# THE BEHAVIOURS OF NON-MĀORI NEW ZEALANDERS TOWARDS THE MĀORI LANGUAGE[1]

Julia de Bres: *Laboratoire de linguistique et de littératures luxembourgeoises, Université du Luxembourg, Campus Walferdange, Route de Diekirch / B.P. 2, L - 7201 Walferdange, Luxembourg <julia.debres@uni.lu>*

## Abstract

When majority language speakers are referred to in minority language planning, it is generally in relation to their 'attitudes'. It is not just the attitudes of majority language speakers that impact on minority languages, however, but also their behaviours. Accordingly, 'planning for tolerability' (de Bres 2008a) targets both the attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers towards minority languages. This article addresses the little-considered question of what behaviours non-Māori New Zealanders might adopt to support Māori language regeneration. An analysis of New Zealand government Māori language policy and the questionnaire and interview responses of eighty non-Māori New Zealanders reveals that, while the government's position on 'desired behaviours' for non-Māori is unclear at best, non-Māori New Zealanders have a wide range of such behaviours in mind. The extent to which these non-Māori are willing to engage in these behaviours is a complex matter, influenced both by their own attitudes towards the Māori language and by other factors. These results have suggestive implications for the future development of Māori language planning targeting non-Māori, but leave open a further question: whether the behaviours identified are those that Māori New Zealanders might themselves desire from non-Māori.

 

## 1. Introduction: 'Desired behaviours' for majority language speakers in relation to minority languages

The attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers play a significant role in the fate of minority languages. Majority language speakers often contribute to a language becoming 'minoritised' (Nelde et al. 1996) in the first place and, once this has occurred, they may then resist attempts to regenerate it. Majority language speakers generally report more negative attitudes towards minority languages than speakers of those languages themselves, and May (2000a: 123) claims as a general feature of minority language policy development that 'no matter how cautiously and temperately promoted and implemented, such policies will invariably invoke opposition, particularly […] from majority language speakers'. Although not all theorists believe that minority language planning should target majority language speakers (e.g. Fishman 1991), May (2000b: 379) claims that 'the long-term success of [minority language] initiatives may only be achieved (or be achievable) if at least some degree of favourable majority opinion is secured'. For minority language planners wishing to promote and protect minority languages, this so-called 'problem of tolerability' (May 2003) of minority languages among majority language speakers provides a rationale for engaging in what I term 'planning for tolerability', or language planning targeting the attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers towards minority languages (de Bres 2008a).

When majority language speakers are referred to in minority language planning, it is usually in relation to their 'attitudes'[2]. It is often claimed, for example, that language attitudes play an important role in language maintenance and regeneration and that it is not only the attitudes of a minority language community themselves that count, but also those of the wider community of which they are part (Boyce 2005: 86; Grenoble and Whaley 2006: 11). It is clearly not just the attitudes of majority language speakers that impact on minority languages, however, but also their behaviours. When majority language speakers frown on the bus in response to a minority language being used in public, when a majority language speaking teacher mispronounces a minority language speaker's name in the classroom, or when a majority language speaking government passes a law banning the use of a minority language in parliament, these happenings may well reflect accompanying attitudes, but the actual behaviours of majority language speakers here are at least as important. Most definitions of language planning

characterise it as an attempt to promote behaviour change (Cooper 1989: 45; Kaplan and Baldauf 1997: 3; Ager 2005: 1039), and this is no less so for a target audience of majority language speakers. Accordingly, planning for tolerability by definition targets not just the attitudes but also the behaviours of majority language speakers, and includes selecting and promoting 'desired behaviours' for majority language speakers in relation to minority languages.

What behaviours are appropriate to promote among majority language speakers in relation to minority languages is not a straightforward question, however, and is one that has been answered by minority language planners differently in different language situations (de Bres 2008a). Planning for tolerability in Wales and Catalonia focuses strongly on majority language speakers learning the minority language (de Bres 2008a) but, as this article will show, desired behaviours for majority language speakers may also include non-learning related behaviours. As Ager (2005: 1039) observes, behaviours that are the subject of language planning may involve either using a language or behaving in some other way *towards* the language (see also Cooper and Fishman 1974: 6). What such behaviours might be in practice is a fundamental question in planning for tolerability.

On the basis of research on planning for tolerability in relation to the Māori language in New Zealand, this article addresses the ambiguous question of potential 'desired behaviours' for non-Māori New Zealanders in relation to the Māori language, that is, which behaviours non-Māori might engage in to support Māori language regeneration. After an initial discussion of the rationale for defining majority language speakers as non-Māori New Zealanders in the New Zealand context, this issue is considered from two main perspectives. The first perspective is that of the New Zealand government. The question asked here is: what behaviours does official Māori language policy seek to promote among non-Māori in relation to the Māori language? The second perspective is that of a group of eighty non-Māori New Zealanders working in Wellington. Two questions are addressed here. Firstly, what behaviours do the participants think the Government is seeking from them in relation to the Māori language? Secondly, what role do these non-Māori see for themselves in supporting Māori language regeneration? The implications of these results are then considered alongside a further, essential, perspective that has been largely unaddressed to date: that of Māori New Zealanders.

## 2. Defining majority language speakers in New Zealand: non-Māori New Zealanders

'Majority language speakers' is a useful umbrella term, but the precise definition of this audience is highly dependent on contextual factors particular to each language situation. There are several possible candidates for a definition of 'majority language speakers' in New Zealand. There are virtually no monolingual Māori speakers left, as almost all Māori speakers are bilingual in English. Majority language speakers could theoretically be defined as all New Zealanders who can speak English, thereby making up the overwhelming majority of people in the country. More sensibly in this context, a distinction could be made between speakers of Māori and non-speakers of Māori. According to the results of the 2006 census, only 4.1% of all New Zealanders can speak Māori (including 23.7% of Māori), so this would put almost all non-Māori into the category of majority language speakers, along with the great majority of Māori.

This has not been the way academics or language policymakers have approached this matter, however. Instead, majority language speakers have overwhelmingly been defined in this context as non-Māori New Zealanders. Māori language policymakers sometimes refer to the 'general population' or 'all New Zealanders' instead of 'non-Māori', but it is almost always clear from context that they mean non-Māori New Zealanders. This makes practical sense in the New Zealand language situation for several reasons.

The first is the numerical majority status of non-Māori. In 2006 non-Māori made up 85.4% of the New Zealand population. Although the term 'non-Māori' includes many different ethnic groups resident in New Zealand, it is likely that policymakers and researchers most often have a particular segment of non-Māori in mind: the ethnic group of New Zealand European/Pākehā New Zealanders, who, at between 67.6 and 78.8% of the population[3], are the numerically dominant ethnic group in New Zealand. Although numerical dominance does not always equate to other kinds of dominance (see Strubell 1999: 16), it is certainly a relevant factor in defining majority language speakers.

