

LITERATURE REVIEW

Language Planning and Policy: Factors that impact on successful language planning and policy

Tony Trinick
Stephen May
Ruth Lemon

Te Puna Wānanga
University of Auckland

January 2020



THE UNIVERSITY OF
AUCKLAND
Te Whare Wānanga o Tāmaki Makaurau
NEW ZEALAND

'Kia ita!'

Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori

MĀORI LANGUAGE COMMISSION



Table of Contents

Literature Review Approach	2
Language Policy and Planning (LPP).....	3
How is language policy considered in relation to language planning?	4
What are the Major Categories (Typologies) of LPP?	5
Status planning.....	5
Corpus planning	5
Acquisition planning.....	6
<i>Implications for Aotearoa New Zealand</i>	6
What is Language Planning (LP) and How have the Definitions Changed over Time?	7
Early developments in LPP (1950s–1960s)	7
Mid-phase LPP (1970s–1980s): An emergent critical reorientation.....	10
Current LPP phase (1980s–present): The rise of language ecology and multilingualism	11
Top-down and bottom-up approaches to LPP.....	12
Levels of language planning: Defining macro-, meso- and micro-.....	14
LPP Frameworks.....	15
Table 3: Descriptive Framework of Historical–Structural Research	17
What are the Success Factors or Types of Activities that Create a Positive Impact on Language Planning?	18
Status planning: The vitality of the language.....	18
Target audience	20
Trends in existing language domains	24
Standardisation versus dialect.....	25
Response to new domains and media	25
Levels of agency—Language champions	27
What Factors have been Identified as Most Effective in Macro-language-planning Particularly in Relation to the Public Service and Wider Society?	29
Summary and recommendations for Aotearoa New Zealand	31
REFERENCES	33

Literature Review Approach

This review draws from a range of literature sources to provide an overview of key themes and common understandings surrounding the factors that impact on successful language planning and policy, particularly with respect to Indigenous/minority language revitalisation and maintenance. Sources for this literature review include research reports, journal articles, books, and critical commentaries.

A number of New Zealand and international electronic library databases were searched using a list of keywords (shown in Table 1) and an annotated bibliography was subsequently developed. The focus in the annotated bibliography was to source more recent literature—that produced between 2008–2019 to show contemporary discussion. The abstracts in the bibliography were drawn on, however, the literature for the review was broadened to include seminal literature which discussed the key factors in macro language planning and policy (LPP) developments, and their implications for Māori language revitalisation and related LPP.

Table 1: *Keywords Used For Literature Search*

Māori Indigenous heritage languages minority languages	language revitalisation	language planning
	reversing language shift	language policy
	language maintenance endangered languages language acquisition	language management
		language rights language ideology language attitudes language beliefs language promotion language vitality language competence
sociolinguistics ecolinguistics	language and education language and business language and culture	bilingualism multilingualism

The review was structured to address the following questions:

- How is language policy considered in relation to language planning?
- What are the major categories (typologies) of LP?
- What is Language Planning (LP) and how have the definitions changed over time?
- What are the success factors or types of activities that create a positive impact on language planning?
- What factors have been identified as most effective in macro-language planning particularly in relation to the public service and wider society?

This literature review is designed to either be read in conjunction with the associated annotated bibliography *Language Planning and Policy* or to act as a stand-alone document.

Key conventions that have been utilised to communicate links between the documents include:

In the literature review -

- The first time a publication selected for this annotated bibliography has been cited in-text, the citation is bolded, indicating that further information is available;
- Publications that are not included in the annotated bibliography have an asterisk next to the first author's name in the reference list;
- Edited chapters that have been listed in the annotated bibliography under the book editors, as opposed to the authors of that specific chapter, have two asterisks next to the first author's name in the reference list.

In the annotated bibliography -

- Section one, references 1-46, have all been cited in the literature review, with extended information;
- Section two, references 47-49, are edited books, where a chapter or section of the overall piece has been cited. Two of the three have also cited the edited collection in its entirety (Hinton et al., 2018; Spolsky, 2012).
- Section three, references 50-63, are additional sources that were consulted in the process of this research. The majority of the texts are focused on the education sector, for example looking in-depth into translanguaging and its potential applications in engaging the linguistic repertoire of bilingual and multilingual students, although there are pieces focusing on language rights and language strategy in Aotearoa-New Zealand. The information gleaned from these sources is invaluable to the topic, so the references have been kept in the annotated bibliography.
- The reference list contains only those texts that have been referred to in the discussion and elaboration of the references included in this annotated bibliography, to facilitate access for those who are interested in reading further in these areas.
- There is a subject index followed by an author index. The authors are those who have been selected as one of the 63 references for this annotated bibliography.

Language Policy and Planning (LPP)

[Language planning is] a body of ideas, laws and regulations (language policy), change rules, beliefs and practices intended to achieve a planned change (or to stop change from happening) in the language use in one or more communities....

Language planning involves deliberate, although not always overt, future orientated change in systems of language code and/or speaking in a societal context. (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 3)

Sociolinguistics is that field that refers to the study of the relationship between language, a society, and how the language is used (Holmes, 2001). Sociolinguists are interested in

explaining why people speak differently in different social contexts and the effects of social factors (ethnicity, class, social status) on language varieties (dialects, registers, genres). According to Coulmas (2005), the central theme of sociolinguistics is linguistic *variety* and *choice*. As is understood more recently, the principal task of sociolinguistics is to uncover, describe, and interpret political, cultural and social aspects that impinge on linguistic choice. The research discipline that examines more specifically the decision-making processes and the intervention and changes in the linguistic organisation of society is language policy and planning (LPP; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). Thus, the field of LPP can be considered a component of a broader sociolinguistic field of study.

How is language policy considered in relation to language planning?

Although the field of study is generally called language planning, the use of this term in its generic sense is somewhat confusing since it refers to several different aspects. For example, language planning is used to define both the *process* and the *study* of language activities. In sociolinguistics, the use and meaning of the terms *language planning* and *language policy* are also frequently contested. Since the emergence of the field of language planning in the 1950s–1960s, discussed in the next section, the terms language policy and language planning (LPP) have been interpreted and defined in a number of different ways, and used synonymously or in tandem in a range of literature, often referring to the same idea (Cooper, 1989; Fishman, 1968; Haarmann, 1990; Haugen, 1972, 1983; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; **Tollefson, 1991, 2016**).

Traditionally, language planning has been seen as the deliberate, future-oriented systematic change of language code, use and speaking, most visibly undertaken by government for some community of speakers—which leads to the promulgation of language policies (Fishman et al., 1971). This definition is consistent with other writers who have defined language planning as a social construct that may involve the discursive production of a language policy (Alexander & Heugh, 1999; Blommaert, 1996; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). Fishman et al. (1971) contended that language policies are decisions taken by constituted organisations with respect to the functional allocation of codes within a given speech community. This view was supported by later researchers, including Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), who argued that language planning and language policy represent quite distinct aspects of the systemised language change process.

More recently, **Spolsky (2017a, 2017b, 2018a, 2018b)** argued that fully understanding language policy requires recognition, not just of failures and success or centralised administration, but of the complexity of factors and levels that need to be taken into account in LPP. Following from this, Spolsky argued that the term language *management* is a more suitable term than language planning and that a management model assumes a range of managers at various levels working to modify the language practices of various members of the community (see also Edwards, 2012 and Sanden, 2014. The latter defines Spolsky’s approach as a sub-concept, and expands on language management as a theory and as a business strategy).

What are the Major Categories (Typologies) of LPP?

Language planning researchers have frequently used the term *typology* to describe language planning activities (see Hornberger, 1994 and the more recent work by **Darquennes, 2010**). However, rarely have they defined the term. In this review, the various typologies of language planning discussed later refer to how the different processes, goals and practices are *categorised* or *classified* by researchers. Language planning has been categorised according to its underlying aims and the ways in which it operates within particular societies. The diversity of political, ethnic and linguistic situations can greatly influence the goals and outcomes of language planning (Ricento, 2000). However, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) noted that researchers in language planning have attempted to differentiate two distinct kinds of language planning activities: those concerned with attempts to modernise the language (corpus planning), and those concerned with modifying the environment in which a language is used (status planning). Although status planning and corpus planning involve different activities, the relationship between these two types of planning processes can be considered complementary (Clyne, 1997) with significant interplay between corpus and status planning (Darquennes, 2010). Cooper (1989) added a third important focus: acquisition planning. Some researchers, for example, Kaplan and Baldauf (2003), have adopted this latter focus in models of language planning in the form of language in education.

Status planning

Although there is not complete agreement on the definition of this terminology, Ridge (1996) proposed that status planning involves the decisions a society or group must make about language selection and implementation. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) added that status planning also refers to deliberate efforts to allocate the functions of languages and literacies within a given speech community, particularly within the official domains of language use, such as those of the government and education. Such decisions involve status choices, for example, making a particular language or variety an official language or a national language. From such a perspective, it has been argued that language status planning issues are related to political issues; thus, the outputs of status planning are laws, clauses in constitutions, and regulations prescribing the official standing of languages and their use in social domains of public administration (Cobarrubias & Fishman, 1983; **Lo Bianco, 2004**). At the individual level, status planning involves the minute-by-minute choices made by speakers every day.

Corpus planning

Corpus planning, on the other hand, focuses on changes to the corpus or shape of a language resulting from deliberate planning (Ferguson, 2006). Darquennes (2010) argues that equal attention be awarded to corpus planning as more research is needed into “the questions of how a society’s goals regarding linguistic diversity can be reached and whether some ways of reaching them are preferable over others” (p. 346). Corpus activities are usually undertaken by language experts, resulting in the production of grammars, dictionaries, literacy manuals and writing-style and pronunciation guides (Ferguson, 2006; Lo Bianco, 2004). Corpus planning is often related to the standardisation (codification) and elaboration of a language, involving the preparation of a normative orthography and grammar (Clyne, 1997). However, like status

planning, corpus planning is driven by political considerations extending beyond the code itself (Ferguson, 2006; Harlow, 2005). For example, to follow puristic ideologies when creating new terms (see Annamalai (1979). In Aotearoa/NZ, purism became important during the time of lexical modernisation and language elaboration in the 1980s and 1990s, providing a criterion for the choice of new lexicon and codification (Harlow, 1993)—this involved avoiding transliterations, instead looking to traditional te reo Māori words as the source of new words.

Acquisition planning

The third dimension of language planning or management, as Spolsky (2018a, 2018b) prefers, concerns language in education or acquisition planning. Acquisition planning concerns the teaching and learning of languages, whether national languages or Indigenous and minority languages, and is often situated in schooling (Bakmand, 2000). According to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), language-in-education planning (equivalent to Cooper's (1989) notion of acquisition planning) substantially involves the state educational sector.

Implications for Aotearoa New Zealand

The focus on Indigenous Māori language revitalisation over the last 40 years in Aotearoa New Zealand highlights all three of these key areas of language policy and planning (LPP), along with the importance of addressing these three areas of LPP simultaneously (Darquennes, 2010; **McCarty & Coronel-Molina, 2017**). The implications for status language planning can be seen in the Waitangi Tribunal's (1986) decision to recognise te reo Māori as a taonga (treasure) – specifically protected by New Zealand's founding document, the Treaty of Waitangi. This led to te reo Māori being made an official language in 1987 and the related development and expansion of Māori language provision in education and the media. Subsequent status language planning discussions have focused on the increasing normalisation of te reo Māori as both an official and a national language (**Albury, 2016; De Bres, 2011, 2015; Higgins & Rewi, 2014; Waitangi Tribunal, 2011**).

Corpus language planning is most evident in the early activities of Te Taura Whiri i te reo Māori (the Māori Language Commission; hereafter, Te Taura Whiri), with a particular emphasis on early corpus language development in schools (Trinick, 2013, 2015; **Trinick & May, 2013**). Te Taura Whiri's activities thus also traverse acquisition language planning, given the central role of Māori-medium schooling in the wider Māori language revitalisation movement (May, 2004; **May & Hill, 2018**). Language revitalisation in schools and education has evolved over time to include other key government agencies, such as the Ministry of Education and the Tertiary Education Commission (Trinick, 2015). Schooling has necessarily not been the only focus, with research commissioned recently into normalising te reo Māori in organisations (Lee- Morgan et al., 2019) and across non-traditional language domains (**Haar et al., 2019**). This follows a strategic change in 2003, with one of the key Māori language strategies developed by Te Puni Kōkiri and Te Taura Whiri was to shift te reo Māori to the next stage of revitalisation by focusing on greater Māori language use in two of the key language domains—whānau and community settings (Chrisp, 2005; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001). This strategy has also been adopted by the newly created Māori LPP agency, Te Mātāwai.

