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Abstract

A growing body of research has focused on culturally compatible education for indigenous populations. For native Hawaiians this is also an effort to decolonize our people and extricate our youths from the typical Western model of education in Hawai‘i. However, more research is needed to discover the traditional learning styles and values of education in the Hawaiian culture. The purpose of this study was to examine the cultural goals, values, and purposes of learning in a modern Hawaiian context in an effort to understand a Hawaiian ethnotheory of learning. Applying a sociocultural perspective of learning and development, I conducted interviews and participant observations with Hawaiian educators and cultural practitioners, such as kumu hula (teacher of Hawaiian dance), mahi‘ai (farmer), weaver and print-maker, haku hulu (featherworker), ho‘okele (traditional voyaging navigator), and kakau ‘ana ka uhi (traditional Hawaiian tattooer).

The results of this study revealed the similarities and differences between classroom educators’ and cultural practitioners’ teaching strategies and philosophies, their purposes and goals for teaching in and through the Hawaiian culture, their emphasis on developing a Hawaiian consciousness and cultural worldview in their students, and their definitions of success for their haumana (students). This study enhances our understanding of the importance and role of contextualized, native knowledge in education and contributes to the growing body of research investigating culturally appropriate education for indigenous peoples.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Uluwehi nā pua i ke kūlāiwi, literally translates to “flowers flourish in their native lands.” Pua (flowers) in the Hawaiian language is also a metaphor for keiki (children); thus, this title also translates as “children flourish in their native lands.”

I would like to note here that while the conventional method of distinguishing multiple languages used within a manuscript is to italicize the words that are not part of the main language of the manuscript, I will not be conforming to this convention as both languages carry equal weight particularly for the purposes of this paper; I will use italics for emphasis only. As a fluent speaker of Hawaiian and English, it is common for me to use both languages in communication. Certain Hawaiian terms are more commonly used in day-to-day language, and it would be inauthentic to translate them to English. For example, kumu hula (teachers of Hawaiian dance) are also commonly referred to as “kumu,” informally, and it would be awkward to continually refer to them as hula teachers. Also, taro patches are most commonly referred to as lo‘i or lo‘i kalo. However, I will, for the sake of clarity, include a translation following the first use of the Hawaiian word.

It should also be noted that, similar to the title, there are often multiple meanings to one Hawaiian word and, at times, metaphoric meanings attached to these words. To elaborate on the “kumu” example—although kumu means teacher, it has multiple meanings. For example, kumu also means tree, source, or foundation. In the results section, I refer to a line in a well-known Hawaiian song: He lālā au no kū‘u kumu, which means I am a branch of my teacher/tree, an extension of my kumu, my source, my
foundation. A teacher, in this sense, carries many layers of meaning. Another example, which is appropriate for this study of a Hawaiian ethnotheory of teaching and learning, is the word a‘o. In Hawaiian, a‘o is the word for both teaching and learning. A‘o aku and a‘o mai identify the direction that the knowledge is being shared, but the concept of teaching and learning are one and the same.

**Purpose**

Although interest in indigenous cultural education around the world has been increasing, relatively little research has been conducted to identify how traditional Hawaiian learning styles and cultural values of education are manifested in schools today. The purpose of this study was to examine the cultural goals, values, and purposes of learning in modern Hawaiian contexts in an effort to ho‘omaopopo (cause to understand) a Hawaiian ethnotheory of learning. This study compared the teaching approaches of both cultural practitioners and classroom teachers to understand the similarities and differences in their pedagogy and investigated how these two types of educators passed down traditional cultural knowledge in the modern context of Hawaiian society. This study may contribute to the growing body of research investigating the role of culture based and culturally appropriate education for indigenous peoples.

My initial interest in exploring Hawaiian ethnotheories of teaching and learning began with the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE) and their two “indigenous” Standards: *modeling* and *student directed activities*. Tharp’s (2006) research found that modeling and student-directed learning were important teaching strategies in indigenous populations. I was curious if and how these Standards were viewed in traditional Hawaiian teaching approaches. My familiarity with the
CREDE Standards and experiences as a Hawaiian learner made me question their use in Hawaiian contexts, believing that they may be valued in Hawaiian practices, but they may not be viewed the same way the literature describes them.

As a Native Hawaiian, I have a deep personal connection to this research topic. My experiences dancing hula since I was a youth with Hālau Mōhala ‘Ilīma shaped my interest in this area of educational research. My learning experiences in a formal Western educational system differed greatly from my experiences learning hula in my hālau hula (hula school) with my kumu, Māpuana de Silva, and informally with my mother, who is also a kumu hula.

These differences in learning experiences are echoed in educational research in indigenous communities, which suggests that the values, expectations, and socialization processes in the Western schooling system are often incongruent with students’ home cultures (Benham & Heck, 1998; Demmert, 2005; Gallimore, Boggs, & Jordan, 1974; Kaiwi & Kahumoku, 2006; Lipka, 2002; Tharp, 2006). Research has shown that children whose home culture severely conflicts with the culture in their school will have difficulties functioning within the school setting (Bougie, Wright, & Taylor, 2003; Kawakami, 1999; Tharp, 2006). This situation can lead to low self-esteem and motivation. Furthermore, these educational situations can undermine cultural perspectives and cause children to devalue their traditions (Cummins, 1994; wa Thiong’o, 1994). In many indigenous cultures, this is a prominent issue and often a byproduct of colonization.

The detrimental consequences of colonization in indigenous societies have been well documented (e.g., Kahumoku, 2005; Kaomea, 2005; Kauanui & Wolfe, 2012; Kipp, 2000; Osorio, 2002; Wolfe 2006). Students in colonized societies commonly exhibit a
pattern of insecurity and ambivalence about their cultural identity as a result of their interactions with the dominant group (Cummins, 1994; Oliver, 1996; wa Thiong’o, 1994). One of the most direct and powerful methods employed in the process of colonization is the establishment of the dominant society’s educational system. The consequences of colonization are ubiquitous in Hawai‘i’s educational history.

**Hawai‘i’s Educational History**

Prior to the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1893, the Hawaiian language was the official language used throughout the nation of Hawai‘i in all government activities as well as in all classrooms (Kawakami & Dudoit, 2000). Numerous books, bibles, and newspapers were printed in the Hawaiian language. Literacy rates among Native Hawaiians were extraordinarily high (Kamakau, 1868; Silva & Basham, 2004). By the 1850s, it was reported that every Hawaiian adult was able to read and write in their native language. At that time, Hawaiians had the highest literacy rate in the world.

After the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, a ban was placed on the use of Hawaiian language in public schools (Kawakami & Dudoit, 2000). Corporal punishment was used to enforce this ban on children who spoke Hawaiian in school. This not only led to the rapid decline of Hawaiian language use among students and their families but also created a hostile school environment for Hawaiian children.

In a relatively short amount of time, educational success for Native Hawaiians declined significantly. In the early 2000s, Hawaiian students were still scoring lower on standardized measures of achievement and had higher drop-out rates than students of other ethnic backgrounds (Benham, 2006; Kana‘iaupuni & Ishibashi, 2003; Office of Hawaiian Affairs, 2011; University of Hawai‘i Institutional Research Office, 2013).
Although statistics show that Hawaiians are still overrepresented in special education and underrepresented in post-secondary education in comparison to their same age peers (Kamehameha Schools 2009; Pacific Policy Research Center, 2010), these statistics are improving.

In relatively recent years, there has been an increase in attention brought to incorporating culture into the classroom (Demmert, 2011; Kana‘iaupuni, 2007). A growing number of educational programs, such as cultural-based charter schools and Hawaiian language immersion programs which practice cultural approaches to pedagogy and curricula, are focused on improving these statistics around and providing culturally responsive education for Hawaiian youths (Kana‘iaupuni, Ledward, & Jensen, 2010; Warner, 2001; Wilson & Kamanā, 2001).

The collectivistic values of the Hawaiian culture often conflict with the individualistic environment of Western education, making the classroom an uncomfortable place for Hawaiian children (Tharp, 2006). Traditional Hawaiian teachings and practices emphasized experience-based learning, often involving hands-on, contextualized activities (Kawai‘ae‘a, DeMorales, Akana, Chun, Garma, Kim, et al., 2002; Pukui, Haertig, & Lee, 1972). Teaching approaches embraced holistic learning, focusing on the child’s overall development including the cognitive, social, emotional, and physical well-being of the child. Social relationships in the learning environment were highly valued. These learning styles significantly differed from typical Western pedagogies that students experienced in formal schooling.

Students’ level of interaction with the teacher was another significant difference for Hawaiian children. At home, Hawaiian children less often engaged in direct adult-
child interactions and more often engaged in child-child interactions (Yamauchi, 2005). Common home activities such as household chores and sibling caretaking were carried out by the children as a group, with the older siblings having responsibility over the younger siblings. These children typically worked together with siblings, cousins, and peers. However, this peer-assisted, cooperative learning was not always encouraged in standard Western classrooms.

Several educational researchers have advocated for school reform to address the need for culturally appropriate teaching methods for indigenous learners (Aranga-Low, 2000; Benham & Cooper, 2008; Grigorenko, Meier, Lipka, Mohatt, Yanez, & Sternberg, 2004; Kaiwi & Kahumoku, 2006; Maaka, 2004). For these researchers, teaching is considered a cultural activity that reflects the shared concepts of education for native people within their culture. Like other cultural activities, learning to teach occurs informally over a period of time. Teaching, therefore, develops in ways that are consistent with the stable beliefs and assumptions that are a part of the culture.

Educational programs that take the home culture into account have been shown to be less detrimental to indigenous cultures and to have more positive outcomes for their students (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, Kauai, Maioho, Winchester, 2008; Tharp, 1982). Adapting culturally appropriate educational techniques to incorporate the differences in culture may be the most effective method for improving cultural development through education (Weisner, Gallimore, & Jordan, 1988). This research acknowledges the importance of examining the cultural setting and integrating key cultural variables in teaching and learning into the school setting.
Many indigenous programs emphasize the importance of maintaining the native language, values, and cultural practices (Armstrong, 2000; Ball & McIvor, 2005; Kana‘iaupuni & Kawai‘ae‘a, 2008; Kawai‘ae‘a, et al., 2002;). These programs advocate going beyond simply including culture in the classroom to address a more holistic approach to students’ overall cultural well-being, including physical, spiritual, emotional, social, and intellectual aspects. The key is to move beyond the mere transmittal of information and to find the methods of sharing knowledge that are culturally relevant for indigenous learners. Educators of indigenous learners can play a key role in decolonizing education for native people, not only through the content of what they teach, but via the context and approach in which they deliver their pedagogy (Kaiwi, 2006; Kaomea 2003; Kawakami, 2004).

**Theoretical Framework**

I examined these issues using a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978). The sociocultural theory suggests that individuals’ thoughts, ideas, views, and beliefs develop from the social interactions in a particular community. According to this theory, learning and development are directly affected by individuals’ active construction of the world around them through interactions with their environment. In this respect, the process of learning is culturally dependent. The methods used in the construction of knowledge is, therefore, culturally specific.

The socio-cultural identity of Hawaiian students is deeply rooted in the language, history, and cultural practices (Kawakami & Dudoit, 2000). The sociocultural perspective, in many ways, is congruent with the Hawaiian culture and values system. Generally, traditional Hawaiian teaching practices highlight the social context of learning
and embrace holistic learning (Chun, 2011). Teaching approaches tend to emphasize experience-based learning activities and nurturing the learners in every aspect of development, not solely intellectual or cognitive development.

**Ethnotheory and Indigenous Research**

This study explored the cultural models that Hawaiian educators held regarding themselves and their students. I hope that through understanding a Hawaiian ethnotheory of learning, I might discern a more culturally appropriate approach to learning and teaching for Hawaiians.

An ethnotheory of learning is a system of ideas, values, and beliefs that are shared by members of a cultural group concerning the learning and development of students (Harkness & Super, 2006; Harkness et al., 2007; Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, Trumbull, Keller, & Quiroz, 2009). Ethnotheory research seeks to understand the interface between culture and the child, or in this case, the learner. In reviewing the literature, I found that research on educational ethnotheory is limited. The topic of parental ethnotheories, which focus primarily on a child’s socialization, learning, and development prior to formal schooling, is much more prevalent in the literature.

Harkness and Super (2006) described parental ethnotheories as the cognitive models and cultural beliefs system held by parents or care-givers in regards to themselves, their families, and their children, and the effect this has on their parent-child interactions. Similarly, educational ethnotheories focus on the cultural belief systems and cognitive models that educators hold in regard to themselves and their learners, and how this influences the ways in which they educate and interact with their students (Harkness et al., 2007; Harkness et al., 2006).
Harkness et al. (2007) interviewed educators in formal Western educational settings from five cultures, Italy, The Netherlands, Poland, Spain, and the U.S. Although these classrooms all followed a similar Western educational model, the authors discovered that within the school context there were culture-specific values and meaning attached to various aspects of student development such as motivation, independence, and self-regulation. Additionally, the significance of certain school activities varied between cultures. For example, “circle time” to Dutch teachers was a time for students to practice listening to each other, while for the American teachers, it was a time for students to express themselves.

Although indigenous educational ethnotheory literature is sparse, researchers in other areas of research, such as developmental and cognitive psychology as well as anthropology, studied the relationship between cultural models and learning (Greenfield, Keller, Fuligni, Maynard 2003; Keller, 2012; Lancy, Bock, & Gaskins, 2010; Lave & Wenger, 1998; Maynard, 2005; Strauss & Quinn, 2001; Whiting & Edwards, 1992). These researchers acknowledged that cultural contexts are constantly evolving and changing; thus, current research is needed to continually analyze the ever-changing contexts (Maynard, 2005).

Many indigenous cultures around the world are striving to revitalize their culture through remodeling their educational system. In 2002, the indigenous people of Greenland implemented a nationwide school reform to replace the Danish-Scandinavian model of education that had been in place since their colonization in the 1700s (Olsen & Tharp, 2012). The Ministry of Education of Greenland selected the CREDE model as the basis for their nationwide school reform. Their reform efforts were designed to
incorporate the native culture into education at all grade levels, from preschool to higher education.

In Aotearoa (New Zealand), the governmental changes during the 1980s led to the allocation of funding for Māori-based education. In 1982, a preschool was created that used the Māori language as the medium of instruction called Te Kohanga Reo (The Language Nest). This preschool led to the development of Māori language immersion schools at the elementary level called Kura Kaupapa Māori in 1985 (Durie, 1999).

Beyond simply using the native language as the medium of instruction, the program was designed to incorporate traditional cultural practices into the classroom. It was created in an effort to restore the use of the Native Māori language amongst youths while also increasing a sense of pride in the Māori culture. In 1987, the Māori Language Act was passed which declared the Māori language as an official language of New Zealand.

The results of the research conducted in these programs suggested strong positive outcomes and a significant increase in the number of Māori children participating in early childhood education (Benton & Benton, 2001; May, 1999). Initial assessments of the program also indicated that the academic achievement of students in the Kura Kaupapa schools were comparable to their peers in standard public schools. Not only had the use of the native language increased, but the students expressed an increased positive outlook on education and pride in their use of the native language.

In Canada, in the 1990s, the federal government allocated funding for the establishment of Aboriginal Head Start programs to address the educational gap for First Nations, Métis, and Inuit children (Ball, 2012). These programs were developed in the community and designed to support native children and their family’s overall wellbeing.
In addition to focusing on education and student readiness, this program brought families and the community together, supporting their native culture and language and providing assistance with social support, health, and nutrition. An evaluation of these programs revealed that one of their strengths was their community and cultural responsiveness. These programs provided resources for marginalized communities and promoted community-specific indigenous language, culture, identity, and traditions.

These are just a few examples of the efforts in indigenous communities around the world that are making strides to alter the course of their native children and close the educational gap. Similar efforts and strides have been made in Hawai‘i in the ‘Aha Punanan Leo and Kula Kaiapuni programs. These public school programs use Hawaiian language as the medium of instruction from preschool to Grade 12 (Ka Papahana Kaiapuni Hawai‘i, 2013). The first graduating class of Ka Papahana Kaiapuni graduated in 1999. These were the first students in over a century to have completed their elementary and secondary education in Hawaiian language. The foundation of this program dramatically increased the number of Hawaiian language speakers below 18 years of age (Yamauchi & Wilhelm, 2001). Evaluations of this program showed that, in addition to meeting or surpassing the standardized test scores of their Native Hawaiian peers in English-only schools, Kaiapuni students were able to successfully pass the University of Hawai‘i English composition test even though English language classes were not introduced until Grade 5 (Wilson & Kamanā, 2001). Kaiapuni supporters suggested that beyond language revitalization goals, the cultural context of the program might be more effective in teaching Hawaiian children than the English language public school program (Luning & Yamauchi, 2010; Yamauchi, Lau-Smith, & Luning, 2006).
CREDE Standards for Effective Pedagogy

In the 1970s, a research study in Hawai‘i called the Kamehameha Early Education Project (KEEP) found several disparities between home and school learning for Native Hawaiian students (Tharp, 1982; Weisner et al., 1988). The KEEP project focused on the incongruent aspects between the home and the school environment and worked to make school more conducive to the interactional and learning styles of Hawaiian children’s home setting. The KEEP project fostered the use of culture in the classroom as a method of pedagogy designed to increase student achievement (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Weisner et al., 1988). This project held that, “What a child brings to school from the natal culture is a foundation on which to build. . . . Culture can aid adaptation to the unfamiliar by providing options to resolve discontinuities between home and classroom” (Weisner et al., 1988, p. 345).

The KEEP research, which began in Hawai‘i, was later adapted to other educational programs serving indigenous people such as the Pueblo of Zuni in New Mexico (Dalton & Youpa, 1998; Tharp, 1999; Tharp, Dalton, & Yamauchi 1994). From this research, several principles emerged as consistent throughout the various cultures and were equally emphasized in educational literature as best practices for culturally and linguistically diverse students (Tharp, 2006). These principles developed into the CREDE Standards for Effective Pedagogy and involved research conducted in over 31 sites around the world (Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, n.d.).

The CREDE Standards for effective pedagogy are as follows:

1. *Joint Productive Activity.* The teacher and students collaborating to generate a product or achieve a common goal.
2. *Language and Literacy Development.* Developing students’ competence in language and literacy of instruction in all content areas of the curriculum.

3. *Contextualization.* Connecting the school curriculum to students’ prior knowledge and experiences from their home and community.


5. *Instructional Conversation.* Teaching students through dialog.


Based on Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory (1978), the CREDE model emphasizes conceptual learning and attempts to raise student understanding to a higher level (Tharp et al., 2000). Learning is viewed as an active process where novices interact with others who are more proficient (Rogoff, 1995; Tharp, Estrada, Dalton, & Yamauchi, 2000). The model has shown to be effective in many indigenous communities, such as Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian cultures. (Doherty, Hilberg, Pinal, & Tharp, 2003; Estrada, 2005; Hilberg, Tharp, & DeGeest, 2000; Saunders & Goldenberg 2007).

