Flagging diversity: The discursive construction of cultural diversity by the Flag Consideration Panel

Taylor Annabell, Auckland University of Technology, taylorannabell26@gmail.com

Angelique Nairn, Auckland University of Technology, angelique.nairn@aut.ac.nz

Abstract

The Flag Consideration Project invited New Zealanders to change the New Zealand flag, and in doing so provided an opportunity for public discussion about what it means to belong to a nation. This article examines the contemporary conceptualisations of New Zealand offered in the 5 Alternatives text that accompanied the first flag consideration referendum. Given the increasing levels of cultural diversity and the historical difficulty faced in ensuring that multiple cultures contribute to the construction of New Zealand, the analysis focuses on constructions of cultural diversity. We used Fairclough's critical discourse analysis to consider ideologies of nationhood prevalent in the text; in particular, we were interested in insights pertaining to bicultural and multicultural constructions of New Zealand. As it happens, the attempts made by the Flag Participation Panel to construct cultural diversity through asserting that New Zealand is inclusive and multicultural, and by referring to Māori culture as well as Chinese. On a surface level, it appears that the constructions address the limitations attached to the current flag, and specifically its Pākehā symbolism. However, the language used by the Panel indicates a continued reliance on a Pākehā perspective of New Zealand and the positioning of Māori as outside the mainstream. Therefore, although the text may have attempted to emphasise commonality and unity regardless of cultural affiliations, it inevitably tokenises cultural difference and offers a seemingly shallow notion of New Zealand as inclusive.

Keywords: biculturalism; cultural diversity; Flag Consideration Project; multiculturalism; national flags

---

Introduction

In 2015–16, New Zealanders had the opportunity to change the national flag by participating in two binding referenda. One of the main arguments for changing the flag was that it did not adequately represent the cultural diversity of New Zealand. Instead, as a symbol of colonisation, it constructs New Zealand from a Pākehā perspective (Mulholland, 2011), which makes it difficult for the national flag to act as a point of identification for all citizens (Eriksen, 2007). New Zealand is an ethnically diverse nation, and the Māori, Asian and Pacific populations are projected to grow

faster than the Pākehā population (Statistics New Zealand, 2015), yet New Zealand continues to struggle to embrace equal representations of cultural groups (Bromell, 2008; Chung, 2015; Fleras & Spoonley, 1999; Thakur, 1995). There is an ongoing challenge to construct a uniform understanding of New Zealand society because the boundaries of belonging continue to blur (Ward & Lin, 2005). Among the biggest barriers to overcoming the 'blur' is New Zealand's colonial past, with its dominance of Pākehā culture (Bell, 1996; King, 2003; Mikaere, 2011; O'Sullivan, 2007). The purpose of this research, then, is to examine how the Flag Consideration Panel addresses cultural diversity in the contemporary New Zealand context, given that the project was designed to solidify an understanding of the nation and bind New Zealanders together under one flag.

The research examines the constructions of cultural diversity at the level of discourse because discourse reflects social worlds and their meanings as well as contributing to their construction (Fairclough, 1992; Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). The text under analysis, *5 Alternatives,* was released prior to the first referendum in which New Zealanders ranked five alternative flag designs. The Panel selected four designs – Koru, Silver Fern (Black and White) and two silver fern designs by Kyle Lockwood – from the public submissions and, due to public support and a social media campaign, a fifth option – Red Peak – was also included. It is our contention that the text offers insight into how the five alternative flag options might align with the changing composition of New Zealand society. We opted to use Fairclough's (1992) critical discourse analysis to unpack how 'diversity' was flagged from an official perspective. The Panel was appointed to oversee public engagement and produce communication to assist New Zealanders in their decision-making, and this method allows for the social context, power dynamics and ideologies embedded in discourse to be considered alongside the discursive constructions.