Accordingly, this paper will focus on the implications for Te Taura Whiri of the latest developments in status, corpus and acquisition planning in language domains, as they pertain to Indigenous language revitalisation. This will include some discussion of the role of language in education but will focus more broadly on other key language domains. (For comprehensive discussions on LPP in schooling, see Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Ó Laoire & Harris, 2006; and Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000. For discussions of te reo Māori LPP in relation to schools, see Benton, 1981, 1984, 1988, **2015**; **Penetito, 2010**; Spolsky, 2005; May & Hill, 2008, 2018. For discussions of te reo Māori LPP in relation to the workplace, see Haar et al., 2019, with relevant research conducted in Ireland by Walsh, 2011 and in Wales by Evas et al., 2013. See **Angouri, 2013** for research conducted at a multinational level.)

What is Language Planning (LP) and How have the Definitions Changed over Time?

Internationally, the changes in language planning perspectives over the years have occurred as a result of dominant global events such as mass migration, imperialism and the formation of new states. In reaction to these changes, theories and agendas of LPP have evolved over time. According to researchers working in the area of language planning, such as Ricento (2000), there is no universally accepted theory of LPP. Ricento argued that the language issues that lie at the base of language planning are too complex and intricately interwoven with other policy domains to be analysed through one paradigm. In his view, it is impossible to constitute an overarching theory for the concept. While not all researchers support this position, it does illustrate the contested discourse of LPP.

Although published accounts of Indigenous and minority LPP have focused on colonial and postcolonial developments from the mid-20th century onwards (May, 2006; Ricento, 2000), LPP activities have been going on for centuries in Indigenous/minority communities around the world and can be considered as old as language itself (**Wright, 2004**). However, the emergence of LPP as a designated area of research emerged only in the 1950s and 1960s in response to solving language problems in new, developing and postcolonial nations. The leading scholars in the field at that time (Fishman, 1968; Fishman et al., 1968; Neustupný, 1974) all saw the multilingualism of newly independent nations as *problems* to which they assumed they could offer *planning* solutions (Spolsky, 2018a, 2018b).

In a useful critique of the field of LPP, Ricento (2000) divided the evolution of LPP as an academic field into three broad stages of development, each stage spanning roughly two decades (see below). He also highlights “three types of factors [which] have been instrumental in shaping the field, that is, in influencing the kinds of questions asked, methodologies adopted, and goals aspired to” (p. 9). These factors are the macro socio-political events and processes, epistemological paradigms, and wider LPP goals. The following sections examine the literature that reflects these evolving theories of language planning, using the generalised eras of development, as suggested by Ricento (2000), to frame the discussion.

Early developments in LPP (1950s–1960s)

As noted above, the initial phase of LPP began in the 1950s and 1960s, in response to the immediate language planning needs of colonial and postcolonial states. During this period, LPP was seen by its proponents as a non-political, non-ideological, pragmatic, even technicist

paradigm. Its apparently simple and straightforward aim was to ‘solve’ the immediate language problems of newly emergent postcolonial states in Africa, Asia, the Pacific, and the Middle East. There were two key emphases in this early LPP work. The first focused on status language planning, with a particular aim of establishing *stable* language contexts in which majority or dominant languages (usually, ex-colonial languages, and most often English and French) were promoted as public languages of wider communication. If promoted at all, local languages—Indigenous and minority languages, in effect—were seen as being limited to private, familial language domains. This process of language status and demarcation between dominant and minority languages, and their related association with public and private domains, respectively, is described in sociolinguistics as ‘diglossia’. While concern was often expressed for the ongoing maintenance of Indigenous and minority languages by early LPP proponents, the principal emphasis of LPP at this time was on the establishment and promotion of *unifying* national languages in postcolonial contexts, along the lines of those in Western, developed contexts (Fishman et al., 1971).

In this sense, the status language planning focus in early LPP work built on a much longer pattern favouring linguistic homogeneity over the maintenance of linguistic diversity, particularly evident in many Indigenous and minority language contexts. This pattern of linguistic homogeneity emerged from the politics of nationalism and the related principle of one-nation/one language associated with the modern nation-state system (May, 2012a, 2016). In Aotearoa New Zealand, for example, it was a one nation/one language imperative that underpinned the 1867 Native Schools Act, which decreed that English should be the only language used in the education of children. This emphasised language rationalisation and English as the de facto national language. Following from this, te reo Māori was consigned to the private sphere—establishing a state of diglossia with respect to English and te reo Māori until the re-emergence of te reo Māori as a language of education in the 1980s, as part of the wider Māori language revitalisation movement (May, 2004). This process was also an international trend—for example, the one-nation/one language ideology justified a similar policy in North American Indian boarding schools (McCarty, 2013).

The second key concern in this early phase of LPP was on corpus language planning, which relates primarily to questions of how to codify and standardise the lexicon and syntax of languages in any given context. This focus applied primarily to the ongoing development of national languages in these postcolonial contexts, once a particular language was selected, although local Indigenous languages were also sometimes included (Ferguson, 2006). These corpus language planning concerns meant that early LPP scholars were preoccupied with laws and regulations and planning issues concerned with processes of language codification and standardisation. Accordingly, LPP was conceived as the responsibility of technical experts who had efficient standardisation techniques at their disposal, supposedly working objectively (Nekvapil, 2006).

Underpinning both these status and corpus language concerns in early LPP work was a presumption that linguistic rationalisation, and subsequent national language selection, were societal benefits, enhancing both the nation-building and modernisation process in postcolonial

contexts. Ricento (2000) and May (2006) have suggested that a widely held view among western sociolinguists at that time was, thus, that linguistic diversity—that is, bilingualism/multilingualism—presented obstacles for national development, while linguistic homogeneity was associated intrinsically with modernisation and westernisation. By couching these LPP emphases in technicist terms, however, the underlying ideologies of linguistic homogeneity and monolingualism which drove these early LPP efforts went largely ignored. As Luke, McHoul, and Mey (1990) observe, while maintaining a “vener of scientific objectivity” (something of great concern to early language planners), LPP “tended to avoid directly addressing social and political matters within which language change, use and development, and indeed language planning itself, are embedded” (pp. 26–27).

This omission was problematic for a number of reasons. First, it did not question or critique the very specific historical processes (arising from nationalism and nation-state formation), that had led to the hierarchising of majority/dominant languages, on the one hand, and local/Indigenous languages, on the other (see May, 2012a for an extended discussion). Consequently, the normative ascendancy of national languages was assumed, even championed, by early advocates of LPP, and all other languages were compared (negatively) in relation to them.

Second, the notion of linguistic complementarity, so central to early language planning attempts at establishing *stable diglossia*, was itself highly problematic. Linguistic complementarity, as understood by early language planners, implied at least some degree of mutuality and reciprocity, along with a certain demarcation and boundedness between the majority and minority languages involved. Situations of stable diglossia, however, are *not* complementary in these respects. Rather, the normative ascendancy of majority and/or national languages specifically *militates* against the ongoing use, and even existence, of Indigenous languages. In other words, if majority languages are consistently constructed as languages of *wider communication* while Indigenous languages are viewed as (merely) carriers of *tradition* or *historical identity*, as was the case in early LPP, it is not hard to see what might become of the latter. Indigenous languages will inevitably come to be viewed as delimited, perhaps even actively unhelpful languages—not only by others, but also often by the speakers of these languages themselves (see **May, 2014** for further discussion).

This helps to explain why speakers of Indigenous languages have increasingly dispensed with their first language(s) in favour of speaking a majority language—a process of language shift or replacement that is a prominent concern of much current sociolinguistic analysis (**Fishman, 2001**; May, 2012a, **2018**; Nettle & Romaine, 2000; **Reh & Campbell, 2018**). Such language shift and loss—or *linguistic genocide*, as Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) would have it—almost always forms part of a wider pattern of social, cultural and political displacement for those Indigenous and minority language speakers. As Crawford (1994) noted, language death seldom occurs in communities of wealth and privilege, but rather in the dispossessed and disempowered. There is a link between language revitalisation and economic development. Moreover, linguistic dislocation for a particular community of speakers seldom, if ever, occurs in isolation from socio-cultural and socio-economic dislocation.

Mid-phase LPP (1970s–1980s): An emergent critical reorientation

By the 1970s, the problematic aspects of this early apolitical approach to LPP were becoming increasingly apparent, as were the limits of solely positivist and technicist approaches in LPP. The limitations of both dimensions were increasingly foregrounded in emergent work in critical linguistics (Fowler et al., 1979; Halliday, 1978) and sociolinguistics (Hymes, 1974). These developments, referred to as *critical theory* approaches (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996), sought to explain LPP in light of broader cultural, political, historical and economic influences. Ricento (2000) characterised this second phase of work in LPP as one in which:

[t]here was a growing awareness of the negative effects—and inherent limitations—of language planning theory and models, and a realisation that sociolinguistic constructs such as diglossia, bilingualism, and multilingualism were conceptually complex and ideologically laden and could not be easily fitted into existing descriptive taxonomies. (p. 14)

The role of ideology in LPP was also investigated more specifically by researchers influenced by key critical social theorists within sociolinguistics. Tollefson (1991, 2016) and Pennycook (1994, 1998), for example, highlighted language inequalities that were apparent in both developed and developing countries, together with the idea that LPP represented only the ideologies of dominant powers. Tollefson (1991) added that language policy was one mechanism by which dominant groups established hegemony in language use at the expense of Indigenous and minority linguistic communities and their languages.

Scholars such as Wolfsan and Manes (1985) eventually focused on the social, economic and political effects of language planning, illuminating the crisis of language inequality as another form of social inequality in the modern world. Additionally, Spolsky (1995), whose work and views have significantly influenced Māori language revitalisation efforts, highlighted that language planning exists within a complex set of social, political, economic, religious, demographic, educational and cultural factors. Language needs to be looked at in its widest context and not treated as a closed universe. This position is markedly different to the views on LPP held by early writers, who, as we have seen, regarded the process as more of a technical exercise carried out by linguists (Cobarrubias & Fishman, 1983).

Cooper (1989) considered other components of the language planners' work as the basis for developing a "process framework" for language planning. This framework included what actors attempt to influence, what behaviours were involved, of which people, for what ends, under which conditions. Haarmann (1990) added that there are different levels of *agency* in language planning—for example, the government, various agencies, pressure groups and individuals. As Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008) have more recently pointed out, it is often these local contextual agents that have most affected macro-level language plans and the outcomes they have achieved. They also suggest that, at the most micro-level of language planning, work is sometimes located with particular individuals who operate to revive or promote the use of particular languages.

Realising that not just government and government agencies are involved in management provides a much richer picture of LPP processes and results. For example, the family is now

recognised as a major and critical site for LPP. Many studies (Caron-Caldas, 2000; **Spolsky, 2012**; Tannenbaum & Howie, 2002; Te Puni Kokiri, 2001) are showing the importance of the family domain as a key site for significant language management. Likewise, the work of linguists such as Jiří Nekvapil (2006; see also Nekvapil & Sherman, 2009; Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003), has shown the complexity and richness of language management in the industrial workplace domain.

Current LPP phase (1980s–present): The rise of language ecology and multilingualism

The third stage in language planning research started about the mid-1980s and continues to the present day, often in tandem with practices described previously. At this stage, research turned to the topic of language ecology, with a focus on multilingualism and the state of endangered languages. Hornberger (2002) considered the language ecology metaphor “as a set of ideological underpinnings for a multilingual language policy” (p. 35). In particular, she pointed to how languages exist and evolve in an ecosystem along with other languages, and how their speakers “interact with their socio-political, economic and cultural environments” (p. 35). From the 1990s, academics such as Skutnabb-Kangas (2000), Phillipson (1992) and May (2001, 2005, 2012a, 2018) have provided a language rights (LR) and/or human rights perspective on language ecology.

One of the principal concerns of LR is that establishment of minority/majority language hierarchies is neither a natural process nor primarily a linguistic one (May, 2012a). Rather, “it is a historically, socially and politically constructed process, and one that is deeply imbued in wider (unequal) power relationships” (May, 2012b, p. 133). The LR paradigm argues that Indigenous and minority languages, such as te reo Māori, along with their speakers, should be accorded the same rights and protections that majority languages already enjoy (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas & May, 2017).

In this latter period, research into Indigenous LLP contexts has increased considerably, particularly with respect to the role of education in supporting the revitalisation of endangered Indigenous languages (**May, 2012c**). In Aotearoa New Zealand, for example, Harlow (2005) and Trinick and May (2013) discuss the linguistic ideologies that underpin the significant modernisation and elaboration of the Māori language undertaken over the last 30 years within the educational language domain in order to support the teaching of subjects in Māori-medium schooling. Hinton and Hale (2001) provide concrete descriptions of how Hawaiian was introduced into new domains through Native-language immersion programmes, the cultivation of Indigenous literacies, media and technology and teacher preparation. Wilson and Kamanā (2011) extend this analysis, arguing that Hawaiian language immersion programmes in schools are a key part of a wider drive to *revernacularise* Hawaiian in the wider community—particularly in those public language domains from which it has been historically excluded. Similarly, Fishman (2001) outlines both the challenges and the possibilities in reversing language shift (RLS) for a wide variety of Indigenous groups, as does, most recently, Hinton, Huss, & Roche. (2018).

