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The attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers have an important impact on minority languages, and it has been claimed 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? The literature has tended to concentrate on the theoretical arguments that need to be conveyed to majority language speakers in order to improve the tolerability of minority languages. In contrast, there has been little consideration of what practical language policy approaches can be used to ‘plan for tolerability’. An analysis of recent language regeneration policy in New Zealand, Wales and Catalonia reveals that planning for tolerability is in fact currently occurring in all of these language situations. This article examines the various approaches taken, focusing on five features of planning for tolerability: recognising the problem; defining the target audience; developing messages and desired behaviours; selecting policy techniques and evaluating success. Given this growing policy activity, the article concludes that planning for tolerability deserves more attention from researchers and policymakers than it has received to date.
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Introduction

It is often claimed that language attitudes play an important role in minority language maintenance and regeneration and that, further, it is not only the attitudes of the minority language community themselves that count, but also those of the wider community of which they are part (Boyce, 2005: 86). Despite this, majority language speakers are seldom considered a target of minority language planning. This article takes a closer look at the theory and practice of minority language planning that targets the attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers or ‘planning for tolerability’. The article considers the impact of majority language speakers on minority languages, whether or not majority language speakers should be a target of minority language planning and, if so, how language planners might go about planning for tolerability. The discussion focuses on selected indigenous languages (specifically, the Māori, Welsh and Catalan languages), but many of the arguments could also...
be applied to other minority languages, such as the minority languages of immigrant groups.

**Impact of Majority Language Speakers on Minority Languages**

In what specific ways do majority language speakers impact on minority languages? In the first instance, the attitudes and behaviours of a majority language speaking group often play a role in causing a language to become minoritised in the first place, through institutional measures such as banning the use of the language at schools or legislating in favour of the use of another language in government. Such measures are also usually accompanied by the direct expression of negative attitudes towards minority languages by majority language speakers in interactions with members of the minority language community (e.g. hostile reactions to the use of the minority language in public), which can have a direct impact on the use of the minority language.

More subtly, negative majority attitudes, as expressed either through ‘overt external pressure on individuals’ or through ‘the implicit pressure of societal norms’ (Chrisp, 2005: 157), can lead to members of a minority language community internalising negative attitudes about their language at a conscious or subconscious level, with a flow-on effect for their language choice. In a study of Mexican American parents in the USA, Evans (1996) found that the stronger the perceived majority group prejudice against the Spanish language when spoken by Mexican Americans, ‘the stronger was the tendency for their families to withhold Spanish, rearing English-speaking youngsters’ (p. 192). On the basis of her data, Evans observed that such perceived prejudice could have two distinct effects on the subjective ethnolinguistic vitality (Bourhis, Giles, & Rosenthal, 1981) of the minority language group: it could either depress subjective ethnolinguistic vitality, so that some parents might ‘absorb to a degree the prevailing negative stereotypes’ about Spanish among the majority language speaking group, or it could leave subjective ethnolinguistic vitality intact but lead parents to ‘seek compromises in order to cope with unfair but apparently immutable circumstances’, by, for example, not passing on Spanish to their children (1996: 197). As Evans (1996: 200) states, the major inference here is that subjective ethnolinguistic vitality ‘conflicts intensely with the degree of perceived prejudice in the larger society [and] that conflict has widespread and serious implications for language maintenance and language shift’.

The psychological effects of past institutional and interpersonal repression of a minority language (or minority language group) can continue to inhibit minority language use even when overt repression has ceased and language regeneration efforts are underway. Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer (1998: 63) observe in relation to the Alaskan Native American language Tlingit that the memory of being punished physically and psychologically for speaking the language at school has led to bitterness among parents about current regeneration initiatives, as evidenced in comments such as ‘they beat the language out of us in school, and now the schools want to teach it’ (p. 65). They explain that in such situations ‘the Native student is experiencing “mixed messages” about the value of learning Tlingit: on the one hand, it is being taught, and people are
saying that it is good to learn it; but on the other hand, the student is aware of the overwhelming anxiety and negative associations surrounding the language, whether spoken or unspoken’ (p. 67).

In addition to these ongoing effects rooted in the past, the attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers often act as a direct impediment to minority language regeneration initiatives in the present. May (2000a: 123) claims as a general feature of minority language policy development that ‘no matter how cautiously and temperately promoted and implemented, such policies will invariably invoke opposition, particularly...from majority language speakers’. May (2001: 270) notes a ‘remarkable congruence’ between the Welsh and Catalan language situations in this regard, with majority language speakers in both contexts: articulating a discourse of individual language rights as a means of opting out of bilingual policy requirements; expressing pejorative attitudes about minority languages more generally, particularly in relation to their ‘adequacy’ in and ‘relevance’ to the modern world; and claiming that bilingual requirements are themselves ‘racist’ and ‘illiberal’. This characterisation also describes the Māori language situation in New Zealand. May (2003: 335) terms such opposition from majority language speakers towards minority languages ‘the problem of tolerability’. Following Grin (1995), May generally uses this term to refer to majority language speaker opposition towards specific minority language policy initiatives (2002: 8) or towards minority language rights (2003: 335); I use it more broadly in this article to refer to the negative attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers towards minority languages more generally. This is because I view the problem of tolerability as encompassing not only majority language speaker opposition to minority language policy initiatives but also all the other distinct ways in which majority language speakers impact on minority language use, as discussed above.

