PROTECTION OF AUTHOR’S COPYRIGHT

This copy has been supplied by the Library of the University of Otago on the understanding that the following conditions will be observed:

1. To comply with s56 of the Copyright Act 1994 [NZ], this thesis copy must only be used for the purposes of research or private study.

2. The author's permission must be obtained before any material in the thesis is reproduced, unless such reproduction falls within the fair dealing guidelines of the Copyright Act 1994. Due acknowledgement must be made to the author in any citation.

3. No further copies may be made without the permission of the Librarian of the University of Otago.
Stuck in the middle or clued up on both? Language and identity among Korean, Dutch and Sāmoan immigrants in Dunedin

by

Roopali Johri

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
at the University of Otago, Dunedin,
New Zealand
24 February 1998
ABSTRACT

It is well established that among immigrants, language shift away from the native language, towards that of the host language occurs over two to four generations. This has been found in numerous places including New Zealand, Australia, North America and Europe. Language has been linked to identity. This thesis explores the effect of language shift on ethnic group identity at the individual and group levels.

In New Zealand, ideology surrounding immigration has altered over the years at an official as well as popular level. Officially, until the 1980s, the metaphor of a ‘melting pot’ was propagated: immigrants were expected to melt and assimilate into the host population and become New Zealanders. Official institutions and education policy during this time were largely monolingual. Popular attitudes have kept up to a certain extent with official attitudes, and lately multiculturalism and pluralism have become more acceptable. New Zealand’s immigration policy, at least in theory, has reflected such changes, with the favouritism shown to most groups ceasing since the 1970s. Now that it is more acceptable for immigrants to be different, do they want to retain their native identity or not? Does the group still think of itself in terms of its native identity or does it consider itself to have a New Zealand identity once language shift to English has occurred or is occurring? How do immigrants feel about this in relation to language attitudes, language learning and attitudes towards the native and host societies? At an individual level is the immigrant’s native identity threatened by adopting English in a multicultural setting?

The immigrant groups chosen for this study were Korean, Sāmoan and Dutch, representing the regions of Asia, the Pacific and Europe respectively. Ten respondents from each of these groups were interviewed. A qualitative method was chosen to allow the subjective and individual nature of identity to come through, making generalisation difficult. The results are discussed with reference to additive and subtractive bilingualism or the cognitive and affective consequences of bilingualism.

The desirability of language and identity shift was found to vary from group to group. The Dutch respondents were the most indifferent about this, even favouring such shift, despite the increased acceptability of pluralism and difference in more recent times. They still seemed to be influenced by the assimilationist ideology prevalent after World War II. The Sāmoans were concerned about the shift and had become more flexible about the definition of Sāmoanness in New Zealand. They were trying to at least slow down if not arrest such shift. The Koreans had not yet
resolved the issue. They favoured language maintenance like the Sāmoans, but had not yet realised the unlikelihood of this and so had not initiated steps to halt it.

At an individual level, the respondents can be said to have experienced subtractive bilingualism as their native culture and language were being eroded. This was attributed to social, economic and political reasons rather than linguistic ones. The framework of additive and subtractive bilingualism does not take into account the wider context and hence I think is insufficient in the analysis of language learning in the context of immigration. Further, bilingualism had more positive than negative consequences for respondents, and was not responsible for any sort of identity problems, as early studies on bilingualism were likely to find.

This study can be seen as part of the recent move away from essentialising ethnicity. In addition, hybridity is regarded as much more positive and inclusive than in the past. Parallel to this, there has been a change in attitudes towards bi- and multilingualism. Such attitudes came through from respondents interviewed for this study.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sāmoan</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maori</strong></th>
<th><strong>Meaning</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'āiga</td>
<td>extended family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ali'i</td>
<td>high chief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ā'oga Āmata</td>
<td>language nest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa'asāmoa</td>
<td>Sāmoan way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fāgogo</td>
<td>legendary stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fale</td>
<td>houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fia Pālagi, fia poto</td>
<td>big headed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hāngi</td>
<td>feast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hui</td>
<td>gathering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i'atoga</td>
<td>fine mat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwi</td>
<td>Māori tribal groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itūmākō</td>
<td>district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kia ora</td>
<td>hello</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōhanga reo</td>
<td>Māori language preschool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kura kaupapa Māori</td>
<td>Māori language school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lāvalava</td>
<td>item of clothing worn by Sāmoans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marae</td>
<td>meeting house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matai</td>
<td>chief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngāi, ngāi, āti</td>
<td>descendants of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu'u</td>
<td>village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>New Zealander of European origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pālagi (pl Papālagi)</td>
<td>Sāmoan equivalent of Pākehā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taonga</td>
<td>treasure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tālofa</td>
<td>hello</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tauhou</td>
<td>stranger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tauiwi</td>
<td>foreigner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tautangata</td>
<td>foreigner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 INTRODUCTION

It is well established that among immigrants, language shift away from the native language towards that of the host language occurs over two to four generations. This has been found in numerous places including New Zealand, Australia, North America and Europe. Language has been linked to identity. This thesis explores the effect of language shift on ethnic identity at individual and group levels.

Given the relationship between language and identity, and that non-English speaking immigrants coming to New Zealand have to learn to use English like a first language when outside the home, language can impact on the ethnic identity of immigrants. Issues to be investigated include whether the group still thinks of itself in terms of its native identity or whether it considers itself to have a New Zealand identity once language shift to English has occurred or is occurring; in other words, do the defining criteria of native identity shift too to incorporate language shift or is there a move away from native identity? How do immigrants feel about this in relation to language attitudes, language learning and attitudes towards the native and host societies? At an individual level is the immigrant’s native identity threatened by adopting English in a multicultural setting?

Research has indicated that in the case of minority group members, the acquisition of a second language can be affected by perceptions of the potential threat such acquisition has for their own sense of ethnic identity (Gardner 1982a:38). The desire to become an accepted member of the host culture may be incompatible with the fear that such belonging might result in the loss of the first language and culture. On the one hand, the learner of a second language may begin to identify with the host language community and to experience feelings of alienation from their native culture. This is known as subtractive bilingualism and is also likely to lead to loss of the first language. On the other hand, success in second language learning can lead to positive attitudes towards the language and to its related aspects (Gardner 1982b:139) such as the wider New Zealand community. This is indicative of additive bilingualism.

---

1 For the purposes of this thesis, language shift is defined as follows: the process in which one’s first language is replaced by a second language in all spheres of usage (domains and language levels). Language maintenance is defined as: the retention of one’s first language in one or more of these spheres either together with a second language or instead of it (from Pauwels 1986:14).
In New Zealand, ideology surrounding immigration has altered over the years at an official as well as popular level. Officially, until the 1980s, as a result of the ‘anglophone cultural hegemony’ (Coleman 1997:289) the metaphor of a ‘melting pot’ was propagated: immigrants were expected to melt and assimilate into the host population and become New Zealanders. Official institutions and education policy during this time were largely monolingual and many immigrants remember being discouraged from speaking their native language and giving up their native culture (eg Griffith et al 1997:266; Leckie 1995a:60). During the 1970s, the Māori renaissance was stepped up with Māori becoming increasingly vocal about their rights and identity. Because of this, and to honour the Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand has become a bicultural country at an official level. Yet, New Zealand is one of the most monolingual countries in the world (Bell and Holmes 1991:153) while the majority of the world’s population is bi- or multilingual.

Popular attitudes have kept up to a certain extent with official attitudes, and lately multiculturalism and pluralism have become more acceptable. Instead of the melting pot, a ‘salad bowl’ analogy, even though over-idealistic, has been proposed. A ‘salad bowl’ is one in which:

all ethnic groups can blend and mix together to create something new and exciting, but without losing their individual characteristics and culture. (Boyer 1995:83)

New Zealand’s immigration policy, at least in theory, has reflected such changes, with the favouritism shown to most groups ceasing since the 1970s (although the Dutch quota was scrapped in 1993, and the Sāmoan quota is still in place). Since the Immigration Act 1987, immigrants have been selected for their skills and personal qualities, not because of their national or ethnic origins.2 Despite increased acceptance of cultural diversity in the 1990s, there is still some anti-Asian and anti-immigrant sentiment (Griffith et al 1997:267). Now that it is more acceptable for immigrants to be different, do they want to retain their native identity or not?

The immigrant groups chosen for this study were Korean, Sāmoan and Dutch, representing the regions of Asia, the Pacific and Europe respectively. These regions have been significant sources of migrants to New Zealand. Europe was the predominant contributor to New Zealand’s population until the 1960s, although it is still a source region. The Pacific has been important mostly since the 1950s. Recently the significance of Asia as a donor region has increased. In this thesis, the

2 Practice suggests that this is still debatable.
aggregation of immigrants (both in general and in reference to respondents) is called ‘group’ or ‘community’ for the sake of convenience, but this does not imply that all Koreans or Sāmoans or Dutch think of themselves as part of a group, nor that they share a lifestyle, culture or other features in common.

Most early investigations into language and identity came from the field of social psychology using quantitative methods; the majority of such work was undertaken in Canada. While such methods have their strong points, they tend to limit variation by boxing their results into rigid categories. The present study has been undertaken qualitatively to allow the subjective and individual nature of identity to come through, making generalisation difficult. Further, it does not focus on language maintenance and shift but on identity. This is partly because language maintenance and shift have recently been investigated in detail among many immigrant groups in New Zealand (see Chapter 3). These have looked at identity to the extent that language is related to identity, but have not concentrated specifically on identity. The bulk of these studies have been in the North Island; my study begins to redress this regional bias. Additionally, it has investigated recent immigrants, while most previous research has examined earlier waves of immigrants.

This study can also be seen as part of the increasing literature worldwide on debunking essentialist models of identity. Much of this has focused on the ‘transnational experience of the migrant’ and as a result there has been an emphasis on border crossing (Friedman 1996:80) or the breaking down of categories. Such research stresses the fractured and fluid nature of identity which contributes to our ‘multiple subjectivities’ (Papastergiadis 1996:257). Similar experiences were voiced in my respondents’ testimonies. Nikos Papastergiadis, in tracing the inversion in attitudes towards purity and hybridity, comments that:

> For as long as the concepts of purity and exclusivity have been central to a racialised theory of identity, hybridity has, in one way or another, served as a threat to the fullness of selfhood. The hybrid has often been positioned within or beside modern theories of human origin and social development, mostly appearing as the moral marker of contamination, failure, or regression. (Papastergiadis 1996:257)

Hybridity is now regarded as much more positive and inclusive than in the past. Parallel to this, there has been a change in attitudes towards bi- and multilingualism. Earlier linguistic research tended to portray bilingualism in a negative light. But bilingualism, like hybridity, is no longer as widely believed to be threatening to an individual.

This thesis has been divided into nine chapters. After this introduction, the first three chapters constitute the literature review. In Chapter 2, I introduce the concept
of ethnicity and outline changes in the study of ethnicity: post-colonial and post-structuralist views allow ethnicity to be much more variable and fuzzy than earlier views. Following this, the relationship between language and ethnicity is examined. Is language a core value in the absence of which ethnic identity will be less than genuine, or does ethnicity itself change? Does a language need to be used to enable identification with it, or can it serve as a symbol of identity? The relationship between identity and bilingualism/second language learning is then investigated, beginning with a review of the changes in attitudes towards bilingualism.

Chapter 3 focuses on language and ethnicity in relation to New Zealand and Australia. A review of selective research in this field is presented. This research has examined language maintenance and shift and language attitudes, but I expand only on the latter. The New Zealand literature is divided into the categories of immigrants, Pākehā, and Māori, whereas in Australia I look at immigrants only. While there are differences between the two countries, there are also similarities, allowing some comparison between them.

In Chapter 4, I profile the immigration to New Zealand of the Koreans, Dutch and Sāmoans. The Koreans are a recent immigrant group, and this is reflected in the paucity of literature on them. In contrast, the other two groups have been immigrating to New Zealand for much longer and there is more research to draw on. The three groups have immigrated to New Zealand in varying circumstances, and this has influenced their life in New Zealand.

Chapter 5 involves a discussion of methodological issues: the methodology selected; choosing immigrant groups and respondents; the interview schedule; and data collection.

The results from interviews and field work are set out in Chapters 6, 7 and 8, with one chapter devoted to each of the three immigrant groups. Within each of these groups, the results from younger and older respondents (at the time of migration) are presented separately. The data is divided into sections on attitudes to language and to bilingualism; ethnic identity; language maintenance and identity; and attitudes to and experiences in the home country and New Zealand. These are summarised and compared at the end of the chapters.

Finally, in Chapter 9, the results from the three groups are compared and discussed, followed by the conclusion and suggestions for further study.

The appendices contain additional information such as immigration and population statistics of the three immigrant groups under study; New Zealand’s immigration
policy; the consent form and interview schedule; and finally, respondents’
demographic details. The glossary of Māori and Sāmoan words used in this thesis
precedes the introduction.
2 THE LANGUAGE-IDENTITY ISSUE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Group identity may be expressed in terms of ethnic identity. The word *ethnic* comes from the Greek word *ethnos* meaning nation; it emphasises the common descent of a group or people (Edwards 1985:6). Approaches to the study of identity have witnessed an inversion: whereas once hybridity was considered a threat because of the implied interracial mix, post-structuralist theory allows pluralism and the fragmentation of identity. In this way it stresses inclusivity and attempts to debunk essentialist models of identity (Papastergiadis 1996:258). In this chapter I will start off by introducing the concept of ethnic identity (ethnicity), looking at the changes in its usage and what ethnicity implies. Next I will explore various aspects in the relationship between language and ethnicity. This will be followed by looking at ethnicity in the context of second language learning and bilingualism. It will be demonstrated that qualitative perspectives on ethnicity are better at allowing its subjective nature to come out.

2.2 ETHNIC IDENTITY

Early anthropological work in the 1950s, 1960s and some in the 1970s defined ethnicity according to objective criteria, that is, as defined by non-members of the ethnic group. For example, a group was identified as a ‘tribe’. The problem with this approach was that such ethnic labels were often arbitrarily or inaccurately imposed. Frederick Barth, an eminent scholar in this field, was the first to view ethnicity subjectively. Subjectively defined ethnicity was defined by group members themselves (Cohen 1978:383). In doing so, it was easier for second and third generation immigrants to choose to retain the ethnic identity of the first generation of immigrants (Isajiw 1974:16). Abner Cohen (1978:386) believed that this shift in perspective from tribe to ethnicity was recognition of the multiethnic and interactive context in which groups exist, rather than an isolated one as the concept of tribe implied. The ethnic group was now the focus in a more realistic context, since ethnicity exists only in the framework of interethnic relations (Cohen 1978:389).

The postmodern conception of identity, as explained by Stuart Hall (1990) does not see it as an ‘already accomplished fact’ (Hall 1990:222) based on fixed and permanent dual selves which we either are or are not (Hall 1992a:255) but as an ongoing process
of ‘production’ which is composed within representation (Hall 1990:222). Hall believes that the individual and their experience of ethnicity are not essentialist, or, in other words, they are not established by Nature, rather:

The term ethnicity acknowledges the place of history, language and culture in the construction of subjectivity and identity, as well as the fact that all discourse is placed, positioned, situated, and all knowledge is contextual. (Hall 1992a:257)

This is echoed by Alberto Melucci (1996:64) who conceives of identity in terms of a field rather than an essence.

The previous conception of a unified and stable identity has been replaced by one which sees identity as fragmented or composed of several, even contradictory identities (Hall 1992b:276-77). Identity is constantly created and recreated depending on context: the individual is not isolated, but is a product of their surroundings.

Identity becomes a ‘moveable feast’: formed and transformed continuously in relation to the ways we are represented or addressed in the cultural systems which surround us. It is historically, not biologically, defined. The subject assumes different identities at different times, identities which are not unified around a coherent ‘self’. Within us are contradictory identities, pulling in different directions so that our identifications are continuously being shifted about. . . . Instead as the systems of meaning and cultural representation multiply, we are confronted by a bewildering, fleeting multiplicity of possible identities, any one of which we could identify with - at least temporarily. (Hall 1992b:277)

The modern world is undergoing incessant and rapid change, to the extent that we can witness ‘globalisation’. Globalisation is defined by Anthony McGrew (cited in Hall 1992b:299) as ‘those processes operating on a global scale, which cut across national boundaries, integrating and connecting communities and organisations in new space-time combinations, making the world in reality and in experience more interconnected’. Globalisation implies ‘time-space compression’ or the speeding up of global processes so that events which occur in one place of the globe can have an immediate impact on people and places far away (Hall 1992b:300). It thus challenges the classical sociological idea of a bounded society. Globalisation is one of the major forces fragmenting identities, leading to a fuzziness of boundaries or ‘shared identities’ (Hall 1992b:302). So for example, since Indian restaurants can be found in large numbers all over Britain, can Indian food still be considered distinctive of India only? In addition, people in so called Third World countries can be made aware of ‘Western’ consumerism by watching television or listening to the radio in their
homes. Such processes lead to identities becoming ‘detached’ from specific times and places (Hall 1992b:302-3).

The fuzziness of ethnic group boundaries can be seen in the concept of ‘hybrid identity’ (Bradley 1996:134) or ‘translation’ (Hall 1992b:310). This refers to the hyphenated identity of immigrants (Bradley 1996:134). Immigrants have connections with their place of origin, the traditions they have left, as well as the culture they have entered. They are likely to carry with them the influences of the particular cultures, traditions, languages and histories they have come into contact with (Hall 1992b:310) or ‘the plurality of knowledges, of cultures and of their continuous fusion’ (Friedman 1996:75). Harriet Bradley (1996:134) believes that they can be for example, neither Indian nor British, since they are different from an Indian who has never left India and not quite the same as a British person who has spent all their life in Britain. Rather they are Indian-British. Hybrid identities are not formed by the combination of two identities, but:

The hybrid is formed, [Bhabha] says, out of the dual process of displacement and correspondence in the act of translation. As every translator is painfully aware, meaning seldom moves across borders with pristine integrity. Every translation requires a degree of improvisation. The hybrid, therefore, is formed not out of an excavation and transferral of foreignness into the familiar, but out of this awareness of the untranslatable bits that linger on in translation. (Papastergiadis 1996:278-9, emphasis in original)

Thus hybridity is not simply a sum of its parts, but involves the negotiation of difference; further, contradictions are symptomatic of it, they are not a sign of failure (Papastergiadis 1996:258).

Hall asserts that hybrid identities have been facilitated by post-colonial migration and that ‘they [immigrants] must learn to inhabit at least two identities, to speak two cultural languages, to translate and negotiate between them’ (Hall 1992b:310). Eva Hoffman (1989) very poignantly describes how she had to do exactly this when she immigrated to Canada from Poland aged thirteen. She had to literally translate her identity at the same time as learning English.

Homi Bhabha, to whom Bradley (1996:134) attributes the development of the notion of hybridity, believes that with globalisation, all cultures and societies are hybrid. This is because all cultures have been influenced by globalisation through migration,

---

3 Yet, there are those who believe that the above view is too simplistic, arguing that national identities are not being ‘homogenised’ (Hall 1992b:304).
travel and tourism, and the resultant cultural exchange and communication. For Bhabha, hybridity is positive since it provides a ‘third space’, ‘a freedom from total submission to either set of cultural values, from which a critical stance or an opposition to hierarchy can develop’ (Bradley 1992:134). Although the ‘third space’ implies liberation from boundaries, Jonathan Friedman (1996:79) points out that since this is a space, it must be bounded too. Bradley views Bhabha’s analysis as useful in the study of ethnic dynamics in the post-industrial world (Bradley 1992:134).

2.2.1 Implications of ethnicity

Ethnicity has been the subject of study by numerous scholars, especially in the disciplines of anthropology, sociology and psychology, yet it remains a ‘slippery’ concept (Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey 1990:310), with hardly any general agreement about its definition. It is further confused by changing emphases which have just been outlined. I will avoid giving a narrow and precise definition of ethnicity since each scholar accentuates a different aspect of it; rather I will only expand on what it implies, which includes:

- belonging to a group and sharing its conditions of existence (Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1992:8); the group may be large or small, socially dominant or subordinate

- having ancestral links with the group

- no necessity for a continuation over generations of the same socialisation or cultural patterns, but some sense of a group boundary (Edwards 1985:10), even if shifting and contested, must persist.

An important aspect of ethnicity is the sense of a group boundary, as opposed to persistence of the same cultural elements. This is not to say that cultural elements are not important, but that they may change, and this is usually the case with generational differences among immigrants. Yet ethnic group continuity may be sustained by shared objective traits like religion, dress or food, and symbolic or subjective feelings of allegiance to a group; or a combination of both (Edwards 1985:10). In fact, ethnicity becomes most visible in a situation where two or more ethnic groups come into contact and ethnic boundaries become recognisable (Fishman 1977a:26-7). Ethnicity then involves the recognition of significant differences between ‘them’ versus ‘us’ (Wallman 1979a:3). Hall (1992b:288) explains this with reference to another analogy, that of ‘night’ and ‘day’: we know what one is because it is not the other. Meaning arises in the context of similarity and difference.
Individuals construct their identity in relation to others. This identity can be shifting, with fuzzy boundaries, or to extend Hall’s metaphor, like ‘twilight’.

The significance of a boundary is thus twofold: boundaries, although changing themselves depending on place and time, remain despite people and cultural elements flowing across them; and social relations are maintained across boundaries, and often depend on boundaries (Barth 1969a:9-10). Barth (1969a:11) stresses that the sharing of culture is a result rather than a defining characteristic of an ethnic group. Instead, it is social interaction which allows perpetuation of ethnic distinctions (Koenig 1980:1). The emphasis on group boundaries rather than group elements makes it especially applicable to groups undergoing change (Isajiw 1974:115).

Anderson (cited in Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1992:4) conceives of ethnic groups “as ‘imagined communities’ since all those who belong assume a sense of commonality with others but not all members can interact concretely to form a real community”. Ethnicity can be distinguished from nationalism, the latter being politically channelled ethnicity (Edwards 1985:6). Ethnicity is not an inherent property of the group, rather it is an ideological construct. So a group which is labelled ethnic in one context can be constructed as religious or national first and foremost in others. This has been done with the Jews (Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1992:4). Joshua Fishman (1972a:187) asserts that ethnicity is a matter of degree rather than of kind; thus it is not an all-or-none phenomenon, instead it can be manifest to varying extents in one’s behaviour.

Not all ethnic groups are equally attached to their cultures of origin. The concept of ‘ethnic salience’ may be defined as ‘the importance an individual attaches to being ethnic’ (Mackie and Brinkerhoff 1984:117). Ethnicity is just one from the range into which one’s identity fractures. In addition, the significance of ethnicity may vary depending on circumstances and settings as noted above. Thus, the salience of ethnicity is situational. Seeing the variable of ethnicity in these terms will allow more attention to be focused on variation in ethnic identity among individuals, rather than on groups (Mackie and Brinkerhoff 1984:117). Ethnicity is placed in the wider social setting in which the individual can assign the importance ethnicity is to have in the situation (Okamura 1981:463). A situational approach to ethnicity takes into account change ‘in so far as ethnicity as a regulating principle of social relations is not viewed as being of unvarying significance’ (Okamura 1981:460). For example, a Korean immigrant may express their ethnicity differently if they immigrate to Japan rather than to New Zealand. Also, in certain situations, the importance of being Korean may recede to the background, with, say class becoming more salient.
The salience of ethnicity has been found to increase in a group contact situation. Simon Herman (1976) studied a group of American Jewish exchange students in Israel for a year. In Israel, most of them wanted to be perceived as Jews, so were disappointed that they were seen as Americans by the (Jewish) Israelis (Herman 1976:138). They tried to distance themselves even more from their American identity when they came into contact with American tourists. They felt that their deep relationship with Israel was different from the one a tourist had with it. One student reported using Hebrew at such times to avoid being mistaken for an American (Herman 1976:140-1). This is a classic case of divergent accommodation, the unconscious shifting of features of one’s speech away from that of the person one is talking to (Giles 1979:268). In this instance language was used to accentuate ethnicity in an attempt to distance oneself from one’s nationality.

Funso Akere (1983) found that the people of Ikorodu⁴ prefer to (or at least claim to) speak Eko, the outgroup urban variety rather than Ijebu, the local dialect, with other people of their ingroup while in Ikorodu itself. However, when outside Ikorodu they use Ijebu with their townspeople to reaffirm their identity as an Ijebu-Ikorodu. Within the community, by claiming to speak the outgroup variety the Ikorodu people distance themselves and maintain their superiority from the Ijebu-speaking communities who are a negative reference group for them (that is, the people of Ikorodu) (Akere 1983:93). Yet, outside it, this hierarchy is forgotten in an attempt to assert their identity even if it means being associated with people they normally distinguish themselves from linguistically.

An ethnic group can be formed in various ways; historically this has occurred through conquests, colonisation and immigration and more recently these processes have come under the guise of capitalism, imperialism and the liberal democratic state (Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1992:3) as well as immigration. It was widely believed that ethnicity in the context of immigrant groups (or ‘pluralism of identity’ [Smolicz and Secombe 1985:139]) was a phenomenon on its way out, a transitional stage until the assimilation of these groups into the dominant mainstream; otherwise known as the ‘melting pot’ theory (Gans 1979:2). Contrary to expectation, this did not happen; instead there occurred what was believed to be an ethnic ‘revival’. Herbert Gans (1979:1) argues that this ‘revival’ was actually not a revival at all, rather it was just an increase in the visibility of ethnicity (and hence not a new phenomenon at all) while acculturation and assimilation continued to take place.

---

⁴ Ikorodu is a suburban town near Lagos (Akere 1983:88) in Nigeria.
The term ‘ethnic’ group often brings to mind a minority group, however this link is a result of power and status dynamics and resultant everyday usage rather than an inherent definitional link as everyone belongs to an ethnic group (Edwards 1985:6). Yet, it has been proposed that members of a minority or subordinate group are more likely to define themselves in terms of their social position and group membership, in other words as elements of a collective entity, while dominant group members are more likely to conceive of themselves in terms of their personal characteristics rather than as a group. For example, women have been found to mention their sexual category membership more often than men, blacks to mention their ethnic affiliation more frequently than whites in the United States, and Jews have been found to mention their religious connection more times than Christians (Deschamps 1982:91). This has been explained in terms of the dominant group members perceiving themselves as subjects whose actions are voluntary and ‘normal’ and the dominated group members seeing themselves as objects who are in a less powerful position. In this context of differential power, ethnicity is seen as a characteristic of minority groups (Deschamps 1982:92). James Dormon’s (1980:32) use of the term ‘white ethnics’ to refer to Americans of European extraction (and hence white) further supports this belief. A review of the literature from Australia on language and ethnicity also reveals that ‘ethnic’ is used to refer to immigrant minorities in Australia, and does not include the dominant host population.

Another example of such usage is provided by Pauline Greenhill (1992:236) who notes that until recently, English immigrants in Canada had not been defined as an ‘ethnic’ group. However, the immigrant generation themselves ‘behave[d] as an ethnic group’ (Greenhill 1992:239), at times deliberately. Their accents, language use and religion singled them out as different from Canadians; in addition, some lived in English residential concentrations and formed associations to maintain their culture. Many English immigrants in Canada defined themselves as non-ethnic on the basis of their mother-tongue and did not expect to find Canada in any way different from their home country (Greenhill 1992:259). The author remarks that:

> Their creation of a sense of English ethnicity is particularly compelling since most did not expect to find cultural and linguistic divergences between themselves and Canadians. Yet English immigrants encounter notable linguistic and cultural variations. (Greenhill 1992:239)

The implication of this is that since the majority of Canadians are descendants of English immigrants from generations ago, the Canadians will be like the English immigrants of today. The fact that they are not surprised the present English immigrants, who are different from the dominant majority, and so are labelled as an
'ethnic' group. To be different today, both groups would have undergone changes independently of the other, something which is often neglected.

It has been argued that today ethnicity is another construct, like race and class, used by the dominant to justify their position and by the dominated to fight for their rights and resources (McCall, Burnley and Encel 1985:27ff). The situation in New Zealand, where Māori are the indigenous minority and Pākehā the dominant power, would seem to lend support to this. Regarding this issue, Paul Spoonley notes that:

The question of national and ethnic identity and the implications for the distribution of resources are highly contentious issues. (Spoonley 1990a:29)

Since the 1970s, Māori have experienced a cultural renaissance, politicising their ethnicity and asserting their rights to equality in the allocation of resources. Such claims are based on the Treaty of Waitangi, which has been largely disregarded for over a hundred years. Māori prefer a bicultural and bilingual country. Pākehā, many of whom do not think of themselves in terms of an ethnic group and even find it difficult to define what makes them Pākehā (refer 3.2.2), find such assertiveness threatening. Without a ‘sense of who they are’ (Spoonley 1990a:29), they are not sure about their contribution to a partnership. There are many instances of Pākehā reacting negatively to increased Māori influence in society. The Māori language and Māori content in education are perceived to be irrelevant. But what many Pākehā are most concerned about is Māori having greater access to economic resources, specifically fisheries and land. Myths of ‘one New Zealand’ and ‘we are all New Zealanders’ have spread and have been used in an attempt to quieten the Māori in their fight for the recognition of ‘being Māori’ (Spoonley 1990a:30).

Even though this thesis has as its main subject immigrant groups in New Zealand, I am not implying that ethnicity is related to migration and is a passing phase in the adaptation of the immigrant group to New Zealand society, on its way to being assimilated into it. Such an association has been made by some scholars who explain ethnicity in terms of process over time (Cohen 1974a:xiii).

Several authors continue to use the term ‘ethnic’ to refer to a subordinate group. To emphasise that I do not mean this, when I come across such usage I will enclose the term ethnic in quotation marks thus: ‘ethnic’.

2.3 IS LANGUAGE EQUIVALENT TO ETHNIC IDENTITY?
The idea that language is linked to group identity goes back to the early nineteenth century. German romanticists of the time assumed that language was the ‘central pillar’ of group allegiance. Johann Herder noted that language was the ‘collective treasure’ of a people which expressed the achievements of its forefathers (F. Barnard cited in Edwards and Chisholm 1987:392). Such a connection between language and group identity was evident in Celtic and other nationalistic movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Edwards and Chisholm 1987). More recent research has challenged this link as simplistic, an area I will explore here.

In 1974 Wsevolod Isajiw examined twenty-seven definitions of ethnicity and found that ‘12 more or less distinct attributes’ (Isajiw 1974:117) of ethnic groups could be identified. Language featured fifth of these twelve, and was stated only six times. It was preceded by common origin or ancestors (stated twelve times), same culture or customs (eleven), religion (ten) and race or physical features (nine); a ‘we feeling’ came sixth, being mentioned four times, minority or subordinate status, or majority or dominant status was tenth with two mentions, and immigrant group was eleventh with only one mention. From this it appears that language is an important aspect of ethnicity to these writers, but not vital (if any feature can be identified as such).

The distinction between group boundaries and ethnic group cultural elements mentioned earlier implies that the original group language as an objective indicator of ethnicity is not an indispensable element of it (Edwards 1985:96) since language shift is a symptom of group contact, usually when one of the groups is more powerful politically and economically (Edwards 1994:20). Yet, some would argue that if a cultural element of an ethnic group changes, especially language, which is a unique ‘repository of an extraordinary historical accumulation of cultural material’ (Dorian 1994:115), then identity too changes, often to the extent that the ethnic group assimilates. Because of the ‘cultural carrying power’ of language, much more is at stake in terms of group identity if a language is lost than if the group’s characteristic dress or dance is lost (Dorian 1994:115). Shared language has been found to be an increased basis of identification compared to shared culture (Gudykunst and Schmidt 1987:157). In the following section I will examine the debate about the relatedness between language and identity.

Joshua Fishman, a prominent scholar in the field of language and identity, is strong in his conviction that language is very intimately linked with identity and culture. He asserts that it is very difficult to tell the whole truth about language and culture since everybody’s point of view will be biased by their imbeddedness in the relationship they are trying to explain (Fishman 1994:83). His opinion on the matter is that a language is symbolic of the culture it is associated with and the members of
that culture. For example, if we overhear someone, even a stranger, speak in a language which we are familiar with, we assume that we know something about that person (Fishman 1994:87). This is because a language is made up of words which express parts of that culture (Fishman 1994:84). The laws, folktales, songs, rhymes and religious texts are linguistic in nature and to be able to fully participate in them and to be considered a member of that group, one must know the language (Fishman 1994:86).

For Fishman (1977a) language is the prime symbol of ethnicity even though there are other symbols, for example, food, dress, shelter, land tenure and artefacts, among countless others. Language is unique among all of these in that it is a means of communication and thus a symbol system in itself. Language is relied upon extensively to ‘enact, celebrate and “call forth” all ethnic activity’ (Fishman 1977a:25), thus it tends to become valued in itself.

Yet he concedes that ethnic identity can survive despite language shift, but that this is not necessarily desirable (Fishman 1994:89). Identity continuity is part of ethnocultural continuity and since linguistic change brings about initial disturbances in the ethnoculture, identity is affected. While it is true that ethnoculture changes anyway, even without language shift, such changes are likely to be internally regulated and hence not as disruptive (Fishman 1994:90) to identity.

Fishman (1977a) further believes that ethnicity can change in three ways, which are:

• in content, however, this does not necessarily imply a change in holistic meaning (Fishman 1977a:30);

• in membership, which is usually a result of intergroup contact leading to other types of behaviour becoming acceptable (Fishman 1977a:31);

• in salience, or the rebirth of ethnicity (Fishman 1977a:32), usually in the face of threat. In such a case, language may be used as a vehicle to mobilise the group and as a symbol to arouse ethnic consciousness. An example of this is an increase in the use of Māori language and in its status as part of the Māori Renaissance in New Zealand. Such increase in salience can reach the extreme form of nationalism.

Monica Heller (1987) contends that in addition to being a group symbol, language plays a role in the formation of one’s relationships and social activities since it is a common means of communication among the participants. It lets the group members think and talk in a certain way and make inferences about other people based on their speech. Thus it plays a definite role in group cohesion.
For Jeffrey Reitz (1985:107), the main concern about language and ethnic group solidarity is the causal sequence between them: which is an effect of the other? After his study of four ethnic groups in Canada, he concluded that language plays a central role in ethnic community participation rather than the other way around. Language and ethnicity have also been proposed to be reciprocally related:

language usage influences the formation of ethnic identity, but ethnic identity also influences language attitudes and language usage.  
(Gudykunst and Schmidt 1987:157)

William Gudykunst and Stella Ting-Toomey (1990:312) rightly concede that the question of which comes first - language or ethnicity - is a chicken-and-egg question and is not the central issue.

If language is connected to identity, it can also be politically manoeuvred to make a statement about ethnicity. Thomas Eriksen (1990) describes the situation in Mauritius. Almost everybody there speaks Kreol, which is derived from French and rarely written, yet according to the official censuses, 15 languages are used regularly (Eriksen 1990:4).

Mauritius has no indigenous population and today consists of Indo-Mauritians (65%, comprising Indian Muslims, Aryan Hindus and Tamils), Creoles (30%, descendants of African slaves), Sino-Mauritians (3%) and Franco-Mauritians (2%) (Eriksen 1990:2). In such a multiethnic population ethnicity is highly visible; division of labour has traditionally been along ethnic lines, and according to Eriksen (1990:3), political events are frequently interpreted in terms of ethnic interests, rather than class interests. However, as social and economic change speed up and Mauritius becomes part of the international market, nationalism is becoming increasingly important in the social, political and economic arenas (Eriksen 1990:30). Yet language, both as a symbol and as a means of communication, is the most important vehicle of nationalism and ethnicity (Eriksen 1990:2). This is manifested in the discrepancy between the language people claim to use and the one they actually do use (Eriksen 1990:4).

The Hindus overemphasise their Indian cultural background using language as a marker of distinctiveness (Eriksen 1990:11). For example, the National Telegu Federation (Telegus comprise 2.7% of the total population), in a newspaper advertisement urged all ‘Telegus of Mauritius’ to answer Telegu in the census when

---

5 It is unclear what this term means, but presumably it refers to Hindus of North Indian origin.
asked about religion, ancestral language and language currently spoken. Unofficially, these questions equate to ethnic identity. What is ironical, and an indicator of the difference between usage and claiming of usage is that this advertisement was in French! Had all Telegus been casual speakers of Telegu, there would be no need for such an appeal (Eriksen 1990:7). Eriksen (1990:8) suggests that the Telegu leaders used this linguistic strategy to maintain their ethnic minority status which would bestow them with more power in a multiethnic national context and at the same time would prevent them from being lumped with Hindus in general.

42% of Muslims on the island now claim Arabic instead of Urdu as their ancestral language. This is an attempt to redefine their ancestral homeland and history as no social prestige is associated with links to Pakistan, whereas the Arab area has seen an increase in its geopolitical importance in the last two decades (Eriksen 1990:9).

The Sino-Mauritians comprise a small proportion of the total population but are economically strong. They claim to use Krel as a first language, even though they speak Mandarin widely. They use language to de-emphasise their ethnic identity in favour of a national identity in order to maintain their status as an economic elite (Eriksen 1990:9-10).

Thus language is used as a political tool by these three groups to emphasise their subgroup identity, to alter their ancestry, and to stress their national identity respectively. For these groups then, language is an important indicator of ethnicity, even where language shift has occurred and group members do not know the language they claim to use; here language has retained its symbolic role as a marker of group identity. In addition, identity at ethnic and national levels is stressed to emphasise one’s minority or majority status.

An extreme version of the view that language is indicative of identity is that language causes identity and culture, that is, we think and perceive reality the way we do because we know a particular language and that this thinking will be different from an individual who speaks another language (Fishman 1994:88). Such processes are said to heighten cultural differences (Loveday 1982:36). This is an extreme form of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity which postulates that one’s thinking is affected by one’s language: ‘the worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached’ (Sapir 1963 [1929] cited in Bayard 1995:185). Such linguistic determinism can be discounted as being somewhat far fetched.
At the other extreme there are many cases where a common language has taken the back seat and class, caste or other factors have been the bases of group formation. Madhav Apte (1979) found that among members of different caste groups in India, region, religion and caste rather than language maintained group cohesiveness. In the southern Indian state of Tamil Nadu, Tamil is the official language. Descendants of eighteenth- and nineteenth- century Marathi-speaking migrants from the central state of Maharashtra still speak Marathi here. The Marathi and Tamil speakers are divided along parallel caste lines and group activity occurs along these caste divisions even though language transcends caste boundaries. Thus Marathi Brahmans identify with Tamil Brahmans as both groups share similar cultural, religious, philosophical and literary traditions and beliefs, and socioeconomic lifestyles. The same occurs with another caste group, that of the tailors, whether Tamil- or Marathi-speaking.

Here we see a case where language does not have a major part in arousing ethnic consciousness, even though language maintenance is an objective trait differentiating the dominant (Tamil-speaking) and minority (Marathi-speaking) communities in numerical terms. The main basis of group formation and activity is socially ascribed status. This is also manifested in segregated residential areas and separate religious, occupational and educational patterns (Apte 1979:374).

To summarise, the two poles of the debate about the relationship between language and identity stretch from language being indexical of identity to the two being unrelated: at one end of the scale is the belief that language causes identity. At the other end of the scale is the view that other features, not language, bring about group cohesion and thus affect identity. The first end is seen by many as exaggerated. Between the two extremes, and a more commonly recognised view, is that language is positively related to identity so that language shift leads to a shift in identity too. The acceptability of such a shift will vary from one group to another from being something to avoid to being desirable, and usually depends on the extent to which language may be a core value for the ethnic group concerned.

2.3.1 Language a core value or residual ethnicity?

---

6 A corollary of this belief is that acculturation leads to second language acquisition (Schumann 1978:29).
The extent to which an ethnic group will consider its identity to be compromised with a cultural change is likely to depend on whether the changed aspect was a ‘core value’. Jerzy Smolicz, who introduced the concept of core value, explains it thus:

. . . whenever people feel that there is a direct link between their identity as a group and what they regard as the most crucial and distinguishing element of their culture, the element concerned becomes a core value for the group. (Smolicz 1981:76-77)

If a culture is language-centred, the group members must preserve their mother tongue in order not to dilute their identity. For such a group, language is not just a means of communication, it is also a symbol of belonging to the group. Immigrants for whom language is a core value may find ‘constructing a viable personal ethnic linguistic system . . . somewhat more problematic’ (Smolicz 1981:88) when faced with a host culture where monolingualism is the norm. Among immigrant groups in Australia, the Dutch have been found not to consider language a core value, and so are keener than most other immigrants to give up their language in favour of English. In contrast, the Greeks or Latvians try to resist assimilation by maintaining their language (Smolicz 1981:86), so language is more of a core value to them.

John Edwards (1994:21) however, finds the concept of ‘core value’ dubious. According to him, it is unlikely that some groups value their language less. Instead, he proposes that groups find themselves in varying circumstances and hence they come up with different adaptations. He believes that mother tongue language retention, though important, is not vital for the continuity of group identity. To him this is a positive thing, since language shift is inevitable in many situations (Edwards 1994:73). In addition, identities themselves change regardless of language used (Edwards 1984a:14). Searching for a core value could also reflect researcher bias: looking for a ‘core’ or essentialist criterion, when this may not exist.

Alan Anderson (1979:68) argues that group identity is not necessarily lost with language shift. Yet he concedes that linguistic change may to some extent indicate acculturation and assimilation. Some groups can be ethnolinguistic, others ethnoreligious, although both are inclined to be important aspects of ethnic identity for most groups. Perceptions about change in identity will be related to how important the language is to the group. Thus, he does not agree entirely with Smolicz.

If identity can be maintained by other cultural aspects, then loss of language, even when it is a core value for the group, need not necessarily signal the demise of group identity. However, in such cases, the culture may be considered ‘residual’ and the identity ‘incomplete’ or ‘non-authentic’ (Smolicz and Secombe 1985:140), ‘less’
(Dorian 1994:115) or ‘not the real thing’ (Lowy et al 1983:249). Another proponent of language shift leading to an incomplete identity is Ofelia García (1994). She argues that a group must make efforts to maintain its language since a minority group like the Latinos in the United States cannot be ‘expected to gain knowledge of itself’ (García 1994:90) through the dominant language, all the more so since colonial relations are involved here. With language shift, this group is denied a ‘whole’ identity which would let them associate with Spanish in other times and spaces. For example, they would be unable to communicate with new immigrants from the same area that they themselves come from, and share with them cultural features like music, poetry and ancestors.

. . . [T]herefore English monolingualism has brought about isolation rather than communication, connection and usefulness that newcomers to a society seek. (García 1994:91)

To García then, language maintenance is desirable because of the majority/ minority connotations of language involved.

Other groups provide contrasting examples. For the Irish, the Catholic religion rather than their ancestral language helped them hold onto their identity when they came into contact with conquering British Protestants (Smolicz 1981:79). Smolicz argues that the Jews have maintained their ethnicity for centuries without preservation of a special language.7 The core value system of the Jews is ‘complex but extremely well integrated’ and is comprised of ‘religion, peoplehood and historicity’ (Smolicz 1981:77). Recently, Jewish ethnicity has been linked to Israel and the restricted use of Hebrew has been extended from the religious domain to that of everyday communication. This highlights that when ethnicity has been maintained without language as a core value, the language associated with the group may be revived (Smolicz 1981:78).

The concept of core value has been used in the analysis of the relationship between language and identity. How much of a core value language is to the ethnic group will depend on the group itself. Those who argue that identity is in any way ‘less’ in terms of degree or genuineness fail to note that identity changes all the time anyway, it is not static. This can be seen from Greenhill’s study of British immigrants in

7 Others, however, are inclined to disagree. For example, Michael Clyne (1988:73) proposes that Smolicz has underestimated the importance of Jewish languages through the ages and that by doing so, he (Smolicz) has ignored the multiplicity of Jewish identity.
Canada. Hence, to seek a core value is to imply that ethnicity draws its essence from a fixed trait, which may not necessarily be the case.

2.3.2 Symbolic ethnicity: Language as symbol and instrument of identity

Carol Eastman (1984:261) distinguishes between the belief level of language and its actual use. She contends that only the former is related to ethnic identity (although there is more to behaviour stemming from belonging to a particular ethnic group). When a person uses a new language, only the language use aspect of their ethnicity has changed, not their sense of belonging to a group. She illustrates this with the example of a Parisian French person going to live in New York using English and not French, but remaining ‘ethnically French until the unlikely event that all factors of that ethnic identity change, including that person’s perception of ancestry’ (Eastman 1984:261, emphasis in original). Since only the use (behavioural) aspect of ethnic identity has changed, not the belief (primordial) level, ethnic identity has not changed (Eastman 1984:265).

From the point of view of ethnic identity it does not make any difference whether we know, speak, or just claim an ethnically related language as long as there is one we can somehow associate with. (Eastman and Reese 1981:109)

She calls such a language an associated one. Thus language shift of an associated language would not imply change in identity since people generally associate with the language of their ancestors (Eastman 1984:260) regardless of whether or not they actually use it for communication. Language would be a symbolic marker of ethnicity in this case; symbolic ethnicity can be defined as the ‘maintenance of groupness’ without many actual group markers’ (Edwards and Chisholm 1987:395). An example of such a language is Hawaiian.

There is certainly an element of truth in what Eastman argues, yet I think she underestimates the extent to which use of a language, regardless of communicative competence, can be an aspect of the behavioural level of ethnic identity for certain groups. For example, the Korean language has designated terms for various members of the extended family. The terms carry connotations of respect for the speakers which are lost when translated into English. Several of my Korean respondents were alarmed at the ‘disrespectful’ behaviour of their children when they spoke in English which does not incorporate the respect terms and did not want these nuances of their native language to be lost since they are reflective of Korean
culture and belief. The same would be true of a series of polite particles and pronouns in Thai and Hindi.

As an instrument, language serves as a means of communication among group members. In this capacity, language knowledge can define the group boundaries, so can preclude those members who do not know the language from participating in group activities where the language is used. Thus when language use is held as a group marker, with language shift, members lose their ethnic group identity and ethnic group cohesion is weakened. Yet there is evidence that language use can change without threatening the group’s ethnic identity if the native language remains an associated language for the group. An associated language serves as a group emblem of tradition, heritage and ethnicity at the belief level. For example, in Ireland, attachment to the Irish language still exists, even though it is not widely spoken, nor is its revival as a means of communication feasible or generally desired (Edwards 1985). In some cases it may be retained for religious purposes only, but not necessarily (Edwards 1977:262). Thus language shift may occur, yet members will think of their language as a token of their group.

. . . [E]thnicity is frequently related more to the symbol of a separate language than to its actual use by all members of a group. (DeVos 1975:15 cited in Eastman 1979:215)

Gans (1979:16) predicts that symbolic ethnicity will be predominant among fourth generation immigrants, who will express their ethnic identity in ‘easy and intermittent’ (Gans 1979:8) ways, such that it will not interfere too much with their daily lives. In the long run this will have consequences at a wider structural level of ethnic groups (Gans 1979:16).

India provides numerous examples where, depending on the situation, people identify with either the language they speak or another one which they associate with. When indicating mother tongue on the census form, some people are likely to fill out the language they identify with at the level of belief, rather than the one they speak (Pandit 1979). In north India, Hindi is the superposed variety, used in school and administration. In the north Indian state of Bihar, Magahi, Maithili and Bhojpuri are the major varieties spoken. None of these are dialects of Hindi, even though Hindi is the dominant language of the state. A Magahi-speaker may indicate their mother tongue as Hindi on the census form to identify with Hindi speakers and not with the neighbouring state of West Bengal. On the other hand, if a speaker wants to

8 cf. Eriksen 1990.
emphasise their local identity, they are likely to say that Magahi is their mother tongue.

Neighbouring states have different languages; however, these can form a linguistic continuum and the local varieties along state borders may actually converge and be mutually intelligible even if the 2 varieties belong to different families. For example Kannada-Konkani-Marathi and Tulu (Pandit 1979:180) are varieties used in the adjacent Indian states of Karnataka and Maharashtra. Kannada belongs to the Dravidian language family while Marathi is Indo-European. Speakers would be likely to fill in the superposed variety (Kannada in the state of Karnataka and Marathi in the state of Maharashtra) when answering the question on mother tongue in the census to distinguish themselves from the neighbouring state, even if in reality they use a dialect of the superposed variety which is more similar to the superposed variety of the neighbouring state. Prabodh Pandit remarks:

The identity pressures demand a discrete demarcation of loyalties, a clear declaration of we and they, while the communication at colloquial levels results in convergence of speech patterns. (Pandit 1979:181)

This distinction between language used and the language of self-identity has prompted Khubchandani to define ‘mother tongue’ and ‘native speech’ as follows:

native speech: the first speech acquired by the child (claiming some bearing on ‘intuitive’ competence)

mother tongue: an individual’s regard for a language as his [sic] own (guided by one’s allegiance to a particular ‘tradition’) (cited in Pandit 1979:180-1)

Thus the implications of mother tongue may be different in monolingual and multilingual countries (Pandit 1979:179).

Associated language also explains how multilingual individuals, who use several languages for communicative purposes, use these languages the way monolinguals use just one communicative language. For example, people in some societies use one language in the marketplace, another at school and yet another in government (Eastman 1984:260). The following example provided by Janet Holmes illustrates this well.

Mr Patel is a spice merchant who lives in Bombay. When he gets up he talks to his wife and children in Kathiawari, their dialect of Gujarati. Every morning he goes to the local market where he uses Marathi to buy his vegetables. At the railway station he buys his ticket into Bombay city using Hindustani, the working person’s lingua franca. He reads his Gujarati newspaper on the train, and
when he gets to work he uses Kacchi, the language of the spice trade, all day. He knows enough English to enjoy an English cricket commentary on the radio, but he would find an English film difficult to follow. However, since the spice business is flourishing, his children go to an English-medium school, so he expects them to be more proficient in English than he is. (Holmes 1992:79)

Such a communicative/symbolic split in the role of language is parallel to a public/private split. Public elements of ethnicity can be expected to be lost first (Edwards 1985:111). In contrast, private elements persist longer because they do not hinder the group’s social mobility. In a study of Slavic, Jewish and Italian group members in Canada, Morton Weinfeld (1985:78) found that attitudinal aspects of ethnicity outlived behavioural ones. Thus the desire for material well-being and advancement (often a reason for migrating) can lead the group to forgo their language in its communicative function. Edwards specifies that such a move is usually endorsed by the ethnic group itself. For him, this is ‘good sense, not traitorous rebellion’ (Edwards 1985:108) since group members make an active decision and select some elements which they retain.9 For example, these may be food or religious celebrations. Edwards (1985:175-6) cites the examples of Mexico and Surinam as places where vernacular speakers themselves opted for the dominant language at the cost of their original mother-tongue. To him the value of symbolic ethnicity is that it allows ethnicity to be maintained at no cost (Edwards and Doucette 1987:54). Orlando Patterson (1975:347-8) asserts that ethnic loyalty is not a consideration when it comes to making economic decisions, hence ethnic identity is affected by economic interests of the group members. The ethnic group in this sense functions to maximise economic potential (Dormon 1980:27). However, as noted, some theorists would argue that such ethnicity is ‘residual’.

An awareness of a split in the role of language is important, as it can avoid inappropriate revival efforts by group leaders on behalf of groups who have experienced language shift in its communicative sense (Edwards and Chisholm 1987:393). Despite the ‘more pragmatic, confirmable, widespread and intellectually established view in the American scene’ (Fishman 1985:365-6) that language can live as a group marker in symbolic form in the absence of its use, Fishman argues that ethnic mother tongue schools still believe in a vital link between language and

9 On the basis of my interviews, I would propose that the situation is not so simple, not necessarily involving an ‘active decision’ to not pass on the native language to the second generation. Rather, my respondents seem to have got caught up in this because of dominant forces which meant that their children were usually more fluent in English.
ethnicity. This may be one reason they are limited in their effectiveness as efforts at language maintenance.

The distinction between the communicative and symbolic functions of language can be interpreted in terms of language as a means of status on the one hand and as a means of solidarity on the other. In most cases, within the ethnic community, use of the vernacular commands covert prestige, while the dominant language is encouraged for practical reasons, enabling group members to succeed in the mainstream. Thus overt prestige can be attained by one’s ability to compete with others, using the more prestigious variety at the cost of covert prestige achieved by using the vernacular. The choice is between solidarity in the ingroup and status in the outgroup. Edwards (1985) therefore calls this ‘the love/hate relationship’ with the languages of both groups.

The language variety which commands covert prestige can be symbolic of resistance in addition to being a source of pride and attachment to the group. Ellen Ryan (1979) in an article, *Why do low-prestige language varieties persist?* answers this question by asserting that this is because language has other values such as being symbolic of a group, even if it has low status. Language loyalty arises because of the ‘inescapable emotional involvement’ (Ryan 1979:148) we have with the first language learned in childhood. The idea of such identity-oriented prestige is supported by Lesley Milroy, who cites the example of Black English in the United States (Milroy 1982:210). The distance between black and white speech is believed to be increasing, largely due to a sense of renewed pride in black speech¹⁰ and also as a means of resistance to the dominant culture. The same can be said about the Chicanismo movement, which grew out of attempts to reassert pride in the Spanish language by Spanish immigrants in the United States. In New Zealand, the Māori language has experienced a similar renewal. Speakers of these less prestigious language varieties may be foregoing social benefits associated with the more prestigious varieties, but the rewards accruing from the former and from membership in their respective communities where the language is used among closeknit social networks, ensure their survival (Milroy 1982:213). Wallace Lambert (cited in Ryan 1979:148) believes that second language learners need to maintain their distinct identity and hence hold on to their first language, or else they may blend in with the outgroup.

William Labov (1973:289) describes New York City as a ‘great sink of negative prestige’ since the locals as well as outsiders do not like its speech. The speech has

---

¹⁰ Although both these points are debatable, with several scholars on both sides.
been variously described as ‘terrible’, ‘distorted’, ‘terribly careless’, ‘sloppy’, ‘horrible’ and ‘lou-zay’ by locals themselves (Labov 1973:281). Despite such attitudes, New Yorkers continue to use the speech because of powerful pressures from below (Labov 1973:283). Such pressures would result in non-conformists being punished. Thus, school children

who come to the city from out of town are quickly compelled to drop their own regional accents. . . . The pressure is greatest against those who would attempt to use an acquired prestige pattern too early. (Labov 1973:284)

Labov (1973:284) maintains that children cannot identify with the middle-class norms (with reference to language) advocated by their teachers. The working-class speech pattern is also associated with masculinity, and this helps to maintain it (Labov 1973:295).

A compromise to the ‘love/hate relationship’ mentioned by Edwards can be achieved by code switching or shifting between the two language varieties. In Dominica, both English and Patois are used, with Patois being the native language of most (who are mainly of African descent). Patois is linked to national identity (Christie 1990:63) while English was brought over by colonisers and hence is associated with the elite and upward social mobility. Thus children are encouraged to become fluent speakers of English. Patois speakers are seen as uneducated and/or ‘countrified’ (Christie 1990:64). English, the high and outgroup variety, is used in business, media and by the government, while Patois is the low variety and is used for informal conversation, although English may also be used here, depending on the social background of the speakers. The more highly educated and sophisticated speakers are stereotypically expected to use English. In actual fact bilingual speakers tend to code switch. Pauline Christie (1990:67) argues that speakers, who are aware of the socio-cultural stereotypes associated with both the languages, code switch to indicate shared identity.

Suzanne Romaine comments on the use of code switching between two varieties, one of which is indicative of status and the other of solidarity (English and Patois respectively in the above example):

code-switching may allow speakers to tread a more neutral path between opposing identities symbolized in two languages. (Romaine 1989:269)

This neutral path allows speakers to participate in both worlds and to draw on the connotations of both languages.
A similar effect may be derived by using the outgroup language but with a distinctive ‘ethnic’ accent. Such language use has been found not to reduce the speaker’s identity in the opinion of ingroup members (Ryan, Hewstone and Giles 1984:139). Here in New Zealand, Māori-accented English used by some Māori (as well as some Pākehā and Pacific Islanders) serves as a solidarity marker (Bayard 1995:144) among the ingroup.

It is difficult to generalise about ethnicity and language since different groups have varying relationships between their language and their identity. To some groups, there is a definite focus on group boundaries rather than group content, so language shift does not imply loss of ethnicity. For such groups, language may be related to ethnicity at a symbolic level rather than a communicative level. In such a situation, language can lend itself to manipulation to make a statement about ethnicity. Group members may claim to use a language even after language shift has occurred. For other groups, language is a core value so language retention is related to maintenance of ethnic group cohesion. Such loyalty to language ensures the continuity of even low prestige language varieties which contribute to solidarity within the group. Within any group there is likely to be variation too, so that the relationship between language and identity can vary from person to person and from situation to situation.

Overall, the relationship between language and identity can be described as complex and varying for different ethnic groups. Early studies tended to box identity into rigid categories, such as ‘tribe’, with little space for intergroup and intragroup variation. Post-colonial and post-structuralist viewpoints of identity which see it as fractured and messy allow for fluidity between language and identity at group as well as individual level. They highlight the fuzziness of boundaries and so are more useful in analysing the non-linear relationship between language and identity.

2.4 SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING/BILINGUALISM AND IDENTITY

From the discussion thus far it is clear that language is definitely linked to ethnicity for some groups at least, even if the language of the group is not a core value of its ethnicity. Given this relationship it should follow that second language learning or bilingualism and language shift will have an impact on identity too. This is illustrated in the following example. Patricia SanAntonio (1987) observed that the Japanese relate their identity to the Japanese language and are hostile towards foreigners who speak Japanese fluently.
... [W]hen a [Western] foreigner speaks Japanese well, the ethnic difference between foreigner and Japanese is reduced to the ‘Asian-ness’ of the Japanese (Miller, 1979). This creates problems because the Japanese do not base their identity on a notion of fellowship with other Asians, but consider themselves unique... (SanAntonio 1987:192)

In such a situation, the Japanese lose their unique status among Asians. The foreigner who can speak Japanese fluently can claim Japanese identity and threaten the Japanese view of themselves as singular (SanAntonio 1987:192). At the same time, learning a second language is difficult because of the association of language with identity. For example, speaking English at work, even in an American company in Japan where company policy is to use English, is equal to a wish to enter into the American corporate group.

Speaking English in various situations in the company is tantamount to making a claim to the identity of a Japanese with whom Americans can work. (SanAntonio 1987:193)

The latter is obviously undesirable, as is speaking English in front of other Japanese (SanAntonio 1987:195). However, this undesirable aspect can also have a silver lining. The English-speaking Japanese employee can be the recipient of promotions and control meetings with American managers who see a silent employee as ignorant or evasive. At the same time, the Japanese employees who do not speak English are grateful to their English-speaking colleagues for not drawing attention to their lack of English skills (SanAntonio 1987:195).

Bilingualism has begun to be treated seriously as a subject only recently. Earlier, linguists thought that bilinguals were abnormal since it was believed to be natural to speak just one language (Loveday 1982:8). Research from the 1930s to the 1950s, done without proper controls, indicated that bilingualism and bilingual education had negative effects (Fishman 1977b:37). Bilingualism was blamed for things like stuttering, left-handedness, schizophrenia, lower intelligence and dual ethnic identities (Lamy 1978:134). A recognition of the positive side effects came about only when more favoured groups in the United States and Canada had obtained bilingual education. In addition, better controls and more rigorous procedures were used in experimental situations (Fishman 1977b; Lamy 1978:134). Fishman argues that this is the reason that Lambert associated second language learning with anomie in 1967 (see below). Such findings are not as common in more recent times as it is increasingly being recognised that bilingualism and bilingual education can have ‘good’ effects (Fishman 1977b:38).
Suspicious attitudes towards bilingualism can prove harmful for language maintenance. In New Zealand, Māori leaders themselves tried to suppress the use of Māori in schools in 1876.

Such a move marks the saddest phase of language loss in a colonial situation - when the colonized people co-operates in, or even seems to lead, the drive towards the loss of its own language. It arises from the overwhelming pressure of the imperial language as the language of advancement or even survival in the new colonial society. (Bell 1991:67)

Parents may then discourage their children from using the parents’ native language (L1). This has damaging consequences even if children are encouraged to learn both languages, since they will be able to use only one language to ‘get ahead’, while the other one will be confined to the home, and perhaps the community group at the most. When children get such messages, they may be torn between the two communities and their progress at school can be affected. In contrast, others may see bilingualism as a bridge between two worlds where the two languages complement each other rather than compete with each other. In such a situation bilingualism is seen as a means of participating in both worlds. Paul Stevens (1983:112) reports such attitudes among some bilinguals in Tunisia, which follows a policy of bilingualism in French and Arabic. Bilingualism is endorsed by the government here and therefore is translated into policy.

In New Zealand, bilingualism has generally been stigmatised by the monocultural institutions (Kerslake and Kerslake 1987:145) including, particularly in the past, the education system (Leckie 1995a:66) and this is one reason why it is difficult for parents to encourage their children to grow up bilingual. Immigrants to New Zealand find English imperative for survival since Pākehā, the dominant group, have limited communication in the public formal domains of business, education, government and the media to English. The prevalent assimilationist attitude means that many monolingual English speakers are averse to hearing any other language being spoken (Hawley 1987:48). This often leads immigrants to discourage their children from speaking the native language at home, which can have detrimental consequences on the children’s education as well as their attitudes towards their own culture since it is devalued. All this can adversely affect their identity.

New Zealanders are not the only ones guilty of curbing bilingualism. A monolingual outlook has been attributed to most Anglo-Saxon based societies around the world (Smolicz 1979:122; Romaine 1991a). Fishman argues that:
monolingualism is a myth fostered by centuries of Euro-Mediterranean linguistic experiences and derived concepts such as universalism, rationalism and liberty. (cited in Loveday 1982:8)

As a result, bilingualism connotes ‘provincialism, oppression and irrationalism’ to Westerners (Loveday 1982:8), and also divisiveness. Australians are reported to resent the use of foreign languages, which they suspect are being used to make fun of them or to make derogatory comments about them (Smolicz 1979:122). A monolingual ethos which discourages linguistic and ethnic diversity is reportedly widespread in the United States, Canada (Wong Fillmore 1991:341) and Britain too (Romaine 1989:276).

It was commonly believed that use of a foreign language was not only unnecessary but also a handicap (Smolicz and Secombe 1985:133). Bilingualism was used as a scapegoat and made responsible for the lack of educational achievement of migrant children. This ignored the role that social class plays in education and that migrant groups often have a disproportionate number of people in labouring occupations, which is likely to be responsible for ‘migrant dropout’ (Smolicz 1979:133). As noted, this is compounded by negative attitudes towards a minority language and culture rather than bilingualism itself causing such problems.

In England, the Linguistic Minorities Project (LMP) tried to show bilingualism as a ‘normal feature of social life, and an individual and societal resource’ (LMP:6) to counter the widespread view in education that bilingualism is problematic. Hence they focused on several areas where bilingualism was the rule rather than the exception for much of the population.

Why is bilingualism stigmatised? As already mentioned, it is partly a result of historical expansion and colonialism which led to the development of monolingual Anglo-Saxon dominant societies in places like North America, England, Australia and New Zealand. But there are further reasons for this belief.

In the early nineteenth century, as now, a people’s language was equated with their culture and nationality. As a result, community wide bilingualism was seen as problematic. Such people were thought to threaten a homogeneous nation state because of their mixed ethnic loyalties. The bilingual community could potentially fight for cultural and political independence. Such attitudes have meant that language shift has assumed political connotations (Gal 1979:2). However, at least among some immigrants in Canada, identification with the ethnic group has been found to be concurrent with a commitment to Canada as a place of residence (Richmond 1974:204). The same has been reported for Samoans in New Zealand (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:19); (see Chapter 8).
Another reason bilingualism has negative implications is that in the English-speaking monolingual countries of the world at present, bilingual communities are usually immigrant ones, for whom bilingualism is seen as part of the process of assimilation. In other words, it is thought to be a passing phase, a means to an end, that of becoming just like the rest of the nationals. The immigrants may or may not have acquired the language of the host (L2) country fluently and the immigrant language itself (L1) has low status because it is spoken by a group of people who have come from a colony (in the case of Britain) (LMP 1985:106). The powerlessness and low status of the immigrants, and often their poor L2 acquisition is transferred to their language and their language characteristics, including bilingualism. In the United States of America, a group called ‘US English’ feels threatened about the status of English as a result of ‘imagined inroads’ (Bayard 1995:133) made by Spanish and other immigrant languages. They are lobbying for English to be made the only official language of the USA (Bayard 1995:133). Fishman (1988:134) warns of the dangers of such a move, seeing it as a power play on the part of old, educated, high-income majority group members, with detrimental consequences to groups who want to maintain their native language.

Bilingualism was proposed to have damaging consequences on an individual’s personality.

The popular consensus about the effects of early bilingualism on personality integration and emotional adjustment is, again, that this bilingual experience is detrimental. (Diebold 1968:236)

Second language learning was believed to be a ‘fundamentally traumatic experience’ or a ‘clash of consciousness’ (Clarke 1976:377, 382) because immigrants coming from so-called less ‘modern’ cultures to live in the USA had to cope with this difference (Clarke 1976:383). A bilingual was even stated to be predisposed towards schizophrenia because each language was related to one personality structure (Diebold 1968:236).

The ‘problem’ of the bilingual may be of a special kind. Which way does one as a bilingual face, when speaking in one or other language: towards one’s own ethnic community when speaking one’s mother tongue, and towards the other community when speaking the ‘host’ tongue? (Weinreich 1986:305, emphasis in original)

The personalities would alter depending on the language of interaction at any given time. One case study has pointed out the possibility that the ethnicity which is valued may be the alternative one which the person is not cued into at the time (Weinreich 1986:305).
Leo Loveday (1982:45) discounts the possibility that bilingualism is equivalent to biculturalism, or else a bilingual would have two different worldviews and would need to juggle these as they changed from using one language to another. However, to the extent that language is a part of culture, it (language) is representative of certain beliefs and practices which are expressed in linguistic interaction.11 Second language learning can encourage the adoption of views different from those embodied in one’s first language and has thus been equated with a threat to ethnic identity (Gardner 1982a:35; Loveday 1982:49).

Identification with the second language community, believed to result in weakening ties with one’s first culture and language, was proposed to lead the learner to become alienated from one’s own group, bringing on feelings of anomie and confusion about their identity. The term ‘anomie’ was coined by Emile Durkheim to express feelings of alienation (Preston 1989:79). Wallace Lambert (1967:104) was the first to associate second language learning with anomie, all the more so in the case of advanced language students. The bilingual was said to experience conflicting pulls, with demands being made on them by the two linguistic communities they belonged to.

