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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the sequel to *Social Work with Immigrants, Refugees and Asylum Seekers in New Zealand* (Nash and Trlin, 2004). Our aim was to provide further information about the experience of social service providers in assisting immigrants and refugees as they settle in their new communities. The service providers were selected from three lists of non-government/not for profit agencies and organisations (hereafter referred to as NGOs), namely: (a) the *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Workers 2001 Diary*; (b) the NGO Refugee Resettlement Network Aotearoa New Zealand, as at March 2001; and (c) the *Ethnic Communities Directory*, 4th edition, 1998. The selection process took into account agency size and the services or programmes they provided in order to include a diverse range of respondents.

The questionnaire was mailed out to 312 NGOs nationwide in 2001. A final, usable total of 90 completed questionnaires was obtained (a response rate of 28.8 per cent). The agencies/organisations surveyed were mainly either branch offices of national NGOs or local NGOs, while a smaller portion were local ethnic community organisations. Five NGO Head Offices completed the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was designed with four main sections and had a mixture of closed and open-ended questions which covered the following areas:

A. general questions about the agency being surveyed, including its funding and programmes in relation to the immigrant and/or refugee client group;
B. questions about the client group(s);
C. questions about agency staffing, qualifications and provenance; and
D. questions about policy issues relating to programme or service provision.

Follow-up interviews with 12 representatives of NGOs that completed the survey were carried out in 2002 to collect additional information in response to particular issues identified in the survey results.

**Results**

- Just under a third of the participating NGOs reported that their clients were or included immigrants in general, 30 per cent had clients who were or included refugees in general, and 18 per cent had clients who came from specific immigrant or refugee groups. Most of the NGOs worked with other client groups as well. The types of programmes and services offered by the NGOs were varied and ranged from very practical assistance (e.g. food and clothing) to therapeutic
services (counselling) and onward referral. The majority of the NGOs were small to medium sized with only a very small number of larger, national organisations.

- Questions about the funder/provider relationship showed that the NGOs understood what the funding providers required, and that they considered the requirements to be reasonable. They were less certain about whether the funding provided was appropriate for the programmes involved, but felt the funding providers were careful about monitoring their outcomes.

- The NGOs described the main strengths of the programmes or services they provided as being accessible, central, specialised, appropriate, educational, safe, practical and involving advocacy. They considered that their services or programmes could be improved by increasing the number of staff, additional space, more time for advocacy, increased cultural support and more certainty about continuity, all matters requiring better financial resources.

- The ethnic origins of clients reported by the NGOs indicated that the sample reflected the range of ethnicities in New Zealand, with nothing unusual in their distribution. Well over half of the respondents considered the programmes or services available through their NGO to be either very well or well matched with the service users’ needs.

- Although slightly less than one-third of the NGOs had a policy of positive discrimination on the employment of former immigrants and refugees, 65 (72.2 per cent) had such persons engaged as staff involved in management, administration and direct service roles. These former immigrant or refugee staff made up 66 per cent of the workforce. There were both advantages and disadvantages acknowledged with respect to having such staff.

- Information elicited on the training and qualifications of a total of 497 staff directly involved in providing programmes and services to immigrants and/or refugees indicated that almost 77 per cent had at least some “relevant training” for their work. However, there was clearly considerable room for further staff development in this emerging field of practice.

- When asked if professional supervision was provided for all staff directly engaged in the provision of programmes or services to immigrants or refugees, three-quarters of the NGOs answered in the affirmative. This indicates general recognition of the value of supervision and a high level of compliance with the need to provide it for staff.
• Over half of the respondents said that immigration policy changes (such as those resulting in increased numbers and/or a greater variety of immigrants and refugees) had had an impact upon their NGO, with a variety of effects such as an increased demand for services, a change in client needs etc.

• Only 24 (26.7 per cent) of the NGOs indicated that they had been involved in any way in government’s development of immigration policy (including the selection and admission of refugees). The more traditional methods of networking, informal consultation, submission writing and lobbying of key stakeholders remain the leading avenues for involvement. Only 15 of those involved in any way in the development of government policy considered that it had been worthwhile.

• The majority (68.9 per cent) declared support for government to develop and implement a policy to assist the (re)settlement of immigrants and refugees. A similar level of support (64.4 per cent) was indicated for the development of an ethnic relations policy to assist the (re)settlement of immigrants and refugees from diverse cultural backgrounds. Almost all who expressed support for an ethnic relations policy agreed that it should be linked with a (re)settlement policy to achieve an integrated approach to the needs and issues faced by new settlers.

• Family reunification, immigrant and refugee (re)settlement policy featured as particular issues while other policy concerns identified were:
  1. the under-resourcing of (re)settlement services;
  2. the need for more social work intervention to assist with (re)settlement;
  3. the lack of assistance for immigrant and/or refugee retraining and updating qualifications to meet New Zealand requirements and assistance with finding work; and
  4. the reluctance of employers to take on immigrants or refugees.

• Finally, 12 respondents from a representative selection of information-rich NGOs in different parts of the country were interviewed as a follow up to the mail survey. Five main themes stood out in these interviews: policy changes; family reunification and settlement; cross-cultural issues; the employment of volunteers; and best practice and weaknesses. In essence, these themes elaborate on and support the information gained from the survey findings.

Recommendations

It is recognised that the value of the above findings has been reduced (but not negated) by the implementation of various (re)settlement initiatives, including the New Zealand Settlement Strategy, since this survey of NGO social service providers
and the follow-up interviews were carried in 2001/2002. However, given the need to monitor and evaluate the adequacy of all initiatives in the context of dynamic environmental conditions and changing clients needs, and the fact that some NGO concerns have not yet been addressed, three broad recommendations are offered as follows.

- Regular monitoring and evaluation of all (re)settlement initiatives, including all components of the New Zealand Settlement Strategy, is required to determine and maintain their best fit with assessed needs. To this end, more information is needed on the perceptions and experiences of all of the main stakeholder groups – programme/service users, provider organisations, funding bodies and other sections of the wider community – involved in the process of (re)settlement.

- Attention should be given to the development and implementation of an ethnic relations policy that complements the New Zealand Settlement Strategy and is compatible with New Zealand’s official policy of bi-culturalism. To this end, and in recognition of their importance, on-going research is required to determine public attitudes, beliefs and experiences regarding immigration, the (re)settlement of immigrants and refugees, and the provision of assistance and support. The information gained can then be applied to public education programmes as appropriate.

- The curriculum and training of community workers, social workers and NGO volunteers should be reviewed and further developed to more effectively meet the demands and challenges of client needs in a new, specialised field of practice with immigrants and refugees.
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INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings of a nationwide postal survey (carried out in 2001) of non-government/not for profit agencies and organisations (hereafter referred to as NGOs) providing social services for immigrants and/or refugees in New Zealand. As part of the New Settlers Programme, it is a sequel to the survey of social work with immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers carried out earlier in the same year (see Nash and Trlin, 2004).

The movement of people (voluntary and forced) across borders is an international phenomenon, an expression of globalisation with implications for the economic and political stability of nations and their cultural identity. New Zealand, by virtue of its distance from other land masses and the absence of close border conflicts, is not threatened in the same way as are so many other states by the prospect of unmanageable numbers of asylum seekers and refugees wishing to resettle themselves. At the same time, however, New Zealand’s immigration policies – whether characterised as globalising international patterns of inward migration (Bedford et al., 2002) or as specifically Asianising these patterns (Parr, 2000) – have resulted in a rapid increase in the numbers of foreign-born residents from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

This report is designed to be read in conjunction with our earlier report (Nash and Trlin, 2004) in which we drew attention to points made by Potocky-Tripodi (2002: 3) who argued that “social work practice with refugees and immigrants requires specialized knowledge of the unique issues of these populations”, and offered the profession a comprehensive account of what she considered to be best practice in this new and challenging field. She systematically explored the many factors which practitioners need to recognise as important in the lives of this client group, using an analysis which reflects on the micro, meso and macro levels of social work practice.

Good practitioners should be informed about human rights and social justice issues as well as international and local law surrounding immigrants and refugees. They must be informed regarding service delivery systems available to them and they need to be knowledgeable regarding key problem areas such as physical health, mental health, family dynamics, cultural diversity, language, education and economic circumstances. Social workers also need to be culturally competent and to have the requisite knowledge and skills to work appropriately with their immigrant and/or refugee clients (Nash and Trlin, 2004: 2). In these terms, the present report complements the earlier one because it focuses on extending our knowledge of
service delivery systems in this field, in particular those of NGOs, their programmes and services and how they are functioning.

Social Service Provision in New Zealand

Both the state and the community provide certain services to assist the settlement of immigrants, the resettlement of refugees or the (re)settlement of clients from both groups, but the extent of help available varies geographically and depends to some extent on the migration category (immigrant or refugee) to which people belong. The interplay between state and community organisations is influenced by the contracting policies now in place and this inevitably affects the provision of services. An overview and examples of some of the services (statutory as well as those of national and locally based NGOs) available to support (re)settlement in New Zealand is useful in contextualising and understanding the findings from this survey. Some of these agencies serve the general population and some of them are specifically for new migrants, including refugees. Given the range and variety of organisations/agencies represented in the examples provided, it may well be argued that service provision in this field is fragmented and complex. It is certainly the case that practitioners engaged in this domain require good networking skills in order to identify the programmes and services available to potential clients and to work effectively with the providers.

Statutory services

- New Zealand Immigration Service
- Mangere Refugee Resettlement Agency
- Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ)
- Internal Affairs
  - Office of Ethnic Affairs
  - Language Line
- Housing New Zealand
- Ministry of Social Development
- Hospital and other statutory health services
- Schools

National non-government organisations

- Citizens Advice Bureau
- Refugee and Migrant Service
- Refugees as Survivors
- New Zealand Federation of Ethnic Councils
- Refugee Council of New Zealand Inc.
- Human Rights Foundation
Locally-based non-government organisations
Auckland Refugee Council
Dutch Friendly Support Networks
Shakti
Chinese New Settlers Service
Refugee Resettlement Support Service

The New Zealand Immigration Service (NZIS) is responsible for the Mangere Refugee Resettlement Agency which provides an intensive six weeks induction and health programme for new refugees. No such induction programme is run by a state service for other new immigrants. General services provided by Work and Income New Zealand and the Ministry of Internal Affairs are as available to new immigrants and refugees as to other residents and citizens, provided they meet the necessary criteria of residence or citizenship. The Office of Ethnic Affairs serves ethnic populations apart from Maori and Pacific Island peoples. In 2002 the Office of Ethnic Affairs launched a new service called Language Line, a telephone interpreting service. Free to staff at various government agencies, this type of service is one that many respondents in both this survey and our previous survey (Nash and Trlin, 2004) indicated would be particularly useful.

Despite the major changes made to New Zealand’s immigration policies since the mid-1980s, and consequent changes in the number and composition of arrivals seeking residence, surprisingly little was known in 2000/2001 about the social service needs of new arrivals from the viewpoint of non-government/not for profit (NGO) social service providers, and the experience of such providers in attempting to meet these needs. Where research had been carried out it was typically limited in scope. Ho et al. (2000), for example, surveyed 20 settlement services provided in the Auckland region, including 4 government agencies and 16 NGOs (8 community groups and 8 migrant groups), and identified four main areas of need: everyday needs; learning English (for those from non-English speaking backgrounds); employment; and supportive connections. Other examples of research known to us at the time of our survey included: Altinkaya’s (1997, 1998) papers on the work and funding needs of the National Association of Home Tutor Schemes; an investigation of recent Chinese migration and support mechanisms in place in Dunedin (Carter, 1999); a detailed study of the nature and functions of a trust set up by Cook Islands people in Auckland (McGeorge, 1995); an account of the development and role of a church-based health programme for Samoans in Auckland (Swinburn et al., 1997); and a useful study of refugee needs and how they are met in Manukau City (Sim, 2001).

