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Developments in the theorising of representation and the constitutive nature of language have encouraged an increased scholarly interest in the discursive construction of social identities, relations, and realities. This includes a growing body of literature internationally that focuses on the construction of social groups positioned as Others. However, critical research in this area is more limited in the domestic setting. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, the contemporary construction of social identities is embedded within a specific socio-political and historical context, including a particular colonial context. This context is fundamental to the ways in which social relations between the white settler Self and various Other groups have been, and continue to be, constituted.

In this thesis, I have explored the discursive representation of Asian identity in dominant institutional discourses in Aotearoa/New Zealand, with a particular focus on the construction of the Asian as Other. Using critical discourse analysis, contemporary newspaper and parliamentary texts were examined to identify content areas, discursive strategies, and lexical choices involved in the representation of the Asian Other by elite institutions in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Through this process, several recurring manifestations of Asian Otherness were recognised, namely those of Asians as threat, Asian as impermanent, Asian as commodity, and Asian as victim. These representations of the Asian Other embody continuities and contradictions. They function to contribute to contemporary understandings
and positionings of Asian individuals and collectives, to the ongoing construction of the Self in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and to the broader national narrative.
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In recent years, many statements have been made about the increasing number of ‘Asians’ in Aotearoa/New Zealand and talk about Asians (particularly in relation to immigration) has been a feature of several recent general election campaigns, most notably those of 1996 and 2002\(^1\). However, narratives about Asians are neither recent nor novel. Although there have been points in time and particular contexts within which this talk has had greater currency, individuals and institutions in Aotearoa/New Zealand have long engaged in the production and circulation of discourses about Asians.

In spite of this history of talk about Asians, there has been relatively little critical examination of how we speak about the social group termed Asian – that is, how we (re)present Asian individuals and communities in and through discourse. Representations necessarily reflect and reinforce the ideologies and value systems of those by whom they are created and controlled. Elite institutions, such as those of the mass media and dominant education and political systems, have a key role in the production and

---

\(^1\) The term ‘Asians’ is enclosed in inverted commas to indicate its usage in this thesis as a socio-political construct that is commonly used to refer to a diverse range of distinct groups in Aotearoa/New Zealand. However, for issues of readability, the term will generally appear without inverted commas in the remainder of the text. The working definition of Asian will be further described in Chapter Two.
circulation of discourses about both Self and Other\(^2\) and, through this, in the construction of social relations. Institutional representations, therefore, play an important role in the construction of social identities and realities in Aotearoa/New Zealand and in the manufacture of public consensus. There is, however, limited critical interrogation of how this operates in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context, particularly in relation to the ways in which dominant representations contribute to the reproduction of unequal power relations in society through discourses of difference or ‘Othering’ discourses, which are seen to be central to the construction of social identities (Hall 1996).

This thesis had two primary goals:
(a) to identify the ways in which Asians as a social group were variously represented in prevailing contemporary discourses through the examination of two important sites of elite discourse production, namely mass media and political institutions, with a particular emphasis on the construction of Asians as an Other group; and,
(b) to consider the symbolic and pragmatic functions of these representations of Otherness in terms of the construction of social identities and relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

\(^2\) Other and Self are used here in their sociological sense. The Other has been defined as “...anyone and anything deemed capable of disrupting the social fabric and the integrity of its imaginary identity: strangers, foreigners, intruders and so-called racial and ethnic minorities, for example” (Cavallaro 2001, p. xiii). In general, the Others are those seen to be different from ‘us’, positioned as ‘outsiders’ (Billington, Hockey & Strawbridge 1998; Riggins 1997). The Self thus signifies ‘us’ or the ‘insider’ group, the identity (individual and collective) against which the Other is contrasted.
The research involved examination of the themes and topics of contemporary public talk about Asians, as well as the discursive and lexical resources, including the words, phrases, and strategies that were deployed in constructing Asian identity and, more specifically, Asian Otherness, in selected texts. Contemporary mass media and political institutions were chosen as sites of enquiry because of their dominance and influence as sources of elite discourse. These two sectors are responsible for a substantial proportion of the public discourse that is generated and distributed within Aotearoa/New Zealand. As such, they are significant players in the representation of social identities and relations through the manufacture and circulation of discourses that have both discursive and material effects. Furthermore, these two institutions often negotiate and mediate each other’s discourses. Analysis of these two sites of production, therefore, allows for the exploration of commonalities and divergences in institutional discourses, and consideration of the ways in which elite institutional discourses influence and intersect with each other.

In Aotearoa/New Zealand, elite institutions, including the government and mass media, tend to be largely dominated by Pākehā voices and characterised by unequal access and power relations. For the most part, elite discourses about Asians are controlled by non-Asians. In spite of an increased role of Asian individuals and communities in the production of discourses (including contributions to dominant discourses, as well as the promotion of alternative and oppositional discourses), Asian voices in public discourse often remain positioned on the margins.
The decision to focus on the discourse of elite institutions is grounded in an interest in examining more closely those who manufacture and control public discourse, thereby shifting a critical gaze onto the institutions involved in the production of public discourse in order to gain a deeper understanding of the ways in which elites influence consensus and, through this, challenge and/or maintain hegemony. However, the emphasis on elite discourse should not imply an undervaluing of the role or significance of other discourses, including everyday conversations, alternative and oppositional discourses, and discourses generated by and within Asian communities.

**POSITIONING THE THESIS**

This thesis is broadly positioned within a social constructionist paradigm. As such there are several underlying theoretical assumptions about the nature of language, discourse, and representation that provide a framework for both the analysis undertaken in the case studies and the approach to interpretation and discussion of findings. Principal among these assumptions is a view of language as constitutive – that is, that reality is socially constructed and that language is the primary means of construction. Within this social constructionist framework, key concepts such as those of ‘race’, ethnicity, nation, and identity are also understood as socially created and contingent.

---

3 As previously noted in relation to the term ‘Asians’, ‘race’ is enclosed in inverted commas to indicate its usage as a socio-political construct. For issues of readability, the term will generally appear without inverted commas in the remainder of the text.
The study has also incorporated theoretical perspectives drawn from post-structuralism, whiteness studies, and Orientalism. Importantly, the work has been approached from a critical position that is expressly concerned with power relations (Wodak 1996a, 2001). This is reflected in the overall research questions, as well as in the choice of critical discourse analysis as the methodology. In terms of methodological direction, the thesis was influenced in particular by the work of Reeves (1983), Wetherell and Potter (1992), Wodak and colleagues (1999, 2001), Fairclough (1992, 1995, 1997, 2003), and van Dijk (1991, 1993, 1997a, 1998, 2000).

In relation to my personal positioning, the thesis was approached from an explicitly anti-racist perspective. This perspective was influenced by personal experience of Aotearoa/New Zealand as a country of entrenched racism, where race matters everyday, in many ways. My identity as tangata whenua has also heavily influenced the development of this project, particularly as it relates to a concern with the unequal power relations that exist in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the ways in which current social identities and realities are explained, legitimised, and naturalised through dominant discourses, and the symbolic and material effects that these discourses have for both ‘in’ and ‘out’ groups. However, my position is also one developed from experiences of ‘looking Pākehā’, in terms of both the unearned privilege that comes with this in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and my exposure to racist discourses by others who often viewed me as a collaborator by virtue of my appearance. Finally, as an academic, I am part of the elite institutions that this thesis is involved in critiquing.
OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

The thesis is structured in four parts. The first two sections of the thesis aim to situate the analysis and later discussion within a contextual and theoretical framework. In terms of context, it is important to consider historical, political, and social circumstances within which contemporary discourses are produced and circulated, in line with an approach that assumes the embeddedness of institutional discourses. Chapter Two provides some of this context with an overview of colonisation, immigration, and settlement in Aotearoa/New Zealand, with particular reference to Asian immigration. It also broadly considers ‘race relations’ and questions of national and ethnic socio-political identities in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The third chapter presents an outline of the existing research on representations of the Other in media and political discourse, drawing on both international and domestic literature, as well as a mapping of work specifically investigating the representation of Asian individuals and communities in politics and the press.

In the second part of the thesis, the key theoretical assumptions that inform and guide the research are outlined (Chapter Four), including a discussion of the concepts of discourse, representation, and ideology. In combination with the fifth chapter, which summarises the methodological approach (critical discourse analysis) and the analytical framework for the case studies, this section aims to provide a theoretical framework for the analysis and discussions of media and political discourse.
Part Three of the thesis (Chapters Six and Seven) presents the analysis of the case studies of media and political discourse, outlining the key findings and themes that arose in each case study.

Part Four of the thesis draws together the contextual and theoretical discussions with the data presented in Part Two into a discussion of institutional representations of Asian identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Chapter Eight). This chapter aims to identify the various discursive resources involved in producing Asian Otherness. It also presents discussion of the functions and implications of these discourses in terms of contemporary social relations. The final chapter (Chapter Nine) makes some concluding remarks based on the most significant findings of the study. In addition, Chapter Nine identifies questions and areas where further debate, discussion, and research may be of benefit.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE THESIS
This thesis aims to contribute to the broader research programme in this area by providing a considered analysis of contemporary representations of the Asian Other in and through dominant media and political discourses in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In this way, it is hoped that the thesis will complement other work being undertaken on representation, as well as related areas of research in other disciplines such as political studies, and media and communication studies.

In line with the approach of the research, the thesis also aims to contribute to a more critical understanding of the role of elite institutional discourses in
shaping social identities and realities in Aotearoa/New Zealand and, through this, to encourage conscientisation and provide tools for reading and challenging dominant discourse.
CHAPTER TWO
BACKGROUND

Underlying notions of belonging to a community or a nation is the designation of some peoples or groups as ‘insiders’ and others as ‘outsiders’ (Billington et al 1998, p. 171).

The positioning of discourses as context-specific and context-dependent necessitates an approach to enquiry that has regard for the historical, social, and cultural settings within which discourses are both manufactured and consumed. Consideration of context is also important in understanding the formation of social identities and relationships, and the various ways in which these are configured and expressed in contemporary society. This chapter aims to provide a general background to social identities and relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand by briefly surveying historical and contemporary relationships between Māori and white settler society¹, before

---

¹ The term white settler society is used in this thesis to characterise the society established in Aotearoa/New Zealand following colonisation by primarily British settlers. It is drawn from the work of Sharene Razack (2002), who describes a white settler society as: “… one established by Europeans on non-European soil. Its origins lie in the dispossession and near extermination of Indigenous populations by the conquering Europeans. As it evolves, a white settler society continues to be structured by a racial hierarchy. In the national mythologies of such societies, it is believed that white people came first and that it is they who principally developed the land; Aboriginal peoples are presumed to be mostly dead or assimilated. European settlers thus become the original inhabitants and the group most entitled to the fruits of citizenship. A quintessential feature of white settler mythologies is,
considering the specificities of socio-political relations with Asian individuals and communities. The chapter also includes an examination of key concepts of race, ethnicity, and nation in terms of their role in constructing group identities in Aotearoa/New Zealand in both formal and informal ways, as well as their relationship to defining and describing Asian social groups. This background, particularly as it pertains to the colonial context of social relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand, informs the framework for analysis and discussion employed, as well as further elucidating the rationale for the critical approach that has been taken in this project.

A COLONIAL PAST AND PRESENT

In line with the theoretical assumptions underpinning this study, representations of Asian identity need to be considered within the broader socio-cultural and -political context of the construction of group identities and relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand, including historic and contemporary relationships between tangata whenua and white settler society. The

therefore, the disavowal of conquest, genocide, slavery, and the exploitation of the labour of peoples of colour. In North America, it is still the case that European conquest and colonization are often denied, largely through the fantasy that North America was peacefully settled and not colonized” (pp. 1-2). As it is used in the current study, the term emphasises certain elements of Razack’s definition, namely the establishment of a settler society by Europeans, the dispossession of indigenous populations, the centrality of racialised thinking, and the persistence of national mythologies to both justify colonisation and explain current socio-political conditions.

Tangata whenua is used in this sense to refer to Māori as indigenous.
dynamics of these relationships influence the formulation of conventional accounts of the past and present in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and are reflected in domestic discourses of identity, ethnicity, and nation, as well as in narratives of Self and Other.

Māori are the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa/New Zealand with long and distinct histories remembered and reproduced in various cultural forms, including oral and visual traditions. This knowledge, however, is often sidelined in dominant histories of Aotearoa/New Zealand. Prevailing accounts commonly make a discursive demarcation between pre-contact and post-contact history – the periods before and after contact with white settlers – with primacy generally given to the 200 or so years post-contact. While wishing to avoid this privileging of post-contact accounts of Aotearoa/New Zealand history, contemporary contexts of discourse production and consumption are inextricably intertwined with the imperialism and colonialism that has defined sustained contact with colonial settlers and institutions.

For Māori, this post-contact period is characterised by active discrimination and major dispossession, achieved through both legislative and illegal means. The colonial agenda has been pursued vigorously through imposed systems of government and the establishment of colonial institutions, as well as by way of military force. In combination with overtly assimilationist policies, and in spite of active resistance and the ongoing assertions of Māori sovereignty, these colonial practices have served to undermine Māori social, economic, and political structures (Reid & Cram 2005). The results have been a significant redistribution of power and resources in favour of white settler
colonials, the privileges of which continue to be enjoyed today, often unacknowledged, and are reflected in current economic and socio-political realities, most obviously in the stark inequalities between Māori and Pākehā across a range of social indicators (Jensen et al. 2006; Ministry of Social Development 2006; Robson 2004).

Imperialism and colonialism are of significance to any discussion of group identities and relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand, both as they have been constructed in the past and also in contemporary settings. Accounts of Aotearoa/New Zealand’s history and current reality that overlook or minimise the impact of colonisation and emphasise perceived benefits that have resulted for those colonised persist (Kirkwood et al. 2005; Wetherell & Potter 1992), a pattern that is echoed in other white settler societies (Augoustinos et al. 1999). Colonisation is frequently represented as an historical process in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and talked about in the past tense. Pennycook (1998) has warned against this narrow view of colonialism, emphasising the need:

… to see colonialism not merely as a site of colonial imposition, not merely as a context in which British or other colonial nation’s cultures were thrust upon colonized populations, but also as a site of production. The practice of colonialism produced ways of thinking, saying and doing that permeated back into the cultures and discourses of the colonial nations. And … these cultural constructs of colonialism have lasting effects even today (p. 2).

In this respect, Aotearoa/New Zealand retains strong symbolic and material ties to England, evident in the structure and traditions of prevailing institutions such as those of the education, legal, health, and parliamentary
systems, as well as through constitutional arrangements that include the Queen of England as Head of State. This attachment is also reflected in dominant and dominating norms and values, including the general prevalence and privileging of English language, and the public recognition of holidays and festivals principally drawn from European traditions. Colonisation thus provides a starting point for understanding not only the historical context of the current work but also the contemporary context within which elite discourses, such as those of mass media and parliamentary institutions, are created, circulated, and consumed. It is in and through the various processes of colonisation that white settler ways of being and thinking have become naturalised and universalised, as they have simultaneously become dominant, especially within elite institutions. This has been integral to the construction of social relations between white settlers and Māori, as well as to the ways in which Aotearoa/New Zealand has engaged formally and informally with Asia, has responded to Asian migration and settlement, and has represented Asian individual and group identity in both historical and contemporary settings.

**MAPPING ASIAN IMMIGRATION AND SETTLEMENT**

An increase in the Asian population in Aotearoa/New Zealand has attracted significant public attention and comment in recent decades. This was particularly the case during the 1990s, following significant changes to immigration regulations that resulted in a marked increase in migration from
countries in Asia\(^3\) (Ip & Murphy 2005). However, movement of peoples from countries in Asia to Aotearoa/New Zealand is not new, nor is the anti-Asian sentiment that has often been a part of the domestic response. The distinctive patterns of Asian immigration to, and settlement in, Aotearoa/New Zealand, and the particular official and public responses, are important considerations in discussions of contemporary representations of Asian identities. The quantification of Asian populations in this section is included to provide background information, rather than as an attempt to link in any simplistic way discourses about Asians, particularly those that could be considered to be anti-Asian, to population increases or demographic shifts in Aotearoa/New Zealand. As an examination of the history of Aotearoa/New Zealand’s response to Asian migration reveals, debate about the presence of Asians, and the virulence of anti-Asian talk in this country, is often only tenuously linked to actual numbers (Ip & Murphy 2005; Leckie 1995; Palat 1996).

‘Chinamen’ and ‘hindoos’: early years of migration and settlement
Isolated trade contacts with sailors and merchants from Asia date back to the 1840s and 1850s. Organised immigration, however, began in the 1860s with the recruitment of Chinese miners to work in the goldfields of the Otago region (Ip 1995; Ip & Murphy 2005; Palat 1996). This occurred within the

\(^3\) For the purposes of this study, Asia is defined broadly as the geographical area that makes up the continent of Asia. In official statistics in Aotearoa/New Zealand, Asia is generally divided up into South-East Asia, North-east Asia, and Southern and Central Asia (see Appendix One for the listing of countries included in Statistics New Zealand’s Classification of country standard) Statistics New Zealand (2006). In the Aotearoa/New Zealand context, West Asia is generally excluded in everyday understandings of Asia.
context of international migration by Chinese workers to a number of different territories including Australia, California, and British Columbia. Initially, the numbers of Chinese arriving in Aotearoa/New Zealand were relatively small, many with the intention of short-term rather than long-term settlement – arriving as what have been referred to as ‘sojourners’ rather than settlers (Ip 1995, p. 163). As employment opportunities in the goldfields diminished, the Chinese miners moved on, leaving Aotearoa/New Zealand or relocating to urban areas to find employment, principally in occupations where they could be self-employed (Ip 1995; Ip & Murphy 2005).

From the outset, the spectrum of responses to the presence of Chinese in Aotearoa/New Zealand included overtly anti-Chinese sentiment, apparent in various public forms such as newspaper cartoons, editorials, and political talk. Within these contexts, opposition to immigration from China tended to be expressed in discourses that emphasised perceived difference, threats to morality, and competition for employment opportunities (Ip & Murphy 2005).

The opposition, however, was material as well as discursive, with Pākehā gold miners actively lobbying the government of the day to restrict entry of Chinese into Aotearoa/New Zealand. In response to complaints by miners, a Parliamentary Select Committee hearing was carried out in 1871 to formally consider the issue of Chinese immigration (Ip & Murphy 2005). Although the hearings exposed overtly anti-Chinese feelings among a number of parliamentary representatives, these arguments were generally discounted by the Committee, with no specific exclusionary provisions immediately resulting (O’Connor 1968). However, in 1881, the government responded to
resistance to Chinese migration with the introduction of legislation explicitly designed to limit the entry of Chinese into Aotearoa/New Zealand. The 1881 Chinese Immigration Act introduced a tonnage ratio and a poll tax of £10 to be applied to all Chinese arriving in Aotearoa/New Zealand from that point on⁴. This discriminatory poll tax remained in place until 1944. The 1881 Act was in line with the pro-white and, more specifically, pro-British immigration stance being pursued by government at the time. The Act, and much of the related legislative and policy restrictions that were to follow, were specifically targeted at Chinese and did not apply to migrants from other parts of Asia. Similar legislation was passed internationally at approximately the same time in attempts to restrict or exclude Asian immigrants, including in several Australian states in 1881, the United States in 1882 (1882 Chinese Exclusion Act), and British Columbia in 1885 (Flores 2003; Ip & Murphy 2005), although the numbers of Chinese entering Aotearoa/New Zealand were few compared with those territories (Palat 1996).

The 1881 Chinese Immigration Act was followed by amendments in 1888, 1896, 1907, and 1908 that consolidated and increased the existing

---

⁴ As part of the 1881 Chinese Immigration Act, a tonnage ratio was imposed that limited a ship to carry one Chinese for each ten tons of cargo. In 2002, the Government of New Zealand apologised for the poll tax. A trust (the Chinese Poll Tax Heritage Trust) was also established, with the Government granting $5,000,000 to the Trust in 2005 as “…a gesture of reconciliation” (Department of Internal Affairs 2007). For further discussion of the poll tax, see also Wong (2003) and Murphy (2005).
discriminatory provisions\textsuperscript{5} as well as instituting further measures designed to restrict Chinese immigration, such as the introduction of an English reading test of 100 words for Chinese applicants in 1907:

The reason for this education test is this: a great many people have urged that there should be a complete stoppage of Chinese immigration but this could not be done without the possibility of trouble in connection with Imperial matters – that is, the royal assent would almost certainly be refused; and I think the course suggested in this Bill is the best to meet the difficulty and prevent an increase in the number of Chinese arrivals (New Zealand Parliamentary Debates 1907, p.838, as cited in Henderson 1998, p. 145).

A number of other restrictive practices and legislative provisions were introduced that expressly discriminated against Chinese migrants, including those specifically related to immigration policy as well as within regulations in other sectors. Amongst these were the imposition of a requirement for the fingerprinting of any Chinese person temporarily leaving Aotearoa/New Zealand, and the removal of the right to naturalisation in 1908 – a right that was not re-established for Chinese migrants until 1952. Chinese were also excluded from eligibility to receive the pension following its introduction in the 1898 Old Age Pension Act (Brooking & Rabel 1995). The 1901 Opium Prohibition Act gave the police powers to enter the home of any Chinese without a search warrant, a provision that remained in place until 1965 (Ip 1995; Ip & Murphy 2005; Leckie 1995; Palat 1996).

\textsuperscript{5} The tonnage ratio was increased in 1888 to one Chinese arrival for every 100 tons of cargo, and again in 1896 to one arrival per each 200 tons of cargo. Similarly, the poll tax was increased to £100 in 1896.
Chinese migrants represented the majority of the Asian population in Aotearoa/New Zealand at this time and were the primary targets of exclusionary immigration legislation. However, migrants from other countries in Asia also faced opposition. The Indian population in Aotearoa/New Zealand was subject to hostility, the extent of which could be considered out of proportion to their relatively small numbers (Ip & Murphy 2005; Leckie 1995). Although Indians were generally in a different position by virtue of their status as British subjects, they were by no means officially considered desirable immigrants. While earlier legislation had specifically focused on Chinese immigrants, the failed Asiatic immigration restriction bills introduced in 1895 and 1896 were aimed at excluding Indians and Japanese, as well as Chinese (Beaglehole 2005; O’Connor 1968). In the same manner, the requirement under the 1899 Immigration Restriction Act for migrants without British or Irish parentage to complete their applicants in a European language was also aimed at restricting Indian and other Asian immigration (Beaglehole 2005; O’Connor 1968). Anti-Indian sentiment was generally expressed through similar arguments to those deployed in anti-Chinese talk, namely the perceived threat that Indians posed as competition within the labour market, but also in terms of sexual and moral threats (Ip & Murphy 2005, p. 25; Leckie 1995, p. 137).

The period following World War I was one of heightened anti-Asian feeling, focused primarily on Chinese and Indian communities whose numbers were
increasing through migration⁶ (Ballara 1986; Brooking & Rabel 1995; O’Connor 1968; Palat 1996). As had been the case in the late nineteenth century, opposition to immigration from Asia often manifested itself as concern about perceived threats, particularly in relation to potential impacts on the labour market from Asian migration. Opposition was expressed in the activities of a number of unions and organisations (including the Returned Services Association (RSA), the Furniture Trade Union, the Auckland Watersiders, and anti-Asian organisations such as the White New Zealand League, the White Race League, and the Anti-Asiatic Society), and by calls for increases in the prohibitive measures already in place and the exclusion and/or repatriation of Asian migrants (Ballara 1986; Leckie 1995; O’Connor 1968).

The 1920 Immigration Restriction Act Amendment Act was introduced during this period. While it appeared on the surface to remove restrictions to Asian immigration through the elimination of thumb-printing and English-language reading test requirements, it introduced a system requiring all non-British arrivals to obtain a permit from the Minister of Customs to enter Aotearoa/New Zealand. This gave the Minister significant discretionary powers to grant, or conversely, deny entry on the basis of perceived ‘suitability’ (Ip & Murphy 2005). In this sense, the legislation was more subtly exclusionary whilst essentially retaining the intent to restrict immigration of peoples not from Britain, especially migrants from countries

---

⁶ Following the First World War, there was also an interest in more broadly restricting other non-Briton immigrant groups, namely Germans and Austro-Hungarians, as well as ‘socialists’ and ‘Marxists’ (O’Connor 1968, p. 52).
in Asia. This provision for the Minister of Customs to exclude any applicant from entry on the grounds of ‘unsuitability’ remained in practice until 1974.

Anti-Asian discourses during this period drew on theories of social Darwinism that were enjoying currency at the time, and accompanying concerns about the consequences of inter-mixing and miscegenation (Ballara 1986). These anxieties were a core feature of the hearings of the Ngata Committee, a committee of inquiry established in 1929 to consider broadly the employment of Māori by Chinese and Indian market gardeners. The Committee had arisen during a time of heightened public backlash and opposition from some within both Pākehā and Māori communities to Pākehā-Chinese and Māori-Chinese relationships, described as a period of ‘moral panic’ (Lee 2003). In addition to investigating employment matters, the Committee was also charged with identifying the extent of relationships between Māori and Chinese or Hindu and commenting on moral issues surrounding the employment of Māori women within Chinese and Hindu-owned businesses (Ballara 1986; Lee 2003). Concerns with the potential negative impact of relationships between Māori and Asians (namely Chinese and Hindu) were reflected in the Committee’s report:

> The indiscriminate intermingling of the lower types of the races – i.e. Maoris, Chinese and Hindus – will … have an effect that must eventually cause deterioration not only in the family and the national life of the Maori race, but also in the national life of this country, by the introduction of a hybrid race, the successful absorption of which is problematic (as cited in Ballara 1986, p. 108).
In 1945, the Chinese and Indian populations were estimated to be around 5,000 and 1,500 respectively (Kember 2002). There had been some temporary and limited concessions for war refugees from China during the Second World War. Both the Chinese and Indian populations increased following the Second World War, partially as a result of changes to regulations making family reunification easier, as well as changes to citizenship legislation providing for the reinstatement of the right to naturalisation for Chinese migrants after 1952 and for Indians to become citizens by virtue of their British nationality (Ip & Murphy 2005; Kember 2002). However, immigration remained difficult and most of the increase in populations from Asian source countries was due to population growth within the communities already living in Aotearoa/New Zealand (McKinnon 1996). Asian immigration was officially still not favoured.

More recently, particularly during the 1960s and 1970s, there has been migration as part of Aotearoa/New Zealand’s refugee commitments from countries such as Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. The acceptance of refugees from the Indochina region is suggested to have initially been reluctant at an official level, with the government requiring that refugees should “meet immigration criteria, should be of practical use to society, and have the ability to be assimilated into the community” (Liev 1995, p. 101). There also appears to have been mixed public opinion about whether or not refugees should be accepted into Aotearoa/New Zealand, and as a result these communities were encouraged to keep a relatively low profile (Liev 1995, p.102). In spite of this, it is estimated that 10,000 refugees from South East Asia came to Aotearoa/New Zealand between 1977 and 1992 (Beaglehole 2005).
In 1961, the Immigration Amendment Act introduced a new requirement for British subjects to have an entry permit, although this was not put into practice until the immigration policy review in 1974 (Beaglehole 2005). Applicants from traditional source countries were still favoured, however, stricter requirements were introduced in 1974 for British and Irish citizens who had previously enjoyed rights of automatic entry (Bedford et al. 2000). According to Brooking and Rabel (1995), public debate during the 1970s was less focused on immigration and more concentrated on race relations and Treaty of Waitangi issues. Where public discussion of immigration did occur, it tended to be in relation to immigration from islands in the Pacific. While migration from the Pacific had been encouraged during the 1950s and 1960s, primarily to provide labour (Bedford et al. 2000), it came under scrutiny during the 1970s. It was during this time the government ran a campaign targeting Pacific Island migrants and their rights to permanent residency in Aotearoa/New Zealand, including the ‘dawn raids’ on the homes of Pacific peoples (Bedford et al. 2000).  

The ‘Asian invasion’\(^7\): recent patterns of immigration and settlement

There have been significant changes to immigration policy in Aotearoa/New Zealand during the last twenty years, under both Labour- and National-led

\(^7\)‘Dawn raids’ refer to the raids on Pacific households in Auckland that were undertaken during this time to identify alleged overstayers.

\(^8\) In April 1993, two articles referencing an ‘Inv-Asian’ and discussing Asian immigration were published in Auckland community newspapers. The articles have been considered significant in terms of the framing of Asian immigration as problematic with negative consequences as well as the inclusion of negative imagery and themes that have persisted and been taken up in the media and by politicians (Spoonley & Trlin 2004).
governments. In 1986, a major review of immigration was undertaken by the then Minister of Immigration, Hon. Kerry Burke. The review was in part an attempt to address concerns about emigration and what was referred to as the ‘brain drain’ (skilled New Zealanders leaving the country to pursue opportunities overseas) (Henderson 1998, p. 142), as well as decreasing immigration into Aotearoa/New Zealand. The Immigration Act introduced the following year, by which migrants were to be selected on the basis of ‘personal merit rather than national or ethnic origin’, marked a critical shift away from the unofficial White New Zealand policy that had favoured ‘Protestant Anglo-Celtic’ migrants for many years (Brooking & Rabel 1995). Traditional Source Country criteria that had disadvantaged immigrants from Asia (and other countries) were abolished. In addition, a Business Immigration Policy was introduced that included new ‘skilled’ and ‘business investment/investor’ categories, alongside ‘family reunification’ and ‘humanitarian/refugee’ categories (Ip & Murphy 2005). The ‘skills’ and ‘business’ categories prioritised certain occupational skills, entrepreneurs, and business people (Beaglehole 2005).

A further review was undertaken in 1990, and in 1991 the National government established the Business Investment Category (replacing the Business Immigration Policy), a General Skills Category (GSC), and a new points-based system (Beaglehole 2005; Brooking & Rabel 1995; Ip & Murphy 2005). Under this system, any applicant was eligible for entry if they attained a certain number of points (based on factors such as employability, age, qualifications, and settlement funds) (Beaglehole 2005).
These policy and legislative changes occurred during the 1980s and 1990s – a period of major social and economic transformation in Aotearoa/New Zealand that was characterised by increasing deregulation and privatisation. According to Kember (2002), the changes to immigration policy were driven primarily by economic goals, including the increasing focus on the benefits of closer relationships with Asian countries and economies as well as the potential role that migration could have on the domestic economy through the introduction of new skills and new capital. As a result of the immigration policy changes, there was a significant increase in the number of migrants from Asia arriving in New Zealand. The Asian population increased from 54,000 in 1986 to 99,000 in 1991 (Kember 2002), reaching 186,000 in 1996 (Statistics New Zealand 1999).

Immigration regulations were revisited in 1995 in response to this increase in the number of Asian migrants coming to Aotearoa/New Zealand and reactions to this demographic shift (Bedford et al. 2002). Stricter English Language Requirements (ELR) were introduced requiring applicants to have proficiency in the English language or pay a bond of $20,000 to be forfeited if a certain level was not reached within 12 months (Ip & Murphy 2005). The English language test was also applied to secondary applicants if they were aged over 16 years (Beaglehole 2005). English language requirements had featured in earlier exclusionary immigration legislation, and have historically been about restricting or limiting the entry of certain groups of immigrants, most obviously Asian migrants, rather than facilitating settlement (Henderson 1998). There was a drop in applicants from Asian countries following the introduction of the 1995 ELR, and in 1998 the $20,000 bond was replaced by a provision allowing for the pre-purchase of English language
tuition (Beaglehole 2005). However, the English language requirement was raised in 2002 for ‘skilled migrants’ to an overall IELTS\(^9\) score of 6.5, the level required for university entrance (Ip & Murphy 2005). This was seen by some as another attempt to limit immigration from Asian countries and attracted criticism from a number of quarters, including opposition political parties.

In 2003, the General Skills Category (GSC) was removed and replaced with the Skilled Migrant Category (SMC). Under this new system, interested applicants were obliged to register an Expression of Interest that would be assessed by the New Zealand Immigration Service before an applicant was invited (or not) to apply for residence. Applicants had to have 100 points or more (calculated on factors including employability, qualifications and age, region of job offer, work experience) and to meet certain “health, character, and English language” criteria (Department of Labour 2005, p.10). Following the introduction of this system, the number of Asian applicants decreased, with Great Britain becoming the largest source country (21% of all residence approvals, 30% of all skilled categories approvals), replacing India and China. For the 2004/2005 period, the UK remained the largest source country of residence approvals (31% of overall approvals, 42% of the skilled/business categories), followed by China (10% of overall approvals, 9% of skilled/business approvals), and India and South Africa (7% each of approvals overall) (Department of Labour 2005).

\(^9\) The International English Language Testing System (IELTS) is an international test that measures English language proficiency across the four dimensions of writing, reading, speaking and listening.
In addition to people migrating from Asian countries, there have been significant increases in recent years in the number of short-term visitors from Asia coming to Aotearoa/New Zealand as international students, temporary/seasonal workers, and tourists. Since the 1980s, international students have been recruited, to study principally at secondary and tertiary educational institutions, as well as English language schools, in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The number of total international student enrolments in 2000 was approximately 50,000, increasing by over 250% to 127,000 by 2002, with the majority of students tending to come from countries in Asia (mainly from China, Korea and Japan) (Ministry of Education 2006). International student numbers have dropped in the last few years, partly in response to negative media attention and concerns about student safety in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The total number of international student enrolments fell to 94,246 in 2005, with lower numbers than previous years from China, Japan, and South Korea. However, China remained the largest source country for international students, representing 38% of total international student enrolments in 2005, followed by South Korea (14%), and Japan (14%) (Ministry of Education 2006).

The numbers of individuals from Asian source countries receiving work permits has also increased since the 1990s. In 2004/2005, individuals from China and Japan represented 8% of total work permits each, with 5% from India, and 4% from South Korea. However, the United Kingdom overwhelmingly remained the largest source country, with 23% (Department of Labour 2005). There are also approximately 500,000 tourists from Asian countries visiting Aotearoa/New Zealand each year (Asia New Zealand 2002; Sos 2004).
According to figures from the 2006 Census of Population and Dwellings, the resident Asian population comprised 9.2% of the total population (354,552), an increase from 6.6% at the 2001 Census (Statistics New Zealand 2007). Within this broad category, many populations are represented, the largest being Chinese and Indian groups, but also Korean, Filipino, Japanese, Sri Lankan, and Cambodian, among others. Asian communities have received some significant media and political attention in recent years, particularly in relation to immigration (McGrath et al. 2005). This includes several periods of concentrated media coverage, such as the 1993 newspaper articles in Auckland on the ‘Inv-Asian’, a series on ‘Asian crime’ in 1995 and 2002, and more recent highlighting of ‘Asian students’ in the media (Ip & Murphy 2005, p. 34). A focus on Asian communities has also been a feature of immigration debates in Aotearoa/New Zealand throughout the period of policy shift that began with the 1986 Review. In 1996 and 2002, New Zealand First (a minor political party under the leadership of Winston Peters) ran overtly anti-immigration general election campaigns, with particular attention on Asian immigration. The anti-immigration position is suggested to have significantly increased the party’s popularity in the 1996 and 2002 general elections (Spoonley & Trlin 2004).

Anti-immigrant, as well as anti-Asian, sentiment has been linked by some commentators to perceived economic and labour market threats, particularly during times of economic insecurity. Economic arguments have certainly

10 The way in which these populations are defined for the purposes of official statistics is discussed in the next section of this chapter.
featured in both historical and contemporary debates surrounding Asian immigration, with trade union organisations, for example, having a long-standing role in promoting concerns about potential threats to the labour market from Asian migrants. It has also been suggested, however, that economic concerns do not sufficiently explain the extent and strength of the hostility that has been expressed towards Asian migrants, nor has anti-Asian sentiment been limited to times of economic downturn, but has also been apparent during periods of relative economic prosperity (Williams 2005).

Economics, therefore, does not provide the key to the nature and intensity of racist feeling in the two countries. In both New Zealand and Australia, racial antagonism changes in tone and animus according to where the ‘savage’ is placed in the racial hierarchy. But also, and in particular, there is a direct correlation between racism and the perceived degree of threat posed by the alien outsider (Williams 2005, p. 33).

Racism and discrimination were explicit in the early immigration and settlement environment, and continue to be part of the experience of Asian communities in Aotearoa/New Zealand. According to Ip (2003), there has been a resurgence of racism directed at Chinese in particular since the 1990s. A study by the Asia New Zealand Foundation found high levels of self-reported discrimination among Asian communities (McGrath et al. 2005). Recent research has also demonstrated discrimination against Asians in employment. In a study of recruitment agency response to New Zealand-born and Chinese migrant applicants with equivalent experience and educational backgrounds, it was found that Chinese candidates were significantly less likely to be ‘actively recruited’ (28% of New Zealand-born applicants compared with 9% of Chinese applicants), and significantly more
likely to not be engaged by the recruitment agency (27% of Chinese candidates compared with 3% of New Zealand-born candidates) (Centre for Applied Cross-Cultural Research 2004). Similar research undertaken at the Auckland University’s Business School found that in a simulated short-listing process, ethnicity and/or immigration status had a negative impact for Asian applicants, and Chinese applicants in particular (Gee Wilson et al. 2005). In addition, there have been ongoing reports of racism experienced by Asians in Aotearoa/New Zealand, including verbal abuse as well as ‘racially-motivated’ crimes such as serious physical assaults and damage to property. In relation to crime, it is likely that official reports underestimate the actual number of these types of crime, due to both the way in which crimes are classified as well as anecdotal under-reporting (de Bres 2005). In the Human Rights Commission’s 2006 Survey of perceived discrimination, respondents identified Asians (72%) as the group they felt most likely to experience a ‘great deal’ or ‘some’ discrimination in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Ministry of Social Development 2006).