A second reason for defining majority language speakers as non-Māori New Zealanders is that the Māori language is generally framed as just one of a range of inter-ethnic issues relating to the ongoing negotiation of the relationship between Māori and non-Māori since British colonisation of New Zealand in the nineteenth century. Language issues are inextricably linked to other inter-

ethnic issues in New Zealand and there is evidence that attitudes towards the Māori language are strongly associated with attitudes towards Māori culture more generally (see e.g. TPK 2002). For this reason, when the Māori language is at issue, analyses appear to naturally fall into familiar ethnic lines.

The third and most important reason for defining majority language speakers as non-Māori New Zealanders, however, is the growing body of research showing the greatest resistance to the Māori language comes from non-Māori New Zealanders (for surveys of research on the attitudes of non-Māori towards the Māori language, see de Bres 2008b: 42-55 and Boyce 2005). Although there is also a range of attitudes towards the Māori language among Māori New Zealanders, not all of whom hold positive attitudes towards the Māori language (see e.g. TPK 2002, 2003c, 2006), it is clear that the 'problem of tolerability' is by far the strongest among non-Māori New Zealanders.

## 3. The New Zealand government's approach to desired behaviours for non-Māori

This section discusses the New Zealand government's approach to desired behaviours for non-Māori New Zealanders in relation to the Māori language. It is based on an analysis of the official language policy between 1995 and 2008 of the two main government Māori language planning organisations in New Zealand: the Māori Language Commission (MLC) and Te Puni Kōkiri (TPK, the Ministry of Māori Development)[4]. The data sources include publicly available policy documents, internal policy documents obtained on request, Māori language promotion materials released by the MLC, and several meetings with government officials between 2005 and 2008[5]. The focus of the policy analysis is at the level of overarching strategic policy, rather than within particular sub-categories of language planning, e.g. acquisition or corpus planning. This high-level cross-government strategic planning for the Māori language only began in earnest in the mid 1990s, hence the time period selected for analysis.

The New Zealand government has acknowledged the impact of non-Māori New Zealanders on the Māori language since the development of the first government-wide strategy for the Māori language in the mid 1990s (MLC 1996). This has included recognition of the historical impact of the attitudes and behaviours of non-Māori on the Māori language, their continued influence in the present, and consideration of the potential benefits of improved attitudes

and behaviours among non-Māori for the future of the Māori language. For example, the following statement highlights the contemporary influence of the attitudes of the majority population on language use among Māori (TPK 2003a: 27)

> Māori language use is affected by the overall social environment in New Zealand. People who use the Māori language interact with others on a regular basis and encounter the language attitudes of the non-Māori majority through these interactions. To revitalise the language it is necessary for wider New Zealand society to value the language and support a positive linguistic environment.

Notable here is the focus on the attitudes of non-Māori New Zealanders in particular, rather than non-speakers of Māori more generally. As discussed above, there are several reasons for taking this approach to defining majority language speakers in the New Zealand situation. It nevertheless remains a notable feature of the Government's approach, given that majority language speakers have been defined differently in other minority language situations. For instance, In Wales non-Welsh people are not a particular focus of planning for tolerability. The relevant target audience there tends to be non-speakers of Welsh more generally, because people of Welsh ethnicity make up the large majority of people living in Wales. In Catalonia, the situation is different again, with three distinct groups of majority language speakers discernible at different stages of planning for tolerability (for a full discussion, see de Bres 2008a). The fundamental point here is that tolerability is at its heart about power relations between minority and majority groups (see May 2001: 195). Tolerability expresses itself in different ways in different places because of contextual factors specific to each situation, relating primarily to how the majority-minority power relationship is defined.

A distinctive aspect of the nature of the behaviours policymakers propose for non-Māori in relation to the Māori language is that learning and using the Māori language is not a primary behaviour proposed for non-Māori. Government policy documents certainly emphasise that non-Māori should have the opportunity to learn Māori. The current Māori Language Strategy, for example, refers to the importance of ensuring the provision of 'opportunities for the non-Māori population to actively engage in learning and using the Māori language' (TPK 2003a: 7), noting that 'non-Māori enrolments in […] Māori language education [are] currently very low' (TPK 2003a: 23). Non-

Māori learning and using Māori is not strongly promoted in the Strategy, however. Instead, policy documents tend to emphasise that learning Māori is not necessarily expected of non-Māori. This provision for non-Māori to 'opt out' of Māori language learning and use has the status of a longstanding theme, being stated in the first Māori Language Strategy document (MLC 1996: 18):

> To create a positive environment for the Māori language, it is necessary to promote positive attitudes to the language and its place in public activities among the general public. This *does not* mean that all New Zealanders will be expected to learn and use the Māori language. Many do not want to learn and use it, and there is no merit in forcing these people to participate in activities where they have no real interest.

The reasoning above appears to be based on the Government's view that not many non-Māori will wish to learn and use Māori. This is not stated so explicitly in later policy documents, where the idea seems rather to be that non-Māori can support the Māori language in other ways than by learning it. The consultation document for the current Māori Language Strategy, for example, while again emphasising the importance of providing opportunities for non-Māori to increase their Māori language skills, notes that 'New Zealanders can express their support and goodwill towards the Māori language without necessarily having to learn or use Māori' (TPK 2003b: 11).

But if non-Māori are not expected to learn and use Māori, what behaviours does the Government wish to promote among them? The most sustained treatment of non-Māori behaviours is found in the three large scale surveys on attitudes towards the Māori language undertaken by TPK (TPK 2002; 2003c; 2006). The 2000 TPK attitudes survey report states that its analysis is based on twin assumptions that, in the immediate future: for Māori people, the objective is to learn and use Māori; and for non-Māori people, the objective is to create a positive disposition towards Māori people learning and using Māori (TPK 2002: 12). The report goes on to make the following comments (2002: 12):

> These assumptions are based on theoretical and practical considerations. Māori is the heritage language of the Māori people, and has been recognised by government as a taonga that was guaranteed to Māori. For Māori to survive, Māori must regularly and systematically choose to speak Māori in their everyday interactions and conversations.

> For non-Māori the role is different. It is unlikely, in the immediate future, that non-Māori will contribute greatly to the actual use of Māori. Currently, less than 1% of non-Māori speak Māori, and as subsequent results show, some 90% of non-Māori have no desire to learn it. However, the disposition of non-Māori towards te reo does impact on Māori language use by Māori because of its powerful influence on the overall linguistic environment. If the majority of non-Māori have generally positive attitudes towards the Māori language, it is likely that this will reinforce positive attitudes among Māori and encourage greater use of Māori.

The focus here is clearly on attitudes towards the Māori language, rather than behaviours, and this focus recurs throughout other policy documents[6]. Exactly what behaviours non-Māori might engage in to support Māori language (aside from having 'positive attitudes') is less clear from the policy documents or from meetings with Māori language policy officials (e.g. meeting with Tipene Chrisp of TPK, 19 December 2005).