Given the paucity of previous research, there was an obvious need for a more comprehensive nationwide survey that could contribute to a greater understanding
of the nature, role, activities, experiences, difficulties and perceptions of NGO social service providers grappling with the needs of immigrants and/or refugees. We believe that the results from this survey will be of value to a wide range of interested parties, including immigrant communities, ethnic voluntary associations, NGO social service providers and analysts involved in government policy development.
METHODOLOGY

Non-government not for profit agencies or organisations (NGOs), from a sampling frame compiled from three lists, were invited to take part in a survey which explored their provision of social services to immigrants and/or refugees in New Zealand. The lists employed for compiling the sampling frame of possible participants were: (a) the *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Workers 2001 Diary*; (b) the membership list of the NGO Refugee Resettlement Network Aotearoa New Zealand as at March 2001; and (c) the *Ethnic Communities Directory, 4th edition*, 1998. In compiling the sampling frame from these sources we included indigenous as well as immigrant ethnic agencies, took agency size into account, and gave particular attention to the inclusion of NGOs likely to address the needs of refugees and/or immigrants.

Response Rate

A questionnaire (see below) was mailed out to 312 NGOs nationwide in 2001. There were 191 returns, of which 64 were not filled in at all, 21 were returned to sender, and 15 were unusable, yielding a usable total of 91 questionnaires, one of which was filtered out since the NGO concerned had no dealings with either immigrants or refugees. In all, 90 questionnaires (a response rate of 28.8 per cent) were completed by NGOs dealing with immigrants and/or refugees. Given the pattern of returns (notably those not completed or returned to sender) it appears that the initial list compiled was too broad (i.e. it included many NGOs to whom the survey was not applicable or relevant). Accordingly, we believe that the 90 usable responses probably represent a much higher percentage of those NGOs serving refugees and/or immigrants than the response rate appears to suggest.

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire (see Appendix 1) was designed in four main sections, with a preliminary filter included in the first section to screen out NGOs which did not fit the survey criteria. Using a mixture of closed and open-ended questions, the four sections in the questionnaire covered the following areas:

A. General questions about the NGO being surveyed, including its funding and programmes in relation to the immigrant and/or refugee client group.
B. Questions about the client group(s).
C. Questions about NGO staffing, qualifications and provenance.
D. Questions about policy issues relating to programme or service provision.
Section A focused upon general questions to ascertain the organisational categories into which NGOs fitted, the types of programmes or services and for whom they were provided. There were questions about funding sources and issues associated with the funder/provider relationship. Respondents were also asked to comment on how they evaluated the strengths and challenges associated with their NGO. This section provided useful baseline information.

Section B asked about the immigrant and/or refugee clients who accessed the programmes or services offered. It included questions about the main ethnic origins of current immigrant and/or refugee clients, and the difficulties experienced in communicating and networking with clients. Respondents were also asked to rate the match between services provided and client requirements, to assess these programmes or services and to identify areas where improvements could be made.

Section C of the questionnaire related specifically to the NGO’s staff and had an administrative focus.

Section D of the questionnaire invited respondents to consider a number of policy issues and topics and their implications for the provision of social programmes or services to immigrants and/or refugees. A final question asked respondents to comment on anything they wished to emphasise or that they felt had not been addressed within the questionnaire.

Follow-up Interviews

Follow-up interviews with 12 people representing NGOs that completed the survey were carried out in 2002. Those selected for these follow-up interviews were from a pool of agencies in different parts of the country that had offered to be interviewed when completing the mail questionnaire. As indicated in the schedule of topics for these interviews (see Appendix 2) the aim – primarily in response to our survey findings – was to gather additional information with respect to: (a) aspects of government policy concerning refugees and asylum seekers; (b) a perceived need for improvements in the knowledge and skills of social workers; (c) the employment and role of volunteer workers; and (d) from the perspective of best practice, perceptions of strengths and weaknesses in the agency’s work with refugees and asylum seekers.
SURVEY RESULTS

The results presented in the following pages follow the four sections of the survey questionnaire.

Profile of Participating NGOs

In the first section of the questionnaire, answers were sought to general questions regarding the client categories, the programmes and services with which the NGOs were involved and the key characteristics of the NGOs themselves. The latter included the religious or secular state of the NGO, its age and the purpose for which it was established. As shown in Table 1 the majority of those participating were local community-based agencies or branch offices of national NGOs while a smaller proportion were local ethnic community NGOs. Five national NGO Head Offices completed the questionnaire. Only 26 (28.9 per cent) of the participating agencies and organisations were providing a programme or service exclusively for immigrants and/or refugees, and the majority of these were local community-based or local ethnic community organisations (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO type</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head office of national NGO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch office of national NGO</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community NGO</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local ethnic community NGO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answers to a further question (as to who the clients were) revealed that among the participating NGOs as a whole, 30 per cent had clients who were or included immigrants in general, 30 per cent had clients who were or included refugees in general, while 18 per cent had clients from specific immigrant or refugee groups. As
expected, the bulk of the participating NGOs worked with other client groups as well.

Table 2: Participating NGOs classified by type and service provision for immigrants and/or refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO category</th>
<th>Services provided exclusively for immigrants and/or refugees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Office of National NGO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Office of National NGO</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community NGO</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Ethnic Community NGO</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The types of programmes and services offered by NGOs in this survey ranged from the very practical (e.g. providing food, clothing) to therapeutic services (counselling) and onward referral. These different types of programmes and services are listed in descending order of frequency in Table 3.

Some key characteristics of the participating NGOs (purpose for which founded, secular or religious status and sources of funding) are summarised in Table 4. Almost three-quarters were secular rather than religious organisations and the majority (65.5 per cent) had been funded for purposes or needs other than those of immigrants and refugees. However, it should be pointed out that NGOs founded specifically to meet the ‘self-help and cultural’ or ‘support and education’ needs of immigrants and refugees (34.4 per cent) were relatively ‘new’ with the majority established since 1980 (compared with about half of all those taking part in the survey), a feature consistent with the impact of dramatic changes in New Zealand’s immigration policies since 1986. Funding typically came from two or more sources, with charitable trusts, central government and the fund-raising activities of NGOs themselves figuring as the main sources. When asked to name their main outside source of funding, a quarter of the 61 NGOs responding to the question identified the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services and one-sixth named the Ministry of Health, while the
remainder cited sources ranging from various other central government departments or agencies (e.g. the New Zealand Immigration Service, WINZ) and particular local government bodies to client fees and donations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmes/services provided</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral on</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s welfare</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (Physical)</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation/housing (short-term)</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting/translation</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation (on arrival)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural support</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (mental)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation/housing (long-term)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: respondents were asked to identify all programmes/services available to clients on the checklist provided.
### Table 4: Selected characteristics of participating NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristics</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose/need for which founded</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian needs of women/children and poverty alleviation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant/refugee self-help and cultural needs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and educate refugees/migrants</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (physical, mental, disability)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual and domestic abuse</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic, organisational and other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secular or religions status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable, not specified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current main funding sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable trusts</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own fund-raising activities</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s national office</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: for funding sources, more than one response could be given on the checklist provided.

Aspects of the working relationship between the NGOs and their current main funding providers were examined via a series of questions, the results of which are summarised in Table 5. On the basis of responses obtained from more than two-thirds of the NGOs, it appears that with few exceptions they felt that their current main funder’s contract requirements were clear and reasonable. Although there was much less certainty about whether the funding provided was appropriate for the programme(s) and/or service(s) involved (opinion was divided on this matter), it was generally agreed also that the funding provider monitored the outcomes of the programme(s)/service(s) concerned. Overall, communication between the funding provider and the agency was perceived to be good but the NGOs were either divided or reserved in their opinion as to whether the funder understood the difficulties or problems involved in dealing with immigrants and refugees. In relation to the latter
point, it may be noted that among those willing to offer an opinion one way or the other, the majority did not perceive funders to be willing to discuss support for new programmes or services to meet needs arising among such clients. Finally, about two-thirds of those who responded agreed that the main funder’s requirements for funding renewal were very time consuming.

Table 5: Attitude of participating NGOs with regard to funding provided, requirements etc of their current main funding provider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Responses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What your main funding provider requires is clearly indicated in your contract</td>
<td>40 18 4 4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main funding provider’s requirements are reasonable</td>
<td>25 33 5 4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The funding provided is appropriate for the programme(s)/service(s) involved</td>
<td>13 20 12 19 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main funding provider monitors the outcome(s) of the programme(s)/service(s) for which funding has been provided</td>
<td>28 27 6 6 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is good communication between the main funding provider and your NGO</td>
<td>24 26 12 4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main funding provider understands the problems or difficulties involved in dealing with immigrant or refugee clients</td>
<td>10 12 21 8 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main funding provider is willing to discuss additional funding to meet new needs arising among immigrants or refugees</td>
<td>6 13 17 11 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main funder’s requirements for funding renewal are very time consuming</td>
<td>23 23 5 13 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Moderately agree, 3 = Moderately disagree, 4 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Don’t know

What can be learned from the attitudes or perceptions reported above? Funding providers may be tempted to conclude that they were doing as well as could be
expected. They could argue that a small number of NGOs were always likely to be dissatisfied with aspects of their service provision contracts, and that complaints about the funding body’s understanding of issues, its willingness to discuss new funding needs and its funding renewal requirements all point to the persistence of problems where the aspirations and expectations of NGOs exceeded available funding and their capacity to meet contemporary management requirements. Such arguments are familiar and not without merit. That said, it could also be argued that there is a need for considered reflection by funding providers.

Two main reasons may be offered in support of such reflection. First, the NGOs have been operating in an environment where government’s development of settlement policy (with the resources required for contingent programmes and services) has lagged a decade or more behind dramatic changes in immigration policy that have produced far-reaching effects and often unexpected social problems and difficulties (see Trlin and Watts, 2004). Second, it is important to acknowledge that most NGOs participating in this survey have (often as a matter of necessity in relation to funding criteria) implemented procedures to monitor the provision of programmes and services, and that such monitoring has involved consideration of best practice standards typically developed in-house or in association with the funding body or some other agency or organisation. In these terms, the perceptions and/or ‘complaints’ of the NGOs should not be ignored or dismissed out of hand but treated as plausible, grassroots indicators of matters in need of attention.

**Links with providers of other programmes and services**

The majority of the participating NGOs had links with other service providers. Typical links mentioned, in the words of the respondents themselves, included:

- Strong links with other service providers working in the refugee field, such as Refugees as Survivors (RAS), Refugee and Migrant Service (RMS), English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), and interpreter services.
- Auckland New Ventures Inc. (for conducting workshops and employment opportunities); Relationship Services (for orientation programmes); website Newkiwis (for employment); and WINZ (for benefits or employment assistance).
- As required, links with local interpreters, advocates and sponsors.
- Member of National Network of Stopping Violence Services.

Overall, the list was comprehensive, indicating a well-networked field of practice.