Other notable examples include Hornberger's (2008) research on Quechua in southern Peru, which identified a number of corpus planning issues, including the sacrifice of dialect variation in the interest of developing a normative, standardised writing system. Her work contained lessons in grass roots or bottom-up language planning in the Americas (see below). Hornberger's work also questions whether schools can save Indigenous languages, an issue echoed by Spolsky (2003) who questioned whether Māori-medium schools alone could save te reo Māori. Similarly, Ó Laoire (2008) has argued that "[s]chools have only limited value in language revival, in that the restoration and successful survival of a threatened language essentially require reinstating and relocating the language firmly in the home domain in parent-child transmission" (p. 208). McCarty (2008, p. 161) also notes that schools cannot do the job alone but that they are nonetheless potential key sites of resistance and opportunity. She adds that schools can become strategic platforms for broader LPP—from language elaboration, to elevating the status of oppressed and marginalised languages.

Top-down and bottom-up approaches to LPP

In reviewing this literature on LPP involving Indigenous peoples in this current LPP period, a key issue that emerges is who makes and carries out the key decisions in the planning and development process. In the early LPP phase, the focus was more on government-led, top-down approaches as key catalysts and drivers of policy (Kaplan, 1989). While such approaches can be influential in shaping and shifting the LPP landscape, particularly in relation to status language planning and Indigenous language revitalisation, there is a growing consensus in the LPP literature that successful, top-down implementation must occur in conjunction with community-led, bottom-up LPP (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). Indeed, Hornberger (1996) and May (1999, 2006) asserted that Indigenous language revitalisation can only truly succeed if the community of users are significantly involved in the development. We can illustrate this important dialectic in relation to the following international examples, focusing, in particular, on state-led developments, on the one hand, and local implementation responses on the other.

In 1988, Norway revised its constitution in order to grant greater autonomy for the Indigenous Sámi. This was particularly significant, since the constitutional amendment replaced over a century of stringent *Norwegianisation* (read: assimilationist) policy towards Sámi, their languages and their culture. As the amendment to the Norwegian Constitution stated: "It is incumbent on the governmental authorities to take the necessary steps to enable the Sámi population to safeguard and develop their language, their culture and their social life" (1988, cited in Magga, 1996, p. 76). The effects of this amendment are most apparent in the regional area of Finnmark, in the northernmost part of Norway, where the largest percentage of the Sámi peoples live. The formal recognition accorded to Sámi led to the subsequent establishment of a Sámi Parliament in Finnmark in 1989, while the Sámi Language Act, passed in 1992, recognised Northern Sámi as its official regional language. The Sámi Language Act saw the formal promotion of the language within the Sámi Parliament, the courts of law, and all levels of education (see Corson, 1995; Huss, 1999; Todal, 1999). In addition, a separate Sámi curriculum was introduced in Finnmark in 1997 and, in 2000, the Sámi Parliament took responsibility for some aspects of the Sámi school system previously controlled by the central

Norwegian Government (Todal, 2003). Both these latter developments, along with the passing of the (2005) Finnmark Act, have further entrenched regional autonomy and Indigenous control for Sámi in the area (Semb, 2005), particularly with respect to education.

The precedent of regional autonomy for Indigenous peoples set by Finnmark has also been evident in Canada over the last decade. For example, in April 1999, the new Arctic province of Nunavut was established, the first formal subdivision of territory in Canada for 50 years. Its establishment was the end result of a 20-year negotiation process with the 22,000 Inuit of the region (out of a total regional population of 25,000). The provincial administration is Inuit-led, and the local Inuit language, Inuktitut, is co-official with English and French in the region, as well as being the first working language of the provincial government (Légaré, 2002).

Comparable developments can be observed in South America, which is home to between 30–40 million Indigenous language speakers. In the 1970s, Peru, with over six million Indigenous language speakers, predominantly of Quechua, was the first Andean nation-state to institute a national bilingual policy in 1972–1973 (Hornberger & King, 1999). Ecuador followed Peru's lead in the 1980s, and Bolivia in the 1990s, with the development of what has since come to be termed a formal policy of *intercultural bilingual education* (IBE). This approach endorses a maintenance bilingual education model, while emphasising the notion of normalisation of Indigenous languages as part of language education policies in these contexts (López & Sichra, 2008).

As part of these developments in Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia, as well as in Colombia, Guatemala and Mexico, community-based, grass-roots Indigenous organisations have also become directly involved in the design and implementation of IBE programmes. In Ecuador, the national administration of IBE came under Indigenous control in 1988, while in Colombia, a constitutional reform in 1991 granted Indigenous peoples the right to design their own educational models (López & Sichra, 2008). This combination of top-down and bottom-up grass-roots responses in LPP, particularly with respect to Indigenous language revitalisation, is also evident in other contexts internationally (see Hornberger, 2008; May, 1999; May & Aikman, 2003; McCarty 2011, 2013; McCarty, Romero-Little, Warhol, & Zepeda, 2018).

Other key issues addressed in these wide-ranging LPP contexts include the central status planning issue of how and where Indigenous languages will be used. Thus, while we have previously discussed Sámi in relation to Norway, Sámi language speakers are spread over a number of countries, with differing language policies on the use of Sámi (Roto, 2018). Another is the acquisition planning issue of who will learn the language and for what purpose. Hinton and Hale (2001) argue that Indigenous immersion education, for example, is the best way to support Indigenous language revitalisation. However, as discussed previously, there are acknowledged limits as to what schooling can accomplish on its own. One of the other major questions that regularly surfaces in such LPP contexts is whether, and to what extent, the majority (non-Indigenous) population should be learning the Indigenous language. Finally, as noted by Hornberger (1996), in relation to the developments of the Quechua language in Peru, there is the issue of what form and norm the elaboration and modernising of the language takes

to enable it to operate in expanded domains. As we shall see, all these issues have been canvassed in the New Zealand LPP literature in relation to the revitalisation of te reo Māori over the last 40 years.

Levels of language planning: Defining macro-, meso- and micro-

Given the important dialectic between top-down and bottom-up LPP, it is appropriate to place the activities mentioned above in the categories of macro-, meso- or micro-language planning. As already noted, the considerable body of sociolinguistic literature examining LPP, particularly in its early phase, focused on the actions of governments and similar macro-level organisations. This is because the primary concern was creating national unity and developing and maintaining communication within emerging nations (Ricento, 2000). Local issues of language planning were seen as secondary to the overall process of planning (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008).

Despite the growing recognition of the significance of bottom-up, community-led, LPP processes, as discussed in the previous section, there has still been a surprising lack of discussion of, as well as little scholarly work on, the idea that language planning can occur simultaneously at the macro-, meso- and micro-levels within a society (Baldauf, 2006). Fishman (2006) and Spolsky (2004) pointed out, for example, that, although language planning may involve government action, in practice a great deal of language planning occurs in micro-structural environments, such as particular sectors of economic or social activity (Baldauf, 2006; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). More specifically, Baldauf (2006) defined micro-planning as referring “to cases where businesses, institutions, groups or individuals create what can be recognised as a language policy and plan to utilise and develop their language resources” (p. 155). Accordingly, such planning occurs as a response to “their own needs, their own ‘language problems’, and their own requirement for language management” (Baldauf, 2006, p. 155). Micro-level language planning examples in Aotearoa New Zealand, for example, include a company developing a te reo Māori policy and plan, or a whānau (family) developing their own, personalised, te reo Māori development plan.

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, p. 5) identified four main areas at different levels concerned with language planning: (a) governmental bodies; (b) the educational sector; (c) quasi-governmental or non-governmental bodies; and (d) individuals and organisations. Macro-level planning generally involves top-down, national, government policies. Meso-level planning may also involve government policy but has a much narrower focus: for example, language requirements for a particular business. The micro-, bottom-up level of planning includes school plans, community or whānau groups, individual households and the language use of individual people.

In summary, LLP can be undertaken in a variety of ways from the development of terms and linguistic norms required by communities through to national policies and Acts of Parliament. These different levels of LPP have been referred to as macro-, meso-, and micro-level language planning (Lewis, 2007). LPP is often initiated as a “response to language decline” (Lewis,

2007, p. 7) and thus specific LPP goals are developed to overcome these processes of language shift and loss.

LPP Frameworks

To provide a theoretical grounding to carry out this literature review on LPP and the various factors that have impacted on the process, this review draws on Kaplan and Baldauf's (2003) and Baldauf's (2006) integrative frameworks of language planning. We also refer, in what follows, to Tollefson's (2016) complementary LPP framework.

The selection of these models was guided by a number of factors: first, as a consequence of the evolution of language planning, Kaplan and Baldauf (2003) maintain that language planning needs to be framed within its broad ecological context. Thus, they developed a revised and expanded version of the LPP models initially developed by early LPP scholars (see earlier discussion and Table 3). Kaplan and Baldauf's (2003) model is thus a reasonably up-to-date contribution which incorporates most of the earlier-mentioned categories and frameworks, allowing an easy reference to, and interaction with, other frameworks.

Second, in addition to the goals of language planning, Kaplan and Baldauf's (2003) and Baldauf's (2006) models include interpretive explanations and considerations of language planning at different levels—macro-, meso- and micro- (see Table 1). Third, Kaplan and Baldauf (2003) agreed that both policy (form) and planning (i.e., function), as initially presented by Haugen (1983), need to be considered, but added that policy and planning should be viewed from an overt (explicit) and/or covert (implicit) perspective as well. In addition, when LPP is undertaken, there is a significant underlying historical and social component that helps to frame the work (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003). A framework reflecting these additions and elaborations in greater detail is set out in Table 2.

Table 2: *Model of Language Planning*

	Levels of language planning		
Approaches to goals	Policy planning	Cultivation planning	Macro-, meso-, micro-levels Awareness of goals Overt covert planning
Productive goals	Goals	Goals	
Status planning (about society)	Status standardisation Officialisation Nationalisation Proscription	Status planning revival Restoration Revival etc.	
Corpus planning (about language)	Standardisation Graphisation Grammatication Lexication	Corpus elaboration Lexical modernisation Stylistic modernisation Renovation Purification Reform Terminology unification Internationalisation	
Acquisition planning	Policy development Access policy Personnel policy Curriculum policy Resources policy Community policy Evaluation policy	Acquisition planning	
Receptive goal Prestige planning (about image)	Language promotion Official/government Institutional Pressure group individual	Intellectualisation Language of science Language of professions Language of high culture	

Note. From Kaplan, R., & Baldauf, R. (2003, p. 202).

Tollefson's LPP model complements and expands on the Kaplan and Baldauf model, providing more specific details on the historical and structural factors that inform and influence LPP processes and outcomes. These are detailed in Table 3.

Table 3: *Descriptive Framework of Historical–Structural Research*

Language planning processes	Examples of micro-level analysis (involves ‘bottom-up’ level of planning)	Examples of macro-level analysis (involves ‘top-down’ national government policies)	Examples of historical-structural factors
Status planning	Multilingual discourse practices in classrooms and schools Implicit language policies in families Translation and interpretation in the police, court and other state institutions	Monolingual ideologies of language in official policy statements Constitutional provisions for official multilingualism Political self-determination in minority-language communities	History of colonialism Linguistic imperialism Linguistic stratification in the job market The role of language in elite closure Language and national identity
Corpus planning	Codification Functional and terminological elaboration Linguistic purification programs New varieties of English and other languages of wider communication	Language documentation Multi-modal literacies The rise of new Indigenous literatures	Standardisation and “accountability” in education Movements for authenticity and cultural identity Ethnolinguistic nationalism
Acquisition planning	Content of curriculum, textbooks and materials Standardised testing and washback Indigenous pedagogies in schools	Movements for Indigenous curriculum and pedagogies International cooperation among linguistic-rights movement	Maintenance of colonial educational systems in post-colonial states Availability of resources and influence of funding sources for textbooks, materials and teacher training Globalisation and English language policy Discourse of the instrumental value of English

Note. Adapted from Tollefson (2016, p. 14)

What are the Success Factors or Types of Activities that Create a Positive Impact on Language Planning?

Status planning: The vitality of the language

Knowing the status and/or vitality of the Indigenous language helps determine what the community's language needs are before starting revitalisation projects. This step assists language planners in developing a language plan that:

- establishes realistic goals and activities based on the language situation in the community;
- uses the resources that are available in the community, such as language leaders or champions, first language speakers and committed community members, as well as additional organisational and material resources;
- reflects the most effective methods and strategies of reaching community language goals.