. . . [T]he bilingual encounters social pressure of various sorts: he can enjoy the fun of linguistic spying but must pay the price of suspicion from those who don’t want him to enter too intimately into their cultural domains and from others who don’t want him to leave his ‘own’ domain. He also comes to realise that most people are suspicious of a person who is in any sense two-faced. If he is progressing toward bilingualism, he encounters similar pressures that may affect his self-concept, his sense of belonging and his relations to two cultural-linguistic groups, the one he is slowly leaving, and the one he is entering. (Lambert 1967:105, emphasis in original)

Such pressures were believed to be the result of wanting to belong to and hence identify with one or another group (Lambert 1967:105), with accounts of bilinguals ‘belonging to neither culture’, ‘without definite cultural roots’ (Grosjean 1982:165, 164). Yet, simultaneously, Lambert (1967:106-7) proposed that bilinguals, in particular those with ‘bicultural experiences’, had the potential to be more open and receptive, and ultimately less ethnocentric. Anomie as a result of second language learning was said to be more likely when the language learner was from a minority group learning the majority language while living in the majority community. In such cases, the person may ‘hover between two ethnic groups’ (Loveday 1982:22) not identifying fully with either one. The threat to ethnic identity was identified as a

11 cf. Sapir-Whorf hypothesis.
barrier to second language learning and intercultural communication (Taylor and Simard 1975).

The terms additive and subtractive bilingualism were coined by Lambert in an attempt to label the cognitive and affective consequences of bilingualism (Landry and Allard 1992:518). If learning a second language has detrimental effects on first language maintenance and cultural identity such that linguistic and cultural assimilation occurs, then bilingualism is said to be ‘subtractive’. On the other hand, it is said to be ‘additive’ if there are no deleterious consequences on first language and culture maintenance. The latter was proposed by Lambert to be characteristic of majority groups while the former was so mainly of minority groups whose language tends to be downgraded in relation to the majority group language (Landry and Allard 1992:518). In New Zealand, bilingualism is likely to be subtractive for Māori learning English but additive for Pākehā learning Māori.

Anomie can be exacerbated when an individual renounces their native culture in favour of the dominant one, yet they are not recognised as part of the dominant culture. Dawn Marley (1993:222) found such an identity crisis among elderly Roussillonnais (Spanish immigrants in France) who had given up their Catalan culture and adopted French culture but they were not perceived either by themselves or by others as truly French. Since their native language was not valued, Marley (1993:223) interpreted their reaction as subtractive bilingualism. In contrast, older immigrants from south Catalonia held their Catalonian culture in pride, and had no desire to identify with French culture, hence they were less likely than the elderly Roussillonnais to ‘become deculturated’ (Marley 1993:223) and experience anomie.

Subtractive bilingualism can have far reaching consequences. Lily Wong Fillmore (1991) in an article entitled *When learning a second language means losing the first*, poignantly describes the cost at which immigrant minority groups often participate in the host society. With language shift to the host language inevitable among children, parents are unable to socialize their children, nor communicate adequately with them. This is highly disruptive to family relations (Wong Fillmore 1991:343). As noted, native language loss has been associated with educational difficulties, all the more so if the child learns neither language fluently (Wong Fillmore 1991:344-5).

A solution to the problem of subtractive bilingualism is to encourage ethnolinguistic minorities to speak their native language at home (Lambert 1979, Wong Fillmore 1991) and to educate them in their native language, rather than in a language which erodes their native language.
This very approach has been taken by a school in the United States. Since December 1996 the Oakland school board has recognised Black English Vernacular (BEV) or ebonics as a primary language.

For black children, treatment of ebonics as inferior English erected an insurmountable psychological barrier to learning standard English. (Billings 1996:A15)

Teachers who speak ebonics will teach Standard English through the medium of ebonics. Instead of telling African American children that their use of language is wrong or bad, it is now respecting their language variety as a legitimate one, even if different.

The move is hailed by some.

In recognizing ebonics as a primary language, Oakland’s school board has made one of the most constructive and potentially far-reaching educational and cultural decisions of the 20th century. The most profound and immediate effect of the board’s decision will be a dramatic improvement in reading ability beginning at the lower elementary level. With that foundation in place, academic performance in all subject areas will subsequently improve. (Billings 1996:A15)

Unfortunately, about 85% of responses received by the San Francisco Chronicle's invitation for comments on this decision were opposed to the new move. Sadly, such opposition came from some African Americans themselves.

As a professional, an African American and a parent, I am outraged that the Oakland school board could be duped into legitimizing the slang of today’s black youth by recognizing it as a ‘new language’ - ebonics.

At a time when the intention of the schools should be to promote the skills students will need for higher education or the job market, the focus instead is to support a speech pattern that is an impediment to mainstreaming. (Letter by Terry C Britt, San Francisco Chronicle, Tuesday December 24, 1996)

The use of ebonics in the education system is thus seen as a barrier to getting on with one’s career. Speakers of a minority language variety have accepted negative attitudes towards their own variety from the majority. However, if one’s first language, ebonics in this case, is valued and respected, for example by schools, in the long run the language will be less likely to be seen negatively by its speakers. Instead of hindering its speakers, it will be seen as a means to success.

There is no evidence that children must unlearn a vernacular - or even a whole language - in order to learn another.
Language problems develop when children are made to feel confused, as when they are ridiculed for correctly applying the grammatically consistent rules of Black English Vernacular. (Vesperi 1997:C15)

The Chicanismo movement in the United States is also attempting to instil positive attitudes towards Mexican American language varieties (Ryan and Carranza 1977:62). This leads to increased pride in their cultural heritage, and can lead to better outgroup attitudes to Mexican American language varieties and behaviour. During the 1970s, bilingual and bicultural education programs were introduced in the United States to enable children from non-English speaking backgrounds to profit from their home and school experiences, rather than be victimised by them. It was found that such programs can boost appreciation for Mexican culture and language without adversely affecting appreciation for the dominant American culture and language (Ryan and Carranza 1977:63). In Wales, the introduction of Welsh-medium primary schools was found to be extremely effective in promoting Welsh identity in young children (Chapman et al 1977:166). Such measures to improve ingroup image can help reduce feelings of anomie by instilling pride in one’s own cultural background.

Bilingualism does not always split one’s response between two competing alternatives. Rather, integration of the two cultures is also possible. Diane Hoffman (1989:120) argues against a linear relationship between language and culture, so that among immigrants use of the host language will not necessarily lead to adoption of that culture and loss of the native culture or vice versa. Instead, an immigrant group can blend cultural continuity and mainstream participation, so that cultural identity can be a combination of both. Among Iranian immigrants in the United States, American work values were found to be incorporated within an Iranian cultural frame of reference (Hoffman 1989:126). Iranian school pupils acquired English to succeed at school, but did not pick up the associated American culture. During an ESL (English as a Second Language) class an Iranian teacher aide wrote on the blackboard, ‘DON’T LET SCHOOL GET IN THE WAY OF YOUR EDUCATION.’ (Hoffman 1989:124). Ironically, English was used here to affirm Iranian values which were being threatened by those promoted by the school as an American institution. Thus the acquisition of English did not lessen identification with their native culture; instead both were integrated to ‘produce a blended cultural perspective that had the potential to transcend the cultural dichotomization so often considered characteristic of cross-cultural adaptation experience’ (Hoffman 1989:125).

The value of bilingual education is now widely recognised by linguists.
For many children from minority-language speaking groups, it seems imperative that their home language can be used as a medium of instruction for at least part of the school day so that their language and culture are seen to have status. In doing this, the learning of the second language will not threaten the pupils' identity because the use of their first language in school will give them pride in their own cultural background, and reinforce their self-concept. (Moorfield 1987:40)

Bilingualism is also said to facilitate the learning of further languages and can lead to the development of positive attitudes towards language learning in general (Feuerverger 1989:343). Contrary to popular belief, in the case of immigrants, bilingual education or speaking L1 at home does not retard the learning of L2 (Hakuta and D’Andrea 1992; Moorfield 1987). In fact, subtractive bilingualism can be the result of disruption in the acquisition of L1 and then insufficient acquisition of L2 (Lievi 1993:120).

In summary, attitudes towards bilingualism have changed in recent times. Earlier, it was seen negatively but this was largely because of historical reasons. Now the positive effects of bilingualism are increasingly being realised. While it is true that there are still accounts of identity problems faced by people learning a second language, it is not language learning itself which causes such problems, as the early studies would indicate. Nor is bilingualism per se responsible for psychopathology or schizophrenia in individuals. When bilingualism is a result of group contact situations, it is a response to changed circumstances where the group has to learn another language in order to get by. Any threat to identity or other problems usually result because of the pressures the immigrant community faces to assimilate into the dominant monolingual host society (Diebold 1968:239). In a case like this, the culture and language of the immigrant community are also likely to be stigmatised because of power dynamics. Such stigmatisation can make an intergroup contact situation - and hence use of the L2 - threatening for immigrants.

2.5 THEORIES OF SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

Several theories of second language learning implicate threat to identity as a factor in language learning. Most work in this area has been done in the field of social psychology using quantitative methods. Grace Feuerverger (1991:660) notes the paucity of qualitative research in the study of second language learning and identity. Social psychological theories focused on identifying the factors and conditions which would hinder or promote second language learning. Earlier studies tended to focus on individual determinants, such as aptitude and attitude, while more recent studies
have taken the socio-contextual environment (Clément 1986:271), specifically power differences, into account too: that is, the difference in power between the first and second language groups.

Until the late 1950s, aptitude was singled out as a chief determinant of second language learning. Then in 1959 Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert found that attitudes to learning a second language\(^\text{12}\) came next in importance, after aptitude, and that attitude and aptitude were independent of each other. This meant that a higher aptitude did not automatically go together with a more positive attitude (Baker 1992:33). They proposed that motivation was determined by the individual’s attitudes toward the other group in particular and toward foreign people in general and by his orientation toward the learning task itself. (Gardner and Lambert 1959:3 cited in Clément and Kruidenier 1983:273)

Gardner and Lambert identified two main types of attitudes or motives, forming the extreme ends of a continuum, for learning a second language (Clément and Kruidenier 1983:273): integrative and instrumental motives.

An integrative motive to learning a second language implies that the learner seeks social and cultural rewards (Harrison 1980:354) and is willing to be like members of the target language community and to be associated with them (Gardner and Lambert 1972:14). An integrative approach connotes attachment to, or identification with a language group and their culture. For example, an integratively motivated learner would learn a second language out of a desire to meet and converse with members of the second language community (Baker 1992:32). Many Pākehā in New Zealand would learn Māori for such purposes. Gardner and Lambert (1972:14) emphasised that such learners, in addition to acquiring a new language, must be willing to adopt behavioural features of the second language community.

An instrumental motive suggests pragmatic and utilitarian reasons for learning a second language. So language learning would be undertaken to obtain economic

\(^{12}\) A second language is one learned in a “second language acquisition (SLA) context, where the target language is mastered either through direct exposure to it or through formal instruction accompanied by frequent interaction with the target-language community in the host environment or in a multicultural setting.” (Dörnyei 1990:48); “[f]irst language retention . . . refers to the maintenance of one’s native language, following the acquisition of a second language, and to the inclusion in an environment where the opportunity (or social acceptance) for using the first language is severely reduced.” (Gardner 1982b:35)
advantages or social recognition or some other form of achievement and is self-oriented. For example the learner would want to get a good job by learning the language (Baker 1992:32). This would include Pākehā who learn Māori for job advancement and for ‘PC’ or ‘political correctness’ purposes.

Gardner (cited in Baker 1992:33) suggested that an integrative orientation led to more success in second language learning than an instrumental one. Children wanting to belong to and identify with peers who spoke the target language have been found to make the best progress in second language learning (Wong Fillmore cited in Verhoeven 1991:206). However, it is not the instrumental or integrative reasons per se for studying a language which are important, rather the orientation is indicative of attitudes towards the target language community and is a vital factor to this extent (Anisfield and Lambert 1972:224-5).

While research on integrativeness and instrumentalism emanated from the bilingual situation in Canada, it has since been applied to immigrant bilingualism (eg Sharma 1983; Verhoeven 1991).

Although the identification of these two motives has been affirmed by research and they are useful concepts for the analysis of linguistic behaviour, they have increasingly come under criticism. The distinction between the two is argued to be conceptual rather than empirical and has a ‘common sense’ appeal to it (Baker 1992:33). Further, the classification of reasons into instrumental and integrative has been problematic. For example, some researchers include travelling abroad as an integrative reason, while others classify it as instrumental. Even though factor analysis can help clarification in this matter, the same item can be interpreted differently depending on the context. Whether travelling abroad represents an instrumental or integrative orientation can depend on the culture and the individual involved (Baker 1992:34). For Jews learning Hebrew, instrumental items could be indicative of a desire for integration into Jewish culture. Learning Hebrew in order to get a job, an ostensibly instrumental reason, would involve getting a job such as a rabbi or Jewish teacher. These entail more participation in Jewish culture than the integrative reason of becoming ‘more a part of the Jewish culture’, the purposes of which can be ‘idealistic and vague’ (Anisfield and Lambert 1972:224). Hence the distinction between the two motives can be blurry rather than clearcut, and in many (even most) cases both motives are at work.

Bonny Peirce (1995), writing from a post-structuralist perspective, also critiques the notions of instrumental and integrative motivations to language learning, arguing that such conceptions do not adequately integrate the language learner and the language learning context. Nor, she continues, do they take into account how power
dynamics affect language learning. For example, in her study of immigrant women in Canada, she found that these women, even though highly motivated to learn English, often resisted attempts to speak English to avoid being identified as immigrants (Peirce 1995:20). Motivation, she contends, implies a fixed personality trait of the language learner who is seen as ‘unitary, fixed and ahistorical’ (Peirce 1995:17).

Surinder Sharma (1983:321) reports a difference among attitudes of parents and children and concludes that:

> ethnic minority parents’ overwhelming support for maintaining the home-languages of the children cannot be differentiated along instrumental and integrative dimensions as found in language attitudes among children. (Sharma 1983:321)

Some researchers question the order: which comes first, attitude or achievement in the second language. Graham Crookes and Richard Schmidt (1991:474) suggest that favourable attitudes towards language learning and the target language community are a result of successful language learning, rather than vice versa.

The two orientations need not be mutually exclusive and can exist in the same person at the same time (Baker 1992:35). In fact, Lambert (cited in Taylor and Simard 1975:248) contends that for ethnic minority groups, both orientations are important. However, this should not be at the expense of loyalty to their native language, since such a feeling is a fundamental psychological need of people.

The status of a group is likely to affect an individual’s orientation. In the case of minority group members, learning the dominant group language can be a means of assimilating into the dominant group. For dominant group members on the other hand, proficiency in the minority group language could permit increased control and domination of the minority group (Clément and Kruidenier 1983:277). For example, immigrants to New Zealand could be expected to differ in their orientation to learning English in contrast to, say, New Zealanders’ attitudes to learning another language.

The instrumental/integrative distinction is reported to be especially applicable to Canada, where the official bilingual policy results in second language learning (Ramage 1990:194).

. . . [B]ecause Canada is a second language learning situation with respect to French and English, factors such as prestige of the target language, availability of target language speakers, and other sociocultural factors are likely to have influenced student motivations for continuing second language study as such factors have been
shown to do when motivations and attitudes are associated with proficiency. (Ramage 1990:193)

Thus, the generality of the two orientations can be limited in terms of specific place, culture, situation, status and age of language learners.

It remains to be seen how much the instrumental/integrative approach will be applicable in the case of immigrants in New Zealand, since immigrants would be expected to be at least instrumentally motivated to learn English. Other context-specific motives would be ignored if this approach were the only one used.

Howard Giles, Richard Bourhis and Donald Taylor’s (1977) concept of ethnolinguistic vitality brings together the ideas of language, identity and status. They argue that ethnolinguistic vitality of a group can affect competence in the language of the group (cited in Clément, Gardner and Smythe 1980:294). The vitality of an ethnolinguistic group makes it likely to behave as a distinctive and collective entity in intergroup situations. This means that the more vitality a group has, the more likely it is to survive as an aggregation in intergroup situations (Giles, Bourhis and Taylor 1977:308). Ethnolinguistic vitality is affected by the structural variables of status, demographic representation and institutional support factors (Giles, Bourhis and Taylor 1977:309). Status refers to the prestige commanded by a linguistic group. Demographic factors include the size of the group and their distribution. Institutional support refers to the extent to which the group is represented in various national, regional or community institutions and whether its language is used in government, business, education and other sectors (Giles, Bourhis and Taylor 1977:309).

Given these factors, it would be expected that in a multilingual setting, the language of the group with the highest ethnolinguistic vitality would be the dominant language. This group would be the dominant one and hence membership in it would be attractive. As a result, non-dominant group members would be expected to downgrade their group membership in favour of the dominant group’s language and culture and could become assimilated into the dominant group, potentially leading to subtractive bilingualism (Clément, Gardner and Smythe 1980:294). Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977:318) propose that in reality, felt or subjective vitality may influence language behaviour as much as actual or objective vitality. On the basis of further research, Jehannes Ytsma, Maria Viladot and Howard Giles (1994:76) identify ideal vitality or the vitality that an ethnic group possesses ideally. In this study, identity and subjective vitality were found to relate to ideal vitality.

Later theories build on these concepts. Gardner (1985) discusses eight social psychological models of second language learning. Given this variety, the choice of a
particular model would depend on ‘pertinence, generality and refutability’ (Clément and Kruidenier 1985:21). Of Gardner’s eight models, Richard Clément and Bastian Kruidenier discuss only those which are most relevant to social psychological aspects of second language learning. These are the ‘intergroup model’ (Giles and Byrne 1982), the ‘social context model’ (Clément 1980) and the ‘socio-education model’ (Gardner 1985). The models are named for the particular constructs they emphasise (Clément and Kruidenier 1985:22).

Gardner’s socio-educational model, as the name suggests, is relevant to language learning in school situations. The intergroup model incorporates aspects of intergroup relations which can influence second language acquisition. It assumes that the groups are in contact, that they use language as an important definition of their identity, and that, to some extent, they compete for economic resources. Clément and Kruidenier (1985:22) argue that because of these presuppositions, the inter-group model too, is limited in its applicability. Instead, Clément’s model is more general since it includes the relative perceived vitality of the groups as well as inter-group contact (Clément and Kruidenier 1985:22).

Clément’s model deals with the socio-motivational factors which influence second language proficiency (Clément and Kruidenier 1985:23) in a multicultural context; specifically it postulates that communicative competence in a second language is influenced by an individual’s motivation (Clément 1986). He identifies two processes which in turn affect motivation. These are: (a) the relative ethnolinguistic vitalities of the first and second language groups, and (b) the frequency of contact with the second language group.

The first process - the primary motivational process - includes two antagonistic aspects: integrativeness which corresponds to the affective orientation towards the second language community and willingness to become similar to its valued members, and fear of assimilation which corresponds to the fear that joining the second language community might result in the loss of the first language and culture. (Clément 1986:272)

Integrativeness and fear of assimilation, the positive and negative poles respectively of the primary process, are determined by the subjective ethnolinguistic vitality of the first language group relative to the second one. Attraction towards a second language group would depend on the individual’s perception of its vitality, and is translated in terms of integrativeness towards members of the group.

In a multicultural setting where intergroup contact is possible, the secondary motivational process develops (Clément and Kruidenier 1985:24). This process
refers to the relationship between the quality and frequency of inter-ethnic contact and the individual’s self-confidence in the capacity to use the second language in an adaptative and efficient manner. (Clément 1986:273)

Self-confidence, which can vary from day to day in any individual, subsumes anxiety or discomfort when using the second language (Clément and Kruidenier 1985:36) and self-ratings of proficiency (Clément and Kruidenier 1985:24). The interplay between the antagonistic forces of integrativeness and fear of assimilation would influence the frequency and pleasantness of contact with the second language group which would develop the individual’s self-confidence with the second language. Thus in a group contact situation, self-confidence is stipulated to be the major determinant of motivation to learn and use the second language (Clément and Kruidenier 1985:24). The self-confidence process does not operate in a unicultural setting (Clément and Kruidenier 1985:35).

In Canada, the self-confidence factor has been found only for Canadian francophones (the subordinate group) learning English, but not for Canadian anglophones (the dominant group) learning French. This has been related to the relative ethnolinguistic vitalities of the two groups (Pak, Dion and Dion 1985:369-70).

In essence, Clément and his associates suggested that self-confidence with the majority language on the part of minority group members may be indicative of assimilation into the language group of the majority. (Pak, Dion and Dion 1985:370)

French and English Canadians are believed to consider language as the most important dimension of their identity, hence, Québec francophones have been found to fear losing their ethnic identity and language as a result of learning English (Taylor and Simard 1975). Ethnic identity may appear to be more important in the Canadian context than elsewhere since the two ethnic groups live side by side. However, even outside Canada, ethnic identity and language can be vital dimensions of self-definition. In the UK, it was found that among migrant parents from ethnic minority groups

[the scores for integrative items for English were low which may reflect some fears among the minority parents over the loss of children’s native culture. (Sharma 1983:321)

Anita Pak, Kenneth Dion and Karen Dion (1985) investigated the relation between self-confidence and assimilation on Chinese students in Toronto. They found that for the students, self-confidence with English was positively related to linguistic but not cultural assimilation. They suggest that this partial agreement with Clément’s model, which argues that self-confidence with the majority group language on the
part of minority group members is associated with greater assimilation into the dominant language group, is because of an important ethnolinguistic difference between Chinese students in Toronto and francophone Québecois, both learning English as a second language. The latter can potentially lose their distinctive ethnic identity by being culturally assimilated into a ‘historically antagonistic outgroup’ (Pak, Dion and Dion 1985:376), whereas the former, being a visible racial minority, would find it harder to be engulfed by another ethnic group (anglophone Canadians) by learning their language (English).

Since language spoken is not a key indicator of ethnic identity for the Chinese in Toronto, one is still considered part of the group without speaking Chinese. Further, there is more to be gained by being proficient in English in terms of education and employment. Given these two factors, the Chinese

may focus more on English than Chinese languages because there are clear rewards and few, if any, costs in terms of one’s ethnic identity.

(Pak, Dion and Dion 1985:376)

Clément’s model can also be seen in the framework of additive and subtractive bilingualism.\footnote{Landry and Allard (1992:518-9) outline the following three criteria to ensure that bilingualism is additive:}

(1) The person demonstrates a high level of proficiency in both communicative and cognitive-academic aspects of L1 and L2.

(2) The individual maintains a strong ethnolinguistic identity and positive beliefs towards his/her own language and culture while also holding positive attitudes towards the second language and culture.

(3) The person has the opportunity to use his/her first language without diglossia, that is without this language being used exclusively for less valued social roles or domains of activity.
and hence membership to it is more attractive in economic terms. If this is accompanied in the individual by confusion about belonging to a particular group, inter-group communication is likely to be hampered, which in turn can have negative consequences on language acquisition.

Subsequent studies have not always been able to confirm Clément’s model. In research on students who had voluntarily enrolled in a bilingual university, status was found to have no influence on integrativeness, fear of assimilation and motivation. Nor was ethnolinguistic vitality related to the constituents of the primary motivational process (Clément 1986:285). It was then proposed that when people voluntarily chose to be in a situation where languages are in contact, the connection between language status and affectivity/motivation are minimal (Clément 1986:286).

While most social psychological studies into second language learning and identity involve language proficiency assessments, I have not done this. Nor have I confined this study within the limits of one or more models which are not universally applicable, although I do use some of the concepts like orientations to language learning and the framework of additive and subtractive bilingualism. The main reason that I expanded on Clément’s model was to illustrate that threat to identity has been identified as a factor in second language learning in a group contact situation. However, I do not use the theory myself as I believe that something as subjective and complex as identity and language cannot be studied in depth using quantitative methods or rigid models which tend to group people together into hard and fast categories, subsuming individual differences. Herbert Pierson (1994:56) notes that methods used in such studies tend to be abstract, ‘allowing the researcher to be inordinately detached from his/her subjects’. Hence such results can be questionable. Instead, personal interviews with respondents are likely to reveal nuances and insights which would otherwise be lost.
2.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter was concerned with ethnicity in the context of language and language learning/bilingualism. Approaches to identity and bilingualism have seen parallel transformations. While a pure identity (stemming from ‘racial’ purity) was initially threatened by hybridity, the tables have turned and now post-structuralist theory has ‘liberate[d] the subject from notions of fixity and purity in origin’ (Papastergiadis 1996:257). Identity has been allowed to cross borders and enter the ‘third space’ where it can be faced with contradictions, fissures and gaps. Rather than being a sum total of its parts, hybridity involves the negotiation of such contradictions. This change in focus has implications for the study of bilingualism which is increasingly being recognised as a positive and normal condition rather than as negative and transitory.

Social psychological and quantitative perspectives on language and identity do not allow identity the space and freedom it is conceived as having in the context of post-colonial societies and globalisation. They tend to confine the complexity of identity by reducing it to a few variables in a model. However, identity is too variable and subjective, not necessarily stemming from a permanent essence and hence is better approached from a qualitative perspective. Such variation also means that it is possible to generalise about identity in relation to particular ethnic groups only to a limited extent.
3 LANGUAGE AND ETHNIC IDENTITY IN NEW ZEALAND AND AUSTRALIA

3.1 INTRODUCTION

After the general introduction to language and ethnicity in the previous chapter, this one will focus on selective research done in New Zealand and Australia which is reasonably similar to mine. In addition to New Zealand, I have chosen to elaborate only on Australia as it is New Zealand’s closest neighbour and both countries have had similar patterns of settlement. Comparative research has also been completed in the two countries. Despite the similarities, there are also significant differences between New Zealand and Australia. New Zealand has witnessed more biculturalism, the focus being on Māori and Pākehā. This is because of New Zealand’s commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi signed between Māori chiefs and the representatives of the British monarchy in 1840. With the Māori renaissance picking up since the 1970s, indigenous issues have been to the forefront and have been more vocally advocated than in Australia. The language debate has been set by the bicultural debate, especially the revival of Māori identity, and with it Māori language. In contrast, in Australia there has been less focus on indigenous languages and issues. Rather, the stand there is more multicultural, focusing on immigrants. This is reflected in Australia’s languages policy.

3.2 NEW ZEALAND

Like Australia, New Zealand has seen a lot of research done in the area of language maintenance and shift, but hardly any has addressed the question of identity in depth. There has also been some focus on language and gender issues. I will not explore this area as my respondents were too few and diverse to allow any generalisations about gender. Unlike Australia, New Zealand does not have an official languages policy. Australia is a world leader in terms of having a languages policy; the policy includes the promotion of English for everyone as well as the languages of immigrants. While the New Zealand government subsidises English language acquisition for immigrants, the current level of subsidy is insufficient.

Many calls for a languages policy have been made in New Zealand. In the early 1990s education ministry analyst Jeffrey Waite formulated a policy. His work reached the stage of a discussion document, Aoteareo, published in 1992 but has since
languished (Matheson 1996a:10-11). In October 1996, a group called Languages Policy 2000 lobbied the government to ‘state their position on a languages policy’ (Matheson 1996b:4). Their language goals are as follows:

- access to English and Maori for all
- provision of appropriate language services to non-English speakers
- opportunity for all to learn a major foreign language
- language maintenance of community languages (Languages Policy 2000 1996)

In addition to these formal moves, several others have called for the development of a languages policy. Figures from the latest Census, conducted in 1996, reveal that nearly one in five Asian immigrants cannot hold a conversation in English (Berry 1998). The President of the New Zealand Federation of Ethnic Councils, Dr Nagalingam Rasalingam, in expressing concern about this high figure, has urged the government to take immediate action to remedy the situation (Berry 1998). While immigration policy has recently been changed to exclude those without an adequate ability in English from entering the country,14 there has been no provision made for those who migrated before this policy. In contrast, Australia’s immigrants are entitled to 510 hours of co-ordinated government-funded English language education under the Adult Migrant Education Program (Berry 1998).

The Ethnic Affairs Service, a branch of the Department of Internal Affairs, has acknowledged that immigrants support language maintenance (Ethnic Affairs Service 1996:5). A rationale for a languages policy for New Zealand put out by Languages Policy 2000 expands on this and other initiatives already taken:

- Aotearoa, a policy document produced in 1992, provides a firm foundation.
- The New Zealand Language Teacher’s Association has guidelines for teaching languages.

14 Immigrants coming in under the General Skills and Business Categories had to meet band level 5 in each of the four modules of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) General Module or Academic Module or else come from an English language background (New Zealand Immigration Service pamphlet Self Assessment Guide for Residence in New Zealand (1997):7-8). Very recently, this has been relaxed to level 4 for Business Category immigrants, who ‘are less likely to depend on the domestic labour market - and therefore English language skills - as they create their own businesses’ (Bradford 1998:A6).
• A Maori language strategic plan project to guide Maori language initiatives over the next fifteen years has been set in train.

• The Ethnic Affairs Service is developing a strategic plan which includes specific statements about community languages.

• The Ministry of Education has emphasised the importance of languages in education through the development of specific language curriculum statements and a range of other initiatives to encourage language learning. (Languages Policy 2000 1996)

Judi Altinkaya (1993:115), the National Co-ordinator of the ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) Home Tutor Service, has advocated the need for this Service to be funded and resourced by the government as part of a languages policy. Hilary Smith (1996) outlines recommendations regarding the linguistic, educational and cultural needs of refugees coming to New Zealand. These recommendations include not just first language maintenance but also the need refugees have to be trained in English. Christopher Hawley (1987), when he was the Education Officer, New Settlers Education Division, Department of Education in the mid 1980s, stressed the importance of including the teaching of Māori in a languages policy. Roger Peddie’s study (1991) of languages policy developments in New Zealand concluded that a policy had failed to develop because of a piecemeal approach where geographically concentrated minorities, Māori as well as immigrants, had demanded their rights (Peddie 1991:39). This resulted partly from the lack of central planning, and a lack of data. At the time of Peddie’s study, the Labour Party was in power, and he thought that a languages policy may result, whether or not New Zealand was ‘ready’ for it, because of Labour’s commitment to partnership and equity (Peddie 1991:40). However, despite repeated calls for a languages policy, none has emerged.

In the following sections, after surveying research on language and identity and language attitudes in relation to immigrants in New Zealand, I will turn my attention to language and identity among New Zealand’s Pākehā and Māori populations.

3.2.1 Immigrants

Some recent studies have shown that children of immigrants can experience subtractive bilingualism. Subtractive bilingualism may be the result of inadequate proficiency in one’s native language (L1) as well as in the second language (L2) (Liev 1993:120), the latter being necessary for survival in the host context. In cases of insufficient L1 acquisition, if parents are not fluent L2 speakers, a communication gap is created between parents and children. Parents are then unable to socialise their children in their preferred and familiar ways. It has been found that children
who are sufficiently fluent in the two languages before they enter school are less likely to have such negative experiences (Liev 1993:120).

In the early 1980s, New Zealand favoured the assimilation of its refugees, following the policy of ‘pepper potting’ with them. ‘Pepper potting’ means that refugees are scattered around the country, instead of being concentrated in one place. As a result many refugees became culturally and linguistically isolated, and finally many moved to Australia to avoid such isolation (Liev 1995:125).

Cambodian refugees have been found to want to retain and pass on their native culture to their children, but simultaneously to acquire appropriate aspects of New Zealand culture; that is, they prefer integration to assimilation (Liev 1995:126). Yet, many refugees from Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam have chosen to assimilate, thinking this necessary for success in the mainstream. Further, they believed their native culture to be inferior, another reason for their neglecting it. According to Man Hau Liev (1995:125-6), their children have become Kiwis in their behaviour, with negative attitudes towards the culture and language of their parents, and most of them have achieved poorly at school or dropped out. Such children ‘have fallen in between both cultures’ (Liev 1995:126) and cannot interact effectively within their parents’ native community, but at the same time they are unlikely to be accepted as New Zealanders even if they think of themselves as Kiwis. Their physical appearance precludes their recognition as New Zealanders, hence ‘they have no real place in society’ (Diep 1993:111).

Refugees have sadly realised the effects of cultural erosion and in the mid-1980s sought public support for L1 classes. While such classes started enthusiastically and successfully, their success was short-lived. Numbers attending classes dropped drastically because teaching methods were outdated, the teachers were untrained bilinguals and volunteer teachers suffered from burn-out, no appropriate bilingual materials were available and funding was virtually non-existent (Liev 1995:129).

Hilary Smith’s (1994, 1996) study of 35 Lao refugee families from Wellington revealed that the Lao valued their native language and culture more highly than that of New Zealand. Language and culture maintenance were desired, leading Smith to identify language as a core value for the Lao. The respondents also had positive attitudes towards English (Smith 1996:209).

Language maintenance and shift has been investigated among various groups of immigrants in New Zealand including the Dutch (Folmer 1992), Sāmoans (Pilkington 1989; Pitt and Macpherson 1974), Koreans (Youn and Starks, forthcoming), Chinese (Roberts 1990), Tongans (‘Aipolo and Holmes 1990), Poles
While the direction of language shift has always been the same, the rate of shift varies. Also the desirability of language maintenance varies from group to group and from person to person within the groups, but an awareness of language shift has been found to correlate with length of stay in New Zealand in terms of generation of immigrants. Thus the third generation is believed to be aware of language shift, and many begin language revival efforts at this stage (Holmes et al 1993:12-11).

Often when immigrants realise that children are not maintaining the native language of their parents, and that some language shift is inevitable, the defining criteria of identity in that group change. Language at this stage is believed to no longer be a defining characteristic of membership in that group, even though ideally this would be preferable. This way children who do not speak the language are not excluded from the group. Mary Roberts (1990:53) notes that the definition of a ‘speaker’ of a language can change to accommodate changes in identity. She found that to be considered a speaker of Chinese in New Zealand, the individual did not need to be fluent in a wide range of topics, but only had to be able to participate in ‘everyday conversations on household topics’. However, since few third generation Chinese New Zealanders would be considered speakers by this criterion, she thought it possible that the ‘standard’ could be revised downward in time.

A change in definition of identity has been found among the Greeks and Chinese in New Zealand (Holmes et al 1993). Maria Verivaki notes that among second generation Greeks, but not first generation, language is not essential for being Greek (Holmes et al 1993:12). From her study of 91 Greeks in Wellington, she found that the desire for language maintenance became stronger with succeeding generations. At the same time, proficiency in the language declined with succeeding generations, hence she argued that Greek became significant at a symbolic level as time went by (Verivaki 1991:109), rather than as a medium of communication. Thus, the Greek language was an important but not defining aspect of Greek identity (Verivaki 1991:115).

Some of Verivaki’s respondents supported attendance at Greek language schools which was held on Saturdays and after school, and advocated the use of Greek at home. However, they were realistic enough not to think of Greek proficiency as essential to being Greek (Holmes et al 1993:12). The respondents thought of Greek as a useful language. While this can be expected of first generation Greeks who used it to stay in touch with ‘home’ where some still hoped to return, Verivaki thought it more surprising for the second generation respondents. The latter found it useful for
similar reasons as the first generation: communicating with relatives and visitors from Greece and for travelling within Greece itself.

The prospect of regular trips back ‘home’ provided a strong motivation to maintain Greek fluency. A trip back to Greece is a high priority for young and old alike, and some young Greek girls take the trip with the express aim of securing a good Greek husband. (Holmes et al 1993:12).

Furthermore, Greek was useful to younger respondents when they did not want to be understood in a public place. Many respondents could recognise the Greek origins of technical vocabulary they used. Attitudes to the Greek language were very positive, partly because of its usefulness (Holmes et al 1993:13). Verivaki (1991:114) also found that second generation respondents did not hesitate to use Greek in public to distinguish themselves from others; in contrast, the first generation did not want to stand out by using Greek in a similar situation.

Like the Greeks, the Chinese in Wellington studied by Mary Roberts did not think it vital for those born in New Zealand to speak Chinese (Holmes et al 1993:13). Yet they valued a knowledge of Chinese. Fifty of the fifty-one respondents wanted their children to speak Chinese and two thirds had sent their children to a language school. Many respondents sensed the need for support of group language maintenance efforts by Chinese being taught in mainstream schools (Holmes et al 1993:13). They did not want language maintenance for the sake of literacy in Chinese, but more for cultural maintenance, so that children would have a knowledge about their cultural heritage and background (Roberts 1990:156-7).

Roberts’ findings are in contrast to previous beliefs about the Chinese in New Zealand, thought to be not unduly concerned about language maintenance (Holmes et al 1993:13). Roberts relates this belief to the low profile which earlier generations of Chinese kept in public as a result of discrimination. For example, the Chinese have been the only group to be debarred from applying for citizenship in New Zealand (between 1908 and 1952). Hence, they appeared to be publicly assimilating by dropping their linguistic and cultural differences (Holmes et al 1993:13). Recently, as New Zealand has become more tolerant of bi- and multi-culturalism (at least in theory) and the Māori language has experienced revival, attitudes of Chinese New Zealanders have changed too, to become more positive towards the maintenance of Chinese language and culture in New Zealand (Roberts 1990:165). This is to the extent that:

... there is an identifiable trend within the community that sees Cantonese language maintenance as a legitimate claim upon the state.
and certainly not something to be conducted entirely out of the sphere of the majority society. (Roberts 1990:169)

In contrast to the Greek and Chinese immigrants were the 100 Tongan adults investigated by ‘Anahina ‘Aipolo (also in Wellington). Most of these were first generation Tongans, born in Tonga (Holmes and ‘Aipolo 1991). Like the Greeks and Chinese (and my Sāmoan respondents), the Tongans had positive attitudes towards the Tongan language, feeling proud of it and believing it to be a beautiful language; in addition, most of them found it useful. Only a small minority wanted to concentrate on English instead of Tongan which would not be useful at work, since that is what they had migrated to New Zealand for.

The relationship between language and identity for Tongans differed from that of the Greeks and Chinese. Tongan was considered to be important for Tongan identity, and it was taken for granted that their children would be able to speak it (Holmes et al 1993:11). Without the experience of language shift, most of these respondents seemed to be unaware of the threat to the survival of Tongan in the long term. Children’s proficiency in Tongan was not considered to be much of an achievement, but that in English was a source of pride. At the same time, it was believed to be natural for New Zealand-born Tongan children to be more proficient in English than in Tongan. A minority of the parents, however, were aware of the possibility of language shift and used Tongan with their children in an attempt to prevent this (‘Aipolo and Holmes 1990:516). In fact, two Tongan kindergartens were set up in the Wellington area and there have been attempts to set up children’s Tongan language classes in the school holidays (‘Aipolo and Holmes 1990:517). The authors conclude on a hopeful note that because of circumstances, Tongan may survive a little longer than European languages other than English have in New Zealand (‘Aipolo and Holmes 1990:518).

While the Poles in Australia have been found to think of language as a core value (see 3.3), this was not borne out in Catherine Neazor’s (1991) study of sixteen Polish first and second generation female immigrants in Wellington. Neazor (1991:53) is unhopeful of the prospects of Polish language maintenance in New Zealand after the first generation has passed away. The author notes that a study by Sarah Surus published in 1985 found that the Poles in New Zealand used English with the second generation to include them in the Polish community. Even the monthly Polish Association newsletter was published partially in English for this reason (Neazor 1991:38).

The community apparently thinks that the use of English rather than Polish may help to keep G2 [the second generation] as active participants in the community. As Surus (1985:33) points out
‘language maintenance is often sacrificed for group maintenance’.
(Neazor 1991:38-39)

Among the Poles, the criteria defining identity have shifted earlier than with some other immigrants. Of Neazor’s respondents, most of the first generation had accepted the reality of language shift even though they did not favour it and so preferred to concentrate on cultural rather than language maintenance for their children. Second generation respondents had similar attitudes to language maintenance and identity (Neazor 1991:48).

The Indo-Fijian community in New Zealand is comprised of recent immigrants, and as such it is too early to be gauging language and identity among them, but it is not impossible to discern trends. Nikhat Shameem’s (1995) study of post-coup (post-1987) Indo-Fijian immigrants in Wellington revealed that respondents (fifty-three teenagers and their mothers) had positive attitudes to Fiji Hindi but these were offset by even more positive attitudes towards English, leading Shameem (1995:280) to conclude that language maintenance may not be guaranteed among this group. In addition, the respondents did not seem to be aware that language maintenance needed their active support (Shameem 1995:293) even though they were in favour of it (Shameem 1995:277). The language maintenance issue was further complicated by the variety of languages which respondents wanted to maintain; the teenagers were split between Fiji Hindi and Shudh Hindi (the standard variety of Hindi spoken in India), while the mothers were split between Shudh Hindi and Urdu (Shameem 1995:278). Language was not identified as a core value for this group. This is likely to be partly because the linguistic repertoire of the respondents was varied, with the Muslims using Urdu and the Hindus using Hindi. Additional languages which respondents knew included Tamil, Punjabi, Gujarati and Fijian. Instead of language it was the shared Indo-Fijian background and respondents’ ability to network within it which were the main markers of identity (Shameem 1995:293).

While respondents had positive attitudes towards Fiji Hindi, they were ambivalent about its status. Fiji Hindi was believed by a majority of the teenage respondents to be a dialect of Shudh Hindi and a ‘broken language towards which Indians in New Zealand held negative attitudes’ (Shameem 1995:278), but in response to a different question, more than three quarters of them believed Fiji Hindi to be a language in its own right. Some mothers and teenagers recognised Fiji Hindi as ‘a newly evolved language with its own character derived from the Fiji environment’ (Shameem 1995:278). Shameem (1995:278) relates the variation in these attitudes to Fiji Hindi, which is not a written language, to the uncertainty surrounding its status and the lack of its categorisation as a language. It may also reflect ambivalent feelings about Indo-Fijian identity after the 1987 coups which were anti-Indian.
The above studies reveal that even though immigrants think of their native language as important, they forgo it as a marker of identity when faced with the reality of language shift in New Zealand’s monolingual environment. This happens despite language maintenance efforts which usually start with the second or third generation. Since most first generation immigrants take language maintenance for granted, they need to be made aware of the imminent threat of language shift so that language maintenance efforts can be undertaken from an earlier stage.

A poignant account of the contradictions involved in immigration is provided by ten immigrant women from Kenya/India, Czechoslovakia, the Tokelau Islands, Chile, Vietnam, Tonga, Laos, Poland, the Philippines and Iran (Jansen 1990). Although these women struggled to cope with life in their new country, they felt that they could benefit from their experiences in the two (or more) cultures they had lived in. Novena Petelo from the Tokelau Islands writes:

I have in my arms both ways. I can see the Tokelau way, it’s good. I can see the papalagi\(^{15}\) way, it’s good. I don’t want to put one down, and lift the other one up, or put the other one down, and lift that one up. I can carry them both. (in Jansen 1990:51)

These women stressed the importance of valuing rather than criticising differences. This would make New Zealand a richer place and children would not feel torn between two opposing sides. Most of the women wanted their children to maintain their native language, but worried that this may not happen. Language maintenance was desired so that children could communicate with relatives overseas and for them to be aware of their parents’ heritage. Livia Escobar from Chile expresses this:

We want them to understand their grandparents and their culture. We think it’s possible from them to speak both good Spanish and good English. (in Jansen 1990:65)

The women wanted to maintain a balance between their native culture and New Zealand culture, and pass this on to their children.

In addition to investigating language maintenance and shift, wider research has been undertaken on the Dutch (Folmer 1992; Schouten 1992; Thomson 1970; van Schie 1987; Wentholt 1954, 1956, 1957) and Sāmoans (Duncan 1995; Fairbairn 1961, 1984; Keating 1978; Kerslake and Kerslake 1987; Kinloch 1976; Macpherson 1984; Pilkinson 1989; Pitt and Macpherson 1974; Sasagi 1996) in New Zealand, but very

\(^{15}\) Papālagi is the plural of Pālagi, which is the Sāmoan equivalent of Pākehā. (Refer Glossary for further items).
little has been done on the Koreans (Youn and Starks, forthcoming), who are recent immigrants. This work will be discussed at relevant points in the immigration history and results chapters.

3.2.2 Pākehā

Pākehā has been singled out as the most controversial ethnic term in New Zealand today (Bayard 1995:152). The debate surrounds its meaning as well as its usage. It is no coincidence that interest in Pākehā ethnicity has become more vocal since the 1980s; it is in response to the Māori renaissance which gained momentum in the 1970s, and is an attempt to assert Pākehā rights and cultural differences (Bell 1996:146-7).

Pākehā is erroneously believed by many to mean ‘long white pig’, ‘white maggot’, ‘white slug’, ‘white thing under a rock’ or other similar things, but as Donn Bayard (1995:155) demonstrates, these phrases do not translate into Māori as ‘Pākehā’. The origin of the term Pākehā is unknown (pakepakeha is a likely candidate), but the word is known to have had connotations of ‘stranger’ during the middle of the nineteenth century. This is understandable, as colonists at the time were strangers. However, Bayard (1995:156) contends that the meaning of the word has changed over time (just as the meaning of the word ‘gay’ has changed recently), and it no longer means ‘foreigner’ or ‘stranger’. These two words translate as ‘tauiwi’ and ‘tauhou’ or ‘tautangata’. Now Pākehā is used by many as the label for the dominant ethnic group in New Zealand. Its widest meaning is ‘non-Māori’ (Bayard 1995:157) but it is rarely used to refer to New Zealanders of non-white origins, for example, Chinese, Indians or Pacific Islanders. Paul Spoonley, the most prolific researcher on Pākehā ethnicity, defines Pākehā as ‘New Zealanders of a European background, whose cultural values and behaviour have been primarily formed from the experience of being a member of the dominant group of New Zealand’ (cited in Bell 1996:147). While Pākehā has a neutral meaning, it can be used in an abusive context just like any other ethnic or national label, such as ‘bloody Pom’, ‘stupid Yank’ and so on (Bayard 1995:155). However, because of misunderstandings surrounding its meaning, many Pākehā prefer to identify as Kiwi, European New Zealander or just New Zealander.

A perusal of the essays in Michael King’s 1991 book Pākehā: the quest for identity in New Zealand reveals that most writers believe that Pākehā are different from Europeans because of their (Pākehā) relationship with Māori. There is hardly any sense of solidarity or groupness among Pākehā, leading David Pearson (cited in Bell...
Avril Bell (1996:148) explains Spoonley’s ideas on Pākehā. Apart from aversion to the use of the word Pākehā stemming from a misunderstanding of its meaning, many Pākehā do not like the term because they are reluctant to be labelled as an ethnic group. In their position as the dominant group, their identity is the national identity too, and in this sense, they think of themselves as outside ethnicity. Related to this, since their culture is the dominant culture, it is believed to be normal and ‘is so common sense as to lie beneath the level of consciousness’ and is not thought of as ‘culture’ (Bell 1996:148). As a result of this, ironically it is Māori culture which is used as representative of New Zealand.

Pakeha culture may be the national culture in terms of providing the pervasive, common sense underpinnings for the ordering of social life, but Maori culture is the national culture when distinctiveness and ethnic exoticism is called for. (Bell 1996:149)

Because of the relationship with Māori implicit in Pākehā identity, Bell (1996:145) asserts that rejection of the label Pākehā is tantamount to rejecting this relationship. On the other hand, acceptance of it is to make the dominant group of New Zealand the Other, rather than the reverse.

The effect of this pairing ['non-Maori, European'] in which Pakeha are the Other is to discursively construct a reversal of the coloniser/colonised relationship between Maori and Pakeha peoples. This reversal of the colonial power relations between Maori and Pakeha suggests something of how Pakeha might work politically as a pro-Maori identity. Pakeha are not only adopting a Maori word but one which constructs themselves as the Other. (Bell 1996:154, emphasis in original)

Further, use of Pākehā is an acknowledgment of the history of colonization and its negative impact on Māori. Thus Pākehā identity implies ‘postcolonial’ political views (Bell 1996:154). While in this sense it is sympathetic towards Māori, the term Pākehā also asserts the right of Pākehā to be in New Zealand (Bell 1996:155).

As noted above, because Pākehā culture is believed to be ‘normal’ there is no certainty regarding what constitutes Pākehā culture, or even if there is Pākehā culture. A survey of some of the literature on Pākehā ethnicity (Bell 1996; essays in King 1991; Pellew 1995; a special edition of Sites on Pākehā ethnicity [1986 issue 13]) reveals that language as a marker of ethnicity rarely features in these writings. Language is so taken for granted that it does not appear to be thought of as characteristic of Pākehā identity except by a few Pākehā. Christine Dann (1991:57) includes the English language in Pākehā culture, while for Spoonley (1991:156) language is an indicator of his identity at a more general level:
The way I speak and what I mean when I use certain terms all mark me out as a New Zealander, and within that context, a Pākehā New Zealander. (Spoonley 1991:157)

King, in an interview with Spoonley (1986), also notes that language at a wide level is part of Pākehā identity:

Language, and by that I don’t mean just English, but I mean a New Zealand idiom and vocabulary, which you are much more conscious of when you are outside New Zealand than when you are in it. (King cited in Spoonley 1986:7)

Joanne Pellew (1995:28) notes that apart from use of language, King has mentioned accent as part of Pākehā identity.

Another Pākehā, Pat Shannon (1986:24), thinks of both, the Māori and English languages, as part of his personal identity. In 1986, Shannon was still struggling to learn Māori, no longer because he thought it would be useful while working with Māori people as he had done in 1966, but this time it was for himself, to ‘regain [his] roots’ even though this excluded Māori culture.

What I am however attempting to do is establish my identity as a citizen of New Zealand/Aotearoa. (Shannon 1986:24)

In a study of 20 Pākehā/European New Zealanders, none of the respondents mentioned language as a characteristic of Pākehā ethnicity, yet Pellew (1995:134) goes on to include language in Pākehā culture:

. . . it is my feeling that Pākehā have a ‘way-of-life’ culture - behaviours, beliefs, language, and custom which differs from any other people. (Pellew 1995:134)

While Pākehā have distinctive language varieties and ways of speaking, unless these are widely and consciously recognised as part of Pākehā culture by Pākehā themselves, language cannot be said to be a salient dimension of ethnic identity for Pākehā.
3.2.3 Māori

Māori are believed to have settled New Zealand sometime between AD 200-500 and AD 1200, with the earliest reliable radiocarbon dates going back to AD 1150 and the weight of archaeological opinion at the later end of this range (Bayard 1995:119). The Māori population in the North Island has always exceeded that of the South Island, the latter receiving much of its Māori population in recent prehistory as a result of migration from the North Island (Armstrong 1987:197). Māori are grouped along tribal lines or ‘iwi’. Iwi are clustered around common descent, and are identified by the founder of the iwi: ‘ngāti’, ‘ngāi’, ‘āti’ (descendants of) followed by the name of the founder. Māori were involved in inter-tribal warfare since the fifteenth century as a means of establishing tribal boundaries (Walker 1989:38). Distinctions arose between North and South Island Māori (Armstrong 1987), and by 1800, Ngāi Tahu became the most powerful and numerous Māori in the South Island (Armstrong 1987:197).

Ranginui Walker (1989:35) notes that before European contact, Māori identity was conceived along tribal lines and did not include physical features like skin colour or hair form. Naturally enough, it was only after this contact that Māori, which means normal or natural, identified themselves as such in relation to Pākehā.

With the establishment of New Zealand as a British colony, the Māori population soon became a numerical and political minority. This was reinforced by their intermarriage with the Pākehā colonisers. The education system bolstered the relative positions of Māori and Pākehā. From 1867, when native schools were set up, the ‘Māori language was used only in the junior classes to induct new entrants into school routines’ (Walker 1989:42), after which English became the medium of instruction. Soon Māori was banned from schools, its usage resulting in corporal punishment (Walker 1989:42).

Such drastic measures saw the decline of the Māori language, and was further exacerbated with the break up of Māori-speaking rural communities and their migration to urban areas after World War II (Bayard 1995:123). In the 1970s, a sociolinguistic survey revealed that 50% of the Māori population was under 15 years of age, but only 15% of this age group spoke Māori. Fluent speakers were 45+ years and constituted the 12% which was dying out (Walker 1989:42). The Māori language, believed to be close to the brink of death at this time, was soon to be rescued from this fate.
As part of the Māori renaissance which began in the mid-1970s, efforts were made to preserve the Māori language. From the early 1980s kōhanga reo (Māori-language preschools) were established, followed by kura kaupapa Māori (Māori-language schools) later in the decade. In 1987, Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori (the Māori Language Commission) was set up to help maintain and encourage the Māori language. In the same year, Māori was made an official language of New Zealand. Universities also started offering courses in Māori (Bayard 1995:124-125). The 1996 Census revealed that Māori is New Zealand’s second most common language, with 153,666 speakers, behind English which has 3,290,451 speakers (Gerritsen 1997:12).

Provisional results of the most recent survey conducted by the Māori Language Commission in 1995 shows that it is still the older speakers of Māori who are most fluent and that there are fewer fluent adult speakers of Māori now than in the mid-1970s (Critic 13 August 1997:14).17 1550 Māori households were interviewed as part of the survey, although only those 16 years and over were included. This is unfortunate, as the under 16-year olds are the ones likely to have benefited from kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori, but these are the very people excluded from the survey. The results show that 59.6% of Māori of age 16 years and older speak some Māori, however, only 26.7% of them ‘are able to carry out daily conversations with any ease’ (Critic 13 August 1997:14) but 92.8% can understand some of the language. While 6.2% of respondents are placed in the high/very high fluency category, it is estimated that 44% of these are 60 years and older (representing 27.3% of the total from this age group) and only 2.9% are aged between 16 and 24.

More women than men in this sample knew Māori, with 55% of Māori speakers being women; however, men appeared to be more fluent: 55% of those in the high/very high fluency category were men. Rural speakers were found to be more fluent than urban speakers (9.3% and 4.7% respectively in the high/very high fluency category). The marae (meeting house) is still the domain where most Māori is used, with 36.5% of Māori speakers using Māori most of the time in a marae. Next is the school at 33.7%, followed by church at 27.0% (Critic 13 August 1997:14). Without a survey of children who have benefited from kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori, it is difficult to say how much change these results represent from the 1970s, although going by the estimate that kōhanga reo produce 3000 young speakers of Māori annually (Critic 13 August 1997:14), it appears that Māori is likely to become stronger in years to come.

17 Critic is the Otago student newspaper.
The Māori language in New Zealand has been assessed as being of low objective ethnolinguistic vitality (Boyce 1992:56). This is offset by positive attitudes towards the language by both Māori and non-Māori, hence in terms of subjective ethnolinguistic vitality it does better (Boyce 1992:56). In a study of 56 Māori residents of Porirua, Mary Boyce found that the respondents had positive attitudes towards the Māori language and praised language maintenance efforts such as kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori (Boyce 1992:163). Past attitude surveys had also found that many Māori people had ‘warm fuzzy’ feelings towards the language but did not want to be involved in language maintenance (Boyce 1992:108-9). Boyce’s (1992:113) respondents were of the opinion that the government had most responsibility for encouraging Māori language use, followed closely by Māori parents and then by educational institutions. A majority of the respondents deemed that Māori should be taught in schools as an optional subject (Boyce 1992:115). The author (Boyce 1992:162) concludes on a hopeful note for the prospects of Māori language maintenance in New Zealand if there is continued support and encouragement for the Māori language such as through kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori.

To the Māori, the Māori language is a ‘taonga’ or treasure, highly prized as something handed down the generations. Boyce (1992:147) also identifies it as a core value for Māori people but then goes on to say that one can claim Māori identity even if one does not speak the language. This would imply that Māori is a core value at a symbolic rather than communicative level in such situations. When speaking English, the Māori pronunciation of words of Māori origin is a symbol of identification with Māori (whether the speaker is Māori or non-Māori) and a marker of solidarity within the Māori community (Boyce 1992:136).

Identifying as Māori can mean varying things for Māori people, depending on which iwi and island they come from, whether they live in rural or urban areas or even their gender or age (Dominy 1990). Disagreements among Māori about what it means to be Māori and the expression of Māori identity have reinforced divisions among Māori, such as rural elders and younger urbanites (Sinclair 1990:225). Despite these differences, Māori share commonalities. Recent studies on Māori ethnicity reveal the importance of ancestry in identifying as Māori (Armstrong 1987; Bellett 1996; Linnekin 1990). With intermarriage to Pākehā, the significance of ‘blood’ as a marker of Māori identity has diminished at least among South Island Māori (Armstrong 1987:202). M. Jocelyn Armstrong (1987:203) notes that Pākehā policy towards Māori changed from assimilation to integration in the twentieth century. Māori, so as to ‘remain’ Māori, engaged themselves in the ‘revival of Maoritanga’ in the period following World War II (Armstrong 1987:204). This covered efforts to revive the Māori language, as well as the promotion of doing things the Māori way.
including speech making, music, arts and crafts. For this, marae were renovated and developed and more hui (gatherings) were organised. The protection of Māori land was also furthered.

The legal definition of Māori included someone who had Māori ancestry, although different amounts of Māori ancestry, blood or descent were needed for varying purposes, such as for the census or voter participation as Māori (Armstrong 1987:206). This definition meant that even those who did not look Māori could be identified as ‘a real Maori’ (Armstrong 1987:207). Yet folk accounts of Māoriness during the late 1960s were more stringent:

Increasingly, in the folk descriptions of Maoris, a Maori should, in addition to having Maori ancestry, display attachment to ancestral lands, use of the Maori language, and a varying list of other distinctive if less crucial behaviours. The latter were collectively referred to as ‘Maori ways’ and included some level of commitment to the marae and hui. (Armstrong 1987:207)

Language was now being primordialised. It was related to Māori ancestry as it was mostly learned by Māori and spoken within their homes or at Māori public occasions like hui. It was also the basis of the Māori revival and essential to doing things the Māori way: exchanging greetings or making speeches at hui or on a marae. Because of this changing definition of Māoriness, Armstrong (1987:207) notes that South Island Māori were seen by North Island Māori to be not only ‘less Maori but ‘not Maori at all’; they had ‘lost the blood, lost the land, and lost the language’.

During the 1970s it was increasingly recognised by Māori that North and South Island Māori were after all Māori and had a common interest: ‘together rather than against could best serve the ethnic revival’ (Armstrong 1987:211). Ancestry and place were still important criteria for identity as Māori, but land, language and other Māori ways were now considered additional (Armstrong 1987:211).

A recent in-depth study of the identity of eight Māori by Donella Bellett (1996) showed that Māori identity in an urban context has become much more fluid than in the past. In urban settings, cultural transmission becomes more difficult, hence knowledge of culture is likely to be less (Bellett 1996:63). Because of this, the criteria for identity have become less strict. Skin colour was used by non-Māori to ascribe Māori identity. Light skinned respondents were believed to be Pākehā, while dark skinned ones were thought to be Māori. Further, the latter were assumed to be ‘real Maori’ and hence to behave in a Māori way (Bellett 1996:43). Language was not considered to be essential for Māori identity, but this was not to deny the importance of language: those respondents who did not speak Māori still thought of themselves as Māori (Bellett 1996:62). A Māori ancestor was the single most defining
characteristic of Māori identity. Māoriness could not be measured and quantified in terms of blood percentages, as Pākehā tend to do. While ancestry was the starting point of Māori identity, culture and shared experiences were also important, as was the desire to be Māori (Bellett 1996:82-3). The draft report of the Māori Language Commission survey of 1995 shows that 82.6% of respondents did not think that knowledge of the Māori language was necessary for Māori identity (draft report of the Māori Language Commission survey, pers comm Ray Harlow 1997).

Jocelyn Linnekin (1990:157) notes that because of intermarriage, Māori definitions of Māoriness have become more inclusive, with the main markers being Māori ancestry and self-definition. This is in contrast to Pākehā definitions of identity, which are more likely to be ascribed on the basis of physical features like hair, skin and eye colour.

Boyce (1992:86-7) demonstrates the difficulty of objective identification as Māori and chooses to use self-identification to overcome this problem. While there are some who identify as only Māori but not Pākehā as well even though one of their parents is part-Pākehā, there are others who have Māori ancestry but do not identify as Māori. Further, some who identify as Māori do not interact with other Māori people nor speak Māori language. In addition to ancestry being a vital criterion for self-identity as Māori, the community has to accept such identification:

Some people may be Maori in ancestry, but not Maori in activity, living to all intents and purposes as if they were Pākehā. Some people may be Maori in all aspects of their life, whereas others may choose to be Maori only for certain activities. The choice of identity made by the individual also has, to some extent, to be sanctioned by the community, for example, a person may identify as Maori, but may not be recognised as such by the Maori community. (Boyce 1992:51)

Boyce (1992:51) contends that in such a case it is not absolute numbers which are indicative of group strength, but subjective identification and interaction as Māori. This points out the difficulty in generalising about ethnicity and its determinants.

3.3 AUSTRALIA

Australia, like New Zealand, has seen much migration since its establishment as a British colony. Three major pre-World War II waves of immigration are recognised - 1825-60, the 1880s and 1910-30. During this time and until the 1970s, anybody who was British, or white after 1901, could settle in Australia (Romaine 1991a:2). As a result, Australia became notorious for its ‘White Australia’ policy which assumed
that immigrants would assimilate into the majority Anglo population. Aborigines of mixed descent were also expected to follow this path, while the rest were predicted to die out (Romaine 1991a:3). Following World War II, the greatest wave of immigration occurred to cater for the country’s economic and industrial expansion. The ‘White Australia’ immigration policy was abandoned as Britain could not supply so many migrants. Yet assimilationist attitudes persisted, especially in the area of language, and immigrants were expected to speak English in public (Romaine 1991a:4).

Such attitudes changed at an official level during the 1970s, when the existence of immigrant communities was recognised and the policy of multiculturalism was introduced. Australia’s national identity was now associated with multiculturalism and multilingualism (Clyne 1991a:220) rather than with cultural homogeneity (Romaine 1991a:5), at least in theory. The 1976 census revealed that there were 75-100 migrant languages used in Australia (Romaine 1991a:5). These languages have slowly been ‘mainstreamed’ with their teaching in schools and their use in ‘mainstream’ churches (Clyne 1991a:220). Perhaps as a result of such measures, monolingual attitudes are reported to be declining while multilingualism is increasingly being promoted (Smolicz 1984:35). As we shall see, this is not necessarily good news for language teaching at tertiary level, as a recent study has shown (Bettoni and Leal 1994).

Australia has seen a plethora of research done on language maintenance and shift, but few relate these phenomena to identity (Clyne 1991a:225). Further, migration studies from an anthropological perspective are lacking (Bottomley 1992:127). In-depth qualitative perspectives can reveal shades and nuances which are likely to be lost in large-scale statistical analyses.

The more finely grained picture available through anthropological work is especially valuable in questioning assumed homogeneities and other forms of reductionism. Anthropologists are also increasingly aware of the problems of representation; not only that of representing the other . . . but of recognising the other in ourselves. (Bottomley 1992:127-8)

Early studies during the 1960s and 1970s focused on the assimilation and absorption of immigrants into the dominant population and this was often represented in terms of progress (eg Johnston 1969:55).18

---

18 In this section, I will refer only to immigrant languages, not to Aboriginal languages.
In a study of second generation Polish children in Western Australia, Ruth Johnston (1969:54-55) found that their supposed assimilation was in fact a myth. In external characteristics like acquisition of English and interaction with Australians, the children appeared well assimilated; that is, their way of life in these areas was ‘typical of the receiving community’ (Johnston 1969:1). However, assimilation did not extend into the subjective realm as many children still identified themselves as Polish. The author believed that methodology may have led to this myth: focusing on external characteristics would make it appear that the second generation was indeed well assimilated (Johnston 1969:54). She found assimilation to be correlated with age and sex. Girls and younger children were less assimilated than boys and older children (Johnston 1969:57). Young age was partly related to increased parental control; while sex was related to occupational considerations:

... boys assimilate better than girls because of future family commitments, occupational reasons, and opportunity which may come their way as a reward for assimilating. (Johnston 1969:55)

Assimilationist models have generally found girls and women to be more resistant to assimilation, including in the area of shift from the native language.

In Johnston’s (1969:58) study, children were found to fit into one of three categories on the assimilation continuum depending on whom they identified with and where they felt they belonged: Polish, Australian or both; none of them were found to identify with neither culture. Assimilated parents were found to be more favourable towards the assimilation of their children (Johnston 1969:29), and food was found to be the ‘last stronghold’ of one’s native culture. Once the immigrants stopped eating Polish food, they were on their way to full assimilation (Johnston 1969:31). This seems rather simplistic as eating certain food(s) would depend on, among other things, its availability as well as ease of preparation in the changed circumstances.

Previous studies had shown that second generation immigrants experienced ‘culture conflict’ or the ‘dilemma of choosing between two cultures within which an individual lives’ (Johnston 1969:63), the two cultures being the native culture of their parents and the host culture of their adopted country. Johnston (1969:64) proposed that the first generation could also experience culture conflict; by not acknowledging this, they were being denied the possibility of assimilation and were erroneously believed to be ‘deeply rooted’ in their native culture. In addition, she argued that not all second generation children experienced such conflict; in fact none from her sample had done so.

They ordered themselves conveniently [on the bi-cultural continuum] along one of the three possible paths of selection and each was contented with his own choice. (Johnston 1969:64)
What they had experienced she identified as ‘culture tension’, something she attributed to most second generation immigrants depending on circumstances. Such tension arose when the host culture demanded the quick assimilation of immigrants, but parents were reluctant for this to happen to their children (Johnston 1969:66-67). While Johnston equated assimilation with progress, she was also critical of it in pointing out that it could lead to tension in immigrants.

Johnston placed her respondents into hard and fast categories depending on their identification, failing to acknowledge that such identification can change from place to place and time to time. Gillian Bottomley (1979:17), taking into account such variation, refutes the assumption that as an immigrant identifies more with the host culture, they identify less with their native one. From her study of second generation Greeks in Australia, she classified her respondents as ‘predominantly Australian’ or ‘predominantly Greek’ (Bottomley 1979:163) based on their experiences. However, these were not bounded and fixed categories as the respondents were able to alternate between identities and roles without experiencing anomie (Bottomley 1979:169). Being able to change language aided such alternation. Identifying as both Greek and Australian was not thought to be contradictory either. The author was positive about such identification, as respondents were able to participate in both cultures.

They [respondents] may indicate a high level of ability to interpret and respond to differential requirements, to operate adequately within a kaleidoscope of roles. (Bottomley 1979:169)

Based on her focus on Greeks in Australia, Bottomley (1992:4) argues that as a result of international migration, international people are created who can identify with their kin, friends and immigrants around the world.

As noted, during the 1970s Australian policy became more in favour of multiculturalism, and Greek as well as other ‘community languages’ were given official status and introduced as academic subjects at schools and universities. As a result, there is some evidence that these languages have attained a much higher profile and Greeks in Australia have been observed to experience an increase in their self-respect (Bottomley 1992:125).

While earlier studies on immigrants focused on assimilation in terms of progress, later ones looked at specific aspects of immigrant assimilation, including language, not necessarily from an assimilationist perspective. The research on language observed language maintenance and shift and tried to answer the ‘whys’ of these phenomena and the conditions under which they occurred. These studies investigated ethnic identity to the extent that language can be part of such identity,
but they did not concentrate on the dynamics of this relationship. Language attitudes also came under the spotlight in some of these studies which focused on immigrant communities like the Greeks (Tamis 1990), the Macedonians and Germans (Kalantzis et al 1989), the Germans (Clyne 1988), the Italians (Bettoni and Gibbons 1988), the Swedes and Russians (Garner 1988), the Russians (Kouzmin 1988), the Dutch and Germans (Pauwels 1986, 1988a) and the Dutch (Ammerlaan 1990a, 1990b; Bennett 1992; Pauwels 1985, 1991).