This brief survey of the immigration and settlement of peoples from Asia in Aotearoa/New Zealand highlights, alongside the discrimination towards Asian groups in general, the specific and systematic racism that has been directed at Chinese individuals and communities. Although there has been increased immigration and contact with Asia, and the pursuit of closer economic and trade relations by successive governments in recent years, Aotearoa/New Zealand’s relationships with Asian peoples and communities remain complex and reflect the enduring impacts of colonial ideologies and discriminatory policies and practices. It is within this context that Asian
social group identity is represented and inter-group relationships are conceptualised.

**NEGOTIATING IDENTITIES IN AOTEAROA/NEW ZEALAND**

Group identities are dynamic, ‘imagined’ collectives that are constructed, negotiated, and contested within particular historical and socio-political environments\(^\text{11}\). Although identity development is sometimes framed principally as an individual, internalised process (Borell 2005), identity can also be conceptualised as socially constructed (Liu et al. 2005) and context-dependent, with the formulation and manifestation of group identity bound up with both time and place. In addition, within social science disciplines, group identities are generally understood to be discursively constructed (Hall 1996; Liu et al. 2005; Meinhof & Galasinski 2005). According to Hall (1996) this requires us to conceptualise identities as:

> produced in specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formations and practices, by specific enunciative strategies. Moreover, they emerge within the play of specific modalities of power, and thus are more the product of the marking of difference and exclusion, than they are the sign of an identical, naturally-constituted unity – an ‘identity’ in its traditional meaning (that is, an all-inclusive sameness, seamless, without internal differentiation) (p. 4).

\(^{11}\) ‘Imagined’ is used here in the sense that Benedict Anderson has used it to refer to the nation as an imagined community. Anderson (1991) proposes that “… all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined” (p. 6), as it is not possible for all members of a community to know all other members.
Within this approach, the notion of difference is central, necessitating attention to be paid to the inter-dependence of the formation of the identities of Other and Self (Hall 1996). This leads to a consideration of key ways in which difference between social groups is produced discursively in identity talk, including in colonial societies through the central discourses of race, ethnicity, and nation.

Social identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand: talking race, ethnicity, and nation
The collective identity of Asian has frequently been constructed within interrelated and intersecting discourses of race, ethnicity, and nation, in both historic and contemporary settings. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, the terms race and ethnicity regularly feature in public and private talk, particularly in relation to social groups and identities, including national identity. They are often presented and received as commonsense categories, and used interchangeably in spite of their different etymological and conceptual traditions. The concepts of race and ethnicity, both as they have been employed historically and as they operate in current contexts, are fundamental to understanding the various ways in which social groups are defined and named in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The history of the usage of the word race in Aotearoa/New Zealand reflects shifts in the concept over time and across sites. The term, as it appeared in the English language, was first used to classify people in relation to notions of descent or genealogy (Jackson & Penrose 1993, p. 4; Jordan 2000, p. 52), later developing into the idea of race as species or sub-species (Jordan 2000). In the 19th century, Social Darwinist thinking impacted on the conceptualisation of race as species, and racial categories became imbued with accompanying
judgements about relative superiority and inferiority (Jackson & Penrose 1993, 4).

The idea of race as a scientifically valid means of classifying human populations has largely been discredited, particularly as developments in fields such as biology and genetics have challenged notions of biologically discrete groups (Jackson & Penrose 1993, p.4) and questioned the nature and extent of the relationship between phenotypic variations, such as skin colour and hair type, and genetic variation. As a result, race is increasingly being understood, particularly within the social sciences, as a socially constructed category that, while not real in any biological sense, exists as a central way “… of conceptualizing and organizing social worlds …” (Barker 1990, p.61) with real and significant social impacts. However, the term race continues to be used, particularly within certain disciplinary discourses, as if it represents a fixed, biological category. In this sense, the rejection of race as a valid scientific means of classifying human variation (primarily as it is represented by differences in phenotype) has not been complete. Further, it has certainly not been abandoned in everyday discourse, and frequently occurs as a synonym for related concepts including ethnicity and nation. The persistence and tenacity of the notion of race relates as much to its usefulness and efficacy, as it does to any perceived scientific credibility. Within the context of imperialism, for example, racial categorisations aided the justification and legitimisation of policies of colonisation and dispossession. The Other, be it the Native Other, or the alien outsider, was represented in racial terms (Nairn et al. 2006), often within a hierarchy of relative superiority and inferiority. Racialised language in identity talk, such as reference to degrees of blood, has
endured and remains part of both everyday and elite discourse in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

As in many international settings, ethnicity is a complex and contested term in Aotearoa/New Zealand, in spite of its common usage in both formal and informal settings. Many definitions emphasise the Otherness of ethnicity – that is, the notion that ethnicity is something that the Other has:

It is always the subordinated Other who is designated as “ethnic” rather than the dominant self, inscribing not merely the existence of racialized difference but also its significance in terms of the differential relations of power that are brought to bear on the process of definition (Jackson & Penrose 1993, p. 18).

As a label, ethnic is commonly used to refer to things that are seen to deviate from the social norm, for example ‘ethnic food’ or ‘ethnic festivals’. The term ethnic is also often collocated with minority, reflecting this conceptualisation of ethnic as representing something that is different or divergent from the ‘mainstream’ or majority identity.

There are overlaps, but also differences, between the usage of the terms of race and ethnicity in everyday language and the way in which population groups within Aotearoa/New Zealand have been conceptualised formally, through official and legislative means. Historically, group identities were constructed in official statistics based on racialised approaches that emphasised descent and blood quantum (Robson & Reid 2001):
(b). Race. (If not of European race, write “Maori,” “Chinese,” “Hindu,” “Javanese,” “Negro,” “Polynesian,” &c., or “Maori half-caste,” “Chinese half-caste,” &c., as the case may be.) (Statistics Office 1916).

Contemporary official definitions have generally moved away from biological definitions to those based on cultural affiliation and self-identification. This change is reflected in the way in which this data has been collected in more recent population censuses, which, since 1986, have allowed for people to self-identify the ethnic groups that they feel they belong to. Although the official move has been away from race-based approaches to the classification of ethnic affiliation, this movement has not been completely operationalised within official statistics, nor has it fully transferred through into the public sphere. There is still substantial variation in the way in which various official agencies collect ethnicity data, the questions that are asked, and the response categories that are included. Many of these response categories reflect confusion over the concept of ethnicity, while others include racial markers such as Caucasian that have the potential to reify discredited categories and reinforce the association of ethnicity with phenotype.

In official statistics in Aotearoa/New Zealand, ethnicity is currently defined as follows:

| Ethnicity is the ethnic group or groups that people identify with or feel they belong to. Ethnicity is a measure of cultural affiliation, as opposed to race, ancestry, nationality or citizenship. Ethnicity is self-perceived and people can affiliate with more than one ethnic group. |
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An ethnic group is made up of people who have some or all of the following characteristics:
- a common proper name
- one or more elements of common culture which need not be specified, but may include religion, customs or language
- unique community of interests, feelings and actions
- a shared sense of common origins or ancestry, and
- a common geographic origin.

Source: Statistics New Zealand (2005)

Ethnicity is categorised based on a hierarchical classification system with four levels, from least detailed to most detailed. At the highest level this includes six categories: European, Māori, Pacific, Asian, Middle Eastern/African/Latin American, and Other\(^\text{12}\). These categories are essentially aggregate ethnic groups or pan-ethnic groups within which there are a number of more specific ethnic groups\(^\text{13}\). For example, the Asian grouping includes approximately thirty groups at the lowest level of disaggregation. Although ethnicity is not a measure of nationality, a number of the categories in the Statistics New Zealand classification system are nationality-based, in that they represent geographical origin rather than ethnicity per se. In addition, the grouping together of ethnic groups is somewhat arbitrary, in the sense that the Asian group is aggregated broadly based on geographical region, as is Pacific. However, the Middle Eastern/African/Latin American grouping is unlikely to share many overlapping characteristics, geographic or otherwise. Most ethnic statistics are reported at this aggregate group level. It is unclear

\(^\text{12}\) There is also a Residual category for those codes that are outside the scope of the classification system or unable to be classified.

\(^\text{13}\) The exception is Maori, which does not have any further disaggregation.
the extent to which official definitions influence the development of collective identities, as opposed to reflecting them – although it is most likely to be a combination of both. It is also unclear the extent to which these official definitions influence public understandings and conceptualisations of race, ethnicity and nation. However, they do have a significant role in defining group identities at a state level, feeding through into institutional policies and practices.

Notions of race and ethnicity intersect with conceptualisations of national identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand in both formal and informal ways, as they do in other white settler societies (Moran 2005). The work of Benedict Anderson (1991) and the idea of the nation as an imagined community has had a significant influence on social scientific understandings of national identity. The nation, often represented in everyday talk as a natural, pre-existing entity, is seen to be primarily constructed through discourse (de Cillia et al. 1999) and the circulation of shared symbols and mythologies. In white settler societies, national mythologies often include the denial or minimisation of processes fundamental to imperialism and colonisation, including dispossession and violence (Razack 2002). In Aotearoa/New Zealand, many of the shared symbols and stories that underlie the representation of national identity also draw on ‘Britishness’ through the intersection of national identity with racial/ethnic identity, by which white settler ways and whiteness, or more specifically Britishness, is normalised and privileged (Murphy 2003, p. 49). However, formulations of national identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand also often include reference to egalitarianism and classlessness (Ip 2003), national values that attempt to make a distinction between traditional British society and the ‘Britain of the
South Seas’. In addition, national imaginings in Aotearoa/New Zealand at times strategically draw on Māori symbols and imagery to make this differentiation and to mark uniqueness. It is in this way that symbols such as haka have been appropriated as national symbols, particularly as they are performed in interactions between nations, yet remain misrepresented and misunderstood within the nation itself.

The notions of Self and Other are fundamental to nationhood (Billington et al. 1998), as is this marking of difference. Nations necessarily entail the definition of boundaries and limits, thereby relying on processes of inclusion and exclusion. These include formal processes such as citizenship and immigration policies and practices, as well as manifold informal processes. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, Murphy asserts that the “…physical exclusion of Chinese from New Zealand, and by extension from the intellectual construct of ‘New Zealand’, was instrumental in the formation of New Zealand’s national identity” (Murphy 2003, p. 48). The processes of denigration and dispossession of the Native Other, and the exclusion of and discrimination against the ‘alien Other’ are, therefore, central to the production of Aotearoa/New Zealand’s national identity.

**Who is ‘Asian’?: definitions of Asian identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand**

Developments over time and place in understandings of race and ethnicity are reflected in the terminology that has been used to describe the collective broadly referred to in current discourse as ‘Asian’. It is unclear when the term first came into common usage in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Other terms
such as Asiatic and Oriental that had popularity historically have tended to become less common over time, although they do still have currency.\textsuperscript{14}

Institutionalised definitions of Asian social group identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand have been constructed primarily around geographical boundaries – that is, an Asian is conceptualised as an individual associated with or considered to be from the geographical region of Asia (however this may be defined). In spite of this, formal usage of the term does not overlap completely with the geographical definition of the Asian continent. For example, Statistics New Zealand excludes the Middle East and some Central Asian countries from their usage of the term (Workshop Organising Team 2005). In this sense, it is a relatively arbitrary way of classifying people, although it is commonly deployed as a natural, taken-for-granted category. This aggregate category includes disparate groups of people in a manner similar to other aggregate social groupings such as European and Pacific. In some cases, more specific aggregate terms such as South East Asian are applied. The situated nature of the term Asian is also demonstrated by the differences in usage of the term internationally. In the United Kingdom, for example, the term Asian is used generally to refer to people of Indian, Pakistani, or Bangladeshi ethnicity. While the primary interest of this thesis is the external imposition of the term Asian on individuals and communities, it should be noted that it is also applied within ‘Asian’ groups under particular circumstances or in order to meet various goals.

\textsuperscript{14} For example, in 2005, during parliamentary question time, both the Prime Minister Helen Clark and the MP Ron Mark used the term Asiatic in reference to their discussion of crime by Asians (see HANSARD, Tuesday 8 March 2005, Questions for Oral Answer: 18956-18957).
It has been suggested that in spite of Asian being a broad, aggregate term in common usage in Aotearoa/New Zealand, it generally does not refer to everyone from the continent of Asia, but is understood to refer to particular groups of Asians. The term is most commonly used to talk about Southeast Asian, Korean, Japanese, and Chinese groups (Foley & De Souza 2005; Vasil & Yoon 1996), particularly Chinese (Ip & Murphy 2005; McKinnon 1996), and is, in general, not used in reference to peoples from West Asia. This association of the term Asian with certain specific groups, and most notably Chinese, is likely to be at least partially related to the particular domestic context within which Chinese have been the primary focus of discriminatory regulations, policies, and discourses.

SITUATING SOCIAL IDENTITIES AND RELATIONS

The construction of social identities and relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand is intimately linked with its socio-political and historical context and, in particular, its colonial context. This includes policies and practices relating to immigration and settlement, as well as the construction of the imagined communities of nation, race, and ethnicity in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context. The ways in which these social relations are organised is part of the ongoing colonial experience in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Wall 1997). Colonialism, therefore, is not viewed as merely an historical context within this study but, in line with Pennycook (1998), as a primary and significant site of cultural production that continues to enjoy considerable influence in contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand.
Although the categories of race, ethnicity, and nation are often represented as
discrete, natural, and immutable, they are increasingly being understood as
socially constituted and imagined, as belonging relies to an extent on
perceived rather than tangible relationships. Their function and impact is
material, however. The formal regulation of identity through the
construction of official categories and classifications has effects both on public
understandings of group identity and on social realities. The ways in which
group identities such as Asian are both formally and informally constructed
also provide insight into the various ways in which the social world is
understood and ordered.

As this chapter has outlined, the term Asian is complex and difficult to
define. Within Aotearoa/New Zealand it is formally based around
geographical distinctions, but in common usage also reflects reference to
specific Asian groups namely Southeast Asian, Korean, Japanese, and in
particular, Chinese. While this makes the term problematic at one level, it is
also of central relevance to the current study, as it illustrates the functional
use of the category and raises questions about how and when the term is
used, by whom, and for what purposes.
Increasing scholarly interest in the discursive construction of social identities and groups is associated with a growing body of literature that examines the various representations of Otherness that are produced and circulated by cultural institutions. In colonial societies, the representation of Otherness has tended to work in concert with representations of race as a way of constructing and expressing difference. According to Hall (1997a), imagery of the racialised Other in the ‘West’ developed within the context of imperial and colonial enterprises. While these images have shifted over time, as a result of spatial and socio-political conditions, contemporary articulations frequently retain elements of earlier representations (Hall 1997b). Representations of the Other, therefore, embody complexities and contradictions, as well as continuities.

This chapter seeks to outline the existing literature relating to the representation of Asian individuals and communities in the discourses of dominant and dominating media and political institutions. This includes a brief survey of the broader research on media and political representations of social identities and groups, with a particular emphasis on discourse analytical literature in this area, as well as a more specific consideration of the domestic and international literature on representations of Asian identity. In undertaking this mapping exercise, the chapter aims to provide both rationale
for undertaking the current research project, as well as a context to the findings and discussion that follow.

**REPRESENTING OTHERNESS IN ELITE INSTITUTIONS**

Cultural institutions have long been involved in the creation and dissemination of representations of social groups. Critical examination of the role of cultural products in the formation of social identities and the discursive production of Other groups is more recent however, and has been influenced by structuralist and post-structuralist approaches to the construction of social groups and social relations (Rankine & McCreanor 2004), as well as by developments in the theorising of culture and the representation of difference, particularly within disciplines such as cultural studies (Hall 1997b).

**Mass media and the portrayal of Other groups**

In relation to the mass media, this increased critical interest was reflected in the emergence of a body of literature in the 1970s and 1980s examining the media portrayal of social groups and socio-political relations, and the coverage of issues of race (Hartmann & Husband 1974; van Dijk 1987; Wilson & Gutierrez 1985). This literature, much of it originating in Britain and the United States, identified a tendency for mass media to portray ethnic groups, particularly those constructed as ‘minorities’, in stigmatising and over-generalised ways, often problematising communities and focusing on issues of crime, deviance, and difference (Hartmann & Husband 1974; Law 2002; van Dijk 1991). In summarising this early work, van Dijk (1991) notes the consistency of much of the findings in relation to mass media coverage of
ethnic and race issues and the implications of this for understandings of social realities and relationships:

While paying extensive attention to these racialized or ethnicized forms of problems or conflicts, it [media] failed to pay attention to the deeper social, political, or economic causes and backgrounds of these conflicts. From the point of view of a ‘white man’s world’, minorities and other Third World peoples are generally categorized as ‘them’, and opposed to ‘us’, and, especially in western Europe, as not belonging, if not as an aberration, in white society (pp. 20-21).

More recent research examining the media portrayal of groups defined as ethnic ‘minorities’ has in general reproduced the conclusions of earlier studies, demonstrating the recurring problematisation of ethnic groups in media coverage and the persistence of negative stereotypes and generalisations (Campbell 1995; Cottle 2000; Mahtani 2001; Reisigl & Wodak 2001; van Dijk 1991). Ethnic ‘minority’ groups in the mass media have been shown to be frequently and consistently associated with specific topics and themes, namely those of crime (and other forms of deviance), immigration, difference, and inter-group relations (Law 2002; van Dijk 1991). In tandem with the foregrounding of particular thematic content is the tendency to represent these topics from what has been termed a ‘dominant perspective’ (van Dijk 1987, p. 40), giving prominence to white voices and sources, while simultaneously marginalising Other voices (van Dijk 1991).

Alongside the examination of mass media portrayals ethnic groups are investigations that are more specifically concerned with the mass media portrayal of immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers (Essed 1990; Lynn & Lea 2003; Teo 2000), as well as related literature that deals more generally
with the media coverage of immigration (Danso & McDonald 2001; Santa Ana 1999). Detailed examination and critique of the depiction of indigenous peoples in and through the media is relatively limited, but includes studies in Canada (Harding 2006; Henry & Tator 2000), Finland (Pietikainen 2003), as well as Aotearoa/New Zealand (see discussion below). In recent years, increased attention has also been paid to investigating the representation of whiteness and multiculturalism in the media (Cottle 2000; Ferguson 1998; Fiske 1996, 2000; Gabriel 1998; Law 2002), with this literature identifying more clearly the “… often contradictory representations of race” (Neal 2003, p. 59).

While the literature points to general tendencies in content and theme, specific manifestations of Otherness appear in variant forms in the mass media across different sites and contexts. In relation to representations of race in the British press, Law (2002) notes that a number of shifts in imagery over time have been identified:

These representations of race have included the brutal and pragmatic economic racism of the slave trade era, the paternal and idealised imagery of the noble savage, the caricatures of minstrelsy, the Victorian science of racial inferiority and the vilification of intermarriage, ‘half-castes’ and emerging poor black communities in British cities in the 1920s and 1930s (Lorimer, 1978; Law, 1981). Cottle’s (1982, 1999) review of the relevant literature has also identified that in the 1950s and 1960s Asian and African-Caribbean migrants were cast as a ‘numbers’ problem linked to urban decline, public ill-health and violence and disorder. In the 1970s, the period of the ‘Great Moving-Right Show’ in British politics, immigrant numbers, young black muggers and the conflict between the extreme right and anti-racist organisations were dominant news themes (Hall et al., 1978) (p. 37).
However, while the specific imagery may change, essential elements of the overall representation are often retained and reproduced. Cottle (2000) observes, for example, that black men are persistently imagined as ‘racialized, criminalized, and sexualised’ (p. 14). In addition, the trend towards stereotypical and often negative portrayals has been found to exist across the range of media formats, genres and products, including in film (Rodriguez 1997; Wilson II & Gutierrez 1985), television (Hartmann & Husband 1974), the press (Law 2002; van Dijk 1991), and in news coverage (Law 2002).

Studies of the portrayal of Other groups in the mass media have included a range of different approaches. Of particular significance for this study is the growing body of literature that goes beyond descriptive analyses of the ways in which various Others (ethnic minorities, migrants, indigenous peoples and so on) are depicted in mass media products, to examine how social groups and social relations are discursively constructed, and the textual and linguistic strategies involved in this construction process. Much of this work has been undertaken within critical discourse studies, including influential work by van Dijk examining racism in elite discourses and the portrayal of ethnic affairs and relations (van Dijk 1987, 1991, 1993, 2000) in both Europe and the United States, and by Wodak and colleagues in relation to discourses of discrimination and anti-Semitism (Reisigl & Wodak 2001; Wodak 1997), and the discursive construction of national identity (de Cillia et al. 1999; Wodak et al. 1999). This literature has been important in exposing the range of content and strategies that are characteristic of discourses about ethnic groups and ethnic affairs in these particular settings.
Conceptualisation of the representation of racialised Otherness in the mass media is informed by related work in other fields, including research into media portrayals of gender, class, sexuality and age, for example. However, the limited number of studies that examine the interaction and interrelationships of representations has been identified as an issue (Meyers 2004).

**Political institutions and the portrayal of Other groups**

In comparison with studies of mass media coverage, literature that examines the ways in which various social groups are characterised in political discourse is relatively sparse. This is in spite of the central and influential role that political institutions have in relation to the construction and representation of social groups, relations, and realities. There has been an increase in studies, including discourse analytical studies, which examine discourses on indigenous peoples, ‘minority groups’, immigration, and ethnic relations in parliamentary debates and other political texts since the 1990s (Blommaert & Vershueren 1998; Carbo 1997; van der Valk 2003; van Dijk 1993, 1997a, 2000). Some of these studies have focused on extreme discourses, whereas others have been more concerned with ‘mainstream’ or Left discourses. A number of studies concentrate on a particular case, such as a high-profile event, while others have been more generally interested in the discursive construction of identities (through political speeches as well as other sources) (de Cillia et al. 1999; Wodak 1996b, 2002; Wodak et al. 1999).

In a comprehensive and influential study of British parliamentary debates about immigration, race relations, and related topics, Reeves (1983) highlighted the ‘deracialisation’ of social relations within parliamentary talk,
not as an anti-racist move but as a way of simultaneously disclaiming racist intent while conveying the speaker’s intentions to the audience. Reeves established that within this particular context, politicians deployed a number of recurring and relatively consistent *argument forms* and *rhetorical modes* to talk about immigration and justify particular political actions in a deracialised manner. These included: personalised, dispositional, and agential; abstracted social process arguments; populist arguments; economic arguments; pro bono public arguments; reciprocity arguments; means oriented arguments; techniques of quantification; analogical transformation; mode of ambiguity; and, attribution (pp. 210-239).1

Through studies of political discourse in France, Germany, Great Britain, the Netherlands and the United States, van Dijk (1997a) has similarly identified a number of what he has characterised as over-arching strategies in parliamentary debates about Others, namely strategies of: positive self-presentation; negative Other-presentation; denial of racism; apparent sympathy; fairness; top-down transfer; and, justification (pp. 36-39).2 These strategies have also been detected in analyses undertaken in other contexts. For example, in an analysis of right-wing parliamentary discourses in France, van der Valk (2003) noted the prevalence of strategies of negative other-presentation, which operated in relation not only to immigrants, but also as a strategy to denigrate the Left.

1 These are further described and discussed in Chapter 5 in relation to the analytical framework used in the current study.

2 Ibid.
Mass media and political portrayals of the Other in Aotearoa/New Zealand

There is limited research that has specifically investigated issues of mass media representation in Aotearoa/New Zealand, particularly as it pertains to representations of social and group identities, including those defined in terms of ethnicity, culture, and nationality. Much of the research that is available in this area has tended to focus on the portrayal of Māori within mass media and coverage of race relations (Abel 1997; McCreanor 1993, 1995; Moewaka Barnes et al. 2005; Spoonley & Hirsh 1990; The Media Research Team 2005; Wall 1997). This work has generally identified a lack of coverage of Māori issues, an over-emphasis on negative content, and a heavy reliance on Pākehā sources and voices (Moewaka Barnes et al. 2005; Rankine & McCreanor 2004), findings that resonate with trends identified in much of the related international literature.

Mass media representations of Māori have also been demonstrated to draw on generalised and stereotypical imagery. In a study of contemporary representations of Māori in the media for example, Wall (1997) identified the ongoing stereotyping of Māori as the ‘Black Other’ and persistent use of racialised discourses. She noted that the recent manifestations of this racialised imagery included the stereotypes of Māori as: the comic Other; primitive natural athlete; radical political activists; and, the quintessential Māori. These stereotypes were variations on earlier portrayals of Māori as savage, warlike, primitive and sexualised, imagery that resonates with representations of Native Otherness in many white settler societies.

In relation to groups other than Māori, recently published analysis of print media portrayals of Pacific peoples in Aotearoa/New Zealand has
demonstrated similar trends in terms of the deployment of problematising and negative representations, with Pacific peoples “… predominantly portrayed as unmotivated, unhealthy and criminal others who are overly dependent on Palagi support” (Loto et al. 2006, p. 100).

In Aotearoa/New Zealand, there is also a broader related literature that is concerned with Pākehā discourses about Māori and Māori/Pākehā relations (Abel 1997; McCreanor 1995; Wetherell & Potter 1992). This literature provides valuable insights into the ways in which social identities and relationships are represented in and through dominant discourses. For example, in their influential research on the discourses of white New Zealanders, Wetherell and Potter (1992) identified the tendency for Pākehā to draw on narratives that justified and legitimised colonisation and current social realities, and to utilise racialised discourses and stereotypes in their talk about Māori.

Although these studies identify commonsense understandings of social relations and provide insight into the construction of social realities through the deployment of what have been termed ‘standard stories’ (McCreanor 1993) or ‘interpretive repertoires’ (Wetherell & Potter 1992), it is difficult to estimate the extent to which the findings in relation to the portrayal of Māori and Pacific peoples and Māori/Pākehā relations apply to other social groups, particularly in the absence of specific literature addressing this issue. It is likely that although there will be some degree of commonality, there is also likely to be significant divergence, particularly in light of the context-dependent nature of social representations.
There is a dearth of literature that examines the portrayal of Other groups in political discourses in Aotearoa/New Zealand. While there is some overlapping literature that deals with the mediated representation of political issues including immigration through the analysis of media texts (Spoonley & Trlin 2004), there is little specific domestic research on the various ways in which social groups, particularly those that are defined in ethnic or cultural terms, are portrayed in political text and talk.

**REPRESENTATION OF THE ‘ASIAN OTHER’**

Contemporary portrayals of Asian identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand have developed within a specific historical and socio-political context. However, current imagery also reflects broader conceptions of Asians as Others, specifically as Oriental Others. Representations of Asian identity in the ‘West’ are fundamentally related to Western imaginings of the Orient. In this respect, Said’s (1978) theorising of Orientalism as

> the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient – dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient (p.3)

has had a major influence on the way questions of the representation of Asians in the West are approached.

According to Said (1978), it is necessary to conceive of Orientalism as a discourse in order to comprehend the ways in which “… European culture
was able to manage – and even produce – the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period” (p. 3). The discourse of Orientalism relies on the relational positioning of the East and the West, in that it is founded on the dichotomy between “… “the Orient” and (most of the time) “the Occident”” (Said 1978, p. 2). The construction of the Asian Other is therefore dependent on oppositional and binary classifications that emphasise distinctions between ‘us’ and ‘them’ (or Self and Other). As Xing (1998) notes, according to “… this East/West, self/other polarity, Orientals are what Occidentals are not” (p. 65). In terms of the portrayal of Asia and Asians in the West, the theory of Orientalism provides a useful framework for understanding the historical and social-embeddedness of contemporary representations of Asians within the discourses of elite institutions in the West, and more particularly, within Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Internationally, there is a body of literature examining the ways in which Asian individuals are portrayed in popular culture and mass media, in relation to both the quantity and quality of representations (Chan 2001; Hamamoto 1994; Kashiwabara 1996; Marchetti 1993; Sun 2003; Xing 1998). These studies note the privileging of particular portrayals of Asian identity, and generally demonstrate that while there has been an increase in Asian players in some areas of the media, there is continued reliance on stereotypical and generalised portrayals of Asians.

A number of these stereotypical portrayals have been identified in studies of ‘entertainment’ media genres in the United States. In relation to Hollywood films, for example, Xing (1998) found that representations of Asians have
tended to be based on three conventional images: the ‘yellow peril’ image (often personified through rape and/or war stories), the ‘Madame Butterfly’ image (typified in relationships between white men and exotic Asian women), and the ‘Charlie Chan’ image (the stereotyping of Asian men as submissive and unassertive) (pp. 55-64). In an analysis of the representation of Chinese masculinity through television, film, and comic books, Chan (2001) showed that Asian men were typically limited to the following stereotypical characterisations:

... the images of Asians, in order to be accepted by mainstream American audiences, need to fall into specific stereotypes, such as the evil dictator of the East, the model minority of Hawaii, or the “super men” of martial arts. These images represent what mainstream white cultural produces find acceptable in terms of Asian images in popular media (p. 119).

Much of this imagery draws on sexualised narratives of the Asian Other. Representations of Asian American men commonly portray them as “sexually deviant, paradoxically either asexual or as a rape threat to white women” (Sun 2003, p.657). This asexualisation of Asian males has been typified in archetypal ‘bachelor father’ roles common in film and television representations of Asian men (Hamamoto 1994). However, the desexualisation of Asian males is rarely, if ever, contextualised in terms of the historical forces by which bachelor societies were created (Sun 2003).

As opposed to the desexualisation of Asian men, Asian women tend to be ‘hypersexualised’ and exoticised. In line with the ‘Madame Butterfly’ imagery noted by Xing (1998), relationships between Asian women and white
men are ‘naturalized’, while relationships between Asian men and Asian women, or between Asian men and white women remain uncommon.

In research of advertising images, a number of other stereotypical portrayals of Asian American identity have been demonstrated, including the depiction of Asian Americans as ‘highly educated, proficient with technology, and affluent’ in US magazine advertising (Paek & Shah 2003). This finding is echoed in a study of television advertising examining the representation of race. Asians were most likely to be included in advertising for technology and most commonly portrayed in a work setting (Mastro & Stern 2003). Mastro and Stern (2003) comment that “… Asians attending to images of self will typically find young, passive adults at work in technology ads. Potentially, this may serve to reinforce perceptions of Asian Americans as dedicated to work only, ultimately tying self-worth to submissiveness and superior achievement” (p. 645). It is likely that this particular imagery is related to categorisations of Asians as hard-working and intelligent, a component of the ‘model minority’ stereotype that has also been identified as a dominant discourse about Asian individuals and communities (Kawai 2005).

The literature on coverage and portrayals of Asians in ‘factual’ media and other non-entertainment genres, such as news reporting, is more limited, as is specific work on the representations of Asians in political discourses. The available literature does suggest however than many of the stereotypical and over-generalised representations that have been identified in entertainment genres, also operate in these areas. In summarising the literature on the portrayal of Asian peoples in the Canadian media, Mahtani (2001) notes a
focus on crime and immigration, and the association of Asians with threat. This representation of crisis or threat is strongly tied to the ‘yellow peril’ stereotype of Asians that exists in media and political discourses, and occurs in a number of settler societies, including the United States, Australia, Canada and Aotearoa/New Zealand. For example, in a study of the news coverage of the 1999 arrival in Canada of approximately 600 ‘illegal’ migrants from China, Hier and Greenberg (2002) identified the problematisation of the Chinese migrants through two thematic modes, namely racialisation and illegality. In addition, they noted how this contributed to what they have described as the ‘discursive construction of a crisis’, by which the migrants became represented as a threat, particularly in relation to health and crime (Hier & Greenberg 2002).

Representations of Asian identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand
There is limited work dealing specifically with the portrayal of Asians in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Of particular significance to the current thesis is the recently published work by Ip and Murphy (2005) examining the representation of Asians in cartoon images. Through the presentation and discussion of both historic and contemporary cartoon images of Asians, most notably Chinese individuals and communities, Ip and Murphy identify a number of recurrent and persistent themes and imagery. This includes the linking of Asians with threat, a form of the ‘Yellow Peril’ image that has been identified in other settings. This notion of threat was conveyed in economic terms, and also as a more general threat to New Zealand identity. In addition, the authors outline a number of characterisations of Asians, including those relating to bad driving, wealth, and intelligence, suggesting that Asians in Aotearoa/New Zealand have functioned as the ‘ultimate Other’
for Pākehā, through repeated stereotypical depictions (Ip & Murphy 2005, p.8).

Of relevance also to the current study is work by Spoonley and Trlin (2004) on the media representation of immigration and immigrants in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Spoonley and Trlin analysed ten years of print media reporting (1993–2003) on immigration issues and, while there was not an exclusive concentration on Asian communities, did identify several key findings in relation to the portrayal of Asians in the Aotearoa/New Zealand media. Notably, the research found that during this period there was a media focus on Asian immigrants, in a way that was often negative or problematising. According to Spoonley and Trlin (2004) the:

... print media, in the early and mid-1990s, tended to equate immigration with the arrival of Asians, and then to employ the label ‘Asian’ crudely so that substantial differences between groups from various Asian countries or regions have frequently been ignored (p. vi).

However, the authors did note that there was a difference over time with the generalised, negative reporting more common in the mid-1990s, and reporting with a more ‘positive’ slant increasing in the late 1990s (2004, p. iv). In addition, they found a distinction existed by type of text, noting news texts tended to be more stereotypical and stigmatising, while feature writing incorporated a generally more positive tone.

In a similar vein is research by Roscoe (2000) into the ways in which immigrant communities were represented in a local television documentary
series, ‘Immigrant Nation’, screened in 1995. The series incorporated four programmes, one of which was focused on Chinese (the others were Italian, Dalmatian, and Irish). While there were positive comments from Taiwanese and Chinese audiences spoken to about the documentary, Roscoe (2000) notes that in trying to cater for a ‘mainstream audience’ in representing marginalised groups, that “… ‘mainstreaming of the margins’ ultimately means that the communities are not represented for and by themselves, but are offered up as ‘exotic others’ to be consumed by the mainstream audience” (p. 257).

In their stocktake of research on New Zealand-Asia engagement, the New Zealand Asia Institute (2005) note that both the limited media coverage of Asia and of Asian communities (both international and domestic communities), and the lack of research into this in Aotearoa/New Zealand, continue to be issues.

**SUMMARY**

In summary, although there is a growing literature on the representation of the Other in mass media and political discourses internationally, there is relatively limited research specifically examining the representation of Asian identity by and through the discourses of these institutions. While there have been a number of insightful studies into the portrayal of Asian identity within entertainment genres such as film and television, there has been less research dealing with other genres, including news and other ‘factual’ genres, as well as political text and talk.
In addition, there is little research that has been produced within the Aotearoa/New Zealand context examining these issues. The majority of that work, albeit limited, has tended to focus on representations of Māori and/or race relations, that is, the Native Other as opposed to the Asian Other. The research that does exist echoes the international literature in identifying the association of Other groups in the media with particular content, the tendency towards negative portrayal, and the persistent use of over-generalisations and stereotypes.

However, a number of repeated portrayals of the Asian Other are evident. In relation to the representation of Asian collectives, the recurring ‘Yellow Peril’ imagery is one of the most enduring depictions. It occurs across different media genres and different sites, including within Aotearoa/New Zealand, and is often associated with themes of criminalisation, crisis and threat (economic, moral or otherwise). In addition, the portrayal of Asians as a ‘model minority’, often drawing on characterisations of Asians as hard-working, intelligent and submissive, continues to enjoy currency.
… the Other is located most fundamentally in language, the medium for representing selves and others (Shapiro 1989, p. 28 as cited in Pennycook 1998, p. 5).

The choice of research questions and approach to analysis is governed in large part by the paradigm within which a study is located and the theoretical assumptions that underpin this. This chapter seeks to outline the overarching theoretical influences, as well as to define and discuss the key theoretical assumptions, that provide the framework for the current study. These assumptions primarily relate to the conceptualisation of language, and more specifically discourse, to theories of representation, and to notions of ideology and elite power. In briefly exploring these, the chapter aims to situate and contextualise the research approach taken in this study and provide the groundwork for examining in more detail in the following chapter the particular methodological framework employed, that is, critical discourse analysis.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
This study brings together a number of theoretical positionings, in line with the interdisciplinarity that characterises much critical discourse analysis. Critical discourse approaches to the study of discourse are generally not based on a unitary theory, tending instead to draw on theoretical perspectives from different traditions and disciplines. This thesis is
principally influenced by theoretical perspectives broadly grouped under the term social constructionism, particularly those that have developed within the disciplines of sociology, linguistics, and cultural studies. Principles drawn from post-structuralism and whiteness theory have also informed the direction of the current study and the definition of underlying theoretical concepts. This section does not attempt to provide a comprehensive or exhaustive discussion of these positionings, but rather seeks to outline how they have variously contributed to the overall theoretical framework of this thesis.

**Social constructionist approaches to inquiry**

Social constructionist approaches have multiple origins, drawing on work from a number of theorists and disciplines (Burr 2003). As a paradigm, social constructionism is not a theory *per se*, but rather a term used as a descriptor for a range of theories that share a common ontological and epistemological base. In this sense, social constructionism can be thought of more broadly as a theoretical approach or positioning that guides research practice.

Four underpinning assumptions have been identified as being key distinguishing characteristics of social constructionist approaches (Burr 2003; Jorgensen & Phillips 2002). The first of these relates to the way in which social constructionism approaches knowledge, and in particular *taken-for-granted* knowledge (Burr 2003). In general, social constructionist approaches view knowledge as something that is produced and subjective. Social constructionism is thus generally in opposition to positivist traditions by which a reality is presumed to exist and, further, presumed to be able to be studied objectively to reveal truth (Burr 2003; Jorgensen & Phillips 2002).
Social constructionist theories are therefore anti-objectivist and anti-empiricist in their rejection of an objective, pre-existing, and universal reality (Barker 2004).