What is clear is that TPK sees behaviours for non-Māori as being different from those of Māori. This ethnicity-based distinction is also a common theme in MLC policy materials, many of which distinguish between the behaviours proposed for Māori and non-Māori, with Māori language learning and use targeted strongly at the former group. That said, if the Government does wish to promote distinct behaviours among Māori and non-Māori, the TPK attitude surveys demonstrate a methodological peculiarity. While TPK states that non-Māori and Māori have different roles to play in supporting the Māori language, the measure used in the surveys to investigate their current behaviours towards the Māori language is identical. The surveys collected information from participants about their participation in the following Māori language and culture related activities: reading/browsing Māori magazines, listening to iwi radio, watching or listening to Māori news, going to a tangi (funeral) on a marae, attending ceremonies or events with Māori welcomes and speeches, visiting Māori art, culture or historical exhibits, going to kapa haka or Māori culture group concerts, and visiting marae. On finding that non-Māori engaged in these behaviours to a much lesser extent than Māori, the 2003 survey report observes as follows (2003c: 30):

> Non-Māori have limited interaction with Māori language and culture and as a result lack an accurate understanding of Māori language issues. This was despite an increase between the 2000 and 2003 surveys in the proportion of

> the non-Māori population who held positive attitudes toward the language. The lack of behavioural change accompanying attitudinal change amongst non-Māori points to the limited usefulness of targeting Māori language revitalisation efforts at the population as a whole. Resources targeted toward those motivated to participate in Māori language and culture is clearly the course most likely to yield language revitalisation results.

The complex relationship between attitudes and behaviours is a valid point in any study on language attitudes, but in this case the reported discrepancy in results between Māori and non-Māori might be better interpreted with reference to TPK's own argument that Māori and non-Māori may have different roles to play in supporting the Māori language. This argument suggests it would be appropriate to examine the participation of non-Māori in different behaviours than Māori[7].

One further source of information about the Government's perspective on desired behaviours for non-Māori is available in the Government's Māori language promotion campaigns, which represent the primary policy technique by which New Zealand policymakers have sought to promote the tolerability of the Māori language among non-Māori New Zealanders. Promoting Māori as a living language and a natural means of communication was one of the core functions assigned to the Māori Language Commission at its creation through the Māori Language Act 1987. The target of this promotion was intended to be the Māori population primarily and, secondarily, the New Zealand population as a whole (Chrisp 1997: 101). There have been a range of discrete Māori language promotion campaigns with a partial focus on non-Māori New Zealanders, including the annual 'Te Wiki o te Reo Māori' ('Māori Language Week') held in July each year, the 'Into Te Reo' (Into the Language') campaign in 2000, the 'NZ Reo/NZ Pride' campaign in 2003, and the 'Māori Language Information Programme', ongoing since 2004. In recent years, language promotion materials with a full or partial focus on non-Māori New Zealanders produced as part of the above campaigns have included two television ads in 2000, a series of five 'Kōrero Māori' ('speak Māori') phrase booklets released annually during Māori Language Week since 2004 and a website launched in 2005 that targets 'everyone who wants to speak the Māori language, or learn more about it' (www.koreroMāori.govt.nz).

Although, as discussed above, the Government has not specified a set of desired behaviours for non-Māori New Zealanders in relation to the Māori language at the strategic policy level, a discourse analysis of these promotional

materials reveals a range of potential desired behaviours in the form of behavioural messages targeted at non-Māori (de Bres 2008b). These include pronouncing Māori words correctly, knowing and using some basic Māori greetings, words and phrases, learning Māori, reacting positively to the use of the Māori language by others, supporting Māori language regeneration initiatives, taking an interest in Māori language and culture, and expressing support for the language, among others. That these desired behaviours are only fully discernible through discourse analysis of the promotional materials is not surprising in itself. One might expect the behavioural messages to be presented implicitly in the promotional materials in order to have the greatest impact on the target audience and, indeed, the materials use a range of subtle discursive techniques to transmit these messages. On the other hand, one would also expect the desired behaviours to be more explicit in the strategic policy materials or in discussions with officials, given that one has to know what one wants to promote before deciding how to do this in more nuanced and perhaps 'tolerable' ways. It is this detailed consideration of desired behaviours for non-Māori at the strategic policy level that appears to be lacking in the New Zealand context.

The discussion so far reveals a lack of clarity in the New Zealand government's approach to desired behaviours for non-Māori. The Government does not strongly propose learning and using Māori among non-Māori, but the desired behaviours actually considered appropriate - aside from having positive attitudes - are not explicitly stated in strategic policy materials. The Government claims that Māori and non-Māori have different roles to play in supporting the Māori language, yet the measure used in the TPK surveys to investigate the current behaviours of Māori and non-Māori is identical. Although the Government is silent at the strategic level on the exact nature of desired behaviours for non-Māori, a range of potential such behaviours are discernible in recent government promotional materials. In the midst of this jumbled picture, there has been no detailed consideration in Māori language planning of what specific behaviours non-Māori in particular could adopt to support the Māori language. The section below approaches this question from a different perspective, by presenting the views of a group of non-Māori themselves on this topic.

## 4. Non-Māori New Zealanders' perspectives on desired behaviours for non-Māori

A data collection process was undertaken in 2007 with eighty non-Māori New Zealanders, using questionnaires (N = 80) and semi-structured interviews (N = 26). The aims of the data collection were to investigate the participants' attitudes towards the Māori language, their responses to current and recent Māori language promotion materials targeted at them, and the role they saw for themselves in supporting Māori language regeneration.

The participants were all non-Māori, aged between 20 and 50, born in New Zealand (or resident in New Zealand for at least the past ten years), and employed at one of nine white-collar workplaces in Wellington, which represented the means of recruitment. The resulting sample consisted of 35 men (43.8%) and 45 women (56.3%), who mostly identified as New Zealand European/Pākehā (82.5%). The participants generally had a very high level of education (91.2% post-secondary education, 73.8% a university degree, and 43.8% a postgraduate degree). It was most common for the participants to be monolingual in English (60%), but six could speak Māori as well (7.5%) and 32.5% could speak another language/other languages. A very high proportion claimed to have learnt some Māori in the past (73.8%), although what they meant by this could be expected to vary. I do not claim that this small non-random sample of participants is representative of non-Māori New Zealanders as a whole, and their high level of education and office-based occupations in particular arguably introduce a class-related bias into the sample, which needs to be kept in mind in interpreting the results. The voluntarism of the sample may also have favoured the recruitment of participants with more positive attitudes towards the Māori language (although the incentive offered of a movie voucher for the questionnaire and book voucher for the interviews also appeared to play a part).