The Greek language has been identified as a core value for Greeks in Australia even though it has undergone some changes in this new country (as well as in Greece). Numerically, it is the second most widely spoken immigrant language in Australia, after Italian (Tamis 1990:485). Nearly 96% of a sample of Greek immigrants have been found to be of the opinion that Greeks living in Australia should be able to use Greek. About 61% desired language maintenance to preserve the heritage, culture and ethnic identity of Greeks in Australia, while 34% wanted it for practical and linguistic reasons (Tamis 1990:493). Even second generation respondents shared the view that the language was necessary for culture. Yet, some Greeks did not value the Greek language and thought that as immigrants they did not need to pass it on their children, nor speak it themselves. They tended to think of themselves as Australian and were mostly educated bilinguals (Tamis 1990:494). Other core values of Greekness are the Greek Orthodox faith and/or Greek cultural values (Tamis 1990:494).

Although language is an essential element of Greek identity, this identity has shifted in Australia. Most second and subsequent generation Greek Australians consider themselves to have the unique identity of *Aftraliotes Hellenes*, Greeks of the Diaspora. This has bicultural elements like the variety of Greek used by Greek Australians and is not shared by monocultural Greeks (Tamis 1990:494).

Anastasios Tamis (1990:494-5) reports that intergenerational conflict over the use and maintenance of Greek has been moderated ‘and to a certain extent eliminated’ as a result of the teaching of Greek at secondary and tertiary levels in Australia.

The tolerance, encouragement and promotion of linguistic and cultural diversity in Australia were high stimulus factors for young Greek Australians to study [Greek]. (Tamis 1990:494)

---

19 In Australia, Greek is the only language whose maintenance has been found to improve in the second generation (Clyne 1993:55).
The official recognition of Greek has led to an increase in its status and value in the eyes of Greeks, encouraging its maintenance. Nearly 55,000 students are estimated to study Greek in 300 supplementary schools, which in most cases have been established by various Greek Communities (Tamis 1990:497). Because of all this, Tamis is very optimistic about the future of Greek in Australia.

Language attitudes have also been investigated among the Macedonian and German communities in the Wollongong and Shellharbour regions. The Germans had been in Australia longer than the Macedonians, were more geographically dispersed, had a higher rate of intermarriage and were more diverse in socio-economic status (Kalantzis et al 1989:196). Related to some of these factors, Macedonian children exhibited more language maintenance than the German children (Kalantzis et al 1989:197). The Macedonians’ main reasons for language maintenance included preservation of culture (socialisation of children) and the language itself which was threatened even in its homeland. The respondents did not agree about which variety of Macedonian should be taught, nor whether or not there was a standard form. While all the respondents agreed that language learning was valuable for the sake of it, there was no consensus about where and when the language should be taught (Kalantzis et al 1989:160). Teaching Macedonian in mainstream schools would make it a more respectable language, increasing its value in the eyes of children who would then be more keen to learn it because they would not be different (Kalantzis et al 1989:161).

In contrast to the Macedonians, the Germans desired language maintenance for different reasons: to allow intergeneration communication, because German was an important international language and because language learning in general was valued (Kalantzis et al 1989:154). As with Macedonian, there was no consensus about the teaching of German. Some believed that German did not need to be taught at mainstream schools, while those who did, disagreed about whether the teaching should start at primary or secondary level. Some did not want ‘ethnic’ schools to become a substitute for language teaching at mainstream schools (Kalantzis et al 1989:155). The Germans related language to identity less than the Macedonians did (Kalantzis et al 1989:197).

The lower level of English skills of the Germans and Macedonians led the authors to conclude that it was not bilingualism itself which was leading to underachievement at school. Instead, it was the way the mother tongue and second language were being acquired, and the sort of curriculum, instruction and environment the children experienced at school and how this may have been unsuitable to the children’s needs
(Kalantzis et al. 1989:198). To remedy this, the authors suggested policy directions based on varying rationales for language maintenance.

While Kalantzis et al. (1989) focused on Germans in one particular area, Michael Clyne (1988) displays the difficulty of applying the concept of core value to Germans at the broader level of a speech community throughout Australia. Even though these people all speak German or have a German-speaking ancestor, they cannot be described as an ethnic group because of the differences in their region of origin, their religion and migration history (Clyne 1988:72). The German speech community includes Templars, Jewish refugees, Eastern and Central Europeans, Swiss, Austrians and West and East Germans. The connotations of the German language to these people varies according to their background; to many postwar migrants it is symbolic of their German background which they want to distance themselves from, to others of Nazism, or of the war when German was the lingua franca of the underdogs in the forced labour camps (Clyne 1988:74-76). German-speaking Austrians can ‘pretend non-involvement in the events of the Third Reich’ (Clyne 1988:76) because they can now relate to Austria as a separate country from Germany. Austrians and Germans in Australia tend to have separate networks and institutions. German-speaking Swiss also tend to remain independent. This fragmented German speech community then has social clubs and organisations which cater to a particular sub-group only (Clyne 1988:77). However, some cities do have a larger ‘umbrella’ organisation which includes all German-speakers regardless of their background.

Such divisions have also meant that German speakers have not been very effective at lobbying for resources, such as public radio time and community language teaching in schools (Clyne 1988:78). German used to be a commonly taught ‘foreign’ language before the policy of multiculturalism was introduced. With this policy, ‘community’ languages (those of minority groups) received official recognition and became included in the education system. However, German is still regarded as a foreign language, not relevant in Australia, and this argument has been used to justify its exclusion from the curriculum (Clyne 1988:81). Hence there are many factors encouraging or impeding the maintenance of German in Australia, and it cannot simply be generalised that German is a core value for German speakers in Australia.

Camilla Bettoni and John Gibbon’s (1988) study among Italians in Sydney shows that even though demographically language maintenance is favoured among Italians, rapid language shift tends to occur because very few of the Italians speak Standard Italian. They speak dialects and regional or popular varieties towards which speakers hold negative attitudes. In contrast, English commands prestige and
Standard Italian is favourably evaluated too. As a result, rapid language shift to English occurs. The authors comment that:

Linguistically Italians value their past in a highly selective way which does not include the narrow confines of either their original Italian town or their ethnic group in Australia. Rather, from their past, they seem to derive an encouragement to break its limits by accepting English and treasuring Italian. (Bettoni and Gibbons 1988:31)

Mark Garner (1988) contrasts language maintenance and language attitudes among Swedish and Russian immigrants in Melbourne. These two groups comprise small and largely invisible immigrant communities, hence their languages have low profiles. This in turn leads to low institutional support for the languages. This leads Garner (1988:47) to propose that the future of these two languages is dependent on factors intrinsic to the communities themselves.

The Swedes regard English, which is used in Sweden too, very highly but do not think of Swedish as very useful since its use is limited to Swedes. However, many of them feel an affection towards it. Yet, they do not like to be linguistically different from their host community. As a result of these factors, in addition to the small size of the community (Garner 1988:41), it is not surprising that the Swedes are believed to experience rapid language shift to English in the second generation (Garner 1988:42). In contrast to the Swedes, the Russians view their native language favourably. Russian commands symbolic status and is believed to be an ideal medium for expressing ‘deep thoughts and passionate emotions’ (Garner 1988:46). On the other hand, English is regarded as more ‘emotionally neutral’, and does not command much symbolic status but is practical. Language maintenance is of major concern, partly so that communication between the younger and older generations (many of the latter have a limited command of English) is not disrupted. Garner (1988:47, 49) concludes that for Swedish language maintenance in Melbourne, continued migration of Swedish-speaking immigrants is necessary, but that Russian is likely to survive because of the emotional and symbolic value speakers attach towards it.

Ludmila Kouzmin’s (1988) investigation into language maintenance among Russian immigrants of the second- and third- wave (post-World War II and post-1974 respectively) yielded interesting results about the relationship between language use and language attitudes. A large majority of respondents from both waves wanted Russian language maintenance, but their reasons for this differed. 86% of second-wave respondents favoured language maintenance because Russian was linked to their identity, religion and history (Kouzmin 1988:62). 76% of third-wave respondents supported language maintenance for general cultural and educational
reasons. Analysing attitudes in conjunction with language use patterns led Kouzmin (1988:63) to posit that language use was not necessarily indexical of language loyalty. This is because the third-wave respondents’ reasons for language maintenance were primarily instrumental rather than symbolic. To this group, the Russian language was no longer associated with Jewishness (ethnic identity) but with Russianness (cultural identity). These two identities were not equally salient, nor did they have similar relationships with language:

It could be said that outside their cultural homeland (the Soviet Union) ethnicity has acquired more salience than language in the scheme of self-perceived identity, and ethnic continuity is divorced from linguistic continuity. (Kouzmin 1988:63)

Kouzmin (1988:63) implied that because of this separation between language and cultural identity, language maintenance was not a likely possibility among this group. In contrast, language loyalty among second-wave immigrants was increasing because of the symbolic functions of the language (Kouzmin 1988:64).

Tim McNamara (1987a, 1987b) explains language attitudes and language shift among immigrants using Tajfel and Turner’s social identity theory. This theory seeks to explain identity based on identification of oneself and others as members or non-members of a particular social group (McNamara 1987a:34). In a changed intergroup context, an immigrant’s social identity is likely to be redefined. The identity which will be salient to an individual at any given time will depend on the intergroup context. For example, when Israelis in Melbourne interact with Gentiles, their Jewish identity is salient but when they come into contact with Australian Jews, their identity as yordim21 is significant (McNamara 1987b:225). In Australia, the redefinition of identity among Israeli immigrants is accompanied by internalisation of the low status given by the majority to Hebrew and other immigrant languages. This leads to language shift away from Hebrew and identification with Hebrew at a symbolic rather than communicative level. McNamara (1987a) uses the theory to explain gender differences among Greek-Australians, the choice of a particular language variety among Dutch immigrants in Australia, language shift among

20 This included reasons such as ‘it’s always useful to know another language and it’s a tragedy to forget or neglect a language skill; to be truly educated one must be multilingual’ (Kouzmin 1988:63).

21 A Hebrew word with negative connotations referring to Israelis living abroad permanently (McNamara 1987b).
Italians and Russians in Sydney and Melbourne and the formation of Australian creoles.

Every study of Dutch language maintenance and shift in Australia has found that Dutch speakers show the most rapid shift to English (Clyne 1991b:241). This results in a contrast to their linguistic repertoire in the Netherlands.

While the Dutch in the Netherlands are one of the most multilingual peoples in the world, immigrants from that country have by their indifference to their first language, produced the most monolingual second generation of any non-British ethnic group in Australia. (Clyne 1991b:241-2)

The Dutch have not established outlets for the teaching of Dutch in Australia (Clyne 1991b:242); rather they have left it in the hands of the state education system (Pauwels 1985:44). In an early study, Anne Pauwels concluded that the Dutch language was not a core value for Dutch immigrants (cited in Pauwels 1986:108). She also found that speaking a dialect of Dutch (Limburg) or German (Swabian) instead of the standard variety did not affect language use patterns within the family very much:

Summing up, it can be said that the fact that dialect is the first language variety of parents has little impact on the intergenerational language use patterns. Other factors such as status of the language, concern for the language, number, age and generation of the children are considerably more influential than language variety. In intergenerational communication, a choice is made between English or L1, regardless of the variety. (Pauwels 1986:109)

However, the rate of language shift was likely to be affected by choice of dialect or standard variety. The Swabians favoured the use of Standard German with other non-Swabian speaking Germans. In contrast, the Limburgs used English rather than Standard Dutch with non-Limburg Dutch speakers. Pauwels (1988a:96) interprets this language use pattern among the Limburgs as an attempt to distance themselves from their minority group status. In contrast, the Swabians’ behaviour is believed to stem from a desire to integrate into the German speech community: they can identify as Swabians and Germans, but the Limburgs ‘refus[e] to exchange their Limburgs group membership for a broader Dutch group membership’ (Pauwels 1988a:96). Such behaviour indicates that language shift from Standard Dutch is likely to be sooner than from Standard German (Pauwels 1988a:97).

In a later exploratory study of attitudes towards the quality of Dutch spoken in Australia, Pauwels (1991:239) found that first generation Dutch were indifferent towards the fact that the Dutch used by them was not the same as that used by native
Dutch in the Netherlands. However, they disapproved of grammatical deviations produced by the second generation. The author speculates that this was an indication of lesser concern with language maintenance: ‘this may be a linguistic reflection of their lack of concern with the maintenance of Dutch beyond the first generation’ (Pauwels 1991:239). Yet they were as concerned about the correct use of Dutch as other speakers towards their native language. Further, since the second generation are considered ‘learners’ rather than ‘native’ speakers of Dutch, the first generation may choose to use English with them. Another study is less pessimistic about the future of Dutch in Australia (Bennett 1992). This will be discussed in the chapter on Dutch results. Tom Ammerlaan (1990a, 1990b) provides a detailed account of the Dutch language in Australia. His work will be referred to at relevant points in the chapters on Dutch results and immigration history.

The only mention of the Korean language in Australia is made by Bettoni and Leal (1994) in their table of the 48 most frequently used languages at home (other than English). Korean ranks 27th on this list, with 8652 speakers in the 1986 census. Sāmoan does not feature on this list at all, indicating that while Korean speakers were a small minority in the mid 1980s, Sāmoans were even more insignificant in numerical terms. Apart from minor mentions of Korean and Sāmoan pidgins, no space is devoted to the Sāmoan and Korean languages in a recent publication, Language in Australia (Romaine 1991b) which ‘give[s] a comprehensive overview and summary of what is known about the sociolinguistic situation of Australia’s major language varieties’ (Romaine 1991a:1). There is no reference to Sāmoan or Korean in The languages of Australia (Schulz 1993). These two languages appear not to be considered significant in the Australian context compared to their importance in contemporary New Zealand.

While Tamis is optimistic about the survival of Greek in Australia, a recent study is less hopeful about the future of minority languages in Australia. After a review of the teaching of languages other than English at tertiary level, Camilla Bettoni and Barry Leal (1994) caution that Australia is not as multilingual as its image proclaims it to be. Despite this multilingual representation, Australians are reported to hold languages other than English in poor esteem (Bettoni and Leal 1994:19). The authors believe that minority language maintenance should not be left solely to minority communities but efforts need to also come centrally from the top. Universities confer prestige to the subjects they teach, and can supply language teachers for schools. Bettoni and Leal (1994:21) argue that the presence of languages at universities can be one measure of the country’s long term commitment to language maintenance. Although a wide range of languages are taught at tertiary level, very few students in
fact study languages. Unfortunately, in the present climate of economic cutbacks, this can threaten the continuity of language teaching (Bettoni and Leal 1994:35).

The authors divide the minority languages taught in Australian universities into three groups. The strength of these groups has varied from time to time depending on external factors. Traditional European languages (like French and German) have been the longest established and were most popular when ‘official Australia continued to look to Great Britain for cultural leadership’ (Bettoni and Leal 1994:33). These languages were reported to be relatively stable and the least threatened of all minority languages taught. The second group of community languages (including Greek, Russian, Spanish and Thai) became prominent during the late 1970s and early 1980s when Australia was trying to establish an independent identity. These languages are now under serious threat, partly because of financial pressures. The third group of trade-driven Asian languages (like Chinese, Japanese and Korean) became increasingly significant in the late 1980s when economic pressures made Australia expand its markets into Asia. Bettoni and Leal (1994:33) are reasonably optimistic about the prospects of the trade-driven languages since economic recovery has been slow. But overall, the authors conclude that Australia is in danger of becoming multicultural without being multilingual (Bettoni and Leal 1994:19).

A survey of the studies on language maintenance and shift in Australia points to the difficulty of generalising about language and identity among immigrants because of variation in factors such as wave of immigration, variety of language spoken, salience of ethnic or national identity and the disparate nature of the speech community, among others. Immigrants may identify with their native language and have positive attitudes towards it, but this is not always translated into language maintenance (Clyne 1991a:221). Such diversity leads Pauwels (1988b:12) to compare the situation in Australia to that in America and assert that it is impossible to predict the future of immigrant languages in Australia. The same can be said about New Zealand too.

3.4 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it seems inevitable that in a language contact situation where one group’s language has more ethnolinguistic vitality than those of other groups, language shift will result, with more and more speakers increasingly using the language with higher ethnolinguistic vitality. While language shift can be predicted, the rate, extent and specific situation surrounding the shift are hard to generalise. Such shift can have an impact on the ethnic identity of the groups involved. Even
when language is a salient dimension of ethnicity for a group, whether immigrant or indigenous, its importance as a medium of communication can decrease because of the reality of language shift. In such a case, loyalty to it may survive only at a symbolic level. While this may be a cause for regret, such fluid definitions of identity at least permit identification with the group that one wants to identify with. Out of respect for the Treaty of Waitangi, and because of increasing calls from Māori for the recognition of the Māori language, New Zealand has tolerated the growing presence of kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori, and even granted Māori official language status. Such moves have encouraged other minority groups in New Zealand to take steps for the teaching of their respective languages. For Pākehā, the dominant ethnic group of New Zealand, language does not appear to be salient for identity; it is taken for granted and hence hardly noticed as a part of Pākehā culture.

The change in ideology towards immigrants from assimilation to multiculturalism is reflected in research. Earlier studies tended to assess immigrants in terms of how quickly they progressed towards being absorbed among the host population, which itself was often conceptualised as an essentialised and homogeneous stereotype. More recent research advocates difference, such as through minority language maintenance. While research on language maintenance and shift has investigated identity to the extent that language is tied to identity, it has not focused on the dynamics of the relationship between language and identity in any depth at an individual or group level, nor with the passage of time in relation to migration goals.

Australia and New Zealand have witnessed similar patterns of immigration, but official policy towards immigrants has differed in the two countries. Australia has adopted a policy of multiculturalism and this is reflected in its languages policy which encourages the teaching of minority languages. This in itself will not necessarily guarantee language maintenance if Bettoni and Leal’s (1994) assessment is anything to go by. Yet if the official recognition of minority languages helps to engender positive attitudes towards these languages, even if initially only among minority group members and not the wider Australian community, it is a clear step away from assimilation. Positive attitudes, in turn, can help bolster language maintenance. The adoption of a comprehensive languages policy is better than none, and this is an area where New Zealand should look towards its trans-Tasman neighbour.

Research on language maintenance in New Zealand displays a regional bias, with most of it emanating from the North Island. While not downplaying the significance and bearing of this research, it is not necessarily easy to extrapolate these results to the South Island where group dynamics may be different because of factors like
smaller populations and often related to this, fewer or no immigrant residential suburbs, less institutional support such as presence in the media, language nests, tertiary support and so on. Research from a qualitative perspective which focuses on identity has also been lacking in New Zealand, as is comparative work on different waves of immigrants. The present study is the first in-depth and comparative one on language and identity among recent immigrants in the South Island.
4 KOREAN, DUTCH AND SĀMOAN MIGRATION TO NEW ZEALAND

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter will outline Korean, Dutch and Sāmoan migration to New Zealand. The latter two have been immigrating to New Zealand much longer than the Koreans, hence there is much more literature available about them. Because of this, less space is devoted in this chapter to the Koreans, but they are no less important than the Dutch and Sāmoans to this study.

4.2 KOREAN MIGRATION TO NEW ZEALAND

Korean22 migration to New Zealand has picked up immensely only in the last ten years or so, with the New Zealand government advertising the country to the Koreans as an attractive migration destination, with its ‘clean green’ underpopulated image. Since 1990, over 12,000 South Koreans have immigrated to New Zealand (refer Appendix A). In fact, in 1995 Koreans were the third most numerous group to migrate here. Most of the immigrants have settled on Auckland’s North Shore (Youn and Starks, forthcoming).

Janice Snowden, the Coordinator of English for Special Purposes at the Otago Language Centre, spent nine years in Seoul where she was head of the English as a Foreign Language section at the Seoul International School. She explained some reasons the Koreans choose to immigrate to New Zealand. These included being able to practice English here, the availability of extra-curricular sports (and its accessibility in terms of cost) and the perception that New Zealand, especially the South Island, is safe. Korea’s high population density limits the amount of space available for sporting activities. Many young Koreans also come to New Zealand to pursue postgraduate study; however, most of them still go to the United States which is marketed aggressively in Korea and is where their fathers have studied.

There were approximately 70 Korean families in Dunedin in January 1997 (Harris 1997). This has jumped considerably from 1984, when there were only 2 Korean

22 By Korea(n) I refer only to South Korea(n), not North Korea(n).
families here. Most Korean migrant families have come to Dunedin within the last 2-4 years, some directly from Korea, others after having spent some time first in Auckland. As I will explain in Chapter 6, this internal migration is driven by a desire to improve their English. Because of the sizeable number of Koreans in Auckland they tend to interact with one another and do not have as many opportunities to speak English. To get away from this, some of them choose to move to Dunedin.

The further influx of immigrants from Korea and other North Asian countries, including Taiwan and Hong Kong, has slackened as a result of the new immigration regulations which became effective in October 1995 (Youn and Starks, forthcoming). As noted in Chapter 3, since then, immigrants coming in under the General and Business Categories are required to qualify for a minimum standard of English or pay a fee, which may be refundable in some circumstances (Department of Internal Affairs 1996:8) (refer Appendix B for full details).

4.3 DUTCH MIGRATION TO NEW ZEALAND

After the sighting of New Zealand by the first European, Dutchman Abel Tasman in 1642 (Schouten 1992:9), the Dutch did not come to New Zealand in substantial numbers for another 300 years, from the middle of the twentieth century onward. Between 1947 and the late 1980s, 38,314 Dutch immigrated to New Zealand (Schouten 1992:257) (refer Appendix A for immigration statistics). In this section, I will look at the history of Dutch migration to New Zealand. Following this, I will investigate how the environment in which this migration was undertaken has influenced the attitudes of Dutch migrants to features of their culture, particularly language.

4.3.1 The first wave of Dutch migration

Tom Ammerlaan (1990a:12) identifies two waves of Dutch emigration, with the cut off point between the two being World War II. During the first wave, North America was a popular immigration destination (Ammerlaan 1990a:12), but there were few Dutch immigrants there compared with those from other European countries.

The aim of those immigrants was to re-create a part of the Netherlands abroad, without religious repression and with economic prosperity. (Ammerlaan 1990a:12)
Dutch migrants of the first wave tended to come from poor, rural, less educated backgrounds. Also, they migrated in large groups and parishes (Ammerlaan 1990a:12).

About 200,000 Dutch emigrated out of Holland in the second half of the nineteenth century (Schouten 1992:32), but hardly any of these migrated to New Zealand. New Zealand’s first census in 1874 recorded 127 Dutch-born people (15 women and 112 men) out of 300,000 settlers. There was no specific Dutch community at the time, with most of the immigrants scattered. In 1878, Otago’s Dutch population of 40 was the most numerous of any province although only two of these were women. Women and men were found in similar proportions to this in other regions of New Zealand too, and this pattern continued largely unchanged for the next 70 years (Schouten 1992:31).

Emigration during this wave was not encouraged by the Dutch authorities with assisted passages, nor did most of the migrants to New Zealand come as part of an organised settlement scheme, or as a result of chain migration. Many Dutch immigrants of this time had had some sort of association with Britain, either as immigrants there, or as children of immigrants. There were no crises in Holland to push emigration. Rather, Hank Schouten (1992:32) suggests that the emigrants were in ‘search of new frontiers’.

4.3.2 The second wave of Dutch migration

The second wave of Dutch emigration was triggered by World War II.

The war hastened the end of crumbling colonial empires and forged new alliances; it also forced people to rethink their future and the future of their countries. (Schouten 1992:47)

The Netherlands’ economy had been destroyed by the war, it had high unemployment, a high population density, the highest birth rate in Europe (Schouten 1992:47) and housing shortages. In addition, the threat of a third World War with Russia loomed high (Ammerlaan 1990a:12). After the Netherlands granted independence to Indonesia in 1949, the repatriation of thousands of Dutch troops and Dutch nationals from Indonesia increased the population pressure (Schouten 1992:47). Emigration seemed to be the answer to such problems and so the Dutch government began to encourage it (Schouten 1992:48).

At the time, New Zealand had a booming economy but faced a labour shortage and was underpopulated. Immigration was used to meet this shortfall. However,
immigrants were acceptable only to the extent that they were perceived to be assimilable into New Zealand society (Mitchell 1996:103) and there was a great suspicion of anyone except white Europeans. Since there were not enough British immigrants to fill in the gaps here, ‘a carefully regulated flow of foreigners of assimilable types, preferably from countries whose inhabitants are of the same stock as ourselves’ [British] (contemporary newspaper article cited in Schouten 1992:48) were sought. The Dutch were deemed to fit this description.

Dutch migrants of the second wave contrasted with those of the first. The former tended to be younger than 45 years of age, unemployed yet educated and skilled, from an urban background and usually single (Ammerlaan 1990a:12). The profile of second wave migrants matched New Zealand’s selection criteria. Migrants who were likely to be a burden on the government were not welcome. Five young Dutch carpenters who arrived in New Zealand in 1939, at no cost to New Zealand, were described as follows in a newspaper article:

They are a fine type, of athletic build and well educated, and are eager to reside in New Zealand. Two are engaged to be married, and are sending later for their fiancees. Two of them have studied English by correspondence.  (Evening Post 26 June 1939 cited in Schouten 1992:49)

In 1948, 96 Dutch immigrants arrived. Many went to work on dairy farms, and created a favourable impression. As a result, more of them were sought to remedy the labour shortage New Zealand was facing. Specifically, New Zealand was targeting building tradesmen, engineering tradesmen, bush and sawmill workers, farm workers, dairy factory workers, trained nurses and domestic workers (Schouten 1992:54-56).

The criteria were that assisted immigrants should be single men or women between the ages of 18 and 35. However, entry permits would be granted for families willing to pay their own way, provided they had guaranteed jobs and accommodation and the parents were under the age of 45. (Schouten 1992:56)

In 1950, an immigration scheme was set up by the Dutch and New Zealand governments (Schouten 1992:56), and this precipitated mass migration. In 1950 itself, 503 Dutch migrated and a peak of 4,575 migrated in 1952 (Schouten 1992:57). By 1956, there were 12,544 Dutch-born people living in New Zealand. 10 years later this figure had climbed to 20,471. However, the big wave of migration ebbed soon after this. Whereas the average annual number of migrants coming in the 1950s was 1834, it was only 596 from 1962 to 1980 (Schouten 1992:256).
The early 1980s saw a slight increase, but again fell to an average of 511 during 1983 and 1989 (Schouten 1992:257). The 1990s too have been seeing a steady decline, from 599 immigrants in 1990 to 229 entries in 1996 (Antony Moss, pers comm).

4.3.3 Recent migrants - a third wave of Dutch migration?

As can be seen from the above figures, comparatively few Dutch have been migrating to New Zealand since the middle of the 1980s. The Dutch-New Zealand annual migration quota of 1000 set up in 1950 was scrapped as of 1993 (Department of Statistics 1993). Yet, as one of my respondents told me, New Zealand is still thought of by the Dutch more as an immigrant rather than a holiday destination. Today’s migrants come to New Zealand from changed backgrounds and under different circumstances, hence I think they can be identified as a ‘third wave’ of Dutch migrants, although this wave is more the size of a trickle.

There is no longer a threat of war in Europe and Holland’s economy has picked up. Hence reasons for migration now are not so much economic as environmental - New Zealand has a ‘clean green’ image, is underpopulated and allows people to pursue outdoor activities. Another major reason for coming is to improve prospects for one’s children (Schouten 1992:251), just like migrants of the second wave.

Migration consultants no longer simply encourage people to emigrate; instead they help them reach informed decisions regarding emigration. Recent emigrants tend to be skilled, well educated and able to speak English. Also, emigration is expensive (over $20,000 for a young couple, including airfares, freight charges and establishing themselves in New Zealand) and can involve a drop in professional status. Often, emigrants may never reach as high a level professionally as they would have in Holland (Schouten 1992:249).

People with valuable work experience and qualifications can be disappointed to find these count for little in their new land. For others a switch in occupation can carry significant risks. (Schouten 1992:249-50)

All my Dutch respondents belong to this third wave of migration. Even though some of them came in the late 1970s, their profile matches those of the third wave best.

4.3.4 Migration ideology
During the middle of the twentieth century, when the Dutch started migrating to New Zealand in substantial numbers, New Zealand’s immigration policy was influenced by prevalent ideas of racial superiority (Schouten 1992:67) and assimilability of different groups (Mitchell 1996). The Netherlands was looked to as a source of potential immigrants only to make up the shortfall in Britons and Scandinavian Nordics, the second choice for immigrants (Bayard 1995:127), arriving here. Dutch migrants were acceptable because they were thought to be of the ‘right’ ‘race’23 and type (Schouten 1992:68) and hence as the ‘chosen aliens’ (Schouten 1992:67), were believed to be easily assimilable into New Zealand as ‘new Britishers’ (Schouten 1992:71). Total assimilation was expected of the immigrants.

Any reluctance to forget their own languages and cultures was taken implicitly as a sign of allegiance to another country, but it was assumed that within a generation or so they would be totally assimilated, that they would be virtually indistinguishable from other white New Zealanders. (Schouten 1992:71)

As a result, immigrants were under great pressure to reject their native language and culture and to take on citizenship (Schouten 1992:71). An adequate knowledge of the English language, especially, was thought to be crucial towards this end, as the title of a textbook of the time reveals - *Alien to Citizen*. 100 English language classes were set up, which not only taught English but also passed on the assimilation message (Schouten 1992:72). It was reiterated in the following, an extract from a New Zealand government grammar book for immigrants published in the 1950s.

**To**

*New Settler Students,*

*In many places in New Zealand*

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am happy to know that, in many places in the Dominion, you come to classes and work to learn the English language.

I hope that this book has helped you and that you will continue your studies and find Book Number Two even more interesting.

You may be sure that the Education Department of New Zealand will do everything it can to help you, but you must do your part also.

Remember that you cannot become a good New Zealander until you can speak good English.

Yours sincerely,

*Minister of Education* (reproduced in *Wordlink* 1997:11)

---

23 The term ‘race’ is highly contentious at present and is generally avoided in academic literature, however, it is used here to emphasise that at the time under discussion, this was not the case.
Because the Dutch were government-assisted immigrants, the government could determine where they were to settle. They did this in such a way as to encourage assimilation. Dutch immigrants were dispersed around the country to avoid them forming their own community and to force them to mix and work with New Zealanders (Schouten 1992:117, 72). Local organisations including the YMCA, Federated Farmers and Rotary were urged to accept immigrants (Schouten 1992:72).

The Dutch, for their part, did their best to assimilate and be the ‘perfect’ migrants (Schouten 1992:169). Schouten (1992:169) attributes this to the Dutch character of being ‘industrious, thorough, enthusiastic and conformist’. They rejected their language and culture to the extent that the second generation Dutch in New Zealand are now almost invisible, a cause for regret among some (Schouten 1992:169; Veltkamp 1998:29). Several of the first generation consciously shunned anything organised by the Dutch. They felt resentment against a country which had pushed them out, offering so little (Schouten 1992:171). There are reports that some Dutch did not think their culture was ‘worth exporting’ and that they often did not have much interest in their background (Schouten 1992:170). The similarities between Dutch culture and the evolving Pākehā culture in New Zealand, derived from various European backgrounds (among others), facilitated the assimilation of the Dutch. All these factors contributed to their dissolving in with the rest of New Zealand’s population, often becoming ‘more Kiwi than the Kiwis’, for example by changing their names (Schouten 1992:121).

An additional factor leading to assimilation of the Dutch was the attitude of the Dutch government itself, which advocated that emigrants should completely cut themselves off from the Netherlands and the Dutch language to aid assimilation and hence successful migration. The Dutch media played its part by regularly publishing the stories of successful emigrants, while avoiding anything to the contrary (Ammerlaan 1990a:12).

Hence it is of no surprise that the assimilation of Dutch immigrants was believed to be satisfactory and is well documented in the literature. As early as 1954 the Internal Affairs Department reported the following with regard to the Dutch:

“...The Dutch seem to have a positive and conscious drive to assimilate. Many even refuse decisively to read the Dutch newspaper, or join a Dutch club lest it should affect their assimilation. They seem to have the same fierce energy to succeed in this as to succeed in their material affairs.” (cited in Schouten 1992:72)

---

24 This differed from other groups who came on their own initiative, such as Pacific Islanders.
I think this assimilationist attitude still influenced the behaviour of some migrants from the third wave, as I found among my respondents (see Chapter 7).

In a study of adjustment among Dutch immigrants to New Zealand society in the mid-1950s, Rob Wentholt (1954, 1956:21, 1957) found that the Dutch wanted to be absorbed among New Zealanders instead of being part of a minority out-group. However, they did not identify fully with the New Zealand way of life, which would have involved ‘revision of [their] values, norms, attitudes, and role behaviour’ (Wentholt 1956:21). Hence, their identification did not keep up with their efforts at adjustment. According to Wentholt the difference between these two is that the former is unconscious, while the latter is conscious and involves free choice. He argued that this could lead to personality problems in immigrants and advised Dutch emigrants against choosing New Zealand as an immigrant destination (Wentholt 1957:94).

Dutch migrants in New Zealand and Australia as well as other countries such as Canada have undergone language shift much faster than any other immigrant group. This is well documented in the literature (New Zealand: Folmer 1992:15; Roberts 1990:72; Kroef in Schouten 1992:137; Australia: Ammerlaan 1990a:13; Bennett 1992:56;25 Clyne 1982:27-28; Clyne 1991b; Smolicz 1981:87; Smolicz and Lean 1979:241; Waas 1993:226-7). Almost complete language shift among Dutch immigrants in Canada has been found to occur within one generation (Gorter 1994:107), whereas other groups take three to four generations to reach the same level (Holmes et al 1993:1). In Europe itself, according to one report, the Dutch language has been predicted to decline quickly if Europe becomes more ‘open’ (de Bot 1994:195). In New Zealand, as in Australia (see Chapter 3), the Dutch have not done very much in the form of organised institutional support for language maintenance (Holmes et al 1993:15; van Schie 1987:157).26 Since using another

25 On the basis of a survey of attitudes among the second generation Dutch in Australia, Bennett is optimistic that Dutch will not decline to the extent of a complete shift to English. She suggests that Dutch is likely to survive on a symbolic level since the second generation are already competent in English and are aware of their use of Dutch (Bennett 1992:59).

26 The one exception to this involved the education of children of Dutch nationals who were working at the Marsden Point Refinery. Hora Hora School in Whangarei set up two Dutch school classes which attracted 40 children at its peak. Since the teachers were trained in the Netherlands, and the Dutch curriculum was taught, these students were believed to face minimal interference in their schooling (van Schie 1987:157).
language instead of Dutch does not equate to denying Dutch identity, language is believed to be less of a core value for the Dutch than it is for other groups such as the Poles or Italians (Ammerlaan 1990b:16), and hence is more likely to succumb to language shift.

Alberdina Kroef, a Dutch woman who migrated to New Zealand during the 1950s and researched Dutch immigrants in the 1970s, related language shift among the Dutch to their habit of ‘see[ing] things in black and white’ (cited in Schouten 1992:138). Out of efficiency, they took literally the message to forget that they were Dutch by adopting English as soon as they embarked on their journey to New Zealand. However, it is unlikely that the process was straightforward, nor that Dutch was completely forgotten.

Ammerlaan (1990a, 1990b) has written in detail of the causes of rapid language shift among Dutch migrants in Australia. Since language shift per se is not the major focus of this thesis, I will not repeat all the reasons here and the reader is referred to these articles for a full account. He cautions that his examination is applicable only to the Dutch in Australia (Ammerlaan 1990a:13). I consider that most of it is also relevant to the situation in New Zealand because both countries recruited Dutch around the same time for similar reasons, and the push factor from Holland was constant. This is evident from the accounts offered by Schouten (1992) about the Dutch in New Zealand and Ammerlaan (1990a, 1990b) about the Dutch in Australia.

Durk Gorter (1994) provides a historical perspective for this rapid language shift among Dutch emigrants. He argues that in Holland itself, Dutch speakers do not greatly value their language, nor do they think of it as the main bearer of their culture (refer Footnote 4, Chapter 7). Even when the Dutch were a seafaring and trading nation, they spoke the language of the colonised in their colonies (Gorter 1994:107). This attitude is reiterated by Schouten who reports that Professor Wil Albeda, a former Dutch minister of social affairs and a prominent speaker on migration, says that ‘the Dutch have never had the feeling that their culture is worth exporting’ (Schouten 1992:170). Gorter (1994:108) proposes that part of the Dutch identity is not to value the Dutch language. In opposition to the Dutch are the Flemish in Flanders (Belgium) who speak a variety of Dutch and are part of the Dutch language community (Gorter 1994:107). The Flemish point a finger at the Dutch, accusing them of being indifferent when it comes to issues of language. Kees de Bot believes it possible that it will be the Flemish who preserve the Dutch language (de Bot 1994:195).
4.4 SĀMOAN MIGRATION TO NEW ZEALAND

Today, Sāmoans in New Zealand (New Zealand-born as well as Sāmoan-born) constitute 53% of New Zealand’s Pacific Islands population, making them the most populous of any Pacific Islands group in New Zealand. In 1991, there were half as many Sāmoans living in New Zealand as there were in Western Sāmoa (Sasagi 1996:12). In this section I will outline Sāmoan immigration to New Zealand followed by an investigation of the maintenance of key Sāmoan institutions in New Zealand.

4.4.1 Sāmoan migration to New Zealand

New Zealand took over the administration of Western Sāmoa (known as Sāmoa since 1997) in 1914 from Germany, the latter having been given its control in 1900. Following World War I, Sāmoa became a League of Nations mandate (1920-1946), and then a United Nations trust territory but continued to be administered by New Zealand during this time, until political independence was finally achieved in 1962 (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:3). Immigration from Sāmoa to New Zealand increased significantly only after World War II and then more recently since the 1960s (Sasagi 1996:13). (Refer Appendix A for detailed immigration statistics). New Zealand is one of several commonly chosen places to migrate to by Sāmoans; the continental United States, Hawaii (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:8) and Australia are others (Duncan 1995:19).

During the interwar years, most Sāmoan migrants to New Zealand came from the port town of Apia. David Pitt and Cluny Macpherson (1974:9) posit that migrants who came at this time did so because they identified themselves and were identified by others as Europeans. Most of them were the offspring of marriages between German, British and American traders and missionaries (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:9-10). Immigrants who came in the 1940s were mostly ‘young, single transient workers’ (Duncan 1995:20).

Mass migration of Sāmoans to New Zealand occurred after World War II, once again mostly from Apia (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:10). However, from the late 1960s, more and more migrants came from Savai‘i, a more rural island. This was partly a result of Savai‘i opening up, but was also characteristic of chain migration.

---

27 By Sāmoa(n) I refer only to Western Sāmoa(n), not American Sāmoa(n).
Once a link had been established through someone in Apia, their relatives in more rural areas could be the next migrants (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:11).

In 1962, a special quota arrangement was set up which allowed 1,100 Sāmoans to migrate to New Zealand annually (in addition to those immigrants who came in under the category of family reunification). Such applicants were ‘required to meet normal requirements in relation to age, family size, health, character, and accommodation, and to be in possession of a guarantee of employment’ (Department of Statistics 1985:121). This quota is still honoured today (cf. the Netherlands quota which was scrapped in 1993 [Department of Statistics 1993]).

Migration from Sāmoa during the 1960s and 1970s helped to fill the demand for labour in New Zealand’s rapidly growing secondary and tertiary sectors (Kerslake and Kerslake 1987:144). More and more women started to migrate from the 1960s, and by the middle of the decade, women migrated in equal proportion to men since migrant Sāmoan women ‘were identified by employers as comprising a potential workforce that was flexible, undemanding and prepared to work hard’ (Larner 1991:55). But since the 1970s, migration from Sāmoa has fluctuated widely. During 1976-77 and 1979-80, there was actually a net loss of 412 in the total Sāmoan population in New Zealand (Department of Statistics 1976-77 - 1979-80). Since the 1980s, there has been a net gain in the Sāmoan population, except during 1993 (refer Appendix A). With so many Sāmoan migrants in New Zealand, the base of Sāmoan population growth here has become natural increase by birth rather than by migration.

The fluctuation in migrant numbers partly reflects New Zealand’s shifting reception to Pacific Island migration, which has itself been influenced by economic recession and accompanying unemployment.

The recession [in the 1970s] also encouraged Pakeha New Zealanders to look more closely at Pacific Islanders and something of a moral panic occurred whereby Pacific Islanders were held responsible for a series of ‘problems’ from unemployment to a decline in law and order. (Spoonley 1990b:158)

During the 1970s, the state targeted overstayers who had stayed on illegally in New Zealand. The racist nature of these practices led the term ‘overstayers’ to become publicly synonymous with Pacific Island migrants. Overstayers were prosecuted and deported and there was a net outflow of Pacific Island migrants in the late 1970s (Spoonley 1990b:158). Measures were also taken to limit the numbers of Pacific Island migrants to New Zealand during the 1970s and 1980s. For example, numbers
of migrants coming in under the South Pacific Work Schemes seldom exceeded 350 in any year (Spoonley 1990b:159).

Economic factors were believed to be the main reasons that Sāmoan migrants came in the post-war period, especially in the early post-war period. At this time, most migrants were single men brought in for specific employment (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:12). This gender imbalance changed in the 1960s with the demand for unskilled female labour, for example, in the textile manufacturing and food processing industries (Larner 1991:55). Pitt and Macpherson (1974:11) argue that their study of Sāmoans in the 1970s revealed that the economic motive was not as strong at that time as was previously believed. During this period most Sāmoans in New Zealand lived in family units rather than singly.

Important reasons for migration during the 1970s were more varied: one was education. Educational facilities in Sāmoa were believed to be of a low standard. Education was considered necessary for personal development, for access to a well-paid job, and was believed to be a moral duty (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:12, 13).

The ‘āiga or extended family was another reason for migration. Continuing migration to New Zealand reflected the re-establishment of kin connections. Single men who migrated in the early 1950s were joined by the rest of their family. Migration to New Zealand allowed the migrants to support their ‘āiga in Sāmoa, to which many hoped to return (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:13, 14). Such movement of people helped to maintain links between ‘āiga in New Zealand and in Sāmoa (Sasagi 1996:18). When migrants sent money to their ‘āiga in Sāmoa, they indirectly contributed to sustaining faʻasāmoa or the Sāmoan way there (Sasagi 1996:14).

Yet another reason for migration was prestige which a person acquired by moving to Apia from a rural area, or especially by migrating overseas to New Zealand. In Sāmoa, New Zealand had the connotation of a ‘sophisticated urban society’ (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:14). Prestige also accrued from making money (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:14).

In addition to these specific reasons, some migrants came simply because they ‘got caught up in the movement, reflecting the fashion or habit of migration without thinking about it’ (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:14).

4.4.2 Sāmoans in New Zealand
In contrast to the relatively quick assimilation of Dutch immigrants, Sāmoans in New Zealand have been found to retain the Sāmoan social structure which is part of fa‘asāmoa, and it is believed that this helps them in their adjustment to life in a new country (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:vii).

From a Samoan perspective, fa‘asamo is a ‘total phenomenon’. It is a world view of Samoan life, and takes a holistic approach to all aspects of life. (Sasagi 1996:6)

Before contact with Christianity, fa‘asāmoa was maintained in Sāmoa through three components: the ‘āiga or extended family, the nu‘u or village and the itūmālō or district.

The ‘āiga is hierarchically structured (Duncan 1995:3) and hence defines social relationships and associated behaviour. It is characterised by wider and more intense obligations than the Pākehā family (Keating 1978:4), with the needs of the individual being secondary to those of the ‘āiga (Fairbairn-Dunlop 1984:104). It has one or more matai or chiefs. The ‘āiga owns and controls the territory occupied by the nu‘u, which is the basic micro-political unit in Sāmoa. It is politically autonomous (Sasagi 1996:7). Itūmālō are formed from alliances between nu‘u (Sasagi 1996:8).

With the influence of Christianity, the powers of ali‘i, the chiefs who traced their origins from Tagaloa the creator, were undermined by that of the missionaries and later the Sāmoan clergy (Sasagi 1996:10, 11). Christianity was thus incorporated into fa‘asāmoa, and pastors became the new sacred chiefs. However, Christianity did not displace the emphasis on communalism. Hence, in more recent times, the ‘āiga is still a very important part of fa‘asāmoa, as is Christianity (Sasagi 1996:12).

In New Zealand’s urban context, the nu‘u and itūmālō are less important (Sasagi 1996:15). The status of matai in New Zealand is also undermined, as status can be achieved in other ways, such as through rank in the church (Sasagi 1996:16). Thus, the ‘āiga and church are the major components of fa‘asāmoa in New Zealand.

‘Āiga

The ‘āiga helps new migrants settle in various ways such as providing them with accommodation, financial aid, childcare (Sasagi 1996:16), and often helps migrants obtain a job before they come to New Zealand. Unlike ‘āiga in Sāmoa, migrant ‘āiga tend to be scattered rather than located in a village. Yet, the relative ease of communication and travel in a city tends to counter this scatteredness. Even though
'āiga are diffused, they tend to have a ‘centre’, usually the household(s) in which the
de facto head(s) live(s). ‘Āiga related activities and their coordination occur at such a
‘centre’ (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:21, 22).

Since ‘āiga members in Sāmoa obtain land use rights as a result of membership, they
are physically and emotionally dependent on their ‘āiga. According to Pitt and
Macpherson, in Sāmoa:

The importance of family membership and solidarity is continually
stressed in both secular and religious contexts. This value placed on
the family, rather than any clearly defined and enforceable set
of sanctions, leads individuals to contribute financially to the support of
the ‘āiga. An individual gains status from his generosity to the family,
and from knowing that his generosity strengthens his links with the

This contrasts with the situation in New Zealand, where ‘āiga members do not gain
their livelihood as a result of belonging to an ‘āiga and are not forced to make a
financial contribution to it. Thus, they are less economically dependent on their ‘āiga
but this is offset by increased emotional dependence on it. In New Zealand, where
the first language is different from the migrant’s first language, the ‘āiga provides a
familiar context (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:24).

Use of the Sāmoan language by ‘āiga members helps to maintain the language.
Grandparents often tell fāgōgo (legendary stories) to their grandchildren and pass on
family history and genealogy (Kerslake and Kerslake 1987:144, 145).

The ‘āiga has survived in New Zealand and is credited with being ‘the most
important focus for migrant identity’ (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:48). It has managed
to endure and become a part of Sāmoan life in New Zealand because of its flexibility
(Pitt and Macpherson 1974:48).

Church

The church is especially important for many Sāmoans in New Zealand where the
position of matai has decreased importance. When members of an ‘āiga belong to the
same church, their kinship ties are strengthened. Fa’asāmoa is reinforced by
churches conducting their services in Sāmoan, especially if the sermon is delivered
in oratorical style. Children can participate by presenting biblical dramas. At one
church I visited while doing fieldwork, for several weeks before Whit Sunday,
children got together with a few adults and spent much of one day of the week
rehearsing. The church service is sometimes followed by lunch (Sasagi 1996:21).
The main role of the church in Sāmoa is spiritual guidance. However, Sāmoan churches in New Zealand have a wider role to play. They assume some of the social welfare functions which the ‘āiga fulfils in Sāmoa, but cannot do in New Zealand (partly because of inexperience). Thus, members can receive practical guidance through the church, such as access to official agencies and lawyers. Churches may also arrange to pick up new migrants when they first arrive (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:52, 53). Other ways churches may assist is by helping migrants fill out forms (such as for remitting money to Sāmoa), or by accompanying migrants when they go shopping for a house (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:58). Many churches now have affiliated language nests (preschools) and conduct Sunday school as well.

4.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter focused on Korean, Dutch and Sāmoan migration to New Zealand. Very little has been published on the relatively recent phenomenon of Korean migration to New Zealand. This sudden influx of Koreans is likely to reduce because of tighter criteria required for migration. Dutch migration was actively encouraged in the years following the Second World War. In more recent times, as the Netherlands’ economy has picked up and there is no threat of war, Dutch migration to New Zealand has trickled off as well. The political climate in which the bulk of Dutch migration occurred has affected the survival of Dutch identity in New Zealand. The attitudes of Dutch migrants towards their language and culture have been coloured partly as a result of this. Some of these attitudes are also shared by Dutch migrants of the third wave, which I will explore in Chapter 7. Sāmoan migration to New Zealand was encouraged later than Dutch migration, and this has recently slowed down as well. Sāmoan immigrants are more keen to retain their key institutions in New Zealand, but these (namely the ‘āiga and church) have adapted to migrants’ needs in transmitting fa‘asāmoa, which has itself adapted in New Zealand.
5 METHODOLOGY

5.1 INTRODUCTION

I collected the data for my thesis from face-to-face interviews with respondents. Such interviews were used to gauge attitudes to the respondents’ native language vis-a-vis English, their opinions on language related matters and detailed information about ethnic identity and immigration. This was supplemented by participant observation and interaction in places such as churches and language nests.

5.2 INTERVIEWS

The face-to-face interview is a commonly used method in sociolinguistics as well as social anthropology to ascertain attitudes (Holmes et al 1993:21). In such an interview the respondent is asked direct questions about their opinions and language use.

Experience in investigation of language attitudes has suggested that an appropriate way is to ask parents quite simply whether or not they want their children to be able to speak their ethnic language when they are adults. (Jamieson 1980:105)

While there is a chance that the respondent can bluff and thus give inaccurate answers, the advantage of this method is that it is possible to elicit detailed responses and to ask each respondent questions about their own particular situation. In this way, the ‘voice’ (Rountree and Laing 1996:128) of the respondent can be expressed, instead of being swallowed up in an impersonal manner, as in a survey or questionnaire. Admittedly, attitudes are not always translated into action, yet they provide an index of what people want, and to this extent, are an index of potential support if some action were to be taken. Positive attitudes to language, while not enough, have been implicated in language maintenance (for example ‘Aipolo and Holmes 1990; Boyce 1992). Boyce expands on this:

Attitudes to language are an important dimension in studying the survival of a language in a language contact context. The conscious and subconscious attitudes of individual members of a speech community impinge on the degree to which that language will be maintained in competition with another. Individuals are also members of groups within a community, and the collective attitudes
E. Jane Bennett (1992:54) stresses that attitudes are useful because they imply a ‘future component’ and hence indicate ‘language maintenance potential, rather than simply a snapshot of the current situation’. Among her second generation Dutch respondents in Australia, commitment to language maintenance lagged behind positive attitudes to it. Yet the correlation between them led her to assert that ‘more positive general opinion is linked to a greater commitment to take steps conducive to language maintenance’ (Bennett 1992:57).

As noted, the reliability of data from an interview can be questionable, as the respondent may try to ‘please’ the interviewer by giving responses which they think will be appropriate or correct. While there is the possibility of this occurring, I think the interviewer has to take the respondent’s word and accept what is said. However, in order to increase the chances for frank and honest testimonies from the respondents, I emphasised to them that there were no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers and that I was interested in their own experiences and opinions. In the case of most questions I was not seeking objective and absolute facts but subjective and relative views (Romaine 1989:266). Attitudes and opinions on language related matters such as those I asked cannot be judged as ‘correct’ or ‘incorrect’ since people usually have their own reasons for believing what they do. Further, identity is very subjective and variation in it cannot be appraised.

Face-to-face interviews are more effective at answering the how and why of bilingual communication, whereas surveys are better at the what (Martin-Jones 1991:53). Surveys are more likely to elicit shorter answers with less attention to the dynamics of the situation (Beebe and Takahashi 1987:113). This is especially so when respondents have to choose their response from a given range of answers, often in the form of check boxes. Such readymade responses make it difficult to judge what information the respondent would have volunteered themselves, and thus what is of most importance to them.

. . . [I]f we present ready-made statements to a respondent we can never know whether he would have made such statements about himself without such suggestion; it is a reasonable conjecture on the other hand if he volunteers statements about himself ‘with a minimum of stimulation’ - that is, saliently - then these attitudes may be taken to be significant ones. (Kuhn 1960:54, emphasis in original, cited in Mackie and Brinkerhoff 1984:119)

In fact, in a series of tests, Edward Pryor et al (1992:226) found that the presence of check boxes can actually skew results by increasing the numbers of groups
designated by the boxes. On the other hand, the lack of check boxes had the opposite effect. The authors suggest that, in their case, the availability of ‘Canadian’ as an option indicated that Canadian was an acceptable and legitimate ethnicity. This affected the overall results of the survey. To avoid such effects and ‘neutralise’ ethnic inquiries, in the following test, the authors used an open-ended format and did not provide check boxes (Pryor et al 1992:227).

To a certain extent, a similar effect may occur in an interview too. Questions being posed about an issue may increase the salience of that issue for the respondents. The Linguistic Minorities Project (LMP 1985:220) in England found that this occurred in their case. The values inherent in the questions and the fact that the interviewers were likely to be in favour of language maintenance are likely to have skewed the responses in support of minority languages. I tried to overcome this by making my questions as open, varied and non-leading as possible.

Other factors which can influence the effectiveness of the interview method in obtaining accurate answers are the gender and status of the interviewer. Marilyn Martin-Jones (1991:51) calls this the ‘interviewer effect’.

Dawn Marley (1993), when doing sociolinguistic research in Perpignan in the south of France, found that her gender, and status as a foreigner and student helped her.

Being English was often vital, not only because it aroused people’s interest, but also because many of them felt less inhibited speaking to a foreigner, for linguistic and other reasons. Being female was also a major advantage - it is certain that a male interviewer would not have had the access that I did to female informants, who made up over half of the sample. Being a student also made me more acceptable to some people who would not have participated in a political or market research survey. (Marley 1993:220)

But being a female can also have its disadvantages in some communities. Li Wei (1994:80) notes that in traditional Chinese culture, men have a higher status than women; the latter are believed to be competent for domestic work only. In such a case, a female researcher may not be taken as seriously as a male one. Yet, Wei rightly goes on to point out that even though social status, linguistic background and gender of the fieldworker affect fieldwork, what matters just as much is the personality of the fieldworker.

There is no ideal candidate for field research. Successful field relationships require the investigator’s sensitivity to the ongoing situation and willingness to overcome difficulties. (Wei 1994:80)
Like Marley, I found that as an Indian woman living in New Zealand, my respondents were interested in my background and many of them asked me questions about this, similar to some of the questions I asked them. Like my respondents I am a second language speaker of English and am multilingual, and thus I was able to establish a rapport with them. In relation to the rest of New Zealand, I belonged to the same ingroup as my respondents. Because of this bond at times I felt that my respondents spoke much more freely to me than they would have to a New Zealander. In addition, since I was a student my respondents wanted to help me with my studies.

I conducted all the interviews in English since I speak neither Korean, Dutch, nor Sāmoan. I did however, learn a few phrases of each language, mainly greetings, and tried to use them, even if only as a token gesture. While it may have been ideal to conduct the interviews in the native language of the respondents, this would have been impossible for me. Wei (1994:78) mentions that most sociolinguistic studies are conducted by non-native speakers since this is what is practical.

There is evidence to show that language used in an interview can affect the outcomes. Deepa Punetha, Howard Giles and Louis Young (1987) found in their analysis of Hindu, Muslim and Sikh immigrants in Britain, along with an indigenous British sample, that the language chosen in the interview affected values expressed. The bilingual respondents could choose to answer the questionnaire in either English or their ingroup language. It was found that those immigrants who used English had values intermediate to those who used their ingroup language and the indigenous British. It would have been impossible to rule out such effects, if any at all, from my study.

5.3 QUALITATIVE METHOD

Natural sciences seek to predict and control natural phenomena using quantitative methods. As a result ‘scientific maturity is commonly believed to emerge as the degree of quantification found within a given field increases’ (Guba and Lincoln 1994:106). Unfortunately, the prevalence of this comparison between the natural sciences and social sciences has led to qualitative research being criticised and considered unscientific, hence my need to justify it here. While not downplaying the place of quantitative methods and research in the social sciences, I will reiterate that qualitative research is more useful when seeking a wide range of complexity and dealing with phenomena like identity which are likely to show immense individual
variation. Although qualitative research can challenge generalisations thrown up by quantitative research, the two methods can complement each other.

The method best suited to seeking individual views rather than hard, objective facts is qualitative. Qualitative research is defined as follows:

> Qualitative research is multimethod in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. (Denzin and Lincoln 1994a:2)

Qualitative research focuses on individual uniqueness as well as commonalities at group level (Rountree and Laing 1996:99). It seeks to do justice to the interactive nature of the research process which is ‘shaped by his or her [the researcher’s] personal history, biography, gender, social class, race and ethnicity, and those of the people in the setting’ (Denzin and Lincoln 1994a:3). Qualitative research focuses on the socially constructed nature of reality and is useful in revealing the complexity and variety in processes and meanings which tend to be lost when quantified. It takes into account situational constraints that influence research including the part the researcher plays in it (Denzin and Lincoln 1994a:4, 7). Thus it involves not just observation but also participation.

One shortcoming I faced as a result of my qualitative methodology was that my study was less comparable with past sociolinguistic research done in New Zealand, most of which is quantitative. It is difficult to compare my results with past research because in addition to differences in method, there are also other variations, such as circumstances surrounding migration: the period of migration and specific reasons for which it was undertaken; details of respondents themselves: class, gender, age, occupation; their location: in the North or South Islands, rural or urban areas; and other factors such as whether respondents migrated with their families or individually. Yet, previous research will be mentioned where relevant to indicate that different factors may be involved, allowing generalisations only to a limited extent. Minimal research has been undertaken on Koreans in New Zealand, while there is a substantial amount on the Dutch and even more on Sāmoans.

5.4 SEEKING RESPONDENTS

I used the network approach (Milroy 1987) to find respondents. This involved getting contacts through a friend and then through the respondents themselves. The friend would first ask the potential respondent whether or not they were willing to
be interviewed. If they agreed, the friend would then give me their contact phone
number. The respondent and I would then arrange a suitable time and place for the
interview. I also asked the respondent whether I could tape record them. There
were no objections to this. I explained to respondents that the interview was not a
test and that no preparation was required for it because I was interested in their
experiences and attitudes. Despite this, one of the Korean respondents asked me to
post the interview schedule to him so that he could familiarise himself with the
questions.

Before seeking respondents I had to decide which groups to focus on. I wanted to
investigate one Asian, one European and one Pacific Island group respectively as
these are the three major areas from which New Zealand has traditionally drawn its
immigrants. There were many reasons for my selection of the three groups I chose.
Dutch and Sāmoan immigrants have been very important in New Zealand this
century because of their numbers. Among Asians, the Chinese have been the most
numerous, but because of high variation among them (such as between mainland
Chinese and Taiwanese Chinese as well as language differences), I eliminated them.
I did likewise with Indians since as an Indian I could have been biased towards
them, and could have potentially conducted interviews in Hindi, which would have
made it harder to compare these with the interviews from the two other groups
which I would have to conduct in English. I decided it was best if I was neutral
towards all three groups. I also eliminated Cambodians since another student (Wilai
Pongudom) had recently completed a thorough study of them. Additionally, if one
of my three groups was a refugee one, the data would be less comparable. I also
learned that most of Dunedin’s Cambodian population had migrated north within
New Zealand or else to Australia. I finally settled on the Koreans since they are a
very recent immigrant group and I had a Korean friend who could put me in touch
with others. Among the Pacific Islanders, I had already conducted research among
Cook Islanders in Dunedin (Johri 1994) and so decided to study a different group this
time. Further reasons for choosing the Koreans, Dutch and Sāmoans were that they
constituted fairly numerous groups in Dunedin and there appeared to be
representative immigrants (although, as I soon learned, these factors were not so
straightforward). Additionally, I did not know of any past research undertaken
among recent Dutch or Sāmoan immigrants in the South Island.

Another factor I had to consider was the number of respondents from each group.
After consultation with other researchers who had used qualitative methods, I finally
decided to interview 10 respondents from each group. I was reassured by my
predecessors that 30 would be a manageable size.
The criteria used when it came to choosing the respondents were that the respondents were not born in New Zealand, had emigrated recently28 with their family, and that English was not their first language. By being born overseas and then migrating here, the respondents would have learned another language, not English, as their first language. When they migrated here, they were likely to have experienced some changes in their experiences and attitudes. Also, the importance of English for them would have increased on their arrival here. I was interested in people who had come here with their families where use of the native language is possible, rather than, for example, students, who may not have been able to use their native language if they lived with New Zealanders. To facilitate comparison I decided to focus on recent immigrants. I was not able to meet all these criteria with all my respondents, but I tried as much as was feasible.

Respondents were divided into two categories, labelled group one and group two. While all respondents were first generation migrants, the older generation was called group one, and the younger one group two. Group one respondents had migrated to New Zealand as adults, and group two had come as infants, children or teenagers. I interviewed six group one respondents from each of the three immigrant groups, and four from group two. The respondents have been given pseudonyms to maintain their anonymity (refer Appendix D for respondents’ details).

Because the respondents were chosen for practical reasons it is improbable that they are representative of the three groups I studied. Yet, Roberts (1990:3) argues that such respondents are likely to be concerned ones since they were willing to be interviewed.

... [A] convincing argument can be made that they are also the people who are most actively concerned with the issue of their place in the New Zealand community and the extent to which language maintenance and shift is part of that larger issue. If any policies were to be introduced that impinged upon these issues, these are the people whose opinions would be important and influential. (Roberts 1990:3-4)

I conducted the Korean interviews first, during October 1995 to May 1996. My first contact was a Korean friend I worked with at university. She put me in touch with another Korean woman. Urged by them, I attended the lunch held immediately after the Korean church service one Sunday to introduce myself to Dunedin’s Korean

28 Recent Dutch migrants refer here to the ‘third’ wave of migration and in the case of the Sāmoans, this translated as those who had emigrated from the 1970s onwards.
community. The Korean service was held in Korean at a Presbyterian church. My first contact introduced me to other members of the Korean community and to the Minister. The Minister explained, in Korean, to members of the community what I was there for. I spoke to several of the Koreans that day and was able to get some names of people willing to be interviewed.

The Korean woman I first contacted through my Korean friend declined to be interviewed herself, pleading shyness. However, I went on to interview many of the people I had made contact with at the church. Through these initial contacts I was able to get in touch with more respondents and in several cases I interviewed the respondent’s child. Several of the respondents were unsure of their ability to respond satisfactorily in English. As it turned out, only one of the respondents was able to understand all the questions I asked, despite my rephrasing these in simpler English. Yet, I think that most interviews were satisfactory and I was able to obtain sufficient data from them. Only one of the respondents was a beginner in English and so I had to find another respondent to replace him. As a result, I ended up completing eleven Korean interviews in total, but used only ten for this thesis.

In between the time that I finished the Korean interviews and wrote the section on the Koreans for this thesis, there were several changes in the Korean community in Dunedin. The Korean Society had been set up a few months before I completed my last Korean interview and a few months later, the Korean Lounge, Koreana, was also established. I conducted brief follow up telephone interviews to investigate if these two changes had had any effect on the Koreans; for example, whether they had provided the Koreans with the opportunity to get together with other Koreans more often. I was able to re-contact nine of the ten respondents. With their permission, I tape recorded them, using a device to connect a tape recorder to the telephone.

Despite having done interviews for an earlier research project (Johri 1994), conducting these interviews constituted a further learning experience for me. One improvement dawned on me at the same time that one of the respondents expressed it to me. This was to supply the respondents with a written copy of the interview schedule during the first interview since the Koreans were usually better at understanding written rather than oral English. Unfortunately I thought of this scheme only while doing my eighth interview, and as it was my eighth interviewee who mentioned it to me I was able to make use of this method only for the last three Korean interviews. I provided all my Dutch and Sāmoan interviewees with written

---

29 I will avoid naming churches to maintain anonymity.
interview schedules too, but very few of them made reference to it. Their comprehension of oral English was better than that of the Koreans.

The Dutch interviews followed, from March to September 1996. My initial Dutch contact was actually a Belgian woman who knew many Dutch people in Dunedin. Through her, I was able to obtain a few names and then I sought more through the latter. It was difficult to find enough Dutch people who had migrated here recently with their family. I decided not to go along to the Dutch Club and Dutch coffee mornings held periodically. Only one of the respondents was a member of the Dutch Club, but he had little involvement in it. None of the other Dutch respondents attended these social activities. The newer immigrants tended to consider such groups cliquey and old fashioned. It was mostly the early immigrants who went to them.

I did the Sāmoan interviews last, some of them concurrently with the Dutch ones, from May to December 1996. My initial contact and first respondent worked with a friend of mine. Through this respondent, I was able to contact more Sāmoans. However, the Sāmoans were not enthusiastic about being interviewed by a stranger. Nor did they like the word ‘interview’, so I used the word ‘talk’ with them. I was told by my first respondent that ‘interview’ conjured up images of an official situation, and this led to nervousness and brevity on the part of Sāmoans. In addition, I had to go through the right channels: my initial difficulty with finding respondents was overcome when I realised that I would have to get contacts through high status people like chiefs and ministers. To make myself familiar with them, I visited a Pacific Island church several times and made contacts. I also went to two language nests in Dunedin and one in Wellington. Here I talked to the supervisors and to mothers.

Pitt and Macpherson (1974:ix), when conducting a study of Sāmoans in New Zealand in the 1970s, found that their respondents did not like a structured questionnaire with its ‘stiff’ question and answer format and were shy of being tape recorded. Thus, after obtaining the demographic details of the respondents, they allowed the interview to take the format of an unstructured discussion. I did not find any such reaction from my Sāmoan respondents. They did not seem to mind that I referred to a typed interview schedule (of which they had a copy during the interview). Further, they were probably all used to devices such as tape recorders which are common in the 1990s.

The interviews with all three groups were conducted in various places to suit the interviewee as well as myself. In most cases I went to the residence, workplace or school of the respondents; others were held in my flat, or an office at the university.
In general the interviews lasted roughly forty-five minutes, although some were less than half an hour or over an hour-and-a-half. I started off transcribing the interviews myself, but later, because of health reasons, hired a transcriptionist, using research grant funds. Transcription was a time consuming task, one hour of recorded speech taking roughly four to five hours to transcribe. I ended up with nearly 425 pages of transcribed text, approximately 59,500 words!

It is important to bear in mind that this study is a situated one. If the questions had been asked differently or by a different person, at a different time or place, the answers may have varied. The particular responses evoked were a result of the nature of the relationship between my respondents and me. Donella Bellett sums this up well:

> Undoubtedly, both the questions posed and the answers given were a product of, and filtered through, both my and their [respondents’] life stories to date, and the context of our relationship. (Bellett 1996:15)

### 5.5 THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

I devised an interview schedule with open questions to elicit detailed responses. This schedule was based on interview schedules or questionnaires used by previous researchers including Edwards (1985); Herman (1976); Heye (1979); Holmes, Bell and Boyce (1991); Marley (1993); Pütz (1991); Romaine (1989); Taylor, Meynard and Rheault (1977); Trudgill and Tzavaras (1977); and Weinreich (1986). While I followed the schedule during the interviews I also picked up leads dropped by the respondents themselves. The schedule went through a few versions, and I made some changes, such as deleting repetitive or superfluous questions, even after starting the interviews. I did not feel the need to do any pilot interviews as I had used a reasonably similar interview schedule in an earlier study (Johri 1994). The final versions of the interview schedule and consent form are reproduced in Appendix C.