Although CREDE developed seven Standards for Effective Pedagogy, most CREDE research has focused on the first five Standards (Tharp, 2006). These five Standards are more commonly used in CREDE practices. Although these Standards originally focused on native populations, they have been shown to be effective for both indigenous and non-indigenous students (Tharp et al., 2000). The last two Standards,
Modeling and Student-Directed Activity, have been given much less attention in research and practice. These Standards have come to be known as the “indigenous standards" as they were found to be of particular importance in indigenous populations, specifically in Native American and Alaska Native culture (Dalton & Youpa, 1998; Tharp, 2006; Tharp, Dalton, & Yamauchi 1994). Although the benefits of learning through modeling and self-directed activities in general educational research are well documented (Bandura, 1971, 1986, 1991; Holec, 1981; Lunenberg & Korthagen, 2005; Schunk & Zimmerman, 2001; Stefanou, Perencevich, DiCintio, & Turner, 2004; Thanasoulas, 2000), little research has focused on the various ways these types of learning are traditionally viewed and currently being used in indigenous cultures.

Hawaiian Educational Practices

Indigenous versus non-indigenous modeling. Research in indigenous cultures has looked at modeling, or observational learning, that occurs outside of formal educational settings (Paradise & Rogoff, 2009; Lipka et al., 1998; Chun, 2011). Prior to the industrialization era, modeling played a major role in educating children in the community (Rogoff, Paradise, Arauz, Correa-Chavez, and Angelillo, 2003). Many indigenous groups used modeling to prepare children to be active participants in a range of community activities. However, the delivery and structure of this indigenous form of modeling was unlike the typical form of modeling found in modern education. The unique characteristics and cultural values placed on observational learning have been studied in several indigenous populations including Mayan, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian.
Non-indigenous modeling common in mainstream classrooms today typically involves the teacher or instructor providing examples or demonstrations for learners to follow (Bandura, 1971). This may include providing step-by-step instruction that directs learners through a series of tasks or providing an example of a finished product. Modeling, in this context, is used as a form of assistance (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Tharp et al., 2000). This type of assistance mainly focuses on the analytical type of thinking; breaking down steps and relying on verbal instruction. However, many indigenous cultures, including the Hawaiian culture, value holistic learning which places the learning experience in the larger context (Ball, 2012; Paradise & Rogoff, 2009; Tharp, 2006). Modeling, in this context, heavily emphasizes observational learning. In indigenous community settings, modeling is more than a form of assistance, it’s a method of instruction.

Many indigenous teaching settings employ a mentoring approach. Children are expected to observe the activities in their surroundings and thereby learn the actions that they would later be expected to master (Paradise & Rogoff, 2009). Children are typically expected to be active participants and contribute to the family and to the larger community (Greenfield et al., 2003; Paradise & Rogoff, 2009). Children in these communities spend much more time with their families as they work, thus allowing the opportunity for children to hone their skills of observational learning (Rogoff et al., 2003). They are often present in these activity settings as “legitimate peripheral participants” (Lave & Wenger, 1991), eavesdropping or listening in on the adult activities. Although these children are not directly involved in the activity, and the adults do not necessarily directly communicate with the child observers, the adults expect the
children to pay close attention and to contribute as a collaborative participant when they are ready. Children are expected to know when and to what to pay attention.

Rogoff, Moore, Najafi, Dexter, Correa-Chavez, and Solis (2007) described what they called “intent community participation” as the commonly observed, but often overlooked, process where young children intently and keenly observe adult activities in which they will eventually be expected to participate. Their research noted that these indigenous modeling techniques differed from other forms of observational learning in that they often involved little or no verbal communication between the expert and the learner.

In non-verbal indigenous modeling, an expert is necessary to model the activity to the learner (Rogoff et al., 2003). Although this method of learning does not necessarily involve directly working with the expert, it emphasizes the importance of social relationships in cognitive development. The child must have the opportunity to observe the activity in the social setting and may spend time acting out the activity in play in order to practice that skill. This play may also involve other, potentially older, or more experienced, children who assist the learner (Maynard, 2002; Rogoff et al., 2003). Therefore, acquiring the skills needed for student-directed learning occurs through the observation of others and their social interactions.

An Alaska Native case study. An ongoing research project with Yup’ik teachers in Alaska shed some light on significant cultural differences in indigenous learning (Lipka et al., 1998). This study found that indigenous teachers in an Alaska Native school used strategies to organize and instruct students in familiar ways that were consistent
with their native values. The following case study provides an example of the use of modeling and student-directed learning in an indigenous classroom (Lipka, 1991).

In a Yup’ik classroom, a native Yup’ik teacher used an upcoming annual beaver round-up festival as the focus of an art lesson (Lipka, 1991). The teacher asked the students to describe the steps involved in beaver trapping and drying beaver pelts. The teacher then modeled the art activity, working on his own beaver pelt at his desk, while providing brief verbal instruction. The teacher intentionally avoided fostering dependence on verbal instruction. Students were expected to visually follow the demonstration and to observe their classmates’ work. The teacher did not speak to the students or talk aloud through each of the steps, nor were the children required to watch him. Some students chose to gather around the teacher’s desk, while others worked with their peers on the floor or alone at their desks.

The pedagogy in this example, which was culturally appropriate for Yup’ik children, differs considerably from mainstream classrooms. These students were afforded much more freedom and responsibility in choosing how they participated and progressed in the activity. The modeling behavior in this example reflected the observational practices in which children are commonly engaged while observing adult work in their community. The teacher provided minimal verbal instructions, worked alongside the students without making his work the focus, and encouraged peer-group solidarity. He showed respect for individuals by allowing students the freedom and right to work with their peers or on their own and to view his work or that of their peers as a model.

**Modeling in a Hawaiian context.** Traditionally, Hawaiian teaching practices often involved a master-apprentice or mentoring style of modeling and observational
learning (Beniamina, 2010; Pukui et al., 1972). For example, traditionally, haumana (students) who were in training to be kumu hula would live with their kumu to be trained in every aspect of hula by living, breathing, and immersing themselves in hula. The Native Hawaiian community frequently uses a well-known ancient proverb “Nānā ka maka; hoʻolohe ka pepeiao; paʻa ka waha” which translates to “Observe with the eyes; listen with the ears; shut the mouth” (Pukui, 1983, p. 248). The continual, wide-spread use of this proverb is indicative of the value of indigenous modeling not only historically, but for Hawaiian people today.

“I ka nānā no a ‘ike, by observing, one learns. I ka hoʻolohe no a hoʻomaopopo, by listening, one commits to memory. I ka hana no a ‘ike, by practice one masters the skill.” (Pukui et al., 1972, p. 48). These sayings indicate the role and responsibility of the student in observational learning. Children show respect to elders by watching, listening, and then doing. Chun (2011) outlined the Hawaiian learning style as a five-step process (a) observing, (b) listening, (c) reflecting, (d) doing, and (e) questioning. Most of this learning is carried out with minimal talking. The student is expected not to speak or ask questions until the lesson is over, and the student is granted permission (Pukui et al., 1972). Questioning is seen as a potential distraction for both the student and the master. For example, in learning a new skill such as net fishing from sharp rocks with big waves, questioning could be distracting and dangerous. Also, if students were allowed to question constantly, then they could not be observing intently. Therefore questioning had an appropriate time and place. This became a problem for students in formal Western education when they were expected to be vocal and consistently participate verbally in
classroom lessons. The students’ lack of involvement may have been seen as a lack of knowledge, comprehension, or interest in school activities.

Self-Directed Learning

To further understand the concept of self-directed learning, I looked at how it is defined in the literature. However, this was a complicated task. Throughout the literature, there are inconsistent definitions, descriptions, and methods for applying and assessing self-directed learning. Researchers use many terms to describe self-directed behaviors in the classroom setting, such as student-directed learning (Lunenberg & Korthagen, 2005), self-regulated learning (Bandura, 1986; Schunk & Zimmerman, 2001), and learner autonomy (Thanasoulas, 2000). In order to be consistent throughout this paper, I use the term self-directed learning.

One of the major issues in defining self-directed learning is determining the essential features from amongst the many varying descriptions, dimensions, and elements involved in self-directed behaviors. Research on self-directed learning consists of a wide-range of definitions, including, but not limited to, a shift in responsibility from teacher to student (Thanasoulas, 2000), students’ sense of ownership over their own learning (Holec, 1981), and offering students choices in school-related decision making (Stefanou, Perencevich, DiCintio, & Turner, 2004). In addition, there are several metacognitive strategies involved in self-directed learning such as, self-monitoring, self-modulating, self-evaluation, self-reinforcement, directed attention (deciding beforehand to focus on general aspects of a task), and selective attention (focusing on specific aspects of that task) (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2001; Thanasoulas, 2000). Other factors influencing self-directed learning also include performance feedback, affective self-reaction, self-efficacy,
standards setting, and self-appraisal (Bandura, 1991). These cognitive strategies are believed to be necessary for the learner to be able to acknowledge their own learning strategies, identify their limitations, and adjust their approach as needed to achieve their learning objective.

Furthermore, the definition and application of self-directed learning vary depending on the theoretical background of the researcher and the purpose of their inquiry. Self-directed learning has been studied by phenomenologists, attributional theorists, metacognitive theorists, constructivists, volitional theorists, and social cognitive theorists (Zimmerman, 1994). Considering the wide range of perspectives analyzing self-directed learning, there is a clear need for some consistency between perspectives in defining and describing this phenomenon.

After reviewing studies on self-directed learning, I found that most researchers focused specifically on one dimension of self-directed learning without considering the other dimensions involved. For example, Stefanou et al. (2004) focused on student choice in the classroom, defining autonomy as “students’ need for latitude over decisions in school” (p. 99). However, these authors argued that autonomy support for this often involved meaningless choices that might not necessarily foster self-directed learning. They divided autonomy support into three categories: organizational (students decided on the guidelines and project due dates), procedural (students chose the media used to present projects), and cognitive (students took responsibility for the overall learning process and were given decision-making power in all aspects of the learning). The authors found that cognitive autonomy support, more than organizational or procedural, tended to lead to long-lasting effects on engagement, motivation, and critical thinking.
The results indicated that, even within a specific dimension of self-directed learning, there were finer aspects that need to be addressed.

The varying and inconsistent concepts within the dimensions of self-directed learning left me with more questions: (a) What are the essential dimensions necessary in developing a self-directed learner?, (b) Are some of these dimensions more valuable than others?, (c) Which dimensions of self-directed learning can be applied in the classroom?, and (d) How can teachers create meaningful self-directing opportunities in the classroom for their students?

**Self-directed learning in indigenous cultures.** Regardless of the way the concept of self-directed learning was defined in the literature, most of these researchers considered self-directed learning to be an autonomous action and rarely considered the social context. Further, I did not find any studies that focused on self-directed learning from an indigenous learning perspective. Many indigenous cultures have the belief that an individual’s learning is affected by, as well as affects, the larger group (Paradise & Rogoff, 2009). Therefore, it appears to be important to consider the larger context of the community in which self-directed indigenous learning is taking place.

If follows that, independence and self-directed behaviors in an individualistic society are highly valued (Greenfield et al., 2003). This raises the question for collectivistic cultures: What role do independence and autonomy play in a culture that values interdependence? In viewing self-directed learning from an indigenous perspective, we may see that students’ decision-making is highly influenced by the social interactions with their peers and their teacher. Some of the major influences on students may include the expectations the teacher has of the students, the students’ understandings
of their responsibilities to the larger group, and their understanding of the consequences their actions have on the larger group. A classroom cannot function with student autonomy, choice, or self-direction if there is not a clear understanding of the students’ roles, responsibilities, and adherence to the expectations of the group. The emphasis on students’ responsibility to the larger group is not surprising considering the collectivistic nature of many indigenous groups, and could give us a new perspective on developing self-directed learning in the classroom.

In Hawaiian culture, self-directed learning and kuleana (responsibility) are tied together in the Hawaiian master-apprentice model called tēnā (Beniamina, 2010). This learning style has a four-step process. First, the child is given simple tasks and responsibilities that are modeled by older siblings. The tasks are divided among the family members according to ability. Through the more advanced learners, children learn their responsibility and the steps involved in completing the tasks. In the second step, the learner is trained for more complex, independent tasks by being only partially accompanied. More responsibility is placed on the learner to make independent decisions on how best to handle a task. The third step is gained when learners have all the knowledge they need to be able to take full responsibility over the tasks without the need of assistance. The fourth and final step involves the responsibility to mentor others. Here the learner becomes the teacher.

Hoʻopili ka hana. Hoʻokō i ka hua o ka hana e hoʻoilina i nā haumāna hou. Teach those same-level skills to another. Knowledge of content and skills is not enough. It has to be apprenticed. Passing on the knowledge to and through the next generation (Beniamina, 2010, p. 20).
The ultimate goal for this learning process is to complete the circle and pass on the knowledge and skills to the next generation. Unlike formal education, the steps of tēnā are not age-specific. Each learner progresses through the stages when he or she is ready. Tēnā provides skills that can be applied in various contexts throughout their lives as learners. The value of kuleana is at the heart of this learning process. Everyone is given a task that contributes to the completion of the larger job and it is, in fact, considered shameful if one does not fulfill their responsibilities.

**Current education in Hawai‘i.** Recent research in Hawaiian language immersion and Hawaiian culture-based classrooms found that these two Standards, *Modeling* and *Student Directed Activities*, were highly valued teaching practices mentioned by Hawaiian educators (Schonleber, 2007). These two Standards were seen as the most culturally congruent pedagogical strategies. The Hawaiian educators in this study felt that it was the role of the teacher to be observant of the child’s readiness and to assist each child in their progress toward self-directedness.

Self-directed learning has also become a focus in Hawai‘i’s educational system. The Hawai‘i Department of Education (DOE) added self-directed learner as one of six General Learner Outcomes (GLO), which were developed as a standard for all students to strive to achieve (Hawai‘i Department of Education, 2013). The Hawai‘i State DOE defines self-directed learning as the ability to be responsible for one’s own learning. Students are rated on three areas, (a) setting priorities and establishing achievable goals and personal plans for learning, (b) planning and managing time and resources to achieve goals, and (c) monitoring progress and evaluating learning experiences. Teachers are expected to promote this development in their students with little to no instruction given
as to how to implement this GLO in the classroom. The value, role, and application of both Modeling and Student Directed Activities should be further researched to consider the cultural differences in education, especially in a multicultural setting such as Hawai‘i.
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Methods

The purpose of this study was to discover or ho’omaopopo (cause to understand) a Hawaiian ethnotheory of learning and to examine the evolution of the Hawaiian culture in the process of revitalization. I used the grounded theory approach to analyze interviews with Hawaiian educators and cultural practitioners. I also observed classrooms of Hawaiian educators for evidence of teaching philosophies and cultural values and practices related to learning. Through participant observations and interviews with Hawaiian educators, I analyzed the cultural goals, values, and purposes of learning in a Hawaiian context that emerged from the research.

Role of the Researcher

Qualitative research often includes a statement of the researcher’s relationship to the participants and topic and how these relationships might affect the study. I am Native Hawaiian born and raised in Kailua, on the island of O‘ahu. I grew up studying hula and learning Hawaiian language through my hālau hula (hula school), Hālau Mohala ‘Ilima. I graduated from Kamehameha Schools, a private school that is funded by a trust left by Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop for the education of Hawaiian children. At Kamehameha and the University of Hawai‘i, I continued to study the Hawaiian language and culture. At the University, I double majored in Hawaiian Language and Psychology.

I am the daughter of a kumu hula (hula teacher) and am fluent in Hawaiian. I use my Hawaiian and cultural knowledge in my research and in my work as an Educational and Cultural Specialist with the Center for Research Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE) program. I have experience conducting research in and teaching as a cultural
specialist in early childhood classrooms and in ka Papahana Kaiapuni Hawai‘i, the Hawaiian language immersion public school program.

I am a proponent for culturally appropriate education for Hawaiian students and personally know many members of the Hawaiian teaching community, including some of the participants in this study. Although my familiarity and personal connections with the participants in this community could have biased my analysis of the data, I would argue that my connections and familiarity with this community afford me insights into Hawaiian ways of teaching and learning that may not be available to a non-Hawaiian researcher. For instance, I may have recognized issues related to Hawaiian language and culture that might not have been apparent to a non-Hawaiian or non-speaker. However, to guard against potential biases, I verified my findings with other Hawaiian educators in the community, to gain insights into whether my analysis was dependable.

**Participants**

Participants were recruited using a snowball method of recruitment (Patton, 2002). Initially, I recruited classroom educators through the CREDE Hawai‘i Program. This program is a professional development program at the University of Hawai‘i’s Department of Educational Psychology that enlists educators in preschool through Grade 12 in both public and private school settings. The cultural practitioners were initially recruited through personal contacts. Subsequent participants were nominated by the initial participating teachers and cultural experts. In an effort to obtain a variety of perspectives, I recruited an even number of practitioners and classroom educators from a range of cultural practices and grade levels, respectively, and was able to recruit a fairly diverse group of educators and practitioners.
Participants included 15 Hawaiian educators and cultural practitioners (8 female, 7 male) who currently teach in the State of Hawai‘i. I should note here that I will be using the term “teach” to include any form of mentoring or instructing that may have been used by these participants. Many of the participants would not necessarily refer to their role as a “teacher” or what they do as “teaching” or even “practicing” as a cultural practitioner. However, for the sake of clarity and ease of reference I will continue to refer to their diverse forms of instruction as “teaching.”

The participants were recruited from three of the eight major Hawaiian islands. Two were from the island of Maui, two were from Hawai‘i Island, and the remaining 11 were on the island of O‘ahu. The participants were between 32- and 65-years-old. In terms of post-secondary education, one participant had an associate’s degree, seven had bachelor’s degrees, four had master’s degrees, one had a terminal master’s degree (the highest degree in that field), and two had doctorate degrees. The years of teaching experience ranged from 7-37 years. For the purposes of this study, a variety of educators were intentionally selected from a range of teaching experience and age levels to attain a variety of perspectives on modern cultural teaching practices.

Eleven participants said that they could speak Hawaiian and learned the language from their family members, from their hālau hula, from a private school for Hawaiian students, or from courses they took in college. Two said they were able to speak some Hawaiian and were primarily familiar with the vocabulary in their content area. Two of the participants indicated they did not speak Hawaiian.

The participants were selected from a variety of instructional settings. The school levels of the classroom educators and dual educators ranged from preschool to college.
One participant taught preschool, two taught elementary, one taught middle and high school, three taught high school, and three taught at the college level (undergraduate and graduate level). Some of the subject areas taught by these participants included oli (Hawaiian chant), Hawaiian language, Hawaiian studies, natural resources/farming, news writing, physical education, World History, civics, modern history of Hawai‘i, and American problems. Three participants taught in the Papahana Kaiapuni (Hawaiian language immersion program); one at the elementary level, one at the high school level, and one at the college level. Three of the participants indicated that they teach in the Hawaiian language but are not in an immersion classroom (one at the elementary level, one at the high school level, and one at the college level).