These considerations aside, an attempt was made to recruit participants with a wide range of attitudes towards the Māori language. The workplace recruitment approach was chosen for this reason. The underlying assumption guiding the selection of workplaces to approach for participant recruitment was that the more directly an organisation's work related to Māori issues, the more likely employees would have positive attitudes towards the Māori language and, conversely, the less directly an organisation's work related to Māori issues, the less likely employees would have positive attitudes towards

the Māori language. The resulting sample thus included volunteers from four 'types' of workplaces:

- New Zealand public sector organisations with a focus specifically on issues relating to Māori, where the nature of the organisation's work specifically predisposed it to fostering positive attitudes towards the Māori language;
- New Zealand public sector organisations without a focus specifically on issues relating to Māori, where the nature of the organisation's work did not specifically predispose it to fostering positive attitudes towards the Māori language, but the organisation operated within a public sector context in which the government had assumed responsibilities to foster Māori language regeneration;
- New Zealand based private sector organisations without a focus specifically on issues relating to Māori, where the nature of the organisation's work did not predispose it to fostering positive attitudes towards the Māori language, but the organisation operated solely within a New Zealand context; and
- International private sector organisations with a division in New Zealand, where the nature of the organisation's work did not predispose it to fostering positive attitudes towards the Māori language, and the organisation's focus was primarily external to New Zealand.

The attitude statements in the questionnaire were used to place participants into three attitude categories, based on those developed in the TPK attitude surveys (TPK 2002, 2003c, 2006)[8]. The categories were 'Supporters' (who had positive attitudes towards the Māori language), 'Uninterested' (who were largely uninterested in the Māori language), and 'English Only' (who had negative attitudes towards the Māori language). The proportion of participants within each category in this research (Supporters 56.3%, Uninterested 38.8% and English Only 5%) are similar to those in previous research (TPK 2002, 2003c). The workplace-based recruitment approach was successful in obtaining participants with a range of attitudes towards the Māori language, which did in fact vary in accordance with the workplace type[9]. The results for attitudes showed evidence of the problem of tolerability among some participants, but also revealed a group of non-Māori with very positive attitudes towards the

Māori language, reminding us that when talking of non-Māori in relation to the Māori language we are dealing with a highly diverse group.

The discussion below focuses on the aspects of the data collection relating to desired behaviours in particular, and addresses two questions. First, which behaviours did the participants think the Government was seeking from them in relation to the Māori language? Second, what did they themselves consider to be appropriate behaviours for non-Māori?

### *4.1 Behavioural messages perceived in promotional materials*

The questionnaire included a section asking participants about their responses to a selection of recent and current Māori language promotion materials. The participants were instructed to view a CD of two television advertisements (the 'Roma' and 'Koro' ads released as part of the 'Into Te Reo' campaign in 2000), read one of the Kōrero Māori phrase booklets, and visit the 'Kōrero Māori' website. They were then asked what, if anything, they thought the creators of each of the promotional materials were asking them to do. This open-ended question aimed to elicit the behavioural messages present in the materials. Based on an analytical method used by Forceville (1996) to test responses to messages in advertising billboards, the participants' responses were classified under one or more themes, and themes with a greater number of responses were judged to represent strong behavioural messages[10].

This analysis revealed that the participants as a whole perceived a wide range of behavioural messages in the materials, including all those discerned in the prior discourse analysis of the materials and several more. The behavioural messages included, for example, learning Māori, taking an interest in Māori, pronouncing Māori words correctly, promoting/advocating for Māori among others, using Māori words and phrases, finding out about Māori culture, taking advantage of Māori language resources, and participating in Māori language regeneration initiatives. In common with the findings of the discourse analysis, therefore, these results suggest that, while the Government has not specifically stated at a strategic level the behaviours it intends to promote among non-Māori New Zealanders, behavioural messages are present in the materials, and were perceived as such by the participants.

Some behavioural messages in the materials were, however, noted by a greater number of participants than others. Three behavioural messages were strikingly common across the promotional materials, and arguably represent the strongest behavioural themes of the Government's overall promotional approach, as perceived by the participants (see Table 1 below). Notably, these

messages all relate to participants learning and using Māori. Messages relating to other behaviours did exist in the participants' responses, but were much weaker than the learning-related behavioural messages. Despite the fact that government strategic policy does not strongly propose learning and using Māori to non-Māori, according to the non-Māori participants in the current research the strongest behavioural message in these materials was still to learn Māori.

**Table 1: Behavioural messages perceived in all four promotional materials (% of participants)**

| MESSAGE | ROMA | KORO | WEBSITE | BOOKLETS | AVERAGE % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Learn Māori | 56.3 | 32.1 | 52.1 | 29.6 | 42.5 |
| Give it a go | 7.8 | 26.8 | 31.0 | 63.4 | 32.3 |
| Speak/use Māori | 35.9 | 30.4 | 19.7 | 23.9 | 27.5 |

Important differences in responses to the promotional materials emerged when the results were cross-tabulated with attitude category. The results showed that participants interpreted the behavioural messages in the promotional materials in a manner in line with their existing attitudes towards the Māori language, so that different groups of participants actually 'got' different messages. Strikingly, the messages that showed the greatest divergence between Supporters and Uninterested participants in the television ads and the booklets related to participants using the Māori language. Specifically, the messages 'speak/use Māori' and 'use Māori phrases' were much more likely to be perceived by Supporters than by Uninterested participants in the Roma ad, Koro ad and phrase booklets (see Table 2 and Table 3).

This common finding for these three promotional materials[11] suggests Uninterested participants were less likely than Supporters to identify use of the Māori language as a behavioural message targeted at them. This is likely to reflect the Uninterested participants' own attitudes towards use of the Māori language by non-Māori, and relates to a noted tendency in attitude research. Fabrigar et al. (2005: 99) observe that pre-message attitudes can bias evaluation of the arguments in a message, so that 'arguments compatible with one's pre-message attitudes are accepted, whereas arguments incompatible with one's pre-message attitude are undermined'.

**Table 2: The behavioural message 'speak/use Māori' perceived according to attitude category (% of participants)**

| PROMOTIONAL MATERIAL | SUPPORTERS | UNINTERESTED |
|---|---|---|
| Roma ad | 44.7 | 21.7 |
| Koro ad | 35.0 | 20.0 |

**Table 3: The behavioural message 'use Māori phrases' perceived according to attitude category (% of participants)**

| PROMOTIONAL MATERIAL | SUPPORTERS | UNINTERESTED |
|---|---|---|
| Phrase booklets | 37.5 | 7.1 |

The results for the promotional materials thus revealed some initial differences between attitude categories regarding the behavioural messages that participants were prepared to accept in relation to the Māori language. It was in the direct questions to participants about their views on behaviours for non-Māori that these differences between attitude categories became especially apparent, as discussed below.