**Main strengths**
When asked to identify what they considered to be the main strengths of the programme(s) and/or service(s) provided by their NGO, eight key themes emerged:

- **Accessibility:** operating with an 0800 number, being open at all times, being free and youth friendly and having translators available.
- **Centrality:** one-stop-shop, offering a place for new immigrants to access various services and/or having the main service providers in one place.
- **Specialist services:** ethnic and gender services which meet community needs, such as those of women and Somali refugees.
- **Appropriate services:** culturally and linguistically appropriate services, professional social services and community-based services.
- **Educational services:** linguistic services, assisting with settlement in New Zealand.
- **Safety:** for women and children who can access information and support with regard to abuse in their home.
- **Advocacy:** representing/championing the needs of those from non-English speaking backgrounds and/or unfamiliar with New Zealand’s social service systems and provisions.
- **Practical assistance:** providing food, clothing and assisting with other material needs.

**Enhancement of programmes and services**

For the final question in Section A of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to identify ways in which the programme(s) or service(s) provided by their NGO could be enhanced if more funding or resources were made available. Answers to this question revealed that the NGOs could enhance their programmes and services in seven main areas.

- **Increase the level of staffing,** both of professionals and paid volunteers.
- **Extra space,** for a better office and storage as well as for client contact and educational purposes.
- **Advocacy – increased representation to meet the needs of those from different cultural/language backgrounds.**
- **Community capacity,** including self-help initiatives.
- **Practical improvements** such as provision of transport, increased availability of service(s) and programme(s) (especially ESOL), better marketing and publication/distribution of newsletters and brochures, and increased access to interpreters.
- **Increased cultural support.**
- **Confidence in continuity for programme or service provision.**

Overall, the answers concerning programme and service enhancement conveyed a feeling of constructive frustration with the status quo. Constructive in the sense that there was little grumbling and many good ideas, but also frustration at the thought
of how much more needed to be done quickly in order to alleviate distress and improve (re)settlement in New Zealand.

To sum up, the first section of the questionnaire provided an introduction to and overview of the NGOs participating in the survey with regard to their work in the field of (re)settlement for immigrants and refugees. The picture that emerged from the data collected is one of articulate, well-informed and very busy organisations with a deep sense of commitment to the work they do and the communities they serve.

The NGO Clients

The proportion of an NGO’s clients accounted for by immigrants and/or refugees and their ethnic origins are shown in Tables 6 and 7, respectively. A bi-polar distribution is evident in Table 6, with 39 (43.3 per cent) and 30 (33.3 per cent) of the NGOs reporting that immigrants/refugees accounted for less than 26 per cent and more than 75 per cent of their clients, respectively. At the lower end of this distribution the NGOs were typically catering to the social service needs of the general population, while at the top end they were predominantly those set up to provide self-help, cultural support and educational services mainly for immigrants and refugees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of clients immigrants or refugees</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main ethnic origins of these immigrant and refugee clients (Table 7) appear to reflect the influence of two main factors. First, recent changes in New Zealand’s immigrant policy and consequent shifts in the arrival of immigrants and refugees
from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Examples include skilled immigrants from Asia (e.g. China, India and Korea) and refugees from countries that have experienced war and civil disorder since the late 1980s (e.g. Somalia, Bosnia, Iraq and Afghanistan). Second, the difficulties experienced by new settlers from non-European and non-English speaking backgrounds as they encounter prejudice and discrimination in employment, accommodation and other areas of (re)settlement. Examples here include those without employment qualifications (e.g. Somali refugees) or non-New Zealand qualifications (e.g. skilled Chinese and Indian immigrants) as well as those in need of tuition to improve their English language skills or counselling to grapple with pre-migration trauma and/or post-migration cultural adjustments.

Table 7: Main ethnic origins* of NGO clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic origins of clients</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East and Southeast Asian (Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, Thai</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African (Somali, Ethiopian, Kenyan)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern (Iraqi, Assyrian, Afghanistani)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Burmese, Bangladeshi)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and East European (Russian, Polish, Bosnian)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American (Columbian, Chilean)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (includes British)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: NGO respondents were asked to list in order up to 3 ethnic origins for their clients.

Respondents were asked whether their organisation/agency specialised in the provision of programmes or services to a particular age or gender group. Their responses showed that 23 per cent specialised, and the main work areas identified were with male offenders and single mothers.

A series of questions focused on whether the participating agencies/organisations had experienced difficulties with respect to informing potential immigrant or refugee clients of their programme(s) or service(s), what these difficulties were and how they could be resolved. Half of the NGOs had experienced difficulties, the main ones being: language difficulties; inadequate financial resources for marketing and public
relations; cultural difficulties; unrealistic client expectations; and client reluctance to approach an agency without an introduction. Moreover, 74 (82 per cent) of the participating NGOs estimated that as many as two-thirds of their potential immigrant or refugee clients experienced difficulties in accessing their programme(s) or service(s). The most significant issues were culture, language and transport. A majority of these NGOs were taking measures to make access easier; for example, by involving resource people from different cultures, advertising, transporting people to classes, and networking with agencies that worked regularly with Refugee and Migrant Services. However, 19 of the 74 NGOs (25.7 per cent) were taking no measures to improve access to their services. Their reasons included a lack of money, their small clientele, a lack of staff and uncertainty as to what measure(s) would help.

Aside from the issue of access, another topic of interest concerned the extent to which the service(s) and programme(s) available were matched to the needs of clients and (if necessary) whether any measures were being taken to improve matters. Well over half of the NGOs considered their service(s) or programme(s) to be either “very well” or “well” matched with client needs (Table 8). Of those indicating less satisfaction with the match, 27.8 per cent said their NGO had no plans for improvements, 17.8 per cent reported that improvement measures were being planned and 10 per cent said that such measures were being implemented. Typical measures being taken or planned included: lobbying for extra money, consultation with other community groups and agencies, promoting culture and language activities, and staff training. Where no measures were being taken, the reasons again included: insufficient funds, the small numbers of clients involved and too few staff.

Table 8: Extent to which an NGO’s programme(s)/service(s) matched needs of immigrant and/or refugee clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent to which matched</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well matched</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well matched</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately matched</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not matched</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NGO Staff

As indicated in the initial profile, the majority of the participating NGOs were small or medium sized; 27 (30 per cent) and 28 (31.1 per cent) had 1-5 and 6-16 staff,
respectively. Among the remainder, the bulk (26, or 28.9 per cent) had 17-46 staff with a small number of others functioning as larger national organisations.

Table 9: Staff of participating NGOs (N=90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff categories</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers/administrators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerical/support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme/service providers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-time employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part-time employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of some key staff details is provided in Table 9. In keeping with their predominantly small size, it will be noted that a substantial percentage of the NGOs reported having no staff responsible *solely* for: management/administrative duties (14.4 per cent); clerical/support duties (30 per cent); or programme/service provision (15.6 per cent). As a matter of necessity, the staff in some cases held more than one role within an NGO and juggled their responsibilities accordingly. With regard to staff directly involved in the provision of programmes or services to immigrant
and/or refugee clients, it was clear that full-time staff were few in number; indeed, 44.4 per cent of the NGOs had no full-time staff, and among those with 3 or more full-time staff only 9 out of 23 had more than 10 full-time employees. On the other hand, while 42.2 per cent of the participating NGOs reported no part-time staff, 47.8 per cent had 1-10 such staff and a further 7.8 per cent reported 11-99. In addition to data presented in Table 9, it was found that part-time voluntary staff were present in half of the NGOs and were rather more common than full-time voluntary staff (only 9 per cent reported 1-6 such staff).

**Staff qualifications, recruitment and retention**

Because the qualifications and training of frontline staff are crucial to the ability of organisations to successfully provide programmes and services to their clients, a question on this topic was included in the questionnaire. Information was elicited on the qualifications and training of a total of 497 staff directly involved in providing programmes and/or services to clients who were immigrants or refugees (Table 10). Almost 77 per cent of these staff members had at least some “relevant training” for their work. Although the categories “professional tertiary” and “non-professional tertiary...” were not explicitly defined in the questionnaire, the results obtained (8.7 and 28.4 per cent, respectively) are probably a fair indication of what one could expect in NGOs with regard to the various types of social work, community work, counselling or ESOL qualifications and training of frontline staff. Clearly there was considerable room for staff development via appropriate qualifications and training.

**Table 10: Main qualifications and training of staff directly engaged in programme or service provision to immigrant or refugee clients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications and training</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional tertiary qualification</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professional tertiary qualification with other relevant training</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No tertiary qualification but other relevant training</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither tertiary qualification nor other relevant training</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Participating NGOs were asked to indicate the number of staff in each category.

Where difficulties with the recruitment of “suitable staff” for work with immigrants and refugees were acknowledged, the main difficulties included:

- lack of funding to employ qualified staff;
• cultural difficulties (i.e. limited choice of available cross-cultural workers due to problems of language or communication, acceptability to a particular ethnic community or knowledge of a particular culture);
• qualification problems (e.g. recognition and/or suitability of qualifications);
• lack of volunteers (people too busy); and
• difficulties in recruiting young people.

Among the efforts being made by NGOs to deal with such difficulties were advocacy for additional funding, keeping an eye open for likely recruits, staff training, using marketing strategies to attract likely recruits, providing work experience and a trial period of work.

Staff retention was also a problem, acknowledged by more than two-thirds of the participating NGOs. The difficulties clustered round financial problems (e.g. low pay, lack of funding for training, having to release government subsidised cross-cultural workers) but also included transport problems, people using the NGO work experience as a stepping stone to something better, burn out and a high turnover rate for volunteers.

Employment of former immigrants and refugees

Although slightly less than one-third of the 90 participating NGOs had a policy of positive discrimination on the employment of former immigrants and refugees, 65 (72.2 per cent) had such persons engaged as staff involved in the provision of programmes and services to immigrant and/or refugee clients. As reported by the NGOs, the main “ethnic origins” of these staff were “Asian” (43.3 per cent), “European” (27.7 per cent) and “Pacific Island” (13.8 per cent) with smaller percentages for “African”, “Middle Eastern” and “Latin American” (7.7, 7.7 and 4.6 per cent, respectively). Accounting for about two-thirds of the workforce, the former immigrant/refugee staff were well represented in management and administrative roles but the majority were engaged in direct service provision (e.g. as cultural advisors, social workers, counsellors, community development workers and as interpreters and translators).

Both advantages and disadvantages were perceived with respect to having former immigrant or refugee staff directly involved in providing programmes or services to clients who were themselves immigrants or refugees. Not surprisingly, the main advantages were: (a) ease of communication, due to language and/or cultural compatibility; and (b) having shared experiences, which facilitated empathy and the ability to give assistance, but also meant that clients felt comfortable coming to the agency for assistance. On the other hand, the two main disadvantages were: (a) the likelihood of unrealistic expectations on the part of clients about the staff member’s ability to influence outcomes; and (b) that immigrant/refugee communities could
place excessive demands on these workers. Other issues or difficulties arose when
the staff member was unfamiliar with New Zealand systems, had poor boundaries
between their personal and professional life, held to professional standards which
were different to those of the NGO, or experienced communication problems (when
there was a mismatch of language or cultures).