The cultural practitioners’ and dual educators’ specializations included three kumu hula, three mahi‘ai (farmers), one weaver and print-maker, one haku hulu (featherworker), one ho‘okele (traditional voyaging navigator), and one kakau ‘ana ka uhi (traditional Hawaiian tattooer). The students taught by these participants ranged from age 4 to kupuna (grandparent) age or, as one participant put it, “twinkle to wrinkle.”

All but one of the participants were of Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian ethnicity. This one participant was Chinese and German, was born and raised in Hawai‘i, and a fluent speaker of the Hawaiian language. Other ethnicities represented by the participants were Chinese, Japanese, Okinawan, Portuguese, Caucasian, Filipino, Irish, Danish, Swiss, Spanish, and Tahitian. Of the Hawaiian participants, two spent much of their childhood on the continental United States and permanently moved to Hawai‘i later in life. All of the Hawaiian participants indicated Hawaiian as the ethnicity that they identified with most.
I would like to note that all of the participants were selected because of their strong cultural practices, beliefs, or affiliations in the Hawaiian community. All of the cultural practitioners in this study were identified by others in the Hawaiian community and are well known for their craft. These participants quoted in this study chose to use their real names rather than pseudonyms. Although some of the educators are perhaps less recognizable, all were identified by me or by their peers, elders, or cultural leaders as having strong ties to Hawaiian educational practices.

Additionally, these participants were intentionally selected from a wide range of cultural practices and experiences in order to achieve a breadth of cultural perspectives on educational practices. I want to be clear that the Hawaiian practices or worldviews that are outlined in this study are not the only Hawaiian ways of being or practicing. These were simply the findings of the research studies I reviewed and the experiences of the participants I interviewed. Often, our kūpuna humbly share their knowledge by saying, “this is how my kūpuna taught me,” and not with the blanket statement of “this is how we do it as Hawaiians.” Our kūpuna typically knew that their way was not the only way and showed respect for how others were taught.

Procedure

I conducted interviews with 15 Hawaiian classroom educators and cultural practitioners. Initially, I planned to select participants evenly from these two groups; half were to be classroom teachers, and the other half, cultural practitioners. However, in the process of selecting participants, a third group of participants emerged. These were educators who fell into both categories, which I am calling the “dual educators” group. Five participants were selected from each of the three categories.
After potential participants were identified, arrangements were made for available times and places to conduct the interviews. At the start of the interview, a survey was administered to collect demographic information and solicit participants’ views on specific domains of learning using a Likert scale and two short answer questions (see Appendix A). Directly following the survey was the semi-structured interview, which ranged from approximately 45-120 minutes long. The interview consisted of open-ended queries about the participants’ teaching experiences and their perspectives on Hawaiian values, goals, and purposes of learning (see Appendixes B, C, and D). All of the interviews were audiorecorded and later transcribed.

All of the participants were given the option to answer the interview questions in Hawaiian or English. Most of the participants who could speak Hawaiian used at least some Hawaiian during the interview. One participant answered many of the questions in Hawaiian but also used English at times.

In order to triangulate the data, I also observed two participants from each of the three groups of educators as they instructed. During these observations, I looked for evidence of teaching philosophies and cultural values and practices related to learning. I observed three cultural practitioner settings and three formal education classroom settings and was able to observe a diverse variety of lessons in a range of instructional settings. For the cultural practitioners, I was able to observe a hula class, a featherwork lesson, and kalo farming. In the formal educational settings, I observed an immersion high school World History class on Maui, a college-level undergraduate print-making class on O‘ahu, and a graduate-level immersion teacher-preparation course on Hawai‘i Island.
Most of the participants’ interviews followed this process of (a) completing the survey, (b) participating in the interview, and (c) following up with an observation when applicable. However, for a few participants there were slight changes depending on the participant’s situation. Two participants submitted the survey in advance. One participant submitted the survey after the interview and one participant submitted the survey after both the interview and observation. One observation was conducted prior to the interview and one interview was conducted long-distance through Skype.

I used member checking to verify my conclusions with other Hawaiian educators, to ensure my analysis was dependable. As themes were emerging from the interviews, I suggested some of these preliminary findings in subsequent interviews and verified the emerging themes with other educators and cultural practitioners who I know from personal contacts.

Data Analysis

As is typical in a grounded theory study, the data were analyzed using the constant comparative method of data analysis (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Creswell, 1998). During the data analysis process, I continued to elaborate on the themes and subthemes as they emerged by referring back to the information in the data set. I used the QSR qualitative data analysis software to assist with the coding. This program allowed me to navigate through the transcribed interviews and to organize the data. Using open coding, I identified themes that emerged from the interview responses (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). I then used axial coding, which is the process of relating themes to each other, and represented the themes as a tree diagram.
Once all of the transcripts were coded, a second researcher coded three of the transcripts (approximately 20 percent) separately to verify the codes and check for reliability. There was 84 percent agreement of all codes, meaning that the second researcher and I agreed on 584 out of 695 codes that I had originally assigned. For the discrepancies, we discussed our coding and came to consensus as to how to assign the final codes.

For the observations, I used an Activity Theory lens to analyze the data (O’Donnell & Tharp, 2011; Rivera & Tharp, 2004). In an effort to operationalize the activity settings, I used the activity settings observation system as a guide. This observation system suggests that there are five variables that should be considered when observing an activity setting: (a) personnel, (b) values and beliefs, (c) task demands, (d) scripts, and (e) purpose or motives (Gallimore, Goldenberg, & Weisner, 1993). During each observation, I noted these five variables and compared the similarities and differences across instructional settings and across the three educational categories of the participants observed.
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Results

Mōhala i ka wai ka maka o ka pua

*Unfolded by the water are the faces of the flowers*

Flowers thrive where there is water, as thriving people are found where living conditions are good (Pukui, 1983, 2178)

As described by the participants of this study, the “living conditions” in which people thrive encompass all aspects of life. The following findings underscored the importance of educators acknowledging and supporting the overall development and wellbeing of the whole learner towards a cultural way of being and thinking. Through an analysis of the data, several themes and subthemes emerged, (a) Cultural Consciousness (development of cultural worldviews, mindsets, values, socializations, behaviors, and relationships), (b) Pedagogies and Philosophies (teaching strategies, practices, and philosophies). (c) Struggles and Success (conflicts and challenges for teaching culture, definitions of success, cultural factors for success, and goals in education).

**Cultural Consciousness**

**Mindset.** One of the most common themes that participants spoke about was the importance of the students’ mindset in the context of learning. Of the 15 participants, 12 (four from each group) acknowledged the role of students’ worldview or mindset in developing the whole learner. Shaping the students’ mindset has an influence on students’ behaviors, cultural perspectives, and ability to receive knowledge. When one of the dual educators was asked to describe a time when he was taught something that he thought was particularly Hawaiian, he described learning to pound poi from ‘Anakala
(uncle) Eddie Ka’anana, a well-known cultural advisor and beloved kupuna in the Hawaiian community.

‘Anakala he’s from Miloli‘i so he get one whole different set of words [Hawaiian words associated with pounding poi], and their process and everything is real different. . . . when they were young it’s not a cool thing to do—if they didn’t do it they wouldn’t eat. So, their processes are real refined, there’s no playing around, there’s no like excessiveness to it. And you gotta ku‘i (pound) enough to feed everybody in this family and that family. There’s no, you know, it’s work. It’s efficiency. So things are, you know, reduced down to, to the primary motions that need to happen. And um, he’s very clear about certain words to use. Um, very clear about your mindset, which is interesting. Because not too many, not too many things you learn now days where, whether it’s Hawaiian or not, that your kumu is very set upon your mindset. And not just be focused, it’s what to think, how to think . . . your demeanor, . . . which influences your perspective, yeah? And your relationship towards whatever you’re doing.

So that’s probably, to me, I think one of the most Hawaiian things that I got taught . . . ‘cause he was very specific in every single way. Not just physically, actually the physical part was real lenient almost. And um, the mental part, you know, the nonphysical stuff that was, he was a lot more strict there. . . . I think for him, the physical part of it was real, um, interchangeable almost. But the mental and, I guess, spiritual, for lack of a better word. The, the nonphysical part of it was, um, very laid out. “These are things that are acceptable. This is not
acceptable. These are the results of those things.” So, that’s probably one of the biggest lessons I got. (Kamuela Yim, dual educator, interview, January 14, 2013)

Participants talked about the use of protocols and chanting to prepare students’ mindset prior to a lesson or entering the learning environment. There are specific chants that are used to ask permission prior to entering. These chants are a way for the student to humbly ask to be given knowledge and to show that they are ready in mind, body, and spirit to learn. These chants are not necessarily used before every class and are sometimes reserved for special events or important occasions. However, in some settings protocols are used every day to ensure students are ready to receive knowledge from their kumu.

A notable example of following protocols and steps to prepare a student’s mindset prior to learning was given by kumu hula Māpuana de Silva, who spoke of the training she goes through with her students and the process students engage in prior to starting each class. Haumana are taught to be thoughtful and deliberate with what they are doing with their body, their words, and their ukana (e.g., belongings, bags, instruments, apparel, etc.). Hula class typically begins with stretching exercises, Māpuana specified that this is another way to prepare students mind and body.

The stretching exercises that we do at the beginning, to warm up their muscles, get their blood flowing which is really good for them physically, but mentally it also puts them here. And when they come, they come from their families, their cars, their friends, their cousins, their swimming pool, their soccer game and they walk in the door and they're not—their brain isn’t here yet. So the exercises pull their brain in and get their muscles ready so that by the time we actually want to
teach them something in hula, they're focused and they can grasp it. (Māpuana de Silva, cultural practitioner, interview, October 4, 2012)

**Behavioral expectations.** Teaching culture involves more than just teaching the cultural values. Culture manifests in the way students behave, think, and feel. Behavioral expectations were mentioned by participants in all three groups (5 of 15 participants explicitly talked about this, 1-2 in each group). These expectations tended to center around how students behaved in the context of the larger group, being aware of their actions towards others as well as belongings and being cognizant of how those actions affected and reflected on the community.

For the kumu hula and the classroom educators who taught hula practices, these behaviors included a range—from lining up slippers at the door of the hālau and tucking in shirts, to how they treat their hula things. There is an expectation to show respect in all aspects of their hula practice. For example, hula skirts should be put on and removed above your head. Something as valuable as that should not be on the ground. Haumana are also taught to respect their instruments as if they are family members and not to touch items with their feet. For example, it is disrespectful to carelessly move hula instruments aside with your feet. These pieces should be given the respect, love, and honor they deserve.

For crew members of the Hōkūleʻa, there is a high expectation to be aware of their behaviors. One main issue for this is safety. On the waʻa (canoe), everyone is expected to behave appropriately and to look out for each other. Yet, beyond the issue of safety, crew members are expected to behave in a way that honors their kūpuna (ancestors). Hōkūleʻa is set to travel around the world in a Worldwide Voyage, so
members are consistently reminded that they are not only a reflection of Hōkūle'a and the crew, but a representation of the entire Hawaiian community. They are expected to show respect when they are guests in another culture and “leave an area with the spirit of aloha” (Nainoa Thompson, cultural practitioner, personal communication, August 8, 2013).

**Values.** Several values were repeatedly expressed as being essential in the learning environment and for students’ development. Among the most frequently mentioned were instilling a sense of community and a sense of kuleana towards the community; having a connection to the people, to the ʻāina (land), and to their ancestors; having pride in themselves, their Hawaiian identity, culture, and language; being humble; and showing respect and aloha.

I think it is important to note that the term “Hawaiian values,” nowadays, tends to bring to mind a generic list of Hawaiian words that represent common values in Hawaiian culture, such as aloha, kuleana, and lōkahi. While these are well recognized, significant values in the Hawaiian culture, the concepts of these values are often referred to in very superficial ways that lack the much deeper and richer conceptual meaning that these words hold. In some cases, in formal Western school settings, these values are depicted on posters on classroom walls and given basic English translations without providing students with a true understanding of the terms’ meanings. In some ways these superficial terms are overused in day-to-day language. Aloha, for example, means love and is also used as a salutation and farewell. If Aloha is only understood at this level, then its true meaning is lost. Aloha is so much more, it is a way of being; it is a way of looking at the world; it is in how you interact with people and show respect. One dual practitioner
described how aloha is in his approach for pushing his students. He and other participants believe that Aloha is not only in praise it’s also in criticism.

It’s not only being critical, it’s giving praise too. And knowing that real aloha is both, and not only one. When students realize you back them and that your goal is not to flunk them but to have them succeed then motivation comes intrinsically.

(Kamuela Yim, dual educator, interview, January 14, 2013)

This encompassing view was reflected in the discussion I had with one of the college-level classroom educators about Kuleana.

You know, I hear a lot about that in the community and I think we talk about it as privilege and responsibility as if people really understand it, but in our Hawaiian thinking it’s . . . part of the same flip side of understanding . . . because many times your responsibility is something you think of as heavy and burdensome and many times negative but your responsibility and your privilege is that thing that should give you joy to give to others . . . contribute to others. I think that if you’re really in that place in the right way it becomes that thing that also empowers you. . . . It actually is a process that also internalizes more self-empowerment, because every time you . . . contribute something so does that come back to you if you come from a place of aloha and kuleana. So I think if education is driven in that kind of light it’s a good place, to direct learning because it means that it has to come from a place of positive. It has to come from a place that is people driven. It has to come from a place that is tied to success, successful outcomes. (Keiki Kawai‘ae‘a, classroom educator, interview, October 23, 2012)
Relationships. All of the participants saw connectedness and relationships as a key aspect in education. “Teachers need to see relationships as part of their role” (Keiki Kawai‘ae‘a, classroom educator, interview, October 23, 2012). This was seen as not only a value in Hawaiian culture but an important part of learning. For example, when a dual educator was asked to describe his approach to teaching, he said,

I try to meet people where they’re at and I try to build relationships. You know, in education there’s that whole three Rs, yeah. Rigor, relevance, and relationship. I kind of think that it’s good, but it’s inverted. It needs to be relationship, relevance, and then rigor. The rigor will come once the relationship and the relevance have set in. Until you establish that, uh, you not going very far. And . . . I think that’s a Hawaiian way. (Dean Wilhelm, dual educator, interview, February 14, 2013)

Dean went on to describe an example of when he met a well-known Hawaiian slack key musician. He wanted him to play music with his group. When this man came to their rehearsal to hear them play, Dean asked him if he’d like to play with them, but instead of deciding, he suggested they get to know each other first and have their families get to know each other. He wanted to connect with them and build a relationship first.

That’s so key, and that’s so Hawaiian. . . . to ask, . . . “where you from?” It’s . . . how we build, how we establish some type of foundation for a common point of connection. And, . . . that’s what I do with all people. . . . whether you’re from Sweden or Waimānalo, you know. So, how do we, how do we first meet somewhere half-way to be able to begin to understand. And then once you understand each other and see where you’re coming from and then once we get to that point then maybe I can start to transmit some of the knowledge I have and
share that with you. And, likewise you can transmit, transmit some of the
knowledge that you have and share with me because I’m of the firm belief that
we’re all, we’re all teachers and we’re all students, yeah. (Dean Wilhelm, dual
educator, interview, February 14, 2013)

Building relationships and connections with the community was one of the most
frequently mentioned values. Incorporating community and culture into the classroom
was considered an important aspect of a Hawaiian approach to education. When Kapolei
Kiili, an immersion high school teacher, was asked how she uses Hawaiian culture in
educating her students, she described the community activities she engaged in with her
students. Although she worked in a Hawaiian immersion setting which engages in many
cultural activities, she felt that building a relationship with her students and the
community was among the most valuable experiences she could provide for her students.

I think that’s why field trips are really a great way for them to extend and enrich
their learning, because they can actually be there. . . . for them to connect to the
‘āina . . . connect to being outdoor and being in the elements. . . . I feel like it
helps to create a balance for them, . . . that’s a way for them to practice their
culture, because they’re learning the history of this island, . . . they’re
participating in something that’s very important, and they’re giving back to the
community, and the impact of helping to rebuild the watershed will help the
generations, . . . so it’s . . . helping them to connect and . . . teach them about their
kuleana. (Kapolei Kiili, classroom educator, interview, November 1, 2012)

For some of the participants, building a relationship with their students and really
connecting with them involved a physical aspect. For example, kumu hula talked about
hugging their haumana when they arrive and leave. In Hawaiian culture, it is common, especially in settings such as hula class, to honi (kiss) and embrace when you say aloha, and this would rarely be seen as uncomfortable or cause for worry. However, for classroom teachers there are different expectations. Hawaiian classroom educators, although culturally are usually comfortable with physically touching their students, are limited by the formal school system which discourages touching students to ward against perceptions of inappropriate behaviors. Yet, some are clear about the importance of physically touching their students to show their support, aloha, and connection. One participant remembered how his Hawaiian language teacher treated him:

[Teachers] have to be real clear about things when you say this, like, um, she touches us when she teaches. I remember her hand on my hand when I’m writing to stop me, to encourage me to, you know, criticize me, but it’s, I asked her about it later on and she said, “You know, it’s so that you know that there’s no separation between us. I put my hand on you so you know that I aloha you no matter what. I’m not here yelling at you and off in the distance where there’s separation between us. Put my hand on you, so you know that whether I give you praise or whether I give you criticism, I’m still here. I’m right here. Right here with you in this no matter what.” . . . I remember that, that made me a better teacher. (Kamuela Yim, dual educator, interview, January 14, 2013)

**Connections with land.** Among the types of connections that participants felt were important, was connecting learners to the land. Having a sense of place and a connection with the ‘āina was highly regarded by almost all of the participants. One of the participants, who recently began teaching in ‘Ewa on the leeward coast of Oʻahu,
familiarized herself with the mo’olelo, mele, and oli of the area so that she might share this with her students.

Those stories of land, and place, and knowing where you’re from, so that you can know who you are, those are very Hawaiian cultural values, Hawaiian ways of knowing and Hawaiian ways of being . . . I do think being in this space in ‘Ewa is kind of a unique context. (Leilani Basham, dual educator, interview, February 27, 2013)

Of course, this was of particular relevancy to the mahi‘ai. One of the dual practitioners who had been building a kalo field for the past five years talked about how he struggled starting out and seeking advice from other farmers.

Another friend of mine, the taro farmer, he said, “You know, the ‘āina, the ‘āina will speak to you, it’ll tell you.” And I was kind of like, “When you talk to me . . . I don’t want esoteric stuff. Talk to me in concrete terms. What do I do?” And the reality is, . . . the land speaks to you and . . . I couldn’t receive that, that kind of knowledge and so you know when, when it seems as if, you know, people who are tied to the land and close to the land it might seem like they speak in riddles. It seems like that, but it’s not riddles, you know, and I’m, . . . learning that. That’s the knowledge, that’s the journey I’m on. . . . And I think these, these are the types of old, and it’s not only Hawaiian, it’s the people who are tied to the land. They’re the ones who have that type of, . . . they see through those lenses that we in our modern world, in modern mindset, until you stop and you move into this . . . . Until you get into the lo‘i and weed . . . it’s all theory. (Dean Wilhelm, dual educator, interview, February 14, 2013)
Ka ‘ike mai luna mai: spirituality in learning. In Hawaiian culture, spiritual beliefs and connecting with ancestors is inherent. The culture and beliefs are one and the same and cannot be teased apart. For the cultural practitioners in particular, sharing and receiving knowledge seemed to carry a spiritual element. As one practitioner described, “Learning is to speak quietly to your mind, to communicate with your ancestor, to use your heart and feelings” (Kuahiwi Lorenzo, cultural practitioner, interview, January 12, 2013).

