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Abstract

This case study examines perceptions of Native Hawaiian youth, staff, and parents of the youth who were taking part in a three-week intensive substance abuse treatment program for youth. The setting is Kahua Ola Hou, a group home located in Ho‘olehua, Moloka‘i, HI. Interviews with the participants (children, staff, and parents) and observations of the activity settings were conducted to find the meaning of the activity settings that were initiated, maintained, and dissolved throughout the day. The activity settings of the program were later analyzed using open coding procedures to provide a picture of the ways in which Hawaiian culture was used to help treat the children in the program. From these data seven themes emerged (‘ohana, forgiveness, being Hawaiian, malama, being pono, Ho‘oponopono, and healing). The ways in which the participants at Kahua Ola Hou defined substance abuse, transmitted Hawaiian cultural values, utilized aspects of Hawaiian culture as treatment, and conceptualized the relationship between activity settings and the transmission of culture are discussed. One finding was that Kahua Ola Hou used a traditional Hawaiian psychological practice, ho‘oponopono, as a treatment method. Data on the meaning and use of ho‘oponopono showed that analyzing cultural activity settings can contribute to our understanding of the activities, why they are happening, the history of the practice, and how the practice occurs. Potential implications are that the more knowledge psychology gains from discovering how people from differing cultures conceptualize the idea of psychology, the more culturally sensitive decisions will be with regards to people from cultures that aren’t familiar. Implications for future research are presented.
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Culture and Activity: A Case Study of Kahua Ola Hou, Moloka‘i, HI

The rise in placement of children in out-of-home-care facilities presents several potential problems (Chakrabarti & Hill, 2000; McDonald, Allen, Westerfelt, Piliavin, 1996). Children are placed in homes outside of their own by social workers, probation officers, a judge in a family court, or parents/guardians. Sometimes, children are pulled out of their homes because the homes have been determined to be an unsafe environment by child protective services (CPS). In other cases, a child is placed in a home because their individual negative behavior has garnished the attention of a teacher or other authority that notified CPS, a probation officer (if they have one), or the parents/guardians themselves. One form of detrimental behavior that children who are placed in homes display is the abuse of drugs, alcohol, or other narcotic substances. It is with these children that this study is concerned.

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th Edition, Text Revision (DSM-IV-TR) (American Psychiatric Association, 2000) provides criteria to help clinicians properly diagnose an individual with substance-induced disorder, substance-related disorder, or substance use disorder. A substance-induced disorder is a disorder or disorders such as persistent anxiety, delirium, hallucinations, or withdrawal that are experienced as a result of long term substance use. A substance-related disorder is a disorder that an individual is experiencing as a direct result of being intoxicated by the substance that they are using. A substance use disorder is defined as being a maladaptive pattern of substance use leading to clinically significant impairment or distress (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Children living in group homes
designed to treat substance problems are most commonly diagnosed with substance use disorder (Dowden & Latimer, 2006).

Substance use disorder is divided into two categories, dependence and abuse (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Dependence is determined if, within a 12-month period, three or more of the following seven criteria are met: 1) tolerance to substance has increased, 2) withdrawal from substance when stops using, 3) substance is taken in increasingly larger amounts, 4) there is a persistent desire to cut down substance use, 5) excess time spent obtaining, using, or recovering from the substance, 6) failure to fulfill major role obligations in school, work, or home, and 7) substance use continues despite knowledge of deleterious physical and psychological effects (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). If within a 12-month period the individual has never met three or more of the above criteria for substance dependence, then it is possible to diagnose them with having a problem with abuse. Abuse is determined if, within a 12-month period, one or more of the following four criteria are met: 1) failure to fulfill major role obligations in school, work, or home, 2) recurrent use in places where it is physically hazardous, 3) recurrent substance related legal problems, and 4) continued use despite having persistent or recurring social and interpersonal problems (American Psychiatric Association, 2000).

One striking omission from the DSM-IV-TR (American Psychiatric Association, 2000) is the absence of separate criteria for substance dependence and substance abuse for children than for adults. Also, the criteria for diagnosis of a substance use disorder do not seem to consider social learning or cultural and environmental factors (Alarcón, Bell, Kirmayer, Lin, Üstün, & Wisner, 2002). Due to this, factors such as family response,
religious or spiritual significance, social acceptability, and patterns of use throughout the life cycle are not considered with the diagnosis (Alarcón, et. al., 2002). In effect, the diagnosis of substance use disorder is given without consideration of the some of the main aspects of an individual’s context.

Even though important aspects of the context of an individual’s life are left out of the diagnosis, a change in context is one of the most commonly prescribed treatments for substance use disorder. Some contextual changes could be as simple as removing paraphernalia, ashtrays, lighters, posters, artwork, or other physical reminders of substance use. In other cases, a contextual change could be dissolving relationships with people that use substances and forming new relationships with non-users that could provide support. In more extreme cases, the prescribed contextual change might be complete removal from their natal context. In these cases the individual would be placed in a different context altogether.

The purpose of this case study is to learn the meanings, values, and goals of the context of the group home Kahua Ola Hou, Moloka‘i, HI, for the children, staff, and parent(s)/guardian(s) that live in, work at, or have a child at Kahua Ola Hou. This case study documents the contextual variables associated with the group home environment of Kahua Ola Hou and explores the perceptions of the staff members, children, and parents/guardians of the group home to discover which contextual variables they perceive to be salient in their experiences in the group home environment.