Given the advantages of having programmes/services provided by former
immigrants and refugees, information was sought as to whether or not the NGOs
kept a register of the linguistic and/or cultural skills of staff members. Although 38
(42 per cent) said they did keep such a register, only 15 of them (39.5 per cent)
offered financial or other benefits to staff for the use of their linguistic or cultural
skills in providing programmes or services to immigrant or refugee clients. Clearly
there was ample scope to improve the recognition or cataloguing of such skills and
remuneration for their use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: Source of interpreters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both within and outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge of how to locate and use interpreters appropriately has been slow to
develop in some social service areas. We asked the NGOs what sources they used to
find interpreters and whether, if they came from within the agency, they were
properly qualified. The NGOs indicated that they looked both within and outside the
organisation for suitable interpreters, often used persons from both sources but on
balance were more likely to find an interpreter outside rather than within the
organisation (Table 11). Where an interpreter was used from within the organisation,
less than a quarter of the NGOs reported that such a person was “always” formally
qualified while slightly more than another one-third indicated that such an
interpreter was “sometimes” qualified (Table 12).
Table 12: Interpreters sourced from within NGO who are formally qualified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formally qualified?</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, always</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, sometimes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional supervision of staff

Often understood outside the field of social and community work as something similar to personal mentoring or coaching, professional supervision has several important functions, notably those of administration, education and professional development. As members of the professional associations of social workers, counsellors and psychotherapists are expected to have regular supervision, one would therefore expect this to apply to many NGO staff. In answer to the question as to whether professional supervision was provided for all staff directly engaged in the provision of programmes or services to immigrants or refugees, three-quarters of the participating NGOs answered in the affirmative. In most cases, it was provided by persons from within as well as outside the NGO, but 20 per cent of the NGOs provided supervision only from within the organisation, while 13 per cent funded supervision from outside sources only. Just under half of the NGOs reported that they expected supervisors to have particular knowledge, skills or experience in work with immigrants or refugees. Recognition of the importance of supervision and the procedures in place to ensure that supervision appropriate to the needs of both staff and clients was available, is well illustrated in the following statement:

“All service delivery staff receive both internal and external supervision on a regular basis. If they have a specific client, whom their regular supervisors can't help with, they are able to access other supervision e.g., if we had a refugee client our first step would be for the counsellor to consult with our Auckland branch staff, then to access a professional supervisor locally to work with so that our service was appropriate and acceptable.”

Policy Issues Relating to Service Provision
In the final section of the survey, the participating NGOs were invited to consider a number of policy issues and their implications for the provision of programmes or services for immigrants and refugees. As a starting point they were asked to indicate if there had been changes in immigration policy and/or the selection or admission of refugees during the last 10 years that had had an impact on their organisation. Over half of the respondents (53.3 per cent) replied that there had been such changes, which included: adjustments to annual immigration targets, changes to the points criteria for skilled and business migrants, and changes to the selection and admission of refugees (for details, see Tralin, 1997; Bedford et al., 2005).

A list of possible effects that the perceived policy changes could have was provided, and each participating NGO that acknowledged the impact of such changes was invited to identify all effects that applied to it. As expected, the responses (Table 13) indicated that the most notable effects were those involving the (often interrelated) demand for services, client needs and community attitudes or support. Less notable, but still important, were the flow-on effects with respect to referrals, funding and staffing.

Table 13: Effects on NGOs (N=48) of changes in immigration policy and/or the selection/admission of refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased demand for services</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased demand for services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in client needs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in community attitudes toward or support for immigrants/refugees</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in availability of agencies/organisations for referrals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing issues (recruitment, retention, skills)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in funding (availability, criteria etc)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NGOs participating in the survey were asked whether they had been involved in any way in government’s development of immigration policy (including the selection and admission of refugees) during the previous five years. Only 24 (26.7 per cent) of

---

1 It is important to remember here that the respondents completed this survey questionnaire at the end of 2001.
indicated that they had been involved, and the types of involvement are presented in Table 14. Clearly the more traditional methods of networking with other agencies/organisations, formal and informal consultation, submission writing and lobbying of key stakeholders remained the leading avenues for involvement. Only a few had resorted to exerting some influence or pressure via the media and only one NGO had taken some form of protest action. Overall, less than two-thirds (15 out of 24) of those involved in the development of government immigration policy in any way considered that it had been worthwhile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of involvement</th>
<th>NGOs answering ‘Yes’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal consultation by central government agency</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal consultation by central government agency</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying of key stakeholders</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission writing to central government agency</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of briefing papers, reports and/or case studies</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking with other agencies/organisations</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest action</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the media</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked whether they had any concerns relating to the settlement of immigrants or refugees in New Zealand, 52 (57.8 per cent) of the participating NGOs indicated that they had. The two main concerns mentioned were: under-resourcing of initial (re)settlement services; and the lack of assistance for new arrivals for retraining and/or updating their qualifications and finding work. Other concerns mentioned included: the social work intervention required to assist with (re)settlement; the reluctance of employers to employ immigrants or refugees; and the poor English language skills of some new arrivals, particularly refugees.
Given such concerns, it was to be expected that the majority (62 or 68.9 per cent) declared that they would support a call for government to develop and implement a policy to guide and assist the (re)settlement of immigrants and refugees. A similar level of support (58 or 64.4 per cent) was indicated for the development of an ethnic relations policy to assist with the (re)settlement of immigrants and refugees from diverse cultural backgrounds. It should also be noted that almost all (52 out of 58) who expressed support for the development of such an ethnic relations policy agreed that it should be linked with a (re)settlement policy to achieve an integrated approach to the needs and issues faced by immigrants and refugees.
FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

In this section we present the main themes from the 12 follow-up interviews with information-rich NGOs selected from different parts of the country. The interview schedule consisted of eight open-ended questions (see Appendix 2). Five main themes stood out, namely: policy changes; family reunification and settlement; cross-cultural issues; the employment of volunteers; and best practice and weaknesses.

Policy Changes

It is widely acknowledged that what refugees need to help them to resettle is to have a compassionate family reunification policy and paid employment, the latter enabling them to provide for their family and to participate in society. For this to come about, not only would government policy (for both the intake and resettlement of refugees) need to change, but so would public attitudes to immigration in New Zealand. For example, in research into public attitudes to immigration in 2003, Gendall et al. (2006) found that while most New Zealanders were uncomfortable with the large-scale immigration of non-English speaking people.

The following observation was made by one interviewee in relation to solving some of the factors which hinder the integration of refugees in New Zealand.

*Government needs to be more selective in taking from groups that are deemed by UNHCR to have a permanent need for resettlement. And the reason I say that is, that in the last three years [1999-2001], close to 80 per cent of all adults that have come in with the New Zealand [refugee] programme have been either pre-literate, often in their own language as well as English, or only marginally literate. And the huge deficit that there is there, and the limitations to employment and so on, are just making it exceedingly difficult when you have government…increasingly requiring [certain] outcomes from settlement, and the chief outcome inditcor is employment.*

It was acknowledged that there is no quick and easy solution to helping people with this degree of learning to catch-up and become part of their new community. As a result, some interviewees suggested that different criteria for targeting different intakes of migrants and/or refugees should be introduced to improve the prospects of eventual (re)settlement and to lower the costs involved. For example, one interviewee indicated that the NGO would advocate for consideration of some kind of (re)settlement potential, even though this is something to which people are often
strongly opposed. At least that way one could take in refugees and immigrants that one could expect to (re)settle reasonably successfully.

In addition to applying criteria which predict success, it was also felt by several of those interviewed that there should be “more front end funding – on arrival funding for services to help people to become independent quickly”. Opinion varied with respect to the amount of help already available to new settlers, whether they be voluntary migrants or refugees. Some felt that there was a great deal of assistance available, whereas others thought this was not the case. While it is still true that there is more specialist settlement assistance (e.g. ESOL classes) available in those parts of the country, such as Auckland, where there is a concentration of immigrants and refugees, there was certainly no formal settlement programme for voluntary migrants in place in 2001/2002 akin to that provided for refugees.

Policy changes to facilitate (re)settlement, however, were not confined to matters of selection criteria for entry to New Zealand or on arrival funding and the availability of services required. Changes were required also to recognise the often protracted process of (re)settlement and the importance of services (notably in language learning) to enable the social/cultural integration of new settlers. As one of the interviewees put it:

*The orientation/(re)settlement doesn’t [just] take 18 months to 2 years,…for many people it takes a life time. And I think specifically of how difficult it is for us or other agencies to get money for orientation/ESOL and literacy programmes for people who are not job seeking. I would like to see policy changes around that, together with more support for parents with young children. For example, free language literacy is a major issue in terms of integration into our pre-schools and family support services.*

Language was recognised as a key to (re)settlement but several of those interviewed also talked about the dearth of cultural courses which would help (re)settlement and integration. For example, one interviewee argued that:

*There are language courses but they don’t have language courses on how to start understanding New Zealand culture any more. A lot of people I talk to don’t know what the rules of rugby are, for instance. …They can’t actually integrate into our community very easily because they don’t understand the pub culture, or they don’t understand the living, the life aspect of how we organise our houses, and our lives and our plants. …I would want those sort of things to be incorporated into any of the language programmes.*
The interviewees showed concern for refugees and asylum seekers, saying that faster processing and a clear understanding of the processes for asylum seekers and refugees would make a big difference. For example:

*There needs to be a policy change about what is available to asylum seekers. They sit around out at Mangere quite often [for] 2, 3, 6 months and get nothing. There are educational classes running but they are not eligible because they are asylum seekers We do some work with them, but I think we are about the only agency that do that at Mangere.*

The issue of people’s mental well-being and how to support them was another matter raised in relation to policy changes.

*And likewise for those people who are waiting for asylum decisions, we are seeing some people who are in our children’s trauma programme [children asylum seekers] who are tremendously affected by what is happening to their parents, and that kind of waiting for applications to be processed. If you are going to make it [application processing] quicker you have still got to get ride of fear as a [part of the] process.*

Finally, one interviewee called for employer education and recognition of past experiences and qualifications and a clearer understanding of what refugees and asylum seekers need to do to get their qualifications upgraded or recognised here. However, there was also a need for the government to provide help to new immigrants, because although “there is a resettlement programme [of some sort] for refugees...we don’t have any **immigrant** settlement policy”.

**Family Reunification and Settlement**

In relation to changes in immigration policy and the admission of refugees it was pointed out by one of the participants that:

*The joint NGOs have lobbied very hard and recommended...to government that New Zealand introduce a special humanitarian programme that would provide realistic mechanisms for looking at family reunion for refugees other than the current very strict requirements which have issues relating to documentation, qualifications etc.*

*The lottery policy [introduced in 2000]... actually caused a huge amount of stress, and I have not been able to find anybody amongst our client group who*
has been successful in getting family members allocated to them under the lottery system. So there is a lot of uncertainty around that and a lot of them are depressed.

