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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the discourse of Hawaiian education by Native Hawaiian (NH) educators. Interviews were conducted in Hawaiian language, Hawai‘i Creole and English with twelve NH educators on the topic of Hawaiian education. Adopting a conversation analytic approach, the interviews are seen as social interactions. The study also uses membership categorization analysis (MCA) to investigate the forms of categories that are invoked between the participants as they construct themselves and others as Hawaiian educators. Though there are many studies done by, for, and about Native Hawaiians, no previous study utilizes MCA as part of the methodology. The analysis reveals three main categories that participants elaborated: Hawaiian education is the transmission of ancestral knowledge and identity; the kūpuna, the elders, are the source of ancestral knowledge; and various membership categories are intricately intertwined in the Native Hawaiian educators’ discourse on Hawaiian education. This study has implications on second language, bilingual, and language revitalization studies.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background and purpose of the study, the Hawaiian education movement, the research questions, and definitions of terms used throughout this study. This dissertation is a qualitative study, which explores the discourse of Hawaiian education. In this study the source of Hawaiian education is the Native Hawaiian (NH) educators themselves, who are committed to improving the education of NH students.

I want us to remember to always ask the question: "What information do you want your grandchild to have?" What abilities, what attitudes? If we focus on what is it that we want our education to be for our grandchildren then that's what Hawaiian education should be for a Hawaiian. The answer is from a Hawaiian (Sing, Hunter, & Meyer, 1999, p. 4).

This study draws from the theoretical framework of Native Hawaiian epistemology (Meyer, 2003, 2008) and Hapa Hawaiʻi, an approach to conducting research with NH communities that incorporates NH philosophy and manaʻo. According to Pukui and Elbert (1986), the term manaʻo means perspective, thoughts, principles, beliefs, feelings, etc. Hawaiian terms will not be italicized, since Hawaiian language is not a foreign language in Hawaiʻi. I wrote this dissertation in the state of Hawaiʻi, which recognizes Hawaiian as one of the two official languages. This is a unique study, since all the participants, including the researcher, are Native Hawaiian, speaking in English, Hawai'i Creole English, and/or Hawaiian language. Also, this study is strengths-based, an increasingly popular approach to conducting research in NH communities (Benham, 2006; Kanaʻiaupuni, 2004), in contrast to the deficit approach highlighting the gloomy conditions and problems of NH (Lefcourt, 2005; Serna, 2005; Tuitele, 2010).
I collected the data in the form of talk story and semi-structured interviews, used Jeffersonian notations to transcribe the interviews, and used membership categorization analysis (MCA) to examine the data. Though there are many studies done on Hawaiian education, for and/or by Native Hawaiians, no study utilizes MCA as part of the methodology. Also, published studies that utilize MCA have neither been done on, nor for NH and in the Hawaiian language. Thus, this research will contribute to the growing body of indigenous scholarly works as well as the discourse of revitalizing and using Hawaiian language, which was once thought to be on the verge of disappearance.

Like Lefcourt’s 2005 qualitative research study, I utilized Hapa Hawai‘i as a hybrid of culturally and academically rigorous approach to conducting research with NH. Hapa Hawai‘i privileges Hawaiian perspectives and sources as well as embraces other traditions, such as MCA (Potter & Hepburn, 2005; Sacks, 1992) and rhetorical sovereignty (Lyons, 2000). Ultimately, the purpose of this research study is to improve schooling for Native Hawaiian children, which will inform other people in their quest to improve education for their children.

The second chapter is a review of literature that examines traditional Hawaiian concepts of ‘ohana and identity, ancestral knowledge, the colonial history of education in Hawai‘i, and the connection of indigenous education and culturally based education to Hawaiian education. In addition, the literature review describes several examples of Hawaiian culture-based schools and programs and different empirical studies conducted by, for, and about NH.

The third chapter identifies indigenous research methodologies and Native Hawaiian epistemology (Meyer, 2003, 2008) as the theoretical framework for this exploratory qualitative study, which contributes to the body of research by, for, and about NH. Bevon-Brown’s (2001) Six Rs (The Right person asks the Right Questions of the Right People in the Right Way at the
Right Place and Right Time) will be utilized as an outline for implementing the research. I am the right person for this research, due to my insider’s position. The research questions are framed in way to make sense linguistically, socially, and usefully for Hawaiians. I asked the right people, twelve Native Hawaiian (NH) educators, about Hawaiian education, since they are NH and educators dedicated to improving the schooling for Hawaiian children. I collected data in the right way, the form of talk story sessions and semi-structured interviews, at the right places, mostly schools, depending upon the convenience of the participants, and the right time. I used observations to follow up and clarify any questions. Membership categorization (Sacks, 1992) is suited to focus on the minutiae within the talk story data and interviews.

The fourth chapter displays the results and in-depth analysis of the interview data. The fourth chapter is organized around the research questions: what are Hawaiian educators’ mana‘o (thoughts, feelings, and perspectives) on Hawaiian education; what are the goals of Hawaiian education; and what forms of categories are invoked between Hawaiians as they construct themselves and others as Hawaiian educators in discourse. Chapter 4 presents detailed and in-depth data analysis on Hawaiian education and goals elaboration category, kūpuna membership category, and various membership categories. The participants, all Native Hawaiian (NH) educators, constructed categories of identity, such as Hawaiian, kūpuna, kumu, and haumāna, which are intricately intertwined to the category of Hawaiian education. Hawaiian education is the transmission of ancestral knowledge and identity; the kūpuna, the elders, are the source of ancestral knowledge; and various membership categories are intricately intertwined in the Native Hawaiian educators’ discourse on Hawaiian education.

The last chapter contains the discussion and conclusion. I provide a brief description of the results, identify some limitations, and make recommendations for future research. I also
discuss the contributions that this study makes for the improvement of education for Hawaiians and other children.

*Background*

Though extensive literature laments the marginalization of Native Hawaiian and generally indigenous peoples as a result of colonization in the areas of socio-economics, education, health, and overall well-being (Benham & Heck, 1998; Benham, 2006; Kameʻeleiwi, 1999; Kanaʻiaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005; Meyer, 2003; Trask, 1993; Warner, 1999; & Young, 1998), the tide is changing. Many individuals, organizations, and communities are collaborating and articulating to improve the education of Native Hawaiian students. Momentum is building among Hawaiian indigenous educators and supporters of change to redefine education through strategies building upon a cultural framework for education (Kanaʻiaupuni & Kawaiʻaeʻa, 2008; p. 68). There are several institutions and programs based on, by, and for Native Hawaiians through varying degrees, such as the Hawaiian language medium schools (Pūnana Leo and Kula Kaiapuni), Hawaiian-based charter schools (Nā Lei Naʻauao), Nā Pua Noʻeau, the Enrichment Programs of (and to some extent) The Kamehameha Schools, and many others. The aforementioned institutions and programs vary according to the extent of the use of Hawaiian language and culture. The participants of this study are members of the programs mentioned. The purpose of this research study is to explore Native Hawaiian educators’ discourse on the schooling of Native Hawaiian children. We are reclaiming our indigenous ways of knowing, being, and living (McCubbin & Marsella, 2009, p. 379).

*Research Questions*

This qualitative study on Hawaiian manaʻo (thought/feelings/perspective) answers the following questions:
1. What are Hawaiian educators’ manaʻo (thoughts, feelings, and perspectives) on Hawaiian education? Education for what? For whom? How will it be delivered?
2. What are Hawaiian educators’ manaʻo on the goals in educating our Hawaiian children?
3. What forms of categories are invoked between Hawaiians as they construct themselves and others as Hawaiian educators in discourse?

Definition of Terms

• A Native Hawaiian (NH) is a descendant of the aboriginal inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands prior to European contact in 1778. For this study, participants identify themselves as Native Hawaiians. The terms Hawaiian and Native Hawaiian mean the same and are used interchangeably throughout this dissertation.

• Kūpuna are grandparents, ancestors, relative or close friend of the grandparent’s generation (Pukui & Elbert, 1986).

• Ancestral knowledge is the primary source for all Hawaiian knowledge, which stem from the kūpuna.

• Kumu are teachers and educators (Pukui & Elbert, 1986). Kumu is an honorific title given to deserving individuals to show respect.

• Charter schools are independent public schools.

• Indigenous is used to describe Native Hawaiian, American Indian, and Alaska native populations. The terms native and indigenous are used interchangeably throughout this dissertation.

• Indigenous research methodologies refer to research conducted by, for, and about native peoples (Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2008).
• Talk Story is a Hawai‘i Creole word that refers to a speech event occurring to establish identity, relationships, and worldviews (Furukawa, 2009; Lum, 2008; Sumida, 1991).

• Hawai‘i Creole English is a language. It is referred to in Hawai‘i as “pidgin,” and reflects local culture and identity (Da Pidgin Coup, 1999; Romaine, 1994).

• Acculturation is another form of transmission that takes place from outside a person’s own cultural group as a result of direct contact (e.g. colonization, migration) or indirect influence (e.g. telemedia or books) (Triandis, 2007).

• Membership categorization analysis (MCA) is a methodology to analyze conversations and interviews, which are considered interactional and social action (Potter & Hepburn, 2005; Sacks, 1992).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This literature review provides conceptual, empirical, and theoretical contexts for my qualitative research study on Hawaiian education. As Native Hawaiians (NH) connect to the contemporary and the past, the research and the praxis, this literature review reflect the literature on NH identity, empirical studies, theoretical frameworks, and traditional and contemporary models of Hawaiian education. The purpose of this literature review is to examine previous empirical research of cultural knowledge and epistemologies of indigenous education. Searches were conducted on the Internet, libraries, and data bases for research articles, books, and book chapters published in the past two decades, under key terms of indigenous education, indigenous research methodologies, Native Hawaiian epistemology, Native Hawaiian education, and culture-based education.

A source that is gaining widespread attention is the research journal by The Kamehameha Schools Research and Evaluation called *Hulili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*. The articles in *Hulili* affirm that “Hawaiian perspectives matter, that Hawaiian language and knowledge systems are flourishing, and that Hawaiian identity and culture are central to Hawaiian well-being” (Kana’iaupuni, 2006, p. v). In seeking ways to show what Native Hawaiian educators are saying about Hawaiian education for Native Hawaiian children, the following questions guide the review of the literature:

1. What is Native Hawaiian identity?
2. What is indigenous education?
3. What is Hawaiian education?
Traditional Hawaiian Concept of ʻOhana and Identity

Mai ka piʻina a ka lā i Haʻeʻeʻe  From where the sun rises at its gateway at Haʻeʻeʻe
A i ka mole ʻolu o Lehua  To the pleasant tap root foundation of Lehua
Eia au ko kama ē  Here I am your offspring
He mamo aloha na Hāloa  A descendant of Hāloa

These lines are from the song Kulaiwi by Larry Kimura, a Hawaiian language professor and one of the founders of ʻAha Pūnana Leo. Kulaiwi means bone land, referring to land where the bones of our ancestors are. Today kulaiwi is understood as native land or homeland.

Hawaiʻi is the homeland of Native Hawaiians, and Native Hawaiians are Hawaiʻi. Through song, dance, research and the various forms of art and work, we Native Hawaiians are still here preserving and creating for our ancestors, our present, and our future.

In order to understand the identity of Native Hawaiians it is important to have the cultural context of ʻohana (family) in the following. ʻOhana means family to traditional and modern Hawaiians. The wellbeing of an individual is interconnected to the wellbeing of the ʻohana. Our ʻohana is traced to the creation of the beginning of life and the universe. We are the children of Papahānaumoku, earth mother, and Wākea, sky father. The gods mated and created all that is sacred to us: the islands, the taro, the chiefs, and the people. According to the Kumulipo, the Hawaiian cosmogonic chant of the creation of life, we have kuleana or duties to our sacred islands, the taro, the chiefs, and the people. We are all ʻohana with the kuleana to honor and to take care of one another. Thus, Hawaiians are the islands, Hawaiians are the taro, Hawaiians are the chiefs, and Hawaiians are the people. “Place is intertwined with identity and self-determination of today’s Native Hawaiians in complex and intimate ways” (Kanaʻiaupuni & Malone, 2006, p. 282). All is ʻohana, and all ʻohana members are interconnected. Our identity
as Hawaiians is defined by our relationship to all that is sacred (Blaisdell, 2005; Handy & Pukui, 1998; Kame‘elehiwa, 1999; Kanahele, 2005; Meyer, 2003; Trask, 1993; Young, 1998).

According to McCubbin and Marsella (2009, p. 376),

Thus ʻohana can be considered an extended and complex arrangement of roles and relationships that include all of the following: Ke Akua (God), Aumakua (Family guardian gods), Kūpuna (Family elders), Makua (Parents), Opio (Children), Moopuna (Grandchildren), and Hanai children (those offspring of other families incorporated into another family to be raised and cared for).

Therefore, place plays a critical role through Native Hawaiian traditions and customs that weave together physical, spiritual, and social ties to the land and sea (Kana’iaupuni & Liebler, 2005; Kikiloi, 2010; McCubbin & Marsella, 2009). Included, for example, is the traditional Hawaiian view of connections to the spiritual world, such as the concepts of piko (body points/center). According to Blaisdell (1997), Native Hawaiian Education Council (2002), and Pukui, Haertig, and Lee (1972), Hawaiians have three piko, which connect us to our past, present, and future. Our first piko is the soft spot on a newborn’s head (fontel), which connects us to our spiritual realm and our ancestors. Our second piko is the navel, which connects us to our parents. Our third piko is private parts, which connects us to our descendants and our future. Hawaiians view the spiritual body and the spiritual world as being connected (Gusukuma, 2009). Though Pukui et al. (1972) wrote about the passing of the piko concept, it is kept alive through me and other Native Hawaiians:

The total idea of piko links that go backward in time to man’s ancestors and forward to descendants yet to come has apparently been lost. With the passing of the piko concept
has gone some of the poetic imagery of Hawaiian thought and Hawaiian language (p. 188).

This study is called, “E Ho’i i Ka Piko” as a conscious act of reviving the piko concept and practice. In today’s understanding “E Ho’i i Ka Piko” means, “return to the source/center.” The piko or source refers to the teachings of the elders. In addition to the spiritual connections that piko can refer to, the piko concept and traditional practice are being revived. Laiana Kanoa-Wong, kumu for The Kamehameha Schools for the Enrichment programs in the summer and Ke Kula ‘o Ānuenue, told me his manaʻo (personal communication, July 12, 2012): the piko concept embodies all the pilina or connections that one makes with the gods, ancestors, elders, parents, future generations and place. It is also a physical place or center. For instance, Pukuʻi, Haertig, and Lee (1972) wrote about how Hawaiians would bury their baby’s piko (the shriveled stump that falls off a newborn’s navel) and the ‘iewe (the afterbirth) in a special place as an act to reconnect the baby to the ‘āina, ancestor. I myself have practiced this tradition. I wrapped both my babies’ piko and ‘iewe in laʻi (ti-leaves) and buried them respectively in a very special place for me, where I continue to be educated, nurtured, and comforted. I still visit my children’s piko for spiritual grounding and inspiration. The piko concept is indicative of the Hawaiian paradigm on the cycle of life, as articulated eloquently by Kahuna Kahale in Lefcourt’s 2005 dissertation on Hawaiian education:

What is in the beginning is in the end and what is in the end is in the beginning representing the intergenerational connection to the ancestors of the past, the present, and the future (p. 101).
Indigenous Education

On September 13, 2007 the United Nations adopted the landmark Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which asserts the political, social, spiritual, and cultural rights of indigenous peoples. The following is Article 14 of the text:

Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational system and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning.

According to the United Nations News Service, the four members of the United Nations that voted against the text are Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States, which have indigenous peoples clamoring for justice. A few years later under new national leadership the United States was the last country to accept the Declaration as a result of the many Native Americans, who wrote in support of the Declaration and worked extensively with federal agencies. President Obama announced his commitment to improve the lives of indigenous peoples in and outside the United States. The following is an excerpt of the United States statement, which can be viewed online at www.state.gov/documents/organization/154782.pdf:

The United States supports the Declaration, which—while not legally binding or a statement of current international law—has both moral and political force. It expresses both the aspirations of indigenous peoples around the world and those of States in seeking to improve their relations with indigenous peoples. Most importantly, it expresses aspirations of the United States, aspirations that this country seeks to achieve within the structure of the U.S. Constitution, laws, and international obligations, while also seeking, where appropriate, to improve our laws and policies.
Let us turn to the foundations of indigenous education by considering an explanation of indigenous. Indigenous peoples of the world have been organizing and collaborating on indigenous educational models, which are based on the revitalization of native languages, spiritual connections to the land (place-based), philosophies, and traditions. According to Indigenous Worldviews: A comparative study (2002) indigenous means those cultures whose worldviews place special significance or weight behind the idea of unification of the human community with the natural world. I believe that whilst colonization is a reality for so-called ‘indigenous’ peoples, the ontological and epistemological concern of unification with the world is a better place for us to meet. There seems to be a general agreement among ‘indigenous’ peoples the world over, whether Maori, Hawaiian, African, Native American and so on, that unification with the world is the primary concern of the worldviews contained within their traditional knowledge (Te Ahukaramu Charles Royal, p. 28).

Thus indigenous knowledge is unique and holistic, thus brings new insights for the practitioners and researchers (McCubbin & Marsella, 2009). Land, language, and community are issues of indigenous identity.

In addition, ‘Umi Perkins, a Native Hawaiian (NH) teacher of Hawaiian history at The Kamehameha Schools-Kapālama, wrote about indigenous people having a consistent and coherent worldview, despite the continual detrimental affects of colonization. Perkins (2007) believes it is imperative for indigenous peoples to develop an indigenous theory, rather than utilize those that have been imposed by colonial institutions. “Thus, I hold that theory is critically important to Hawaiian (and Indigenous peoples’) well-being” (p. 63). Furthermore, Perkins identified five components in the emerging body of Indigenous theory: the concept of
harmony or balance; the importance of place and history; experience, practice, and process; the holistic and collective nature of indigeneity; and the cyclical and genealogical nature of time, represented by the spiral or koru¹.

Perkins, like many indigenous scholars, grapples with the slippery definition of indigenous, which is related to land and original status of the people. Wilson (2008) uses the term indigenous to refer to the people and peoples who identify their ancestry with the original inhabitants of Australia, Canada, and other countries worldwide. Indigenous is also used as an adjective to describe “things that belong to these peoples like Indigenous knowledges” (p. 34).

Smith (1999) admits, “the term ‘indigenous’ is problematic in that it appears to collectivize many distinct populations whose experiences under imperialism have been vastly different” (p. 6). At this point of this paper, I would like to direct your attention to a brief description of the colonial educational history of Hawai‘i. “Colonialism was, in part, an image of imperialism, a particular realization of the imperial imagination,” (Smith, 1999, p. 23).

**Colonial Educational History of Hawai‘i**

Since their arrival in Hawai‘i, nonindigenous peoples have disenfranchised Hawaiians from their land, their sovereignty, their language, and their culture and have even redefined their identity. Thus, nonindigenous peoples have a long history of speaking and deciding for Hawaiians in virtually every aspect of life, and this has had devastating results for the indigenous people (Warner, 1999, p. 69).

The colonial educational history of Hawai‘i evolved from the establishment of public missionary-administered schools, the ban on the Hawaiian language, and the resurgent of Hawaiian language and cultural movement, which are decolonizing efforts to restore Hawaiian-

¹ According to Perkins, the koru resembles a sprouting fern in Maori. I called him on October 7, 2009 for clarification.
focused schools and education. Before the arrival of the missionaries, families were responsible for the education of children. Chun (2005), Kahakalau (2003), and Pukui (1972) illustrate traditional Hawaiian education centered on the ‘ohana. Native Hawaiians highly valued education that was skill-based, place-based, and practical. Keiki were taught by caregivers including older siblings and adults who were considered masters in their occupations, (Takayama, 2008, p. 253). According to Wong (2010, p. 11), “he mea laha ole ka ike o na kupuna no ka mea aole no like ia ano ao ana mai ke ao ana ma ke kula.” (The knowledge of the elders were unlike the kind of education in school.) Then the American missionaries arrived in 1820 and made fundamental educational, spiritual, and social changes.

When the missionaries arrived, with the support of the Hawaiian ali‘i (chiefly class), they established schools with an emphasis on reading, writing, and bible studies. In 1840 the Kingdom of Hawai‘i passed a law that all children from four to fourteen must attend school (Pukui, Haertig & Lee, 1972). In 1896 three years after the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian government by an American force, the School Act made English the required language of instruction in all public schools of Hawaii‘i. A strategy used by colonial governments is to methodically eradicate indigenous language and culture. Monolingualism and thus monoculturalism became the official policy (Haas, 1992). “As a result of replacing Hawaiian-medium education with English-medium education, Hawaiians and Hawai‘i as a whole have lost a number of benefits that could be reclaimed by further development of contemporary Hawaiian-medium education” (Wilson & Kamana, 2006, p.155).

Colonization was accompanied by a loss of culture, language, traditions, beliefs, values, esteem, vision, and well-being all in the name of westernization, which places a premium
on asimilatin and subordination of indigenous people (McCubbin & Marsella, 2009, p. 386).

*Traditional Hawaiian Education*

Hawaiian education is defined by the context you’re in and by the experiences you have. The term Hawaiian education did not exist 20 years ago. In the context of school, the terms Hawaiiana and later Hawaiian studies were the fare of education in schools. The idea of Hawaiian system of knowing or Hawaiian pedagogy are fairly recent discussions about education about and for Hawaiians (Sing, personal communication, September 29, 2009).

Insights from traditional Hawaiian perspectives provide a range of possibilities that may count as Hawaiian education (Wong, 2010). According to Meyer (2003) learning is a social process and the community is the center of Hawaiian education. The community is the immediate and extended family or ʻōhana for Hawaiians. The concept of the three piko (body points/center), which was explained previously, illustrates the spiritual and physical connections a Hawaiian has with the ʻōhana. The Hawaiian sense of spirituality, family, place, and legacy are maintained and perpetuated through these connections (Native Hawaiian Education Council, 2002).

*Ancestral Knowledge*

The source of all Hawaiian knowledge or ancestral knowledge stem from the kūpuna, who are grandparents, ancestors, relative or close friend of the grandparent’s generation (Pukui & Elbert, 1986). According to Native Hawaiian (NH) kumu hula Pualani Kanahele, who belongs to four generations of kumu hula and professor at the University of Hawai‘i-Hilo, the kūpuna are
the ancestors and keepers of Native Hawaiian intellect from time immemorial. Often the channels are open, and information flows freely through dreams, thoughts, and participation in hula, and other aspects of daily Hawaiian living (2010, p. xiv). Meyer (2003) identifies spirituality and knowledge as the cultural contexts of knowledge. Throughout her work on Hawaiian epistemology, she uses reported speech (Holt, 2003) by citing what her mentors told her in the interviews. The following is one example, illustrating knowledge as ancestral knowledge in an interview with Rubellite Kawena Johnson, a NH expert on the Kumulipo and former professor at the University of Hawai‘i-Mānoa, on January 15, 1997; “The domains of experience (body-centric) are conditioned by our relationship with gods. The spirituality and conduct between gods and humans is part of knowledge” (p. 154). In a similar vein, Kikiloi (2010) states in his article to reintroduce the original island names of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands through an examination of traditional sources:

As Native Hawaiians, each of us has the ability to tap into a preconscious reservoir of past experiences and to access all that exists in a storehouse of knowledge called ancestral memories (p. 74).

Whose past experiences is Kikiloi referring to? Is it ours? Is it the kūpuna? Pualani Kanahele (2010) audaciously declares, “All that I need to know of this world is in my ancestors, and they, my ancestors, are in me (p. xii). Ancestral knowledge is a timeless, integenerationl transmission of tradition.

Another aspect of transmitting cultural traditions is tēnā. For example, Beniamina (2009), a Hawaiian educator from Ni‘ihau, in a talk story fashion, explains the concept of tēnā as our Hawaiian way of living life, a learning lifestyle. Through tēnā, knowledge has been passed down from generation to generation. Tēnā is a multistep process and strengths-based approach
to learning, which accommodates to learners of diverse abilities. A child or any learner for that matter is given and is accompanied through a task.

The prominent authority on Hawaiian education is Mary Pukui (1895 – 1986), who was a kumu hula (Hawaiian master dance instructor), scholar, and educator in Hawaiian culture and language. She laid the foundation for contemporary Hawaiian education, which is based on the knowledge and works of kūpuna (elders and ancestors). “Her grandparents chose Pukui as a punahele (favorite), so she was entrusted and trained in the many different aspects of Hawaiian teachings and practices. As her grandmother's tag-along companion, Mrs. Pukui stored up knowledge. What she learned spanned her grandmother's pre-missionary era past and the turn-of-the-century years before her own birth” (Pukui, Haertig, & Lee, 1972, p. 127). Pukui explained the wisdom of the ancestors to guide future generations. Her two volumes, Nānā I Ke Kumu, are standard reference to Hawaiian communities (Chun, 2006).

Pukui recorded and translated several ‘ōlelo no’eau (wise proverbial sayings) referring to education and learning. “The real teaching was within the family” (Pukui, Haertig, & Lee, 1972, p. 49). Kahakalau also acknowledges the importance of ‘ohana and ‘ōlelo no’eau, which illustrate the values our ancestors placed on education. “The ‘ōlelo no’eau provide deep insight into Hawaiian epistemology and worldview” (Kahakalau, 2003, p. 42). The following are very common examples of ‘ōlelo no’eau (Pukui, 1983) that reflect traditional views on the education of children:


Observe, listen. Keep the mouth shut. Imitate.

*I ka ho‘olohe nō, ho‘omaopopo.*

By listening, one understands.
According to Chun (2006) Pukui revealed the five responses that students have to learning and teaching: observation (nānā), listening (hoʻolohe), reflection (paʻa ka waha), doing the task (hana), and questioning (nīnau). Also, my late kumu hula, John Keola Lake, shared his experience when learning in a traditional Hawaiian way:

When I was a child, we didn’t have paper, we just had to listen. So those words have hung in my mind after all these years. That was part of Hawaiian training: first you watch, you observe, but most important you listen. Before you ask questions, you listen. And you mimic and you mimic and you mimic. We sharpen our skills of memory through the art of listening. Our skills of listening and hearing have been lessened by the use of pen and paper and the tape recorder (Harden, 1999, p. 141).

Genealogies, epic stories, and wisdom are passed on orally from one generation to another. Hawaiian identify is in the land, which instructs us how to live, love, and work. Families developed sophisticated agricultural, fishing, canoeing, healing, navigating, and other essential systems to thrive in our home. One learns from family members past and present (Young, 1998).

Furthermore, Huihui Kanahele-Mossman (2011), daughter of kumu hula Pualani Kanahele, writes about this teaching method as the only one she experienced in hula tradition: From basic steps to lyrical composition, my only training was through observation, listening, doing, and being corrected as needed (p. 80). This teaching method has been a tradition that has stood the test of time; she is the fifth generation trained by her ʻohana as hula practitioners. Kanehele-Mossman’s dissertation is based on ancestral epistemological process, which includes the teaching of ancestral stories to Native Hawaiian students, who in turn make observations, ask questions, make connections to ʻāina and create deeper meaning and knowledge. Kikiloi (2010)
elaborates on the significance and relevance of ancestral knowledge to the descendants of this land called Hawai‘i:

    Our ancestors left us these ancient traditions as a legacy, a prescribed map of reference points to help us navigate our lives and steer us through the uncharted waters that lie ahead in our future. Stories and traditions about our islands give us a sense of place and belonging, reminding us that this is a lasting home, one that we will remain rooted in forever (p. 74).

    In addition, Kame‘elehiwa shares her insight in her 1992 work; Learning from our ancestors, whose deeds of courage inspire our own; their thoughts and desires become the parameters of our ambitions (p. 19). They are the models which we Hawaiians have patterned our behavior. Since oral literature played a prominent role in Hawaiian life, it was imperative for children to listen and observe. Pukui’s great contribution to Hawaiian education is affirming our identity for belonging to wise and intelligent ancestors and our ‘āina (land). Culture- and land-based schools and education programs continue to instill our identity to the ‘āina.

*Culturally Based Education (CBE)*

    A firm grounding in the heritage language and culture indigenous to a particular place is a fundamental prerequisite for the development of culturally-healthy students and communities associated with that place, and thus is an essential ingredient for identifying the appropriate qualities and practices associated with culturally-responsive educators, curriculum and schools (Assembly of Alaska Native Educators, 1998, p. 2).

    Cooperative learning, integrated curriculum, whole language, family involvement, authentic assessment, “hands-on”learning, place-based education, culturally based education are just a few buzz words that have become part of the popular venacular and are increasingly
influencing classroom practices (Novick, 1996). Culturally based education (CBE), sometimes known as culturally responsive education, relates directly to academic performance (Aguilera, Lipka, Demmer, & Tippeconnic, 2007). Demmert and Towner (2003) show a direct relationship between CBE and improved academic performance among Native students. The following theories support CBE: cultural compatibility theory, cognitive theory, and cultural-historical-activity-theory (CHAT). According to the cultural compatibility theory, when school activities are closely aligned with those of the community, more likely the goals of the school can be reached. According to the cognitive theory, connecting new knowledge with prior knowledge may result in improved learning. As per CHAT, issues of culture, language, cognition, and community and socialization are important to learning. The three aforementioned theories place culture at the center; culturally responsive education is to build on the strengths and experiences that children bring to the classroom. Increasingly the continuity and congruence between children’s home experiences and the school environment is critical to the success of children (Novick, 1996; Tharp, 1991; Tharp, et. Al, 2007).