This review begins by defining a group home and the type of clients that Kahua Ola Hou serves. Then a description of the role of case studies in research is provided. This description of the role of case studies leads into the theoretical basis of why the
group home should be looked at from an activity settings perspective. Next, a definition of culture and the role it plays in the transmission of meanings, values, goals, and behaviors is presented. Finally, the methodology employed during this case study is described.

**Group Homes**

Kahua Ola Hou is a group home for youth who abuse substances. Group homes provide treatment and adequate supervision to at-risk children. At-risk children are children who have been identified by a school, social worker, or probation officer as having problems functioning in their natal environment due to behavioral and/or emotional issues (Chakrabarti & Hill, 2000; McDonald, Allen, Westerfelt, & Piliavin, 1996). At-risk children who have been placed in a group home are usually there due to severe emotional disturbances, conduct disorder, substance abuse, and/or other Axis I diagnoses as described in the DSM-IV-TR (Chakrabarti & Hill, 2000; American Psychiatric Association, 2000; McDonald, et. al., 1996). There are also group homes for children with developmental disabilities, but for the purposes of this case study only group homes for children with substance abuse are discussed.

A typical group home has groups of children (usually around six) living under the care of paid staff members that work different shifts so that the home has an adult present for 24 hours a day. Constant supervision is provided for the safety and well-being of the children and others by these staff members (Chakrabarti & Hill, 2000; McDonald, et. al., 1996). Depending on the level of care that the children in the group home require, there are differing staff-to-child ratios (Chakrabarti & Hill, 2000; McDonald, et. al., 1996). This staffing depends on the number of people available to fulfill the roles in the home.
One of the possible implications of a low staffing level in a group home is that additional staff members need to be hired. Another potential effect that different staffing levels could have on the group home is on the diffusion of responsibility. With higher staffing levels, staff members may be more prone to assume that other staff members are taking care of certain duties that need to be completed for the group home to meet its goals. Conversely, lower staffing levels could result in an increase in a sense that they are responsible for an outcome and are accountable for their behavior (O'Donnell & Tharp, 1990).

In addition, group homes are more likely to have a professional psychologist or psychiatrist on staff that meet with the children on a weekly basis and continually assess their progress. This professional could prescribe medications to the children, counsel them, or prescribe activities for them. Professionals usually has considerable influence over the group home environment because they can adjust the structure of the contextual factors of the group home to change the program and suit the children's needs (Chakrabarti & Hill, 2000; McDonald, et. al., 1996).

A group home for children with substance use disorders is designed to provide an alternative context to the one in which they are using substances. The alternative context removes the individual from the physical reminders, the negative social circles, and allows the individual to see the effects of their own behavior. This alternative context usually functions as a source of new meanings, values, and goals for the children under their care. The philosophy is if old meanings, values, and goals related to a maladaptive pattern of substance use are removed, a new set of meanings, values, and goals related to an adaptive lifestyle change can replace them (De Leon, 1997; Jainchill, 1997).
Jainchill (1997) reviews some of the salient characteristics of group homes that treat adolescents with problems of substance abuse. This review describes an out-of-home placement that treats children with substance abuse, i.e., a therapeutic community. A therapeutic community is guided by the perspective that substance abuse is a disorder of the whole person (De Leon, 1997). This perspective is guided by four interrelated views: 1) the disorder in the context of the individual and their lifestyle, 2) the person's individual unique characteristics, 3) the recovery of a global change in the individual's lifestyle and identity, and 4) certain values, morals, and beliefs, such as honesty, trustworthiness, and work ethic are essential to recovery (De Leon, 1997).

Kahua Ola Hou fits these four requirements of a therapeutic community with some noticeable differences. Most therapeutic communities have a 6-12 month average duration of stay for their clients; Kahua Ola Hou's clients only stay three weeks. Also, most therapeutic communities have a mixture of degree and non-degree professionals. At Kahua Ola Hou most of the staff are non-degree, yet highly experienced with Native Hawaiian culture. It is important to note the similarity of Kahua Ola Hou with therapeutic communities: both treat substance abuse as a disorder of the whole person (De Leon, 1997; Jainchill, 1997; Lee, 1998; W. Lee, personal communication, October 17, 2005).

The structure of a therapeutic community usually consists of two clients per bedroom and common areas such as a kitchen, dining room, living room, recreation room, and outside areas. In most cases, the children are responsible for the appearance of their own rooms and share responsibility for common areas. The role of community is paramount to the recovery of the children within these homes. The dynamic of the treatment community as a family is of much importance because in many cases the youth
come from dysfunctional homes. Often the relationship between the staff and the child mimics a parent-child relationship, and the relationship the child has with their peers mimics that of siblings (Jainchill, 1997).

A typical day in a therapeutic community is highly structured from wake-up to bedtime. After wake-up there is time to prepare for breakfast, eat, clean up, begin the days activities, prepare, eat, and clean up lunch, participate in more structured activities, participate in daily group meetings, prepare for, eat, and clean up dinner, shower, participate in the evening activity, then go to bed. The activities that are planned throughout the day are all designed to treat different psychological issues within the child to help them overcome substance abuse (Jainchill, 1997). Despite the noticeable difference in the length of stay, Kahua Ola Hou fits the criteria of a therapeutic community quite well.