When Nainoa Thompson spoke of navigation and gaining that knowledge, he spoke extensively about the mana in knowledge, the sacredness of gaining knowledge, and the responsibility connected to sharing that knowledge.

For the navigation, the knowledge that comes from the education, well, the knowledge is power. And the education is designed in a way that you teach it in a sacred way. So the sacredness is not so much because you see it as being so-called sacred, . . . but it’s because you need to protect that knowledge. Because if misused you gave the power for the wrong reasons. (Nainoa Thompson, cultural practitioner, interview, January 30, 2013)

The role of language and culture in shaping worldviews. All of the participants talked about the importance of students learning culture and language. Some recognized that for even non-Hawaiian students understanding the Hawaiian language and culture helps to shape students’ worldview no matter what their ethnicity.

I also really believe that language and culture for our students, especially if they’re of Hawaiian ancestry, and even if they’re not so much, if they don’t have koko (Hawaiian blood) or whatever, I think it does wonders for them with . . .
understanding themselves, like being able to identify themselves with a culture, with a people, with a language, with a history... with values, and... it helps them to... grow... in a solid way, so that they’re solid from the inside out. They become confident people, you know, intelligent people that participate in the community as a citizenry, and really... you know, really understand the concepts of... mālama ‘āina (caring for the land), and like... reciprocity, like giving back to the community... and I think it really helps them to build their self-esteem... and you know, just help them in their social-emotional development as they’re growing, as children... so that, by the time they get to the high school... typically all high school students go through that adolescent phase of trying to figure out who they are... and these kids, they definitely go through that, ‘cause they’re children... but I think for them, having Hawaiian language and Hawaiian cultural knowledge and ‘ike and consistently surrounded by it... sort of helps to shape and mold them, and create that for themselves. (Kapolei Kiili, classroom educator, interview, November 1, 2012)

Educators believed that understanding Hawaiian language and oli (chanting) may influence students’ mindset and may change the way they view, interact with, and think about the world in which they live. One participant spoke of how learning oli shaped how he views and interacts with his environment.

The way you look at the different chants and you try and think of those things and your relationships to them and how... Hawaiians have the ability to directly influence nature. That’s a trip... that’s really not... widespread perspective on, not just nature, but like... the ability of your mind, I guess... and your own
ability as a person. So, that made me have a real different perspective of my surroundings I guess. Which is, you know, back to us saying that language affects your perspective, yeah. If you read these chants and you don’t speak Hawaiian you would never ever get that. Ever. And, if they translated it you still wouldn’t get it. You have to read the Hawaiian to get it. . . .

It affects your relationship and this is, this is the greatest example right here. Before chanting and before learning to look at language and chants in that way, my perspective on land was, was, you know, wholesome I guess. I love it and, . . . I love going in the mountains, I love going in the lo‘i, But, . . . there’s a separation. . . . Before it was inanimate and animate. Both have life, both need respect, both have a role. . . . now through chant . . . it’s very different, . . . my perspective is it’s not so much animate and inanimate, it’s just, um, generations removed. So, how I would talk to you, and I would greet you, I would greet my tutu the same way. In the morning when I chant I greet the sun the same way. So the sun has a name, . . . and the name is Kānehoalani. So that’s a name that Hawaiians gave to the sun. When you name the sun, it gives me a familiarity, . . . a familiarity between me and this thing that exists outside of my scope. . . . now I can address it and I can ask it for things. And I can praise it for things, and I can thank it for things, and I can have a relationship, a one-to-one relationship with my environment. (Kamuela Yim, dual educator, interview, January 14, 2013)

Another educator went on to say,

Culture can be taught in process as, as well as content. It could be taught, through culture and be taught as culture. You know, cultural knowledge. So, I see both is
important in educating students so I will teach them about teaching in a cultural way and I will also teach them through that cultural way. And I think both need to happen, they’re very critical in instruction. (Keiki Kawai‘ae‘a, classroom educator, interview, classroom educator, October 23, 2012)

**Pedagogies and Philosophies**

*He lālā au no ku‘u kumu*

*I am a branch of my teacher/tree*

The most frequently mentioned teaching strategies identified by almost all of the participants as fundamental to learning in a Hawaiian context were modeling, relevancy, and experiential learning. Modeling was described by most of the participants as a typical Hawaiian way of learning, referencing the ‘ōlelo no‘eau, Nānā ka Maka. Observation was, and still is, a highly valued skill and a widely used teaching strategy, according to the participants in this study.

. . . I think we start with environment, place . . . the first teacher was our Earth itself . . . the Earth can teach you a lot of things and I think that’s where traditional indigenous knowledge was, included scientific processes with observation, with observation and asking questions, “why is this”; “how come this”; “why is this moon rising at this point and at this time”; “why is the sun setting here and setting there”; “what is the correlation between, . . . seasons”; “what is the correlation between, . . . species, migrations, behaviors of animals and fish”; “why in some places, . . . things grow better . . .” So I think that kind of knowledge is, . . . very scientific, very deep knowledge . . . (Eric Enos, cultural practitioner, interview, January 25, 2013)
Practitioners had high expectations for their students to be observant and reflective. This included honing students’ ability to self-reflect and engage in reflective questioning. “Questioning is deeper learning” (Keone Nunes, cultural practitioner, interview, January 31, 2013). For classroom educators, this meant allowing students to observe the activity at hand and then giving them time to reflect and practice.

Relevancy was another issue that came up repeatedly by almost all the participants. However, there was a slight difference between how classroom teachers and cultural practitioners talked about relevancy. Some classroom educators generally spoke of relevancy as connecting a topic or lesson to students’ lives, to their sense of place, or to real world applications.

I just try to do field trips to connect to the . . . for example the newswriting class, so historically when the printing press came to Hawai‘i, there was this explosion with this technology, and we have hale pa‘i, which is the museum, a printing press museum in Lāhaina, so in those ways . . . it relates to newswriting, and then it also relates to history and culture of Hawai‘i, so . . . I like to be able to . . . take a look at all my standards and benchmarks, and all the little nitty gritties of the . . . the system that I teach in and then make it all connect through some kind of outdoor activity that the kids will enjoy and . . . sort of connect the dots inward . . . so just making the . . . subject areas that I teach very relevant to their lives.

(Kapolei Kiili, classroom educator, interview, November 1, 2012)

This was also true for cultural practitioners, however, for some participants, there was an added concern about making traditional practices relevant in modern contexts and applicable to students’ lives in today’s society. They were concerned about how to
maintain traditional practices if they were not relevant for contemporary youths. The traditional voyaging canoe, Hōkūle‘a, is a case in point. This wa’a (canoe) traveled through the Pacific using traditional navigation techniques without the aid of modern navigational tools. Although the practices are traditional, this wa’a connects to the Hawaiian community and the world in modern ways, through video, blogs, and websites and through its mission of Mālama Honua, sharing stories throughout the world of people who are making a difference in their community.

Our children aren’t being raised in . . . the 1800, they are being raised in the . . . 21st century you know . . . but if they are timeless in our culture, if they are basic in . . . and part of the essence in our, our being as Hawai‘i, then we should be able to lomi (massage) that and bring the pearls of that wisdom into our contemporary context. And I prefer to do that . . . so as research grows out of that kind of understanding then it stays connected. It’s like doing hula. You know there’s some people that do hula, and they can be very creative in ‘auana (modern hula) but you recognize that it’s hula. And sometimes you’re not too sure if (laughing) it’s the cusp of being something else. (Keiki Kawai‘ae‘a, classroom educator, interview, October 23, 2012)

Mo‘olelo. Storytelling is another culturally appropriate approach that is part of relevancy, connections, and relationship building. Sharing personal stories fosters relationships between the teacher and students as well as between peers. Several of the participants talked about the role of storytelling in their teaching practices. Interestingly, two cultural practitioners, three dual practitioners, and only one educator explicitly acknowledged using storytelling in their teaching practices. However, I observed that
almost all of the participants used storytelling in their teaching and in our interviews. A few participants even acknowledged that their stories were taking them far beyond the question and apologized for going off topic. Yet, I found that some of the most interesting and in-depth answers emerged from the stories they told. Their stories were some of the most intriguing and enjoyable parts of the interview, as their personal stories shed light on their true passions, their journey in life, and the future they saw for their students. In some cases, I actually found the questioning process to be interruptive from the stories they naturally wanted to tell.

In my observations, all six participants also encouraged or used storytelling in their lessons for various purposes. For some, it was used to connect with their students on a personal level, and for others, it was to encourage the students to connect with each other and put their experiences into context. Kuahiwi Lorenzo shared the stories of the history of the Hawaiian people as it has evolved over the generations to give context and purpose to what the students were learning. Dean Wilhelm used stories to honor his kūpuna by describing the lineage of how he was taught and how things were explained to him. Maile Andrade, a dual educator, encouraged her students by sharing the story of her and her former students’ struggles and triumphs.

You know because we use mo’olelo (stories) . . . Stories are a way, because we say here’s how traditional people, through story, taught things of observation, you know. And, and it’s really, learning is really creating in child a wonder. . . . You’ve ignited that spark of fire in that child. And we spend so much time in education taking away that spark, but really, how come? (Eric Enos, cultural practitioner, interview, January 25, 2013)
One cultural practitioner was asked to describe his teaching style and had a unique perspective on our “oral” culture. There are two sides to telling a story.

Talking story, . . . this is . . . another fallacy I think that Western education puts upon . . . cultures like Hawaiian culture. They call our culture oral, oral culture. But it’s not an oral culture in the Western sense because in the Western sense . . . cultures pass on knowledge . . . through stories and chants, . . . it entails a lot of . . . vocalization. That’s not, that’s not true. It’s not o-r-a-l, it’s a-u-r-a-l. That’s how I look at it. Because it’s not that everyone speaks, it’s that most people listen and a few people speak and that’s real different, yeah. And within an aural culture everything makes a difference. Your surroundings will determine how you learn.

Whether you’re hungry or not determines how you learn. What’s happening at home will determine how you learn. And I think, by and large, that still is applicable to, especially to Hawaiian kids or to Pacific Island kids. Now days they’re very aural in that sense, yeah. And so, when a teacher comes in not knowing all of the things that the person . . . is going through, the efficacy of the lesson is different for each and every student, yeah. So, you have students who are coming by, . . . in large part, an aural way of learning and not that o-r-a-l, but the a-u-r-a-l way of learning and the teacher coming from a rote way of learning and that’s where you have the disconnect. (Keone Nunes, cultural practitioner, interview, January 31, 2013)

I also found during my observations and interviews that many participants were rather poetic when they spoke. This was evident in the stories they shared and the teachings of their kūpuna. When you consider the breadth of ‘ōlelo no‘eau, oli, and mele
(songs) that reflect the use and significance of kaona (hidden meaning) in Hawaiian culture, this is not surprising.

This idea of kaona in teaching and learning goes beyond relevancy and into deeper meanings and personal connections to ancestors, land, community, and family. A college professor who was also a kumu hula was developing a multi-level curriculum for Hawaiian language classes building kaona into how she teaches and the curriculum she created. She described how the third-year unit was contextualized based on the story of an ‘ohana (family). This story, which involved a typical Hawaiian family with extended relatives, was purposefully designed in a way that everyone could relate. Using Hawaiian language, this story demonstrated the interaction of an extended family welcoming and interacting with a newborn child in the family.

It’s Hawaiian because our family and our genealogy . . . is important to us . . . and that goes not just for our kūpuna but you know, future generations. So in the text, the curriculum, this new child that’s born is sort of the metaphor of the new student that’s a student new to language . . . and so the birth . . . and the journey of that life is of this child . . . is kinda like that journey of knowledge. (Leilani Basham, dual educator, interview, February 27, 2013)

One of the most interesting teaching strategies I found frequently in my observations was the use of humor in teaching and learning. All of the participants I observed used humor in their teaching and had relationships with their students and their mentees that allowed for playful joking and teasing. This also included physical playfulness of poking or nudging in jest. One mentor described the many strategies he used including the use of metaphor, storytelling, and humor.
Oh you have to have different strategies because you cannot do it all with metaphors. You start sounding like Plato . . . Aesop’s Fables or something like that. I mix it up . . . using humor. Humor is not a teaching technique within Western society. But within Pacific Island societies, humor is big. I use stories a lot . . . stories of past successes and past failures . . . And [another] successful teaching technique is . . . listening . . . So the answers come from [the students], I’m not giving them the answers. So that’s, to me, a very Hawaiian technique.

(Keone Nunes, cultural practitioner, interview, January 31, 2013)

Ma ka hana ka ‘ike: In doing one learns. This ‘ōlelo no‘eau was the most commonly referenced by participants in all three educational groups. For classroom educators, this usually meant field trips.

When we’re in the classroom . . . we can read articles, we can have discussions and . . . they can get as much as they can get, through those means. But when they go outdoors, and they touch, feel, smell, talk . . . they experience it, with all their senses . . . that’s when I know that it’s really more pa’a (solid, retained). (Kapolei Kiili, classroom educator, interview, November 1, 2012)

Teachers also saw this as motivating for their students and as having a major effect on their development as a contributor in their community and their sense of purpose. Another teacher described how she used this model as a guide for her Hawaiian language class at a public high school on the leeward coast.

The way I learned, especially from my tutu is . . . ma ka hana ka ‘ike. . . . You just watch and you do it. . . . There’s no instruction on exactly how to do it, . . . and a lot of it is listening, and it’s a lot of verbal and not . . . written instructions. . . .
think even at like hula, . . . you watch, you listen, you replicate. . . . that’s the way I did learn it and I know that’s the Hawaiian perspective. ‘Cause our language was oral. It was never written. So, you know, trying to take that concept and do that in a classroom as, from the teacher perspective, that’s why I have trouble, because of the students we work with. I’m trying to change this year to give it an oral approach, before I actually teach the grammatical written structure. (Puni Badis, classroom educator, interview, December 19, 2012)

Another participant described the following:

The mission is . . . to get out and be more hands on . . . and experiential by nature, but . . . we also know the demands of the schools. I understand as a teacher the demands you have. To maintain standards and all of this jargon that . . . teachers . . . have pressure to maintain . . . Kaiapuni schools they have . . . a double challenge in many ways. . . . But it really solidified my mindset . . . you hear what places where Hawaiian language can be spoken because . . . when I’m here with Uncle Earl he’ll explain things in a way so you don’t forget it. . . . we were talking about water and flooding . . . so you need to be aware . . . when the stream comes it’ll just tear up whatever’s in the way when the rains come . . . . Then he asked me, “What is the word for stream?” So I said, “Kahawai.” He said, “Right, well what does that mean?” I said, “Stream, you know, I don’t know.” “Kaha is cut.” So the stream, and it will cut wherever it wants to cut when it’s big enough. That’s the mana of kahawai. So when you use a mo‘olelo to tie it into the vocabulary it becomes real and it becomes permanent and that’s what happens when you have experiential learning that takes place. And that was very
Hawaiian. . . . It’s good to be academic and all of that, but you know . . . there’s so much out there that people are saying we need to learn. . . . Everything vying for our time, and energy, and attention. I think in many ways it’s getting back to somewhat the simple core . . . of who we are, not only as Hawaiians, but as people . . . That is . . . important and that’s kind of what we’re doing here, getting back to the basics. Work ethic, you know. Health, getting outside, exercising your mind, your body, your spirit, and the ‘āina. And then giving to the land and then receiving . . . [it’s a] reciprocal relationship. (Dean Wilhelm, dual educator, interview, February 14, 2013)

Several participants from all three educator groups noted the importance of fostering independent, critical thinkers, stating that this was recognized in traditional Hawaiian teaching practices as well.

I believe a good teacher is actually facilitating knowledge. . . . We don’t want students to regurgitate knowledge; we want them to be independent thinkers. And so you have to think of strategies for ways of them to learn. And so we’ll have themes like we’re on a theme right now about creation and genealogy. And so their visual language on this poster speaks of their genealogy or speaks of a creation process. And then when we look at our Native Hawaiian creation process, what are those things that make it Hawaiian versus Christian or versus Chinese or versus whatever. We may have points that connect us, but what makes it Hawaiian? And that’s what we’re teaching and trying to articulate. So . . . when we weave lauhala or when we make kapa, this is a product of the way our ancestors saw the world and lived in the world. You know, some things are
functional, . . . when you go to a museum and look at Hawaiian objects from our material culture . . . a lot of it is, surpasses time. . . . That, you know, what makes it Hawaiian too, is excellence. What you see that our ancestors did is of excellence. . . . if you’re just going to make a bowl to eat poi out of, you know, any kind of thing would work. Why did they create a thing that is beautiful? The carvings or the leis . . . took it beyond the function of the form. And I also believe because that’s how they lived in this world, you know. It’s about gaining mana. You know, you can’t gain mana if you’re doing sloppy stuff . . . if you’re not doing stuff that connects you to the gods. (Maile Andrade, dual educator, interview, February 12, 2013)

Kamuela Yim, one of the dual educators, described his experience and approach to teaching in both the Kaiapuni and public school settings. He outlined his cultural approach to curriculum, shared his thoughts on the importance of teaching culture, and described how he hopes it influences his haumana.

. . . no matter what I do, it was Hawaiian first. . . . I was teaching science and we would do like . . . plate tectonics . . . Hawaiian first was we learned . . . Pele’s voyage from Kahiki (Tahiti) up through the northwest Hawaiian islands down to Hawai‘i. So that follows the geological time [for] the Hawaiian islands. And, if you view Pele as the hotspot then it completely coincides with the fact that Pele is the hotspot that goes from the top of the northwest islands down to Hawai‘i where she resides now, which is true. . . . But the fact that that chant was written 300 years ago . . . completely influences your perspective to understand that Hawaiians was fricken on it. And they didn’t have science, they didn’t have all
these, you know, ground penetrating radars and, they knew that it happened. . . . you find it in chants, you find it in . . . mele, and you find it in moʻolelo. So . . . Hawaiian first was very important.