According to the review of relevant research by Demmert, Grissmer, and Towner (2006) CBE is based on the following six critical elements: recognition and use of Native languages as the language of instruction; pedagogy that stresses traditional cultural characteristics; pedagogy in which teaching strategies are congruent with the traditional culture; curriculum that is based on traditional culture and knowledge; strong community participation; and strong sense of social justice for the improvement of the community. The purpose of CBE is to transmit culture and knowledge and develop the skills and talents needed to function successfully in modern society.

Culture is a tool of adaptation, not a straitjacket, or cake of custom. Culture can, but does not necessarily, prevent a child from adapting to an unfamiliar situation. Quite the
opposite can be true; culture can aid adaptation to the unfamiliar by providing options to resolve discontinuities between home and classroom (Weisner & Gallimore, 1988).

Furthermore, culturally based education is aligned with the efforts of Hawaiian based education. For example, Kanaʻiaupuni, Ledward, and Jensen (2010) illustrate the positive impact of culturally based education with student outcomes. This large, empirically based research is a project based on the collaboration of the Kamehameha Schools, Hawaiʻi Department of Education, and Nā Lei Na'auao, Hawaiian-focused public charter schools alliance. The results show that the students with greater Hawaiian culture affiliation have stronger connections with their community, which positively impacts their math and reading test scores. Also, Fukuda, Ah Sam, and Wang (2008) demonstrate the positive influence of Hawaiian culture/place-based education on students in terms of academics and motivation.

Contemporary Hawaiian Education

We do not do Hawaiian things. We are Hawaiians doing things. So, of course our education is distinct. We come from a different cosmology. That, for me, is the core of Hawaiian Education. It's time for us to draw our pedagogy, policies and curriculum from our own epistemology and no longer compromise on the priorities that have been asked from us long ago (Sing, Hunter, Meyer, 1999, p. 13).

Hawaiian education is a philosophy that is rooted in a sense of indigenous being (Kaiwi, 2006). Drawing from the Assembly of Alaska Native Educators, the Native Hawaiian Education Council (2002) created Nā Hōnua Mauli: Hawai‘i guidelines for culturally healthy learning environments, which are reminiscent of the seven categories of making knowledge (Meyer, 2008). The seven cultural guiding themes for Hawaiian education success are ‘ike hōnua (value of place), ‘ike hoʻokō (value of applied achievement), ‘ike kuana‘ike (value of cultural
perspective), ‘ike mauli lāhui (value of cultural identity), ‘ike piko’u (value of personal identity), and ‘ike pilina (value of relationships). Similar to the aforementioned cultural themes, the Executive Summary of Nā Lei Na‘auao, The Kamehameha Schools and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs adopted the following as definitions for Hawaiian-focused schools: be initiated, supported, and controlled by a Hawaiian community; offer Hawaiian-cultural-based curriculum, instruction and assessment; and be committed to perpetuating Hawaiian culture, language, values and traditions; and actively contribute to the growth of Hawaiian-focused education through participation in ongoing research and dissemination of best practices.

For many Hawaiians, Hawaiian education programs are our cultural kīpuka – oasis from which traditional Native Hawaiian culture can be regenerated and revitalized after over two centuries of colonial domination and oppression. Programs like the Kamehameha schools, Hawaiian immersion and charter schools, and Hawaiian early childhood programs funded by the Native Hawaiian Education Act are safe havens where we can re-learn our native language, and our native ways of knowing and interacting, and recuperate our native cultural practices... (Kaomea, 2009, p. 121).

Extensive literature on Hawaiian education is based on the works of many authors. In particular, Alice Kawakami has written several articles on the subject of Hawaiian education. For instance, Kawakami, Aton, Glendon, and Stewart (1999) describe an example of Hawaiian culture-based curriculum and evaluation in the Nāʻimiloa Curriculum project. Some aspects that have proven successful at each Nāʻimiloa site include Hawaiian values that focus on identity, social interactions, physical environment, and artifacts.

Identity is of utter importance to Hawaiian students because it provides them with a foundation from which they can build upon in the western school system. This
foundation provides them with self-confidence and self-pride, both of which are necessary for success in any aspect of education and in life in general (Kawakami et.al, 1999, p.19).

Furthermore, in another study (Kawakami and Aton, 2001) interviewed Native Hawaiian (NH) educators from the Nā Pua No‘eau Program, which is based on Hawai‘i Island. According to the perspectives of successful Hawaiian educators, the two critical elements for Hawaiian learning are authentic environments and experience-based learning. The authors of the study suggest that the two aforementioned “features be incorporated in the design and implementation phases of new programs and used in formative evaluation and monitoring of developing programs” (p. 55).

In addition, NH educator, Yvonne Lefcourt interviewed NH kahuna (priests), kupuna (elders), educators, and community members on Hawaiian education in her 2005 qualitative study. The participants shared their experiences and wisdom, which continue to be relevant and meaningful. According to kahuna Kahale, a participant in her interview

Hawaiian education is knowing who you are, and where you come from. It is incorporating the elements of nature into your everyday lives and learning from it, absorbing it. Hawaiian education is complex, intellectually stimulating, and can be the best education curriculum on earth (p. 101).

Hawaiian Culture-Based Schools and Programs

In the last three decades, Hawaiian education has evolved into many Hawaiian culture-based schools and programs. Education specialists from the Hawai‘i Department of Education (DOE), The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), The Kamehameha Schools, and Nā Lei Na‘auao collaborated to define Hawaiian education and identify examples of Hawaiian culture-based

Although *Nā Lau Lama’s* (2005) objective is to improve the educational outcomes of Native Hawaiian students, it is critical to note that the practices recommended by the Nā Lau Lama working groups benefit all students. The relevance created by differentiated, place-based, and rigorous project-based learning experiences has the potential to deeply impact the quality of education for all of Hawai‘i’s children (p. 2).

*Nā Lau Lama* (2005) is an excellent source containing detailed examples of Hawaiians creating, implementing, and assessing Hawaiian culture-based educational programs. This study briefly demonstrates examples, such as Hawaiian language medium schools (Pūnana Leo and Kula Kaiaupuni), Hawaiian-based charter schools, Nā Pua No‘eau, the Enrichment Programs of (and to some extent) Kamehameha Schools (KS), and many others. Below are a few examples that provide a range of Hawaiian education today. Among the examples, Kamehameha Schools is the oldest institution, training NH leaders. The original campus is located in Kalihi on the island of O‘ahu. The following section is an overview of KS, beginning with its Protestant origins.

*The Kamehameha Schools*

Ring, ring Kalihi ring

Swell the echo of our song

Ray, ray, ray, ray, ray rah
Ray, ray Kamehameha

Let hills and valleys loud our song prolong

Above is an excerpt from The Kamehameha Schools’ alma mater, *Sons of Hawaii*, which was written by William B. Oleson and Theodore Richards. Notice that the alma mater was written in English, which indicate the influence of Western ways in the nineteenth century. Oleson was a reverend and fervent American democrat from New England (King & Roth, 2006). This section provides a brief history of Kamehameha Schools to illustrate the context of this research proposal and research questions.

The history of the Kamehameha Schools (KS) reflect the tremendous and dynamic changes in Hawai‘i Nei. High Chiefess Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop (1831-1884), the great granddaughter of Kamehameha Nui, bequeathed her assets to the creation of Kamehameha Schools, a day and boarding school one for boys and one for girls. The schools were founded in Protestant beliefs in 1887 and intended to address the severe social problems Hawaiians were facing in the late nineteenth century, which included “poverty, alienation from their lands, and continued depopulation from foreign-introduced diseases” (Goodyear-Kaopua, 2005, p. 25). In her will, the High Chiefess included instructions of the kind of education she wanted for Hawaiian children:

I desire my trustees to provide first and chiefly a good education in the common English branches, and also instruction in morals and in such useful knowledge as may tend to make good and industrious men and women; and I desire instruction in the higher branches to be subsidiary to the foregoing objects (Bishop, 1883, Section Thirteen).

From the High Chiefess, Kamehameha Schools was created to assimilate Hawaiian children in the Western way. “As an agricultural and military academy for the next several
decades, KS trained its students as blue collar and civil service workers and as good Christian husbands and wives” (Goodyear-Kaopua, 2005, p. 25). The boys trained to be farmers, mechanics, and military soldiers, and they wore military uniforms everyday, whereas women studied homemaking, music, and gardening.

The trustees believed in the importance of leading a Christian life. As a result every Sunday the cadets would march along the rice fields of Kalihi to Kaumakapili Church. The uniforms were West Point gray and made of thick material designed for durability (Osorio & Young, 1997, p. 5).

For example, my great grandfather, Lowell Kalani Kupau graduated from KS in 1896 and became a lawyer. Years later several of his sons, grandchildren, and great grandchildren from his first wife, Sarah Cullen, and his second wife, Elizabeth Kaaia, graduated from KS.

The emphasis was on being American, not Hawaiian. For example, the Hawaiian language was banned at Kamehameha Schools (KS). Students were punished for speaking Hawaiian (Trask, 1993). One of the kaiapuni teachers, Keola, shares her/his experience in Yamauchi et. al’s research study (2000),

When I graduated from Kamehameha Schools at the time when Hawaiian wasn’t taught there, so when I graduated from there, it was like I was not a Hawaiian, I was a haole [white] person...So when...I took Hawaiian language it was like wow you know, we as Hawaiians have something to be proud of... (p. 390).

Though The Kamehameha Schools (KS) transitioned to become a rigorous college preparatory school in the 1960s and 1970s, assimilation was the status quo. Even in the 1980s when I attended KS, male students were required to participate two years in the JROTC program and wore their military uniforms to school every Thursday to school. Also, the emphasis was on
being a good and industrious American student. I studied Hawaiian language, which was still considered a foreign language. Many of my classmates were more interested in studying Japanese and Spanish, since Hawaiian was not seen as being important and economically useful. Hawaiʻi’s main economic industry is tourism. Thus, there continues to be a mindset for the preference of Japanese language over Hawaiian language, since many people work in the tourist industry and many of the tourists speak Japanese.

In the 1990s The Kamehameha Schools (KS) underwent revolutionary changes in terms of leadership, due to the many controversial court cases over the Native Hawaiian admission policy of KS (King & Roth, 2006). Ultimately, the mission of KS has undergone several changes, reflecting the changing times. Many stakeholders, which include alumni, KS teachers, and community leaders, urged Kamehameha to make KS a Hawaiian school for Hawaiians. Based on the KS’s strategic plans it is as though KS transformed itself on the surface to another being, almost unrecognizable from its Western beginnings. The fluid transformation is nothing less than phenomenal.

What ties all of Kamehameha Schools ‘ohana of past and present is our spirit. Osorio and Young (1997) tell the musical history of KS, which captures the true character all of us who have been touched by our beloved High Chiefess Bernice Pauahi Bishop:

We are the young men and women who sang “Aloha ‘Oe” to our departed queen in 1917. We are the lovesick and lonely ones who crooned to each other across the buildings and roads separating the boys’ and girls’ schools. We are the kolohe ones who danced and sang the mele ma’i in secret. We are the solemn and earnest ones who sang “Pauahi Ke Aliʻi” at every Founder’s Day or “The Lord’s Prayer” in Hawaiian with the Bishop Memorial Choir (p. 83).
KS continues to remake itself from the urgings of the KS ‘ohana or stakeholders, such as alumni, students, parents of students, community members, and the public. According to the Kamehameha Schools Strategic Plan, 2000-2015,

Kamehameha Schools will cultivate, nurture, perpetuate, and practice ‘Ike Hawai‘i (which includes Hawaiian culture, values, history, language, oral traditions, literature, and wahi pana – significant cultural or historical places-etc.

The Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP)

In the late 1970s and early 1980s the Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP) sought to improve the cognitive and educational development of Native Hawaiian children through research-based programs. The KEEP program was created, implemented, studied, and modified based on Hawaiian culture for Hawaiian children (Banks & Neisworth, 1995). According to KEEP’s research, emphasis is on learning from models, shared functioning, and direct assistance by intervention in performance when error occurs (Tharp, Jorda, Speidel, Au, Klein, Calkins, Sloat, & Gallimore, 2007, p. 279). Thus, the various ‘ōlelo no‘eau illustrate the values our ancestors placed on education, such as

Ma ka hana ka ‘ike (Through work there is learning)

Nānā ka maka, ho‘olohe ka pepeiao, pa‘a ka waha (Observe with the eyes, listen, and be quiet)

In addition, the KEEP research suggests that Hawaiian children tend to prefer to work in groups in school and do meaningful tasks, which are carry overs from the home environment. Thus, the classroom was organized to fit the children, rather than changing the children to fit with the school.

Also many Native Hawaiian children typically speak Hawai‘i Creole or “pidgin.” KEEP refers to pidgin as Hawaiian-English. According to KEEP’s linguistic studies, Hawaiian-
English-speaking children are competent in understanding and communicating in their own dialect. In Standard English they have more difficulty understanding connected discourse and reducing grammatically accurate utterances (Tharp et. al 2007, p. 286). In addition, effective cognitive strategies appear to lie in the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978), where teaching must be provided by the assistance of a more capable teacher or peer (Tharp et. al 2007, p. 289). As a result of several years of research and personal knowledge of Hawaiian children, the KEEP language arts program was designed. KEEP provided teacher training and developed a program, in which the school setting is congruent to the home culture.

The significance of KEEP is far reaching. Similar research of the KEEP program were applied in schools for the Navajo in Arizona as well as for Wai‘anae High School and the Kamehameha Schools pre-School. After decades of its original research, KEEP continues to be recognized and cited for its cultural congruence program element. KEEP became a system of related educational development activities that spanned three states, 3,000 students, many cultures, many languages, and many more corrections and alternatives (Tharp & Gallimore, 1991, p. xxi). Ultimately, the KEEP program produce positive effects on student reading achievement (August, Goldenberg, & Rueda, 2006). The research shifted from a deficit approach to a more constructive perspective or interpreting Native Hawaiians’ behavior within their own cultural context (McCubbin & Marsella, 2009).

*Nā Pua No’eau*

Under the direction of Dr. David Sing for the past fifteen years, Nā Pua No’eau is based out of the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo. Sing believes in creating conditions for optimizing learning for Hawaiian students. In his dissertation, Sing (1986) set out to see if classroom conditions that are congruent with Hawaiian home values and practices would raise the
achievement level of Native Hawaiian college students. Based on empirical research (Gallimore & Howard, 1968; Weisner, Gallimore, & Jordan, 1988), learning environments that are structured around the Hawaiian concept of ‘ohana and community create a better learning experience for Hawaiian students. The results indicated the achievement level (GPA) of the college students in the treatment group was not significantly higher than the control group; however the experimental group had a significantly more positive attitude toward school, school personnel, and themselves than the control group.

Furthermore, as the Director of Nā Pua Noʻeau, the Center for Gifted and Talented Native Hawaiian Children, Sing created a program for gifted and talented Hawaiian children from kindergarten to twelve grade. When I asked him in an email why he went from researching Hawaiian students taking remedial classes in college to gifted and talented youths, he responded, “The Chancellor asked me to design a model and submit a proposal on behalf of UHH. I applied my same learning theory model of creating conditions for optimizing learning for Hawaiian students to K-12 as I did for the college students” (personal communication, 2009). Every child has gifts and talents, and it is up to the program to help that child discover what her or his talents are. Native Hawaiians’ educational practices embrace respect, spirituality, education, family, and Hawaiian life ways (Sing, 2008). Nā Pua Noʻeau’s philosophical foundations (Sing, 1993) are established in consideration of the historical, socio-psychological, and cultural aspects of Native Hawaiians in education: build upon the positive aspects/academic strengths of students; integrate Native Hawaiian values as a foundation; raise self-esteem; and integrate appropriate instructional strategies for optimizing learning for Native Hawaiians.

Nā Pua Noʻeau demonstrates how culturally appropriate pedagogy promotes and supports Native Hawaiian students in learning their language, culture, and history and at the same
time raises their achievements and aspirations in a European American-based curriculum (Sing, 2008, p. 149).

ʻAha Pūnana Leo

In 1983 a small group of concerned Hawaiian-speaking educators with federal support established the ʻAha Pūnana Leo, a non-profit organization, to reestablish Hawaiian language medium education and save Hawaiian from extinction (Wilson & Kamana, 2006). There was a profound realization by a coalition of kūpuna (elder) and young adult moʻopuna (grandchildren) that the loss of the language would also mean the loss of mana, the unique spiritual powers of the language. According to the belief of many kūpuna, lost along with the language would be the very existence of Hawaiians as a distinct people (Nā Lau Lama, Community Report, p. 58). It began with the Native Hawaiian language preschool immersion program. Today, Native Hawaiian children can obtain their entire K–12 education in Hawaiian. After ʻAha Pūnana Leo persistently lobbied for three years, the state of Hawaiʻi removed the ban on Hawaiian language. Community members established Hawaiian immersion schools throughout the Hawaiian Islands, ranging from preschool through high school. According to page 63 of Nā Lau Lama-Community Report (2005),

Using the Hawaiian language promotes a strong Hawaiian cultural identity providing a Hawaiian cultural lens from which to view the world and fully participate in all aspects of contemporary globalized life as a Hawaiian.

Currently there are eleven Pūnana Leo Family-Based Language Nests in Hawaiʻi that serve three and four year old children and their families. The mission of Pūnana Leo is E ola ka ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, which means long live the Hawaiian language. I proudly sent my daughter, Keolaʻoli, for two years to Pūnana Leo o Honolulu, which is located in Kalihi, Oʻahu. She
graduated in June 2010. I continue to support Keola‘oli and the Hawaiian nation by sending her to Ke Kula ‘o Samuel M. Kamakau, a Hawaiian immersion charter school in Ha‘ikū, Kāne‘ohe. Like many families, I am raising my children using Hawaiian, which is my second language (Henze & Davis, 1999).

Furthermore, in addition to Hawaiian immersion preschools, there are nineteen public schools in the Hawaiian language immersion program (Ka Papahana Kïiapuni Hawai‘i) for children kindergarten to grade twelve in Hawai‘i. Ka Papahana Kïiapuni Hawai‘i strives to provide a quality education based on knowledge of the Hawaiian language and culture as the foundation. Some of the kïiapuni schools are charter schools.

*Na Lei Na‘auao - Native Hawaiian Charter Schools*

The charter school movement in Hawai‘i is very active and dynamic, because it opens up the possibilities of innovative models of education. There are various types of charter schools in Hawai‘i, offering many kinds of educational opportunities for children, families, and communities. Charter schools are independent public schools that have some degree of autonomy over their educational programs and operations in exchange for greater accountability for student outcomes.

In Hawai‘i the State Board of Education is currently the only agency in the state authorized to approve charters (a contract). There are thirty-one public startup and conversion charter schools on five islands that operate under a charter with the Charter Review Panel (CSRP). Each charter school is governed by its own local school board (Hawai‘i State Teacher Association, 2009).

In 2000 Hawaiian communities collaborated and created Na Lei Na‘auao – Native Hawaiian Charter School Alliance. Hawaiian-based charter schools were developed to combat
the effects of the colonial educational history of Hawai‘i. There are fifteen Native Hawaiian public charter schools, seven of which are part Hawaiian language medium schools, which are known for being Hawaiian-focused, providing an education grounded in culturally relevant content and context (Kana‘iaupuni, 2008, p. 32). They share the belief that Native Hawaiian students have not failed in the Hawai‘i public education system but that the current public education system has failed Native Hawaiian students. Their goal is to honor the past and ensure a bright future by building the spiritual, physical, mental, and material health of their students (Borofsky, 2009, p. 171).

Native Hawaiians are proving that NH can create, implement and evaluate models of education, can design and utilize research methodologies, and define epistemologies. Also NH can work together to establish comprehensive, Native-controlled system of education, as they assert their indigenous right as Hawai‘i’s Native people (Kahakalau, 2005; Kawagley, 1990; Meyer, 1998; Smith, 1999; Tibbets, Kahakalau, & Johnson, 2007). On page 33 of Nā La‘au Lama, Executive Summary

Indigenous education movements around the world, Nā Lei Na‘auao schools assert that ancient is modern. This means that Hawai‘i’s traditional ways of learning must shape quality modern models of Hawaiian education and that ancient Hawaiian ways of knowing must define 21st-century Hawaiian pedagogy.

For example, Kahakalau (2003) illustrates a pilot project that was converted into a K-12 Hawaiian-focused charter school called Kanu o Ka ‘Āina (Natives of the Land), which is located on Hawai‘i Island. Kahakalau describes the charter school (KANU) which she helped create in collaboration with community members and ‘ohana: Balancing both, the old and the new, the
Hawaiian and the haole, Kanu o Ka ‘Āina is designed to assist Native Hawaiian students to become bi-lingual and bi-cultural, able to successfully navigate in two worlds (p. 4).

Another example is Kana‘iaupuni’s 2008 comprehensive study on the impact of culture-based charter schools on Hawaiian student outcomes in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) context. The aforementioned study illustrates the complexities and challenges faced by Hawaiian-focused charter schools, which are working with some of the most disadvantaged populations in the public school system and are significantly increasing achievement among their lowest-performing students. However, the No Child Left Behind Act and its restructuring measures threaten to extinguish the indigenous approaches that are the foundation of Hawaiian-focused charter schools (p. 50). The study raises questions about the way student success is measured in an increasingly standardized approach.

*Berry and Kim’s Model of Acculturation (1987)*

There are several definitions of acculturation. For this study, I am using Triandis’ (2007, p. 65) version, which cites Chun, Balls-Organista, and Martin’s 2002 definition of acculturation as another form of transmission that takes place from outside a person’s own cultural group as a result of direct contact (e.g. colonization, migration) or indirect influence (e.g. telemedia or books). Berry (2009) cites his and various works to further explain the concept of acculturation strategies as the various ways that groups and individuals seek to acculturate. Perhaps a useful tool to further illustrate Kahakalau’s aforementioned statement is Rezentes’s (1996) application of John W. Berry and Uichol Kim’s two-dimensional model of acculturation to Native Hawaiians. The two issues that they found in relation to acculturation are (a) the extent to which individuals consider it of value to identify with and maintain the cultural characteristics of their own ethnic group, and (b) the importance individuals attribute to maintaining positive
relationships with the mainstream society and other ethnic groups. Furthermore, the four ways in which members of various ethnic groups can participate in a culturally diverse society are integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization. According to Berry (2009, p. 366)

When individuals do not wish to maintain their cultural identity and seek daily interaction with other cultures, the assimilation strategy is defined. In contrast, when individuals place a value on holding on to their original culture, and at the same time wish to avoid interaction with others, then the separation alternative is defined. When there is an interest in both maintaining ones original culture, while in daily interactions with other groups, integration is the strategy… Finally when there is little possibility or interest in cultural maintenance (often for reasons of enforced cultural loss), and little interest in having relations with others (often for reasons of exclusion or discrimination) then marginalization is defined.

One of the five themes that Lefcourt (2005) extracted in her study on Native Hawaiian (NH) education is hybridity, which refers to struggle between Native Hawaiian and Western integration. Through semi-structured interviews, participants, who were all Native Hawaiian (NH) priests, elders, educators, and community members, expressed concerns on how to perpetuate their rich cultural heritage without jeopardizing their own identities, culture, history, genealogies, and birthright as indigenous people of Hawaiʻi (p. 156).

Rezentes (1996) applied Berry and Kim’s model to Hawaiian psychology, and I will attempt to address the model in relation to Hawaiian education, particularly Hawaiian-focused schools. For kula kaiapuni and Nā Lei Naʻauao schools it is valuable to maintain Hawaiian cultural integrity and to relate to other customs. Thus integration is important for the aforementioned Hawaiian-focused schools. Hence Kahakalau’s 2003 words above: balancing
both the old and the new, the Hawaiian and the haole. In a special issue of *Indigenous Language Education* Henze and Davis (1991) address this issue of integration

Indigenous educators are constantly challenged by the conflict and compromise associated with developing curriculum that reflects indigenous worldview while attending to those Western forms of knowledge that students may need for future economic survival (p. 17).

As for the application of Berry and Kim’s model to Kamehameha Schools (KS), it is nebulous. KS is busy transforming its image at least on the outside, judging by the enormous media blitz. For the last few years, KS has been touting itself as a Hawaiian school for Hawaiian children, as a result of expensive court settlements, changes in leadership and decision making processes. On the inside of KS there is a revolution, as administrators and teachers attempt to overhaul the programs and curriculum, which is not an easy feat, considering the Protestant beginnings of Kamehameha Schools (KS) over one hundred and twenty years ago. Recently, Hawaiian culture-based strategies are helping to steer the schools toward greater integration of traditional Hawaiian ways of knowing and viewing the world (Nā Lau Lama, 2005, p. 48). A study of the effectiveness of culturally relevant pedagogy in the education of Native Hawaiian children is Kadooka’s (2010) dissertation. Though the study was limited to six grade-level teachers at the Kamehameha Elementary School Kapālama Campus which is not representative of the entire tri-complex campuses of The Kamehameha Schools (KS), Kadooka (p. 47) asserts there is none to little evidence that it is being implemented at Kamehameha Elementary School. Is Kamehameha Schools a Hawaiian school or a school for Hawaiians? A research study is needed to investigate the culturally relevant pedagogical
understandings, methods, and outcomes of the Kamehameha Elementary teachers to ensure that Kamehameha Elementary School is indeed a Hawaiian school. The literature review suggests that Kamehameha Schools (KS) is an institution in flux between integration and assimilation. Thus, for Hawaiian educational models and institutions, the acculturation strategies include a mixture of integration and assimilation. Berry (2009) contextualizes the research question on acculturation.

The review of the literature deliberately stems from a strengths-based approach, illustrating traditional Hawaiian education as being the foundation of contemporary Hawaiian education. There is a strong emphasis on what is modern is ancient, and programs and institutions reflect the philosophy of honoring and nurturing the teachings of the kūpuna to prepare our children for the contemporary globalized world of the 21st century.

A growing base of evidence suggests the successes of educational programs and strategies that build on the strengths of Native Hawaiian families and communities to stimulate the minds and hearts of Native Hawaiian learners (Nā Lau Lama, Community Report, 2005, p. 5).

Relevant Methodologies and the Six Rs

Bevon-Brown’s 2001 article on special education is an excellent example illustrating how to conduct research with ethnically diverse groups. For instance, to overcome the widespread concern about cultural bias, “researchers can develop some methodological adaptations and strategies that can be used to conduct culturally and sensitive research, evaluation, and assessment” (p. 138): the right person must ask the questions; the right questions must be asked; questions must be directed at the right people; questions must be asked in the right way; and, questions must be asked at the right place and at the right time. The aforementioned guidelines
(The Six Rs) also provide a framework to illustrate Hapa Hawai‘i, which is similar to Lefcourt’s Papa Hana (2005), an approach to conducting culturally appropriate research within Native Hawaiian communities.

*The Right Person to Ask*

The Six Rs are Bevon-Brown’s (2001) guidelines, which were derived from interview data. The first R is the right person must ask the right questions, which is really about insider perspective. Dr. Manulani Meyer asserts (personal communication – February 11, 2009 – email), “it matters who is talking!” There are certain cultural nuances that outside researchers may miss or misunderstand, for not being part of the community being researched. Also, this is an issue about access to participants and communities. I am the right person for this research; based on Hawaiian epistemology, I have a natural advantage. I am a Native Hawaiian (NH), Hawaiian language and Hawai‘i Creole speaker, kumu and mother of two children. I have a solid understanding and grounding of the traditions of my ancestors. In addition, for the past fifteen years I have been an educator in various institutions, such as the Hawai‘i public schools, Saint Louis School, and Chaminade University. “Also, because I am working within communities that I am already a part of, rapport has already been built and trust established” (Wilson, 2008, p. 40). In terms of the emic involvement as a Native Hawaiian (NH) researcher conducting research with, by and about Native Hawaiians, I enthusiastically follow other NH female leaders, educators, and activists in educational research, such as Dr. Manulani Meyer and Dr. Ku Kahakalau (2004).

Therefore, I embrace the insider (emic) indigenous role as an asset, which Au and Raphael (2000) described

Researchers of diverse backgrounds can make exceptional contributions to education. By
virtue of having been raised within the culture and continuing to endorse its values and beliefs, these researchers may have insights likely to be unavailable to researchers of mainstream backgrounds (p. 178).

Furthermore, as far as the importance of who is talking about research conducted by NH, about NH, and for NH, NH scholars reveal inconsistently their identity as NH and researcher. Based on mainstream research practices, Kadooka (2010), Kawakami and Aton (2003) and Lino (2010) do not identify themselves as being or not being NH. On the other hand, some scholars identify themselves as NH. For instance, Serna (2005) reveals her identity as a NH in the research bias section of her intervention/study. She asserts

I am a Native Hawaiian and believe in its cultural values. As a Native Hawaiian female, I strongly believe that cultural interventions or a cultural-based learning environment are effective means to assist Native Hawaiian students to become productive and contributing beings (p. 66).

Almost in the same vein as Serna (2005), Kadooka (2010) refers to herself as the researcher, throughout her study on the teachers’ use of culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) at Kamehameha Elementary School (KES). On page 66, she contends

It was important to maintain an etic approach where this researcher was able to maintain a non-biased and neutral stance in order to see any unique CRP patterns and events.