In a recent review of effective treatment strategies for substance abuse in youth, Dowden and Latimer (2006) cite a complete lack of research articles dedicated to empirically investigating group homes for substance abuse treatment for children. Furthermore, they found very little qualitative research where the perspectives of the youth were taken into account along with those of the staff. There was, however, plenty of research on group homes that happened to have children who abused substances. There was also research on effective treatment strategies for adults with substance abuse in group homes. Based on this evidence, their review showed that targeting multiple areas of need, including familial relationships, structural familial variables, academic and vocational performance, life skills, and antisocial peer group involvement led to successful outcomes with youth. They also found that programs that were delivered in a
community that was similar to their home community and that had low staff turnover decreased the recidivism of the youth (Dowden & Latimer, 2006).

Kahua Ola Hou is a substance abuse treatment program that attempts to instill Native Hawaiian cultural values in the youth under their care (Lee, 1998; W. Lee, personal communication, October 17, 2005). The premise of Kahua Ola Hou is that there is a gap between the knowledge of Hawaiian cultural values of the past and the modern Hawaiian cultural values that needs to be bridged. The philosophy is that once this gap between cultural values is bridged, the children will be more capable of refusing the temptation of substance abuse in the future because they will be more in tune with themselves and aspects of their own culture (Lee, 1998; W. Lee, personal communication, October 17, 2005). This approach to treating substance abuse in children is sufficiently unique to warrant the study of Kahua Ola Hou as an individual case.

Case Study

A case study is both the process of inquiry about the case and the report of the case itself (Stake, 2000). The purpose of a case study is to discover what can be learned from the particular case, not to generalize to other cases or phenomenon. This is because a case study is designed to find out as much as possible about the particular case of inquiry. It is most commonly used when the case in and of itself is of interest (Stake, 2000).

For the purposes of this study, Kahua Ola Hou is the case of interest. The environment (or context) of Kahua Ola Hou is evaluated to find out about the relationship it has with the individuals involved with it. The relationship between Kahua Ola Hou's environment and the individuals working and living there is important because research
in psychology has shown that the environment wherein an individual exists affects the values and behaviors of the individual (Bennett, Anderson, Cooper, Hassol, Klein, & Rosenblum, 1965; Vygotsky, 1978). Therefore, the data collected and interpreted is specific to this case (Stake, 2000).

A problem herein arises. How can data regarding the case be collected in a manner subjective enough to provide the meaning of the context for the participants, yet objective enough that researcher bias and error do not unnecessarily taint the results? One way is to employ theory regarding the link between context and individual behavior. Recent advances in the field of community psychology lend themselves nicely to this end. The central tenet of community psychology is to understand human behavior from a contextual perspective (Bennett, et. al., 1965; Sarason, 1981). Activity setting theory has been used in a variety of community and education settings (O'Donnell & Yamauchi (2005). O’Donnell, Tharp, and Wilson (1993) posit that activity settings theory provides a way to examine an individual’s behavior contextually, while accounting for the subjective and objective aspects of human behavior (O’Donnell & Tharp, 1990; O’Donnell, et. al., 1993).

*Activity Settings*

The basic unit wherein the subjective and objective characteristics of an event occur is the activity setting. The activity setting is the context that provides purpose, resources, and constraints on the participants of the setting (O’Donnell, et. al., 1993). Common communication styles, cognitions, and meanings are all derived from the interaction that takes place during the activity setting. In this way, activity settings can be viewed as the basic building blocks of culture and community (O’Donnell & Tharp,
Because it is important to understand how this all works together, a description of the objective and subjective characteristics of an activity setting follows.

There are six objective characteristics of the activity setting: 1) a physical environment where the activity takes place (the house or facility the group home is located at), 2) a time that the behavior or activity begins and ceases (3:00pm to 4:00pm), 3) funds on which the activity depends (funds are used to obtain physical resources such as food, furniture, funds to pay for staff roles, etc.), 4) positions that the people have with behaviors expected of each (roles such as direct care staff members, supervising staff members, children), 5) people that participate in the activity (staff, parents, and children), and 6) symbols that are associated with the activity (language or other symbols used to share the meaning of interactions) (see Figure 1) (O'Donnell & Tharp, 1990; O'Donnell, et. al., 1993). These characteristics interact to create and maintain the activity setting. Objectively, these characteristics can be seen, documented, and described to others.

The primary subjective characteristic of activity settings is intersubjectivity. Interaction between people is at the heart of activity. Intersubjectivity develops during this interaction. Two processes facilitate interaction and the development of intersubjectivity: joint productive activity and reciprocal participation. Joint-productive activity is the activity that occurs when people work together in a setting toward a common goal (O'Donnell & Tharp, 1990: O'Donnell, et. al., 1993). A way to increase the level of participation of each of the individuals involved in the activity setting is through reciprocal participation. Reciprocal participation occurs when each of the activity setting participants mutually assists and receives assistance from each other.
during the activity (O’Donnell & Tharp, 1990; O’Donnell, et. al., 1993). The reciprocal nature of the activity results in an increased level of participation and interdependence among the participants. This increased levels of participation and interdependence can result in the most important subjective characteristic of activity settings, intersubjectivity.

The level of *intersubjectivity* is the extent to which the participants of an activity setting display similarity in the ways that they think about, experience, and describe the world (O’Donnell & Tharp, 1990; O’Donnell, et. al., 1993). As intersubjectivity increases goals become more similar, more cooperation occurs, and there is greater harmony among the group. Over time the level of intersubjectivity can denote the level of success and meaning of a particular activity for its participants. Intersubjectivity is required for the six objective characteristics to work in unison towards the common goal of the activity setting.