Secondly, social constructionists conceive of knowledge as historically and culturally located (Burr 2003; Jorgensen & Phillips 2002), that is, all knowledge is situated and contingent on specific settings of time, space, and place:

Not only are they [all ways of understanding] specific to particular cultures and periods of history, they are seen as products of that culture and history, and are dependent upon the particular social and economic arrangements prevailing in that culture at that time (Burr 2003, p. 4).

According to Jorgenson and Phillips (2002), this positions social constructionist theories as anti-foundationalist, in that they are “… in opposition to the foundationalist-view that knowledge can be grounded on a solid, metatheoretical base that transcends contingent human actions” (p. 5). This notion of the situated nature of knowledge has implications for the way in which social constructionists view all knowledge, including that which is produced by social constructionists themselves (Burr 2003, p. 4).

A third underlying assumption of social constructionist approaches is that of the interdependence of knowledge and social processes. Social interaction is seen to be central to the ways in which knowledge is constructed and becomes accepted as commonsense (Burr 2003; Jorgensen & Phillips 2002). Knowledge is created through social processes and practices, and in this
manner knowledge is not only discursively constructed but also socially constructed through social interactions.

Finally, knowledge is understood by social constructionists to be linked not only to social interaction in terms of its creation, but also in the sense that knowledge governs and structures social actions and processes. In this way, knowledge is produced through social processes, while it simultaneously informs and shapes those very social processes and determines the actions that are considered normal or accepted, and those that are not (Jorgensen & Phillips 2002).

These assumptions about the nature of knowledge and reality, and the relationships between knowledge and social action and interaction, orient the social constructionist researcher away from claims of truth and objectivity. This apparent rejection of the notion of a reality or truth has been an aspect of social constructionist theorising that has attracted discussion and critique (c.f. Burr 2003 for a fuller discussion of this).

**Poststructuralism and the social world**

Within this broader social constructionist orientation, poststructuralist theorising has influenced the approach of the current research, specifically in relation to the conceptualisation of language and the notions of subjectivity and identity. Poststructuralism is one theory that falls within the broader category of social constructionism (Jorgensen & Phillips 2002, p. 6), developing from and building upon the structuralist theories of the 1950s and 1960s.
Principally associated with the Swiss linguist Saussure, structuralism introduced a new way of approaching language that emphasised the role of underlying structures in the production of meaning (Burr 2003, p.50). Structuralism was deeply interested in the way in which meaning was produced through a system of ‘signs’ (Barker 2004), rejecting the view that language reflected a pre-determined reality, and instead arguing that language constructed meaning through a relational system of ‘signifiers’ and ‘signifieds’ (Burr 2003, p.52), also referred to as a ‘system of differences’ (Chambers 1997, p.34). Although Saussure argued that signs had no pre-fixed meaning and that concepts were, therefore, ‘arbitrary divisions and categorisations of our experiences’, he did contend that meaning became fixed once it was connected to a particular sign (Burr 2003, pp. 51-52). Structuralism was influential in questioning earlier understandings of language and the relationship between language and reality, introducing a critical aspect by promoting a focus on the processes by which meaning is produced (Cavallaro 2001).

Poststructuralism came to the fore in the 1970s, building on and critiquing structuralism. Often associated with key theorists such as the deconstructionist Derrida, it has been influential in a number of disciplines including cultural studies. Structuralism and poststructuralism have a shared understanding of the primary role of language in the production of meaning and identity (Burr 2003) and a common anti-essentialism. However, poststructuralism has challenged the emphasis in structuralist approaches on ‘binary divisions’ (Baldwin et al. 1999, p. 24; Barker 2004, p. 161; Chambers 1997; Johnson et al. 2004), instead positing the view that “… meaning is always deferred, in process and intertextual” (Barker 2004, p. 161). In this
sense, poststructuralism embraced the idea of many truths rather than a universal truth (Baldwin et al. 1999, p. 24; Barker 2004).

Poststructuralist theorising influences the way in which subjectivity is approached, and has implications for the conceptualisation of identity. In particular, the anti-humanist notion that identity is constructed and shifting turns focus away from attempts to discover an internal essence in a subject, to an exploration of the way in which identities are situated, negotiated, and produced in particular ways at particular points in time (Johnson et al. 2004). According to Burr (2003, p. 54), this necessitates an examination of the discursive landscape within which individuals and collectives interact, as it is without individuals, not within, that social identities are formulated.

**Critical whiteness**

In addition to poststructuralism, this research draws on theorising of whiteness to inform the overall approach. During the 1970s and 1980s, while there was increased academic focus on issues of race, ethnicity, and culture, and in particular multiculturalism, there was a general absence of work considering whiteness, with much of the renewed interest remaining centred on marginalised or ‘minority’ ethnic groups (Fine et al. 1997). However, whiteness studies have become more visible in recent years as an area of academic inquiry, particularly since the 1990s (Hambel 2005; Hurtado & Stewart 1997), with a number of key scholars including Toni Morrison, David Roediger, Ruth Frankenberg, Peggy McIntosh, and bell hooks producing critical works in this area. Developments in the theorising of whiteness have occurred within different disciplines, with feminist scholars making a significant contribution to the field (Hambel 2005). Although this more
focused academic interest is relatively recent, notions of whiteness have a long history. Hambel (2005) notes that there has long been a ‘consciousness’ of whiteness among non-white and marginalised communities. This more recent critical attention to whiteness built upon earlier work, particularly that of Du Bois (Fine et al. 1997).

While whiteness as a concept is relatively complex to define, it is generally understood as a social construct that is historically and culturally bound and shifting as opposed to a natural, pre-existing social classification (Fiske 2000; Frankenberg 1999; Gabriel 1998). According to Hambel (2005), it is “… a multi-layered construct embedded in the fabric of westernised society and centred on the way that white institutions, cultures, and people are racialised and ethnicised by history and society” (p. 75). Definitions of whiteness often include reference to power and/or dominance (Fine et al. 1997). Frankenberg (1993) emphasises this aspect of dominance as central to the concept of whiteness:

whiteness refers to a set of locations that are historically, socially, politically, and culturally produced and moreover are intrinsically linked to unfolding relations of domination. Naming ‘whiteness’ displaces it from the unmarked, unnamed status that is itself an effect of its dominance. Among the effects on white people both of race privilege and of the dominance of whiteness are their seeming normativity, their structured invisibility (p. 6).

Although recognised as a social construct, whiteness is also seen to have material consequences, through the conferred privilege accrued by white people and the accompanying systems of domination and oppression by which whiteness is maintained.
Language is centrally important in constructing and sustaining whiteness, as it is by means of what Gabriel (1998) has termed ‘a set of discursive techniques’ (p. 13) that whiteness is produced. Among the discursive techniques identified are those of exnomination, naturalization, and universalisation (Fiske 1996, p. 43; Gabriel 2000). Exnomination allows a social group to remain unnamed or unmarked; to just exist. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, this exnomination process can be seen to operate through a tendency to avoid marking the dominant group ethnically. While Other social groups are frequently labelled through reference to perceived group characteristics or differences, the ‘majority’ group is much less likely to be either externally or internally labelled in such a way (Gabriel 2000). The privilege of being nameless is reflected in the resistance that some ‘majority group’ members have to being named, for example as an ethnic group, resulting in assertions that ‘we are just New Zealanders’. Closely related to exnomination is naturalization, described by Gabriel (2000) as the process by which “… phenomena which are the product of social and cultural processes come to appear as just their by force of nature, innate ability or circumstances beyond human control”. It is through naturalisation that White ways of being and doing become institutionalised and taken-for-granted, while Others and Other ways are constructed as abnormal and different, if not deviant. Fiske (1994) has also identified universalisation as a tool of whiteness, “… where whiteness alone can make sense of a problem and its understanding becomes the understanding” (p. 43 as cited in Gabriel 1998, p.13). This is enacted in Aotearoa/New Zealand, for example, through the universalisation of white settler paradigms and concepts, and the marginalisation of Other world views. Where Other understandings are
included, they are often framed as perspectives or viewpoints, as opposed to realities.

Other discursive tools of whiteness have also been identified, namely *indivisibility* (Chambers 1997) and *invisibility* (Chambers 1997; Dyer 1997; Frankenberg 1993). Indivisibility allows for Other groups to be divided and categorised. According to Chambers (1997), this process is centrally important to the production of whiteness:

> ... the difference between white and nonwhite depends in crucial ways on there also being differences among the multiple categories that constitute the paradigm of the nonwhite, since it is only by differentiation from a pluralized paradigm that the singularity of whiteness as nonparadigmatic, its undivided touchstone character, can be produced ... In short, to pluralize the other is to produce one’s own singularity (p. 190).

While Other groups are pluralised in this manner, Chambers notes that they are also ‘homogenized’, in contrast to white groups. In this manner, the indivisibility of white groups is further realised through the individualisation of their members:

> Whereas nonwhites are perceived first and foremost as a function of their group belongingness, that is as black or Latino or Asian (and then as individuals), whites are perceived first as individual people (and only secondarily, if at all, as whites) (Chambers 1997, p. 192).

Invisibility is perhaps one of the most powerful aspects of whiteness, as it allows whiteness to remain unseen and, therefore, unchallenged and
unchallengeable. In addition, whiteness works with, alongside, and through other discourses including those of class, gender, and sexuality (Fine et al. 1997; Frankenberg 1999; Gabriel 1998).

Whiteness provides particular theoretical perspectives on the production and representation of identities, particularly racialised identities. Developments in the theorising of whiteness have contributed significant insights into the ways in which representations of Otherness or blackness are intertwined with those of whiteness, and the fundamental interdependence of the production of the Other and the Self (Frankenburg 1997). Weis, Proweller & Centrie (1997) discuss how this has been enacted in the colonial process through “… the ways in which discourse about nonwestern “others” are produced simultaneously with the production of discourse about the western white “self” …” (p. 213).

Theories of whiteness, therefore, encourage a shift in the focus of research, or the ‘gaze’, towards interrogation of dominant and dominating groups or, as Toni Morrison (1992) describes it, a shift in “… the critical gaze from the racial object to the racial subject; from the described and imagined to the describers and imaginers; from the serving to the served” (p. 90). This shift in gaze has also promoted an increased focus on white privilege (Hambel 2005), as well as on the way in which institutions produce whiteness (Fine et al. 1997). There has been some criticism of whiteness studies in relation the potential to reprivilege whiteness through this shift in focus. However, as Cuomo & Hall (1999) outline, the goal of critical whiteness is to ‘decenter’ whiteness, by challenging the invisibility within which it operates and gains power.
For the purposes of this study, theorising around whiteness is important in that it supports a focus on dominant and dominating institutions, such as those of the mass media and prevailing political systems, through a redirection of the critical gaze onto those with privileged access to resource, voice, and power. Whiteness theory also brings into focus the interrelated and inter-reliant nature of racialised social constructions. That is, it encourages consideration of the both relational and oppositional nature of the social constructions of whiteness and Otherness.

**KEY THEORETICAL CONCEPTS**

In addition to the theoretical orientation underpinning the study and providing the guiding framework, there are a number of key concepts that are fundamental to the methodological approach undertaken. These include the notions of discourse, representation, ideology, and elites. In line with the social constructionist framework outlined above, these concepts are approached as constructed and contingent. They are briefly discussed below, both in general terms and with particular reference to the way in which they are operationalised in the current research.

**Considering language and discourse**

Recent decades have witnessed the development and articulation of distinct theoretical and analytical approaches to discourse across a range of disciplines. Although the study of discourse arose within the discipline of linguistics, since the 1960s it has appeared within a number of other human and social sciences and, more recently, within several disciplines outside the
humanities and social sciences (Howarth & Stavrakakis 2000b). Approaches to the theorising of discourse are inextricably related to conceptualisations of language, and the increased interest in the study of discourse has been proposed to be closely linked to a significant shift in academia in theorising the role of language in the construction of knowledge (Jaworski & Coupland 1999). Many disciplines have become concerned with the need for an awareness of language, and of the structuring potential of language, as part of their own investigations (Jaworski & Coupland 1999, p. 4), reflecting the influence of social constructionist theorising. In humanities and social sciences, this increasing recognition and investigation of the constitutive nature of language has been referred to as the linguistic turn (Phillips & Hardy 2002; Torfing 1999).

Despite increased interest in the study of discourse, a degree of ambiguity and imprecision often accompanies the use of the term. There are a number of overlapping and, in some cases, competing meanings attached to the concept that tend to vary depending on the context within which the term appears (Jorgensen & Phillips 2002; Wodak 1996a). It is possible, however, to distinguish at one level between the way in which the term discourse is used in an everyday sense and the broader, more detailed meanings of the term in the study of discourse (what will be referred to as conceptual or theoretical definitions). This distinction is important in understanding the approach to discourse that has been taken in this thesis.

Everyday definitions tend to highlight the communicative function of discourse, and the term discourse as it occurs in common usage generally centres on the speech or linguistic communication aspects of discourse
(Phillips & Hardy 2002; van Dijk 1997b). A further way in which the concept is used in an everyday sense is to refer to a specific body of language, such as ‘medical discourse’, that is associated with a particular site of language use and encompasses the ideas and theories behind the language, as well as the actual language itself (van Dijk 1997b).

As interest in the study of discourse has grown, more comprehensive and theoretical understandings have developed. The term is increasingly being used across a range of social science and humanities disciplines including those of linguistics, critical theory, sociology, and social psychology (Mills 1997). Both intra- and inter-disciplinary variation in meaning exists and there is no uniform or accepted understanding of discourse at this theoretical level. A range of definitions have been proposed, including:

... discourse as a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world) (Jorgenson & Phillips 2002, p. 1).

‘Discourse’ is more for me than just language use: it is language use, whether speech or writing, seen as a type of social practice (Fairclough 1992, p. 28).

Thus, discourse refers to actual language use in social context. As such, discourse goes beyond the traditional linguistic boundary of the sentence and is seen as primarily a social interactional phenomenon. It is manifested in both written and spoken modes.... It not only has communicative meaning (‘message’) but also interactional meaning (i.e. personal, social and cultural functions) (Shi Xu 1997, p. 30).
The above examples demonstrate the range of conceptual meanings associated with the term discourse and the different emphases involved, which are to a large extent dependent on the paradigms within which a particular discourse approach is situated. The point of convergence for these definitions is the assertion of discourse as more than ‘language in use’. While accepting the communicative and linguistic dimensions of discourse, theoretical understandings are expanded to incorporate functional and interactional aspects. As van Dijk (1997b) has noted, discourse analysts:

... agree discourse is a form of language use. But since this is still quite vague and not always adequate, they introduce a more theoretical concept of ‘discourse’ which is more specific and at the same time broader in its application. They want to include some other essential components in the concept, namely who uses language, how, why and when (p. 2).

For the purposes of this study then, discourse is understood as language use within a social context, as a type of social practice. It has, as noted by Shi Xu (1997), communicative and interactional characteristics and can encompass both spoken language (talk) and written language (text), as well as other forms of communication such as art (Jaworski & Coupland 1999; van Dijk 1997b).

**Discourse, representation, and ideology**

From a cultural studies perspective, language is viewed as a ‘representational system’ (Hall 1997a, p. 1). While commonsense definitions of representation tend to understand it as reflecting a pre-existing object or reality, albeit in a symbolic way (Barker 2004, p. 177), for cultural studies representation is seen
to be centrally involved in the production of meaning, as opposed to reflecting or mirroring a reality (Barker 2004; Hall 1997c). From this standpoint, it is contended that representations are significant in the construction of the social world, including social processes, relations, and identities (Bernstein 2002) and, therefore, are a centrally important area for study.

As representations are not reflections of a reality, they are open to varied interpretation and embody contestability in meanings, with each ‘reading’ of a representation considered equally legitimate (Cavallaro 2001, p. 39). However, as Cavallaro (1999, pp. 40-41) notes, representations are often ‘naturalized’, so that their constructed nature is obscured and critical projects should, therefore, involve the denaturalisation and questioning of representations.

Representation understood in this way is seen to be intimately linked with power. According to Barker (2004), the “power of representation lies in its enabling some kinds of knowledge to exist while excluding other ways of seeing” (p. 177). This concern with power leads on to a consideration of the relationship between discourse, representation, and ideology, as representations have a fundamental role in producing and maintaining ideology. Ideology has also been conceived of in various ways, with definitions drawing on differing theoretical perspectives (Cavallaro 2001, p. 76). Some definitions of ideology draw more heavily on Marxist and post-Marxist approaches, within which ideology tends to be viewed as ‘false consciousness’, ‘misconception’, or ‘misrepresentation’. These definitions tend to link ideology with class struggle and the ways that ideology works to
sustain class privilege. Within the Aotearoa/New Zealand context, Wetherell and Potter (1992) contend that this misrepresentation or false consciousness is fundamental to maintain and recreate “… the colonial and capitalist status quo, conceal its actual interests and reproduce the relations of economic production which have been established in New Zealand” (p. 25). According to Burr (2003), although this approach to ideology encourages a critical perspective on discourse, it also raises challenges for social constructionists, in that the view of ideology as ‘false consciousness’ is in opposition to the anti-essentialist position of constructionism that there is no objective truth or reality with which to contrast falsity (Barker 2004, p. 98; Burr 2003, p. 84).

Ideology has also been approached as “knowledge deployed in the service of power” (Burr 2003, p. 85). This conceptualisation emphasises the way in which knowledge is used in relation to power, as opposed to being concerned with whether the knowledge is true or false (Thompson 1990). This approach aligns with Foucault’s position that discourses are not intrinsically ideological, rather that it is the way in which particular discourses are used that is ideological (Burr 2003, p. 85). Fairclough (1995) acknowledges this aspect of ideology in saying that to show “meanings are working ideologically it is necessary to show that they do indeed serve relations of domination in particular cases” (p. 14).

A further view of ideology is that of ideology as ‘lived experience’. This concept draws heavily on the work of Althusser and his concern with institutions as what he terms ‘ideological state apparatuses’ (Burr 2003, p. 85). In this approach, ideology is seen to be both discursive and material, with
institutions viewed as centrally important to the dissemination and perpetuation of elite ideologies (Cavallaro 2001).

Ideologies are not fixed or static. As they are about social understandings and beliefs, they vary and change over time. Further, Fairclough (1995) makes an important distinction between the ‘ideological’ and the ‘persuasive’. Using media discourse as an example, Fairclough contends that ideologies are not ‘adopted’ as a position might be to persuade an audience in a certain direction, but rather are ‘taken for granted’ (1995, p. 45).

For the purposes of this study, the following definition of ideology is adopted, where:

…ideology can be understood as the attempt to fix meaning for specific purposes. Ideologies are then grasped as discourses that give meaning to material objects and social practices; they define and produce the acceptable and intelligible way of understanding the world while excluding other ways of reasoning as unintelligible and unjustifiable. Ideologies are thus about binding and justification rather than being concerned with truth, falsity and objective interests. They are the ‘world-views’ of any social group that both constitute them as a group and justify their actions (Barker 2004, p. 98).

**Elites and elite institutions**

This research is primarily interested in the discourses of institutions, and specifically elite institutions, grounded in a concern with power relations that underlies most critical research endeavours. Elite institutions tend to be the institutions with the most power in terms of access to resources and to voice. In line with a critical whiteness perspective, the interest in shifting the gaze of
inquiry onto those dominant and most privileged in society focuses attention on the elite institutions within which whiteness is embodied and enacted in Aotearoa/New Zealand, as in other white settler societies.

Elites have been defined as “… a group or social category of people in a social system that occupies a position of privilege or dominance” (Johnson 2000, p. 101), and can include members of prevailing or dominating cultural institutions such as the mass media, education systems, politicians, and corporates (van Dijk 1993). Elite institutions are considered to have a significant role in the (re)production of ideological representations (van Dijk 1991). Elite discourses are an area of focus for critical discourse studies as:

... elite power and influence are often discursive and are implemented by preferential access to and control over public discourse and its consequences for the manufacture of consensus. This is particularly the case for the symbolic elites, those who control the means of communication and who are engaged in the manufacturing of public opinion (van Dijk 1993, p. ix).

Mass media and political institutions as elites
The mass media is a key player in the production and circulation of elite institutional discourses, with a unique role in not only reflecting the assumptions and values embedded within its own institutions, but also in mediating the discourses of other elites such as politicians, governmental agencies, the police, academics, and so on¹. Access to the media is not equal, even in democratic societies where values of free speech and an open press

¹ This aspect of media discourse, and more particularly the relationship between political discourse and the media, will be addressed more fully in a later section.
are often promoted as central tenets. In many countries mass media is
dominated by the voices and interests of those who already enjoy the greatest
access to power and resources (Fairclough 1995, p. 40). Mass media
discourses therefore serve as an indicator of elite discourse. However, the
media is also a site for the contestation and challenge of dominant discourses,
and the opportunity within the media for the production and circulation of
alternative discourses, albeit within certain constraints, is also important.

As has been noted, media discourses both produce and reproduce social
understandings and public commonsense. They are important in terms of
what becomes public – that is, what is circulated in the public sphere. They
are also significant in terms of their relationship with other elite institutions,
such as political institutions and official sources of discourses. They have a
role in influencing the understandings of social issues, thereby influencing
the acceptability of different explanations or moves. This in turn can relate to
decision-making, how an issue is understood, and how acceptable a proposed
solution is. As with political discourse, effects of media discourse are not
simply discursive. Media discourses, through their privileged role in the
production and circulation of discourses, can and do have real and material
impacts on society, communities, and individuals. Consideration of the role
of media discourse in constructing social identities and relationships
therefore has both theoretical and pragmatic dimensions.

Political discourse has a central role in the (re)presentation and
(re)production of issues and understandings at a national level. Politics is
intrinsically bound up with power and, within this context, political
discourse is linked to policies and decisions that impact directly on the lives
of individuals and communities. The legislation and policies that govern everyday social practice, for example, are forms of institutionalised political discourse. As Reeves (1983) notes, political discourse “… is related to decision-making or to the absence of decision-making, which gives it a little more significance than that of a casual conversation in a public bar” (p. 1). In this sense also, political discourse is associated with both material and symbolic power, with access to and control over decision-making and what becomes public. It has an authority both in and of itself as an elite discourse, but also through its many tangible effects on everyday life.

SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM WITH A CRITICAL EYE

This study is influenced by the broad philosophical base of social construction, as well as more specifically by poststructuralism and whiteness studies. These influences combine to produce a framework that guides the study, bringing with it a number of methodological and pragmatic implications.

Firstly, in line with the anti-objectivist, anti-empiricist stance of these theoretical approaches, the research does not intend to identify a ‘truth’, but rather to provide one situated reading that will be open to the same critical attention as all knowledge. The core understanding of reality and knowledge as both produced and contingent, rather than pre-existing and acontextual, is of particular relevance to the way in which key concepts of language, discourse, and representation are conceived within this project, as well as the way in which categories such as identity, ethnicity, race, and nation, are defined. Fundamental to the study, therefore, is the positioning of these
categories as socially-constructed and specific within given temporal and spatial contexts. In addition, there is recognition of the interconnected and intersecting nature of these social categories, and the role of social interaction in constructing and sustaining them.

Whiteness studies theorising has encouraged a focus in this research on elite institutions, reflecting a desire to better understand and critically examine the sites of production of dominant and dominating representations in contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand society. The current research is a less direct whiteness project in the sense that the interrogation is not directly focused on the production of whiteness, but rather on the production of Otherness by white institutions in the service of whiteness in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The theoretical approach embodies an explicitly critical and reflexive positioning\(^2\), a feature of social constructionist research practice (Burr 2003). This study, therefore, has an over-arching theoretical framework that can be considered to be social constructionism from a critical standpoint, drawing on poststructuralist and whiteness perspectives more specifically to conceptualise the intersections between language, discourse, and representations of both the Other and Self.

\(^2\) Wodak defines critical as “having distance to the data, embedding the data in the social, taking a political stance explicitly, and a focus on self-reflection as scholars doing research” (Wodak 2001, p. 9).
The previous chapter has introduced the basic assumptions underpinning this thesis and located the current project within an overarching theoretical framework that aligns with broadly social constructionist understandings of the nature of knowledge and reality. The focus within this chapter is on describing the particular research approach undertaken in the thesis in terms of methodology, method, and analytical framework. This includes a brief overview of methodological and analytical approaches to discourse analysis, followed by a discussion of the critical discourse analysis approach used in the current thesis. The methods of data selection, retrieval, and coding, in relation to both general principles as well as specific methods for the individual case studies, are summarised. Finally, the chapter describes the development of the analytical framework and the processes of data analysis employed.

**APPROACHES TO DISCOURSE ANALYSIS**

There are a number of discrete approaches to the study and analysis of discourse that necessarily vary depending on underlying philosophical and theoretical positions. These positions in turn influence the choices that are made about the areas of interest for discourse research and the methods employed in analysis. Early discourse studies were heavily influenced by the linguistic traditions within which they developed (Howarth 2000, p. 1).
During the 1960s and 1970s, theories such as structuralism, post-structuralism, hermeneutics, and Marxism encouraged a broadening of the concept of discourse studies (Howarth 2000), and a variety of methodologies have since appeared in different disciplines including, among others, ethnography, structuralism and semiotics, sociolinguistics/pragmatics, cognitive psychology, social psychology/discursive psychology, and communication studies (van Dijk 1997b, pp. 25-27). The result has been the development of similarly diverse discourse analytical approaches such as conversation analysis, discursive psychology, interactional linguistics, critical linguistics, and critical discourse analysis. The interdisciplinary nature of discourse studies ensures that there is no universal approach and cultivates an environment for considerable debate around the different approaches and their perceived strengths and weaknesses.

Whilst there are a number of points at which different discourse analytical approaches diverge, it has been proposed that all approaches share a common theory of language and subject drawing on the work of Saussure and later structural linguists, as well as poststructuralist theories and, in particular, the work of Foucault (Jorgensen & Phillips 2002). That is, it is through language that reality is accessed and given meaning. Discourse analysis has, therefore, as its primary concerns, the relationship between language and reality and the role of language in constructing and maintaining social reality (Burman & Parker 1993; Jorgensen & Phillips 2002; Phillips & Hardy 2002). In addition, discourse analyses tend to draw on interpretive and reflective methodological traditions (Burman & Parker 1993, p. 3).
However, a distinction has been made at a high-level between approaches to discourse analysis that view discourse as structure and process, and those that emphasise the understanding of discourse as social action/interaction (van Dijk 1997b, 1997c). Approaches that conceptualise discourse as structure and process, including discourse grammar and semiotics, emphasise aspects such as semantics, grammar, schemata, style, and rhetoric, have a closer alignment with traditional linguistics, and tend to be more abstract (for a fuller discussion, see van Dijk 1997b). On the other hand, approaches formulated around an understanding of discourse as action or interaction explicitly stress the relationship between discourse and its social context. They are more removed from traditional linguistics (van Dijk 1999b) and position discourse in relation to its social function and environment, although structure is still an important consideration (van Dijk 1997c, p. 2).

**CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS**

This research programme broadly follows a critical discourse analysis approach. Critical discourse analysis is a social discourse approach that developed out of critical linguistics (Teo 2000). Emerging in the 1970s, critical linguistics was interested in examining the structuring and constructive roles of language (Wodak 2001, p. 5), and is associated with the work of Fowler et al (1979), and Kress & Hodges (1979), among others. Critical discourse analysis appeared in the 1990s (Wodak 2001, p. 4), as one of a number of critical approaches in the humanities and social sciences.

According to Weiss and Wodak (2003, p. 5), critical discourse analysis tends to draw principally on critical-dialectical and phenomenological-hermeneutic
backgrounds, and on theories from social and linguistic disciplines. However, it is generally not associated with one theoretical or methodological tradition, nor does it limit itself to one particular set of methods. In this sense, it has been referred to as a ‘shared perspective’, rather than a methodology *per se* (Bell & Garrett 1998, p. 6), utilising a variety of theoretical, conceptual, and analytical tools.

In spite of this diversity of background and method, critical discourse analysis generally shares a number of basic considerations that connect critical discourse approaches and distinguish them from other related approaches. These relate to the fundamental understandings of language and discourse, the types of questions asked by critical discourse analysts, the approach to analysis, and the explicit critical positioning.

In critical discourse analysis, discourse is conceptualised as a form of social practice (Fairclough & Wodak 1997; Wodak 2001), and as both constitutive of and constituted by the social world (Fairclough & Wodak 1997; Jorgensen & Phillips 2002). The relationship between language and society is of basic interest, particularly the relationship between language and power:

… CL [Critical Linguistics] and CDA may be defined as fundamentally concerned with analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. In other words, CDA aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signalled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use (or in discourse) (Wodak 2001, p. 2).
Critical discourse analysis is, therefore, also interested in questions of ideology, and the role of discourse in ideological processes and practices.

A further feature is the importance that is placed on viewing discourse within its broad context, and particularly within its historical context (Fairclough & Wodak 1997; Jorgenson & Phillips 2002; Meyer 2001). Context also relates to the broad understanding of discourse in terms of intertextuality and interdiscursivity (Meyer 2001). In the study of discourse, context is often regarded as central, particularly in social discourse approaches. Traditionally, context has been quite narrowly framed in research to include variables such as the research setting and the demographic characteristics of participants (for example, gender, age, or occupation) (Wodak 1996a, p. 21). However, as it is used in social discourse approaches, context has a broader meaning that incorporates the wider historical, cultural, political, and social context within which the discourse is occurring. This distinction can also be conceptualised as one of different levels of context, for example of local and global contexts (van Dijk 1997b). The local context is described as encompassing characteristics of time, space, and environment, as well as features about discourse participants, their roles and objectives (van Dijk 1997b, p. 19). According to van Dijk (1997b), the global context, that is the broader historical, socio-cultural, and socio-political context, becomes important:

as soon as we identify ongoing discourse or other actions as constitutive of organizational or institutional actions and procedures (legislation, a trial, teaching, news reporting, etc.), and when participants are involved in the interaction as members of social categories, groups or institutions (women vs
men, blacks vs whites, young vs old, supervisors vs subordinates; or the various participants in education, parliament, the court or the police) (van Dijk 1997b, p. 19).

These have also been variously referred to as local and broad contexts (Cicourel 1992, cited in Wodak 1996a, p. 21). Reisigl and Wodak (2002) propose a triangulatory conceptualisation of context that includes four aspects: the actual language or text, the intertextual/interdiscursive relationship, the ‘situational context’ (including social and demographic characteristics), and the wider ‘sociopolitical and historical context’ (pp. 41-42). Context is considered critical in interpreting the meaning of texts. In viewing context as fundamental to the study of discourse, the assumption is not necessarily made that context alone constructs discourse, but rather that discourse is also constitutive of context, that is, the dialectical relationship between discourse and context is highlighted.

In terms of analytical practice, critical discourse analysis is characterised by the use of linguistic categories, as well as hermeneutic, interpretive approaches (Fairclough & Wodak 1997; Meyer 2001). Critical discourse analysis also has a strong claim to interdisciplinarity (Meyer 2001), and this is evident in the diversity of theoretical, methodical, and analytical tools that analysts in the field draw on in their work.

Finally, a critical perspective is central to critical discourse approaches and determines the focus of studies and the types of research questions that are asked. In line with a critical perspective, critical discourse analysts are principally interested in researching ‘social problems’ (Fairclough & Wodak
and are concerned with unequal power relations. In this sense, critical discourse analysis is overtly political (Wodak 2001). The critical perspective also requires that critical analysts be consciously self-reflexive of their own discourses, to maintain the integrity of the critical approach (Billig 2003; Wodak 2001, p. 9).

**METHOD**

There is no one preferred method of data collection or analysis associated with critical discourse approaches, with procedures for gathering data and development of categories for analysis dependent on the base theoretical assumptions and the particular area of enquiry of a given study (Meyer 2001). This section summarises the method employed in this thesis for the selection of the datasets, retrieval of data, and process of analysis.

**Selection of the dataset**

The corpus for this study was broadly drawn from two datasets: texts from four major domestic newspapers collected over an eighteen-month period from June 1st 2002 to December 31st 2003; and, parliamentary debates and political speeches from 2001 – 2002 (inclusive). Selection of data for inclusion was guided by several general principles, as well as specific criteria relevant to each dataset. The general principles guiding selection across the datasets were:

- *Texts were written:* Inclusion was limited to written texts. Visual data (such as photographs, cartoons, graphs and/or figures) were therefore excluded
from the datasets. This was primarily due to pragmatic rather than theoretical considerations.

- **Texts were produced and circulated in Aotearoa/New Zealand:** The dataset was restricted to texts that were domestically produced and circulated. This thereby excluded media texts supplied by international media sources. In relation to political texts, inclusion was restricted to political speeches that were ‘performed’ in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

- **Texts referred to Aotearoa/New Zealand:** There were a number of identified texts that related to events in Asia. These were of contextual interest in that they provided an overview of the way in which Asia is portrayed, for example, the types of news items about Asia that are common or are emphasised. It is likely that understandings of Asia are intrinsically bound up with domestically produced representations of Asian identity. However, the main focus of the study is the discursive construction of Asians as a social group in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and therefore texts about Asia, events in Asia, or Asians in an international context were excluded from analysis.

- **Texts referred to Asian individuals or communities:** To be included for analysis, the text had to refer to ‘Asian’ people or communities. Articles that were about Asian geographic regions, business in Asia (including reference to Asian markets and companies), and agricultural references (such as those to the Asian tiger moth) were excluded.

Neither the selection of sites of production (mass media and political institutions), nor the sample within sites (four major newspapers, Hansard records of parliamentary debates, and political speeches), was designed to be representative in the sense of delivering quantifiable or broadly generalisable
findings that could be extrapolated to other sites or contexts. However, the dataset could be considered to be representative of the discourse practices of dominant print press and parliamentary texts within Aotearoa/New Zealand in the early 2000s. The timeframe for data collection meant that the dataset was also likely to reflect the range of discourse practices within these sites. The timeframes for the political and media datasets overlap but are not identical. This is due to the staggered nature of data collection (with the political dataset being collected first), as well as the need to limit the media dataset as a result of the size of the corpus. However, both datasets do include the 2002 general election period.

Media dataset: identification and collection

The media dataset was drawn from a sample of newspapers published during an 18-month period (June 2002 – December 2003 inclusive). Four major newspapers were included in this study (three dailies and one weekend newspaper with national distribution):

- The New Zealand Herald (Auckland)
- The Dominion Post (Wellington)¹
- The Press (Christchurch)
- Sunday Star Times (national circulation)

¹ At the beginning of data collection, there were two daily newspapers in Wellington, a morning paper (The Dominion) and an evening paper (The Evening Post). In July 2002, these two newspapers combined to form one daily morning newspaper, known as The Dominion Post.
All newspapers were non-tabloid newspapers and, with the exception of the New Zealand Herald, were owned by Independent Newspapers Limited (INL) and then by Fairfax Media (who purchased INL in July 2003). This resulted in some duplication of articles, as the same article was sometimes run in more than one of these newspapers under the same or a similar headline.

The selection of these four newspapers was related to both theoretical and pragmatic factors. Firstly, these newspapers represented, at the time of the study, those with the biggest circulation and widest availability from the three major cities in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch), as well as the only nationally-circulated weekend newspaper. Although circulation and availability are imprecise proxies for effective access at best, they do provide some measure of the pervasiveness or dominance of these newspapers. Secondly, these newspapers were all indexed on Newztext, an electronic database maintained by an independent company (The Knowledge Basket) that indexes a number of print publications, including most major daily newspapers. The database allows for headline, subject, or fulltext searching (including Boolean searching) of indexed articles, and also provides for the electronic retrieval of articles.

Data items for inclusion were identified through manual reading and prospective collection of articles, as well as searching of the Newztext database and online archive maintained by the New Zealand Herald for the keyword ‘Asian*’. Through this process, approximately 1500 articles were identified. These articles were browsed to ascertain those that were outside of the scope of the study. In addition to the general principles for inclusion
outlined above, the media dataset was restricted to news articles and other non-fiction content of print media, such as editorial texts and feature articles. To this extent, other forms of content such as advertisements were excluded, as were texts from specialist sections of the newspaper, including sports, business, entertainment, and property. Letters to the editor were also excluded in general, but were obtained to provide context where appropriate.

Political dataset: identification and collection

The corpus of political discourse was drawn from parliamentary debates and public speeches made by Members of Parliament (MPs) during the study period (2000 – 2002 inclusive). In Aotearoa/New Zealand, transcripts of parliamentary debates and oral questions are recorded verbatim in Hansard and are publicly available in both print and electronic form. In order to identify the dataset for this study, Hansard parliamentary debates and oral questions were searched using the electronic database maintained by The Knowledge Basket. Public speeches delivered during the study period (2000 – 2002) were identified from searchable databases on party websites, internet searches, and from references made in media articles and press releases. Transcripts of each relevant debate, question or speech were then retrieved (either electronically or from print versions). Supplementary data identified during the search process as relevant, including parliamentary press releases, political comments in the media, and policies, were also obtained to provide the broader context to the analysis. As with the media sample, the general criteria for inclusion in the dataset were applied. There were no additional criteria specific to the political discourse dataset.
Analysis

In developing the methods for the analytical process, key related theoretical and methodological work in critical discourse analysis was drawn on, in particular, the work of van Dijk (1991, 1993, 2000) and Wodak et al (1999, 2001, 2002). The analysis broadly involved two phases: preliminary coding of the corpus of texts for contextual details and identification of topics; and, detailed analysis of a sample of texts, focusing on the deployment of specific discursive and lexical resources.