In another similar study conducted at the Kamehameha Schools Elementary on the teachers’ NH cultural perceptions, Tuitele (2010) like Kadooka got her dissertation from the University of Southern California. Tuitele writes about her role as a researcher as an insider,

I am the vice principal at this site. There is much that I already know about the faculty at KES because I was a teacher at this site for fifteen years (p. 79).
Other NH scholars express the struggle with researching one’s own community. For instance, Ka’omea (2004, p. 28) explains vividly the conflicting expectations:

For instance, in my experience I have found that while the academy expects that its members speak from theory, Native Hawaiian communities expect that their members will speak from experience. While the academy expects that research relationships will be detached and objective, Native Hawaiian communities expect that these relationships will be intimate and enduring. While the academy expects that its members contribute to the scholarly community through rigorous intellectualism, Native Hawaiian communities expect that their members will contribute through vigorous activism.

Also, Lefcourt (2005) gives testimony about the conflict as an indigenous researcher conducting research in her own community. She interviewed NH kūpuna (elders), kahuna (priests), community members, and educators about their schooling experiences and what they envision Hawaiian education:

As an indigenous scholar-researcher, I found this study both a blessing and a curse. It was a blessing to be amongst the great wisdom of NH elders, educators, and the people, who shared their cultural knowledge and heartbreaking stories. At the same time I found this research a curse to carry out the tremendous kuleana (responsibility) of bringing the oppressed stories to the forefront to be heard while at the same time taking the risk of threatening my position in the academy and the larger research community (p. 73).

The Right Questions

In addition to minimizing cultural bias, Bevon-Brown’s (2001) Six Rs are great strategies for conducting good research. In the previous section, the first R, The Right Person Asks, was explained. In this section, the second R, the Right Questions, will be highlighted. To elicit
accurate and relevant results, it is imperative that the right questions be asked. When working with ethnically diverse communities, researchers have to consider differences in terms of culture, linguistics and worldviews.

When creating the research questions for study, I had to lomi (massage) the questions so that they would make sense to me and the other participants. For instance, I am interested in what NH educators say, think and feel about Hawaiian education, so asking them, “What is Hawaiian education?” is not enough. Instead, a better question is, “What is your mana’o on Hawaiian education?” When the term mana’o is used in the question, then the question elicits more than just a definition or description of Hawaiian education. Since the question is general enough and culturally appropriate, the question invites many possible answers. The following is an explanation on the term manaʻo, which will further illuminate the research question. According to Pukui and Elbert (1986, p. 236), manaʻo means thought, idea, belief, opinion, theory, thesis, intension, meaning, suggestion, mind, as well as desire, want; to think, estimate, anticipate, expect, etc. In addition, manaʻo is a very common term known and used by many Native Hawaiians (NH) as well as many local residents in Hawai‘i. Also, this question is framed in a Hawaiian perspective, so it is easily translatable to Hawaiian, which is, “He aha kou manaʻo no ka naʻauao Hawaiʻi?” Therefore, the research question, “What is your manaʻo on Hawaiian education?” is a very good research question, from a NH perspective.

Another example is the research question on acculturation. It was suggested that I ask, “What does an educated Hawaiian person look like?” I had trouble grappling with the question, from a NH perspective. I could not translate it to Hawaiian, so I asked other Hawaiian speakers, who had the same puzzled look. We could not translate the question to Hawaiian. Since NHs tend to be group oriented and concerned about the community at large, particularly what one can
do for the benefit of the community, it does not make sense to ask, “What does an educated Hawaiian look like?”

Therefore, the problem was the question, which did not make sense from a Hawaiian perspective; the question had to be changed in order for it to be a good research question, considering the subject and participants of the study. The following question makes sense; what are the goals of Hawaiian education? In Hawaiian the research question is, “He aha nā luʻukia o ka naʻauao Hawaiʻi?”

_The Right People - Naming the Voices_

The first two Rs from Bevon-Brown’s (2001) research strategies were covered in the previous sections. This section will now cover the third R, the Right People. Since the study is on NH educators’ perspectives on Hawaiian education, I sought NH educators as participants. These NH educators were selected based on their work and personal experiences. We Indigenous people, are transforming the paradigm of research (Wilson, 2008). One area of contention is the mainstream expectation of anonymous informants. For instance, some NH scholars are challenging this practice, since it goes against Hawaiian practice of naming the source. Like Meyer (personal communication – February 11, 2009 – email) asserts in the previous section on the right person asks, it matters who is speaking:

Naming the voices of the twenty informants has been an important element in keeping this work cultural and authentic. Citing names on each of the quotations validates the findings from a Hawaiian ontological and epistemological base. Although this belief may clash with mainstream expectations of anonymous qualitative data, it is absolutely fundamental if this work is to be taken seriously in our Hawaiʻi community (Meyer 2003, p. 140).
Also, Kahakalau identifies the names of the people and schools in her 2003 work. Wong (2010) goes even further in her 2010 study on the traditions and language of Niʻihau. She identifies the participants (many are her own family members), her genealogy, and direct speech, all of which establishes her relationship with the participants and place, which ground her identity. Therefore, authenticity is not an issue (Markham, 2004). Thus, Meyer (2003), Kahakalau (2003), Wong (2010) and I use our identities as researchers, analysts, and ultimately Native Hawaiians as a resource (Widdicombe, 1998).

In some instances the situation may call for confidentiality. For instance, Lefcourt (2005) was asked by her participants to not reveal their identities as a way to protect them and their cultural knowledge, which is seen as intellectual property. The aforementioned participants were concerned that someone would exploit their knowledge to make a profit. Several other NH researchers, such as Crabbe (2002) and Kawakami and Aton (2003), chose not to reveal their interviewees’ names, following mainstream research practices. Other examples include Serna (2005) and Kanahele-Mossman (2010), who interviewed Native Hawaiian minors.

I used the snowball method of recruitment (Polkingborne, 2005). For instance several participants referred others as excellent participants based on their knowledge, experience, and relationships in the betterment of Native Hawaiian children. Most interviews lasted from 20 to 40 minutes at various places. I identify the names of the participants and places of the interview sites in Chapter Four Results and in Appendix A.

In the Right Way at the Right place and Right Time

The fourth, fifth, and six Rs (Brown-Bevon, 2001), in the Right Way at the Right Place and the Right Time, will now be addressed. Cooperation and access are not automatically to members of the same community. Also, even if certain procedures and protocol are followed,
access to participants and interviews are not always granted. Relationships and connections are very important for Hawaiians, however there are limitations. For example, in my previous pilot studies I approached people I knew for interviews, and only four out of ten of them answered my research questions via email, after I made several email requests. In another instance, after leaving a few messages with his secretary and several emails, one individual did not allow me to interview him. He was a friend and classmate of mine from high school; he said he was too busy. However, he did suggest I contact someone else and told me to use his name. Fortunately for me, this person kindly answered my research questions.

Furthermore, Kawakami and Aton (2001) admitted that few of the participants in their study returned the questionnaires. When they conducted their research, the aforementioned authors explained that most of the participants preferred to be interviewed by phone or in person, rather than completing and returning questionnaires. In addition, both Lefcourt (2005) and Meyer (2003) explained the importance of prayer and food to properly open interview sessions with Native Hawaiians for research study. I did not observe their gracious protocols, because I did not make the time. It was not a priority for me, since I was often times feeling overwhelmed with juggling my responsibilities with caring for my two small daughters and working full time as a high school teacher.

In addition to the importance of relationships and interview protocols, the Right Way is the language or languages that are utilized in the interviews. Since I am a Native Hawaiian (NH) and Hawaiian language speaker, I spoke mostly Hawaiian to other NH educators, whose abilities in Hawaiian language varied. Of the thirteen of us participants, two are manaleo (native speakers). I am not a manaleo. I became fluent in Hawaiian language after studying it formally in classes at Kamehamha Schools and at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. Seven of the ten
interviews including the two focus groups were conducted mostly in Hawaiian with light sprinklings of English and Hawai‘i Creole. The other three interviews and focus group were conducted mostly in English with light sprinklings of Hawaiian and Hawai‘i Creole. There is mana (spiritual essence/power) in the spoken word. Speaking, thinking, feeling, and creating in Hawaiian language allow me to connect to the powerful currents of ancestral knowledge. Also, though Hawai‘i Creole (HC) historically, socially, academically, and politically continues to be a stigma for some individuals. Most local people in Hawai‘i refer to HC as Pidgin. According to Pukui, Haertig, and Lee (1972, p. 64), “pidgin is basically a form of relating between persons. It is quite different from ways of relating when two persons speak standard English to each other.” I embrace Pidgin, because that too is a part of my identity. Therefore, the languages that are utilized in the interviews and focus groups are part of Bevon-Brown’s 2001 work on strategies, the Six Rs, namely the fourth R, the Right Way.

Bevon-Brown’s Fifth and Sixth Rs, the Right and the Right Time, developed organically in my research situation. Since I work full time as a teacher and mother of two young children, time is a precious commodity. I made arrangements with a few of the participants in this study. For some I had a few serendipitous moments when our paths crossed and luckily I had my audio recorder with me in my car. For most of the interviews, I made arrangements with the participants to meet them at their work sites, such as Ke Kula ‘o Samuel Kamakau in Kāne‘ohe, Punānā Leo ‘o Kamakau in Kāne‘ohe, and Punānā Leo ‘o Honolulu in Kalihi. Other locations include Kaumakapili Church in Kalihi, Kenny’s Restaurant in Kalihi, and Native Hawaiian Educator Association Convention, which is held at Windward Community College in Kāne‘ohe. I wanted to make it convenient for my friends, because they were doing me a big favor by welcoming me into their lives and by graciously sharing with me their mana‘o. Also, I wanted
them to be comfortable. Meyer (2003, p. 132) explained the importance of place for the interview sites:

> It is quite possible that site was, in fact, the interview. Place as passion. ‘Āina as kumupa‘a, kūpuna, aumākua (Land as foundation, elder, ancestor). The site synergized with every nuance of this formulating Hawaiian epistemology. This vibrant understanding is a difficult thing to capture in a written mode. But, suffice to say, it was experienced.

Just as the literature review demonstrates the relationship of ancient teachings with modern pedagogy, so too must research methodology reflect culturally relevant ways and western practices to conduct research in Native Hawaiian communities. The next chapter in this study describes my methodology. I created a research methodology called Hapa Hawai‘i, which means part Hawaiian. Hapa Hawai‘i reflects my perspective as a Native Hawaiian conducting research to meet western academic standards and honor Hawaiian sensibility. Hawaiian epistemology and indigenous research methodology are the foundation of Hapa Hawai‘i, which integrates membership categorization analysis to analyze the data. I utilized Bevon-Brown’s (2001) Six Rs to outline my research methods.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In this study, I incorporated both Native Hawaiian (NH) and western qualitative research techniques. In an international arena, indigenous research methodologies illustrate indigenous peoples working to decolonize research practices by centering indigenous perspectives. In Hawai‘i Nei, Hawaiian epistemology honors ancient NH perspectives. It is my kuleana (responsibility) is to integrate NH perspectives with western research, which has been done before by other audacious NH researchers, whom I am deeply grateful for leading the way for the rest of us to follow. I call my version of this hybrid fusion of conducting researching in, by, for, and about NH Hapa Hawai‘i, which means part Native Hawaiian with western influence.

Spiritually, academically, linguistically, politically, and organically, Hapa Hawai‘i aims to reverse the effects of the cultural bomb, which is to annihilate a people’s belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland (Ngugi, 1986, p. 3).

My concoction, Hapa Hawai‘i, is a conscious practice to shift the focus from western to NH and from mainstream to indigenous. It is in direct contrast to the commonly used term, Hapa Haole. According to Pukui and Elbert (1986, p. 58), hapa haole means part-white person, of part-white blood, part white and part Hawaiian, as an individual or phenomenon. Hapa Haole is a term used to describe music, hula, and people. Hapa Hawai‘i blossoms from the growing tradition to decolonize research methodologies, drawing from sources of Hawaiian epistemology and western research traditions. I used Bevon-Brown’s (2001) Six Rs, which I explained in the
previous section, to illustrate my research methodology. I consciously used Hapa Hawai‘i when I conducted, transcribed, translated, and analyzed the data from the interviews. My decision on how to and what to transcribe and translate was intricately part of the analysis. Each Hawaiian language excerpt in this study includes detailed transcript containing a break down of two lines per transcript line, such as the original spoken data and the idiomatic translation.

*Indigenous Research Methodologies*

Over the past few years research on, with, about, and for indigenous peoples have grown (Wilson, 2008). Indigenous peoples clamor for decolonization and self-determination, and these two significant concepts are interconnected closely. Some indigenous peoples conduct research methodologies with the aim to decolonize research paradigms and to politically decolonize indigenous peoples. Indigenous peoples are networking with each other across oceans and continents to negotiate the space for the overall wellbeing of indigenous communities. According to Bennett deMarrais (1998, p. xiv) related to issues of power and powerlessness is the notion of voice in the research process. Who tells the story and whose story is told?

Native peoples must have a voice, we must ask the questions and critique existing knowledge. We must not only be evaluated, we must evaluate. We must not be researched, but research. By cementing our presence in the production of knowledge, we can be vigilant over how it is used and the power that knowledge confers (Kana‘iaupuni, 2004, p. 28).

Smith’s 2012 work, *Decolonizing Research Methodologies*, is the influential primer for indigenous researchers. Though she is not the only indigenous researcher, Smith is considered to one of the authorities for indigenous research methodologies (IRM). Smith has attracted a lot of attention to indigenous peoples and research. IRM have strengths and limitations. Depending
on one’s perspective, indigenous research methodologies (IRM) inform and challenge mainstream western research practices. White and Tengan (2001) state, “The arrival of indigenous scholars in the halls of the academy and in the pages of major books and journals is transforming disciplines, disciplinary boundaries, and the products of knowledge about indigenous societies” (p. 399). The act of writing our own stories in our own languages empowers and encourages us, others, and future generations (Hoʻomanawanui, 2008; Mattox-Primocio, 2008).

Indigenous researchers ask some critical questions about research. For whom is the research? Who benefits from the research? What is the purpose of the research? Why is the research being done? Who “owns” the research? This is necessary since much research on NHs in the past was conducted by outsiders of the culture, whom may have misinterpreted, misrepresented, or distorted the true essence of NHs (Lefcourt, 2005, pp. 68-69).

The decolonization of research methods is about “centering our concepts and worldviews from our own perspectives and for our own purposes” (Smith, 2012, p. 39). Indigenous peoples have experiences, histories, epistemologies, ontologies, and languages that need to be honored. Warner (1999) boldly advocates that Indigenous Peoples have the kuleana (right, responsibility, and authority) to make decisions for themselves in language and cultural revitalization. By essentially placing us at the center, the research should help indigenous communities. Indigenous research methodologies contribute to the body of knowledge of indigenous peoples about themselves and for themselves for their own needs, rather than objects of investigation (McCubbin & Marsella, 2009; Porsanger, 2004). This is when researchers are no longer in the background, merely observing and recording. Indigenous researchers are defining research, and are not asking for acceptance and permission to voice their positions. “The aim is to intersect
qualitative research and postcolonial theory in ways that make possible the production of new 
spaces for recasting research in liberatory ways that foreground indigenous epistemologies and 
ways of knowing in the field” (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008, p. 38).

Some characteristics of indigenous research methodologies include research that is 
relevant and contributes to the overall well-being of indigenous communities in terms of 
education, health, and other fields (Fong, Braun, & Tsark, 2003). “For above all, indigenous 
research should be about healing and empowerment” (Kaomea, 2004, p. 43).

For instance, some communities have developed protocols for researchers who want to 
do research on indigenous peoples. For example, research on the Maori, the indigenous people 
of New Zealand, has to be cleared through the particular tribe involved. According to Smith 
(2012) the researcher needs to have genealogical connection to the particular tribe. If an 
indigenous person is not the principal investigator, Smith recommends indigenous people to 
become partners in the research by working collaboratively with the researcher, who also present 
the research after it is conducted.

**Hawaiian Epistemology**

The separation of mind from body is not found in a Hawaiian worldview. It was not 
apparent in any interviews, in any body of literature, in any dreams that arrived in service 
to this unfolding reflection. Indeed, intelligence and knowledge were embedded at the 
core of our bodies-the stomach or *naʻau*. The naʻau for Native Hawaiians is the site for 
both feeling and thinking. (Meyer, 2008, p. 223)

Meyer (2008) presents seven categories of knowledge making: spirituality and knowing: 
the cultural context of knowledge; that which feeds: physical place and knowing; the cultural 
nature of the senses: expanding our ideas of empiricism; relationship and knowledge: self
through other; utility and knowledge: ideas of wealth and usefulness; words and knowledge: causality in language; the body/mind question: the illusion of separation. Meyer invites us to consider the possibilities of embracing ancient sensibilities, subjectivity, and objectivity to achieve harmony and validation.

I draw from tradition in the context of a Native Hawaiian (NH) perspective and worldview for examining what Hawaiian educators say about Hawaiian education. I am a Native Hawaiian who descends from the ancestral divine gods of the Hawaiian Islands. As a Hawaiian language speaker and kumu hula (hula master), I have access to chants and other orature as “the means to organize, maintain, and convey knowledge” (Young, 1998, p. xiii), since I connect to the past, present, and future generations. My connection to traditional literature and ancestral knowledge inspire me to create and compose new stories, a record of mana’o, and experiences for future generations. Also, I am an educator. I have taught Hawaiian history, chant, dance, and language in the Hawai’i public school system for over ten years, The Kamehameha Schools summer enrichment program Kulia I Ka Pono, and Chaminade University. Most importantly, I am a mother of two Native Hawaiian girls. I am nurturing and educating them to take on the kuleana of being leaders of the Hawaiian nation. I am inspired by Kumu Hula Pualani Kanahele’s encouraging and bold words as she states the kuleana (responsibility) that NH possess:

We, as Native Hawaiians, must continue to unveil the knowledge of our ancestors. Let us interpret for ourselves who our ancestors are, how they thought, and why they made certain decisions. In the process, we treat them with honor, dignity, love, and respect—whether they be akua, ali‘i, or kānaka – because they are our ‘ohana, our family (2010, p. xv).
Naming the Voices

Therefore for this study to have credibility in the Hawaiian community, it is imperative that I made an effort to reveal the participants’ identities with their signed permission. It keeps me accountable, because anyone who is interested can personally and directly check my sources, rather than merely accept my word at face value. Also, as a kumu hula, I have been trained to identify my sources. It is very common among Hawaiians to ask each other, “Where did you get that chant? Who taught you that hula? Who told you that story?” Purposefully withholding the source is culturally considered bad form in some Hawaiian communities. With that being said, I had to be flexible and sensitive to the participants in this study. Prior to the interview, I ask if I can reveal their identities in the study. Every single one of the participants graciously gave me permission to identify them by name and signed off on the consent form. This is why the names of the informants are included in Chapter 4 and Appendix A in this study. According to Meyer (2003), “standing apart from the shadows of anonymity offers credibility, authenticity and integrity— it sets the stage for deeper inquiry into more cultural processes of research (p. 140).

The Participants

The participants are twelve Native Hawaiians (NH) educators from Hawaiian culture-based charter schools, Hawaiian immersion schools, the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa and Kamehameha Schools. They are eight females and four males, with from ten or more years of experience in teaching mostly Native Hawaiian students. The group of participants consists of teachers and administrators. This is a unique study, since all the participants are Native Hawaiian, speaking in English, Hawai‘i Creole, and/or Hawaiian language. The following section will explain how and why these NH educators were specifically selected, based on their background.
Purposeful Sampling

Through purposeful sampling (Seidman, 1998) I selected the participants in the study, based on their years of experience and expertise. Polkinghorne (2005) states “such selections are purposeful and sought out; the selection should not be random or left to chance” (p. 140). Since I am a Native Hawaiian and educator, I have direct access and contact with many other Native Hawaiian educators in Hawai’i. These are the people who chose to work toward the betterment of Native Hawaiians and Hawaiian education. Some of the participants recommended other NH educators, “who might be informed participants for the study,” which Polkingborne (2005, p. 141) refers to as a snowballing strategy.

Methods

Since this study is concerned with participants’ perspectives, a qualitative research design was chosen as the appropriate approach (Bennett deMarrais, 1998). This study explored how NH educators invoked Native Hawaiian membership categories when talking about Hawaiian education. This research project utilized a combination of methods, including talk story approach, semi-structured interviews, and observations. Conversation analytic perspective and membership categorization analysis of empirical materials were used in an effort to articulate the perspectives of twelve NH educators on Hawaiian education and educating Hawaiian children. Empirical materials include audio-recorded participant talk story sessions and/or interviews and transcript of interviews. I conducted eight individual interviews and two focus group discussions. For this study, I followed Potter and Hepburn’s suggestions (2005) on writing up research on reporting interviews, which should include the following: relevant interview questions, extracts with Jeffersonian transcriptions, extracts with line numbers and short lines depicting elements of talk and analytic interpretations, and how participants were approached.
I utilized a talk story approach when conducting interviews and focus group discussions as the first method used in this research study. Talk story in this study is more than “a rambling personal experience narrative mixed with folk materials” as described by Watson (1975, p. 54). Au (1980) describes talk story as a major speech event in Hawaiian culture, which still emphasizes oral literature as a vehicle for transferring, interpreting, and disseminating knowledge. Boggs (1969, p. 41) describes talk story as, “one recounts and experiences, and others respond in like fashion.” In their article about Native Hawaiian (NH) education, Sing, Hunter, and Meyer (1999, p. 4) affirm, “talk-story is how we as Hawaiians best approach an issue. It includes all our voices and the nuance of group energy, group mana.” Furukawa (2009), Lum (2008), and Sumida (1991) articulate insightfully that talk story is a speech activity that establishes identity, relationships and worldviews. In the next chapter, I will show in my analysis of the data, which is in talk story form, how participants invoke membership categories with associated characteristics, indexicality, occassionedness, relevance, orientation, consequentiality and structure (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998), using my Hawaiian lens (Lefcourt, 2005).

Furthermore, through the talk story approach I conducted semi-structured interviews to elicit a wide-range of responses from specific questions, since I was interested in what Native educators had to say about Hawaiian education. Unlike standardized or structured interview, which is associated with questionnaire research and statistical analysis (Wooffitt & Widdicombe, 2006, p. 29), “data from the semi-structured interviews in this study were not restricted to yes/no or factual responses. Thus, the interviews yielded large, unanticipated, and insightful data.”

A fundamental part of doing conversation analysis (CA) is the process of transcribing
in as close detail as possible such features of the recorded interaction as the precise beginning and end points of turns, the duration of pauses, audible sounds which are not words (such as breathiness and laughter), or which are ‘ambiguous’ vocalizations, and marking the stresses, extensions and truncations that are found in individual words and syllables,” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999, p. 75).

In addition, institutional talk also is an apt term to describe the interviews as talk story-like in this study. Heritage (2004, pp. 224-225) describes the three main types of institutional talk, which is referred to as institutional interaction involving: the participants in specific goal orientations, which are tied to their institution-relevant identities; special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contributions to the business at hand; and inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts.

From the get-go, the talk story-like interviews were established as interviews. I asked my friends, colleagues, and kumu if I could interview them. Although the talk sessions may appear to be informal and semi-structured, there are set questions in the interviews. The goal of the interaction was to gather the data for my dissertation, some of the conversation did not occur spontaneously. Many insightful and amazing things blossomed in the interviews, which the participants and I guided around the research questions. Also, the talks are mainly asymmetric, since I am the one asking the questions and the respondents answer my questions. In most of the talks, the interviewees spoke much longer than I did, which is indicative of our roles in interviews.

In order to transcribe the talk story-like interviews, which are sites of discourse (Tierney & Dilley, 2002), I listened to the recorded interviews numerous times and utilized the Jeffersonian notation. The use of Gail Jefferson’s notations has become conventional practice
“that capture elements of talk that are interactionally relevant,” (Potter & Hepburn, 2005, p. 6). My challenge was to craft the interviews in a talk-story fashion to avoid formal institutional talk, in which the roles of interviewer and interviewee are “constrained to stay within the boundaries of the question-answer framework” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999, p. 149). I posed the question to the selected Native Hawaiian interviewees, what is your mana’o on Hawaiian education? He aha kou mana’o no ka na’auao Hawai‘i?

*Lessons Learned from the 2010 Pilot Study*

This dissertation builds upon the findings of a small pilot study, *Mana’o Hawai‘i*. I conducted the pilot study from 2009 - 2010. I used two audio taped and one video taped interviews (approximately forty-five minutes each) and emails from five Native Hawaiian educators. I asked the participants for their mana‘o (thoughts, feelings, and perspectives) on a range of questions on Hawaiian education, special education, and inclusion.

I utilized membership categorization analysis (MCA) to examine the data, because I was not interested in testing a theory. MCA is sometimes referred to as ‘anti-theoretical.’ MCA is also useful to examine the interviews between multicultural speakers. We spoke Hawaiian, Hawai‘i Creole, and English throughout the interviews. The aforementioned pilot study focused on the participants’ use of language or indexicality to explain ‘taken-for-granted’ assumptions about mana‘o Hawai‘i (Hawaiian thoughts, feelings, and perspectives). When I asked participants questions about Hawaiian education, the participants systematically and incestuously used culturally-rich terms. For example, many of the participants in this study used the words ‘kākou’ and ‘we’. Thus, the participants’ use of ‘kākou’ and ‘we’ includes me as the listener and other Hawaiians. Furthermore, kākou is a Hawaiian term that means ‘we three or more.’ Even
though there are only two of us in the interactional talk or email, the participants use ‘kākou’ instead of the term ‘kāua’, which means ‘we two inclusive.’

Perhaps the participants responded in this way, because the participants, including myself, share identities of being Hawaiian and educators. All of the participants are familiar with me, because we either worked together, went to school together (Kamehameha and the University of Hawai‘i-Mānoa), participated together in protest marches, and are acquainted with many of the same people and Hawaiian events. That is why I understood what the participants were communicating to me, and perhaps that is why they said what they said to me. When I needed some clarification, I returned to the interviewees to follow up. Through a conversation analytic perspective, I am able to articulate what is common sense to me as a Native Hawaiian educator to an outside audience.

Data Collection

In the vein of MCA, data collection is data making. I treated the interviews as social action (Wooffitt & Widdicombe, 2006) and talk-in-interaction (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1999). Also, the interviews contain reported speech (Holt, 2000). In several instances, the participants in the study told me what they heard from others, which is a very Hawaiian method. In Hawaiian oral tradition the role of place, time, and people involved are connected and significant (Meyer, 2003). Also, I worked with Baker’s assumption about language and social action in her 2004 writing:

(1) interviewing is understood as an interactional knowledge about how members draw on their cultural knowledge, including their knowledge about how members of categories routinely speak; (2) questions are central part of the data and cannot be viewed as neutral invitations to speak – rather, they shape how and as a member of which categories the
respondents should speak; (3) interview responses are treated as accounts by a member of a category for activities attached to that category (p. 163).

I interviewed and recorded the participants in their classroom, office, work settings, church and even parking lot. It was important to meet the participants when and where it was convenient for them, since they were doing me the favor. Also, I wanted the participants to feel comfortable to share; it is culturally appropriate, for us to speak Hawaiian, English, and Hawai‘i Creole. I transcribed the interviews, using the Jeffersonian transcription techniques (Jefferson, 2004). I met with the participants to go over the accuracy of the transcriptions. I made fieldwork observations as my secondary source of data.

Membership Categorization Analysis

I use Hapa Hawai‘i, based on Indigenous research methodologies and Hawaiian epistemology, to frame my study. Since I was interested what categories Hawaiian educators invoke when we talk about Hawaiian education, I use membership categorization analysis (MCA) from a conversation analysis (CA) perspective to examine my data. The analysis in the next section considers interviewing as an interactional and social action, in which members draw on their cultural knowledge. The interview questions shape how participants respond, and the responses are treated as accounts by members of a category for activities attached to that category (Baker, 2004).

Membership categorization analysis (MCA) has its roots in the work of Harvey Sacks in the 1960s (Stokoe, 2006). Sacks drew on social sciences sources by Erving Goffman and Harold Garfinkel, two prominent figures in American sociology. Garfinkel is noted for creating ethnomethodology, which investigates the methods by which social members make sense of the social world they hold in common (Kasper, 2009). In collaboration with his colleagues Emanuel
Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2008), Sacks studied conversation and created two branches of work: conversation analysis (CA) and membership categorization analysis (MCA), which were closely connected to Garfinkel’s ethnomethodology. CA is very useful for systematically explaining in detail how verbal interactions are performed (Silverman, 1998) and organized in an orderly manner (Kasper, 2009). Conservation analysis examines sequences of talk-in-interaction, such as turn-taking, gaps and overlap, adjacency pairs and preference organization, sequential structure and repair (Roulston, 2010, p. 167). In 1973 Gail Jefferson developed the symbols used to transcribe verbal interactions, and such notational symbols include for intonation, silence, sighs, hesitations, etc. Gail Jefferson has been the major figure (Potter & Hepburn, 2005, p. 6) in developing styles of transcription. According to Sacks (1992, pp. 40 – 41) a class of category sets are ‘which’-type sets, categories are inference rich, and any member of any category is presumptively a representative of that category for the purpose of use of whatever knowledge is stored by reference to that category. Inference rich information is also referred to as common-sense knowledge, which Sacks calls this whole apparatus the MIR device (Membership Inference-rich Representative). The analysis of categorization gives the researcher access to the cultural worlds and moral orders on which the texts hinge (Perakyla, 2005, p. 874). “Membership categories, membership categorization devices and category predicates, like all other natural language phenomena, are all examples of indexical expressions” (Hester & Eglin (1997, p. 11). Words have different meanings, depending on the context. Categories and categorical descriptions crop up in conversational turns, accomplishing social action (Stokoe, 2009).