Kahua Ola Hou has each of these six objective characteristics within each of its activity settings that can be observed and documented. Also, each activity setting has an observable and often obvious joint-productive activity that it is working towards. Finally, the level of intersubjectivity between the participants of the activity setting can be observed and recorded as well. Once this is done the descriptions of the activity settings of the group home Kahua Ola Hou can be used to evaluate the nature and meaning of the context of the environment in which the children live.

One aspect of the context of Kahua Ola Hou that is looked at specifically is the use of and transmission of cultural values through the activity settings. Specifically, how are Hawaiian Cultural values used to affect the individuals receiving treatment at Kahua
Ola Hou? To begin, a look at the definition of culture from a psychological standpoint follows.

Culture

Culture has been defined and redefined for individuals throughout time and across contexts. Recent theorists in community psychology (Marsella & Yamada, 2000), anthropology, and developmental psychology (Weisner, 1996) have provided similar definitions of culture that account for the differences and interactions that occur at the individual level, the contextual level, and across time. Of these, Marsella and Yamada (2000) most accurately represent the idea of culture without ignoring this important interplay between the individual, context, and time:

“[Culture is the] shared learned meanings and behaviors that are transmitted from within a social activity context for purposes of promoting individual/societal adjustment, growth, and development. Culture has both external (i.e. artifacts, roles, activity contexts, institutions) and internal (i.e. values, beliefs, attitudes, activity contexts, patterns of consciousness, personality styles, epistemology) representations. The shared meanings and behaviors are subject to continuous change and modification in response to changing internal and external circumstances,” (Marsella & Yamada, 2000, p.10).

This definition deserves some teasing apart. The first sentence states that culture is shared learned meanings and behaviors. It is important to note here that the meanings and behaviors of the culture must be shared in order for it to be considered a “culture”. This is important because it makes one of the key elements of activity settings,
intersubjectivity, a key element of culture. As discussed earlier, intersubjectivity is present in an activity setting when there is shared meaning and behaviors between participants. It also states that these shared learned meanings and behaviors are taught to individuals in the context of activity over time. As noted earlier, activity settings are the settings in which interaction between individuals occurs. It follows that it is in activity settings that individuals can interact and transmit aspects of their own culture.

The next sentence states that within these activity settings, culture is represented both externally and internally. If culture is indeed transmitted within these activity settings, then the transmission should occur both externally and internally. Objective characteristics of the activity setting, such as physical resources and roles that people have, would make up the external aspects of culture. Subjective aspects of the activity setting, such as intersubjectivity, would make up the internal aspects of culture.

Finally, Marsella and Yamada (2000) add in a caveat stating that cultures change over time due to changes that occur with regard to external and internal situations. This idea could be tested using activity settings theory as well. The external variables of an activity setting could affect or change a culture. Some examples might be how the amount of food (physical resource) in a geographical area could become scarce and create a culture that operates in a more communal fashion. Another example is how an island town could be destroyed by a tsunami (physical environment) resulting in the creation of a new culture made up of the scattered survivors of the old cultures. Besides external changes, internal changes can affect a culture. Some examples could be how the civil rights movement resulted in an internal change in beliefs about the value of another person based on their perceived racial differences, or how the September 11th, 2001
attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon resulted in a new joint productive activity for the government and military of the United States to fight against terrorism.

Hawaiian culture, though similar to a time long ago, remains forever changed due to external and internal circumstances. External factors such as colonization, disease, alcohol, drugs, and tourism coupled with internal factors such as loss, depression, anger, sadness, and despair have all contributed to the altering of Hawaiian culture. Still, basic values such as *aloha* (love) and ‘*ohana* (family) have persevered.

One of the most important aspects of Hawaiian culture is the family, or ‘*ohana*. The ‘*ohana*, is the basic unit of Hawaiian society. Unlike many western cultures, Hawaiian culture does not place as much emphasis on individuality. In Hawaiian culture the ‘*ohana* is the central unit, with all members of the ‘*ohana* contributing to it. Indeed, in many Hawaiian homes, it is not uncommon to have the grandparents, parents, children, aunties, uncles, and cousins living under the same roof. Furthermore, an ‘*ohana* can hanai (the Hawaiian word for adopt) outside individuals who develop a close relationship to the ‘*ohana*.

The emphasis on ‘*ohana* as the central unit creates some difficulty for modern Hawaiians since modern Hawaiians are situated in the more individualistic United States. Concerns over whether Hawaiians can be individualistic enough to thrive in this society are at odds with concerns over whether Hawaiians can maintain their obligations to their ‘*ohana*. Besides preserving other important aspects of Hawaiian culture (such as hula, music, art, fishing, canoe paddling, etc.), the preservation of the ‘*ohana* is a main concern.
Regardless of the changes that have occurred within Hawaiian culture over time, ethnographic theorists such as Weisner (1996) suggest that culture is the main influence on a child’s development. If culture is such a salient and influential factor influencing individuals, and activity settings are the vehicles in which cultural values and behaviors are transmitted, then exploring the relationship between culture and activity settings should help to determine some of the effects that culture has on the individual. Knowledge such as this illuminates the nature of the interaction between Hawaiian culture and substance abuse treatment at Kahua Ola Hou.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this case study is to describe the context of Kahua Ola Hou using the activity settings as the unit of analysis to discover the meaning, values, and goals behind the activity settings for the individuals working at and living at Kahua Ola Hou. It could also serve the purpose of advancing theory with regard to the relationship between culture and activity settings. This type of knowledge could have potential implications for service provision at Kahua Ola Hou. It could also have potential implications for service provision amongst group home practitioners and administrators, who experience the interplay of culture and activity in the home. Some research questions have been formed to address these purposes.