**Evidence of the Problem of Tolerability**

Most research to date relevant to the problem of tolerability has been undertaken in the field of language attitudes research. This field has developed three main categories of methods for the study of language attitudes: direct, indirect and societal treatment methods (Garrett et al., 2003: 15–16). All of these can be used to investigate the problem of tolerability, but the most commonly used in this context are direct methods, which involve asking participants direct questions about their attitudes towards minority languages, usually in the form of questionnaires and/or interviews.

In New Zealand, such research has consistently shown that the attitudes of non-Māori New Zealanders towards the Māori language are considerably less positive than those within the Māori community (see Nicholson & Garland, 1991; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2002, 2003a, 2006). Research has also shown that while non-Māori New Zealanders express positive attitudes towards the Māori language in response to questions phrased at a general level, they express less positive attitudes in response to specific Māori language regeneration initiatives. For example, two-thirds of Nicholson and Garland’s (1991) overall sample agreed that the Māori language had a place in contemporary
New Zealand society, but only 20% of non-Māori were in favour or there being more Māori language programmes on television, compared with 72% of Māori. There is also some evidence of what might be termed ‘not in my backyard’ attitudes towards the Māori language among non-Māori New Zealanders. Te Punī Kōkiri (2002), for example, found that while 90% of non-Māori New Zealanders agreed that ‘it is a good thing that Māori people speak Māori on the marae and at home’, only 40% agreed that ‘it is a good thing that Māori people speak Māori in public places or at work’. Boyce (2005: 94) comments that ‘the wider community frequently expresses support for Māori in a “yes, but” manner’.

In Wales, there is evidence to show that support for Welsh language regeneration correlates with proficiency in Welsh. In his study of the linguistic situation in the Teifi Valley, Evas (2000) found that although 56.5% of Teifi Valley respondents overall were in favour of small companies receiving concessions in tax bills in order to offer services in Welsh, this positive response overall was made up of 73.6% of mother tongue speakers of Welsh, 38.9% of second language learners in favour and only 29.3% of non-speakers of Welsh. Through a survey of 494 teacher trainees in four teacher training institutions in Wales, May (2000a) identifies two competing discourses, one the ‘discourse of opportunity’, which focuses on Welsh language requirements providing people with the opportunity to become bilingual, and the other the ‘discourse of choice’, which focuses on individual choice as a means of opting out of Welsh language requirements. May notes that each discourse is predominantly associated with language ability, with Welsh speakers more likely to invoke the discourse of opportunity, and non-speakers of Welsh more likely to draw upon the discourse of choice. A 1996 attitude survey commissioned by the Welsh Language Board (NOP Social and Political, 1996) provides some evidence of more negative attitudes towards the Welsh language being held by non-Welsh people in particular, as opposed to non-speakers of Welsh more generally. For example, half of the respondents who thought of themselves as Welsh agreed with the statement ‘Welsh is relevant to modern life’ (including 83% of fluent Welsh speakers), compared with only 28% of those who considered themselves to be English or British. Furthermore, a market research report commissioned by the Welsh Language Board (2003) reported that the Welsh speakers in their focus groups identified the ‘negative attitudes of some non-Welsh speakers’ as one factor inhibiting their Welsh language use.

In Catalonia, going back a little further in time, empirical research on language attitudes and behaviour at the beginning of the 1980s revealed a divergence between the language attitudes of Castilian speaking ‘immigrants’ to Catalonia from other regions of Spain and the indigenous Catalans (Gardner, Puigdevall i Serralvo, & Williams, 2000: 343–344). The majority language speaking Castilians: did not want the Catalan language to be imposed on them and rejected its compulsory use; did not want to face discrimination on linguistic grounds; were unaware of the recent history of repression of the Catalan language and therefore considered the imbalance between the two languages to be normal. In contrast, the minority language speaking Catalans: wanted to be very respectful towards the immigrant population; switched easily from Catalan to Castilian as they did not want to be impolite;
wanted to forget the history of repression of Catalan language and therefore did not transmit it to the younger generations; used only Castilian in business and commerce because everybody could understand it; did not exercise their statutory language rights when dealing with public institutions; agreed that there should be an increase in the use of Catalan in public, but did nothing to help change the situation and did not want to cause any trouble, even if they were convinced that they were right.

**Majority Language Speakers as a Target Of Minority Language Planning**

There is general agreement on, and ample evidence of, the impact of the attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers on minority languages. Theoretical perspectives differ, however, on the question of whether majority language speakers should be a focus of attention in minority language regeneration planning. There is a wide divergence of views on this matter, ranging from those strongly in favour to those strongly opposed.