The development of the analytical framework and categories for analysis in this thesis was iterative and the selection of the smaller sample of newspaper texts for detailed analysis was informed by the preliminary coding that occurred as the first phase of analysis. This is not uncharacteristic of critical discourse approaches, which generally tend not to make a clear demarcation between data collection and analysis stages, in line with hermeneutic traditions (Meyer 2001, p. 25).

Preliminary coding

In terms of the preliminary coding, the political texts were coded for: date; type (for example, general debate, debate related to a bill, oral question, political speech); speaker name, party, and position; and, main topic categories (up to 3 categories for each item). The newspaper texts were similarly coded for: date, type (for example, news item, editorial, feature article); actors; keywords in headlines; and, main topic categories (up to 3 categories for each item).
The preliminary coding also identified four categories of texts: texts that were considered to be about Asians; texts that were predominantly about a specific topic, such as immigration or export education, within which Asians were involved as actors or as a sub-topic; texts where Asians were included as one of a number of ‘ethnic groups’; and, texts where Asians were ‘ethnically’ labelled in the absence of labelling of other actors.

This preliminary coding allowed for the broad description of the corpus, as well as an outline of the context of discourses. Through this preliminary coding, texts to be considered in further detail were identified. This was based on identification of recurrent topics and key periods of discourse production.

**Categories for detailed analysis**

The size of the corpus and scope of the current study meant that the detailed analysis focused on a sample of the most productive texts and on particular dimensions of discourse. This focused analysis of the discursive and lexical features of texts was informed by critical discourse analytical studies with similar areas of enquiry, particularly the work of Wodak and colleagues (1999, 2001, 2005) and van Dijk (1991, 1993, 2000). Specifically, the analytical framework was largely based on the categories of analysis identified by Reisigl and Wodak (2001). In their work, analysis was structured around three dimensions of discourse: content (contents or topics); discursive strategies; and, linguistic means and realisations. Drawing on this model, the analytical process in this study similarly focused on three discourse dimensions, referred to as: contents; discursive strategies; and, lexical choices. Within these categories, various discourse aspects were emphasised based on the
research questions of this study and the literature review. This choice of analytic categories was to facilitate examination of not only what was said in texts, but also the means of realisation. That is, the analytical categories were chosen to enable exploration of the content of texts about Asians, and the discursive resources deployed to construct and represent Asian identity, particularly Asian Otherness.

CONTENT
Previous research has identified that discursive representations of non-dominant groups tend to revolve around a limited number of topic areas and themes (Wodak 1996b). In relation to coverage of ‘ethnic affairs’, these topics tend to include immigration, crime and deviance, ‘ethnic relations’, ‘cultural differences’ (van Dijk 2000, pp. 34-35). Examining the content of texts in the corpus was in order to provide insights into the topic areas and themes that print media and political discourses about Asians tended to be concentrated on, and through this develop an understanding of what van Dijk has termed ‘global’ meanings (van Dijk 2000, p.34). In relation to content, therefore, the analysis focused on identification of the range of topics associated with newspaper and political texts about Asians, the various ways in which these topics were (re)presented, and the themes associated with these topics. In addition, analysis also included consideration of content at the more detailed level of disclaimers, actors, categorisations, and other semantic modes, where relevant.

DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES
Discursive strategies are understood as “systematic ways of using language” (Reisgel & Wodak 2001, p.44). The analysis was interested in the various
strategies that were used within texts to represent Asian identity. There are a
range of different types of strategies that can be employed in the construction
of identity and discourse about Others, a number of which have been
previously identified in related work. For example, van Dijk has outlined
recurring strategies employed in talk about Others in the media and in
political discourse, including those of: positive self-presentation; negative other-
presentation; denial of racism; apparent sympathy; fairness; top-down transfer; and
justification (van Dijk 1997a, pp. 35–39).

In relation to positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation,
Reisigl and Wodak (2001) identify the following discursive strategies:
referential/nomination strategies (strategies employed to represent social
identities and groups); predicational strategies (strategies that assign attributes
to social identities/groups); argumentation strategies (strategies that draw on
topoi to justify ‘positive and negative attributions’; perspectivation, framing or
discourse representation (strategies by which those deploying the discourse
position themselves and their perspective); and, intensifying and mitigating
strategies (pp. 44-45).

In addition, a number of argument forms used to talk about race and
immigration were identified by Reeves (1983) in his study of British
parliamentary discourse, namely:

- personalised, dispositional, and agential arguments (arguments focused on
  individual or group attributes and behaviours);
- abstracted social process arguments (arguments that identified potential (and
  often negative) ‘social processes’ that would result from immigration);
- populist arguments (arguments that drew on the popularity of an action to justify it);
- economic arguments (arguments centred around the availability of resources and rights to access those resources);
- pro bono publico arguments (arguments that emphasised the benefit to the majority of a particular course of action);
- reciprocity arguments (arguments that focused on the balancing of behaviours or actions);
- and, means oriented arguments (arguments designed to meet a ‘taken for granted’ goal) (p. 211).

The extent to which these previously identified strategies were at play in the texts in the dataset was of interest, but the analysis also hoped to identify novel or specific strategies if they existed. Argumentation strategies, along with rhetorical strategies, are associated with persuasive functions of discourse and were considered relevant in this study because of the inclusion of discourse genres that are more associated with persuasion, namely parliamentary debates and political speeches, as well as media editorials and opinion pieces (van Dijk 2000b, p. 43).

LEXICAL MOVES AND CHOICES

There were a number of aspects of lexicalisation in texts that were considered especially pertinent to the research questions. This included a consideration of the labelling and categorisation of Asians within texts and the use of personal pronouns and possessives. In relation to the labelling of Asians within texts, the analysis was particularly interested in the extent to which this was ‘racialised’, ‘ethnicised’, or otherwise focused on perceived group
characteristics, as well as the use of common or recurring collocations. In terms of categorisation, the analysis aimed to identify the lexical realisation of stereotypes that were applied to Asian individuals and communities, noting that stereotypes are “… one of the major discursive strategies that ensure that differences between people are recognized” (Riggins 1997, p. 9). In addition, there was an interest in the extent to which labels and categorisations worked to differentiate or homogenise identity. The role of personal pronouns and possessives in the discursive construction of identities, including national and ethnic identities, has previously been identified. (Reisgel & Wodak 2001; Riggins 1997). Riggins (1997) notes that in terms of lexical strategies inclusive and exclusive pronouns and possessives “… are the most revealing of the boundaries separating Self and Other …” (p. 8).

SUMMARY

Discourse analytical approaches share a common concern with language and language in use. Critical discourse analysis, as one of the critical approaches to discourse analysis, has a fundamental interest in the relationships of language (and discourses) to society, social practices, and power, and takes explicitly political stances as evidenced in the choice of research questions and areas for enquiry. For these reasons, critical discourse analysis was congruent with the theoretical assumptions and focus of this study.

The analytical process and the framework applied to the texts guided analysis but also provided a useful starting point for synthesis and discussion of the findings within and across the sites, as presented in the chapters that follow. The process and framework was also designed to facilitate the identification
of distinct or novel moves and devices within the case studies, while also allowing for the comparison with previously identified discursive strategies.
Changes in society and culture manifest themselves in all their tentativeness, incompleteness and contradictory nature in the heterogeneous and shifting discursive practices of the media (Fairclough 1995, p. 52).

Media institutions are primary and significant sources of public discourse. Dominant mass media institutions have an extensive sphere of influence, aided in contemporary society by developments in technology, such as satellite television and the internet, which facilitate the widespread distribution and circulation of media messages, both within territories and on a global scale (Caldas-Coulthard 2003). Far from being merely neutral suppliers of information, the mass media has a central role in reflecting and reproducing social understandings, particularly in relation to social identities, relationships, and group difference (Fairclough 1995). Media discourse is important then in influencing broader social conceptualisations of Asians as a group, in framing them in relation to other groups, as well as simultaneously creating and reproducing understandings of Self and Other. In gaining an understanding of the way in which Asian people are represented in Aotearoa/New Zealand through and by institutional discourse, consideration of the way in which the media talks about non-dominant groups such as Asians, and the images it emphasises (or conversely de-emphasises), is critical.
The discourses of the media also serve an important function in terms of reflecting, or informing of, social changes, thereby providing a vehicle by which to examine the continuity and discontinuity in discourses over time (Fairclough 1995, p. 52). In relation to the construction of social identities then, media discourses allow insights into changing representations of identity and social relationships.

This chapter explores the ways in which the media, through discourses in major daily newspapers, broadly constructs Asian identity within Aotearoa/New Zealand and, more specifically, represents Asian Otherness in a contemporary setting. The chapter begins with a brief discussion of the role of media and its importance and functions in contemporary society, before outlining some of the general features of media discourse. Discourse analysis of a case study of contemporary representations of Asian identity in major daily newspapers in Aotearoa/New Zealand is then presented and discussed, incorporating a more in-depth focus on specific, productive texts that represent key events, concentrated periods of media attention, or dominant themes that emerged during the time period.

**CHARACTERISING MEDIA DISCOURSE**

This case study explores the representation of Asian identity in dominant mass media in Aotearoa/New Zealand, focusing on print media (as represented by texts drawn from daily newspapers). Media discourses have some particular characteristics, including features related to media institutions, to modes of production, and to the purpose of production.
Factors with specific relevance to this case study will be discussed briefly below, including those more specifically associated with newspaper texts.

A first consideration is the public nature of mass media discourse, which is integral to its purpose and drives its production. Much mass media revenue is generated by advertising, which benefits from the widest possible public circulation and exposure of media products. The media is, therefore, cognisant that it is generating discourses for public consumption, a feature it shares in common with political discourse, although it could be argued that the consideration of the audience is even more fundamental in media discourse production.

The commercial drivers behind much mass media discourse production distinguish it from other institutional discourses such as political or academic discourse. Profit-making concerns of the media necessarily influence the processes and choices that are made institutionally. Some commentators have raised questions about the influence of ownership of media by major multinational corporations on the independence and diversity of opinion of mass media (Rosenberg 2002). Fairclough (1995) discusses *marketisation* as one of two tensions influencing current media discourse (alongside the increasingly *conversationalized* nature of media language), questioning the role of the media in this instance:

In the case of the media, for instance, is the commercial imperative (especially in television) to constantly entertain (Postman 1987), almost without regard to the nature of the programme, compatible with the tradition of public service broadcasting? If audiences are constructed, and competed for, as consumers,
even in news and current affairs programmes, does this not negate the claims of broadcasting to constitute a public sphere (Habermas 1989) in which people, as citizens, are drawn into serious debate on the issues of the day? (p.11).

Institutional processes and practices influence the ways in which media discourses are produced, and these practices vary depending on the type and mode of media product. The news, for example, is by its nature required to be as up-to-date as possible, usually produced within a relatively short timeframe to remain current. Time pressures and the processes that have developed within media institutions to meet the goal of timely production are, therefore, likely to influence decisions about news texts generated. This may be less the case for other media products, such as documentaries, which are likely to be filmed over a period of time and have, in this sense, a more considered text.

Media institutions have both formal and informal conventions that guide decisions about what content is covered, how, from which perspectives, and in what formats (Fairclough 1995). For example, within mass media institutions there is a tendency to draw heavily on the discourses of other elite institutions and to rely on particular sources such as parliament, police, government departments, and prominent people, meaning that there is differential opportunity for having a story told at all (Fowler 1991). As Fowler (1991) notes, “…there is no regular mechanism for capturing the activities and views of ‘members of the public’: they are cited only when they enter the news arena by some other door, e.g. happening to witness an accident …” (p.22).
Of particular relevance to this study is the role of the media in negotiating political discourse. In many cases in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the public may be accessing their official discourses via the media – that is, political discourses are a common feature of media coverage, through press conferences, coverage of party press releases, official reports in the print media, and so on. While there is relatively open access to the original source material in Aotearoa/New Zealand (for example, via Hansard, the radio, television coverage, and websites), many people will be exposed to political discourse that has been mediated by the mainstream media.

Decisions governing what is considered to be deserving of media coverage are bound up with notions of newsworthiness. According to Fowler (1991), events become news through their “selection” for coverage, rather than through anything inherent in the event itself. In addition, that which is considered newsworthy will change over time and context, as well as within context depending on the different criteria in play (Fowler 1991, p. 12). The selection of news stories is influenced by institutional factors (discussed above), but also by broader social, cultural, political, and economic determinants. Decisions of newsworthiness are intertwined with the need to maximise consumer interest, but are also influenced by proximity, in the sense that stories closer in a geographical or cultural sense may be considered more worthy than distal stories. The potential content for media discourses is unlimited, and these choices are constantly being made at both conscious and subconscious levels. Mass media, therefore, establishes boundaries which,

1 See Fowler (1991) for a fuller discussion of the criteria of newsworthiness.
while they may by pliable and fluid, provide a frame around what stories are considered worthy of being told and in what ways.

A substantial portion of media discourse is pre-meditated and scripted, rather than spontaneous. In addition, content generally undergoes an editorial process, be it formal or informal, which acts as a further check on the discourse. There are some exceptions to this, for example, talkback radio and television, and live media segments, where the discourse is unscripted or less controlled than that of other media products such as print media. Furthermore, there is a general increase in unscripted discourse entering into media situations that have traditionally been more formally structured, such as the news, in the form of ‘spontaneous’ comment from presenters, for example. This practice is likely to be related to what has been described as the informalization of media discourse (Fairclough 1995), or the tendency of media discourse to become increasingly conversationalised.

As with political discourse, the dialectical nature of media discourse needs to be acknowledged. That is, media institutions produce and reflect social understandings, and in that sense, both influence, and are influenced by, society. This dialectical aspect may function in a more direct manner within the media than other institutions, for example, through letters to the editor, phone in polls, opinion pieces, and talkback radio.

**Mass media in Aotearoa/New Zealand**

In Aotearoa/New Zealand, there are a range of domestic media institutions, including those often referred to as ‘mainstream’ media institutions, as well as a variety of alternative media producers and products. Mainstream media
is defined for the purposes of this thesis as that which is dominant or prevailing in terms of influence and control. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, mainstream media tends to be dominated by members of the non-indigenous Pākehā population, follow broadly ‘Western’ models of production, and use English language as the primary medium. It includes many sites of production, such as television, radio stations, print media, as well as increasing web-based media sources. Access to mainstream media is through both free sources (radio, free-to-air television, online access to newspapers), as well as by subscription or payment (for example, cable and satellite television, and subscriptions to newspapers and magazines).

In addition to the mainstream media institutions, there are also a number of other media sources, in particular Māori media, independent media, as well as community-based media including newspapers, radio stations, and provincial television. These types of media sources have increased in number and accessibility in recent years, in part due to the development of technologies such as satellite and cable television, digitalisation, and the internet, which have significantly impacted on the global accessibility of media discourses, both dominant and alternative voices.

At the time the case study was undertaken, there were a range of newspapers in circulation, including daily newspapers in the majority of metropolitan and urban areas, one weekly weekend newspaper with national circulation (the Sunday Star Times), a range of local weekly newspapers (often non-subscription based), as well as tabloid publications. Many of the daily newspapers were also able to be accessed electronically, as well as being available for reading in public libraries.
REPRESENTING ASIANS IN NEWSPAPER DISCOURSE

As previously outlined in the methods section, the analysis of media discourse incorporated a preliminary overview of texts from the four newspapers for the period June 1st 2002 to December 31st 2003. This preliminary mapping identified over 800 texts that made some reference to Asian individuals or communities during the time period of the case study. The majority of these were news items, but there were also a number of feature articles, commentaries and opinion pieces, and editorials.

Each of these texts was classified based on the extent to which it could be considered to be about Asians. A text about Asians was defined as one within which Asians (individuals or communities) were a primary focus or principal actors. On this basis, articles were judged to broadly fit within one of four categories. Firstly, there were those items that could be seen to be explicitly about Asians, usually signalled by references to Asians in the headline, by-line, early or otherwise prominently in the article. Secondly, there were a number of texts that were predominantly about a specific topic, such as immigration or the export education market, within which Asians were involved as actors or as a sub-topic. The detailed analysis of texts focused principally on items from these two categories. The third category included texts where reference to Asians was peripheral or in passing, and/or where Asians were one of a group of actors in the story, for example, texts

\[\text{[footnote]}\]

\[^{2}\text{It is likely that the articles retrieved do not represent the full potential dataset, due to limitations of the search process and the sensitivity of the electronic search database. Where quantification of the dataset is included in the text, it is to contribute to an understanding of the broader context rather than to provide for assumptions about representativeness or generalisability.}\]
that included reference to Asians within a broader reference to ethnic groups such as reports of the ethnic distribution of a population characteristic. The final category incorporated texts about specific topics where Asians were identified or expressly labelled, and labelling was generally absent for other actors. A sizable proportion of texts in the last category were crime reports that made reference to Asians as victims of crime, crime suspects, or as perpetrators of crime. Although these latter two categories could not generally be considered to be texts about Asians, they are broadly considered in the analysis as they contribute to an understanding of the varied and intersecting ways in which Asians are labelled in the media. Examples from these texts are therefore included where pertinent.

In terms of overall content, the major topic areas that texts about Asians were associated with were crime (and other forms of ‘deviance’), immigration, Asian students (and international education more generally), settlement issues, and social and ‘race’ relations. In addition, there were several particular events around which there were periods of more concentrated media coverage. This included, for example, the launch of the Pan-Asian Congress, a non-governmental lobby group established in October 2002, coverage of and reaction to immigration issues during the 2002 general election campaign, responses to the circulation of a New Zealand First pamphlet about immigration in November 2003, and the SARS virus in early 2003.

---

3 SARS refers to Sudden Acute Respiratory Syndrome, a communicable disease that emerged as a global issue in 2003, the spread of which internationally was seen to be associated with travel (WHO 2004).
Many of the content areas overlapped across texts, for example, texts about Asian crime often also referred to Asian immigration or Asian students. A number of recurring subtopics were also evident including driving, abortion rates, population issues, impacts on race relations and/or host community backlash, and the economic effects of migration and export education.

The following section discusses selected texts in more detail in relation to the various ways in which Asians, as individuals and collectives, were represented in the press, with an emphasis on representations of Otherness. Using the framework outlined in Chapter Five, analysis of these passages concentrated on the content (topics, themes, and categorisations), the strategies, as well as the lexical moves, deployed in the texts. Discussion is organised around the dominant content areas identified in the preliminary survey of the dataset, and focuses on exemplar texts, including examples from additional related texts where appropriate to illustrate the particular discourse feature under consideration.

**Representing Asians as foreign students: ‘changing the face’ of New Zealand?**

A prevalent area of content evident in newspaper texts drawn from this period was that of Asian students. Many texts about foreign students, and what has been termed ‘export education’ in general, specifically concentrated on students from countries identified as Asian, the primary source of international students during the study period. ‘Asian’ plus ‘student’ was one of the more common collocations of descriptors in both headlines and the body text of articles. The frequent usage of the term ‘Asian student’ and
reference to Asian source countries within the context of coverage of export
education has the potential effect that even in the absence of specific reference
to Asians, the term ‘foreign students’ or its variants (including foreign fee-
paying student, overseas student, international student, and English-
language students) act as code for Asian student.

Although articles about Asian students occurred throughout the study
period, in 2003 there were several periods of increased or concentrated
reporting on foreign students in general, and Asian students in particular.
This included a focus in early 2003 during the SARS outbreak that related
primarily to the risks of SARS, including the potential role of people
travelling to and from Asia – foreign students, as well as tourists and other
temporary visitors – in the spread of the disease. Following coverage of
crimes or events reported to involve or be associated with Asian students,
there were related texts produced concerning the export education market,
the role and impact of foreign students in New Zealand, and the risks, both of
and for, students.

In terms of the texts analysed, there were various ways in which Asian
students were discursively characterised as Others. Although this included
inconsistencies in the attributes ascribed to Asian students and accounts of
their role in Aotearoa/New Zealand and accompanying cultural, social, and
economic impacts, there were also commonalities across a number of texts in
terms of recurring modes of meaning, and argumentation and lexicalisation
strategies, both in texts that were specifically about Asian students as well as
those more generally about foreign students. To demonstrate this, the
discussion below draws largely on excerpts from a feature article published
in the Sunday Star Times in August 2003, entitled: ‘Foreign students changing the face of the future’. This text was one of a number of feature articles, opinion pieces, and editorials to discuss foreign students, and more specifically Asian students, during the study period, in addition to more general news items. The article overall was concerned with the social and economic impacts of foreign students, with especial reference to Auckland city. It is useful as an exemplar in that it demonstrates several recurring content areas and discursive strategies that serve to differentiate and Other Asian students. The article begins with the following sentences:

(M1) Foreign students. They pack the buses, cram the libraries and horde the footpaths. They sometimes dominate the headlines with murder, kidnappings and fatal crashes in fast cars. But in money terms New Zealand can’t do without them.

The 80,000-plus secondary and tertiary students who study here, the majority from north-east Asia, generate $1.7 billion a year in revenue for New Zealand. Half is spent in Auckland. ['Foreign students changing the face of the future', Sunday Star Times, 17 August 2003, feature article].

This excerpt, while the reference to Asian students is somewhat indirect, introduces several central themes of Otherness, namely the portrayal of foreign (‘Asian’) students as competition, as perpetrators and victims, and as commodities.

Foreign students as competition
The excerpt (M1) demonstrates the framing of foreign students as competition, in this instance as competition for space and other physical and
non-physical resources. In the quote above, this is primarily achieved lexically. Firstly, it is accomplished through the use of the words “pack”, “cram”, and “horde” to convey a sense of limited space or crowding, words that suggest negative connotations. Competition between groups (foreign students and the rest) for the same resources is suggested – the implication being that if foreign students “pack the buses, cram the libraries and horde the footpaths”, the ability of others to access or use these resources may be compromised. In this sense, it is a discursive move that establishes a relationship based on competing interests for resources between them (in this case, foreign students) and us (in this case, local students or residents).

Secondly, repeated use of the pronouns “they” and “them” simultaneously differentiates foreign students from ‘us’ and positions them as an out-group. This imagery of pressure on resources is one that occurs in other texts broadly about Asian students. In the examples below, it manifests as pressure on physical space, through the invocation of imagery of Asian students as taking up or occupying space:

(M2) South of Victoria St, where Whitcoulls has its flagship store on Queen St, is becoming an Asian microcosm as the education sector gobbles up office space...[‘Law firm finds central site now a fringe location’, New Zealand Herald, December 23 2003, news article].

(M3) ... and came upon a group of Asian youngsters who had just exited a language school and spilled across the footpath. [‘We’d better get used to each other’, New Zealand Herald, July 13 2002, opinion piece].

The construction of Asian students as competition also appeared in other articles in the form of the competition that they create for “New Zealand”
students in terms of access to social or economic resources such as education and employment, as in the extracts below:

(M4) Fewer Chinese and Korean students may be allowed into New Zealand because of the negative impact they are having on the education of Kiwi children … He [Education Minister Trevor Mallard] was concerned about the quality of education for local children. “If you have arrangements where we’re really stretched for teacher supply and you have a pile of Asian kids coming in and we have trouble getting teachers to teach Kiwi kids, then that’s not a good situation.” ['Govt to review Asian student numbers’, Sunday Star Times, 24 November 2002, news article].

(M5) Foreign fee-paying students and overseas-trained doctors at New Zealand’s medical schools are squeezing some New Zealand medical students out of jobs. The squeeze is emerging as a new census of students shows a third of all medical students are Asian. ['Kiwi students miss medical jobs’, The Press, 10 October 2003, news article].

As noted with regard to the exemplar text, the imagery of pressure on resources is emphasised in these extracts (M4,M5) through word choice, for example, reference to being “stretched for teacher supply” in extract (M4), and the “squeeze” on jobs in extract (M5). Asian students are positioned as competition for “Kiwi” or “New Zealand” students by means of the diversion of teaching resources away from “local” students, and in terms of providing competition for employment by “… squeezing some New Zealand medical students out of jobs”. In both extracts, quantification of the apparent problem and its impact is vague. In addition, it is not clear, as in the case of the medical student example above (M5), whether the Asian medical students referred to in the second sentence are all in fact foreign fee-paying students or
overseas trained doctors, as in both these extracts, all Asian students are constructed simultaneously as foreign (fee-paying) students and as non-New Zealand or non-Kiwi, that is, as outsiders.

*Foreign students as perpetrators and victims: crime and racism*

The second theme introduced in this article is that of foreign students alternatively as victims and perpetrators of crime and other undesirable behaviours. In extract (M1), foreign students are associated with “… murder, kidnappings and fatal crashes in fast cars”. The criminalisation of Asians is a recurrent theme in articles during this period and is more fully discussed in a later section. It is strongly associated with texts about Asian students, as well as with particular criminal activities, and functions more broadly as part of an overall strategy of negative other-presentation, identified as a central strategy in discourses about Other groups (van Dijk 1997a). The theme is developed further at a later point in the same article:

*(M6)* The large numbers of foreign students, particularly Asians, has brought with it crime and racism. A trial is about to begin in Christchurch involving a group of Asians who attacked another group in a restaurant. And there have been murders, kidnappings and beatings.

To get a student visa, a person must show they have a return ticket and $10,000 for each year of study deposited in a New Zealand bank. For some Asian students, money is no object. One recently spent $60,000 in a month gambling at a Christchurch TAB ['Foreign students changing the face of the future', Sunday Star Times, 17 August 2003, feature article].

This excerpt (M6) demonstrates the concurrent construction of Asian students as both perpetrators and as victims of criminal behaviour. The references to
crime illustrate discursive moves that also occurred in several other texts about Asians. Firstly, examples or anecdotes are provided as evidence to support statements that are being made about crime and racism. This is then supplemented by general, vague references to “… murders, kidnappings and beatings”. This pattern of generalisation, accompanied by isolated examples or anecdote as evidence, is not uncommon, and appears twice in the excerpt above. These related moves of generalisation and vagueness are discussed further below in relation to media coverage of crime.

Crime and racism are directly linked in the excerpt (M6) to the increase in numbers of foreign students, with particular reference made to Asian students. Crime is also connected to Asian students through reference to the money they are reported to have as a visa requirement, as well as via more generalised references to Asian wealth (“For some Asian students, money is no object.”). These generalisations have the potential to perpetuate stereotypes of Asians as wealthy, a characterisation identified in this case study as well as in the accompanying analysis of political texts.

Through the use of the passive voice, racism and crime are framed so as to imply that they are an inevitable side-effect of increased numbers of Asian students – “… large numbers of foreign students, particularly Asians, has brought with it [my emphasis] crime and racism”. This argument of the inevitability of racism (and crime) is played out in discourses about Asians in particular and immigrants in general, and tends to link these outcomes in a simplistic or linear way to increasing numbers. The article later includes references to examples of racism:
Many Asian students had to put up with racist remarks. In Christchurch, one bus driver mimics Asians when they get on, and another was observed by the Sunday Star-Times recently waiting for a young Chinese woman running to get to his bus, only to drive off and leave her standing when she got to the vehicle. Asian students spoken to by the Star-Times said many shop assistants looked down on them, though they were only too happy to take their money. Many felt more comfortable shopping where there were Asian staff. Two months ago, the Nelson Malborough Institute of Technology met with police, after students complained they were afraid to go out at night because of racial harassment. ['Foreign students changing the face of the future', Sunday Star Times, 17 August 2003, feature article].

Racism is broadly discussed using the same pattern identified in relation to crime – through the use of generalisation and vagueness and the accompanying provision of examples. As the earlier background chapters describe, racism towards Asians, and Chinese in particular, is not new and has long been a feature of Aotearoa/New Zealand society irrespective of population size. The argument line that racism is caused by diversity, or is a by-product of increasingly diverse populations, can promote the idea that racism is about dealing with the Other, occurring at an interpersonal level, as perpetuated by individuals. This limited view of racism is not specific to Asian discourses, but is a feature of them. It also can restrict the discussion to an explanatory frame that is focused on numbers (of ‘them’) as an issue.

Foreign students as commodities
The third theme introduced in the opening lines of this article (M1) is that of the financial benefits foreign students are seen to bring with them. This was one of the more common contexts within which discussion of foreign
students in general, and Asian students in particular, took place. Several texts about Asian students focused on the perceived benefits that overseas students bring to Aotearoa/New Zealand, specifically in terms of what is referred to as an ‘export education market’. This text, as well as other news items, feature articles, and opinion pieces, make reference to the amount of money that the export education market brings in to Aotearoa/New Zealand.

(M8) The 80,000-plus secondary and tertiary students who study here, the majority from north-east Asia, generate $1.7 billion a year in revenue for New Zealand. Half is spent in Auckland. The education industry is now our fifth largest foreign exchange earner after tourism, diary, meat and forest products …

In simple terms, Heart of Auckland chief executive Alex Swney says all Kiwis have to embrace foreign students.

“All we seem to hear is the negative side. They are a huge economic generator. Go to London and look at the West end….People don’t realise how important students are to the economic benefit of the city” ['Foreign students changing the face of the future’, Sunday Star Times, 17 August 2003, feature article].

A considerable proportion of the article overall was spent discussing economic aspects of the export education market in Aotearoa/New Zealand and, more broadly, relationships with source countries. The benefits that are seen to flow from this market are framed in terms of trade or monetary benefits, as opposed to non-economic benefits or other forms of capital, such as cultural capital. In this sense, Asian students are constructed as products or trade. Lexically, this commodification of Asian students is achieved in this and other texts through the deployment of economic language, including
reference to markets, industries, and students as foreign exchange earners and economic generators, as in the examples below:

(M9) Asian students will be the target market ['Girls’ school branches out', Dominion Post, 26 December 2002, news article].

(M10) China provided the majority of the 80,000 international students who came here last year for secondary or tertiary education. They are the lifeblood of an industry that has become one of the top-five contributors to our national wellbeing. ['Good name as educators in jeopardy', New Zealand Herald, 19 September 2003, editorial].

(M11) He [the Race Relations Commissioner] said people who blamed the increase on the Government were confusing international students with international migrants. “International students are like international tourists and we don’t say we shouldn’t have tourist from Asia because they are one of the mainstays of our economy and international students are an important part of the economy as well” ['Come back next year with a smile, visitors to Queen Street told', New Zealand Herald, 25 December 2003, news article].

There are, however, instances when the non-economic benefits of international students were discussed, including in relation to their contribution to diversity and to the ‘increasing multiculturalism’ of Aotearoa/New Zealand. However, these texts also have the potential to commodify Asian students in the sense of constructing ‘them’ as products for ‘our’ consumption.

Within the broader corpus of texts about Asian students, there were a number of other sub-topics identified, including the needs of foreign
students, particularly Asian students, their experiences while in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and the broader relationships between Aotearoa/New Zealand and various source countries. These texts also included discussion of issues of crime and racism, some drawing on comment from those involved in the provision of education or support for overseas students, as well as from students themselves. In simplistic terms, a number of texts took what might be considered a more sympathetic view of issues for students, discussing pastoral care needs and contextualising the export education market. However, while these texts may not be as productive for analysis of the strategies involved in the construction of Asian Otherness, in general they do not disrupt the on-going narrative identified in the exemplar article of Asians as students, as foreign, and as non-New Zealand.

Crashing cars and getting pregnant: Representing (ir)responsibility
At times, texts concerning foreign students (often synonymous with Asian students) drew on themes of deviance and (ir)responsibility. These themes are a feature of discourses about the Other in general, but tend to be more explicit in this case study in relation to Asian students or immigrants. In regard to Asian students, this is possibly because they overlap with common representations of youth as risk-taking, less responsible and, therefore, more likely to be involved in ‘undesirable behaviours’ such as dangerous driving, abortion, and crime. There were a number of content areas within which these themes of deviance and irresponsibility were played out. This included the broad topics of Asian students (discussed above) and Asian crime (discussed below), as well as the specific sub-topics of Asian drivers and Asian abortion. These texts provide examples of the ways in which Asians
are positioned as Others through reference to behaviours or attitudes that deviate from the (often unstated) norm.

**Driving while Asian**

During the study period, there were several articles about driving safety and foreign or overseas drivers that focused on ‘Asian driving’ as an issue (Box 6.1).

**Box 6.1: Examples of headlines of articles about Asian drivers**

- Accidental tourists (Sunday Star Times, 29 September 2002, feature article)
- Drivers fooling cops with fake $150 foreign licences (Sunday Star Times, 29 September 2002, news article)
- Coroner urges tougher laws for foreign drivers (Sunday Star Times, 17 November 2002, news article)
- Asian road code to curb accidents (Sunday Star Times, 23 February 2003, news article)
- Driving rights cut both ways (New Zealand Herald, 25 February 2003, editorial)
- Driver, 16, breached conditions of licence (The Press, 3 July 2003, news article)
- Boy racer, 13, caught at 132kmh (The Dominion Post, 23 July 2003, news article)
- Manager says don’t blame Asian drivers (The Press, 26 July 2003, news article)

As in many of the texts about foreign students, Asian drivers were constructed as foreign through the concurrent use of the terms Asian and foreign, or synonyms such as overseas drivers. For example:

(M12) Asian drivers are the targets of a proposed new scheme that would see the road code translated into Asian languages. The plan, from the Land Transport Safety Authority, aims to better educate foreign drivers, hopefully reducing road crashes. “There appears to be significant difficulty for Chinese drivers coming into a different community to adjust,” traffic safety manager Karen
Hay said...['Asian road code to curb accidents', Sunday Star Times, 23 February 2003, news article].

**M13** Forcing overseas students and new migrants to sit driving tests before giving them visas would curtail New Zealanders’ driving rights when they are overseas, says an Auckland City Council report. Commissioned because of concerns held by the council’s law and order committee about the standard of Asian drivers, particularly students... ['Driving rights cut both ways', New Zealand Herald, 25 July 2003, news article].

In these excerpts (M12, M13), the process worked both ways in that all Asian drivers (and Chinese drivers specifically) are framed as foreign/overseas drivers and, conversely, all foreign drivers are constructed as Asian. The overlapping construction of Asian drivers as not simply foreign, but as specifically non-Kiwi or non-New Zealander, also reoccurred:

**M14** Stop lambasting Asian drivers – Kiwis are just as bad...

... But LTSA regional manager Dennis Robertson has defended foreign drivers, saying New Zealanders are “just as silly”. “There are a lot of New Zealanders driving outside the conditions of their licence, but as a national problem, Asian drivers account for only 1 per cent of the crashes anyway”, he said ['Manager says don’t blame Asian drivers', The Press, 26 July 2003, news article].

In the above extract, while attempts are made to discount Asian driving as a major issue by reference to the proportion of road accidents reportedly involving Asian drivers, Asian drivers are simultaneously reified as both foreign drivers and non-New Zealanders.
As with texts about Asian students (above) and Asian crime (below), anecdotes and *extreme examples* were employed to demonstrate the apparent association between Asians and certain driving behaviours. For example:

**(M15)** In another recent incident a young Asian hit a power transformer and pole with his Toyota Supra car then ploughed into the Nelson supermarket he intended shopping at ['Boy racer, 13, caught at 132kmh', The Dominion Post, 23 July 2003, news article].

**(M16)** Last week a 13-year-old Asian boy was clocked driving at more than 130kmh near Blenheim, frustrating police, who say the incident highlights “a problem” with irresponsible young Asian drivers ['Manager says don’t blame Asian drivers', The Press, 26 July 2003, news article].

Within these texts concerning driving behaviour, Asians were repeatedly located as outsiders, namely as foreign students, tourists, or migrants, with their behaviour variously characterised as ignorant, irresponsible, dangerous, or criminal, although there were instances where it was framed as a problem to do with youth and lack of experience, as opposed to their group identity as Asian.

Aside from the articles that focused explicitly on Asian driving behaviour, texts reporting on vehicle incidents or crashes also labelled drivers as Asian in a way that presupposed an association between the group identity (Asian) and the behaviour (driving). This happened in the absence of similar labelling of other actors, and is discussed further in the later section on categorisation.
‘Asian shame’: Asian abortion

A further topic area that drew heavily on themes of (ir)responsibility, as well as those of cultural difference, was in regard to abortion. Texts about abortions among Asians did not appear consistently during the study period, but were concentrated around two peaks of coverage surrounding the release of annual figures on abortion rates that appeared in the media in June 2002 and again in November 2003. A number of these texts, including both news articles and opinion pieces, were explicitly focused on Asian abortions (Box 6.2). Abortion was also raised as a sub-topic in other texts that were concerned more broadly with issues for Asian students.

Box 6.2: Examples of headlines of articles about Asian abortion

- ‘Increase in women having more than one abortion’ (The Dominion, 12 June 2002, news article)
- ‘Abortion rates for Asians high’ (New Zealand Herald, 12 June 2002, news article)
- ‘Multi-abortions 'not uncommon' for Asians’ (The Press, 13 June 2002, news article)
- ‘Abortion rates up for Asian students’ (The Evening Post, 13 June 2002, news article)
- ‘Overseas students need care’ (New Zealand Herald, 14 June 2002, editorial)
- ‘Student troubles’ (The Evening Post, 29 June 2002, feature article)
- ‘Asian shame’ (The Press, 29 June 2002, feature article)
- ‘Chinese students dominate abortion clinic's patients’ (The Press, 21 November 2003, news article)
- ‘Abortion doubling as contraception – says study’ (New Zealand Herald, 21 November 2003, news article)
- ‘Abortions soar for Asians who fear pill’ (The Dominion Post, 22 November 2003, news article)

These texts are complex in that they intersect both with discourses about abortion, and with media discourses about health issues in general. In
addition, they tend to demonstrate the gendered nature of much discourse about sexual and reproductive issues, particularly in regard to issues of pregnancy and termination. It is difficult, therefore, to completely untangle the values underlying this text and their specificity to Asian abortion as a topic, as opposed to abortion in general. They do, however, draw on recurring themes, arguments, and explanatory models in representing Asian abortion and asserting difference. The following excerpt from an article reporting on the release of annual figures on terminations of pregnancy that described an increased number of terminations among ‘Asian women’ illustrates a number of these discursive moves and strategies.