How are internal and external representations of Hawaiian culture transmitted within the activity settings of Kahua Ola Hou? What are the criteria for normal substance use and abnormal substance use at Kahua Ola Hou? How do internal and external representations of Hawaiian culture affect the etiology of substance abuse disorder at Kahua Ola Hou? How do internal and external representations of Hawaiian culture affect
the treatment milieu for substance abuse at Kahua Ola Hou? What is the role of internal and external representations of Hawaiian culture for the individuals living in and working at Kahua Ola Hou? What is the degree of intersubjectivity present amongst the participants of the activity settings of Kahua Ola Hou?

Method

Setting

Kahua Ola Hou is a program for youth located ten miles west of Kaunakakai, on the island of Moloka'i, HI. Kahua Ola Hou is a three-week residential program that takes in six-eight youth at a time from the islands of Moloka'i, Lanai, and Maui in an attempt to help them stop using drugs. The program is run by an administrator and seven staff members, and is set in a six-bedroom home. The home is located on about a half acre of property that is well manicured and maintained.

Participants

The children who were participating in the three-week program at the group home, the staff members that worked at the group home, and the parents and guardians of the children who were staying at the group home all participated in this study. Each group was interviewed and observed throughout the data collection phase of this study. Some background information on each of these groups follows.

Children. The children who resided at Kahua Ola Hou were placed there voluntarily for substance abuse. The children were 2 males or 3 females ranging in age from 14-18, and were be diagnosed with substance abuse disorder. The ethnicity of the children was mostly Native Hawaiian, but those who were not were born and raised in Hawai'i. The youth stayed at Kahua Ola Hou for three weeks and participate in the
activities of the group home. After the three weeks, the youth went back to their homes, or were referred to another program that could help them on a more long-term basis.

Staff. At Kahua Ola Hou there was one administrative staff member and six direct care staff members. The administrative staff member scheduled employee shifts, provided direction, and held the direct care staff members accountable for their work. The administrative staff member had been working in the field of substance abuse treatment and prevention for over twenty years. The direct care staff members worked in shifts throughout the day so that the supervision of the children could be provided twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. The direct care staff members had the most contact with the children in the group home.

Parents/Legal Guardians. The parents and legal guardians of the children at the group home were the individuals who had the most vested interests in the child. While their child was at the group home, they participated in required supervised visits with their child. At Kahua Ola Hou, one of the program requirements was that the parent(s)/guardian(s) visit the youth while they lived there.

Data Collection

In the first phase of this study all of the participants filled out a short demographic survey. Next, interviews were conducted with the children, staff members, and parents of the children that lived in the home to obtain the perceptions of the individual participants of Kahua Ola Hou. Finally, observational data about the activity settings that existed at Kahua Ola Hou were collected. These data were used to describe the context of Kahua Ola Hou. The relationship between the context of Kahua Ola Hou and the individual participants were then analyzed.
Demographic Survey. A paper and pencil inventory asking questions about demographic information (including age, gender, race, cultural identification, and level of identification with Hawaiian culture) was given to all participants immediately before the interview (Appendix E).

Interviews. Interviews were conducted with the children who lived at the group home, the staff members that worked at the group home, and with the parents or guardians of the children who lived at the group home. Each interview took between 45 to 60 minutes to conduct and was recorded with a digital audio recorder that was immediately uploaded onto a password-protected computer following the interview. The interview was then transcribed word for word.

The interviews were semi-structured. The semi-structured interview began with an open-ended question such as, “What is the role of culture at Kahua Ola Hou?” The interviewee was allowed to answer this question as long as they liked. When they were done, a series of prompts based on this open-ended question was asked if necessary. The prompts were designed to obtain information on any aspect of the question of specific interest to the researcher. Questions and prompts for the children, staff members, and parents are in Appendix F, G, and H respectively.

Observations. Observations of the daily routine of the group home for the duration of the three-week program at Kahua Ola Hou were conducted. The observations focused on the activity settings that emerged, how they were initiated, how they were maintained, and how they were dissolved. They also focused on the internal and external aspects of Hawaiian culture that were taught. The researcher made a narrative of how each of these activity settings operated for the entire duration of the activity setting.
Specifically, the researcher spent one to two hours a day for three weeks with a group of children and staff members, observing and recording the objective and subjective characteristics of each activity setting. Two of the activity settings that were observed were planned group meetings and mealtimes because the group meetings and mealtimes were regularly scheduled activities. Other activities that occurred at the home (such as playing games, completing chores, gardening activities, etc.) were observed as they occurred.

To provide an accurate description of the observed activity settings, a checklist was used to record the six objective characteristics of the activity setting (Appendix I). After an accurate description of each activity setting was documented, a brief summary of the joint productive activity was made. This summary was based on the stated goals and meanings behind a particular activity. The stated goals were listened for by the researcher during the observational period and then documented. Also, and especially in cases where the goal was not clearly stated or missed, the leader of the activity setting was asked outright, “What is the goal of this activity?”