At the negative end of the scale, Fishman (1991, 2000) is skeptical about focusing on majority language speakers or ‘outsiders’ in language regeneration. His theory of reversing language shift (RLS) places the responsibility for most language regeneration action on those who advocate an ‘Xian-via-Xish’ identity (2000: 465):

> It requires an enterprising and committed Xian community for its stability and does not take any comfort in the possible assistance of Yians-via-Xish (Germans who have learned to speak Yiddish as a means of penance for the Holocaust or mainstream New Zealanders who have learned to speak Māori as an expression of sympathy for the Māori plight), who have a different community base and for whom pro-Xish efforts are normally situational, temporary, idiosyncratic and even reversible. RLS cannot be based on acts of charity by outsiders.

Fishman is also dubious about the usefulness of focusing on attitudes more generally in language regeneration, given his views concerning the weak link between language attitudes and language use, the difficulty of separating out the impact of attitudes as opposed to other factors on endangered language use, the fact that attitudes are hard to measure and that it is difficult to devise concrete measures to change attitudes (1991: 49, 2000: 464, 478–480). He is also opposed to the use of ‘atmosphere effects’ (such as use of the language in the media or government services, or any language regeneration initiatives that serve to create a more positive external ‘atmosphere’ for language regeneration without focusing directly on the primary goal of intergenerational language transmission) in situations where intergenerational language transmission has not been secured.

In contrast to Fishman, May (2000a, 2000b, 2001, 2002) places great emphasis on the importance of securing the tolerability of minority language policy initiatives among majority language speakers. May (2000a: 101) argues that what is needed for the long-term health of a minority language is for the language to be both formally recognised by the state (‘legitimated’) and
supported within civil society (‘institutionalised’) (see also Nelde, Strubell, & Williams, 1996: 11–12). This is where the problem of tolerability comes in, because majority language speaker opposition means that such institutionalisation of a minority language is not easily achieved. It is also a complicated matter because, as so often in language planning, there is more at stake than language alone. As May (2001: 195, 2000b: 381) emphasises, the promotion of minority language rights will always be contentious because it involves challenging existing power structures, so that greater recognition of minority language rights is closely tied up in greater recognition of the rights of minority groups more generally. The use of the term ‘tolerability’ is particularly useful here, as it captures the notion of inherent opposition involved in majority-minority language relationships (in a way that ‘tolerance’, for example, does not). Fishman’s RLS model has been criticised in this regard for not taking sufficient account of opposition to language regeneration amongst majority groups. Referring to the work of Glyn Williams (1999), Colin Williams (2000: 14) notes that:

Much of Fishman’s programmatic, evolutionary prescription for social change is inherently consensual and conservative… Fishman’s work does not take enough account of the power relations inherent in any language-related competitive context.

Despite the difficulties inherent in any such power struggle between minority and majority language groups (and to some extent because of these difficulties), addressing the problem of tolerability is arguably of vital importance for minority language regeneration. May (2000b: 379) goes as far as claiming that ‘the long-term success of [minority language policy] initiatives may only be achieved (or be achievable) if at least some degree of favourable majority opinion is secured’.

The problem of tolerability is a useful explanatory concept for analysing some aspects of the dynamics of minority and majority language relationships. It also provides a solid rationale for addressing the attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers as a target of minority language regeneration planning. This does not amount to claiming majority language speakers should be the primary focus of such planning. I agree with Fishman that language regeneration efforts should focus first and foremost with members of the minority language community who wish to regenerate their language. Given the ongoing impact of the attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers on the potential for minority language speakers to use and thereby regenerate their language, however, I argue (in contrast to Fishman) that focusing some attention on majority language speakers from an early stage in the process is important. It is certainly crucial to set priorities and guard against spreading scarce resources too thinly, but as Chrip (1998: 107) has commented in relation to the promotion of the Māori language in another ‘non-core domain’, the public sector:

We are often encouraged to see such activities as ‘either/or’ situations, that is Māori language promotion in the public sector is played off against Māori language promotion somewhere else […]. Such activities
can, in fact, be seen as ‘both/and’ situations, where the promotion of the Māori language in the public sector can complement and support the promotion of the language in the core domains, without distracting the key players in those domains.

I believe that multiple approaches are required for successful language regeneration, and that not least among these should be addressing the attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers towards minority languages.

Planning for Tolerability

Once the problem of tolerability has been recognised in a minority language situation, however, how do language planners go about addressing it? The literature to date has tended to concentrate on the theoretical arguments that need to be conveyed to majority language speakers to improve the tolerability of minority languages. The broad message strategies that have been proposed include: emphasising the general advantages of instituting minority language rights, on the basis of the economic and welfare benefits that will accrue not only to minority groups themselves but also to the wider nation-state of which they are part (Grin, 2005: 451, 457; May, 2005: 326–327); stressing moral obligations of justice on the basis of the historical disadvantages faced by minority groups and/or the rights of national minorities (May, 2001: 195); encouraging empathy, by highlighting that in a globalising world the maintenance of linguistic diversity should be of increasing concern to speakers of all languages (May 2001: 194); encouraging greater linguistic awareness among majority language speakers, e.g. sensitising majority language speakers to the idea that all languages have combined identity/instrumental dimensions (May, 2003: 113); emphasising that the recognition of minority language rights need not impinge on majority language rights (May, 2000b: 380) and pointing out key misconceptions and inconsistencies in arguments against the utility, or lack thereof, of minority languages (May, 2005: 335).