For further elaboration, the following example is considered a classic of Sacks’s use of membership from a child’s story: ‘The baby cried. The mommy picked it up.” Sacks noted that
we are likely to hear ‘the mommy’ as the mother of this ‘baby’. Silverman (1998, p.78) asks, why do we hear the baby’s cries as the reason why the mommy picks it up? Sacks observed that we infer that baby and mommy come from a collection of categories called family.

This study shows how Hawaiian educators invoke categories of identities while talking about Hawaiian education (Widdicombe, 1998). A person’s identity reflects membership of some feature-rich category. To analyze the data of this study, I use a variety of the five principles (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998) that categories have: associated characteristics or features; indexicality and occassionedness; relevance and orientation; procedural consequentiality; and conversation structure.

Since I too am a participant, I am aware of how I draw upon my own knowledge, position, and agenda, which will be brought in the analysis (Stokoe & Smithson, 2001; Widdicombe, 1998). I used MCA to examine how collections, categories and predicates are used on the occasions of their occurrence (Hester & Hester, 2012).

Unlike the tradition of Sacks (1992), I made the conscious decision to begin analyzing the data, while I was collecting and transcribing the data, instead of waiting until all of the interviews and focus groups were completed. This was a time management strategy, based on the available resources that I had. As mentioned in the aforementioned section I utilize membership categorization analysis (MCA) by Eglin and Hester (1992). I let the data “speak” to me. Sacks (1992) referred to this type of openness, rather than being stuck to a particular theory, as “unmotivated inquiry.”

Furthermore, since I was interested in details of talk in interaction between and among Hawaiian educators, MCA, which has its roots in CA (conversation analysis), is congruent to moʻolelo. The term moʻolelo is a succession of talk, according to Pukui and Elbert (1986). MCA
and CA are both empiric and analytical perspectives used to closely examine talk. I process MCA and CA through my Hawaiian perspective and then present the data analyses.

In addition, I triangulated the interview data with observation data and support from the literature. I returned to the written literature in some instances to further support my results. Following up on my hunches, I returned to the sources to conduct some member-checking (Roulston, 2010) in some instances to verify the transcriptions and interpretations. This turned out to be a very worthwhile experience, adding more clarity and credibility to my research. In addition, conducting research with my children present is a challenge, which could be seen as a limitation, depending on one’s perspective.

The following chapter presents the results of my research. Chapter 4 is organized in two sections; the first section is around the study’s first two research questions: what is Hawaiian education and what are the goals of Hawaiian education. The second section is organized around the third research question: what membership categories are invoked between Hawaiian educators. According to the participants in this study, Hawaiian education is the transmission of ancestral knowledge and identity, braiding past, present, and future as a timeless resource.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The chapter is organized around the study’s research questions on Hawaiian educators’ manaʻo (thoughts, feelings, and perspectives) on Hawaiian education: what is Hawaiian education; what are the goals of Hawaiian education; and what membership categories are invoked between Hawaiian educators. The first section of this chapter presents Hawaiian education and the goals of Hawaiian education. The section section presents the various membership categories that the participants constructed. Since the participants in the study constructed an abundant amount of membership categories, section two is divided into two parts; one part presents the membership category of kūpuna (elder), and the following part presents various membership categories.

Chapter 4 presents detailed and in-depth data analysis on Hawaiian education and goals elaboration category, kūpuna membership category, and various membership categories. The participants, all Native Hawaiian (NH) educators, constructed categories of identity, such as Hawaiian, kūpuna, kumu, and haumāna, which are intricately intertwined to the category of Hawaiian education. Hawaiian education is the transmission of ancestral knowledge and identity; the kūpuna, the elders, are the source of ancestral knowledge; and various membership categories are intricately intertwined in the Native Hawaiian educators’ discourse on Hawaiian education.

In this chapter I present a detailed and thick analysis of the data. Since who is talking and place matter significantly, I identify relevant information about each participant, our relationship, and the interview site before presenting my analysis of the data to provide context. I used a conversation analytic perspective to examine the data. The transcription is based on
Gail Jefferson’s notations, which has become conventional practice (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). In the English and Hawai‘i Creole interviews, Hawaiian language terms are italicized, whereas in Hawaiian language interviews, English and Hawai‘i Creole terms are italicized. Each Hawaiian language excerpt in this study includes detailed transcript containing a break down of two lines per transcript line: original spoken data and idiomatic translation. The section on talk in interaction, such as interviews, consist of a sequence including: who, where, data analysis, and excerpt from data. I used the audio recordings of the interviews and transcripts to analyze sequences that best exemplified how participants invoked membership categorizations when talking about Hawaiian education.

The Native Hawaiian (NH) participants, including myself, construct categories of identity, such as Hawaiian, kūpuna, kumu, and haumāna. The categories are relational and relevant, numerous and similar, fluid and timeless, intricately intertwined to the Hawaiian education. Hawaiian education is the transmission of ancestral knowledge and identity. Hawaiian education and Hawaiian identity are inseparable. I liken my approach to Kikiloi’s 2010 study on a unified Hawaiian identity:

all traditional accounts stem from the vast pool of memories handed down and verified by our ancestors. Rather than discredit or position one source or tradition versus another, this research compares texts in an effort to find consistency in words and similarities in spirit and theme. Variations therefore only add and build upon the established core tradition (p. 80).

Results from the First Two Research Questions

Hawaiian education is the transmission of ancestral knowledge and identity. Since we are Hawaiian, it is our kuleana (responsibility) to help our children become Hawaiian parents, who are grounded in Hawaiian culture. Hawaiian educational practices teach
Hawaiians or teach for Hawaiian children to retain our identity. Hawaiian education comes from a Hawaiian perspective for the generations after us.

Excerpts 1 & 2 – Group Interview with Ku Kahakalau and Theresa Makuakane-Dreschel

The first two excerpts of this chapter are from the first and unscheduled interview that I conducted; I placed my audio recorder in my bag that morning, hoping to acquire an interview or two at the annual Native Hawaiian Education Association (NHEA) Windward Community College in Kāneʻohe, Oʻahu. NHEA attracts numerous Native Hawaiian educators, scholars, supporters, and colleagues, who are dedicated to improving the education of Hawaiians.

After eating lunch, I approached Ku and Aunty Theresa, who were sitting together, for an interview. After a few minutes of chit chat over the purpose of the interview and other things, I asked my research question, “He aha kou manaʻo no ka naʻauo Hawaiʻi?” (What are your thoughts on Hawaiian education?) This excerpt illustrates the intricate connection between Hawaiian education and Hawaiian identity.

Excerpt 1 Hawaiian Identity & Education

1 K: So anyway, I wanted fo ask you ladies
2 I have so much aloha and mahalo
3 T: ha ha ha
4 K: You know I’ve been bugging you
5 fo years about this ha ha ha
6 KU Maikaʻi that we have the time now here yah
7 K: About he aha kou manaʻo (.). Hawaiian education? What are your thoughts for Hawaiian education?
8 Ma ka ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i↑ a i ↓’ole ma ka ‘ōlelo Haole In Hawaiian or English
9 He aha kou manaʻo no:(.) naʻauo Hawaiʻi?
10 What are your thoughts manaʻo about Hawaiian education?
11 KU: You know ‘O ko: kākou mau keiki. He Hawaiʻi lākou You know we have children. They are Hawaiian
12 and ‘o ke kumu o ka hoʻonaʻauo ‘ana and the foundation of education
13 e kokua aku iā lākou e noho ma:u he mau poʻe Hawaiʻi is to help them remain as Hawaiian people
14 E lilo i kānaka mākua Hawaiʻi To become Hawaiian parents
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I think the main reason for teaching and educating is to support and help the children become Hawaiian parents.

In line 7 I (K) ask the essential question, “What are your thoughts on Hawaiian education?” to two of my long time acquaintances. In line 8 I (K) am constructing myself as an interviewer by asking the essential question, which invoke Ku (KU) and Aunty Theresa (T) as members of the collection of Hawaiian educators. Also, since I (K) ask the question in Hawaiian and English, I give KU and T options of what language to use. Also the term single personal pro-term “kou” (your) as seen in lines 7, 9 and 10, conveys a more personal meaning and connection, than merely using the term “ka” (the). Also in line 9 the slight stretch of and pause after the term “no” (for) can represent a word search. Since we proceed to speak in Hawaiian, we implicitly invoke the collection of Hawaiian speakers.

It is noticeable that KU ascribes membership via category-implicative description “You know ‘o ko kākou mau keiki” (We have children) He Hawai‘i lākou (They are Hawaiian) constructing herself, the interviewer, and T in the collection of Hawaiian mothers and educators in line 11. This is accomplished firstly through the use of the plural first person inclusive pro-term “kākou” form of the category. Describing the category bound action of having children is relevant to this membership category of parents. By describing our “children as Hawaiian,” she constructs the three of us as Hawaiian. In lines 12 – 14 KU constructs our children as being subgroups (people and parents) of the larger community that is Hawaiians. KU ties education and teaching as the objects of the predicate in lines 12 and 15 respectively therefore constructs...
cultural practices as having strong level of level of importance for all Hawaiian educators and parents.

In line 12 KU constructs Hawaiian education as having a strong importance for all Hawaiian educators and children. In lines 17 and 18 KU continues constructing the three of us as Hawaiian mothers and makes the act of supporting and helping the children a predicate that is relevant to the construction of that category. KU clearly is specifying that our children become “Hawaiian parents” which is another collection that carry certain kuleana (responsibilities and obligations), such which as education and teaching.

Excerpt 2

Excerpt 2 also depicts the intricate connection between Hawaiian education and Hawaiian identity, in which both are inseparable. Excerpt 2 also follows KU’s response to the question, “What are your thoughts on Hawaiian education?” Theresa Makuakane-Dreschel explains that Hawaiian education is for the children and the youth.

Excerpt 2 He Hawai‘i Kākou

20 e lilo i kānaka mākua Hawai‘iʻi
21 become Hawaiian parents
22 T: Ah: ‘O ko‘u manaʻo um (.) um (.) pono kākou
23 I think um we need
24 e hoʻomau i nā (.) naʻauao Hawai‘i um (1.0)
25 to continue Hawaiian education
26 o hoʻo hoʻonaʻauao um (.)
27 teach
28 no ka mea he Hawaiʻi kākou↑
29 because we are Hawaiian
30 Um (3.0) ah ‘ae Hawaiʻi kā(h)kou.
31 Yes we are Hawaiian
32 No leilā a (3.0) then pono kākou e hoʻomau
33 Therefore then we need to continue
34 i nā mea Hawaiʻi a pau loa
35 all of the Hawaiian things
36 no nā no nā kamaliʻi no nā (. ) no nā ‘opio
37 for the children for the youth
T (Theresa) aligns herself with KU’s construction of membership category, identifying the three of us (KU, T, and the interviewer/researcher) as Hawaiian educators, as seen in lines 22 and 23. In line 20 T makes the act of continuing Hawaiian education relevant to the construction of the category of Hawaiian educator. This is accomplished through the use of the plural first person inclusive pro-term of the category “kākou” (we) in line 19. T advocates (as seen in lines 19 – 23) that, “pono kākou” (we need to) “e hoʻomau i nā naʻauo Hawaiʻi” (to continue Hawaiian education), because “Hawaiʻi kākou” (we are Hawaiian). She performs a word search in line 21 “o hoʻo hoʻonaʻauao” (teach). In line 24 T says, “no leila” (therefore), pauses for three seconds, and reinstates her previous opinion, “then pono kākou e hoʻomau” (then we should continue). The what “we” should “continue” is seen in line 25: (nā mea Hawaiʻi a pau loa” (all of the Hawaiian things). In line 25, T constructs these features as having some level of obligation and significance for all Hawaiian educators, who are Native Hawaiian and teach Hawaiian things, “no nā kamaliʻi no nā ʻōpio” (for the children for the youth).

Excerpt 3 - Group Interview with ‘Iwalani Pi‘ena and Kumulaʻau Sing

The next excerpt of data analyses is from a group interview with ‘Iwalani Pi‘ena and Kumulaʻau Sing. This group interview was conducted at the Kamehameha Schools-Kapālama Campus in the girls dorm of Kapiʻolani Nui in the summer of 2011. Our paths intersected at the Kūlia I Ka Pono program, which is part of the Kamehameha Schools Exploration Series, aimed at providing opportunities for Native Hawaiian youth who attend non-KS schools. According to the KS website, www.ksbe.edu/communityeducation/site/programs/grades_5-8/kulia_i_ka_pono: this program builds on the foundations of Hoʻolauna by using place, Hawaiian culture, values and traditions to strengthen students’ identities as Hawaiians and build leadership skills.
After lunch, I interviewed two of the NH kumu on what they think about Hawaiian education, while Kumula’au’s two children supervised and played with my two daughters in another room near by, since they are a few years older than my children. Kamehameha Schools-Kapālama Campus, Kapi’ilani Nui Dorm, and Kūlia I Ka Pono all matter in the focus group as a site. It is this piko or center where we draw mana (spiritual power or essence) and inspiration. From the beginning of the group interview, we, the three participants, construct a collection of members that comprise a ‘ohana, family, in the context of Hawaiian education.

Excerpt 3 is from the beginning of the group interview, when I explain the research questions and the direction of the discussion. This is another example illustrating the connection of Hawaiian education and Hawaiian identity.

Excerpt 3 Hawaiian Education Category Elaboration
1 K: So this research really jus asking you guys
2 What’s your manaʻo on Hawaiian education
3 What do you guys think the goal of it
4 (.) and then from there we take it
5 (2.5)
6 So brother ((referring to Kumula’au))
7 He aha kou manaʻo no ka naʻauo Hawaiʻi?
8 What are your thoughts for Hawaiian education?
9 (4.0)
10 Ku: Hm (3.0) well I think it’s different
11 for every generation
12 It’s different
13 Um cause the values of
14 our young Hawaiians today
15 is much different from the Hawaiians
16 ten years ago versus twenty years ago
17 The values are really different um

I (K) refer to the participants, ‘Iwalani Piʻena and Kumula'au Sing, as “you guys” in lines 1 and 3. After a 2.5 second pause as seen in line 5, I refer to Kumula’au as “brother” in line 6, which indicates a familial relationship and a casual setting for the discussion. There is a notably long pause (4.0 seconds) in line 8, after I ask the research question, “He aha kou manaʻo no ka
na‘auao Hawai‘i” (What are your thoughts for Hawaiian education?). Kumula‘au (Ku) responds in line 9, “hm” then pauses for 3.0 seconds, indicating a word search. Ku elaborates on how Hawaiian education is a reflection on the values of a given generation; different generations have different values, as seen in line 9 – 16. Ku invokes several membership categories with attributes; “our young Hawaiians today” in line 13 have values that are different from “the Hawaiians ten years ago versus twenty years ago” in lines 14 and 15. The two categories of Hawaiians have values, but their differences are attributed to their placement in time, such as today, ten years ago, and twenty years ago.

Kumula‘au (Ku) is also inferring that Hawaiian education is a reflection of the values of Hawaiians, according to the generation at that particular time. Thus, Hawaiian education and Hawaiian identity are fluid. Kumula‘au‘s explanation is similar to an email I received from Dr. David Sing, which is quoted on page 14.

Excerpt 4 - Interview with Chadwick Pang

Chadwick and I worked as kumu for the Kamehameha Schools (KS) summer Enrichment Programs; Chadwick worked at Ho‘olauna, which is like the week long Hawaiian leadership Kulia i Ka Pono program. This interview took place at Kenny’s Restaurant at Kamehameha Shopping Center below KS over breakfast. Kenny’s Restaurant is a popular coffee house, due to its convenient location and delicious food. Since I was not sure about Chadwick’s competency in the Hawaiian language and we speak mostly English with some sprinkling of Hawaiian when we are together, this interview is conducted in English. We chatted for about an hour over breakfast, before I started the interview.

Excerpt 4 Hawaiian Education Category Elaboration

92 K: (1.5) What is your mana:ʻo on Hawaiian educa:tion?
93 C: (.) Um I think there’s um (.) some big issues about that↓
I think are we going to talk about education that is Hawaiian? Or are we going to talk about western education that is for Hawaiians? Um tho- that’s the two biggest subsets of the: them. There is is it education by Hawaiians for Hawaiians or is it Haoles teaching Hawaiians how to be Hawaiian? K: Ha C: Cause I have a issue with that too: K: Ha ha ha C: Um ya::: ha um but I think Hawaiian I mean >actually right now I have to say< Hawaiian education encompasses all of those things (.). But (.). in the end: my preference is for (.). Hawaiians who are grounded in Hawaiian culture and in grounded in Hawaiian educational practices who: (.). then in turn teach (.). Hawaiians or teach for Hawaiians

After talking about his grandfather as his inspiration for becoming a teacher, which is presented in the next chapter, I asked Chadwick the research question, “What is your mana’o on Hawaiian education?” in line 92. Since the term mana’o is common among Hawaiian educators, I did not translate it for Chadwick. Excerpt 4 illustrates some critical, contested and political issues on Hawaiian education, which are similarly covered in the Henze and Davis’s 1999 article on indigenous language education.

In line 94 Chadwick (C) identifies “some big issues about that.” In this instance, like colloquial English, the word issue is a synonym to the word problem. He unpacks some “big issues” by pointedly asking sequentially, “are we going to talk about education that is Hawaiian?” (line 96); “or are we going to talk about western education that is for Hawaiians?” (lines 97-98). C continues elaborating on the category of Hawaiian education in lines 101 -102: “is it education by Hawaiians for Hawaiians”; “or is it Haoles teaching Hawaiians how to be

In lines 102 and 103 that Chadwick (C) expresses concern with “Haoles teaching Hawaiians how to be Hawaiian” since he states, “cause I have a issue with that too” in line 105. C emphasizes the word issue by stretching the sound and raising and lowering his pitch in the first and second syllable. C answers his own critical questions on Hawaiian education by stating in lines 109 and 110, “Hawaiian education encompasses all of those things.” C indicates his preference for “Hawaiians who are grounded in Hawaiian culture and in grounded in Hawaiian educational practices who then in turn teach Hawaiians or teach for Hawaiians” as seen in lines 112 – 117.

Excerpt 5 – Interview with Hau‘oli Akaka

Hau‘oli ‘Akaka taught over seventeen years at Kailua High School as a Hawaiian history and music teacher. He also worked for The Kamehameha Schools as the Director of Enrichment Program and for the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) in the Education Division. Hau‘oli is a very recognizable, credible and adored Hawaiian educator. He also is a long-time friend of mine and our roots go deep. When I was a freshman, he was a senior at Waipahu High School (WHS). Also, we were in Hui o Ka Palena ‘ole, the Hawaiian Club at WHS, under the leadership of the late Kumu Hula Mililani Allen. We also worship at Kaumakapili Church on Sundays in Kalihi, where the interview took place. During the interview, my baby, Kaliloa, squirmed and fussed in my lap, while my older daughter, Keola‘oli, played around us. Since Hau‘oli indicated at the beginning of the interview that he and his family had a scheduled lunch to attend shortly afterwards, this was a very focused interview.
In Excerpt 5 Hauʻoli elaborates the category of the current Western (Haole) public school education as something different and not right for Hawaiian children and Hawaiian teachers. He also upgrades this Western public school education (Haole thought and work) as something that oppresses Hawaiian children and Hawaiian teachers. Hauʻoli also incrementally invokes the collections of Hawaiian children, Hawaiian teachers and Hawaiian people.

Excerpt 5 Hawaiian Education Category Elaboration

92 K: He aha kou manaʻo no ka naʻauao Hawaiʻi? (2 min 40 sec)
   What are your thoughts for Hawaiian education?
93 H: Ka naʻauao Hawaiʻi oh he laulā kēia nīnau
   Hawaiian education This is a broad question
94 ʻakā o koʻu manaʻo e like me um kēia pā hana
   but I think this platform is like
95 you know um ʻaʻole ʻokoʻa↓a↑
   you know not different
96 ʻAʻole kūkahi nā keiki Hawaiʻi yah
   Hawaiian children do not stand alone yes
97 Mākou ka poʻe Hawaiʻi mai nā kanaka ʻē aʻe
   We are the Hawaiian people from other people
98 ʻAkā me he mea la i loko o ke kula aupuni
   but it’s something inside of the public school
99 ʻano um ʻokoʻa ke aʻo ʻana
   teaching is kind of different
100 Ke kaila o ke aʻo ʻana
   The style of teaching
101 and ʻaʻole kūpono no nā keiki Hawaiʻi=
   and it is not right for the Hawaiian children
102 ="i kēia manawa" now
103 ʻAʻole kūpono me nā ku↑mu↓ Hawaiʻi kekahi
   It is not right with the Hawaiian teachers too
104 ʻAʻole paepae ʻia you know
   They are not supported you know
105 um he um manaʻo (. ) Ha:ole
   it is a Haole/foreign thought
106 K: ʻae yes
107 H: He mau ah hana Ha:ole you know
   Those are Haole/foreign works
108 K: ʻae yes
109 H: and maopopo iā kākou
   and we understand
110 A ʻo ia paha kekahi pilikia e hoʻokaomi wale ai
   And perhaps it is a problem that oppresses
111 ka lāhui Hawaiʻi
the Hawaiian people
me nā lahui ʻē me nā lahui ʻoiwi ʻē aʻe
with the other peoples

K: ʻae
yes

H: ʻAʻole ʻē. He ʻoʻiwi
It is not strange. It is native

I (K) ask in line 54, Hauʻoli (H) his manaʻo for Hawaiian education, he answers, “ka
naʻauao Hawaiʻi oh he laulā kēia nīnau” (Hawaiian education oh this is a broad question) in line
55. He then downgrades “this question” by using the contrastive and connecting term “ʻakā”
(but). He continues to unpack his manaʻo by indicating, “o koʻu manaʻo e like me um kēia pā
hana” (I think this platform is like). H infers Hawaiian education is “this platform”. In line 57 it
is not clear what is “ʻaʻole ʻokoʻa” (isn’t different). Also H pronounces the term ʻokoʻa with a
rise and lowered pitch (↑↓), which is characteristic of Hawaiʻi Creole (HC) or Pidgin.

According to Dr. Puakea Nogelmeier, a Hawaiian language professor at the University of
Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, in the 1991 dvd He Makana no Na Kumu Kula: A gift for teachers of
Hawaiian students, “In Hawaiian when you ask a question, you use the same inflection as you
use in Pidgin.”

Hauʻoli (H) invokes the first membership category “nā keiki Hawaiʻi” (the Hawaiian
children) in line 58. ʻAʻole kūkahi” (not standing alone) is its predicate or category-bound
attribute. He infers that Hawaiian children tend to be group oriented, like the Hawaiian people.
In line 59 Hauʻoli identifies “mākou” (we 3+ EXCL) in the collection “ka poʻe Hawaiʻi” (the
Hawaiian people). H’s use of the pro-term, “mākou” is exclusive and does not include me. It is
not sure what is meant by “mākou ka poʻe Hawaiʻi mai nā kanaka ʻē aʻe” (we are the Hawaiian
people from other people) in this context. The following line (60) “ʻakā me he mea la i loko o
ke kula aupuni” (but it’s something inside of the public school) is a transition between the collection “ka po‘e Hawai‘i” (the Hawaiian people) and public school (ke kula aupuni).

Hau‘oli (H) elaborates the category of Western public school education as something that is different and oppresses Hawaiian children and Hawaiian teachers in lines 61 – 64 respectively: “‘oko‘a ke a‘o ‘ana” (the teaching is different); “ke kaila o ke a‘o ‘ana (the style of teaching); and “‘a‘ole kūpono no nā keiki Hawai‘i i kēia manawa” (it isn’t right for Hawaiian children now). H also invokes the collection of Hawaiian teachers in line 65, when he says “‘a‘ole kūpono me nā kumu Hawai‘i kekahi” (It isn’t right with Hawaiian teachers also). The last part of the word “kūpono” is stressed, emphasizing its importance. Also the pitch rises and lowers in the word “kumu” indicating an emphasis. H infers “it” to be the Western public school system. H continues in lines 66, 67 and 68 respectfully, explaining the negative aspects of Western public school system: “‘a‘ole paepae ‘ia” (does not support); “he mana‘o Haole” (it is a foreign idea); and “he mau hana Haole” (those are foreign works). K agrees with H’s assessment as shown in lines 68, 70 and 75.

In line 71 H switches to English for one connective word and returns to Hawaiian language, “and maopopo iā kākou” (and we understand). He uses the pro-inclusive-plural-term “kākou” including me in his construction of the education system category. He then incrementally unpacks how the Western public school system is a problem for Hawaiian people and others in lines 72, 73 and 74: “‘o ia paha kekahi pilikia e ho‘okaomi wale ai” (perhaps it is a problem that oppresses); “ka lāhui Hawai‘i” (the Hawaiian people); “me nā lāhui ‘ē me nā lāhui ‘ē a‘e” (and the strange races and the other races). H does a self-repair in line 76, “‘a‘ole ‘ē. He ‘ōiwi” (not strange. It’s native).

Excerpt 6 – Interview with Chadwick Pang
Excerpt 6 is a direct continuation in the interview, immediately following Excerpt 4. In Excerpt 6 Chadwick (C) elaborates on the category of Hawaiian education. C unpacks the goal of Hawaiian education as retaining our identity, culture, and heritage as Hawaiians. Hawaiian education and Hawaiian identity are inseparable. Similar to Excerpts 1 and 2 from Ku Kahakalau and Theresa Makuakane-Dreschel's interview, Hawaiian education is seen as a part of the living essence of Hawaiian people; it is not a thing that is separate from Hawaiian people (Warner, 1999).

Excerpt 6 Goal of Hawaiian Education

117  C: or teach for Hawaiians
118 →K: ↑What is↓ the goal↓ of Hawaiian education↓? (44min 57sec)
119  C: (1.0) for me↑↓ it’s for us
120             to: retain our sense of identity:↑↓
121             our culture and our heritage
122             otherwise↓ we’re gonna be
123             bleached and white-washed
124             with all this western education
125             that we’re gonna forget how to be Hawai↓:an↓
126             (.) Or the importance (.) of what (.) made it
127             unique in the first↑ place↓
128  K: Indeed (.)

In line 118, after Chadwick (C) answers my question on Hawaiian education, I (K) ask him “↑What is↓ the goal↓ of Hawaiian education↓?” It is notable that the pitch rises before the word “what” and falls after the word “is” in an Hawai‘i Creole way. Also the terms “goal” and “education” are slightly stressed, which is an indication of an emphasis. C begins answering my question in line 119, “for me↑↓ it’s for us” indicating this is his own personal mana‘o. The “us” includes me in the collection of “Hawaiian people” which is seen in the lines prior to Excerpt 2. C continues unpacking the goal of Hawaiian education, which is connected to Hawaiian identity as seen in lines 120 – 121: “to retain our sense of identity, our culture and our heritage.” He then contrasts Hawaiian education with western education, which he has an issue with, as seen in
lines 122 – 127: “otherwise we’re gonna be bleached and white-washed with all this western education that we’re gonna forget how to be Hawaiian or the importance of what made it unique in the first place.” The terms “bleached” and “white-washed” are colorful terms to describe Haole.

Excerpt 7

Right before this excerpt, I (K) ask Chadwick (C) about what he was doing with his keiki (children) for the Hōʻike or Finale of the Hoʻolauna Program at Kamehameha. Hōʻike for the enrichment programs at Kamehameha Schools is an opportunity for the students to display through song and dance what they learned over the one-week long program. C elaborates on his Hawaiian sensibility in Excerpt 7 below.

Excerpt 7 Category Elaboration – Hawaiian Sensibility
164  C: and sometimes and I wa: tch burle: sque
165  K: Ha ha ha ha
166  C: and then you know that same night
167  I want watch burlesque
168  and get some dance moves
169  and I want to put in the Hō:ʻi ke
170  K: HA HA HA
171  C: you know
172  K: “lo:ve it lo:ve it”
173  C: and I think
174  K: “lo:ve it”
175  C: Whateva appeals to
176  no: it just whatever appeals to me
177  but whatever my Hawaiian sensibility
178  an- and it’s all about like um: (.hhh) (1.0) ya↑↓
179  >when inspiration comes↑<
180  >inspiration comes↓< bu::t
181  then I have to either fu::n nel
182  it throu::gh my Hawaiian lens
183  or push it through my Hawaiian filter
184  and then (.) then after talk with my ↑ na:‘au and see
185  Is this right↑↓?
186  Is this good↑↑for me↓?
187  Do I feel comfortable teaching this?
188  Do I fee::l comfortable having↑ >you know<↓
189  my keiki learn this um
C explains to K (me) that he gets inspired by burlesque as seen in lines 164, 167, 168 and 169: “I watch burlesque”; “I want watch burlesque”; and “and get some dance moves”; and “and I want to put in the Hōʻike”. I (K) laugh in line 170 and laugh louder in line 177, since burlesque is something unconnected to Hawaiian song and dance. Thoroughly amused, I (K) say in a quiet and squeezing voice, “I love it love it” in lines 172 and 174. Then C unpacks his inspiration and does a self-repair in lines 175 – 177: “whateva appeals to not just whatever appeals to me but whatever my Hawaiian sensibility.” The pitch rises for the term “not” and falls for the term “just” emphasizing the correction.

Hawaiian sensibility in lines 179 and 180: “when inspiration comes inspiration comes”. It is notable that Chadwick (C)) specifically identifies and graphically illustrates what he does with this “inspiration” in lines 181 – 184: “then I have to either funnel it through my Hawaiian lens or push it through my Hawaiian filter and then after talk with my naʻau.” It is notable that C uses the terms “my Hawaiian” before the terms “lens” and “filter” indicating his personal connection.