In addition to the respondents’ demographic details, I wanted to elicit information about their language abilities and domains of language use; their subjective ethnic identity; their attitudes to the language-identity link; their attitudes to their native language (L1) and to English; and their attitudes to living in New Zealand vis-a-vis their reasons for migration. By asking questions on such topics I was trying to ascertain the extent to which respondents may have experienced additive and/or subtractive bilingualism and how their identity fitted into this. In addition, I wanted to evaluate the usefulness of the framework of additive and subtractive bilingualism.
Before conducting the interviews I had to obtain the consent of the Ethics Committee of the University of Otago. The respondents each signed a consent form, giving me permission to use the information they were giving me at the same time as I guaranteed their anonymity.

I have included extracts, including some long ones, from the interviews in the results chapters (Chapters 6, 7 and 8); this is to enable the ‘voice’ (Rountree and Laing 1996:128) of the respondents to come through directly without my interpretation of it. I believe it is important to maintain the integrity of my respondents’ testimonies. In some instances, I have had to add a few words in square brackets [ ] to make the context of the quotation clear. Short quotations have been run on to the main text, but longer ones are indented and in a distinct font.

Conventions I have used in the extracts are as follows:

. . . irrelevant portion of interview omitted

??? inaudible or incomprehensible portion

?xyz probably word ‘xyz’, for example, ‘?annoy’ is probably the word ‘annoy’

All respondents were given pseudonyms to maintain their anonymity. In interviews I used the words ‘Pākehā’ and ‘Kiwi’. By Pākehā I referred to New Zealanders of European origin and this is what my respondents meant by this term too. However, I think our use of the word ‘Kiwi’ or ‘New Zealander’ differed. By both these terms, I meant the general New Zealand population, whereas in general my respondents took these words to mean the dominant group, specifically Pākehā. Such exclusive usage of these terms is not uncommon (Bayard 1995:154-5) despite the discriminatory overtones.
5.6 CONCLUSION

After choosing the groups of immigrants I wanted to focus on, I approached the question of language and identity and language attitudes among immigrants from a qualitative perspective. This proved to be an effective method as I was able to elicit detailed responses from respondents about issues which have variable and complex reactions. However, it made comparison with past research more difficult, as most of this has been undertaken quantitatively. In the next three chapters I will present the results from the interviews.
6 KOREAN RESULTS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The following three chapters present the results of the study. This chapter discusses the Korean respondents. The first part will look at why the Koreans chose to migrate to New Zealand and what languages the respondents know. Then I will give a detailed account of interviews with the first and second groups respectively, followed by a comparison of the two.

6.1.1 Reasons for migrating to New Zealand

Most Korean group one respondents and the parents of group two respondents came to New Zealand to improve their own lifestyles and for their children to acquire a better education.

Why? I like to have an opportunity to live in very peaceful place yes, because Korea is, Korea, especially in economics, Korea is improving very rapidly, in research and ???. Through that period we were, very pressed, and to study hard, in school, to work hard in company. It distresses me too much, and nowadays competition to study, work to enter the university is too severe to my daughters. So I don't want let them to to, to live, to let them live in the same way I have lived. So I, I wish to change the circumstances, environment for my daughters. (Intae)

The less polluted environment of New Zealand was also attractive. Education was believed to be better and the cost of living was generally considered to be lower here, the latter being an important consideration for Jiyoung’s parents who had five children. Most respondents reported that life was much busier and more competitive in Korea. Joohee’s father wanted to retire in New Zealand. Women’s diverse experiences of marriage had brought them here: Sunghee came to escape the responsibilities brought on by marrying the oldest son of a large family, while Minja came because she married a New Zealand man she had met in Korea. Chulsoo, a minister, had migrated to get some understanding about Christianity in a western culture. He believed that he had exhausted his opportunities in the missionary area in Korea. He had learned about New Zealand at an ecumenical conference in
Australia where he had met New Zealand representatives. According to another respondent, Korea was very crowded, and people were kinder here in New Zealand.

In a survey of 577 immigrants in New Zealand, the three main reasons given for coming here were very similar to those of my Korean respondents and were as follows, ‘quality of life and environment’ (47%), ‘better opportunities for children’ (39%) and ‘better standard of living’ (33%) (Department of Internal Affairs 1996:21). Previously, Koreans in New Zealand have been reported as having come here for a better lifestyle ‘related to New Zealand’s image of a clean green country in the South Pacific with a fair social system’ and for the education of their children (Youn and Starks, forthcoming).

America and Canada were also commonly chosen to emigrate to by Koreans, but recently awareness about New Zealand had increased (refer Appendix B for immigration policy).

I think a lot of Korean, they like to immigrate to America, and Canada, and now suddenly New Zealand government advertise a lot in Korea, with in the newspaper, sometimes, TV, they advertise with green nice clean country, and people reckon, not many people there, nice clean weather or air, that’s why people start coming here and also it was easy to come, with such an amount of money, you can come here with business papers and when you pass certain mark like 28 or 31 mark, it is easy to get as a university graduate, that’s why it was so many people at short period, lots of people coming here.  (Sunghee)

6.1.2 Language abilities and use

All the respondents knew Korean as well as English. Only Sookil believed he was equally good in both languages; he had been in New Zealand longer than any of the other respondents (except for his mother who was a group one respondent). As he was only 14 years old when he came here and had attended school in New Zealand, he had been able to acquire English faster than his mother who did not have as much contact with English-speakers. The remaining respondents reported being more fluent in Korean. Other languages known by them included Japanese, Mandarin, French, Greek, Hebrew and German, mostly to a limited extent.

The respondents had learned English at middle school in Korea where it had been a compulsory subject for 3 or 5-6 years, depending on the age of attending school. Their English teachers had been Koreans. However, the English learned at school
was quite different from spoken English and emphasis had been on reading written English, so most found it harder to converse in English than to read it. None of them had used English in their daily lives in Korea and only four had or were taking courses in English in New Zealand.

All the respondents used Korean with other Koreans in New Zealand, except when there were non-Korean speaking people about. This was to avoid being rude and to avoid arousing suspicions about themselves. At home most spoke Korean, except for Minja who was married to a New Zealander and those who wanted to practise English. English was used at school, university, and at work where they encountered mostly non-Korean speaking people.

6.2 GROUP ONE RESPONDENTS

There were six group one respondents. Two of the females were mothers of the two group two male respondents. All the group one respondents were born in Korea. At the time of interviewing, they had been living in New Zealand for between 11 and 1.25 years. They ranged in age from 39 to 50 years old, and all had children born in Korea. Minja had spent fifteen years of her life in Japan, where she was married to a non-Korean, yet her husband had spoken fluent Korean and she had used Korean with him. Now in New Zealand she had remarried a Pākehā who did not speak Korean.

While interviewing two of the men, their wives were also present, and every now and then they would join in the conversation, although they seemed neither as fluent in English, nor as confident as their husbands.

All the respondents were from Seoul, the capital of South Korea. Their occupations varied considerably, including housewife, businessperson, voluntary worker/translator, Korean minister (of religion) and student. In terms of education, Sunghee and Minja had finished high school while Mira had spent four years at college. Among the men, Chulsoo had a Masters degree from Korea, and had done a post graduate course in Theology in Dunedin at Knox College, Intae had a degree with a major in architecture, and Ilwon was undertaking a BD (Bachelor of Divinity) at Knox College.

The respondents were all from urban backgrounds, well educated and from the middle or upper classes. A trend for recent Korean immigrants to be educated has also been reported from the United States (Yoon 1995:316).
6.2.1 Attitudes to language and to bilingualism

All the group one respondents would use Korean to write or tell their life story because they were more fluent in it than in English.\(^{30}\) Ilwon would translate it into English after that if needed.

Because I can express very, through English, I can speak very simply, for example, wind blows, sun shine, but I am very poor to use the adverbs and adjectives, sun shines how? It is very difficult for me to express, I can express my ideas and what I feel, what I think. In Korean language I am very fluent to express. (Intae)

The Korean language was also the main choice for writing letters to relatives in Korea, who were much more fluent in Korean themselves.

Most respondents would use Korean media if available in Dunedin. Korean radio broadcasting was accessible in Auckland with a choice between three: Protestant, Catholic and ‘normal’. Many respondents read Korean books too. The Christians read the Bible in Korean. Intae had anticipated the inavailability of Korean books in Dunedin:

. . . because we expected that there will be no Korean book market here, so we prepared many books for our daughters and ourselves, but after reading those books we have no books anymore. (Intae)

Only the men ordered Korean language newspapers/magazines from Auckland and/or Christchurch or got them sent from friends in Korea. This way they were able to keep in touch with what was happening among other Koreans in New Zealand as well as in Korea. Several respondents watched Korean videos which were sent from friends in Auckland or brought over by new immigrants.

Most respondents preferred to use Korean in general, while only Ilwon preferred to use English since this would let him complete his course here in New Zealand, and then get a job.

\(^{30}\) This question was adapted from Jürgen Heye (1979). It was based on the assumption that to write or tell (in case respondents were illiterate) one’s life story, a topic which can be considered very personal and intimate, respondents would use the language they felt more closely associated with and were more fluent in. As we shall see, these assumptions were not necessarily upheld.
I prefer at the moment English because for our study, my wife should study in English because she study some natural way of food, she should study English. English is very good language. (Ilwon)

All the respondents liked to speak and hear Korean. None of them expressed any negative attitudes towards Korean.

Speaking in Korean? Yeah! For example last night I spent four hours with other Korean couple to speak in Korean about many kinds of things. We enjoyed. (Intae)

Some were proud that Korean was a very scientific language. The importance of Korean for New Zealand was believed to be increasing, especially in areas such as tourism and business.

Sometimes it is very interesting for me to see the Korean teams make a rugby, rugby games on the television. It was played in Australia and the New Zealand broadcasters chose the games. One teams wears Goldstar marks, one team wears Hyundai. 
What, what marks?
Hyundai is motor-vehicle manufacturer in Korea. Korean company.
Oh yeah!
And Goldstar is electronics, electronical product company. They wear two Korean companies! Like that, if Korean economies has influence to other countries, I think they will try to learn the Korean language. (Intae)

Chulsoo was appreciative of the fact that the few dialects in Korea were mutually intelligible, eliminating communication gaps and hence also regional differences among Koreans from the various islands. He believed this had enabled Korea to have a unique culture.

. . . there are some dialects in Korea but they can be understood by all Koreans so all Koreans have no problems of communicating each other even though there are about more than 1000 islands. On Korean peninsula all people can make communication easily and also as you recognise my country Korea has been divided during almost 50 years but we can still make communication there because we have ??? languages so we have very unique cultural conditions, other countries don't have. (Chulsoo)

A common language has been identified as a factor which facilitates the maintenance of minority group identity since it eliminates sub-group differences (Min 1991).
Another contributing element is the concentration of immigrants in particular occupations. Thus, in the United States, the ‘coincidence of cultural and economic boundaries’ (Min 1991:226) helps the Korean immigrants maintain their native cultural tradition.

The Korean language was important to my respondents, mainly because it was part of their ethnic identity in some way or other. Without it, they would ‘lose their roots’, something they had been brought up with, and a common bond with their parents. It made them feel that they still had a place in Korea: ‘That is our way of thought, tradition, our identity.’ (Ilwon)

It was also important in bringing together their family members in New Zealand.

Yes, in a way it does, it’s the only, the one unity we have, kids don’t think they are Korean, only when they speak to me in Korean, then we feel we are all in same group. (Minja)

Koreans who preferred to speak in English with other Koreans were thought of as ‘stupid’ or arrogant but not unpatriotic and the situation was believed to be ‘no good’. The respondents would reply to them in Korean. I was assured that there were no such Koreans in Dunedin.

I haven’t met anyone like that, but if there are one like that I think they are a bit weird I’ll feel, if they don’t, I say hello in Korean and they won’t answer me in Korean, and they like speaking in English to me, I think I’ll just laugh, I’ll think it’s quite funny. . . . They’re being idiots I think, being stupid. (Minja)

Most respondents did not think they were any better or worse in Korean now, including Minja who had to use English with her non-Korean husband: ‘No, not really, it’s always there and it’ll be always there, I don’t think it changes very easy, once you are born, it’s Korean, no.’ (Minja)

Many corrected their children’s incorrect Korean, while the rest did not need to as their children did not make any mistakes while speaking Korean. Ilwon encouraged his son’s English, but his wife encouraged the son’s Korean so that he would not forget it. They believed that this had confused their son. Nevertheless, he was reading books of both languages.

(Ilwon:) Yes, we have many books, she is
(wife:) I encourage our son to read Korean books, but he encourages him to read English books. I like to read in Korean.
(Ilwon:) Yeah, sometimes. Sometimes we found he’s not good in Korean, and mother especially point that and she correct
(wife:) please don’t forget
(Ilwon:) and she actually encourage him to read Korean books, but I don’t, I rather encourage him to read English books.
(wife:) He is confused. . . . That’s why he read two kinds of books, in the morning, he started to ??? by reading Korean books almost every morning.
(Ilwon and wife)

The families of most respondents used only Korean or mainly Korean at home, while Ilwon’s family tried to use English to practise it. Those who enforced Korean at home realised that their children were becoming more fluent in English by speaking it outside the home and that their ability in Korean was decreasing in some cases. They were afraid that they would not be able to communicate effectively with their children if the latter were not fluent in Korean. By using Korean at home, they hoped that their children would not forget it. Otherwise, some of them feared that they would not be able to converse about abstract things, especially on philosophical, social and historical topics.

We use Korean language, absolutely Korean language in home. Once before my daughter asked me to allow her to speak in English in home to improve her English, but I, I didn’t allow it. . . . Because if we forget our Korean own language, I think it will, it will, it leaves us to make us very poor to communicate with each other after ten years or fifteen years. Because my English and my wife’s English will improve, a little, not much, I think, even though we try to study English, the improvement will be very little. But my daughters are very fluent in English, even though she learns English here two years. I think she’s better than me now. But after fifteen or twenty years, if she forget Korean language, my grandson and my granddaughters will will not know the Korean language and they will not understand our situation and our way of thinking. I worry about that. I ask them not to speak Korean language in their school but not to speak English in my home. (Intae)

The family who used English at home were aware that this would be frowned upon by other Koreans, hence they were ashamed to admit it at first. At home they used English in order to improve their ability in it.
In home we always use, it’s a little bit shame for us, no it’s not a shame but we try to speak in English, in the home, that’s the way we have way to have a better English, but we couldn’t do that very well. (Ilwon)

Often, there can be a difference between reported and actual usage of language by the respondents. With the Korean respondents as far as I could tell there was no discrepancy. When I met Koreans with other Koreans, they always used Korean. Church services are held in Korean too. Often Koreans would answer the phone in Korean and then use Korean if the caller was a Korean. One respondent had a message first in Korean, then in English on his answer phone. Another factor discouraging my respondents from using English was their belief that they were not fluent enough to communicate effectively in English.

English had been a compulsory subject at school for all the respondents, but they had used very little English in their lives in Korea. Only Minja had used English with
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31 English was first introduced into Korea around 1882 when the policy of isolation against the ‘western attackers’ was abandoned (Shim 1994:226). The knowledge of English was limited to a few at this time. It was learned by people who had to deal with foreigners for customs purposes. Upper class children learned ‘western’ knowledge and foreign languages by American teachers at the Royal Academy. In addition, English-speaking missionaries founded several schools (Shim 1994:226). During the period of Japanese colonization in Korea (1910-1945), the Japanese language was forced on the people at the expense of Korean. English was considered an enemy language during World War II, and teaching or learning it was illegal (Baik 1992:24). Yet, the impact of English increased indirectly through Japanese. After the war ended and Korea was liberated from Japanese rule in 1945, English-speaking UN troops went to Korea, bringing about direct contact between English and Korean (Shim 1994:226). At the same time, secondary schools started teaching English again. Yet, it was GI terms rather than school English which had a greater impact (Baik 1992:24). “To hungerstricken street children of Korea during and after the Korean War, being able to utter English-sounding words meant gum, chocolate and canned meat thrown out by American GIs” (Shim 1994:226). During the sixties, Koreans who had pursued higher education overseas returned to Korea and constituted the powerful elite in their respective fields (Baik 1992:25, Shim 1994:227). They wrote in English and translated English books into Korean (Baik 1992:25). This practice of going to an English-speaking country for higher education increased during the seventies and eighties. There was also a rise in the numbers of people being transferred to work in English-speaking countries. The main reason for learning English at this time was to enable graduate students to survive overseas or to communicate with foreigners in the areas of business and trade (Shim 1994:227). When Seoul hosted the Asian Games and the Olympic Games in 1986 and 1988 respectively, a new era in the relationship with English began. The general public, such as taxi drivers and shopkeepers, came into contact with English speaking
any regularity at work, working as a Korean-English translator in Korea (and also now in New Zealand). The respondents started to speak English habitually only after coming to New Zealand so found this difficult. Intae believed he was able to understand some accents better than others.

Sometimes, I can [understand] the New Zealand people’s English, but sometimes I can’t. For example highly qualified people speak very clearly, but workers speaks very fast, and, it, when I, when I contacted labourers in here, almost, I cannot understand their words. (Intae)

The group one respondents wanted to improve their English. It would let them survive in New Zealand; in addition, it was being used more and more around the world. Even in Korea, it was spoken more widely now, but only in business and trade.

If I live here permanently, and also nowadays English must be more important in my life here because including me Korean peoples are surrounded by peoples speaking English, so if we don’t want to be isolated by people speaking English we have to improve the ability to command English to make good relations and to make, to create new culture, so from being here English taken more important. (Chulsoo)

Only Minja said she liked learning languages.

Because I lived there [Japan] for, like my second hometown there, because I speak the language, if I forget, it’s kind of wasting of my time, wasted my time, I’m very very interested in languages anyway, from childhood; I try to speak Japanese whenever I can. (Minja)

foreigners with whom they had to use English (Shim 1994:227). “Ordinary Koreans began to feel the imminent need to learn and speak English. These feelings eventually developed into the desire to attain the identity of ‘modern’, ‘sophisticated’, ‘assertive’ and ‘educated’ person [sic] that came with the ability to speak English” (Baik 1992:26). More up-to-date teaching methods were introduced for teaching English, the grammar-translation method being replaced by the audio-lingual method. Productive skills (writing and speaking) in English were now believed to be just as essential as receptive ones (reading and listening) (Baik 1992:26). In more recent times, English is no longer a privilege of the elite (Baik 1992:27). Rosa Shim (1994:239) attributes the recent spread of English in Korea to ‘prestige’ rather than to need. English is associated with education and success, and hence a higher status.
Despite the use of English at an international level and it rendering travel and global communication easier, very few respondents would have learned it had they not needed to do so to live in New Zealand.

Interestingly, Minja thought of English as a means of communication between different linguistic groups. As such, English would ideally let people maintain their non-English native languages.

I mean you shouldn’t forget your own language, and if you speak, that’s why English is there, English is international language, but you also shouldn’t forget your own language. (Minja)

The Koreans’ grasp of English in general was seen as poor, and this was thought of as problematic, because it hindered communication with New Zealanders as well as other day to day activities.

I think all Koreans they are very very desperate to learn English, a lot of people try but because they have to speak Korean at home, very slow learning, but Koreans are very very keen, they know they can’t do anything without learning English, so they all very very desperate and also they think it’s very important to speak English. (Minja)

Two women especially were less confident about their English ability and thought they would not be able to go ahead with the interview with me as a result. When I phoned the respondents for the follow up interview, again, it was the women who felt unsure about being able to answer the questions.

In Chapter 3, I noted that according to the latest Census, nearly one in five Asians cannot hold a conversation in English. The Koreans top this list, with 40.7% of the total Korean population of 12,657 unable to converse in English (Berry 1998).

Here in New Zealand, Intae and his wife had decided to not attend parties anymore as they felt lonely and isolated because they were unable to communicate effectively in English.

Oh, that’s a big problem, because it’s a language problem, we usually we have failed to decide to come to the party even though sometimes we are invited by the New Zealand. . . . but in a party if we get us together, sometimes I and my wife is lonely in the party, if there is no one to takes care of me or my wife, we are, we feel very difficulties to participate in dialogue. If there is New Zealander it is more hard for us to understand, because they speaks to each other very fast. (Intae)
This situation was especially unfortunate since this family had first lived in Auckland and then shifted away from there to Dunedin to get more opportunities to speak English.

I settled, I settled down in [area] in Auckland, and [area] is very famous region with very nice, very gentle area. Many Koreans are living in that place, later on we found there are too many Korean students in the college, and they have no reason to use English. All they hear the teachers words in the lessons, but they have no time, no chances to use, speak English. So we thought, at the time, it will take very long time for them to understand English. So we decided to come to Dunedin, because there are here are, only a few numbers of Korean students in school. That’s the reason. (Intae)

After all these respondents had immigrated here, the New Zealand government had changed its immigration regulations, and all subsequent immigrants and their families had to pass an English exam (refer Chapter 3). This is going to dramatically slow down further Korean immigration into the country. I asked two respondents whether they thought that this new immigration requirement would mean that Koreans would learn English sooner in Korea or use more English in Korea. Neither of them thought that this would be the case. However, Intae told me that from this year (1997) school children in Korea were starting to learn English sooner to enable Korea to be part of the process of globalisation.

Not because of the immigrants. As you know, the globe is very close and day by day, year by year, we have to open to the other countries. So in my country Korea, the, most of us thinks to make, to be a member of the globalisation we need to speak the other kinds of languages. For example, mainly English. Secondary, French or German or Japanese, or Chinese. So the Ministry of Education in Korea, Korean government changes the system, for example from nine years old in, for example standard three level in New Zealand, the school will teach English to the children. It means that from this year. Till last year, all children starts to learn English when they are 13. The changes means that four year earlier [they start to learn English]. Because as you know, maybe you know that Korea is a very big economic power to export and import. I heard that, eleventh biggest country of trade in the world. So the necessity of learning English and speaking English and hearing English grows much bigger and bigger. (Intae)
Janice Snowden (see Chapter 4), who spent nine years teaching English in Seoul, did not think that the new English language requirements for immigration to New Zealand would encourage people in Korea to learn English.

No I don’t, because there are easier countries to emigrate to, Canada doesn’t have this rule, the States doesn’t have this rule. No I don’t, I think we’re cutting our own throat with it, I really do. (Janice Snowden)

Even though English was not used in daily life in Korea, it was useful in some occupations such as in the export and trade businesses. English was also used by some people working in the church for corresponding with churches overseas, or else jargon was borrowed by professionals such as engineers. But generally, people there would try to avoid speaking English. Only those who used English at work had the confidence to speak it outside work too.

. . . when you see the Korean people in Korea, if you ask something [in English] on the street, most of the people escape, they just laugh even though they knew because we don’t have any experience to talk to foreigners, they just escape, they say, ‘I don’t know’ and just laugh and go. I saw once on TV program, and there was foreigner, he try to interview Korean people [in English], they all escape and laugh, and some people talk, and because they work in foreign company or something. (Sunghee)

Yet Ilwon believed that it was very important to be fluent in English in Korea.

Yes, important, very important, we have many foreign people and for them we should use English rather than many other languages, we could use only one, English as a standard. (Ilwon)

The positive aspects of learning English varied from ease of communication through the ability to use the language in most places in the world, to being able to make friends here. For Chulsoo it meant that the origin of his culture was accessible to more people around the world, and he did not have to wait for books to be translated into Korean to read them.

Most of the women did not think there were any negative aspects of learning English. Intae found it difficult to use English, while the other two men felt as if their Korean side was diminishing.

Even though I have been here three and a half years, I feel Korea is getting far away slowly from me and also if I use English more and more and if I am getting more confident to command English I think, I feel I can
live here without any problems so such a thought come in my mind. I tend to make decisions to live here, so but I’m not sure that’s negative thing or not, but anyway in a word, if I stay here more period the Korean is taken away from me. (Chulsoo)

Most respondents strongly believed that New Zealanders should be encouraged to learn other languages, but Sunghee felt that this was unlikely since New Zealanders did not even learn Māori first.

Yes. It is necessary for New Zealanders to learn other languages. Because sometimes I have got the impression from New Zealanders they are not open minded to the world because they live in isolated small island. They have not enough chances to contact the other countries, ethnic groups and other cultures. So I think this is a little closed culture. To learn other cultures, the best way is to learn other languages. Without understanding languages, how can they communicate and how can they understand others. So I think it is necessary for them to learn for example French, German, Japanese, Indian, Korean and then they will understand the other peoples. (Intae)

Raj Vasil and Hong-Key Yoon (1996:36) report that most Asians in New Zealand recognise the validity of calls for biculturalism before multiculturalism. My respondents felt that if New Zealanders learned another language, this would be taken as a friendly gesture by Koreans. This was thought to be fair since the Koreans themselves were making an effort with English. In addition, bilingualism would make New Zealanders less insular. Attitudes towards a language and towards its speakers are related, and knowledge is believed to preceed attitude (Boyce 1992:123). Language learning, especially when a positive experience, can lead to positive attitudes towards target language speakers. Bilingualism is thus likely to lead to greater tolerance and understanding. Boyce notes the potential benefits of this for Māori and Pākehā in New Zealand:

Perhaps an initial change in attitude from that of the majority position has to come first, in order that learning is embarked upon at all. Increasing familiarity with the language, and through that with the culture, customs and practices of Maori people, will help Pakeha to overcome their fear of the unknown, and perhaps even lead to more understanding of, and support for Maori efforts to reverse language shift and regain power. (Boyce 1992:123)

As bilinguals or multilinguals, the respondents were in favour of bilingualism for New Zealanders.
6.2.2 Ethnic identity

All respondents thought of themselves as Korean, except for Mira who considered her ethnicity to be Asian since Korea is a part of Asia. However, her Korean identity was more important to her than her Asian one. Some respondents emphasised that their ethnic identity could not change even though they were living in New Zealand or were New Zealand citizens.

Of course, I have tried, and I will try to be a member of this society, but even though I get citizenship in New Zealand, I cannot be a New Zealander, I have to die as a Korean, whereever I live.

You can still be a Korean in New Zealand society.

Yeah, but I will try to be harmonised, I mean manage my life as a harmonised New Zealander, neighbours and other citizens, but I cannot be the same kind of people, absolutely. (Intae)

Minja was the only respondent whose ethnic identity was not important to her. She attributed this to being married to a New Zealander, and said she often forgot that she was Korean: ‘... I feel that’s where I belong, but sometimes I forget I’m Korean, in a way ...’ (Minja)

Living away from Korea in New Zealand, where respondents were often mistaken for being Chinese or Japanese, had made a few aware of their ethnicity which had become more salient as a result.

Language was an important indicator of their ethnicity. This was either because they spoke Korean or because they did not speak English as well. In addition, culture, customs, way of thinking and physical features were important for Korean identity.

Cultural things must be spoke at this stage. I believe that all ethnics have different cultural way of making their life rich, so for example they are different dates to be celebrated in the world, so for example, this weekend is being celebrated as labour holiday or weekend by New Zealanders but Koreans are not really celebrating such day but we have other dates we have to celebrate to keep our identity. We celebrate those in New Zealand, celebrating special dates is also important to make good identity. ... (Chulsoo)
6.2.3 Language maintenance and identity

Most respondents thought that language was crucial to ethnic identity, and ought to be maintained. Some even felt a distance from couples where one was not Korean because without being able to speak Korean, the non-Korean could not participate to the same extent in Korean group activities, nor share the jokes: ‘It is most important thing I think, we should keep Korean language, that is our culture and way of living, and way of thought, it is most important.’ (Ilwon)

Attitudes and behaviour were also believed to be an important component of ethnicity. Chulsoo gave me an example of this. In Korea, it is considered offensive for younger people to touch older people on the head. Until he realised that this did not hold true for (non-Māori) New Zealanders, he had misunderstood the behaviour of his younger classmates in New Zealand. Now that he recognised that this gesture was usually done in a friendly context among New Zealanders he did not mind it.

The respondents thought that it was important for children to speak the language of their parents. This was important for their Korean identity, and also for allowing close communication between parent and child. Children born to Korean parents outside Korea who did not speak Korean were not necessarily thought of as Korean.

I think first language. Occasionally I meet some Korean who have grown up in New Zealand or Australia or America from child, so some of them can’t make conversation in Korean, so whenever I meet such people, I think they are not really Korean because they can’t command Korean. Language must be great priority. (Chulsoo)

Grandchildren who would not speak Korean posed a dilemma. The respondents obviously did not want to reject their grandchildren as non-Korean, but at the same time they thought that the Korean language was essential to Korean identity.

After some years, after my daughters get married, if she has her own children, I think she will not ask her children to speak in English like me. Only to ??? and after one generation I think they will no idea to use Korean language anymore.

Do you think they will still be Koreans?
No.

How do you feel about that?
Through the history in middle America between, around the Mexico area, there are those like the Chinese people in Dunedin, the third or fourth generations are living in this area from Korea. But they don’t know even to
call his father ‘father’. They don’t know ‘abogi’, ‘abogi’ is Korean language
to call, when we call father, ‘abogi’, they don’t know even that word. So is
very difficult to call them Korean, not Korean or confused. I am confused.
Are they Korean?
Do you think they are?
(wife:) How can I?
And what do you think of that? I mean does it, do you think the Korean
language should be maintained?
(Intae:) As much as possible, but I can’t make them use Korean. (Intae
and wife)

Yet some of them, especially Sunghee who had been away from Korea the longest,
realised the practical difficulties involved in this.

There must be some limit, because when they come here, my daughter
has just graduate primary school, and my son he is second year in middle
school, so there must be some limit . . . (Sunghee)

None of the group one respondents thought that their own ethnic identity had
changed, however, some had noticed that this was not so with the younger
generation. A few believed that minority groups had to make an effort to change to
fit in with the majority rather than the other way around. Although a change in
identity was not necessarily desirable, some respondents had resigned themselves to
it.

Yes, I think if my children stop speaking in Korean after growing up 20 or
30 years later, they might not be determined by being called pure Korean.
So probably they will be called Korean Kiwis or something like that.

. . .
Personally I don’t want to see such a happening ??? but also I am not
going to keep our identity far away from the cultures growing up in New
Zealand. As I made a definition, New Zealand is going to be multicultural
society so all ethnics wanting to live here have to make several
endeavours to create new culture suitable for New Zealand, rather than
pushing minor ethnics upsetting major culture. (Chulsoo)

Most respondents thought that the government had no role to play in minority
language maintenance, rather this was the responsibility of the ethnic group.
Sunghee thought that language learning was specifically the mother’s duty, since the
father went off to work outside the home and did not spend as much time with the
children.
I don’t expect the New Zealand government to do these kinds of things because they cannot support our everyday life, for example, even though we were granted to immigrate to New Zealand by the department of immigration, even though I graduated from the university, is a waste-paper, my certificate is waste paper in New Zealand. (Intae)

Intae did not expect any efforts towards language maintenance by the government when it did not even recognise his qualifications and experience.

Only Chulsoo hoped that Korean would be taught in schools here, regardless of other factors. The others thought it should depend on considerations such as the size, needs and interests of the Korean population or because of increasing trade between New Zealand and Korea: ‘I’m not sure, Korean family very small, in future we’ll need but at the moment I don’t think so.’ (Mira)

A few respondents thought the Korean population here was too small to warrant having textbooks in the Korean language, and some believed that this was not necessary; textbooks in English would suffice.

No I think English is more than enough, people come here to learn English mainly, I don’t think any other language will be necessary, they spend dozens of money just to learn English, my daughter teaches English today, that’s one of the reasons I don’t take you home, I do it here. She tutors Korean kids. She teach Japanese as well. People do spend money and I don’t think the textbooks should be in any other ethnic languages, English is more than enough. (Minja)

If Korean was offered at school here, very few respondents would encourage their children to take it. Mira considered that her children knew enough Korean and hence needed to concentrate on English now.

In general the respondents thought that English was sufficient for official notices, road signs, forms and such purposes, especially for Koreans now resident here. Since they were not tourists, they had to make the effort to learn English. Also, because English was an international language, most people would be able to read signs in it. If different languages were used, the question would arise about which ones to use and which to leave out. The fairest way out of this was to use only English.

________________________________________

32 This referred to signs such as road names rather than international symbols used on signs.
All the respondents thought that the Korean language should be maintained here by the Koreans. Most preferred to use Korean at home even though this was thought to slow down the acquisition of English. The practice of some families encouraging their children to associate with New Zealanders, not Koreans, so that their English language skills would develop, or themselves using English at home was frowned upon. The maintenance of minority languages would help to make New Zealand multicultural.

Yes, language must be maintained. It doesn’t matter how many people are here, but if really want to have like multicultural society, the first consideration must be focused on minority ethnics so even though Korean and Japanese, Indians are not many here, but their language and their culture must be honoured by major ethnics, language must be maintained. (Chulsoo)

Despite expressing the desire for Korean language maintenance, Ilwon thought it was acceptable for Koreans in New Zealand to concentrate on English at the moment. At the same time he thought that the Korean language was important for New Zealand as well.

Korean people, Korean families they are going to, they should learn English first, so if they you don’t use Korean at the moment, it’s alright. Their ability of English language should be better and better. Now Korean is the second best language of nations, in tourism, only in tourism, Japanese tourists, they come from long time ago but nowadays many Korean tourists increase, last year and Korean language is now second best language in New Zealand tourism. (wife:) For business, for New Zealand. (Ilwon and wife)

6.2.4 Attitudes to and experiences in Korea and New Zealand

All the group one respondents had more interaction with Koreans than with non-Koreans. Even though Dunedin’s Korean population was small, it was increasing, allowing the Koreans to meet more Koreans.

Yes, I’ve got more Korean friends because they keep coming, there were only two families in the beginning but now there are about 40 to 50 families here. (Minja)
Minja who was married to a Pākehā man said her lifestyle was different from that of an average Korean because she was married to a non-Korean, yet she had more Korean friends.

As mentioned, at the time of interviewing there was no organised context in which Koreans could meet one another. There was, however, a Korean church. The minister of the church was doubtful of the usefulness of the Korean church. New immigrants in Dunedin contacted the church to help them settle into the city, but after this, since not all Koreans are Christians, the church was not frequented by all of them. Despite this, when I attended the social gathering held after the church service, I met at least two Buddhist Koreans there.

Pyong Gap Min (1991:228) reports that in the United States, Korean immigrant churches help new immigrants adjust to their new life, maintain their native cultural traditions and encourage interaction among the Koreans. Some Koreans were found to go along to church mainly to meet their friends. The Korean churches have a ‘fellowship hour’ lasting between half an hour to an hour after the Sunday service, when church members interact with one another and share refreshments (Min 1991:229).

At the time of my initial interviews, the Korean church in Dunedin held a ‘fellowship hour’ after the service. By a year and a half later, two more Korean churches had been established in Dunedin. Of all my respondents (groups one and two), only one, the Minister, went to church regularly. Jiyoung, a group two respondent, went occasionally if her parents were going. Another three had stopped going, Mira (a Buddhist) because she had now met all of Dunedin’s Korean population, Minja because she did not have time, and Ilwon had switched to a ‘New Zealand church’. The rest did not go to church. One respondent estimated that only about half of the Koreans attended church. The increase in the number of Korean churches indicates that church is an important part of life for at least some Koreans in Dunedin, yet this was not the case with my respondents.

The Korean Society was set up in December 1995. By then I had completed all except the last interview and was able to ask only this last respondent about the Society. As one of its first activities, the Society had been instrumental in compiling a directory of Koreans in the city. It also helped the Koreans prepare forms dealing with matters like property in Korea. Over 80% of Koreans in Dunedin had joined the Society by paying their enrolment fees. The Society was not planning to hold Korean language classes in Dunedin yet. The Korean population in Dunedin was too small to make this viable. However, the Koreans in the Society used the Korean language.
No. It would take some years I think, because there are only some tens of boys and girls are here, with that numbers it is very difficult to manage the facilities. (Intae)

The Korean Society looked after the welfare of Koreans in Dunedin and helped those in trouble.

They are looking for a way to take care of the international students from Korea, in Auckland University no! Otago University. Because in last month there is trouble between Taiwanese student group and Korean students’ group. After hearing the news the Korean Society meeting was organised and they will try to take care of the Korean students, to let them harmonise with the other ethnic groups. I think they will find out to support them or help them. (Intae)

The follow up interviews with the Koreans gave me the opportunity to ask about the respondents’ participation in the Korean Society. All the respondents were members. One respondent’s husband was the President of the Society. Most respondents said that the Society did not do much but some activities included:

On a special day, like end of the year or Christmas, Anniversary day, we gather together. All Koreans gather together, if they want to, with the ??? and celebrate each other. And also we invite veterans who joined the Korean war during 1950s. So we had a ceremony last year [1996] on August 15 and also we joined festival market day selling food. (Sunghee)

Another context in which the Koreans could potentially meet was the Korean Lounge. The Korean Lounge was the brainchild of Mr Glen Jo and his wife Mrs Julia Jo.33

. . . I was encouraged to open a lounge by the chairman and by other directors [of the Korean Society], but is my own decision. They promised me to support my lounge, but it is my vision, it is my own vision. (Mr Jo)

The Korean Lounge sells Korean provisions which are necessary for Korean cooking and has a book and video library. Its purpose is not restricted to that of a shop,

33 The Jos’ name is revealed here with their permission which I obtained on the consent form; had I used Mr Jo’s pseudonym in connection with the Korean Lounge, his identity would have been revealed.
library and newspaper supplier; it also provides a place where Koreans can meet not only other Koreans, but also New Zealanders. To facilitate such interaction, the Lounge has a room with billiards tables.

*Why do you plan to open the Lounge?*

Because, as I told you, there are about 300 Koreans in Dunedin and we feel thirsty of Korean cultures. We, it is very difficult for us to get the Korean medicines, newspapers, and books and television programmes. We are isolated. So I decided to make a meeting place for the Korean people for us and then, as I told you, we are very difficult to join the Kiwi society. It’s not easy. Where should I go to be a member of the organisation in Kiwis. So I change my thought. I will prepare a meeting place and then I will invite the Kiwi people who wants to come, who want to know the Koreans. So I decided to make a lounge.

...  

*So will it be for other people as well as Koreans, the Lounge?*

Not just for Korean People? I was misunderstood that when I speak of the Lounge, many of the Kiwi people thinks, misunderstands that they are going to open their own Lounge, but I emphasise that it will be open to everybody who wants to make friends with Koreans. (Mr Jo)

Mr Jo had encountered several setbacks while trying to find a location. When nearly all the details about the lease had been worked out, he was asked to meet with the existing tenants. The latter had raised concerns about ‘security and toilet cleaning problems’ and were not willing to come to a solution with Mr Jo. Nor were they available or communicative after airing their grievances. Mr Jo felt that the real issues were being masked.

They did not say any kind of things [about] ethnic segregation. They didn’t show any kind of worries but we felt that kinds of atmosphere. They didn’t want the Korean peoples to get together in the privacy. We felt that, because they did not try to communicate, they tried to solve their worries. (Mr Jo)

Despite these initial obstacles, Mr Jo had succeeded in finding another location for the Korean Lounge.

More than six months after the Lounge had opened, I went to see Mr Jo again. He was very happy that his Lounge was doing well. Koreans used the shop section to buy provisions like spices and sauces. Non-Koreans preferred to shop for the other items stocked by the shop, namely stationery, gifts and accessories. The billiards
room was used by Korean students who, living with Kiwi families, felt homesick for Korean culture and company.

Because the international students from Korea, normally they stay in Kiwi homes but sometimes they feel homesick and they want to read the Korean books and they want to talk each other. In that case they came here and they get together and they speak in Korean language and they can read Korean books. (Mr Jo)

The younger generation, such as the university students, brought along their New Zealand friends too.

The Lounge is open from noon. The shop shuts at 6 PM, however the billiards room is open as long as it is being used. School pupils come and use it after school. The Lounge has Korean billiards tables, which are different from those used in New Zealand. Members use the Korean language while in the Lounge. Mr Jo was confident that the Korean Lounge provided the Koreans with a space to meet as well as buy provisions vital for preparing Korean meals.

So do you think this Lounge gives the Korean people in Dunedin a place to meet? Like sort of, do you think it brings them together?
Yes. For example today is very quiet but yesterday from twelve o’clock until five continuously here we have four or five Korean families and very much crowded, very noisy.

I think Korean peoples are very pleased to have this kind of Lounge for their own and the convenience to get the Korean spices in Dunedin because before I opened the shop and Lounge they had no place to be together, or they almost impossible to buy those kinds of things for their meals. (Mr Jo)

As already mentioned, the Korean Lounge’s video and book library enables the Koreans in Dunedin to keep up with television programs and movies made in Korea. The books were all donated by Korean families living in Dunedin. Korean newspapers published in New Zealand were also distributed by the Korean Lounge to interested Koreans.

So, how many families come and take the newspapers, roughly?
Roughly, half of the families because I receive approximately thirty newspapers, is all out in a week. So I think half of them. (Mr Jo)
Although Mr Jo had been asked to start Korean language classes as part of the Lounge, he thought that the Korean population of Dunedin was too small to make this feasible. Yet, parents were eager to teach Korean to their children, so he had Korean language learning books in his library which could be borrowed by Koreans learning the language.

During the follow up interviews I asked the respondents whether they used the Lounge. Very few of them patronised it, while those who did used it mainly to buy Korean foodstuffs. Koreana was basically thought of as a shop. Further questioning revealed that short term students from Korea were the main users of the Lounge and enjoyed playing billiards there.

*Do your kids go there to play billiards or anything?*


*Your kids?*

No no. Just teenagers from Korea to study English or such like that.

*So the people who live in Dunedin, like the Korean people here, do they go there?*

Usually don’t go there.

*Why not?*

Because, most parents, don’t want to see their children playing billiards there and also fun. Except billiards, there is nothing which can attract young students there. (Chulsoo)

The establishment of the Korean Society and the Korean Lounge had had a limited impact on interaction among the Korean respondents. Sung Ho Youn and Donna Starks (forthcoming) found that much participation in the Korean community was seen as hindering the respondents’ main aim of rapid integration into New Zealand culture. Perhaps the relative inactivity of the Korean Society was a manifestation of a similar feeling.

Most respondents had had bad experiences in New Zealand as a result of language difficulties or because of a lack of familiarity with the culture. Some of them felt that when they did not speak English fluently, instead of trying to understand, their listeners did not pay attention. The respondents’ use of Korean with other Koreans was often misinterpreted as a means of maintaining distance from New Zealanders, rather than an inability to speak in English. Also, sometimes they were asked why they had come to live here when they were not fluent English speakers. It was believed that New Zealanders unfairly used their majority status at such times. They also felt upset and helpless if they could not justify or explain themselves as a result
of being less fluent in English. This was to the extent that Sunghee sometimes felt like returning to Korea.

Yeah. Sometimes if we speak Korean language between Koreans in front of the Kiwi people, they ask us to speak in English. They don't understand we cannot speak English very well. Always they ask us to speak in English because they are majority and we are minority. I think they are sometimes they feel very strongly they ask us to speak English. ‘Why do you speak in Korean?’ Because we can't speak English well. (Intae)

Problems resulting from cultural differences diminished as respondents became more familiar with customs in New Zealand, and they realised that certain ways of doing things which were unacceptable in Korea were acceptable here. The respondents had found Kiwis more understanding when it came to cultural differences, but less tolerant when it came to language differences.

Two respondents told me about their experiences of racial discrimination. As mentioned, this included Mr Jo when trying to find a venue to set up the Korean Lounge. Sunghee thought that the Pākehā who told her to go back to her country had no right to do so since Pākehā themselves were immigrants in a place first settled by the Māori.

I just talk back to them, it's not your land, it’s Māori land, you come here with your grandpa, 100 years ago, but me come here 10 years ago, what's the difference does it make, but they reckon it belong to them and they reckon you have to go your land. (Sunghee)

Minja was the only respondent who had not experienced language difficulties because she was very fluent in English.

In fact I didn't have problems because I was able to speak English, so I have less problems, I do help other Koreans with my English ability, I translate them and I go and look after them some people, counselling and I help new Korean immigrants, I take them to doctors and I do a lot of running around. (Minja)

The Korean educational qualifications of some respondents or of their spouses were not recognised here in New Zealand. The affected families found this hard to deal with. Intae was trained as an architect and had worked as an architectural engineer in Korea before coming here. He had expected his qualification and experience to be recognised here since he was able to obtain points for them under the points system of immigration. However, he was bitter that this had not happened, and had no
more faith in New Zealand’s government. Instead of being able to contribute his skills and expertise to his adopted country, his strengths were being wasted.

Chulsoo’s wife was ‘struggling’ to finish the requirements needed to be a pharmacist in New Zealand.

My wife used to be Korean pharmacist and so she struggling now to be registered as a pharmacist over here in New Zealand. Last year she passed the examination of which foreign pharmacist from overseas have to do before being registered as a pharmacist of New Zealand. After passing the exam only all pharmacists from overseas had to take another step called internship course lasting 6 months, so my wife is on internship course, so she has passed 4 months, so that means she has 2 months to go. (Chulsoo)

Mira’s family was no longer able to live together in New Zealand because her husband could not find a job here. Unlike Intae, this man had decided not to give up his profession but to remain in Korea, away from his family.

At the moment my husband is in Korea, he is a medical doctor, he has applied many to get a job in New Zealand, but it is so hard to get a job, and he’s not young enough to study more here, so he stayed Korea. (Mira)

Mira found it hard being apart from her husband.

Recently, the Otago Daily Times reported the case of a Korean maritime engineer who was waiting to hear from the New Zealand Qualifications Authority as to whether or not his engineering degree and 20 years of industry experience would be recognised in New Zealand (Price 1996a). Like Intae who was an architect, he thought New Zealand wanted him for his education and professional experience since he had been given points for these two under the points system of immigration.

A similar experience of high expectations of life in their adopted country and frustration is reported by Youn and Starks (forthcoming) among Korean immigrants.

---

34 Since October 1995 the immigration policy has changed, making it compulsory for applicants coming in under the General Category and Business Category to obtain professional registration in New Zealand before they can score points for their qualifications (Department of Internal Affairs 1996:8-9). This way, potential immigrants can be sure that their qualifications will be recognised in New Zealand before making the decision to emigrate (refer Appendix B for details).
in Auckland. They had met with frustration as a result of difficulties experienced in New Zealand, especially in the area of language.

Korean immigrants in the United States too are reported to experience status anxiety ‘arising from incongruence between their previous status and their current one’ (Jo 1992:395). In Korea, they belonged to the middle and upper middle urban classes and many had professional careers. In the United States their education, skills and work ethic were not recognised and they were forced into new occupations such as small shop ownership. The loss in social status was hard for them to deal with (Jo 1992:405-6). Being highly motivated to regain their lost status, many became self-employed business owners (Yoon 1995:332) like Intae.

Some group one respondents found New Zealanders, or Dunedinites in particular, isolated.

I think up to now Dunedin city is not cannot be defined as real multicultural society, the city may be defined as conservative Kiwi society, because Dunedin is isolated from the world, . . . but nowadays there are signs of developing Dunedin city as a multicultural city. (Chulsoo)

. . . sometimes I have got the impression from New Zealanders they are not open minded to the world because they live in isolated small island. They have not enough chances to contact the other countries, ethnic groups and other cultures. So I think this is a little closed culture. (Intae)

Most women found New Zealanders cold and could not understand the Pākehā way of showing love to family. They found it unbelievable that Pākehā got together with their family only once a year at Christmas. Family ties were reported to be stronger among Koreans. Ilwon’s wife had coined the term ‘family egoism’ because she and her husband had found that people in New Zealand did not seem to care about others outside one’s family, not even their neighbours.

I think so, they feel the same way, not only Korean people, I have some friends from overseas, like Germany, Japan, Hong Kong, Polish, all overseas they feel same way about their language and Kiwi people’s attitude. So we all feel same way, because we have a group, we meet monthly with potlucks, we feel the same way, we are very islander people, I mean English people here are insular people, they don’t show their feelings, their love to people. . . . We are very emotional, we have lots of emotions, and we can lean on each other, we stick together more than Kiwis, more warm feelings each other. (Sunghee)
Other Asians have also found that ‘Pakeha reticence and their more formal and inhibited style’ hinder interaction between Asians and Pākehā (Vasil and Yoon 1996:44). In addition, immigrant women have reportedly felt dissociated from New Zealanders. Language has been identified as a major impediment, however the finding that even women who speak English come across communication difficulties would indicate that competence in English does not preclude such occurrences (Leckie 1995a:61).

This perceived selfishness of Kiwis, marriage breakups and independence of the second generation were frowned upon by some of my respondents, especially the women.

Kiwi, something is good, but most of them are no good I think, I mean marriage life or children and parents they are very independent, I don’t like that. (Mira)

Yet Minja said that in Korea people often pursued further education not only to better one’s career prospects, but also to increase one’s chances of finding a suitable marriage partner. She was happy that her children had been able to get away from that in New Zealand.

Very important, so much competition, you can’t get a job if you don’t graduate one of the best universities, you can’t even get married, you can’t even find a boy or girl, it became like that, it became too much, so much competition, stupid. You know what I mean, girls just try their best to enter university to find same level husband, you know try to be group, that sort of calculating future, more than the love, you calculate each other, who has got same amount of money and the woman will try to find a doctor or dentist, someone who can make money, and those guys will try to find some woman with the same degree or even better degree than what they have, so it’s like a business, no love and I don’t believe in that, in that manner I adopt a lot of westernized ideas, we don’t have love, we shouldn’t be married, but my differences between Koreans because I have lived in overseas and I have married life overseas. (Minja)

Nevertheless, she was proud that Koreans were well educated. She did not like it if the Koreans’ lack of fluency in English was taken as a sign of being uneducated. Another respondent echoed the importance of education to the Koreans.

What was appreciated about New Zealand was its clean environment, lack of crowds and the availability of space.
Lots of land compared to our country, we mainly live in apartments, tall storey buildings, but here they have wide land, very clean air, and not many people, so I can say I like that. (Sunghee)

Opinions varied about the desirability of adopting aspects of New Zealand culture. Most women did not want to change, while most men thought that as immigrants, it was essential for them to adapt and find a balance between New Zealand and Korean culture. As already mentioned, it was thought that minority groups in New Zealand had to make an effort to ‘create new culture’ here in New Zealand by changing, rather than expecting the majority to adapt to accommodate the minority groups.

I am getting what I think used to the culture because I have been here about three and a half years so I am changing and I am struggling to make good harmony between the culture I have and the culture in New Zealand and also it’s that European culture there are several other cultures brought by other ethnic, Indians, or Pacific Islanders or Polynesians or from countries, something like that so if we want to live here, if we want to see New Zealand good country I think we have to do something for creating new culture rather than forcing minor ethnics to accept European culture, English culture. (Chulsoo)

Intae and his wife had adopted Anglicised versions of their names in New Zealand since they did not like their Korean names being mispronounced.

No this is, this is calling name. Because we have our own Korean names but is not easy for the Kiwi people or other, for example even you, I think you cannot pronounce my Korean name correctly. I don’t want to be called incorrect pronunciation. For example. Lets try [scribbling noises], this is my Korean name written in English. How do you pronounce it?

[my attempt to pronounce it]
Yeah! but my name is [correct pronunciation]. A little different. So I don’t want to be called in different pronunciation so I prefer the English name [, very similar with this and if this helps them to pronounce very easily, so I chose this one.

Do many Korean people change their name in New Zealand?
Yes, many of them. But they, I think, even me, I don’t like the English name, I love my Korean name. But for the convenience of them, they choose the English names. (Intae)
Most respondents had re-visited Korea, but Minja had decided she was not returning anymore.

Every two years, I mean twice I have been, so far, but now I don’t really, I prefer to go somewhere else. . . . I went back to Korea two years ago, I couldn’t stand, I just couldn’t stand it anymore, I got lost, so many cars and people, you can’t go shopping, no matter where you go everybody is pushing you, becoming like a Bombay market. I remember Bombay, it’s all like this, so I don’t have any homesick now. (Minja)

Overall, the respondents appeared to have mixed attitudes towards Korea and New Zealand. While most had experienced cultural, racial or linguistic intolerance here, they still preferred the less hectic life that New Zealand allowed them to lead. At the same time, most were attached to Korea too.

6.2.5 Summary

The group one Korean respondents were keen to improve their English mainly to cope with living here. Despite being aware of the usefulness of English as an international language very few would have learned it were it not needed for life in New Zealand. It was believed that Koreans had a poor grasp of English, and this was seen as a problem. The women in general were less confident of their English ability than the men. This could be because fewer of them were in paid employment and so had less contact with English speakers than their husbands and children. In addition, only one woman had received higher education, whereas all the men had.

The positive aspects of learning English included facilitating communication while travelling, being able to make friends here, not having to wait till books were translated into Korean and increased awareness about Korea in the rest of the world. The negative aspect for two of the men was that they felt their Koreanness was diminishing. Overall, very few respondents thought of language learning as a threat to ethnic identity.

Most respondents favoured bilingualism and thought that New Zealanders should learn an additional language. This would be interpreted as a gesture of friendliness by the Koreans and would help to make New Zealand a multicultural society.

Most respondents preferred the Korean language, it was part of their Korean identity, embodying their roots, tradition and thoughts. It brought together their family members, hence some of them feared that if their children were not very
fluent in Korean, communication between them would be limited. Generally, they corrected their children’s Korean when it was incorrect. Most spoke Korean at home even though they thought this could hinder their own fluency in English. The Korean language was also believed to be important for business and tourism in New Zealand. Koreans who used English with other Koreans were frowned upon by most. The Korean language was a marker of solidarity among Koreans.

The respondents had more interaction with Koreans than with non-Koreans. Intae avoided social occasions with other New Zealanders because of language problems. This was unfortunate since interaction with New Zealanders would theoretically improve his English. In Youn and Starks’ study (forthcoming), 90% of the respondents had mostly Korean friends.

The establishment of the Korean Society and of the Korean Lounge, Koreana, did not help much to heighten a sense of ‘community’ among the respondents. The Korean Society compiled a directory of Koreans in Dunedin, but it did not provide regular opportunities for interaction among the Koreans. Although all respondents were members of the Society, they had minimal participation in it. The immigrants did not go to the Lounge primarily to meet Korean friends; time and work constraints being their excuse.

The respondents’ Korean identity was important to all except Minja who had married a non-Korean. Most thought that language was an important part of this identity and hence language maintenance was desired. Yet the Korean population in Dunedin at the time was believed to be too small to make Korean language classes viable. Very few respondents realised the practical difficulties involved in language maintenance by immigrants. The desire for language maintenance and concerns about language shift have been expressed by Youn and Starks’ (forthcoming) sample of 51 Korean respondents in Auckland. Such concerns are justified as language shift has occurred among immigrant communities in Australia and New Zealand (see Chapter 3).

No group one respondents believed their own ethnic identity had changed after coming to New Zealand, however, some had noticed this among the younger generation.

Most respondents deemed that the ethnic group should be responsible for language maintenance, rather than the government. The majority of them believed that Korean language teaching should depend on practical considerations such as size of the Korean population here, interest in it, and need for it, such as for trade. However, as immigrants, the respondents were willing to put in the effort to acquire
fluent English. Korean immigrants in Auckland have been found to support the
government’s involvement in helping immigrants improve their English skills (Youn
and Starks, forthcoming).

In the experience of most respondents, New Zealanders were not very tolerant of
their limited fluency in English. Some felt disadvantaged because of this while two
had encountered racial discrimination. Other Asians have also found that they have
unrealistically been expected to be fluent in English soon after their arrival here and
to even use it in public with their ingroup (Vasil and Yoon 1996:44).

The respondents had migrated here in search of a better standard of living. However, some of their educational qualifications and professional experience were
not recognised and so they found restricted opportunities, instead of the better
opportunities they had come for. This made them frustrated and had adversely
affected their self-esteem.

Most women did not want to change their lifestyle here although the men thought it
was the responsibility of minority groups to adapt and find a harmonious balance or
‘new culture’ between the Korean and New Zealand ways of life. Previous research
has also found that Asian immigrants recognise that it is up to them to adapt to their
new country to make life better in the latter (Vasil and Yoon 1996:48).

By coming to New Zealand in search of a higher quality of life, some respondents
had endured personal hardship. This included retraining in their chosen
occupational field or relinquishing their original profession; living away from family;
and avoiding social interaction with New Zealanders. On the whole however, most
respondents were relatively satisfied with life here.

The person who was least oriented towards Korea was Minja. She recognised this,
and attributed this partly to being married to a Pākehā and partly to having lived in
Japan for fifteen years. ‘Is it still all right for you to have interview with me because
I’m not really lived in Korea only, and I’m married to a Kiwi, lifestyle is quite
different . . .’ (Minja)

In some ways she had the most integrative attitude towards language learning of the
six group one respondents. She was interested in language learning for its own sake,
yet she was indifferent to the availability of Korean media in Dunedin. She was very
confident in her English speaking ability, having worked as a Korean-English
translator. All three languages she knew were important to her, and she believed
that if she forgot Japanese, the time she had spent in Japan would have been wasted.
Minja’s Korean identity was not important to her because she was married to a non-
Korean; in fact she often forgot that she was Korean. After her last visit to Korea, she had decided that she would not go there again.

Ilwon had the most positive attitude to English, even calling it a scientific language! He had the most instrumental approach to learning English, preferring to speak English at home and encouraging his son to use English too. He would translate his life story into English if needed, and he would not use Korean language media if they were available here. He was the only one who believed that it was important to be good in English in Korea. Ilwon also thought that Korean was important for New Zealand. He believed New Zealanders should be bilingual only if it caused no confusion. Despite his emphasis on English, he considered his ethnic identity to be Korean and that language was the most important indicator of this identity. The negative result of learning English was that he was forgetting Korean, yet he did not think his identity had changed.

6.3 GROUP TWO RESPONDENTS

The four group two respondents had been in New Zealand for varying lengths of time, ranging from 1.25 to 11 years. Their ages at the time of interviewing were between 16 and 25 years. All these respondents came from Seoul. They were either pupils at secondary school or students at the University of Otago.

6.3.1 Attitudes to language and to bilingualism

The two males, Kildong and Sookil, would prefer to write or tell their life story in English, while the females, Joohee and Jiyoung, would use either only Korean or both Korean and English. Kildong thought that English allowed better expression even though he had learned English for less time than the others. Sookil was better at written English than at written Korean. Having left Korea at the age of 14, his Korean vocabulary was limited to that of a 14 year old. Korean was also the language used to write letters to relatives in Korea by those who corresponded.

The only exposure the respondents had to Korean language media was videos sent by friends in Auckland. At the time of interviewing, there was no local Korean video or book library. Jiyoung was able to access the Korean Herald on the Internet; however, this was in English. Most respondents expressed a desire for Korean media to be available, such as radio and TV programs; they also read Korean books; Joohee proudly told me that she had about 200 of them here.
Most respondents preferred to use English over Korean. Changing between languages for different speakers was difficult. Yet, they all liked to speak Korean.

... sometimes you know like if I speak in English I don't feel that much, like I don't [understand] poem, I do sometimes, but I hardly [understand] poem, and ... like in Korean I don't [understand] all poems but I do understand some poems but like I think I have less feeling in English and some like slangs even they say, if they say their opinions I don't, 'oh, did you say that?' you know sort of, but if I speak in Korean I don't understand some jokes nowadays because they keep changing, but most of things I can understand, Korean is a bit more, I think I act more sensitive in Korean. (Jiyoung)

At the same time, some negative attitudes to Korean were expressed, although these were not always explicitly stated. It was believed that Koreans spoke very loudly when they used Korean in public, drawing attention to themselves. Also, the Korean language had led to strange reactions from New Zealanders.

... they [Kiwis] think, for example, that Korean language is very strange for them, when I teach them a word they can't pronounce it, they like own English, not ethnic language. (Kildong)

Respondents considered that Korean could not overtake languages such as French and German in importance in New Zealand. However, this could actually happen, as Asian language departments are expanding in universities while European language departments are shrinking, and some companies in New Zealand recruit people with a knowledge of Korean. The number of tourists coming from South Korea to New Zealand during the first half of the 1990s has increased more than that from any other country, except Taiwan (Price 1996b). The New Zealand Dairy Industry is now looking for graduates with a knowledge of the Korean language (advertisement in Critic 8 May 1996). Early in 1997, the Dunedin City Council signed a memorandum of friendship with a Korean delegation from a district of Seoul to strengthen ties between the two. This preliminary document marked the beginning of contact in the future (Harris 1997). Dunedin already attracts Korean students, both secondary school students and English language students and it has the

---

35 This situation is likely to change given the Korean and South East Asian economic troubles in early 1998.
potential to lure tertiary students (Harris 1997). The English language students have so far ranged in age from 8 to 28 years (Price 1997a, Price 1997b).

Some respondents expressed the belief that New Zealanders were intolerant of other languages. This may have contributed to their own negative attitudes towards Korean and their preference for English.

Sometimes they like us, but when we gather, only Asians gather, they hate that, because when we gather we speak our own languages, not English, they hate it but when I am alone and join them they like that because I don’t speak my language, I speak English so they like that. (Kildong)

Even though the respondents preferred to use English in New Zealand and had some negative attitudes towards Korean, they all felt attached to the Korean language and thought the language was important to them. It was part of their ethnicity: a link with Korean culture and a connection to Korea.

It’s quite important because otherwise I would have lost my identity as a Korean and on top of that, I do enjoy speaking different languages, like in the past I’ve studied German before, and right now I’m studying French and I’ve tried to study Japanese as well, so I’d like to keep as many languages as possible. (Sookil)

All respondents agreed that Korean brought together their family members, especially where the parents did not speak fluent English and the younger children were not very fluent in Korean. Without Korean, communication in these families would have been limited.

Although most respondents expressed a general preference for using English in New Zealand, they did not think it acceptable for Koreans in New Zealand to speak in English to other Koreans. Such people were believed to be denying their Koreanness.

I think they have wrong way, they are Korean, not English person. In my classroom there are three Taiwanese and one has lived here five years and one another one born here but the student who was born in Dunedin, he cannot speak Taiwanese at all. I think in my situation it looks very strange to me, Taiwanese student cannot speak Taiwanese but only English, I think it’s very bad for himself. (Kildong)
However, the females thought it was acceptable to speak in English with other Koreans for the practice. In the presence of non-Koreans, though, all the respondents preferred to use English so as not to let others feel isolated.

Most respondents believed their Korean was not as good as it was when they came here, either because they did not make as much of an effort to speak well, or because they were not able to keep up with changes in the Korean language in Korea.

When I speak to my family or other Korean people, it's just simple everyday language, it’s not in academic way, so I end up using simple phrases, so I’ve forgotten many hard words as such and I’m not actually expanding my vocabulary by reading any literature in Korean or anything like that, so I’m sort of getting to where my pronunciation is perfect in Korean, but I’m beginning to sound like a 10 year old. (Sookil)

None of the respondents’ parents encouraged only the Korean language in their children. This was because the children knew Korean already. Most parents encouraged English or English and Korean, so that their children could secure employment in New Zealand. Those who made mistakes while speaking in Korean were usually corrected by their parents.

English was important to the respondents because it would ease adjustment to life in New Zealand.

Listener[^36] is about normal life so I need to read it because if I try School Cert[^37] it’s about other culture and I need to know about other culture and New Zealand life. (Joohee)

They were all keen to improve their English language skills.

None of the respondents had a choice about learning English, which had been a compulsory subject at school in Korea. As migrants in New Zealand, the English language was imperative for their survival. All group two respondents would have learned English even if they did not need it in New Zealand. This was mainly because English would be useful anywhere in the world, including Korea.

[^36]: Listener refers to The New Zealand Listener, a national weekly magazine.

[^37]: School certificate is a national examination taken by students at the end of the third year of secondary school, usually at the age of 15 or 16.
Yes, I like to learn many languages anyway and even if I was in Korea, Korean people cannot speak in English but if you can speak in English, you’ll have better jobs. And also I want to see like the other cultures, I want to travel around the world, someday. (Jiyoung)

In Korea, a knowledge of English is useful at school to the extent that it is a subject and hence all students have to sit English exams. Beyond school, it can improve job prospects.

It certainly helps to get good jobs anyway because of the fundamental difference between English and Korean, a lot of Koreans find it hard to learn the language, ie English. So if you can speak English, you have a better chance of getting a good job. (Sookil)

Positive aspects for the Korean group two respondents about learning English included being able to get on with daily life in New Zealand, including finding a job and making friends.

Well, definitely in New Zealand, being able to actually live everyday life. If I couldn’t speak English I couldn’t get around or do anything by myself, I’ll always be relying on someone to do things for me, so it’s independence thing as far as living in New Zealand is concerned, and if I was to go back to Korea to live there, as I said, I’ll be getting a good job in some big exporting company, because speaking English well is something a lot of Koreans can’t do, so I’ll be in those very select group of people who can actually do that. (Sookil)

Negative aspects related to learning English evoked expressions from most about the difficulty of learning English and the frustration arising from this.

I don’t like to find the dictionary, takes so long time if I have hard vocabulary, if I read hard book there are heaps of unknown vocabularies and I need to find all of them, if I want to, sometimes I just skip it and just guess the meanings, sometimes makes sense but sometimes doesn’t and like comprehension there are heaps of vocabularies which Kiwi doesn’t understand as well, for me it’s really really hard and I just guess it as ??? really upset me, that’s really bad. (Joohee)

Attitudes to bilingualism were favourable.
You understand more, you learn more and quite interesting to find like Korean sentence works like this, but English sentence works like that and if you compare the things, you can understand more . . . (Joohee)

Most respondents had learned or were learning additional languages at school/university and enjoyed learning languages even if this was for practical reasons. Language was believed to be a key to culture, hence language learning meant learning about other people as well. Being able to speak in additional languages was taken as a sign of friendliness. Language learning could also be interesting just for its own sake.

### 6.3.2 Ethnic identity

Most respondents thought of themselves as Korean, while Kildong thought of his identity at the broader level of Chinese. Their Korean/Chinese identity was very important, but less so to Sookil who had been in New Zealand the longest and had changed a lot in this time. The most important indicators of their Korean/Chinese identity varied considerably, including their way of thinking, place of origin, physical features, or accent (while speaking English).

> Because I find, I don’t know, I feel I’m Korean, everything in Korean is more comfortable with me, and well I think that’s it, and also sometimes I feel oh yeah, I’ve got really good friends here, but sometimes I stop some conversation on certain stage because . . . I can feel these people [Kiwi] don’t understand this much or something like that. . . . (Jiyoung)

Many had been mistaken for tourists, and were used to it by now, often using it to their advantage. Sookil also commented that he was seen as a foreigner by New Zealanders, even though he had been here for eleven years and had adopted many New Zealand customs and ways.