This theoretical focus in the literature is vital to establishing a rigorous foundation for the exercise of promoting the tolerability of minority languages and also provides useful arguments for counteracting majority language speaker opposition to minority language initiatives. As a practical strategy, however, it has its limits. Approaches that point out misconceptions and inconsistencies and stress moral obligations are potentially problematic if the aim is to promote tolerability. Such arguments, if baldly stated, seem more likely simply to irritate those majority language speakers who are already antagonistic to minority language rights and cause them to entrench their positions. As Grin (2005: 457) remarks, these arguments are likely to ‘[cut] no ice among those who are not already convinced of [these] claims’. Furthermore, some majority language speakers’ objections to minority language rights are clearly emotionally rather than rationally based. May (2005: 336) observes that the assertion of some majority language speakers that minority language initiatives amount to an infringement of their own linguistic rights ‘is not based on any perceived threat to the minority language, but rather upon the implicit, sometimes explicit, wish of majority language speakers to remain monolingual’.
The anti-minority language rights stance is also often overtly political, as May acknowledges elsewhere (2003: 115):

This bipolar construction of majority/minority languages [by opponents of minority language rights] is neither necessary nor warranted. It is also far from disinterested, although it is often presented as such. Rather, it is a specific sociopolitical ‘move’ in the contest over language rights – a move that aims to secure the linguistic status quo ante for majority language speakers, should the social and political dominance of their language ever appear to be threatened by the ‘intrusion’ of a minority language into the public realm.

Pointing out to majority language speakers that their claims are based on emotion and political power plays is not likely to make them change their mind about minority languages. The theoretical literature on tolerability thus provides only limited real-world guidance to policymakers and communities currently engaged in the day-to-day business of language regeneration planning. What practical language policy approaches can be used to improve the tolerability of a minority language among majority language speakers? How can we go about ‘planning for tolerability’?

In this article, I define planning for tolerability as any form of language planning that targets the attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers towards minority languages. Despite a relative lack of attention in the literature to practical methods, a close inspection of language policy in New Zealand, Catalonia and Wales reveals that planning for tolerability is in fact currently occurring to a greater or lesser extent in all of these situations. In the remainder of this article, I discuss the approaches taken to planning for tolerability in these three contexts, focusing on five features of planning for tolerability: recognising the problem; defining the target audience of majority language speakers; developing messages and ‘desired behaviours’; selecting policy techniques and evaluating success.

The discussion is based on an analysis in 2007 of language policy documents from each language situation over the past 10 years (both publicly available and provided on request), as well as contact with policymakers at the main language planning institutions in each context (via email in relation to Catalonia and via email and face-to-face meetings in relation to New Zealand and Wales). It is important to note that the focus here is exclusively on language planning by government organisations. Language planning can and does occur at all levels of society; the focus on government organisations alone in this article is due to reasons of scope and ease of access to comparative information across international contexts. The focus is also at the level of overarching strategic policy, rather than within particular sub-categories of language planning, e.g. acquisition or corpus planning.

Planning for Tolerability in New Zealand

The New Zealand government has recognised the importance of the attitudes and behaviours of non-Māori New Zealanders towards the Māori language since the beginning of the development of the first government-wide strategic
plan for the Māori language in the mid-1990s. Policy documents acknowledge the impact of such attitudes and behaviours in the past, making reference to institutional repression of the Māori language, assimilationist attitudes held within wider society, and the internalisation of these attitudes by Māori as some of the factors that led to the decline of the language (Te Puni Kökiri, 1999: 6, 2004: 14–15). Statements such as the following also recognise the continued impact of the attitudes of the majority population on language use among Māori (Te Puni Kökiri, 2003b: 27):

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

Notable here is the focus on the attitudes and behaviours of non-Māori New Zealanders in particular, rather than non-speakers of Māori more generally. This definition of majority language speakers as non-Māori New Zealanders makes practical sense in the New Zealand language situation, where Māori language is viewed as just one of a range of inter-ethnic issues relating to the ongoing negotiation of the relationship between Māori and non-Māori New Zealanders since European colonisation of New Zealand in the early nineteenth century. Language issues are inextricably linked to other inter-ethnic issues in New Zealand and, as we have seen, the main majority language speaker resistance to the Māori language comes from non-Māori New Zealanders.