The factors that affect the maintenance or shift of a traditional language of a speech community, such as te reo Māori, collectively indicate the *vitality* of a language (Landweer, 2016). In sociolinguistic research, the vitality of a language can be considered by factors such as intergenerational language transmission, absolute number of speakers, proportion of speakers within the total population, shifts in domains of language use, response to new domains and media, opportunities for education in the language, language attitudes and policies, community members' own attitude toward their language, language competence, amount and quality of language documentation (Baker & Wright, 2017; Fishman, 2001; Hale, 1998; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

In order to clearly know the status of the language, a language survey might be required. A language survey assists language planners in getting a more detailed picture of the overall health of the language from the whole community which, in turn, supports the development of language goals for the community (De Bres, 2011; Hutchings et al., 2017). There are different types of language surveys, and each survey reflects certain aspects that the language planner might want to know in more detail, such as attitudes towards language status and knowledge, language goals, language competence, language use, language activities, willingness to participate in activities, use of the language at home, at school, or in the community. For example, in 1976, in response to the increasingly parlous state of the language, the rural Rūātoki community located in the Tūhoe tribal area in the North Island were able, through the strength of their own convictions and the use of data from the seminal Benton (1979) study into the health of te reo Māori, to persuade both the Minister of Education and officials of the Education Department (changed to Ministry of Education in 1991) that a bilingual school should be set up in Rūātoki (Benton, 1988). Richard Benton's (1979) earlier influential sociolinguistic survey provided the catalyst for subsequent Māori language revitalisation efforts (focused primarily on education) from the 1980s onwards, while Hutchings et al. (2017) contemporary work provides an update of Māori language use in Māori communities, employing a

comparable survey approach to that of Benton. There are also international surveys that monitor language use over time in a range of domains, such as the Basque Street Survey (Altuna & Urla, 2013), which might provide an additional useful point of reference.

Surveys are thus an essential part of the language planning process and are useful at all stages, including planning, implementation and evaluation. It is useful to know the knowledge and dispositions of everyday people rather than the experts in regard to language policy and language revitalisation because it provides a picture of the linguistic landscape within which policy is being developed (Albury, 2016; De Bres, 2011; **Poutū, 2015**; Trinick, 2015). A number of studies into the vitality of te reo Māori were carried out from the late 1980s through to 2010 (see **Boyce, 2005**; Brown, Cullinane, Reid, & Vernon, 1990; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001, 2008, 2009a, 2010). In general, the findings were similar—Māori attitudes towards te reo Māori were positive. On one level, this was good news because sociolinguists argue that positive attitudes and accurate beliefs about a language contribute significantly to the ability of minority languages to co-exist and prosper alongside majority languages (Grin & Vaillancourt, 1998). However, one of the limitations of the findings of these attitude surveys is that positive attitudes towards te reo Māori have not always translated into correspondingly positive action by Māori to speak te reo Māori (Bauer, 2008). For example, there is a considerable discrepancy between those who have positive attitudes towards te reo Māori (94%) and those who rate their language competence, their proficiency as “well or very well” (14%), in both the 2001 and the 2006 censuses (see Te Puni Kōkiri, 2008, p. 19). Similarly, positive attitudes at a general level towards te reo Māori, among both Māori and non-Māori, are not always maintained in relation to more specific language requirements (e.g., knowledge and use of te reo Māori in schools). Albury (2016, **2017**), and De Bres (**2008a**, 2015), drawing on May’s (2000) notion of *tolerability* (see later), explore the differences between general and more specific language attitudes to te reo Māori, particularly among the non-Māori New Zealand population.

In engaging with Māori language policies, the key is to focus on the policy’s wider priorities in relation to the debates mentioned earlier, how they have changed over time, and how they are continuing to change. A main area of debate here is in relation to the idea of *linguistic purism*. Linguistic purism was a key feature of Te Taura Whiri’s early corpus language policy work in the 1980s and 1990s. It resulted in the organisation championing the revival of obsolete native terms—at the expense of existing, widely used, transliterations among first language (L1) speakers—as the most acceptable means of establishing te reo Māori as a standardised educational language. The result, over time, has been an increasing disjuncture in the vocabulary use of L1 and L2 te reo Māori speakers, with the latter using the *kupu hou* promoted by Te Taura Whiri as a result of their experiences in Māori-medium education and their related exposure to new subject and curriculum development (Trinick, 2015; Trinick & May, 2013).

More broadly, Albury and Carter’s (**2018**) work explores how today’s Māori youth feel about ideologies of linguistic purism in relation to te reo Māori. Drawing on a cohort of students from Otago University, they firstly analysed youth attitudes to different strategies for coining new words, and then to the recurring purist discourse—produced by Māori kaumātua (elders and leaders) and in other Indigenous contexts more broadly (for example, that the Indigenous language is best spoken only at an advanced proficiency without errors or interference). While the students in the study did not appear to have a strong preference for purist or non-purist

approaches to developing Māori vocabulary, for language use the data suggest that Māori youth may sooner favour compromise (Dorian, 1994) or realistic hybridity (Zuckermann & Walsh, 2011) rather than linguistic purism. From this, Albury and Carter concluded that the rangatahi in their study seemed much less purist in their use of te reo Māori. This stands in sharp contrast to the ideology that shuns the switches and errors that arise through incipient bilingualism, which still underpins current New Zealand policy approaches to developing Māori language competence. This is because linguistic purism may be of political interest to a collective (older and younger fluent speakers) but creates unrealistic expectations and anxiety amongst youth who seek linguistic emancipation from these strictures and expectations (see also Birnie, 2018, in relation to comparable attitudes among adult Māori language learners).

Target audience

De Bres (2008a) noted that a number of researchers (for example, Boyce 2005) claim that attitudes play an important role in language maintenance and regeneration and it is not just the attitudes of the minority language community themselves that count, but also those of the wider community of which they are a part. Essentially, the argument is that majority language group attitudes to a language can unconsciously influence minority language groups to internalise negative attitudes about their language, with a flow-on effect for their language choices (Chrisp, 2005; **Hardman, 2018**). The psychological effects of past institutional and interpersonal repression of an Indigenous or minority language (or minority language group) can thus continue to inhibit minority language use even when overt repression has ceased and language regeneration efforts are under way (De Bres, 2008a).

In addition to the ongoing historical effects, the attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers often act as a direct impediment to language revitalisation initiatives in the present. May (2000) noted as a general feature of minority language policy development that “no matter how cautiously and temperately promoted and implemented, such policies will invariably invoke opposition, particularly [...] from majority language speakers” (p. 123). For example, when kōhanga reo and Māori-medium schooling emerged in the 1980s in response to the parlous state of the language, the compulsory state education sector remained ambivalent towards, or actively resisted, Māori community language aspirations (McMurchy-Pilkington & Trinick, 2008). May (2000) terms such opposition from majority language speakers towards minority languages *the problem of tolerability*. He goes on to argue that the long-term success of minority language initiatives may only be achievable if some degree of favourable opinion, or tolerability of these initiatives is secured among majority language speakers. “Once the problem of tolerability has been recognised in a minority language situation, however, how can language planners address it?” (p. 113).

As De Bres (2008a) outlined, a focus on tolerability raises a number of key additional questions: where does planning for tolerability fit into current models of language planning? What *desired behaviours* are appropriate for majority language speakers? What other policy techniques and approaches might be appropriate to achieve tolerability-related goals? These questions are at the heart of current debates about the direction of Māori language policy—in particular, whether Māori language policy should continue to focus on Māori and/or whether it should broaden its scope to include both Māori and non-Māori?

A number of key recent contributions have argued that te reo Māori needs to become a language for all New Zealanders in order for it to thrive, and research has found that non-Māori involvement could have a positive impact on these revitalisation initiatives (Albury, 2016, 2017, 2018; Albury & Carter, 2018; De Bres, 2008a; 2011; Hardman, 2018; **Hepi, 2008**; Higgins & Rewi, 2014; **Ngaha, 2011**). For this to occur, however, there would need to be a multi-pronged approach. On the one hand, normalisation of te reo Māori as a spoken language, a language of choice, would need to already be occurring in the wider New Zealand society (Higgins & Rewi, 2014; **Olsen-Reeder, 2017**). On the other, the perceived value of te reo Māori needs to continue to be targeted and enhanced among both Māori and the wider New Zealand population (**Hunia et al., 2018**; Hutchings et al., 2017; **Olsen-Reeder et al., 2017**; Penetito, 2010; Poutū, 2015). Achieving wider tolerability for te reo Māori as a language for all New Zealanders would also help to address ongoing opposition to the language from a small, but vocal group, of commentators in the New Zealand context (Barrett-Walker et al., 2019).

This remains an important issue because of the general agreement in the LPP literature about the impact of the often-negative attitudes of majority language speakers on minority languages. Theoretical perspectives on whether majority language speakers should be a target of language revitalisation efforts, however, continue to differ. De Bres (2008a) noted that there is a wide divergence of views on this matter, ranging from those strongly opposed to those strongly in favour. Fishman (2001), for example, is overtly sceptical about focusing LPP on majority language speakers in language revitalisation efforts. Fishman (2001) argued that reversing language shift (RLS) cannot be based on the acts of charity of others and questions the usefulness of focusing on attitudes, given the difficulties of establishing a strong link between language attitudes and language use, and devising concrete measures to change attitudes.

From a Māori language perspective, Ngaha's (2011) research participants believed that if te reo Māori becomes a language for all New Zealanders, the potential cultural losses will be significant. Ngaha (2011) discussed the way that the adoption of a language-and-territory ideology (with all New Zealanders being encouraged to learn and use te reo Māori as a national language) would negate a language-and-identity ideology (the link between Māori language, tikanga and identity). A potential loss could lie in the attrition of culture, as te reo Māori becomes a language for all, instead of "te arero tūpuna" (the ancestors' tongue). As she concluded, "[s]haring the valuable language resources with non-Māori who may not have commitment to the respectful use of te reo and tikanga Māori, because they have no associations with Māori community, is [thus] not seen as a priority" (p. 253).

However, by the same token, the potential cultural gains of acquiring te reo Māori could be even more significant. Becoming fluent speakers of te reo will not in itself make people Māori (since Māori ethnicity is defined by descent, not by language use, as in the case of Basque, for example). However, the values transmitted through te reo may well have a transformative effect on wider New Zealand society; widespread knowledge of te reo Māori across communities would strengthen and, hopefully, entrench the language, alongside English, as a national

language of Aotearoa, while, for immigrants, learning te reo would be part of the process of becoming New Zealanders (Richard Benton, personal communication, 20 Jan, 2020).

Benton's observation highlights another key issue highlighted in the LPP literature – who manages the language revitalisation initiatives? In Albury's (2016, 2017, **2018**) studies on folk linguistic (everyday) attitudes to te reo Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand, the majority of his non-Māori research participants did not support the growing argument that te reo Māori and its revitalisation should be managed in large measure by Māori. Albury (2018) found, for example, that the majority of the youth he surveyed, "envisaged interethnic custodianship of the language whereby Māori and non-Māori alike participate in language acquisition" (p. 77). The rangatahi in his study requested Māori language education for all, and identified classrooms as the main base responsible for language acquisition. They also raised questions concerning the issue of degrees of proficiency in te reo Māori. Is it satisfactory for every New Zealand citizen to be able to speak a couple of words in te reo Māori? Or should the threshold be set higher (e.g., including te reo Māori as a core/compulsory school subject)?

From the opposite direction, Moon (2018) argued that accepting inaccurate pronunciation will be the only way to "save" te reo Māori. While the spiritual and cultural importance of te reo Māori was acknowledged by Moon (2016) in an earlier work, the evolution of his argument illustrates the potential threat of the misuse or misappropriation of te reo Māori by others. Moon's (2018) argument is that pronunciation of te reo Māori is not important and that people should just be encouraged to speak te reo Māori in whatever way they are able. However, phonological knowledge is one of the foundational bases of a language (and language learning). What would the impacts be if the New Zealand Standard English pronunciation of te reo Māori, for example, was deemed to be acceptable? What would be the losses?

More broadly, researchers such as De Bres (2008a, 2008b) and May (2000, 2001, 2012a) argue that the impact of majority language speakers on the minority is so influential that, despite the obvious risks of appropriation involved, they question leaving majority language speakers entirely out of any initiatives. De Bres (2008a, 2008b) argued that LPP should focus on attitudes, because attitudes have had a significant impact on the use of endangered languages in the past and have probably been an important factor in their decline. If attitudes are an important factor in language use, it follows that they must also play a role in revitalisation (De Bres, 2008a, p. 25). As already discussed, May (2000, 2001, 2012a) also placed great emphasis on improving the tolerability of minority language policy initiatives among majority language speakers. May (2000, a, p. 101) argued that what is needed for the long-term health of a minority language is for it to be both formally recognised by the state (*legitimated*) and supported within civil society (*institutionalised*). Both lead, crucially, to the wider normalisation of an Indigenous or minority language over time—a key factor in addressing/remediating ongoing language shift and loss.

That said, the institutionalisation of an Indigenous or minority language is not easily achieved. Thus, while te reo Māori has been legitimated as an official language of Aotearoa New Zealand since 1987, its normalisation in the wider society to date remains limited. Te reo Māori has

been successfully (re-)established as a language of education, since the development of Māori-medium schooling in the 1980s, but this still only reaches approximately 10% of the Māori school population. The advent of Māori television in 2004 has expanded the visibility and use of te reo Māori in the media but, again, this reaches only a small percentage of the wider population. Likewise, the promotion of Māori language week has increased in visibility, reach and influence over the years, but only constitutes a very limited time focused solely on te reo Māori (De Bres, 2011, 2015). Meanwhile, there is a growing concern, and related debate, about what to focus on next in Māori language policy along with the related need to guard against spreading resources too thinly (Chrisp, 2005).