> What do you think others see you as?
> As still a foreigner I guess, I think it’s natural for New Zealanders to see any Asian as foreigners because in many ways it is still European dominated country.38

---

38 Sookil emphasised that when he said that New Zealand was a European/white dominated country, he did not mean it in a negative context.
So when you think people see you as a foreigner here, does that annoy you?

Umm, depends what their attitude is, if they see me as a foreigner in bad way, as like saying you coming into my country and you know what are you doing here, which I have come across before, then it does annoy me, but if they see me as a foreigner, another person living here, because everyone has come here in say last 100 years, so it really doesn’t bother me as long as it isn’t in a negative context. (Sookil)

Such perceptions had affected his identity, and he still thought of himself as a bit of a foreigner, despite feeling partly Kiwi after having lived here for so long.

Do you think of yourself as a foreigner?
Yeah, well it’s half-half I guess, because everyone living in New Zealand sees New Zealand as a white dominated country I sort of hold the view as well because it’s probably not wrong to say that this is European country and I came here, I’m just an immigrant, and because I’m more educated than others I sort of hold the pride and respect that I’m contributing something to the society, I’m not just a dole bludger or anything like that, but yeah, in many ways I do see myself as a foreigner. (Sookil)

His Korean identity was based on his physical features and his accent. Physical features are impossible to change, whereas his thinking and culture had changed somewhat, so he admitted that he felt somewhat ‘stuck in the middle’.

It [my identity] has changed quite a bit since I lived here, my attitudes have changed, my culture as such, I’m sort of stuck in the middle, I’m not completely Kiwi, but then I’m not completely Korean either in many ways, like good example is my going flatting. I mean for a lot of New Zealanders it’s very natural to go flatting when we get over 20, but my parents don’t like it because in Korea you most likely live at home and then you move out when you get married. Things like that. (Sookil)

In this sense he felt neither completely Korean nor Kiwi.

6.3.3 Language maintenance and identity

The Korean language was important to the respondents because they were Korean and they referred to it as ‘my language’. They thought that language was important
for ethnicity and that it should be maintained. This was partly because culture was represented in language, such as respect terms in the Korean language. These distinctions were lost in English.

I think language is actually more important because once everyone starts speaking English, they start to blend in with everyone else and I think the idea uh the language itself contains the culture as well, just the way things are phrased, and how they speak to each other, like when a Korean child speaks to an elder, they actually use slightly different forms of language, whereas in English, you just refer everyone as ‘you’ and ‘him’ and that’s not done in Korean and if Korean kids started doing that, if all the Koreans in Dunedin starts speaking English to them, such respect will be lost, with the language, language goes as well, so I think language is quite important. (Sookil)

Being able to speak one’s ‘own’ language brought people together.

Yes, if someone can speak their own language, then we can feel more joined with them and we can think of Korean more than the other one [culture], but if you don’t speak language at first then you don’t think of that culture and you forgot that your own culture, yeah it compromises [their identity]. (Joohee)

The Korean language was believed to be especially important in New Zealand where it distinguished Koreans from Chinese and Japanese since all these three groups looked the same.

Only Sookil realised the difficulty of bringing up children born of Korean parents speaking Korean in New Zealand.

What do you think of children who do not speak the same language(s) as their parents?
That’s an interesting one because my mum’s sister is married to an Australian and she tried really hard to teach her kids Korean, they are living in Hong Kong and the kids go to English school, so it’s really hard, I realise that it’s really hard to teach two languages, and although ideally you should be able to speak your own, well your parents’ language, I don’t actually blame them for not being able to speak, say if a Korean kid was born here, and he can’t speak Korean that well, well, I’ll just say oh yeah, that’s the way it goes, I wouldn’t blame the parents for not trying or the kids for not trying.
So do you think that kid would still be Korean if he or she couldn't speak Korean?

I think it'd be alienated from both sides, like as far as Koreans are concerned, he’s not complete Korean either because he or she can’t speak the language anyway, so he or she will be viewed as a foreigner to Korean, whereas if the person was living in New Zealand, he still will be viewed as foreigner as well because the person will be Asian, which is quite interesting because say if you’re Dutch, a Dutch couple moved here and had a kid here, the kid will be viewed as a New Zealander, whereas if Chinese couple moved here or Korean couple moved here, and the kid could speak perfect English, the person will still be viewed as a foreigner. (Sookil)

It is ironic that both the Korean and the Dutch children would probably consider themselves as New Zealanders if they had grown up in New Zealand, but the Dutch child would be better accepted by the general population as a New Zealander. Vasil and Yoon (1996:42) note that similar sentiments have been expressed by other Asian immigrants, who find they do not get accepted fully as New Zealanders despite their efforts to adapt and integrate into New Zealand society. In fact, one immigrant now made only minimal efforts to adapt after being discouraged by the responses of New Zealanders (Vasil and Yoon 1996:42). Jacqui Leckie’s research with Indo-New Zealanders, however, indicates that sports can transcend such divisions.

To some extent, participation and success by several Indo-New Zealanders is a signifier to New Zealanders of the ethnic group’s ‘assimilability’, as sport could be described as New Zealand’s main ‘religion’. (Leckie 1995b:156)

With regard to ethnic identity change at an individual level, group two respondents thought their identity and attitudes had changed after coming to New Zealand. This was mainly because they were living in a different culture, but partly also because of using more English.

Well, yeah, I’d say, I mean it’s probably a combination of things, the fact that I’m actually living in New Zealand and all my friends are New Zealanders or Europeans that probably changed my attitude in many ways as well but language plays certain parts, but because I can speak Korean, certain way of thinking never changes, like I wouldn’t go around to my father’s friends and direct them as ‘you’ or anything like that, even in Korean, it'll be something I can’t even do, I can’t say, I can’t call them by name, because a lot of New Zealand children just call their father’s friends
by their first name which is not done in Korean, and I wouldn’t do that, so certain things are kept. (Sookil)

The identity change was seen positively, broadening the respondents’ horizons: ‘I think I change the more better, better thinking . . .’ (Joohee)

At the same time, respondents had not forgotten their Korean backgrounds: ‘I know how to act around Koreans and how to act around Europeans.’ (Sookil)

Opinion was split over responsibility for language maintenance, with some respondents thinking it should be the government but others thought it should be the group itself: ‘. . . government is third person and they don’t actually understand the intricacy of language.’ (Sookil)

Only Joohee suggested that the Korean language should be offered at schools as an option, although the rest thought it should be offered in the future when Korea may have more influence in New Zealand. Sookil was of the opinion that New Zealanders would not have much use for bilingualism, even though bilingualism in itself would be good.

I don’t think they [New Zealanders] should be forced [to learn a second language], I mean if they, I think it’ll be good for them to actually learn something else, but to be honest, I don’t think they’d get that much use out of it, anyway . . . (Sookil)

Only the females thought that textbooks should be written in minority group languages. This was to help with comprehension.

Yeah, sometimes I feel because sometimes very hard to understand like words, language, English language is quite hard, if we have Korean version, it helps to understand, hard to get it, that’s the problem. (Joohee)

The males took the more practical approach of becoming more adept at English since it is necessary in New Zealand for employment.

No, because we have to use English in school in New Zealand, I think ethnic language text book is not good because when you have to go to university and get a job we have to use English. When we use ethnic language we can’t get a job or we can’t work in New Zealand, because New Zealand uses English, not ethnic language or Korean, Japanese, Chinese. (Kildong)
If Korean was offered as a subject at school here, none of them would have taken it since they were all fluent in the language. It was aptly pointed out that were it offered, probably only the basics of the language would be taught, which the respondents knew anyway.

None of the respondents felt the need for official letters, notices, road signs, forms and leaflets to be printed in Korean. The size of the Korean population did not warrant it. However, the size of the Māori population did justify the use of the Māori language for such purposes.

If the number is there to justify that, like say, Māori, obviously they have to do that, but like Korean, I don’t think the number is there to justify such drastic measures, because you can go so far, you can say, well if you’re writing in Korean, why aren’t you writing in Dutch and French and German and I think it gets a bit silly. (Sookil)

6.3.4 Attitudes to and experiences in Korea and New Zealand

Most respondents had mainly New Zealanders as friends. At school and university, they came into contact predominantly with non-Koreans.

I've got more Kiwi friends because just about 100 of them [Koreans] are here, and they are all different age group, so quite hard to meet and we don't have many parties and things so we don't meet very often, so I have more Kiwi friends. (Joohee)

Sookil and Jiyoung (who had been here eleven and five years respectively) did not identify or associate with more recent immigrants from Korea. Although Koreans in Korea and Koreans in New Zealand had both changed, each had changed in different ways, and so the earlier immigrants did not have that much in common with the newer ones.

I feel more comfortable with the other people here in New Zealand [other people, not Korean?] yeah, that's right, because I came here about five years ago and everybody thought different, most of the student are about, they came here about three years or later, so we don’t have much in common nowadays [with new Koreans, you mean?] yes, and also even if they came here about the same time as me, but we all have different backgrounds, the party and social life in Korea is different, so I feel who is
doing my course or living with [me], these people are more comfortable with me, so I found Kiwi is more comfortable with me. (Jiyoung)

Despite having more in common with non-Koreans than with recent Korean immigrants, Jiyoung found that there were still some differences between her and New Zealanders: ‘By my experience, we have some differences.’ (Jiyoung)

Since all four respondents were at school or university, they came into contact with the general New Zealand population through their classmates. At the time of interviewing there were less than 40 Korean families in Dunedin. Without a Korean club or group, meeting other Koreans was difficult, except at church.

With the opening of Koreana there was little change for the group two respondents. Only two used the Lounge, roughly once a month, and only for buying Korean food and stationery. Joohee took her Kiwi friends to it, and the latter found the Lounge interesting. None of the respondents went there to meet Korean friends. Some of them borrowed videos and books occasionally.

The Korean Society, set up in December 1995, was perceived as an organisation for adults. As with group one respondents, the establishment of the Korean Society and the Korean Lounge did not appear to have changed much for the respondents in terms of meeting other Koreans.

Some respondents had had negative experiences soon after their arrival because of limited fluency in English. Jiyoung felt humiliated when Koreans were thought of as dumb because of their lack of fluency in English. Joohee had not been able to join in the conversation of her friends, so she had felt lonely and isolated.

When I came here first here I couldn’t communicate very well, I was isolated, like in class. I was in the group, but I couldn’t laugh because I couldn’t understand, I couldn’t speak, because I couldn’t speak English, so I just sit there and eat my lunch, and my tea, I was quite lonely, but now I can join the conversation, not really many problems. (Joohee)

Jiyoung had also been made fun of by a teacher at school. He had targeted her by asking her many more questions than he asked the rest of the class. She was frustrated by her poor command of English at the time and was unable to complain.

. . . so I got about 6-8 questions in a day, people supposed to answer 1 or 2 but he just making fun of me, cruel and one day I started to answer, that was first time I answered, and I was pretty impressed that I could answer but he just touched his huge head and said, ‘See, she can answer the
common question’. I couldn’t complain because I couldn’t speak in English, but I found it was not fair. (Jiyoung)

Both of these respondents had improved in English when I interviewed them and so no longer felt hindered. Leckie (1995a:61) also documents feelings of loneliness, homesickness and social isolation experienced by female migrants.

Only Sookil had experienced racial discrimination.

When I first came here, there wasn’t such anti-Asian attitude here but with more immigrants coming in now I think a lot of people are feeling rather threatened, so like when on weekends when I go out drinking with my friends I do come across a couple of idiots who call me names, tell me to go back to where I come from and but I mean I do get that. I’m finding more such incidents recently than I used to like say back 5-6 years. 5 or 6 years ago when I went out on weekends, I think you find them more on weekends because people get drunk and they start to lose control, back in those days I didn’t really expect such incidents, maybe once in 6 months or something, but now I find that it happens every month, you know, at least if that, you know, once a week, every two weeks. (Sookil)

As with group one respondents, there was a general feeling among group two respondents that New Zealanders were insular and did not know very much about other parts of the world.

. . . they [New Zealanders] don’t know what’s going on in the world, they think very different from what we think and what we know, New Zealand people, it’s good, they think they are very good, but they don’t really understand how fast the world is going or something. (Jiyoung)

The aspect the respondents liked most about the New Zealand way of life was its relaxed nature. Here people had free time to pursue hobbies like sports and gardening, while in Korea, competition forced people to work all the time.

Kiwi people is enjoys life, Korean people is always busy and in New Zealand the Kiwi people is very free, they enjoy sports, gardening, we can’t do that in Korea because Korean society is very very busy because too many people, you always have to work for the future, and if you don’t do that, you fail, but in New Zealand, I can’t explain. (Kildong)

However, this very relaxed atmosphere could sometimes be excessive, and this was the feature of New Zealand life which was disliked by some respondents.
Being relaxed, it could be seen as contradictory, but in many ways being too relaxed is also bad because you want something done and they say oh come back next week, whereas like if you're in Korea and you want something you can get it next day. That's something I felt when I first came to New Zealand and I still feel that. But I think it is changing in many ways, I mean when I first came here, the supermarkets weren't even open on Saturdays, and now it's open seven days a week and things like that, it's strange. (Sookil)

Apart from enjoying the free time in New Zealand, the respondents had acquired various aspects of New Zealand culture living here. These included flatting, dressing less modestly and being less shy (for a female), eating New Zealand food, watching rugby and drinking alcohol. Of the two university students, one was living in a flat, while the other lived in a hall of residence. Since both of them were living away from home, they ate more New Zealand than Korean food. Rules of eye contact are different in Korea, but here in New Zealand Jiyoung did not follow the Korean way.

. . . Korean girls don’t go to shower room without proper gear because they shy to show and I just have towel and also I eat New Zealand food more than most Koreans do and I don’t really get shy, I think it’s my personality, but I am friendly to everybody and like eye contact, Korean people if they get somebody’s eye contact then they turn around their face but me smiling. (Jiyoung)

Picking up such aspects of New Zealand culture was seen as part of living here, and the respondents did not mind it. In fact, change was seen as necessary since they were living in a foreign country.

. . . living in New Zealand, you have to adopt certain features of the New Zealand culture as well because otherwise you’re being snobby yourself as much as the others. You have to accept that you are in a foreign country and you have to change certain things. . . . It doesn’t bother me at all, I am living in New Zealand and it would be stupid to try to live like a complete Korean because it’s not possible and besides I’ve been living

---

39 Flatting in New Zealand refers to a group of people, usually between two and seven, living together in a flat, which may be a house or an apartment, and (usually) sharing expenses as well as chores like cooking and cleaning.
here for most part of my teenage years, so I’m not quite sure what the Korean youth culture is. (Sookil)

In comparison to New Zealand, Korea was seen as more dynamic and modern and was liked for this reason: ‘Korean life is very modern than New Zealand, I think Korea is very international than New Zealand, New Zealand is only New Zealand . . .’ (Kildong)

The Korean way of life still felt natural to those who had been away for quite some time although they could not really say why this was so.

Well obviously it’s most natural for me because I am Korean so, it's really hard to explain isn’t it? I think it just feels natural for me to be amongst Koreans in many ways. (Sookil)

The busy and competitive lifestyle of Korea was not missed.

Too busy, sometimes lose human, there’s so many people, and they all have their business and they don’t care like education is really hard, it’s not fair education, we need to study very hard to get into university, like high school students, my friends in Korea, they go to school at 6 AM in the morning, they come back about 11, and then they go to another education centre to study and they come back at 1 in the morning, then study again, then go to bed at 3 and get up 5, it’s hell, I hate it, I absolutely hate it and they should change it, but old government don’t think like that. (Joohee)

Only Jiyoung went back to Korea regularly for visits. Relatives coming here to visit meant that Sookil did not go back very often, and this had contributed to his distance from Korea.

I actually haven't been there for 10 years. I’ve only been back once and I’ve lost all my contacts with my friends from school. It’s easy to say I’ll write to each other all the time, but if you don’t see each other for years you lost contact. So only people I’ve got over there are my relatives, and most of them have come over here for visits once in a while anyway, so I have no reason to actually go back to see anyone and I got my friends here so we just go on holiday and stuff around the country. The only time I can actually go anywhere is over summer, because that’s when the varsity is on holiday and around that time also I’m just going on holiday with my friends down here anyway, so I’ve never really got a chance to go. (Sookil)
Regular visits to the homeland are believed to increase cultural ties with it, revive identification with the homeland and help to maintain the language (Feuerverger 1991:670).

Visits to the ethnic homeland seemed to create a source of meaning and pride in their ethnic language and culture which previously had been missing for many of the students. The ‘static’ immigrant picture of the ‘Old Country’ that they had experienced through the eyes of their parents was transformed into a vital, modern way of life. (Feuerverger 1991:675)

Without such visits to reconnect him to Korea, Sookil had lost ties with Korea and its youth culture, so he did not identify much with it anymore and was not even interested in finding out about it. The newer immigrants had more recent bonds with Korea, and wanted to return for a visit.

6.3.5 Summary

Since education was a major reason for coming to New Zealand, the respondents saw the importance of learning English to achieve this end. English was a second language to them yet was now of prime importance in New Zealand. They were generally aware of its international status and usefulness around the world. They would have tried to learn it anyway, even if they did not need to. It also meant that they would be able to learn about other cultures and meet people from them. Most were learning at least one additional language at school or university.

Korean was also important to the respondents. They displayed a contradictory attitude towards it: an attachment to it made them feel Korean, yet they also had negative attitudes. This may have been partly as a result of intolerance displayed by New Zealand towards the use of their first language. However, none of them felt any bitterness as a result of this. They accepted that they had to make some changes in their adopted country and that such changes enriched them.

The Korean language was important as it brought together their family members. It would let them communicate effectively when they went back to Korea. Generally, it was not acceptable for Koreans in New Zealand to use English with other Koreans.

Parental encouragement to learn one or another language varied, and did not seem to have had much effect on the respondents, except perhaps in one case. Although none of the respondents claimed to be encouraged to speak Korean by their parents so as to not forget it, Sookil’s mother, who was a group one respondent, said she encouraged her children to practise their Korean to maintain it. She had been here
longer than any of the other respondents and had realised the possibility of language shift. The parents of the other respondents did not appear to have realised the implications of language shift yet, having been in New Zealand for a relatively short time.

The respondents mainly thought of their identity as Korean. Ways of thinking, place of birth and growing up, and physical features were the most important determinants of their ethnicity. Language was deemed to be important to maintain their ethnic identity and the respondents hoped for language maintenance in New Zealand. Sookil, who had been here the longest, realised the difficulty of transmitting Korean to New Zealand-born children of Korean parents and argued that such children would find it problematic being accepted by both Koreans and New Zealanders. He was still perceived as a foreigner in New Zealand even though he identified more with New Zealanders than with recent Korean immigrants.

Korean was not thought of as important in New Zealand yet, and opinion was split equally between the group and the government when it came to responsibility for language maintenance.

Most respondents thought their ethnic identity had changed after coming here, and such change was seen positively, and an inevitable part of shifting from one country to another. Only Sookil had experienced racial discrimination in New Zealand while Joohee and Jiyoung had felt disadvantaged by their lack of fluency in English when they first came here. Yet, in general they found New Zealanders friendly and most of them had more New Zealand than Korean friends. The respondents who had been here longer identified more with New Zealanders than with recent Korean immigrants, even though they were all from Seoul.

In general, the females were more attached to Korean. The males had a more instrumental approach to language learning and to bilingualism than the females did. Yet, for the females, language choice was indicative of proficiency rather than attitudes. Thus, for them (the females) it was admissible to speak English with other Koreans in order to practise it. For the males, learning English clearly meant a good job in New Zealand (or even in Korea). The females would find textbooks written in Korean helpful, while the males would find them a hindrance in their learning of English and thus success in New Zealand. Such a split in attitudes may be a reflection of gender role expectations in Korea, where traditionally men were the breadwinners and women the homemakers. Even in the late 1980s women generally left paid employment after marriage (Kim and Hurh 1988:153). Language learning was often seen as the mother’s responsibility.
Of all the respondents, Kildong had the most instrumental approach to learning English and to bilingualism. He was the only respondent who did not learn an additional language. He may have been influenced by his parents, who had encouraged him and his sister to speak in English at home to practise it. However, they had abandoned such efforts since they were unable to express themselves as well in English. He liked to watch the news on TV, thinking that he would be able to learn better English this way than by watching drama and comedy programs.

Sookil had been in New Zealand longer than the others (eleven years) and the effect of time was clearly revealed in his case. He showed the most language shift in terms of ability with Korean and English. He was the least interested in Korean media and had less interaction with Koreans than the others. His approach to language learning was practical; he believed in learning only those languages which had any importance, even though he enjoyed speaking multiple languages. Having been here so long, he had lost touch with his Korean friends. He preferred to spend his summer holiday here in New Zealand with his New Zealand friends rather than go back to Korea for a visit. He had probably changed more than the others, and thought of himself as a mixture of Korean and New Zealander even though he was perceived as a foreigner in New Zealand.

6.4 CONCLUSION

English, the language with the highest ethnolinguistic vitality in New Zealand, was very important to both groups of respondents as they needed it for daily life here. The respondents had mainly instrumental attitudes to it, but this was to varying extents. Keen to be fluent in English, the respondents were worried if they lacked such fluency. Group two respondents were especially highly motivated to become fluent in English which would enable them to compete in the job market in New Zealand. As this would fulfil their purpose for migration, it did not threaten their ethnic identity.

Some families had shifted from Auckland to Dunedin which had a sparser Korean population, so that they could meet non-Koreans and practise speaking English with them. This resulting increase in Dunedin’s Korean population was seen as a source for more Korean friends by group one respondents who interacted more with
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40 As noted in 2.5, the distinction between instrumental and integrative motives can be blurry and somewhat subjective.
Koreans than with non-Koreans. In direct contrast to this, group two respondents thought that there were not many Koreans in Dunedin and that it was hard for them to meet other Koreans. This seems to indicate that group one put more effort into meeting Koreans than group two did. Related to this was the limited identification between early and recent Korean immigrants for group two but not for group one. Group two seemed to have experienced more change in New Zealand, and only group one seemed to be able to identify with Koreans who had migrated at a different time. Group two respondents were indifferent to the activities of the Korean Society, conceiving it more as an adults’ organisation. However, the adults too did not do very much as part of the Korean Society. The feeling of ‘community’ was even less among group two than among group one. Neither the Korean Society nor the Korean Lounge had increased interaction much among the Korean immigrants, so they did not heighten the weak sense of ‘community’ among the respondents. Very few respondents avoided interethnic communication with New Zealanders; this was because of perceived insensitivity from the latter.

The Korean language was important to both groups of respondents. However, group one seemed to be more attached to Korea, the Korean language and culture. This was likely to be at least a result of their having spent more time there. They did not express any negative feelings towards the Korean language, which group two did. The negative attitudes of group two had arisen in the context of New Zealand; however, the respondents did not limit their vision to this local context but saw Korea as important internationally.

Language was a significant part of the respondents’ Korean identity, and they generally wanted the Korean language to be maintained by the Korean community in Dunedin. Group one respondents especially feared a communication gap with the younger generation if Korean was not maintained. Language shift was more evident in the case of the group two respondents. They were less fluent in Korean than their parents but more fluent in English. However, without a long-established Korean community in New Zealand who had experienced complete language shift over the generations to warn them, very few respondents realised the practical difficulties involved in trying to maintain Korean overseas. Hence it was thought that Dunedin’s Korean population was too small at the time to warrant setting up Korean classes. At the same time, group one respondents were not sure whether they would be able to think of their grandchildren as Korean if the latter did not speak Korean. For them, Korean identity in the long term seemed to be fixed: to be Korean, one had to speak the Korean language; it was not possible to claim identity with the Korean language at a symbolic level.
Group one did not think their identity had changed, but most of group two did. Group one respondents who thought their Korean side was diminishing as a result of living here and using English did not think of this change in terms of identity change. Change was perceived by group two as a positive thing, something that had enriched them. Some change and assimilation was seen as necessary for living in New Zealand. Since the respondents preferred the quality of life in New Zealand to that in Korea, they were willing to make some changes and adjustments. Such assimilation was not feared by group two. Even though their ties with their native language and culture had weakened, none showed evidence of experiencing feelings of anomie. Group one respondents were not as open to change as group two but they had noticed that this was inevitable, and so had resigned themselves to it. As immigrants, they thought that they had to change rather than expect New Zealanders to accommodate to them. This was a trade off they had made for the better quality of life in New Zealand which they had emigrated for. Because the respondents’ native language and culture were being eroded (at varying rates for different respondents), they can be said to have experienced subtractive bilingualism. However, most respondents did not see English language learning as a subtractive process which took something away from them, but instead as a process of adding on: familiarity with another language and culture, and also the ability to succeed in their chosen country. Further, respondents had positive attitudes to bilingualism.

Group two respondents seemed more oriented to New Zealand than group one respondents. Respondents from both groups had experienced language difficulties and discrimination. However, as group two respondents became more fluent in English, such experiences were fewer.

In general, the women were more attached to the Korean language. The men had a more instrumental approach to English than the women. The women were less confident in their English ability than the men. In a previous study, Korean women have been found to be less confident with English than men (Youn and Starks, forthcoming).

The women were more resistant to change in New Zealand, whereas the men were more likely to think that as immigrants, they had to make an effort to fit into the culture here. The one woman who was different from the other Koreans in general knew that she was different, and attributed it to being married to a Pākehā. Korean identity was less salient to her and to the group two respondent who believed himself to be partly Kiwi; to the rest, their Korean identity was more salient.

Koreans are relatively recent immigrants to New Zealand. During the past couple of years, formal networks have been established among them in Dunedin, but these
appeared to have had a limited impact on their interaction. Generational differences emerged among the respondents, with group two being more oriented towards New Zealand society than Korean society. Group one was more concerned about Korean language and culture maintenance in New Zealand, fearing a potential communication gap with New Zealand-born Koreans. Respondents who identified with the Korean language did so at both communicative and symbolic levels; no split had occurred between the two yet. It is too early yet to say whether or not language is a core value for the Koreans, but going by the accounts of most other immigrant groups, it is unlikely to be so. Unless steps are taken soon, the Koreans are likely to witness language shift, like other immigrant groups before them. This is especially likely as Korean immigration to New Zealand has now tapered off, reducing the chances of interaction with incoming Korean language speakers. With language shift, it is likely that the definition of Korean identity will also shift and become more flexible to include non-Korean speakers.
7 DUTCH RESULTS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The Dutch respondents migrated to New Zealand during what was identified as the ‘third’ wave of Dutch migration. In this chapter I will analyse their responses during my interviews with them. Although they are different from my Korean respondents, major commentary on these differences will be discussed in Chapter 9.

7.1.1 Reasons for migrating to New Zealand

The main reason cited by the Dutch respondents for migrating to New Zealand was for the sake of the children’s education and because here the children would ‘literally have more space to grow up’ in. At the same time, it let them get away from the busy and hectic lifestyle in the Netherlands. Anna and her husband came here because here they would be able to ‘go farming’. They had been to New Zealand once before to visit relatives and had liked the country then. Hans and his wife had chosen New Zealand specifically rather than Australia or Canada because his wife was English and they thought that of these countries, New Zealand would be the most similar to England. The physical beauty of New Zealand was another attraction, especially for Jan and his wife who did not know anybody here.

Well at the time I was married and we had two young children of two months and one and a half years and we felt that we could offer them more space literally, more space to grow up than in Holland where it is very crowded. So that was basically the main reason we wanted to emigrate. Then we had four options to go to: Canada, Australia, Brazil and New Zealand. And the choice of New Zealand finally came because we met somebody from New Zealand who had lots of slides with him about the country and we saw that we said yes, this is such a beautiful country, that’s what we wanted, so we really didn’t know anybody here. That’s how we came to New Zealand, yeah. (Jan)

The reasons the Dutch respondents gave for coming here were thus very similar to those of the Korean respondents, but were somewhat different from those of Dutch migrants who came out just after the Second World War to escape the threat of war and for other economic reasons. Immigration consultants in the Netherlands point
out the common reasons for migrating here - today’s migrants come because of ‘green’ issues. Because the Netherlands’ economy has picked up now, the main push for migration to New Zealand has shifted from economic to environmental factors. New Zealand is believed to be less polluted and is less crowded than the Netherlands and allows people to pursue outdoor activities (Schouten 1992:251, 253).

7.1.2 Language abilities and use

After arriving in New Zealand, the respondents had started off using Dutch at home, but now only two of the families still spoke mainly Dutch. The others had switched to English or a mixture of the two, prompting Anna to occasionally urge her husband ‘to talk Dutch for a change’. The switch to English or a mixture had occurred after varying lengths of time, although two families had changed very soon after migrating. Those who had started using English the earliest with their families did so as an attempt to integrate, the next to shift did it because their children were getting confused by the constant switching between languages, while those who had changed later did so as they found that English became more and more easy to converse in.

Yes, we did [used English straight away in the family], we found it very important that coming to a new country we all had to adjust as fast as possible, it was our choice to come here, and for us it was I think the best thing to do. (Renate)

The respondents who used mainly English with their children spoke more Dutch with their spouses. In fact, only Hans said he used ‘English now’ with his wife whereas the others at least mixed the two. Anna and her husband used English with their children because the latter were born here and these children thought it was easier to speak in English.

English was the preferred choice of the respondents in the presence of non-Dutch people. This was to avoid being rude. Europeans commonly come across the languages of their neighbours and so are used to hearing other languages being spoken. However, during the 1950s when the Dutch started immigrating here in numbers, some New Zealanders’ suspicion and fear of foreigners made them

41 Refer Appendix A for a comparison of the population densities of South Korea, the Netherlands, Sāmoa and New Zealand.
intolerant towards the use of any other language apart from English. As a result, immigrants quickly conformed to using English only in the presence of New Zealanders, to avoid being accused of criticising New Zealand or New Zealanders in their first language (Schouten 1992:136). This tradition of conformity has lingered even among more recent Dutch immigrants (and has been picked up by Korean immigrants as mentioned in the previous chapter).

Many group one respondents from my study used mostly English with their children (including Anna whose children were born here), while Jan and Martin used mostly Dutch and Ineke used both.

In 1977, Kroef (cited in Schouten 1992:137) and later, Jetske Folmer (1992:8-9) found similar results from their studies of Dutch immigrants in New Zealand. Parents spoke mostly Dutch with each other until their eldest child started school. From then on, parents used mainly English with their children but Dutch between themselves, and the children too, started to converse mostly or exclusively in English. In fact, Kroef, who is a fluent bilingual, was able to speak to her immigrant adult respondents in Dutch, but found it unusual not to be able to do so with their children.

“It was one of the strangest findings . . . I found it impossible to talk Dutch to people my age, although we spoke to our parents in Dutch. It shows that habits govern the use of language and some situations dictate we use a certain language.” (Kroef cited in Schouten 1992:137)

Similar results have been found in Australia, where first generation Dutch parents used English with their children much more than in other immigrant groups (Smolicz 1981:86).

The group one respondents I interviewed had learned English, French and German at school in the Netherlands. English had been compulsory at school, while any additional languages were usually optional. Now, most respondents thought they were better in English and only a small minority thought Dutch was their best language.

No, I think I find it easier to express myself in English. When my daughter rings from Holland she speaks Dutch and I’m talking English. (Renate)

The group two respondents all had a better command of English than Dutch. They could all speak Dutch and read it, even if only to a very limited extent, but they could not all write it. They were especially unable to keep up with Dutch slang. These respondents had all learned English in New Zealand and they spoke it with a New Zealand accent.
7.2 GROUP ONE RESPONDENTS

The six group one respondents had been in New Zealand between ten and seventeen years. At the time of interviewing, they ranged in age from 36 to 60 years, with most of them in their late 40s. As noted, Anna’s children were born in New Zealand. Jan had lived for three years in Belgium, but all the rest had lived only in the Netherlands before coming here. He now had an American partner with whom he had to speak English, and his children (born of a Dutch mother) were in the Netherlands at the time. Hans was married to an Englishwoman. However, the latter had moved to the Netherlands around the age of 10 years and spoke fluent Dutch.

The respondents found it was difficult to translate their Dutch education into New Zealand standards. They had all had post-primary education, but they were not restricted in their choice of a high school at this level. Anna and Jan had taken the equivalent of New Zealand’s University Entrance examination, but the latter then attended secondary agricultural school. Ineke had attended home economics school after completing her primary education. All three of the men had training in their respective fields.

Of the women, Anna was a homemaker and mother, Renate was a paid cook while Ineke had stopped working as a painter after having suffered an accident. The occupations of the men were: professional consultant (Jan), architectural model maker (Hans) and quantity surveyor (Martin). All these respondents now had occupations which were reasonably similar to those they were involved in prior to migrating to New Zealand.

The educational and occupational profile of my respondents comes very close to that outlined by Hank Schouten for recent Dutch immigrants, who are likely to be more educated and skilled than earlier migrants. However, most recent migrants still come from the building trades, agriculture and horticulture (Schouten 1992:251) and this was evident among my respondents. Since recent migrants tend to be more highly educated, they are also likely to be more fluent in English.

7.2.1 Attitudes to language and to bilingualism

The number of group one respondents who would write their life story in English (because they now found English easier) was the same as those who would use
Dutch; Anna belonged to the latter category even though she found English easier to write in.

Dutch, I think. Yeah, although it’s hard, I find when I even write letters to home to my sisters or mum or friends or whatever, all your everyday life is so in English, you see you probably have maybe the same thing, and some words you just can’t find the right expression what you really want to say, . . . but I would write in Dutch still, I think. (Anna)

That’s difficult, I find it easier now to write letters in English than in Dutch, I know that when I write Dutch letters, I let lots of English words slip through when I go fast, so I’d probably use English I think. (Renate)

For the latter half, the use of Dutch was a means of asserting their Dutch identity and would make the story more accessible to the Dutch people who were more likely to be interested in the life of someone from a similar background. Jan would translate it into English after that if needed. He occasionally dabbled in poetry and writing, and used either Dutch or English depending on his mood and in which language things ‘came to the fore’.

A few respondents, especially the males, used Dutch language media. Most women adamantly insisted that they did not use any at all as there was sufficient media to read or watch in English. The remaining respondents seemed to be indifferent; they would for example read Dutch magazines if they came across some, but they did not actively seek Dutch language media. Renate and her husband now read the English subtitling rather than listening to the oral Dutch on Dutch movies. Very few respondents still ordered or had ordered Dutch newspapers or magazines from the Netherlands or Australia.

[Martin:] . . . I have my own Dutch books here which I’m sometimes reading again, otherwise there is not much in Dutch available in Dunedin anyway, is there?

What are those books there? That whole series?

Encyclopedias. Dutch ones, we took it with us when we came and I must admit it’s very worthwhile doing it. Even the boys both use it.

[son:] But we get you to translate.

[Martin:] Yeah, but that’s not the point, it’s there to encourage. (Martin and son)
Some of the men clearly regretted the lack of Dutch radio programs and Jan was vaguely thinking of doing something to redress this, especially for older Dutch people.

Yes, I've been thinking about that, that we are basically lacking a Dutch radio program here, and it may be quite nice to contribute something to that, to make it, to start it, I think because, especially when people are getting older, they revert back to their own language, their own cultural background, and you find especially with elderly people, they even lose the English tongue and they specially the people who are getting to the stage when they are really getting frail and then they get light forms of dementia, for example, they generally talk only in their own language. (Jan)

Dutch news, broadcast from the Netherlands in Dutch, is accessible late at night on shortwave. Some respondents had listened to this in the beginning, but hardly ever did so now. This was because its time and frequency changed regularly, the reception was unclear and it was too late at night for some. Further, they found that their connections with the Netherlands had waned as time went by.

When I got here I had an airmail edition of one of the major Dutch papers, and it came every week but it is also prohibitive in cost and I suppose there is not so much the need for it anymore because I am here now so . . . and I suppose that in the beginning you are here and you are still very much attached to the land where you came from, and you want to keep up with it, but you can’t, it gradually fades out, just as much as your friends’ circle from Holland fades out and you hear less and less and less and by the time they fade out there’s something new coming for you in its place, so the regular need for having Dutch information becomes less critical, and every now and then it’s fine . . . (Jan)

The Dutch language was believed to be changing faster than immigrants could keep up with it from New Zealand: ‘. . . Dutch language is one of those that keeps on changing very very fast and it’s very hard to keep up with that.’ (Hans)

The lack of variety in types of radio broadcasts in New Zealand was felt.

42 A recent study points out that the pronunciation of northern standard Dutch (spoken in the Netherlands) has changed dramatically this century (Van de Velde et al 1997:384).
. . . Well in Holland you have that [several kinds of music] too because Holland is so close to all the other countries we have music from France and Germany and Greece and Spain and Italy and so on. And it’s nice listening to it. Here the only thing you hear is English. And you have to listen to the National Programme to sometimes hear a foreign, in other language, and I think that’s no good, but that’s me because I am so used to other music. (Martin)

Kroef (cited in Schouten 1992:137) found similar results from her interviews, that only a limited number of families read Dutch material and that interest in this had weakened over time. Also, Radio Netherlands broadcasts were not very popular.

Few listened to the Radio Netherland broadcasts, and then only when a relative was staying or if a Dutch incident was in the international news. (Schouten 1992:137)

In Folmer’s study, first and second generation (the latter New Zealand-born) respondents occasionally listened to the Dutch news on the radio and to Dutch music. Those who read, did so in both English and Dutch, but those who were raised in the Netherlands read the most Dutch (Folmer 1992:11). The latter showed the least language shift, which may have facilitated their ease with reading it.

The Dutch language is read and heard much more in the Australian media than in New Zealand. At least two Dutch newspapers (in Dutch and English) are published in Australia, Dutch Australian Weekly and Dutch Courier. In Melbourne, Dutch can be heard weekly for between 1 to 2 hours each on three separate radio stations (Ammerlaan 1990a:13). Even back in the 1970s, Melbourne had a Dutch (book) library with over 6000 volumes reported in 1976 and a magazine reading circle (Clyne 1976:86). Despite this, Dutch immigrants in Australia experience the fastest language shift of all immigrant groups (Clyne 1991b:241). A full account of Dutch print media available in New Zealand is given by Robert Leek (1997). He notes that several publications have been started in New Zealand, but these have been and are ‘likely to be of an ephemeral nature’ (Leek 1997:284) because of the rapid absorption of Dutch immigrants among New Zealand’s Pākehā population.

Among my respondents, Dutch was the choice of language for writing letters to the Netherlands because they may not have been understood otherwise. Anna, who found it easier to use English, wrote to a sister in Canada in English.

Most respondents did not have a specific preference between speaking English or Dutch.
I don't have any real preference, it just comes naturally, as soon as someone speaks English to me, I speak English back, someone talked Dutch to me, I'll talk Dutch back. (Hans)

Several respondents thought the Dutch language was important to them. Reasons for this varied, from it being part of their ethnic identity, to it being something familiar, and a means to understanding their family and culture. Most of those who used at least some Dutch at home thought it brought together their family members, including extended family in the Netherlands.

... the language is finally is after all the key of giving you access to your own culture. How else can you, you can observe anything but everything is absolutely worthless if I can’t talk about it, so I need to have the language ready on hand to be able to convey what I experience and some things require their own language otherwise it doesn't work. So that is important...

... it's the key to my own people. (Jan)

On the other hand, to a few, Dutch was just a means of communication.

The respondents liked to hear and speak Dutch, although some were more indifferent than others. Some respondents found they had to concentrate very hard to speak it, indicating that they did not use Dutch very often.

Yes [I like to hear Dutch], if the opportunity is there, I actually find very difficult here to speak Dutch, even if they are Dutch people because you're so used to it, somebody, you know if you meet somebody, you're so used to speak English to them that if they start talking Dutch I’m always a bit taken back and I have to force myself to talk Dutch, there's just that you have to translate the words back in Dutch, while if you do that for a few days, or say half an hour or so, after that you’re all right, but I know that when I start talking Dutch, the first half an hour I have a terrible English accent because you really have to force yourself to, and after half an hour I’m all right, but that’s probably because we don’t have any Dutch friends and I've got a brother-in-law here who is Dutch, but his wife is Greek so we all speak English in their house too. (Renate)

The respondents found Dutch tourists especially interesting to listen to.

Yes [I like to speak Dutch], especially if you meet people that actually come, are very fresh from Holland, like tourists and that, people who have
just been over, something like that, yeah. You pick up different things, yeah. (Hans)

Anna and Ineke thought Dutch on television now sounded ‘funny’ or ‘weird’ and they had to make an effort to understand it.

It sounds funny in me ears, I don’t know what the story was, about a winter there, there was flooding and so on, there was a Dutch guy on a farm and he speak Dutch, and I said to my husband, ‘that sounds funny in me ears’, I’m not concentrating on that, I’m not really listen what he was saying. (Ineke)

Ammerlaan (1990b:16) argues that because the Dutch language does not keep up with Dutch migrants’ personal development after migration, they think of it as ‘inferior and antiquated, and therefore doomed to disappear from usage’. His Australian respondents did not use the Dutch language because they believed that it sounded “ ‘banaal’ [sic] (bland), ‘unnatural’ and ‘harsh’, had a ‘flat’ intonation pattern and its sentence structure [was] ‘the wrong way around’ ” (cited in Ammerlaan 1990b:16). In contrast, English was believed to allow more specific expression because its vocabulary was perceived to be more extensive and complex. One of his respondents commented:

“Dutch is clumsy. For example, you have the word ‘ziekenhuis’, which means ‘sickhouse’. Isn’t that stupid! It sounds as if they do not have a word for it, and somebody has to make it up. English on the other hand is much more erm . . . terse, it uses ‘hospital’, clear and short.” (cited in Ammerlaan 1990b:16)

In addition, Dutch words were believed to ‘lack sufficient depth of meaning’. So for example, the English word ‘love’ conjured up a deeper emotion than its Dutch translation equivalent ‘liefde’. Similarly, Dutch metaphors were perceived to be awkward in relation to Australian ones (Ammerlaan 1990b:16). This is in stark opposition to one of my group two Korean respondents, who could feel more deeply in the Korean language rather than in English.

Ammerlaan relates such reactions to the ‘efficiency-oriented motivation’ of migrants and additionally asserts that they are a result of the lack of further development in the migrants’ Dutch language after migration.

43 This is a good example of a folklinguistic myth; both words have three syllables!
Perhaps these negative feelings reflected that the Dutch that had been learned was children’s Dutch, and that deeper emotions and more subtle meanings developed during and after adolescence in an English environment with new concepts were given their English linguistic labels. (Ammerlaan 1990b:16)

However, this reason does not explain why Germans do not have similar attitudes to German, which is closely related to Dutch and also has ‘transparent’ vocabulary such as ‘Krankenhaus’. Germans have been found to respect German and have taken active steps to pass it on to their children by teaching it at the ‘Goethe Institut’ (Ammerlaan 1990b:16).

Most of my respondents felt that they could not keep up with changes in the Dutch language and in this sense their ability had changed. As noted, the Dutch language was believed to be rapidly changing.

. . . the Dutch language is said, is one of those languages which changes very fast, and it’s very hard to keep up with it, so if you get someone out of the ‘50s who, actually most of the people came out in the ‘50s, have got their own language, if you get people coming out from Holland now, then they have got real trouble talking to each other because they’ve got so many integrated words now, that are so different, that they will understand each other, but it would be easier in English. (Hans)

Jan acknowledged the changes in the Dutch language but did not think of this in terms of a change in his ability with Dutch.

No, I still think that it is up to scratch, I’ve got a great affinity for languages, and I try very much to keep that up to date, I’m always or very often asked by other people to look at Dutch or English texts for example and pick up mistakes and that sort of things or spelling or words or that sort of things, yet if I write myself, and I give that next door to screen, they always pick a few things, ‘that is a bit too Dutch, you have to uhh . . .’. When I read some texts in South African for example, you can really notice it is South African, and the sentence construction is different, and they use different types of words and yeah. But that sort of colour also makes that what I have written is really me and that is okay.

. . .

. . . I notice I just got a new book on [topic] which has been translated from German into Dutch and that book is in my opinion just about unreadable, the language they use, the sentence construction they use is just, I have never seen such appalling Dutch, so whether that is because I am
gradually growing into belonging to a group of people who speak old fashioned Dutch because when I talk to immigrants who have been here 30 years ago, there’s a marked difference in their word use than what I do, but when I read this book, it is a specialist subject, I realise that, but the words they have invented, the sentences they have put together, they sound to me most odd and I am going to talk to somebody who is training in or teaching in Dutch to see what he thinks about this, because I find it most intriguing. (Jan)

Kroef noted the rapid change in the Dutch language as it is used in the Netherlands now, leading to its divergence from the Dutch spoken by immigrants. As a result of this separation, older immigrants (from the 1950s) would have words in their repertoire which are not often heard in the Netherlands any more. As new terms are coined with technological change, immigrants tend to use only the new English term and tend to be surprised when they hear contemporary spoken Dutch in the Netherlands (cited in Schouten 1992:139).

Half the group one respondents did not think there was anything wrong with Dutch people using English with each other instead of Dutch if they found English easier. To them, it was a matter of personal choice because of habit and ease with one language rather than another.

I haven’t got any problems with that, it’s just part of the way of life, this, I mean as I said earlier on, when someone speaks English to me, whoever it is, or from whichever language he comes, I’ll speak English back, it’s just one of those unwritten rules, and I think most people will do that, even the Dutch will do that, between themselves, if I see a Dutch person, he’ll speak English to me, I’ll speak English back because he seems to be more comfortable with English, otherwise he wouldn’t do it. (Hans)

The other half thought this was strange and that such a person was hiding from their origins.

Yes, I’ve got a few of those friends, they said they vowed that they never would speak any Dutch. I think they are denying themselves their background.

. . .

Oh, I think it does irk me, if somebody knows his native language very well, and refuses to speak it to me, yeah. I know of one chap who runs a business here and he is very nice and he just does not acknowledge and as a result I just never buy there, I don’t like it. (Jan)
Like some of my respondents, Folmer’s (1992:10) Dutch respondents in New Zealand let their Dutch interlocutor choose the language of conversation. In Australia, some Dutch immigrants avoid using Dutch in an attempt to put in some distance between themselves and other Dutch whom they consider ‘too arragant’ [sic] and always wanting to ‘be right’ (cited in Ammerlaan 1990b:16).

English was important to the group one respondents to the extent that it allowed communication and hence survival in New Zealand. To some respondents it was now a part of their life: ‘It’s me now probably, that’s where I live now, it’s my life now.’ (Anna)

A majority of the respondents would have learned English even if it was not needed here. This was because English would facilitate travel and was needed in some technical fields. Also, it was very useful in the Netherlands given its size and proximity to other countries and English media. Most Dutch people knew basic

44 Without access to any publications in English on the spread, use of and attitudes to English in the Netherlands, I had to rely on the subjective reports of four people: Tom Ammerlaan, Robert Leek, Pauline Wegener and Margriet Wegener. The following information comes from correspondence with them.

Following World War II, English replaced French as the most important foreign language in the Dutch education system and is now the official second language of the Netherlands. After the War, the status of English was boosted because it was the language of the liberators, and had connotations of representing modern culture, replacing the ‘stuffy’ pre-World War II one. While Dutch is now used in areas such as politics, trade, business and education, many English words have crept into the Dutch language and are widely used. A command of English is required from low-level jobs in commerce, to the service and hospitality industries, to management level positions. At present, the study of English begins in earnest at secondary level where it is compulsory for at least 3 years. At tertiary level, courses may be held in English when it serves as a lingua franca for exchange students or when the lecturer is an overseas-born speaker of English. Much of the academic literature at tertiary level is in English. Ammerlaan notes that at the Arnhem School of Business at least half the teaching is done in English to attract increased funding. As a result of the wide use of English in the Netherlands, Dutch people are frequently in contact with English and are reputed to speak it well.

English loanwords are readily accepted into Dutch for several reasons. Some English words are believed to sound more interesting (such as ‘privacy’, ‘employability’). Other words are borrowed when there is no translation for them in Dutch (for example ‘computer’). In addition to academic as well as popular literature published in English, the media, including advertisements, foreign pop
English even if they did not use it for daily communication; in addition, the Dutch language had adopted many English words.

In Holland you have to use quite a bit of English to get around especially in my area where you come into technical areas, most of the people will speak English too, not as full sentences, but most of the things you are talking about are English. (Hans)

Positive aspects of learning English included being able to participate in life in New Zealand, in addition to mere survival. It also allowed communication with more people. Only Martin mentioned that language learning was good for its own sake.

Well, it’s always positive to learn a language and if you live in New Zealand you have to learn the language where you are, and that must be positive. (Martin)

There were no negative aspects to learning English for any of the respondents.

Bilingualism, thought to be enriching for one’s thinking and expression, was generally favoured by the respondents who were themselves at least bilingual. However, a few thought that additional languages learned should be ‘useful’ ones like Japanese (in New Zealand), not languages like Dutch, Greek and Latin which had a limited number of speakers or were dead.

I think probably at schools, they should, not specifically for the ethnic side of the language, but for the business part, as the kids get older, they should learn a second language, as I said, Japanese probably is now very

music and American movies, have also been responsible for the spread of English words in Dutch. According to Margriet Wegener, attitudes towards English are more positive than they are towards the German language, which is also closely related to Dutch. This is because of continued resentment towards the Germans and to Nazi involvement in World War II. Such animosity is also believed to be characteristic of the younger generation. Further, the Netherlands relies heavily on trade and as such has to keep up with international languages. Margriet Wegener is of the opinion that Dutch identity may also be responsible for the relatively easy acceptance of English words (compared to the French who have established the Academie Française to keep the French language ‘pure’) as the Dutch have always been open towards foreigners and refugees and are noted for adopting the language of their customers. Since the seventeenth century, Jews and others escaping religious persecution have found refuge there, without threat to Dutch identity. Margriet Wegener comments that the Dutch are believed to identify with specific cultural habits and traditions rather than ‘a feeling of their nation’s greatness’. Hence Dutch identity itself may promote the borrowing of English loanwords.
important, and so, yes, they should learn a second language, but not like Dutch or Greek, because those are languages which they, it’s only small number of speakers, you really have to learn something which is a broad language, because I mean if I live in Holland now, you learn German and English, and French because living in Europe those are the countries you are dealing with and you don’t have that here, French here is not really relevant, same as Dutch. (Renate)

Jan thought that he, like New Zealanders, should learn Māori: ‘Yes and in that respect I am still lacking in my opinion a major link here, and it’s that I don’t speak any Māori, and I think they should do that.’ (Jan)

Since Jan had grown up multilingual, he did not find it problematic to read subtitles in foreign language movies.

. . . Sometimes in the film festival you pick up something, and English people might find it cumbersome to go to a foreign language film because of the undertitling and because of my European upbringing and the multitude of languages in Europe, even if you don’t speak for example Swedish or Danish, you still pick up words out of the language, and there’s always little bit of crossover, left, right and centre, so I don’t find it so cumbersome, and you pick up generally enough from the original text, so if you slip up, you have still got your undertitling to deal with. (Jan)

He was able to use his knowledge of European languages in New Zealand.

7.2.2 Ethnic identity

All the group one respondents thought of themselves as Dutch, although Anna said she felt partly Kiwi too now: ‘Dutch, predominantly Dutch with some Kiwi influence I would say these days.’ (Anna)

Very few respondents (only men) thought that their Dutch identity was important to them and was a source of pride. The others were indifferent about their Dutch identity; in fact, Renate said it was very unimportant to her.

The main reason for feeling Dutch was a Dutch upbringing which had shaped the respondents’ personalities and influenced aspects such as habits, ways of thinking and doing things. This early effect could not be shaken off. Only Hans mentioned language in connection with his Dutch identity, while Renate thought of herself as
Dutch because she was born there. Jan had done a lot of thinking about his Dutchness.

That’s a difficult question, at the moment I am reading a book which is called *The embarrassment of the riches*. I don’t know whether you know it. It is written by a Mr Schama and who’s done extensive research into the daily life of Dutch people during the Golden Age.\(^{45}\) When you ??? you might be very interested in it, and so it’s a sizeable book. I find it quite revealing because I have often wondered what my personal identity or traditional identity really is. For example, and that may be a very biased observation, but when I look at you, you are from India, and I will immediately associate that with the fact that you come from a particular province, you come forth from a particular caste, and all of that puts you somewhere in a confined space in the social structure of your country and so therefore, that comes with an X number of traditions, and so therefore I experience you as somebody who is steeped in tradition. And when I look back on my background, I say, what is then our specific tradition? I don’t wear any folkloristic clothing anymore. The only thing I wear is clothes, yes, that’s traditional but I have been taught to speak the general standard Dutch, I don’t speak a local dialect for example, my parents just prohibited, as simple as that, and so I cannot really converse in a local dialect for long time, I know just little bits. So what is then really? What makes me so Dutch? When I started reading this book I suddenly realised that I’m extremely Dutch, there’s no doubt about it, whether I speak a dialect or not, undeniably I belong to the Dutch people and I think it sits somewhere in a little bit of, there’s some measure of free spiritness about Dutch people, they work hard, they look for opportunities, they are in general sense, they are well versed with all sorts of aspects in society. We’ve had, all of us have had a good education, even if you don’t go to university, the high schools are pretty good so you get nice, broad base of information in your package. We’re outspoken, much to the detriment I must say, because people here are certainly not outspoken, they ask you here ‘how are you’ and they really don’t want to know. If you tell them they are shocked. So I think we are far more up front. Things are how they are, you get through them, and you dealt with them. My partner [American] who had a New Zealand husband found it an absolute delight to live with

\(^{45}\) The Golden Age refers to the seventeenth century.
me because she always said you know exactly where you stand, you are either angry or you aren’t but nothing hangs about, you’re just everything come and I think that is probably very much a Dutch characteristic. (Jan)

The Dutch disposition to be ‘brutally frank’ (Schouten 1992:140), as mentioned by Jan, is in contrast to the ‘English trait of diplomacy and tact as a cover for liars and hypocrites . . .’ (Schouten 1992:141). The outspokenness of the Dutch led many early immigrants to complain about New Zealand when New Zealanders asked what they thought about New Zealand; hence the description ‘arrogant Dutchies’ (Schouten 1992:140).

All the respondents were seen as Dutch by people here, or at least different or a foreigner. Jan did not think he would ever be fully accepted as a New Zealander.

I think we would be classified as the Dutchies, no doubt about that.

Well, I don’t think that I am particularly discriminated by it, although I don’t think that I will ever belong to the very inner hub of the beings of the New Zealanders. The same remark as Sukhi Turner⁴⁶ made the other day, she does not belong to the old boys’ network, well, I don’t belong to the old boys’ network either, and so it is very difficult and it takes ???. I know an awful lot of people here and I think they are pleasant but I think that in their eyes I always am a foreigner. (Jan)

The few respondents who got mistaken for tourists did not mind it.

### 7.2.3 Language maintenance and identity

Most respondents, especially the men, thought that language maintenance was important for maintaining one’s ethnic identity. This was because language identified people and let them maintain contact with their origins and relatives. Being bilingual also let the respondents’ children have an ‘agility’ with additional languages.

I think to keep the Dutch language alive is very important. As I said before, for us but as well for the children. And I am sure that they will benefit from it if they go over to Europe and are used to the Dutch, in that respect then

---

⁴⁶ An Indian-born woman who was the mayor of Dunedin at the time.
they can communicate a lot easier with their grandparents or uncles and nephews and everybody. And I’m sure because we went over two years ago, and [younger son] and [elder son] didn’t speak Dutch here, because we spoke Dutch to them, and they answered in English here. They still do that, I speak Dutch to him and he replies in English. But when we were in Holland it all changed within a couple of days, because they knew it but here they were really afraid of saying something in Dutch because they think it’s wrong. And we say ‘no just try’, in Holland this was very important for them and they did very well. And then when their grandparents, his grandparents came out here, he could communicate with them and their English was not very good, and [younger son’s] Dutch was improving all the time. So in that respect I think it’s very important to keep the Dutch going. (Martin)

Unlike the Koreans, none of the group one Dutch respondents mentioned the possibility of difficulty in intimate communication with their children as a result of language shift. Kroef voiced this concern to Schouten.

The rapid language shift, with parents and their children having different first languages, must have often hampered discussion on serious personal matters - such as religion and sex education - where parents would have preferred to use Dutch but had to use English to make themselves understood. (Schouten 1992:137)

Compounding this problem of communication is the tendency of immigrants to revert to their first language in old age (Schouten 1992:137, Clyne 1976:78). This movement was noted by Jan as mentioned earlier.

The males encouraged the Dutch language among their children and corrected their children’s incorrect Dutch because the school promoted English, but other respondents encouraged both or neither language. Anna, whose children were all born in New Zealand, was trying to teach them Dutch since they were returning to the Netherlands soon for a visit. Such variety in the respondents’ behaviour makes it hard to generalise.

Well, they have done that [learned English] through school, well they are actually better at it than I am, so I can’t teach them English anymore, but we try to keep up the Dutch, because we get people over from Holland and they both speak quite well, Dutch. (Hans)

A majority of the respondents considered it important that children should know the language of their parents, for the sake of their own ethnicity as well to be able to communicate with the extended family in the Netherlands.
I don’t think that I would love them less, but it, there may be a handicap for them, with respect to their own identity, and again by keeping Dutch alive, they’ve got at least the doors open to go either way. (Jan)

Yet, most respondents did not use Dutch on a regular basis with their children. They were fluent enough in English to use this for effective communication with their children. Anna had experienced the difficulty of passing on Dutch to her New Zealand-born children. She had just ‘gone with the flow’ and had not been very conscious of language shift.

I feel bad about it [that my children do not speak Dutch] myself probably that I didn’t really put enough effort in, because I could have, or we could have, as parents, have it as an everyday thing popping up and maintaining it or speaking it more to them or just keep it up, some people do, some parents bring their children up bilingual, say one parent always talks Dutch with their children, and we could have, but we always felt not even very conscious about it probably. The way just life goes, everyday, you just go with the flow, it’s easier, and you choose probably for the easiest way, it takes a lot of effort to maintain the other language as well. (Anna)

Renate, for whom neither language maintenance nor Dutch identity were matters of importance, did not think the second generation needed to maintain Dutch since she thought of them as New Zealanders.

Do you think that if Dutch people here stop speaking Dutch, they’ll still be Dutch?

Probably first generation feels like that, but second generation, I think they’re just New Zealanders and that’s the way they feel . . . (Renate)

Half the respondents believed that their ethnic identity had changed in New Zealand; this was a response to the changed social and cultural atmosphere they had to face here, rather than language per se. These respondents thought such change on their part was positive.

I think my identity has changed since been living in New Zealand, because you have to adapt to the New Zealand style of living, which is different from the Dutch way of living. Especially in Dunedin, everything is very sedate and easy, that’s not the way it was in Holland. The ways of life are different. (Martin)
Most respondents proposed that if the group wanted the language to be maintained, it was really up to them to do something about it, rather than expect the government to take responsibility for it.

Ha ha, the government, yes [sarcastic]. So, no, the government cannot do that, for the very reason that they are not Dutch, so you can’t ask them to do something typically Dutch if they are not, so that is one thing, and I think that if somebody wants to retain any Dutch identity then it’s got to come from within, it’s got to come from yourself, whatever you organise. (Jan)

Only Hans thought that initial government input needed to be sustained by the group itself.

None of the respondents thought that Dutch should be offered as an option here in New Zealand schools. Such a move was not warranted for various reasons. Dutch was a minority language on a worldwide scale; in fact Hans did not think it would last as the main means of communication beyond the next 100 years even in the Netherlands; there were not enough Dutch people in New Zealand and it was believed to be too difficult. Instead, several respondents argued that a more useful language like Japanese would be a better choice.

No, there’s not enough of Dutch around in the whole world and if you look on a world scale English is the main language so I don’t quite see that, I think it’s more important to learn Japanese at the moment.

... I don’t know, but it’s not a necessary language, it’s one of those that will fade away very soon.

What do think about that, the possibility of it fading away?

That has always been there, that possibility and everybody in Holland knows that, because it’s too small, there’s only about 15 million people in the whole world who speak it.

In the country itself though, everybody speaks Dutch, don’t they?

Yes, but I think that will change, it won’t last.

What do you think they will speak then?

I think most of that will go to English, and maybe to German, but I would think English would be the main language in say a hundred year’s time.

That’s quite drastic.

Yeah, oh yeah, because well everything that you do and all the textbooks that you can get these days, especially when you go in more scientific areas, are all English, so everybody at school has got to learn English, at a certain stage you got to talk English to foreigners going on in techniques
and everything, so that whole area will just change, has changed already and then part of a good example is actually Belgium, Belgium has got two languages, French and Dutch and the other part, the so called Dutch, but most of them speak English now, they have to, because they don't want to speak French because they don't like the French and they have got so much contact overseas that they've got to speak another language and English is the most common one. (Hans)

Dutch immigrants in Australia have been found to have similar instrumental attitudes towards the Dutch language (Ammerlaan 1990b:16). Since Dutch is not used very much in Australia and English can be used with relatives from the Netherlands, Dutch immigrants in Australia were not keen for their children to learn Dutch, not even for the sake of its inherent qualities. They preferred their children to learn languages such as Japanese, Chinese and Malay which are ‘more valuable and economically profitable as far as future job prospects were concerned’ (Ammerlaan 1990b:16). Thinking along such lines has been associated with ‘the predominantly efficiency-oriented motivation underlying emigration’ (Ammerlaan 1990b:16).

In a study of Dutch, German, Italian and Polish groups in South Australia, Smolicz and Lean (1979:241) found that Dutch parents, more than any other parents, including British and Irish, wanted their children to learn only English.

. . . [T]he Dutch formed an exception among ethnic groups, since they exceeded Australians from English speaking backgrounds (British and Irish) in their rejection of Australian children learning any language other than English. (Smolicz 1981:87)

My respondents did not see any need for textbooks in Dutch either.

No, you either live here or you go. Look, also most of the Dutch people and certainly of the current generation they do speak English very well and there are even high schools which run a Dutch and an English curriculum and you can simply choose. (Jan)

Most respondents would have encouraged their children to take Dutch at school if it were offered in Dunedin, although Ineke would do so only if her children did not know Dutch already. The others would leave it up to the children themselves.

If it was there, yes, I would like them to take it if it was there, but I would never advocate that they would have to start teaching Dutch at school, I think like Japanese is very important that they would start it at school, because that's what you would use in this country and somewhere along the world, it's not a world language, it's not. (Anna)
The need for road signs, forms, public notices and letters to be in Dutch was not felt, partly because this was an English-speaking country so immigrants had to adjust to that. If there were sufficient numbers from a language group in New Zealand then this could be warranted.

Most respondents did not think that there was a future for the Dutch language in New Zealand, even though this would be ‘nice’ according to Martin. Since the Dutch people themselves did not use it, it was unlikely to be maintained. Members of the second generation were believed to be New Zealanders, and the only remnant of Dutchness left in them (if at all) would be their name. Retaining the language was not an issue for most.

Here in New Zealand, I think it will very fast fade away, I think once our generation is gone, the language will be gone as well, because the children very quickly go into the New Zealand routine, and they won’t go back.

What do you think will happen to your group identity then? Oh, that will go too, the only thing that will might remain is the name, the last name, most of the people I know have actually changed that. The ones, I mean I’m talking about the younger generation. (Hans)

Very few thought that Dutch should be maintained here, the rest believed it to be a matter of personal choice or else they were indifferent about the issue.

In everybody’s home, not just in their home, I shouldn’t say that, as much as a person would like, it’s a very individual need I think, especially the older generation, seek the contact with Dutch people and have those Dutch groups, I mean you probably find that there’s a lot of older people belonging to groups like that, and then the Dutch is still very valid I think and very valuable to them as well, to speak that with other people. But, maintain, that’s a personal choice, what everybody feels comfortable with, or feel the need for. (Anna)

In general the respondents thought that other Dutch people had similar attitudes to language and ethnicity, even though most of them did not know too many Dutch people. Individual background within the Netherlands was believed to affect attitudes to change in New Zealand.

I think so. Except the older ones might be hanging on more to the Dutch culture than what we do, and to a certain extent, it also depends what culture you bring in from your childhood, from your own family and region
type of thing, but I do think the older ones hang on to it a bit more, although they still are part of the New Zealand way of life as well. (Anna)

7.2.4 Attitudes to and experiences in the Netherlands and New Zealand

Only Hans had more Dutch friends than non-Dutch friends, the other respondents had more interaction with the general population, even if they had a few close Dutch friends. Some respondents did not want to associate with early Dutch immigrants.

No, there’s a whole group of Dutch people I don’t want to have anything to do with. Especially, this sounds sort of strange maybe, the early immigrants, I have got little contact with and I haven’t got a lot of time for them either. I’ve been in, some years ago there was a Dutch exhibition to be organised here and they asked me to come onto the committee and there were a whole lot of those people and it was a nightmare, you couldn’t work with those people and everybody felt so important that they kept on talking and you didn’t do any business, so finally I said ‘Look, I’m leaving this, I’ll take this little bit, I’ll be responsible for it, I’ll organise it, but I don’t want to come to the meetings because this is a waste of time.’ (Jan)

Renate emphatically stated she had no Dutch friends, even though her name was given to me by another Dutch person. Having more New Zealand friends was a means of adjusting to life and culture in New Zealand, instead of sticking to Dutch ways.

No, we don’t have any Dutch people as friends, our friends are all New Zealanders.

Is that intentional?

No, probably because we came here and started living as New Zealanders. (Renate)

Very few respondents knew anything about the Dutch Club. Hans was an inactive member, while Jan and Martin had briefly attended. The women also avoided the Club. It was perceived to be for the older, earlier immigrants, as well as for second and third generation Dutch, who had become New Zealanders. The respondents did not have much in common with them. Also, as part of the process of adaptation here, they were trying to meet New Zealanders, rather than Dutch people.

When I got here, they invited me to become a member of the Dutch Club and I kindly refused because I said I am not here to meet Dutch people, I
am here to meet New Zealanders, so that is that, so I declined. And I've been there once, and the only thing which struck me there was they had a portrait of the Dutch queen in a frame but that is maybe understandable but the interesting thing was that the English queen was hanging there and they were together hanging in the same frame, that I found most unusual, and maybe that sort of symbolises a bit how it is there at the moment in this club. I think that English and Dutch is spoken there fifty-fifty\(^47\) and as years progress because that club has been established by early immigrants from the ’50s and we are now 40 years later and gradually they are probably having members from the second or maybe third generation immigrants, they are just Kiwis, yeah, I don't think that apart from the hard core older people who are still coming there but yeah.

(Jan)

The interaction of my Dutch respondents (or lack of) with other Dutch, shows how futile it is to generalise on a supposed basis of ‘ethnic identity’.

The Dutch Club of Dunedin itself has had a chequered history, in fact, it nearly died in the late 1980s. Previous activities such as car rallies, picnics and St Nicholas Day celebrations had focused on children, but as they matured, interest in the Club dwindled.