The second thing was critical thinkers. Now days a lot of . . . this generation, my generation too, including me, . . . are not nearly able to have the level of critical thinking that our kūpuna did. Like you know, whose grandpa is not like, “grandpa I gotta make a sled.” “Okay, let’s go figure it out.” “What?” If my daughter came home and said, “Dad I gotta make a sled.” “Um . . . let’s go check online.” You know, nobody figures things out anymore. It’s always this just, “Go check online. Let’s just check online.” So, to develop critical thinking, Hawaiian first, critical thinking, and . . . starting at the end product of what . . . you want your student to be. What do you want them to become at the end of your teaching and then working backwards. So you teach them all these different skills and you teach them all these different stuff, but to know that everything that they do is to build a kahua (foundation) on their Hawaiʻi. ‘Cause I think a lot of the problem now days for Hawaiians is entrenched in that. You’re a Hawaiian, like, you know, if a Japanese got kicked out of Hawaiʻi where would they go? Japan. If I wanted to learn German and no Germans in Hawaiʻi knew it, where would I go? Germany. I could do that for Chinese, I could do that for every other place, but if there’s a Hawaiian that doesn’t know Hawaiian in Hawaiʻi we are shit out of luck. But for a lot of Hawaiian that’s what it is too, like, they try to fit in a Western role, but they don’t. But they don’t know anything about a Hawaiian role so then, what the hell is left? So for kids in Kaiapuni and now, for me, kids in public
school, if they take my language class it’s to show them that it’s not okay to be Hawaiian . . . it’s, you’re blessed to be Hawaiian. You know, I have expectations of you that you are Hawaiian, that you should be at this level. And the level is not low, the level is not dumb, the level is not illiterate, and the level is not lazy. The level is awesome sauce, amaze balls, completely beyond anything that you can imagine, should be where you’re at, not where I want you to be at. That should be your baseline.

So, . . . how does culture . . . and language . . . play into that? . . . hopefully at the end of it, it’s to have them view my perspective and later on build on their own perspective. . . . I think it’s important that they have their own Hawai‘i—not to fall back on, but to always stand on. . . . So if they completely fail trying to be American, it’s all right because you’re trying to go beyond your boundaries. Don’t think that that is what you need to live up to. You need to live up to being a Hawaiian and I’m trying to teach you how to do that now. So if America fails you it’s all right cause you can be a damn good Hawaiian and . . . that’s the best thing that you can give to the Earth is to be a good Hawaiian cause there’s not enough of them. So, I think my perspective is a thousand percent biased. (Kamuela Yim, dual educator, interview, January 14, 2013)

When Kuahiwi Lorenzo described his kumu’s approach to teaching him featherwork, he shared that some of the other haumana didn’t understand his method. His kumu would show them the basics without much direct instruction and then leave them to create within the culture and expand from his teachings. Some students felt lost and didn’t think they were being taught at all, but Kuahiwi told them that “your kumu taught
you everything.” When they had trouble their kumu just told them to take it apart, but the
students didn’t want to undo all their hard work. When the students didn’t want to take it
apart Kuahiwi told them, that they’re missing the lesson.

So I try my best to teach enough for a student to succeed . . . but then they have to
be themselves because in . . . feather work, the feather work becomes you. What
you put into it . . . is an extension of you . . . your mind, your heart. In other
words, if it doesn’t look good and you feel satisfied then I guess that’s you . . . I
remember taking a whole lei apart because the critique said in that first two inches
that I did, you’re missing something and it was like, yeah I kind of knew that, but
. . . I finished the lei . . . and then I took it apart. . . . And then I put it back
together again. Well, . . . it’s like hula. Learn the basics, and when you become a
master you can do anything. (Kuahiwi Lorenzo, cultural practitioner, interview,
January 12, 2013)

As Kuahiwi described, there’s a freedom or self-directedness to the process,
deciding for himself if his work is passable or should be redone. This doesn’t mean that
his work had to be perfect or that his kumu expected him to identify the imperfections,
but the product of his work should be something he’s proud of even if it’s flawed because
it represents himself. During the course of this study, I was honored to become a student
of Kuahiwi and learned to make a kāhili paʻalima. As a student, I observed that he taught
me in the same method in which he was taught. He briefly demonstrated the steps as I
observed the cut of the feathers, the placement of the string, and the position of his hands
as he worked. I did my best to follow along and mimic what he did. When I was unsure
of myself, he encouraged me to work it out on my own first and only after attempting to
figure it out for myself would he help me if I still needed assistance. It was a stark contrast to the type of education I have come to expect through formal education. I had no pen or paper to write notes to remind myself of the steps to take, the tips he shared, or the areas he showed me where I could be creative within the piece. I learned that as soon as our mentoring sessions were over, I needed to go straight home and continue to practice, or I would not be able to remember everything he taught me. It was a challenge, but I found it immensely rewarding.

**Attributes of student achievement.** The participants were administered a survey with questions regarding their views on the importance of certain attributes of learning; these were intelligence, skill, effort, and practice. In order to determine their perspectives on which aspects they viewed as most important, participants were asked to rate these on a 5-point Likert scale. Overall, the participants ranked these in order of importance as effort, practice, intelligence, and finally, skill (see Figure 1). However, effort and practice were rated much higher (4.73 and 4.67 respectively) than intelligence and skill (3.00 and 2.82 respectively).

![Figure 1. Attributes of Student Achievement: All Participants](image)
Participants were also asked about their views on the value of praise versus criticism and extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation. Overall, intrinsic motivation was rated much higher than extrinsic (4.57 and 3.17 respectively) and praise was rated higher than criticism (3.80 and 2.90 respectively). However, when these survey results were analyzed by educational group a few differences appeared (see Figure 2). For example, when I compared the responses of classroom educators to all other participants (practitioners and dual educators), I found that teachers ranked skill and extrinsic motivation higher than the cultural practitioner and dual educator groups.

When asked to elaborate on their use of praise and criticism, participants from all three groups most frequently stated that they use verbal praise. However, classroom educators were the only group that mentioned providing written feedback of both praise and criticism for their students. Participants in this group said they provide clear expectations, goals, and outcomes sometimes using rubrics; then provide specific feedback using rubrics or documenting their feedback directly on students’ work.
Some of the classroom educators and dual educators indicated that they typically provided praise individually, but sometimes in a group setting. One cultural practitioner mentioned that criticism is only given as a group, stating that praise was given with positive correction in general while criticism was described as a group activity and was reserved for advanced students. Two classroom educators described how they use rewards to praise their students’ work and one cultural practitioner talked about rewarding her students as a group.

Educators from all three groups talked about the goals for using praise. Classroom and dual educators talked about the learning goal when discussing the purpose of praise, while the cultural practitioners stated that the goal of praise was to motivate and promote pride in their students.

For classroom educators, criticism was typically related to correcting inappropriate behaviors. One cultural practitioner said that he used modeling as a way of providing feedback by periodically demonstrating the process again to correct students and affirm that the lesson was learned. Another practitioner also described using physical actions (e.g., hitting their hands) instead of verbal criticism in order to guide, redirect, assess their progress, or alert students to missteps.

I found that cultural practitioners more than others (although they were not the only ones) referred to praise and criticism on the same scale. One classroom educator said that both praise and criticism should come from a place of aloha to improve student learning. A dual educator said both should be focused and specific, differentiating the feedback for the individual learner. For example, he found that for students who do not perform well in Western classrooms, praise is effective, but for students who are used to
achieving in a Western setting, criticism can be much more effective and may even encourage them to become more focused.

**Social organization.** During my participant observations, I found the learning environments to be very peer oriented with a comfortable family-like environment. I observed two cultural practitioners, two classroom educators, and two dual educators. For the dual educators, I chose to observe one in their formal classroom setting and the other in their mentoring setting. In other words, I observed three formal educational classroom settings with two classroom educators and one dual educator and I observed three informal learning settings with two cultural practitioners and one dual educator. Table 1 describes the three observations in the formal classroom setting and Table 2 describes the three observations in the informal educational setting.

Table 1

**Formal Classroom Observations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context of Teaching:</th>
<th>Personnel:</th>
<th>Setting:</th>
<th>Activities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Educator, Kapolei Kiili</td>
<td>▫ One teacher ▫ Six 10th grade students ▫ One visiting student in class for the day ▫ One adult SPED assistant</td>
<td>▫ High School Immersion classroom ▫ Subject: World History ▫ 1hr 13mins</td>
<td>Students worked in pairs to summarize and translate (to Hawaiian) each section of the chapter. Students then presented to the whole class what they learned and created an activity to engage the other students. At the end of the presentation and activities, the teacher had the students engage in a final activity that summarized that chapter and extended their learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context of Teaching</td>
<td>Personnel:</td>
<td>Setting:</td>
<td>Activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Educator, Maile Andrade</td>
<td>▪One professor, ▪Four students</td>
<td>▪College, undergraduate-level</td>
<td>Students worked on their first print-making project, designing a flyer for an event which was culturally themed. Students worked on their independent project while giving each other feedback and tips. The teacher then met with students as a group to discuss their progress and plan next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Educator, Keiki Kawai<code>ae</code>a</td>
<td>▪One professor, ▪One tech support, ▪Six Hawai`i students total in class</td>
<td>▪College, graduate-level course, ▪Indigenous Culture-Based Education class</td>
<td>For the first half of the class time, the Hawai<code>i students presented their action research projects to the whole group. For the second half of class, all other students were dismissed, except the Hawai</code>i students. The Hawai`i students debriefed with their teacher about their presentations and research process, reviewed guidelines and planned their next steps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Two students on Hawai`i Island
- By videoconference:
  - Two students on Moloka`i
  - Two students on O`ahu
- Others attending by videoconference:
  - Te Wananga o Awhanuiangi-Whakatane, Aotearoa
  - University of British Columbia, Canada
  - About seven students and teachers from Dine College, Navajo Nation
  - About nine students and teachers from University of Arizona
  - By Phone (because of technical difficulties):
    - University of Alaska, Fairbanks
Table 2

Informal Setting Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context of Teaching:</th>
<th>Personnel:</th>
<th>Setting:</th>
<th>Activity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Practitioner, Māpuana de Silva</td>
<td>One kumu hula instructing 17 students</td>
<td>Adult women’s hula class at the hālau. Some of the students in this class are also kumu hula.</td>
<td>Class began with students sitting in a circle, sharing personal updates in their lives. Afterward, they sang songs that they recently learned, and then danced hula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Practitioner, Kuahiwi Lorenzo</td>
<td>One educator (featherworker) One assistant Four students</td>
<td>Feather-making workshop at a Hawai‘i resort.</td>
<td>Class started with the teacher providing history on feather work in Hawai‘i. Then the teacher demonstrated the feather working activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Educator, Dean Wilhelm</td>
<td>One mentor (mahi‘ai) One high school student</td>
<td>Lo‘i kalo (taro fields).</td>
<td>Pulling weeds, clearing lo‘i.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the settings I observed had a collaborative structure, the students worked closely with peers and their mentor or teacher. I noticed that in the classroom observations, these educators worked more as a facilitator offering support and assistance as needed. Some educators clearly structured the class to have students be a support system for each other. Most of the students seemed to feel comfortable voicing their concerns and asking questions as needed. Although there were varying degrees of direct instruction in these classes, they also seemed very conversation based, valuing the students’ comments and ideas.

Keiki’s graduate level class, for example, was impressively collaborative considering that it was a distance learning course. In the class I observed, students
presented their action research project to their peers who were video or phone conferencing in from neighbor islands and other countries. Several times during their presentations students expressed their gratitude for the assistance and support they received from their on-island and neighbor island peers and acknowledged how much they depended on each other. After the presentations, the other groups were dismissed, and the students from Hawai‘i continued their class, discussing their next steps and their plan for the rest of the semester. Although more than half the class was not physically in the room, this group was clearly close and had a very warm and supportive relationship. I believe this, in large part, was because of the family-like environment fostered by their professor. She interacted with her students in a loving and supportive manner almost as a parent or guardian.

In the informal settings, I noticed there was a casual ease and talk-story feeling in these learning environments, coupled with the expectation to work hard to accomplish their goals. The mentors encouraged conversations while working but also expected focused attention and observation. One case was slightly different from the others, Dean worked with one young man (a high school student) to clear weeds from a kalo patch. Both men worked incredibly hard while they talked story with me and Dean showed his mentee the techniques he was taught for planting and pulling kalo. His mentee followed his lead and anticipated their needs for the next job. Compared to the classroom settings I observed, there was much less direct instruction. Praise, I observed, was also given indirectly. Dean complimented his mentee several times praising his level of commitment and work ethic by telling me how he is such a hard worker and how much he has seen his mentee grow and mature over the years. He spoke with pride about his mentee
intentionally speaking loud enough to ensure his mentee was listening to what he was telling me.

Many of these classes, both formal and informal, included quite a bit of laughing, joking, and mutual warmth. The most notable example of this was Māpuana de Silva’s hula class, the class began with students sitting in a circle updating one another on personal news (e.g., their health, family situations, successes in their lives) that haumana wanted to share. When it was time to dance, the kumu asked the haumana to decide what they wanted to do. The students chose a mele and wanted to remain in a circle to dance. Anyone who had danced before knows that this is challenging and confusing at times, but in this class it was just fun. The haumana laughed at themselves, and their kumu laughed along with them, as they made mistakes, turning in the wrong way and switching the placement of their hands and feet as they accidentally followed the opposite movements of their hula sister dancing across from them.

Mentoring. In addition to my participant observations, I also became a student to two other practitioners. Based on our interviews I was able to get a sense of how these practitioners were taught and how they passed on their knowledge. Most mentors said that they started by creating a “place of pono,” a safe and welcoming environment that is also fun to encourage student to be excited about and create a passion for learning. Then mentors focused on building relationships with their students, connecting learning to their lives, and putting their learning in the context of Hawaiian history and of modern society. They encouraged students to answer questions on their own, to think for themselves so they might gain a deeper understanding. Mentors held that this approach empowers the haumana to feel successful in learning. Students usually engaged in hands-on experiences
with time to practice and complete their task or product. Mentors consistently assessed their haumana throughout this process. After students ‘ūniki (graduate) at the highest level of knowledge attainment, they have more freedom to be creative with their craft and make it their own, while honoring their kumu by staying within the foundations of their teachings and style.

Often, these mentors’ approaches included a “sink or swim” mentality. Teachers had high expectations for self-directedness and independent critical thinking. Mentors viewed these skills as important for demonstrating dedication and commitment to learning. When students asked a question, teachers often gave the questions right back to them. This is a way for the kumu to assess students’ readiness based on how they respond to their returned questions.

The assessment . . . is not what I think they know. The assessment is what they show me they know. Which is different because with an assessment, if you’re assessing a student what do you use for your assessment?—the grades, the attitude, all that, but . . . you’re making a subjective point. When I do the assessment, it’s not what they show me as far as tests, as far as aptitudes, or attitudes. It’s what they show me and what they retained and what has become part of them. To see whether or not they’re ready for the next level because if they haven’t retained what I expect, then they’re not going to go to the next level. Kind of different, yeah? (Keone Nunes, cultural practitioner, interview, January 31, 2013)

Several cultural practitioners said they avoided giving the answer to the haumana to force the students to decide what to do on their own. For example, one dual
practitioner (mahi‘ai and oli teacher) mentored a student in protocol and chanting. One of his mentee’s younger sister would spend time with him and her brother at his home and at the lo‘i.

She likes to come to the lo‘i with me now. She likes to chant. . . . “Okay you want to chant, let’s go chant. I teach you these chants . . . I tell her, “This chant, you use this chant like this.” And then I know she’s practicing it. Like we’ll chant it every once in a while at home. Then I don’t bring it up for a month. Then we go to the lo‘i and I go, “Okay, go ahead.” Go ahead, what?” “Chant.” “What chant?”

“I don’t know, figure it out. I gave you a bunch of chants, whichever one you think is the right one.” So go and, and you know it’s . . . you should be thrown into the spot. There is a time when you have to decide for yourself. I give you five chants, they’re not applicable right here. “You gotta figure out which one it is . . . think about it.” There is no right answer . . . there’s acceptable boundaries . . . [I’m] not looking for spot on, I’m looking for you to think and to figure it out. So, that to me, is the ultimate right there. When you take something and you apply it somewhere else without me prompting you. . . . You know you need to figure it out. I give you time, just do it. And she does it, she’s really good. (Kamuela Yim, dual educator, interview, January 14, 2013)

This kumu expected the student to take initiative, decide the appropriate chant for the appropriate time and purpose without being told. Some kumu noted that students often perceived this method as unorthodox, even frustrating and uncomfortable, because this is not the way they were accustomed to learning in a modern Western school system.
I found that mentors consistently assessed students, not only to observe their readiness, commitment, and interest in learning, but also aptitude, critical thinking skills, and self-directedness. This allowed the kumu to observe the students’ skill level on an individual basis and assess their ability to think critically and to complete the task on their own.

. . . this is very stereotypical of me but . . . a lot of people that succeed in . . .

Western classroom settings, . . . a lot to them don’t say show me. . . . Show me what that means. Show me how you do that.” And a lot of times you look at old timers, they don’t say much, but they watch every single thing you do. I think that’s how they learn how to do everything. They just so observant and then, . . . behind closed doors they try, try, try, try, try. Then they go and they watch, then they try, try, try, try. It develops critical thinkers. That’s where, that’s the resultant of that, of modeling. When there’s not spoken explanations, modeling develops critical thinkers and it develops observant people. Two of which is highly lacking now days. (Kamuela Yim, dual educator, interview, January 14, 2013)

Through my observations, both as an observer and a haumana, I found that the mentors taught in the same manner in which they themselves were taught by their kumu. Their teachers expected them to show commitment and dedication to be worthy of gaining their traditional knowledge, and in turn, these practitioners expected no less from their students.

All of the mentors expressed a deep respect for their teachers and recognized the importance of honoring their kumu. As one cultural practitioner described, “My approach
to teaching is to honor my teacher, and his teachers, and our ancestors . . . is to teach what I was taught, then to provide assistance” (Kuahiwi Lorenzo, cultural practitioner, interview, January 12, 2013).

When one cultural practitioner was asked why he became an educator, he indicated that he didn’t choose this role but that it was his kuleana to honor his kumu by passing on the knowledge he was given.

It’s just a kuleana that’s placed upon you, and you either pick it up or . . . you forget about it. And I decided to, I said, “Well I can’t forget about it because I had teachers.” So, . . . if I don’t leave some people with the knowledge necessary to pass on things, then my teachers shouldn’t have taught me. And, that weighs more than anything else. For me personally it doesn’t mean anything, but for me culturally I have to, I have to teach somebody or else all the things that my kūpuna taught me was wasted. And I don’t ever want that to happen. It’s my responsibility, not to the next generation, but to the previous generation. (Keone Nunes, cultural practitioner, interview, January 31, 2013)

For this cultural practitioner and others, the obligation and kuleana was not to the keiki but to the kūpuna. This seemed to be one of the most important factors in their role as a cultural practitioner. Part of their responsibility in honoring their kumu was to pass on the cultural knowledge they were given. Some practitioners, although highly knowledgeable in their field, were reluctant to consider themselves the “expert.” In my observations, I noticed that this was not necessarily due to their years of experience, skill, or confidence levels. It was in comparison to their kumu, whom they felt was far more knowledgeable and could not be surpassed. This seemed to be related to their feelings of
honor and humility to have the opportunity to have learned from their teachers. As one participant shared,

I don’t see myself as a teacher. I see myself as a student fundamentally because I know the great teachers and I’m not them. So this is not . . . a statement of humility; it’s a statement of the truth. And so everything that I do today has been because I was told to do it. The instructions were laid by an amazing generation of leaders that kept voyaging together and made it successful. . . . it’s all about learning and with the obligation and the kuleana and the need to make sure you share it. (Nainoa Thompson, cultural practitioner, interview, January 30, 2013)

Although I believe humility does play a role in this sentiment, I do also recognize the respect and humbling nature of being taught by such knowledgeable kumu. This display of humility and respect was a tribute to their kumu and reflected the values of haʻahaʻa (humility) and hōʻihi (respect) that they instilled in their haumana.