Family reunification (in particular, but not exclusively, for refugees) was recognised by all interviewees as problematic. For example, one interviewee declared that:

*Family reunification and the length of time it takes is a major source of worry for many people. It is a laborious process, which I think it could be much more fairly put together. I mean we are not a country that takes a large number of refugees, so holding people’s families together is surely a way of ensuring that people do settle well in a country, that they do have that stability. But putting them through years of separation and so on, is just not right. It has big effects on the children.*

Another interviewee provided a helpful illustration of the problems he encountered in working towards family reunification with his clients:

*I am working with a number of South Asian people... who have come to New Zealand to succeed. The successful families don’t always want to be burdened by involving the family, and so a lot of these people seeking visas and seeking to come to New Zealand under reunification are actually finding more support from non-family groups, than from family. Because of the lack of resources (I mean families have to provide housing or provide support for housing) it is actually quite a risk for settled families to... take on that burden. I mean, most of us couldn’t do that if we had to pick up another family overnight.*

*When I was with the benefit review committee, there were a lot of families who had under-estimated the time and cost of resettling extended family members and the impact it has on their own family unit, their own work life, their own social lives, etc. I think that possibly in our global society it is an interesting question about where we choose to be, but if we are going to allow people to come into New Zealand as part of family reunification, then we need to set up... support for the base family.*

The interviewees acknowledged the difficulties of sorting out family relationships and eligibility, but those in direct contact with people striving to bring in parents, spouses, siblings and children were very aware of the distress and confusion experienced under the systems in place at the beginning of the new millennium.
Cross-cultural Issues

The cross-cultural issues raised were aptly expressed by one person who had a comprehensive take on the matter:

There are varying levels of skill in this area in New Zealand. Because we are a specialised service we have a very high skill level in this area, and for us the training opportunities are limited. We send people off-shore to improve their skill levels, which raises funding issues. We employ bi-lingual workers to work with us, to give us cultural advice/training on a day-by-day basis as a worker. Then there are generic social workers who haven’t had exposure to cross-culture work who require a basic training in terms of what is different about cross-cultural work, what is significant about how you deliver services to groups who have had the kind of mental health experiences that these groups have had, etc., etc. That whole exposure to different cultures...Even stuff like, don’t put your hand out to shake the hand of a Muslim man because that basically means that is before you can get engaged.

One of the big problems in this area is [that] agencies that don’t have much contact with clients from minority ethnic groups do not want to put resources into it...so their opportunity for cross-cultural training is not there. We offer a little cross-cultural training outside this agency.

On the other hand, there were some interviewees who pointed out the need for clients from different cultures to learn about the ways in which New Zealanders offer help. In other words, what counselling involves, what one can expect from a social service agency and where the boundaries between friendship and professional service exist. For example, one interviewee argued that:

I am not sure that there is enough understanding of social work practice from other cultural perspectives, or about what we actually mean by that...the issue of bi-cultural work is to be able to understand not only my culture but [an]other people’s culture in terms of their value system and empowering and enabling that, and it is quite an intensive skill really. I would say that after 20 years of work I still wouldn’t consider myself bi-cultural...

To be able to assess, you need to know the client’s politics, ethnicity, social status, rather than just refer them [for example] to a group of working Samoans. I guess we don’t even think about it for Pakeha, that...[there are] some lawyers or some professional agencies, that you wouldn’t send some
clients to. But with other ethnic cultures we sort of forget that there is an appropriate match as well. Maybe that is the sort of training that people need to be aware of a bit more.

Obviously there is much room for cross-cultural miscommunication, and one interviewee provided a graphic example of this:

_We had a health worker from the city council come to an orientation…and he was a very, very white skinned male, looked very British, a lovely guy, but he came in front of all my Somali women and started to talk about safety in the home, and why we keep meat in the fridge, and where you put it and all these sorts of things. He demonstrated with a big kitchen fridge, and it created an uproar for these Somali women [who had come straight from the refugee camp]. …they thought, although we had an interpreter, that we were accusing them of putting meat in the fridge and having meat juices dripping everywhere. They were quite hot and bothered. And here was this very white main from the city council in a tie and a suit; he couldn’t cope!_

**Volunteer Workers**

Volunteering was the next theme and we found a variety of opinions on the recruitment, selection, retention, motivation and matching of volunteers.

Some interviewees (often from the larger organisations) were confident about their supply of volunteers. For example, one said that:

_We run an ongoing orientation programme for people who are vulnerable from the minority ethnic communities and migrants. We have children illiterate, people who were pre-literate learners and people with disabilities. So our volunteers have to take a range of work with that group. Some of them become volunteer tutors, some of them become volunteer assistants in the programme classes. Now they are the people who engage very quickly and don’t seem to go away. Our next group of volunteers are the drivers who bring the people to that programme – just drop them and go away. Now they are more difficult to engage…_

_It’s forming a relationship that keeps them on board. And it is fun and it is an enjoyable way to spend the morning, and they feel like they are making a significant contribution._
Another interviewee described how they had modernised their relationship with volunteers, resulting in better qualified staff:

...[we achieved an] improvement in the calibre of the volunteer programme through redesigning and trialling projects. We have a comprehensive and successful volunteer programme, now approved as an NZQA certificate course. It involves all volunteers being police screened, [with] assessment [and] pre-placement interviews to assess suitability and placement of volunteers.

This agency, like others interviewed, recognised the changing trends in volunteering and was adapting to these successfully:

The profile of volunteers has been changing enormously. Fifteen years ago the majority of volunteers were women, probably church-based and with time to give during the day. Nowadays the majority are still women although about 30 per cent are now male. We are not advertising as much as we did for volunteers because, through word of mouth, information about our programme is getting around.

We ask people about their motivation, and how they found us: from the worksite, the telephone book, TV ads, and word of mouth.

Several reasons for becoming a volunteer were mentioned. These included: the calibre of the training programme; positive reports from volunteers who were enjoying helping a family; a desire to do something constructive, which was not being fulfilled by professional life; and CV boosters.

Managing volunteer programmes was not always easy and some of the difficulties reflected changing demographics and work patterns. For example, one interviewee noted:

We have had to change the roles for some people, because people are often not available during the day. So increasingly we have to pick up things that would have been done by volunteers with our own specialist staff, and assign volunteers to do things they can do in their timeframes.

There are also times when volunteers can become disillusioned, especially by the negative attitudes of some refugees and other new settlers they work with. Some clients can have unrealistic expectations of the programme or service being offered with resultant unsatisfactory relationships between the volunteers and new settlers.
Cultural and gender matching is also an issue. For example, if one’s volunteers are women, one needs pairs of women to work with single Muslim men as opposed to individuals for work with Muslim women. Mention was also made of difficulties experienced in matching staff for work with particular age groups. For example:

*Staffing at the service is appropriate to our main purpose — to provide services for young people 10 to 25 [years of age] inclusive. The refugees are a small group of users. This service has recently been challenged to address this group but does not have [the] resources to do so.*

**Best Practice and Weaknesses**

The final theme focused on best practice and weaknesses. Answers to questions on these topics were perhaps predictable, but they were given frankly and with considerable feeling.

Interviewees described their agency’s best practice with pride. Having fully qualified and experienced staff was emphasised, together with respect for the staff, a commitment to ethical practice and respect for people from minority groups. For one agency, good advocacy skills were considered the cornerstone of their practice. The need for a sound macro view approach and community work skills was important, and for some their agency’s multi-disciplinary and multicultural character was significant as illustrated in the following example:

*We have two South Africans (one South African Indian, one South African white)…a Chilean,…an Argentinean,…a Scot, [and] there are two people who have worked extensively in Malaysia and Indonesia… We also have a very strong team of interpreters; around about 42 interpreters from about 7-8 different nationalities, and they have all been, you know, recognised and qualified.*

One agency, run by new settlers, described two aspects of its work that its members regarded particularly highly:

*We are proud [of] two things. [First] we are bridging the gap between the Chinese who come in here and the mainstream community. Bridging the gap, we encourage the people to participate in [the] local community and society. We don’t want the Chinese to stick together, isolated from others… [Second] We aim [to] create a comfortable place for the new migrants…*
place to learn [a] new culture and to [be]...confident...to participate [in]
local society. This is what we are proud of.

While this agency prided itself on encouraging participation in New Zealand society, however, another organisation took pride in providing a cultural oasis for its members: “Keeping the traditions alive, our customs and traditions”.

The most commonly mentioned weakness was concerned with the lack of funding and resources in general. This weakness affected staff workloads, job security in terms of employment continuity, the ability to employ as many staff as required with the necessary specialist knowledge and skills, and to find office space for them. One NGO drew attention to an immediate outcome of the lack of resources, namely:

_The waiting list. The inability to respond to the level of need. That really stressed staff. We could do short-term work, [however] we don’t believe that would give long-term solutions, but some agencies do._

Another interviewee referred to cultural and political issues that couldn’t be tackled because of limited staff resources:

_I think dealing with some of the political and economic issues that they arrive with [is a major weakness and obstacle]. The gender [and] cultural assumptions people come with [are significant]. How can we help them be part of the local community if we can’t help them analyse or reflect on their own cultural values, conflicting with New Zealand cultural values, because we don’t have the staff?_

Staff levels of exhaustion were also mentioned more than once. Arising from high workloads, the commitment of staff and an inability to employ additional staff, this problem of exhaustion has obvious implications with regard to safe and effective practice.
DISCUSSION

Overall, the survey respondents have provided an account of the NGO sector which indicates both competence and insight into the difficulties encountered in the provision of social services. Because we chose to include NGOs serving voluntary migrants and/or refugees, their clients were from all corners of the world and had widely varying and diverse needs. Understandably, therefore, the difficulties these NGOs encountered stemmed in part from the availability or otherwise of the resources required to meet the needs they identified or that were presented by clients themselves. With this point in mind, the following discussion focuses on matters of funding, staffing, public attitudes and government policy.

The majority of the NGOs participating in this study were founded during the last twenty years, and became involved in immigrant and refugee assistance for a variety of reasons and in different ways, depending on their purpose and staff composition. A key point to note is that there has been a perceptible expansion of NGOs since 1984, a trend undoubtedly associated with both: (a) the impact of changes in New Zealand’s refugee intake and successive policies introduced to facilitate and expand economic immigration; and (b) the retreat of the welfare state – marked by changes such as the growth of the purchaser/provider split, and government policies that communities respond to the social needs of their members (Stansfield, 2001). In this context, it is important to remember that the New Zealand government at the beginning of the new millennium had two output classes in Vote Immigration: D1, services to increase the capacity of New Zealand through immigration; and D2, services to position New Zealand as an international citizen with immigration-related interests and obligations (Vote Immigration, 2001, B.5 Vol. 11:5). Vote Immigration listed three objectives for Output Class D2, namely: the promotion of New Zealand’s immigration-related interests; provision of a safe haven for refugees; and fulfilling international obligations. However, only 15 per cent of the intended budget for Vote Immigration (2001) was designed to service Output Class D2. Whether or not this is enough is a matter of opinion, but it is important that the community be assisted to meet the needs of new arrivals, no matter what their status.

Funding issues were (and still are) of crucial significance to NGOs trying to meet the needs of immigrants and/or refugees with financial support from charitable trusts and government sources. The NGOs involved in this survey showed a good grasp of funding issues, including the consequences of choosing particular programmes and services to deliver. They considered that they had robust systems in place to ensure that their programmes met purchaser specifications and were aware of the effect of purchaser requirements on their practice standards and resources. On the whole, they
assessed the requirements of their funding provider(s) as reasonable and appropriate, and described programme outcomes as being carefully monitored. In general, communication between the main funding provider and the NGO was favourably perceived but the funder was not deemed to be willing to discuss funding for new programmes or services to meet new needs arising among immigrant or refugee clients. The funder’s requirements for funding renewal were also seen to be very time consuming.