The nation, national identity and cultural hegemony

A nation is defined by Anderson (1991, p. 1) as an 'imagined political community', which only exists through citizens sharing a belief in commonality and connection. As a result, the social construct of the nation relies upon national symbols such as the national flag, which not only represent what the nation stands for, but provide citizens with a constant daily source of identification (Anderson, 1991; Billig, 1995; Cerulo, 1993; Elgenius, 2011; Schatz & Lavine, 2007; Smith, 2001). In particular, the national flag is the 'main image' projected by the nation (Elgenius, 2007, p. 14) and the colours and design of the national flag express and project specific messages about the nation to citizens (Cerulo, 1993; Elgenius, 2005; Eriksen, 2007; Smith, 1982; Weitman, 1973). According to Mulholland (2011), the Union Jack on the New Zealand flag continues to symbolise colonisation, which does not align with values that currently reflect the nation (Mulholland, 2013). It tells the story of the nation's origins as a British colony (Crampton, 1990; Elting & Folsom, 1967; Talocci, 1982) because the flag provides insight into events that 'define the nation' (Smith, 2001, p. 5) and offers a subjective interpretation of the past. The New Zealand flag reflects British heritage rather than the heritage of other groups of New Zealanders (Ministry of Justice, 2014), and may not facilitate identification for minority cultural groups (Fox, 2011).

The construction of New Zealand's flag from a Pākehā perspective (Mulholland, 2011) could be expected due to the dominance of this group in society. According to Gramsci (1977, cited in Urbinati 1998), hegemony refers to the domination of one group's ideas, values and perspectives in society, which may then be accepted by others as common sense and normal. Pākehā came to occupy a hegemonic position in New Zealand through the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, subsequent European immigration, and marginalisation of Māori culture and identity through policies of assimilation and integration (King, 2003; Mikaere, 2011; Pearson, 2005; Walker, 2004). Colonisation created a 'structural relationship of Pākehā dominance and Māori subjection' (Walker, 2004, p. 10), and national identity therefore reflected Pākehā hegemony (Bell, 1996; King, 2003; Mikaere, 2011; Pearson, 2005).

By functioning as a symbol of identification, the national flag highlights boundaries between those who do and do not belong (Elgenius, 2011). This may occur within the nation instead of between nations, as is the case of New Zealand. Within the large and diverse group that comprises the nation, the national flag should 'serve as a basis for identification' (Eriksen, 2007, p. 4) and act as a symbol of unity and solidarity (Elgenius, 2005; Eriksen, 2007; Firth, 1973). However, if the flag is considered to belong to one group in particular, it is difficult for it to be adopted by the wider group of the nation (Eriksen, 2007; Kølsto, 2006). For example, according to Mulholland (2011), by emphasising New Zealand's origins, the current flag does not acknowledge the Treaty of Waitangi principles and contributes to the 'virtual invisibility' of Māori (Fox, 2011, p.9). It could be expected, then, that the descriptions in *5 Alternatives* address cultural diversity to overcome such issues.

Ongoing negotiation of cultural hegemony

The national flag can be changed or modified to reinforce significant social, cultural or political change experienced in society (Elgenius, 2011; Firth, 1973) and marks the beginning of a 'symbolic regime' (Elgenius, 2005, p. 72). In New Zealand during the 1960s and 1970s, there was a revitalisation of Māori culture (Bell, 2009; King, 1985; Walker, 2004), which increased the importance of Māori issues politically and led to the legal recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi. This development allowed for the formal acknowledgement of both Māori and non-Māori New Zealanders as 'distinct but equal partners' (Sibley & Liu, 2007, p. 1222), and a bicultural framework was used to define New Zealand (Bell, 2009; Fox, 2011; King, 2003; Liu, 2005; O'Sullivan, 2007; Pearson, 2005; Sibley & Liu, 2007). The ideology of racial harmony and assumed superiority of Pākehā culture were challenged (Bell, 1996; King, 2003; Mikaere, 2011; O'Sullivan, 2007; Spoonley, 2015), and Māori culture constructed New Zealand as positively distinct (Harding, Sibley & Robertson, 2011; King, 2003; Liu, 2005; Mikaere, 2011; Sibley & Liu, 2007). It might be that, given the changes that have occurred in society since the current flag was developed, the alternatives could better reflect the changing nature and identity of New Zealand and emphasise the bicultural components advocated for in our constitutional document.

Admittedly, understanding New Zealand's cultural identity through a bicultural lens inevitably fosters a new 'myth of national identity' (Chung, 2015, p. 93) because it