In addition to recognising the problem of tolerability in theory, policymakers have undertaken practical policy initiatives aimed at improving the tolerability of the Māori language among non-Māori New Zealanders. The main focus in New Zealand has been language promotion campaigns. Promoting Māori as a living language and a natural means of communication was one of the core functions assigned to the Māori Language Commission at its creation in 1987. The target of this promotion was intended to be the Māori population primarily and, secondarily, the New Zealand population as a whole (Chrisp, 1997: 101). There have been a range of discrete Māori language promotion campaigns with a partial focus on non-Māori New Zealanders, including the annual ‘Te Wiki o te Reo Māori’ (‘Māori Language Week’) held in July each year, the ‘Into Te Reo’ (Into the Language’) campaign in 2000, and the ‘NZ Reo/NZ Pride’ campaign in 2003. Until recently, such promotional activities have been undertaken by the Māori Language Commission on an ad hoc sporadic basis, due to funding restrictions. Since 2004, however, the Commission has been provided with ongoing funding of NZ$ 1 million a year for a ‘Māori Language Information Programme’, with the dual intended outcome that ‘more Māori will use reo Māori and that all New Zealanders will value the Māori language’ (Māori Language Commission, 2004: 6). In recent years, language promotion materials with a full or partial focus on non-Māori New Zealanders produced as part of the above campaigns have included two television ads in 2000, a series of five ‘Kōrero Māori’ (‘speak Māori’) phrase booklets released annually during Māori Language Week since 2004 and a website
launched in 2005 that targets ‘everyone who wants to speak the Māori language, or learn more about it’ (www.koreromāori.govt.nz).

A distinctive feature of the New Zealand approach to planning for tolerability is the nature of the ‘desired behaviours’ policymakers propose for non-Māori New Zealanders in relation to the Māori language. When asked what non-Māori New Zealanders could do to support the Māori language in a 2003 survey, most Māori respondents said ‘have positive attitudes towards the language’ (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2003a). This focus on attitudes rather than language learning is also reflected in government policy documents, which, while emphasising that non-Māori New Zealanders should have the opportunity to learn Māori (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2003b: 7), also make statements such as the following (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2003c: 11):

If the majority of New Zealanders and New Zealand institutions have positive attitudes towards the Māori language, this will reinforce the status of the Māori language and encourage people to learn te reo Māori, and make greater use of their language skills. New Zealanders can express their support and goodwill towards the Māori language without necessarily having to learn or use Māori.

Exactly what behaviours non-Māori New Zealanders might engage in to support Māori language, aside from learning the language, is less clear from the policy documents or from meetings with Māori language policy officials (meeting with Te Puni Kōkiri, 19 December 2005). One can, however, discern a range of potential desired behaviours from the Māori language promotion materials released to date, including pronouncing Māori words correctly, knowing and using some basic Māori greetings, words and phrases, reacting positively to the use of Māori language, encouraging others in learning and using Māori, accepting the use of the language by public organisations, supporting Māori language regeneration initiatives, taking an interest in Māori language and culture and expressing support for the language.

Whether any of the New Zealand initiatives in planning for tolerability have been successful to date is not, as yet, clear. Three-yearly government surveys since 2000 (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2002, 2003a, 2006) suggest consistent improvement in the attitudes of non-Māori New Zealanders towards the Māori language, but as these are not linked to particular policy initiatives they do not allow for linking any changes in attitudes to policy initiatives related to planning for tolerability.

Planning for Tolerability in Wales

When one analyses the strategic policy materials released by the Welsh Assembly Government and the Welsh Language Board over the past 10 years, the first apparent difference from the New Zealand situation is that non-Welsh people in particular are not singled out for any special attention. Instead, where majority language speakers are referred to, it is non-speakers of Welsh. Welsh Language Board officials confirm this, acknowledging that the ethnic element of language policy is not something they either think about or have much research on (meeting with Welsh Language Board,
13 September 2007). This points to a fundamental difference between the Welsh and the New Zealand language situations, suggesting that in Wales tolerability may primarily be an intra-ethnic rather than an inter-ethnic issue. This situation likely stems from the fact that Welsh people are a majority group within Wales, unlike Māori in New Zealand.

Welsh policy documents explicitly recognise the influence of non-speakers of Welsh on Welsh language use in one specific sense: the increasing in-migration of non-speakers of Welsh to primarily Welsh speaking areas (see Welsh Assembly Government, 2003: 21). Campbell (2000: 24) describes the effect of such in-migration on Cwm Gwendraeth, a de-industrialised area in south west Wales with a high concentration of Welsh speakers:

Many rural villages in the outlying areas of the valley have experienced difficulties in maintaining Welsh-language networks as monoglot incomers create situations whereby the English language becomes the *lingua franca* of social discourse. In recent years, evidence has come to light of a growing social polarization between Welsh speakers and English incomers in certain areas, giving rise to tensions and hostilities.

Welsh policymakers have developed a range of initiatives to address this issue. One such initiative is the Moving to Wales project, which operates in partnership with real estate agents in North and South-West Wales. As part of this project people moving into Welsh-speaking communities are provided with ‘Welcome Packs’ which ‘[introduce] them to the linguistic heritage of the area and [provide] details of how to learn and respect the language’ (Welsh Assembly Government, 2003: 34). This approach is complemented by an associated website (www.movingtowales.com). Other relevant initiatives are the ‘Assimilating Newcomers project’ in the South-West area of Anglesey and related initiatives in the Llŷn Peninsula, the Tanat Valley, Penllyn and rural Conwy (Welsh Language Board, 2007: 32). These Welsh Language Board funded projects, while executed differently in each area, all involve local ‘community facilitators’ or ‘animateurs’, who directly contact non-Welsh speakers who have moved to the area and try to increase their awareness of the area’s linguistic and cultural character, with the hope that they will understand and appreciate these elements and perhaps go on to learn Welsh (Helen Thomas, Menter Iaith Môn, personal communication, February 15, 2007). It is clear that the desired behaviour for the majority language speakers who are the target of these initiatives, while focusing partly on attitudes, is mainly to learn Welsh.