Chadwick (C) continues unpacking his Hawaiian sensibility in line 184 by having a “talk with my naʻau and see” which illustrates the concept of naʻau as the connection between the mind and body, intellect and emotion (Meyer, 2003). As a form of reported speech, C checks with his naʻau by asking questions, as seen in lines 185 – 189: “Is this right? Is this good for me? Do I feel comfortable teaching this? Do I feel comfortable having you know my keiki learn this?” I (K) assess his naʻau check with emphasis as seen with the stretching of the word “hoi:hoi:” (interesting) in line 190. In addition, his “talk” with his naʻau is similar to Lani
Waiau’s discussion on her “naʻau check” as seen in the Excerpt 8 after the one on Hawaiian perspective.

**Excerpt 8 – Interview with Kawika Makanani**

Excerpt 8 is from an interview with Kawika Makanani. Kawika weaves the story of the Hawaiian movement of the 1970s and his long-standing role at the Kamehameha Schools as a student, teacher, and librarian. His story is a genealogy, identifying members of the Kamehameha Schools ‘ohana. Also Kawika is my former Hawaiian history teacher at Kamehameha Schools. In the first ten minutes, Kawika (K) and I (Ku) talk story about the recent developments of Kamehameha Schools’ admission policy in English. He invokes the collection of the ‘ohana of the Kamehameha Schools, including students, teachers, and leaders. Most of the interview is characterized as a very asymmetrical organization of talk (Baker, 2004; 169), in which I talk much less than Kawika. It is also referred to as extended speech.

Excerpt 8 illustrates Hawaiian perspective and it is an example of reported speech, which is used to refer to the presentation of discourse that purports to be from a prior occasion, and may originate from another author (Holt, 2009, p. 277). In several of the interviews the participants produced reported speech as a way as a practice of genealogy recitation (Furukawa, 2009). From a Hawaiian paradigm, this practice is a form of validating information, by identifying the source, namely the individual or individuals involved (Meyers, 2009) and the place setting.

**Excerpt 8 Hawaiian Perspective – Reported Speech**

710  K:  And dear Sarah Quick who now goes by Sarah Keahi
710  Ku:  I was gonna ask about her
710  K:  What’s up with ‘anakē ha ha ha
          Aunty
710  K:  °ha ha°
710  Ku:  Keahi now
710  K:  She had assisted Dorothy Kahananui
710  in the Hawaiian language classes
710  in the early 1960s and then she was hired full time
710  Um so following that um into the late 60s
there weren’t that many Hawaiian language students and classes
Ku: Pololei
Correct
K: Until we got in the 1970s when the Hawaiian culture exploded.
(.hhh) But after I had got- ah come on campus
Ah this must’ve been around 1980 1981
(.hhh) (hhh) ah we were walking down the Konia Hallway together one day and she said
You know Kawika (hhh) Hawaiian history class
we really should be teaching (.um Hawaiian history
from the Hawaiian perspective yah
Ku: wo(h)w°
K: and it’s not a mandate. It was just (.a suggestion.
Ku: He wahi manaʻo ʻo ia
It’s just a thought
K: and she didn’t poke me in the ribs with her elbow but
Ku: Ha ha ha
K: and I I heard her. I said you know (.)
that really makes a lot of sense because
the only (.class that was teaching the history
of the Hawaiian people (.hhh) through
the view↑point↓ of Hawaiian history being
taught at that time
was through (.ethnic studies at UH Manoa↓
Ku: hhh°
K: (.hhh) (hhh) you know Hawaiian a- a- our history
our way was their mantra at that time
Ku: [Hm mm mm]
K: So whether it was Pilipi- no whether it was Japanese

Excerpt 8 above takes place twenty minutes and fifty-four seconds into the interview, in which Kawika (K) evokes a previous situation that occurred. First he identifies his colleague by name and gives an update of her in line 527: “and dear Sarah Quick who now goes by Sarah Keahi.” By referring to her affectionately as “dear”, K conveys that they had a close personal relationship. Also her name change from Quick to Keahi reflects some kind of significant change in her marital and personal status. I (Ku) formulate the upshot by inquiring about her in lines 528 and 529: “I was gonna ask about her. What’s up with ‘anakē?’” By affectionately referring to Sarah Quick, my former Hawaiian language instructor when I was a student at the
Kamehameha Schools, as ʻanakē (aunty), I am showing respect and aloha. We both laugh as seen in lines 529 and 530 as though sharing an inside joke or understanding, which is called “kaona” in Hawaiian. According to Puku and Elbert (1986), kaona is “hidden meaning, as in Hawaiian poetry; concealed reference, as to a person, thing, or place; words with double meanings that might bring good or bad fortune,” (p. 130). I (Ku) repeat her current name, “Keahi now” in line 531. K (Kawika) unpacks his colleague’s credentials by describing her employment status in lines 532 – 534: “She had assisted Dorothy Kahananui in the Hawaiian language classes in the early 1960s and then she was hired full time.” It is notable that K did not explain who Dorothy Kahananui was; perhaps her reputation as one of the founders of teaching Hawaiian language at KS is so well known that he need not identify her. Therefore, Sarah Keahi’s association with Dorothy Kahananui increases her own credibility as a Hawaiian language kumu, and K’s association with Sarah Keahi increases his credibility too. K also identifies the period in time and status of Hawaiian language at KS in lines 534 – 537: “in the early 1960s”; following that into the late 60s”; and “there weren’t that many Hawaiian language students and classes”. I (Ku) agree with K’s explanation by saying “pololei” (correct) in line 538. K continues describing KS in the context of the current situation of Hawai‘i in lines 539 – 542: “until we got in the 1970s when the Hawaiian culture the Hawaiian Renaissance exploded. But after I had got- ah come on campus. Ah this must’ve been around 1980 1981.” All this backstory places the reported speech, which may be seen as a kind of drama unfolding with characters, a setting and dialogue.

Next, enter the characters in line 543 - 544: “we were walking down the Konia Hallway together one day and she said”. The setting is Konia Hallway, which is located in the upper campus of KS, where mostly the upper classmen attend classes. He was “walking down the
Konia Hallway together” (lines 543 and 544) with his colleague, Sarah Keahi, who casually said to him, “you know Kawika. Hawaiian history class we really should be teaching um Hawaiian history from the Hawaiian perspective” as seen in lines 545 – 547. It is notable that K uses Sarah Keahi’s way of speaking to tell this personal story. I (Ku) softly say, “wow” in line 548, conveying understanding of the significance of Sarah Keahi’s suggestion to Kawika (K). K then downgrades Sarah’s utterance in line 549: “and it’s not a mandate. It was just a suggestion.” I (Ku) formulate the upshot of K’s utterance by saying in an affectionate way, “he wahi manaʻo ʻo ia” (It’s just a thought) in line 550. K continues unpacking his colleague’s suggestion to him in line 551: “and she didn’t poke me in the ribs with her elbow but” and I laugh in line 552, indicating the humor in the situation. K continues his story in lines 553 and 554, “and I I I heard her. I said you know that really makes a lot of sense because” in a conversational tone.

Then Kawika (K) goes on to unpack the historical context of teaching from the Hawaiian perspective in lines 555 – 559: “the only class that was teaching the history of the Hawaiian people through the viewpoint of Hawaiian history being taught at that time was through Ethnic Studies at UH Manoa”. K further elaborates in lines 561 and 562: “you know Hawaiian a- a- our history our way was their mantra at that time.” Thus, K connects the source (Ethnic Studies Department at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa) of Sarah Keahi’s suggestion.

Excerpt 9 Naʻau Check - Interview with Lani Waiau

I scheduled an interview with Lani Waiau is the Assistant Director of Ke Kula ʻo Samual Manaiakalani Kamakau, which is a Hawaiian immersion charter school in Kāneʻohe, Oʻahu. Since my oldest daughter, Keolaʻoli, has been attending this school in the lush valley of Haʻikū, I frequently converse or walaʻau in Hawaiian with Lani. I see Lani before and after school, dedicating herself to the excellent quality of Hawaiian education by and for Hawaiians.
Prior to this excerpt, Lani (L) was speaking about the importance of building relationships with students. She shares that if she senses that there is a conflict among students, she has no problem in putting the lesson on the side and taking care of the matter. Her student’s overall well-being is more important than the lesson.

Excerpt 9 Naʻau Check

252 L: Inā ‘a’ole au e kōkua e hō’a‘o e kūkākūkā
If I do not help and try to discuss
253 um mea ‘ole ko’u ha’awina i kekahi manawa
um my lesson is nothing sometimes
254 mana’o wau ‘o ia kekahi o ko’u ikaika
I think that is one of my strengths
255 ‘a’ohe o’u pilikia i ka ha’awina
I have no problem with the lesson
256 ma ka ‘ao‘ao mālama kākou
on the side and we take care
257 yah ‘ano so ho’ohenehene
Yes I kind of tease
258 ko’u ‘ōlelo mau naʻau check
when I always say naʻau check
259 oh wait wait kala mai
oh wait wait sorry
260 K: Naʻau check?
Insides check?
261 L: Pono ka naʻau check no ka mea ‘ike wau
The naʻau check is proper because I know
262 ‘a’ole holo maika‘i nei kēia
This is not going well
263 K: Oh maikaʻi
Oh good

The trouble-source is at line 216. The repair initiation is at line 218, and the repair operation is at line. L treats naʻau similarly to how Chadwick Pang (C) treats naʻau in the prior excerpt; L teasingly always says “naʻau check” as seen in lines 215 – 216 and C has a talk with his naʻau as seen in line 184 in Excerpt 6. To understand the significance of Lani and Chads’ use of the term “naʻau”, explanation of the concept of naʻau is in order.

According to Pukui and Elbert (1986, p. 257), naʻau is intestines, bowels, guts; mind, heart, affections; of the heart or mind; mood, temper, feelings. For Hawaiians, naʻau is the same
place where knowledge and feelings reside; unlike western philosophy, intelligence and emotions are inseparable. Meyer (2003, p. 123) elaborates,

Here it is, the core of a Hawaiian philosophy of knowledge. It boils down to the connection mind has with body and body has with intellect. For Hawaiians, separation of the two was an illusion.

Excerpt 10 Putting it in the Universe

This is the point in the interview when we finished discussing the significance of the plural inclusive pro-term “kākou” (we 3+ INCL)), Lani (L) elaborates on the category of Hawaiian education. Like the term “kākou” those who are with us physically and spiritually, Hawaiian education is something that continues long after us and our posterity.

Excerpt 10 Kākou and Hawaiian Education

589  L:  [ha ha ha] ’Ike kākou ‘ike kākou
      ha ha ha we know
      ‘Oi aku ka nu::i
      It is bigger
      So kēia ke kuleana o
      So this is the responsibility of
      ka ho‘ona‘auao Hawai‘i
      Hawaiian education
      So ‘oi aku nu::i ma luna o kāua wale nō
      So it’s bigger than just us two
      yah it’s bigger than just us two
      ʻae
      yes

596  L:  He mea (.) kākou no ia
      It is something for us
      Well (.) and if we don’t know it
      we at least (.) hope that
      it’s more than us two yah

599  K:  Pololei
      Correct

601  L:  Right battling the battle
602  K:  [no nā hanau::na ↓↑yah aku
      for the generations afterwards
      Yah that it lasts longer
      than ko kāua wā
      than our time

605  K:  Pololei
      Right
606  L:  Right like or else
607   >he aha ka waiwai o ka kākou hana<
608   >inā ‘a’ole e ola ma hope o kāua<
609   K:  ‘Ano pohō kēlā yah?
   It’s kind of pointless
610  L:  So
611  K:  Li‘ili‘i
   A little
612  L:  Mana‘o wau ke ho‘ohana kākou
   I think when we use
613   i ka hua ‘ōlelo kākou (.) ke ‘a::no::
614   you know e like me kēlā mana‘o
   Putting it in the universe
615   E ola mau a mau
   Long live forever
616   K:  Oh:::: ‘ae ‘ae
   Oh yes yes
617  L:  Kēlā ‘o ia ko‘u
618   Hāpai ana wau
   I support
619   hana ana wau hāpai ana wau i kēia mana‘o
   I support I support this idea
620   hana ana wau i kēia mau hana
   I do these works
621   (.) i hiki ke ola ma hope ↓↑yah?
   So that they’ll live afterwards
622  K:  ‘a::e::
   yes
623  L:  Hala loa wau
   When I am long gone
624   O ka mau no ke o ka maika‘i ‘i‘o kēia hana
   The genuine goodness of this work will continue
625  K:  E:::
626  L:  Yah and that I played a role in that right?
627  K:  Hmm
628  L:  Right? You know that I had a kuleana in that

In lines 589 - 590 Lani (L) states, “‘ike kākou ‘ike kākou” (we know we know); “‘oi aku ka nui” (it is bigger). Lunpacks Hawaiian education in lines 593, “so ‘oi aku nui ma luna o kāua wale nō” (so it’s bigger than just us two). L continues reiterating that Hawaiian education will last beyond us in lines 596 – 599.

Excerpt 11 Piko and Ancestral Knowledge Categories - Interview with Leina’ala Medeiros
Excerpt 10 illustrates the hope that Lani Waiau has for our endeavors in the education of Hawaiian children. Excerpt 11 returns the focus to the piko, the center, where we never left, according to Leina‘ala Medeiros. It is the piko that contains the works and knowledge of the kūpuna, which is something innate; we are born with ancestral knowledge.

This is another impromptu and spur of the moment interview. When I arrived at Ke Kula ‘o Kamakau for a scheduled interview with the director, Lani Waiau, I saw Leina‘ala Medeiros there and asked her for an interview. Luckily for me, she graciously agreed. Leina‘ala is the kahu (director) of Pūnana Leo o Kamakau (PLOK), the Hawaiian immersion preschool at Kamakau, a charter school in Kāne‘ohe, O‘ahu. I know her when she used to be the kahu (director) of Pūnana Leo o Honolulu (PLOH), the school my daughter, Keola‘oli, attended for two years. That day of the interview at PLOK I also had my baby, Kaliloa, with me. Leina‘ala and I talked story in the preschool classroom, sitting on little chairs, while Kaliloa played with educational toys in the room.

Excerpt 11 Piko and Ancestral Knowledge Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>L: ‘A‘ole mā‘kou e ha‘alele i ka piko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>We did not leave the center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Ua mau nō ka noho ‘ana i ka piko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Living in the center continues indeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>‘Akā na‘e, ua nī‘ele paha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>However, perhaps we are interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>i ka ‘ao‘ao ‘ē a‘e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>in the other side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>K: Mm e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>L: I ko‘u mana‘o ‘a‘ole ha‘alele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>I think we didn’t leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Inā lo‘a ka piko, pau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>If one has the center, that’s done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>It’s pa‘a ((Hands clap)) Pa‘a ka piko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>solid/firm. The center is solid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>K: ʻEʻ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>L: I kā kā kākou hana e hō‘ike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>In our work it shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>inā kama‘aina ʻoe i kou piko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>if you are familiar with your center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inā hoʻomanaʻo ‘oe i ka hana
If you remember the work
i ka wā kahiko
in the olden times
I koʻu manaʻo he innate weʻre born with it
I think it's innate we're born with it

K: 'Ae
yes

L: 'Aʻale haʻalele
didn't leave

K: Ancestral knowledge paha
Perhaps it is ancestral knowledge

L: 'Ae pololei E like me kēnā 'ae
yes correct like that. Yes

In Excerpt 11, Leinaʻala (L) formulates an upshot from line 218, which I say, “E hoʻi ka piko,” (return to the center). She constructs and unpacks the “Hawaiian” collection with the predicates; “did not leave the piko or center” and “it’s innate” like “ancestral knowledge.”

Excerpt 4 is from a few minutes later from line 218, illustrating the connection of the categories of piko and ancestral knowledge. L says in line 245, “‘aʻole mākou e haʻalele i ka piko” (We did not leave the center). The inclusive plural pro-term “mākou” refers to Hawaiians as seen in line 228 in the transcript in the appendix. L continues elaborating on the piko category as seen in line 246: “Ua mau nō ka noho ana i ka piko.” (Living in the center continues indeed). In lines 247 and 248 L continues, “‘akā naʻe, ua nīʻele paha i ka ‘aoʻao ‘ē aʻe.” Though L does not say explicitly “who” L could be inferring that the “who” may be “we Hawaiians” may be interested in the other side. Perhaps the “other side” may be outside the piko, outside the center, outside Hawaiʻi.

In line 250 L restates what she says earlier in line 245, but does not use the pro-term “mākou”: “I koʻu manaʻo ‘aʻole haʻalele” (I think we did not leave). L further unpacks the piko category. In line 251 L explains “inā loʻa ka piko, pau” (if one has the center, that is done). Line 251 can also be translated as “if the center is there, that is done.” In line 252 L first says “It’s
paʻa” then clarifies, “Paʻa ka piko.” (It’s solid/firm. The center is firm). She claps her hands in line 252 emphasizing the word “paʻa”, which is a common hula motion depicting “paʻa”. I (K) agree by softly saying, “e” as seen in line 253. L further explains in lines 254: “I kā kā kākou hana e hōʻike” (in our work it shows). Then L switches from the plural inclusive possessive pro-term “kākou” (we) in line 254 to the singular possessive pro-term “kou” (your) in line 255: “inā kamaʻaina ‘oe i kou piko” (if you are familiar with your center). Leina‘ala continues in lines 256 and 257: “inā hoʻomanaʻo ‘oe i ka hana i ka wā kahiko” (if you remember the work in the olden times).

It is notable that Leina‘ala (L) explains in Hawaiian and in English in line 258: “I koʻu manaʻo he innate we’re born with it” (I think it’s innate). I (K) agree in line 258 and formulate an upshot, also in Hawaiian and in English in line 259: “ancestral knowledge paha” (perhaps it’s ancestral knowledge). L aligns with me in line 260: “‘ae pololei. E like me kēnā ‘ae” (yes correct like that yes).

Excerpt 12 - Interview with Alohalani Ho

In Excerpt 11 Leina‘ala Medeiros explains that ancestral knowledge is something we are born with. She is inferring that we are Hawaiians. In Excerpt 12 Alohalani Ho explicitly elaborates that Hawaiian education is the teachings of the elders; also it is the responsibility of Hawaiians to educate our children in Hawaiian language, which relates to the elders’ teachings.

Alohalani Ho is a Pūnana Leo o Honolulu (PLOH) and Kamehameha graduate. She returned to be a kumu at Pūnana Leo o Honolulu, where she taught my daughter, Keolaʻoli, for two years. Alohalani also earned a M.A. in Education from Chaminade University. In the late afternoon Alohalani and I talked story in the office of PLOH in Kalihi. We spoke about our growing young children, attending graduate level classes on the university level, and how much
work it is for Hawaiian mothers who are also kumu. Alohalani is also a former student of Lolena Nicholas, who is still a kumu of Pūnana Leo o Honolulu and the last participant in this study.

The data analysis on aunty Lolena Nicholas’s interview is in the following section.

Excerpt 12 Hawaiian Education Category Elaboration

237  K:  Ti: he aha kou mana’o
   Ti, what is your mana’o for Hawaiian education?
238  Alo:  No ka ‘auao Hawai’i?
   For the education of children
239  K:  Ma ka ‘ōlelo Hawai’i
   In Hawaiian language
240  Alo:  (1.0) I ko’u mana:’o inā he Hawai’i ‘oe
   I think, if you are Hawaiian
241  K:  ‘ōlelo ‘oe he Hawai’i ‘oe
   you say you are a Hawaiian
242  Alo:  i ko’u mana’o (.), um kūpono (.), ka ho’ona’auao
   I think it is proper to educate
243  K:  ke keiki (.), um i ke ‘āla o ko kākou mau kūpuna
   child in the path of our elders
244  Alo:  Ka ho’ona’auao ‘ana (.), ma ka ‘ōlelo Hawai’i
   The teaching in Hawaiian language
245  K:  i ko’u mana’o
   I think
246  Alo:  o ka mana’o kē- kēlā (.), ke a’o ‘ana
   that is the idea of teaching
247  K:  i nā keiki ma o ka ‘ike kū’una
   the children through the traditional knowledge
248  Alo:  ‘O ia nō >ka ‘ike o ko kākou mau kūpuna<
   It is the knowledge in our elders
249  K:  Kekahi ‘mau (.), ka naka no’ono’o lākou
   Some Hawaiians they think
250  Alo:  ↑Oh: (.), a’o i ke kanaka ka ‘ōlelo Hawai’i
   Oh teaching the Hawaiians Hawaiian language
251  K:  la::wa kēlā
   that is enough
252  Alo:  He:: ho’ona’auao Hawai’i kēlā
   That is Hawaiian education
253  K:  ‘Akā <i ko’u mana’o> (.),
   but I think
254  Alo:  inā ↑ua ke ↓hiki (.), ke kapae i ka- ke a’o ‘ana
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The previous sequence might represent Alo’s gloss: ‘If you say you are Hawaiian, then educate your child in the traditions of our elders, because that is Hawaiian education. That is what Hawaiians do. I (K) ask Alo, “Ti, he aha kou mana’o no ka na’auao Hawai’i?” (Ti, what is your mana’o for Hawaiian education?) in line 247. Ti is an affectionate term, a shortened form of ‘sister’. Ti is used among people, who are familiar and close with one another. So when I refer to Alo as Ti, I am connecting to her on a more personal level. Alo quietly asks for clarification, inferring that “na’auao Hawai’i” or Hawaiian education has many meanings: “ma ka ‘ōlelo Hawai’i” (in Hawaiian language) line 250. I unpack “na’auao Hawai’i” by specifically identifying “ma ka ‘ōlelo Hawai’i” (in Hawaiian language) “ma ke kula Hawai’i (in Hawaiian schools)” in line 251. I repeat the question in line 252, “he aha kou mana’o” (what do you think?). Mirroring my question, she answers “i ko’u mana’o” (I think) in line 253. Then Alo invokes a ‘Hawaiian’ category, “inā he Hawai’i ‘oe” (if you are a Hawaiian) with the predicate “‘ōlelo ‘oe he Hawai’i ‘oe” (you say you are a Hawaiian) in lines 253 and 254. Alo repeats “i ko’u mana’o” (I think) several times in this excerpt: lines 255, 258, 266, and 270, emphasizing this is her personal opinion in this interactional instance.

Alo further unpacks the attributes of ‘Hawaiian’ category when she says (lines 255 and 256) “kūpono ka ho’ona‘auao i ke keiki i ke ‘ala o ko kākou mau kūpuna” (it is proper to educate...
the child in the path of our elders). Alo implicitly changes footing from saying “ʻoe” (you) single second person (line 253) to “ko kākou” (our) first person plural inclusive possession (line 256). Interestingly, instead of using “kāua” (we 2 INCL), she uses “kākou” (we three or more inclusive), even though there are only the two of us sitting at the table. According to Lolena Nicholas, a Native Hawaiian speaker from Niʻihau, in another interview, it is incorrect to use the term “kākou” in this situation with just two speakers. Instead, “kāua” is the correct term to use. The use of “kākou” and “kāua” will be taken up in another section of this study. For now, let us return to excerpt at hand.

Alo also identifies “ka ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi” (Hawaiian language) in line 257 and “ʻike kuʻuana” (traditional knowledge) in line 260 as attributes of “naʻauao Hawaiʻi” (Hawaiian education) in line 257. She connects attributes of “naʻauao Hawaiʻi” to “ka ʻike o nā kūpuna” (the knowledge of the elders) in line 261. Alo invokes another collection of “kekahi mau kanaka” (some Hawaiians) in line 262 from a larger community of Hawaiians, who have another view of naʻauao Hawaiʻi. “Noʻonoʻo lākou” (they think) teaching Hawaiians Hawaiian language is enough (lines 263 and 264) and “he naʻauao Hawaiʻi kēlā” (that is Hawaiian education) line 265. In contrast to this, she further constructs a more authentic, pre-western and nostalgic version of Hawaiian education in lines 267-269: “inā ua hiki ke kapae i ke aʻo ʻana (if can skip the teaching), “mai ka puke ʻaʻapo wale” (from the book just learn from observing)” and “mai ka ʻāina mai ka mea o nā kūpuna” (from the land from the things of the elders). Alo creates a dichotomy that learning from “ka puke” (the book) is not part of the tradition of the elders, whereas observing the land and the things of the elders is. Like Alo, Tuti Kanahele speaks fluent Hawaiian.

Excerpt 13 - Interview with Tuti Kanahele
In Excerpt 12 Alohalani Ho elaborates on the category of Hawaiian education as consisting of the teachings of the elders, including Hawaiian language. From the elders, we turn to the youngest learners. In Excerpt 13 Tuti Kanahele asserts that education begins in vitro. Hawaiian education is a genealogy, connecting multi-generations of family (kūpuna, māmā, keiki, pēpē). Talking story with Tuti Kanahele is like braiding a long, extended and unbroken lei, going full circle weaving in similar parts of the whole, giving mana to the visceral knowledge Hawaiians are born with, the ancestral knowledge. T generates and uses the collection of ‘ohana, family, in her description of Hawaiian education. Within this collection there are categories, such as pēpē (baby), keiki (child), kūpuna (elder), and Ke Akua (God).

This interview is one of two unplanned, unscheduled ones that occurred at Ke Kula ‘o Samuel Kamakau in Kane‘ohe, O‘ahu. When I went to pick up my daughter, Keola‘oli, at A-Plus, an afterschool daycare program, Tuti Kanahele arrived with her daughter to also pick up her grandson at the same program site. When I saw Tuti, I decided right away this would be an excellent opportunity to talk story as well as interview her. Tuti Kanahele is a manāleo (native Hawaiian speaker) and educator. Fortunately, I also had my audio recorder in my car for serendipitous moments like this. However, I didn’t have a consent form on me. I obtained Tuti’s signed consent later. Tuti graciously agreed to assist me with my study.

After about three minutes of making arrangements to drop off Tuti after the interview and clarifying an issue on word search (Kurhila, 2006) in Hawaiian, the interview seemed to be flowing, the children returned to the site where Tuti and I were having our talk story. After a brief interruption, the talk story resumed as shown in Excerpt 13 below.

Excerpt 13 Hawaiian Education Category Elaboration
145  T:  Ua ho‘i mai lākou ‘a‘ole pilikia=
                They (3+) returned. No problem
In line 145 T (Tuti) indicates the arrival of the children is “‘a‘ole pilikia” (not a problem), and in line 146 I (K) make an effort to shift the focus back on the interview task at hand: “ho‘omau so::” (continue so). The term “so”, a discourse marker, elicits the reason for continuing the contact. I restate the research question in line 147: “he aha kou mana‘o no ka...
na’aauao Hawai‘i?” (What is your mana’o for Hawaiian education?). T response overlaps the last two words of my question in line 148: “no leila e like me” (so like) and continues in line 149: “ka’u ‘ōlelo ‘ana” (I was saying). “No leila” (so) in line 148 contingently emerges from preceding talk as a reminder, refering to the earlier part in the interview. In line 149 T makes reference to her initial response to the research question in the beginning of the interview, “He mau māhele ka na’aauao” (Education are parts). In line 151 I (Ku) align to T’s reminder: “‘ae ‘ae pololei” (yes yes correct), inferring understanding.

T situates education within the contexts of time, family and location as seen in lines 152 - 155: “ka ho’ona’aauao ‘ana mai ka wā o nā kūpuna a me lākou kekahi o nā kūpuna mea” (education from the time of the elders and their elders things). T continues unpacking education in line 156: “ua a‘o mai ka wā pēpē” (education takes place in the time of infancy). While the baby is in the mother’s womb, the baby is learning (lines 157, 158, 160 - 165). While T explains this phenomenon, K agrees (lines 157 & 160).

**Excerpt 14**

In Excerpt 14 Tuti Kanahele continues braiding the familial lei together, pulling in the concepts of mo‘okū‘auhau (genealogy) and ancestral knowledge as seen in Excerpt 13 (43 minutes and 31 seconds into the interview). Echoing Leina‘ala Medeiros’s assertions that we Hawaiians are born with ancestral knowledge, which is related to genealogy, since our genealogy illustrates our connection to our ancestors.

**Excerpt 14 Mo‘okū‘auhau and Ancestral Knowledge**

1208  T:  >‘Akā ua maopopo lo’a iā kākou ka ‘ike but it was understood, we have the knowledge
1209  Hānau ‘ia kākou me ka ‘ike< (.)
      We were born with the knowledge
1210  >ka ‘ike o ko kākou mau kūpū:na me kākou nō
      The knowledge of our elders are with indeed us
1211  Mai ka manawa i hānau ‘ia kākou
      From the time we are born
A::: nui wale mai
It is just great from

Kēlā mau ‘ike pau loa, yah↑↑↑
al of those knowledges, yes

Ma ka ma ka moʻokū‘auhau
In the in the genealogy

Aia me kākou
is with us

K: ‘a::e
yes

In line 1208, “ua maopopo lo’a iā kākou ka ‘ike” (it was understood that we have the knowledge). T could be inferring to “ka wā o nā kūpuna” (the time of the elders), but the use of the plural inclusive pro-term “kākou” we blurs the lines of time between then and now. T continues generating the ‘ohana collection, “hānau ‘ia kākou me ka ‘ike” (we were born with the knowledge) as seen in line 1209. By using the term “kākou”, T is including K and others. T continues unpacking the concept of ancestral knowledge, which many educators are reiterates that from the time we are born, the knowledge of our elders is with us (lines 1210 – 1211) and in our genealogy (lines 1214 – 1215). Thus, from the time a baby is in the mother’s womb, the baby is growing and learning, and when the baby is born, the baby possesses the knowledge of the elders and ancestors through the genealogy. The baby is connected to the ancestors through the genealogy, a succession of generations.