(M17) Some Asian students are requiring two abortions a year, which a Christchurch doctor says is a disturbing consequence of their unwillingness to use contraception. Christchurch GP Pippa MacKay, who performs abortions, commenting yesterday on a 20 per cent jump in the number of Asian women having abortions between 2000 and 2001, said multiple abortions were not uncommon.

“The pill is not frequently used in Japan, China, or Korea,” she said. “Contraception when it is used is used sporadically. It is a really hard road to get across that the pill is OK. They have fewer moral issues about abortion.” Dr MacKay said their attitude to abortion was unacceptable. “How many abortions does it take for them to accept that is not the way to do it?” [‘Multi-abortions ‘not uncommon’ for Asians’, The Press, 13 June 2002, news article].

The extract (M17), which opens the article, establishes a boundary around the ensuing discussion within which multiple abortions and, specifically, multiple abortions among Asians, are framed as problematic. This construction of abortion as a problem is aided lexically through the use of words and phrases such as “disturbing consequence” and “unacceptable”.
Abortion is also constructed as morally problematic, primarily by means of the statement that “They [Asians] have fewer moral issues about abortion”, introducing a comparison between ‘them’ and the un-named ‘us’, who by default have more moral issues about abortion. Further examples of the problematising of abortions among Asian women, and abortion in general, is found in other articles:

(M18) Young Asian women living in New Zealand are having abortions at an alarming rate. Why? Asian women students literally let loose in New Zealand are falling pregnant and ending up on the abortionists’ tables, swelling New Zealand’s already ghastly abortion statistics [‘Asian shame’, The Press, 26 June 2002, editorial].

(M19) The education of foreign students has been one of this country’s outstanding success stories … Worryingly, however, there are signs of fraying about the edges. The fact that Asian women, many of them students, have the highest abortion rate of any ethnic group in New Zealand carries a warning that the industry must not ignore if it wishes to maintain a full head of steam … [‘Overseas students need care’, New Zealand Herald, 14 June 2002, news article].

The article (M17) referred to above draws on models of (ir)responsibility, particularly in relation to contraceptive use, through reference to non-use of contraception (“… their unwillingness to use contraception”), improper use of contraception (“Contraception when it is used is used sporadically”), and “unwillingness” to modify behaviour (“It is a really hard road to get across that the pill is OK”; “How many abortions does it take for them to accept that is not the way to do it?”). The inclusion of comment from an official voice, in this case that of a medical professional, functions to provide authority to the
claims made in the text, a strategy of authentication that is also apparent in other texts about Asians.

The article (M17) also contains examples of vagueness and generalisation, moves identified in relation to Asian students (above) and Asian crime (below). Vagueness is indicated by the use of the qualifier “some” (“Some Asian students are requiring two abortions a year …”) as well as through non-specific quantification (“… multiple abortions were not uncommon”). Where there is specific quantification, it is in terms of percentages rather than absolute numbers. Generalisations are made in the article about group behaviour, beliefs, and values by which attributes are assumed to be shared by all members of a group. Further examples of this move of generalising group behaviour occur in other texts about abortion among Asian women:

(M20) Ashamed and miserable, they often tell no-one outside the clinic, least of all their parents. These young women come from countries where they are taught they should be virgins at marriage. Their parents and their schools keep a close eye on them. Then, as foreign students here, free, naïve, lonely, and unsupervised, many find themselves pregnant ['Asian shame', The Press, 29 June 2002, editorial].

These articles contribute to recurring imagery in a number of stories about young Asians in New Zealand (and particularly, Asian students), as out of control. The need for termination is argued as being related to characteristics about Asians themselves, namely cultural norms and beliefs about contraception, and broader knowledge of and attitudes to sex and pregnancy. While in some cases, the decisions made around the use of contraception and subsequent termination are positioned as resulting from lack of information,
at other times they are represented as unwillingness to conform to local conventions and/or irresponsibility in contraceptive use, as well as a result of Asians not having the same moral or cultural standards as other social groups in terms of termination. In general, the articles tend to frame an increase in the number of abortions as problematic, and place Asian students, in particular Asian women, as the primary contributor to the increase. In addition, they either implicitly or explicitly contrast apparent Asian practices in regard to termination of pregnancy with ‘our’ behaviour in a way that at the same time homogenises ‘their’ group behaviour and differentiates it from ‘ours’.

The ‘Chinese kidnapping season’

In this case study, crime was identified as a recurrent topic area, a general tendency that has been demonstrated in literature on the coverage and representation of Other groups in the press. In addition to articles broadly about crime within which reference was made to Asian perpetrators or victims, the dataset included a number of articles that overtly focused on crime reported as being committed by, or impacting on, Asian individuals and communities.

---

4 In April 2003, an Auckland judge used the phrase “Chinese kidnapping season” in reference to recent kidnapping cases among Chinese students. The comment was reported in the press and picked up by politicians.
In the newspaper dataset, the phrase ‘Asian crime’ (as well as the more specific phrase ‘Chinese crime’) appeared on a number of occasions, contributing to the construction of a category of crime that was presumed to be specific and different from other illegal behaviours. This assertion of a particular type of crime – Asian crime – was developed most obviously in texts focused on criminal activities alleged to have a specific association with Asian communities, including those of kidnapping and extortion.

As an example of newspaper narratives of Asian crime, analysis was undertaken of a series of articles that appeared in the New Zealand Herald in April and May 2003 focused on this issue. The following discussion will concentrate principally on one of these articles, drawing on examples from
other texts where relevant. On May 10th 2003, the New Zealand Herald ran an article entitled ‘Kidnapping cases hit one a week’, broadly reporting on the apparent increase in “Asian crime”, and specifically extortion-type crimes, in the Auckland area. The article opened with the statement that:

(M21) Asian students in Auckland are falling victim to kidnap and extortion crimes at the rate of one a week [‘Kidnapping cases hit one a week’, New Zealand Herald, May 10 2003, news article],

going on to quote several police sources about rates of extortion-type crimes and their reported association with Asian communities. The article employed a number of discursive moves in representing Asian crime and differentiating the alleged phenomenon from crime more generally.

The first of these was the utilisation of the previously identified strategy of denoting Asians concurrently as perpetrators and victims of crime. This strategy, as it operates within the context of press discourses on Asian crime, frames crime as a particular problem for Asian people who function variously as criminals or victims. In doing this, it also serves to Other Asian crime by portraying it as essentially about ‘them’ (Asians), although impacting on ‘us’ (the un-named, but non-Asian majority) through increased pressure on police resources and the diversion of resources away from criminal activity that affects ‘our’ communities, an argument also pursued by the New Zealand First party in the accompany case study of political texts. This argument line appears in a more explicit form in an editorial published during this period of heightened media concentration that discussed a letter written about ‘Asian crime’ to the New Zealand Herald by a Senior Constable in Auckland:
Mr Lamb [Senior Constable] said he was so busy dealing with these [crimes committed by Asian students] that he could not respond to calls from the public while patrolling downtown. [‘Don’t shoot this police messenger’, New Zealand Herald, May 22 2003, editorial].

This extract (M22) negatively contrasts ‘their’ crimes (crimes committed by Asian students) with those affecting “the public”, framing Asian crime both in terms of competition for police resources and as a threat to the ability of the police to respond to the needs of the wider public.

As part of the enactment of the broader strategy of criminalisation, the discursive devices of vagueness and generalisation were used variously in this text in regard to the detailing of criminal activity, as demonstrated in the examples below:

He [Detective Inspector Gavin Jones] said extortion-type crimes among students were “a big issue for us”…

Other cases involve standovers, where a group will pressure a victim into withdrawing around $1000 from ATM machines of signing over ownership of cars …

… the students are often found carrying weapons …

… where their quarrels sometimes break out into large brawls …

[‘Kidnapping cases hit one a week’, New Zealand Herald, May 10 2003, news article].

Vagueness and generalisation was simultaneously achieved through the use of qualifiers such as “often” and “sometimes”, making the occurrence of particular behaviours appear common or frequent. Generalisations such as
those above serve the essentialisation of the concept of ‘Asian crime’ by promoting behaviours as typical rather than atypical. The provision of generalised examples or anecdotes operated as a means of establishing evidence for claims being made, and to authenticate or legitimise statements.

In addition to these ambiguous references to criminal activity, the text also cited specific examples of what were referred to in the article as “extortion-type crime”, for example:

(M24) The Weekend Herald has learned of a student kidnapping with a $1 million ransom demand late last year that was foiled when the 22-year-old victim escaped and called police. It has also learned of several other cases which did not hit the headlines, including one in which kidnappers packed a young Asian woman into a suitcase but eventually took her back to her flat when she could not come up with the money. [‘Kidnapping cases hit one a week’, New Zealand Herald, May 10 2003, news article].

However, while reference is made to specific crimes, the reporting remains vague, with no direct attribution of sources.

As part of an overall strategy of negative other-presentation that operated through the broad criminalisation of Asian individuals and communities, there was an association in this text of Asians and, more specifically, Asian students, with particular criminal behaviours, primarily those referred to as ‘extortion-type crimes’ (kidnapping, demanding with menace, and so on). In fact, the article quotes a police source as saying kidnapping is a “… crime more commonly committed by Asians on Asians”. In this respect, it Others the criminal behaviour further by differentiating Asian criminal behaviour
from criminal behaviour in general. In terms of this study, it is essentially an aside whether or not these crimes do appear more in some social groups than in others statistically. What is of interest is the tendency for crimes seen to be more common in non-majority groups to become associated implicitly and explicitly with that group in a way that naturalises the association – as if the behaviour were a function of group belonging. In particular, crime associated with a non-white ethnic group or non-majority group can become ethnicised. The crimes are ethnically marked, including through the ethnic labelling of victims, suspects, or perpetrators. The ethnicising of criminal behaviours is apparent in this article in the following extract:

(M25) There are other ethnic gangs or groups among Vietnamese, Cambodians and Japanese. ['Kidnapping cases hit one a week', New Zealand Herald, 10 May 2003, news article].

The reference to these “gangs or groups” as “ethnic” in the context of an article about ‘Asian crime’ reinforces an association between the ethnicity and the behaviour. The extract embodies an implicit presupposition that some ‘gangs or groups’ are ethnic, and correspondingly that some are not. In addition, Vietnamese, Cambodians and Japanese are marked as ethnic and, more broadly in the article, as Asian.

A further feature of discourses about Asian crime that was apparent in this and other articles was the argument line of Asians as being reluctant to report crime to authorities. This reluctance was frequently accounted for through reference to “cultural reasons” – that is, the explanation for the behaviour
was located in the culture of the perpetrators and/or the victims. For example:

(M26) Police believe this is the tip of the iceberg and say many more similar crimes are not being reported by Asians, who tend to shy away from dealing with authorities for cultural reasons. ['Kidnapping cases hit one a week', New Zealand Herald, May 10 2003, news article].

This argument was drawn upon in several other articles about ‘Asian crime’:

(M27) He waited two days to approach police, which Mr Brown put down to a fear of his attackers and cultural distrust of police. ['Victim helps break extortion ring', New Zealand Herald, April 25 2003, news article].

(M28) Add language barriers, confused identities, an imported mistrust of the police, patchy interpreter services, and brazen attempts to silence witnesses and you have a recipe for trouble. ['There’s big trouble in little China', The Press, 31 October 2002, feature article].

(M29) In essence, Asian students see the police and the court system as a soft touch. In their countries of origin, the police respond to trouble with guns and often misplaced gusto, corruption is prevalent and the courts impose sentences that are designed to deter ['Don’t shoot this police messenger', New Zealand Herald, 22 May 2003, editorial].

(M30) “The standover thing is a cultural thing …” ['Lid stays on crime by Asians', The Press, 28 September 2002, news article].

These extracts demonstrate the homogenisation of Asian culture by presupposing shared characteristics and common attitudes towards police
and the wider justice system (for example, “… cultural distrust of police …” and “… an imported mistrust of the police …”). This homogenisation is explicit in extract (M29), which groups all Asian students together by generalising about “… their countries of origin …”, implying shared characteristics in terms of both criminal behaviour and responses to crime. This explanatory model has the potential to reinforce the notion that certain social groups, usually non-dominant groups, have a common culture that significantly governs the behaviour of individual members.

The first examples (M27, M28) also illustrate how narratives of Asian criminality, particularly as they pertain to victimhood, draw on characterisations of Asians as passive, reluctant to become involved with police, and, at times, fearful. These characterisations overlap with the persistent stereotypes of Asians as quiet and submissive that have been identified in this and other studies.

This recurring theme of Asian victimhood is apparent in the focus on Asian people, and particularly Asian students, as victims of crime, sometimes at the hands of ‘unsrerpulous’ unnamed perpetrators, other times at the hands of other Asians. The framing of Asians as crime victims is in part achieved through the labelling of crime victims as Asian when it is not central to the text. In crime reports, it was not uncommon for Asian victims to be marked as Asian in the absence of ethnic labelling of other actors. This theme of victimhood occurred in the content area of crime, but also in relation to texts about racial discrimination, Asian student needs and pastoral care issues, and Asian abortion. One of the lexical devices for achieving this was the use of
the passive voice, which allowed for the representation of Asians as having things done to them, thereby removing a sense of agency. For example:

\[(M31)\] Asian students in Auckland are falling victim [my emphasis] to kidnap and extortion crimes at the rate of one a week. ['Kidnapping cases hit one a week', New Zealand Herald, May 10 2003, news article].

\[(M32)\] Asian women students literally let loose in New Zealand are falling pregnant and ending up on the abortionists’ tables … ['Asian shame’, The Press, 26 June 2002, editorial].

In general, an over-arching strategy of negative other-presentation was a feature of newspaper texts about Asian crime, primarily realised through the construction of the notion of group-specific crime. In relation to this content area, familiar strategies of vagueness and generalisation were employed, as well as the homogenisation of Asian communities in terms of their reported criminal behaviours and responses to crime. Differentiation was achieved through the positioning of Asians as both victims and perpetrators of crime, as well as through the representation of Asian crime as specific and particular.

Immigration, social change, and social relations
A relatively common example of the differentiation and distancing of Asian communities was through texts about immigration and related texts concerning migrant settlement issues and, more broadly, social relations. As noted in an earlier section, coverage of immigration during the time-period of the case study included periods of concentrated attention linked to political discourses on immigration. These periods of heightened coverage occurred
around the general election in mid-2002 and the establishment of the new government in late 2002, following speeches about immigration at the New Zealand First Party convention in November 2002, and again in late 2003 surrounding the release of a controversial New Zealand First pamphlet about immigration.

As a consequence, media reporting during this study period incorporated coverage of New Zealand First positions on immigration, including the publication of political speeches or extracts from speeches. The accompanying chapter on political discourse examines in more detail various discursive strategies used to talk about Asian immigration by New Zealand First Party members, within the context of parliamentary debates and public speeches, and those texts that were the most productive as examples of Othering through the content area of immigration are dealt with in the political case study.

The media dataset also included a number of texts, including news articles, editorials and opinion pieces, that were discussions of and responses to New Zealand First discourses. This included texts that could be categorised as critical of New Zealand First’s position, as well as articles that endeavoured to contextualise contemporary discussions of Asian immigration through reference to historical circumstances and practices (Spoonley & Trlin 2004).

Asian people were constructed as Others in many texts about immigration, including texts that were generated by New Zealand First, as well as those produced in response. This was achieved primarily through the association of the content and thematic area of immigration with Asian people, both
directly through texts about Asian immigration but also indirectly through coverage of the New Zealand First campaign and commentaries on immigration, as well as coverage of responses to this. It was also achieved through repeated utilisation of the collocation ‘Asian immigrant’ (or variously, Asian migrant).

The broader content area of immigration included sub-topics of population increases and related issues of settlement and resources in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Box 6.4: Example of headlines from articles about Asian populations in Aotearoa/New Zealand

- ‘More Asians in NZ’ (The Dominion Post, 30 October 2002, news article)
- ‘Asian population predicted to swell to 604,000 by 2021’ (New Zealand Herald, 11 June 2003, news article)
- ‘New beginnings and old struggles (Sunday Star Times, 22 June 2003, feature article)
- ‘Asians shut out, corruption let in, says MP (The Dominion Post, 3 July 2003, news article)
- ‘One in four NZ Chinese born here’ (New Zealand Herald, 27 October 2003, news article)
- ‘Wong invokes an Asian army of potential’ (The Dominion Post, 4 November 2003, news article)
- ‘Asian families make new start’ (The Press, 30 December 2003, news article)

During the study period, texts that dealt with themes of social change and social relations also tended to overlap with topics of immigration and settlement, race relations, racism and tolerance, including news articles, such as those reporting on ‘racially-motivated’ crimes or polls of popular opinion, as well as a number of feature articles, opinion pieces, and editorials.
The following discussion draws heavily on a feature article entitled ‘Alien feelings rise in Godzone’ that was carried in the New Zealand Herald on the 13th July 2002 (14 days out from the 2002 general election). The article, while it may be somewhat atypical in terms of the way it originated, demonstrates several discursive techniques for constructing Asian Otherness or difference, and is, therefore, a productive text for analysis. The article was produced as a follow-up piece to a letter to the editor published in the same newspaper, occurring during one of the periods of heightened coverage of the issue of ‘Asian immigration’. The letter was included at the beginning of the article:

(M33) This Letter to the Editor (below) encapsulated the sentiments of unease that are providing political fodder in an election campaign in which immigration is an issue. PETER CALDER talked to its author to tap into the feelings that are fuelling the debate.

Sir,

Today I waited in a queue at a Howick bank. There were five people ahead of me. Three were Asian, two were Indian, both the tellers were Asian and the manager sat in her office – an Asian. The sixth person in the queue was me – a third generation (New Zealander) of English descent, with blue eyes and blond hair. Nobody was speaking English and I just wanted to cry. Today I felt like an alien in my own country.

J Wilson, Howick

Waiting in a queue at her local bank, she noticed that everybody else in the building was Asian. She felt like a stranger in a land she had always called home and, she writes, she wanted to cry. In the midst of an election campaign in which immigration is emerging as an issue, the letter struck a chord. Its writer was giving clear voice to an idea often grumbled in undertones. It seemed worth putting a human face to the words, worth asking what would
move someone to write in such anguished tones. ['Alien feelings rise in
Godzone', New Zealand Herald, 13 July 2002, feature article].

The rationale for the follow-up feature article is signalled by reference to the letter as reflecting some wider feeling or “sentiments of unease”, rather than an extreme position, although it is vague as to whose “sentiments of unease” the letter encapsulated and with whom it “struck a chord. In general, the letter writer is framed as a reluctant voice. As the article continues, a number of incidental facts are provided about the letter writer, including details of the length of time she had resided in Howick (a suburb in Auckland), that she had raised her family there, and that the family had decided to stay in Howick rather than moving to Australia. These details operate as a way of credentialing the letter writer. Firstly, this is achieved through the argument line that commitment to or depth of feeling for Aotearoa/New Zealand is directly related to the length of time that someone has spent in the country. This argument also appears explicitly in the letter writer’s own words, through reference to herself as being a “… third-generation (New Zealander) …”. It is an argument form that is relatively common in discourses about belonging, rights, and entitlements in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and is used in dominant group discourses both in reference to Māori people (with longer claims to belonging), as well as to more recently arrived migrants (with shorter claims to belonging). The argument also featured in the political case study.

The inclusion of information about the letter writer’s and her husband’s jobs represents them as an ordinary couple, validating the opinion expressed in the letter as that of an ‘ordinary’ person speaking out, rather than a radical or
extremist viewpoint. This operates within a macro-strategy of justification, where viewpoints which might be considered offensive or unpalatable are represented as everyday. The popularising of the particular point of view of the letter is also achieved in the text through generalised referencing to imply a widely-held position:

(M34) Who, in Auckland at least, hasn’t stood at a crowded city intersection or taken a city bus only to notice that every other face was visibly foreign, usually Asiatic?...

…The face of the country is changing and white-skinned New Zealanders of British ancestry are finding the adjustment hard …[‘Alien feelings rise in Godzone’, New Zealand Herald, 13 July 2002, feature article].

The article employs a number of other justification strategies to pre-empt suggestions of racism, prejudice, xenophobia or similar in the letter writer. For example, the article states that “… it is worth noting that she enjoys working for a business that is owned by a man of Asian extraction”, suggesting that this precludes an ability to be biased or racist. This justification strategy is a variation on the ‘Some of my best friends are …’ disclaimer identified by van Dijk (1987). In this article, it is also followed by an explicit denial of prejudice in saying that ”…she has nothing against Asians in particular”. However, the article does not question the letter writer’s discomfort at being in a setting where there are relatively more Asians or where English language is not the primary language being used. In this way, circumstances where English is not the principal language being spoken are represented as intrinsically upsetting, as is being the only non-Asian in a particular situation.
In this article, issues with the number of Asians in Aotearoa/New Zealand are generally expressed as concern, discomfort, or unease, rather than prejudice or racism. Public concern is framed in this text (and others) as being directly related to the number or proportion of Asians in the population:

(M35) ... In the 1996 census, 83 per cent of the population identified as European but official statistics show that only 70 per cent of births in 1999 were of children whose parents would call them European.

The Asian population is expected to double to 370,000 by 2016 ... ['Alien feelings rise in Godzone', New Zealand Herald, 13 July 2002, feature article].

(M36) It is probably a function of the population’s size and diversity ['Good name as educators in jeopardy', New Zealand Herald, 19 September 2003, editorial].

Popular resentment or backlash is also represented in this text and others as a product of the apparent ‘visibility’ of the Asian population, particularly in contrast to other migrant populations:

(M37) There’s a visibility question as well. Our largest immigrant numbers have always come from Britain and Europe and don’t stand out in a crowd. ['Alien feelings rise in Godzone', New Zealand Herald, 13 July 2002, feature article].

(M38) ... number of Asian students is more noticeable here than it is in the larger cities of the United States, Canada and Australia ... The consequences cut both ways: the students feel more conspicuous and the host population is more fearful of them ['Good name as educators in jeopardy', New Zealand Herald, 19 September 2003, editorial].

(M39) While the Asian face of Christchurch is visible, it is nothing compared to Auckland. In some electorates, such as Roskill, Asians make up in excess of a
quarter of the population. From there it is not too difficult to point the finger at surging migrant numbers to explain the traffic congestion that has hamstringed the city and the soaring house prices … ['Peters’ foes take bait’, The Press, 6 December 2003, opinion piece].

(M40) Nobody can deny that visibility. It’s on the buses – the streams of Asian faces pouring off a Big Red around 9am any weekday near any of the city’s tertiary institutions, or the many private language schools now in the city centre. It can be startling for the unwary. ['Asia on Avon’, The Press, 26 October 2002, feature article].

In particular, extracts M38 and M40 link visibility of the social group (as represented by phenotypic difference) with fear (“… and the host population is more fearful of them”) or unease (“It can be startling for the unwary”). The argument simultaneously locates Asians within a hierarchy of difference, where they exist as more different than other migrant or ethnic groups, and naturalises ‘in-group’ responses, be they apprehension, fear, or otherwise.

A key discursive feature of this article that operated as a way of differentiating groups was the deployment of racialised language to identify ethnic groups through reference to appearance. This occurred as a means of marking Asians (the Other), but also as a way of marking Self. For example:

(M41) Waiting in a queue at her local bank, she noticed that everybody else in the building was Asian.
On a wet Thursday, Howick village … looks pretty pakeha.
A pair of youngsters, … and a busking teenage violinist are the only Asian faces …
… where I will later see a far higher proportion of Asian faces.
We go somewhere and say: ‘We’re the only whites here’.
Who, in Auckland at least, hasn’t stood at a crowded city intersection or taken a city bus only to notice that every other face was visibly foreign, usually Asiatic? The face of the country is changing and white-skinned New Zealanders of British ancestry are finding the adjustment hard… ['Alien feelings rise in Godzone', New Zealand Herald, 13 July 2002, feature article].

These examples, particularly the repeated references to Asian faces, presume the existence of a discernible and, therefore, categorisable Asian face. The construction of Asians as at once different and foreign is explicit in this extract (“…every other face was visibly foreign, usually Asiatic?”). A further way in which this differentiation is achieved in this article is through the association of the term ‘New Zealanders’ with Pākehā or British social groups (except for one occasion where it is used generally), both in the letter writer’s words as well as more generally in the article:

(M42) … - a third generation (New Zealander) of British descent
      … will be familiar to plenty of other pakeha New Zealanders.
      … white-skinned New Zealanders of British ancestry… ['Alien feelings rise in Godzone', New Zealand Herald, 13 July 2002, feature article].

Asians in the article are not referred to as Asian New Zealanders, or New Zealanders of Asian descent. As in many texts concerned with social relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand, Asians are either assumed to be immigrants or foreigners, or are expressly marked as such.

CATEGORIZING ASIANS IN NEWSPAPER TEXTS
The newspaper texts analysed in this case study provide insights into the use of labelling, particularly the assignation of group labels of identity such as
ethnicity or nationality in the construction of media narratives. In addition, they provide a site for examination of the stereotypical representations of Asian individuals and collectives through media texts. The application of labelling and stereotypes are both previously identified devices in Othering discourses.

Nomination and ex-nomination: making Asians visible in media texts

In reading and analysing the broader dataset of media texts that made reference to Asians, it became evident that there were instances where actors in a discourse item were specifically identified and marked as Asian, while other actors in the same text either remained uncategorised in terms of an ethnic, cultural, or national identity, or were categorised by reference to some other socio-demographic characteristic, such as age or profession. This occurred both in relation to texts that could be considered to be about Asians, but also in texts that had specific other topics. The following extract from an article about tuberculosis (Tb) in Canterbury provides an example of this:

(M43) Two cases of tuberculosis (Tb) have been identified in Canterbury. An elderly man and an Indian woman were confirmed to have the disease in the last week. In a third notification to health authorities an 11-year-old Korean schoolgirl was suspected to have Tb… Canterbury health authorities this month renewed calls for tougher Tb screening of foreign students after an Asian student was found to have the disease … ['Two new cases of TB identified', The Press, 23 December 2003, news article].

In this example, labelling of three of the actors includes terms that could be associated with group ethnic, national, or cultural identity (that is, Indian woman, Korean schoolgirl, Asian student). The ethnicity of the fourth actor
(an elderly man) remains undisclosed, although he is categorised by reference to gender and a broad age group. In any text, there is an almost infinite number of ways in which actors could be identified and labelled. At some point, therefore, decisions are made, either consciously or unconsciously, about the labels or categories that are to be included in a particular text. In relation to the extract above, the labels “Indian”, “Korean”, and “Asian” were seen to be of relevance. The use of markers of ethnic, national, or cultural group identity links this group identity with the topic of the article in a way that presumes association, in this case a relationship between being Asian, Indian and/or Korean and having tuberculosis. In addition, the use of the labels “schoolgirl”, “student”, and “foreign student” reinforce the representation of Asians as students, as discussed earlier in this chapter.

This extract also provides an example of the concurrent use of broad and specific markers. Korean and Indian could be seen to be more specific labels, while Asian is a broader term that often would be seen by some to include Korean and Indian. It is not possible to establish whether or not the broad term is used here as a substitute for detail when that information was not available, or for another purpose.

Texts about crime, driving, and drowning provide other examples of this type of ethnic marking:

(M44) Constable David Cross, of the Blenheim police, said an Asian couple, travelling north, were overtaking a truck when their Honda collided with a south-bound Toyota driven by a 56-year-old Kaikoura man. ['SH1 collision', The Press, 3 September 2002, news article].
(M45) On the Inland Kaikoura Road, six Asian tourists had minor injuries when their rental car went over a bank about 3.20am. In the North Island, two people were killed in a head-on collision ... ['Road toll mounts in weekend', The Press, 27 January 2003, news article].

(M46) A 15-year-old boy died while swimming at Lake Rotoma, 35km northeast of Rotorua, at 1.30pm on Saturday, and a 27-year-old Asian homestay student died three and a half hours later in Lake Karapiro, just south of Cambridge. ['Police urge care after lake drowning', New Zealand Herald, 29 December 2003, news article].

(M47) May 15: Two Asian men aged 20 and 21 were swept away in Manukau Harbour while wading back to shore after a fishing trip.

May 16: A four-year-old boy drowned in the Motueka river. ['Recreational drownings blamed for higher toll', The Dominion, 12 June 2002, news article].

The ethnic nomination of Asian drivers and drowning victims, and the concurrent ex-nomination of other (presumably non-Asian) actors imply that ethnicity is a relevant factor in relation to Asian actors only. For example, in an article outlining the drownings for May 2002, from which extract M47 is drawn, details are included on 10 drownings, with ethnicity only included once in reference to “Two Asian men ... ”. The use of these markers naturalises the association between behaviour and group ethnic or national identity in a simplistic way where ethnicity becomes a proxy for behaviour. The relationship between the ethnicity and the outcome is represented as natural, and in some instances, causal.

These extracts are examples of the tendency of mass media to mark or label some groups, and leave others unnamed. This is bound up with the way in
which the media represents ‘race’ and ethnicity. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, the unmarked category tends to be the dominant Pākehā majority. The marking of actors by reference to measures of group identity such as ethnicity and nationality is a feature of media discourse that has previously been identified. Within the scope of this study, it was not possible to establish the extent to which Asians are marked in media texts in comparison with other groups, such as Māori. While this is also a question of interest, of greater pertinence to this study is the identification of the types and topics of texts within which Asians are made visible in this manner. The tendency seemed to be in texts were there was some suggestion or implication of an inherent association between being Asian and the behaviour in question, and in relation to the content areas of crime and other deviant behaviours, immigration, and Asian students.

**Asian as a marker of phenotype**

One of the more frequent occurrences of the term Asian in newspaper texts during this period was within reports of crime or other incidents such as drownings or missing persons, where it was used variously to mark suspects, offenders, and victims. In instances where it was used as a descriptor for the purpose of identification, as opposed to the detailing of specific phenotypical features such as hair or skin colour, it relied on the presupposition that the readers had a shared understanding of what Asian looks like.

Aside from its more passive usage as a marker for the purposes of identification, there were also examples in the texts where references were specifically made to Asian faces:
...higher proportion of Asian faces...

...Who, in Auckland at least, hasn’t stood at a crowded city intersection or taken a city bus only to notice that every other face was visibly foreign, usually Asiatic?... ['Alien feelings rise in Godzone’, New Zealand Herald, 13 July 2002, feature article].

(M49) The language is English but the faces are mainly Asian – Chinese, Korean, Japanese – with a sprinkling of South Americans and Europeans. ['Mean hosts jeopardise a billion-dollar industry', New Zealand Herald, 1 June 2002, feature article].

As noted previously, there are two base, inter-related assumptions at play. The first of these assumptions is that Asian people look like each other and can be identified as Asian – simply by looking at their faces. Secondly, it is assumed that Asian people look different from other people and can, therefore, be distinguished from other social groups. Through this usage, racialised markers of group identity and the association of phenotype with ethnic groups, and more specifically, non-dominant groups, is reified.

**Stereotypes and repeated characterisations**

In addition to the labeling of Asians within texts, the analysis identified that there were recurrent characterisations and attributes applied to Asian people in press discourses. Most commonly in the media texts in this case study this included recurring categorisation of Asians as quiet and passive, and as wealthy.
Quiet and passive

A number of texts included references to the ostensibly quiet, passive nature of Asian individuals and communities. This stereotype has already been noted in relation to the content area of crime, particularly as it relates to a purported ‘reluctance’ to report criminal behaviours to authorities. However, the characterisation also featured in the press in the context of other content areas, including immigration:

(M50) Front-line police officers … were traditionally busier with white supremacist gangs than the city’s quiet, compliant Asian community … [‘There’s big trouble in little China’, The Press, 31 October 2002, feature article].

(M51) New Zealand’s soft-spoken Asian community has had enough of political attacks … [‘Asians launch power lobby group’, The Press, 4 October 2002, news article].

Wealthy

A further categorisation of Asians that was apparent in texts during this time period was that of Asians as wealthy. The attribution occurred most commonly in relation to students:

(M52) To get a student visa, a person must show they have a return ticket and $10,000 for each year of study deposited in a New Zealand bank. For some Asian students, money is no object. One recently spent $60,000 in a month gambling at a Christchurch TAB. [‘Foreign students changing the face of the future’, Sunday Star Times, 17 August 2003, feature article].
(M53) A Wellington property investor plans to charge wealthy Asian parents $500 a
day to look after their children and teach them English … ['Investor plans
$500-a-day English school', The Dominion Post, 28 February, news article].

(M54) Police in the city said extortion and protection rackets were a continuing
problem. Asian students knew others had lots of money and were taking
advantage of that. Much of it went unreported. The victims simply paid to
stop being assaulted ['Foreign students changing the face of the future',
Sunday Star Times, 17 Aug 2003, feature article].

It is ambiguous in some texts whether these attributions are regarded as
positive or negative. Regardless, the deployment of these characterisations is
productive in the construction of Otherness in that they homogenise the
diverse Asian community.

**SUMMARY OF MEDIA CASE STUDY**

This case study provided for both a broad overview of the types of topics that
were associated with newspaper talk about Asians, as well as a more in-depth
consideration of the discourses and discursive moves associated with the
construction of Asian identity in media texts, with a particular focus on the
construction of difference or Otherness. The preliminary coding of texts
identified that the types of articles about Asian people within this study
period were limited to a number of recurring topics and themes. In general,
Asian identity was most commonly associated with topics of export
education (foreign, international and/or overseas students), immigration
(including migration, population trends and distributions, and settlement
issues), crime (as both victims and perpetrators), deviant behaviour (bad
driving, high abortion rates, drowning), and race relations and
discrimination. For a number of these topics, particularly immigration, crime, and foreign students, there was significant intersection and interaction with political discourses. This included the reproduction of political speeches, reporting of political statements or positions, and periods of intense coverage of political discourse such as that occurring around the time of the 2002 general election.

While some of the discourses could be characterised as anti-Asian, the newspaper texts overall tended not to be manifestly anti-Asian, but much more complex and layered, particularly those that were concerned with social relations or ‘race’ relations, as well as those focused on the needs or concerns of Asian communities.
In Aotearoa/New Zealand, few people would remain untouched by political discourse in one of its many forms – as public speeches and party press releases, as policy and legislation, or as part of everyday political discussions and debates. Political discourses tend to be widely reproduced and circulated and, through the construction of ‘official’ discourses, political discourses contribute to shaping social reality and creating public consensus. One aspect of this is the role of political discourse in the construction of identity and, in particular, in the political construction of the identity of Others. It is of interest, then, how politicians write and speak about members of non-dominant groups, and how these groups are defined in policy and legislation, or constructed in parliamentary speeches and debates. According to Cornell and Hartmann (1998), identity is politically constructed in both formal and informal ways. Formal modes include citizenship and naturalisation rights, voting rights, immigration policies, and official statistics. Identity is also politically constructed informally through speeches and debates, that is, more generally through talk about Others (Cornell & Hartmann 1998).

The aim of this chapter is to explore the ways in which Asian identity is represented in contemporary political discourse in Aotearoa/New Zealand through an examination of recent parliamentary debates and political speeches. The role and significance of political discourse as a form of elite
institutional discourse has been broadly discussed in earlier sections of this thesis. This chapter briefly summarises the boundaries, key characteristics, and context of political discourse for the purposes of this case study. Attention is then focused on presenting and discussing the various representations of Asian individual and collective identities in relation to the analytical framework previously outlined. As with the media case study, this incorporated a focus on productive texts and the dominant themes that emerged from the wider dataset. This chapter provides a basis for consideration of how broader social representations of Asian identity and, specifically, Asian Otherness, are achieved in contemporary political discourse.

DEFINING POLITICAL DISCOURSE

In spite of the central role of language in politics, discourse has not historically been the focus of great attention in political studies (Chilton & Schaffner 2002; Howarth & Stavrakakis 2000). However, there is a growing interest in the study of political discourse (Feldman, 2000), which has been linked to the expanded availability of political messages through developments in technology and the media (Chilton & Schaffner 1997, p. 206). In the domestic context, the public is increasingly exposed to a range of political messages in a variety of forms. Aotearoa/New Zealand has what could generally be considered a relatively open parliamentary system, with access to political discourse available in various formats and mediums including Hansard transcripts of parliamentary debates and questions, radio and television broadcasts of parliamentary sessions, and political speeches and party policies available in print and electronic form. Further to this, as a
result of their role and status as elites, politicians have what has been termed ‘preferential access’ to the media and other modes of dissemination (van Dijk 1993, p. ix). It is not uncommon for the media to reproduce political discourses in the form of extracts from speeches and press releases, often verbatim. In sum, political institutions and actors have a relatively increased ability to widely distribute their discourses, with the public concurrently able to access the discourses in their various forms with relative ease.