Neither De Bres (2008a, 2008b) nor May (2012a) suggested that majority language speakers should be the primary focus of LPP but, rather, it is important to focus some attention on them from an early stage. De Bres (2011) argued that it is important for Te Taura Whiri and Te Puni Kōkiri to support, in their official policies, the targeting of non-Māori in language regeneration initiatives. However, clarification is needed over the desired behaviours of non-Māori in relation to language planning. As De Bres (2011) concluded, “[f]urther evaluative research is required to link language promotion campaigns to longer-term changes in the attitudes and behaviours of non-Māori New Zealanders” (p. 374). This could potentially support the Pākehā involved in Hepi’s (2008) research, who had made a commitment to te reo Māori and found themselves as a result, “between two worlds, and felt they now did not fit totally into one world or the other” (p. 142; see also Birnie, 2018).

Higgins and Rewi (2014) similarly argued for the wider normalisation of te reo Māori. They proposed an expansion in domains of use and the acknowledgement of the importance of intergenerational transmission, without limiting all of the language regeneration efforts to the whānau/family domain. They also argued the need to de-prioritise te reo Māori as a taonga under Article 2 of Te Tiriti. Te reo Māori needs to become “a means for us to communicate across the whole nation and not just on our marae” (p. 31). Part of the answer to this difficulty is simply the limited reflection of te reo in the ‘linguistic landscape’ (Landry & Bourhis, 1997; Gorter, 2013). Furthermore, although government agencies are enjoined to make their services available through te reo, there is no legal obligation for them to do so: s 9 [2] of the Māori Language Act 2016 explicitly denies clients “any legal right that is enforceable in a court of law” (Richard Benton, personal communication, 20 Jan, 2020).

There are a limited number of examples in the international LPP literature of practical language policy measures that could be used to promote the tolerability of minority and/or Indigenous languages. Grin (1995) proposed a model for public services provision in which services are provided in a minority language according to the population in that region, but tolerability is achieved by guaranteeing those from the language majority will always get service in the majority language. Grin and Vaillancourt (1998) recommended language promotion programmes in New Zealand to promote the *normalcy* of te reo Māori. May (2000) suggested a compromise regarding bilingual language requirements at workplaces, whereby a dual responsibility is placed on employer and employee for the employee learning a minority language. May (2000) also suggested following the “policy of quiet coercion” (p. 124) apparent

from the Welsh Language Act Guidelines, and thus taking a “gradual and graduated approach” (p. 124) to minority language policy so as not to antagonise majority opinion. More recent developments in the Welsh context, however, highlight how the institutionalisation of Welsh has been further strengthened—particularly, in the work environment—via the work of the Welsh Language Commissioner (**Mac-Giolla Chríost, 2016**).

Trends in existing language domains

This brings us to the debate in the LPP literature about which language domain or domains should be the focus of LPP. Ó Laoire and Harris (2006) contended that the school has become one of the most critical sites for reversing language shift and for language revitalisation in endangered language contexts—this is certainly the case in Aotearoa New Zealand. Ferguson (2006) also argued that the school is perhaps the most crucial language domain, adding that the school often bears the entire burden of language planning implementation. One of the reasons for this is that education is most often controlled by the state, and thus can be readily used as an agency of state language planning. Second, education is the site where the socio-political and ideological values of the language community are transmitted and reflected—the very values that may support language revival. Schools can, therefore, become agents of positive language change, raising language loss or language use issues with students and the language community, thereby influencing the linguistic beliefs and practices of the language community (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). However, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, 2003) highlighted a range of issues associated with the discontinuities that result from stand-alone language-in-education planning, including slow dissemination, lack of resources and limited audience.

These tensions over the role and limits of schooling are clearly evident in the current Māori LPP context. For example, the schooling domain was an early primary focus of Te Taura Whiri, particularly in relation to the considerable corpus planning work which occurred during the 1980s–1990s. However, in more recent years, we have seen a shift away from the potential over-reliance on education in discussions of Māori language policy to iwi (tribal) and whānau (family) initiatives (**O’Regan, 2018**; Te Paepae Motuhake, 2011). This is exemplified most clearly in the establishment of the statutory body, Te Mātāwai (see tematawai.maori.nz) responsible for the implementation of the latest iteration of Māori policy, developed by and for iwi, Māori and Māori language communities.

Part of this shift has been predicated on a growing acknowledgement of the limits of relying on education alone as the basis for language revitalisation, as discussed earlier. Wai 262 (Waitangi Tribunal 2011), for example, highlighted this concern, arguing for a broader approach to Māori language policy that infused “the core motivating principles of mātauranga Māori [Māori approaches to knowledge]...into all aspects of our national life” (p. 715). Harlow and Barbour (**2013**) argued for even wider domain use and institutional support. This is supported by Higgins and Rewi (2014) who advocated for an expansion of te reo Māori language use into all language domains.

A related emphasis in more recent Māori language policy discussions has been on intergenerational family transmission, particularly in relation to Fishman’s (2001) seminal work on this key aspect of language revitalisation. This is evidenced, for example, in Te Puni

Kōkiri’s commissioned research (Chrisp, 2005) and in *Te Reo Mauriora* (Te Paepae Motuhake, 2011), which both proposed that intergenerational family transmission and a wider public policy infrastructure in support of te reo Māori be the two central priorities in Māori language policy over the next 20 years (Ruckstuhl, 2018). What a (re-)emphasis on intergenerational family language transmission runs the risk of, though, is the underplaying of the importance of a *public* role, and related wider normalisation, in the maintenance of te reo Māori over time. This is important because, returning to our earlier discussion of the difficulties involved in establishing stable diglossic contexts, if an Indigenous language remains primarily a local language, spoken in informal language domains (such as the family and/or the community), the wider linguistic *hierarchies of prestige* (Liddicoat, 2013) underpinning the dominance of English in New Zealand society remain uncontested (De Bres, 2015).

What is needed, then, is clearly both an ongoing focus on formal language domains, such as education and the media (see later), *alongside* an emphasis on intergenerational family transmission. This combination is critical, given that the greatest challenge to increasing the number of Māori speakers of te reo is simply the difficulty in engaging them; this applies to Māori in all levels of society. As Hardman (2018) notes, “the majority of Māori are not really that interested in investing the time required to learn the language to the degree of proficiency needed to sustain household interactions in Māori” (p. 69). Te Taura Whiri and Te Mātāwai could potentially have important and complementary roles here: Te Taura Whiri promoting the use and acquisition of the more standardised form of Māori for the country as a whole, and supporting efforts to achieve this, while Te Mātāwai working at the community level facilitating the efforts of iwi and local Māori groups to propagate and revitalize their local variants of the language (Richard Benton, personal communication, 20 Jan, 2020).

Standardisation versus dialect

Another key area of ongoing debate in the New Zealand context relates to the tension between standardisation—important for language learning—and the maintenance of dialectal variation. In the international LPP literature, standardisation is seen as a key to ensuring intertranslatability between standard languages (Liddicoat, 2005). However, this emphasis conflicts with the language goals of the various Māori iwi who are, to this day, trying to revitalise their local dialects (Harlow & Barbour, 2013; Hutchings et al., 2017). The recent advent of the iwi-focused Te Mātāwai programme is likely to see increased focus on dialectal variation going forward, which has implications for language learning and curriculum development in Māori-medium school contexts (Trinick & May, 2013).

Response to new domains and media

Like the home and education, the media are often perceived as having “an important role to play in Indigenous language revitalisation” (Matamua, 2006, p. 140). Despite this perception however, Cormack (2007a, 2007b) noted that the link between language revitalisation and minority language media has not yet been adequately proven. However, Cormack (2007b) further argued that, despite this criticism, one of the significant appeals of Indigenous language media is its ability to create a community of language users. By reaching whānau in the home, the media have the potential to encourage language use and intergenerational language

transmission (Timms, 2013). Bell (2010) similarly argued that the media is useful for educational purposes in the Indigenous language, particularly so when there is a dearth of print resource available in the language. Bell (2010) also notes that the media influence the status of the language by normalising the language in modern contexts (see previous discussions). Cormack (2007a) likewise argued that Indigenous language media promotes language prestige or status through employment linked to media production. Indigenous media can also usefully provide a language corpus, including recordings of the language from older speakers on different topics and use of different dialects. We see this, for example, in the archival television series produced by Māori TV and Television NZ.

The use of technology for Indigenous language development is also a key area of emerging LPP. This began with the development of audiotapes and video that later evolved into language learning software, language websites, and online language dictionaries (Hinton & Hale, 2001; Keegan & Sciascia, 2018). Recent developments have included virtual language worlds and language applications for smartphones and tablets—e.g., those used in the Yup'ik bilingual programme and with respect to the revitalisation of the Mohawk language (Begay, 2013). Similar applications have recently been developed for te reo Māori including the use of online dictionaries and language learning applications, such as Save Lingo (Mirza, 2017), as well as Kupu, Reobots, and Drops (see [idealogue.co.nz/tech/2019/09/apps-helping-revive-te-reo-maori](https://www.idealogue.co.nz/tech/2019/09/apps-helping-revive-te-reo-maori)). Te reo Māori is also becoming available on the widely used language learning application, Duolingo, by the end of 2020, which will facilitate wider accessibility to and engagement with te reo Māori (See: <https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/education/118810398/duolingo-app-to-add-te-reo-mori-course-for-beginners>).

Within the past decade, the number of websites dealing with Indigenous languages has expanded significantly to include sites on vocabulary and phrases, narratives and traditional stories told in the language by traditional elders, reference materials such as dictionaries and grammars, and sites dedicated to teaching materials such as lessons and games (Begay, 2013). Researchers and curriculum developers have also turned to the world of gaming to stimulate language learning for its ability to allow people to play, interact and learn simultaneously while also “enjoying the freedom to fail with low risks, to experiment, to create digital identities, exert varying degrees of effort, and interpret content in their own way” (Blake, 2011, p. 28).

Various opinions about the utility of technology within Indigenous communities range from the belief that technology is a significant contributor to language revival to technology being unnecessary and costly (Bennett, 2003). For example, a practical advantage to mobile technology is that it is readily available and a tool many of the younger generation are in tune with. One of the disadvantages of technology, however, is the cost, along with access issues, especially in rural areas (Galla, 2009). There is still insufficient research into the effectiveness of smartphones and mobile applications for language learning but with the ever-increasing development of language apps for smartphones, more assessment on the effectiveness of this device will become available. However, there is a view that if Indigenous communities do not meet the challenges of modernity with their language, their languages will be perceived as increasingly irrelevant and stigmatised, especially among youth (Trinick, 2015).

Levels of agency—Language champions

Haarmann (1990) suggested that there are different levels of agency in language planning—for example, the government, various agencies, pressure groups, and individuals. As Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008) have more recently pointed out, it is often these local contextual agents that have most affected macro-level language plans and the outcomes that they have achieved. They also suggested that, at the most micro-level of language planning, work is sometimes located with particular individuals who operate to revive or promote the use of the language. Spolsky's (2018b) amended approach to language planning suggests that there is an important place for language advocates in his proposed model of language management. Ruckstuhl's (2018) research into the Māori Language Act 2016 also identified the importance of language advocates—e.g., the work of Dame Kāterina Te Heikōkō Mataira in establishing kura kaupapa Māori and Te Ataarangi. Similarly, Selby (2016) highlighted the influence of Whatarangi Winiata as the driving force behind the Te Āti Awa, Ngāti Raukawa and Ngāti Toa Rangatira language plan, *Whakatupuranga Rua Mano, Generation 2000*, to revive te reo Māori use among these iwi. Hunia et al. (2018) explored more broadly the factors that enhance and support the wellbeing of te reo Māori in kura and schools, alongside language use in homes and communities. Their findings suggest that the consistent efforts of a few whānau and pouako, complemented by language communities with strong relationships both between and amongst whānau, kura and community, were key in enhancing the health and wellbeing of te reo Māori (language advocates were identified as being a significant factor in the well-being of the schools and kura they were exploring).

Thomas (2007), and more recently Flowers (2016), argue that there is a paucity of international academic research published with regard to language planning and policy in business organisations. However, there are a number of good reasons why corporate LPP plans should be investigated further. A number of LPP researchers have discussed the language needs of business and the workforce (Hagen 1988; Ingram, 1996; Lambert 1990; Phillipson 2001). Meanwhile, virtually all of the still scant literature on developing a corporate language policy framework has been conducted by human resource management scholars and published in business management journals (Thomas, 2007). A second reason to study language policy in corporations is that corporate LPP affects everyone, either directly or indirectly, who works in or will work in a corporation. A third reason to study corporate language policy is that the language needs of business have a direct effect on the language policy decisions of governments, both in the area of social justice and in educational policy (Thomas, 2007).