### *4.2 Views on desired behaviours for non-Māori*

The participants were asked about behaviours towards the Māori language in both the questionnaire and the interviews. The questions in the questionnaire were intended to elicit participants' views on the range of behaviours that might be appropriate for Māori and non-Māori in relation to the Māori language. The questions were open-ended, so as not to predetermine their selection of behaviours. To analyse their responses, the same approach was used as for the responses to the promotional materials, i.e. identifying themes in the participants' responses and allocating participants' responses to these themes[12]. The interviews then took a selection of potential desired behaviours and enquired in more detail into the views of a randomly selected subset of participants regarding these behaviours[13]. For reasons of space, this article focuses mainly on the questionnaire results, although it should be noted that the results discussed align with the interview findings. I discuss the interview results in detail in de Bres (2008b).

Of course the behaviours discussed here, as proposed by the participants, cannot be seen as a straightforward reflection of the participants' actual behaviours. This was not considered to be a problem in this context, as the main purpose of the exercise was to elicit participants' views on potential desired behaviours for non-Māori. As so little research has been undertaken on non-Māori behaviours towards the Māori language, I saw it as useful to focus in an exploratory manner on what behaviours the participants viewed as appropriate for non-Māori. Addressing this initial question is important before the question of whether non-Māori actually engage in these behaviours can be asked.

The questionnaire participants were first asked what they thought Māori New Zealanders could do to support the Māori language. The most common behaviours (mentioned by over 10% of participants) were: speak/use Māori, learn Māori, encourage others to speak/learn/value Māori, encourage non-Māori in particular to speak/learn/value Māori, promote or advocate for Māori, pass Māori on to their children, be positive about/proud of Māori, use Māori in the home, use Māori in public, teach Māori to others, and be open and inclusive about the language and culture. Notably, many of these behaviours rely on Māori already knowing the Māori language.

The participants were then asked what they thought non-Māori New Zealanders could do to support the Māori language. The results showed that, again, although the New Zealand government has not fixed upon specific behaviours that non-Māori could engage in to support the Māori language at a strategic level, the participants had in mind a wide range of such behaviours. The most commonly mentioned behaviour for non-Māori, as for Māori, was to learn the language, but followed this time by 'be accepting of Māori language/ respect others' right to use it', rather than non-Māori using the language themselves, although 'speak/use Māori' followed next. Also above 10% were: appreciate/value Māori language, use correct pronunciation, promote/advocate for Māori, welcome use of the language, and learn phrases/basic Māori. These behaviours proposed for non-Māori were in some ways similar to the perceived role for Māori, particularly in terms of the most common behaviour: learning Māori. The other behaviours above, however, relate less to significant use of the language and more to accepting and encouraging its use by others, as well as supportive gestures such as pronunciation and learning Māori phrases.

The nature of the behaviours the participants proposed for non-Māori also varied between attitude categories. When the results for non-Māori behaviours were cross-tabulated for attitude category, the top three most widely divergent behaviours between Supporters and Uninterested participants were: learn

Māori, speak/use Māori, and use correct pronunciation. These results reveal that the high prominence of learning and speaking/using Māori in the overall results was carried largely by Supporters.

**Table 4: Behaviours proposed for non-Māori according to attitude category (% of participants)**

| BEHAVIOUR | SUPPORTERS | UNINTERESTED |
|---|---|---|
| Learn Māori | 62.2 | 27.6 |
| Speak/use Māori | 26.7 | 3.4 |
| Use correct pronunciation | 20.0 | 6.9 |

Overall, Uninterested and English Only participants tended to envisage a limited and largely passive role for non-Māori, whereas Supporters pictured a highly active and varied role. Uninterested participants were more likely than Supporters to propose the following behaviours for non-Māori: be aware of Māori language; be accepting of others using the language; not always link the Māori language to political issues; maintain ceremonial uses of the language; learn phrases; use phrases; encourage children to be tolerant of Māori culture; encourage children to learn basic Māori; and teach Māori in schools. These results shows the Uninterested participants' focus on more minimal personal use of Māori language (e.g. learning and using phrases, rather than learning and using the language), and also their focus on 'awareness' of the language rather than active promotion. Strikingly, the behaviours proposed for non-Māori by Uninterested participants were often expressed as 'not' doing something harmful rather than doing something positive:

> Not raise any barriers to Māori using the language (M-U-40/45-PbG[14])
>
> Not dismiss it (M-U-25/30-PrI)
>
> If not interested in it for self, don't let this stop other people (F-U-30/35-PrI)

In contrast, Supporters were more likely than Uninterested participants to suggest the following behaviours for non-Māori: learn Māori; speak/use Māori; give it a go; take an interest in Māori language; value Māori language; promote/advocate/express support for the language; promote the language to other non-

Māori; teach others the Māori that you know; encourage others to learn/use/value Māori; welcome use of the language; use correct pronunciation; support Māori language initiatives; support Māori broadcasting; find out about Māori culture; encourage children to learn about Māori culture; and make Māori language compulsory in schools. These responses show an interventionist view of the role of non-Māori, involving not only taking an active personal interest in Māori language and culture, but also attempting to spread this interest among others.

Some Supporters did propose more passive forms of support for the Māori language, relating, for example, to attitudes and listening to the language:

> I think my main contribution will be attitudinal, i.e. that I recognise the importance of it and the respect it deserves (M-S-25/30-PbM)

> Probably more important than speaking [Māori] is the importance of learning to listen to Māori even when it is not understood (F-S-30/35-PbM)

Many Supporters, however, went much further than this, expressing behaviours that involved actively advocating for the Māori language:

> Talk about how important the language is to cultural revival and survival, whenever the subject comes up (F-S-40/45-PbM)

> Try to counter people's stereotypes and assumptions about Māori and Māori language (F-S-20/25-PbM)

> Don't back down when people ask what the point is (F-S-35/40-PbM)

> Try and dispel anti-Māori sentiment (M-S-30/35-PrNZ)

> Be accepting. Talk it up (M-S-30/35-PrI)

> Push/lobby for Māori to be used more in official situations (F-S-40/45-PbG)

> Encourage Māori friends and colleagues to be proud of their language (F-S-40/45-PbG)

These behaviours, notably, reveal the Supporters' openness to directly promoting the tolerability of the Māori language among their social networks.

The results also showed that while English Only and Uninterested participants saw a clear distinction in roles between non-Māori and Māori in relation

to the Māori language, Supporters were more likely to view these roles in a similar light. The Uninterested and English Only participants tended to explicitly distinguish between the behaviours of Māori and non-Māori on the basis of the ethnic connection of Māori to the language, and to use this as a reason for their own lack of engagement in behaviours to support the Māori language:

> I see the language as being relevant to Māori but I do not consider it part of my cultural heritage (M-U-40/45-PbG)

> Learn it – it's their language (M-EO-25/30-PbG)

In contrast, the Supporters' views on language learning and use by non-Māori were much closer to the behaviours they proposed for Māori. Some Supporters explicitly noted the lack of distinction they perceived between Māori and non-Māori roles:

> I don't see any meaningful distinction between the activities that Māori and non-Māori can do to support the Māori language (M-S-25/30-PbG)

> I think all New Zealanders have a role to play and I think the role is the same (F-S-25/30-PbG)

This contrasts with the Government's view that Māori and non-Māori have different roles to play in supporting the Māori language. It is striking that it was the Uninterested and English Only participants who shared this official view, in contrast to the participants who claimed to be most supportive of the Māori language.