excludes those who are not Māori or Pākehā (Bromell, 2008; Chung, 2015; Fleras & Spoonley, 1999; Thakur, 1995). In other words, members of New Zealand society may continue to be subordinated in the construction of the nation because of ideas and values that became hegemonic under biculturalism. To overcome the limitations of biculturalism, an alternative position that the Flag Consideration Panel could adopt to create a uniform conceptualisation of New Zealand is that of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is presented as a 'useful tool in managing diversity' (Maaka & Fleras, 2005, p. 275), because it encourages an openness to cultural diversity and allows for the equal participation of minorities within society (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999). Although multiculturalism has already been officially implemented in Canada and Australia (Bedford, Ho & Ligard, 2000; Pearson, 2005; Sibley & Ward, 2013; Spoonley, 2015), the extent to which New Zealand can be constructed as multicultural is unclear. Although there is a lack official policy (Bedford, Ho & Ligard, 2000; Pearson, 2005), New Zealand is defined as 'multicultural' by some (Briggs, 2011; Fleras & Spoonley, 1999; Fox, 2011). Ward and Lin (2005) suggest that New Zealand has de facto multiculturalism, while others (Bromell, 2008; O'Sullivan, 2007; Walker, 2004) consider it incompatible with biculturalism. If multiculturalism is implemented, Māori could hold the same status as another ethnic minority despite being an indigenous people. Thus analysing the *5 Alternatives* text to determine how New Zealand is constructed will also offer an insight into whether official sources are attempting to adhere to a bicultural framework, or whether they intend to solidify New Zealand as a multicultural nation. Either way, there will be implications for different factions of society, depending on which cultural identity is adopted.

The Panel may draw on, reinforce or develop any of these existing constructions of cultural diversity, which may become embedded as common sense and regarded as hegemonic. The presence of biculturalism or multiculturalism in the text could signal an attempt to further integrate them into New Zealand society but may also contribute to their symbolic representation. This is because biculturalism often leads to tokenism (O'Sullivan, 2007) and New Zealanders support biculturalism theoretically and symbolically but not in terms of resource allocation (Harding, Sibley & Robertson, 2011; Liu, 2005; Sibley & Liu, 2007). This finding is echoed by Sibley and Ward (2013), who found higher levels of support for more abstract principles of multiculturalism such as appreciation of diversity and support of integration, but a resistance to ideology that sought to address social inequalities between ethnic groups. These tensions may be played out at the level of the text, and evidence of either ideology needs to be examined in light of the issue of tokenism.

Method

Given the conjecture over how New Zealand is defined (Ward & Lin, 2005), it is anticipated that the Panel's construction and promotion of cultural diversity on behalf of New Zealanders can be considered part of a hegemonic struggle over the way ethnic groups contribute to the nation. To explore this hegemonic struggle, we opted to engage in discourse analysis because it enables social realities to be interpreted (Flick, 2009; Phillips & Hardy, 2002). By adopting a critical perspective, we could also uncover ideologies and relations of power encoded in the discourse (Fairclough, 1992;

Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). In his method of discourse analysis, Fairclough (1992) proposes that the researcher engages in a three-dimensional framework: analysis of the text, discursive practice and social practice. The textual analysis involves examining the text structure, cohesion, grammar and vocabulary. The discursive practice focuses on the processes of production, distribution and consumption of the text, to determine to whom the text is targeted, the motivations behind the production of the text and, to a lesser extent, the potential impact of the text on a diverse audience. Finally, the social practice entails the researcher considering the way discourse may produce, reproduce or transform ideology and hegemony. It is outside the scope of this research paper to examine every element in the text; therefore, this research will focus specifically on the way language is used to construct cultural diversity underpinned by the notion that 'signs are socially motivated' (Fairclough, 1992, p. 74).

The text under analysis, *5 Alternatives,* was produced before the first referendum in which New Zealanders ranked the five design options. The text provides an official and designer's description, and six illustrations of each alternative design. The 'official' description offers a literal interpretation of the elements in the design, while the 'designer's' description explains how each alternative flag projects an image of the nation (Cerulo, 1993; Elgenius, 2011; Smith, 1982; Weitman, 1973). The Panel and the Secretariat (government officials who assisted the Panel) had the power to edit the designer's descriptions (Archer, cited in Lin, 2015). The modifications from the original descriptions submitted by the designers also provide insight into how cultural diversity was constructed from the official perspective, which is also discussed below.