ʻAʻohe pau ka ʻike i ka hālau hoʻokāhi—All knowledge is not taught in the same school (Pukui, 1983, p. 24). Some of the mentors believed that many teachers are needed to truly learn a craft. These mentors valued the fact that they had several teachers. Each teacher provided specific insights in various aspects of their education that were invaluable to their learning.

Some practitioners expressed a concern about finding a balance in teaching between melding the past with the present and making traditional practices accessible for younger generations. One participant said that as much as Hawaiians value the past, they also value innovation, believing that education needs to combine innovation with the knowledge of the past. Several participants talked about making the past relevant to today
and providing opportunities for keiki to engage in these practices. Sadly, many of the practitioners’ areas of cultural expertise (e.g., farming, featherwork, traditional navigation) are less commonly practiced in today’s society, so youths generally have less exposure to these learning opportunities.

Of equal importance was the need to pass on their knowledge and find successors to teach their craft. Unlike typical learning settings, mentoring takes many years to train before students are ready to be on their own. Keone Nunes, the traditional native tattoo artist, for example, shared that he sometimes trained students for 7-15 years just learning and stretching skin before letting them tattoo on a person. The amount of training that goes into this takes a high level of commitment and dedication. Similarly, in hula, students who ‘ūniki as kumu often dedicate many years of hula training before reaching this level.

Part of the mentoring process for several practitioners was having the learners go through the process of making their own materials and tools (e.g., hula instruments, pattern making tools, tattooing instruments). Sometimes, students were even required to grow the plants necessary to make their tools in order to appreciate the work that goes into developing these resources and to build a relationship with those materials. One practitioner believed that the tools teach you, you don’t teach the tools. He only allowed students to make their own tools after years of training and only after he assessed that the tools chose them and that they were ready to use them.

I found that the context of the cultural practice affected the type of mentoring received. Some settings, because of their structure, lent themselves to be more instructional, for example, hula classes have set hours of instruction per week. Whereas,
working in a lo‘i has a more flexible time commitment of working towards the day’s goal until the job is done. In the more instructional settings, students were expected to follow, observe, and be alert and aware of others around them. In the less instructional settings, directions were given and learners were expected to follow instructions without much supervision. To some extent, this required anticipating what was needed to complete the job, taking initiative, and looking ahead to what should come next.

The context also affected how advanced students were selected. Most mentors said that the age of the learner was not a factor in their practice, but a few felt that age did make a difference in how they received knowledge. Two practitioners specifically noted that younger children learned faster than adults. Adults were typically not as open as children to receiving new knowledge. They were often set in their ways, used to being bosses, and tried to bring in external knowledge. Children, on the other hand, had not yet developed set habits. They were open and flexible and would simply listen and learn. For navigation and hula, it was beneficial to have haumana start at an early age (as early as 1 year old for navigation); conversely, for farming and tattooing, adult students were easier to train. One practitioner felt that the younger students today were so used to information being easily obtained and simply handed to them. He found that adult learners had more patience. Though, some of the practitioners observed that this had less to do with age and more to do with maturity and experience.

When mentors were asked how they trained new students, several said they throw them in, starting small and increasing their responsibilities. They felt that the best way for students to learn was to have them do it themselves, give them time to practice, and provide opportunities for them to observe others as they work. When mentors were asked
how they knew when a student was ready to progress and learn something new, almost all of the participants talked about assessing the student’s level of commitment. They pushed the student and watched to see if they kept coming back and pressing forward. One mahi’ai said that students usually want to go straight to pulling kalo, but he has them start at the basics with weeding, which is a hard but vital work. He used this as a test to see how they handled the job, and if they don’t like it, they don’t come back. Mentors said they often assessed students in these ways, randomly testing and observing students to see how they figured it out. Although mentors also said that they gave them tasks they believed the students could handle, starting simple and giving them a little at a time. They said they knew a student was ready when they were consistently learning and progressing and continued to have the right attitude.

**Struggles and Success**

*He kāhiko ho‘okahakaha no ia kula*

*Finery belonging to the plain, put on display*

(Said of a place when blooming season arrives, Pukui, 1983, 651)

Many of the educators and practitioners had varying perspectives when it came to their definitions of success. Some practitioners attributed their view to their upbringing in a time when being Hawaiian was not something of which to be proud. With the struggles the Hawaiian community still faces and the educational gap for Hawaiian youths, our people are still struggling to improve our living conditions.

What became Ka‘ala Farms was actually, . . . [from the] renaissance and activism of the 60s and 70s. We never set out to create Ka‘ala Farms. It was to deal with injustice . . . how come Hawaiians no more nothing, how come Hawaiians, . . . a
whole list of we no more, we no more, we no more, then the anger and the so the question is how come we’re strangers on our own land, how come, you know, places of wealth or gated communities where once were fished, access to cultural sites are off limits and we’re seen as second class citizens. . . . I started my work, . . . graduating from a private school and not having any sense of my culture and what a Hawaiian school, school for Hawaiians and then, you know, being so lost when you go to a university. At that time there wasn’t Hawaiian studies and, anything like that. So you’re in, you’re in a real minority. . . . [Hawaiian kids] don’t have the luxury of parents that can say, “You need to go to college” and help pay your way to college. I would say a majority of kids like at that time. . . . like I said, it was like that time was Vietnam, it was Martin Luther King, it was, you know, the revolution, sort of the burning of Watts in L.A., social unrest, American Indian movement, you know, black movement, brown power. Fighting the war in Vietnam for who, why are we there, you know, what is this communist, why, you know, we’ve been sold a bill of goods and we felt betrayed by that country, the very same country and then never learning the Hawaiian history. It wasn’t taught by the school I went. Culture wasn’t taught. (Eric Enos, cultural practitioner, interview, January 25, 2013)

Another practitioner shared similar experiences growing up which shaped his view of success for Hawaiian youths.

I grew up differently. I grew up somewhat chained to kind of debilitating impact about feeling inferior because of the color of your skin. I just hoped that our young people. . . . don’t have the chains and . . . don’t have to carry those leg
irons of inferiority. . . . I was born and raised into it in a society that did that to you, you know, crushed you. So that’s my kind of deeper level of how I would say, I would define success in terms of how an individual sees themselves and the possibilities and the potentials and the beauties of life on this particular earth. . . . I would also define success in those who are honest about what is happening to their world and have duty to service to do something about it. I don’t define success by those who make, who accumulate a lot of stuff off the backs of those who suffer because of it. . . . And I would define success as those who have in their minds and in their hearts their sense of what they value and they live those values, they mirror those values and they take care of those values. And honestly, if you want that, you can teach it. . . . success is in the ability to change, . . . the problem that we have is that the world is changing so quick, but our schools are not. And so in education, success is when you create the change and become the change. It’s a hard order. It’s a tough one. So, everything about the system is trying to make you not change. (Nainoa Thompson, cultural practitioner, interview, January 30, 2013)

As described earlier, many participants noted that fostering students’ connectedness to their community and sense of place is essential to their learning and development. Many participants voiced a concern for the struggles that students face in the culturally unfamiliar learning environments of Western school systems where learning is often decontextualized for these students.

The most difficult challenges—place and purpose. . . . Students have difficulty in school if they don’t feel connected to that place. That learning place is their place
of education. I don’t think we can really motivate students . . . I think motivation really comes from the way we touch, self-motivation, because we cannot do it for them no matter what . . . we do. We can’t do it for them. They have to do it for themself. (Keiki Kawaiʻaeʻa, classroom educator, interview, October 23, 2012)

Another classroom educator said,

Indigenous people think that everything is connected. You gotta find the connection, the connecting point, yeah? Everything in this system, in this world is connected. You just gotta find that, that magical piece. The “holistic” of it, right. Because now everything is compartmentalized, and everything is separate and that’s where we getting into trouble. (Kaipoʻi Kelling, classroom educator, interview, December 12, 2012)

Several participants described the difference they perceived between teaching in a Hawaiian versus a Western context in regards to the the content, context, process, and purpose of teaching.

. . . the context is different. The whole point is the context, and the intent for what you want in the outcomes of learning I think is different. So therefore, the processes of learning to achieve that are different. One is guided more by more traditional [Western] ways of content, skills, and tests. The other is guided more by form, function, and purpose. (Keiki Kawaiʻaeʻa, classroom educator, interview, October 23, 2012)

Another participant shared . . .

That it is through the delivery of the content . . . rather than teaching culture or history or language as a separate content area. It’s the way . . . in which you
educate your kids that makes a difference for Hawaiians. And I want to be able to
help our teachers get through that. You know, by helping them to understand the
importance of building relationships and not only with the kids, but with the
families. To know who the kids really are, know who the kids really are, not just
here at school, but at home. I mean kids come to school with so much knowledge
from their ‘ohana and we don’t even tap into that. We only, we don’t tap into the
knowledge that each child brings, and we definitely don’t tap into the knowledge
that exists in the family. Um, so that’s, that’s one thing, the importance of
relationships and knowing keiki and their ‘ohana. Everything is knowing the
importance of the ‘ōlelo no‘eau, ma ka hana ka ‘ike, and the learning isn’t a
passive activity, it’s an active thing. And kids . . . should be learning for real
purposes, they should be creating things that happens in life and not just doing
things to turn in for the sake of proving that you’ve gotten through it and then out
the other ear it goes once the lesson is done. So yeah, ma ka hana ka ‘ike for real
purposes. (Liana Honda, dual educator, interview, January 17, 2013)

Most of the educators felt that having their students connect to the information
and be engaged in the learning process was so much more important than simply
memorizing the content. I found that the teaching philosophies between the classroom
educators and cultural practitioners were very similar. This is not surprising as the
educators in this study were also culturally Hawaiian and participated in other cultural
learning settings occasionally as students. Although there were several similarities
between educators’ views on defining success, there were many differences in the
challenges they faced.
Educators spoke of their limitations to engage in cultural practices in both public and charter schools. These teachers most frequently spoke of the limitations of the school-mandated requirements, including state and federal educational standards, benchmarks, and standardized tests. Educators struggled with the back and forth between Western and Hawaiian teaching. It’s a constant struggle to find space, time, curriculum, and resources to teach in Hawaiian ways. One teacher stated that she felt the Department of Education did not support charter and Hawaiian Language Immersion schools and did not want these programs to succeed.

The limited time constraints even affected these classroom educators’ teaching approach. One teacher said that because of time constraints she often had to correct students quickly without giving students the time and space they needed to figure out solutions for themselves and to learn from their mistakes. Schools also didn’t have a budget for experiential, hands-on, off-campus activities or cultural ceremonies. One teacher said she applied for grants yearly to support her students’ cultural learning.

**Challenges in modern contexts.** Many of the participants reflected on how differently knowledge is transmitted today. Children aren’t learning by “sitting at the feet of kūpuna” (Keone Nunes, cultural practitioner, interview, January 31, 2013) as they once did.

I think you need to create the environment for young people today in order for them to be able to learn effectively. You cannot just go throw them outside in the ocean and try to teach them the way that Mau taught me because I had the best of the two worlds. I had [a mentor who used technology to teach me about the stars], I had science and technology and ended up creating learning opportunities for me
that I could trust, ‘cause I understood it. And you had Mau that comes from the complete indigenous side. In that, “You see what I see, and the difficult thing, that’s easy, but you gotta go feel what I feel.” And that’s the one you can’t teach. (Nainoa Thompson, cultural practitioner, interview, January 30, 2013)

Several participants spoke of the difference between today’s students and their expectations, compared to the way participants were taught by their kumu. They noted that students were used to the convenience of technology. If they had a question they want answered, they simply looked it up on the internet. Some of the cultural practitioners felt that students were given information too easily without making them work to figure it out for themselves. So often, students expect so much to be handed to them:

This is what I call the McDonald’s syndrome. McDonald’s syndrome is . . . you go through a drive through, you order your meal, within a couple minutes you get your meal, and as you’re eating, you don’t realize what you’re eating. You don’t taste it . . . it’s not ‘ono (delicious). It can’t be ‘ono. . . . Now it’s like anything else . . . when you work in the yard you can be sweating, you can be working hard, all of a sudden you realize you thirsty, you turn on . . . the spigot outside and you take a drink of water through the hose . . . tastes like the best thing you’ve ever tasted. It’s because you’ve worked for it. I think now days people don’t work for what they want to know. (Keone Nunes, cultural practitioner, interview, January 31, 2013)

Maintaining the wisdom of our kūpuna was viewed as vitally important in revitalizing the Hawaiian culture by these participants, especially in this day and age. A
few participants talked about not considering themselves the experts but feeling the 
kuleana to step up in the absence of those elders who truly are the experts. As one 
participant described, the next generation is having to step up whether they feel ready or 
not because the kūpuna generation is being lost.

Those who I would always think carry those things, now they no stay, right? Now 
what, he [his kupuna] when spend dat time wit’ you. Okay, now what? You goin’ 
keep dat wit’ you, or you goin’ share wit’ as much people as you can while you 
have your time? And, and what scares me is we will be kupuna before we even 
reach the age kupuna. Yeah, you see, to be kupuna you earned that because 
you’ve lived that long. Because of that length of life, you have this perspective, 
you have this way, you earn to be kupuna. Once my mentors go, I’m the next guy. 
Whether you ready for it or not. We’re living even more in a time that it’s 
becoming a necessity, rather than a rite of passage. So how you going do that? 
When you yourself inside feel that, “Brah, I never even get enough time 
experience to be in that position.” Right? It’s scary. (Kaipo‘i Kelling, classroom 
educator, interview, December 12, 2012)

Identity issues and defining Hawaiian. Participants felt that this cultural 
disconnect in learning and education added to students’ struggles with identity. Hawaiian 
identity is a sensitive topic that many Hawaiians, especially young Hawaiians, personally 
deal with, in trying to define who they are, what makes them Hawaiian, and their 
“Hawaiianess.” One participant touched on an important issue for Hawaiian students, and 
I think Hawaiians in general, of being too cultural for students who had not previously 
been exposed to cultural settings. He spoke of his concern for being too Hawaiian for his
students—he’d lose them and their interest if they could not relate to what he was teaching because he used too much language or culture. Beyond making sure what he was teaching was contextualized for his students, it was also a matter of hilahila (shame) for Hawaiian youths. This became a sensitive identity issue for students who were proud to be Hawaiian but had little exposure to Hawaiian language and culture.

One participant said that there isn’t really a way to compare learning in a Hawaiian context to learning in other contexts, stating that the Hawaiian context today is really a hybrid context; that the spaces we occupy are no longer only Hawaiian. Another participant held to the belief that Hawaiian culture is a living culture; that modern Hawaiian culture includes contemporary practices grounded in traditional concepts and techniques. This issue came up a few times with other participants as a significant issue for many Hawaiians trying to define their Hawaiian identity.

[I’m] dealing with that now with a young group of printmakers who take my print class, they have notions of what culture is and what being Hawaiian is, which are very superficial. So we have to address that, . . . going back to identity, going back to who we are as a people. . . . I look at it as a process . . . for them, ‘cause they haven’t gone through it. So, using visual art, you know, whenever I give an assignment in print I get kalo all the time and I feel like putting kalo as a restriction, “You cannot use kalo! Anything but kalo,” ‘cause we’re not about kalo only. . . . the young Hawaiian artists [say], “I don’t feel Hawaiian so I can’t be doing Hawaiian art.” So it’s an identity issue. . . . It’s a very colonized idea. And the other one too is boxing ourselves out. Because we don’t understand what that means, they put restrictions. “Hawaiian is . . .” and if I don’t fit in this box,
I’m screwed. I’m not Hawaiian, now I have a conflict. Well, who made the box? You know, we made the box on ourselves, but also we listened to ... external people or whatever, telling us that. . . . to me [it’s] the living culture . . . they’re using skills of old with customary practices, and they’re using contemporary material. . . . they’re doing the same technique. They’re just expressing it in a contemporary way. And you’re telling this native weaver she’s not native? . . . No, I went through this, its mana suck. You go work it out. I’ve already worked it out.” (Maile Andrade, dual educator, interview, February 12, 2013)

Defining success. Most participants did not refer to academics when they talked about success for Hawaiian learners. Students were considered successful if they contributed to the community, cared for their family, and practiced Hawaiian values of respect and kuleana. Educators aimed to instill a strong sense of place, identity, and Hawaiian values in their students.

Success is not defined through academics. Success is defined in being able to take care of yourself and your family, being happy with what you do, and being able to get along and help others. And I think that’s different from a typical Western because success . . . is really defined by many through the academics, through the attainment of, you know, good jobs or graduating from college. And while that is a great thing, I would take a farmer who is kind to others and can work with others over somebody who . . . doesn’t know how to build good relationships and wants to work in isolation. . . . It’s the social emotional skills that are really important, I mean when you get down to it that’s what companies are looking for and that’s what we’re all looking for in one another. It’s not how
good you are in math, or reading, or writing. Those are just skills. Anybody can learn skills like that, academic skills. And anybody can. (Liana Honda, dual educator, interview, January 17, 2013)

Among the participants, one of the most commonly identified definition of success for Hawaiian students was having a Hawaiian identity and knowing their culture and preferably the language as well, and living Hawaiian values:

Success . . . is again, knowing who you are and where you’re from. And that means knowing your language and your history . . . and I’m all for knowing all kinds of language, all kinds of histories and all kinds of practices, but if you know all of that and you don’t know your own . . . then that’s a problem . . . and it’s been a problem, and there’s been a disconnect . . . we’re the first generation. . . . we’re the first group that had a choice . . . prior to my generation, you know, there weren’t classes offered. There still aren’t classes offered in a lot of places, right? This still isn’t knowledge that’s taught in every high school. There’s some places where students come out with knowledge, and there’s some places where they don’t have anything. . . . There’s still people . . . because they don’t know what they don’t know, they think that success can be found . . . through assimilation, basically . . . just going for the Western model of knowledge and success. . . . and I think for us as a people . . . it’s been seriously detrimental not to know who we are and where we’re from and our language. (Leilani Basham, dual educator, interview, February 27, 2013)

One dual practitioner stated that most important cultural factors to students’ success were honesty, relationships, trust, respect, and aloha.
Honesty. You got to be true. You got to be true to yourself and you got to be true to your environment. Like, also, building relationships . . . mālama ‘āina is usually a relationship to the land . . . relationship to people, relationship to everything. That’s the whole, I think, Hawaiian culture thing. That’s how we relate, you know, ‘cause . . . we are connected . . . and aloha, what that really is. Aloha is reciprocal. It’s not like you give, give, give and I take, take, take. It’s the relationships again, it’s two ways and it’s moving back and forth. I think that’s important. So teaching, part of the thing with having students, I think it’s trust too.