The boundaries of political discourse are not always clear and may overlap with other discourses. A primary consideration, therefore, needs to be what counts as political. This depends not only on content, and the individual or institution producing the discourse, but also on the function of the discourse (Chilton & Schaffner 1997, p. 212). At a high level, Schaffner (1996) divides political discourse into two broad categories: institutionalised and non-institutionalised. Institutionalised political discourse refers to that which is generated within the political institution by politicians and bureaucracies, including debates, political speeches, legislation, and policy. Within this broad category, however, a number of further distinctions can be made based on criteria such as the intended audience for the discourse (for example, domestic or international, internal or public) or the format that it is produced in (for example, political speeches, party manifestos and policies, parliamentary debates, press releases and commentaries, legislation, and official government policies and protocols). Non-institutionalised, or everyday political discourse, incorporates political discourses that are created outside the political institutions, although the boundary between the two may not always be clear cut (Schaffner 1996).
Taking into account this high-level distinction, institutionalised political discourse has a number of distinctive features and characteristics in general. Firstly, much institutionalised political discourse is pre-meditated and considered (Reeves 1983; van Dijk 1991). Parliamentary debates, for example, are for the most part prepared in advance, as are responses to oral and written questions in parliament, and party press releases (although the extent to which political actors seriously consider the possible impact of their choice of language is no doubt variable). This is suggested to be even more the case when the discourse relates to potentially controversial or sensitive matters (van Dijk 1997a, p. 35). Some of the more formal forms of political discourse, such as legislation and policy, are particularly deliberate in the sense that they have usually passed through draft phases and been critiqued, reviewed, and revised a number of times. The pre-formulated nature of these forms of political discourse may create different expectations of them than those of casual or spontaneous utterances. Further, political actors are generally aware of the fact that their discourse is going to a wider audience and will be on public record, particularly in the case of formalised discourse such as parliamentary debates, public speeches, and party press releases (Reeves 1983; van Dijk 1991).

A second distinguishing feature of political discourse is that, on the whole, politicians are speaking not as individuals but as representatives (Schaffner 1996, p. 203). This adds an important dimension to the analysis of political discourse in the sense that individual actors engage publicly in discourses that may be in conflict with their private beliefs and so linguistic strategies need to be employed to achieve the appearance of conviction. Conversely, private or individual opinions that intrude on a politician’s public discourse
may be assumed to be representative of their political role. In addition to this, the nature of many parliamentary systems creates a role for ‘oppositional’ discourse, in that part of the role of different parties and politicians is to oppose the government. Some discourses, therefore, may be more a function of the politician’s opposition role than reflections of a strongly held personal or party position (van Dijk 1997a).

A further characteristic of political discourse is its dialectical nature. Political discourse may have a more pronounced dialectical relationship than other institutional discourses as a significant part of the role of political parties and individual members of parliament is to represent the views and concerns of their constituents. Political discourses are influenced by the public and, in turn, influence the public and other elites through the media and other avenues. However, van Dijk (1997a) questions the extent to which political discourse is a reflection of constituencies, given that politicians’ “... access to truly popular opinion is marginal or at best indirect; politicians talk mostly to other elites, and what they read is written by elites, even when such discourses claim to express the concerns of the population at large” (p. 34).

**Features of political speeches and parliamentary debates and questions**
In addition to the characteristics outlined above, there are several features of parliamentary debates, questions, and political speeches that are of relevance to this case study. These include their ‘on-the-record’ nature, persuasive style, and self-promoting character.

Public speeches are one of the ways in which politicians communicate directly with constituents and the wider public. Although parliamentary
debates and questions are on public record, and politicians are no doubt aware that there is the potential for anything they have said during the parliamentary session to be available to the public, they are not directly addressing the public *per se*, as is the case in speeches given at public meetings, launches, campaign functions, party conferences, and so on. There is, therefore, a distinction in terms of local context, that is, the immediate audience for the discourse, and the more distal context.

The persuasive nature of political talk is a feature of both parliamentary debates and public political speeches in that a primary function of these types of linguistic activities is often to persuade the audience to one position and away from opposing positions (van Dijk 1993). As Reeves (1983) notes:

> Specialised political discourse is best understood within the context of the political legitimation process in which the representatives of particular social classes or class alliances seek to persuade the population that they are acting for the public good and in the general interest (p. 3).

Speeches and debates that are for the public record are prime opportunities for politicians to promote themselves, their party, and its policies and successes. They often contain reference to areas where it is felt that achievements have been made and where there is perceived public support, and tend to minimise areas where there has been difficulty, controversy, or relatively less success. They are also an opportunity to criticise the opposition, and to highlight points of differentiation between party policies and actions. This oppositional aspect of political discourse has been noted above as an important consideration (van Dijk 1993). Public speeches around
the time of an election campaign are prime examples of political discourse that is designed to self-promote and persuade the public of the merits of one party and its policies, and ultimately to persuade them to vote a certain way.

**Setting the scene: the domestic political context**

The extent to which institutionalised political discourse reflects a range of positions and voices is related to the type of parliamentary system that is in operation, and its relative openness, as well as more broadly to the ways in which a society is structured. On the one hand, political discourse in Aotearoa/New Zealand could be considered to represent a relatively diverse and comprehensive range of political opinion. The Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) system introduced following the 1993 referendum resulted in minor parties having a more significant role in parliament than had been the case under the previous parliamentary system, with an accompanying increased likelihood of minority or coalition governments. Although the degree differs, political parties, including those in opposition, have comparatively open access to the media to disseminate their messages. On the other hand, the extent to which mainstream political institutions are representative of Aotearoa/New Zealand society in terms of gender, religion, ethnic group, and so on is debatable. Parliament continues to typically consist of members of the dominant white settler group and the level of political representation of people from non-dominant groups remains relatively limited.

This study of political discourse concentrates on recent political discourse from the years 2000–2002 (inclusive). This time period included a general election (held on 27 July 2002) at which a coalition government led by the
Labour Party was re-elected for a second term. It is likely that the public were exposed to an increased level of political discourse in the period leading up to and immediately following the election and also that the discourse produced during this time relied even more heavily on persuasive and self-promoting strategies. It is also important for the purposes of this case study to note that immigration, and in particular ‘Asian immigration’, was an issue highlighted by some parties during the election campaign, most notably the New Zealand First party.

The Government prior to the July 2002 general election was a Labour-led Labour/Alliance coalition, under the leadership of Prime Minister Helen Clark. The main opposition party was the National Party, although a number of other minor parties were also represented in this government (namely ACT, New Zealand First, the Greens, and United Future). Following the 2002 election, Labour formed a coalition government with the Progressive Party\(^1\) and also had an agreement with the United Future Party on issues of supply and confidence. The other parties represented in parliament at the time of the study included National, ACT, New Zealand First, and the Green Party. National and ACT are broadly considered parties of the political right, with ACT being generally regarded as further right than National. New Zealand First’s position is less clearly defined. The Party entered into a coalition with the National Party (a right-wing party) following their election in 1996, and currently has a supply and confidence agreement with the Labour-led

\(^1\) In April 2002, the Alliance party split into two parties: the Progressive Party, under the leadership of Jim Anderton, and the Alliance party.
coalition (a left wing party). The Green Party is commonly thought of as a leftist party.

REPRESENTING THE ASIAN OTHER IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE
An early stage in the analytical process was the preliminary coding of political texts in the broader dataset. Firstly, this related to the identification and exclusion of those texts that were outside the scope of the study (as determined by both the general and case-specific principles of selection outlined in Chapter Five). Secondly, the preliminary coding was designed to provide an overview or summary of the dataset, including information on the frequency and distribution of texts, the contexts within which texts were produced and circulated, and the general topics that emerged from the corpus.

In total, 92 Hansard texts were included in the dataset, representing an average of 30 references to Asian individuals or communities in parliamentary debates and oral questions each year. A table summarising the data on references to Asian individuals or communities within parliamentary debates and/or oral questions during the study period, including distribution by political party, is included below (Table 7.1).
Table 7.1: Hansard references by party, type and frequency, 2000-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Party</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Parliamentary debate (34), Oral question (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Parliamentary debate (23), Oral question (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand First</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Parliamentary debate (9), Oral question (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Parliamentary debate (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance/Progressive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parliamentary debate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parliamentary debate (1), Oral question (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Future</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parliamentary debate (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References to Asian individuals or communities occurred within parliamentary debates in a range of contexts including bill readings, general and urgent debates, addresses in reply, Prime Minister’s statements, and oral questions. The majority of references were from members of the opposition National Party (39%) or the Labour Party (27%), the two major parties represented in government at the time. In relation to the National Party, a number of the references were from Pansy Wong, who was widely referred to as New Zealand’s first ‘Asian MP’ when she entered parliament in 1996, and who had National Party portfolio responsibilities for Asian Relationships during the time period of this case study. Approximately half of the New Zealand First Hansard texts were from Ron Mark, the New Zealand First spokesperson for Law and Order. While the majority of texts that included references to Asian individuals or communities did come from the National and Labour (66%) parties, a number of these were in passing and the texts would not all be considered to be texts about Asians. The texts from New Zealand First, however, generally tended to be texts about Asians.
In addition, there were 50 political speeches identified for inclusion in the broader dataset, the majority of these occurring in 2002 (Table 7.2).

Table 7.2: Speeches by party and speaker, 2000–2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand First</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Winston Peters</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Donnolley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>George Hawkins</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Clark</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phil Goff</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Carter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Micheal Cullen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth Dyson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Maharey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Party</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pansy Wong</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don Brash</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sandra Lee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laila Harre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Coalition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jim Anderton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Richard Prebble</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant proportion of these speeches were from the leader of the New Zealand First Party, Winston Peters. The speeches occurred in a variety of settings and contexts, including during or at the launch of conferences and other events, and to various organisations, as well as during the election campaign at campaign meetings and rallies.

The topics that are discussed in the political sphere necessarily reflect the proximal context, including the purpose of the text and the immediate topics
of parliamentary debates, bills, and political speeches (van der Valk 2003), as well as broader social and economic contexts.

Overall, there were not a substantial number of instances in parliamentary texts or in public political speeches where Asians were directly referred to during the time period of this case study, particularly when compared with the accompanying case study of mainstream press. Where there were references to Asians, they tended to be within the context of several recurring topics and sub-topics including those of: immigration, crime, and policing; ethnic affairs, diversity, and relations; and group rights and representation. Alternatively, Asians were referenced in relation to a particular event, such as the 2002 apology by the Government to the Chinese community for the poll tax, or the establishment of a non-governmental Pan-Asian Congress in October 2002. In political texts classified as texts about Asians or within which Asians were main actors there was a smaller range of global topics, although the topics of immigration, law and order, and social relations/ethnic affairs remained prominent.

This overview of the texts in the larger sample provides a broad characterisation of the range and types of political texts at a macro-level. The following section examines texts in more detail, drawing on the analytical categories of content, strategy, and lexical choices as outlined in an earlier chapter. As with the media chapter, the discussion is organised around the various representations of Asian individuals and communities within the political texts. Examples are drawn from the parliamentary texts and political speeches to illustrate the ways in which these discursive moves and strategies were deployed to construct Asian Otherness. This analysis focused on texts
that were deemed to be texts about Asians as defined in the methodology chapter. However, the discussion also draws on examples from the entire corpus of texts, where relevant, and from supplementary material to provide context.

Immigration and anti-immigration: Asians as outsiders

During the study period, a focus on or inclusion of Asians as actors tended to be within political texts that were broadly associated with a global topic of immigration and related themes and sub-topics including migrant settlement, citizenship, and social relations. Immigration is a relatively constant theme in political discourse, although there are times and contexts within which debates and discussion of immigration gain more prominence and currency. This was particularly the case in Aotearoa/New Zealand during the general election campaign in mid-2002, where immigration was a central issue, as well as in the latter months of 2002. Key texts from these periods of concentrated attention are discussed below as examples of the intersection and interaction of the representation of Asians with political discourses about immigration (although texts from other times during the study period will be referenced where appropriate).

As well as the theme of immigration being more prominent at certain times and within certain contexts, it is also more commonly associated with particular political parties. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, discourses about

\[2\] Attention on immigration, and specifically on New Zealand First’s position on immigration, was heightened following speeches made at the New Zealand First Annual Party Conference in November 2002 by the Leader, Winston Peters, and MP, Brian Donnelly.
immigration have tended to be associated with the New Zealand First Party in recent years, a minor opposition party that has run several general election campaigns with immigration as a central focus, particularly those of 1996, 1999, and 2002. However, it is not limited to this party and the other major and minor parties all talk about immigration, both in response to New Zealand First and independently.

The linking of immigration and the Asian community in the 2002 general election campaign

During the 2002 general election campaign, New Zealand First ran an election campaign that explicitly focused on three issues: crime; the Treaty of Waitangi; and, immigration. This resulted in a period of heightened attention within both media and political institutions on issues of immigration and, more specifically, on the New Zealand First campaign (labelled by many as ‘anti-immigration’) and responses to this from other political actors and parties.

The centrality of the immigration issue to the New Zealand First election campaign was signalled early on in the run-up to the 27th July election with a speech entitled ‘Immigration Matters’ delivered by the leader of the party, Winston Peters, to a public meeting in Wellington on 5th June 2002. The speech focused overtly on immigration, referencing the experiences of other countries and politicians including Pim Fortuyn in Holland, Jean Marie Le Pen in France, and the Howard Government in Australia. The speech also included criticism of the New Zealand Immigration Service (NZIS), particularly in relation to alleged immigration fraud by Bangladeshi peoples, as well as discussing economic and social impacts seen to be linked to
immigration. Excerpts from this speech, and others that occurred during the New Zealand First campaign, are discussed below as examples of the ways in which immigration was discursively linked to Asian communities during the 2002 general election.

In the speech ‘Immigration Matters’, as in a number of New Zealand First speeches that included a focus on immigration, reference was made to “people of Asian ethnicity”:

(P1) There are now more people of Asian ethnicity than Pacific Island peoples.
People of Asian ethnicity have more than doubled in a decade.
Two thirds of people of Asian ethnicity live in Auckland.
These are facts.
Stating these facts is not implying criticism of people of any particular ethnicity.
The overwhelming majority of people who migrate to New Zealand are fine, hard working and law-abiding people.
This is not implying any criticism of them as individuals.
In fact, if we were in their shoes we too would see New Zealand as the Promised Land.
The issue has nothing to do with whether migrants are nice people.
The point is that current levels of immigration are fundamentally changing the character of our country in a totally ad hoc way ['Immigration matters', Public speech by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 5 June 2002].

---

3 Specific reference was also made to Bangladeshi peoples in relation to cases of immigration ‘fraud’ as well as passing reference to Pacific Island peoples in the quote P1.
This passage incorporates a number of strategic and rhetorical moves that are features of New Zealand First discourses on immigration, as well as characteristic of anti-immigration discourses identified in other parliamentary settings. Firstly, in establishing the size or extent of the issue (that is, the number of people of Asian ethnicity), the speaker uses general rather than specific modes of quantification. For example, the speaker claims that there are “… now more people …”, and that the numbers have “… more than doubled …”. The actual numbers, therefore, remain unquantified while simultaneously being constructed as problematic. Reeves (1983) referred to this use of ‘vagueness and indeterminacy’ as one of the rhetorical techniques of quantification identified in British parliamentary debates about immigration and race relations. Vagueness is also used when the speaker makes claims about people of Asian ethnicity (such as “Two thirds of people of Asian ethnicity live in Auckland.”). In this case, it is ambiguous whether or not all of the “… people of Asian ethnicity …” referred to are immigrants, as opposed to citizens, international students, tourists, or so on. Through this lack of specificity, also previously identified in the analysis of media texts, all Asians become associated implicitly with immigration.

Following the reference to people of Asian ethnicity, a justification strategy is deployed to legitimate the linking of immigration with people of Asian ethnicity, as well as to allow the speaker to disclaim that a particular group is being singled out for criticism. That is, the speaker appeals to the force of facts (Reeves 1983; van Dijk 1993). In this sense, the speaker justifies a focus on people of Asian ethnicity by asserting that they are simply stating the ‘facts’. In presenting ‘factual’ information, claim is being made to taking a neutral position as a purveyor of information, thereby obfuscating the role that is
played by the producers of the discourse in the selection of the facts to be presented and, conversely, those which are to be minimised or excluded. As it is not possible in most discourse events to incorporate all related facts, discretion must be used in the selection of which information to highlight at any given time. In this excerpt, the appeal to the force of fact as a pre-emptive defence shifts attention from the decision that was made in this instance to focus on ‘facts’ about people of Asian ethnicity, as opposed to ‘facts’ about, for example, South African immigrants or immigrants from Britain. The contrasting of numbers of people of Asian ethnicity with the Pacific Island population, the reference to the rapidity of the increase in numbers of Asian people, as well as the allusion to the geographical concentration of Asian people within the Auckland region, signal these specific ‘facts’ to the audience as being considered of particular significance to debate and discussion surrounding immigration in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

As part of disclaiming any criticism or negative focus on a particular group, in this case people of Asian ethnicity, this extract also incorporated a common strategy of empathy, referred to by van Dijk (1997a) as apparent sympathy. The speaker firstly refers to the overall good character of migrants (although this is qualified by the use of the words “… overwhelming majority …”, implying that there is a group of migrants, albeit a minority, who are not “… fine, hardworking and law-abiding people …”), and claims to understand why immigrants would want to come to Aotearoa/New Zealand. However, the statement of empathy precedes a qualification. In this instance, irrespective of how “fine” the immigrants are and “our” empathy with “their” desire to come to Aotearoa/New Zealand, according to the speaker immigration is having an impact on the “… character of our country …”. The use of
possessive pronouns ("our", "we", and "their") in this extract position the migrant as outsider. The immigrant is, therefore, constructed as an incoming threat to "our" country. Reference to the "... totally ad hoc ..." nature of the change that will allegedly result from immigration heightens the threat imagery by invoking a sense that immigration is uncontrolled and, therefore, uncontrollable.

This notion of a threat to the ‘character’ of Aotearoa/New Zealand society and to broader social cohesion is a theme that reappears in other New Zealand First texts about immigration. It is frequently presented as if it were an almost inevitable by-product of immigration, once again drawing on discourses of inevitably identified in the media dataset in relation to crime and racism. The threat to social cohesion is addressed more directly in a speech delivered in Masterton on 5 June 2002:

(P2) The current levels of immigration pose a serious threat to the social cohesion of this country ...
Most immigrants get no further than Auckland.
What has happened as a result of short sighted immigration policy is that we have developed major concentrations of migrants who have little reason or incentive to move beyond their own community.
For example, two thirds of people of Asian ethnicity live in the Auckland region.
This country was built on fundamental values.
New Zealand First is concerned that many of our immigrants come from societies where these are not the prevailing values.
Caution is called for. [Public speech at Masterton YMCA Conference Room by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 21 June 2002].
In this passage, the concentration of immigrants in certain areas is again highlighted as an issue. The reference to “… short sighted immigration policy …” suggests that the concentration of migrants within their own communities is a concern. The fact that “… two thirds of people of Asian ethnicity live in the Auckland region” is again raised and becomes linked with the threats to social cohesion that are presented as being related to the geographical and social distribution of the Asian population. In this manner, residential segregation or concentration is framed as inherently problematic – that is, living in the same region in concentrated communities is constructed as a threat to social cohesion in and of itself. This argument relates back to the idea that threats to social cohesiveness are linked to the number of people coming into a country or the scale of immigration, rather than other factors such as responses from, or acceptance by, a host community.

The threat to social cohesion posed by immigration is also constructed as a threat to ‘values’, namely the values the speaker identifies as “fundamental” to Aotearoa/New Zealand – democracy, the rule of law, and individual freedom. Once again using vague quantification, it is asserted that “… many of our immigrants come from societies where these are not the prevailing values”, implying that these societies have values that are different and potentially oppositional to those the speaker has outlined as fundamental to Aotearoa/New Zealand. In urging “caution”, the latent assumption is that there is an existing, implicit risk. While the speaker is not direct in referencing Asian immigrants in this sentence, the recent mention of “people of Asian ethnicity” makes it likely that this will be the social group foremost in any audience’s mind.
In criticising immigration practices and policies, there was some evidence that Peters tended to draw on topoi that have been shown to be associated with anti-immigration discourses in other settings, notably the *topos of burden*, the *topos of unemployment*, and the *topos of abuse* (van der Valk 2003; van Dijk 2000b). The topos of burden constructs immigration and, therefore, immigrants as a burden on society, through for example, increased pressure on infrastructure and resources, or dependency on social services and governmental benefits. As an example, in New Zealand First speeches on immigration, the ‘burden’ is constructed through allusion to family reunification policies, by which family members of immigrants can migrate into Aotearoa/New Zealand, as well as within the frame of impacts on infrastructure.

(P3) Immigrants beget immigrants because of the priority given to bringing in members of extended families – spouses – parents – siblings – dependent children. As a result, the arrival of a single qualified individual can eventually lead to the entry of large numbers of relatives and dependents without any qualifications or obvious benefit to New Zealand. [*The sleeper awakes*, Public speech at Hamilton by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 18 July 2002].

(P4) Did you vote for millions of dollars to be spent on services for new migrants? … There is an enormous social cost to unchecked immigration and these costs are imposed upon every other member of society. The influx of immigrants to Auckland is pushing up house prices, creating inflation. [*Immigration or you*, Public speech at Otiira Marae, Moerewa by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 30 June 2002].
There are more Asians in New Zealand today than Pacific Islanders. Most of both live in Auckland and yet Auckland cannot cope with the unplanned demands on its infrastructure. ['Coming back – ready or not', Public speech to Opotiki Grey Power by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 4 June 2002].

The topos of unemployment, or the argument that immigrants are not fully employed and, therefore, are having a negative or unequal impact on the economy and on social services and resources, is closely related to the topos of burden.

On television in the weekend a magazine item complained about the neglect of Asian unemployment, now at over 20%. … and alongside those adults out of work and supported by the taxpayer are thousands of children who are necessarily a charge on the State. ['Black widow at large', Public speech at Tauranga by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 22 July 2002].

As it is applied to Asian unemployment, this argument provides an example of the contradictory characterisations of Asian migrants, who are at other times portrayed as hard-working and a threat to the host community in terms of competition for jobs (discussed further below).

The topos of abuse draws on an argument that immigrants are abusing the system and laws of their new country, and are benefiting unfairly from this abuse. It is enacted in New Zealand First speeches most commonly through the discursive device of providing anecdotal evidence or extreme examples:

Most immigrants are hard working and law abiding. But not all are. A few weeks ago the Weekend Herald’s lead article was a report of an Indian convicted, imprisoned and deported for sex offences who has bypassed
immigration controls and returned to this country. The press reported that this individual returned to New Zealand using a false name and then married his sister in law. On the basis of this marriage he gained permanent residency. And that is not an isolated example. ['Immigration matters’, Public speech at Kilbirnie by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 5 June 2002].

(P8) You have had a chap in jail down here in Christchurch who we think might be Sean Wu … Nobody knows how he got here but he has been arranging sham weddings. How many Sean Wus are there? ['Another gravy train exposed’, Public speech at Christchurch by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 8 July 2002].

While these argument forms were predominantly a feature of New Zealand First discourse, they also appeared in texts from other political parties. For example, in a speech entitled ‘Immigration leads inflation’, the leader of the ACT Party, Richard Prebble, drew on both the topos of burden and the topos of unemployment in discussing immigration (although in the same speech, Prebble rejects New Zealand First positions as ‘anti-Asian xenophobia’):

(P9) A minority of immigrants are skilled … Even those with skills are not necessarily employable. There are still more than 900 doctors whose qualifications are not recognised, who are on welfare … ['Immigration leads inflation’, Public speech by Richard Prebble, ACT Party, 7 April 2002].

While these topoi are neither specific nor limited to discourses about Asian immigrants, they become linked in the domestic context through the continued subtle and overt association of immigration matters with Asian communities.
This linking of Asian ethnicity to immigration is explicit in a speech delivered by Winston Peters in Christchurch during the 2002 election campaign, in which Peters refers to the ‘Asianisation’ of New Zealand:

(P10) And we pretend we don’t have a problem! It remains politically incorrect to raise these issues. Well, folks, it is time to rattle a few cages. Because these scams are giving all refugees a bad name. They are swept under the table to avoid accusations of racism. They are changing the face of New Zealand forever.

This is Asianisation by stealth …

…

Who asked you whether you wanted to Asianise New Zealand … by a Napier or a Nelson each year? Are we aware of all the consequences? [‘Another gravy train exposed’, Public speech at Christchurch by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 8 July 2002].

In talking about the “Asianisation” of Aotearoa/New Zealand, Peters overtly frames the immigration debate in terms of Asian immigration. The potential effect of this, and of the highlighting of facts about Asian immigrants in other speeches and debates, is that it conveys a message that in debates on immigration Asian immigration is a primary, if not the primary, concern. While the links between people of Asian ethnicity and the ‘problems’ that are identified as being associated with immigration are not always explicit within individual texts, the foregrounding of facts about people of Asian ethnicity in discussions of immigration problems makes it more likely that the audience will make the connection cognitively, particularly in the absence of specific reference to other immigrant groups such as British, Australian, or South African migrants.
This extract also contains an example of the previously identified strategy of empathy or apparent sympathy (“… these scams are giving all refugees a bad name …”), as well as the use of racialised language (“… changing the face of New Zealand forever …”). Additionally, it introduces a line of argument to justify raising immigration as an issue. That is, that there are real problems being ignored or minimised because of the desire by politicians to not be seen as racist or ‘politically incorrect’. This is an argumentation strategy that recurs in New Zealand First speeches to legitimise the direction of their discourse on immigration, as well as to explain why these ‘issues’ are not being discussed by other political actors or parties. The argument relies on a presupposition that ‘political correctness’ is having a suppressive effect on politicians and the broader public in terms of the ability to have open debate or to discuss certain topics.

New Zealand First received considerable attention, and some criticism, for their focus on immigration during the election campaign. This came from other political parties, and from within the broader community, as well as being expressed through the media. In responding to criticism that their discourse was anti-immigrant, New Zealand First made use of several strategies of justification, including (a) appealing to the force of facts by quoting figures, (b) challenging political correctness (both strategies introduced briefly above), and (c) appealing to an authentic voice.

Appealing to the force of facts was identified in relation to the first extract (P1) as a way of countering criticism and disclaiming racist or anti-immigrant sentiment. It is of interest that this justification strategy is also used in direct
response to anti-immigrant discourse, whereby ‘facts’ are introduced to
disprove or respond to claims that are seen to be anti-immigrant (for
example, as a response to claims about Asian crime, discussed in a later
section). As a justification strategy, reference to political correctness provides
for arguments with controversial or offensive elements to be defended in
terms of them being a challenge to the suppressive force of political
correctness.

The extract below from Peters demonstrates the strategy of appeal to an
authentic voice, deployed in texts in this case study in response to claims of
anti-immigrant, or specifically anti-Asian, intent.

(P11) There was a young Chinese women [sic] migrant in the audience for that
Wellington speech. Naturally the reporters raced to get her response. What
distinguishes her from Pansy Wong was that she was there and actually heard
what I said. This is what she said to the reporters at the end of my speech – and
there are her words as reported by the media not mine.

"I agree with what he says – immigration needs to be managed"
That is the authentic voice of a new New Zealander. She knew what I was
saying was sane, sensible and needed to be said. Naturally she didn't appear on
TV that night, but imagine if she had criticised me. ['Kiwi culture and values
under threat', Public speech at Pukekohe by Winston Peters, New Zealand First
Party, 21 June 2002].

In referencing someone from within the group under scrutiny, the aim is
twofold; to both give an argument some greater level of credibility and
authority, as well as to negate any criticism of the discourse as racist or, in
this case, anti-Asian. The speaker quotes a Chinese migrant who was a
member of the audience of an earlier speech as being in agreement with the
position being articulated by the speaker. In doing this, the unspoken, but clear, message is ‘if an Asian person agrees with me, then my speech can not be anti-Asian’.

A number of New Zealand First speeches focused on immigration during the election campaign also drew on water metaphors, a rhetorical device that has been previously demonstrated to be associated with discourses about immigration. For example:

(P12) … People of Asian ethnicity have more than doubled in a decade. Two thirds of people of Asian ethnicity live in Auckland. The only time over the past decade that the flow of immigrants has been checked was when New Zealand First reduced it to a trickle after the 1996 election. The trickle is again a torrent. ['Immigrants fiddle while Kiwis pay', Public speech at Rotorua by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 15 July 2002].

(P13) The count of people of Asian ethnicity more than doubled in the ten years between 1991 and 2001. The only time this slowed down was when New Zealand First put the brakes on immigration back in 1996. When you voted at the last election, did you know that the floodgates would be opened. ['Immigration or you?', Public speech at Otiria Marae, Moerewa by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 30 June 2002].

(P14) Ours is the only party that has dedicated its election campaign – simply – directly – boldly to the rights of ordinary Kiwis: … The right to stop being swamped by a flood of immigrants ['Immigrants fiddle while Kiwis pay', Public speech at Rotorua by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 18 July 2002].
In the first two extracts, the association with Asian immigration is more
direct, while in a number of other cases, such as the third example, the water
metaphor is employed more generally in reference to immigration overall.
However, in these instances the population under most scrutiny within the
speeches is the Asian population and the metaphor, therefore, remains linked
at this level.

*Responses to anti-immigration discourses*

There were a number of texts that responded to discourses seen to be ‘anti-
Asian’ or ‘anti-immigrant’ that came from political parties across the
spectrum. Several of these texts indicated that they were specifically
responding to New Zealand First discourse and, more particularly, Winston
Peters. A number of responses also occurred through the media via press
releases and reporting of political comments and have been discussed briefly
in this context in the previous chapter. These responses occurred during the
2002 election campaign period, as well as at other times of heightened
political focus on Asian communities. One such period was in the latter
months of 2002, following speeches at the New Zealand First Party
Convention in early November 2002 by the leader Winston Peters and MP
Brian Donnelly. Both speeches incorporated comments about Asian
immigration. The speech by Winston Peters, entitled ‘*Sowing the seeds of
sectarianism*’, focused on “mass immigration” and the “Treaty of Waitangi
grievance industry”, and discussed potential threats posed by separatism.
The speeches prompted responses from a range of other political actors and
parties, both within the House and outside, including the examples below.
(P15) We should say to Mr Peters that New Zealand’s culture is to be tolerant – and it is Mr Peters who is bringing the politics of racial division into this country [General debate, Richard Prebble, ACT Party, 13 November 2002].

(P16) We have a proud history as a tolerant and open-minded nation. New Zealand has fought racial hatred around the globe ever since the Second World War. Now a desperate politician threatens to besmirch our reputation for his own personal gain [General debate, Chris Carter, Minister of Ethnic Affairs, 11 November 2002].

(P17) New Zealand has a much better future as a tolerant and diverse country than as the inward-looking isolationist outpost that NZ First wants us to be [Public speech by Jim Anderton, Progressive Party, 15 November 2002].

One of the features of the responses to anti-Asian and, more broadly, anti-immigration discourse was the use of nationalist rhetoric and language of positive self-presentation. This included references to tolerance and inclusion, as well as the denial of widespread prejudice or racism in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Positive self-presentation and nationalist rhetoric are characteristics that anti-Asian and anti-immigration rhetoric shares in common with responses to anti-Asian discourses. For example, New Zealand First also appeals to “our” proud history and exemplary human rights records to justify their position on immigration.

Responses to anti-immigration discourse also emerge in the form of economic arguments. For example, in the same speech as extract P17 above, Jim Anderton claims:
But the way New Zealand First has unscrupulously denounced immigrants is not only a social issue; it is also an economic issue. New Zealand needs immigration, and we are going to need to be even more welcoming in the future...

It will mean bringing in some skilled workers to meet the demands of job-rich, high-value exporting industries that we need to strengthen... [Public speech at opening of the Progressive Whangarei Office by Jim Anderton, Progressive Party, 15 November 2002].

In this aspect, they overlap with discourses about export education and Asian students discussed in the media case study. That is, justification for the presence of Asians is within the context of reference to the benefits – sometimes cultural, more often economic – that immigrants generally, and Asian immigrants specifically, are seen to bring to Aotearoa/New Zealand. As with the argument forms mentioned above (positive self-presentation and nationalist rhetoric), economic arguments are also used by both sides. They are used by anti-immigration positions to argue against immigrants in terms of the alleged threats that they pose to economic conditions, including wages and job opportunities for ‘New Zealanders’. However, as in the example P18 above, they are also used to argue for immigration, in terms of productivity and providing a necessary skilled workforce.

**Law and order**

Topics of crime and policing in political talk have been noted to overlap with immigration discourses, and in these cases are often associated with themes of criminalisation and deviance. In this case study, issues of crime and policing that included references to Asian individuals or collectives tended to focus on Asian migrants and/or Asian students and were the topic of several
questions and debates in parliament, primarily initiated by the New Zealand First Party, as well as occurring in political speeches outside the House. The content of these texts generally centred on the levels of involvement of people of Asian ethnicity in criminal activity, as well as related issues of police resourcing. An example is the following extract from an oral question by Winston Peters to the Minister of Police:

(P19) Is he seeing any signs that the increased number of Asians in the Auckland region is putting pressure on Auckland police? [Oral Question from Winston Peters (New Zealand First) to the Minister of Police, 5 November 2002].

The question posed in this extract links increased Asian immigration with both increasing crime and pressure on resources. These argumentation strategies are not uncommon in discourses about immigration, that is, the linking of immigrant groups to criminal activity (attribution of a negative characteristic) and arguing scarcity of resources (arguing a relationship between immigration and pressure on scarce resources), and have been identified by Reeves (1983) in his study of British political discourse about immigration and race relations.

The linking of Asian social groups, immigration, criminal activity, and pressure on policing resources are strategies that recur in New Zealand First discourse. For example, the notion of a phenomenon referred to as ‘Asian crime’, and the consequences of this for police staffing and resourcing, was addressed more directly in two debates in the House by New Zealand First Spokesperson for Law and Order, Ron Mark, in late 2002, in speeches generally about immigration:
We will continue to raise the issue of immigration, because with the numbers of immigrants we are seeing – 65,000 a year – that issue is permeating every area of our society, and, without controls, it is creating problems. I refer to the article on Asian crime in the Press on 31 October. My question to the Government is this: if the Government is so concerned about how immigrants, including Asians, are being treated, why does it not help out the police in Christchurch? Bob Kerr has said that never in his life has he seen the sorts of problems that he now witnesses with regard to Asian crime. But when we go and talk to Lincoln Tan, what does he say? He says the police are understaffed and do not have translators … [General debate, Ron Mark, New Zealand First Party, 13 November 2002, p. 1813].

In this first passage, an explicit connection is made between increasing immigration and crime, and more specifically, Asian crime. As in the media examples discussed previously, the use of the phrase ‘Asian crime’ implies a particularity of crime that is different and delineable. As evidence or support for his argument, the speaker uses several techniques. Firstly, the speaker refers to a newspaper article from the Christchurch paper, the Press, on Asian crime, providing an example of the relationship between media and political discourses and the ways in which media discourse is (re)presented in political talk. Secondly, reference is made to expert voices, including Bob Kerr (a policeman) and Lincoln Tan (a Chinese journalist). Thirdly, the speaker uses the strategy discussed earlier of employing an authentic voice, that is, including ‘evidence’ from members of the community in question, in this case, the Asian community. This is demonstrated clearly in the excerpt below:
It is easy to criticise, so I will give one suggestion to this Government: with the numbers of Asian immigrants that we have, why does the Government not have an exchange programme, whereby it brings in Asian police to work alongside our police and assist in translation? Recently a Singaporean lady spoke to me at the Returned Services Association. She said it was nonsensical that when it comes to licensing, Asians were allowed to bring their own translators along. She said the translators heard the questions, interpreted the questions, and then talked about the answers before delivering them. Guess what the answers were? They were always the right answers, because the applicants are allowed to bring along a friend as a translator. That was said to me by a Singaporean lady who was married to a New Zealand soldier and who has been in this country for 35 years. That is what she says. There are many more Asian families out there who have had a gutsful of the nonsense. They are New Zealanders with 30 or 40 years here [General debate, Ron Mark, New Zealand First Party, 13 November 2002, p. 1813].

In addition to quoting Lincoln Tan, a Chinese journalist, there is specific mention of information from “… a Singaporean lady who was married to a New Zealand soldier and who has been in this country for 35 years”. The inclusion of additional details about the woman, namely her marriage to a New Zealand soldier and the length of time that she has been in New Zealand, seem to be provided as extra credentials. The second example is more ambiguous and refers to the “… many more Asian families out there who have had a gutsful of this nonsense”. It is unclear who those Asian families are, how many of them have “had a gutsful” and, further, how the speaker is aware of this. However, as in the first example, that they “… are New Zealanders with 30 or 40 years here”, is included as information of significance. Implicit in this extract is an association between length of time in Aotearoa/New Zealand and one’s status as a ‘New Zealander’. Further,
the reference to length of residency can be seen to be setting up an acrimonious relationship between members of the Asian community who, as suggested by this speaker, have been in the country for “30 or 40 years”, are New Zealanders, and have the same concerns about immigration and crime as other New Zealanders, and the more recently arrived Asian immigrants who are constructed as part of the problem. It is claimed that the call for restrictions is coming from the established Asian community in Aotearoa/New Zealand. It is also argued from the position that it is for the good of the immigrants – that there is no support or back-up for them, and so it is not fair that they are allowed to immigrate without that support. This argument of ‘for their own good’, part of what Reeves (1983) refers to as *pro bono publico* arguments, is also present in the following extract:

(P22) They [Asian families] are telling us in New Zealand First about what the Labour Government is doing by permitting and promoting out-of-control immigration, with no support systems for these new New Zealanders, no back-up for them, no back-up for the police, and no back-up for fisheries officers – and did I get criticised in Christchurch the other day for talking about the stripping of rocks from our beaches in Canterbury! Guess what? The very people who talked to me were people from inside Environment Canterbury … [General debate, Ron Mark, New Zealand First Party, 13 November 2002, p. 1813].

In this extract (P22), we also see examples of the argument of pressure on social (policing) and environmental (shellfish) resources.

The issue of ‘Asian crime’ is addressed further by Ron Mark (New Zealand First Party) on the 4th December 2002, during a general debate, where the notion of specific crimes associated with Asians is introduced:
This is a time when we have proudly announced we have let in a record number of immigrants – some 70,000 – many of whom we do not even have the ability to communicate with. We are reading in our newspapers of extortion rackets being run in our Asian communities in Christchurch, and the police are on the record as stating: “it is an onerous task investigating crimes in a murky, alien underworld culture, and even more difficult to successfully prosecute cases.”