Flagging diversity in discourse

Bicultural constructions of New Zealand

The Panel constructs cultural diversity through referring to Māori culture, which could be viewed as an attempt to conceptualise New Zealand as bicultural. Of the five flag designs put forward for public consideration, Red Peak and Koru incorporate 'Māori weaving *taniko* patterns' and 'Māori *kowhaiwhai* patterns' respectively, which addresses the absence of Māori in national imagery – specifically in the current flag (Fox, 2011). The descriptions appear to explore the meanings behind elements of the designs and justify their inclusion from a Māori perspective. For example, the assertion that the *koru* 'represents new life, growth, strength and peace' reflects the symbol's meaning in Māori culture. The colours in Red Peak 'reference the story of Rangi and Papa, a creation myth in Māori mythology', which enables the history of New Zealand to begin with mythological origins of Māori society (Walker, 2004), rather than relying on the traditional narrative of European settlers. The Māori interpretations may ensure the Panel does not perpetuate Pākehā use of *koru* and *kowhawhai* for commercial and nation-building purposes, which reduces their traditional meaning and undermines the integrity of Māori culture (Shand, 2002; Thomas, 1995). Instead, the inclusion of Māori culture and meanings in the descriptions may substantiate the place of Māori in New Zealand society.

The presence of *te reo Māori* in the text reinforces the value placed on Māori culture in national identity. The use of *te reo* allows the meaning and significance of *taniko*, *kowhaiwhai*, and Rangi and Papa to be conveyed in ways that English words would be unable to achieve. Essentially, it offers access to a Māori world-view (Rankine et al., 2009) and reinforces efforts to revitalise *te reo* (Bauer, 2008) in the context of the declining proportion of the Māori population who are able to converse in the language (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). Furthermore, it could feed into the construction of New Zealand as bicultural and foster the perception that *te reo* is part of New Zealand life.

However, the use of *te reo* and the function of the word 'Māori' as an adjective constructs Māori culture and people as distinct from New Zealand rather than as part of national identity. Rangi and Papa is a creation myth in '*Māori* mythology' rather than 'mythology' or '*New Zealand* mythology' (emphasis added) and consideration of rewording provides insight into an 'interpretative perspective' that underpins it (Fairclough, 1992, p. 237). In this case, the adjective serves to position Māori as a cultural group outside of the mainstream, and by extension reinforces the dominance of Pākehā cultural hegemony. This reinforces Stuart's (2005) finding that news media construct Māori as 'them' compared with Pākehā, who are the implied 'us'. This could suggest that a Pākehā perspective is adopted by the Panel and consequently the issue of the flag reinforcing boundaries of belonging remains. It undoes the attempt to ensure Māori patterns are not culturally appropriated, which is part of the ongoing process of colonisation (Shand, 2002). Instead, it could be argued that the implied 'us' (Pākehā) continues to borrow from Māori culture to claim national distinctiveness.

The efforts to address Māori culture may also be tokenistic. The presence of the word 'Aotearoa' in four of the five descriptions is another instance of the contribution of Māori to the construction of New Zealand but the word also carries meaning due to wider social processes and context (Fairclough, 1992). 'Aotearoa' has regularly been used as part of the official, symbolic expression of biculturalism since 1970s (Doerr, 2009; Pearson, 2000), although 'New Zealand' remains the sole official name of the nation. As such, 'Aotearoa' may be interpreted as a tokenistic acknowledgement of Māori culture.

This perspective is reinforced by the use of the adjective 'indigenous' to describe the silver fern rather than status of Māori in New Zealand (Bell, 2014). The word choice draws attention to the lack of references to Māori people or culture outside the word 'Aotearoa' in the descriptions of the Lockwood flags. In the original description, the colour white was described as representing 'Aotearoa, "Land of the Long White Cloud", the Māori name for NZ' and the colour red was considered a 'prestigious colour to Māori'. The removal of these statements marks a removal of acknowledgement of Māori in the construction of New Zealand, or at the very least the Panel's decision to downplay their involvement. It also suggests the power dynamics between the designer and the Panel are unequal.

Multicultural construction of New Zealand

The Panel also constructs cultural diversity through the inclusion of the word 'multicultural' in three of the flag descriptions. Multiculturalism is a politically loaded

word in the New Zealand context (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999) because it conflicts with biculturalism and potentially undermines the place of Māori in society. However, in this text multiculturalism is treated as common sense rather than as a political framework, which could encourage an acceptance of this ideology without understanding its implications. New Zealanders could interpret from the text that multiculturalism is a defining characteristic of the nation because the term is used as an adjective – for example 'Aotearoa's peaceful *multicultural* society'.