Finally, at the end of each activity, signs of intersubjectivity between the individual participants of the activity setting were documented. To document signs of intersubjectivity, a subjective evaluation was made by the researcher based on whether or not it the participants of the activity setting acted and thought alike. Examples of these instances were noted. The narrative description of the intersubjectivity within the activity setting was checked against interview data at a later time to make sure that the interpretation of intersubjectivity in the activity setting made by the researcher was valid (Appendix J).
Data Analysis

The research questions were designed to start out broadly and then become more narrowly focused during the research process as the relevant concepts regarding the activity settings, the culture of the group home, and their relationships were discovered. These qualitative methods yielded thick, descriptive data that was culturally appropriate for the people working at and living at Kahua Ola Hou. Once collected, open coding procedures denoted by Strauss and Corbin (1998) were used to analyze this data.

During open coding, objective and subjective data were broken down into discrete parts, closely examined, and compared for similarities and differences. Events, happenings, objects, and actions/interactions that were found to be conceptually similar were grouped under more abstract concepts termed themes. These themes were then described and later combined to form hypotheses about the case. This theoretical structure allowed for the discovery and formation of new explanations about the nature of the case (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Confidentiality

An informed consent (assent for children) form was read, understood, and signed by all of the potential participants of the study. There was a staff consent form, parental consent form, consent to interview parents form, and an assent form for the children (Appendices A, B, C, and D).

Also, a master code sheet was used to keep the names of the participants confidential (Appendix K). Each participant was assigned a number by the researcher. This number was recorded on a master code sheet consisting of the names, numbers, and position (staff member, child, or parent). The master code sheet was necessary because
demographic, interview, and observational data was collected using the names of the participants which made it possible to compare demographic and interview data with the observational data. At the conclusion of this study, the master code sheet was destroyed.

*Role of the Researcher*

It is important to discern the history that I had as a group home employee and the role that I had as a researcher at Kahua Ola Hou. I was a group home employee in a large group home based in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountains in Northern California from 1993 until 2003. For this reason I wanted to conduct a study that would explore how group homes in Hawai'i operate. Then, in 2005 as part of the Quentin Burdick Rural Health Practicum I participated in as a student at the University of Hawai'i, I traveled from Oahu to the rural island of Moloka'i and stayed there for six weeks. While I was there I formed a relationship with the administrator of the group home, Kahua Ola Hou. Once I had a relationship with the administrator, he gave me permission to conduct my study at his group home.

My role as a researcher at Kahua Ola Hou was to discover the salient aspects of its context to discover what effects, if any, it had on the behavior of the individuals involved with Kahua Ola Hou. I went to Kahua Ola Hou every day, and had all the freedom of a staff member at Kahua Ola Hou. I was able to conduct my research in relative anonymity.

When I first arrived at the house, it seemed as though the children saw me as another staff member. Almost immediately, however, the administrator of the group home made it clear to the children that I was not a staff member, that I was there to do research on Kahua Ola Hou, and not to feel nervous around me. The children were
curious at first as to what I would be doing. A few jokes were made that I would be sneaking in late at night and to watch them sleep. For the most part, I was able to blend into the environment of Kahua Ola Hou quite well.

One reason I was able to blend in so well is that the staff knew who I was before I arrived, and that they were informed that I would be observing the three week program while I was there. Another reason was that the children had never been to Kahua Ola Hou before. In fact, some of them had never even been to Moloka‘i. Indeed, as far as the youth were concerned, having an observer present during their activities was just how Kahua Ola Hou was. This is not to say that there weren’t times where I stepped out of the researcher role.

At times, I was presented with a choice as to whether or not I would participate in an activity setting. An example of this would be that if an activity was taking place I would never turn down the opportunity to talk with somebody, or to help one of the children with part of the activity if I was asked to do so. On one hand, participating in the activity made it difficult to document some of the objective and subjective characteristics of the activity setting I was a part of. On the other hand, I was a part of the activity setting whether I liked it or not, just by being present as an observer. Finally, I decided that since the other staff members were all participating in the activity, and the children were participating in the activity, I felt I would be more intimidating and out of place if I refused to participate and merely watched them from afar.

Still, I believe that the fact that I was involved with some of the activities did not affect the way in which the activities normally ran. I asked the staff and the administrator if they felt anything was running differently than usual so that I could take steps to make
sure I did not alter how things went. They would always tell me that the activities were running just fine, and that I wasn't changing a thing. In fact, the administrator told me that the staff are quite used to observers since his funders and other individuals who licensed him to operate often came by to check on how Kahua Ola Hou was doing.

Results

The purpose of this case study is to describe the context of Kahua Ola Hou using activity settings as the unit of analysis. The case study was conducted to discover the meaning, values, and goals for the individuals working at and living in Kahua Ola Hou. Also, the case study was conducted to help illuminate the relationship between activity settings and the transmission of Hawaiian cultural values. Furthermore, the question, "How are Hawaiian cultural values used to treat substance abuse in Hawaiian youth?" was explored.

First, data regarding the components of the activity settings at Kahua Ola Hou as collected via the Activity Settings Observation Checklist (Appendix I) are presented. As mentioned earlier, the components that constitute an activity setting are: 1) physical environment, 2) time, 3) funds, 4) positions, 5) people, and 6) symbols. Each of these components was documented during the activity settings that were observed throughout the course of the study.

Characteristics of Activity Settings

Physical Environment. The physical environment where the vast majority of the observed activity settings took place was at the dining room table, located in the center of the home. The dining room table was a large table with twelve chairs, enough to accommodate all of the children, staff, and any visitors that might be participating in or
observing the activity. The table was in a well lit area and was surrounded by a TV/VCR/DVD player on one side, a dry erase board and rule chart on the other side, a window that looked out into the backyard on the third side and the front door entryway area for the house on the other. Since the table was in the center of the house, it served as a divider between the boys' bedroom/bathroom area and the girls' bedroom/bathroom area and was often referred to as such. More importantly, the table served as the gathering place for the participants of the activity settings to interact with each other.