Apart from this specific context, the policy documents do not reflect any official acknowledgement of the impact of the attitudes of non-speakers of Welsh in general on Welsh language use in other parts of Wales. Despite no acknowledgement of this issue at the strategic level, however, some policy initiatives do address the attitudes of non-speakers of Welsh more generally. One notable example is ‘language awareness and sensitivity training’, which is provided by organisations such as the nationwide network of mentrau iaith (community language organisations). The Menter Iaith Conwy provides such training both to non-speakers of Welsh, to increase their awareness of the Welsh language, and to speakers of Welsh, to arm them with the necessary
knowledge and strategies to respond constructively to negative attitudes expressed by non-speakers of Welsh (meeting with Meirion Davies, Menter Iaith Conwy, 20 September 2007). Both of these approaches can be seen as planning for tolerability. These initiatives appear to have developed locally, however, rather than on the basis of any national policy decision. This is reflected in the Welsh Language Board’s approach of developing a Language Awareness Strategy to attempt to improve quality and consistency across the diverse programmes currently underway (Welsh Language Board, 2006).

The Welsh Language Board is world-renowned for its focus on language marketing, and some of the Board’s recent marketing initiatives have had a partial focus on non-speakers of Welsh. The annual ‘Cymraeg yn gyntaf/ Welsh – Give it a go’ campaign, for example, has a secondary audience of non-speakers of Welsh, who are encouraged to ‘give Welsh a go’ during the week of the campaign, in addition to the primary focus on speakers of Welsh to ‘speak Welsh first’ in service interactions (meeting with Non Roberts, Menter Iaith Môn, 17 September 2007). Other marketing campaigns respond in part to the impact of non-speakers of Welsh on Welsh language use. For example, the ‘Twf’ (‘growth’) campaign, which promotes Welsh language transmission in the family, responds in part to research showing that families in which one parent does not speak Welsh are less likely to pass Welsh on to their children (meeting with Welsh Language Board, 13 September 2007). Similarly, the ‘Cymraeg: Kids Soak it Up’ campaign, featuring a cartoon sponge, attempts to calm the fears of non-Welsh speaking parents about their children’s participation in Welsh medium education (meeting with the Welsh Language Board, 13 September 2007), by promoting the message that ‘young children learn language easily ... they soak it up, as a sponge soaks up water’ (see www.cymraeg-kids-soak-it-up.com). There has been one national language attitudes campaign aimed entirely at non-speakers of Welsh more generally, namely the 2004 ‘Work, Play, Live ... Use Welsh’ campaign. The aim of this campaign was ‘to raise interest in the Welsh language and demonstrate that it can be used in all aspects of life’ (Welsh Assembly Government, 2004: 2), and the campaign included a series of posters on billboards and buses across Wales, television advertisements and a website. Although the monolingual nature of the campaign suggested that a non-Welsh speaking audience was envisaged, the Welsh Language Board now acknowledges that the ‘call to action’ for this campaign was perhaps unclear, as non-Welsh speakers wondered how they could ‘work, play and live’ using Welsh if they could not speak the language (Jeremy Evas, Welsh Language Board, personal communication, November 28, 2007). It is fair to say that such campaigns targeting majority language speakers represent the exception in Wales and that, in general, the Board has tended to focus on the attitudes and behaviours of existing speakers of Welsh, to encourage them to make use of their Welsh language skills, rather than targeting the attitudes and behaviours of non-speakers of Welsh (meeting with the Welsh Language Board, 13 September 2007).

Some of the tolerability-relevant initiatives in Wales have been subject to evaluative exercises, e.g. the Twf campaign (Welsh Language Board, 2002) and Language and Awareness Training (ELWa, 2005).
Planning for Tolerability in Catalonia

In contrast to Wales, the impact of the attitudes and behaviours of majority language speakers on Catalan language use has been explicitly recognised since the beginning of large-scale language regeneration planning in the early 1980s, and majority language speakers (speakers of Castilian Spanish) have been a specific target of Catalan language planning since this point.