Similarly, the designer's description of Red Peak reads, 'this flag breaks down *multicultural* elements into simple, *shared* forms' (emphasis added). It suggests that New Zealanders will be able to identify with the flag because the 'elements' can have multiple interpretations that will resonate with New Zealand citizens, regardless of their wider cultural affiliations. By emphasising the 'multicultural' in the description of Red Peak, the Panel has extrapolated beyond the design's original bicultural symbolism and referred to an ideology that is not yet officially implemented. The designer's original description emphasised the flag's bicultural foundations, but this is amended to multicultural to fit the perhaps more inclusive purposes of the Panel. Furthermore, the statement that 'this flag breaks down *multicultural* elements' appears first in the description of Red Peak. The sequential structure of the statements reveals power relations because the 'architecture of the text' contributes to the meaning within it (Fairclough, 1992, p. 77). It positions the multicultural construction ahead of the statements that address New Zealand from a Māori perspective, and reveals the relative power of the Panel compared with that of the designer.

Inclusiveness of cultural diversity

The Panel also constructs New Zealand as inclusive of cultural diversity, which is indicated by the inclusion of the phrase 'our yin and yang' in the text. This phrase was not part of the designer's original description but added to explain the significance of the colours black and white on the flag's design.[1] The words 'yin' and 'yang' are borrowed from Chinese and appear in the New Zealand Oxford Dictionary (Deverson & Kennedy, 2005). Accordingly, their presence in the text could signal the way that New Zealand society encompasses other values and practices from different cultures, which is valuable given the increasing levels of cultural diversity particularly from Asia (Spoonley, 2015). Yin and yang are concepts from Chinese philosophy, referring to the integration of two opposite but complementary energies that shape the world (Fang, 2005). The notion of two different elements existing in harmony could be linked to the relationship between Māori and Pākehā, in which case 'our yin and yang' constructs New Zealand biculturally, and could suggest an interdependence between the two cultures in the nation.

The concept also emphasises that the forces are in opposition and contradictory, which means that the application of this concept to cultural diversity becomes problematic and may in fact allude to the difficulties in the Pākehā–Māori relationship. The harmonious construction of cultural diversity discussed above relies on a simplistic reading of the concept. Indeed, in the West, the phrase tends to refer to the 'distinction between cooperation and competition' (Patterson, 2000, p. 236), which is only part of

the concept. The text may empty the depth of meanings associated with 'yin and yang' and could be a tokenistic reference to cultural diversity in an effort to ensure that the flag design did not only point to biculturalism. However, because yin and yang refer to two elements, this also serves to extend the bicultural construction, in which case a Chinese symbol is used to represent the partnership between Māori and Pākehā.

The Panel also constructs cultural diversity without overtly referring to culture or ethnicity through the emphasis on inclusivity and unity. The metaphor of the silver fern may allow reality to be constructed in a particular way and influence perception and belief (Fairclough, 1992). According to the text, 'a single fern spreading upwards represents we are all one people growing onward' and another description states that 'the softly curved spine of the frond binding us all together'. The fern can be interpreted as 'binding' together different cultures, which is emphasised through the use of the pronouns 'we' and 'us'. The 'national we' activates a sense of unity and allows the author of the text to speak on behalf of the group (Cheney, 1983; Fairclough, 1992). The belief that the silver fern represents all New Zealanders is presented as uniformly agreed, and can prompt feelings of belonging amongst those who respond favourably to the messages of the text. The assertion of fern as a symbol of unity, which could signal a conflation of Pākehā identity with New Zealand's identity, and the issue of a reliance on Pākehā symbols endures. The silver fern became a national symbol when New Zealand was a settler society (Wolfe & Barnett, 2001) and is implicitly connected to Pākehā identity and belonging as part of Kiwiana (Bell, 2012).

Linguistically, the phrase 'we are all one people' continues the emphasis on unity and the adjective 'all' could bind New Zealanders together. However, examining the phrase intertextually reveals the way the text draws upon previous texts, and may seek to transform meaning (Fairclough, 1992). During the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, William Hobson said to the signing *rangitaria*, *'he iwi tahi tatou'*, which was translated as 'now *we are all one people*' and this phrase was uttered by leaders at early Waitangi anniversary ceremonies (Sorrenson, 1998). The accompanying ideology of 'one people' assumed New Zealand to be unified, which dangerously hid the domination of Pākehā over Māori (Walker, 2004) and underpinned policies of assimilation and integration that occurred before the 1970s (Sorrenson, 1998; Walker, 2004). The use of this phrase in *5 Alternatives* could be viewed as a modern iteration, which has evolved beyond the previous ideological meaning. However, it also potentially reinforces the outdated, assimilationist construction of New Zealand (Mikaere, 2004) and could marginalise the contributions of Māori and ethnic minorities.