Another physical environment that was documented as part of the observational part of the study was the outside grounds of the group home. The grounds consisted of a parking area in front of the house, a large lawn that wrapped around the house from one side to the backyard, and a storage container and greenhouse on the other side. Across from the parking area was a garden that consisted of a grove of about thirty banana trees, and a smaller garden area that had taro, Hawaiian peppers, and eggplant. Near the greenhouse there was a pig pen with a young pig named Wilbur that was fed scraps left over from breakfast, lunch, and dinner. The storage container held tools for maintaining the yard and other equipment such as tents for outside activities, ladders, and other assorted items. The greenhouse was still relatively new and was empty with the exception of tables that were still being constructed for plants. Finally, near the lawn was a large 6' diameter, 4' wide industrial cable spool that was laid on its side. The spool was painted green and had the word 'PONO' painted on it in bold red letters. The spool was referred to as the 'pono table', and was used to conduct group activities outside the house when the dining room table was being used for another activity such as parental visits and ho'oponopono. The table was large enough and tall enough to stand around and conduct
group activities with the entire group if necessary. Also, the table served as a place for children to spend time by themselves if they needed. Overall, the grounds and the inside of the house were kept clean and neat.

*Time.* The times that the majority of the activity settings were observed were during mid-morning from around 10:00am – Noon, from Noon – 3:00pm, and sometimes during the evening from 6:00 – 9:00pm. These time periods were chosen because they were the times where group activities occurred meaning all of the youth were present. Other times, such as during morning wake up, chore, and breakfast time from 8:00am – 10:00am, or chore and shower time in the late afternoon from 3:00pm – 6:00pm, the youth and sometimes even staff were involved in individual activities. This is not to say these activity settings were never observed, just not as often.

Much of the time spent at Kahua Ola Hou was observing the starting and ending times of the activity settings that occurred throughout the day. The times where activity settings began, ended, and transitioned into the next were some of the most important time periods to observe because it showed how the staff got the children to participate in the activity, to follow the activities rules, and the way in which the staff and the children interacted with each other.

At Kahua Ola Hou, most activities began with a prayer. A staff would ask the group who wanted to say the prayer and one of the youth would usually volunteer. The youth then said a short prayer to the group. The prayer seemed to set the tone for the activity and say to them in a symbolic manner, “The activity is starting.” The prayer also said to the youth that there was a higher power than them including the staff in the room.
When the prayer was over, the purpose for that activity and the rules for that activity were typically explained.

An example of an activity that began with a prayer was when the youth met with a man from the community who had had problems with alcohol, marijuana, and ice in the past but had overcome those problems. He and the staff at Kahua Ola Hou said that he was there to tell his story and answer any questions the youth had about him. When the activity began, the man told his story about how he got into drugs, how they destroyed his life, and how he struggled to get off and stay off of drugs. The kids were then encouraged to ask questions about what the man went through. The man was very frank and candid with the youth. The youth seemed to respect his honesty. When the activity was nearly over, the staff asked if anyone would like to close the activity with a prayer. One of the youth volunteered, and during his prayer he thanked the man for coming to them and telling them his story. When the prayer ended, the activity setting ended and there was a transition time where the man was talking individually with some of the youth. Other youth had left the group to help the staff begin preparing lunch.

Activity settings typically ended in this way, where the youth all began participating in smaller, different activity settings. This was the choice of the staff at Kahua Ola Hou, to end activities without a clear plan as to what activity was going to happen next for the youth. For them, however, it worked. The youth seemed to use that time to get to know each other better, to get to know the staff better, or to take care of chores they wanted done. The staff too used that time to get to know each other better, to get to know the kids better, and to take care of tasks such as paperwork or chores around the house that they needed to complete. Eventually the staff pulled the youth and other
adults back together and began the next activity. By paying attention to how the activities of Kahua Ola Hou began, ended, and transitioned into the next it was possible to see how the individuals at Kahua Ola Hou interacted with each other during group activities and during smaller transitional activities.

**Funds.** According to the administrator of Kahua Ola Hou, Alu Like, Inc., a non-profit organization designed to assist Native Hawaiians in achieving social and economic self-sufficiency, provided the funds they received to operate. The name Alu Like means, “striving (working) together,” and their motto, “E alu like mai kākou e nā ʻoiwi o Hawaiʻi,” means, “Let us work together natives of Hawaiʻi.” Alu Like provided the majority of the funding that supported Kahua Ola Hou. The administrator of the group home formed a relationship with the administrators of Alu Like and had successfully acquired funding for a home, staff, and other physical resources such as food, furniture, bedding, hygiene, cleaning products, outdoor tools, etc. The funds were also used to pay for staff payrolls. The administrator acquired the funds to support the implementation of his “Pono Curriculum,” the program that Kahua Ola Hou followed (described later). These funds, however, are not what the administrator is most proud of procuring.