Summary of the Results from Research Questions 1 and 2

I present meticulous analysis in details, using a conversational analytic, membership categorization analytic and Hawaiian perspective. The participants, all thirteen of us Native Hawaiian educators elaborate on the category of Hawaiian education. Hawaiian education is the transmission of ancestral knowledge and identity. The goal of Hawaiian education for Native Hawaiian educators, kumu, is to connect the present generation with the virtuous teachings of the
past generations for the future generations. Like ancestral knowledge, Hawaiian education is timeless; it will continue through our posterity.

In the following section, I present the results from the third research question: what forms of categories are invoked between Hawaiians as they construct themselves and others in the discourse of Hawaiian education. Since the participants invoke copious amounts of category memberships, the next section is divided into two parts; one part is devoted to the category and collection of kūpuna (elders). The other part following the kūpuna (elders) is devoted the various membership categories, which we, the participants, co-construct.

Results from the Third Research Question

The following section examines the data analysis from the third research question: what membership categories are invoked between Hawaiian educators. Since the participants in the study constructed an abundant amount of membership categories, two parts are devoted to present examples of membership categories; this part presents the membership category of kūpuna (elder), and the following part presents various membership categories. Hawaiian education is the transmission of ancestral knowledge and identity of the past, present, and future. The following excerpts and data analysis elaborate the significance of the kūpuna (elders, ancestors), which is the beginning, the source of Hawaiian knowledge and identity. The participants in this study construct the kūpuna membership collection as teachers and advisors, whose teachings and works are timeless. The kūpuna are the source of ancestral knowledge, which is contained in our genealogy. The kūpuna are there for assistance, and they are: the living and even from beyond; Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian people; the ‘āina; and God.

Kūpuna Membership Category

Excerpt 15 – Group Interview with ‘Iwalani Pīʻena and Kumulaʻau Sing
Excerpt 15 follows directly after Excerpt 3 on page 68 of this dissertation. ‘Iwalani elaborates on the significance of kūpu:na, who knose knowledge is noteworthy.

Excerpt 15 Kūpu:na Collection
39 K: "Maikaʻi" (.). Aʻo ‘oe, e↑ Ti↓?
40 He aha kou mana↑ʻo↓?
What is your manaʻo?
41 ‘Iwa: Um (.). I guess along the same line you know
42 we have to move along with the times
43 but yet ah without that comes the ‘ike
44 knowledge
45 that is passed on yah from our kūpu:na
46 elders
47 and the wisdom that was passed on
48 And everything (.) everything that we get into
49 you have to use (.). ah
50 you know you got to (.). mihi kahele yah↑↓
51 step carefully
52 You gotta be careful how you step
53 where you step and always (.). I think
54 you always have to seek
55 the assistance of your kūpu:na
56 you know cause they know
57 They’ve seen it
58 They’ve been through it

Following Kumulaʻau (Ku), I (K) quietly acknowledge Ku’s manaʻo on Hawaiian education “maikaʻi” (fine) in line 33, and ask (in Hawaiian) ‘Iwalani (ʻIwa) for her manaʻo: “Aʻo ‘oe e ↑Ti↓?” (and you, Ti). “He aha kou mana↑ʻo↓?” (What is your manaʻo?). It is notable that Kumulaʻau (Ku) and ‘Iwalani (Iwa) speak English with a sprinkling of Hawaiian throughout the interview and I (K) continue to ask them questions in Hawaiian. The affectionate term, Ti, is short for sister and used commonly among people who are very familiar with one another. My use of the term Ti in line 39 indicates the close relationship that I have with Aunty ‘Iwa.

In line 35 ‘Iwa (ʻIwalani) pauses slightly after saying “um” and continues, “I guess along the same line you know,” aligning her manaʻo with Ku’s manaʻo. ‘Iwa constructs a new
collection using the inclusive pro-term, “we” in line 36: “we have to move along with the times.”

Throughout the interview as seen in the excerpts, ‘Iwa infers that “we” may consist of
Kumula’au, myself and ‘Iwa herself, the participants sitting around the table at the time of
interview. In line 38 ‘Iwa reinforces the “we” collection with “our kūpu:na” (elder). Also, the
term “kūpuna” is stressed by stretching the second syllable, which indicates something notable.
In lines 37 and 38 ‘Iwa continues, “but yet ah without that comes the ‘ike (knowledge) that is
passed on yah from our kūpu:na (elders).” ‘Iwa constructs a “kūpuna” collection in lines 37 - 40,
with the implicative descriptions that go together: “ the ‘ike (knowledge) that is passed on”; “the
wisdom that was passed on”; and “everything that we get into.” ‘Iwa switches using the
inclusive first person pro-term “we” to “you” in line 41: “you have to use”. The “you” may be
me or any other person for that matter.

Excerpt 16

Following up on ‘Iwa’s explanation of kūpuna (elder) as seen in the previous excerpt, I
(K) ask ‘Iwalani (‘Iwa) for more clarification.

Excerpt 16 Kupuna Collection Elaboration

56  K:  When you say kūpu:na (.)
       Elder
57   whom are you referring to (?)
58   Or what are you?
59  ‘Iwa:  kūpuna meaning not only
   elder
60   those that are li:ving
61   but those even from beyo:nd you know:
62   I believe that through pu:le
       Prayer
63   you can (.). your kūpuna will gui:de you
       elders
64   But you just gotta be: pono
       Right
65   You gotta be intuned
66   to hear it to know it
67   and then know for surely that this is
68   you know (1.0) u:m how to (.). go
69  Ku:  °mm°
ʻIwa: And sometimes you gotta take that step
Just like how we teach the kids here
You gotta take that risk
We’re creating this little (.)
pu’uhonua for you
sanctuary
but within this little realm
you take the risk
We’ll help you
We’ll guide you
But you gotta take the step in order
for us to koku:a you know
help
Then we can tell you which way to go.

As seen in lines 56 – 58 in Excerpt 15: “When you say kūpu:na whom are you referring
to or what are you?” ʻIwa answers in lines 59 - 62: “kūpu:na meaning are not only the living, the
elders, but those even from beyond”. Through pule, prayer (line 56), one can access kūpu:na for
guidance (line 57).

Following up on ʻIwa’s explanation of kūpu:na, K asks I for more clarification, as seen in
excerpt 3. ʻIwa answers that the kūpu:na are not only the living (line 54), the elders, but also
those from beyond (line 55). Through “pule” (prayer) as seen in line 63, “you can your kūpu:na
for will guide, inferring that you can have call upon your kūpu:na.

ʻIwa constructs a category membership as “one-who-calls-upon-kūpu:na” with the
attributes or conditions of “but you just gotta be pono (right). You gotta be intuned to hear it to
know it and then know for surely that this is you know how to go. And sometimes you gotta take
that step” (lines 64 – 70). Thus, ʻIwa constructs the kūpu:na collection and “one-who-calls-upon-
kūpu:na” as a membership-category device (MCD), consisting of rights and obligations or
kuleana, that are understood by the members participating in the talk story focug group at this
time (Hester and Hester, 2012). ʻIwa continues unpacking the “kūpu:na” MCD by connecting to
her students at the Kūlia i Ka Pono summer enrichment program at the Kamehameha Schools;
“just like how we teach the kids here. You gotta take that risk. We’re creating this little puʻuhonua for you but within this little realm you take the risk” as seen in lines 71 – 76. ʻIwa may be speaking to me in her Director membership capacity, since she is in charge of the program. She may even be referring to “you” and “we” as me, the interviewer and participant who worked under her supervision for two years as a kumu. Or “you” may be just you in general. Thus, the memberships in the “kūpuna” and “one-who-calls-upon-kūpuna” MCD may be fluid as identities in focus shift (i.e. “you” or “we” as kumu, student, family member, etc.) as seen in this excerpt.

The fluidity of membership identity continues in lines 77 – 81: “we’ll help you. we’ll guide you. But you gotta take the step in order for us to kōkua (help) you know”. The terms help, guide and kōkua are familiar to the category-description of kūpuna that ʻIwa describes earlier in the interview/talk story. Iwa infers that “we” are members of the “kūpuna” collection, consisting of members who are “living” and “even from beyond” as seen in lines 60 and 61

Excerpt 17

In Excerpt 17 ʻIwalani (ʻIwa) continues unpacking the genealogy recitation of the “kūpuna” collection and specifically indicates her deceased kumu hula, John Kaimikaua, as a member of the collection. ʻIwa continues weaving the kūpuna in the lei of Hawaiian education, after K asks how hula has helped her.

Excerpt 17 Reported Speech - Kūpuna John Kaimikaua

124 ʻIwa: I guess and and ca:ll on my kūpu:na to(.) assist elders
125 you know and help when
126 I need the kōkua (.) you know help
127 And even when we go to to
128 um (.) the different ah huakaʻi
129 fieldtrip
130 you know (1.0)um sheez you know
130 John shared lots of things and
Taught us many things and continues to you know. We still continue to learn so ah in every aspect of my life. And it’s just enriched it even more. I think it’s helped and ah confirmed I guess some things are already you know that my own kūpuna elders.

‘Iwa calls on her kūpuna to assist (line 124) when she needs kōkua, help (line 125). She even calls on her former kumu hula, the late John Kaʻimikaua (lines 130), who shared lots of things, taught many things (line 131), and continues to (line 132). ‘Iwa constructs her kumu hula as her kūpuna, her deceased elder that is still accessible.

In lines 124 – 126 ‘Iwa reinforces the attribute of “kūpuna” incrementally: “call on my kūpuna to assist”; “you know and help when”; and “I need the kōkua.” Iwa also switches from referring to “our” kūpuna as seen in line 38 to “my” kūpuna in line 124. In lines 130 - 132 ‘Iwa connects her deceased kumu hula, John², to the “kūpuna” collection, who “shared lots of things and taught us many things and continues to you know.” ‘Iwa is inferring that her kumu, John, is still teaching as though he were still alive in line 133: “we still continue to learn.” The term “continue” is used in lines 132 and 133, connecting ‘Iwa to her kūpuna and kumu, which may be intricately tied together or separate, depending on how one’s viewpoint. Besides “help”, ‘Iwa identifies “teach” another description of kūpuna, transforming the collection of “kūpuna” to “kumu” (teacher). ‘Iwa unpacks the pervasive and ever present “kūpuna” collection, which is “in every aspect of life. And it’s just enriched it even more. I think it’s helped and ah confirmed

² As a follow up, I verified with ‘Iwa that John is indeed her beloved kumu hula, John Kaimikaua, who also shared and inspired me to teach about Molokaʻi traditions when I was a teacher at Molokaʻi Intermediate and High School from 1995 – 1999.
I guess some things are already you know that my own kūpuna my family taught and what I was brought up with” as seen in lines 134 – 141.

**Excerpt 18 - Interview with Chadwick Pang**

Excerpt 18 also contains a genealogy recitation (Meyers, 2009), which is a form of validating information. Chadwick identifies his source of being interested in becoming a teacher (his grandfather) and place (Kalihi Valley). From a Hawaiian perspective, people and places matter.

**Excerpt 18 Grandfather as Member of Teacher Category**

118 C: Good. No (. ) makes ( ) sense
119 K: So why↑ did you↓ pursue education especially to become a tea:cher?
120 C: It sounds↑ like↓ you want to be a te:acher
121 K: Mm ↓yes (. ) I think I’ve always had
122 C: the um desire to ↑teach
123 And being it stems from my ↑grand↓fa:↑ther
124 u:m we lived in Kalihi Va:lle:y
125 and (. ) I think my music my desire
126 for music education came
127 from my gra:ndfather
128 Because (. ) I remember growing up
129 he was the music minister of our church
130 and he used the church
131 K: Mm
132 C: as a vehicle to teach um keiki
133 in our community:: and adults in
134 our community how to play music
135 So not only (. ) did he (. ) arrange the music
136 for the church for every Sunday
137 he had a class set up to teach ukulele
138 Again a class to teach people
139 how to play gui:ta::r

I (K) formulate (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998) the upshot of Chadwick’s (C) remarks as seen in lines 15 and 16, by asking, “So, why did you go into education especially to become a teacher?” C (Chadwick) invokes that category of “my grandfather” as seen in line 20. C reminisces about his grandfather being the music minister (line 26) of their church. C ties “teach
“Keiki and adults how to play music”, “arrange the music”, and “teach ukulele and guitar to people” to the category of “music minister”.

Excerpt 19 - Interview with Leina‘ala Medeiros

Previous in the interview, L (Leina‘ala) invokes the collection of “nā kūpuna” (the elders), so I (K) ask L for clarification. L elaborates on the significance of kūpuna, their knowledge, and examples.

Excerpt 19 Nā Kūpuna Collection Elaboration
88 K: No ke aha mai nā kūpu:na? Why from the elders?
89 L: Like (.) ah
90 K: Nā kūpu::na nā hana o nā kūpuna The works of the elders?
91 L: Like ah ua hana ua nānā lākou They worked and watched
92 i nā ouli (.) i nā manawa a pau the (?phases) all the time
93 ‘A’ole nānā i nā ‘alemanaka Roma They did not observe the Roman calendar
94 Nā ‘ōuli o nā pō mahina The phases of the moon
95 K: ‘ah°
96 L: Kama‘aina lākou a hilina‘i nu::i o ka ha:na They are familiar and really believed of the work
97 Nu:‘u i ka ha:na ma ka hana ka ‘ike The (?summit) in work and through work there’s knowledge
98 ‘Ike kākou ke ho‘olohe kākou i ka manawa a pau We know when we listen all the time
99 K: ‘ae yes
100 L: But ma ka hana (.) he mea nu:i But (?) work is an important thing
101 ma ka ‘ao‘ao: na‘auao on the side of wisdom
102 ma ka hana through work
103 ‘A’ole e ha‘i wale not just spoken
104 K: E e Yes
105 L: ‘A’ole e hō‘ike wale Not just show/display.
106 ‘a‘ole lawa kēlā e hana That is not enough. Work
I (K) ask L in line 88, “No ke aha mai nā kūpuna” (why from the kūpuna) with a stretch in the second syllable “pu”. L answers in line 89, “like” (like in English) then pauses slightly as though gathering her thoughts. I proceed in line 90 to assist L by restating the question, “nā kūpuna nā hana o nā kūpuna” (the elders the works of the elders). L then identifies the predicates of the elder collection: “ua hana ua nānā lākou i nā ‘ōuli i nā manawa a pau” (They worked watched the phases all the time) in lines 91 and 92. She continues by stating in line 93, “‘a’ole nānā i nā ‘alemanaka Roma” (they did not observe the Roman calendar); instead in line 94 the elders “nā ‘ōuli o nā pō māhina” observed “the phases of the moon”. L produces a membership category device (mcd), which consist of contrasting categories (‘alemanaka Romana/pō māhina). I (K) align with L’s explanation in line 95 with a quiet “ah” also indicating comprehension. L continues in line 96, “kama’aina lākou a hilina’i nui o ka hana” (they are familiar and really trusted in the work). L uses the pro-term “lākou” to refer to the elders. L emphasis that the elders really trusted by stretching out the sound of nui. In line 97 L continues “nu’u i ka hana ma ka hana ka ‘ike” (the summit is in work and through work there’s knowledge). The last part of line 97, “ma ka hana ka ‘ike” is a well-known ‘ōlelo no’eau, elaborated in the work by Pukuʻi (?).

In line 98 L (Leinaʻala) uses the pro-term “kākou” (we 3+ INCL)) instead of “mākou” (we 3+ EXCL) which she used in Excerpt 1. This shift in pronouns now includes me. “‘Ike kākou ke ho’olohe kākou i ka manawa a pau” (we know when we listen all the time) in line 98, and I (K) align with L’s statement in line 99, “‘ae” (yes). L then infers that the “ho’olohe” (listen) is not the same as “hana” (work or doing) in line 100: “but ma ka hana he mea nui” (but
through work it is an important thing). Also L upgrades “ma ka hana he mea nui” by stretching out the word “nui” emphasizing its importance. The switching of Hawaiian to English and back to Hawaiian (in lines 98 and 100) with the use of the connective term “but” may indicate an interactive act of contradiction (Sierra, 1998). Therefore L infers that “hana” (work or doing) in line 100 is the preferred act, whereas “hoʻolohe” (listen) in line 98 is the dispreferred act.

L further unpacks “hana” in lines 101, 102, and 103 respectively: “ma ka ʻaoʻao naʻauao” (on the side of education); “ma ka hana” (through work); “ʻaʻole e haʻi wale” (not just telling). I (K) align with L’s explanation by saying, “e e” (yes) in line 104. L infers in incremental moves that education consisting of attributes of “hoʻolohe” (listening), “haʻi wale” (just speaking), and “hōʻike wale” (just showing) contrast Hawaiian education. L creates contrasting categories of education, another membership category device, which consist of Western education and traditional Hawaiian education, based on the previous mcd of telling times (ʻalemanaka Romana/pō māhina lines 93 and 94). L further indicates “that” is not Hawaiian education: “ʻaʻole lawa kēlā. E hana.” (that is not enough. Work.) in line 106. L sums up her manaʻo in line 107, “i loko o ka hana e aʻo mai” (through work one learns). L connects “hana” (work or doing) with “ʻike kuʻuna o nā kūpuna” (traditional knowledge of the elders).

Excerpt 20

Excerpt 20 illustrates Leinaʻala’s elaboration on kūpuna collection. I (K) formulate the question on line 187, “he aha kou manaʻo nā kūpuna” (What do you think are the elders?) based on the upshot of Leinaʻala’s explanation on why it is better to share and support the beliefs of the kūpuna, as seen in lines 178 – 180.

Excerpt 20 Kūpuna Collection Elaboration

178 L: no leila ʻoi aku ka maikaʻi
Therefore it is better
179 i nā kaʻana like a hāpai (.)
sharing and supporting
ka manaʻo o nā kūpu:na
the beliefs of the elders

"Mmm ."

A–↑↓nā mao↑↓ po lākou ah
If you understand them

ʻO ia ke kumu
that is why

He kō↑↓ a kēlā (.)
ʻAle he
It is a help. No (?)

He aha kou
What do you think

[(kuhi?)]
(choice?)

What do you think are the elders?

He aha kou manaʻo nā kūpu:na?
What do you think are the elders?

Hhh

ʻO ↑↓ wai nā kū↓pu:na?
Who are the elders?

[kou manaʻo]
your thoughts

koʻu manaʻo nā kūpuna
I think the elders

[hoihoi loa wau]

Nā kūpuna e
The elders

nā ↑kū↓puna Hawaiʻi
are Hawaiian elders

ʻae
yes

ah (. ) ua noho maʻaneʻi ma mua o mākou (.)
They lived here before us

E like me kuʻu pāpā:
Like my father

He kanaka Pilipino ʻo ia
The is a Filipino man.

ʻAkā noho ʻo ia me nā kanaka Hawaiʻi
But he lived with Hawaiians

Ua hānai:: ʻo ia i ke ʻano (. ) Hawaiʻi
He was adopted like a kind of Hawaiian

"Oh:::

ʻAkā naʻe pili i ka ʻāina
however close to the land

mālama ʻāina aloha ʻāina
took care of the land, loved the land

Aloha kanaka <Kanaka Pilipino>
Love people. Filipino man

No leilā (. ) ʻano: (. ) maʻalahi
So it is kind of easy for me

e hoʻopili (. ) i kuʻu pāpā
to relate to my father. And my mother is indeed Hawaiian.

Mai Maui mai (.) kā mākou koko Hawaiʻī
Our Hawaiian blood is from Maui.

Ah:: nā kūpu::na:: Oh ↓yah maikaʻi
Ah the elders oh yes fine

ʻO nā kūpu::na nā kanaka i noho i (.) Hawaiʻī
The elders the people lived in Hawaii.

ma ↑mua o mā↓kou
before us
a hana (.) a ola i ka wā kahiko
and worked and lived in the olden times
A (.) ua hana nā mea ah
And did the things
a ua hana nā mea a pau
and did everything
makemake au i kēia manawa
I want now

They’ve done everything

that we’re trying to go back to

That’s the kūpuna I’m referring to

In response to my question in line 187, when L (Leinaʻala) exhales as though she were going to say something, I quickly ask another question for more clarification in line 189, “ʻO wai nā kūpuna?” (Who are the elders?). L responses “ok” in line 190, which slightly overlaps the last part of my question in line 189. I (K) further guide L, seeking her thoughts, her manaʻo, emphasizing your “kou manaʻo” (your thoughts) in line 191. L attempts to elaborate on the collection of kūpuna by stating: “koʻu manaʻo nā kūpuna” (I think the elders) in line 192; “nā kūpuna” (the elders) in line 194; and “nā kūpuna Hawaiʻi e” (the Hawaiian elders) in line 195. I align with her answer as seen in line 196 “ʻae” (yes). L hesitates as though unsure or searching for a word as seen in line 197, in which she pauses slightly after saying “ah.” Then she elaborates by identifying the attributes of the kūpuna collection in lines 197 – 201 and cites her Papa, grandfather, as an example: lived here before us, like my Papa, he is Filipino, and he was adopted like a Hawaiian. L shares about her family who lived on Maui and lived before us. It is
notable that L codeswitches to English in lines 217 – 219, as she further assesses the kūpuna, who have done everything that we are trying to go back to. Who are the “we” that L is referring to in line 218? Based on the data, it is not clear who “we” are. I should have followed up with a question to clarify the identity of “we”.

Excerpt 21 – Interview with Lolena Nicholas

In the interview, aunty Lolena Nicholas liberally sprinkles the membership category of kūpuna.

Excerpt 21 Kūpuna Collection

23 K: He kumu ʻoe koʻu (.) manaʻo
   You are a teacher, I think
24 He aha kou manaʻo no ka naʻauao Hawaiʻi?
   What are your thoughts for Hawaiian education?
25 L: He maikaʻi ka ʻimi naʻauao
   Searching for knowledge/wisdom is good
26 mea maikaʻi
   a good thing
27 Ke ola nei ka ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi (?)
   The language is living
28 K: So pehea ka poʻe Hawaiʻi (.) e aʻo aku?
   How do Hawaiians teach?
29 (?) Mea mai ʻoe
   According to you
30 Mea mai nā kūpu:na
   According to the elders who teach?
31 So he aha ka: (.) nā kūpu:na e aʻo aku ai
   So what do the elders teach?
32 L: Nā mea a nā kūpu:na e aʻo aʻku
   The things the elders teach
33 K: ‘ae
   yes
34 L: Inā ‘oe he mea kēlā ‘ano kūpu:na
   If you are kind of an elder
35 Ua nui ko lākou mau iʻi:ke
   Great is their knowledges
36 Nui ko lākou mea e aʻo mai ai iā ʻoe
   They have a lot to teach you
37 Inā ‘oe loʻa ka kūpuna yah
   If you have elders and me
38 E like me:: me aʻu koʻu kūpuna ua hala ʻo ia
   like my elder who passed
39 i koʻu makaʻhi:ki ʻekolu
   when I was three years old
In the Excerpt 19 aunty Lolena (L) invokes the membership category of kūpuna (line 57). Then makes an assessment in line 58, “ua nui ko lākou mau ‘ike” (great is their knowledges), and their “‘ike” (knowledges) and “nui ko lākou mea” (they have a lot of things) are category-bound attributes of kūpuna membership category. Teaching is a predicate of kūpuna, “e a‘o ai iā ‘oe” (to teach you) in line 59.

Excerpt 22

Later in the interview Aunty Lolena further specifies the kūpuna category-bound attributes, such as virtuous things, as seen in Excerpt 22.

Excerpt 22 Kūpuna Collection Elaboration

255 L: Hiki ke ola nā mea maika‘i
The good things can live
256 Nā kūpu:::na (?)
The elders
257 Ia‘u pela paha nā mea pono
For me maybe the virtuous things
258 E hoʻomau yah
To continue
259 Hiki ke ola i kēia hanauna Mm°
Can live in this generation
260 K: ‘Ae° (1.5) ‘o ia
yes it

As seen in lines 255 and 256, Aunty Lolena elaborates on the attributes of kūpuna category: “hiki ke ola nā mea maika‘i” (the good things can live) “nā kūpuna” (the elders). Aunty Lolena gives her personal opinion, “ia‘u” (for me) in line 257 about continuing “e hoʻomau” (line 258) the virtuous things, which she is inferring as the things of the kūpuna, in order for them to live in this generation “hiki ke ola i kēia hanauna” (line 259). In line 260 I (K) quietly align “‘ae” with her assessment in the previous lines.

Excerpt 23 Kūpuna as God – Interview with Tuti Kanahele
The ultimate elaboration and highest exaltation of kūpuna can be seen in Excerpt 23.

After 36 minutes and 40 seconds into the interview on Hawaiian education, which centers on family, Tuti Kanahele (T) produces a membership category of kūpuna, the elders, as Ke Akua, God (lines 980 & 982. Prior to this membership category, T speaks a great length about being raised by her Tūtū on Kaua‘i, the importance of family for Hawaiians, and her religious upbringing. T’s Tūtū gathered the children and other family members and read from the Bible. T went to church every Sunday, reading the verses from the Bible. God created the heavens and earth. God is the ultimate ancestor, from which all knowledge, inspiration, and blessings spring from.

Excerpt 23 Kūpuna as God Collection

980  K:  Akamai loa nā kūpuna
        The elders are very clever

981  T:  Oh nani nani ko lākou ‘ano
        Oh their way is so so glorious

982  E like me Ke Akua
        like God

983  Ke no‘ono‘o wau i nā kūpu:::na
        I think the elders are

984  e like me Ke Aku::a
        like God

985  K:  ‘O ia ho‘i
        really

986  T:  Ka nani o Ke Aku::a
        The glory of God

987  K:  ‘O ia ho‘i I‘m just in awe:::
        really! I‘m just in awe

988  T:  >Pololei< ‘o wau kekahi
        Correct. Me too

989  K:  I was like wow dos fuckas
        I thought, wow those guys

990  knew stuffs, bra
        knew a lot of stuff

991  I mean unreal der mana‘o
        What I’m saying is their ideas

992  der ‘ike is like wow:::::::
        and their knowledge are amazing!
In Excerpt 23 (line 979) I (K) assess the kūpuna “akamai loa nā kūpuna” (the elders are very clever). In response T (Tuti) formulates a categorical upshot of K’s description of the elders’ way is glorious (line 980). “… nā kūpuna e like me Ke Akua’ (…the elders are like God) (lines 983 & 984). Since T did not say, “nā akua” (the gods), she refers to the Christian God. T uses category-implicative descriptions, such as “Akamai loa nā kūpuna” (the elders are very clever) and “nani ko lākou ‘ano” (the elders’ way is glorious”. My “‘o ia ho‘i” (really) in line 985 aligns with T’s category of kūpuna as God. Also I switch from Hawaiian to English as seen in line 987 “‘O ia ho‘i I was like in awe” (Really I was like in awe). However T does not code-switch in line 988, still speaking in Hawaiian.

I (K) codeswitch to Hawai‘i Creole in lines 989 and 990, and T (Tuti) codeswitches to English in line 991. I name the kūpuna (elders) to “dos fuckas” (those fuckers) category and unpack its incumbent features or “predicates” (Stokoe, 2009, p. 77) as “they knew stuffs” and “unreal der mana‘o der ‘ike” (their ideas and their knowledges is amazing). It is interesting to note that the term “fuckas” used in this excerpt does not carry disparaging meanings, based on the predicates in the excerpt.³

This concludes the part on the membership category of kūpuna (elder, ancestor), which is the beginning and the source of Hawaiian knowledge and identity. The following part presents various membership categories. Hawaiian education is the transmission of ancestral knowledge and identity of the past, present, and future. Native Hawaiian (NH) educators invoked many membership categories, which are intricately related: Hawaiian educator, classroom teacher, student, manāleo. The relational membership categories illustrate the connections NHs have

³ I am very embarassed for using such a crass reference to the kupuna.
with one another and with education, because NHs tend to be group affiliated; relationships are significant.

Various Membership Categories

Excerpt 24 – Kawika Makanani - Hawaiian Classroom Teacher and Student Category

In Excerpt 24 Kawika (K) describes incrementally and chronologically his many different roles and experiences at Kamehameha Schools (KS) over the years as a teacher, librarian and student.

Excerpt 24 Classroom Teacher Category

122 K: Ha ha um and having been a classroom teacher for 22 years
123 and at the last 11 years or so
124 as a Hawaiian Pacific Collection Librarian
125 I’ve seen a lot of changes and
127 I’ve participated in a lot of the (. ) um
decision making not at
the highest levels of course
but at school level um at the
department level within the um
Midkiff Learning Center ah within
the high school within the campus
and to some degree um within
the institution but°ch you know
um I I I feel very (. ) positive
about the the direction in which
Kamehameha Schools is going
because when as a student
here we had very little
that would have translated into
what we would call Hawaiian Studies today
And I took u:m a Hawaiian so
called Hawaiian history course
when I was a senior and

K self-ascribes “classroom teacher” category for 22 years” (lines 119 & 120) and “Hawaiian Pacific Collection Librarian” category (line 122) for the last 11 years (line 124). K identifies the predicates “seen a lot of changes” (line 123) and “participated in a lot of the decision making” (lines 124 & 125) on several different levels throughout years at KS. K
assesses KS in lines 136 – 138 “I feel very positive about the direction in which Kamehameha Schools is going.” The assessment is in contrast to what KS used to be like, “because when as a student here we had very little that would have translated into what we would call Hawaiian Studies today” (lines 139 – 142). Kawika includes himself and the students (we – line 45) at KS when he was a senior in line 50.