The shallow construction of inclusivity is also echoed in the representation of New Zealand's past, which seeks to emphasise commonality. In the description of the Lockwood silver fern flag, the blue colour represents the Pacific Ocean, which 'all New Zealanders or their ancestors crossed'. The 'all' implies that people had to travel across the ocean, regardless of where they started, to reside now in New Zealand and that they have that trip in common. Undoing the unity created could be the statement that the Southern Cross 'helped guide early settlers to our islands'. The phrase 'early settlers' alludes to the dominant and official version of New Zealand history beginning with Europeans' arrival. Bell (2014, p. 7) objects to the word choice of 'settler' because it obfuscates the physical, legal and symbolic violence that accompanies 'colonial

invasions of indigenous homelands' and people. That said, the 'settler' is accompanied by '*our* islands', which could signal inclusiveness of all members belonging to New Zealand. The label 'early settlers' could apply to other cultural groups, not just Europeans. Cheney (1983) describes 'our' as a persuasive lexical tool that can encourage acceptance of a perspective in order to belong to the collective. In this instance, New Zealanders are encouraged to view their experience of arrival in the same way, which excludes cultural differences from the narrative. The construction of the past in this way may allow for common ground to be fostered (Cheney, 1983) through the focus on what is shared, but it could be problematic if it encourages a perspective of history devoid of cultural differences and injustices.

Conclusion

The preferred means of construction of cultural diversity by the Panel were multiculturalism and an emphasis on inclusiveness. The inclusive discourse may be viewed as a continuation of the myth of egalitarianism, which is considered a defining aspect of New Zealand's national identity (Bell, 1996; King, 2003; Liu, 2005; Rae, 2011; Sibley & Liu, 2007). The use of this strategy is concerning because the concept of equality was used to disguise the subordination and domination of Māori (Barclay, 2005; McCreanor, 2005). Furthermore, the text used a constructive strategy of emphasising commonality and unity, and the selective reconstruction of the past, to hide cultural differences and the ways in which some groups experienced racism and assimilation when arriving in New Zealand. It may suggest to New Zealanders that the differences between cultural groups – especially historical treatment – no longer need to be addressed.

The text highlighted the struggle to build New Zealand biculturally beyond Māori imagery and symbolic gesture. There was a juxtaposition between seemingly genuine integration of Māori values alongside the construction of Māori as an out-group in New Zealand society. Beyond this, the decision to edit out descriptions that connected design elements to Māori culture potentially sends a powerful message about the perceived value of Māori culture and ideas in New Zealand. The text suggests that the official perspective on the nation continues to struggle to see beyond a Pākehā lens, and instead perpetuates Pākehā selective amnesia (Mikaere, 2011). The way cultural diversity was constructed could be part of maintaining the cultural hegemony of Pākehā values and ideas, despite the appearance of embracing the contributions of other cultural groups in society.

Overall, the analysis suggests that the five alternative flags were unable to overcome the critique levelled at the current New Zealand flag. In other words, the other options also were unable to encompass all members of the nation. The descriptions did refer to societal changes that occurred since the original flag was adopted, through the ideologies of biculturalism and multiculturalism embedded in the discourse. However, these frameworks both appeared to be inclusive at a surface level yet continued to be underpinned by 'patterns of power and privilege' of the dominant group (Maaka & Fleras, 2005, p. 275). As a result, the discursive construction of

cultural diversity undermined the notion that New Zealand had evolved significantly and required a new national flag due to the Pākehā perspective implied in the text.

Notes

[1] Both the yin and yang symbol and Silver Fern (black and white) alternative flag is divided into black and white areas by a curved line or the fern, and each half features a dot or fern leaves of the opposite colour respectively.

References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Barclay, K. (2005). Rethinking inclusion and biculturalism: Towards a more relational practice of democratic justice. In J.H. Liu, T. McCreanor, M. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (eds), *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, pp. 118–39.

Bauer, W. (2008). Is the health of *te reo Māori* improving? *Te Reo*, 51, 33–73.

Bedford, R., Ho, E.S. & Lidgard, J. (2000). *International Migration in New Zealand: Context, Components and Policy Issues*. Hamilton: Population Studies Centre, University of Waikato.

Bell, A. (2009). Dilemmas of settler belonging: Roots, routes and redemption in New Zealand national identity claims. *The Sociological Review*, 57(1), 145–62.