Putting funding to one side, another area of concern to the NGOs participating in our survey was that of staffing. The NGOs were clear that where they had robust volunteer programmes supported by accessible services providing advocacy, English language services and practical support, there was a stronger likelihood of new settlers participating in society and eventually making a contribution to it. At the same time, however, both the recruitment and retention of volunteers was acknowledged to be problematic. The volunteer profile was changing, a feature of contemporary New Zealand society that has impacted upon the activities not only of NGO social service providers but also those of virtually all sporting, recreational and other special interest groups as well. A higher cost of living, hence a need for two incomes in many households that accelerates the return of mothers to paid employment, and the removal of a compulsory retirement age are among the reasons often cited in the media. There are consequently fewer people (especially women) available to offer their services as volunteers, and those who do often have mixed motives. They may wish to be of service to the community, but also seek to embellish their CVs and to gain free training and work experience which may lead to paid employment elsewhere. Under such circumstances it is not surprising that many of the survey respondents and those involved in follow-up interviews indicated that their organisations suffered problems with volunteer staffing which are costly in terms of lost time and the use of limited resources.

A high proportion of the NGOs reported that they employed staff who were themselves immigrants or former refugees. The majority of these staff members were engaged as cultural advisors, counsellors, community workers or interpreters. As expected, there were both advantages and disadvantages noted with regard to their employment. While it is clearly a good thing that they can understand and assist clients with backgrounds similar to or the same as their own, they are often under pressure from clients who hold unrealistically high expectations of what ‘compatriot’ staff members can achieve. A similar problem has been noted in relation to Plunket Nurses and other primary health care staff in Auckland and Wellington (North et al., 2006)

Local community and social workers are beginning to recognise that when they work with new settlers, whether they be immigrants or refugees, they are engaged in a
new field of practice that entails new knowledge and skills if they are to respond competently to the needs identified and difficulties presented by clients (see Nash and Trlín, 2004; Nash, 2005; Nash et al., 2006). The challenges faced are complex, involving people who may well be traumatised and/or suffering from depression and other mental health problems at a time when they are grappling with the multitude of tasks and issues associated with (re)settlement (e.g. housing, employment, language learning etc.) and are often doing so isolated from much needed family support in a strange and unfamiliar environment. Agency staffing and qualifications, given the nature of the work and the workforce available, were clearly matters of concern. Nevertheless, many NGOs described commendable training programmes being offered to their staff as well as excellent programmes and services for their clients.

Policy issues relating to service provision were obviously important for the NGOs surveyed, and many of them were therefore keen to participate in dialogue with government policy analysts and decision makers when there were opportunities for them to do so. However, a key factor underlying the willingness of government to respond to calls for policy changes, new policies and increases in funding, as well as the willingness of people to step forward for volunteer work with NGOs, is the nature of public attitudes toward immigration, immigrants and refugees. It may also be argued, quite reasonably, that communities and neighbourhoods with positive and constructive attitudes toward new settlers are more likely to facilitate their social and economic integration. Bearing these points in mind, two recent studies on the attitudes of New Zealanders to immigration and immigrants are pertinent here. In the first study, a telephone survey of 300 people, Ward and Masgoret (2004) found that about 75 per cent had positive attitudes towards immigration and immigrants, perceiving them more as potential contributors to society rather than being a threat and providing competition. They also found a positive association between the socio-economic status and attitudes of participants; the higher the status, the more favourable were the attitudes expressed. In the second study, a nationwide mail survey, Gendall et al. (2006) found that cultural diversity, cuisine and economic growth were identified as positive aspects of immigration, but there was also a feeling that negative aspects included an increase in crime and other social and economic costs. In terms of policy, respondents generally agreed with the provision of English language support, information centres and other services for immigrants. But at the same time, most wanted more consultation with policy makers, fewer immigrants, screening for some communicable diseases, and only close family members admitted under family reunification schemes. Taken together, these two studies suggest that New Zealanders have a reasonably tolerant attitude towards immigration and immigrants in general. Accordingly, if policies were put in place to better reflect, support and strengthen these attitudes, then the path to (re)settlement could be made easier.
Finally, it is pleasing to note that since the present survey and follow-up interviews were conducted in 2001 and 2002, respectively, various important policy initiatives have occurred. For example, policies such as those considered in the Wellington region to attract new settlers and help them with advice and assistance through a “work broker scheme” indicate that the business sector has certainly recognised the need to welcome and assist immigrants who can contribute to the region’s economic growth (Allen, 2004: A13). Government initiatives include:

- Language Line – a telephone-based interpreting service launched by the Office of Ethnic Affairs in 2003 and expanded in 2004 to provide interpreting support to 10 agencies (with many more linked Offices and services) in 37 languages.
- The Auckland Metro Migrant and Refugee Strategy – whereby the Ministry of Social Development funds: the integration of Work and Income employment services into community migrant and refugee centres; the establishment of specialist migrant employment programmes and services; and the reduction of case loads for specialist case managers to provide more intensive assistance.
- Community-based social services for immigrants and refugees – where the Ministry of Social Development works with communities (initially in Auckland, Hamilton and Christchurch) to assess social service needs, and facilitates both: (a) the purchase of additional services to meet immediate needs; and (b) the design, development and delivery of services by immigrant and refugee communities themselves.
- The New Zealand Settlement Strategy – which was officially announced in 2004 (though its development can be traced back to the beginning of the new millennium), and focuses on six goals for immigrants, refugees and their families concerning: employment appropriate to qualifications and skills; confidence in English language use and access to language support; access to information and responsive services available to the wider community; the formation of supportive social networks and the establishment of a sustainable community identity; multiculturalism and social integration; and participation in civic, community and social activities (Department of Labour, 2004).

These initiatives, especially the New Zealand Settlement Strategy which tackles some aspects of the flawed relationship between immigration policy and settlement (see Trlin and Watts, 2004), have finally begun to address a number of the difficulties and problems reported by NGO social service providers. In particular, Settlement Strategy funding for the period 2004/2005-2007/2008 suggests that NGOs will benefit from: additional funding for the Refugee and Migrant Service, a national NGO that provides services to refugees during the first year of resettlement; the establishment of a national migrant resource services network to coordinate the delivery at the local level of settlement advice and information; and the establishment of a national
settlement structure and secretariat for coordination, information sharing and regular meetings between all stakeholders involved in (re)settlement (Department of Labour, 2004). These aspects, coupled with the community-based social services initiative, will be welcome but are by no means a ‘cure’ for all that ails those NGOs committed to a better society in their work with new settlers.
CONCLUSION

The global movements of people are transforming nation-states and forcing policymakers to recognise what lies behind them. It will not do for governments to simply order the tide to retreat via the implementation of policies at national borders, and they are gradually beginning to understand that there is a need to harness the new energies and to channel them constructively so that all can benefit. This understanding, however, cannot be limited to just the flows (arrivals and departures) across national borders but must also embrace the complex adjustments that comprise the process of (re)settlement. In this context, Spoonley et al. (2003: 3) have argued that:

The absence of state policies that directly address the issues of the civic and economic participation of migrants post-arrival, or the needs of culturally-diverse descent communities, has generated a number of tensions in society where there is a relatively undeveloped conception of nationality and citizenship.

Similarly, White et al. (2002:160) drew attention to the need in the post-arrival period for new settlers to receive coordinated support “as they face the complex process of attempting to understand the new society, to fit themselves into that society and to anchor their lives”. They also pointed out that issues related to the well-being of new settlers cannot be divorced from issues related to the host society’s attitudes, beliefs and habitual responses.

The points made by both Spoonley et al. and White et al. are important and were supported by NGO survey respondents in this study. Our findings indicate that the participating NGOs were well informed, frontline service providers who understood the implications of immigration policy changes for their work but were concerned at the lack of (re)settlement programmes or services and their ability to meet existing and/or new needs with the resources available to them. In particular, it was found that:

- While the NGOs understood what funding providers required, and considered the requirements to be reasonable, they were less certain about whether the funding provided was appropriate for the programmes involved, and the majority did not see funders as being responsive to new needs as they arose.

- While confident of the strengths of the programmes and/or services provided (well over half considered them either very well or well matched with the users’
needs) the NGOs considered that their services and/or programmes could be improved by increasing the resources available.

- While almost one-third had a policy of positive discrimination for employing former immigrants and refugees, over 70 per cent of the NGOs had such persons engaged as staff (accounting for 66 per cent of the workforce). However, it was acknowledged that there were both advantages and disadvantages associated with the employment of such staff.

- While almost 77 per cent of staff directly involved in providing programmes and services to new settlers had at least some “relevant training” for their work, there was still considerable room for staff development in this emerging field of practice.

- While three-quarters of the NGOs affirmed that professional supervision was provided for all staff directly engaged in providing programmes or services to new settlers, the above finding on training and qualifications underlines the need for vigilance in this area.

- While over half of the NGOs said immigration policy changes had had an impact with a variety of effects (e.g. an increased demand for services, a change in client needs etc.) only 24 (26.7 per cent) indicated that they had been involved in any way in government’s development of immigration policy, and of these only 15 considered that it had been worthwhile.

- Almost 69 per cent declared support for the development and implementation of a policy to assist the (re)settlement of immigrants and refugees. A similar level of support (64.4 per cent) was indicated for the development of an ethnic relations policy to assist the (re)settlement of people from diverse cultural backgrounds. Almost all who expressed support for an ethnic relations policy agreed that it should be linked with a (re)settlement policy to achieve an integrated approach to the needs and issues faced by new settlers.

- Finally, with regard to policy concerns, family reunification and the lack of (re)settlement policy featured as particular issues while others identified were:
  1. under-resourcing of (re)settlement services;
  2. the need for more social work intervention to assist with (re)settlement;
  3. the lack of assistance for immigrant and/or refugee retraining and updating qualifications to meet New Zealand requirements and assistance with finding work; and
  4. the reluctance of employers to take on new settlers.
Obviously the sting of these findings has been reduced (not negated!) by the implementation of the New Zealand Settlement Strategy and other initiatives since the NGO survey and follow-up interviews were conducted in 2001/2002. However, it cannot be emphasised too strongly that the Settlement Strategy and earlier initiatives are no more than a beginning and are likely to be at risk from the politicisation of the immigration debate and future changes in government. The Strategy and other initiatives must also be monitored and evaluated to ensure that they are adequately matched to assessed needs that are themselves subject to change in a dynamic social, economic and political environment and with shifts in the strength and composition of international migration. Accordingly, and with an eye to those NGO concerns that have yet to be addressed, we offer the following recommendations.

**Recommendations**

- Regular monitoring and evaluation of all (re)settlement initiatives, including all components of the New Zealand Settlement Strategy, is required to determine and maintain their best fit with assessed needs. To this end, more information is needed on the perceptions and experiences of all of the main stakeholder groups – programme/service users, provider organisations, funding bodies and other sections of the wider community – involved in the process of (re)settlement.

- Attention should be given to the development and implementation of an ethnic relations policy that complements the New Zealand Settlement Strategy and is compatible with New Zealand’s official policy of bi-culturalism. To this end, and in recognition of their importance, on-going research is required to determine public attitudes, beliefs and experiences regarding immigration, the (re)settlement of immigrants and refugees, and the provision of assistance and support. The information gained can then be applied to public education programmes as appropriate.