The language policies implemented by the Catalan government have evolved through three stages, broadly a first phase from 1980 until 1990, a second phase from the beginning of the 1990s until the end of the twentieth century (see Gardner et al., 2000: 343; Strubell, 1999: 24) and a third phase from 2000 onwards. These three phases can all be related to distinct problems of tolerability in Catalonia involving separate groups of majority language speakers. Although the periods are not entirely separable, broadly the first phase relates primarily to the in-migration of a large number of non-Catalans into Catalonia from across Spain in the 1970s, the second phase relates to the attitudes of majority language speakers across Spain towards Catalan language policy from the 1990s onward and the third phase relates to a new wave of immigration into Catalonia from outside Spain. In one sense, the new immigrants in the third phase cannot be seen as ‘majority language speakers’ given that most are not native speakers of Castilian but arrive in Catalonia with a range of first languages. As Gardner et al. (2000: 353) note, however, the underlying assumption here is that these immigrants will learn Castilian instead of Catalan. The Catalan situation is thus an interesting example of how the problem of tolerability can express itself in distinct (albeit related) ways within a single language situation, and how the umbrella category of ‘majority language speakers’ can be defined in different ways at different times. In all these phases in Catalonia, as in New Zealand, majority language speakers have been defined as people from outside the Catalan ethno-linguistic group.

Catalan language policymakers have used a range of approaches to planning for tolerability. A strong theme has been language promotion campaigns, starting with the ‘Norma’ campaign of 1982 in which a 10-year old cartoon girl encouraged Catalans to practice a ‘bilingual conversation’ (Gardner et al., 2000: 344), that is to speak in Catalan even if their interlocutors addressed them in Castilian, given that many Castilian speakers in Catalonia understood Catalan. Norma was accompanied by the slogan ‘el català ` e´s cosa de tots’, translated as ‘Catalan is everybody’s business’. A more recent promotional campaign relating to immigrants from outside Spain was the ‘Tu ets mestre’ (‘You are a teacher’) campaign in 2003, in which Catalans were encouraged to speak in Catalan to new immigrants to encourage the ‘linguistic integration’ of the latter into Catalan society (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2003). The ‘Dóna corda al català’ (‘Give Catalan a boost’) campaign since 2005 also has a partial focus on new immigrants, with one of the three main aims of the campaign stated as being ‘raising awareness among new arrivals so that they take the plunge into Catalan’ (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2006). These campaigns have used a range of media, including radio, television, posters and the Internet to transmit their messages about the Catalan language.
A range of further current policy initiatives relating to recent immigrants and the Catalan language serve a claimed dual aim of promoting the Catalan language and facilitating the integration of new immigrants. Since the year 2000, international immigration had become a key feature of Catalonia’s demographic dynamic, with around 90% of the total growth of the Catalan population during the period 2001–05 being the result of immigration from abroad (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2005a: 154–155). In 2005, the Catalan government approved a Citizenship and Immigration Plan for 2005–08, identifying 70 actions across 12 priority areas, one of which is ‘linguistic reception and social use of the Catalan language’ (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2005a: 163). The rationale given for the inclusion of Catalan language outcomes in the plan is that ‘when immigrants use the Catalan language as a vehicle for communication, it can greatly increase their level of integration’ (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2005a: 160). The document also acknowledges, however, that immigrants learning Catalan works in favour of the government’s Catalan language policy to ‘promote Catalan as the customary language of communication and citizenship in Catalonia’ (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2005a: 163). This appears to involve a strategic attempt to convert this ‘problem’ for the Catalan language into a strength. There is no suggestion in the document, for instance, of a need for immigrants to learn Castilian in order to integrate into Catalonia. Relevant current initiatives include the ‘Voluntaris per la llengua’ (‘Language Volunteers’) programme, a scheme whereby Catalans provide Catalan language tutoring to immigrants to Catalonia on a voluntary basis (Kolyva & Angelescu, 2004), and a range of resources produced by the Catalan government, including both ‘welcoming guides’ in various languages, with information on living in Catalonia in general and on the Catalan language, and language-specific guides, which compare Catalan with various other languages spoken by immigrants to Catalonia, including Arabic, Berber, Chinese, Punjabi and Ukrainian, among others 8.

In terms of addressing the issue of the attitudes of majority language speakers across Spain towards the Catalan language, one of the objectives of the Catalan government’s 2005–06 language policy Action Plan relates to the perceptions and treatment of the Spanish State towards the Catalan language (Generalitat de Catalunya, 2005b: 2). The objective is (my translation):

To participate actively in the political, institutional and civic effort to attempt to obtain an egalitarian treatment for the diverse languages of the Spanish state and to adapt the status of the Catalan language, in the setting of the European Union, to fit with its legal, demographic, political and cultural reality.

This responds to the challenge for Catalan policymakers that ‘the Spanish state is still a monolingual state and still has much latent animosity against the “other” languages’ (Gardner et al., 2000: 352). A recent development in this regard is an agreement signed in March 2007 between the governments of Catalonia, the Basque Country and Galicia, to collaborate in matters of language policy. The aim of the agreement is to enable the governments to exchange experience and to work together for the recognition of the Spanish State as a multilingual state and increased social equality between languages
The agreement covers several areas, including (but not limited to): encouraging the Spanish state to adopt measures in the education system to ensure teaching of the history and culture of regional and minority languages to all Spanish students; sharing their respective strategies for promoting increased use of the Basque, Catalan and Galician languages; and developing strategies for promoting and improving the prestige of the Basque, Catalan and Galician languages internationally.