Excerpt 25 – Hau’oli Akaka – Teacher and Hawaiian Identity

Just as Kawika shares his many roles at KS as a student, teacher, and librarian, Hau’oli (H) also shares fondly his experiences as a classroom teacher. H incrementally explains the significance of education for us, the po’e Hawai‘i (Hawaiian people). His explanation resembles a thesis, which includes main idea, supporting details and examples, and re-stating of the main idea.

Excerpt 25 Hawaiian Educator Category Elaboration

112 H: No ka ke a’o ʻana ka ʻoihana kumu
For teaching, the teacher occupation
113 Well ka hoʻonaʻauao: um you know he mea nu:i
Well education you know is an important thing
114 no ko kākou yah↑↓↑
for us yah
115 i mea e um (.). hoʻopiʻi aʻe i ko kākou kūlana
as a thing to raise our status
116 K: ʻae
yes
117 H: You know um ko kākou lahui
You know our people
118 And ah ʻo ia ka mea i ola ai aʻu
And it is the thing that healed me
119 mai koʻu wā kamaliʻi a hiki kēia manawa
from my childhood till now
120 You know ka hoʻonaʻauao ʻana iaʻu ↑↓ho
You know education for myself
121 ma ke ↑kula ma ke kula nu:↑i
at school and the university
122 ah ma ke kaiaulu↑ me nā ah kūpu:↑na
ah in the community and the elders
123 me nā kaiapuni ana
and the public schools
124 You know ma ka ʻōlelo me nā lo:ea Hawaiʻi
by the language with the Hawaiian experts
ma loea ku:la you know
by the experts school you know
Mau ke aʻo ʻana me
The teaching continues with
kēlā mau ʻike naʻauao
those wise knowledge
ko kākou poʻe kūpuna
of our ancessters
ko kākou poʻe kumu
our teachers
a ua ʻulu wau ʻo wau iho
and I grew
and ma mua ma muli o kēlā ʻulu oʻu
and before as a result of that growth of mine
hoʻokahi (.) ah koʻu ah ʻiʻini i koho ai
my one desire is the choice
i ka ʻoihana ah ke ala (.) kumu
of the teaching path profession.
Hiki (.) iaʻu ke hoʻonaʻauao aku hoʻoulu aʻe
I can educate establish grow
K: ʻae
i (. ) nā loina: pilina ma hope oʻu yah
the customs relationships after me yah
K: ʻae
H: So he mea nui ka hoʻonaʻauao ʻana
So education is an important thing
no kākou ka poʻe Hawaiʻi
for us the Hawaiian people
Inā (.) akamai e ʻike i ka naʻauao ah kekahi kanaka
If someone is smart and sees the wisdom
K: ʻae
yes
H: he laulā ana kēlā naʻauao i mea e holomua ai
that wisdom is broad as a means to move forward
K: ʻae
yes
H: ka lāhu:i. ʻAʻole hoʻomua wale iaʻu iho yah:
the race. Not just moving myself forward

In lines 112 – 114 H makes an assessment: “no ke aʻo ʻana ka ʻoihana kumu” (for
teaching, the teacher occupation); “hoʻonaʻauao he mea nui” (education is an important thing);
and “no ko kākou” (for us). He uses the plural inclusive pro-term “kākou” to include me and
others, the Hawaiian people, which he identifies in the previous excerpts. According to H,
education is important, because it is something that “e hoʻopiʻi aʻe i ko kākou kūlana” (raises our
status). H invokes the Hawaiian people category, as seen in line 117: “ko kākou lāhui” (our people). I will explain the significance of H’s frequent use of the term “kākou” in the data analysis of Excerp 4. H unpacks the predicates of education throughout his life in lines 118, and 119: “‘o ia ka mea i ola ai a‘u” (it is the thing that healed me) “mai ko‘u wā kamali‘i a hiki kēia manawa” (from my childhood till now). Hau‘oli lists the educational places and educators to provide a context and validates his mana‘o in lines 121 – 124. To facilitate the analysis, I extracted from the interview data and listed the following educational settings: “kula” (school), “kula nui” (university), “kaiaulu” (community), “kaiapuni” and (public schools). H also constructs a comprehensive list of collections in lines 123, 124, 127, and 128: “loea Hawai‘i” (Hawaiian experts), “loea kula” (school experts), “ko kākou po‘e kūpuna” (our elders) and “ko kākou po‘e kumu” (our teachers), whose predicate is to teach “ka ‘ōlelo” (the language) line 124 and “kēlā mau ‘ike na‘auao” (those wise knowledges). H explains in line 126, “mau ke a‘o ‘ana” (the teaching continues) by the aforementioned educators and educational settings.

Hau‘oli (H) further reiterates his one desire, which is to pursue teaching as a profession in lines 131 and 132: “ho‘okahi ko‘u ‘i‘ini i koho ai” (one my desire that is chosen) “i ka ‘oihana ke ala kumu” (the teaching path profession). As a kumu and kūpuna (H became a grandfather recently), H explicitly identifies his category-bound attributes or kuleana: “hiki ia‘u ke ho‘onauao aku ho‘oulu a‘e” (I can educate, establish) “i nā loina pilina ma hope o‘u” (the customs, relationships after me). As a conclusion in a thesis, in lines 138 and 139, H re-states the main idea “so he mea nui ka ho‘ona‘auao ‘ana (so education is an important thing) “no kākou ka po‘e Hawai‘i” (for us the Hawaiian people). He adds in lines 140, 142 and 144 that “inā akamai e ‘ike i ka na‘auao kekahī kanaka” (if someone is smart and sees the wisdom of another), then “he laulā ana kēlā na‘auao i mea e holomua ai ka lāhui” (that wisdom is broad as a means to move forward
the nation). H is inferring that the “lāhui” (nation) in line 144 is the Hawaiian nation, based on
the previous lines in the transcript. Also in line 144 “ʻaʻole holomua wale iaʻu iho” (not just
moving myself forward), H infers that the collection “Hawaiians” tend to be group-oriented
people, rather than individualistic.

Excerpt 26 – Leinaʻala Medeiros - Mākou (We) The Practitioners Collection

Both Hauʻoli and Leinaʻala elaborate on the role of Hawaiian educators in this study.

Since Leinaʻala uses the term mākou, which means “we 3 or more EXCL), I asked for
clarification. She identifies we as the practitioners.

Excerpt 26 Mākou (We 3+ EXCL) The Practitioners Collection

269  K: ʻO wai o mākou?
Who are mākou (we 3+ EXCL)?
270  L: ʻO mâkou he kanaka (.) ke kanaka
We are a person the people
i hana i ka naʻauao Hawaiʻi
who do Hawaiian education
271  So ka practitioners that are still here
the
272  i koʻu manaʻo
I think
273  ʻAʻole haʻalele loa lākou
They never left
274  When I say lākou o kākou
they or we
275  K: ʻO Kākou*
we (3+inclusive)
276  L: Um. Thatʻs a maikaʻi nīnau
good question

For clarification, I (K) ask in line 269, “ʻO wai mākou” (Who are mākou?). Mākou is a
plural exclusive pro-term meaning “we”. In line 260 Leinaʻala (L) unpacks the term “mākou”: “
ʻO mākou he kanaka ke kanaka” (we are a person the people). The term “kanaka” can mean
person, people, or Hawaiian. L unpacks the collection of “mākou” as those “who do Hawaiian
education. So the practitioners that are still here” as seen in lines 271 and 272. L says “i koʻu
manaʻo” (I think) in line 273 and “ʻaʻole haʻalele loa lākou” (they never left) in line 274. It is
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notable that L switches was explaining the term “mākou” then switches to another pro-term, third person plural “lākou” (they) in line 274. L’s clarification get even blurier in line 275: “when I say lākou (they) o kākou (or we). I (K) softly say, “kākou” (we inclusive plural) in line 276. L refers back to my question as seen in line 277: “um. That’s a maika‘i (good) nīnau (question).”

_Excerpt 27 – Alohalani Ho - Mother Student Kumu Category_

Excerpt 27 is six minutes and fifty-five minutes into the interview in the Pūnana Leo o Honolulu office in Kalihi. We discuss the challenges of our multi-facet roles of being mothers, university students and kumu.

_Excerpt 27 Mother Student Kumu Category_

226  Alo:  Yah just hana ka internet
        Just do it on the internet
227  K:   ‘ Ae maopopo ia‘u (.). but (.). ha:u‘oli wau (.)
        yes I understand but I’m happy
228  Pōmaika‘i iā ‘oe
        Congratulations to you
229  Alo:  Mahalo
        Thanks
230  K:   no kou hana
231  cause maopopo ia‘u he nu:i ka hana
        because I understand it’s a lot of work
232  <me he māmā lā (?)>
        as a mother
233  Alo:  Yah
234  K:   <me he kumu (.). ma nā Hawai‘i la>
        and a teacher in Hawaiian
235  Alo:  Hmm
236  K:   <Mau nō ka hana no kākou a pau>
        The work is ongoing for all of us
237  Alo:  M:h:mm:
238  K:   Ti: (.). he aha kou mana‘o
        Ti, what is your ma‘na‘o (.).

I (K) congratulate Alohalani (Al:o) “pōmaika‘i iā ‘oe” (congratulations to you) in line 237 for graduating with an M.A. in Education from Chaminade University. After congratulating Alo for her “hana” (work) in line 239, I sympathize and relate to her situation, “cause maopopo
iaʻu” (because I understand) in line 240. I invoke a multi-facet category of Alo and myself as ‘mother’, ‘university student’, and ‘kumu’ (Hawaiian teacher) with the predicate of “he nui ka hana” (it’s a lot of work) in line 240. The ‘university student’ category is inferred, rather than explicitly invoked, based on what was we spoke about earlier in the interview. I infer that it’s a lot of work for a single individual, trying to balance and fulfill the responsibilities as a mother, university student and kumu all at once. In line 245, I upgrade the work as ongoing, “mau nō ka hana” and overtly include myself and others belonging to this weighted-category of ‘mother’, ‘university student’ and ‘kumu’: “no kākou a pau” (for all of us 3+incl). Alo aligns with the invoked category and assessment: “yah” in line 242, “hmm” in line 244, and extra stretching out the “hmm” in line 246, which emphasizes her alignment. In line 243 it is not clear what “ma nā Hawaiʻi” (in Hawaiian) is referring to. Based on the interview and subject, “ma nā Hawaiʻi” may refer to Hawaiian content-based schools. What is clear from this sequence is that the category of ‘mother’, ‘university student’ and ‘kumu’ commonsensically go together with hard work in a way that ‘anyone could see’ (Stokoe, 2006, p. 482). A gloss might be ‘Being a mother, university student and kumu require hard work, and you graduated with a Master’s degree. So you work hard.’

Excerpt 28 – Kawika Makanani - Kamehameha Students

In Excerpt 28 Kawika (K) describes the students at the Kamehameha Schools (KS), what they should learn, and that they become leaders of the charter school movement in Hawaiʻi. This excerpt represents the unfolding history of KS and the centering on things Hawaiian from a Hawaiian perspective. I have heard over the years this re-centering movement as the Hawaiianizing of KS. K invokes the Kamehameha student (KSS) category with the attribute of being Hawaiian.
Excerpt 28 KS Students Collection
710  K:  Of every student (.) u:m bu:t (.) you know
710  I strongly feel that because of the “the” clientele
710  that we have here
710  Ku:  ‘ae hiki nō
710  yes can
710  K:  They are all Hawaiian. They should learn their
710  history from a Hawaiian point of view
710  Ku:  [pololei]    pololei
710  correct correct
710  K:  And (.) so (.) that that’s one of the positive things
710  Bu:t (.) at the same ti:me you know the question is
710  how can we impact upon the public schools?
710  Well any other school that might have
710  Ku:  [wo(h)wō]
710  K:  An an an interest i:n (.) u:m looking at the
710  history of Hawai‘i from a Hawaiian point of view
710  (.hhh) so: (.) one of the good things was that
710  many of our graduates have gone on and become
710  lea↑ders↓ and teachers within the
710  charter school movement
710  Ku:  “pololei”
710  correct
710  K :  So: (.) all the Hawaiian cul:ture (.) ah charter

It is notable that he refers to the KSS as “the clientele” in line 696. According to the American Heritage Dictionary (1985), the term “clientele” means a body of customers or patrons. Also, K uses the pro-term “we” in that same line. In lines 699 and 700, K refers to the KSS: “they are all Hawaiian. They should learn their history from a Hawaiian point of view.” K places emphasis on the terms “Hawaiian” and the second “they” in line 699, speaking strongly, in alignment with his statement in line 696, “I strongly feel.” I (Ku) agree with K’s sentiments as seen in lines 698 “‘ae hiki nō” (yes can) and 701 “pololei pololei” (correct correct). What is interesting here is that I am responding in Hawaiian and K is continuing to speak English, so the two languages are being used simultaneously without any seemingly conflicts of understanding. K (K) makes an assessment about the “ho‘ohawai‘i” (Hawaiianizing) of KS in line 702: “that’s one of the positive things.”
Then K shifts the inward gaze of KS to looking outward by asking in line 704: “How can we impact upon the public schools?” It may well be that K is inferring that “we” means the students, alumni, teachers, and leaders of KS. So “we” are the benefactors of Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop and “we” have a kuleana or responsibility to the public schools. K makes another assessment in line 709 - 711: “Many of our graduates have gone on and become leaders and teachers within the charter school movement.” Therefore K transforms the (Kamehameha Schools student) KSS category to KSS collection, consisting of KS students with the predicate of becoming “leaders and teachers” in charter schools. I (K) agree to this collection as seen in line 713: “pololei” (correct), since I use my knowledge and experience when I was a teacher at Hālau Kū Mana New Century Charter School back in 2001. The following excerpt illustrates the deep connections and relationships that “we” KS alumni have outside of KS.

Excerpt 29 – Role of KS in the Hawaiian Charter School

Excerpt 29 is the most vivid and dynamic talk-in-interaction in the entire interview with Kawika Makanani. Throughout most of the interview, Kawika, the respondent, speaks extensively and I, the interviewer, speak much less. Excerpt 29 reflects a serendipitous moment, when we both realized we spoke with the same person within a very short period of time. This part of the interview appears less of an interview and resembles more of a natural conversation, due to the symmetrical organization of the talk in terms of length and frequency of talk-turns. This results in highly collaborative and affiliative sequences (Holt, 2002).

Excerpt 29 follows closely behind Excerpt 28, when K (Kawika) invokes the KSS (Kamehameha Schools student) category and transforms it to KS students’ collection, which includes former KS students and teachers.

Excerpt 29 KS Role in Hawaiian Charter Schools
710 K: Many of our graduates have gone on and become
As seen in line 710 – 712, Kawika says, “Many of our graduates have gone on and become leaders and teachers within the charter school movement.” I (K) affirm with Kawika’s statement: “pololei” (correct) as seen in line 713. Next Kawika unpacks the significance of the
Hawaiian culture schools in lines 714 – 716: “so all the Hawaiian culture charter schools generally of course take this approach.” K infers “this approach” is “looking at their history from a Hawaiian point of view” as seen previously in lines 699 and 700 in Excerpt 5.

Speaking of a Hawaiian point of view and Hawaiian culture charter schools, I mention to Kawika in line 717: “amazing. I jus was talking with Hina Wong.” Line 717 is a clear (HC) Hawaii Creole or Pidgin example. For instance the word “just” is cut off to “jus” and “Wong↑↓” is spoken with a rising and falling pitch, which usually reflects an emphasis. Even the way K says “yah” reflects HC intonation, and he laughs “ha ha” seemingly to know Hina Wong.

Then I (Ku) launch into a seemingly sub-topic, sharing my thoughts on Hina Wong in lines 719 and 720: “Last night I was trying to set up a nīnaule (interview) with her.” K’s “oh oh” in line 721 reflect his comprehension, and he asks in line 723: “You ↑have her number↓ or email?” in an HC. Generally when HC speakers ask a question, the question begins with a subject, such as you. Whereas an American English speaker would generally ask the same question like, “do you have her number or email↑?” with a rising pitch at the end of the sentence. After K asks me (Ku) if I have her number or email, I respond in line 724, “ya↑↓” with a rising and falling pitch, reflecting my HC background. K continues the topic of Hina Wong in lines 725 and 726 with a short reported speech: “actually yesterday I was at a meeting and I said I gotta talk to Hina.” I (Ku) respond in lines 727 and 729: “ok I get back to you on that one.” “Cause I pono ia'u i ka'u kelepona.” (I need my phone). Again I speak Hawaiian in a mostly English interview, and it does not seem to cause any problems since K says, “ah::” in line 730. Since the “ah::” is stretched out, it appears that K comprehends my Hawaiian. Then I (Ku) shift to focus on to my lack of cellphone status in line 731 by saying, “‘auē” (my goodness). K
laughs at my situation, which I assess in lines 733 and 735: “It’s kind of maika↑↓i (good) to be off the grid yah↑↓” This is another example of Hawaiian and HC mixed together seemlessly. K agrees in line 736, “oh↑ yah↓” and I laugh in the next line.

Though it may appear that our conversation is meandering naturally from Hawaiian charter schools, KS leaders and teachers, Hina Wong, and finally my cellphone, there is a connection to the aforementioned subtopics. As seen in line 738, K (Kawika) perceptively identifies the connection: “well it’s everything related so: yah↑↓” so.” I see the connection and agree saying, “‘ae” (yes) as seen in line 739. K explains in “So every time we start going off track” in line 741, “I kind of drive you back” in line 743. K infers that our conversation is “going off track” while I (Ku) blissfully continue: “Yah Hina Wong I get it” in line 742 and “cause Hina love her Colin Wong class of 1990” in line 744. This sequence from lines 741 – 744 appears to be like a twisting lei, consisting of two different strands of topics (“going off track”/strategy-focused and “Hina Wong”/topic-focused) weaving together mutually.

Also the connection that Kawika and I have with Hina Wong is significant, because it is an example of how inter-connected some KS alumni are, especially the graduates who have gone on and become leaders and teachers in the Hawaiian culture charter schools. In the bigger picture Hawaiians tend to cultivate relationships, particularly in the field of education.

*Excerpt 30 – Lani Waiau - Hawaiian Identity*

Prior to this part in the interview, Lani (L) was sharing about the importance of showing to students how to love one another and be humble. At this point, L is criticizing a certain collection of “dis-da-only-way-to-be-Hawaiian”. This excerpt illustrates how Lani and I co-create the criticism of the Hawaiian collection.

*Excerpt 28 Hawaiian Identity*

252  L:  Cause manaʻo wau ‘o ia kekahi pilikia
Because I think it is a problem
i kēia manawa nui ka ho‘onui ‘ike
now there is an increase of knowledge
e ho‘omākaukau kākou ka po‘e Hawai‘i
for us to prepare Hawaiian people
‘ano ho‘o†ka:†no ma kekahi ‘ano
kind of arrogant in a kind of
me he †me:†a la
like one says
“oh dis da only way to be Hawaiian”
“oh this is the only way to be Hawaiian”

K: ['ae pololei]
yes correct
L: ††yah "Oh >‘a‘ole ‘oe ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i<
Oh you don’t speak Hawaiian
>‘a‘ole ‘oe he kanaka Hawai‘i”<
You are not Hawaiian

K: Essentialized Hawaiian
L: No Yah pono e pono
No yah have to have
e maopopo a kama‘āina
to understand and get accostomed
I nā (.) that the (.) the ra::nge I guess
To the plural that the range I guess
K: ‘ae pololei ‘ākea
yes right broad
L: ‘Ākea mahalo mahalo
broad thank you
ke ‘ākea o kēlā ‘ano mea
the broadness of that thing
no ka mea (.) ‘oko‘a ko‘u kuleana
because my responsibility is different
mai kona kuleana mai kona kuleana
from his or her responsibility
akā nō na‘e (.) waiwai a mea nui a pau
but everything is valued and important
No:: ka lāhui yah
By the race yes
Like ko‘u makaūkāne ‘a‘ole ‘o ia ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i
Like my father didn’t speak Hawaiian

L invokes this collection, and she identifies this collection as a problem in line 292
“cause mana’o wau ‘o ia kekahi pilikia” (because I think it is a problem). L reports the
restrictive category-bound attributes of Hawaiian in a very sassy voice as though she was
imitating someone else as seen in lines 299 and 300: “oh ‘a‘ole ‘oe ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i” (oh you don’t
speak Hawaiian); and “‘aʻole ‘oe he kanaka Hawaiʻi” (you are not Hawaiian). Thus, the predicate for this collection is being able to speak Hawaiian. I (K) formulate an upshot to this collection by identifying it as “essentialized Hawaiian” as seen in line 301. L aligns to stereotypical Hawaiian collection by saying “no yah” in line 302, then unpacks the collection by constraining it that there is a “range” of Hawaiians. I (K) formulate an upshot again by responding in line 305: “‘ae pololei ‘ākea” (yes correct broad). The term “‘ākea” describes the “range” of Hawaiians. L aligns to my assessment and repeats my assessment as seen in lines 306 and 307: “‘ākea mahalo mahalo” (broad thanks thanks) and “ke ‘ākea o kēlā ‘ano mea” (the broadness of that kind thing). L unpacks range, by explaining that individuals have certain kinds of “kuleana” or responsibilities. L uses a membership category device (mcd); certain kuleana is associated different individuals. In lines 308 and 309: “‘oko’a koʻu kuleana” (my responsibility is different); “mai kona kuleana mai kona kuleana” (from her/his responsibility or her/his responsibility). L assesses the kuleana as “waiwai a mea nui” (valuable and important) as seen line 311 and “no ka lāhui” (for the race/people). The term “lāhui” is political and ethnic. Then L makes an example by referring to her father in line 312. Excerpt 31 will continue with the data analysis further.

Excerpt 31

After Lani (L) rejects the category of a Hawaiian person, invoked by some people, with the predicate of speaking Hawaiian, Lani refers to her father to situate information within Hawaiian epistemology. She refers to a personal story, making genealogical connection (to her father) and validating the information. She recalls a previous conversation she had with her father.

Excerpt 31 Category Membership 14 min 30 sec

273 L: Like (.) koʻu↑ makaukā↓ ne
like my father

↑‘a‘ole ‘o ia ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i↓↓‘i:
he doesn’t speak Hawaiian

‘A‘ole ‘o ia he kanaka (. ) maopopo nui
he isn’t a Hawaiian who understands a lot

i nā mea:: but- ↑kā↓ na mea
of things, but his things

maopopo ‘o ia ka ‘oi: (. ) kela
he knew excellently

She begins the reported speech with “like ko‘u makuakāne” (like father) in line 311 and infers her father is Hawaiian. She unpacks her utterance from line 312, reporting “‘a‘ole ‘o ia ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i” (he doesn’t speak Hawaiian) and “‘a‘ole ‘o ia he kanaka maopopo nui i nā mea” (he isn’t a Hawaiian who understands a lot of things) he is still “kanaka” (Hawaiian) as seen in lines 313 and 314. Lani mentions “nā mea” (the things), which could be interpreted as Hawaiian things or just things in general. In lines 314 and 315, “but kāna mea, maopopo ‘o ia ka ‘oi kēlā” (his things, he knew excellently), which infers that there are more predicates to the membership category of Hawaiian than just speaking Hawaiian.

Excerpt 32 – Kawika Makanani – Non-Proficient Hawaiian Language Speaker

In Excerpt 32, I (Ku) and Kawika (K) negotiate what language to continue. In line 1, I (Ku) ask a question to direct the interview to the research question. Hawaiian perspective (line 1) is a connecting concept to line 4’s mana‘o. As seen in line 4, Ku switches to speaking Hawaiian, by asking the research question, “He aha kou mana‘o no ka na‘auao Hawai‘i?” (What are your thoughts on Hawaiian education?) K responds, “‘ae” (yes) and asks, “ah ma ka ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i” i a i ‘ole ma ka ‘ōlelo Pelekane” (in Hawaiian or in English – lines 6 and 7). In line 8 Ku answers, “Aia no iā ‘oe.” (It's up to you), giving K the option of which language to use. Then K unpacks his preference for speaking in English in line 9, “‘Oi aku ka ‘ōlelo Pelekania, no ka mea ‘a’ole poehu au i ka ‘ōlelo makuahine” (English is better, because I am not fluent in
the mother language) as seen in lines 9 and 10. After that, both K and Ku continue speaking in English, using a sprinkling of Hawaiian terms throughout the interview. Excerpt 32 does more than display a language preference; Kawika implicitly self-ascribes as an non-proficient Hawaiian language speaker. Proficiency in Hawaiian language is not a required attribute for a Hawaiian educator in general, even though Hawaiian language is related to Hawaiian identity. Being proficient in Hawaiian language is a source of contention among Hawaiians, which is illustrated in the data analysis from Lani Waiau’s interview in Excerpt 31.

**Excerpt 32 Non-Hawaiian Language Speaker**

1. Ku: A while ago you were talking about say Hawaiian perspective little bit going back to the wi::ll
2. K: hmmm↑↓
3. Ku: So I wanted to get (.) your manaʻo
4. He aha kou↑ manaʻo↓ (.) no ka naʻauao↑ (.) Hawai↓ʻi?
   What are your thoughts on Hawaiian education?
   yes ah in Hawaiian language
6. a i ‘ole ma ka ‘ōlelo Pelekane
7. Ku: [Aia nō↑ iā ‘oe↓] It’s up to you
    um English is better
9. no ka mea ‘aʻole poeko au
   because I’m not fluent
10. ‘i ka ‘ōlelo makuahine yah ↑↓
    In the mother tongue
11. (.hhh) (hhh) So::: yah↑ um↓ (.)

**Excerpt 33**

In Excerpt 33 I ask Hauʻoli Akaka to clarify what he means by kākou (we 3+ EXCL), which is commonly used Hawaiian term. H (Hauʻoli) explains that kākou means us, the Hawaiian people, including the two of us sitting at the table for the interview and my children.

**Excerpt 33 Kākou (We 3+ INCL) Collection**

   Who is kākou? You say
93. Kākou kākou ka poʻe Hawaiʻi
   Kākou (we) we are the Hawaiian people
As an upshot to Hauʻoli’s frequent use of “kākou” the pro-term that is used frequently among Hawaiian educators throughout this study, I (K) ask him (H) inline 145, “‘o wai kākou?” (who is kākou?). As a means to elaborate my question I use H’s reported speech in lines 145, 146 and 147: “ʻolelo mai ‘oe” (you say) “kākou kākou ka poʻe Hawaiʻi” (kākou kākou the Hawaiian people); “‘o wai kākou?” (Who is kākou?); and I ask H, “e ʻoluʻolu e hoʻowehewehe” (please explain). Thus, I construct the collection “kākou” which Hauʻoli describes as we, the Hawaiian people.
H promptly explains emphatically in lines 148 and 149: “Kākou ka poʻe Hawaiʻi. Kākou ka poʻe me ke koko Hawaiʻi” (Kākou the Hawaiian people. Kākou the people with Hawaiian blood). H continues unpacking “kākou” a plural inclusive pro-term in lines 145 and 146: “kākou ka poʻe ʻiliʻili mai nā kūpuna” (kākou the descendants from the elders) and “ka poʻe ʻōiwi mua loa o kēia ʻāina o Hawaiʻi” (the very first native people of this Hawaiian archipelago). H also includes me in line 155 “ʻo oe kekahi” (you are too) and my children in lines 157 and 158 “ke noho wau kū kamaʻilio me ʻoe” (When I sit and talk with you) “me kāu poʻe pua” (and your children) in the collection “kākou” which surprised me. Perhaps Hauʻoli included my children because they were immediately present at the time of our interview talk story session: my seven-year old daughter Keolaʻoli was running around and screaming; my 1 ½ year old Kaliloa was fussing and squirming in my lap. H graciously sums it up in lines 160 and 162: “He mau ʻōiwi” (are native) “so iia no ke kākou yah” (so that is it with kākou yah). I laugh in lines 156 and 159 for not noticing the obvious; my children and I are Native Hawaiian.

This section of Chapter 4 depicts the various membership categories and collections, which the participants invoked. These categories and collections are interwoven and intricately connected to our identities we share as Native Hawaiians and educators. In particular, the issue of what is a Native Hawaiian, whether one speaks Hawaiian or not for instance, is contested as seen in the excerpts above. We are constructing and resisting what makes a Hawaiian person Hawaiian. Though we, the participants and other Native Hawaiians, have not come to a consensus, the identity discussion is healthy as well as essentially connected to what is Hawaiian education. The Hawaiian language and concepts used in the study indicate the various layers of meanings, which are co-constructed by the participants in talk-in-interaction.

Review of the study
This chapter provides the analysis of the study. This section highlights the review of the qualitative study, which explores the discourse of Hawaiian educators via conversation analysis (CA), membership categorization analysis (MCA), and Hapa Hawai‘i on the topic of Hawaiian education. For this study, I created Hapa Hawai‘i, which incorporates both Native Hawaiian (NH) and western qualitative research techniques as a culturally relevant and rigorous methodology of conducting research with, by, and for NHs. In addition to Hapa Hawai‘i, Bevon-Brown’s Six Rs (2001) was used as the framework for organizing and conducting the study: The Right Person Asks the Right Questions of the Right People in the Right Way at the Right Place and the Right Time. Through purposeful selection and semi-structured interviews, twelve other Native Hawaiian (NH) educators were asked about their mana‘o (thoughts, feelings) on Hawaiian education. The interviews of the NH educators were recorded with an audio recorder, transcribed using Jeffersonian notations, and examined with a Hawaiian and CA perspective.