- The curriculum and training of community workers, social workers and NGO volunteers should be reviewed and further developed to more effectively meet the demands and challenges of client needs in a new, specialised field of practice with immigrants and refugees.
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Survey Questionnaire

MASSEY UNIVERSITY  
NEW SETTLERS PROGRAMME  
INFORMATION SHEET

A Survey of Non-Government/Not for Profit Agencies and Organisations Providing Social Services to Immigrants and Refugees in New Zealand

This project is part of the New Settlers Programme which explores the experiences of immigrants in New Zealand. The Programme Leader is Associate Professor Andrew Trlin and the Programme is funded by the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology. For further details, please see our website: http://newsettlers.massey.ac.nz

The aim of this survey is to examine aspects of the characteristics, work, clients and staff of non-government/not for profit agencies and organisations providing social services either: (a) exclusively to immigrants and/or refugees in New Zealand; or (b) to immigrants and/or refugees who account for a substantial proportion of the clients. This survey is a companion to our survey of social work with immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers which was carried out earlier this year. We expect that the results from this survey, together with information collected in the previous study, will facilitate a greater understanding of the work carried out and the issues faced by agencies and organisations such as yours. The information gathered will be of use to a wide range of end-users, including analysts involved in government policy development.

We would be very pleased if your agency or organisation would participate in this survey. In the case of national organisations we are aware that regional or branch offices have their own particular characteristics and issues, so if your agency or organisation falls into this category we would certainly welcome your participation. Filling out and returning the questionnaire implies your consent to participate. The questionnaire should take no more than 1-2 hours to complete. Survey findings will be reported in aggregated form only and will be published in both a technical report and articles in professional journals. Your response is confidential and will not be traced to you as an individual agency or organisation. The code number on the first page of the questionnaire is simply to assist us with the administration of the survey and with any follow-up, if necessary.

The principal researcher for this survey is Dr Mary Nash who may be contacted at:  
School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work  
Massey University  
Palmerston North

Telephone: (06) 350 5799 ext. 2827  
E-mail: m.nash@massey.ac.nz

Associate Professor Andrew Trlin (New Settlers Programme Leader) will be assisting Dr Nash as her co-researcher at all stages of this survey.

Please return the questionnaire by 23rd November in the Freepost envelope provided, whether or not it has been fully completed.
Section A. First, we would like to ask you some general questions about your agency/organisation.

Note: (a) A non-government/not for profit agency or organisation will hereafter be referred to as an NGO.
(b) Regional or branch offices of national NGOs should respond in terms of their own regional/branch position, practice or experience.

1. Please indicate which one of the following categories best describes your agency/organisation.

   - Head office of national NGO
   - Branch/regional office of national NGO
   - Local community NGO
   - Local ethnic community NGO
   - Other (Please specify)

2. With regard to the provision of programmes or services to immigrants and/or refugees, which one of the following categories best describes the position of your NGO?

   - Programmes/services are exclusively for immigrants and/or refugees including their family members
   - Programmes/services not limited to immigrants or refugees but they are included among clients
   - No immigrant or refugee clients

Do not proceed with survey. Please return questionnaire in the envelope provided.
3. Who are your NGO’s clients? (Please tick all that apply)

   Immigrants in general
   Refugees in general
   Specific immigrant and/or refugee group(s)
   (Please specify) __________________________
   Other clients
   (Please specify) __________________________

4. Is your NGO religious or secular in character?

   Religious
   Secular

5. When was your NGO founded? _____________ (year)

6. What purpose or need was your NGO founded to meet? (Please specify)
   __________________________
   __________________________

7. What type(s) of programme(s) and/or service(s) does your NGO currently provide? (Please tick all that apply)

   Accommodation (temporary)
   Accommodation (long-term)
   Advocacy
   Child welfare
   Counselling
Cultural support
Employment
English language (ESOL)
Food and/or clothing
Health, mental
Health, physical
Household furnishings
Immigration consultancy
Interpreting/translation
Legal
Orientation (on arrival)
Referral on
Sponsorship
Women’s welfare
Other programme/service

8. What are the main current sources of funding for the programme(s) and/or service(s) provided by your NGO? (Please tick all that apply)

Central government ministry/departments
Local government sources (e.g. city council)
Charitable trust(s), sponsor(s)
Own NGO fund-raising enterprises/activities
Funding supplied by national office
9. With regard to the sources of funding identified in Question 8, please name your **main current outside funding provider**.

Not applicable □ (Go to Question 11)
(No funding outside own NGO or national office)

10. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements concerning your **main funding provider**?
(1=Strongly agree, 2=Moderately agree, 3=Moderately disagree, 4=Strongly disagree, 5=Don't know)

- What your main funding provider requires is clearly indicated in your contract
  □ □ □ □

- The main funding provider's requirements are reasonable
  □ □ □ □

- The funding provided is appropriate for the programme(s)/service(s) involved
  □ □ □ □

- The main funding provider monitors the outcome(s) of the programme(s)/service(s) for which funding has been provided
  □ □ □ □

- There is good communication between the main funding provider and your NGO
  □ □ □ □

- The main funding provider understands the problems or difficulties involved in dealing with immigrant or refugee clients
  □ □ □ □

- The main funding provider is willing to discuss additional funding to meet new needs arising among immigrants or refugees
  □ □ □ □

- The main funder's requirements for funding renewal are very time consuming
  □ □ □ □

11. Does your NGO have in place procedures for monitoring the provision of programmes or services?

- Yes □ (Go to Question 12)
- No □ (Go to Question 15)
12. If Yes in response to Question 11, are these monitoring procedures part of the funding criteria?
   
   Yes ☐
   
   No ☐
   
   Not applicable ☐
   (No funding outside own NGO or national office)

13. Does your monitoring involve consideration of best practice standards in the provision of programmes or services?
   
   Yes ☐ (Go to Question 14)
   
   No ☐ (Go to Question 15)

14. If Yes in response to Question 13, please indicate the main source of these best practice standards.
   
   Developed within NGO ☐
   
   Developed outside NGO ☐
   
   Developed in association with funder(s) ☐
   
   Developed in association with other agencies/organisations ☐
   
   Other ☐
   
   (Please specify) ____________________________________________
   
   ____________________________________________

15. Are there links been between your NGO and other social service providers in connection with the provision of programme(s) or service(s) for immigrants and/or refugees?
   
   Yes ☐ (Go to Question 16)
   
   No ☐ (Go to Question 17) ☐
   
   Not applicable, because ________________________________
   (Go to Question 17)
16. If *Yes* to Question 15, please outline the nature of these links.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

17. Overall, what do you think are the **main strengths** of the programmes or services provided by your NGO and used by clients who are immigrants or refugees?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

18. In what ways do you think that the programmes or services provided by your NGO, and used by immigrants or refugees, **could be enhanced** if more funding/resources were available?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Section B  This section asks questions about the immigrant or refugee clients who access your programmes or services.

19. Please estimate the percentage of all of your current clients who are either immigrants or refugees

____________________ (percentage)

20. What are the main ethnic origins of your NGO’s current immigrant and/or refugee clients (e.g. Chilean, Chinese, Somali, Samoan)? (Please list in order up to three)

i. ________________________________

ii. ________________________________

iii. ________________________________

21. Does your NGO specialise in the provision of programmes or services to a particular age group and/or gender?

Yes  □ (Go to Question 22)

No   □ (Go to Question 23)

22. If Yes in response to Question 21, please specify the particular age group and/or gender concerned.

______________________________

23. Have any difficulties been experienced by your NGO with respect to informing potential immigrant or refugee clients of your programmes or services?

Yes    □ (Go to Question 24)

No     □ (Go to Question 25)

Don’t know □ (Go to Question 25)
24. If Yes in response to Question 23, please identify up to three of the main difficulties experienced.

i. ________________________________

ii. ________________________________

iii. ________________________________

25. Do you believe that potential immigrant or refugee clients experience difficulties in accessing your NGO’s programmes or services?

Yes □ (Go to Question 26)

No □ (Go to Question 30)

Not sure □ (Go to Question 30)

Don’t know □ (Go to Question 30)

26. If Yes in response to Question 25, please rank in order the five main reasons that in your opinion make it difficult for potential immigrant/refugee clients to access your NGO’s programmes/services. (Please put 1 in the box beside the most important reason, 2 for the next reason, and so on.)

Cost of programmes/services □ □ 70

Cultural issues □ □ □ □ □

Transport problems □ □ □ □ □

Opening hours of business □ □ □ □ □

Gender issues □ □ □ □ □

Child minding needs □ □ □ □ □ 75

Clients not meeting funding criteria □ □ □ □ □

Language □ □ □ □ □

Waiting lists □ □ □ □ □

Fear of authority □ □ □ □ □

Other reason not adequately covered above (Please specify) □ □ □ □ □ 80
27. Has your NGO taken any measures to make it easier for these clients to access your programmes and services?

Yes ☐ (Go to Question 28)

No ☐ (Go to Question 29)

Not applicable ☐ (Go to Question 30)

28. If Yes in response to Question 27, please describe the measures taken to improve access.

__________________________________________________________________________

(Go to Question 30)

29. If No in response to Question 27, please explain why no measures have been taken to improve access.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

30. In general, to what extent are your NGO’s programmes or services matched to the needs of immigrant or refugee clients?

Not matched ☐ (Go to Question 31)

Moderately matched ☐ (Go to Question 31)

Well matched ☐ (Go to Question 34)

Very well matched ☐ (Go to Question 34)

31. If you answered Not matched or Moderately matched in response to Question 30, have any measures been (or are being) taken or planned by your NGO to improve the match between client needs and the programmes/services provided?

Yes, measures taken ☐ (Go to Question 32)

Yes, measures planned ☐ (Go to Question 32)

No ☐ (Go to Question 33)
32. If Yes in response to Question 31, please outline the measures
taken/being taken or planned.

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

(Go to Question 34)

33. If No in response to Question 31, please indicate the main
reasons.

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

34. Finally, are there any other points or comments you would like to
make about your NGO's immigrant and/or refugee clients?

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
Section C This section relates specifically to the staff members of your agency/organisation.

35. How many staff (full-time and part-time) are engaged by your NGO for their main job, whether paid or voluntary, in each of the following categories? (Please indicate the number of staff in each category).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management/administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme/service providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. What is the work status of staff members in your NGO who are directly involved in the provision of programmes or services to clients who are immigrants or refugees? (Please tick all categories that apply and indicate the number of staff in each case).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time paid work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time paid work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time voluntary work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time voluntary work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. What are the main qualifications and training of those staff (full- or part-time, paid or voluntary) engaged in the direct provision of programmes or services to clients who are immigrants or refugees? (Please indicate the number of staff in each category).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional social work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other tertiary qualification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No tertiary qualification but other relevant training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither tertiary qualification nor other relevant training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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38. Have difficulties been experienced in recent years by your NGO in recruiting suitable staff for work with immigrant or refugee clients?

Yes □ (Go to Question 39)

No □ (Go to Question 41)

Don’t know □ (Go to Question 41)

Not applicable, □

because ____________________________  (Go to Question 41)

39. If Yes in response to Question 38, please indicate the nature of the three most important recruitment difficulties.

i. ____________________________________

ii. ____________________________________

iii. ____________________________________

40. Please indicate how your NGO has dealt with or is dealing with these recruitment difficulties?

____________________________________

____________________________________

41. Have difficulties been experienced in recent years by your NGO in retaining suitable staff for work with immigrants and/or refugees?

Yes □ (Go to Question 42)

No □ (Go to Question 43)

Don’t know □ (Go to Question 43)

Not applicable, because ____________________________ (Go to Question 43)
42. If Yes in response to Question 41, please indicate the nature of the three most important staff retention difficulties.

i. 

ii. 

iii. 

43. Are there any current staff members (full- or part-time, paid or voluntary) in your NGO who are themselves former immigrants or refugees?