Ans Paardekooper, an early activist, sums up the club’s fate: “Now we’re all integrated not many people need the club except the elderly.” (cited in Schouten 1992:177)

With this realisation, the Club has been reactivated with a changed direction, catering for the elderly. It provides for their regular companionship by organising outings. Membership has swelled from 16 to 48 (Schouten 1992:177-8), an indication that the change has been welcome.

Willem van der Ree, the migration attaché with the Netherlands Embassy in Wellington, reiterates that recent immigrants keep away from Dutch clubs as well as the local Dutch community (cited in Schouten 1992:251). However, he goes on to say that after ten years, the immigrants ‘become more involved with other local Dutch people, but they often have little in common with migrants who came decades

\(^{47}\) The use of English and Dutch ‘50-50’ has also been reported for most Dutch clubs in Australia (Clyne 1976:88; Ammerlaan 1990a:13).
earlier’ (cited in Schouten 1992:252). My respondents on the other hand, seemed to keep avoiding other Dutch people here (except for their close Dutch friends).

Unlike the experience of some Korean respondents, none of the female Dutch respondents had experienced any discrimination in New Zealand. Instead Kiwis were believed to be very understanding when it came to language.

No, I haven’t, I really think people here are very, probably part of their politeness, I don’t know, they realise, especially in the beginning that it’s not your native tongue you’re speaking, and they really go out of their way to make you feel alright, that they do understand what you say, or take the time to find out what you want to say. (Anna)

However, the male respondents had all felt disfavoured in varying circumstances. Jan had had a neighbour who did not like Dutch people. Hans thought he had missed out on a few job opportunities because he was Dutch. Martin had experienced nastiness on occasions.

Oh um, how can you say it in a nice way? A lot of them if they don’t agree with you, which is ok for me, then the Kiwi starts to cry and say ‘Oh tulip muncher’. I don’t know why it is but that’s probably coming back to about forty years ago, and they still, if they don’t agree with you they say and that’s fine but they get a wee bit nasty and go on. (Martin)

In New Zealand, the respondents had picked up aspects of New Zealand culture, much of it subconsciously. Such adaptation was a way of fitting into New Zealand.

Well, I don’t know, probably whole way of living, we just feel at home here and the people are, I don’t know exactly what it is, people always told us we are living as ‘real New Zealanders’, so what they mean by that I’m not sure, I don’t know if it’s a compliment or not. (Renate)

The respondents felt comfortable about making such changes. As immigrants, it was up to them to adapt rather than vice versa. Yet, Anna and Jan thought that at the same time, it was important for them to retain their native identity too.

I feel good about that [making changes] because you want to be part of New Zealand I think. I don’t want to be a New Zealander, but you want to fit in, it’s just, yeah, I wouldn’t want to always separate myself and want to be a real Dutch person in all aspects of life, no. (Anna)
Renate, however, was comfortable living as a New Zealander: ‘Well, as I said, we’ve got a feeling that we just live as New Zealanders, so it’s, we’re quite comfortable like that.’ (Renate)

The respondents had realised the need to be flexible as part of adjusting to life in a new country. As Schouten (1992:251) says, ‘They come because they are looking for a new way of life and a challenge.’ All this made New Zealand a more interesting and appealing place.

I think there is something extremely pleasant about this country, that everybody does just, if you want to do that, do it, go for, people are in that respect, less controlling, I think than the Dutch society. In Dutch society people really, a lot of people really live for the looks of the neighbours, if you know what I mean and here that is not so pronounced, and so freedom, just go for it, and that’s nice.

. . . if you choose to live in a foreign country I think you have to accept that it is different, I met Dutch immigrants here and they were absolutely out of, they were unhappy here because they compared all the time, they compared what they had in Holland, they compared with what they have here, and I think that’s the best recipe for going back, and any Dutchman who comes with that sort of laments, I will tell them pack up your bags and go back home because that’s never going to work, you will have to accept that if you go and plant yourself in another country and you live in a different society and it’s got different values, it’s got different structures and you will have to have the flexibility to wanting to fit in there, but at the same time you don’t have to lose your own identity, and if anything, and I think that is a nice aspect of, a potentially nice aspect of New Zealand there are people of so many different nationalities and that gives colour to society. I like that, if you were not here I would not have Indian food and I love it, and if I were not here you never would have some traditional Dutch meat if you would like to indulge in that, so it gives a lot of extra spice to society, to have more races. (Jan)

As explained, most Dutch migration to New Zealand occurred when immigrants were expected to assimilate completely to the New Zealand way of life. This attitude was compounded by the then Dutch government’s encouragement for emigrants to drop their native language and culture. The Dutch were recruited as immigrants because they were believed to be malleable into the New Zealand mould. I found that this attitude still lingered to a certain extent among a few respondents, even
though they had migrated more recently, when total assimilation was no longer expected of immigrants.

Well, it was one of the reasons why we came. I haven’t got any problems with that, I mean you make the choice and you do that on purpose, you go there, you do it, you don’t look back.

... No. We came here to settle into a new country, and when you go somewhere, you’ve got to adapt, what’s normal in that country, you got to leave behind what’s normal in your country. (Hans)

Half the respondents believed that they retained some aspects of the Dutch way of life in New Zealand, but only at a personal level at home and not as part of a group. Such aspects included celebrations like St Nicholas Day. The remaining respondents were either not interested in maintaining this, or else believed that as immigrants they had to integrate in New Zealand.

I’m not interested in that, so as I say, we don’t have any, I know Dutch people here who are still celebrating St Nicholas instead or Christmas or maybe both, but we avoid that, we believe if you hold on to your Dutch customs, then why are you here? You just go back to Holland and live over there, so that’s really it. (Renate)

Yet, Jan thought his life was still somewhat European and he often sought to affirm this.

I think it [my life] becomes a bit of a mixture, but there is still very much European flavour to it, I would say.

... Invariably if there is a French movie I am going to that, and if there is a Dutch movie coming up, yes, I should go and see that but it happens very seldom. ... So I like to go and see European films, if anything, it also satisfies a certain hunger for familiarity. (Jan)

Like the Korean respondents, the aspect about New Zealand that the Dutch respondents liked most was its relaxed lifestyle with its freedom and space. ‘It’s nice and slow and you have lots of space here, overseas it’s all hurry, hurry, hurry.’ (Ineke)

Once again, this relaxed nature had its dark side, that of being slack or of appearing as a ‘rough bunch’. The features of Dutch life that the respondents liked most included life in the Netherlands being more family orientated, the belief that Dutch
people were more ‘up front’, and that there was much more choice in nightlife in the Netherlands than in Dunedin.

A corollary to the relaxed life of New Zealand was that life in the Netherlands was too fast and crowded. People tended to live in ‘their own little cells’, afraid to change their ways in case they did something wrong and got criticised; there was limited ‘freedom’. Such features of the Netherlands were not missed.

All the respondents had been back to visit the Netherlands at least once after having emigrated here. The trip usually lasted between six to eight weeks. Renate was returning the following year for her daughter’s wedding, but after that she would much rather travel elsewhere than back to the Netherlands. In fact, apart from Anna, none of the others seemed too keen to visit the Netherlands often.

Yes. The reasons I have been back, the first time was my parents’ 50th wedding anniversary, and the next time when I am going my daughter is getting married there, otherwise we wouldn’t have gone back yet.

... I prefer to go to other countries, go to Australia, I haven’t had the opportunity yet to go to the North Island here, so I’d like to see all those things first before I go back to Holland. (Renate)

One reason the respondents did not return more frequently to the Netherlands was the high cost involved in flying over the entire family. Another deterrent may be that in the Netherlands in the 1950s, going back was a sign of heading back from where the respondents had come, away from the goal of assimilation.48 Ammerlaan reports this attitude about the Dutch in Australia.

For emigrants in the 1950’s [sic] emigration was considered irrevocable: there was no chance of a quick return, or a regular visit to an aging parent. The view then was that if one returned this was due to personal failure. As a result the Dutch emigrants forced themselves to look forwards, towards integration into a new ‘home’.

(Ammerlaan 1990a:12)

This attitude appeared to have changed somewhat among my respondents who had gone back mainly for family reasons. However as noted, apart from Anna who had been here the least time, none of the others were too keen to return. In general, the longer they had been here, the less attachment they felt with the Netherlands. The

48 The relative difficulty of going back on a ship, which takes much longer than flying over, would have been another obvious reason making it hard to return during the 1950s.
respondents who had been here longer, having left the Netherlands earlier, may still have been influenced by the belief that returning, even for a visit, was the equivalent of ‘failure’. Also, the longer they had been here, the more their ties with the Netherlands would have dulled.

7.2.5 Summary

The Dutch respondents had migrated to New Zealand chiefly for the sake of their children’s education. At the same time, they wanted to get away from the Netherlands, which was getting very crowded. As immigrants, they thought they had to adapt themselves to fit into New Zealand. Coming from Europe and speaking a language which is much closer to English than Korean or Sāmoan are, as well as being educated, most of the Dutch respondents are likely to have had a better pre-migration command of English than the Korean and Sāmoan respondents.

A majority of the group one respondents used both English and Dutch, and had no specific preference between the two. They had more instrumental than integrative attitudes to English, which was above all a means of survival for them in New Zealand. Yet most of them would have learned it had it not been necessary for life in New Zealand. This was in recognition of its value not only in the Netherlands but also internationally. Now, half of them would use English to write their life story because they found it easier than Dutch. The same half were either indifferent to or else thought it acceptable for Dutch people to use English with other Dutch.

The respondents had both instrumental and integrative attitudes towards the Dutch language. For some respondents, Dutch was taking on more of an instrumental value and its integrative value was decreasing. For these, Dutch was now useful only to the extent that it allowed communication with relatives back in the Netherlands. The language was important to a few group one respondents because it was part of their ethnic identity and was something familiar. Half the respondents found unacceptable the practice of some Dutch people using English with other Dutch. This was interpreted by these respondents as a means of disclaiming their Dutch ancestry.

All the respondents used Dutch in New Zealand, even if it was only for writing letters to relatives in the Netherlands. However, using Dutch required a lot of

49 This can also be interpreted as an integrative reason.
concentration for some respondents now. Most of them did not use Dutch media of any form. Only half of them would use it to write their life story. Again, this was mostly to do with their Dutch identity. Most thought that their ability with Dutch had changed or that they could not keep up with the changing language in the Netherlands. While those who used some Dutch at home believed that Dutch promoted bonding between family members, such bonding was limited partly because the families which used Dutch used English as well. Although most respondents had positive attitudes to Dutch, they simultaneously deemed it to be an unimportant language of the world because they believed it had very few speakers and was used in limited places worldwide. To two of the women it now sounded ‘funny’ or ‘weird’.

All the respondents supported bilingualism. This was for both instrumental and integrative reasons. From their own experience of having learned between two and four languages, they could say that it was good for one’s thinking. Yet, many of them considered that it was better to learn a useful language, such as Japanese (in New Zealand) rather than say Latin, Dutch or Greek.

Most respondents had more friends and interaction among the general population than with Dutch people. In fact, some deliberately kept away from Dutch people. By migrating to New Zealand, not only were they trying to get away from the Netherlands, but also from Dutch people. This was also partly an attempt to distance themselves from an immigrant identity and to be like New Zealanders who did not mix exclusively with one group. Even though most respondents did not know many other Dutch people and did not seem to share a sense of ‘community’ with them, they surmised that other Dutch people here would probably have similar attitudes to language and ethnicity as they themselves did. Given the wide range of opinion among the respondents, this is likely to be true.

Very few respondents knew anything at all about the Dutch Club, which was seen to be mainly for the early Dutch immigrants. Most respondents seemed to shun it deliberately.

All respondents still thought of themselves as Dutch, except Anna who had been here the least time. She now conceived of herself as partly Kiwi too. Dutch identity was imparted by upbringing more than anything else; language was a minor determinant. This identity was important to only two of the men, one woman considered her Dutchness to be very unimportant and the rest were indifferent. All were perceived as Dutch or at least foreign or different here. The respondents who believed that their ethnicity had changed thought of this as beneficial, and a result of living in a different country rather than using a different language.
Only Martin thought that the Dutch language should be maintained in New Zealand, yet he, along with the others, did not think that Dutch had a future here. The men related language maintenance to ethnic identity since language enabled contact with one’s background. For Anna, language maintenance was important only at a personal level. Very few respondents encouraged their children to use the Dutch language at home, while most would urge or would have urged their children to take it at school were it offered. The majority of the respondents thought that any efforts at language maintenance had to come from within the group. Dutch was not perceived to be important or useful enough to be offered at schools here as an option. Since immigrants had to make the effort to adapt to their host country, the respondents believed they had to use English textbooks and road signs. Hence, there was no reason to make these available in Dutch and other languages.

Only the male respondents mentioned having experienced any form of bias to their Dutchness in New Zealand. All the respondents had adopted features of the New Zealand lifestyle and culture. Moves taken by immigrants to adapt were judged to be not only acceptable but also necessary. At the same time though, a few respondents did not want to be indistinguishable from the average New Zealander, and wanted to retain their Dutch identity. Half the respondents had retained some Dutch customs at home (in addition to Dutch food).

All the respondents were happy about having immigrated, and enjoyed the comparatively relaxed pace of life here. They had all visited the Netherlands at least once, and some were planning further trips in the near future. Yet most of them did not seem too keen to visit very often.

The main female-male difference among the group one Dutch respondents was that to the men their Dutch identity was more important than it was to the women, and at the same time, the men believed that language maintenance was important for ethnic identity. Thus, it is not surprising that the only respondents who encouraged the Dutch language in their children were some of the men. The men also used Dutch media more than the women and seemed to be more oriented towards the Netherlands and Dutch culture than the women. This overall pattern may be related to the men’s, but not the women’s, experience of discrimination against the Dutch in New Zealand. This may have led the men to be more defensive about their background and to develop some negative attitudes towards Kiwis. Such female-male differences among my respondents are in contrast to previous findings about language maintenance by the two sexes. Female Dutch immigrants have been found to maintain the language more than men, have more positive attitudes to language maintenance and be more involved in language maintenance activities (such as visits
to the Netherlands, attendance at Dutch language classes) (Bennett 1992:56, 61; Clyne 1982:7, 42). Without further research, it is difficult to generalise from my results.

Of all the respondents, Renate was the one who was most oriented away from the Netherlands and Dutch culture. Her family had intentionally started using English to communicate with one another soon after immigrating here to quicken the adjustment process and to ‘start living as New Zealanders’. She now found the Dutch language hard to use and preferred to use English. She had encouraged the English language more than Dutch in her children. To her, there was nothing wrong with Dutch people using English with one another. Renate’s Dutch identity was totally unimportant to her. She was not interested in retaining any features of the Dutch way of life in New Zealand and she was not concerned that second generation immigrants would be New Zealanders. She insisted that she did not know any Dutch people here. Nor did Renate want to go back to the Netherlands. She believed in the value of bilingualism, but only for learning ‘useful’ languages. Overall, her attitude to language was more instrumental than integrative.

In contrast, Martin’s Dutch identity was very important to him and he was proud to be Dutch. He still used Dutch with his family and encouraged his children to speak Dutch so that they would not forget it. He strongly believed in the importance of Dutch language maintenance and thought that the Dutch language should be maintained here (although he was not very optimistic about this happening). He found it strange that Dutch people preferred to use English rather than Dutch in one another’s company. He did not think that he had adopted much New Zealand culture. However, this may have been a subconscious expression of his orientation towards the Netherlands rather than New Zealand. His approach to English was mostly instrumental, he would not have carried on learning it if he did not need it here. Yet he thought that it was good to learn any language, so he also had integrative reasons for language learning.
7.3 GROUP TWO RESPONDENTS

Three of the four group two Dutch respondents had been living in New Zealand for 13-14 years, having come here when they were 5 or 6 years old. One of each of their parents was a group one respondent. The fourth respondent, Olga, had been here for 22 years. She was born in Surinam, formerly Dutch Guyana. At the age of about 18 months she had gone to the Netherlands with her Dutch parents and older sister and then they had all migrated here after another 6 months. The respondents ranged in age from 19 to 24 years at the time of interviewing. Three of them were either polytechnic or university students, while Niek was working at a local fast food outlet after having spent the previous two years at university.

7.3.1 Attitudes to language and to bilingualism

All the group two respondents would use English to write their life story because they were able to express themselves better in English than in Dutch. While most of them used Dutch media, they did so on a very irregular basis. For example, some of them would occasionally watch Dutch movies. Niek used to read the Dutch *Australian Weekly* when his family got it and was now trying to read a Dutch novel. In addition, he occasionally listened to the Dutch news on the radio. His grandparents\(^50\) used to send his family videotapes of Dutch programs and of soccer games which they enjoyed watching.

Well I've been trying to [read Dutch] because I want to go back over there so I've sort of started reading bits again. Like I was just trying to read *The Day of the Jackal*, which I've read in English, so I figured if I tried to read it in Dutch I could understand what was going on. But it's taking a long time to read! (Niek)

The respondents used either one or both languages to write letters to relatives in the Netherlands. The language they used depended on ease and on their own as well as the recipient’s proficiency in Dutch and English. Sometimes the respondents would start in Dutch but finish in English since writing in Dutch took too long. Often the use of Dutch was restricted to greetings and farewells.

\(^{50}\) Visiting grandparents have been identified as the ‘most important factor in Dutch language maintenance’ (Clyne 1976:78).
English was the preferred language of all the group two respondents for general communication: ‘I prefer English, otherwise I’ve got to switch and I get mixed up.’ (Mark)

The Dutch language was of varying importance to all the respondents. It was a part of their ethnicity for a few, even if only a small part, and it allowed them to communicate with their relatives in the Netherlands. The prospect of travel to the Netherlands made it more salient too.

Oh it’s getting more important all the time, I think because I’m actually starting to do things with it now. I didn’t think much of it for a while because I was thinking ‘Oh well I’ll be in New Zealand for a long long time’, whereas now I’m sort of thinking of going back and doing things, so it’s getting more and more important the longer I think of going back, which I should be doing soon. (Niek)

Most respondents liked to speak and hear Dutch. It was something familiar to them.

I get a wee bit embarrassed sometimes [when I speak it] because when I hear it in my head, it sounds to me like I’m still at a 6 year old level, so, but I’d love to learn to speak it, like, a lot better. (Vicki)

Only Niek believed that his ability with Dutch had not changed since coming here, whereas the others were finding it harder to use Dutch. Niek was the one whose family spoke Dutch and so he used Dutch more than the other respondents did.

I don’t think it’s changed much at all. Because I knew all the basic stuff and I still do. I didn’t know much slang, because I was six, and now, the slang that I might have known now doesn’t get used. (Niek)

Mark noticed that contact with Dutch speakers was good for his competence in the Dutch language.

. . . last year we got some relatives coming over from the Netherlands, of course they spoke Dutch, so we spoke Dutch at home then and it soon came back, so I know quite a bit.

. . .

I think it’s still there, it’ll come back if I go to the Netherlands, it’ll soon come back, if I keep speaking it, and so on, but as far as like learning new words, slang and so on, I don’t think I know any of them anymore. (Mark)
Niek had been urged by his parents to keep using Dutch so as not to forget it, while the parents of the others had encouraged neither language. Vicki and Olga had been encouraged by their parents to learn English rather than Dutch. In the case of Olga this was because the school in New Zealand had recommended it. She now expressed regret about this.

When I came to New Zealand, probably when I was I dunno, I think I carried on speaking Dutch pretty much until I went to school, or kindergarten. So it sort of hung around till I was four or five and then I was encouraged to speak English.

*By your parents?*

Yeah, and the school. I think I was pretty much actively discouraged from speaking Dutch, because it was better for me to learn English, so I think we sort of started speaking English at home so I kind of lost my Dutch because of that.

*Were the family happy with that?*

Yep. I talked to Mum about that and she reckons that now they realise that you can actually hold on to your native language, so it’s sort of a bit of a shame that we were discouraged from speaking it. (Olga)

Folmer (1992:9) also came across a respondent who had dropped Dutch after being told to do so on entering school in New Zealand. This ‘either-or’ (Smolicz and Lean 1979:242) attitude to language learning, whereby it was believed that a person could learn only one language fluently, was characteristic of the assimilationist ideology of migration prevalent in the 1950s in Australia (Bennett 1992:68) and New Zealand. However, this assimilationist climate has now been replaced by one of multiculturalism, and some second generation Dutch in Australia have expressed displeasure that they were denied the chance to learn Dutch as their parents tried to assimilate to their adopted country (Bennett 1992:68).

Most respondents did not have negative attitudes to other Dutch people who preferred to use English instead of Dutch when speaking with Dutch people. In fact, some of them did it themselves. They were more fluent in English, so found it easier to use. Niek believed that attitudes to other languages in New Zealand pressurised people to use English instead of another language: ‘I think it’s just because you’re in an English speaking country that people give you funny looks if you start talking in other languages.’ (Niek)

Even the early Dutch migrants found that New Zealanders were intolerant of the use of any language apart from English. As Europeans, the Dutch were used to hearing many languages, and so found this attitude strange (Schouten 1992:136).
To the group two respondents, English was obviously important as a form of communication in New Zealand. Like the Koreans, they did not really have a choice and had learned it because it was necessary for living here. When leaving the Netherlands, they had been able to speak only basic English, such as counting to 10 and greetings. They had learned further English after coming to New Zealand, mostly at school.

Very important. I don’t know, I haven’t thought about that. Great to communicate, with basically, I don’t know! I don’t have any kind of sentimental attachment to it, but um.

Do you have that for Dutch?
Yeah I think so, yeah. (Olga)

Most would have learned English even if they did not need it here. In the Netherlands, English was a school subject and this knowledge was useful outside school too: ‘I think it is now. It’s always been a compulsory language in Holland, I mean English, and like all my cousins are fairly good in English.’ (Niek)

The positive aspects of learning English for the respondents included being able to survive in New Zealand, education and communication not only with New Zealanders, but also with people from all around the world. Without English their lives would be more restricted.

Well, there’s lots of positive aspects because I live in an English-speaking country, because there’s just no way I’d be able to be at varsity for one thing, and I just wouldn’t be able to communicate with anybody, just my parents and sisters, and that’s all. . . . Because I think a lot of countries have to learn English at school, so you might be able to communicate with lots of different cultures and that, even if you don’t know other people’s language, you can still communicate with English I think. (Vicki)

There were no negative aspects to learning English for the group two respondents; Niek thought it was always useful to know additional languages. As noted, Olga expressed regret about losing her Dutch, but she did not attribute this directly to learning English.

Just losing my Dutch. But I don’t think that’s a byproduct of learning English, I think that’s a byproduct of being discouraged from Dutch, comes from both. (Olga)

All the respondents believed in the value of learning additional languages, although Mark and Niek were not so sure about its value to New Zealanders. Bilingualism
was deemed to be polite because one was making the effort to learn about something different; it was good for one’s thinking and could facilitate travel.

Yeah, yeah, I think having another language is pretty valuable. Just from my experience in Holland, when I went back there. Like most people in Holland speak two or three languages. And I think it’s a, I don’t know it just seems to me ??? I just think it’s really good for people’s thinking, because it’s sort of like concepts are expressed really differently in different languages, and I just think it’s really mind expanding and I think it’s really good for people to know more than one language. (Olga)

Most respondents had learned additional languages. Vicki had learned Dutch while at Auckland University, Olga had taken German at school since that was closest to Dutch and Niek had learned French and Māori. All of them expressed a desire to improve their Dutch because they were planning to go to the Netherlands soon.

7.3.2 Ethnic identity

Half the respondents thought of themselves as Dutch.

I usually put down European, because I don’t like the word ‘Pākehā’. So by European do you mean Kiwi or do you mean Dutch? Umm I think Dutch. (Vicki)

This Dutch identity was becoming more and more salient to Niek as he came into contact with people from other ethnic groups.

I think it’s starting to be more important now than it used to be. It used to be ‘Oh yeah I’m sort of Dutch but I live here so maybe I’m a New Zealander’, but now that, when I got to varsity I saw all the different cultures and everything else I thought I’m Dutch and that’s how I want to stay. And so like with my name being [Dutch pronunciation], it’s sort of hard to get people to say [Dutch pronunciation] rather than [English pronunciation] but it’s not [English pronunciation]! (Niek)

The respondents conceived of themselves as Dutch for similar reasons including wanting to be Dutch, links to the place where their relatives lived and their birthplace, and familiarity with the Dutch language for the respondent who fluently spoke Dutch. They also wanted to visit the Netherlands to learn more about the culture.
I don’t know actually, I just feel like most of my relatives are over there, and I was born there and because I do want to go back someday, but I still don’t know where I’d actually settle down to live.

... I like to think of myself as Dutch

Do you ever think of yourself as Kiwi?
I think I am very Kiwi, but I just like to have that, still that little link with my relatives in Holland, so I like to call myself Dutch as well, so yeah. But I’m probably much more Kiwi than I am Dutch.

But do you feel yourself to be Dutch?
Yeah. (Vicki)

The other respondents thought of themselves as a mixture of Dutch and Kiwi, each to varying extents.

I’m pretty much a New Zealander I think, yeah, I’m not sure eh. I kind of, I call myself Dutch I suppose.

What do you think you are more of?
Um, more a Kiwi. (Olga)

I don’t know, I’ve never really thought about it. But I’m Dutch because I was born there. But I feel just as much English.

By English, do you mean English English or Kiwi?
Kiwi. (Mark)

These respondents did not really know why they thought of themselves as New Zealander and Dutch. When pressed, they came up with reasons such as place where the respondents lived now as well as birthplace; language, both a knowledge of Dutch making them Dutch and of English making them Kiwi; and identifying with other New Zealanders. Their reasons for identifying as they did were reasonably similar to those who identified as Dutch: ‘I don’t know. Um I guess my language and where I live. The way I identify and I guess that that’s the New Zealanders. Yeah, not sure.’ (Olga)

Mark’s Dutch and Kiwi identity was not important to him, but Olga was becoming more aware of her identity.

---

51 Mark’s mother was from England, but spoke fluent Dutch.
Yeah, I’m quite aware of it, quite a lot. I think it is [Kiwi and Dutch identity is important to me].

*Which part?*

Well, I’m aware that, I often talk about wanting to be a New Zealand citizen.

*Are you not?*

No. And I sort of, I think that’s part of my identity, and I actually say that to friends, I wanna get a New Zealand citizenship so I can feel like a real New Zealander, so I can feel like I actually belong here.

*Are you a Dutch citizen?*

Yeah, I’ve still got a Dutch passport.

*Are you a New Zealand resident?*

Yeah. (Olga)

Even though Olga believed that a knowledge of English and living here made her feel Kiwi, without citizenship she felt as if she did not have an inherent right to be here. The need to obtain a visa to re-enter New Zealand after being in the Netherlands made her feel insecure about her place in New Zealand.

... the only thing I really feel is not fully a Kiwi. Like I just don’t often, especially when I hear Winston Peters talking, I feel like an immigrant, like a bludging immigrant sometimes really and I sort of think [*why bludging?] Oh because I don’t know, I guess education and stuff like that, I kind of, yeah I feel almost like I’m sponging off New Zealand sometimes. Even though I feel like I belong here. It’s sort of like I don’t I don’t feel like I have an inherent right to be here, sort of thing. I feel like my inherent rights to be anywhere are in Holland, you know, I have an inherent right to be there, but not necessarily in New Zealand. I still feel like I’m sort of, yeah, I don’t feel like I’m attached to New Zealand in any kind of strong way, even though I am in my mind. But I don’t feel like I’m legally or physically kind of attached to New Zealand, you know? Like I felt that when I went back to Holland on my Dutch passport, because I had a, when you leave the country you, I had to get a, the only visa I had to get was one to get back into New Zealand, a resident permit, and to reapply for my residency. And if I stayed in Holland for 5 years or more I would lose my permanent residency in New Zealand! And I would have to basically go

52 A populist politician whose campaign in New Zealand’s 1996 general elections featured frequent attacks on immigrants.
through the reapplication process, again like everyone else, so I felt sort of quite insecure about, I kind of felt almost like they could kick me out! I felt like I could be kicked out, or like I didn’t have any God given right to be here sort of thing. . . . I think it’s just the residency thing, that’s why I’ve been thinking about getting out citizenship so that I can feel like a real Kiwi. I hadn’t really thought about it a lot until I went through the process of going overseas and getting this permit. . . . (Olga)

In contrast to herself, Olga called her younger brother, who was born in New Zealand and could only understand a little bit of Dutch, a ‘real Kiwi’.

The friends of most respondents knew of the respondents’ Dutch connections. If this was not known, then the respondents did not really mind. They were not treated like foreigners, but like New Zealanders: ‘I think they kind of see me as a Kiwi but from Holland. I think they just treat me like anyone else.’ (Olga)

No respondents were mistaken as tourists, probably because they all spoke English with a New Zealand accent. This was in contrast to one respondent’s father who spoke English with a Dutch accent.

No [I don’t get mistaken for a tourist], but that’s because I don’t have an accent or anything. Dad does, it’s quite funny. In Nelson, we went on holiday to Nelson and that happened to him quite frequently, it was good! (Niek)

7.3.3 Language maintenance and identity

The Dutch group two respondents did not have such strong opinions about language and ethnicity as did the Korean group two respondents. More of the former gave me responses such as ‘I don’t know’ or ‘I’ve never thought about that’ suggesting that such matters were not really salient to them.

Half the Dutch group two respondents thought that language maintenance was necessary for identity. One of these was Niek who used the most Dutch of the group two respondents and the other one was Olga who did not speak Dutch and did not feel very Dutch herself: ‘I think it’s part of it. . . . I guess if you’ve got, if you speak the Dutch then you feel more Dutch.’ (Olga)

The others argued that immigrants should make the effort to learn the language of their adopted country. Dutch language maintenance was believed to be important.
only to the extent that it allowed communication with relatives back in the Netherlands but was not deemed to be needed for living here.

I don’t think it’s very important because I think that when you move over to somebody else’s country, you should try as hard as you can to learn their language. So I think the only reason why I’d like to keep it up is if I ever go back there, I can talk to my friends and relatives there, but I won’t keep it just to try and keep speaking it here.

... I think amongst themselves when they’re sitting at home then it’s all right to keep their language, but they should, I don’t think they should be expecting other people in New Zealand to be learning their language because they’ve moved to New Zealand, so they should be trying to speak English.

(Vicki)

To the respondents themselves, the Dutch language was important at least at a personal level. Even Olga, who did not speak much Dutch, felt some sentimental attachment to it. To the others, it was part, even if only a small part, of their ethnicity, it was ‘their’ language. Despite this, very few of them were actively doing anything to maintain the language for reasons other than its necessity for communication when they returned to Holland. Niek was the only respondent who used Dutch on a regular basis at home. He thought that the Dutch language ought to be maintained by Dutch people in New Zealand, although he surmised that this was unlikely.

Oh I think it’s pretty much gonna go the way it’s going now, sort of quietly but surely. There are quite a few Dutch people but sort of not enough to do anything more than what’s happening now.

... Yep, I’m all for keeping the language that you first learned or second learned or third learned or however many you know. (Niek)

The other respondents considered that whether or not they wanted to maintain it was dependent on the Dutch people themselves.

In New Zealand? The future of it. I have no idea. I guess, I guess I don’t know. The Dutch community must be pretty big, there must be a, I guess it would grow.

... Um, I guess so, I don’t know. I don’t think anyone other than the Dutch community has any obligation to maintain it though. I think it’s a personal
thing, people, if they want to hold onto their language. I don’t think that the government, you know I don’t think that there is any kind of obligation there to make sure Dutch is. Never really thought about that. (Olga)

Only Olga deemed that other aspects of Dutch culture were also an important part of Dutch identity here in New Zealand. Her mother had retained some aspects of her Dutch lifestyle here.

Other things as well, like the festivals and the celebrations and stuff, like St Nicholas. Yeah I think they’re important too.

...Yep, she [Mum] loves it, definitely. We do, oh, our family still does things like St Nicholas and stuff, on the 6th of December, and Mum does like doing Dutch food and what else, she’s just into Dutch music, and she listens to French music as well! Yeah she like, she’s often, she still often compares like ‘Oh in Holland it’s like this’ and ‘In Holland it’s like that’ and ‘See this is really Kiwi, it’s really different from in Holland’ and she’s often, yeah, she does. She talks about it and talks about wanting to do Dutch things. (Olga)

Most respondents did not think that their ethnic identity had changed or else were not sure about this. Those who believed that their identity had changed did not relate the change specifically to using a different language.

Not sure. I was never aware of my identity [Dutch]. In hindsight, I probably, I don’t know actually. My identity’s still sort of in between the two, I mean I’m still, feel like a Kiwi but I still have that kind of pull. Yeah I’m not sure. (Olga)

All the respondents considered that language maintenance was the responsibility of the group itself, although Mark and Niek thought that some government input, such as in the form of policy, could be beneficial.

Well, the group is quite important, they keep it going, so I think it’s mainly up to them, but the government might have something to do with it, you know by saying that they’re allowed to speak Dutch. (Mark)

The females were of the opinion that Dutch should be offered as an option at school and would have taken it were it available, but the males thought it would be impractical to offer it in New Zealand, although one of them believed it would be ‘great’. Vicki had taken it at Auckland University and Olga had learned German at
school. ‘Yeah, definitely. I took German, that was the next best thing. But if there
was Dutch then I definitely would have taken it.’ (Olga)

Most respondents did not think that textbooks, road signs, notices, and leaflets
needed to be published in Dutch. If people emigrated to New Zealand, they should
be prepared to study in English and use English widely, just like New Zealanders.

Not really. Doesn’t seem feasible because there’s a, I suppose there’s a
lot of Dutch people but there’s a lot of Cambodian people and there’s a lot
of all sorts of people. You can’t produce everything in every language. It
wouldn’t be feasible, I don’t think there’s any obligation to produce
anything in Dutch. (Olga)

Most of them did not know whether other Dutch people had similar attitudes to
language and ethnicity as the respondents themselves. Niek, who was in favour of
language maintenance, hoped they did.

7.3.4 Attitudes to and experiences in the Netherlands and New Zealand

All the respondents had more interaction with the general population than with
Dutch people. Dutch contacts were mainly through Dutch friends of their parents.
The females did not know anything about the Dutch Club, but the males did and
Niek used to attend it with his parents. His family had stopped going after deciding
they could independently organise Dutch activities (such as celebrating a Dutch
festival) rather than participate in them at the Club. Olga emphasised that her
mother played ‘Scrabble’ with other Dutch people who played the game in Dutch.
Overall, there was very little sense of ‘community’ among the Dutch group two
respondents.

None of those who could speak Dutch had had negative experiences in New Zealand
as a result of this. Niek felt that he had been a novelty item when he first came here
because of language and cultural differences.

... when I first got here everybody was like ‘Oh wow he doesn’t speak
English’ and I was really interesting because I didn’t know a lot and I was
from a different country. (Niek)

Most respondents did not know much about the Dutch way of life, having left it so
early. Because of their absorption into New Zealand culture, they could not tell what
cultural traits they had picked up in New Zealand: ‘I think I’m so immersed in New
Zealand culture I wouldn’t know what was New Zealand culture and what wasn’t.’ (Olga)

Niek had not picked up the local attitude to drinking, whereby drinking was an end in itself. Further, in his experience, some New Zealand males were ‘male chauvinistic pigs’ because of their attitudes to rugby and drinking.

The majority of the males are male chauvinistic pigs! Most of them are all right, but you know you get the so-called rugbyheads, who sort of drink lots and fall over, and play rugby and fall over and ruck each other to death. I just don’t like the idea. Drinking to me is something you do socially, it’s not just ‘Oh let’s get pissed\(^{53}\) and fall over! Yay!’ ‘What shall we do tonight guys? Let’s get pissed.’ Oh God yuck, I’ll go home and read a book or something. (Niek)

Some respondents did not think they knew enough about the Dutch way of life to compare it with New Zealand’s. The rest however, enjoyed the relaxed pace of life here, especially in Dunedin.

It’s very laid back and relaxed I think, I like Dunedin especially, it’s very friendly and stuff, because when I was in Auckland I felt that everyone was too busy doing their own thing to say ‘hello’ and stuff like that and I just feel like Dunedin’s a really friendly place and that. (Vicki)

Most respondents had been back to the Netherlands since immigrating here, but only once. Two reasons for the infrequent visits were the expense of flying the family there while some of the respondents’ relatives from the Netherlands had visited them in New Zealand. Vicki’s sister had returned permanently to the Netherlands and was getting married there later that year. Vicki and her family were going to go back for the wedding. Niek and his family had been able to go back only because they had won the trip in a competition.

We went once but that was because we won the trip! About three years ago I think, Abel Tasman anniversary, like 250 years\(^{54}\) since he sighted New Zealand, and Telecom were having a thing, ring Holland and go in the draw. So we rung quite a few times and won the trip, which was good.

\(^{53}\) Pissed is a slang term meaning drunk.

\(^{54}\) It was actually 350 years since Abel Tasman sighted New Zealand.
But we can’t really afford to go back a lot. We went there for six and a half weeks and so that was a week of travel and five weeks there. The busiest five and a half weeks of my life! (Niek)

Some aspects of the Netherlands had really impressed Niek.

When we went back I was really surprised about how everything went all the time and everything was always ongoing. Like, well we went, like here if you go to a movie or something, the latest you can go is like 10:00 or 10:30, but in Holland we went to the movies at 3 in the morning, and it was a weekday and it was just normal and it was packed. It was really amazing, the transport system over there is just so much better. That’s because there are lots of people in a small area, I suppose. (Niek)

While the respondents were keen to explore the Netherlands to become more familiar with it, they preferred to live in New Zealand.

7.3.5 Summary

The Dutch group two respondents used mainly or exclusively English, except for Niek who used both English and Dutch at home. They all preferred English over Dutch and so did not have negative attitudes to other Dutch people who preferred to speak English instead of Dutch. English was basically a means of communication to them, allowing them to get by in New Zealand. However, most would have learned English even if they did not need it for living here. The female respondents had been encouraged by their parents to use English, which had happened at the expense of their ability in Dutch. This could have been the reason for their indifference to Dutch language maintenance in New Zealand, although at a personal level Olga was sorry about this.

The Dutch language was also important to the respondents. They felt a sentimental attachment to it because it was part of their ethnic identity, it was the language of their relatives or because it would help them communicate when they went back to the Netherlands. Most liked to speak it or to hear it being spoken. In New Zealand, they used Dutch media very irregularly. The Dutch language had become more salient to some respondents recently, including Niek who had realised that he could go to the Netherlands and use it there, and Olga who had been actively discouraged from speaking it as a child in New Zealand. Olga regretted this now as she realised that she could have easily learned to use both Dutch and English simultaneously.
Bilingualism was favoured by the respondents and most of them had learned or were learning at least one additional language. All wanted to improve their Dutch but only Vicki and Niek were doing or had done something about it; Olga would have learned Dutch if it had been available at school.

The respondents had much more interaction with the general population than with Dutch people and they knew very little or nothing at all about the Dutch Club in Dunedin. The Dutch Club was perceived to be more for earlier Dutch immigrants. The respondents were unaware of attitudes of other Dutch immigrants to language and identity; there was minimal sense of ‘community’ among them.

Half the respondents thought of themselves as Dutch even though they were immersed in New Zealand culture. The other half thought of themselves as a mixture of Dutch and Kiwi. Reasons for feeling Dutch or Dutch-Kiwi included language, where Dutch language imparted Dutch identity or English imparted Kiwi identity; birthplace and current place of residence; location of relatives; and finally, wanting to be and identifying with Dutch or Kiwi. All were perceived to be Kiwi by people here since they looked like most other New Zealanders and did not speak English with a Dutch accent. Nevertheless, some of their friends knew them to be of Dutch origin. Any change in ethnic identity the respondents had experienced after coming here was not related to using a different language and was looked upon positively.

Their Dutch or Dutch-Kiwi identity was salient for only some: for Niek as he came into contact with people from other cultures; and for Olga who was aware of her identity because she was not a New Zealand citizen, and so did not feel like she had an inherent right to be here. Both these respondents came from families who emphasised the Dutch language and/or culture.

Issues of language maintenance and ethnicity were not really important to the respondents; most of them had given little thought to such matters in the past. Only half thought that immigrants should maintain their native language in their adopted country while to Olga culture was also important. Language maintenance was seen as the responsibility of the group, although according to the males, the government would be welcome to play a minor role. The majority did not feel the need for textbooks and road signs to be published in Dutch and other minority languages in New Zealand. Immigrants were expected to adapt and use the language of their adopted country.

All the respondents had positive attitudes to living in New Zealand and did not know enough about the lifestyle in the Netherlands to be able to compare the two.
Most had been back once, and all were planning to go again soon. Bennett (1992:59) found in her study of 100 second generation Dutch Australians (born in Australia) only a ‘moderate’ level of involvement in this activity which helps to maintain language. Sixty-eight of them had visited the Netherlands, although only sixteen of these in the two years previous to the study.

The Dutch males were not sure of the value of bilingualism for New Zealanders. They thought it impractical to offer Dutch as an option at schools in New Zealand, while the females would welcome this move. The females considered language maintenance to be the obligation of the group, whereas the males thought that the government should supplement group efforts. To the males, the language they used was part of their ethnic identity more than it was for the females.

Not really, no, sort of one or the other [belonging to a group].

*And which one is that?*

Probably English.

*Do you mean Kiwi?*

Kiwi, yeah. And at school I’m seen like a normal New Zealander, whatever, just get on with people, and if I went to Holland, I’d probably think I’m more Dutch.

*Why would that be?*

Because you’re here, in New Zealand people speak English, so you sort of think you belong more with them as a group, while in Holland, they’re sort of different, hard to explain. (Mark)

. . . I feel that I’m immersed in both [New Zealand and Dutch cultures] so that’s good. . . . Even though I haven’t been there [Holland] for a while I can still speak the Dutch, I can still read the Dutch, I can understand what’s going on. When it comes on the news I know what’s going on, so I think I’m pretty clued up on both. (Niek)

Of all the group two respondents, Niek was the only one who was encouraged by his family to use and maintain the Dutch language and to a lesser extent, culture. He believed his fluency with Dutch connected him with the Netherlands even though he had not been there for a while. Niek received Dutch language videos from his grandparents in the Netherlands and while his grandparents were visiting in New Zealand, his family had subscribed to a Dutch language newspaper. He had gone along to the Dutch Club for a while with his family and occasionally went to Dutch parties. He was the only respondent for whom his Dutch identity was important. Niek was the most attached of the respondents to the Dutch language and culture and hoped for Dutch language maintenance in New Zealand. He was actively taking
steps to improve his Dutch. He had more integrative attitudes to language than the other respondents hence he was ‘less practical’ in his approach to the use of language. For instance, he was the only respondent to think that textbooks available in Dutch in New Zealand would be good for those who found English difficult. Similarly, he considered that some road signs in Dutch could be useful.

In contrast, the other respondents were more oriented towards New Zealand than the Netherlands and Dutch culture and language. Mark was probably the respondent who felt least connected with and most indifferent towards the Netherlands. He had never returned since coming here. More than the others, he believed that, as immigrants, the Dutch should do what people here did, which meant using English for communication as well as for other purposes such as learning from textbooks. He did not use any Dutch media, nor the Dutch language with his family, except in the presence of Dutch friends. He was the only respondent who had not learned an additional language.

Olga had left the Netherlands earlier than the rest of the group two respondents and spoke Dutch less often and less fluently than them, yet she was interested in the Netherlands and Dutch culture and language. This may have been because she had been actively discouraged from speaking Dutch by her school, so that she would be able to acquire fluent English. She felt the influence of Dutch culture through her mother who still maintained some aspects of it such as celebrating St Nicholas Day, and who often compared New Zealand to the Netherlands. Olga had returned to the Netherlands once and was planning to possibly study there. Her orientation towards the Netherlands may also have been a result of her feeling threatened about her position in New Zealand where she was not yet a citizen.

7.4 CONCLUSION

Both groups of Dutch respondents had more instrumental than integrative attitudes towards English. This was in common with the Korean and Sāmoan respondents and was expected, because as immigrants, English was their means of survival in New Zealand. Also like the Korean and Sāmoan respondents, the Dutch respondents expressed varying shades of instrumentalism. In contrast to the Korean and Sāmoan respondents, English was the main means of communication among the Dutch respondents, even in their families. This was especially so for group two. Respondents from both Dutch groups showed definite signs of language shift, using Dutch in very few domains. Many group one respondents were now more fluent in English than in Dutch and found it easier, to the extent that some of them used it
with their Dutch spouse or when speaking over the telephone to relatives in the Netherlands. Some respondents from both groups now used Dutch only for writing letters, or parts of letters, to relatives in the Netherlands.

The Dutch language was important only to some of the respondents, but more to group one than to group two. For the former, Dutch was a means of communication and a feature of their upbringing; for the latter, Dutch was a part of their ethnicity, but mainly at a symbolic level, since apart from Niek, they were not very fluent in it. Because of group two’s limited ability with Dutch, they found it more acceptable than group one to use English with other Dutch people. Most respondents from both groups thought that Dutch was an insignificant language both in New Zealand and in the international context. Dutch language maintenance in New Zealand was not desired by most of them. Olga, the group two respondent who had been stopped from speaking Dutch as a young child, regretted this now as she realised that she could have been bilingual in Dutch and English. She had noticed that other people like her also felt the same. The possibility of disruption in intergenerational communication because the younger generation was less fluent in Dutch had not occurred to any of the respondents, probably because the older generation was fluent in English.

Language definitely did not seem to be much of a core value for many of the respondents. These respondents, if they still wanted to maintain their Dutchness did so through other means, such as through family life (which was believed to be more cohesive in the Netherlands), Dutch friends or by celebrating festivals like St Nicholas Day. However, most respondents were indifferent to maintaining their Dutchness.

All the respondents were in favour of bilingualism; but group one thought that a ‘useful’ language should be learned, and so had more instrumental attitudes to it.

There was hardly any sense of community among the Dutch respondents. Many, especially from group one, purposely kept away from other Dutch people and the Dutch Club. This was mostly an attempt to integrate and mix with New Zealanders. Like other Dutch clubs in New Zealand, the Dunedin one tends to attract older people, who have more time (Schouten 1992:174).

In terms of ethnicity, group one thought of themselves as Dutch, while group two viewed themselves either as Kiwi or Kiwi and Dutch. The respondents’ subjective identity is likely to have been largely formed by the way they were received by New Zealanders too, so while group two were seen as Kiwi, group one were perceived as Dutch. For the latter, upbringing was the major determinant of ethnic identity, but
for group two it was language. They identified with English which let them feel
Kiwi, and with Dutch at a symbolic level which allowed them to identify themselves
as Dutch. Those who thought their ethnic identity had changed believed this was
good; it helped them integrate here. Some respondents specifically wanted to be
‘clued up on both’ Dutch and Kiwi, that is, they wanted to be a bit of both and in this
way retain their Dutch side too.

Group two was more keen to re-visit the Netherlands. This was often out of
curiosity about their origins and to find out more about a country they had left when
very young.

The respondents saw the necessity to change and adapt to make their emigration
successful. The assimilationist attitude, which had influenced immigration policy
during the 1950s and which had led to the Dutch being recruited to immigrate to
New Zealand at the time, was still alive to a certain extent among some respondents,
even though the assimilationist climate had changed somewhat by the time they had
emigrated.

The Dutch respondents were identified as belonging to the ‘third wave’ of Dutch
emigration who migrated to New Zealand when complete assimilation was no
longer expected of immigrants. Yet, some Dutch respondents still seemed to be
influenced by such an assimilationist attitude which guided the second wave of
emigration just after the Second World War. Overall, the Dutch respondents were
not too concerned about Dutch language maintenance in New Zealand. While some
tried to deliberately get away from their Dutch background, others tried to find a
balance between being Dutch and living in New Zealand. Since the latter had
limited support at community level, they tended to do so in the privacy of their
families. Because the respondents looked like most of the New Zealand population
and group two spoke English with a New Zealand accent, in most cases, they were
granted Kiwi identity by New Zealanders. This in turn triggered some respondents
to identify as Kiwi or part-Kiwi along with Dutch: a hybrid identity. Group two
respondents identified with the English language, as well as with the Dutch
language. However, since very few of them could speak fluent Dutch, identification
with Dutch was more at a symbolic than communicative level. This split had
occurred earlier for the Dutch than it did for the Sāmoans, and allowed Dutch
identity even in the absence of Dutch language ability. The definition of Dutchness
in New Zealand was flexible and was not based on an essential criterion like
language.
8 SĀMOAN RESULTS

8.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results from interviews with the Sāmoan respondents. As with the chapters on the Korean and Dutch groups, it starts with the main reasons the Sāmoans had for migrating to New Zealand. This is followed by examining the respondents’ language use and abilities, and the results from the first and second groups of respondents. Finally, I compare these groups in the conclusion.

8.1.1 Reasons for migrating to New Zealand

The Sāmoan respondents, or their parents in the case of group two respondents, had been attracted to New Zealand mainly because of its better standard of living in relation to Sāmoa and because New Zealand provided more economic and educational opportunities for them and their children. In addition, the Sāmoans were able to send money ‘home’ to help support their āiga. Working in New Zealand benefited not only the respondents themselves, but also their children as well as their āiga in Sāmoa. These reasons have commonly been found to be the most important reasons for Sāmoan migration to New Zealand in the post-war period (Fairbairn 1961:23; Keating 1978:3; Kinloch 1976:200).

Other specific reasons cited by my respondents for coming to New Zealand included educational opportunities at the University of Otago (accessible by the award of a scholarship) and taking up a vacancy in the ministry. Jonah stayed on in Dunedin after initially coming for six months on a training course from work. Several respondents had relatives or friends here from whom they had previously heard about life in New Zealand.

Ah! Well, to be very honest at the time, see it was a lot of people talking about ‘Oh New Zealand you know’, people before me you know, people that they had been in New Zealand, went back and they said ‘Oh you should see you know, a lot of things in the . . . ’, and in that frame of mind it seems to me, this is paradise! You know, New Zealand is paradise! You know considering Sāmoa is very you know very low, low low low, in the growing and in terms of of finance and you name it. And they talking about eating bread all the time and fish and chips, which you don’t know about
yet, I mean at the time I don’t know this fish and chips, you know and you name it! Going to the movie all the time and you know, all these things.
(Sio)

8.1.2 Language abilities and use

The respondents were at least bilingual in Sāmoan and English. Most could understand, and some could speak, other Polynesian languages including Māori, Niuean, Cook Islands Māori, Tongan and Tokelauan. The ability to understand other Polynesian languages was partly a result of the similarity of these languages because of their shared origin, and because some respondents had relatives from other Pacific Islands. Familiarity with languages such as Māori and Cook Islands Māori had developed in New Zealand for some of the respondents. Albert, who was a minister (of religion), had learned Greek and Hebrew as part of his theological studies. Susana was learning Japanese at school, while Pita was proud to be able to say ‘hello’ in 30-40 different languages. He greeted me by saying ‘Namaste’ (‘Hello’ in Hindi), usually much sooner than I thought of greeting him with ‘Tālofa’ (‘Hello’ in Sāmoan).

All except one of the group one respondents thought they were more fluent in Sāmoan than in English. Surprisingly the exception was Maria, who had been in New Zealand the least time. Like most other group one respondents, she had not been allowed to use Sāmoan at school in Sāmoa which would have resulted in punishment. Similar cases have been documented in other countries. For example, in New Zealand in 1867, Māori leaders themselves wanted to disallow the use of ‘[even] a word of’ Māori in schools (Bell 1991:67). This was to promote the learning of English, considered essential in getting anywhere in New Zealand. The situation in the Cook Islands was parallel to this during the 1890s (Johri 1994:6). In New Zealand, most group one and two respondents used mainly or only Sāmoan at home with their families.

Of the group two respondents, Tomasi was born in New Zealand. He was equally fluent in speaking English and Sāmoan; however English was more ‘natural’ to him. Pita was better in English partly as a result of his parents having used mostly English with him at home. Susana, who had been here only two years, was more fluent in Sāmoan while Sina was equally able in both. Yet the latter found that she sometimes now mixed English with Sāmoan when speaking to her siblings.
Although younger Sāmoans in New Zealand display language shift, they have been found to maintain it better than some other immigrants. In a study of 40 Sāmoan families (of which only 6 had children born in Sāmoa) in the Wellington area, Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop (1984:101) found that a majority (78%) of the young children spoke fluent Sāmoan, while a small minority (13%) were reasonably competent speakers. The parents were more fluent in Sāmoan and used it in their daily life. English was their second language (Fairbairn-Dunlop 1984:103). Jane Pilkington (1989:31) also found that all four Sāmoan couples in her study used Sāmoan with each other, and that their children spoke Sāmoan in all domains. If the children used English among themselves, it was only after they had started going to school. Despite reduced language shift among Sāmoans in comparison to other groups, these and many other studies have expressed concern about Sāmoan language shift in New Zealand (Hunkin 1987; Walker 1983/84).

8.2 SĀMOAN GROUP ONE RESPONDENTS

The six group one respondents had been living in New Zealand from two years to two and a half decades. They were all born in Sāmoa. Maria had lived in Papua New Guinea for two years and could speak a variety of pidgin English. The respondents ranged in age from 35 to 60 years at the time of interviewing.

The women had had at least three or four years secondary schooling, while all the men had received more education. Jonah was now undertaking a Bachelor of Theology at Knox College, while Albert had spent four years at a theological college in Sāmoa. Sio had attended a technical school in Sāmoa where he had learned various trades. He equated this with the final level of secondary school.

Some respondents were working, or had worked, for the Sāmoan community in the past: Sio had run a Sāmoan Access Scheme,55 Albert was a minister of a Sāmoan church and Maria worked at a Sāmoan language nest. Lesa had an unskilled job at the hospital, while Agnes was retired. Jonah was a student. Those who had worked in Sāmoa before migrating to New Zealand had been involved in various clerical,

55 An Access Scheme ran training courses for the unemployed to teach them skills for the workplace. It was replaced by TOPS (Training Opportunities) in the early 1990s, the main difference between the two being that people going through TOPS receive recognised qualifications (Education Training and Support Agency, pers comm).
skilled and subsistence activities. These were somewhat different occupations compared to those undertaken following migration.

8.2.1 Attitudes to language and to bilingualism

The group one respondents’ choice of language for writing or telling their life story was influenced above all by the audience rather than by self. They would write it in English if it were destined for Pālagi readers and/or Sāmoan for Sāmoan readers. Prior to colonisation by the Europeans, Sāmoan culture, like other Polynesian cultures, was unwritten. Hence, there was a great emphasis on oratory including story telling and involvement of the audience. Professor Aiono Fanaafi Le Tagaloa (1989) writes about the importance of this for Sāmoans. Perhaps this had been an influence on the Sāmoan respondents’ choice for such an activity. Sio had already written a story about himself in English because it was going to be read in New Zealand. He would translate it into Sāmoan if Sāmoans were going to read it too. They all used the Sāmoan language to write letters to relatives in Sāmoa.

All the respondents used Sāmoan language media, although levels of enthusiasm varied. Tangata Pasifika (a television program the title of which translates as ‘People of the Pacific’) was a favourite. Sāmoan radio news, Sāmoana (a monthly Sāmoan language newspaper published in Auckland), and Sāmoan library books were also commonly used. Jonah had been involved in making episodes of Tangata Pasifika, while Sio had made Sāmoan media more accessible in Dunedin, by arranging for Sāmoana to be available here. In addition, he had run a Sāmoan radio show for a while. The show had been conducted in Sāmoan and included news, events, sports and music. Unfortunately a lack of funding had stopped the show. Sio was now writing two books in the Sāmoan language on specific aspects of Sāmoan culture and people in Sāmoa and New Zealand.

The Bible, translated in Sāmoan, was also widely used. This was very important to the respondents, and for a few was the only Sāmoan book they read.

56 Most Sāmoan language texts seem to be religious or educational (Hunkin 1997). Sāmoan language newspapers are reported to be ephemeral in nature and English tends to be the lingua franca in publications destined for Pacific Islanders (Holding 1997).
Yeah the [main] book I always read in Sāmoan is the Bible. Because this is the main part of the life and also to explain to your kids. Because that's where you learn and encourage . . . what to do. (Agnes)

All the respondents liked to hear and speak Sāmoan, especially when it was ‘rightly and richly’ used, according to Sio. Most of them preferred to use Sāmoan, although Maria, who was more fluent in English, acknowledged that she mixed it with a bit of English to make herself better understood. The Sāmoan language was very important to them as part of their ethnic identity. Being from Sāmoa, they were brought up with Sāmoan. Using it here made them feel less homesick and hence more at home: ‘Well, I’m proud to be Sāmoan, so what would be the use of being Sāmoan and you know not knowing and not speaking the language.’ (Maria)

The language was a clue to their Sāmoan identity and also a marker of their rank within the Sāmoan community itself. Thus, from one’s use of language it was possible to tell whether the person was of chiefly status or not. Hierarchies exist within the Sāmoan language, so that there are specialised vocabularies of courtesy and ceremony. For example, a different term would be used for ‘death’ depending on whether the deceased was a chief or an ordinary person (Duncan 1995:96, 97). Sāmoan, when correctly used, reflects well on the speaker. This is especially so in the case of Sāmoan formal speech (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:73).

Sio thought that his ability with Sāmoan had improved here but the others did not think theirs had changed. All the respondents corrected their children’s mistakes in Sāmoan and all, except Lesa, used mostly or only Sāmoan with their children. Lesa had got into the habit of speaking English at work, and continued this usage even at home. Most respondents encouraged their children’s usage of both the Sāmoan and English languages. Some had noticed that several New Zealand-born Sāmoan children had nearly lost their Sāmoan language, and they did not want this to happen with their own children. For them, Sāmoan was even more important in the New Zealand context where the school domain encouraged English.

As you know, they know English really well. But the only thing we have to tell them is don’t take away Sāmoan from them, if there’s something wrong, we have to straighten it out and make it right. But English they know really well. They’re really good at that. (Agnes)

The Sāmoan language was encouraged by group one respondents because they believed it to be part of their own and their children’s origin; in addition, Sāmoan was necessary for communication with older relatives and was a means of knowing the culture as well. The few respondents who encouraged their children’s usage of
Sāmoan only did so because English was promoted outside the home; none encouraged only English usage. Jonah did not think it necessary for Sāmoan children growing up in New Zealand to speak in Sāmoan, as long as they were familiar with Sāmoan culture (and hence appropriate behaviour) and could understand the Sāmoan language.

‘Elders’ and ‘identity’ have been found to be the main reasons that Sāmoan migrants in New Zealand taught Sāmoan to their children (Fairbairn-Dunlop 1984:102). Communication with elders would allow the children to learn Sāmoan customs and ways, as well as make the children closer to, for example, grandparents. This in turn, especially a good grasp of Sāmoan customs, would protect the children from being torn between two opposing value systems, and promote secure self-identity (Fairbairn-Dunlop 1984:103). Fairbairn-Dunlop identifies four further interconnected reasons leading to language maintenance among Sāmoans in New Zealand. Firstly, parents spoke Sāmoan in daily life because it was their primary language, and because they were more comfortable using it. Secondly, they did not find it vital to speak English to get a job in New Zealand (this will be expanded below). Thirdly, ‘the migrant[s had a] tendency to strive for greater identity even at the cost of decreased mobility, security and prosperity’ (Fairbairn-Dunlop 1984:103). Finally, (and the most important according to Fairbairn-Dunlop) the parents followed faʻasāmoa which led them to have certain behavioural expectations of their children. They wanted to inculcate Sāmoan values and beliefs in their children, so that they would be Sāmoan (Fairbairn-Dunlop 1984:104).

Some of Fairbairn-Dunlop’s sample used Sāmoan at home with their children. The author also mentions the possible existence of tension between wanting to maintain Sāmoan and knowing that English was necessary for academic achievement (Fairbairn-Dunlop 1984:104). I did not find evidence for any such tension among my respondents. Instead, my group one respondents thought it their duty to encourage Sāmoan, all the more so because English was the main language used outside the home and Sāmoan community. This change is likely to reflect a different context in New Zealand since the early 1980s, when multiculturalism and bilingualism were less acceptable than they are now.

All my group one respondents disapproved of Sāmoans using English with other Sāmoans, although some thought it to be a personal decision, especially in a new country. Jonah estimated that one out of ten Sāmoans used English instead of Sāmoan. Such people were accused of being a disgrace to Sāmoans by trying ‘to be a Pālagi’ when they were not. Without the Sāmoan language, bonding between Sāmoans would be lacking.
I hate them. Is that word hate good enough?! I dislike them, because I knew, even people that you know the background in Sāmoa, and you grew up with them in Sāmoa, and here they are in New Zealand you hardly hear them saying Sāmoan. But I just don’t agree with it, say ‘don’t agree’, put the word ‘hate’ away! You know, I don’t agree with what they are doing.

(Sio)

In certain circumstances, use of correct English by Sāmoans commands respect, but in others, it is criticised. Fluent English speakers may act as translators for Sāmoans when they go to a doctor or lawyer or ‘other elite places of contact’ (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:72). In such cases, fluency in English is indicative of an understanding of a Pālagi culture and its economic and social systems. In other situations, however, the opposite happens, and use of English leads to loss of respect. In Sāmoan social situations, an older migrant who prefers to use English may be labelled fia Pālagi or fia poto meaning big headed. The presence of Pālagi guests at Sāmoan occasions makes it appropriate to use English. This is a legitimate situation where competence in English may be demonstrated (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:72).

The Sāmoan group one respondents had all learned English as a compulsory language at school. As mentioned, most had to use it as a first language while at school. Jonah, who had attended a bilingual school, was not concerned about fluency in English, as long as his ability in it would let him manage: ‘. . . But English is my second language, so [I] can’t be bothered getting [better in] it. As long as you know what to do and how to speak.’ (Jonah)

English was important to the respondents to the extent that it was a means of survival in New Zealand, including employment and communication with non-Sāmoans, as well as allowing easier communication while travelling overseas. In addition, it was useful in Sāmoa too, especially in the job market:57 ‘. . . it’s the

57 Today, English is the language of wider communication (LWC) in Sāmoa. It is used in domains such as business, trade and politics. Even in the late 1980s it was the official medium of instruction in Sāmoan schools; however in reality its use depended on the teacher and their proficiency in English. Sāmoan is used in areas like social interaction and local government (Huebner 1989:61, 62). This has not always been the case. Prior to the introduction of colonial administration, most Sāmoans did not need to use any spoken language apart from Sāmoan (Huebner 1989:64).

After World War I, secular education increasingly replaced the previous education system with its emphasis on oral language skills. Also, an expanding population and the establishment of businesses
English language that will take you, even in Sāmoa, it’s the English language that will take you where you want.’ (Maria)

My findings here contrast with those of Fairbairn-Dunlop (1984:103). In the latter study, the migrants found that they could procure jobs even if they did not speak fluent English because in comparison to Sāmoa, New Zealand had abundant jobs. The author says this was a reason that parents passed the Sāmoan language on to their children. However, by the time I conducted my research, the unemployment situation had changed in the ensuing dozen odd years. Unemployment had increased in New Zealand, making it harder to secure a job.58

The positive aspects of learning English for the group one respondents included having increased access to education, jobs, news media and communication with non-Sāmoans.

Yeah, it’s really good to learn English you know. Because you understand what other people they talking about, you know if they talk to you, and if you want to go looking for a job, you can speak English. You gonna ask, or write application down, or CV to make it out, write it out . . . (Lesa)

Nobody talked of an inherent interest in language learning itself.

favoured the spread of English. ‘The increasing reliance on a monetary society and the rise of commercial centres created a demand for at least some proficiency in English’ (Huebner 1989:66). Following World War II, when Sāmoa was made a UN trustee supervised by New Zealand, it increasingly demanded autonomy. The latter was related to proficiency in English. The education system recognised that while the majority of Sāmoan school students would be involved in agricultural activities in villages after completing primary school, some would go on to secondary school and higher education, in search of clerical or administrative jobs. Hence, English replaced Sāmoan as the medium of instruction beyond Standard 4 (Huebner 1989:68, 69).

Thus, English took over from Sāmoan in several domains, especially public ones, and became the means to success in school and in paid employment (Fairbairn-Dunlop 1984:103). Karen Watson-Gegeo (1989:2) predicts that English will continue to have an important role in Sāmoa because of Sāmoa’s economic and political relationship with New Zealand, and other countries.

58 According to the Household labour force survey, unemployment in New Zealand has increased from 3.8% in December 1984 to 9.5% in March 1994. The latter is a reduction from 11.1% in March 1992 (Kelsey 1995:260). The latest available rate (September 1997) was 6.6%. The rate of unemployment among Pacific Islanders in September 1997 was 15.5%, much higher than the national rate (Statistics New Zealand, pers comm).
Albert was the only one who mentioned a negative aspect to learning English - the creation of a generation gap between older and younger Sāmoan people. This was a result of language shift among the younger generation, who in many cases were less fluent in Sāmoan than their parents. Often, this was to the extent that it hindered communication between the two.

The respondents thought that monolingual New Zealanders should learn another language, as it would let them communicate with more people and broaden their understanding.

That's up to them, but according to the situation of the world in the time, they should remember that English is not the language to communicate with other peoples. It’s good for them because they were living in New Zealand, they go out for example in the Pacific, so they should know, should understand in the world, in the wide world, people living in different countries. (Albert)

Sio thought that it was selfish not to learn an additional language, while Agnes believed that Māori people should know Māori. Fairbairn-Dunlop (1984:102) also found that a few parents from her sample were ‘sorrow[ful]’ about the Māori language being lost by the Māori.

8.2.2 Ethnic identity

I am a Sāmoan, I am proud to be a Sāmoan, I will remain being a Sāmoan.

(Jonah)

The three ideas in this statement sum up the ethnic identity of the Sāmoan group one respondents. All thought of themselves as Sāmoan and did not think that this could ever change. Sio especially wanted other people to know that he was Sāmoan and what this meant, so he would wear a lāvalava, a Sāmoan garment, whenever he could. When attending a funeral, he had taken along a Sāmoan fine mat, i’atoga, to signal his Sāmoan identity to people. To him, his own culture was the best, although he thought that everyone should have such an attitude towards their own culture.

Sāmoan, Sāmoan, I want people to know I am a Sāmoan. You know why? You know like Sunday when you came in and saw me wearing a lāvalava, and that’s my style, in the summertime. I always wear lāvalava and I always walk barefeet and things like that, and you haven’t seen me at the time where I carrying a . . . token of its [Sāmoan] culture, I usually do it in
the church on communion Sunday. And I’m wearing a lāvalava because I know how to wear a lāvalava and I know how to talk about my lāvalava. And every people say, ‘Hey you’re wearing a nice skirt’ and I say ‘Hey, come here, come here, come here. This is not a skirt, this is a lāvalava.’ So you have to educate people, rather than making assumption that you are somebody else! (Sio)

Their Sāmoan identity was very important to the respondents, all the more so because they were able to find warmth and love with other Sāmoans living in New Zealand. Sio had been awarded the title of chief; hence his Sāmoan identity was very salient to him.