In 1996 the Minister claimed that in Auckland’s Asian community, young people were being forced to pay protection money to avoid being beaten up. And we read today in the Christchurch Press of that happening more, and more … [General debate, Ron Mark, New Zealand First Party, 4 December 2002, p. 2473]

This extract (P23) follows the pattern of other debates, where reference is made to the numbers of immigrants coming to Aotearoa/New Zealand, before turning to the topic of crime in Asian communities. In this passage specific mention is made of types of criminal activity through reference to ‘extortion rackets’ and ‘protection money’. The evidence is more generalised, however. For example, non-specific reference is made to “reading in our newspapers” about extortion in Christchurch. Although specific mention is made later in the speech to the Christchurch Press, the statement that the payment of protection money is “happening more, and more …” is vague and does not quantify any absolute increase in frequency. Although the expert voice is included, in this case the voice of the police in the form of a direct quote, the voice is not attributed to any one individual, but rather ambiguously to the police as a whole. This gives the idea that the sentiments expressed in the quote may be generally shared by all police, whereas they may in fact have been the quote of an isolated individual or individuals.
A further feature of note in this passage is the allusion to language and cultural barriers that are seen to be part of the issue of ‘Asian crime’. In this case, reference is made to being unable to communicate with immigrants, as well as the mention in the quote of “… a murky, alien underworld culture …” that impacts on the ability of local police to investigate and prosecute cases. This theme of language and cultural barriers is recurring in debates concerning ‘Asian crime’ or, more generally, crime among migrant or ‘ethnic’ communities. For example:

(P24) Dail Jones (NZ First) on behalf of Ron Mark (NZ First), to the Minister of Police: Are police experiencing any problems when investigating crimes committed by immigrants, asylum seekers or refugees?

Hon. George Hawkins (Minister of Police): Every criminal investigation has its own peculiar features and challenges. When necessary, the police have access to interpreters who are able to assist with language and cultural barriers.

Dail Jones: What does he propose to do to address the problems raised by front-line police officer Bob Kerr from Christchurch, who stated in the Press of 31 October 2002: “Both the predators, and their victims, bring to New Zealand a bewildering parallel Asian justice system, which police are struggling to penetrate”.

Hon. George Hawkins: The local police are working with the Asian community to overcome the problems. [Oral question, Dail Jones (New Zealand First) to the Minister of Police, 5 December 2002, pp. 2532-2533].

Response to the ‘Asian crime’ issue is often presented within an explanatory frame of low rates of Asian offending. In the following extracts, as in other examples, the Government minister includes in their response to questions
about crime among ethnic groups reference to the “under-representation” of Asians as offenders:

(P25)  *Ron Mark (NZ First) to the Minister of Police:* Does he keep any crime statistics on the following ethnic groups: Somali, Thai, Korean, Chinese, Scottish, Irish, Dutch or South African; if not, why not?

...  
*Martin Gallagher:* Are members of the Asian community in New Zealand over-represented as offenders in police crime statistics?  
*Hon. George Hawkins:* Not only are Asian New Zealanders some of the most productive people in our population, but they are also some of the most law-abiding. They make up over 6 percent of our population and represent only 2.2 percent of offender apprehensions ... [Oral question by Ron Mark (New Zealand First) to the Minister of Police, 12 November 2002, pp. 1730-1731].

(P26)  *Hon Paul Swain (Minister of Transport) on behalf of the Minister of Police:* Demand for police services is predominantly driven by population. Any increase in population tends to result in increases in calls on the police for services. However, I am advised that members of the Asian community are under-represented in terms of offending in New Zealand, and, indeed, make an extraordinary contribution to New Zealand’s economic and social development ... [Response by Paul Swain (on behalf of Minister of Police) to oral question by Winston Peters (New Zealand First), 5 November 2002, p. 1547].

The success of this as a counter-strategy to anti-Asian discourses may be limited by the fact that the debate remains constrained by the original frame established. The argument originates from the basis of the number of Asians involved in crime, with responses tending to include reference to the numbers of Asians not involved in crime – and in this sense, it does not actually shift the debate away from discussion of the number of Asians.
The speakers in extract P25 and P26 also mention the economic and social contribution that Asian people make to Aotearoa/New Zealand society. This argument is commonly deployed as justification for immigrants or other ethnic groups being in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and occurs in relation to international students and tourists as well as migrants.

There were other occasions where references were made to crimes in a way that an association is made between the Asian community and a particular behaviour, however, the most common and explicit association was within the context of increasing immigration.

**Social relations and ethnic affairs**

There were several times at which topics of social relations, particularly those which might be termed ‘race’ or ethnic relations, were associated with Asians, including in speeches to Asian community organisations, as well as during discussion of immigration and migrant settlement issues. The theme of social cohesion in relation to immigration has been briefly discussed above, in regard to the context of immigration as a threat to social cohesion and as a justification for calls for restrictions to, or increased regulation of, Asian immigration. The threat to social cohesion in this context, as employed in New Zealand First discourses, was framed not only in terms of a threat to values but also as a threat posed by separatism or segregation. In his speech to the New Zealand First annual conference in November 2002, for example, Winston Peters claimed:
In the Auckland region one in three were overseas born. As a result, huge swathes of our major population center have become migrant communities. The media already refers to the ‘Asian community’, the ‘Indian community’, and the ‘Pacific Island’ community as if these communities were distinct and independent, self contained entities – states within a state.

… We are witnessing the Balkanisation of our country. It is time to ask serious questions about the national identity and what New Zealand expects of those who join us … [‘Sowing the seeds of sectarianism’, Public speech at New Zealand First Convention by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 10 November 2002].

However, in the dataset there were also a number of examples of references to social cohesion in relation to cultural diversity and social inclusion. This occurred within the context of Asians as migrants, as well as more broadly within the context of Asians as ethnic:

I want to acknowledge to you all, that I appreciate the challenges that New Zealand presents to you. We do things differently here than elsewhere, and it takes some adjusting to the ways of New Zealand. But, it is certainly so, that all of us who live in this country, share a common goal – and that is to work towards creating a better life for ourselves and for each other.

There are many positives stemming from this for both those who have recently arrived in this country and for those who were born here. We have a variety of restaurants, music, dance, traditions and festivals. We are a diverse country rich in its peoples. People of New Zealand now speak many different languages and this can bring so many opportunities. Most of all though, cultural diversity allows us to appreciate one another. We can achieve this largely because of our differences, rather than in spite of those differences. We as a society must also ensure that those who settle in New Zealand are able to achieve their potential and make the most of their New Zealand experience …

[Public speech by George Hawkins (Minister for Ethnic Affairs), 3 March 2000].
In this example, taken from a speech made by the then Minister of Ethnic Affairs to Asian community groups in Auckland, diversity is presented as providing positive opportunities for both migrants and host communities. Differences are acknowledged, but so is commonality of goal. In this manner, themes of difference and diversity are introduced in language that is typically associated with debates about multiculturalism. In this extract (P28), the opportunities seen to arise from diversity include divergent cultural practices and norms, such as language. The speaker also notes that this diversity brings with it “… a variety of restaurants, music, dance, traditions and festivals”.

In the same speech, however, immediately prior to the extract above, diversity is also represented as differences between ‘them’ and ‘us’, as opposed to an acknowledgement of differences within ‘their’ group. Although intra-group diversity is sometimes recognised, the use of singular forms such as ‘… the Asian community…’ (rather than Asian communities) remain common. In the extract below (from the same speech), the use of “your language”, “your culture”, and “your community” simultaneously construct difference from ‘us’ and similarity with each other. In this way, diversity is concurrently acknowledged and constrained.

(P29) It is important that the New Zealand police has within its ranks officers who speak your language fluently, who understand your culture, who understand the ways of where you come from. It is also important that when you need the police, that they understand the inner workings of your community. [Public speech by George Hawkins (Minister for Ethnic Affairs), 3 March 2000].
In texts broadly concerned with ethnic relations, reference was also made to
tolerance, particularly within the context of tolerance for diversity and
difference.

(P30) Our government stands for tolerance and inclusion. I am delighted that
representatives of a range of political parties are here today. That indicates that
the broad mainstream of political debate will promote and defend the rights of
minority groups to live a decent life in our country … [Public speech at launch
of Pan Asian Congress, Helen Clark, Prime Minister, 4 October 2002].

Language of positive self-presentation, such as claims to tolerance, is another
previously identified feature of discourses about the Other or ethnic
minorities (van Dijk 1997a). However, the word tolerance, although used
here as a positive attribute, implies that there is something about ‘ethnic
minorities’ that needs to be tolerated. This has been further critiqued by
Blommaert and Vershueren (1998), who discuss the way in which the notion
of tolerance in itself constructs diversity as problematic. Claims to tolerance
often leave unstated the limits of inclusion or tolerance and whether or not it
extends to fundamental change in value systems, approaches, or power or is
limited to embracing the concept of the exotic Other adding flavour and
diversity to the community through the introduction of ‘different’ festivals,
languages, and cuisines as suggested in the earlier extract (P28).

A final consideration in relation to the content area of social and ethnic
relations was the issue of the relationship between time in Aotearoa/New
Zealand and belonging. This was employed as a justification strategy by
New Zealand First speakers as a way of credentialing or establishing
authority of opinion. However, it was also raised as an issue by the National Party Spokesperson for Asian Issues, Pansy Wong, who questioned the discursive linking of time and belonging in a way that implies greater credibility or sense of belonging directly related to the length of time individuals or communities have been in Aotearoa/New Zealand:

(P31) Having come from an Asian community background, I raise the problem of the continued emphasis on people having to demonstrate they are committed to New Zealand. Is the demonstration of commitment strictly a quantitative measure, measured by the number of days and the number of years one stays in a country? Is it measured by substance? Or is it a measure of commitment simply that one happens to stay in New Zealand up to the time one’s application is cancelled to become citizens … [Debate on Citizenship Amendment Bill, Pansy Wong, National Party, 16 October 2001, p. 12475].

**Categorising Asians: Asians as (an)Other group**

In political talk, there were a number of ways in which Asians were constructed as a specific Other group. This included the positioning of Asians as one of a number of social groups or communities, as a sector interest group, as an ethnic minority group, and as a migrant community.

*It doesn’t matter whether they are Asian, Pakeha, or Maori …*:

There were a number of instances in political talk where Asians were included in a list of groups, such as in the excerpts below:

(P32) It doesn’t matter whether they are Asian, Pakeha, or Māori, they know they can get people elected [Debate on Bay of Plenty Regional Council (Māori Constituency Empowering) Bill, Ron Mark, New Zealand First Party, 8 August 2001, p. 10781].
It has been this Government that has heightened awareness in communities like the Pacific Island and Asian communities to educate them in respect of what their people should or should not bring into this country in terms of food products [Debate on Biosecurity Amendment Bill, Clayton Cosgrove, Labour Party, 15 August 2001, p. 11001].

Well I ask the members opposite what about Pacific Islanders? They are not mentioned ... Why are Māoris mentioned and not Pacific Islanders? I thank the member for her interjection. What about Chinese New Zealanders? Why are they not mentioned? For that matter, what about the people who are really discriminated against: middle-aged white men? They are not mentioned either. [Debate on Public Trust Hill, Richard Prebble, ACT Party, 11 December 2001, p. 13793].

In the first two examples, Asians are represented as a distinct community able to be delineated and compared with other groups, such as ‘Maori’ and ‘Pacific Islanders’. In this sense, Asians are constructed as one of a number of social groups, in contrast to the more dichotomous framework of one Other and one Self that occurs elsewhere. The third example introduces a variant of group labelling by deployment of the more specific term ‘Chinese New Zealanders’. However, the function of the term ‘Chinese New Zealander’ is essentially the same as ‘Asian’ in this example, as a comparator or in contrast to other groups. For the most part, this strategy of listing and contrasting a number of groups, including Asian, in parliamentary texts appeared in two contexts.

The first was in relation to a discussion of real or perceived ‘differential rights’ or treatment. For example, in excerpts (P32) and (P34) it was in
relation to the discussion of Māori rights, and specifically provisions for the recognition of Māori rights in legislation and policy. In this sense, reference to the social group Asian/Chinese New Zealander served a particular function in constructing the position of Māori and Asians simultaneously as equal groups deserving of ‘equal rights’, revolving to some extent around the presupposition that Māori were in receipt of ‘special attention’. Asians are presented as one of a number of interest groups or sector groups that should also be considered in the distribution of rights or benefits. In these cases, it is not always possible to distinguish between when this argument is being used to challenge Māori rights as opposed to asserting Asian rights. The following excerpts also demonstrate this function:

(P35) Will the Minister be imposing financial penalties on institutions that do not meet the needs of the hundreds of thousands of European, Asian and other students; if not, how does he respond to concerns that this is yet another example of this Government’s racial discrimination? [Oral question by Muriel Newman (ACT Party), to the Associate Minister of Education (Tertiary Education), 8 November 2001, p. 12960].

(P36) Following the launch yesterday of the professional body known as the New Zealand Teachers Council, where only Māori culture was on display, is it the message to the nation that we are now replacing one monoculture with another monoculture and completely ignoring that we have children who are New Zealanders of Asian descent, Polish descent, and Arab descent? [Oral question by Ron Mark (New Zealand First), to Minister of Education, 20 February 2002, p.14499].

(P37) Very few of us here think we should give assistance based on race, creed, or religious beliefs, or that a wealthy Māori who lives in Remuera should receive assistance when a poor Asian person in Papatoetoe does not. It is pretty clear, if
we start with a fundamental platform for any social policy development, that any State assistance should be delivered to people on the basis of their need. [Debate on Housing Corporation Amendment Bill, Maurice Williamson, National Party, 26 June 2001, p. 10052].

There were also examples in the political dataset of the opposite, with Asian interests being contrasted against rights or opportunities for Māori (and Other) communities, as in the example below:

(P38) I will take just one little example: zoning … It is a disgrace that there has been a 40 percent drop in the number of Pacific Islanders and a 35 percent drop in the number of Māori at Auckland Grammar. The only reason that some Māori and Pacific Island students are there is that they have siblings at the school. When those families have moved on, and the principal of Auckland Grammar says, Auckland Grammar will become bicultural: Pakeha and Asian … [Debate on Prime Minister’s Statement, Dr Nick Smith, National Party, 12 February 2002, p. 14253].

The second context of usage (as demonstrated in P33) relates more to specific issues that are seen to be relevant to a particular community, for example, biosecurity risks. This excerpt too presupposes that the audience understands Pacific Islanders and Asians as groups likely to be travelling into the country, associating Asians (and Pacific Islanders) with movement, but also with biosecurity risk. In addition, the use of the possessive pronoun ‘their’ (“… what their people should or should not bring into this country …[my emphasis]”), distances the speaker and the audience from both these communities.
This strategy of listing Asians is a way of discursively representing them as just one group, among many. In this sense, it can be viewed as part of a macro-strategy of group construction.

Asians as ‘ethnic New Zealanders’

In relation to the representation of Asians as an Other group, Asians were accounted for in political texts as an ethnic minority group. This representation combined two elements – Asians as ethnic and Asians as a minority – that functioned both independently and concurrently to construct Asian group identity and to position Asians in relation to other social groupings. Examples of this representation are evident in an October 2002 speech by the Prime Minister Helen Clark, delivered at the launch of the New Zealand Pan Asian Congress. The establishment of the Pan Asian Congress occurred during a period of heightened anti-immigration discourse. The speech, therefore, needs to be understood within the context of the Government’s response to ‘anti-Asian’ sentiments seen to be associated with other political actors and parties.

Within this speech, several references are made to the status of Asians in Aotearoa/New Zealand as an ethnic group:

(P39) The Pan Asian Congress, once formally established, will be an ethnic organisation of tremendous importance . . .

(P40) It will be able to have input into the formation of policy which affects New Zealand’s ethnic communities . . .
Asian New Zealanders are contributing to New Zealand in many ways: economically, socially, and culturally. In turn I hope that New Zealand governments will always be friends and allies of ethnic New Zealanders . . .

[Public speech at launch of Pan Asian Congress, Helen Clark, Prime Minister, 4 October 2002].

In the excerpts above, the word ‘ethnic’ was not essential to the text in terms of overall coherence or grammatical correctness. The use of the term ethnic in the phrases ‘ethnic community’ and ‘ethnic New Zealanders’ denotes some communities or New Zealanders as ‘ethnic’, such as Asians, and other communities or New Zealanders as ‘non-ethnic’. This view of ethnicity as something that Other people have (in the domestic setting, usually non-European or non-Western people), expresses ideological positionings of Self as normal and Other as different.

The second quote (P40) relates discursive group construction to social practices and actions by implying boundaries on the role of ethnic communities in terms of their involvement in political decision making. Ethnic New Zealanders are, according to the speaker, “… able to have input into the formation of policy which affects New Zealand’s ethnic communities …”. It leaves un-named who Aotearoa/New Zealand’s non-ethnic communities are, and what policy would affect them that would not affect ethnic communities.

The idea that there are some communities that are ethnic, and others that are not, appears in several other political discourse events, including speeches by the Minister for Ethnic Affairs for example:
According to the 1996 Census, the Ethnic sector contains over 8 per cent of the New Zealand population ... Within the Ethnic population here in the Waikato, 52 per cent are of European origin, 43 per cent are of Asian or South East Asian origin and 5 per cent from other parts of the world ... [Public speech, George Hawkins, Minister for Ethnic Affairs, 26 August 2000].

In excerpt (P41), the Prime Minister refers to the contribution that Asian communities (as ethnic communities) are making in economic, social, and cultural terms. Reference to the contribution of ethnic communities is one of the strategies of justification deployed by elites, including politicians, to defend or legitimise the presence of Other communities. The excerpt also introduces a reciprocal responsibility on governments to remain ‘friends and allies of ethnic New Zealanders’. However, this also constructs the relationship between the Government and ethnic New Zealanders as one of ethnic New Zealanders as associates, in contrast to being an integral part of the Government for example.

In the same speech, Prime Minister Helen Clark also makes references to Asians as a minority group (sometimes as an ethnic minority). For example:

Our government stands for tolerance and inclusion. I am delighted that representatives of a range of political parties are here today. That indicates that the broad mainstream of political debate will promote and defend the rights of minority groups to live a decent life in our country ... [Public speech at launch of Pan Asian Congress, Helen Clark, Prime Minister, 4 October 2002].

We want all New Zealanders to enjoy access to opportunity and we want members of ethnic minorities to enjoy economic and social status on a par with
that of other New Zealanders. [Public speech at launch of Pan Asian Congress, Helen Clark, Prime Minister, 4 October 2002].

Again, this representation of Asians as an ethnic minority establishes the level at which they are seen to have rights in New Zealand. It sets up a relationship with the majority that is based on numbers, which in a democratic system equates to power. In democracies, the rights of minority groups are often weighed up against the rights of the majority. As is the case with the use of the word ethnic, other terms could have been employed, and the repeated use of both ethnic and minority within the speech implies a more deliberate and conscious use of the terms than might be attributed to a single instance of use. The use of the personal pronoun our to refer to “our country” and “our government” is ambiguous as to whether this includes or excludes ethnic minorities.

The dataset contained additional instances where people of Asian ethnicity were conceptualised as an ethnic and/or minority community. For example:

(P45) … the Government’s continual dismissal of ethnic communities concerned about the abolition of the Race Relations Office was sheer arrogance, and spoke volumes about Labour’s commitment to ethnic communities … The majority of those submissions were from Asian communities [Debate on Human Rights Amendment Bill, Paul Hutchinson, National Party, 5 Dec 2001, p. 13728].

(P46) … After all, we have seen in section 36 of the principal Act reference to various groups, including, for example, ethnic minority groups, particularly in the Asian community – the group that I am familiar with … [Debate on Broadcasting Amendment Bill, Pansy Wong, National Party, 24 February 2000, p. 775].
The ethnic groups that Mr Prebble referred to, namely the Pacific Island people, Asian people, and the many other races that have settled here in Aotearoa New Zealand, are protected by the Crown under article 1 of the treaty ... [Debate on Bay of Plenty Regional Council Bill, Mita Ririnui, Labour Party, 29 August 2001, p. 11175].

Police inform me that they keep offender apprehension statistics, where ethnicity is defined by a number of ethnic groups, including Caucasian, Māori, Pacific, Asiatic, and other groups. [Oral question by Ron Mark (New Zealand First Party), to the Minister of Police, 12 November 2021, p. 1730].

The latter two examples also demonstrate the continued use of reference to race and racial categories (Caucasian and Asiatic) in political talk about social groups in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

It is noted that members of the Asian community may internally label themselves as an ethnic minority also. However, in discussing the discursive construction of Asians as an ethnic minority, the aim is to highlight the way in which people of Asian ethnicity are externally constructed through the institutional discourses of the non-Asian majority.

Asians as migrants

While the discursive construction of Asian as immigrant was primarily a feature of New Zealand First discourse during the study period, the association also appears in other political discourses, although generally in a less overt manner that would not generally be considered to be anti-Asian. For example, in a speech made by the Prime Minister Helen Clark at the
launch of the Pan-Asian Congress in October 2002, the following statements are made:

(P49)  One in five New Zealanders were born overseas, and one in three Aucklanders were born overseas. Almost four hundred thousand Kiwis come from backgrounds other than Māori, Pacific Island, or Anglo-Celtic. The heritage of many of these people comes from the world’s largest continent – Asia, with its unique languages, cultures, and traditions. [Public speech at launch of Pan Asian Congress, Helen Clark, Prime Minister, 4 October 2002].

While the link is not explicit, it sites the speech about the Pan-Asian Congress and the Asian community in terms of people born overseas (although later in the speech reference is made to the “longstanding presence” of some communities, “especially the Chinese”).

(P50)  ... We now have fewer people who are unemployed and fewer long-term unemployed. Unemployment is down for Māori, for Pacific Islanders, and for Asian migrants – these figures are all down. [Debate on Prime Minister’s Statement, Steve Maharey, Minister of Social Services and Employment, 14 February 2001, p. 7631].

In the extract above (P50), Asian is collocated with ‘migrant’, and it remains unclear whether or not the speaker was specifically talking about Asian migrants, or using the term ‘Asian migrants’ to refer to the Asian community in general. In either case, Asian individuals and communities are one more linked with the content area of migration.
This positioning of all Asians as recent migrants was also challenged in a parliamentary debate by Pansy Wong, a National Party MP (appointed spokesperson for Asian Issues), particularly in relation to the potential for it to result in standardised narratives about differential rights, entitlements, and status:

(P51) …He [Minister for Ethnic Affairs] should aim to change the mindset that these communities are all relatively new migrants. Indeed, Chinese New Zealanders have been here since the 1860s. Many have earned their right to be here many times over – to be treated as fellow New Zealanders, no more, no less . . .

[Debate, Pansy Wong, National Party, 10 February 2000, p. 425].

Stereotypes and characterisations

In addition to the discursive construction of Asian identity as immigrant, ethnic minority and interest group, a number of characterisations and stereotypes are attributed to people of Asian ethnicity in political discourse.

Quiet and passive

A generalisation about Asians that was evident in contemporary political discourse was that of Asians as quiet and passive. This stereotype has previously been identified in the media chapter, particularly as it related to issues around ‘Asian crime’. In the following extracts, the imagery is invoked by National Party MP Pansy Wong:

(P52) Seldom have I seen the usually passive and silent Asian community rise to such a challenge so magnificently … [Debate on Human Rights Amendment Bill, Pansy Wong, National Party, 16 August 2001, p. 11045-11046].
... The Wellington Asian community leaders accompanied me to the marae to show our support and friendship, and to join in the celebration of our national day [Waiting Day]. I was caught up in the sensitive issue of women’s rights to speak during the powhiri. In a quietly spoken, polite, diplomatic but firm, Asian way, we negotiated a way forward ... [Debate, Pansy Wong, National Party, 10 February 2000, p. 424].

... I was very pleased to see that the usually quiet and gentle Chinese communities members were prepared to speak up and stand up to show their feelings ... [Public speech, Pansy Wong, National Party, 2 December 2002].

It is a function of what Bhabha (1996) terms the ambivalent nature of stereotypes, that this imagery can variously be conceptualised as positive when constructed as diplomatic, gentle, and softly-spoken (as in examples P53 and P54), but also derogatory if understood to represent passive inaction, submissiveness, or reticence, such as the way in which the stereotypes were utilised in discourses about crime in Asian communities.

*Intelligent and hard-working*

One of the common stereotypes associated with people of Asian ethnicity in a number of settings is that of Asians as hard working, intelligent, and committed to education. This stereotype also appeared in political texts during this time period:

(P55) Like New Zealand's Asian communities, the government values education and a strong work ethic highly [Public speech at launch of Pan Asian Congress, Helen Clark, Prime Minister, 4 October 2002].

(P56) Your response confirms that hard working Chinese migrants like yourselves want a better-managed immigration service ['One country: one country, one
As with many ethnic stereotypes, the hard-working categorisation is not a new stereotype. While in a certain sense this stereotype could be considered as a positive representation of Asian communities, it is a stereotype nonetheless and contributes to the notion that a certain behaviour or attitude can be universally assigned to a diverse group of people. As noted above, the stereotype can be, and has been, used in a way that imbues it with negative connotations. For example, a strong work ethic can be alternatively presented as single-mindedness or competitiveness.

A closely related and sometimes overlapping stereotype is that of Asians, in particular Asian students, as intelligent and committed to education.

(P57) I was interested in tonight’s Evening Post article about the dux of Newlands college, the success of students from Asian families, and the contrasting attitudes of Asian societies and New Zealanders generally towards education. Perhaps the worst figure was that 90 percent of the duxes of schools in the Hamilton area were of Asian extraction, something that was attributed to the higher value that Asian families place on education … [Debate on Student Loan Scheme Amendment Bill, Stephen Franks, ACT Party, 12 December 2000, p. 7311].

(P58) Or take a glance at the page of photographs which the New Zealand publishes each year, showing the duxes at New Zealand high schools – typically, something close to 40% of those shown are Asian. Or look at the results from this year’s scholarship (NZEST) exams, where just over 40% of the top 60 students in the country have Asian heritage. These young people are enriching
our country with their hard work and their talent. Just as a look at any youth orchestra around the country shows how New Zealanders of Asian heritage are enriching our culture. ['New Zealand and Asia: where does the National Party stand?', Public speech, Don Brash, National Party, 2 December 2002].

Again, while the stereotype in and of itself may not be negative, the assigning of characteristics such as intelligence to an individual based on their ethnicity reinforces racialised approaches to ethnicity. The racialised nature of these stereotypes is foregrounded in extract (P57), where the speaker draws on the notion that Asian people are visually distinct and identifiable – that is, able to be distinguished as Asian in photographs or by ‘just looking’ at the youth orchestra.

In some instances, the stereotypes are deployed against other ‘ethnic’ groups. Winston Peters, for example, in a speech broadly about Māori political representation, claims:

(P59) … If Maori want to find the real enemies hindering their progress I say look no further than the political correctness fostered by white liberals and the lack of internal discipline of Maori themselves. Why is it that descendants of the Chinese goldminers in Otago are now doctors, lawyers and successful business people? Why is it that within a few years of arriving here – unable to even speak the language properly and living in an alien culture – many refugee Asians are setting up successful businesses or gaining top marks in our schools and universities? Why are Maori not doing this? ['The way ahead – one country, one electoral franchise', Public speech, Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 13 September 2000].
In this manner, stereotypes can have negative consequences for not only the groups directly referenced but also through their use to compare social groups, in the same manner that racial hierarchies compare and rank social groups.

Wealthy

The stereotype of the wealthy Asian migrant has featured in passing in earlier comments, particularly in relation to competition, primarily in terms of social and economic resources. One example of this is in debates surrounding access to schools, in particular, access to places in popular or ‘desirable’ schools. For example, New Zealand First put forward this argument in a speech during their 2002 election campaign:

(P60) Over 95% of the business investor category of immigrants are Asians – but in many cases the business they are buying into is places in our schools for their kids. We can understand that, but is it what we want. Have you been asked? Do you mind if your kid has to go to another school as a result. ['Another gravy train exposed', Public speech at Christchurch by Winston Peters, New Zealand First Party, 8 July 2002].

In this case, it is proposed that Asian immigrants are “buying” places for their children in “our schools” (note the use of the inclusive pronoun “our”), the result being that other children – “your kid” – may be denied access to their school of choice. In this extract, there is an implicit association of Asian immigrants with wealth.

The argument over access to schooling and the role of members of the Asian community also occurs in parliamentary debates about zoning of schools. In
these circumstances, the competition is most often represented as being between Māori and Pacific students versus Asian and European students.

(P61) I will take just one little example: zoning … Auckland Grammar will become bicultural: Pakeha and Asian. The Government’s policy rewards those who have an eye for real estate and those who have thick pockets, but if an ambitious young student from a Māori or Pacific Island family wants to enter one of Auckland’s top schools, this Labour Government is going to lock the door on that student and to stop him or her from getting in. [Debate on Prime Minister’s Statement, Dr Nick Smith, National Party, 12 February 2002, p. 14253].

(P62) In June last year I put out a statement headed: "Rich European and Chinese only". My statement reads: "One of Auckland’s best schools is set to become the domain of rich European and Chinese students. … The institution’s rich, multicultural environment will be decimated. Wealthy inner-city European and Chinese students will replace the dark-skinned kids from south Auckland." That was a statement that I put out on 20 June last year. How about that for a prediction? Chinese student enrolments are up by 77 percent … Never mind, good on them, I say. They can afford it. Let them get into the schools if they can afford it … [Debate, Donna Awatere Huata, ACT Party, 12 February 2002].

In these examples, from members of separate opposition parties, criticism is directed at the Government’s policy of zoning that is claimed to be leading to less access for Māori and Pacific Island students to places in ‘desirable’ schools, in this case, Auckland Grammar. While the criticism is not levelled directly at Asian people, the idea of Asian parents as wealthy people able to buy their way into good education for their children, at the expense of other groups of students, is reinforced. It locates Asian communities within a context of serious competition for resources such as schooling and housing.
SUMMARY OF POLITICAL CASE STUDY

For the most part, explicit references to people of Asian ethnicity in political speeches and parliamentary debates during the study period were relatively infrequent, with the tendency to be concentrated around the content areas of immigration, law and order, and ethnic relations.

From the key texts analysed, there are several features of the political discourse about Asians that are of note. One such characteristic is the lack of clarity over who is actually being talked about when the term Asian is being used, and the continuing tension between the recognition of the diversity within the Asian group on the one hand, and the continued use of the vague aggregate term Asian – that is, the tension between homogeneity and heterogeneity. To this extent, the political discourses of Asian ethnicity remain essentialised. This essentialisation also manifested itself in the occurrence of stereotypes about Asians, namely those of being quiet and passive, hard-working and intelligent, and wealthy.

A number of the strategies and rhetorical moves that were noted during the analysis are moves common to discourses about the Other in general. This includes the discursive construction of Asians in New Zealand as an Other group – that is, as immigrants, as minorities, as ethnic – the use of exclusionary language and the attribution of stereotypes (both positive and negative). As much of the political discourse about Asian communities tended to focus on issues of immigration, many of the strategies of argumentation and much of the rhetoric was also common to political discourses about immigration.
It became apparent during the analysis that much of the political discourse about immigrants and ethnic groups tended not to be explicit in presenting a negative view of the Other (with the possible exception of New Zealand First’s discourses). This is probably a function of current social norms regarding the social acceptability of certain types of talk, as well as the public and pre-meditated nature of much political discourse.

People of Asian ethnicity are represented in a variety of ways depending on the source of the political discourse. The most enduring construction, due in large part to the discourses of New Zealand First and responses to those discourses, is that of Asian as immigrant.
The East and its Asian Others have long been a part of the imagination and discourses of the West. The analyses of mass media and political texts in this thesis have concentrated on the construction of Asian Otherness in and through contemporary discourses of elite institutions in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This chapter seeks to synthesise and summarise these Othering accounts in relation to the content, strategies, and lexical devices involved across the sites of production. This is followed by a discussion of the ways in which these various linguistic and discursive moves contribute to a number of recurring representations of the Asian Other in contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand society. Finally, the chapter reflects on the functions that these representations serve in the construction of group relations and social realities, and their utility for the elite institutions that are primarily involved in their production.

THE CONTENT OF TALK ABOUT ASIANS

The content of talk about social groups is an important dimension of the discursive representation of social identities, in terms of the topics that are present (or absent), the themes that are associated with particular groups, as well as the recurring or prevailing stereotypes and categorisations. Of special interest to the current investigation were the ways in which these aspects of
the content of talk about Asians contribute to an enduring construction of Asian as Other.

In large part, explicit references to Asians in political speeches and parliamentary debates during the study period were relatively infrequent, with texts that could be considered to be about Asians (that is, texts where Asians were the main topic or major actors) even less common. Where references to Asians did occur, they tended to be broadly in relation to debates about immigration and issues perceived to be related to immigration (such as crime and social cohesion) and, to a lesser extent, ‘ethnic affairs’ in general. In contrast, references to Asians in the print media occurred much more frequently. This was in terms of texts that could be categorised as specifically about Asians, as well as those that included Asians as a sub-topic, as minor actors, or as one of a number of social groups. However, as with the political texts, media texts tended to draw on a number of recurring areas of content. In relation to media texts specifically about Asians, this included the topics of: immigration (and related issues of settlement, population change, citizenship and social relations); Asian students (and, more broadly international students and export education); crime and other ‘undesirable behaviour’ (including dangerous driving, abortion, shellfish poaching and smuggling, and drowning); and, ethnic affairs, race relations and discrimination. This distribution of content areas resonates with the findings of similar and related studies internationally that have identified a tendency for press and political discourses about ethnic groups to be concentrated around a limited number of topics namely those of immigration, crime, cultural difference, and ethnic affairs (Law 2002; van Dijk 1991).
Through these topics, it was possible to identify common or repeated themes related to the recurrent content areas (outlined in Table 8.1). A number of the topics were inter-related and overlapping and could be associated with more than one theme. It was not within the scope of the current study to determine whether or not these topics areas occurred more or less often in relation to Asians as opposed to other social groups. Of interest was the extent to which the foregrounding of particular content domains contributed to the Othering of Asians within contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand society.

Table 8.1: Recurring content in contemporary media and political talk about Asians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Examples of topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>Immigration policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration and social cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts on infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalisation</td>
<td>Asian crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victims needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policing resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance and irresponsibility</td>
<td>Driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abortion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger</td>
<td>Driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Border security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health risks (e.g. SARS, tuberculosis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Pressure on resources, infrastructure and space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Asian students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social harmony</td>
<td>Race relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discrimination and racial attacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement/social cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural difference</td>
<td>Cultural behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural attitudes and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>Asian students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitors and tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Migrants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At one level, these themes and topics reflect the socio-political and socio-historical environment during the study period and the issues that were viewed as newsworthy or politically relevant. A number of the themes identified, especially those of criminalisation, deviance, and danger, are commonly considered to be newsworthy. A crucial point of differentiation, therefore, is the extent to which these themes and content areas were racialised or ethnicised in texts about Asians, as well as the degree to which they emphasised difference.

In this study, the social group termed Asian was repeatedly identified in texts about immigration and related topics, as well as through the frequent use of the designations Asian immigrant and Asian migrant in texts about specific other topics. This association of Asian social groups with immigration was a notable feature of media and political discourses during the time period of the case studies, especially in relation to New Zealand First policies on
immigration, and within the context of the 2002 general election campaign. During the 2002 election campaign, as had been the case in the 1996 election, the issue of immigration became highly politicised (Munshi 1998; Spoonley & Trlin 2004, p. 24). Immigration-related issues, including current immigration policies, settlement and integration of migrants, and the social and economic impacts of immigration, were discussed in the political arena, and extensively covered in the press. The politicisation, and the concurrent ‘Asianisation’¹, of immigration issues in Aotearoa/New Zealand was evident in many texts in this case study. In addition, Asian communities were ‘immigrationised’, in the sense that they came to be represented principally as immigrants through repeated linking with immigration issues.

Conceptually, the thematic area of immigration presupposes the existence of boundaries, namely those of the nation, that distinguish ‘insiders’ from ‘outsiders’. The recurrent association of particular social groups with themes of immigration in both political and media talk thus serves to frame social relations in terms of ‘in’ and ‘out’ groups, perpetually locating the immigrant as ‘outsider’. The related topic areas (for example, settlement, integration, and demographic changes) accordingly revolve to a large degree around this insider/outsider relationship. In this manner, it is not only discourses categorised as ‘anti-immigrant’, such as those more commonly associated with right-wing political parties, that contribute to the representation of the immigrant as Other. Texts that highlight perceived benefits of immigration,

¹ In a study of newspaper articles from major New Zealand dailies in 1996, Munshi (1998) describes how the media contributed to the ‘Asianisation’ of the immigration issue through their repeated linking of immigration with Asian communities.
while they may construct immigration in a way that de-emphasises alleged problematic aspects, do not disrupt the underlying representational narratives of Asian as immigrant or of immigrant as outsider.

Themes of criminalisation and deviance have previously been identified in relation to the discursive construction of Other groups (Campbell 1995; Hartman & Husband 1974; Law 2002; van Dijk 1991). In terms of the specific topic areas, Asians were linked with certain criminal and deviant behaviours in both the media and political texts in this study, including extortion, kidnapping, gang activity, bad driving, abortion, and to a lesser extent, gambling and shellfish poaching. These content areas overlap with those identified by Spoonley and Trlin (2004) in their analysis of the media coverage of immigration and crime in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Within these themes of criminalisation and deviance, the subgroup of Asian students received particular attention for their alleged involvement in undesirable behaviours.