   Yes ☐ (Go to Question 44)

   No ☐ (Go to Question 49)

44. If Yes in response to Question 43:

   (a) how many of these former immigrant or refugee staff are there in your NGO?
       Number 
       
   (b) how many of these former immigrant or refugee staff are directly involved in providing programmes or services to your immigrant or refugee clients?
       Number 
       
45. What are the main roles of all former immigrant/refugee staff in your NGO? (Please tick all categories that apply and in each case indicate the number)

   Management/administration ☐ ______ 
   Clerical/support ☐ ______ 
   Programme/service providers ☐ ______ 

46. What are the main ethnic origins of staff (e.g. Chilean, Chinese, Samoan) who are former immigrants or refugees and directly involved in providing programmes or services to clients?

   (Please list in order up to three)

   i. 
   ii. 
   iii. 

17
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47. What are the **main qualifications and training** of staff who are former immigrants or refugees and engaged in the direct provision of programmes or services to immigrant or refugee clients. (Please indicate the **number** of staff in each category.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional <strong>social work</strong> tertiary qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other tertiary qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No tertiary qualification but other relevant training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither tertiary qualification nor other relevant training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. Please indicate any perceived **advantages** and/or **disadvantages** of having former immigrant or refugee staff directly involved in providing programmes or services to your NGO’s immigrant and/or refugee clients?

**Perceived advantages:**

i. ......................................................................................................................... □

ii. .......................................................................................................................... □

**Perceived disadvantages:**

i. .......................................................................................................................... □

ii. .......................................................................................................................... □ 161

49. Does your NGO have a **policy of positive discrimination** on the employment of former immigrants or refugees for the provision of services to immigrant or refugee clients?

- Yes □
- No □
- Don’t know □
50. Does your NGO have a **register** of the linguistic and/or cultural skills of its staff members?
   - Yes
   - No

51. Does your NGO offer **financial or other benefits** to staff for the use of their linguistic or cultural skills in providing programmes or services to immigrant or refugee clients?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know

52. Where provision of a service or programme to immigrant or refugee clients requires the **use of an interpreter**, where does your NGO get its interpreter(s) from?
   - Within NGO
   - Outside NGO
   - Both within and outside NGO
   - Not applicable, because ____________________________

53. Where interpreters are used from within your NGO, are those persons **formally qualified** as interpreters?
   - Yes, always
   - Yes, sometimes
   - No
   - Don’t know
54. Does your NGO provide **professional supervision** (internal or external) for all staff directly engaged in the provision of programmes or services to immigrant or refugee clients?

   Yes  ☐ (Go to Question 55)

   No  ☐ (Go to Question 57)

55. Is this professional supervision provided from within and/or outside the NGO?

   From within NGO only  ☐

   Funding for outside supervision only  ☐

   From within and outside NGO  ☐

56. Are these supervisors required to have particular knowledge, skills or experience in work with immigrants or refugees?

   Yes  ☐

   No  ☐

57. Are there any further comments you wish to make about your NGO’s staff and/or the topics in this section of the survey?

   ______________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________
Section D  Finally, we invite you to consider a number of policy issues and topics and the implications for the provision of social programmes or services to immigrants and refugees.

58. Have there been changes in immigration policy (including selection/admission of refugees) during the last 10 years that have had an impact on your NGO?

   Yes  [ ] (Go to Question 59)  [170]
   No   [ ] (Go to Question 61)

59. If Yes in response to Question 58, please identify up to three significant changes in immigration policy (including the selection and admission of refugees) that have had an impact on your NGO?

   i. ____________________________________________  [ ]
   ii. ____________________________________________  [ ]
   iii. ____________________________________________  [ ]

60. Please indicate how these changes have affected your NGO. (Please tick all that apply)

   Increased demand for programmes/services  [ ]  [175]
   Decreased demand for programmes/services  [ ]
   Change in immigrant/refugee client needs  [ ]
   Change in community attitudes toward, and support for, immigrants/refugees  [ ]
   Staffing issues (recruitment, retention, skills)  [ ]
   Change in availability of organisations for referrals  [ ]
   Change in funding (availability, criteria, etc.)  [ ]
   Other change(s) (Please specify)  [ ]  [181]

   ____________________________________________
61. Has your NGO been involved in any way in government's development of immigration policy (including selection and admission of refugees) during the last five years?

Yes □ (Go to Question 62)

No □ (Go to Question 64)

Don’t know □ (Go to Question 64)

Not applicable □ (Go to Question 64)
(national office matter only)

62. If Yes in response to Question 61, please indicate the nature of this involvement. (Please tick all that apply)

Formal policy development consultation by central government agency or body □

Informal policy development consultation by central government agency or body □

Lobbying of key stakeholders □

Submission writing to central govt. agency □

Presentation of briefing papers, reports etc. □

Networking with other NGOs □

Protest action □

Use of the media □

Other □

63. On balance, has the involvement identified in Question 62 been worthwhile in terms of the benefit(s) for the time and effort required?

Yes □

No □
64. Does your NGO have any particular concerns relating to the settlement of immigrants or refugees in New Zealand?

Yes □ (Go to Question 65) □

No □ (Go to Question 66) □

65. If Yes in response to Question 64, please identify two of your NGO’s main concerns.

i. ________________________________ □

ii. ________________________________ □

66. In your opinion, would your NGO support a call for Government to develop and implement a settlement policy to guide and assist the settlement of immigrants and refugees in New Zealand?

Yes □

No □

Don’t know □

Not applicable □ (national office matter only)

67. In your opinion, would your NGO support a call for the Government to develop and implement an ethnic relations policy to assist with the settlement of immigrants and refugees from diverse cultural backgrounds?

Yes □ (Go to Question 68) □

No □ (Go to Question 69) □

Don’t know □ (Go to Question 69) □

Not applicable □ (Go to Question 69) □ (national office matter only)
68. If Yes in response to Question 67, should the ethnic relations policy be linked with a settlement policy to achieve an integrated approach to the needs and issues faced by immigrants and refugees?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Don’t know ☐

69. Do you have any other comments to make concerning the provision of programmes or services by NGOs to immigrants and refugees in New Zealand?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this questionnaire.

Please read the important information on the next page.
Would you be agreeable to a possible follow-up interview to discuss further the way your NGO caters for the needs of immigrants and/or refugees in New Zealand?

Yes □

No □

If Yes, please provide the contact details below:

Name: ____________________________________________

Address: _________________________________________

______________________________________________

Telephone (work): ________________________________

E-mail: _________________________________________

Would you like a summary of the findings arising from this survey?

Yes □

No □

If Yes, please write your name and address below (if not provided above):

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

Please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed, Freepost envelope provided by 23rd November 2001.
Appendix 2

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE, FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

1. What policy changes would you like to see the new government bring in to help in your work with refugees and asylum seekers?

2. Can you tell me how the changes you identified would help in your work?

3. Can you tell me how the family reunification policy affects those refugees and asylum seekers you work with?

4. Respondents to our surveys suggest that social workers who are only occasionally involved with refugee work are often unaware of the network of agencies with specialist skills and knowledge in this area. Would you agree with this observation?
   
   If yes, what would you suggest could be done to improve matters?
   
   If no, could you explain why?

5. The data from our survey indicates a need for more training in cross-cultural knowledge and skills for social workers and others. From your agency view point, would you agree with this finding? If so, what would you like to do to address the matter, or what initiatives are already underway to deal with it?

6. The data also suggests that attracting and keeping volunteers is growing harder. What role, if any, do volunteers play in your agency?

7. From the perspective of best practice
   
   a) What would you say is your agency’s strongest feature with respect to work with refugees and/or asylum seekers?

   b) What would you say is your agency’s weakest feature with respect to work with refugees and/or asylum seekers?

8. Are there any other points you would like to make regarding your agency’s experience of work with refugees and asylum seekers?
AUTHORS

Mary Nash

Mary Nash is a Senior Lecturer in the School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work, Massey University, Palmerston North. Her doctoral thesis was a study of the history of social work education in Aotearoa New Zealand. Mary teaches in the Bachelor of Social Work Degree, the Diploma in Social Service Supervision and the Masters of Social Work Degree. The author and co-author of numerous articles in refereed journals and chapters in books (some of which are cited elsewhere in this report), Mary’s major publications include: (as co-editor) Superwoman Where Are You? Social Policy and Women’s Experience (Dunmore Press, 1992), Social Work in Action (Dunmore Press, 1994), Spirituality and Social Care: Contributing to Personal and Community Well-being (Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2002), Social Work Theories in Action (Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2005); (as co-author) Social Work in Context: Fields of Practice in Aotearoa New Zealand (Massey University, 2001), Social Work with Immigrants, Refugees and Asylum Seekers in New Zealand (New Settlers Programme, Massey University, 2004).

Andrew Trlin

The former Programme Leader for the New Settlers Programme, Andrew is an Honorary Research Fellow in the School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work, Massey University, Palmerston North. His main research interests are in the broad areas of social demography and social policy in contemporary New Zealand, but he is best known for his work on immigration policy and immigrant settlement. Andrew’s publications on aspects of international migration include: (as author) Now Respected, Once Despised: Yugoslavs in New Zealand (Dunmore Press, 1979); and (as co-editor) the series New Zealand and International Migration: A Digest and Bibliography (Department of Sociology, Massey University 1986, 1992, 1997, 2005). Andrew served on the Ministerial Committee that produced the report Drawing on the Evidence: Social Science Research and Government Policy (Ministry of Research, Science and Technology, 1996), and he has recently been appointed as a panel member to the Human Rights Review Tribunal.
SELECTED NEW SETTLERS PROGRAMME
PUBLICATIONS (To August 2006)

Henderson, A. 1998: Politics and policies: legislation and language, pp.142-158, in
Panny, R.E. (ed.) People-People-People: Proceedings, Comments, Essays. Third
Zealand Federation of Ethnic Councils (Inc.), Christchurch.

Henderson, A. 2003: Untapped talents: the employment and settlement experiences
of skilled Chinese in New Zealand, pp.141-164, in Ip, M. (ed.) Unfolding
History, Evolving Identity: The Chinese in New Zealand, Auckland University
Press, Auckland.

Settlers Programme profile, pp.41-56, in Moloughney, B. and Ng, J. (eds.)
Chinese in Australasia and the Pacific: Old and New Migrations and Cultural
Change. New Zealand Conference of ASCADAPI (Association for the Study of
Chinese and Their Descendents in Australasia and the Pacific Islands), University of
Otago, ASCADAPI, Dunedin.

requirements and immigration policy in New Zealand, 1986-1997, New Zealand

Henderson, A.M., Trlin, A.D. and Watts, N. 2001: Squandered skills? The
employment problems of skilled Chinese immigrants in New Zealand, pp.106-
Ltd, Richmond, England.

migration chains among skilled immigrant groups: Chinese, Indians and South
Africans in New Zealand, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 32(7): 1227-
1250.

Housing experience and settlement satisfaction: recent Chinese, Indian and
South African skilled immigrants to New Zealand, Housing Studies, 20(3): 401-
421.

Lovelock, K. and Trlin, A. 2000: The Immigration Industry in New Zealand: A Survey of


Watts, N. and Trlin, A. 1999: *Utilisation of Immigrant Language Resources in*


Watts, N., White, C. and Trlin, A. 2001: English Language Provision for Adults and/or Refugees from Non-English Speaking Backgrounds in Educational Institutions and Training Establishments in New Zealand, New Settlers Programme Occasional Publication No. 4, New Settlers Programme, Massey University, Palmerston North.