The participants were also asked in the questionnaire what barriers they perceived to non-Māori more actively supporting the Māori language ('Can you think of any reasons that might prevent you from engaging in behaviours to support the Māori language?'). Barriers to supporting the Māori language existed for all participants, but the nature of these barriers was different. For English Only and Uninterested participants, it was often their own attitudes towards the Māori language that acted as barriers to engagement (including lack of interest, incentive, perceived relevance, usefulness, and general monolingual views):

> Not interested. Not my culture (M-EO-25/30-PbG)

In contrast, Supporters were more likely to cite barriers falling into two themes. The first theme related to the energy involved in learning a language (a perceived lack of time, laziness, the effort required, little knowledge, limited access to learning opportunities). It is not surprising that participants noted the time and effort required to learn a language. More interestingly, however, the second theme related to how participants thought others might respond to them supporting the Māori language (including embarrassment or shyness, fear of looking 'PC', and being ridiculed for making mistakes). The comments in the questionnaire suggested the feared responses of others (both Māori and non-Māori) were a real stumbling block to some Supporters more actively supporting the Māori language:

> It's easy to feel like the Pākehā trying to be PC and looking ingenuine. That is intimidating. (M-S-30/35-PrNZ)
>
> Strong prejudices, I do not want to anger anyone that has strong feelings against the Māori language. (M-S-30/35-PrNZ)
>
> An unwelcoming environment: either towards the Māori language in general, or to my position as a Pākehā person or speaker without fluent pronunciation attempting to speak Māori (which I have experienced a few rare times). (M-S-25/30-PbG)
>
> Some Māori people who can be intensely critical of Pākehā people attempting to give te reo a go. (F-S-20/25-PbM)
>
> Non-Māori workers in the workplace (F-S-30/35-PrI)

The responses suggest several interesting conclusions. First, majority language speakers may themselves be inhibited from supporting a minority language in an environment where the problem of tolerability is evident, even when they want to do so. Second, the potential for negative reactions is seen as coming from two directions: from both Māori and non- Māori. Third, Supporters in particular may need more support to encourage confidence in supporting the Māori language. One might say that the attitudes of these Supporters are in the 'right place' when it comes to supporting the Māori language: once again the issue here seems not to be attitudes but rather behaviours.

## 5. Discussion

The responses of the participants in this research raise a number of issues in relation to the New Zealand government's current approach to planning for the tolerability of the Māori language. These issues include how effective the Government's current approach to planning for tolerability is, how achievable its goals are (i.e. is achieving tolerability among non-Māori a likely prospect?), and what other policy techniques might be appropriate for promoting tolerability[15]. Four issues in particular are discussed here, those that relate specifically to desired behaviours for non-Māori.

### *5.1 Distinction in roles of Māori and non-Māori*

One thorny issue is the notion of the distinction or otherwise in desired behaviours for Māori and non-Māori in relation to the Māori language. The Government has consistently maintained that the roles of Māori and non-Māori in relation to the Māori language are distinct. The results of the data collection, however, showed that those participants most interested in supporting the Māori language generally saw no meaningful distinction in the roles Māori and non-Māori could play in supporting the Māori language. In contrast, those who had negative attitudes towards the Māori language did tend to perceive a meaningful distinction in roles, and were likely to use this ethnic distinction as an argument for their lack of participation in supporting the Māori language. Given the close connections between the Māori language and Māori culture and identity, it is likely that Māori will always be the driving forces behind Māori language regeneration. Furthermore, given the history of past repression of the Māori language and culture by the non-Māori majority, there is a risk that those non-Māori who see no distinction between the roles that Māori and non-Māori can play in supporting the Māori language might be seen as trying to 'take over' the Māori language (this point is discussed further below). There are thus extremely delicate issues here in terms of language ownership. On the other hand, in some international situations ethnicity has very little importance in planning for tolerability – in Wales for example attention is targeted solely at speakers and non-speakers of Welsh (de Bres 2008a). It is worth at least considering whether the current ethnic distinction made by the Government in planning for tolerability could in some ways be counterproductive, and whether there really is a meaningful distinction in the behaviours that Māori and non-Māori can adopt to support the Māori language. It could be argued, for example, that the behaviours adopted by non-Māori to support the Māori

language could be similar to those of Māori, but the underlying orientation remain different, including an acknowledgment of Māori retaining 'mana reo' over the language[16]. This particular form of ethnic distinction between Māori and non-Māori is perhaps present in the New Zealand curriculum (Ministry of Education 2007), which observes that: 'by learning te reo and becoming increasingly familiar with tikanga, Māori students strengthen their identities, while non-Māori journey towards shared cultural understandings.' The message here appears to be that both Māori and non-Māori can engage in the same behaviour (here learning Māori) but due to their different ethnic backgrounds their engagement with the language may be different in nature and effect. This is a controversial issue, but merits further discussion.

### *5.2 Non-Māori and language learning*

Another important and related issue is to clarify the nature of desired behaviours for non-Māori in relation to the Māori language, with a focus in particular on the place of language learning. The research participants overwhelmingly felt that Māori language promotion materials were encouraging them to learn the Māori language, despite this not being a strongly stated aim of government Māori language policy in relation to non-Māori. If the Government wishes to promote behaviours other than learning Māori among non-Māori, it will need to make these behaviours clearer in future initiatives aimed at planning for tolerability. A further issue relates to the justification of the message itself. As noted above, language planners involved in planning for tolerability in other language situations internationally (particularly Wales and Catalonia) have demonstrated a concerted focus on majority language speakers learning the minority language, rather than engaging in other non-learning related behaviours (de Bres 2008a). The Māori population currently makes up by far the largest group of speakers of Māori, and this seems likely to continue. Nevertheless, the fact that the participants felt Māori language learning was being asked of them anyway, in combination with minority language learning being universally promoted across ethnic groups in both Wales and Catalonia, suggests it is worth considering whether Māori language learning should be more strongly promoted among non-Māori.

