419C-89D4-DF52664F809F/0/quickstatsaboutunpaidwork.pdf

Walrond, C., 2007, "Tokelauans", *Te Ara — the Encyclopaedia of New Zealand*, updated 21 September 2007.
http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/NewZealanders/NewZealandPeoples/Tokelauans/en