The main reasons the respondents thought of themselves as Sāmoan included being born and brought up in Sāmoa as well as knowing and practising Sāmoan culture here in New Zealand. Significant aspects of Sāmoan culture included the language and food, observing respect and maintaining the hierarchy. Mixed ancestry did not stop self-identity as a Sāmoan if one’s birthplace had been Sāmoa. For example, Lesa who had a German grandfather, still thought of herself as Sāmoan.

Some of the respondents thought that it was hard for Pālagi as well as other Pacific Islanders to identify them as Sāmoans, especially as there were Pacific Islanders from so many different islands in New Zealand now. These Sāmoans themselves could not always distinguish between different Islanders until they spoke, and then the language they used identified them. In contrast, other respondents thought that they could never get away from their Sāmoan identity, and therefore people could always pick them out as Sāmoan. They also thought that they could usually correctly distinguish between different Pacific Islanders. Half the respondents had been mistaken for tourists, but if they felt any negative reactions to this, they did not display it.

8.2.3 Language maintenance and identity

The respondents thought that maintaining the Sāmoan language was important, but not vital, for ethnicity. In New Zealand, the language was significant to the extent that it allowed communication between people of different generations, as most of the older generation did not speak English, while the New Zealand-born Sāmoan youth were not as fluent in Sāmoan as the older generation. It was also essential that the language was used appropriately, as its use varied according to context, depending on whether it was used for everyday conversation, for speeches or for
Albert thought that ideally he should conduct the church service in both languages, so that it would be universally understood. However, he did not think he had the confidence to do so in English.

Sāmoan parents have been found to be more strongly in favour of language maintenance than other Pacific Islands parents. In a study of first generation immigrant mothers in the Wellington suburb of Newtown, 91% of the Sāmoan respondents wanted their children to speak Sāmoan compared to 67% of other Pacific Islands women (Jamieson 1980:105). Sāmoan children were found to maintain Sāmoan twice as often as other Pacific Islands children maintained their language - 24% for the former but only 12% for the latter (Jamieson 1980:106). Although the Sāmoan language was being maintained, it was not as much as the mothers wanted it to be (Jamieson 1980:107-8).

In my study, children born of Sāmoan parents who did not speak Sāmoan were still considered Sāmoan. This situation was considered problematic, not only because it hindered communication as mentioned above, but also because such children would not be as emotionally involved in the Sāmoan community. If children could not speak Sāmoan, the parents were held responsible for not encouraging the language in their children.

... Because the parents will not understand the English and the children not understand the Sāmoan. So there is a gap there, so it cannot create you know that warmth, fellowship in the Sāmoan family, and some sort of differences. (Albert)

The Sāmoan culture, including institutions like the church, which brought people together, and customs like respect, love and sharing were believed to be the most important parts of the Sāmoan way of life in New Zealand.

The culture, the culture. They have to know the culture, they don't know that, you're out, you're wasting your time. Because if you don't know your culture, you end up to be something that you are not. You are a, just a rubber stamp somehow. (Sio)

Jonah saw the Sāmoan customs as influential contributions Sāmoans made to New Zealand. Yet, Albert believed that Sāmoans were inhibited by New Zealand law in fully maintaining their customs.

Supporting this contention is a study by Veligitone Sasagi (1996) of the extent to which Sāmoan cultural values were recognised by the Resource Management Act. He found (1996:54) that regional and local authorities gave inadequate consideration
to cultural values of minority groups (apart from Māori) when formulating policies. Because the Resource Management Act is bicultural in nature (the two recognised cultures being Māori and Pākehā), other cultures are subsumed under Pākehā hegemony (Sasagi 1996:67). In cases where city councils (such as Manukau and Porirua) ‘appear[ed]’ to consider minority cultural values, the public (Sāmoans) thought otherwise (Sasagi 1996:54). Examples of dissatisfaction included not being able to build churches in socially and spiritually suitable places. Some churches were built in commercial areas which were unsuitable because children were supposed to take ‘their minds off the world around them’ (Sasagi 1996:37). Another example was not being able to have houses in which cultural protocol could be followed. I’atoga or fine mats were often larger than the space available to view them, hence they could not be opened (Sasagi 1996:32).

At a personal level, only Jonah thought that in New Zealand his Sāmoan identity had changed to accommodate to different circumstances, but this was just at a superficial level. Such adjustments included having to wear trousers and shoes rather than a lāvalava with bare feet in the winter because of the cold. When speaking English, he felt that he was also donning a different personality. Nevertheless, under such exterior changes he was still Sāmoan. The other respondents also argued that their ethnicity could not change. If they were born Sāmoan ‘God would know’ who they were regardless of their subsequent place of residence or how well they spoke any other language. Religion probably influenced this belief; there was no changing or hiding their Sāmoan identity from God.

. . . well you should say that to yourself too, my culture is the best culture in the world, you should say that, don’t [be] afraid to say it. You know that’s my encouragement and my warning to you, speak about it, stand on your two feet for your culture, and for you. Because no-one can take it away. Because you must remember this one as well, no matter how good your English is in New Zealand, no matter how, no matter how, no matter how you know the system, you are an Indian, and I am a Sāmoan. (Sio)

At a wider level, all the respondents hoped that the Sāmoan language would be maintained in New Zealand, but in general they were not very optimistic about this happening. Maria compared the situation with that of the Māori language, which was feared to be declining until measures to reverse this were introduced in the 1970s and 1980s; (see Chapter 3). Similar steps could be taken to halt Sāmoan language shift, such as teaching it in schools. Such a move would be welcomed by all the respondents and they would (or would have) encourage(d) their children to take it. Sāmoan was already compulsory at several schools in Auckland, the largest
Polynesian city in the world. Some other places also had a high enough Sāmoan population to warrant such a move, although the language did not necessarily have to be compulsory, just offered as an option. Including Sāmoan in the education system would not only directly help its survival by teaching it to more young people, but also indirectly, as it would give the language status and value in the eyes of Sāmoans and non-Sāmoans. Maria Talaitupu Kerslake and Donald Kerslake (1987:145) report that New Zealand-born Sāmoan children and young adults ‘do not see the Sāmoan language as important because it is not taught at school’.

In 1997, Sāmoan was introduced as an option in some early childhood centres, primary and secondary schools. Despite being the third most widely spoken language in New Zealand (NZPA 1997:5) and lobbying efforts since 1974, it has not been made a School Certificate subject. Sāmoan parents who had been punished for using Sāmoan at school as children were sceptical of such a move. However, it has been said that:

New Zealand schools had a duty to their Samoan students to try to break down the assimilationist policies which their parents had been brought up with. (NZPA 1997:5)

The New Zealand Qualifications Authority is currently making a decision about this matter (NZPA 1997:5).

Jonah informed me that Pacific Island Studies had been introduced at universities in Wellington and Auckland, and would soon follow in Palmerston North and in universities in other cities. Papers like Christianity in the Pacific were taught by lecturers from several different Pacific Islands who could communicate in their respective mother tongues. Such measures encouraged the use of Sāmoan at an academic level and thus helped to maintain it.

Fairbairn-Dunlop (1984:109-110) found that about half her respondents thought it ideal for Sāmoan to be taught in schools but in practice preferred that time at school was spent on English and Maths. This finding contrasted with mine. Some of my respondents were doing their best to keep the Sāmoan language alive. Albert used it to deliver his services/sermons. The desire for Sāmoan to be taught at schools was borne out in the work of one respondent, as described in the following paragraph.

Yes, certainly, most certainly [Sāmoan should be taught in schools]. Which is the group that I’m now involved with the last two years, is called the group that teach the Sāmoan language in New Zealand, Aotearoa. So we got a branch in Dunedin, which is, I am the [position], and we are now working to the direction of informing all level of schools, for cultural
purposes, and language taught in most institutions. So just striving towards that. (Sio)

The respondents working in Sāmoan media and the language nest were aware of the possibility of language shift and were attempting to slow this down.

This contrasts with Pilkington’s findings. Her respondents took for granted the continued use of Sāmoan and were not involved in language maintenance efforts (Pilkington 1989:32). Instead, their concern was the opposite - that the children acquire fluent English (Pilkington 1989:33). My respondents were not worried about this since their children spoke fluent English through interaction outside the Sāmoan community.

The Sāmoan language is taught at non-mainstream schools too. A school with a different approach is Nga Tapuwae College, New Zealand’s first community secondary school in Mangere, South Auckland. It is based on the philosophy that until a person has developed security and confidence in their own culture, they cannot turn to another one and appreciate it. The school was set up in 1976, with Māori and French being taught at all levels. Pacific Islands languages, including Sāmoan, were not introduced until early 1986 (Gluckman 1987). This represented a change in attitudes prevalent during the early 1970s. In 1974, when an attempt was made to introduce Sāmoan in some schools (teachers feared that Sāmoan would decline, as was happening with Māori at the time), local Sāmoan parents thought that this would be contrary to their reason for immigrating to New Zealand, which was to let their children have access to the New Zealand education system. However, 10 years after that, the request of Pacific Islands parents had changed, and now they wanted schools to help them maintain their first language. As a result, teachers were trained, and in 1984, Hillary College introduced the teaching of Sāmoan and Cook Islands Māori.

The principal aims and objectives of teaching Samoan were seen as helping New Zealand-born Samoans develop a strong sense of their Samoan identity through learning their language, and helping migrant Samoan students maintain and enrich their appreciation of their culture and language within the New Zealand environment. (Gluckman 1987:112)

Nga Tapuwae introduced this program in 1986. However, it was opposed by teachers of traditional subjects who felt that there was not enough time for so many options. Even though the program is hindered by scarce funding and resources, Ann Gluckman (1987:116), the founding principal of the school, positively asserts Nga Tapuwae as a forerunner of multiculturalism in New Zealand.
Language maintenance was believed by my respondents to be a group responsibility and more specifically a family obligation (supplemented by the school teaching reading and writing skills), where children were socialised in their culture including language, customs and appropriate behaviour. Parents wanted government support in the form of funding and policy to facilitate the teaching of Sāmoan in schools. Textbooks and road signs in Sāmoan would be helpful to those struggling with English, but according to some respondents, the availability of such services should be dependent on the size of the Sāmoan population. With regard to their attitudes to language and ethnicity, the respondents estimated that other Sāmoans had similar attitudes to them.

The Sāmoans are proactive about the importance of passing on their language and culture to the younger generation and have set up language nests (Ā'oga Ámata) at preschool level. At secondary level, a ‘Pastor School’ attracts children after school. Dunedin has a handful of Sāmoan language nests, of which I visited two. To maintain their anonymity, I will refer to them as Language Nest A and Language Nest B. The following information came from discussions with staff and mothers at the schools and other members of the community who were involved with the schools.

Language Nest A was attached to a church and had been licensed since 1994. Before that it had operated as a play group for 8 years. It was funded by the government and could have a maximum of 25 children. It ran from Monday to Friday, from 9 AM to 3 PM. At the time of my visits to it, there were 18 children, with one certified staff member and 3-4 mothers participating. Of these, those who were paid received less than the minimum wage, so the work was considered to be voluntary. The staff were mainly Sāmoan, but there was also one Pālagi who spoke limited Sāmoan.

At the school, the children were involved in activities like art, listening to stories, learning songs and rhymes. These were often focused around Sāmoan themes such as making tapa prints. The children also played, ate and slept, and spent some time on lessons and on tidying up. Lessons included learning the Sāmoan alphabet, and other aspects of Sāmoan culture. Religious teaching was also incorporated into the activities, for example, saying grace before a meal.

Most children at the school were Sāmoan, however, several were part-Tongan, -Pālagi or -Māori. Communication was mainly in Sāmoan, although some English was also used after some parents requested this. This was to facilitate the transition of the children to an English-medium school when they left the language nest at the age of 5.
I spoke to several mothers at the nest. I observed them using mostly Sāmoan with the children, except for a few words of English. They sent their children to this language nest so that the children would learn the Sāmoan language and something about the culture as well. They did not want their children to lose the Sāmoan language. The parents did not feel the need to encourage their children in English which they would learn by living in and going to school in an English-speaking country.

Language Nest B was attached to a school, and was as yet unlicensed at the time, so was allowed to operate for only three hours, three days a week. However, it ran from Monday to Friday from 9 AM to 12 PM, with the children divided into three groups, who all attend on different days. In total there were 19 children when I visited it. This nest received some government funding.

In contrast to Language Nest A, I observed mostly English being used at Language Nest B. The supervisor told me that this was partly because many of the children came from mixed families. Their parents used mostly English with the children; however, she was now trying to encourage them to speak Sāmoan so that the children would not lose the language.

As at Language Nest A, the children played and ate, and there was a lesson in the last half hour when, for example, Sāmoan numbers, colours, and days of the week were taught.

These two language nests were therefore quite different: A seemed to concentrate on the transmission of Sāmoan language and culture, while B seemed to be less concerned about this aspect (although the supervisor was slowly trying to change this). Since both these nests were very close to each other, parents who sent children to one could have sent their children to the other in some cases. So I asked a mother at B why she chose that one rather than A. She informed me that all the mothers who had children at B were mutual friends, they met at least once a month and helped with childcare for others in this group. I formed the impression that B was more of a childcare centre, while A was more of a centre for the learning of language and culture.

I also visited a language nest attached to a church in Wellington. It received government funding, and at the time had 25 children out of a maximum capacity of 30. It operated from 7:30 AM to 5 PM, but had two shifts. It had started in 1985 with mothers helping, but now all the staff were trained. The nest was open to anyone who wanted to learn Sāmoan. Most children there were Sāmoan, but some were part-Māori or -Pālagi or other -Pacific Island. The children were involved in activities
similar to those in Language Nests A and B - play, prayer, rhymes, ‘theme of the week’ such as safety, Olympics. Further, some Māori basics, such as greetings, days of the week and numbers were also taught out of respect for the Treaty of Waitangi.

Once again, the supervisor stressed the importance of the Sāmoan language for Sāmoan children; it was ‘their language’. The nest encouraged the use of Sāmoan, so the main means of communication there was Sāmoan. However, at home many of the children reverted to replying in English. This was partly explained by the supervisor of another language nest whom I spoke to. She had noticed that those children who had older siblings tended to use more English, as the older siblings would use English once they started school, while those who did not have older siblings used mainly Sāmoan. Kerslake and Kerslake (1987:145) also report that the more time children spend at school, the more they tend to speak English and less Sāmoan. A similar situation has been found among other immigrant groups too: German and Dutch speakers in Australia (Pauwels 1986:108).

The Pastor School, as it was called, carried on from where the language nest stopped. It was first established in Dunedin in 1976. Maria’s husband David59 told me about the Pastor School since he was involved with it. Classes were usually held from 4 PM to 6 PM from Monday to Friday, and also on weekends. It had to be somewhat flexible so that children could do their homework and fulfil their mainstream school obligations. The Pastor School operated from January till April, followed by exams in May or June. However, Sunday School, where similar teachings were passed on, continued throughout the year. The Pastor School had 40-45 students at the time. Classes were divided according to age group; the ages of children ranging from 5 to 18. The school received some funding from the Department of Internal Affairs, but also relied on donations from members of the church to which it was attached. The teachers were mostly female volunteers. It was believed that women were very effective at disciplining children and passing on the language and culture to the younger generation.

The school started by teaching reading and writing in Sāmoan, and translation between Sāmoan and English. Then cultural and behavioural aspects were also incorporated. This was linked to the Bible; for example, respect for parents. However, David pointed out that culture was best learned through a ‘hands on approach’ by living it; hence culture was difficult to teach in an artificial situation like a classroom. Such a problem is less likely to occur in a Sāmoan-dominant

---

59 A pseudonym.
neighbourhood where children live close to other Sāmoans with whom they can use the Sāmoan language and practise Sāmoan culture. In Wellington, the presence of many Sāmoans living in close proximity was found to reinforce the maintenance of Sāmoan and faʻasāmoa.

They ‘lived’ their language and customs, and demonstrated to the children the value of Samoan as a means of communication. (Fairbairn-Dunlop 1984:106)

A major difficulty the children at the Pastor School faced was going from 6 hours in an English-speaking environment (school) to the Pastor School and then back home where Sāmoan was used. As a result, many of them had language problems, usually with Sāmoan. The Pastor School was aware of this, and was trying to reduce this problem by encouraging Sāmoan from an early age.

The Sāmoans have established their own education system to teach what was important to them and what was ignored in the mainstream education system. However, they had to work around the latter. Since many Sāmoans had migrated to New Zealand for their children to have access to better educational opportunities, they did not want to hinder this.

8.2.4 Attitudes to and experiences in Sāmoa and New Zealand

Most respondents had more interaction among Sāmoans than among the general population. This was especially true of those who were involved with one or more Sāmoan groups, sometimes in a professional capacity.

Yes. Well I used to be a leader of the Sāmoan community for five years. And our activities at the time is catering for the need and for workshops and things for the Sāmoan community in terms of the culture, the language and other things. (Sio)

All the respondents were part of a Sāmoan community associated with their respective churches. The church groups were engaged in activities such as youth group, choir, sports, workshops, and housie60 among others. Several also ran Sunday schools where Agnes and Maria taught or had taught. These community

60 Housie is a form of bingo played as a gambling game.
groups gave the Sāmoans an opportunity to meet and socialise with other Sāmoans, reinforce Sāmoan culture and speak Sāmoan.

The church has been found to be even more important for Sāmoans in New Zealand (Fairbairn-Dunlop 1984:107), who do not live in as close proximity as they do in fale (houses) in rural areas of Sāmoa (Fairbairn-Dunlop 1984:105). This was borne out in my study too. In the absence of Sāmoan neighbourhoods in Dunedin, the church has an especially important role to play in providing Sāmoans a focus for meeting and interacting.

Fairbairn-Dunlop described her sample as ‘a group of self-contained extended families’ (1984:111) who interacted mainly within their ‘āiga or with other Sāmoans. They mixed with Pālagi only out of necessity. Parents did not like their children to be friends with Pālagi but they could not exercise as much authority over older children (Fairbairn-Dunlop 1984:107). This situation was different from my findings. Although my respondents mixed mainly with other Sāmoans, their interactions were not ‘self-contained’ among the Sāmoans. Some respondents informed me that intermarriage was becoming increasingly acceptable.

None of the women mentioned having experienced discrimination in New Zealand, whereas the men did. Sio had found that New Zealanders did not understand Sāmoan culture, and Jonah thought he had missed out on jobs because of his Sāmoan background. On one occasion, he had tried to assert his Sāmoan identity but this had been misunderstood. In his experience, Pacific Islanders were automatically demoted to second place.

One job I went with a lāvalava on to an interview, they wouldn't have it, boss was looking at me like, said 'Why are you dressed like that?', [and I said] 'That's my culture and I'm not going to wear the lāvalava to work, I coming here to to interview, I'm not coming here to work [at this moment]', and he finished.

... The thing is that with the New Zealand way of life, in here, that I don't like it the way they look at us. That's what I said, I had, I say to myself New Zealand is one of the racist country. In everything. The way they look at us Pacific Islanders when they come into shops and all that, you know, when you come to look for a job they always look at you and, in that sort of sense, so it's, that's, I hate to see that. Because I've been to a lot of things that they look at us that way. So it's no good. That's why I hate, but some, it's the same to all other cultures because of good peoples and bad peoples, but on the overall basis, you know when we go to government
departments for something or help you know, well they look at you, you know. You can always see a big ‘no’ on their faces, you know before you actually say something. So I don’t know whether it’s just the wrong person that you meet at the wrong time or, sort of the overall feeling that’s behind it. . . . (Jonah)

The women believed that they had not picked up traits of New Zealand culture, apart from speaking English. On the contrary, Maria thought she had become more Sāmoan in her ways.

Well, back home, in Sāmoa, you know, it’s very hard for me to describe it, but I think I used a more . . . we call it Pālagi, a more Pālagi approach to the way we lived before we came to New Zealand. But since we moved here I’ve certainly taken a more Sāmoan, more Sāmoan stance, if you know what I’m trying to say. Well, for example, with the clothes that my children wear when we come to church, I’ve found that I, well they usually wearing the lēvalava [in New Zealand], and, whereas back home we dressed them up in long pants and western clothes. (Maria)

The men had adopted some features of New Zealand. Sio was taking part in Māori activities such as hāngi (feasts) and funerals and was also speaking additional languages including Māori, Cook Islands Māori and Niuean. Albert was considering bringing up his children with a combination of Sāmoan and New Zealand customs, but was finding this difficult. He also feared a potential gap between his children and their grandparents who lived in Sāmoa.

Yeah there were some, some of the Sāmoan ways, sometimes we disagree a bit but sometimes we, we know this is the way we, our parents had brought us up, from the beginning so we still have the decision whether to leave that behind or still have it. So all the time we’re still looking at that, because we’re looking, we are standing as parents now in the middle looking back to our parents, the way they brought us and looking to our children growing up in New Zealand, so it’s very hard to. There were some things of the Sāmoan way we can’t get to our children. But encourage the Sāmoan, yeah. Most of the New Zealand way of life they were not accepted in Sāmoa by the grandparents and the old people. So we are still in between and looking for what we are going to gain for the good of our parents in Sāmoa and all the peoples and the good of our children. So from there on that is why we still have that kind of feeling of homesick[ness], because trying to make our children live together with our parents is go to Sāmoan and live together there. So the English language
separated the children from the communication to the older ones. It’s difficult. (Albert)

Only Jonah acknowledged the need to adapt Sāmoan culture in a new context.

. . . But when you come to New Zealand context you got to adjust your culture to the New Zealand way of life. Not really [that hard to do] but, I think it’s like gifts, giving and offering to every, Sāmoan got everything before money. But in New Zealand you gotta budget, but us in the island there’s no such thing as budgeting. You expect things for a day and then it comes in, when the thing comes in. Whatever you get that day you throw everything into it. But New Zealand you gotta budget until Wednesday you gotta get some money, so that sort of idea that our people should know and understand too, because it’s a different context here in New Zealand, so you gotta adjust yourself to it. But we’re finding a lot of our Pacific Islanders and Sāmoans especially they fall into a lot of difficulties . . . (Jonah)

At the same time, he thought it was important for New Zealanders to be adaptable too, especially when it came to Sāmoan customs which were important to the Sāmoans.

I like the New Zealand, I understand the way they are, and understand my own culture as well. So I mean that’s good, in the middle, where I can be flexible on both sides. I don’t really ignore the New Zealand way of life, but there are some importance within there to us, but in a sense I hate to see them [New Zealanders] say that you or you [Sāmoans] are doing the wrong thing, you know. I don’t want that. There are some ways that we are introducing into the New Zealand context that they should understand too, because we value that too, see, so there must be flexibility among them. (Jonah)

The respondents seemed to be more oriented to Sāmoa and the Sāmoan way of life than the New Zealand one. Some of them were grateful for employment and settlement here, but there was a cultural clash between New Zealand customs and Sāmoan ones. Consequently many respondents thought that New Zealand did not have much to offer them in terms of culture. It was mainly the material comforts of New Zealand which they appreciated. Also, New Zealand was perceived to be safer than other countries.
Well the only thing that I think New Zealand is good in a way that it's provided a lot of jobs for us, for our people. But I've seen and I've lived up here, I've always, the good people that actually are, you know, are, wish to stay here, and if they don't have the jobs. So if you don't have a job you rather go back to the island, you see. So I hate to see people they come over here and stay and they don't have the, they don't have the the jobs. Because basically that's why we came over here to New Zealand, you come here to New Zealand to work and to send some money back to your island and families to bring them up you know. But if you don't have a job you rather go back because it's very hard. (Jonah)

In the opinion of several respondents, New Zealand parents were too lax with their children, who consequently gained too much independence. The latter were also seen to be lacking in respect for elders, and claiming their rights on the grounds of ‘unfairness’. Such practices were not acceptable among Sāmoans. In Sāmoa, even after marriage, a man was still accountable to his parents.

In contrast to New Zealand ways, the respondents felt at home with Sāmoan culture, its customs, traditions, respect and language. The church brought them all together, letting them socialise and reinforce their beliefs, and giving them opportunities to partake of Sāmoan food.

The communication, the getting together of Sāmoans when they are coming together and the warmth of our fellowship and everything we can, sharing our everything in our language, in our own customs and cultures and everything like that. (Albert)

A few respondents disliked aspects of Sāmoan culture at the same time, for example excessive community demands and abusive discipline.

All the respondents, except Maria who had been here only two years, had visited Sāmoa at least once. They were all keen to re-visit and most wanted to return permanently once their children had been through school or tertiary education or after their own retirement. Sio and his family had already returned to Sāmoa but had come back to live in New Zealand when one of his sons became sick. Those who wanted to return were waiting for their children to be financially independent. Their ‘own life’ in Sāmoa was easier, and the climate was warmer, making Sāmoa more attractive.

The desire among Sāmoans to return home to Sāmoa has been well documented in the literature since the 1960s.
Most of them plan to return to their homeland and go back with the increased prestige and knowledge that a stay in New Zealand will give. (R L Challis cited in Fairbairn 1961:23)

The subject of return is also part of the Sāmoan creation myth. In the final of three episodes of the myth, Tagaloa the Messenger and Tagaloa the Creator return to the heavens after visiting Earth (Kinloch 1976:81).

It was also the theme of a novel written in the early 1970s by Albert Wendt, and is reflected in its title Sons for the return home. In the novel the protagonist’s (called ‘the boy’) family wanted to return to Sāmoa after the sons were educated. Of this, the boy told his Pālagi girlfriend:

. . . But he [my father] was truly happy and alive in Samoa. I suppose my mother is the same way too. Our whole life here is only a preparation for the grand return to our homeland. Their hopes and dreams all revolve round our return. (Wendt 1973:40)

The boy’s parents painted an idealised image of Sāmoa out of their romantic memories. Sāmoa attained a mythical and legendary quality for the boy and his brother (Wendt 1973). However, this illusion was shattered for the boy when his family did finally return.

It was hard to believe that he had spent nearly twenty years preparing and waiting for this return. So many years and now nothing more than an uncomfortable seat, as a stranger, in a bus packed with the mythical characters of the legends his parents had nourished him on for so long. (Wendt 1973:172-3)

Despite the increased status of his family in Sāmoa, acquired as a result of having lived in New Zealand, the boy did not like Sāmoa and returned alone to New Zealand.

Remitting money to their ‘āiga in Sāmoa is a way of remaining part of the family which immigrants hope to join on their return (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:14). Migrant Sāmoans could return to their village unless they had violated ‘Samoan Law’ and had been thrown out of their village (Kinloch 1976:81). Some migrants wanted to return because they had experienced discrimination in New Zealand (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:15).

However, in Ian Fairbairn’s (1961:23) experience, the wish to return usually died out, hence perhaps its label ‘myth of return’. As more and more Sāmoans migrate to New Zealand, and ‘āiga are established here, fewer migrants want to return. Also, migrants, like everyone else, change their views and attitudes without being aware of it much of the time (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:15, 16). The idealised view that
many migrants hold of Sāmoa is sometimes burst when they go back to Sāmoa for a visit. Pitt and Macpherson (1974:19) think it unlikely that there will be a mass return to Sāmoa. ‘Return’ could also become a movement between the two countries, as with one of my respondents who had come back to New Zealand.

The desire to return has been proposed to be ‘nostalgia for the past rather than a plan for the future’ (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:16). It is not as strong in young New Zealand-born Sāmoans. Many of them have not been back to Sāmoa, or if they have, then only for short periods, and they are less familiar with fa’asāmoa and the Sāmoan language. Even though they think of themselves as Sāmoan first, then as New Zealanders, they do not want to live in Sāmoa which is perceived as having fewer economic opportunities (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:16).

Sāmoans are not the only immigrants who have been found to want to return home. In Britain, black workers’ desire to return to the Caribbean or India is believed to make their lives in their adopted country meaningful (Bradley 1996:126). Indians in New Zealand sometimes retired in India, particularly if their wives had not migrated. The children of migrants often expressed a desire to return, but this was seldom carried out (Leckie 1995b:151-2).

The wish to return among my respondents can be related to several interconnected factors, regardless of whether or not it is actually fulfilled. It made their time in New Zealand purposeful, giving it an aim. The respondents considered that New Zealand did not have much to offer them culturally and they did not like being relegated to second place, but they were appreciative of what was offered financially and educationally. Once these purposes had been fulfilled, accomplishing their reasons for migrating to New Zealand, they wanted to go back to a lifestyle and place which they found more familiar. It is also likely to be a longing for what they had left behind. Once back in Sāmoa, they tended to have a higher status, having become familiar with Pālagi ways and the English language. Perhaps it also partly explains why the respondents had limited interaction with Pālagi in comparison to the Dutch and Korean respondents. Turkish Muslim immigrants in the Netherlands were found to neither put much effort into interaction with the host society outside of work or school, nor into learning the Dutch language, because they thought of their stay in the Netherlands as temporary (Sunier 1995:68). It is also likely to be a reason that Sāmoans maintain their language better than other immigrant groups.
8.2.5 Summary

The Sāmoan respondents had migrated to New Zealand mainly for their children’s education and for economic reasons. Through working in New Zealand, they could support their immediate family and also remit money home to Sāmoa and support their ‘āiga there.

All the group one respondents were bilingual in Sāmoan and English. They supported bilingualism, arguing that it was beneficial for one’s thinking as well as for communication. Their attitudes to Sāmoan were more integrative than instrumental. Sāmoan was very important to them, especially in New Zealand where English was the dominant language outside the home. Sāmoan was a marker of their identity, among Sāmoans as well as with non-Sāmoans. The language was also a means to their culture and the Sāmoan way of life, fa’asāmoa. All the respondents used Sāmoan language media and some of them were involved in producing or distributing it. The respondents took steps to correct their children’s mistakes in Sāmoan and they encouraged them to use either both Sāmoan and English or only Sāmoan, but not just English.

The deliberate use of English instead of Sāmoan with Sāmoans was objected to. A majority of the respondents had more contact with Sāmoans than with non-Sāmoans. In some cases this was because the respondents were working with or for Sāmoans. All the respondents were involved with a group affiliated with their respective churches. Such involvement gave them the opportunity to reinforce their culture, speak Sāmoan and enjoy Sāmoan food. Most of them thought that their attitudes to language and ethnicity were similar to those of other Sāmoans.

The respondents’ attitudes to the English language were more instrumental than they were to the Sāmoan language. They had all learned English as a compulsory language at school where they had been prohibited from using Sāmoan. English was important to them to the extent that it let them get by in New Zealand, it was a means of communication and gave them access to jobs (the latter also applies in Sāmoa). Only Albert thought that, for Sāmoans, learning English had a negative effect by creating a generation gap.

All the respondents identified themselves as Sāmoans and were proud to do so. They did not think that this identity could change, regardless of other languages known or place of residence, although Jonah deemed that some surface-level adjustments had to be made. Such modifications led to minor cultural changes, such as wearing different clothes because of New Zealand’s colder climate. Sāmoan
identity was very important, especially in New Zealand, where it brought Sāmoans together. The main determinants of Sāmoan identity were place of birth, socialisation and culture. Only those respondents who believed that others could identify them as Sāmoan could themselves distinguish between different Pacific Islanders.

The maintenance of Sāmoan language was important, but not essential for retaining Sāmoan identity. Since not all New Zealand-born Sāmoan children could speak Sāmoan, the criteria for ethnicity had to be broad enough to include them. Such children were still considered Sāmoan. This situation was problematic because they tended to be less involved with the Sāmoan community and they were not able to communicate effectively with the older generation. Sāmoan identity could be maintained by following Sāmoan customs in the absence of language.

Overall, the respondents believed that ethnic identity could not change, but the criteria determining it could and culture could adjust too. This way, children born of Sāmoan parents were still regarded as Sāmoan.

The respondents hoped for Sāmoan language maintenance in New Zealand, but were not very confident about this outcome. Language maintenance was believed to be mainly a family responsibility, but in addition to the school, the government could also contribute to help maintain the language, through funding and policy.

The respondents were oriented more towards Sāmoa and life there. They maintained fa’asāmoa, with the ‘āiga and church as the most important elements of it. Most wanted to return permanently to Sāmoa once they had retired and/or their children were independent. New Zealand did not have much to offer them apart from better educational opportunities and jobs and thus economic security and material comforts. New Zealand cultural customs were not compatible with Sāmoan ones. Furthermore, in Jonah’s experience, Pacific Islanders in New Zealand were automatically ranked second, and doors were closed to them even before they were opened, simply because they were ‘PIs’. He recognised the need for Sāmoans to adjust somewhat to different circumstances in New Zealand, but at the same time he expected understanding and flexibility on the part of New Zealanders towards Sāmoan culture.

As was the case with the Dutch group one respondents, the Sāmoan group one men used more Sāmoan media than the women. The women were less confident about their ability in English, possibly partly related to their having had less formal education than the men. Two of the women were hesitant to be interviewed, thinking that they would not be able to communicate effectively in English. Agnes
brought along her daughter to act as a translator. My results contrast with those of previous studies. Pilkington (1989:31) found that women in her sample were more proficient in English than men. In another study, Sāmoan mothers were found to use less Sāmoan at home than fathers (Jamieson 1980:104). Yet, Sāmoan women played ‘a more significant role in the initiation of their children into the English-speaking world’ than Tokelauan women (Jamieson 1980:105).

The respondents believed that their ethnicity could not change. However, the men thought that they could be identified by others as Sāmoan and that at the same time, they could usually correctly differentiate between other Sāmoans and Pacific Islanders. The women, on the other hand, believed that it was hard for Pālagi as well as for themselves to correctly identify Sāmoans and different Pacific Islanders until they had spoken, and then the language identified them. The men thought that they could not escape their Sāmoan identity. The women seemed to be more resistant to change, as none of them thought that they had adopted aspects of New Zealand culture after living here.

In general, the Sāmoan group one respondents had opinions and attitudes which were more similar to one another than those of any other group of respondents. In some ways though, Jonah was different from the rest. He thought that Sāmoan culture had to adjust to circumstances in New Zealand and hence adapt at a surface level. He believed that his Sāmoan identity had changed in New Zealand and that he had a different personality while using English. However, such modifications were only superficial, so he was still Sāmoan. This recognition of change seems to indicate that of the respondents he was the most open to change. He was also the respondent least interested in Sāmoan language maintenance for his children. He had a very instrumental attitude to English, not interested in becoming more fluent in it as long as he was able to get by in it.

8.3 SĀMOAN GROUP TWO RESPONDENTS

Of the four Sāmoan group two respondents, Tomasi was born in New Zealand, while the rest were all immigrants. Tomasi had accompanied his family to Sāmoa during his thirteenth year. At the time they had gone with the intention of living there permanently but this trip had turned out to be a year long visit only. Since he had experienced living in Sāmoa and had used Sāmoan as a first language while over there, I included him as an interviewee. The other three respondents had migrated here between 2 and 21 years ago, at the ages of 15 years (two of them) and
11 months. Sina and Pita were born in Sāmoa. Susana was born in Papua New Guinea and had gone back to Sāmoa with her family at the age of 2 years.

It was very difficult to find Sāmoan group two respondents. While I was seeking respondents who were born in Sāmoa and had then migrated here, I was told that most young Sāmoans in Dunedin were either New Zealand-born or had come here on a scholarship and were to return as soon as they had finished their studies. Thus it was impossible to control for factors such as age of arrival (or birth) in New Zealand. At the time of interviewing, the ages of the respondents ranged between 17 and 30. Susana, Pita and Tomasi were students, the first at school, and the other two at the University of Otago as well as the Dunedin College of Education. Sina had an administrative job at the University. One parent of each of the respondents was a group one respondent.

8.3.1 Attitudes to language and to bilingualism

Only Susana, who had been here the least time, would use Sāmoan to write her life story, the others would use English for this purpose. Pita would use English only because he could not write in Sāmoan. The choice of three respondents was driven by ability, while Sina would prefer English so that more people would have access to it.

All the respondents used Sāmoan media of some sort, although Tomasi seemed the least interested of all. Some had access to Sāmoan media because their parents arranged it. Books were available through contacts as well as libraries. Tangata Pasifika on TV was also a favourite. Other popular items were Sāmoan dance videos or Sāmoan newspapers including the Observer, published in Sāmoa in a mixture of Sāmoan and English, and Sāmoana, from New Zealand published mainly in Sāmoan. Radio programs in Sāmoan, broadcast from Auckland, were not easy to tune into here; however, Sina had listened to them when in Auckland. Sāmoan media, whether in the Sāmoan language or not, allowed respondents to keep in contact with Sāmoan events in New Zealand and Sāmoa.

Yeah, it just keeps you up to date with what's actually happening within you know your own community, not just here in New Zealand but also back home in the Islands and also right throughout the world. (Sina)

All the respondents read the Bible in Sāmoan. Sina and Susana used Sāmoan to write letters to relatives in Sāmoa, while Pita used English and Tomasi used both. The language used generally depended upon the respondent’s ability in Sāmoan.
I only write letters to my friends. In Sāmoan. One friend wrote in English so I was really glad she wrote English. So I wrote back in English to her. 

**Why were you glad?**

Because like if I was back home I wouldn’t write a letter in good English, but she tried and it was really good when I read it. Like I really know the English language and I can write it, and yeah I was really glad she can do it in English and if I was back home I think I can’t do, but now I think I can do it and I can. (Susana)

Most respondents preferred to use Sāmoan in general, while Sina’s preference depended on the situation she was in. Choice was not necessarily determined by ability, as in the case of Pita who was better in English yet expressed a preference for Sāmoan.

The Sāmoan language was very important to the respondents. It was associated with their Sāmoan identity and their culture and allowed communication with relatives in Sāmoa. Pita, who was not very fluent in Sāmoan, wanted to improve his ability so that he could comprehend his background more deeply.

Very important. It’s basically to grasp my language is to grasp my culture. And to grasp myself as well. I just need to understand my own language. At the moment that’s what I’m striving for. After I’ve finished here and finished paying off my loan, I hope to go to Sāmoa for a couple of years and really grasp the language. (Pita)

The respondents liked to speak and hear Sāmoan and had no negative attitudes towards Sāmoan in response to these questions.

Oh I love speaking Sāmoan. To me it’s like I feel at one with myself when I’m speaking Sāmoan. Yeah, or even singing in Sāmoan, it’s very special. (Pita)

Of the three respondents born outside New Zealand, most believed that their fluency in Sāmoan had deteriorated, including Susana who had only been here for two years. Even though Sina did not think her ability with Sāmoan had changed, she admitted that occasionally she could not remember some Sāmoan words. Yet, she felt confident that she still knew the language.

. . . like knowing the language I don’t think it has changed.
. . .

Probably sometimes, like when I’m at home, like I don’t intentionally mean to, I would include English when I’m also speaking in Sāmoan, and I don’t
mean to. So I sort of tend to lose some of that like speaking full Sāmoan and include some English. But I don’t see it as being negative, I mean I just see it that I’ve sort of not purposely, but I’ve, you know, like I’ve forgotten what word in Sāmoan that means so I’d use an English word. (Sina)

The respondents were corrected by their parents if they spoke Sāmoan incorrectly but this was not regular for those who were fluent in it: ‘Yes, and I correct their [my parents’] English! It’s probably why I speak more English at home than I do Sāmoan!’ (Pita)

All the respondents had been encouraged in Sāmoan,61 so that the language would not be lost, and some had been encouraged in English as well. Because English ability was seen to be encouraged in the wider community it was not the responsibility of parents.

Yeah they did [parents encouraged us to learn English], but they also encouraged that we speak our own language so that we don’t lose it. They wanted us to learn English but at the same time they didn’t want us to lose our Sāmoan language. That’s why we always spoke Sāmoan at home, and outside home you know with friends at our school, we could speak English, but at home they always spoke in Sāmoan. (Sina)

All the respondents believed that speaking Sāmoan brought their family members together. The majority spoke only or mostly Sāmoan at home with their families.

The Sāmoan language? Yeah I think it does, a lot, it does a lot. Because like I said a lot of Sāmoan elders and that cannot express themselves in English. Like they need to express themselves in Sāmoan, and that’s, that really brings everyone together . . . (Tomasi)

Only Tomasi did not mind Sāmoan people using English with other Sāmoans. To him, language use was a matter of confidence and a means of letting the speaker’s ability in different languages be known.62

__________________________

61 Pita’s parents had not put this into practice, using English most of the time.

62 As noted in 8.2.1, Pitt and Macpherson (1974:72) found that only in situations where Pālagi were present, was it appropriate to use English and demonstrate one’s competence in it.
I don’t mind, I mean it’s a confidence thing. I mean if they can’t speak, I mean there’s no such thing as people not electing to use Sāmoan, you know not wanting to use the Sāmoan language. I think it just comes down to them not knowing how to use the Sāmoan language, it’s not that they know it and they don’t want to speak it. It’s just they don’t know how to express themselves in Sāmoan.

. . . they’re probably trying to establish that they can speak both, that they’re fluent. Because a lot of Sāmoan people, Sāmoan, and when they ring up on the phone a lot of Sāmoan people they tend to speak English to us, to the children, rather than speaking Sāmoan to us, but we know how to speak Sāmoan. (Tomasi)

The others, including Pita who was least fluent in Sāmoan, did not find such a practice acceptable. It was believed to be equivalent to denying one’s Sāmoan identity and trying to be somebody else, a Pālagi or European in this case.

I’d find that real, I’d get really insulted! I’d think that that person, I mean yeah that’s just, this would be just my view, like I’d think that person is like trying to be, wanting to be like a European or something, like what we would call ‘to be a Pālagi’. I don’t know whether you have a term in Indian for it. Like I would just think that they’re arrogant because like, it’s like when you acknowledge that somebody else knows how to speak Sāmoan and you know how to speak Sāmoan, it’s like real natural and it’s just a custom with us that you speak in Sāmoan. Like you don’t go off and speak in English when you know very well that person knows how to speak Sāmoan just like you. Like I’d only, I won’t feel offended if say like there’s another person there that can’t actually understand what we’re talking about. Then I won’t be offended. But I’d be greatly offended [if there was nobody else], like I’d think ‘Oh what an arrogant’. (Sina)

Like the Korean and Dutch group two respondents, the Sāmoan group two respondents had a very instrumental approach to English. Apart from Susana, the remaining Sāmoan group two respondents had learned English in New Zealand. It was a second language even for Tomasi, the New Zealand born respondent, since his family initially spoke to him in Sāmoan only. English was mainly important to the respondents as a means of communication. It allowed them to acquire a job and education in New Zealand. Only Pita, who used mostly English at home, thought of it as a part of his ethnic identity.
It’s also very important. Mainly now because it’s become a part of me. And New Zealand is a big part of me. And, it’s also the language of commerce, so, yeah it’s essential in many ways. (Pita)

The respondents would have learned English even if they did not need it for living in New Zealand. Sina liked the challenge of learning languages and Tomasi thought knowing an extra language would be beneficial.

A good grasp of English was believed to be useful in Sāmoa too, where it is compulsory in schools, and is used in business. English could open doors to more opportunities: ‘It is, because like it’s the language of commerce. It’s how they see their future I think.’ (Pita)

Positive aspects of learning English included access to new opportunities, knowledge and communication.

I can look at things from a different perspective. Oh there’s a lot of positives, I just can’t think of them at the moment. And like, oh well, like communicating, because it’s becoming a universal language now so I can communicate you know with a wide range of people. (Pita)

English had broadened the respondents’ horizons. Susana thought she was ‘lucky’ in relation to her peers in Sāmoa since she was now fluent in English. English represented a ‘future’, opening opportunities denied to their parents:

Well basically, because like I said my parents wanted us to like, you know, get to have, you know the opportunities that they actually missed out. And so, yeah that’s why I, you know, like was really determined to be able to speak English fluently. I just felt, I think we all felt, I mean even the other, my other brothers and sisters, we felt that with English you could probably do a lot more. You know like you can get by and understand a lot more things than just knowing Sāmoan. Particularly here in New Zealand. (Sina)

The only negative aspect of learning English was its difficulty for Pita. For the rest, there were none: ‘Besides the confusion part! I always get, it’s very confusing, yeah they’ve got so many words.’ (Pita)

The respondents believed in the value of bilingualism, and that monolingual New Zealanders should learn an additional language; some respondents thought this language should be Māori. Bilingualism would let people learn about another culture and expand their thinking.
I think they [monolingual New Zealanders] should be [encouraged to learn another language] because I feel they are so limited, yeah I just feel they are limited. I know people that like only discovered there were other Pacific Island countries, they didn’t even realise there were other Pacific Island countries. But I, it just to me, it just opens up another world. Because like in a language also you’ve got the culture embedded in that so you learn a lot.

... I think I remember one person saying that I should be speaking English because it’s New Zealand. It was only a wee kid as well, and I said, ‘Oh’, well it was a long time ago, and I tried to explain to him that he should be speaking Māori but he didn’t quite take in that concept! No, he was quite young. (Pita)

The respondents themselves were all bilingual in Sāmoan and English. In addition, they could understand a little of other Polynesian languages because of the relatively close relationship of these languages.

8.3.2 Ethnic identity

Most Sāmoan group two respondents felt that their ethnic identity was fragmented; most had experienced some contradictions as to whether they were Sāmoan or Kiwi or both (covered in detail in the next section). Sina and Susana thought of themselves as Sāmoan, whereas Pita and Tomasi considered themselves a mixture of Sāmoan and New Zealander (Sāmoan New Zealander and New Zealand-born Sāmoan respectively). This was probably related to either early migration (age-wise) or to being born in New Zealand for the males; and, to later migration (age-wise) for the females, one of whom arrived here relatively recently. Tomasi believed that now all Sāmoans were either ‘full Sāmoan or ... New Zealand-born Sāmoan’.

Oh, I’m trying to, yeah I’ve been thinking about that one for a wee while. Like in sixth form I just went through that phase of trying to find out who I was. Well I discovered that I’m a Sāmoan living in New Zealand, or I’m a Sāmoan New Zealander, I tend to call myself. (Pita)

Even though Pita thought of himself partly as Kiwi, he did not like being thought of as European/Pālagi by Sāmoans, because this was tantamount to negating his Sāmoanness. However, he was struggling to make his Sāmoan identity ‘stronger’: ‘Sometimes I get accused for being a Pālagi! I feel quite insulted!’ (Pita)
Pitt and Macpherson (1974:16) also found that New Zealand-born Sāmoans thought of themselves first as Sāmoan, then as New Zealanders.

... [M]ost feel that they are both Samoans and New Zealanders, in different senses, contexts, and situations. New Zealand-Samoans may feel themselves to be Samoan in ancestry and culture and yet loyal New Zealand citizens or residents taking an active part in many aspects of New Zealand life. (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:19-20)

In a later study, Cluny Macpherson (1984:123) contends that the attitude which Sāmoan adult migrants hold towards their culture and its utility, especially for their future, influences the ‘environment’ they consciously and subconsciously create for their children. On this basis, and to reveal the extent of intra-group variation, he identifies three environments which will ‘contribute to the transformation of Samoan culture: from a distinct unified one, to a series of variants’ (Macpherson 1984:113). These environments affect children’s attitudes towards and experience of Sāmoan and New Zealand cultures.

In the first environment, parents adhere to and encourage Sāmoan language, values, personnel and activities. Non-Sāmoan values and institutions are absent (Macpherson 1984:114). In the second environment, children at home are exposed to Sāmoan as well as non-Sāmoan (Pālagi in the context of New Zealand) values and institutions, but parents do not actively encourage the former. Instead, the two are presented as mutually exclusive, each one being appropriate depending on the situation (Macpherson 1984:120). Finally, in the third one, non-Sāmoan features are present and parents are oriented towards these and encourage them (Macpherson 1984:120). Children raised in the first environment are initially mainly oriented to Sāmoan culture, while those in the second think of themselves as Sāmoan in some ways, and value this. Finally, parents in the last environment think of their children as New Zealanders. Yet, all these children are brought up to believe that they are Sāmoans: respectively ‘real Samoans’, ‘Samoans’ and the ‘right kind of Samoans’ (Macpherson 1984:124). These identities can change later in life, and the results will influence the direction of the expression of Sāmoanness in New Zealand.

Macpherson (1984:114) concedes that this is just a model, and actual distribution of the environments needs to be systematically tested. On the basis of my study, however, I would argue that his model is simplistic and reductionist in limiting variation to three categories. Also, the characteristics of these three are not necessarily what he identifies. For example, Pita’s parents used mainly English with him, as a result of which he was not very fluent in Sāmoan. He attributed his limited understanding of Sāmoan culture to this deficiency and wanted to remedy it. Macpherson’s model would imply that all the children of one family would have
similar attitudes to Sāmoan and New Zealand cultures but this seems to oversimplify matters.

All my respondents thought their Sāmoan identity was important to them, mainly because they had come into contact with differences between Sāmoans and Papālagi and their respective cultures. In fact Tomasi thought this difference gave him an identity in relation to New Zealanders, whom he thought of as having no identity. His difference let him have access to two worlds. On the other hand, Pita sometimes felt a bit limited in both his worlds.

Very important. Because like at times I just get so confused and sometimes I feel a bit put down sometimes when I hear somebody talking [Sāmoan] and I don’t understand what they’re saying. Or if I’m in a conversation then I get stuck and I don’t know what to say because that’s my limit! And, yeah I just get stuck, it’s a bit saddening for me really because I’m really trying to make that part of me strong again. (Pita)

Sina felt that she had to ‘put aside’ her Sāmoan identity when she went to her paid job. However, she did not mind this, she just got on with the job. Susana contrasted her life now, which was run by time, with her life in Sāmoa which was slower, but where she had learned very important things.

Identification was attributed to culture, including values, church, language and dancing; family background; birthplace; and according to one respondent, the ‘no die’ attitude.

Yeah I think because I was born there, for sure, and also the values that I’ve been sort of brought up with and I guess the way I look, and I don’t know about the way I speak. But yeah, probably just the values that I’ve been you know brought up with. And also the language, definitely. (Sina)

What makes me or what makes [Sāmoans] in general? [you] Just the way I do things, like with the ‘no die’ attitude. . . . ‘No die’, you know like, don’t care, just give a go, like have a go at something, you know without any worrying. That’s sort of like the Sāmoan attitude, do or die. You know sort of it’s very strong attitude, you know you find most Sāmoans they like to give something a go, don’t worry about what other people say, yeah. That’s important. (Tomasi)

Most respondents were seen as Pacific Islanders by people here and Tomasi was regarded as a New Zealander.
They see me as a New Zealander really. They don’t really, like most of my
friends, most of my European friends they don’t really talk about me being Sāmoan. I’m just treated the same way as anyone else. So I find that
quite, quite respectful.

Would you like to be known as a Sāmoan?
Yeah. I mean some people get me mistaken for being Māori, so. I mean .
. . I mean I don’t say ‘I’m not a Māori’, just if they ask I’ll say ‘I’m Sāmoan’,
and they’ll say, ‘That’s cool’. They tend to really like Sāmoans, more than
most, I’m not being arrogant, just more than other cultures. So that’s quite
cool! (Tomasi)

Tomasi was the only one mistaken for a tourist; since he was born here he did not
like this. Pita, on the other hand, could pass as a local both here and in Sāmoa: ‘No
[I don’t get mistaken for a tourist]! Not in Sāmoa I don’t either, so either way I’m
still a local!’ (Pita)

8.3.3 Language maintenance and identity

Language did not emerge as essential for maintaining ethnicity; this was partly
because not all Sāmoans in New Zealand could speak Sāmoan. However, Pita and
Tomasi conceded that without knowing the language, the maintenance of culture
was somewhat compromised.

I think, well, the proper behaviour is very important. But also in our culture,
the culture is embedded in the language, so it’s . . .

Do you think the culture can be maintained without the language?
Fully, no, I don’t think it can. I don’t think it can be fully maintained without
the language. But, for those people that can’t grasp the language I think
it’s good they’re making a start on the culture, to make them, you know, to
identify with that part of themselves. (Pita)

The following of fa‘asāmoa, the Sāmoan way, including customs and associated
behaviour, was believed to be just as, if not more, important for Sāmoan identity.
Fa‘asāmoa was real in some aspects of daily life, so for example, at celebrations like
birthdays and weddings, Sāmoan customs were upheld. Hierarchy was also
maintained, and chiefs commanded respect in certain pre-determined ways.
Sāmoan culture was also reinforced at church.

Since the Sāmoan language was not vital for maintaining Sāmoan identity, children
who could not speak Sāmoan but were born of Sāmoan parents would still be
considered Sāmoan. Yet, Tomasi, when speaking in general terms, not specifically about his (grand)children, considered that language and culture were inseparable and inherent to Sāmoan identity. Without these, a Sāmoan could not be ‘a real Sāmoan’.

Most important, is just knowing your identity. I mean there’s a lot of Sāmoans here that, I mean they say they’re Sāmoan, but I’ve always been brought up to classify. I mean the classification of Sāmoan being to know the languages, to know the culture. You know, so there’s a lot of people that sort of don’t know either. I mean but still they classify themselves as Sāmoan, and they may be by you know marriage or you know through genetic but to me it’s not really, that’s not really the real Sāmoan.

... That’s the main thing in Sāmoan, is an identity, knowing the Sāmoan language and culture...

*What’s more important, the language or the culture, or are they both sort of equal?*

They’re sort of equal. To know the culture is to know the language. I mean if you can’t speak the language then, they’re sort of the same.

(Tomasi)

As noted, three respondents spoke predominantly Sāmoan at home. Pita used more English because his parents had not spoken Sāmoan all the time. He felt that because of his limited fluency in Sāmoan he was hindered in understanding his Sāmoan background. He tried to compensate for this by being highly involved in Sāmoan culture through his dance group.

Competence in culture has been associated with competence in the related language (Kinloch 1976:219). This is to the extent that migrant children who reject both their parents’ culture as well as their host culture have been found to be incompetent in the language of their parents, and in the language of the host culture, leading to miscommunication (Kinloch 1976:216). On the other hand, bilingual competence has been related to bicultural competence (Kinloch 1976:220).

My respondents considered a situation in which children did not speak the same language as their parents said.

I think it’s quite sad. Because I met and heard of many children who oh, teenagers who identify with the European or the New Zealand culture, the main culture here. And sometimes I feel myself they’re losing that part of them. But then again like if you’re, if your father was Korean and your
mother was Sāmoan, yeah you run into complications and I can understand that bit as well. . . . To me it's quite saddening if you don't, if you don't learn, if you don't know those parts of you. Or even know something about them. (Pita)

There were several such cases among the Sāmoans and the community judged them harshly, accusing them of not knowing their background and not picking up Sāmoan customs such as respect. It was believed that the children were at a loss at such times. The parents were blamed for not passing on the language.

Most respondents did not think their ethnic identity had changed. Yet, as mentioned, most were confused about their fractured identity which was constantly being produced and reproduced according to circumstances. Sina was not confused but knew that some of her ideas had changed; nevertheless she still thought of herself as full Sāmoan, not part Kiwi. She had migrated to New Zealand at the age of 8 or 9, after having spent enough time in Sāmoa to become familiar with Sāmoan culture and language. In New Zealand, her parents actively encouraged her to keep following Sāmoan customs and to speak Sāmoan. She did not find it hard to compartmentalise her life into Sāmoan and non-Sāmoan sides and shift accordingly. She was able to make the most of both cultures. Such fluidity did not threaten her Sāmoan side.

No I don't, I don't ever think of myself as being part Kiwi, although I like, I think I will always think of myself as being full Sāmoan, but I also think that living in New Zealand I've been able to adopt, you know some Kiwi attitudes, I don't know, customs maybe, type of thing. But I never think of myself as part Kiwi at all. (Sina)

The other respondents did not find it as easy to cope with their fractured identities and adjust their behaviour according to context. They found it more difficult to reconcile the differences between the two sides within themselves.

I like to stick it to one personality, because I do like the Sāmoan way, the Sāmoan personality, and I like that to, also to be English.

So you try and be the same?
But it's really hard to be the same! yeah.

. . .
Sometimes I just sit there and wonder who I am and where I come from, but since I am in my, I'm with my family, I realise that I'm from Sāmoa, yeah. (Susana)
Very much [I feel lost between two cultures], I seem to get stuck right in the middle there. I don’t, I really want to go up, like Sāmoa, but I don’t think I can survive up there. Yeah I want to go up but I feel that I won’t be able to survive up there. I’m pretty much New Zealand orientated, and I quite like it here, but I feel I could be more happy up there! I know it’s a bit confusing, it’s, I don’t know, I’m still having this battle, this internal battle inside myself.

. . . I hope that I will become content, I’ll just become content with whatever I decide to do. Because like I said in the beginning, I’m pretty much a Sāmoan New Zealander, living in two worlds. (Pita)

Pita had gained a better understanding of Sāmoan culture and ways of thinking after participating in a university course and this had helped him come to terms with his ethnicity.

. . . At the moment that PACI 101, Christianity in the Pacific, we’re concentrating on Sāmoa, the culture and just studying a bit of our, to me it’s, in a way it’s explained a lot, how I think, why I think that way. Because I’m very, in some ways I’m very traditional in the way I think about things, because of my upbringing. But I’m also very European in the way I think also . . . (Pita)

In a previous study, couples in which both partners were Sāmoan thought their children identified as Sāmoan, but children of Sāmoan-Pālagi couples were not so sure about their ethnic identity. Further, in this case, some correlation was found between language and ethnic identity, that is, between a lack of emphasis on Sāmoan identity and lack of proficiency in Sāmoan (Pilkington 1989:33).

Pitt and Macpherson (1974:62) also reported that the younger generation experienced confusion about their ethnic identity.

Young New Zealand Samoans, like many second generation migrants in many countries, do not fully belong either to their original culture or to their new one. Uneasy with fa’aasamoa, with few tangible links in Samoa itself, this second generation group does not feel completely accepted in the European world. (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:62)

In such situations, the church helped people to maintain their Sāmoan identity and to find their way around the Pālagi world (Pitt and Macpherson 1974:62). Most of my respondents, however, did not have problems being accepted by New Zealanders. Perhaps in the years that have elapsed since Pitt and Macpherson’s study and mine, attitudes of New Zealanders towards Sāmoans (and vice versa)
have changed to become more accepting and New Zealand society itself has become more multicultural.

My respondents strongly felt that the Sāmoan language should be maintained in New Zealand. Most of their parents had tried to pass the language on. There was optimism that the language would be maintained within the Sāmoan community, especially in Auckland, Hamilton and Wellington where there was a high Sāmoan population.

Most Sāmoan group two respondents believed that language maintenance efforts should start within the community concerned, and then some government assistance, especially financial, would be welcome. The government was also in a position to implement policy about languages.

All the respondents thought that Sāmoan should be offered as an option at schools, particularly in places like Auckland. Pita called New Zealand a ‘Polynesian’ country, and so thought Sāmoan (and Māori) would be much more useful than European languages like French and German.

I think it should be. Well really New Zealand is a Pacific Island country, and like the only Pacific Island, well, do you call it Pacific Island, well the only Polynesian, well it’s a Polynesian country I should say, the only Polynesian language you get taught at school is Māori. But to me, I’m still trying to find the use of French, German. I can see the point of Japanese, but yeah. French and German I’m still trying to find a purpose for those. I took Latin! I took Latin in the third and fourth form, it’s a really, I was hoping it would help me with my English. It just helped me get more confused! Nah, but it did help me with many words. (Pita)

Three respondents would have taken Sāmoan language courses at school if they had had the option. Susana did not think she needed to since she was fluent in Sāmoan already.

Textbooks in Sāmoan would also be beneficial, for example for use in Sāmoan language nests, or for new migrants.

Yes, especially for the early, the early learners, early children, children that come over from Sāmoa. There should be a document where they can, that they’d be able to understand, in their own language first before they you know then you can sort of bring English in now and then. A lot of children are pressured and that’s how they don’t do so well at school, because of the English. English document. (Tomasi)
However, Susana thought that English textbooks were also needed for improving one’s English. Pita argued that Māori textbooks should be made available before those in other languages, however he realised the practical difficulties involved with this.

Most respondents would find road signs in minority languages helpful, while Pita thought these should be in English and Māori. Tomasi had seen signs in various different languages in Australia, and so he thought that if Australia could cater for its minorities, why couldn’t New Zealand?

A majority of the respondents thought that they were fairly representative of other Sāmoans with a similar background in terms of their attitudes to language and ethnicity. Since the respondents interacted regularly with other Sāmoans, their judgements are probably acceptable.

Yeah I think probably a lot of them do, I’m finding that a lot of the New Zealand-born Sāmoans it’s quite hard for them to sort of to get into the attitude that I have. I don’t know, it’s just I guess the way they’ve been brought up, in that they have had to learn Sāmoan language. But people similar to me that have come here and done schooling and already know, yeah I would say that they hold very similar views. (Sina)

8.3.4 Attitudes to and experiences in Sāmoa and New Zealand

All Sāmoan group two respondents had more interaction with Sāmoans than with non-Sāmoans. This was partly because some of them had large families, and also because they were all involved with some sort of Sāmoan group, whether cultural or church-affiliated. Such groups let them get together with other Sāmoans and practise aspects of their culture, such as songs and dances. Although there were several different groups throughout New Zealand, similar groups got together annually. For example, in 1997, all the Sāmoan university students associations of New Zealand were meeting at Waikato University in Hamilton which was hosting the So’otaga (translating as ‘unity’). This was a cultural, academic and sporting exchange (Critic 5 May 1997) which 300 students and supporters were expected to attend. The activities in the So’otaga included an opening Christian rally, sports events, cultural speeches and debates in English and Sāmoan, a Talent Quest and Island Night, and the Sāmoan Cultural Night. In addition to Sāmoans, students from other backgrounds also attended - Cook Islands, Niuean, European, Indian, Fijian and Tokelauan (Critic 5 May 1997).
Pita had started his own cultural group and was happy to be able to share his culture with non-Sāmoans.
Did you start your cultural group?
Yeah I did. Mainly it was the startup to, I think it was the end, yeah about sixth form. But I was sort of going through that stage where I figure out ‘Who am I?’ you know, and like, well actually the teachers at [school] they, they asked me to put together a group to perform at a cultural awards evening. And then I thought, ‘Heck I don't know any dances!’ And that really got me to wonder that I should really know all these things. So then yeah I just put together a group. There was four of us at the beginning, yeah, no sixth form, definitely sixth form. And well now well I’ve got 30, about 30, well it’s a multi Polynesian, well Pacific Island group. We’re learning, we learn Māori songs, Sāmoan, I think the Sāmoan seems to take over a wee bit, it’s just because I know more Sāmoan.

Are there more Sāmoan people in there?
Yes there are more Sāmoan. We also learn Cook Island, there’s three Cook Islanders, . . . also learn Niue, because we’ve got two Niueans in the group. Plus we’re gonna be learning, well Tongan and Tokelauan, which I get taught from either friends from College, or friends from varsity.

Are there any Pākehā in it?
Yes there are quite a few Pākehā, and, I think two of them are very good in their Māori, very good at speaking Māori. And another two are fairly young and are very interested in learning, which is really good to see. For me it’s quite honourable to see somebody learning about your culture. Yeah, somebody different, and it’s just sort of an honour for other people. And I’m really happy to share my culture with other people, people that are interested and keen. (Pita)

High levels of interaction with Sāmoans in a variety of domains has been found to aid language maintenance (Pilkington 1989:33). This also applied to my respondents.

Most respondents had come across discrimination or negative experiences in New Zealand but such incidents were not very frequent. Sina had been misrepresented when she was translating at court, while Pita and Tomasi had come across cultural insensitivity.

63 This group was so successful that it was asked to participate in an international dance festival in Finland!
Yeah a couple of times, like I said that experience I had in court where I had to interpret for a Sāmoan guy and I just found that oh just the whole way, the whole system, it was like they were putting what I was saying, like it was just different from how they put it across. It came across as not what I was saying, you know so they put words into my mouth, I mean like I would speak to them in English and tell them. Like I would interpret to the guy in Sāmoan, he would tell me and I would then tell the lawyer. But it wasn’t, like what they were saying it wasn’t you know what I was saying. Yeah it was different. (Sina)

Probably when I was, probably get into racial issues there, when I was younger but these days no. I remember, last year of high school, basically instead of saying hello I said Tālofa, and for people that was new! You would think Kia ora was new. And that was something I tried to promote around the school, and like I had people saying Hello in different languages to me which was good. So, that was sort of encouraging, every now and then you get a few silly ones, like, oh well that’s life. (Pita)

At times. At times, like racism and stuff. Yeah just not to a high extent, but like, you know when you’re at parties and stuff, a lot of people like drink too much, they say what they don’t, things that they’ll regret later, but no, it’s not like you walk down the street and people call you names and stuff. No, it’s never been like that for me, never. So that’s quite good. (Tomasi)

The respondents had changed and picked up local traits in New Zealand. Sina was less ‘traditional’ now, having adopted more modernised attitudes; Pita had learned Māori while Tomasi had spent some time flatting. These respondents were pleased about such changes. Sina thought that she was able to compare the pros and cons of two countries (for example, the schooling system) and was able to benefit from both ‘worlds’ or ‘cultures’, while Pita stressed it was necessary for people living here to learn Māori.

I think it’s essential, really, I think it’s essential to learn Māori. Mainly because I’m keeping an open mind that New Zealand will become a bilingual country, bicultural country. And like I’m so tempted now, when I get a chequebook I’m gonna write it all in Māori! Or even if I’m doing deposit slips I’m gonna do it all in Māori. Yeah I think it should be one of

64 Kia ora is a Māori greeting meaning ‘Hello’.
the languages we should be speaking, but, as you can hear now, we’re not! Or else we’d be speaking Māori. (Pita)

Various aspects of New Zealand were liked most by the respondents. For two of them it was the relaxed and friendly nature of the people and lifestyle here. Susana was surprised at the independence of teenagers here, since compared to her, they did not seem to rely on their parents to help them. Pita enjoyed the availability of technology in New Zealand - especially computers, television and movies.

These positive qualities of New Zealand were disliked in some instances. For example, Susana who praised the independence of teenagers thought that parents in New Zealand were not strict enough with their children who did not listen to their parents. Other dislikes about New Zealand were the perceived cultural insensitivity and arrogance of Kiwis and their individualism as opposed to the community-oriented nature of Sāmoa.

It’s very individualistic! Where in Sāmoa there’s more community base, they’re very very sociable. Like for myself I think I’d be more comfortable greeting another Pacific Islander than I would like another European. Or, I don’t know, I could be wrong, depends what the European was like! (Pita)

Apart from Susana who had been here only two years, the other three had visited Sāmoa. Sina, who had been here the longest, had been back the least, only once for her grandmother’s funeral and Pita and Tomasi had been three times each. Trips to Sāmoa usually lasted about two months. All the respondents wanted to re-visit Sāmoa, but not to live there permanently. Pita especially wanted to acquire a better understanding of Sāmoan language and culture, which had been difficult while living in New Zealand.

Oh definitely [I want to go back], well maybe not to live, but to, well I hope to, well I really want to polish up on my own language and my own culture, because I felt I’ve missed a lot of that. Yeah, I really do miss it. (Pita)

Tomasi who was born here had found Sāmoa very different when he went back to live permanently. More than anything else, he found it hard to use Sāmoan as a first language all the time. Too scared to go to school, he had stayed away until the second term! However, after initially struggling, he had improved at Sāmoan.