International research that has been conducted thus far in this area has focused primarily on multinational corporations located in foreign countries (local or parent company language – see Angouri, 2013), in multilingual contexts, or use of English as an international language of business. The impact of developing LPP for indigenous languages in business and corporations has not yet been substantively explored, although the promotion of Irish and Welsh provide useful examples of the comparable development of national minority languages (see Evas et al., 2013; Walsh, 2011).

In the New Zealand context, research into LPP in business organisations is similarly scarce. Te Taura Whiri have commissioned two reports (see Lee-Morgan et al., 2019 and Haar et al.,

2019). Haar et al. (2019) note that little is known about the organisational use of Māori language and culture in New Zealand businesses. Neither of the two studies considers the use of te reo Māori from explicitly LPP perspectives, although the Lee-Morgan et al., (2019, p. 27) report references a language planning model developed by Bernard Spolsky and Tipene Chrisp (cited in Hond, 2013, p. 129), which identifies five individual elements that are inherently connected and assist in language normalisation planning. The report also provides seven success indicators such as organisational mission, leadership, meaningful engagement, positive Māori language experiences, innovation and our national identity (Lee- Morgan et al., 2019, p.145). Haar et al. (2019) provide a few examples of how organisations can promote te reo Māori. For example, they note a useful starting point for promoting te reo Māori is providing specific, practical ways that small organisations can use Māori language in the workplace such as a campaign providing free online resources (e.g., a one-page downloadable Māori word sheet) (Haar et al., 2019, p. 47).

A number of local and international studies have focused on the economic approach to language and language planning. Local studies include that of Grin and Vaillancourt (1998) in their report to the New Zealand Treasury. As a result of the Government's concern with setting measurable and achievable outcomes for Māori language regeneration, the Treasury commissioned international language planners Grin and Vaillancourt to undertake an analysis of international language regeneration policies and consider their implications for the feasibility of Māori language regeneration in New Zealand. The paper (Grin & Vaillancourt, 1998) involved a number of different strands of recommendations (e.g. in broadcasting, education, bilingual signage) as well as international comparisons of initiatives implemented effectively overseas (in Wales, the Basque Country and Ireland). A more recent study has been conducted by Roskrige, Morrison and Maxwell (2017) in their report to Te Taura Whiri on the contribution of Māori language and culture to the New Zealand economy. As noted in other studies (see Lee-Morgan et al. 2019), they suggest that there is an inconsistent approach to policy responses and investment in te reo Māori. In their study, te reo Māori as a language is seen as a form of "human capital" or skills, knowledge and experiences possessed by an individual which can be used to support production or productivity (Roskrige et al. 2017).

A number of studies have been conducted into the role of language legislation in LPP. Ruckstuhl's (2018) case study of New Zealand's 2016 Māori Language Act, and how it was passed into legislation, focuses on the role of the language expert in influencing policy in favour of Indigenous language rights in democratic nations (see also May, 2018). Theories of public policy change, specifically the evidence-based policy approach, are used in the examination of the role of the language expert in this regard. Two independent review groups' reports are analysed, finding similarities and differences in Te Paepae Motuhake (2011) and the Waitangi Tribunal's (2011) recommendations on shifting the emphases in Māori language policy development. Her findings are argued to be important "if language experts wish to turn argument and evidence into action to advance minority and particularly Indigenous languages" (p. 316).

More recently LPP work has focused on the critical role of language planning agencies. Ricento (2000, p. 208) argued that "the key variable which separates the older technicist approaches

from the newer critical/postmodern ones is agency”. It is in this context that the scope and levels of language agencies have been much diversified in the literature, and that the language academy (LA) such as the work of Te Taura Whiri has become a focus. Spolsky (2006) concurred with Fishman (2006) that the academies generally act as the supporters or guardians of the purity, uniqueness and classicisation, opposing the real-world pressure toward folksiness/vernacularism, Westernization, panification and *einbau* (the tendency of strong languages to pull weaker ones toward them). Therefore, put simply, the mission of the LAs is to be “responsible for language cultivation and the maintenance of language purity” (Fishman, 2006, p. 90–91). Most language academies around the world tend to be quasi-governmental agencies, for example Te Taura Whiri. The conspicuous role of Te Taura Whiri lies in its soft power, influencing people's language choice through its prestige, which is bestowed by the *mana* its individual members as well as the institutional image as a whole. Internationally, LAs are valued for their effective role in supplementing program implementation via prestige building and the role models of their luminous members (Fishman, 2006).

What Factors have been Identified as Most Effective in Macro-language-planning Particularly in Relation to the Public Service and Wider Society?

As discussed in the preceding sections, macro-language-planning strategies remain a critical factor in the successful revitalisation of Indigenous languages over time in international contexts, and within Aotearoa New Zealand. Key macro-language-planning strategies include the following:

1. Status, corpus and acquisition planning all need to be attended to simultaneously in macro-LPP development as part of a comprehensive strategy in support of Indigenous languages (see Darquennes, 2010; McCarty & Coronel-Molina, 2017; Spolsky, 2018a, 2018b). Where one aspect of LPP is privileged over the others—as in the early corpus-development focus of Te Taura Whiri, for example—the longer-term consequences for other key aspects of LPP can be unhelpful.
2. Similarly, there is a need to establish a balance between top-down and bottom-up language revitalisation strategies—linking macro-, meso-, and micro-LPP strategies explicitly. In the New Zealand context, this is most evident in the current debates concerning the role of the school and the media (top-down) alongside iwi-focused intergenerational family transmission (bottom-up) initiatives. However, both are clearly needed if Māori language revitalisation strategies are to continue to be effective over time—particularly, in light of the ongoing threat to te reo Māori use.
3. Indigenous and minority language revitalisation also requires a dual focus on public and private language domains of use. The former normalises the language in the wider society, as well as directly contesting existing linguistic hierarchies of prestige that position Indigenous and minority languages as marginal, and of little value and use. The latter is a crucial aspect of intergenerational family transmission and community language use.

Again, both are required to address effectively, and remediate, ongoing language shift and loss. As noted, there is still a paucity of research literature that explicitly examines language use in business and corporations from LPP perspectives.

4. Key LPP tools, particularly language surveys, need to continue to inform all stages of LPP development and their relative effectiveness. As De Bres (2011) observed, “[a]ny language planning project should involve an evaluation of effectiveness in achieving its objectives, to assist in refining the approach and to feed into future planning” (p. 374). Language surveys need to be able to chart the differences between general and specific attitudes to Indigenous LPP (positive attitudes towards a language at a general level are easier to achieve than positive attitudes to specific language initiatives—e.g., making te reo Māori a compulsory/core part of New Zealand schooling). They also need to address both Indigenous and majority language constituencies, as well as every-day, and key stakeholder attitudes to the formulation and ongoing development of LPP priorities (Trinick, 2015). Finally, surveys are needed to track actual language use over time, in a range of domains (Altuna & Urla, 2013; **McCarty et al., 2018**).
5. Changing wider attitudes in support of Indigenous language revitalisation and language use requires a targeted information and dissemination strategy on, for example, the value of te reo Māori and bilingualism in English and te reo Māori in the New Zealand context (May, 2004; **Turnbull, 2018**). This is particularly important in achieving wider tolerability, particularly among majority language speakers, for Indigenous LPP developments.

Summary and recommendations for Aotearoa New Zealand

1. New Zealand does not, as yet, have a comprehensive language policy but with the increasingly diverse nature of the population, it is becoming more important to develop a policy strategy that has te reo Māori (and English) at its centre but which also addresses, where appropriate, other languages (e.g., Pasifika and Asian) in the New Zealand context (Hunia et al., 2018; May & Hill, 2018; **Peddie, 2005**; Waitangi Tribunal, 2011). Such a policy would start with te reo Māori me ngā tikanga, but should be a long-term vision, with a place for Pasifika language communities and other migrant language communities in Aotearoa New Zealand (May, 2004). Aotearoa New Zealand has been a predominantly English, monolingual society for too long. In all sectors, there should be more than tolerance for other languages, there should be use of a range of languages, and a movement towards bilingualism and, eventually, multilingualism.
2. The current whānau and iwi emphases in Māori language policy, exemplified by Te Mātāwai, must not lose sight of the ongoing importance of key public language domains, such as education, business and corporations (Lee-Morgan, 2019) and the media (as well as related uses of technology) in relation to successful Māori language revitalisation (Albury, 2016, 2017, 2018; De Bres, 2015; May & Hill, 2018). Te Taura Whiri can continue to provide an important complementary focus on these issues going forward.
3. The increasingly urban nature of New Zealand society (and the Māori population within it) needs to be taken into account in relation to Māori language revitalisation, maintenance, and contexts of use. Similarly, the growing percentage of young, urban Māori needs to be a key policy and stakeholder target for Māori language policy, particularly with respect to new technology and social media. As Higgins and Rewi (2014) argued, te reo Māori must become more than a language to be spoken at the marae. It must become a national language, heard and spoken in all language domains. This wider imperative should necessarily be extended to include non-Māori youth as well as te reo Māori language learners (see also 5.).
4. New and ongoing research must be conducted into LPP areas where there is currently an obvious gap in the literature. These include:
 - a. Regional variations or dialects of te reo Māori (What is the importance and significance of dialectal maintenance as opposed to teaching a standardised form of te reo Māori?)
 - b. Youth use of te reo Māori (How is the language being used? In which domains? When and why are choices being made to switch to conversing in te reo Māori? What strategies or tools could support youth in choosing to speak te reo Māori more frequently? How can technology and social media be leveraged to expand engagement with te reo Māori and related language learning and use)
 - c. How can the number of language learners of te reo Māori be increased across all demographic groups and what are the desired levels of language proficiency?

- d. What factors are the most effective in macro-language planning in relation to the public service and business?
5. What is the place of Pākehā and wider non-Māori groups in Aotearoa in Māori language revitalisation? How can different language constituencies be brought effectively on board, and act as language advocates/champions, for Māori language revitalisation? As Ngaha (2011) observes, for example: “I close now with this consideration for the children of this land, both Māori and non-Māori, who ... in time to come will not ask ‘Why do we have to learn Māori?’ But will instead ask ‘Why ever not?’” (p. 256).

REFERENCES

- Albury, N. J. (2016). An old problem with new directions: Māori language revitalisation and the policy ideas of youth. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 17(2), 161–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2016.1147117>
- Albury, N. J. (2017). The power of folk linguistic knowledge in language policy. *Language Policy*, 16(2), 209–228. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-016-9404-4>
- Albury, N. J. (2018). “If we lose their language we lose our history”: Knowledge and disposition in Māori language acquisition policy. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 17(2), 69–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1389281>
- Albury, N. J., & Carter, L. (2018). “An unrealistic expectation”: Māori youth on Indigenous language purism. *International Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 2018(254), 121–138. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2018-0036>
- *Altuna, O. & Urla, J. (2013). The Basque Street survey: Two decades of assessing language use in public spaces. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 224, 209–224.
- *Alexander, N., & Heugh, K. (1999). Language policy in the New South Africa. *Culturelink, Special Issue*, 9–33.
- Angouri, J. (2013). The multilingual reality of the multinational workplace: language policy and language use. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 34(6), 564–581. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.807273>
- Annamalai, E. (1979). Movement for linguistic purism: The case of Tamil. In E. Annamalai (Ed.), *Language movements in India* (pp. 35–59). Mysore, India: Central Institute of Indian Languages.
- Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2017). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (6th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Bakmand, B. (2000). National language planning, why (not)? *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 3. <https://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr3/bakmand.htm>
- Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2006). Rearticulating the case for micro language planning to a language ecology context. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7(2&3), 147–170.
- Barrett-Walker, T., Plank, M.J., Ka’ ai-Mahuta, R., Hikuroa, D., & James, A. (2019). “Kia kua te reo e rite ki te moa, ka ngaro: Do not let the language suffer the same fate as the moa”. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* 17. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2019.0526>
- Bauer, W. (2008). Is the health of Te Reo Māori improving? *Te Reo*, 51, 33–73.
- Begay, W. R. (2013). *Mobile apps and Indigenous language learning: New developments in the field of Indigenous language revitalization*. The University of Arizona. <http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/293746#>
- Bell, A. (2010). Advocating for a threatened language: The case for Māori on television in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Te Reo*, 3 (2010), 3–26.
- Bennett, R. (2003). *Saving a language with computers, tape recorders, and radio. Nurturing Native Languages*. Northern Arizona University.
- *Benton, R. (1979). *Who speaks Māori in New Zealand*. New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- *Benton, R. (1981). *The flight of the Amokura: Oceanic languages and formal education in*