As is clear from the above, the desired behaviours for majority language speakers in Catalonia have largely been to learn and use Catalan, although some attitudinal elements have also been involved, particularly in relation to majority language speakers across Spain. The emphasis on language learning and use is closer to the Welsh approach than the New Zealand approach. The focus of Catalan language policy on immigrants also parallels the Welsh policy of targeting in-migrants to Welsh-speaking areas. An important difference here, however, is that most in-migrants to Wales are existing speakers of the majority language (English), whereas most immigrants to Catalonia are only potential speakers of the majority language (Castilian).

Evaluation activities appear to be more strongly established in Catalonia than in Wales and New Zealand, with evaluation initiatives documented for (at least) the Tu ets mestre campaign (Areny i Cirilo, 2004), the Dóna corda al català campaign (Guerrero, Montse, Joan Solé, & Simó, 2006; Generalitat de Catalunya, 2006) and the Voluntaris per la llengua programme (Campos & Genovès, 2005).

Conclusion

All three of the language policy situations discussed in this article demonstrate some degree of sensitivity to the influence of majority language speakers on minority language regeneration, but the problem of tolerability has been addressed in quite different ways in each. The three approaches to planning for tolerability differ in relation to the extent to which the problem is recognised (partially or strongly), the nature of the target audience (non-speakers of the language versus members of a dominant ethnic group), the messages developed and behaviours proposed for majority language speakers (language learning or other supportive behaviours), the specific language planning techniques used (from language promotion campaigns to linguistic welcome initiatives to policy dialogue) and the evaluation initiatives undertaken (non-existent or established).

Whether or not one considers planning for tolerability to be an appropriate focus of minority language regeneration planning, the three language situations discussed in this article demonstrate at the very least an innovative and growing repertoire of language policy approaches addressing this problem. They also raise theoretical and practical issues, including questions such as: 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? Can and should the same
principles and techniques be applied to non-indigenous minority languages, or minority languages that are not endangered? For these reasons alone, in the context of the continuing development of language planning theory and practice, planning for tolerability deserves more attention from researchers and policymakers alike than it has been accorded to date.
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Notes

1. Following conventional contemporary definitions in social psychology, attitude is defined here as ‘a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor’ (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993: 1). ‘Negative’ and ‘positive’ attitudes do not, therefore imply a value judgement on the attitudes themselves, but rather describe the evaluation directed towards the attitude object that is exemplified by a given attitude. In this sense, being opposed to the killing of children is as much a ‘negative attitude’ as being opposed to the greater use of the Maori language. A ‘language attitude’ in particular is an attitude towards language, whether this be towards a language as a whole, features of a language, the use of a language or the language as a marker of a particular group (among other possible language-related attitude objects).

2. One more practically focused example is found in Grin (1995), the original source of the term ‘tolerability’ in this context. Grin proposes a model for the provision of public services in which such services are provided in a minority language according to the minority language community’s numeric representation in each region of the state, but tolerability is achieved by guaranteeing that the people who form the linguistic majority in the state will always get service in the majority language, regardless of whether they ‘qualify’ for it numerically in a certain area or not. He claims that this will ‘give majority opinion more time to adjust to the evolution in the respective status of the languages spoken in the polity [and that] this may significantly increase tolerability, and thereby create firmer grounds on which to build immigrant language rights’ (1995: 45).

3. Fishman (1991: 84–85) also recommends focusing on the benefits of bilingualism as one of the ‘value positions’ that RLS activists should try to convey. He claims that bilingualism is a benefit for all, ‘Xmen’ and ‘Ymen’ alike, and that ‘RLSers must stress the genuinely creative, innovative and enriching gain of bilingualism’.

4. This is based on May’s observation that majority language speakers often regard minority languages as instrumentally useless and merely as ‘carriers of identity’. May (2003: 113) suggests that ‘If majority language speakers are made to realise that their own languages fulfil important identity functions for them, both as individuals and as a group, they may in turn be slightly more reluctant to require minority-language speakers to dispense with theirs’.
5. Documents analysed include A strategy for the Welsh language (Welsh Language Board, 1996), The Welsh language: A vision and mission for 2000–2005 (Welsh Language Board, 1999), laith Pawb: A National Action Plan for a Bilingual Wales (Welsh Assembly Government, 2003) and The future of Welsh: A strategic plan (Welsh Language Board, 2005), among others.

6. The Welsh Language Board claims that language awareness training in the workplace evolved largely as a result of public sector organisations responding to the duty under the Welsh Language Act 1993 to ‘[prepare] schemes giving effect to the principle that in the conduct of public business … the English and Welsh languages should be treated on a basis of equality’ (Welsh Language Board, 2006: 3).

7. New Zealand policymakers and researchers have looked to Wales for inspiration in relation to language marketing as early as Nicholson and Garland (1991) and the Welsh experience was noted by policymakers in developing the Māori Language Information Programme (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2003c: 11).

8. Website of the Generalitat de Catalunya: http://www.gencat.net/benestar/societat/convivencia/immigracio/recursos/materials/index.htm.
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