The notions of deviance and criminality rely on basic taken-for-granted assumptions regarding what is ordinary and acceptable within a given social context, as it is only through the positioning of certain behaviours as normal that abnormality, or deviance from the norm, can be conceptualised. Within a theme of criminality or deviance, therefore, the associated topics and sub-topics involved need to be broadly understood as aberrant. Repeated linking of Asians to behaviours commonly constructed as criminal and deviant, achieved through the content areas outlined above as well as various strategies and lexical moves discussed in further detail below, emphasises imagery of Asians and their behaviours as different and anomalous.
Narratives of danger are thematically related to those of criminality and deviance, as well as to conceptualisations of the Other as threat. In texts in this study, danger was constructed as external threat in several ways through the content areas of, for example, dangerous behaviours (including crime and poor driving) or through health risks (such as SARS and tuberculosis). At times, Asian communities, particularly Asian students and Asian immigrants, were represented as dangerous to broader social cohesion in Aotearoa/New Zealand. For example, this occurred in New Zealand First discourses about immigration through reference to the alleged risks posed by the geographical concentration of migrant groups.

Competition emerged as a theme in both political and media talk about Asians, particularly in relation to topics of immigration and Asian students, where it tended to be manifested in discourses that focused on competition for space and resources. In terms of space, this applied to housing and building space, as in narratives about space for Asian students (both accommodation and space for schooling) and in residential housing markets (particularly related to Asian immigrants). It also applied more directly to physical space, such as footpaths and roads.

The theme of competition was also apparent within the context of education, employment, and other social and economic resources. This content area included examples of the recurrent categorisations of Asians as hard-working, as intelligent, and as wealthy. These stereotypical categorisations are discussed in more detail in the next section in relation to the ways in which they were realised in texts analysed for this study. Within this
thematic site, however, they functioned to construct Asians as competition by means of their ability to either earn (through their hard work and/or intelligence) or buy (through their wealth) access to resources.

The theme of competition was not limited to discourses that could be seen as anti-Asian or anti-immigrant, such as those of New Zealand First, where the construction of the other as competition for scarce resources is an identified topos (Reeves 1983; van Dijk 2000b). It appeared in a number of texts in the form of concern for local interests (i.e., ‘New Zealanders’ or ‘Kwis’), but also at times as concern for Asians themselves (e.g. concern that there are insufficient resources or opportunities available). In addition, there were examples of the framing of Asians as competition for Māori resources or interests, more notably within texts from the political dataset.

The notion of competing interests necessarily implies an oppositional relationship, which, at the extreme, is represented by conflict and struggle. In this sense, competition positions ‘Asian interests’ in opposition to, or competing with, other interests. The threat, whether unspoken or made explicit, is therefore that Asian interests have the potential to override or impinge upon ‘our’ interests. This positioning is achieved argumentatively and lexically through various discursive strategies discussed below.

Cultural difference is a recurrent content area in relation to discourses about social collectives constructed as ethnic groups. Themes and topics of cultural difference tend to associate particular and specific behaviours, practices, and beliefs with social groups in a way that essentialises difference and naturalises the relationship between group belonging and those behaviours,
practices, or beliefs. In terms of Othering, the content area of cultural
difference functions precisely through the emphasis on group difference,
albeit it frequently enacted through marked individuals. Closely related to
cultural difference are themes and topics of social harmony. Issues of
diversity, integration, and social cohesion are often located in relation to
cultural differences in attitudes, values, and behaviours. These are variously
portrayed as positive (for example, contributing to increased
‘multiculturalism’ in Aotearoa/New Zealand, or through providing greater
exposure to ‘ethnic’ foods and customs as in examples in the political case
study) or negative (for example, as posing a potential threat to social
cohesion). Racism and discrimination appeared as topics within this broader
theme of social relations, and at times were constructed, through a discourse of
inevitability, as a pre-determined by-product of increasing diversity.

In addition, in both media and political texts, Asian Otherness was
represented through themes of transience. This occurred through content
that emphasised Asian movement, particularly in terms of texts about Asian
students and/or Asian tourists. It also manifested itself in the highlighting of
the temporary status of Asian students and tourists, as well as the positioning
of Asian communities as recently arrived migrants.

Within the broad themes and global topics, texts in the study could variously
be conceived of as positive, negative, or neutral. Often, positive, negative
and/or neutral elements occurred concurrently within individual texts. An
approach to content, however, that is focused on identifying whether or not
the portrayal of individuals and communities in political and mass media talk
is negative or positive, has been suggested to have limited usefulness (hooks
1992; Xing 1998). This is because the comparison between positive and negative portrayals is both somewhat simplistic and also relative (Xing 1998). As Xing (1998, p.18) points out, “What is considered “positive” or “negative” depends on the point of view of the audience as well as the viewer’s positioning”. In addition, positive stereotypes, including those circulated in response to negative categorisations, remain in essence stereotypes and, therefore, do not disrupt the stereotyping process but have the potential to reify essentialised approaches to ethnic identity (Xing 1998).

For some time now the critical challenge for black folks has been to expand the discussion of race and representation beyond debates about good and bad imagery. Often what is thought to be good is merely a reaction against representations created by white people that were blatantly stereotypical … It is also about transforming the image, creating alternatives, asking ourselves questions about what types of images subvert, pose critical alternatives, and transform our worldviews and move us away from dualistic thinking about good and bad (hooks 1992, p. 4).

In relation to content in this study, it was not so much of interest whether individual texts or textual elements could be classified as positive or negative, but rather what the potential effects of any given text were. As Reeves (1983) identified in his framework of racialised discourse, a racist effect can result from a text with no explicit racist intent. The primary consideration, therefore, is the extent to which the content of any text – positive, negative, or otherwise – contributed to the ongoing construction of Asian as Other.
Across the media and political texts, a range of argumentation and linguistic strategies were used to represent Asian individuals and communities as Others, a number of which have been previously documented in related studies. These strategies were realised by different discursive means. The more common strategies and means employed to mark Asian as Other in the media and political texts analysed in this study are outlined in Table 8.2.

The strategies operate at different levels to construct Asian as an Other group. The first four strategies – those of differentiation, homogenisation, denigration, and constraint – operate at a micro-level, while the strategy of justification and legitimation is a macro-strategy, operating broadly across the other strategies, and through the content areas and themes identified earlier.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Realisation</th>
<th>Examples from case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Immigrationisation</td>
<td>Repeated use of the designations Asian immigrant and/or Asian migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflation of established communities with recently arrived migrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreignisation</td>
<td>Designation ‘Asian student’ used as reference for foreign/overseas/international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cotemporaneous use of the words Asian and foreign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison or juxtaposition with in-groups (e.g. ‘locals’, ‘Kwis’, ‘New Zealanders’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nomination/ex-nomination</td>
<td>Ethnic/national labelling of Asian in the absence of labelling of other actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labelling Asian as an ‘ethnic group’, ‘minority group’, or ‘cultural group’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racialisation</td>
<td>Deployment of racialised language (e.g. Asiatic, Asian faces, Asian descent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Asian’ used as a signifier of phenotype</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distancing</td>
<td>Use of inclusive and exclusive pronouns (e.g. we, our, us cf. them, their, they)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogenisation</td>
<td>Amalgamation</td>
<td>Singular collectives used to aggregate Asian communities and/or countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of collective pronouns (e.g. they, their)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essentialisation</td>
<td>Use of racialised language (e.g. Asian faces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invocation of stereotypes (e.g. wealthy, hard-working, intelligent, quiet and passive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalisation and vagueness</td>
<td>Use of non-specific language (e.g. some, many, often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denigration</td>
<td>Negative Other-presentation</td>
<td>Drawing on extreme examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ascription of negative attributes or motives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraint</td>
<td>Ethnic minoritisation</td>
<td>Use of the collocation ‘ethnic minority’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectionalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portrayal of Asians as a ‘sector interest’ group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification and legitimation</th>
<th>Appeal to the force of fact</th>
<th>Reference to statistics or numbers to establish claims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentication</td>
<td>Drawing on ‘Asian’ voices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to authority</td>
<td>Referencing ‘official’ or authoritative voices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparent sympathy</td>
<td>Framing statements as being sympathetic to the actors or actions under consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdote and example</td>
<td>Provision of examples or anecdotes to provide evidence for a generalised statement or claim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalisation and vagueness</td>
<td>Generalised quantification (e.g. using percentages/proportions rather than numbers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of non-specific language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disclaimers</th>
<th>Denial of racism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positioning argument as a challenge to political correctness/racism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Positive self-presentation | Reference to tolerance |
Strategies of differentiation

In terms of this study, strategies of differentiation involved the persistent positioning of Asians as an outsider group, by which all Asians were constructed as immigrants, foreigners, ethnic, or otherwise outsiders. As noted in the discussion of content areas, immigrationisation occurred through the repeated situating of Asians within a context of immigration, whereby all Asians became conceptualised as immigrants. The recurrent use of the designation Asian migrant and/or Asian immigrant across the range of thematic and topic areas identified in this study reinforced this commonsense notion of Asian as immigrant. Immigrationisation was also achieved through the conflation of recently arrived Asian communities with well-established Asian communities, accomplished discursively through a lack of clarity or distinction about who was considered to be part of the particular Asian group being referenced. This blurring of diversity within Asian communities, which serves to obfuscate the length of settlement of Asian communities in Aotearoa/New Zealand, was also directly challenged in several texts identified in the case study.

Foreignisation was enacted in texts analysed through the contemporaneous use of the words Asian and foreign, as well as by means of the juxtapositioning of Asians with “local” or “New Zealand” groups. These discursive techniques were perhaps most apparent in relation to Asian students and Asian driving, where comparisons were repeatedly made between foreign and local interests. The imagery of Asians as enduring foreigners is one that has been noted in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Ip & Murphy 2005), as well as in other settings (Turnbull 2003; Kawai 2005).
Strategies of differentiation also operated through the concurrent nomination and ex-nomination of social groups, principally in these case studies through the marking and labelling of Asian actors as Asian (or code words such as foreign student or immigrant) and the ex-nomination of other social actors. This happened primarily in areas of deviant or abnormal behaviours, for example, crime, drowning, or driving. This labelling practice is well-established within mainstream media institutions. In the Aotearoa/New Zealand context, for example, it has been shown that Māori are labelled as Māori in the reporting of crime much more frequently than the dominant Pākehā group (Kernot 1990).

This technique of nomination/ex-nomination also occurred in relation to the labelling of Asians as an ethnic group, minority group, or cultural group. In a number of texts, the categorisation of Asians as ethnic was within the context of the discussion of the ethnic distribution of some variable or attribute, where reference to Asian appeared alongside reference to other ethnic groups such as Māori. Although the ‘majority’ group (European/Pākehā) was included at times, there were also examples of texts where ethnic was used to specifically refer to non-majority groups. The conceptualisation of Asians as an ethnic, minority and/or cultural group, particularly in discourses where the numerically dominant ‘majority’ group remain unlabelled, positions them as members of a group with particular associated beliefs and behaviours different from the non-ethnic, acultural majority.

In terms of lexicalisation, it was evident from both political and mess media texts that discourse about the Other, including Asians, at times drew on racialised language. This included reference to phenotypic characteristics in
defining group membership, primarily references to Asian faces. In addition, Asian was used as a marker of identity in crime and other press reports – not only for the purposes of identifying victims, but more significantly as a means of categorising suspects. As noted in the media chapter, for this type of marking to function, particularly as a way of identifying suspects, it presupposes a shared understanding of what Asian looks like. It can, therefore, serve to entrench phenotypical approaches to ethnic identity. Phenotype remains one of the principal ways in which difference is marked and conceptualised in race-conscious societies, including Aotearoa/New Zealand.

As part of distinguishing and contrasting the Asian Other from Self, inclusive (such as ‘we’, ‘us’, and ‘our’) and exclusive pronouns (such as ‘you’, ‘your’, ‘they’, ‘them’, and ‘their’) provided a means of distancing Asians from ‘us’. In this study, the utilisation of inclusive and exclusive pronouns occurred both in texts that could be classed as anti-Asian, as well as those that could be classified simplistically as more positive or sympathetic. These lexical devices are a familiar and persistent feature of talk about the Other (Riggins 1997).

**Strategies of homogenisation**

Asian is essentially a broad aggregate term that, at least within official classification standards for ethnicity in Aotearoa/New Zealand, refers to a number of more specific ethnic groups. At times, in both the media and political case studies, reference was made to the diversity within Asian communities, with particular groups sometimes identified (most commonly, Chinese and to a lesser extent, Japanese and Korean). However, Othering
was realised through the tendency in some texts to refer to Asian groups in a way that amalgamated these distinct groups together. This was achieved, for example, through the use of the definite article and singular nouns, i.e., ‘the Asian community’, to represent Asians as a discrete, monolithic community. In addition this homogenisation included the aggregation of recently arrived migrants with well-established, longstanding Asian communities, as well as the ‘conflation’ of Asian students with Asian immigrants (Benson 2003). In this way, the specific ethnic groups within this broad aggregate grouping tended to remain undifferentiated.

This process of amalgamation, as it occurs in the media in Aotearoa/New Zealand, has been discussed by MacPherson and Spoonley (2004):

The decision to subsume various groups within a new larger ethnic ‘entity’ may result from an ignorance of the extent of differences between groups, or lack of interest in the nature of the differences, the ethnic categories in popular usage, the realities of an informational economy, or combinations of these factors. The media may be only partly responsible for this conflation. The requirement, for instance, that politicians’ claims are covered may force the media to report these populist views and, in the process, give currency, and some authority, to these analyses, even where journalists are well aware of ethnic distinctions. However, the mass media have considerable power to filter, alter and contest these views (p. 224).

Amalgamation not only obscures the heterogeneity of distinct and diverse social groupings, it also facilitates scapegoating (McPherson & Spoonley 2004, p. 225).
Homogenisation was further accomplished through the essentialisation of Asian individuals and communities. In this case study, essentialisation was operationalised by means of the deployment of racialised language (discussed above in reference to strategies of differentiation), as well as the invocation of stereotypical imagery (also a potential strategy of differentiation). The particular stereotypical categorisations that were foregrounded in contemporary press and political discourses were those of Asians as intelligent and hard-working, as wealthy, and as quiet and passive.

Stereotypes of Asian intelligence and propensity for hard work are persistent motifs in discourses about Asian communities, in both the domestic and international contexts. In this study, the stereotype of Asian intelligence was enacted primarily through reference to student achievement and purported cultural attitudes to education. This depiction of Asian students as intelligent and committed to education presents a contradictory portrayal to the representation of Asian students as involved in criminal and deviant behaviours that was a feature of media and political texts in the case studies. These ascribed attributes of intelligence and hard-work form part of the ‘model minority’ image that posits that “… Asians are a minority group endowed with cultural values such as a strong work ethic and devotion to education that predispose them to economic and educational achievement” (Kibria 1998, p. 952).

The portrayal of Asians as wealthy appears to be a somewhat more recent stereotype within the Aotearoa/New Zealand context. It has previously been identified in relation to students from Asia (Butcher & McGrath 2004) and immigrants (Ip & Murphy 2005; Spoonley & Trlin 2004). In a study of
newspaper reporting on Asian students, Benson (2003) states that in Aotearoa/New Zealand, “… Asian students have a tendency to be represented as either rather well off or “rich” or in the exact opposite, with poverty associations on a level with refugees” (p. 8). Stereotypes of Asian wealth were a feature of the “Inv-Asian” newspaper articles published in Auckland in 1993, where reference was made to expensive homes and cars (Ip & Murphy 2005; Spoonley & Trlin 2004). The continued salience of this generalisation was evident in texts from both the media and political sites. This more contemporary stereotype is paradoxical to the characterisations of Asians in early domestic discourses as willing to “… live on the proverbial smell of an oily rag” (Ip & Murphy 2005, p. 19).

The categorisation of Asians as quiet and passive was a feature of Othering discourses in both the political and press datasets. In the political discourse context, it was predominantly employed in relation to responses by the Asian community generally, while in the press context it appeared to be primarily through the content area of crime in terms of purported reluctance to report criminal activities or to engage with authorities. At a lexical level, the characterisation was achieved through the use of particular words (such as quiet, compliant, soft-spoken, passive, and gentle). As with the other stereotypes noted above, this imagery also forms part of the imagined ‘model minority’ identity attributed to Asians.

A further means of actualising homogenisation was through the use of non-specific language and generalised quantifiers (for example, ‘some’, ‘many’, ‘often’, ‘frequently’) that facilitated the attribution of individual behaviours, attitudes, and actions to a social group as a whole.
As a discursive strategy, homogenisation limits the reality of Other groups through the deployment of stereotypical and generalised imagery and the minimisation of diversity. In this way the Other becomes conceptualised first and foremost as a member of a social group embodying the features and attributes ascribed to that group, as opposed to a unique, independent-acting individual.

**Strategies of denigration**

Strategies of denigration are a further previously identified feature of discourses about the Other. In this study, strategies of denigration involved negative-other presentation and, more specifically, criminalisation. Negative-other presentation was performed through the emphasis on behaviours or actions seen to be deviant, such as crime, abortion, and bad or irresponsible driving. Denigration was also achieved through the ascription of negative attributes or motives to Asian actors, such as the references to immorality and irresponsibility in the media texts about abortion.

Criminalisation is a common technique in negative-other portrayal, and a recurring strategy in discourses about the Other, about foreigners, and immigration (Reeves 1983; Reisigl & Wodak 2001; van Dijk 1997a). Within texts drawn from both the political and press datasets in this study there were examples of the criminalisation of Asian individuals and communities and the ethnicising of particular types of crime purported to be more associated with Asians. This was achieved lexically through the labelling of suspects, perpetrators, and gangs as Asian, and by utilisation of particular words to denote criminality (for example, Asian violence, extortion, standover, and
kidnappings). The primary and arguably most successful means of realisation however, was the repeated use of the phrase ‘Asian crime’, occurring within texts from both elite sites, which served to create and reify a particular and specific type of criminal activity.

Extreme examples were used to provide evidence of deviant behaviour. As a strategy of denigration, extreme examples allow for atypical actions to be rearticulated as evidence, encouraging the problematisation of the broader social group while simultaneously justifying the apparent concern expressed in the discourse. They also give voice to the most negative examples of behaviour.

Some of the more commonly identified strategies of denigration that have been described in related work were less apparent in this study (for example, the use of racial epithets). This is possibly because of the sites of discourse under exploration and the pre-meditated and public nature of their discourse. It may also reflect the changing social context governing what is considered socially acceptable. However, strategies of denigration, particularly as they relate to the problematisation and criminalisation of Asians in Aotearoa/New Zealand, remain an important part of the construction of the Other.

**Strategies of constraint**

A further way in which difference or Otherness was constructed in this study was through the discursive manufacture of boundaries around Asians as a social group, by which their identity became constrained. This included constraint enacted through the ethnicisation and minoritisation of Asians, which often occurred concurrently. Through this process, Asian rights and
interests were defined in relation to their position as an ethnic minority – immediately establishing a relative positioning with the ‘un-ethnicised’ majority. The application of the term minority constructs ethnic group status in relation to a numerically-dominant group, with group status conceived of as at least partially dependent on quantification. The implicit association suggested by the collocation ethnic minority is that ethnic groups are minority groups and minority groups are ethnic groups. As was raised in the political discourse chapter, the representation of groups as ‘ethnic minorities’ frames their social roles and rights in relation to both the proportion of the total population they represent numerically, and as different, and in some cases, subordinate to total population rights and roles.

Asian identity was also discursively constrained through the representation of Asians as a sector interest group. As demonstrated in the political case study, in a number of texts this occurred within the context of balancing the supposedly competing rights and interests of Asians with those of other groups, most notably Māori. This aspect of the construction of Asians as another Other overlapped with ethnic minority discourses. In their work on Māori /Pākehā relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand, Wetherell & Potter (1992) note that “… the dominant group ruling class consolidates and reproduces its advantage through presenting its partial and sectional interests as the universal interests of the entire community” (p. 24). In this case study, there was evidence of this strategy working in the opposite direction in that the interests of non-dominant or marginalised groups (in this instance, Asian) were portrayed as ‘partial and sectional’.
Strategies of justification and legitimation

The strategy of justification and legitimation is an important macro-strategy in discourses about Other groups, particularly those defined as marginalised. They are used to deflect criticism away from the speaker, and defend a speaker’s position. In this study, a number of justifying and legitimising strategies were used in elite talk about Asians. The first of these was the appeal to the force of facts, a strategy identified by van Dijk (1993; 1997a) in parliamentary talk about immigration and ethnic minorities. In this strategy, reference to facts such as crime statistics or immigration numbers are deployed as ‘evidence’, to support claims of objectivity, and to deflect attention away from accusations of bias. As a discursive technique, it is closely related to the numbers game argument described by Reeves (1983) in his study of British parliamentary talk about ethnic groups. An aspect of the way in which the numbers game argument operated within texts examined in the current study was through the utilisation of a discourse of inevitability, whereby social problems including crime and racism, were linked directly to population numbers in a way that presupposed an inherent association between the problem and increasing population size.

Additional strategies deployed to provide evidence and back up claims in relation to talk about the Asian Other in this study included appeals to an authentic voice, appeals to official voice, and reference to anecdote and experience. With regards to appeal to an authentic voice, this strategy functioned by drawing on a voice from the group under scrutiny – in this case, an Asian voice – to support a particular statement or argument line. By providing ‘evidence’ from an inside voice, this strategy also aimed to pre-
empt criticism of the speaker, particularly where the discourse involved potentially sensitive or controversial claims.

The appeal to an official voice occurred most frequently in relation to content areas of crime, deviance, and irresponsibility, where official sources were deployed in support of an argument. The official voice appeal functions in part by the higher authority that is assumed to accompany someone speaking in an official capacity. In addition, there is often an underlying assumption that a person speaking in an official capacity is speaking on the basis of expertise and an objective assessment of the case, rather than on the basis of personal opinion or group interest.

Apparent sympathy, a strategy identified by van Dijk (1997a) in studies of political discourses in Europe and the United States, involves the speaker aligning themselves with the Other in terms a shared or mutual understanding. In this way, apparent sympathy serves to minimise claims of racism or discrimination by positioning oneself alongside, rather than in opposition to, the Other group. It is, however, usually accompanied by qualifications.

As a discursive technique of justification, the provision of anecdote and example operates to strengthen arguments, particularly in regard to the attribution of specific behaviours or motives. Van Dijk identifies the use of ‘examples’ and ‘illustrations’ as characteristic of discourse about in and out groups, including racist discourse (van Dijk 2000b, p.37):
In racist discourse, thus, we may find a general opinion statement, for instance about how They break the rules, do not adapt, are deviant or even criminal. But, to prevent negative evaluation by the hearer, speakers usually feel obliged to give some example or illustration of a general statement that is negative about immigrants. A very credible story in that case provides the experiential ‘evidence’ for the general statement (2000b, p. 37).

Generalisation and vagueness were features of discourses about the Asian Other, and were primarily achieved through the use of generalised quantification (as discussed in homogenisation), or what Reeves (1983) refers to as non-specific quanitification, as well as the deployment of equivocal language. The ambiguity achieved through generalisation and vagueness functions to make claims embedded in elite discourses more difficult to challenge or refute. According to Wodak (2002), vagueness allows discourses to have appeal for wide audiences, noting that the “… more sensitive the issue (such as the Nazi-past), the vaguer the discourse becomes” (p. 164).

Disclaimers were also involved in legitimating talk about the Asian Other. They occurred in this study in discourse events that could be understood as anti-Asian or anti-immigrant, especially those generated by Winston Peters and the New Zealand First Party. Disclaimers were generally used to deny racism on the part of the speaker. Closely related to this was the positioning of anti-Asian or racist discourses as a challenge to the allegedly suppressive influence of ‘political correctness’ on open debate.

Finally, the strategy of positive self-presentation was identified as a way of justifying and legitimating lines of argument. This most commonly took the form of claims to tolerance and fairness, particularly within the context of
opposition to anti-Asian rhetoric. Van Dijk (1997a) notes that talk about Other groups frequently incorporates “… many references to “long traditions” of hospitality, tolerance, equality, democracy, and other values” (p. 36).

This macro-strategy of legitimation and justification is not particular to discourses about Asians, but rather has been identified as a feature of discourses about Other groups in general. In this study, the strategy operated to facilitate talk about Others in ways that appeared reasonable and considered and, therefore, less open to challenge or dissent.

PERPETUATING OTHERNESS: REPRESENTATIONS OF ASIAN AS OTHER

Through analysis of the media and political texts, it was possible to identify recurring representations of Asian Otherness, constructed by means of the discursive and lexical tools outlined above. These repeated images characterise common ways in which the Asian Other was manifested in the discourses of selected mainstream politicians and newspapers in Aotearoa/New Zealand during the time period of this study.

Asian as impermanent

An enduring construction of Asian identity that emerged from the media and political texts in this study was that of Asian as an impermanent Other. The persistent positioning of Asians as outsiders, be it as international students, tourists, or immigrants, promotes the conceptualisation of Asians as recently arrived and transitory relative to other social groups. The tendency in much dominant discourse toward non-differentiation between longstanding Asian
communities, permanent residents, and more temporary students or tourists from Asia, fuels this public perception.

It has been noted that early migrants from China often arrived with the intention of temporary rather than long-term settlement (Ip 1995). However, in the face of often virulent opposition, communities from various countries in Asia have settled and become established in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In contemporary talk about Asians, these established Asian communities in Aotearoa/New Zealand are regularly re-defined and associated with the newer, transient arrivals.

This discourse of impermanence constructs Asians as visitors, guests, or travellers in a manner that can serve to undermine claims to belonging. When the construction is extended out or, as stereotypes are, is applied in a generalised way to all Asians, it serves to establish a relationship with other social groups that positions Asians as less permanent, less committed, and, therefore, less invested in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This impermanence, when framed as a lack of commitment to Aotearoa/New Zealand, can also be used to draw boundaries around the expected or acceptable level of contribution to, and participation in, national decision-making.

The construction of transience or impermanence has the potential to assist white settler claims to belonging by establishing Asians as more recently arrived and, therefore, more immigrant than the white settler population. In this sense, it can function to validate white settler assertions of indigeniety, simultaneously strengthening white settler claims and weakening Asian claims to belonging.
Asian as commodity

The commodification of the Other has been identified in other settings and with regard to other social groups (Earl 2005; hooks 1995). In Aotearoa/New Zealand for example, the commodification of the Native Other is frequently realised through the appropriation of Māori symbols and imagery.

In this interrogation of press and political sites, commodification occurred by means of discourses that constructed Asians in terms of their potential or realised benefit to Aotearoa/New Zealand. Within the content areas of immigration, tourism, and export education, this was most commonly enacted in reference to material and monetary benefits. Recent studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand have identified this aspect of the portrayal of Asian students in the media (Benson 2006; Collins 2006). In an examination of export education in Auckland, Collins (2006) discusses the representation of Asian students as ‘economic products’:

> The generalised economic facts about the Asian student are as follows: they are wealthy, consumption-obsessed, able to be measured like other inputs and outputs, and as such can be moulded, purchased, value-added through practices like investment, accountability and marketing … It seems that this goose [goose with the golden eggs] like the cow and the sheep that preceded it can be grazed to the maximum benefit of individuals, (educational) businesses or the national economy (2006, p. 224).

This particular manifestation of the Asian Other explicitly demonstrates the contradictory nature of racial stereotypes and representations. On the one hand, Asians are constructed as economic markets, as income generators, as
products. However, they are also depicted in discourses in this study as economic threats in terms of competition for employment and economic impacts on infrastructure. Correspondingly, economic arguments were deployed in this study to argue both for and against an increased Asian presence in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Less frequently, Asians were commodified in press and political texts as products for our cultural consumption. Whether commodified as economic product or cultural product, in discourses of Otherness the benefits of Asian communities are not conceptualised as intrinsic, but rather their presence is seen to require justification in terms of their ability to provide benefit to Us (the white settler Self).

**Asian as threat**

The imagery of Asian as threat is certainly neither new nor novel to the Aotearoa/New Zealand context. Early discourses about Chinese and Indian communities represented them variously as moral, social, sexual, and economic threats (Ip & Murphy 2005; Leckie 1995; Murphy 2005). Contemporary manifestations of Asian as threat retain elements of these earlier discourses. Asians continue to be constructed as a threat to social and economic resources. The imagery of Asians as competing for employment perseveres, with the positioning of Asian labour market interests as oppositional to those of real “Kiwis”. This perceived labour market threat contrasts starkly with the lived experience by many Asians of employment discrimination in Aotearoa/New Zealand.
The idea of Asians as a threat in terms of competition for non-Asians is also rearticulated in contemporary settings to encompass other sectors including education and housing. In addition, Palat (1996) identifies the construction of Asians as a threat to natural resources, claiming that:

... rather than being stereotyped as a backward, less civilised people ominously threatening to overwhelm and submerge the fledgling European outpost in the antipodes, migrants from Asia are now portrayed as a driven people, seeking to denude the natural resources of Aotearoa and irretrievably tarnish its ‘clean green’ image by their insatiable greed (p. 36).

A variant form of the sexual threat imagery was evident in this case study in media texts surrounding abortion. In contrast to earlier domestic discourses where concern had been framed in terms of the consequences of miscegenation (Ballara 1986), or the asexualisation of Asian American men (Hamamoto 1994; Sun 2003), sexual threat in contemporary press discourses is rearticulated as an intra-Asian threat borne of lack of sexual knowledge, differing values, and unwillingness to conform to local standards.

Representations of Asian as threat also functioned in terms of the discursive construction of danger and deviance, principally through the criminalisation of Asian populations. Less commonly, danger was represented in terms of biological threat, maintaining the association of Asian communities with disease that had been a part of early discourses in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Ferrall 2005; Ip & Murphy 2005).

Finally, Asians were constituted as threat simply by virtue of their presence – as a threat to social cohesion and harmonious race relations. This threat is
seen to be associated with Their visibility and difference, drawing on the discourse of inevitability discussed earlier by which difference is seen to be unavoidably related to social problems.

The continued utilisation of imagery of Asian as threat exposes the continued utility of the ‘yellow peril’ in contemporary settings. In terms of governing social practice, the construction of Asian threat provides space for the perpetuation of restrictive discourses and social actions directed at Asian communities.

Asians as victims
In this thesis, Asian Otherness was also manifested in the representation of Asian victimhood. This occurred most explicitly in relation to Asians being victims of social problems, predominantly crime and racism, but also within the topic areas of abortion and drowning. Asian victimhood is bound up with stereotypes and generalisations about Asian passivity that have been identified in this case study as well as in other settings (Mastro & Stern 2003; Xing 1998).

The framing of Asians as victims, often within accounts that emphasise the quiet, passivity of the community, serves to reinforce the idea of Asians as less in control. In addition, passivity can be rearticulated as submissive behaviour. As part of the model minority stereotype, the portrayal of Asians as passive and quiet provides a comparator within elite discourses with Other groups who have been constructed as aggressive and vocal, such as the Native Other.
This passivity contrasts with the agency generally attributed to Self – part of the construction and demarcation of Other groups is through this removal of their agency, either materially or discursively. For example, passivity has been identified in non-indigenous people’s discourses about Aboriginal peoples in Australia, where it manifested itself in representations of Aboriginal people as ‘unproductive’ (Augustinos et al 1999, p. 372).

In terms of the function of this representation, it is important to note that the linguistic enactment of victimhood not only creates discursive victims, but also has the potential to produce real victims through representing Asian communities as passive and reluctant to report crime or undesirable behaviours (Xing 1998).

**ONCE AN OTHER, ALWAYS AN OTHER**

Asian identity is defined and redefined in institutional discourses in ways that vary over time and across context, as social norms and prevailing values shift. The analyses presented in this thesis, however, demonstrate the constancy of elements of discourses of Asian Otherness as they occurred in the contemporary mainstream press and political talk in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This included the association of Asians within both sites of production with negative content areas and the reliance on the use of generalised, stereotypical imagery to construct Asian as an Other group. These representations were realised through a variety of discursive and lexical strategies that both manufactured and legitimated Otherness, and featured in mainstream and liberal discourses, as well as in extreme talk. In addition, the research reaffirmed the paradoxical nature and character of
discourses of identity, particularly as they pertain to the constitution of ethnic, racial, or national groupings.

The definition and constitution of white settler identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand, both historically and in contemporary contexts, has relied on the (re)production of multiple Others. The indigenous or ‘Native Other’ is present in national narratives as a primary and dominant representation. However, additional Others are necessary to define both Self and Native Other. The coexistence of multiple Others allows for the un-named, universalised and normalised Self to compare and contrast Other groups, to play their rights and interests off against each other, leaving the role of elite groups in determining commonsense discourse and governing social actions largely unexamined.

The perpetuation of representations of Asian Otherness in dominant (and dominating) discourses provide a vehicle for elite institutions, including mainstream media and political institutions, to construct boundaries around social identities, defining who Asian are to be understood as in relation to us (or Self), as well as in relation to other Others, such as Māori. These discursive boundaries not only delimit social groups, but also influence social relations and realities. In terms of creating and maintaining realities within which the dominant white settler group (in the case of Aotearoa/New Zealand) remains centralised, these discursive limits are fundamental, as they synchronously produce both the centre and the margins.

These contemporary representations of Asian difference are (re)produced and circulated within a context of expanding economic and trade relations with a
number of Asian countries and a period of significant economic growth and shifts in market power in Asia. There is the need to balance the representations of Asians that are constructed in Aotearoa/New Zealand and their utility and function in terms of constructing social identities and realities, and the representations that will have most efficacy in terms of maintaining good trade and diplomatic relations with Asian countries. This reflects the complex interrelations between economics on the one hand and issues of ‘race’, identity and nation on the other hand, particularly as they are played out on an increasingly global stage.

As contexts and circumstances change, it is likely that elite representations of Asian identity will also evolve and shift. However, for the dominance and privileging of white settler norms and values to be maintained, it will remain necessary to be able to separate Them from Us, both discursively and materially. It is likely, therefore, that the construction of the Asian Other by elite institutions such as the media and politicians in Aotearoa/New Zealand will persist as long it is useful, productive, and to the ultimate benefit of the dominant group.
This thesis has attempted to make transparent some of the processes involved in the construction of Asian Otherness within contemporary elite media and political discourses in Aotearoa/New Zealand, primarily in terms of the linguistic and discursive resources that are deployed within and across the sites of production. A number of these resources, including many of the themes, arguments, strategies, and linguistic devices, are common to the discursive construction of Otherness in other settings and contexts.

The study also identified several prevailing manifestations of the Asian Other, namely those of impermanence, commodity, threat, and victim. These contemporary representations embodied elements of earlier domestic discourses about Asians, particularly in regards to the extent to which they drew on enduring themes of difference, deviance, and danger. Further, the continued salience of stereotypical and racialised characterisations of Asian social identity was evident in texts from both political and media institutions.

The mediated nature of these representations needs to be acknowledged. Although establishing the extent to which they are accepted, adapted, challenged, or resisted by the broad social audience was not a part of the current study, it is not anticipated that these representations are simply received and reflected back. Readings of the same texts by different eyes in different contexts will produce variable and divergent interpretations.
In line with the critical aims of the study, there was no attempt to substantiate the accuracy of these representations in terms of whether or not they reflect a ‘truth’ or a social ‘reality’. At one level, this consideration would enable us to explore the ways in which falsities, exaggeration, and generalisations are used as discursive strategies. However, the primary interest of the analysis was in examining how these representations work to perpetuate discourses of Asian Otherness. Similarly, there was no attempt to quantify texts in relation to whether or not they could be conceived of as positive or negative in terms of their construction of Asian individuals and communities. As has been noted, texts often contained both positive and negative elements. In addition, within both media and political sites of production there were examples of sympathetic voices, oppositional voices, and resistance discourses.

As is the case with projects of this nature, the analysis raises as many, if not more, questions than it answers. There are a number of particular areas identified in this thesis where further work would be valuable. This includes a broadening of the investigation to explore additional media and political products, such as television, film, and public policy. In addition, our understanding of dominant representations of Asian Otherness would benefit from interrogation of other important sites of elite discourse production, including the education system.

The study does provide an overview of contemporary elite representations of the Asian Other in Aotearoa/New Zealand that allows us to simultaneously consider the interdependent and co-constitutive elite representations of Self. In doing so, it is hoped that the project contributes to an ongoing
conversation on the construction of social identities in Aotearoa/New Zealand.
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## APPENDIX ONE: STATISTICS NEW ZEALAND CLASSIFICATION OF COUNTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 South-East Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>South-East Asia (not further defined)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>South-East Asia (not further defined)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mainland South-East Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5100</td>
<td>Mainland South-East Asia (not further defined)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5101</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5102</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5103</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5104</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5105</td>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Maritime South-East Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5200</td>
<td>Maritime South-East Asia (not further defined)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5201</td>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5202</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5203</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5204</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5205</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5206</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>North-East Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>North-East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100</td>
<td>North-East Asia (not further defined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6101</td>
<td>China, People's Republic of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6102</td>
<td>Hong Kong (Special Administrative Region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6103</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6104</td>
<td>Korea, Democratic People's Republic of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6105</td>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6106</td>
<td>Macau (Special Administrative Region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6107</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6108</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>Southern and Central Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Southern and Central Asia (not further defined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>Southern and Central Asia (not further defined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Southern Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7100</td>
<td>Southern Asia (not further defined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7101</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7102</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7103</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7104</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7105</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7106</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7107</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7200</td>
<td>Central Asia (not further defined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7201</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7202</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7203</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7204</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7205</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7206</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7207</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7208</td>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7211</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>