- the Pacific*. New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- *Benton, R. (1984). Bilingual education and the survival of the Maori language. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 93(3), 247–266.
- *Benton, R. (1988). The Māori language in New Zealand education. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 1, 75–83.
- Benton, R. (2015). Perfecting the partnership: Revitalising the Māori language in New Zealand education and society 1987–2014. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(2), 99–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2015.1025001>
- *Birnie, J. (2018). *Exploring learner-centredness for adults learning te reo Māori: Easing the path to language acquisition* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Otago, Dunedin.
- *Blake, R. J. (2011). Current Trends in Online Language Learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(1), 19-35.
- *Blommaert, J. (1996). Language planning as a discourse on language and society: The linguistic ideology of a scholarly tradition. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 20(3), 199–222.
- **Boyce, M. (2005). Attitudes to Māori. In A. Bell, R. Harlow, & D. Starks (Eds.), *Languages of New Zealand* (pp. 86–110). Victoria University Press.
- *Brown, A., Cullinane, M., Reid, A., & Vernon, I. (1990). *New Zealanders' attitude to a bilingual society* (Research report prepared for the Māori Language Commission and Department of Māori Studies). Massey University.
- *Caron-Caldas, S. (2000). The influence of family, school, and community on bilingual preference: Results from a Louisiana/Québec case study. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 21, 365–381. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400003040>.
- *Chrisp, S. (2005). Māori intergenerational language transmission. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 172, 149–182. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2005.2005.172.149>
- *Clyne, M. (1997). *Undoing and redoing corpus planning*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- *Cobarrubias, J., & Fisherman, J. A. (Eds.). (1983). *Progress in language planning: International perspectives*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- *Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge University Press.
- *Cormack, M. (2007a). Introduction: Studying minority language media. In M. Cormack & N. Hourigan (Eds.), *Minority language media: Concepts, critiques and case studies* (pp. 1–16). Multilingual Matters.
- *Cormack, M. (2007b). The media and language maintenance. In M. Cormack, & N. Hourigan (Eds.), *Minority language media: Concepts, critiques and case studies* (pp. 52–68). Multilingual Matters.
- *Corson, D. (1995). Norway's "Sámi Language Act": Emancipatory implications for the world's Indigenous peoples. *Language in Society*, 24, 493–514.
- *Coulmas, F. (2005). *Sociolinguistics: The study of speakers' choices*. Cambridge University Press.
- *Crawford, J. (1994). Endangered Native American languages: What is to be done and why? *Journal of Navajo Education*, 11(3), 3–11.

- Darquennes, J. (2010). Language contact and language conflict in autochthonous language minority settings in the EU: A preliminary round-up of guiding principles and research desiderata. *Multilingua* 29(3-4), 337-351.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.2010.016>
- De Bres, J. (2008a). Planning for tolerability in New Zealand, Wales and Catalonia. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 9(4), 464-482.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200802354435>
- *De Bres, J. (2008b). Planning for tolerability: *Promoting positive attitudes and behaviours towards the Māori language among non-Māori New Zealanders* (Doctoral thesis).
<http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/handle/10063/687>
- De Bres, J. (2011). Promoting the Māori language to non-Māori: Evaluating the New Zealand government's approach. *Language Policy* 10, 361-376.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-011-9214-7>
- De Bres, J. (2015). The hierarchy of minority languages in New Zealand. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 36(7), 677-693.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1009465>
- *Dorian, N. C. (1994). *Purism vs. compromise in language revitalization and language revival*. *Language in Society*, 23(4), 479-494.
- ** Edwards, J. (2012). Language management agencies, in B. Spolsky (Ed.), *Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy* (pp.418-436). Cambridge University Press.
- * Evas, J., MacGiolla Christ, D., & Williams, C. H. (2013). *A Review of the Work of Mentrau Iath, Language Action Plans and the Aman Tawe Language Promotion Scheme*. Cardiff, Language, Policy and Planning Research Unit, School of Welsh, Cardiff University.
- *Ferguson, G. (2006). *Language planning and education*. Edinburgh University Press.
- *Fishman, J. (1968). Sociolinguistics and the language problems of the developing countries. In J. Fishman, C. Ferguson, & J. Das Gupta (Eds.), *Language problems of developing nations* (pp. 3-16). John Wiley and Sons.
- Fishman, J. A. (2001). *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective*. Multilingual Matters.
- *Fishman, J. (2006). *Do not leave your language alone: The hidden status agendas within corpus planning in language policy*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- *Fishman, J., Gupta, J. D., Jernudd, B. H., & Rubin, J. (1971). Research outline for comparative studies of language planning. In J. Rubin & B. Jernudd (Eds.), *Can language be planned?* (pp. 293-305). University Press of Hawaii.
- Flowers, A. (2016.). *Global Writing For Public Relations: Connecting in English with stakeholders and publics worldwide*. New York and London: Routledge
- *Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and control*. Routledge & Keegan Paul.
- *Galla, C. (2009). Indigenous language revitalization and technology from traditional to contemporary domains. In J. A. Reyhner & L. Lockhard (Eds), *Indigenous language revitalization: Encouragement, guidance & lessons learned* (pp. 167-182). Northern Arizona University.

- *Gorter, D. (2013). Linguistic landscapes in a multilingual world. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 33, 190-212.
- *Grin, F. (1995). Combining immigrant and autochthonous language rights: A territorial approach to multilingualism. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & R. Phillipson (Eds.), *Linguistic human rights: Overcoming linguistic discrimination* (pp. 31–48). Mouton de Gruyter.
- *Grin, F., & Vaillancourt, F. (1998). *Language revitalisation policy: An analytical survey: Theoretical framework, policy experience and application to Te Reo Māori* (Report to the Treasury Working Paper 98/9). NZ Treasury.
<https://treasury.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2007-10/twp98-06.pdf>
- Roskruge, M., Morrison, S. & Maxwell (2017). *Measuring the value of the contribution of Māori language and culture to the New Zealand economy*. Prepared for Te Taura Whiri i te reo Māori. Hamilton, New Zealand, The University of Waikato.
- Haar, J., Ka'ai, T., Ravenswood, K., & Smith, T. (2019). *Ki te tahatū o te rangi: Normalising te reo Māori across non-traditional Māori language domains*. Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.
- *Haarmann, H. (1990). Language planning in the light of a general theory of language: A methodological framework. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 86, 103–126.
- *Hale, K. (1998). On endangered languages and the importance of linguistic diversity. In L. A. Grenoble & L. J. Whaley (Eds.), *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response* (pp. 192–216). Cambridge University Press.
- *Halliday, M. (1978). Sociolinguistic aspects of mathematics education. In M. K. Halliday (Ed.), *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning* (pp. 194–204). Edward Arnold.
- Hardman, A. (2018). *Literature review: Perceptions of the health of the Māori language*. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Harlow, R. (1993). A science and mathematics terminology for Māori. In E. McKinley & P. Waiti (Eds.), *SAMEpapers* (pp. 124–137). Hamilton: Centre for Science, Mathematics and Technology Education Research, University of Waikato.
- **Harlow, R. (2005). Māori: Introduction. In A. Bell, R. Harlow & D. Starks (Eds.), *Languages of New Zealand* (pp. 59–66). Victoria University Press.
- Harlow, R., & Barbour, J. (2013). Maori in the 21st century: Climate change for a minority language? In W. Vandebussche, E. H. Jahr, & P. Trudgill (Eds.). *Language ecology for the 21st century: Linguistic conflicts and social environments* (pp. 241–266). Novus Press.
- *Haugen, E. (1972). *The ecology of language*. California University Press.
- *Haugen, E. (1983). The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In J. Cobarrubias & J. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in language planning: International perspectives: Contributions to the sociology of language* (pp. 269–289). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hepi, M. (2008). *Pākehā identity and Māori language and culture: Bicultural identity and language in New Zealand*. VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.

- Higgins, R., & Rewi, P. (2014). ZePA—Right-shifting: Reorientation towards normalisation. In R. Higgins, P. Rewi, & V. Olsen-Reeder (Eds.), *The value of the Māori language—Te hua o te reo Māori* (pp. 7–32). Huia.
- *Hinton, L., & Hale, K. (2001). *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. Academic Press.
- Hinton, L., Huss, L., & Roche, G. (Eds.). (2018). *The Routledge handbook of language revitalization*. Taylor & Francis.
- *Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
- *Hornberger, N. (1994). Continua of biliteracy: Quechua literacy and empowerment in Peru. In L. Verhoeven (Ed.), *Functional literacy: Theoretical issues and educational implications* (pp. 237–256). John Benjamins.
- *Hornberger, N. (1996). Maintaining and revitalizing Indigenous languages in Latin America: State planning vs. grassroots initiatives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 2(3), 159–165.
- *Hornberger, N. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, 1(1), 27–51.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2008). Voice and biliteracy in Indigenous language revitalization: Contentious educational practices in Quechua, Guarani, and Maori contexts. In K. King, N. Schilling-Estes, L. Fogle, J. J. Lou, & B. Soukup (Eds.), *Sustaining linguistic diversity: Endangered and minority languages and language varieties* (pp. 95–112). Georgetown University Press.
- *Hornberger, N., & King, K. (1999). Authenticity and unification in Quechua language planning. In S. May (Ed.), *Indigenous community-based education* (pp. 160–180). Multilingual Matters.
- Hunia, M., Keane, B., Bright, N., Potter, H., Hammond, K., & Ainsley, R. (2018). *Tautokona te reo: The wellbeing of te reo Māori in kura and schools*. Te Wāhanga He Whānau Mātau He Whānau Ora NZCER.
- Hutchings, J., Higgins, R., Bright, N., Keane, B., Olsen-Reeder, V., Hunia, M., Morgan, E., Martin, J., Fong, S. H., Emery, W., Black, T., Edwards, H., Hammond, K., Te Aika, L-H., Wylie, C., Felgate, R., & Kearns, R. (2017). *Te ahu o te reo: Te reo Māori in homes and communities. Overview report: He tirohanga whānui*. New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- *Huss, L. (1999). *Reversing language shift in the far north: Linguistic revitalization in Northern Scandinavia and Finland*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- *Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- *Kaplan, R. B. (1989). Language planning vs planning language. In C. N. Candlin & T. F. McNamara (Eds.), *Language, learning and community* (pp. 193–203). NCELTR, Macquarie University.
- *Kaplan, R., & Baldauf, R. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory*. Multilingual Matters.
- *Kaplan, R., & Baldauf, R. (2003). *Language and language-in-education planning in the Pacific Basin*. Kluwer Academic.

- *Keegan, T. T., & Sciascia, A. (2018). Hangarau me te Māori: Māori and Technology. In M. Reilly, G. Leoni, L. Carter, S. Duncan, L. Paterson, M. T. Rātima, & P. Rewi (Eds.). *Te Kōparapara: An introduction to the Māori world* (pp. 359–371). Auckland University Press.
- * Landry, R. & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality, an empirical study. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 16(1), 23-49.
- *Landweer, M. (2016). Indicators of ethnolinguistic vitality review and score sheet. *GIALens*, 10(1), 1–14.
- Lee-Morgan, J., Muller, M., Seed-Pihama, J. & Skipper, H. (2019). Tukua ki te Ao: Progressing the normalisation of te reo Māori in organisations. Report to Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori
- *Légaré, A. (2002). Nunavut: The construction of a regional collective identity in the Canadian Arctic. *Wicazo Sa Review* 17(2), 65–89.
- *Lewis, H. G. (2007). *Current initiatives in furthering the development of Welsh-medium education and the linguistic aims of the Welsh Assembly Government*. An Chomhairle um Oideachas Gaeltachta agus Gaelscolaíocht
- *Liddicoat, A. (2005). Corpus planning: Syllabus and materials development. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 993–1012). Erlbaum.
- *Liddicoat, A. (2013). *Language-in-education policies: The discursive construction of intercultural relations*. Multilingual Matters.
- *Liddicoat, A., & Baldauf, R. (2008). *Language planning in local contexts*. Multilingual Matters.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2004). Language planning as applied linguistics. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 738–762). Blackwell.
- *López, L., & Sichra, E. (2008). Intercultural bilingual education among Indigenous peoples in South America. In J. Cummins & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Bilingual education: The Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd ed., vol. 5, pp. 295–309). Springer.
- *Luke, A., McHoul, A., & Mey, J. (1990). On the limits of language planning: Class, state and power. In R. Baldauf & A. Luke (Eds.), *Language planning and education in Australia and the South Pacific* (pp. 25–44). Multilingual Matters.
- Mac-Giolla Chríost, D. (2016). *The Welsh Language Commissioner in context: Roles, methods and relationships*. University of Wales Press.
- *Magga, O. (1996). Sámi past and present and the Sámi picture of the world. In E. Helander (Ed.), *Awakened voice: The return of Sámi knowledge* (pp. 74–80). Nordic Sámi Institute.
- *Matamua, R. (2006). *Te reo pāho: Māori radio and language revitalisation* (Doctoral thesis). Massey University, New Zealand.
https://mro.massey.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10179/1864/02_whole.pdf
- *May, S. (1999). *Indigenous community-based education*. Multilingual Matters.
- *May, S. (2000). Accommodating and resisting minority language policy: The case of Wales. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3, 101–128.
- *May, S. (2004). Accommodating multiculturalism and biculturalism in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Implications for language policy. In P. Spoonley, C. McPherson, & D.

- Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata, tangata. The changing ethnic contours of Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 247–264). Thomson/Dunmore Press.
- *May, S. (2005). Language rights: Moving the debate forward. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9(3), 319–347.
- *May, S. (2006). Language policy and minority rights. In T. Ricento (Ed.) *An introduction to language policy* (pp. 255–272). Blackwell.
- *May, S. (2012a). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language* (2nd ed). Routledge.
- *May, S. (2012b). Language rights: Promoting civic multilingualism. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 131–142). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203154427>
- May, S. (2012c). Educational approaches to minorities: Context, contest, and opportunities. In A. Yiakoumetti (Ed.), *Harnessing linguistic variation for better education* (pp. 11–44) Peter Lang.
- *May, S. (2014). Contesting public monolingualism and diglossia: Rethinking political theory and language policy for a multilingual world. *Language Policy*, 13(4), 371–393.
- *May, S. (2016). Language, imperialism and the modern nation-state system: Implications for language rights. In O. García & N. Flores (Eds.), *Oxford handbook on language and society* (pp. 35–53). Oxford University Press.
- May, S. (2018). Surveying language rights: Interdisciplinary perspectives. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03036758.2017.1421565>
- *May, S., & Aikman, S. (Eds.). (2003). Indigenous education: Addressing current issues and developments [Special Issue]. *Comparative Education*, 39(2). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3099875?seq=1>
- *May, S., & Hill, R. (2008). Māori-medium education: current issues and challenges. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Can schools save indigenous languages?* (pp. 66–98). Palgrave Macmillan.
- May, S., & Hill, R. (2018). Language revitalization in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In L. Hinton, L. Huss, & G. Roche (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of language revitalization* (pp. 309–319). Routledge.
- *McCarty, T. (2008). Schools as strategic tools for indigenous language revitalization: Lessons from Native America. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Can schools save indigenous languages?* (pp. 161–179). Palgrave Macmillan.
- *McCarty, T. (Ed.). (2011). *Ethnography in language policy*. Routledge.
- McCarty, T. L. (2013). *Language planning and policy in Native America: History, theory, praxis*. Multilingual Matters.
- McCarty, T. L., & Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2017). Language education planning and policy by and for indigenous peoples. In T. L. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Language policy and political issues in education* (3rd ed, pp. 155–170). Springer International.
- McCarty, T. L., Romero-Little, M. E., Warhol, L., & Zepeda, O. (2018). Critical ethnography and indigenous language survival: Some new directions in language policy research and praxis. In T. L. McCarty (Ed.), *Ethnography and language policy* (pp. 31–52). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203836064>

- *McMurchy-Pilkington, C., & Trinick, T. (2008). Potential & possibilities. In V. Carpenter, J. Jesson, P. Roberts, & M. Stephenson (Eds.), *Ngā kaupapa here: Connections and contradictions in education* (pp. 133–144). Cengage Learning.
- * Myhre, J. (2005). *The attitude of non-Māori second language learners of the Māori language towards Māori language use* (Unpublished Master's thesis), University of Otago.
- Mirza, A. B. (2017). *Design and implementation of social persuasive ubiquitous knowledge systems to revitalise endangered languages* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- *Moon, P. (2016). *Ka ngaro te reo: Māori language under siege in the nineteenth century*. Otago University Press.
- *Moon, P. (2018). *Killing te reo Māori*. Campus Press.
- *Nekvapil, J. (2006). From language planning to language management. *Sociolinguistica*, 20, 92–104.
- *Nekvapil, J. & Sherman, T. (2009, May). Pre-interaction management in multinational companies in Central Europe. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 10(2), 181–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200802399133>
- *Nettle, D., & Romaine, S. (2000). *Vanishing voices: The extinction of the world's languages*. Oxford University Press.
- *Neustupný, J. (1974). Basic types of treatment of language problems. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in language planning* (pp. 37–48). Mouton de Gruyter.
- *Neustupný, J. V. & Nekvapil, J. (2003, March). Language management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4(3&4), 181–366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200308668057>
- Ngaha, A. B. (2011). *Te reo, a language for Māori alone? An investigation into the relationship between the Māori language and Māori identity* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- *Ó Laoire, M. (2008). Indigenous language revitalisation and globalization. *Te Kaharoa*, 1, 203–216.
- *Ó Laoire, M., & Harris, J. (2006). *Language and literacy in Irish-medium primary schools: Review of literature*. National Council for Curriculum and Assessment. An Chomhairle Náisiúnta Cuaclaim agus Measúnachta.
- Olsen-Reeder, V. (2017). *Kia tomokia te kākahu o Te Reo Māori: He whakamahere i ngā kōwhiri reo a te reo rua Māori*. (Doctoral thesis). Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand. <http://hdl.handle.net/10063/6166>
- Olsen-Reeder, V., Higgins, R., & Hutchings, J. (2017). Language value as a tool for Māori language research. In V. Olsen-Reeder, R. Higgins, & J. Hutchings (Eds.), *Te ahu o te reo Māori: Reflecting on research to understand the well-being of te reo Māori* (pp. 37–76). Victoria University Press.
- **O'Regan, H. (2018). Kotahi mano kāika, kotahi mano wawata—A thousand homes, a thousand dreams: Permission to dream again. In L. Hinton, L. Huss, & G. Roche (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of language revitalization* (pp. 107–114). Routledge.

- **Peddie, R. (2005). Planning for the future? Languages policy in New Zealand. In A. Bell, R. Harlow, & D. Starks (Eds), *Languages of New Zealand* (pp. 30–55). Victoria University Press.
- Penetito, W. (2010). *What’s Māori about Māori education? The struggle for a meaningful context*. Victoria University Press.
- *Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Longman.
- *Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. Routledge.
- *Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Poutū, H. (2015). *Kia Tiori ngā Pīpī: Mā te aha e kōrero Māori ai ngā taitamariki ngā wharekura o Te Aho Matua? He tuhinga roa hei whakatutuki i ngā tikanga o Te Tohu Kairanga i Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa, Papaioea, Aotearoa*.
<http://hdl.handle.net/10179/7752>
- Rehg, K. L., & Campbell, L. (2018). *The Oxford handbook of endangered languages*. Oxford University Press.
- *Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 9–24). John Benjamins.
- *Ricento, T., & Hornberger, N. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 401–427.
- *Ridge, S. (1996). Language policy in a democratic South Africa. In M. Herriman & M. Burnaby (Eds.), *Language policy in English dominant countries* (pp. 15–34). Multilingual Matters.
- *Roto, J. (2018). *Sámi and Sápmi—Addressing the issues of indigenous people and natural resources in the northernmost parts of Europe*. https://www.nordregio.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Sami_ENG.pdf
- *Rubin, J., & Jernudd, B. (Eds.). (1971). *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations*. University of Hawaii Press.
- Ruckstuhl, K. (2018). Public policy and Indigenous language rights: Aotearoa New Zealand’s Māori Language Act 2016. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 19(3), 316–329.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2017.1391496>
- *Sanden, G. R. (2014). Language management x3: A theory, a sub-concept, and a business strategy. *Applied Linguistics* 37(4), 520-535.
- Selby, M. (2016). The road to reclamation—The story of Ōtaki. In D. Day, P. Rewi, & R. Higgins (Eds.), *The journeys of besieged languages* (pp. 79–93). Cambridge Scholars.
- *Semb, A. (2005). Sami self-determination in the making? *Nations and Nationalism* 11(4), 531–549.
- *Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education—Or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Lawrence Erlbaum.
- *Skutnabb-Kangas, S., & May, S. (2017). Linguistic human rights in education. In T. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Language policy and political issues in education. Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (3rd ed., pp. 125-141). Springer.
- *Spolsky, B. (1995). *Measured words: The development of objective language testing*. Oxford University Press.

- *Spolsky, B. (2003). Reassessing Māori regeneration. *Language in Society*, 32(4), 553–578.
- *Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy: Key topics in sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- *Spolsky, B. (2005). Māori lost and regained. In A. Bell, R. Harlow, & D. Starks (Eds.), *Languages of New Zealand* (pp. 67–85). Victoria University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (Ed.). (2012). *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, B. (2017a). Investigating language education policy. In K. King, Y-J. Lai, & S. May (Eds.), *Research methods in language and education, Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 1–12). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02329-8_3-2
- Spolsky, B. (2017b). Language policy in education: Practices, ideology, and management. In T. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Language policy and political issues in education: Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 1–14). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02320-5_1-2
- Spolsky, B. (2018a). A modified and enriched theory of language policy (and management). *Language Policy*, 18(2019), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-018-9489-z>
- Spolsky, B. (2018b). Language policy: From planning to management. In C. C. S., Kheng, & B. Spolsky, (Eds.). *Un(intended) language planning in a globalising world: Multiple levels of players at work* (pp. 301–309). De Gruyter Open. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110518269-017>
- *Tannenbaum, M., & Howie, P. (2002). The association between language maintenance and family relations: Chinese immigrant children in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 23(5), 408–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630208666477>
- *Te Paepae Motuhake. (2011). *Te Reo Mauriora: Te arotakenga o te rāngai reo Māori me te rautaki reo Māori*. https://www.tpk.govt.nz/_documents/te-reo-mauriora.pdf
- *Te Puni Kōkiri. (2001). *The use of Māori in the family*. Ministry of Māori Development.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. (2003). *Te rautaki reo Māori/Māori language strategy*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Māori Development.
- *Te Puni Kōkiri, (2008). *Te oranga o te reo Māori 2006: The health of the Māori language in 2006*. <https://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/a-matou-mohiotanga/language/the-health-of-the-maori-language-in-2006>
- *Te Puni Kōkiri. (2009a). *Ngā waiaro atu ki te reo Māori: Attitudes towards the Māori language*. <https://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/a-matou-mohiotanga/language/summary-sheet-of-the-2009-maori-language-attitudes>
- *Te Puni Kōkiri, (2010). *Summary sheet of the 2009 Māori language attitudes survey*. <https://www.tpk.govt.nz/mi/a-matou-mohiotanga/language/summarysheet-of-the-2009-maori-language-attitudes>
- Te Taura Whiri I te Reo Māori (2017). *Te Ahu o te Reo: Te reo Māori in homes and communities*. A report prepared for Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research working in partnership with Victoria University of Wellington. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Taura Whiri I te Reo Māori.
- Thomas, C. (2007). Language policy in multilingual organisations. *Working papers in Educational Linguistics*, 22(1), 81-104.

- *Timms, C. E. (2013). *Indigenous language revitalisation in Aotearoa New Zealand and Alba Scotland* (Doctoral thesis). University of Otago, Dunedin, NZ.
<https://ourarchive.otago.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10523/3851/TimmsCatrionaE2013PhD.pdf>
- *Todal, J. (1999). Minorities within a minority: Language and the school in the Sámi areas of Norway. In S. May (Ed.), *Indigenous community-based education* (pp. 124–136). Multilingual Matters.
- *Todal, J. (2003). The Sámi school system in Norway and international cooperation. *Comparative Education*, 39(2), 185–192.
- *Tollefson, J. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. Longman.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2016). Language planning in education. In T. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Language policy and political issues in education: Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 1–14). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02320-5_1-2
- *Trinick, T. (2013). Language policy and planning: Reviving Māori. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com>
- *Trinick, A. (2015). *Te reo tātai: The development of a mathematics register for Māori-medium schooling* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Trinick, T., & May, S. (2013). Developing a Māori language mathematics lexicon: Challenges for corpus and status planning in Indigenous contexts. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 13(4), 457–473.
- Turnbull, T. (2018). Bilingualism in New Zealand: A field of misconceptions. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 70–76.
- *Waitangi Tribunal. (1986). *Findings of the Waitangi Tribunal relating to Te Reo Māori and a claim lodged by Huirangi Waikerepuru and Nga Kaiwhakapumau i te Reo Incorporated Society (Wellington Board of Māori Language)*. Government Printer.
- *Waitangi Tribunal. (2011). *Ko Aotearoa tēnei: A report into claims concerning New Zealand law and policy affecting Māori culture and identity (WAI 262)*. <https://waitangitribunal.govt.nz/news/ko-aotearoa-tenei-report-on-the-wai-262-claim-released/>
- * Walsh, J. (2011), *Contests and Contexts: The Irish Language and Ireland's Socio-Economic Development*. Peter Lang.
- *Wilson, W., & Kamanā, K. (2011). Insights from indigenous language immersion in Hawai'i. In D. J. Tedick, D. Christian, & T. W. Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities* (pp. 36–57). Multilingual Matters.
- *Wolfsan, N., & Manes, J. (1985). *Language of inequality*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wright, S. (2004). *Language policy and language planning: From nationalism to globalisation*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- *Zuckermann, G., & Walsh, M. (2011). Stop, revive, survive: Lessons from the Hebrew revival applicable to the reclamation, maintenance and empowerment of Aboriginal languages and cultures. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 31(1), 111–127.