### *5.3 Bridging the attitude-behaviour divide among non-Māori Supporters*

Although some participants in the current research were not interested in adopting behaviours to support the Māori language, there was also evidence of

a group of people who were highly motivated to support the Māori language. In addition to engaging in their own supportive behaviours, these 'supporters' could potentially influence the attitudes and behaviours of other non-Māori towards the Māori language. In this sense, they could play an important and perhaps distinct role in promoting the tolerability of the Māori language. In order to exploit this potential more effectively, however, there is a significant barrier to overcome: the stated lack of confidence among many supporters of the Māori language, which appears to act as a significant impediment to active engagement in behaviours that they in principle support. On this basis, a priority in planning for tolerability could be how to address the lack of confidence expressed by a number of those non-Māori who currently do want to support the Māori language. Such an approach would need to address the fears expressed by some participants regarding the potentially negative reactions of both Māori and other non-Māori to their behaviours in supporting the Māori language. One option, for example, could be to focus on the potentially positive reactions of Māori or non-Māori to such behaviours in future promotional materials. In relation to the reactions of Māori in particular, given the history of the Māori language it is not surprising that some participants reported their attempts to support the Māori language as being met with suspicion and mistrust from Māori. There is, however, a risk that such reactions from Māori might in extreme cases result in supportive non-Māori retracting their support for the Māori language, thereby potentially reinforcing the problem of tolerability. The results thus also suggest a potential role for Māori New Zealanders in promoting tolerability by encouraging the tentatively supportive behaviours of some non-Māori towards the Māori language.

### *5.4 Research on behaviours, rather than about behaviours*

The current research focused on the views of non-Māori participants on possible desired behaviours for non-Māori in relation to the Māori language. Talking about behaviours is, of course, very different from actually undertaking them. One important area of future research will be analysis of the actual engagement of non-Māori in these behaviours, e.g. through recorded real-life data of their interactions with others. This would shed further light on the extent to which non-Māori in fact engage in behaviours to support the Māori language, how they execute these behaviours, and how others respond.

## 6. Conclusion: The perspectives of Māori New Zealanders

This article has considered the perspectives of New Zealand government language policymakers and a group of non-Māori New Zealanders on desired behaviours for non-Māori in relation to the Māori language, revealing a complex picture of approaches on this issue. As the focus of the research was on non-Māori in particular[17], it is silent on the vital question of what Māori New Zealanders think about these issues. There is little existing research on the views of Māori regarding desired behaviours for non-Māori towards the Māori language. Boyce (1992: 140-141) touches on some issues that might surface from such research. In her study of the reported Māori language proficiency, patterns of use and attitudes of a group of Māori participants living in Porirua, she found that while non-Māori support for Māori language regeneration was welcomed and the responsibility for maintaining Māori was seen as one that all New Zealanders shared, there was also a degree of mistrust 'that Pākehā people will take over the language, just as they have taken over land and natural resources'. Boyce therefore called for Pākehā support 'on Māori terms', and 'in a way that empowers Māori people and does not lead to their further disadvantage, linguistically or otherwise'. Do the behaviours for non-Māori discussed in this article fit this kind of approach? Tito (2008) reports on research undertaken with Māori secondary school students in the Wellington region, in which the students talked about the (mis)pronunciation and (mis)use of Māori words by non-Māori teachers, and how the students associated these with perceived negative attitudes on the part of the teachers towards both the Māori language and the Māori students themselves. Former MLC Chief Executive Haami Piripi has commented in relation to the use of Māori words by non-Māori that:

> It can be seen as tokenistic, but I grew up in a Māori-speaking environment and my experience has been that non-Māori people who do try to speak Māori or make a bit of an effort, it's always seen as a sign of respect and an acknowledgment of our mana[18].

The findings of Tito (2008) and the comment above suggest the possible importance of three of the potential desired behaviours for non-Māori discussed in this article: attention to pronunciation of Māori words, use of Māori words, and speaking Māori. Apart from isolated pieces of research and anecdotal comments such as the above, however, there is little data on these matters,

and it is likely that the views of Māori as to desired behaviours for non-Māori would be as diverse as the views of non-Māori reported in the current research. Of course these views will be crucial - for the future of planning for tolerability and perhaps also for that of the Māori language itself.

## Notes

1. This article is based on PhD research at the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, undertaken from 2005 to 2008. I would like to thank my primary supervisor Professor Janet Holmes for her support and guidance, as well as my second supervisor Dr. John Macalister for his helpful input. I would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on an earlier version of the article.
2. Following conventional contemporary definitions in social psychology, an attitude is conceptualised here as 'a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor' (Eagly and Chaiken 1993: 1). Traditional accounts (e.g. Katz and Stotland 1959) separated attitudes into three components: the affective (feelings about an attitude object), the cognitive (beliefs about the object) and the conative (predispositions to act in a certain way towards the object). Recent analyses in attitude research more generally (e.g. Eagly and Chaiken 1993), however, have viewed beliefs, affect and behaviour as separate from but related to attitudes, in that attitudes can both be inferred from and influence them. Accordingly, the term 'attitudes' is reserved in this article for evaluative tendencies, and affect, beliefs and behaviours are seen as interacting with attitudes rather than being their parts (Albarracín et al. 2005: 5).
3. The 2006 census included the ethnic category of 'New Zealander' for the first time. Those 11.2% of respondents who selected this category are likely to have included many who would previously have identified as New Zealand European/ Pākehā.
4. This is not to suggest that these government organizations are the only groups involved in Māori language planning. Language planning is not the sole preserve of government, but rather occurs at all levels of society (see Ager 2003: 7). There are non-government groups working in Māori language regeneration planning in New Zealand, and many iwi (Māori tribal group) organisations in particular have highly active Māori language planning programmes, for example Ngāi Tahu, Ngāti Raukawa, Tūhoe and Ngāti Porou (see Spolsky 2003: 568). For reasons of scope, this article focuses on government activity alone. Nonetheless, I hope that much of the data collected in the current research will be of use to anyone working in Māori language regeneration planning, including iwi organisations.
5. Some of the main policy documents analysed include *Toitū te Reo* (MLC 1996), *Te Tūāoma – The Māori Language: The Steps That Have Been Taken* (TPK 1999), the *Survey of Attitudes, Values and Beliefs about the Māori Language*

(TPK 2002, 2003c, 2006), *He Reo e Kōrerotia Ana, He Reo Ka Ora* (TPK 2003b), *Te Rautaki Reo Māori* (the Māori Language Strategy) (TPK 2003a), *Te Reo Māori i te Hāpori* (TPK 2004), as well as several Cabinet papers and TPK/MLC internal policy papers relating to the development of the Māori language strategy and Māori language promotion policy.