—— (2014). *Relating Indigenous and Settler Identities: Beyond Domination*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bell, C. (1996). *Inventing New Zealand: Everyday Myths of Pakeha Identity*. Auckland: Penguin.

—— (2012). Migrating meanings: New Zealand *kiwiana* collectors and national identity. *Australasian Journal of Popular Culture*, 1(3), 349–63.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.

Briggs, L. (2011). Cultural symbols and the experience of immigrants: Can individuals who have developed in one cultural environment learn to live in another? In A. Fox (ed.), *Symbolising New Zealand*. Dunedin: Uniprint University of Otago, pp. 33–41.

Bromell, D. (2008). *Ethnicity, Identity and Public Policy: Critical Perspectives on Multiculturalism*. Wellington: Milne Printers.

Cerulo, K.A. (1993). Symbols and the world system: National anthems and flags. *Sociological Forum*, 8(2), 243–71.

Cheney, G. (1983). The rhetoric of identification and the study of organizational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 69(2), 143–58.

Chung, H. (2015). Native alienz. In G. Ghosh & J. Leckie (eds), *Asians and the New Multiculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Dunedin: Otago University Press, pp. 93–118.

Crampton, W.G. (1990). *The World of Flags: A Pictorial History*. London: Studio Editions.

Deverson, T. & Kennedy, G. (2005). *The New Zealand Oxford Dictionary*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Doerr, N.M. (2009). 'Rude speech' and 'ignorant audience': Power of ignorance and language politics at an Aotearoa/New Zealand school. *Critical Studies in Education*, 50(3), 323–35.

Elgenius, G.A. (2005). Expressions of nationhood: National symbols and ceremonies in contemporary Europe. PhD thesis, University of London, http://etheses.lse.ac.uk/638.

—— (2007). The origin of European national flags. In T.H. Eriksen & R.P. Jenkins (eds), *Flag, Nation and Symbolism in Europe and America*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 14–30.

—— (2011). *Symbols of Nations and Nationalism: Celebrating Nationhood*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Elting, M. & Folsom, F. (1967). *Flags of All Nations and the People Who Live Under Them*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap.

Eriksen, T.H. (2007). Some questions about flags. In T.H. Eriksen & R. Jenkins (eds), *Flag, Nation and Symbolism in Europe and America*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 1–13.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fang, T. (2005). From 'onion' to 'ocean': Paradox and change in national cultures. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 35(4), 71–90.

Firth, R. (1973). *Symbols: Public and Private*. New York: Routledge.

Fleras, A. & Spoonley, P. (1999). *Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous Politics and Ethnic Relations in New Zealand*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Flick, U. (2009). An Introduction to Qualitative Research (4th ed.). London: Sage.

Fox, A. (2011). Introduction. In A. Fox (ed.), *Symbolising New Zealand*. Dunedin: Uniprint University of Otago, pp. 7–11.

Harding, J.F., Sibley, C.G. & Robertson, A. (2011). New Zealand = Māori, New Zealand = bicultural: Ethnic group differences in a national sample of Māori and Europeans. *Social Indicators Research*, 100(1), 137–48.

Jørgensen, M.W. & Phillips, L.J. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage.

King, M. (1985). *Being Pākehā: An Encounter with New Zealand and the Māori Renaissance* (3rd ed.). Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton

—— (2003). *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin.

Kølsto, P. (2006). National symbols as signs of unity and division. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 29(4), 676–701.

Lin, M. (2015). *Flag Referendum: Official 109-page Correspondence of the Flag Consideration Panel*, https://millionvoicesblog.files.wordpress.com/2015/11/oia_-panel-correspondence.pdf.

Liu, J.H. (2005). History and identity: A system of checks and balances for Aotearoa/New Zealand. In J.H. Liu, T. McCreanor, M. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (eds), *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, pp. 69–87.

Maaka, R. & Fleras, A. (2005). *The Politics of Indigeneity: Challenging the State in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Dunedin: Otago University Press.

McCreanor, T. (2005). 'Sticks and stones may break my bones …': Talking Pakeha identities. In J.H. Liu, T. McCreanor, M. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (eds), *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, pp. 52–68.

Mikaere, A. (2004). Are we all New Zealanders now? A Māori response to the Pākehā question for indigeneity. *Red & Green*, 4, 33–45.

—— (2011). *Colonising Myths, Māori Realities: He rukuruku whakaaro*. Wellington: Huia.