(Maile Andrade, dual educator, interview, February 12, 2013)

Another theme that emerged from the participants’ definitions of success was building relationships and giving back to the community.

. . . the excellence that we promote and we instill in our kids . . . even on this campus [immersion school within an English school] . . . other teachers [on the English side say], “the Hawaiian immersion students, they really do kinda stick out from the rest of the general population” in a very good way, because you can see that the students are more respectful, you know, in their demeanor. They have been surrounded in the importance of respect, and mālama . . . they still represent our program and our values and everything very well, . . . within the larger context of the school, . . . and the community as well. And our kids, they’re . . . actually much more well-rounded . . . individuals. . . . so, it’s sort of . . . [an] ambivalent sort of experience . . . within the DOE . . . I feel so proud of them.

(Kapolei Kiili, classroom educator, interview, November 1, 2012)
Teachers also spoke about the influence teaching culture and in cultural ways had on their students. Some of the teachers felt that one of the most important influences is the idea of students having a sense of meaning and purpose in their lives as students and as members of a community.

I work with students from a place of concern and desire for them to reach their learning goals and hold them to high but reasonable standards in fulfilling them. I spend time to build positive mentoring relationships with my students. Selecting meaningful learning activities that they can engage in on their own and with others in the learning process—have them make connections, use it, practice and apply in ways that I believe they will internalize and find meaning, purpose and contribution to others is a good process for motivating students. Processes that help students to reach self-actualization through work and reflection are also part of the process to self-motivate students. (Keiki Kawai‘ae‘a, classroom educator, interview, October 23, 2012)

One of the mahi‘ai shared that he felt the most important thing for his students was,

... for them to make a connection ... so that there’s some meaning and purpose in life because for the most part the kids who I’m teaching they’re ... at a place in their life where they’re really struggling, ... So it’s challenging for these young people ... they’re at a place where lot of things don’t connect to them, with them ... I’m not pretending to say that this, everybody connects with this because most, reality is most people don’t connect to this. And that’s okay, but that’s how we do. And I think when they make that connection and ... somehow, someway
what they’re doing and the things that they enjoy doing have some kind of meaning and purpose then their life has greater meaning and purpose. (Dean Wilhelm, dual educator, interview, February 14, 2013)

Another participant said that success was students’ knowing who they are and having a solid foundation in their cultural identity but also being able to function in Western society and successfully navigate the larger world.

I think success for a Hawaiian youth . . . maybe today, that’s different from yesterday, or the generation before . . . is having a firm foundation in oneself, like your own identity as a native Hawaiian . . . so in your culture and in your language . . . but also be able to navigate the Western world if you will, and have a balance the both . . . and be able to exist and live in both contexts . . . and to know when it’s appropriate for one thing or another, you know . . . for example . . . one of my haumana this year, born and raised in Moloka‘i . . . has a lot of ‘ike, you know, cultural knowledge and his own passions, . . . his cultural knowledge and language and . . . the values is very pa’a, and so now it’s [getting] him to feel confident to be who he is, and interact with other people that might not understand who he is, . . . in confident ways . . . whether it’s through presentation, or wri[ting] . . . I think a successful Hawaiian youth . . . can do both, you know, or can be adaptive to the context of wherever they’re at, and . . . still have the sensitivity to whatever the situation requires of them, and . . . be solid in the values . . . yeah, be solid in the values that they possess, and practice, you know . . . because you can practice aloha in a non-Hawaiian setting. (Kapolei Kiili, classroom educator, interview, November 1, 2012)
**Indefinable connection.** One of the ultimate goals that educators wanted for their students was for them to reach a deeper level of knowledge acquisition, being able to understand the deeper meaning and purpose behind the lessons, and ideally to reach an almost spiritual level of enlightenment, connection, and appreciation of the knowledge gained.

... it connects to... their culture and their mindset, and I think, especially for those who are Hawaiian. There’s something that resonates much deeper and I cannot necessarily explain that because it’s in me and, and I don’t know how to necessarily translate that. (Dean Wilhelm, dual educator, interview, February 14, 2013)

In a related view, a classroom educator said,

I think being in a Hawaiian [class]... there’s this... cycle of reciprocity that’s sort of required, you know... like, to give of yourself, not completely, but... to be a contributor within the community... last year when I took the kids to Auwahi, I had them reflect like, okay... it’s a lot of work, we’ve gotta get up super early to drive there, we gotta hike, we gotta sweat, you know, we planted like fifteen hundred trees in one day... it’s a lot of work. But how do you feel... while you’re out there? And one of the things I remember one of my students saying, is like... they feel connected to their kupuna when they’re doing work like that... and I was like, wow... that’s awesome... you’re connecting to your kupuna, not your iPod... I’ve succeeded! (Kapolei Kiili, classroom educator, interview, November 1, 2012)
Several participants talked about this unexplainable feeling when it came to truly understanding or connecting with the knowledge.

On one level it’s just, you know, no ka pono ka ‘āina a me ke kanaka, right? Trying to find a space where we as people can regain . . . a position of pono, of balance, and success and knowledge . . . and then, that goes on the individual level as well as the group level, because I found a lot of empowerment through this knowledge. So I want to give my students that, right? Who don’t even realize how, you know, in some ways . . . they feel it, but then they can’t really maybe articulate it. (Leilani Basham, dual educator, interview, February 27, 2013)

This participant felt this change when she learned Hawaiian. As a hula dancer she learned the mele and understood what she was dancing or who the dance was honoring. She even felt connected to the meaning of the dance and the importance of the mele, but when she could finally understand the language and the kaona of the words for herself, she felt a deeper connection, and it had a stronger meaning for her.

. . . so when I teach my students I want them to . . . I wanna wake them up to that knowledge . . . and wake them up to that history . . . and so . . . I do make the statement that . . . if you’re dancing hula and you don’t speak Hawaiian, then you’re not understanding it at the level that you could be, basically . . . which isn’t to say that you have no understanding of it . . . it’s just to say that it’s a more limited understanding . . . so that Makee ‘Ailana was the song that I was dancing when it was like, I understand this song . . . and that was like a lightbulb . . . and then . . . trying to bring those together . . . for my students, and trying to push the idea to them that . . . if you really wanna get it, you’ve gotta get it in Hawaiian . . .
But . . . not in a way that makes the people who don’t understand the Hawaiian feel like, oh, then I shouldn’t be dancing hula, ‘cause that’s not my point either . . . my point is it’s about a process . . . and that we’re all somewhere different in our process of learning. There’s never a final goal that you get to and you’re done . . . And we don’t all start at the same place, so it’s always about . . . so that’s like for Kūnihi ka Mauna. It’s all about making the journey up the mountain, however your journey has to be, but keeping going. (Leilani Basham, dual educator, interview, February 27, 2013)

Native spaces and kīpuka. Several participants spoke of the importance of physical or conceptual kīpuka (oasis or places of growth). One mahi‘ai described how his goal is to create a kīpuka for the community. He said that in the past 5 years of building this lo‘i, this kīpuka, about 2,000 people have come to kōkua (help) in some way, by pulling weeds, planting kalo, or offering encouragement and support.

It’s been a long journey, we’re still journeying, you know. We’re not there yet, necessarily, but, um, but we’re here carving out a kīpuka . . . a place that is going to be able to be a source for, you know, truly whole food, kalo, and all those things, but also be . . . a resource for the community. To come to, uh, connect, uh, body, mind, and spirit . . . this place here is . . . a resource for, . . . nā mea Hawai‘i. (Dean Wilhelm, dual educator, interview, February 14, 2013)

So we . . . all take . . . our seat in the wa‘a, and everybody has a different role, and everybody has something different to give. But it’s all committed to perpetuating, and carrying on, and helping. All of us can move forward and we all have vital roles to play. (Dean Wilhelm, dual educator, interview, February 14, 2013)
Participants also talked about the need to create a native space in the educational setting. One participant talked about how we exist in the world and negotiate the space as native people. She felt this was essential to nation building and establishing who we are.

Hawaiian identity I think . . . has to do with the maoli inside of the kanaka, you know that living spirit. That . . . helps to kind of sustain you and from that comes your confidence and . . . your bravery and . . . your sense of security; it’s wrapped in that that living spirit of you called the maoli. . . . most of our work here . . . has been founded around shaping and carving those spaces around this idea of our kumu honua maoli ola and the three major pillars are piko, which has to do with looking at connections and relationships and those connections and relationships can be seen and unseen they are genealogically . . . connected. There are family talents that we’re born with and we hope we nurture, . . . and foster them in an educational setting. . . . the maoli is about that whole identity space, . . . the spiritual connection, our action and behaviors, our traditional knowledge and our language—all of that shaping that . . . we’ve experienced through a variety of ways whether it’s through hula, in our homes, our relationship outside with the community, all of those pieces nurture that, that special maoli spirit. And then the last is the honua, the places, and the places are very important ‘cause those are the particular context where, where that cultural sense of ourselves . . . is fostered. . . . I look at [the understanding of the cultural sense of self] as being very basic and timeless understandings. So the, the challenge for us . . . is to really be able to shape the intentions of those understandings into more contemporary context.

(Keiki Kawai‘ae’a, classroom educator, interview, October 23, 2012)
**Goals.** The majority of the goals mentioned dealt with the holistic development of the student; their well-being, motivation, empowerment, and living up to student’s potential. “The goals for my students, . . . [going] back to that idea of space of mana, . . . is that they are empowered by their knowledge . . . to speak their language, and know their history . . .” (Leilani Basham, dual educator, interview, February 27, 2013).

Another participant added,

My goal for teaching language and culture is . . . preservation and continuation. ‘Cause I noticed . . . these generations . . . the past few years [are] very different . . . from how I grew up, you know, society is changing, you know, so. I just want them to be aware, and the importance of the language and their part in preserving it. . . . ‘Cause a lot of my students are part Hawaiian or Hawaiian, and none of their family members speak Hawaiian. . . . I told them as a Hawaiian it’s your kuleana . . . to take on this and pretty much mālama, you know. I’m not saying you have to be fluent by the end of the school year. But, you just have to understand the importance of our language and our culture, and do . . . whatever your part is. Even if it’s really small, it’s something, you know. So I try to kinda instill that importance in them. (Puni Badis, classroom educator, interview, December 19, 2012)

One classroom educator talked about Hawaiian youths needing to have pride and humility, these might seem like opposing values, but this is not uncommon in Hawaiian thought. Hawaiian youths should be taught to be proud of their culture and their people but to be humble on an individual level—humble in how they interact with others and
how they share their knowledge, how they honor their kūpuna and show appreciation and respect.

**Effects on students.** Two mentors explicitly talked about how creating a strong foundation in cultural identity led to the success of their students. This sense of identity aids the student through struggles and empowers them to handle the challenges in other learning environments.

You know, what I find . . . [is] the kids in the hālau who adapt to this Hawaiian style of learning, do much better in a Western situation. They’re the smart, brilliant kids. That if they can learn in the Hawaiian way it’s [guaranteed] they’re gonna succeed in the Western. (Māpuana, de Silva, cultural practitioner, interview, October 4, 2012)

This was also true for their non-Hawaiian students. “for me, first and foremost, it’s about them being able to feel confident in themselves as native Hawaiian children—even our non-native Hawaiian children, it gives them a sense of self . . .” (Kapolei Kiili, classroom educator, interview, November 1, 2012).

When educators were asked how they believed teaching in Hawaiian ways influenced their students, a few educators mentioned the goal of having their learners be able to defy stereotypes, live up to their potential, and be proud of who they are. “A successful Hawaiian is one that breaks every stereotype out there, . . . and at the end of the day is proud to be a Hawaiian. Knowing his or her . . . language I think would be a bonus ” (Kamuela Yim, dual educator, interview, January 14, 2013).

I think a lot of them, the mindset changes . . . they’re taking a lot more pride in their culture, their language. . . . I tell them in the beginning, . . . I’m not teaching
this just for you to get your credits to graduate, . . . it’s something for life.” . . .
that’s how I think the foundation in the beginning has to be set, where, . . . you
have to take pride in this, you have to be proud of what you’re learning. You have
to . . . take this as your own and be proud of it. . . . Especially for the students that
are Hawaiian . . . not only culture as a people but even as a school community. . . .
‘Cause we’re heavily stereotyped, but . . . when you get to know the kids, the kids
have very big hearts . . . they fight for what they think is right, . . . they’re very
family oriented. So, you know, they have good points, we just always see the bad
points or the bad points are always highlighted. The statistics don’t look great, but
if you know the students, there’s so many good qualities [and] what’s really hard
is . . . we have . . . these really good students, . . . but, we don’t have enough
resources for them to, to become their full potential. We don’t have enough
support systems...we don’t have enough community and parental support. You
know, because of that cycle that they’re stuck in,...it’s tough, but we gotta
highlight...those success stories . . . (Puni Badis, classroom educator, interview,
December 19, 2012)
Chapter 4

Discussion

The results of this study revealed the main purposes, values, and goals for these cultural educators, which include but are not limited to, fostering connections to the past, community, and kūpuna; making traditional knowledge relevant in a modern context; and strengthening culture, language, and identity for their haumana. In exploring their perspectives, I was able to distill their beliefs and philosophies and discern similarities and differences between formal and informal educational practices.

In Hawai‘i, as with many colonized indigenous societies, colonization resulted in the devaluing of our culture and native teaching practices, which has led to issues of identity, inequality, and educational inequity. One way to close the cultural gap, after generations of suppression of the Hawaiian culture, is to go back to find the thread of Hawaiian ways of teaching and pedagogical approaches that are organic, intuitive, and relevant today. A goal of this study was to identify practices that can shed more light on the traditional ways Hawaiians have passed knowledge from generation to generation.

More and more educators and educational programs in many indigenous cultures are advocating for and incorporating culture in their teachings and using traditional strategies to address the struggles that indigenous learners experience in formal educational settings (Demmert, 2011; Kana‘iaupuni, Ledward, & Jensen, 2010; Krug, 2004; McIvor, 2005; Wilson & Kawai‘ae‘a, 2007). The findings in this study support the literature on the importance of incorporating indigenous culture and language into education. All of the participants stated that maintaining and perpetuating the Hawaiian culture and language is one of the most important aspects of teaching, not only teaching
about Hawaiian culture but teaching *through* culture. These educators felt that teaching students about their culture and language gave students a sense of purpose and meaning, strengthened students’ identity, instilled pride, and empowered students on an educational and personal level.

**Formal and Informal Practices**

During the interviews, the participants reflected on their teaching strategies at levels they may not have considered prior, describing concrete examples of strategies that previously may have been abstract understandings. Many of the participants, especially the cultural practitioners, instinctively knew the value of what they taught and how they taught such that in the past they did not need to analyze it. My questions gave them the opportunity to put into words the intentions behind what they did and why it was significant, to explain exercises that prepared the mind and body or why they made consistent, inconspicuous observational assessments. These results highlight the subtle yet significant and rather unique teaching and learning strategies that organically occur in Hawaiian contexts. In part, the purpose of this study was to take these practices from intuitive and implicit to explicit.

Culture manifested in formal classroom educators’ teaching practices in several ways; for example, through curriculum, activity designs, and hands-on community experiences. These teachers typically had many more limitations than did cultural practitioners. Even though all of the classroom educators had some limitations (at minimum, accountability to their institution and administration), the K-12 group seemed to have even more constraints than the preschool and college level educators.
I found that the educators from all three groups shared similar reasons for teaching Hawaiian culture and goals for their students; however, they expressed significantly different challenges to teaching in Hawaiian ways. Some of the challenges are fundamental. One participant questioned the word “curriculum,” stating that if curriculum is not a Hawaiian concept, then how can we have a Hawaiian curriculum.

Among the biggest challenges were the limitations of time and space for all K-12 schools, including immersion and cultural-based charter schools. According to Noelani Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2013), curriculum even in these schools is still controlled by federal standards, which limit the flexibility of integrating culture in the classroom. Goodyear-Kaʻōpua called for education that provides for self-sufficiency of the schools and accountability of the State, and ultimately for sovereignty in education for all Hawai‘i schools. Granting us this freedom in formal education would allow us to apply native knowledge systems and assessments, and to create bi-literate language learning to change the shape, format, and essence of the school system.

Informal processes and approaches to teaching in indigenous cultures have been well documented (Greenfield, Maynard, & Childs, 2000; Lancy, 2012; Lave & Wenger, 1998; Paradise & Rogoff, 2009). Flexibility and freedom are less of an issue in informal educational settings. Cultural practitioners described very distinct philosophies and approaches to teaching, particularly allowing time to teach in deep, meaningful, contextualized, and culturally responsive ways. In speaking with and observing these participants, similarities began to emerge among their practices (see Table 3). While not all of these elements are generalizable to every informal teaching setting, the following table outlines their mentoring strategies.
Table 3

Cultural Practitioner Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mālama (Support, building rapport)</td>
<td>▪ Build relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Create a place of pono.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival of the Fittest</td>
<td>▪ Throw students in, “sink or swim” mentality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Have haumana do the hardest work first and see who survives and sticks with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Test to see who shows commitment and tenacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Not much direct teaching until it is needed and allows time for students to practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Required to make own materials and tools even growing your own plants to make materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Have students problem-solve and figure things out on their own, only interjecting when necessary. May include students learning from mistakes and learning from observing others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Allow more independence, creativity and innovation in the students’ craft (usually for advanced students).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Expectations for Students</td>
<td>▪ Students are expected to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ observe using all senses (including common sense).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ behave with respect and in culturally appropriate ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ show dedication and willingness to work hard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ understand their kuleana to the larger group or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ show care in what they do; always working neatly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Assessment</td>
<td>▪ Constant assessing and observing on the part of the kumu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Students step up gradually to more advanced work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Typically over a long period of time in order to gain a deep understanding, appreciation, and respect for their craft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Usually, kumu does not share all knowledge with every student. Only select knowledge depending on student’s level of commitment and purpose in learning — knowledge/wisdom should be given to the right person for the right reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Students advance only after careful assessment by their kumu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Only at the highest level of knowledge attainment are students given permission to advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Different levels of mentoring; varied by students’ readiness and purpose in the learning context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Some students learning just for fun, other have more serious commitment—kumu adjusts to the learner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ If only sharing broad knowledge, then approach is different, for example, may not throw into the hardest part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Feedback | ▪ Seems to include less direct feedback or praise, more indirect praise or group praise.  
▪ Criticism is common but not perceived as negative. It reflects the high standards and expectations of excellence for the learner.  
▪ Builds on a strong relationship that’s developed over time and based on a subtle familial pride in mentee.  
▪ Haumana show mutual respect and admiration through their dedication, hard work, and by honoring the teachings of their kumu. |
| Mo’olelo | ▪ Often involves storytelling and humor—this builds the intimate relationship but is also tied to the learning.  
▪ Sharing of self and knowledge.  
▪ Creates lineage, connecting haumana to their teacher’s kumu. |

From an outsider’s perspective, the “survival of the fittest” approach may be seen as harsh; however, in spite of the fact that this may be atypical for learners today, this approach characteristically includes a high standard of individual expectations and group obligation coupled with high levels of support, warmth, and genuine regard amongst peers and the kumu in an often familial environment.