6. See for example TPK (2003b: 11): 'If the majority of New Zealanders and New Zealand institutions have positive attitudes towards the Māori language, this will reinforce the status of the Māori language and encourage people to learn te reo Māori, and make greater use of their language skills'.
7. I argue elsewhere that TPK's alternative interpretation of these results is one of a number of indicators of a more general underlying ambivalence towards focusing on non-Māori in Māori language planning (see de Bres 2008b: 109).
8. The categories and the allocation of participants to them are not identical to those used by TPK, the reasons for which are discussed in de Bres (2008b).
9. As predicted, the results showed a strong association between workplace type and attitudes towards the Māori language ($p=0.002$). Participants in Māori public sector organisations were overwhelmingly likely to be in the Supporter category (90%), followed at some distance by participants from general public sector organisations (60%), followed by participants from New Zealand private sector organisations (42.9%), followed by participants from international private sector organisations (34.6%).
10. There are significant limitations to this approach, as Forceville acknowledges. In particular he notes the difficulty of allocating the responses to themes, given that 'the wide variety of responses volunteered by the participants had to be somehow classified in a limited amount of categories' (1996: 177). This introduces a significant level of subjectivity into the classification process. Furthermore, the results obtained represent only the views of those participants who choose to respond, i.e. just because a participant does not state a particular view in response to an open-ended question does not mean they do not hold that view. Some participants tend to respond in more detail than others, which also influences the results. The results presented for the participants' responses to the promotional materials should be viewed with these limitations in mind. Despite the limitations, this approach was valuable in this specific context. In advertising much thought goes into creating strong messages. Despite individual variation in how others might interpret the responses of the participants, the strongest messages should still come through, and there is value in attempting to measure (quantitatively) how widely they are shared.
11. The results for the website were inconclusive, with some use-related messages more likely to be perceived by Supporters and some by Uninterested participants.
12. The use of this method again calls up the limitations discussed further above, relating to its subjective nature. I consider these limitations mitigated in the present context by the use of other complementary forms of data analysis,

i.e. qualitative analysis of some of the questionnaire data and the subsequent interview data.

13. The behaviours discussed in the interviews were: pronouncing Māori words in a 'Māori' way, knowing and using Māori greetings, words and phrases in English, learning/speaking Māori, responding positively to the use of Māori by others, supporting Māori language regeneration initiatives, and taking an interest in Māori language and culture.
14. A notation system is used where quotes appear to summarise participant characteristics. Gender is indicated by M or F; attitude category by S, U or EO; age by tranche; workplace by PbM, PbG, PrNZ, or PrI; all are linked by hyphens. For example F-U-25/30-PbG indicates the participant is a female uninterested participant aged 25 to 30 working in a general public sector organisation.
15. Another issue, further away from the focus of the current article, is whether the same principles and 'desired behaviours' discussed in this article can or should also be applied to non-indigenous minority languages in New Zealand. Anecdotally, it appears that the 'problem of tolerability' exists not only in relation to the Māori language but also in relation to other minority languages in New Zealand, such as Pacific languages. Some of these languages are also endangered. For members of these language communities, tolerability of their languages among majority language speakers could be argued to be just as important as, if not more important than, their own tolerability of the Māori language. Complex issues arise here relating to collective and individual language rights, which are beyond the scope of this article.
16. I thank one of the anonymous reviewers for their observations on this point.
17. This was due both to reasons of scope and methodological considerations. As a non-Māori New Zealander working on a controversial inter-ethnic issue, I viewed it as most appropriate and potentially most effective for me to undertake research with non-Māori participants.
18. The Press, 31 July, 2004, cited in Davies and Maclagan (2006: 90).

## References

*Abbreviations used*

TPK Te Puni Kōkiri
MLC Māori Language Commission

Ager, D. 2003. *Ideology and Image: Britain and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ager, D. 2005. 'Prestige and image planning'. In E. Hinkel (ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum: 1035-1054.

Albarracín, D., M. Zanna, B. Johnson and G. Kumkale 2005. 'Attitudes: Introduction and Scope'. In Albarracín, D., B. Johnson and M. Zanna 2005 (eds.) *The Handbook of Attitudes*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum: 3-19.

Boyce, M. 1992. 'Māori language in Porirua: a study of reported proficiency, patterns of use and attitudes'. Unpublished MA thesis. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.

Boyce, M. 2005. 'Attitudes to Māori'. In A. Bell, R. Harlow and D. Starks (eds.) *Languages of New Zealand*. Wellington: VUW Press: 86-110.

Chrisp, T. 1997. 'He taonga te reo: The use of a theme year to promote a language'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 18, 2: 100-106.

Cooper, R. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Avon: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper, R. and J. Fishman 1974. 'The study of language attitudes'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 3: 5-19.

Davies, C. and M. Maclagan 2006. 'Māori words – read all about it'. *Te Reo* 49: 73-99.

de Bres, J. 2008a. 'Planning for tolerability in New Zealand, Wales and Catalonia'. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 9, 4: 464-482.

de Bres, J, 2008b. 'Planning for tolerability: promoting positive attitudes and behaviours towards the Māori Language among non-Māori New Zealanders. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington. http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/handle/10063/687

Eagly, A. and S. Chaiken 1993. *The Psychology of Attitudes*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Fabrigar, L., T. MacDonald and D. Wegener 2005. 'The structure of attitudes'. In Albarracín, D., B. Johnson and M. Zanna 2005 (eds.) *The Handbook of Attitudes*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum: 79-124.

Fishman, J. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Grenoble, L. and L. Whaley 2006. *Saving Languages*: *An Introduction to Language Revitalisation*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Katz, D. and E. Stotland 1959. 'A preliminary statement to a theory of attitude structure and change'. In S. Koch (ed.) *Psychology: A Study of a Science*. New York: McGraw Hill: 423-475.

May, S. 2000a. 'Accommodating and resisting minority language policy: the case of Wales'. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 3,2: 101-128.

May, S. 2000b. 'Uncommon languages: the challenges and possibilities of minority language rights'. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 21,5: 366-385.

May, S. 2001. *Language and Minority Rights*. *Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*. London: Longman.

May, S. 2003. 'Rearticulating the case for minority language rights'. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4,2: 95-125.

Ministry of Education 2007. *New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
MLC 1996. 'Toitū te Reo' (policy document). Wellington: MLC.
Nelde, P., M. Strubell and G. Williams 1996. *Euromosaic. The Production and Reproduction of the Minority Language Groups in the European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
Spolsky, B. 2003. 'Reassessing Māori regeneration'. *Language in Society* 32,4: 553-578.
Strubell, M. 1999. 'Language, democracy and devolution in Catalonia'. In Sue Wright (ed.) *Language, democracy and devolution in Catalonia*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters: 4-38.
Tito, J. 2008. 'Māori language use in New Zealand secondary schools : what are the issues for teachers and students?' Unpublished MA thesis. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.
TPK 1999. 'Te Tūāoma' (policy document). Wellington: TPK.
TPK 2002. 'Survey of Attitudes, Values and Beliefs about the Māori Language' (policy document). Wellington: TPK.
TPK 2003a. 'Te Rautaki Reo Māori - The Māori Language Strategy' (policy document). Wellington: TPK.
TPK 2003b. 'He Reo e Kōrerotia Ana, He Reo Ka Ora' (policy document). Wellington: TPK.
TPK 2003c. 'Survey of Attitudes, Values and Beliefs about the Māori Language' (policy document). Wellington: TPK.
TPK 2004. 'Te Reo Māori i te Hāpori' (policy document). Wellington: TPK.
TPK 2006. 'Nga Waiaro atu ki te reo Māori. Attitudes towards the Māori Language' (policy document). Wellington: TPK.