Summary of Findings

Through meticulous examination and in-depth analysis of the transcription within the limitations of the study, the following conclusions were made. Hawaiian education is the transmission of ancestral knowledge and identity for past, present, and future generations. It is timeless, holistic and cyclical as a beautiful lei. It is a genealogy, connecting family members to ancestral knowledge and wisdom. Also, Hawaiian educators constructed membership categories, such as kūpuna, who is the source of ancestral knowledge, of inspiration, and of what we will become. Other membership categories, such as students, kumu, and Hawaiian are so intricately intertwined with our identity as Kanaka Maoli, the Native people of Hawai‘i nei, illustrating our interconnectedness with our three piko, our centers, which link us to our ancestors, the present
generation, and our posterity. According to Tava and Keale (1989, p. xiv), “past and present often merge-Western notions of objective fact sometimes succumb to the richer Hawaiian subjective insight.”

The following chapter includes a discussion, implications, limitations, contributions, reflections, and conclusion. Ultimately, this study is for the improvement of education for Native Hawaiians and all children.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Discussion

This chapter includes the following: discussion of the study, implications, limitations, contributions, researcher’s reflections, and conclusion. This chapter is presented with oral and written discourse intertwining, adding strength, validity, and authenticity to the study.

In terms of Rezentés’s (1996, p. 73) application of John W. Berry and Uichol Kim’s two-dimensional model of acculturation to Native Hawaiians (NH), the study suggests that it is valuable to maintain one’s cultural identity and characteristics as well as maintain relationships with other groups. Instead of the term acculturation, integration is more apt to be applicable in the case of this study. According to the participants in the study, Native Hawaiian education is the integration of ancestral knowledge in the contemporary. The following example of integration is illustrated by a deeply sincere conversation I had with my kahu, Reverend Richard Kamanu at Kaumakapili Church in Honolulu. On the Sunday following Thanksgiving I shared with him that I could not place Jesus Christ above my ancestors, Pele, and the many other gods. While we held hands, he said with a smile, “We are both Hawaiians and Christians” (personal communication, November 25, 2012). That is an example of Hapa Hawai‘i, which embraces the diverse cultural identities in the contemporary with grace and flexibility.

Another example of integration is my kumu, the late John Keola Lake, who is a devout Catholic and Kahuna Nui; he used to conduct ceremonies honoring our ancestors at various heiau, places of worship, throughout the Hawaiian Islands, and faithfully attend mass on Sundays. He trained and educated many people in the spiritual traditions and rituals of our ancestors; he honored both his Hawaiian and Catholic traditions with grace. I still marvel at his
deep knowledge of Hawaiian culture and hula. He is an excellent example that the universe is infinite, and there is room for many truths to coexist comfortably.

*Ola na Iwi* The bones live.

The aforementioned ‘ōlelo no‘eau or wise saying refers to “a respected oldster who is well cared for by his family” (Pukui, 1983, p. 272). This section of the discussion is highlights the importance of the kupuna or ancestors for the Hawaiian educators and Hawaiians in general in this study. An offshoot of the research question, what are Hawaiian educators’ manaʻo (thoughts or feelings) on Hawaiian education, is who are the kupuna? I posed this question several times to the participants of the study, who interestingly responded in various ways. Chapter Four presents thick description and analysis of the kupuna category. Since kupuna play a significant role in the transmission of Hawaiian cultural knowledge and identity, which is Hawaiian education, it is imperative to return to the piko or source, the kupuna.

Mary Kawena Pukui, the source for Hawaiian culture, hula, and things Hawaiian, compiled, translated and interpreted many proverbs and poetical sayings from a Hawaiian perspective in the 1983 work. Numerous ‘ōlelo no‘eau illustrate the importance and value kupuna have on the Hawaiians. One common example found on page 68 is

*He hulu aliʻi.* Royal feathers. Said of the adornment of a chief, or of an elderly chief himself who is one of a few survivors of his generation and therefore precious.

Also, page 69 of Pukui’s work further elaborates the metaphor of hulu, feathers, as family:

*He hulu makua.* A feather parent. When most of the relatives of the parents’ generations were gone, the few left were referred to as *hulu makua* and considered as precious and choice of feathers. *Hulu* can refer to relatives as far back as three generations.
Kupuna are referred to as hulu, because hulu were used to make the valuable cloaks, capes, helmets and leis reserved for the ali‘i, chiefly people. Hulu is coveted for its scarcity and value. Therefore, kupuna are respected for their wisdom and teachings by Native Hawaiians. It is the kupuna who are the source and educators for Hawaiian education and families. According to Pukui et al. (1972),

All seniors or kupuna were respected. Grandparents were especially loved... (p. 126). The elder can make a great contribution to community as well as family. The old beliefs, arts, and skills must be recorded and handed down. The kupuna is a needed kumu (source) of all this knowledge (p. 131).

Furthermore, Hawaiian language has many layers of interpretations and significance. For instance, bones refer to the deceased, whose knowledge and aloha are memorialized by the living descendants. The following example illustrates the memorialization of one of Hawai‘i’s beloved princess, Ke Ali‘i Bernice Pauahi Bishop, by the students, staff, and ‘ohana of the Kamehameha Schools (KS).

On December 20, 2012 I went to speak with Kumu Kawika Makanani at KS Midkiff Learning Center about employment opportunities there. I asked Kumu Kawika about my observation of the apotheosis of Ke Ali‘i Pauahi, the great great granddaughter of Kamehameha the Great and the founder of KS. I told him I observed the many sightings of Ke Ali‘i Pauahi’s portrait in nearly every classroom, office, and even bus of KS; Ke Ali‘i Pauahi is omnipresent on campus, a strategic and concerted maneuver of KS administration. This phenomena was not seen in my years when I was a KS student from 1985 – 1988. Kumu Kawika’s response to my observation is very interesting and related to NH’s honoring our kupuna and ali‘i: “We have this responsibility to honor her. We do it so much, we are kind of elevating her status: makua,
kupuna, aumākua, akua.” The aforementioned, noteworthy quote is worth analyzing for clarification, illustrating the meaning making that Kawika and I co-construct in talk-in-interaction. Kumu Kawika infers we as the Kamehameha Schools (KS) ‘ohana, which consist of students, teacher, staff, and others. I may be included in this we, but it is not certain based on the empirical material. Kumu Kawika also infers that it is our responsibility or kuleana as members of KS or possibly Native Hawaiians in general to give Ke Ali‘i Pauahi the respect that is due to her as an ali‘i (chiefess) and founder of KS. Kumu Kawika incrementally invokes Ke Ali‘i Pauahi’s fluid categories from parent, elder, family guardian, and god, which are based on the translation of the last part of the excerpt. Thus, Ke Ali‘i Pauahi has been transformed and elevated to god-like status.

This modern deification of our ali‘i is a hybrid of Christian and traditional Hawaiian practices. The KS ‘ohana call upon Ke Ali‘i Pauahi for assistance and guidance, honor her for allowing us to benefit from her benevolence, and praise her for being an exceptional ali‘i. The following passage (Pukui, Haertig, and Lees, 1972) eloquently captures the ‘aumakua concept, which is seen in the above excerpt:

The concept of aumākua was a nearly ideal one. The Hawaiians lived within the close relationships of the ‘ohana (family or family clan); the aumākua remaind members of the clan. The ‘ohana invested family authority in its senior members; the aumākua as spiritual ancestors were certainly seniors. With one’s aumākua, a human-to-spirit communication was possible. One spoke to an aumākua through ritual and with reverence, but without the almost paralyzing awe the akuas or impersonal gods

---

4 Since I did not have my audio recorder, the excerpt is not in Jeffersonian notations. I did not plan on talking about anything remotely related to this dissertation study, since I really just wanted to inquire about employment opportunities at KS.
sometimes inspired. Therefore, an *aunakua* could also be a “spiritual go between,” passing on prayers to the *akua*\(^5\) (p. 35).

Like our ancestors and our posterity, we continue honoring kūpuna; the ‘iwi or bones of our kūpuna continue to thrive because of our aloha.

**Implications**

This study implies that there is variation to Native Hawaiian discourse, which is very traditional, historical, and healthy for a thriving, dynamic people. The following widely known ‘ōlelo no‘eau, wise proverbial saying, apply illustrates the various schools of thought and knowledge; ‘A‘ohe pau ka ‘ike i ka hālau: *all knowledge is not taught in the same school*. One can learn from many sources (Pukui, 1983, p. 24). For example, there are many halau, hula schools, directed by many kumu hula, hula masters, with various teachings, trainings, and traditions. All halau contribute to the perpetuation and cultivation of hula in their own ways, which add many vibrant versions to hula traditions.

In addition, another account illustrates the variation of Hawaiian traditions; Catherine A. Lee, in collaboration with Mary Kawena Pukui and Dr. E. W. Haertig, writes in the introduction to *Nānā I Ke Kumu, Volume 2*:

There are gaps and possibly discrepancies in accounts of Hawai‘i’s traditions. For centuries, Hawai‘i’s history – official, family, and personal – was stored in the memorized chants of genealogists and in the long memories of family seniors. When a district chief and his subjects were virtually wiped out in a battle, more than lives were lost. Also lost were segments of history. Portions of Hawai‘i’s past remain unknown. Also, as one Hawaiian moved to another district and yet another stayed in an isolated

\(^5\) Akua means god or gods.
spot, the remembered past is sometimes more of regions than of the islands as a whole (p. xi).

This passage infers that there was not one homogenized Hawaiian tradition, as reflected in the various membership categories and collections invoked by the participants of this study. Each of the participants has unique ancestral knowledge and traditions, like the various island traditions. For example, Molokaʻi is an island noted for its expert kahuna (sorcerors) and enormous moʻo (lizards), which guarded or terrorized the inhabitants and outsiders. Also, Hawaiʻi Island is known for Pele, the revered goddess of the burning volcano pit. Just as the islands have various features and traditions, so do the descendants of the islands, the Native Hawaiians.

Furthermore, Smith (2012) also discusses the idea of contested histories stories and multiple discourses about the past…(p. 34) especially among indigenous communities who value oral and written literatures. Native Hawaiians have a literary and historical tradition of not always being in agreement, which can be seen in the late nineteenth century Hawaiian language newspapers. Writers debate the validation of knowledge and authority in the newspapers:

Later criticisms centered on accuracy of content and the credibility of individual writers when presenting shared knowledge of history, legend, or practice. Legends, historical notes, or genealogical material presented in the newspaper could be critiqued by readers who would correct published work, silence the writer outright or mount a defense of that material (Nogelmeier, 2010, p. 88).

Thus, it was not uncommon for readers to submit corrections or rebuttals to previously printed material and for the editors to print the on-going public dialogue for all to view. This phenomenon reflects the dynamic interaction of oral knowledge and written literature, which continue to thrive in the present. In this sense, variation among the participants of the study adds
to the pools of knowledge; upon closer examination of oral and written literatures, the pools appear to have limitless depths.

**Limitations**

The following is a discussion of the limitations of the study. One limitation or strength depending on how one’s perspective, relates to the participant selection bias or purposeful sampling (Seidman, 1998) in the study. Twelve familiar individuals were recruited, whom I respect and have developed relationships over the years. These experienced Native Hawaiian participants, who teach in Hawaiian institutions and programs, do not represent all Native Hawaiian educators. Though there are some variances in their manaʻo (thoughts and feelings) on Hawaiian education, the participants in general share common goals and values. The results may not generalize to other settings or people. The study may have yielded different results, if I recruited unfamiliar and elderly Native Hawaiian educators from neighbor islands and the U.S. continent. Also instead of relying on audio content and transcription analysis, my study may have been enriched by observing video content and analyzing body language.

**Contributions of This Study**

The possible contributions of the present study are as follows. It offers conversational data and empirically grounded analysis on the discourse of Hawaiian education. This is the first study that utilizes Conversation Analysis (CA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) to explore what Hawaiian educators think and feel about Hawaiian education in Hawaiian language; like the hybridity nature of this study, Hapa Hawaiʻi is a major contribution to the field of research as a viable and vibrant methodology.

Hapa Hawaiʻi (HH) is a dynamic integration of Native Hawaiian and mainstream qualitative research traditions. HH is a flexible mindset and methodology, reflecting the active role that
indigenous researchers are creating, conducting, and critically analyzing studies that benefit indigenous and other communities. HH substantially adds to the growing research traditions, and it audaciously shows that a researcher can be an academic scholar and cultural practitioner at the same time. One’s cultural and scholarly resources are synergistic assets to be embraced and cultivated.

Also this study contributes to the improvement of education for Hawaiians as well as all children. The results of my research indicate that schooling is meaningful when one’s own cultural beliefs and surroundings are utilized. Also, we can learn a lot from the kūpuna on how to be good land stewards, nurturing people, and contributing community members. Ancestral knowledge will outlive the federal mandates of No Child Left Behind, Common Core Standards, Hawaii Content Standards, and Hawaii Standards Assessments.

In addition, this study can make contributions in second language, language revival and bilingual educational studies. Ten of the twelve participants speak Hawaiian as a second language, whereas two of the twelve participants are native speakers. This study expands second language studies, which usually focus on native and second language speakers. Some participants in this study speak Hawaiian as a second language. Also, as more children are schooled in Hawaiian language as the medium of education, many of these Hawaiian language speakers are becoming educators, parents, scholars, and administrators in many different fields, utilizing Hawaiian language. The use of Hawaiian language is expanding in many different forms of media, to meet the demands of a growing Hawaiian language population. For example, more Hawaiian students and schools expect their teachers to be proficient in Hawaiian language, which means we educators need go beyond expectations to excel in the field of Hawaiian education and research. I challenge Hawaiian scholars and scholars of Hawaiian culture to take
on the kuleana, responsibility, to raise the standards and challenge us to seek knowledge from written and oral literatures.

Just as the demands for Hawaiian language speakers increase, so does the potential for future studies. Hawaiian language is dynamic like people; our surroundings and other people influence our interactions. For example, NeSmith’s 2005 work contrasts the speech of second language learners and native speakers of Hawaiian language. He argues that second language speakers create what may be considered a new dialect of Hawaiian. I highly recommend further research in this topic from a conversation analysis (CA) perspective to provide detailed empirical material from a larger sample than NeSmith’s study. Also, the research should be from a Native Hawaiian. I concur with NeSmith that the state of the Hawaiian language is “a matter for Hawaiians to define and debate” (p. 147). Nonetheless, there is room available for many others to join us and to contribute to the growing field of Hawaiian language.

Furthermore, I strongly recommend the following: study conversation interactions in Hawaiian language and Hawai‘i Creole; use the Jeffersonian transcription to transcribe interviews and recordings of Native speakers; and transcribe Hawaiian language materials, especially the newspapers that are over one hundred years old. It is interesting to note the relationship between Hawaiian language and Hawai‘i Creole, what is commonly referred to as Pidgin. In the 1991 DVD He Makana No Na Kumu Kula: A gift for teachers of Hawaiian students (Kahanu), Dr. Puakea Nogelmeier, a noted scholar in the field of Hawaiian language, is seen teaching a group of Wai‘anae High School students chanting. Nogelmeier (P) makes a connection between Hawaiian language and Pidgin in terms of the inflection of the voice when asking a question:

Excerpt from He Makana No Na Kumu Kula: A gift for teachers of Hawaiian students

1 P: Is Pidgin another lanuage
Did you know that Pidgin is actually drawn from Hawaiian. In Hawaiian when you ask a question (.) you use the same inflection as you use in Pidgin.

Nou kēi haʻale. That’s a hou that’s a question

Saying oh dis your house

((Nogelmeier nods his head, as though checking for understanding with the students))

The inflection that Nogelmeier refers to is seen throughout the interview transcripts of both Hawaiian language and Pidgin. An interesting issue to explore is the influence of Pidgin on Hawaiian language, which is a dynamic like its people. There are some instances in the transcripts illustrating this very issue among the participants. In addition to Pidgin, other mainstream discourse markers, such as like and you know, are used by the speakers. There are even excerpts displaying the participants lamenting the influence of the aforementioned discourse particles, including the ‘Valley Girl’ like which “remains widespread and very robust” (Seigel, 2002, p. 57) not only among young girls from San Fernando Valley, California between the ages of 15 – 22. Like it or not, Valley Girl talk is here, as seen in the transcripts of the interviews.

Also, Pukui, Haertig, and Lee (1972) have something to add to the to the Pidgin/Hawaiian inflection discussion, such as “Pidgin never was, and today is not, a truly Hawaiian cultural tradition. It is an identifying mark of long-established Island residence” (p. 62). So what is Pidgin? “Pidgin is a hybrid language reflecting a social-economic status,” (ibid, p. 304). This study has some implications to the field of Hawai‘i Creole, Pidgin, which is worth exploring since Pidgin is still used today among local residents and Hawaiian language speakers. Lum (2008) provides a convincing work on local culture on local local identity, particularly the
“persistence of Pidgin (Hawai‘i Creole) as its language.” (p. 6). Also, Sumida (1991) insightfully points out the controversial limitation of the use of Pidgin, which was one’s playground language, neither of the white-collar office nor of the schoolroom, where pidgin suffers and survives cycles of banishment and simply refuses to become “assimilated” into standard English. For the immigrants’ pidgin continues in a living creole language alongside “standard” languages of this part of America (p. 104).

Also, several of the interviewees referred to what other people have said in the form of reported speech, which establishes one’s credibility from a Hawaiian perspective. Holt’s 2002 study uses conversation analysis to investigate the use of reported speech in talk-in-interaction relates to what many of the participants in this study do to validate the story, as seen in Excerpts 8, 17, and 28.

For example, the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Hawaiian language professors, such as Dr. Puakea Nogelmeier, Naomi Losch, and others have organized a movement, calling upon Hawaiian civic clubs, halaus, canoe clubs, and thousands of interested volunteers to assist with the ‘Ike Ku‘oko‘a initiative to get Native Hawaiian language newspapers online and accessible to the public. The mission is to reconnect and bridge knowledge from Hawaiian historical resources of over one hundred Hawaiian language newspapers from 1834 – 1948. In the nineteenth century, “Hawaiians quickly numbered among the most literate peoples in the world and filled the pages of many local newspapers with poetry, chants, and historical narratives in addition to news and opinions” (Sumida, 1991, p. xi). This is an amazing endeavor for Native Hawaiians, scholars, and interested people to honor our ancestors, enlighten the present generation, and inspire our posterity. My research would make an excellent contribution to the efforts of connecting us to the wisdom of who we were, who we are, and who we will become
through the examining and disseminating of Hawaiian knowledge found in oral and written literatures.

*Reflections as a Researcher*

Like Hawaiian education, my research is placed in the context of family and culture. There were several instances when I had to bring my children along when I conducted the interviews, which was challenging for me to multi-task as a mother and a researcher. During these occasions I directly addressed the needs of my children, such as changing soiled diapers, consoling my crying fussy baby, and hushing my obnoxious seven year old. Even the other participants in the interviews offered to assist, indicating that family and relationships take precedence over research. In addition, I realized over time that my daughters are participants in the interviews, since they influenced the dynamics and interactions in talk. Some of my children’s involvement in the interviews is contained in the audio recordings, which reveal their loud screams, protests, and disturbances when mommy was talking to other adults. The recordings and transcripts of their presence loudly remind me of the purpose of my research, which is for the betterment of the Hawaiian nation. My children, along with many others, are the future.

This study blossomed organically; while working full time as a teacher for Farrington High School, I am also raising two energetic young girls. Time is a precious and coveted commodity, especially for a working mother and researcher, juggling a growing family, fulltime employment, rigorous research, and precious sanity. I am grateful to all the helping angels, such as my understanding colleagues, cooperative advisor, and supportive family members.

Therefore, to do what I needed to do as a mother and researcher, I kept my audio recorder in my car, because I used what little precious time I had to transcribe the interviews sometimes
while I waited for my oldest daughter at her music class on Saturdays, while I waited for the laundry to wash and dry at the laundry mat, and sometimes while my baby slept. I was ready to “throw down” an interview with my audio recorder, and sometimes luckily I even had the foresight to pack blank consent forms in the car. Sometimes I was not so fortunate. For the times I did not have the forms, it was a headache to track the people down to complete the form. So I learned to drive with the audio recorder and blank consent forms in the car, along with the diaper bag. Also, I analyzed the data, while I sat in the back of faculty meetings, which did not require my active participation. I worked arduously and quietly, missing out on information regarding the confusing restructuring status of Farrington High School. When I felt inspired, I wrote and revised this dissertation while Kahu Richard Kamanu preached from the pulpit of Kaumakapili Church in Kalihi. I like to think that the angels and my aumakua were helping me along the way of this spiritual, academic, and long journey. Ultimately, I have no regrets for completing this study and beginning the next chapter in my life. It is what is it.

So what is it? My quandary is how do I systematically and coherently present the results of the dissertation without losing my voice and credibility? Is it a membership categorization analysis (MCA) study or a Native Hawaiian (NH) study? It is a hybrid, a unique study that blends MCA and NH perspectives. I purposefully selected MCA to examine the discourse of Native Hawaiian educators, because it felt right in my naʻau (gut). Also, MCA is internationally recognized as a significant and growing field. I aspire to take my research outside of Hawaiʻi as a scholar. In addition, MCA is a useful tool to make what is taken for granted explicit. For example, being from the same cultural background as the other participants in this study, NH, it was easy for me to take for granted some common cultural understandings and nuances. MCA assisted me with examining and presenting the NH discourse in detail for those who may or may
not be NH. Thus, I was able to keep my voice as a NH and academic scholar. This journey has truly humbled and emboldened me.

Conclusion

What is modern is ancient. The kūpuna left a wealth of traditions and knowledge for the past, present and future generations to live meaningfully and connectively. It is our kuleana to return to the piko, seek wisdom, create new knowledge, honor tradition, and embrace our role as kūpuna. We are the past, present, and future. I truly hope that I have brought honor and respect to my kūpuna, the participants who assisted me with my study, and the forthcoming leaders who will ‘auamo i ke kuleana, take on the responsibility, of educating the nation in a pluralistic society. Amama. Ua noa.
Appendix A: Dissertation Participants and Places of Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants Interviewed for Dissertation</th>
<th>Places of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hauoli Akaka</td>
<td>Kaumakapili Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalihì, Oʻahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alohalani Ho</td>
<td>Pūnana Leo o Honolulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalihì, Oʻahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku Kahakalau and Theresa Makuakane-Dreschel</td>
<td>Windward Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāne‘ohe, Oʻahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuti Kanahele</td>
<td>Ke Kula ʻo Samuel Kamakau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāne‘ohe, Oʻahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawika Makanani</td>
<td>The Kamehameha Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kapālama, Oʻahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leinaʻala Medeiros</td>
<td>Pūnana Leo ʻo Kamakau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāne‘ohe, Oʻahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolena Nicholas</td>
<td>University of Hawaiʻi-Mānoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Oʻahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwick Pang</td>
<td>Kenny’s Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalihì, Oʻahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Iwalani Piʻena and Kumulaʻau Sing</td>
<td>The Kamehameha Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kapālama, Oʻahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lani Waiau</td>
<td>Ke Kula ʻo Samuel Kamakau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāne‘ohe, Oʻahu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Consent Form for Participation

Consent to Participate in Research Project
E Hoʻi I Ka Piko: Native Hawaiian Educators’ Perceptions on Hawaiian Education

Aloha mai kāua,

Would you kindly kōkua me in a research project looking at Hawaiian education? I will conduct this project in order to earn my PhD in the College of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Hawaiʻi-Mānoa. The title of my research project is E Hoʻi I Ka Piko: Native Hawaiian Educators’ Manaʻo on Hawaiian Education.

Project Description - Activities and Time Commitment: I am asking you to participate in a fifteen to thirty minute interview session, which will be audio recorded with your permission. On the bottom of this form there is a section asking if you agree or refuse to be recorded. Please feel free to check the appropriate box. I will ask you to discuss your manaʻo on Hawaiian education. I am recording the interview, so I can later type a transcript—a written record of what we talked about during the interview—and analyze the information from the interview. After transcribing the interviews, I will share the transcripts with you for your review to check for accuracy or to clarify any statements made. If you participate, you will be one of a total of ten Native Hawaiian educators who I will interview individually. You may be asked to participate in a focus group consisting of three Native Hawaiian educators: me (the researcher), you, and a friend or colleague. One example of the type of question I will ask is, “What is your manaʻo on Hawaiian education?”

Identity Revealed or Withheld: In addition to asking your kokua for this project, I would also like to ask for your permission to reveal your name in the study. If you give permission for me to reveal your name in this study, please place a check next to yes. In order for this study to have credibility in the Hawaiian community, it is highly recommended that the identities of the participants in the study be revealed. Hence the ‘ōlelo noʻeau, “E nānā i ke kumu,” which means “Look to the source.” If you are uncomfortable with having your identity revealed in the study, but would like to still kōkua me, write a check next to no below. Instead we can create a pseudonym name to conceal your identity.

I will store the digital audio recording of our interviews on an external hard drive in a locked drawer. The recordings may be used for future research purposes.

Voluntary Participation: Participation in this research project is voluntary. You can choose freely to participate or not to participate. In addition, at any point during this project, you can withdraw your permission without any penalty of loss of benefits.

Benefits and Risks: I believe there are no direct benefits to you in participating in my research project. However, the results of this project might help me and other researchers learn more about Native Hawaiian educators’ perceptions on Hawaiian education. I believe there is little or no risk to you in participating in this project. If, however, you are uncomfortable or stressed by
answering any of the interview questions, we will skip the question, or take a break, or stop the interview, or withdraw from the project altogether.

**Questions:** If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact me either by e-mail or telephone. The second copy of the form is yours to keep.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, in this project, you can contact the University of Hawai‘i, Committee on Human Studies (CHS), by phone at (808) 956-5007 or by e-mail at uhirb@hawaii.edu.

Mahalo again for your kokua in this project.

‘Oia ‘i‘o,

Kuuleilani Reyes, Researcher
(808) 232-5413
kuuleila@hawaii.edu

Please keep the prior portion of this consent form for your records.

If you agree to participate in this project, please sign the following signature portion of this consent form.

**Signature(s) for Consent:**

I agree to participate in the research project entitled, *E Ho‘i I Ka Piko: Native Hawaiian Educators’ Perceptions on Hawaiian Education*. I understand that I can change my mind about participating in this project, at any time, by notifying the researcher.

Yes _____ I give permission to be recorded for this research project described above.

No _____ I do not give permission to be recorded for this research project described above.

also

Yes _____ I give permission to reveal my name in the research project described above.

No _____ I do not give permission to reveal my name in the research project described above. Please use the following pseudonym to conceal my identity: ____________________
Your Name (Print):  _____________________________________________

Your Signature:  _____________________________________________

Date:  _________________________________
Appendix C: Transcription Conventions

→ Relevant to the point being made in the text
↑ Rising intonation
↓ Falling intonation
! Animated pronunciation
wor- Abrupt cut-off or self-interruption of the sound in progress
: Lengthening of the sound just preceding the colon
word Stress or emphasis
WORD Especially loud sound
°word° Quieter than the surrounding talk
<word> Slower than the rest of the speech
>word< Faster than the rest of the speech
[ Starting point of overlapping talk
] Ending point of overlapping talk
( ) Talk to obscure to transcribe
(word?) Transcriber’s best estimate of what is being said
(1.2) Length of significant pause in seconds
( . ) Micropause
(( )) Nonverbal behaviors
h Audible outbreath
.h Audible inbreath
Ps Pause
## Appendix D: Interview Excerpt List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ku Kahakalau</td>
<td>Hawaiian Identity &amp; Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theresa Makuakane-Dreschel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ku Kahakalau</td>
<td>Hawaiian Identity &amp; Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theresa Makuakane-Dreschel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>‘Iwalani Pi‘ena Kumula‘au Sing</td>
<td>Hawaiian Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chadwick Pang</td>
<td>Hawaiian Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hau’oli Akaka</td>
<td>Hawaiian Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chadwick Pang</td>
<td>Goal of Hawaiian Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chadwick Pang</td>
<td>Hawaiian Sensibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kawika Makanani</td>
<td>Hawaiian Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lani Waiau</td>
<td>Na‘au Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lani Waiau</td>
<td>Kākou &amp; Hawaiian Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Leina‘ala Medeiros</td>
<td>Piko &amp; Ancestral Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alohalani Ho</td>
<td>Hawaiian Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tuti Kanahele</td>
<td>Hawaiian Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tuti Kanahele</td>
<td>Mo‘okū‘auhau &amp; Ancestral Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>‘Iwalani Pi‘ena Kumula‘au Sing</td>
<td>Kūpuna Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>‘Iwalani Pi‘ena Kumula‘au Sing</td>
<td>Kūpuna Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>‘Iwalani Pi‘ena Kumula‘au Sing</td>
<td>Kūpuna Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chadwick Pang</td>
<td>Grandfather as Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Leina‘ala Medeiros</td>
<td>Kūpuna Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Leina‘ala Medeiros</td>
<td>Kūpuna Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lolena Nicholas</td>
<td>Kūpuna Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lolena Nicholas</td>
<td>Kūpuna Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tuti Kanahele</td>
<td>Kūpuna as God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kawika Makanani</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher &amp; Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Hau‘oli Akaka</td>
<td>Teacher &amp; Hawaiian Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Leina‘ala Medeiros</td>
<td>Hawaiian Practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alohalani Ho</td>
<td>Mother, Student &amp; Kumu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kawika Makanani</td>
<td>Kamehameha Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Kawika Makanani</td>
<td>Role of KS in Hawaiian Charter Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lani Waiau</td>
<td>Hawaiian Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Lani Waiau</td>
<td>Hawaiian Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lani Waiau</td>
<td>Non-Hawaiian Language Speaker Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Hau‘oli Akaka</td>
<td>Kākou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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