**Characteristics of Learners**

According to my observations, development seemed to unfold without a lot of stimulation, yet with an emphasis on reflecting, observing, and listening. In regards to their mindset, haumana are expected to have a quiet, reflective mind during the learning process. Educators encouraged reflective internal questioning and curiosity to support the development of strong independent critical thinkers. Students were also expected to be attentive and observant and to follow their kumu without questioning.

Proving one’s dedication was a major priority for the cultural practitioners, apparently more important than intelligence, talent, or skill. Although, commitment was
not on the survey administered to the educators, effort and practice were ranked as the highest priority for these educators. This finding fits with the cultural practitioners’ expectation for learners to be intrinsically motivated. Unlike, formal schooling, students are not required to attend classes or participant so intrinsic motivation and commitment are highly valued. Practitioners seemed to use this as a way of assessing their strengths, aptitude, readiness, eagerness, determination, and devotion to learning. Students were expected to show respect to their kumu, their peers, and their ukana. Additionally, students were expected to be aware of their actions and behaviors in the context of the group, understanding how this can affect those around them and reflect on the community.

All of the participants commonly mentioned the kuleana of the learner to their kumu, peers, community, and ancestors. Haumana were also expected to practice Hawaiian values, including aloha, hō‘ihi, and haʻahaʻa, to know the appropriate ways to behave, and to obey their kumu. Ultimately, students were expected to understand their responsibility in the larger context of perpetuating the language, culture, and craft that they’re learning.

Most of the activities I observed were in group settings with the expectation that the learner supports and contributes to the group. In one of the mahiʻai apprenticeship settings, the learning occurred one-on-one, yet even in this setting, the teacher emphasized that the task they were completing benefited the larger Hawaiian community in that it established a kīpuka for people to gather, eat, and connect with the ʻāina.

**Modeling and self-directed learning.** As the results of this study revealed, modeling and self-directed learning were frequently mentioned by the educators. Similar
to the finding in other indigenous communities (Dalton & Youpa, 1998; Tharp, 2006; Tharp, Dalton, & Yamauchi 1994), the two CREDE Standards were conceptually different in Hawaiian contexts. Participants described modeling as a well-known form of traditional teaching, quoting the ‘ōlelo no’eau, “Nānā ka maka” (Pukui, 1983, p. 248). Interestingly, this saying is described to include not asking questions. Yet, according to these participants internal questioning and curiosity was encouraged. Questioning the kumu, however, was not encouraged. This observational approach was also tied to having a reflective nature in learning and the ability to think critically about what you are observing in the learning environment. Navigation is an excellent case in point of the importance of intense observation needed in order to understand the natural surroundings including the stars, waves, winds, and clouds.

This concept also lent itself to self-directed behaviors. Educators described students who were expected to be self-reflective, self-questioning, and independent, critical thinkers. Students were expected to take initiative in their learning, determine for themselves the best steps to take, and learn on their own and from their own mistakes. Although some researchers might refer to this as autonomous (Thanasoulas, 2000), this ignores the social context of learning. Self-directedness in this context is situated in relation to the learning environment and the larger community. For example, learners were expected to self-govern their behaviors and actions in the learning environment. Although this is an autonomous action, it is tied to the effects their actions would have on the larger group. As participants explained, learning the language and culture, in itself, was for the betterment of the entire lāhui, to maintain and perpetuate our culture for future generations.
Kumu are Still the Haumana of their Kumu

Several educators, particularly the cultural practitioners, expressed that they themselves were both students and teachers. They honored their kumu by passing on the knowledge they were given, but did not consider themselves to be at the same expert status as their kumu. I noticed an interesting pattern, when many of these participants were asked about their perspective, they often referred to the wisdom of their kūpuna by sharing something they were told by or an experience they had with their kūpuna. This demonstrated how much they revered their kūpuna and cherished the knowledge that was shared with them. It also revealed the extent that their kūpuna and kumu shaped who they are today, the role their wisdom played in their lives, and how this manifested in their teaching practices.

Nā Mea Huna No‘eau

In understanding the participants’ educational and cultural ideologies, I noticed that some of the educators in all three educator groups referred to common ‘ōlelo no‘eau, particularly, ma ka hana ka ‘ike. The use of ‘ōlelo no‘eau demonstrated the importance of these teaching styles for Hawaiians both historically and today. These sayings illuminate the way our ancestors taught, the learning styles they emphasized, and the manner in which descendants have learned best for generations.

Perpetuating Hawaiian culture and practices were of the highest importance for all the educators. I noticed that the main goals and purposes for teaching Hawaiian culture followed the Hawaiian concept of the three piko. In Hawaiian thought, everyone has three piko or “connection” places on the body, connecting to the past, present, and future. These educators viewed the purposes of knowledge sharing as (a) connecting to the past
to honor their kūpuna and to place learning in a historical context; (b) connecting to the present by making knowledge relevant for modern day society, providing a native space or kīpuka, and instilling pride and empowering our people; (c) and connecting to the future by maintaining and expanding on our kūpuna wisdom and developing successors in young people who will one day become the keepers of our native knowledge and be responsible for perpetuating our culture.

Connectedness and relevancy were a common theme mentioned by all of the educators and was described as having multiple layers of meaning. There was a clear priority of making learning relevant to students’ lives, to the community, to the land, and to each other. While another layer had to do with melding native wisdom with modern practices, making traditions relevant in today’s changing society, and modifying approaches while maintaining the integrity of the cultural knowledge. This approach allowed for innovation within the learning context while holding true to the cultural foundations and values.

According to these educators, students’ successes were also tied to their connections with others—contributing to the community, caring for their family, and practicing Hawaiian values of hō‘ihi and kuleana. They believed that knowing the culture and language and having a sense of identity and connectedness could bring meaning and purpose to their students’ lives. Educators aimed to instill a strong sense of place, identity, and Hawaiian values in their students so that they would know who they are in the context of the larger world.

Many indigenous cultures are pushing for the integration of native knowledge in education (Aranga-Low, 2000; Ball & McIvor, 2005; Lipka, 2011). In Yup’ik, Alaska
Native culture, for example, Lipka (2007) suggests educational settings find ways to allow for what he refers to as a “third space” for indigenous learning in the classroom. Incorporating native practices involves using traditional techniques that are expressed in contemporary ways through formal education.

**Theoretical Implications**

The findings of this study fit with the sociocultural perspective which suggests that individuals’ thoughts, ideas, views, and beliefs develop from social interactions (Vygotsky, 1978). This theory suggests that culture is learned through interactions with others in the community. Thus learning in any educational setting is a cultural activity (Lancy, Bock, & Gaskins, 2010; Weisner, 2011).

Vygotsky’s (1978) theory puts knowledge in a cultural and historical context and suggests that culture is co-constructed. The results of this study support Vygotsky’s theory in its focus on how aspects of culture are passed down from generation to generation. As suggested by Vygotsky, thought processes and behaviors are shaped by interactions with others within the historical and cultural context.

**Practical Implications**

This study is significant in its investigation of indigenous practices, views, beliefs, and ways of being in both formal and informal educational settings. Gathering the perspectives of cultural practitioners as well as classroom educators adds native voices to the growing body of research investigating the role of indigenous, contextualized knowledge in learning contexts and the role of culturally responsive education for indigenous learners.
The findings of this study demonstrate the benefits of conducting ethnotheory research for culturally focused educational programs both in Hawai‘i and for other indigenous communities seeking culturally appropriate teaching strategies. Accessing these educators’ and practitioners’ perspectives can provide some insights as to how to incorporate cultural strategies in classrooms. The cultural practitioners, in particular, had unique methods of evaluation and observation of students’ learning. Understanding the perspectives of these educators may assist educational leaders in creating policy to support the use of culture and traditional teaching strategies in the classroom—the priority of organic development and pace over content knowledge, meeting students at their level of development, and allowing time for students’ to develop their thoughts, reflect on their learning, figure things out on their own, and gain hands-on experiences.

This study highlights the importance of incorporating culture in the learning environment and supports the call for native educational practices in formal educational settings. Understanding the cultural definitions of success and purposes of learning should have a role in the classroom experience and influence educational policy and practices.

As colonization typically occurs through the educational system (Cummins, 1994), I believe education is the key to rebuilding the Hawaiian nation. I was not born into the generation that was physically beaten for speaking our native language in school, nor was I part of the generation that was treated as inferior and unintelligent because of our ethnicity, but I have witnessed the pain of these struggles in the words and in the eyes of our kūpuna and see the continued effects on our youth. The struggles with oppression and loss of language, culture, and identity have taken their toll over generations and it
will take generations to heal and rebuild our lāhui. My goal is to be a part of the current and future generations who are striving to empower our people and to contribute in some small way to raising Hawaiian consciousness.

**Limitations and Future Research**

This study is unique in its use of both interviews and participant observations to gain insights into the practices of various cultural practitioners and classroom educators. Potential limitations of this study that should be considered are the reliance on self-selection and self-report. All of the participants in this study volunteered to participate and reported on their own practices. However, these participant observations allowed me to verify the self-reports.

A future research study could add to this Hawaiian ethnotheory by expanding the range of educator and cultural practitioner perspectives. Another possible extension of this research would be to interview these participants’ students and mentees to compare the haumana perspective with the kumu perspective. Collecting the learners’ views would be insightful and add a new perspective in the research. For example, in one of my observations, a mentee shared a story about how his uncle was teaching him how to hunt. He said during his first time hunting, his uncle just threw him in and made him do all the hard work. He recognized this was different from how he was used to being taught in school. His mentor pointed out that was learning in a Hawaiian way and told him that one day he would become the teacher and be the one telling some other young man to do all the hard work. And in this way, the lessons are passed down generation to generation.

Mōhala ka pua, ua wehi kaiao,

*The blossoms are opening, for dawn is breaking* (Pukui, 1983, 2179).
This journey of discovering a Hawaiian ethnotheory of teaching and learning has unfolded and bloomed from the wisdom and knowledge of these kumu. This ethnotheory gives life to these strong, grounded native voices—these kumu that are the foundation of their haumana. As pua are nurtured and thrive, when given the appropriate amount of light and rain, they branch out from the kumu while remaining grounded. As this ethnotheory revealed, Hawaiian learning and teaching styles are still relevant in today’s modern context and the ancestral knowledge of our kumu and kūpuna continue to blossom in the new day.
Appendix A

Background Survey

Instructions: Please circle the best answer or fill in the blank next to the question.

1. What is your name? _________________________

2. What is your ethnicity(s)? Please list in order of the ethnicity you identify with most. _________________________

3. What is your age? ______

4. Where did you grow up? If not in Hawai‘i, how many years have you lived here?

5. Do you speak Hawaiian? If yes, when and how did you learn the language? In what contexts do you use the language?

6. What is the highest level of schooling that you have completed?
   - High school degree
   - Associate’s degree
   - Bachelor’s degree
   - Master’s degree
   - Doctoral degree

7. What is your occupation? _________________________

8. What do you teach? _________________________

9. Where do you teach? _________________________

10. How many years have you been teaching? ____________

11. When did you decide to become a teacher?
   - As a child
   - In high school
   - In college
   - While working in another career field
   - Other (please explain) _________________________

12. Please describe the typical learners in your class (age, mixed age groups, ethnicity, etc.)
Instructions: For each of the following items think about how important each concept is for students to be successful in the learning context in which you work. Rate the level of importance on a scale of 0-5 (0=not important, 5=very important).

The learning context in which I am thinking about is: _______________

13. Please rate the level of importance of *intrinsic motivation*:

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

14. Please rate the level of importance of *extrinsic motivation*:

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

15. Please rate the level of importance of *practice* in learning:

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

16. Please rate the level of importance of *intelligence* in learning:

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

17. Please rate the level of importance of *effort* in learning:

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

18. Please rate the level of importance of *skill or talent* in learning:

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

19. Please rate the level of importance of *praise*:

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

20. Please rate the level of importance of *criticism*:

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
21. What kind of praise and criticism do you use?

22. How do you motivate the students you are teaching?
Appendix B

Interview protocol: Educators

1. Where did you learn the Hawaiian culture? From whom?
   a. How was this taught to you?

2. What role does the Hawaiian language or culture play in your life?

3. How do you use the Hawaiian culture in educating students?

4. Could you provide an example of something you taught or were taught in a Hawaiian way? and explain why you think this is particularly Hawaiian?

5. What kinds of education related cultural activities have you been involved in? What was your role? How often?

6. What kinds of cultural activities do you do with your students, both related and not related to school? (Language-related activities?)

7. What are your goals for using the Hawaiian culture in an educational setting?

8. How does learning Hawaiian culture influence your students?

9. What cultural factors do you think are the most important for students’ success (e.g., community connections, values, traditional knowledge, cultural identity, etc.)?

10. How do you think the Hawaiian community would define success for Hawaiian youths in general?

11. How do you think teaching in a Hawaiian context is different from teaching in other contexts? Could you provide an example?

12. Have you ever experienced a conflict between wanting to teach in a Hawaiian way and being constrained by expectations from the educational system (e.g., DOE or the University system)?

13. How do you think learning in a Hawaiian context is different from learning in other contexts? Could you provide an example?

14. How do you think what you described is similar or different to traditional Hawaiian teaching historically? Why?

15. What are your goals for your students and how are these goals similar or different to typical “Western” educational programs?
16. What aspects of education for Hawaiian students, in your opinion, are most valued?

17. What do you see as the most difficult challenges for Hawaiian learners in educational settings?

18. What made you want to become a teacher?

19. What does it mean to be a teacher?
   a. How does this relate to learning?

20. The next two questions are about specific teaching or learning styles. The first one is *modeling or observational learning*. Do you feel this is important in the Hawaiian culture? Why or why not? If possible, please give an example.

21. The second learning style is *self-directed learning*. Do you think *self-directed learning* is important in the Hawaiian culture? Why or why not? If possible, please give an example.
   (If explanation is necessary: Self-directed learning is described as a process where the responsibility shifts from the teacher to the student. The student assumes ownership over their learning using strategies such as self-motivation and self-evaluation).

22. Do you have any other comments you would like to make regarding your perspective on anything we have been talking about?

23. Are there other teachers or cultural practitioners that you recommend that we talk to about this topic?

24. Would it be all right to contact you if I have other questions? Would you like to use a pseudonym or your real name (choose a pseudonym)? Would I be able to use your voice/image in a presentation of these results?
Appendix C

Interview protocol: Cultural Practitioners

1. Where did you learn the Hawaiian culture? From whom?
   a. How was this taught to you?

2. What role does the Hawaiian language or culture play in your life?

3. How do you use the Hawaiian culture in educating students?

4. Could you provide an example of something you taught or were taught in a Hawaiian way? and explain why you think this is particularly Hawaiian?

5. Could you please describe your approach to teaching? What style or strategies do you use as a cultural practitioner?

6. How do you think what you described is similar or different to traditional Hawaiian teaching historically? Why?

7. How often do you train someone new? What is the typical process of training a new learner? Does the age of the new learner make a difference (adult vs child learner)?

8. How do you find/choose students?

9. How do you know when someone is ready to learn something new?
   a. How do you know when they’ve learned it?

10. How does learning Hawaiian culture influence your students?

11. What cultural factors do you think are the most important for students’ success (e.g., community connections, values, traditional knowledge, cultural identity, etc.)?

12. How do you think the Hawaiian community would define success for Hawaiian youths in general?

13. How do you think teaching in a Hawaiian context is different from teaching in other contexts? Could you provide an example?

14. How do you think learning in a Hawaiian context is different from learning in other contexts? Could you provide an example?

15. What made you want to become a teacher?
16. What does it mean to be a teacher?
   a. How does this relate to learning?

17. The next two questions are about specific teaching or learning styles. The first one is *modeling* or *observational learning*. Do you feel this is important in the Hawaiian culture? Why or why not? If possible, please give an example.

18. The second learning style is *self-directed learning*. Do you think *self-directed learning* is important in the Hawaiian culture? Why or why not? If possible, please give an example.
   (If explanation is necessary: Self-directed learning is described as a process where the responsibility shifts from the teacher to the student. The student assumes ownership over their learning using strategies such as self-motivation and self-evaluation).

19. Do you have any other comments you would like to make regarding your perspective on anything we have been talking about?

20. Are there other teachers or cultural practitioners that you recommend that we talk to about this topic?

21. Would it be all right to contact you if I have other questions? Would you like to use a pseudonym or your real name (choose a pseudonym)? Would I be able to use your voice/image in a presentation of these results?
Appendix D

Interview protocol: Dual educators

1. Where did you learn the Hawaiian culture? From whom?
   a. How was this taught to you?

2. What role does the Hawaiian language or culture play in your life?

3. How do you use the Hawaiian culture in educating students?

4. Could you provide an example of something you taught or were taught in a Hawaiian way? and explain why you think this is particularly Hawaiian?

5. Could you please describe your approach to teaching? What style or strategies do you use as a cultural practitioner?

6. How do you think what you described is similar or different to traditional Hawaiian teaching historically? Why?

7. What are your goals for using the Hawaiian culture in an educational setting?

8. How does learning Hawaiian culture influence your students?

9. What cultural factors do you think are the most important for students’ success (e.g., community connections, values, traditional knowledge, cultural identity, etc.)?

10. How do you think the Hawaiian community would define success for Hawaiian youths in general?

11. How often do you train someone new? What is the typical process of training a new learner? Does the age of the new learner make a difference (adult vs child learner)?

12. How do you find/choose students?

13. How do you know when someone is ready to learn something new?
   a. How do you know when they’ve learned it?

14. How do you think learning in a Hawaiian context is different from learning in other contexts? Could you provide an example?

15. How do you think teaching in a Hawaiian context is different from teaching in other contexts? Could you provide an example?
16. As a classroom teacher, have you ever experienced a conflict between wanting to teach in a Hawaiian way and being constrained by expectations from the educational system (e.g., DOE or the University system)?

17. What kinds of cultural activities do you do with your students, both related and not related to school? (Language-related activities?)

18. What are your goals for your students and how are these goals similar or different to typical “Western” educational programs?

19. What do you see as the most difficult challenges for Hawaiian learners in educational settings?

20. What made you want to become a teacher?

21. What does it mean to be a teacher?
   a. How does this relate to learning?

22. The next two questions are about specific teaching or learning styles. The first one is *modeling* or *observational learning*. Do you feel this is important in the Hawaiian culture? Why or why not? If possible, please give an example.

23. The second learning style is *self-directed learning*. Do you think *self-directed learning* is important in the Hawaiian culture? Why or why not? If possible, please give an example.
   (If explanation is necessary: Self-directed learning is described as a process where the responsibility shifts from the teacher to the student. The student assumes ownership over their learning using strategies such as self-motivation and self-evaluation).

24. Do you have any other comments you would like to make regarding your perspective on anything we have been talking about?

25. Are there other teachers or cultural practitioners that you recommend that we talk to about this topic?

26. Would it be all right to contact you if I have other questions? Would you like to use a pseudonym or your real name (choose a pseudonym)? Would I be able to use your voice/image in a presentation of these results?
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