Ministry of Justice (2014). *Regulatory Impact Statement: Considering Changing the New Zealand Flag*, http://www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/informationreleases/ris/pdfs/ris-justice-flag-oct14.pdf.

Mulholland, M. (2011). Challenging our symbols of nationhood. In A. Fox (ed.), *Symbolising New Zealand*. Dunedin: Uniprint University of Otago, pp. 15–30.

—— (2013). Reflections on symbols of nationhood. In S. Katene & M. Mulholland (eds), *Future Challenges for Māori: He kōrero anamata*. Wellington: Huia, pp. 11–17.

O'Sullivan, D. (2007). *Beyond Biculturalism: The Politics of an Indigenous Minority*. Wellington: Huia.

Patterson, J. (2000). Mana: Yin and Yang. *Philosophy East and West*, 50(2), 229–41.

Pearson, D. (2000). The ties that unwind: Civic and ethnic imaginings in New Zealand. *Nations and Nationalism*, 6(1), 91–110.

—— (2005). Citizenship, identity and belonging: Addressing the mythologies of the unitary nation state in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In J.H. Liu, T. McCreanor, M. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (eds), *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations*. Wellington: Victoria University Press, pp. 21–37.

Phillips, N. & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse Analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rae, M. (2011). Landmarks: Architecture and monuments as symbols of cultural learning. In A. Fox (ed.), *Symbolising New Zealand*. Dunedin: Uniprint University of Otago, pp. 43–50.

Rankine, J., Barnes, A.M., Borell, B., Kaiwai, H., Nairn, R., McCreanor, T. & Gregory, A. (2009). Intentional use of Te reo Maori in New Zealand newspapers in 2007. *Pacific Journalism Review*, 15(2), 174–90.

Schatz, R.T. & Lavine, H. (2007). Waving the flag: National symbolism, social identity, and political engagement. *Political Psychology*, 28(3), 329–55.

Shand, P. (2002). Scenes from the colonial catwalk: Cultural appropriation, intellectual property rights, and fashion. *Cultural Analysis*, 3, 47–88.

Sibley, C.G. & Liu, J.H. (2007). New Zealand = bicultural? Implicit and explicit associations between ethnicity and nationhood in the New Zealand context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(6), 1222–43.

Sibley, C., & Ward, C. (2013). Measuring the preconditions for a successful multicultural society: A barometer test of New Zealand. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 37(6), 700–13.

Smith, W. (1982): Introduction. In M. Talocci (ed.), *Guide to the Flags of the World*. London: Sidgwick & Jackson.

Smith, W. (2001). *Flag Lore of All Nations.* Brookfield, CT: Millbrook Press.

Sorrenson, K. (1998). Waitangi: Ka whawhai Tonu Matou. In P. O'Brien & B. Vaughn (eds), *Amongst Friends: Australian and New Zealand Voices from America*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press

Spoonley, P. (2015). New diversity, old anxieties in New Zealand: The complex identity politics and engagement of a settler society. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(4), 650–61.

Statistics New Zealand (2013). Speakers of *te reo Māori*, http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/snapshots-of-nz/nz-progress-indicators/home/social/speakers-of-te-reo-Māori.aspx.

—— (2015). National ethnic population projections: Information releases, http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/estimates_and_projections/national-ethnic-population-projections-info-releases.aspx.

Stuart, I. (2005). The Māori public sphere. *Pacific Journalism Review*, 11(1), 13–25

Talocci, M. (1982). *Guide to the Flags of the World.* London: Sidgwick & Jackson.

Thakur, R. (1995). In defence of multiculturalism. In S. W. Greif (ed.), *Immigration and National Identity in New Zealand: One People, Two Peoples, Many Peoples*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, pp. 255–81.

Thomas, N. (1995). Kiss the baby goodbye: 'Kowhaiwhai' and aesthetics in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Critical Inquiry*, 22(1), 90–121.

Urbinati, N. (1998). From the periphery of modernity: Antonio Gramsci's theory of subordination and hegemony. *Political Theory*, 26(3), 370–91.

Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle Without End*. Auckland: Penguin.

Ward, C. & Lin, E. (2005). Immigration, acculturation and national identity in New Zealand. In J.H. Liu, T. McCreanor, M. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (eds), *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations.* Wellington: Victoria University Press, pp. 155–76.

Weitman, S.R. (1973). National flags: A sociological overview. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 328–67.

Wolfe, R. & Barnett, S. (2001). *Kiwiana! The Sequel.* Auckland: Penguin.