The aspects of Sāmoa which the respondents liked the most were not material, rather they were related to fa’asāmoa. This included having kept alive and valuing
Sāmoan customs - culture and language - in New Zealand (especially for Sina who was a fourth generation respondent65); the church which brought people of all ages together and where people made new friends; and discipline which the Sāmoan way emphasised. Such discipline had really helped Tomasi when he had gone flatting.

The most disliked aspects of Sāmoa were also related to faʻasāmoa: the maintenance of hierarchy and respect. By living in New Zealand, the respondents had been exposed to the emphasis on independence and this had made them critical of the Sāmoan custom of respect. In some instances in New Zealand, adherence to this custom had worked to their disadvantage. This was seen as ‘illogical’, and as result, Sāmoans were labelled as ‘ignorant’ by Pita. Thus, some group two respondents had become critical of some aspects of faʻasāmoa.

Probably how we’re so, we’re not so open. You know like we’re so shy we tend to take everything, like people just sort of, like we’re not so outspoken, and we don’t sort of you know, stand up like I notice it in, I mean it’s happened to me too, like in lectures, say for example. We never question anything, we just assume that the person that’s up there knows everything. But that’s the way we’ve been taught, like it’s like you know, your senior, somebody senior than you knows better than you and you can’t question that. I think that’s what I really dislike, in that because of that way of respecting your elders, we tend to hold back, we think, oh they’re much older and I have to respect them so I don’t want to question what they’re saying. . . . Yeah it’s very hard, I mean like I used to always sit at the back, you know in lectures, because I don’t know, I just didn’t feel comfortable, sitting in the front. And you know students would be like you know questioning things and like I’d be sitting there thinking, god they are so lucky they can question because I’ve been taught differently. You know I’ve been taught that, and it’s been right throughout my schooling, even at secondary school, I’ve always had that and it’s been so hard for me to sort of get away from it. It’s only sort of now, when I’ve been in jobs that I’ve actually had experiences where I’ve had to stand up type of thing, you know I’ve had to sort of. But we just assume that everything that is given to us is right and don’t question it. So I guess it’s like the lack of being, you know the lack of open, you’re not so open I would find. They just tend to

65 Sina’s great grandparents and grandparents had immigrated to New Zealand but had returned to Sāmoa because they fell sick here.
sit back and take everything as it comes, you know they don’t object to anything, they don’t question whether it’s right or what. (Sina)

The respondents’ likes and dislikes about New Zealand and Sāmoa had been shaped by their own diverse experiences in the two cultures. For example, Susana, a teenager, found Sāmoan discipline very harsh, especially in relation to the relative independence of her Kiwi peers. Tomasi had found Sāmoa less relaxed than New Zealand, perhaps as a result of his year-long sojourn in Sāmoa not being very pleasant. Sina, who was now working, did not find it as easy as her Pālagi peers to question authority.

8.3.5 Summary

The Sāmoan group two respondents had an emotional attachment to the Sāmoan language. It gave them access to Sāmoan culture and allowed them to communicate with Sāmoan relatives. In such ways, it was part of their ethnic identity. Their attitude to it was more integrative than instrumental. All used Sāmoan media to varying extents. Their general preference was for the Sāmoan language. Most spoke mainly Sāmoan at home, and the language was believed to bring together their family members. The respondents were reproachful of the use of English among Sāmoans who knew how to speak Sāmoan. This was equated with arrogance and negating one’s background while trying to be somebody one was not.

Most respondents thought that their ability in Sāmoan had deteriorated in New Zealand. Their mistakes in Sāmoan were corrected by their parents, who encouraged them to use either Sāmoan or Sāmoan and English. However, Sāmoan was believed to be the responsibility of the parents, but not English. The respondents had more contact with Sāmoans than with non-Sāmoans and were part of a Sāmoan church-related or cultural group. Such interaction gave them an opportunity to practise the Sāmoan language as well as aspects of Sāmoan culture.

In contrast, the respondents had more of an instrumental attitude to English; an exception here was Pita who considered that English was part of his ethnic identity too. English allowed the respondents to communicate effectively and assured them a future, not only in New Zealand, but also in Sāmoa. English offered educational and economic security and was a means of fulfilling their parents’ main reason for migrating to New Zealand.

Bilingualism was supported by the respondents who were bilingual themselves; it was believed to make people more open-minded and would also open doors to
different cultures. Some respondents thought that New Zealanders should learn Māori.

The females thought of themselves as Sāmoan, whereas the males thought of themselves as Sāmoan and Kiwi. Yet, most of them had felt that their ethnicity was a mixture and this had sometimes led to confusion - were they Sāmoan, Kiwi or both? Sāmoan identity had taken on more importance to the respondents after having been exposed to different cultures - Sāmoan and Pālagi. In their experience, they had to don a separate ethnicity in each of these two ‘worlds’ (for example, whether at work with Papālagi or at church with Sāmoans). When respondents found this difficult to do, or to incorporate, they experienced confusion. However, much of the time, they were able to negotiate their ethnic identity. Such processes are characteristic of hybrid identity (Papastergiadis 1996).

The respondents’ ethnicity was derived mainly from culture, place of birth and upbringing, and as a result of living with their family. Most were recognised as Pacific Islanders by other people, but were not usually mistaken for tourists.

The respondents generally believed that Sāmoan identity could be maintained in the absence of the Sāmoan language; however, this would result in the Sāmoan identity being somewhat changed, since without language, maintenance of Sāmoan culture would be affected. The upholding of fa’asāmoa, or the Sāmoan way, was necessary to maintain Sāmoan identity. The criteria for identity were broad enough to include the increasing numbers of New Zealand-born Sāmoan children who could not speak Sāmoan. Such children were censured, and so were their parents who were blamed for not teaching the Sāmoan language to their children.

Sāmoan language maintenance was hoped for by the respondents, especially where there was a high Sāmoan population. Language maintenance was considered to be a community responsibility, but it was thought that the government could help with finance and by formulating policy permitting the teaching of minority languages. It was believed that Sāmoan should be taught at schools as an option, and most respondents would have taken it themselves were it offered. Textbooks and road signs in Sāmoan would be helpful.

Most respondents had experienced discrimination in New Zealand, but this was not regular. The respondents had changed and adapted in New Zealand. Such a move was seen positively, as it let them experience the best of two ‘worlds’. Most had visited Sāmoa and wanted to do so again. However, living in New Zealand had also resulted in their becoming critical of some Sāmoan customs, which they often felt hindered by. This harks back to Bhabha’s ‘third space’ from where an immigrant is
not subject to either of the two sets of cultural values they are exposed to, but to a combination of them which is the ‘third space’. From this space, the individual may become disapproving of hierarchy in the original value sets (Bradley 1992:134).

Female-male differences which emerged are likely to be the result of differences in length of childhood in Sāmoa. The females had lived in Sāmoa until their mid-teens, whereas the males had lived there for only a year each and had learned English in New Zealand. The females seemed to be more confident about their ability to use Sāmoan and spoke more Sāmoan at home than the males. Perhaps as a result of this the females were encouraged in both Sāmoan and English by their parents, while the males were encouraged in Sāmoan only. The females thought of their ethnic identity as Sāmoan, while the males thought of it as both Sāmoan and Kiwi. The latter were more ambivalent about the importance of the Sāmoan language for Sāmoan identity. Ideally, language was important for identity, since without language, Sāmoan culture was altered. But because not all Sāmoans (especially New Zealand-born ones) had acquired Sāmoan, maintenance of fa‘asāmoa including customs and behaviour, even if somewhat modified, was necessary for Sāmoan identity.

Of all the respondents, Pita struggled most with what he called ‘the Sāmoan part’ of him. Born in Sāmoa, he had migrated to New Zealand with his family when he was 11 months old. He was disappointed to find out that he had not even spent his first birthday in Sāmoa. In New Zealand, his parents encouraged him to use the Sāmoan language, however, they spoke more English with him. As a result, he was not very fluent in Sāmoan. Even though he was accepted as a local both in New Zealand and in Sāmoa, he was often confused about his ethnic identity. This was partly because he knew less about his Sāmoan side. He wanted to go back to Sāmoa for a while, and improve his ability in Sāmoan, believing that this would help him understand and strengthen his Sāmoan side. Studying about Christianity in the Pacific had helped him do this already to a certain extent. He believed that in the absence of language, at least culture could maintain his Sāmoanness. He took great pleasure in his dance and in teaching it to others. Pita’s direct contact with Sāmoa had been cut off at a very young age, and he had not acquired fluent Sāmoan in New Zealand. As a result, he felt ‘stuck in the middle’ between Sāmoan and Pālagi cultures. He thought that getting to know more about Sāmoa and becoming more fluent in Sāmoan would help to resolve his confusion.

In contrast, Tomasi was born in New Zealand, but had spent a year living in Sāmoa. He too had been confused about his fractured identity, but to a certain extent now felt that he had resolved this confusion. He was a fluent speaker of Sāmoan and
English. Yet he had less of an integrative attitude to Sāmoan than the other respondents: Tomasi was the least interested in Sāmoan media and to him the Sāmoan language was, above all else, a means of communication with relatives in Sāmoa rather than a part of his ethnic identity. He was the only one to think there was nothing wrong with Sāmoans using English rather than Sāmoan with other Sāmoans. Tomasi’s confusion about his identity had been partly resolved, largely because he believed that he understood Sāmoan and Pālagi cultures.

8.4 CONCLUSION

Attitudes of both groups of Sāmoan respondents to English were more instrumental than integrative. English let the respondents survive in New Zealand and represented a ‘future’ to them. Yet, most group one respondents did not want their children to be taught English at the expense of Sāmoan. Further, for most respondents of both groups, it was not acceptable to use English instead of Sāmoan with other Sāmoan speakers, when the speaker knew Sāmoan. Only Pita’s family used more English than Sāmoan at home. As a result, he was not as fluent in Sāmoan as he would have liked to be, and he wanted to remedy this, thinking it would also give him a better understanding of the Sāmoan way.

Most respondents of both groups preferred the Sāmoan language. They had a very integrative attitude towards the Sāmoan language, and most were more fluent in Sāmoan, although this was more true for group one than for group two. Most respondents’ families used Sāmoan as a first language at home, but in many cases the younger generation was mixing English into their Sāmoan. Sāmoan was a part of the respondents’ ethnic identity, and it helped them get a better grasp of fa’asāmoa. The latter was encouraged by the respondents’ families and passed on to the younger generation. Some group one respondents were concerned that many younger Sāmoans were not acquiring the language fluently. Because of this, the criteria for Sāmoan identity had shifted in New Zealand, to include even those Sāmoan children who did not speak the language.

Both groups of respondents believed that bilingualism was advantageous, and hence supported it. It would broaden one’s experiences in terms of communication and understanding.

Respondents from both groups had more interaction with Sāmoans than with non-Sāmoans. Church provided them with a place and an occasion to meet regularly.
Such interaction ensured the preservation of the Sāmoan language, even if this was to a limited extent among group two respondents.

All the respondents hoped for Sāmoan language maintenance in New Zealand, but group two respondents were more optimistic about this. In contrast, group one respondents were more realistic about the limitations of this. Yet, many were involved in maintaining the Sāmoan language and features of Sāmoan culture.

The main difference between the two groups emerged in terms of their ethnic identity. While most group one respondents did not think that their identity had changed or could change, most group two respondents had experienced confusion about their fragmented identity. Exposed to different ways of life with their associated values, the latter group felt pulled in two directions. Most could at least partially resolve the confusion stemming from these fractured identities.

Another area where group one opinions and attitudes differed from those of group two was that of perspectives to Sāmoa and the Sāmoan way of life in relation to New Zealand. Most group one respondents wanted to return permanently to Sāmoa once their children had finished their studies and had become independent. Group one respondents thought of life in Sāmoa as familiar. In contrast, group two respondents would be content with just visiting Sāmoa, not actually living there. Some group two respondents had even become critical of elements of fa'asāmoa. Thus, group one respondents were more oriented towards Sāmoa and fa'asāmoa than group two respondents. The former were also more reluctant to change, and believed that New Zealand had little to offer them apart from economic and educational benefits.

My study supports conclusions from previous studies (for example Pitt and Macpherson 1974, Sasagi 1996) that Sāmoans in New Zealand maintain fa'asāmoa and that the 'āiga and church are the main foci of it in New Zealand. However, there are clear differences in attitudes to these between the two groups, and it is possible that fa'asāmoa may weaken among the younger generation in the future.

The Sāmoan respondents’ motives for migration had not altered very much from those of previous post-World War II Sāmoan immigrants. Furthermore, they were still maintaining fa'asāmoa in New Zealand and passing it on to their children. However, whether the latter maintain it as strongly is yet to be seen. The Sāmoan language was very important to the respondents who hoped for language maintenance in New Zealand. But the language was no longer considered vital as part of the Sāmoan identity in New Zealand. This was an attempt to keep up with changes that Sāmoans in New Zealand were experiencing, so that they would not be
excluded from claiming Sāmoan identity. Those who could not speak the Sāmoan language could still identify with it at a symbolic level. All respondents identified as Sāmoan, and simultaneously some younger ones chose to identify as Kiwi. Identity was fluid and so were the criteria defining it; such adaptation was in response to changes the immigrants were facing.
9 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Major themes which emerged out of interviews with the three groups of respondents are discussed here. The main focus of this thesis is identity and attitudes in the face of language shift. This was investigated at individual and group levels. The discussion is specific to the respondents I interviewed. No claims are made for its statistical validity, nor is it a generalisation to all Korean, Dutch and Sāmoan immigrants in New Zealand or overseas. Rather than lessening the value of my work, I believe such qualitative work complements quantitative work and is invaluable. While the latter can be more useful in discerning trends, qualitative methods can more effectively reveal the contradictions and nuances obscured when using quantitative methods which tend to impose a false unity where there may be diversity, and structure where there is often no structure (Bradley 1996:179). While it is possible to generalise from the results of quantitative studies, qualitative studies expose the shades lost in large scale studies and indicate the limits of such generalisations. Instead of putting out a global or grand narrative, qualitative studies like this one focus on a local narrative from a post-structuralist approach (Bradley 1996:178).

It should be noted that in this discussion I will mention language maintenance and shift to the extent that it was one of my findings. However, I will not go into this in detail because it is not the major focus of the thesis. Nor will gender differences be discussed, as I had too few respondents in each group to generalise about this (except to say here that Korean, Dutch and Sāmoan women from group one were less confident in English than men from the same group).

9.1 LANGUAGE ATTITUDES

The Sāmoan and Korean respondents were more favourably inclined towards their native Sāmoan and Korean language respectively than the Dutch respondents were towards their native Dutch language. While positive attitudes are not enough for language maintenance, they are a small step towards it (see 5.2). Even though the native language (L1) identified the respondents from all three groups, the Dutch

---

66 Yet, like Bottomley (1979:169), I will compare my results with other studies.
tended to use more English at home, whereas the Koreans and Sāmoans used more of their L1. The Koreans and Sāmoans made an effort to obtain L1 media, but the Dutch seemed to be primarily indifferent about this. The Dutch preferred to use English or either language in general and did not mind too much if people from a Dutch background spoke to other Dutch in English. The Koreans preferred Korean or English, but disapproved of Koreans conversing in English with other Koreans. Similarly, the Sāmoans did not find it acceptable for Sāmoans to speak in English rather than Sāmoan with other Sāmoans, and they expressed a general preference for the Sāmoan language. L1 was a marker of solidarity among Sāmoans and Koreans, but hardly so among the Dutch. Respondents from all groups supported bilingualism as it was likely to promote intercultural tolerance as well as knowledge, but the Dutch were more in favour of ‘useful’ languages being the additional ones learned. Some respondents from all three groups (Korean, Dutch and Sāmoan) highlighted the importance of New Zealanders learning Māori.

At a personal level, most respondents from all groups thought that language was important for their own ethnic identity. For those Dutch respondents who did not use Dutch very often anymore, it would appear that L1 was important more at a symbolic than at a communicative level (see 2.3.2): the Dutch language was something they could identify with, but not necessarily something they could speak. Most Koreans and Sāmoans used their L1 and tried to pass it on to their children. The Dutch were less concerned that their children should be fluent in L1.

The Dutch still appeared to be influenced by the climate under which Dutch migration to New Zealand was first encouraged during the middle of this century (see 4.3.4). During this time, the Dutch were targeted as ideal immigrants because they were considered to be from a desirable ‘race’ (Schouten 1992) and were believed to be easily assimilable into New Zealand’s dominant white population (Mitchell 1996). Indeed, partly as a result of this environment surrounding the recruitment of the Dutch, most Dutch migrants of the time became invisible among New Zealand’s Pākehā population. Although the conditions and mood surrounding immigration have changed more recently, and the Dutch are no longer sought after as ideal immigrants, many recent Dutch migrants still seem to be influenced by the ideology that was prevalent just after World War II. Their physical appearance let them blend in easily with Pākehā. They wanted to adapt to life here as soon as possible, and this process often involved the replacement of the Dutch language with English, even as a means of communication within the family in several cases. This was one reason
that they showed less attachment to L1 in comparison to the Korean and Sāmoan respondents.67

The English language was also a determinant of identity for a few respondents, mostly from group two. It was important to all groups of respondents at least to the extent that it would allow them to obtain an education in New Zealand and then survive by finding employment. This would partially fulfil the respondents’ goals for migrating to New Zealand. This represents an instrumental attitude to learning English, where English is learned for utilitarian reasons, with some sort of economic achievement being the goal (Lambert 1967). However, all immigrants would be expected to have instrumental attitudes towards the language with the highest ethnolinguistic vitality (see 2.5) in their adopted country, confirming power relations. As such, the concept of instrumental attitude is not especially relevant in the case of immigrants learning the host language of their adopted country and is not necessarily indicative of their attitudes towards the host (and target) language community. While it is possible to single out those with integrative reasons for learning English, separating the reasons into one of these two orientations can be problematic as the dichotomy between them is vague. For example, many of my respondents wanted to learn English to facilitate their participation in the wider New Zealand community. This could be interpreted variously as an integrative and/or instrumental attitude.

9.2 LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE, SHIFT AND IDENTITY

The results from this study concur with those from previous studies insofar as the Sāmoans were found to be maintaining L1 reasonably well (see 8.1.2) while the Dutch were not (eg Folmer 1992; Roberts 1990). Yet respondents from all groups displayed evidence of language shift. L1 was used in fewer domains in New Zealand and the younger generation was less fluent in it than their parents. The extent of language shift varied from group to group. The Koreans exhibited comparatively little language shift. L1 was their main language of communication at home. Since the Koreans had been in New Zealand for the least length of time of the three immigrant groups, it is difficult to say whether this limited shift was a result of

67 Further reasons (such as the close linguistic relationship between English and Dutch) for rapid language shift among Dutch have been covered in detail elsewhere (eg Ammerlaan 1990a; 1990b) and I will not reiterate them here.
time or not, although, going by previous accounts (see Chapter 3), it seems likely that the Koreans will experience further language shift with increased length of stay in New Zealand. The Dutch respondents had undergone considerable language shift. Most of them used English as a first language at home, and a few even spoke or wrote letters to Dutch relatives in the Netherlands in English. Like the Koreans, the Sāmoans displayed limited language shift. They used mainly Sāmoan at home and with Sāmoans outside the home too.

The Koreans and Sāmoans wanted their respective L1 to be maintained in New Zealand, but most Dutch were not as concerned about this. The third generation of immigrants has been credited with an awareness of language shift and language revival efforts (Holmes et al 1993:10-11). As noted, the Koreans were relatively recent immigrants in New Zealand. This is one reason that they had not yet experienced extensive language shift and hence most of them were not really aware of language shift either. They did not think that Dunedin had a large enough Korean population to sustain a Korean language class. In contrast, the Dutch have been migrating to New Zealand for a much longer time, and they are aware of language shift. My Dutch respondents, even though they had been here longer than most Korean and Sāmoan respondents, were relatively recent arrivals and were aware of language shift but very few of them wanted Dutch language maintenance in New Zealand; most were not concerned about it. The few who were concerned about it confined their language maintenance efforts to the family in the absence of support at a wider level. Sāmoan immigrants have also been coming to New Zealand for a much longer time and there is a well established Sāmoan community in New Zealand. Because of the support of this community and the experience of early immigrants, the Sāmoan respondents were aware of the reality of language shift among younger Sāmoans in New Zealand, whether immigrants or New Zealand-born, and felt disturbed about it. They had tried to halt or at least slow down this shift by establishing Sāmoan language nests or Ā'oga Āmata, Pastor Schools and Sunday schools which all taught the younger generation the Sāmoan language.

Most respondents from all groups deemed language maintenance to be primarily an ethnic group responsibility. If the group considered the language important, it was up to them to maintain it. While the initiative had to come from the group, the government could help in the form of funding or policy. The three groups wanted to see their language being used to different extents in New Zealand. The Koreans did not sense the need for Korean to be taught in New Zealand schools yet (there were not yet enough Koreans here and Korea was perceived as unimportant for New Zealand at the moment), and the majority of them did not think that textbooks, official notices, etc needed to be printed in Korean. The opinions of the Dutch were
similar to those of the Koreans. Many believed Dutch to be unimportant not only in New Zealand but also around the world. In contrast, the Sāmoans wished their L1 to be taught at schools here, and some of them would have found textbooks, official notices, etc printed in Sāmoan helpful. A brochure entitled *You can't vote in the referendum unless you're enrolled* put out by the Electoral Enrolment Centre in mid-1997 could be obtained in the following languages: Māori, Cook Island Māori, Tongan, Sāmoan, Niuean, Tokelauan, Chinese and Korean in addition to English. The government can thus take heed of New Zealand’s immigrant population when it is expedient to do so and make information more accessible to them. Past research has shown that when societal institutions pay attention to the native language and culture of minority children, they are more motivated to learn a second language (Skutnabb-Kangas cited in Verhoeven 1991:228). In addition to promoting second language learning, such inclusion of minority languages could lead to more favourable attitudes towards them (Romaine 1989:258), raising their status. This in turn is likely to favour language maintenance.

While language maintenance was believed to be a group rather than government responsibility, within the group, it was the parents’ duty (according to a few respondents, specifically the mothers’ duty) to pass L1 on to their children. In cases where children did not learn their parents’ L1 and language maintenance was considered important, the parents were blamed. However, without any languages policy in New Zealand (see 3.2), parents are often in a dilemma about their children’s language learning process. Furthermore, parents complained about the difficulty of bringing up children as bilinguals in a monolingual country. The monocultural nature of New Zealand’s institutions has been blamed for language shift among Sāmoans (Hunkin cited in Pilkington 1989:29; Kerslake and Kerslake 1987:145). Leckie (1995a:66) found that the monolingual and monocultural education policy in New Zealand prompted some second generation immigrants to react negatively if their parents used L1, leading to tension between the two generations.

The lack of guidance available to parents is manifested in the immense variation among my respondents with regard to the language that group one encouraged in their children or the language that group two was encouraged to learn. Most Koreans and Sāmoans tended to encourage or be encouraged to speak their L1, or both English and their L1, and the Dutch were more inclined towards either both languages: L1 and English, or only English or only Dutch. Those who encouraged their children to speak English did so out of the belief that L1 would hinder the children’s acquisition of English and ability to perform well at school. It was thus an attempt to integrate into New Zealand society. Others encouraged L1 when they saw that outside the home, the children used mainly English and acquired it.
relatively easily.\textsuperscript{68} Others struck a balance by encouraging both languages or in some cases, neither language. Children were confused if each parent encouraged a different language. To avoid such confusion for both parents and children, New Zealand needs to have a clear languages policy which takes into account the desires of the immigrants themselves as well as the needs of living in New Zealand; the policy should thus include native language maintenance (for groups which want this) as well as English teaching for immigrants. The first and second generation need to be made aware of the imminent threat of language shift so that they can start language maintenance efforts sooner rather than later.

As mentioned, respondents thought that language was related to ethnic identity at a personal level. At group level and in the long term however, the case was a bit more complicated. At this broader level too, the Korean respondents deemed language important for ethnicity; the symbolic and communicative levels of language still coincided for them. If their grandchildren (living in New Zealand) did not speak Korean, the respondents would be in a dilemma as to whether the grandchildren would be Korean. They did not want to reject their grandchildren as Korean, yet at the same time they did not think that the grandchildren would be able to participate to the same extent with other Koreans without knowing the Korean language. One group two respondent speaking partly from experience thought that such children would be alienated from both Koreans and Kiwis, as they would not be accepted fully as either. Language was less of an issue to the Dutch respondents. Many did not really care that the second generation did not speak Dutch. Any identification with the Dutch language at group level was only with the symbolic aspect of it, not the communicative. The Sāmoan respondents thought that ideally, language was related to ethnic identity. However, they were aware of language shift, and so the definition of Sāmoanness had changed somewhat to accommodate language shift. Thus, second generation Sāmoans in New Zealand could still be considered Sāmoan if they did not speak the language. As with Dutch, the Sāmoan language was then an associated language for those who could not speak Sāmoan: they could identify with it at a symbolic level but not communicative level. The boundary demarcating Sāmoans from non-Sāmoans remained, even if the cultural elements contained within the boundary varied (see 2.2.1). However, this boundary was becoming blurred as those inside and outside it shared more and more cultural traits. L1 was

\textsuperscript{68} As noted in Chapter 2, studies show that in such a situation, English (that is, the host language) does not need to be used at home for children to become more proficient in it (Hakuta and D’Andrea 1992; Moorfield 1987).
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not a core value (see 2.3.1) for the Dutch respondents, nor was it so for the Sāmoan respondents, even though this would have been preferable in the case of the latter. With the Korean respondents, who have been here for a relatively short period of time, it is hard to say yet whether L1 will be a core value.

Because the Sāmoans were aware of language shift, they had various mechanisms to slow this down. In addition, they had relaxed the identifying criteria of Sāmoanness. The Koreans did not benefit from insight gained through experience as did the Sāmoans, and hence they (Koreans) had not yet been able to resolve the issue of language and ethnic identity in the long term. A comprehensive languages policy would perhaps aid the Koreans in dealing with such issues.

The Sāmoans are not unique in becoming more flexible about ethnic identity. The same has happened not only with other immigrant groups in New Zealand and Australia as documented in Chapter 3, but also further overseas. When immigrant groups want to retain their native ethnic identity (and in many cases their physical appearance makes them do this), they have to adapt to circumstances and broaden the criteria defining ethnic identity.

A recent example of the definition of ethnicity shifting to accommodate changes undergone by second generation immigrants in the USA is provided by Ana Celia Zentella (1994). For Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico, knowledge of Spanish is an essential component of their identity. However, among Puerto Rican immigrants in the United States, this is no longer necessary. Rather, being Puerto Rican is dependent on family origins (Zentella 1994:165). As with Sāmoans in New Zealand, the definition of group membership has changed and language as an indicator of ethnicity has been dropped to avoid the exclusion of family members and friends who have experienced language shift to English.

Such a change may be variously construed. For the Dutch respondents, shift in communicative language was interpreted more as a move towards Kiwi identity (their physical appearance permitted this) than a shift in Dutch identity itself. In this case, the boundary remained, but there was a movement of people across it. Among Arvanites (descendants of Albanian migrants) in Greece, language shift to Greek has been regarded as a change in the criteria for Arvanite identity by older members, but as an attempt to change their ethnic identity by the younger generation (Trudgill and Tzavaras 1977). Unlike the Arvanites, there was not such a marked dichotomy of opinion among my Dutch respondents.

Most of my respondents can be said to have experienced subtractive bilingualism because their first language and culture were being eroded (see 2.4). Hence it would
appear that bilingualism has had negative consequences for them. However, very few of them attributed this loss directly to learning English, but rather to living in a new and monolingual, monocultural society, where bilingualism is often still discouraged. Learning English was not seen as a threat to identity by the majority of respondents. Because migration had been a choice which most of them had made, those who did not want to return to their country of origin thought it was important to create ‘new culture’ and to acquire fluent English to be able to participate effectively in life here. This way they would fulfil their goals for migration. Bilingualism was in fact seen positively by the respondents, for instrumental as well as integrative reasons. The framework of additive and subtractive bilingualism fails to take into account the broader circumstances and hence I think it is inadequate in the analysis of language learning in the context of immigration.

9.3 ATTITUDES TO AND EXPERIENCES IN THE NATIVE COUNTRY VIS-A-VIS THE HOST COUNTRY

Respondents from all three groups had experienced discrimination or negative incidents in New Zealand. The reasons for such cases varied, and very few respondents had such encounters on a regular basis. All the respondents except group two Dutch were likely to be mistaken for tourists. The latter were also most readily seen as Kiwi by New Zealanders because they looked like most other New Zealanders and spoke English with a New Zealand accent. In contrast, the Koreans, group one Dutch and Sāmoans were usually regarded as Asian, Dutch and Pacific Islander respectively. Discrimination and being mistaken for a tourist/foreigner made very few respondents want to return to their native country, but it did appear to have an effect on their ethnic identity, as we will see in the next section.

The Dutch were more likely to interact with New Zealanders than the other respondents, whereas the Sāmoans were most likely to interact with other Sāmoans. This is likely to be a reason for the Sāmoans maintaining their L1 reasonably well, and it would have also reinforced adherence to L1 group norms, leading to fa‘asāmoa being maintained to some extent. In a study of Turkish and Portuguese immigrants in the Netherlands, the Turks were found to maintain traditional institutions more than the Portuguese. This was attributed partly to the Turks retaining close links with other Turks, not only in the Netherlands but also with those from their native village and other areas of Western Europe. Because of such ties among them, behavioural patterns were reinforced through social control (Lindo 1995:154-55). Some Koreans from my study deliberately tried to avoid situations where they would be in close contact with New Zealanders because of past negative
experiences in similar situations. Some Dutch, on the other hand, intentionally kept away from other Dutch immigrants, especially early ones. Such patterns were related to personal likes and dislikes and bad experiences with certain groups of people; they were an attempt to integrate rapidly into New Zealand society and/or to retain links with the past. Such interaction also demonstrates the situational nature of ethnicity (see 2.2.1): recent Dutch immigrants thought they had very little in common with early Dutch immigrants.

Only the Sāmoan group one respondents (most of them) wanted to return permanently to Sāmoa; the majority of the others wanted to remain living in New Zealand. Most Koreans were keen to visit Korea, but the Dutch group one respondents did not share as much enthusiasm for visiting their native country. Group two Dutch respondents wanted to visit the Netherlands, usually out of curiosity. The Sāmoans’ wish to return was related partly to negative experiences in New Zealand, but mainly to their reasons for migrating and to a strong attachment to Pacific Island culture and the environment. Once their children had been educated and had found employment, and the respondents themselves had helped to support their ‘āiga in Sāmoa, they would have fulfilled their reasons for migrating to New Zealand, and sought the familiar environment they remembered. This wish may not be fulfilled, but what is important is that it gave their time in New Zealand a purpose. Respondents from Korea and the Netherlands had some similar reasons to the Sāmoans for migrating here: they wanted their children to get a higher quality education and have access to employment opportunities in a less competitive and superior environment, both of which New Zealand was believed to offer. Unlike the Sāmoans though, the Koreans and Dutch were also trying to escape permanently from their native countries which were viewed as overcrowded and extremely competitive. New Zealand’s comparatively unpolluted and uncrowded environment, its physical beauty and the opportunities it offered for outdoor pursuits were further attractions.

9.4 ETHNIC IDENTITY

Many theorists (eg Carrithers 1992; Wolf 1982) would argue against the distinctness of cultures, since all cultures are constantly interacting with one another and hence changes in one are likely to impact on others too. This is to the extent that Hall (1992b:303) talks about ‘cultural homogenization’, a result of time-space compression. Thus we can speak in terms of a ‘global village’ (Hall 1992b:302) where identities become less specific:
The more social life becomes mediated by the global marketing of styles, places and images, by international travel, and by globally networked media images and communications systems, the more identities become detached - disembedded - from specific times, places, histories, and traditions, and appear ‘free-floating’. (Hall 1992b:303; emphasis in original)

There appears to be a gap here between academic theory and the experiences of my respondents, for whom culture, society and identity (New Zealand and their native one) were perceived as separate entities. Hence, it is possible to speak about shifting between the two or an inclination towards one or the other.

Identity is a very subjective issue which most people are not aware of unless they are self-reflective. Awareness of ethnic identity is not constant and often emerges only when one’s experiences are influenced by ethnicity (Bradley 1996:137). Faced with New Zealanders in a group contact situation (see 2.2.1) and thus with difference, and often mistaken for what they were not (such as Chinese or Japanese instead of Korean), many of my respondents had thought about their ethnic identity and most were aware of it.

Although ethnic identity was mediated by context and showed individual variation, overall it was more salient to the Koreans and Šāmoans but less so to the Dutch. The Dutch group two respondents in particular appeared to be more aware of their national identity as New Zealanders than of their ethnic identity as Dutch. Among the Koreans, ethnic identity was not as important to those who were oriented most towards New Zealand. They were also most fluent in English, compared to the remaining Koreans. In the case of the Dutch, ethnic identity was more important to those who were the most interested and active in Dutch language and culture; most of them used the Dutch language more than the others. Thus, among the Koreans a lean towards New Zealand made the respondent’s ethnicity less important to them, and among the Dutch, a lean towards the Dutch side made ethnicity more salient to the person. In this case use of and ability in language was related to an inclination towards the community which used the language.

Such an inclination changed the salience of the respondent’s ethnic identity relative to their native identity. The Korean respondents were keener to retain the Korean language and culture in New Zealand than the Dutch respondents were about Dutch language and culture. A Korean who emphasised Korean language and culture was likely to be perceived as ‘more Korean’ than someone who did not and was likely to face fewer negative sanctions from other Koreans. The opposite was true for the Dutch: emphasising Dutch language and culture was likely to bring about increased censure from other Dutch. Thus a lean towards the less desirable ‘side’ (according to
ethnic community norms) appeared to change the salience of ethnic identity for the respondent. A Korean who was considered to be ‘less Korean’ than other Koreans in New Zealand found their Korean identity less important, while a Dutch person who was perceived as ‘more Dutch’ than other Dutch in New Zealand found their Dutch identity more important. The salience of ethnicity was different for such exceptional respondents. This would seem to indicate that for my Korean and Dutch respondents, language was related to identity. This was to the extent that ability in or use of a language allowed one to be more like the community which used the language and this deviation from the ethnic group changed the salience of ethnicity to the person involved.

It could be argued that the influence was the other way around, where increased interaction with English speakers meant that the respondent used English more often rather than their L1 and was hence more fluent in it. However, respondents who were more fluent in or used English more than others did not necessarily interact more with English speakers. Nor was the opposite true, so respondents who interacted more with L1 or English speakers were not necessarily more fluent in L1 or English respectively than were others. So, for the Dutch and Koreans, language appears to be related to identity at an individual level to the extent that ability in the ethnic group’s less preferred language (that is, Dutch language for the Dutch respondents and English for the Korean respondents) made the person deviate in terms of the salience they attached to their ethnic identity. This did not occur with the Sāmoans, all of whom thought of their ethnic identity as important.

Group one Sāmoans did not think that their ethnic identity could change; all the others did, even if this had not necessarily happened in their own cases. The situation of most Koreans who believed that their identity had changed and of Sāmoan group two respondents can be described as ‘stuck in the middle’ (between two cultures). Because respondents from these groups looked different from the average New Zealander (who is fair skinned), they were not fully accepted as New Zealanders. This was especially so for the Koreans, since Polynesians are more numerous than Asians in New Zealand, and have been here longer. At the same time, some of these respondents felt that they were not fully Korean or Sāmoan either because they had less in common with L1 speakers or because of limited ability in their L1. These respondents, regardless of what they thought their identity was, were not fully accepted in either society (New Zealand nor their native one) or else their participation in these societies was limited. Hence, they were ‘stuck in the middle’ between these two societies. Yet, even though they were ‘stuck’ many were able to negotiate their identity depending on circumstances.
In contrast, the situation of most Dutch who believed that their identity had changed can be described as ‘clued up on both’. The Dutch looked like the majority of the New Zealand population; many had consciously adopted aspects of New Zealand culture; in addition, group two respondents had learned English in New Zealand, and so spoke English with a New Zealand accent. Thus, group two Dutch were more readily accepted as New Zealanders. Even if the Dutch respondents did not speak Dutch fluently, it did not affect their acceptance by other Dutch people, who do not greatly emphasise Dutch language maintenance. These respondents did not have a problem being accepted by either the Dutch or by New Zealanders, hence rather than being ‘stuck’ they were ‘clued up on both’. This in turn meant that they did not need to emphasise their Dutch identity and L1, while those who were ‘stuck’ had to do so with regard to their L1 and native identity in order to be more readily accepted by their native community.

The respondents can be said to have a hybrid identity, incorporating elements from their native culture as well as from New Zealand and global cultures. It is arguable that the concept of hybrid identity or hybridity has limited applicability as there are no ‘pure’ cultures left in the world. All cultures have been invaded by the processes of ‘migration, travel and tourism, cultural exchange and communication’ (Bradley 1996:134) leaving them ‘impure’. The implication that all cultures are contaminated is a static view of culture which does not recognise that cultures constantly change and there is unlikely to be a ‘pure’ culture which derives its essence from fixed criteria. It can also be argued that hybridity is restricted in its suitability to New Zealand, since all New Zealanders have a hybrid identity, being able to trace their ancestry to Māori/English/Scottish/ Chinese or whatever forebears who may have migrated to New Zealand in the past. There has been much intermarriage among Māori, Pākehā and others. Pākehā have a distinct culture even if many Pākehā themselves do not recognise this (Spoonley 1990). As the dominant group today, the major societal institutions (political, social, economic, educational, etc) function mainly according to their ways. When immigrants, whether from Europe or from elsewhere, interact with this mainstream (Pākehā) culture, they experience differences between it and their native culture. To the extent that the respondents

---

69 The more a person’s accent resembles that of the host community, the more favourably they are believed to be regarded by the host community, and hence are more accepted (Loveday 1982:23-4). In New Zealand, there is preliminary evidence that speakers with a ‘foreign’ accent are prejudiced against and thought of as foreigners (Watts 1981).
mentioned acquiring elements of Pākehā culture, and combining it with their native one, they can be said to have a hybrid identity.

A belief in change in ethnic identity was judged subjectively by the respondents; no objective criteria were used in the interview to determine whether or not ethnic identity had actually shifted. Regardless of whether the respondents’ ethnicity had actually altered or not, the response seemed indicative of willingness to change. The Koreans mentioned that ethnic identity could be transformed, but none of group one thought that this had occurred in their own respective cases. After migration, most Koreans were open to modification in New Zealand and wanted to create ‘new culture’. The Dutch also noted that ethnicity was fluid and at least half of them from both groups thought that their own ethnic identity had changed. The Dutch were especially keen to adapt in New Zealand as an attempt to integrate here as soon as possible. Since neither the Koreans nor the Dutch wanted to return to their native countries to live, such modification was interpreted as necessary to enable immigrants to adapt to their host country. The Sāmoan group one respondents, on the other hand, did not think that their identity could alter. Born a Sāmoan, they would always remain Sāmoan. They did not appear to be very agreeable to adaptation in New Zealand. New Zealand did not have much to offer them apart from employment and education; once they had partaken of these, most wanted to return to live in Sāmoa. Unlike the Dutch and Korean respondents, and group two Sāmoan respondents, group one Sāmoans had more ‘ties which bound them in another place’. As noted, intended length of residence in the target language community has been identified as a factor affecting social distance maintained with the target community, as well as target language acquisition (English in this case). This was another reason group one Sāmoans were less inclined to adaptation in New Zealand. On the other hand, group two Sāmoan respondents experienced their ethnic identity as fragmented. Overall then, a belief in the ability of ethnicity to change seemed to be related more to willingness to adapt rather than identity change per se. The desire to adapt was itself partly related to whether or not the respondents wanted to live permanently in New Zealand.

Subjective opinions about a shift in ethnic identity at a personal level were found to be partly related to perceptions about a change in L1 ability. Group one Koreans and group one Sāmoans, who had not experienced a shift in their own ethnic identity, did not think that they were better or worse in their respective L1. In contrast, the

70 This quotation is taken from the title ‘Ties that bind in another place’ of a review article in the Otago Daily Times, Saturday, May 31, 1997.
remaining respondents mentioned that they were now less competent in L1 and many felt that their ethnic identity had changed.

The inclination to adapt was also manifest to a certain extent in how many respondents thought of themselves as Kiwi or as a mixture of Kiwi and their native identity. More Dutch than Korean or Sāmoan respondents believed themselves to be Kiwi or part native identity and part Kiwi. As noted, the Dutch were most readily perceived as Kiwis by New Zealanders. They were least likely to be mistaken as tourists or foreigners in New Zealand. Thus, the respondents’ identity seemed to be formed at least to some extent by other people’s subjective opinions about their identity.

Identity itself was found to be shifting rather than static. Sāmoan and Dutch immigrants have been in New Zealand much longer than Korean immigrants. Numerous studies (see Chapters 4, 7 and 8) have found that most Sāmoan immigrants are trying to retain their culture and language in New Zealand, while the opposite is more true for Dutch immigrants: most of them have been found to want to become invisible among the rest of New Zealand’s population. There is likely to be little regret if second generation Dutch lose their Dutch identity and become New Zealanders. In contrast, Sāmoan immigrants have tried to retain their Sāmoan identity. They have realised that some change is inevitable, and so have adapted the defining criteria of Sāmoan identity. For example, fa’asāmoa has undergone some modifications in New Zealand and many second generation Sāmoans are not very fluent in the Sāmoan language, yet are accepted as Sāmoan. My Dutch and Sāmoan respondents were aware of the fluid nature of ethnicity over time, even if some of them did not think that their own ethnic identity could change (at a personal level). The Korean respondents did not seem to be as clear on this issue, without the benefit of experience of earlier immigrants.

9.5 CONCLUSION

This thesis focused on identity in a situation involving language shift. This was investigated at individual as well as group levels. Since language can be linked to identity at various levels, a change in one could affect the other. A qualitative approach was taken, with in-depth interviews with 30 immigrants comprising 10 Koreans, 10 Dutch and 10 Sāmoans. Such an approach ensured that details about respondents’ identity, which cannot be quantified, were not lost. This, I believe, made the study richer and did justice to respondents’ diverse testimonies.
Such research is especially relevant in New Zealand, a country which draws on immigrants, many of whom do not come from English-speaking countries. The consequences, or at least the perceived consequences, on identity of acquiring another language can influence inter-ethnic communication and language acquisition in addition to the well-being of the immigrants themselves. This in turn can affect the immigrant’s participation in education, work and social life. Negative results of acquiring English would defeat the purpose of immigration to New Zealand, since most respondents came to New Zealand for a better standard of living, education and less competitive lifestyle. Fortunately then, learning English itself was believed to have few negative effects.

The results from the Dutch and Sāmoan respondents were found to support those of previous studies: the latter were more concerned about and involved in language maintenance, while most of the former were indifferent, or even opposed to it.

Bilingualism was favoured by the respondents. Instead of splitting one’s personality into two, it was seen to be more of an ‘addition’: a positive step which would not only be ‘mind-expanding’ but also make one more culturally sensitive and aware. Learning English or improving one’s command of English was not seen as a threat to one’s ethnic identity by most respondents. While it is true that most respondents experienced native language and culture shift and hence identity shift, this was attributed to social, economic and political reasons rather than linguistic ones. Had New Zealand been less monolingual and more tolerant, respondents would probably still have had to become fluent in the host language, but they are likely to have had a better chance at maintaining their native language. Migration required adaptation so most respondents were willing to make changes. Many accepted that this would involve the dilution of their native culture, but that this was important for their migration experience to be successful. A better standard of living was an important reason for migration, and to achieve this, respondents would need to speak fluent English, enabling them to continue their education and to compete in the employment sector. Although many respondents would like to have maintained their native language and culture and to have passed these on to their children, they also wanted to be able to succeed here. Those who desired to return to their native country were less willing to make such adjustments.

The respondents can be said to have experienced subtractive bilingualism as their native culture and language were being eroded. As mentioned, this was not believed to be a direct result of language learning, but a part of migration. The framework of additive and subtractive bilingualism does not take into account the wider context and hence I think is insufficient in the analysis of language learning in the context of
immigration. Further, bilingualism had more positive than negative consequences for respondents, and was not responsible for any sort of identity problems, as early studies on bilingualism were likely to find.

All respondents had varying degrees of instrumental attitudes towards English, as it would let them survive in New Zealand. Instrumental and integrative motives are important as they are supposed to be representative of underlying attitudes the language learner has towards the target language community (Anisfield and Lambert 1972). However, in the case of immigrants in New Zealand, all of them can be expected to have instrumental attitudes towards English, and so this is not necessarily indicative of their attitudes. In addition, with some reasons (for example, ‘to make friends with New Zealanders’) it can be difficult to choose which motive they are representative of, as they may represent both. Hence the usefulness of such concepts is also limited in the case of immigrants.

At an individual level, ethnicity was found to be related to language. The salience of ethnicity (Mackie and Brinkerhoff 1984) varied from group to group, with it being less important to the Dutch, but more so to the Koreans and Sāmoans. The salience of ethnicity also varied at an individual level, with ethnic identity being more or less important to those who were exceptions to the ethnic group in terms of inclination towards their native language community or New Zealand.

Respondents’ awareness of their ethnic identity had increased or even been created since being placed in an ethnic group contact situation in New Zealand. Such awareness was also heightened if respondents were mistaken for other ethnic group members, or even for tourists. Some respondents asserted their ethnic identity to increase awareness and gain understanding about their ethnic group. Interaction also occurred or was avoided along ethnic group lines to a certain extent, with respondents choosing to associate with or shun members from a particular ethnic group, based on past experiences and perceived similarities and differences with them, as well as to speed up the integration process.

A gap was found between academic theory and the personal experiences of respondents. Some theorists argue against the distinctness of cultures because of globalisation, but to my respondents cultures were experienced as separate, hence they could talk about their native and New Zealand cultures. Identities were also perceived as discrete, with respondents becoming more Kiwi, and/or (not necessarily simultaneously) less Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan.

Individual identity was influenced, at least partly, by how respondents perceived New Zealand as seeing them. The Dutch were most likely to be accepted as New
Zealanders, and they were also more likely than the other respondents to think of themselves as New Zealanders or part New Zealanders. A belief in the fluidity of identity was found to be related to openness to adaptation in New Zealand. Sāmoan group one respondents were less keen to make changes while living here, as they wanted to return to Sāmoa, and conceived of their identity as permanently Sāmoan. In the case of all respondents, most of those who believed that their identity had shifted also acknowledged that their ability in L1 had changed in New Zealand.

While respondents perceived themselves to be partly Kiwi to varying extents, this subjective ethnicity was not necessarily granted them by New Zealanders. The main criteria for being accepted as a New Zealander seemed to be skin colour as well as command of the English language, especially the accent it was spoken with. Dutch group two respondents best met these requirements; they thought of themselves as Kiwi, and at the same time as Dutch. Their limited fluency in Dutch did not hinder their acceptance by the other Dutch. Hence, they were described as ‘clued up on both’: they could participate fully in both cultures in New Zealand, and were accepted fully in both.

In comparison, some Korean and Sāmoan respondents could not participate fully in Korean or Sāmoan society because of limited ability in L1. Those who considered themselves as partly Kiwi were not necessarily accepted as such because they looked different from Pākehā. Because these respondents felt limited about their acceptance and participation in both societies, they were described as ‘stuck in the middle’. However, identity was fluid and respondents were often able to negotiate their identity; hence the gap between being ‘stuck’ and ‘clued up’ was not always that great. In metaphorical terms, sometimes the glass was half full but at others it was half empty.

While language was found to be related to ethnic identity at an individual level, at group level the relationship was more complex and variable. Advantages which accrued from an established immigrant community included making new immigrants aware of issues of importance to the community. While both the Dutch and Sāmoans have been immigrating to New Zealand for decades, in Dunedin, there is a strong, established community only in the case of the Sāmoans, not the Dutch. This itself is an indicator of the importance these groups place on maintaining their native language and culture, and interacting with others from the same ethnic group. Although I interviewed relatively recent first generation Sāmoans and Dutch, they were aware of language shift, with either the community (in the case of the Sāmoans) or other immigrants (in the case of the Dutch) making respondents aware of the shift. The Koreans in New Zealand are still first generation immigrants, and a
Korean community was being established in Dunedin during the course of this study. Without the experience of a long established community, and having themselves witnessed very limited language shift, the Korean respondents were not yet aware of this phenomenon.

The desirability of language and identity shift varied from group to group. The Dutch respondents were the most indifferent about this, even favouring such shift, despite the increased acceptability of pluralism and difference in more recent times. They still seemed to be influenced by the assimilationist ideology prevalent after World War II, but they also had confidence from experience in the Netherlands that knowing English would not water down their Dutch identity. The Sāmoans were concerned about the shift and had become more flexible about the definition of Sāmoanness. They were trying to at least slow down if not arrest such shift. The Koreans had not yet resolved the issue. They favoured language maintenance like the Sāmoans, but had not yet realised the unlikelihood of this and so had not initiated steps to halt it.

For those Dutch respondents who could not command fluent Dutch, any association they felt with the Dutch language occurred at the symbolic level. With the Sāmoans who were not fluent in Sāmoan, identification with the language was at this level of belief too. Thus, for these two groups of immigrants, language had split into the levels of communication and symbol. Even if respondents could not speak the language, they could claim identity with it as a symbol; hence language became an associated language (Eastman 1984). At group level (that is, in the long term) the Sāmoans identified more strongly with L1 and wanted to retain their native identity more than the Dutch. To maintain the Sāmoan group boundary, elements of ethnicity had shifted; this ensured that the boundary remained. In the case of the Dutch, people had moved from inside the boundary to outside it. Language was not a core value for either the Dutch or the Sāmoans. Instead, the groups were dynamic and responsive to change. Such flexibility ensured the continuity of Sāmoan identity since the Sāmoans were still perceived as Sāmoans, but not necessarily that of the Dutch who could become invisible among the rest of New Zealand’s Pākehā population.

For the Koreans, such a split had not yet transpired. As a result, they were not sure whether or not they would be able to accept their grandchildren, who would grow up in New Zealand, as Korean if they could not speak Korean. To the Koreans, identification with the language meant being able to speak it too, or else elements of the culture would be lost. The Sāmoans were also concerned about the loss of culture with language shift, and this was another reason they had established
Sāmoan language nests and other Sāmoan language classes. Even though identity was experienced as discrete, it was found to be fluid rather than static. It was not derived from a single essence and so could withstand change.

Despite the Sāmoans’ wish for language maintenance, the experience of the community had made them realise the inevitability of language shift. Without such a community in New Zealand to warn them of language shift, the Koreans were not taking any steps to maintain the language. By the time they become aware of language shift, probably in the second or third generation, any efforts at language maintenance are likely to have limited effectiveness, as is the case with the Sāmoans. Immigrants need to be made aware of language shift before it reaches an advanced stage, so that they can attempt to stem this at an early stage when it will probably be more effective. This is an aspect which needs to be incorporated into a languages policy, which New Zealand lacks. While New Zealand immigration policy attracts highly skilled immigrants who have the potential to contribute to society, it does not do very much to help them maintain their diversity once in New Zealand. Although immigrants are no longer as strongly expected to assimilate, other policies in New Zealand have not kept up with this loosening up in immigration policy and tend to be less multicultural, sometimes not even bicultural. The findings from this thesis point to the need for New Zealand to develop a languages policy which takes into account the welfare of immigrants (among other language-related aspects such as the needs of Māori). This should take into account both native language maintenance and the English language needs of immigrants.

Further issues of interest were identified but could not be pursued in this thesis. One of these was gender differences in the case of language and identity. Because of the small number of respondents from each of the three groups (10 from each immigrant group), it was impossible to generalise about gender. This would be worthwhile researching with more respondents. In addition to analysing attitudes of respondents, identity can be investigated through actual linguistic behaviour such as code-switching (eg Romaine 1989).

Since this study was based in the South Island, it has helped somewhat in rectifying the regional bias in this field, as most previous studies have been undertaken in the North Island. Studies need to be conducted in different South Island settlements, as well as in North Island settlements. Dunedin does not have an established Dutch community, nor are there spatial concentrations of any one immigrant group in the city. Similar research done in another city in New Zealand could yield different results, depending on community dynamics in that particular city.
9.5.1 Final remarks

This thesis has contributed to the growing body of literature on language contact in New Zealand, specifically language among immigrants, coming from an anthropological, qualitative and post-structuralist perspective. By focusing on and talking directly to people who have come from other countries to settle in New Zealand, such research increases our knowledge about the migration and relocation process from a vital angle, that of language and personal beliefs about it. Immigrants to New Zealand are likely to find themselves handicapped, when outside the home and their community group, if they cannot speak English. Their well-being depends on their ability to communicate in English since they are unlikely to obtain employment nor be able to participate in the wider community without these skills. Yet, immigrants may want to concurrently retain aspects of their native culture, like language. Their success at striking a balance between the two will be influenced by their own efforts, as well as efforts on the part of the host society.

An important focus of this thesis was identity. Past studies on language among immigrants have stressed language maintenance and shift, with little emphasis on identity. Investigating identity has added another perspective on language behaviour among immigrants. It also adds to the increasingly topical subject of hybrid identity, which is at the centre of much recent literature (both academic and fictional). At the same time that hybrid identity is becoming not only acceptable but also positive, attitudes towards bilingualism have witnessed change. Bilingualism is increasingly recognised as having good rather than bad effects.

The results suggest that Sāmoan immigrants are joining Māori and the growing ranks of immigrants, including Indo-Fijians, Greeks, Chinese and Poles among others, who experience language shift, despite attempts to impede this. To retain native identity in the face of language and culture shift, the definition of identity has shifted among these groups. It remains to be seen how strongly the Koreans will push for language maintenance, and if the Dutch will reclaim their Dutch identity after being absorbed among Pākehā. Korean immigration to New Zealand is tailing off because of a change in immigration requirements since 1995. Without the continued influx of fluent Korean speakers to New Zealand, Korean language maintenance is likely to be in even greater jeopardy.
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ARRIVALS IN NEW ZEALAND

Figure 1. Number of arrivals in New Zealand during 1982 to 1996 of Korean, Dutch and Sāmoan immigrants

(Source: Antony Moss, New Zealand Immigration Service, personal communication)

71 All statistics on Korea refers to South Korea only and on Sāmoa to Western Sāmoa only.
Figure 2. Number of arrivals in New Zealand during 1921 to 1980-81 of Dutch and Sāmoan immigrants

Notes:
1921 figure is for nine months ending December 1921.
1935-36 forwards: Includes the 12 months ending 31 March.
1921 to 1965-66 and 1975-76 to 1979-80: Number of new immigrants intending permanent residence by nationality.
1970-71: Number of permanent arrivals by country of last residence (excluding long term arrivals and visitors).
No figures available for South Korea during this time.

NET GAIN OR LOSS IN IMMIGRANT POPULATIONS IN NEW ZEALAND

Figure 3. Net gain or loss in Dutch and Sāmoan populations in New Zealand during 1982 to 1996

Notes:

The difference between the number of people approved for residence in New Zealand by region and nationality (Graph 1) and the number of permanent and long term departures by country of next permanent residence.

(Source of departures: Infos database, Migration section, Department of Statistics)
Figure 4. Net gain or loss in Dutch and Sāmoan populations in New Zealand during 1921 to 1980/81

Net gain/loss in immigrant populations in NZ
1921-1980/81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sāmoa</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935-36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1921 figure is for nine months ending December 1921.
1935-36 forwards: Includes the 12 months ending 31 March.
1921 to 1960-61: The difference between the number of new immigrants intending permanent residence by nationality and the number of New Zealand residents permanently departing by nationality.
1965-66 to 1980-81: The difference between the number of permanent and long term arrivals and departures by country of last and next residence.
No figures available for South Korea during this time.

POPULATION DENSITY

Figure 5. Population per square kilometer of surface area - South Korea, Netherlands, Western Sāmoa and New Zealand

Notes:

1980 and 1985 figures for Korea and Sāmoa are estimates of questionable reliability.

New Zealand figure includes Campbell and Kermadec Islands and Antipodes, Auckland, Bounty, Snares, Solander and Three Kings island, of which only Campbell and Kermadec Islands are inhabited.

APPENDIX B: NEW ZEALAND’S IMMIGRATION POLICY

The new immigration policy adopted by the government in 1974 put an end to unrestricted immigration from the United Kingdom and Ireland. Henceforth, immigrants from all sources were selected on the same criteria (Department of Statistics 1990).

New Zealand’s immigration policy is designed to encourage the entry of skilled labour into New Zealand, and to protect domestic employment opportunities for New Zealand citizens and residents who have the right to reside here permanently. At the same time, considerable emphasis is placed on humanitarian considerations such as the reunification of families, and the provision of settlement opportunities for refugees. (Department of Statistics 1985:120)

Applicants were allowed in on occupational grounds if their occupation came under the Occupational Priority List (OCP) published by the Department of Labour. This was a list of ‘occupational skills in demand in NZ which warrant recruitment from overseas’ (Department of Statistics 1985:121). These applicants had to fulfil certain criteria in terms of age, health and character, and family and in most cases had to prearrange accommodation and employment. Businesspeople who could contribute both skills and capital were also considered (Department of Statistics 1985:121).

Other grounds for application included family reunification and refugee resettlement, as noted, in addition to the Western Sāmoa and the Netherlands quotas by which 1100 Western Sāmoans and ‘an annual quota’ of Dutch were accepted (the latter was scrapped in 1993).

In 1991 entry on the basis of occupational grounds changed to a points system, where points could be gained for age, qualifications, work experience and investment capital. The immigration residence policy was revised once again in 1995, and a detailed description of it (and changes since 1991) follows:

The **General Skills Category** is also known as the ‘points system’ because a minimum number of points is needed to gain residency. Minimum requirements include a three year base qualification, two years’ relevant work experience, age 18 to 55, and English language skills. The General Skills Category replaced the similar General Category and General Investment subcategory in 1995 when the points system was adjusted. The changes included extending English language skill requirements to non-principal applicants aged 16 years and over and the introduction of a new English language test; registration requirements for about 25
occupations where registration with the statutory authority governing professional standards is legally required in New Zealand - for example doctors; and more weight placed on a job offer in New Zealand.

Under the **Family Category**, people who have a relationship with a New Zealand citizen or resident, such as being married or in a de facto or same-sex relationship, may qualify for residence. Marriage does not guarantee residence - like the other partnership sub-categories the relationship must be genuine and stable. The category also enables New Zealand citizens and residents to be joined here by their parents, children and adult siblings in some circumstances.

The **Humanitarian Category** allows people whose circumstances are exceptionally difficult to gain New Zealand residence if this is the only reasonable solution to their situation. Applicants must have at least one close relative who is a New Zealand citizen or resident and who supports their application.

Under the **Business Investor Category** applicants must score a minimum number of points to gain residence, as under the General Skills Category. Minimum requirements include the transfer to New Zealand of $750,000 for investment for at least two years, two years’ business experience, age 25 to 64, and English language skills. Funds must have been earned by applicants through their business skills, and must be invested rather than, for example, purchasing a family home. The Business Investor Category replaced the similar Business Investment Category following policy adjustments in October 1995.

Under the **Western Sāmoan Quota** up to 1,100 Western Sāmoan citizens may be granted residence in New Zealand each Government financial year (ending 30 June) provided they have a job offer in New Zealand.

Up to 800 people are granted residence under the **Refugee Quota Programme** each Government financial year. Under the program refugees must be nominated for resettlement in New Zealand by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. A smaller number of people gain residence after claiming refugee status (also known as asylum seekers) on or after arrival in New Zealand.

(Source: New Zealand Immigration Service Fact Pack [March 1997, 7:2])
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW KIT

CONSENT FORM

I, the interviewer, want to ask you some questions to learn about the Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan community here in Dunedin. I'm interested in your customs, language and ethnicity.

I want to be able to remember everything you say so I’d like to use a tape recorder to help me remember what you tell me.

I will begin by asking you some questions about yourself and your background for the purposes of context. The information you give me will be confidential and your name will not be associated with it. Only my thesis supervisors and I will have access to the tape. The tape will be stored in the Anthropology Department at the University of Otago.

You, the interviewee, are free to not answer any questions you feel uncomfortable with or to end the interview at any stage.

I have read the above and agree to it.

_________________________  ______________________
Interviewee     Date

_________________________  ______________________
Interviewer     Date
# INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex:</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td></td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td></td>
<td>71-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td></td>
<td>91-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupation in New Zealand

Occupation before coming to New Zealand

Education

What is your mother tongue/which language did you first speak at home?

Where were you born?

When did you come to New Zealand?

Why did you come to New Zealand?

Do you wish to return?

Where else have you lived? When?

Which languages do you know?

For every language you know, are you able to understand all contexts, from slang to news presentation?

When did you first learn English? In what context? From whom?

Is/was English spoken by your:
- mother
- father
- brothers and sisters
- other family members (grandparents, cousins, etc)?

With your children which language do you mostly use when you
- scold
- praise
- them

323
instruct/teach
help (with school work)
chat with
speak lovingly to them?

Which language do you use with
your wife/husband/partner
your grandparents and their generation
your parents and their generation
your brothers and sisters
your children and their friends
your grandchildren and their generation
your friends
your workmates
government employees
your neighbours
anyone else (eg minister of religion)

What language do you and your family use at mealtimes?

Do you correct your children’s Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan at home?

Do you encourage your children to learn Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan?

Do you encourage your children to learn English?

Do others in your family use any other language? Which? When?

Which language do you mostly use at work?

Where are most of your workmates from?

Which language do you use at a party or social gathering?

If you were to write/tell your life story, which language would you use?

Which newspaper/s and magazines do you read?

Which TV programs do you watch?

Which programs do you listen to on the radio?

If there were radio and TV programs in Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan, would you listen to/watch them?
Do you read any books in Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan?

Do you watch videos and movies? In which language are most of them?

Which language do you write letters to your relatives in?

Describe yourself in terms of your ethnic identity.

How important is your ethnic identity to you? (ie are your actions and attitudes in your daily life affected by your ethnicity?)

What do you think is the most important indicator of ethnic identity?

How would you identify a Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan person here?

What do you think others see you as?

Do you ever get mistaken for a tourist? If yes, what is your reaction?

Do you have more contacts/interaction with Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan people or with the general population?

In your opinion, what is the most important part of the Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan way of life for Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan people in New Zealand?

How important do you think is the maintenance of Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan for the continuity of your group identity? Or are attitudes and sentiments more important?

Who do you think should be responsible for the maintenance of minority group languages - the group itself or the government?

Do you think ethnic groups should be prepared to change their language, while possibly retaining other features of group life, or should they try to retain their language in particular?

What other aspects of New Zealand culture have you adopted?

How do you feel about adopting these traits?

If you speak Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan do you like to speak it?

Do you like to hear it spoken?

Which language do you prefer to use?

What is the importance of Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan to you?
What is the importance of English to you?

Do you think your ability with Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan has changed since you came here?

How important do you think Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan is in bringing together the members of your family?

What do you think of children who do not speak the same language(s) as their parents?

Is there a Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan community group in Dunedin? What sort of activities does it undertake?

Which language do members use in it most of the time?

Is it involved in maintaining/reviving Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan?

If yes, what has been the response to it?

Do you think Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan should be taught in ordinary schools?

Do you think textbooks should be written in the ethnic group languages?

Would you encourage your children to take School Certificate or Bursary Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan?

Do you think the authorities should produce versions of official letters, notices, road signs, forms and leaflets in other languages used by groups in New Zealand?

Should monolingual English New Zealanders be encouraged to learn ethnic group languages? Why (not)?

What do you think of ethnic group members who speak only English and never Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan?

What do you think is the future of Korean/Dutch/Sāmoan here?

Should it be maintained? Why (not)?

What sort of city do you think Dunedin is?

- Kiwi
- Scottish
- multicultural
- other
Why?

When you are with other people from your community who also speak English, do you prefer to use English or Korean/Dutch/Samoan? Why?

If a community member speaks to you in English, do you think they’re showing off or being unpatriotic?

Why did you learn English (as a second language)?

If you did not have to learn English to live in New Zealand, would you still learn it?

Was it important to be good in English in Korea/Holland/Samoan?

Do you go back to Korea/Holland/Samoan for visits? How often and for how long do you go?

To you, what are the positive aspects of learning English?

What are the negative aspects of learning English?

What do you like most about the Kiwi way of life?

What do you dislike most about the Kiwi way of life?

What do you like most about the Korean/Dutch/Samoan way of life?

What do you dislike most about the Korean/Dutch/Samoan way of life?

Have you had any negative experiences/problems as a result of being a Korean/Dutch/Samoan speaker in New Zealand?

Do you think other group members hold similar attitudes to language and ethnicity as you do?

Do you think your identity has changed after adopting English in New Zealand?

Do you have any conflict as a result of this (ie do you think you are compromising your (ethnic) identity [if it is important to the person])?

How do you cope with this?

Do you think you have more than one personality, corresponding to the language you are using at any one time?

If yes, do they create any tension in you?
Do you ever feel lost between two cultures? Why (not)?
APPENDIX D: RESPONDENTS’ DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS

Table 1: Korean group one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pseudonym</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>level of education</th>
<th>occupation</th>
<th>age/age group upon arrival in NZ</th>
<th>age/age group when interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mira</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>housewife</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunghee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>businessperson</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minja</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>translator, voluntary worker</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chulsoo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>Minister of religion</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intae</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>tertiary (in progress)</td>
<td>businessperson</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilwon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Korean group two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pseudonym</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>level of education</th>
<th>occupation</th>
<th>age/age group upon arrival in NZ</th>
<th>age/age group when interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joohee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>secondary (in progress)</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiyoung</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>tertiary (in progress)</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kildong</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>secondary (in progress)</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Respondents had the option of indicating their age group if they were not comfortable with revealing their age.
<p>| Sookil | M | tertiary (in progress) | student | 14 | 25 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Age/age group upon arrival in NZ</th>
<th>Age/age group when interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Homemaker, mother</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineke</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Painter (off work)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Professional consultant</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Architectural model maker</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Quantity surveyor</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Age/age group upon arrival in NZ</th>
<th>Age/age group when interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vicki</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tertiary (in progress)</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tertiary (in progress)</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tertiary (in progress)</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niek</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tertiary (in progress)</td>
<td>Fast food outlet worker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5: Sāmoan group one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pseudonym</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>level of education</th>
<th>occupation</th>
<th>age/ age group upon arrival in NZ</th>
<th>age/ age group when interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnes</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>retired</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>unskilled job</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>41-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>Sāmoan language nest worker</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sio</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>[Sāmoan community]</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>Minister of religion</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6: Sāmoan group two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pseudonym</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>level of education</th>
<th>occupation</th>
<th>age/ age group upon arrival in NZ</th>
<th>age/ age group when interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>administrative assistant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pita</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomasi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>tertiary</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>(born here)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>