When Kahua Ola Hou was built, raw materials such as wood, cement, and labor were needed. The administrator claimed that he was able to find people that would help him build the home, and people to donate and provide the materials for the home. He said that for him the home was built for free by the people of Molokaʻi. The ability of the administrator to find individuals that would donate to his home continued on after the home was built. During the study, one individual donated his time and equipment to come over to the home and clear a patch of land with his tractor to plant banana trees.
The administrator also claimed that he was going to get the trees from a nearby nursery that was going to donate them to his home. Point being that although Alu Like, Inc. provided the majority of the funding for day-to-day operations of the home, the administrator was able to garnish support from a variety of resources through donations of materials or time.

**Positions.** Positions or roles were set for people to play at Kahua Ola Hou. The children's role was that of the client, the participants who were receiving treatment at the group home. The children's role was to learn about themselves and to participate in the activity settings as they occurred throughout the day. They were also given the responsibility of taking care of some of the chores of the home such as helping to prepare meals, cleaning up after meals, cleaning their room, cleaning the house, taking care of the yard and garden, and feeding the pig. According to interviews with the staff and children, planning the activities was not a role that they had a say in. They were to participate in the activities that were planned for them by the administrator and staff that worked at the home.

The parents had a role at Kahua Ola Hou as well. One of the stipulations of accepting a child into Kahua Ola Hou for the three-week treatment period was that the parents would visit the home one day during the middle of the session and would be present for graduation at the end. For the day that the parent was present during the middle of the session, they were to participate in a ho'oponopono session with their child. The meaning behind and purpose of these sessions are discussed later in the results. The role that the parents were to play was that of a supporting caregiver who believed in
Kahua Ola Hou and would continue the lessons that were learned at Kahua Ola Hou after their child graduated and returned home.

The staff working at the group home were responsible for supervising the children, initiating, running, and dissolving activity settings, and making sure that the children were participating in the activities appropriately. This meant that the staff, like the administrator, wore many hats. Sometimes they were facilitating chores, leading by example, teaching, and directing how they should be done. Sometimes they were running group discussions, calling children on their behavior and making sure all of the children had an opportunity to participate. Other times they were counseling children one-on-one, helping them with a crisis they were going through or with completing their work during the activities. In each of these cases, the staff was perhaps charged with the most challenging role of all, making sure the treatment milieu was followed.

The administrator played a large role in the day-to-day operation of Kahua Ola Hou. The main responsibility of the administrator of the home was to make sure that the staff followed the treatment milieu and other policies of the home. This meant that the administrator had to teach the policies to the staff, supervise the staff to make sure they adhered to them, and to role model the way that the activities should be run for the staff. At the beginning of the three-week period, the administrator ran more activities than at the end of the three-week period so that the administrator could set the tone for how the administrator wanted the staff to run the activities. Furthermore, whenever there was an emergency such as one of the children getting sick or causing major disruptions in the home due to behavior, the administrator would assist the staff or take over and intervene.
Finally, as mentioned earlier, the administrator was responsible for making sure that the home had the funds it needed to operate.

*People.* Demographic data from the surveys of the people in the home showed that there was one administrator, 5 staff, 5 children, and 5 parents who were all involved with the study. Six of the participants were male, and 10 were female. 15 out of 16 of the participants ($n = 16$) were Hawaiian or part Hawaiian. The people that participated in the home's activities were the children that lived at the home, the staff that worked at the home, the administrator who oversaw the operations at the home, and parents who had children residing at the home. As mentioned before, each of these people played vital roles at Kahua Ola Hou since that without one of these types of people, the home would cease to exist.

At Kahua Ola Hou, everything seemed to begin with the administrator. The administrator created the curriculum and had procured the funds for the home to operate. Based on those factors alone, it can be seen why this would be. Upon further investigation, however, it was clear that the administrator did not just command respect and admiration from the staff and the children at the home because he made the rules and wrote the checks. The administrator of the home had a very strong and likeable personality that other people seemed attracted to. Because of this the administrator was an important resource for support, information, skills, and access to other settings for the staff and the children.

The administrator was well liked and admired because of the way in which he interacted with others, he listened to every word that they said and seemed genuinely interested in what they had to say. The fact that he was well liked made it easier for him
to inspire his staff to help the youth, and inspire the youth to help themselves. He also chose to surround himself with people who thought and believed like he did with regards to what would help the youth under Kahua Ola Hou’s care.

The staff at the home was three females and three males ranging in age from 30 to 52. Each of the staff was Hawaiian or part Hawaiian and all ranked Hawaiian culture as the culture they identified with most (see table 1). The staff followed the lead of the administrator in that they all tried to emulate the way in which he worked with and interacted with the children. The staff would listen to the youth with the intention of understanding the youth. They would also try to joke with the youth and make them laugh as the administrator did; though sometimes those jokes fell flat. None of the staff had the strong personality that the administrator did, but they all listened to the administrator intently. Furthermore, they all spoke of the administrator and his treatment program as if it was the best thing for the children. They really seemed to believe the same things the administrator did about the home, and that they were making a difference just by being available to the youth.

This level of commitment from the staff showed that the administrator had made the choice to hire individuals who would work for him and be inspired by him. It also showed that the staff was willing to listen to and be inspired by the administrator. This meant that the administrator and staff at Kahua Ola Hou had an established way that they would act when they were running group activities or transitioning between them. Finally, the fact that the staff were very approachable and that they believed the same philosophy as the administrator with respect to helping the youth made it easier for them to interact with the children who lived at the home.
The youth in the home began their stay by initially rejecting the treatment plan at Kahua Ola Hou. The first few days and nights were difficult for the youth in that they were just brought from their own homes to a new, unfamiliar home. The youth were challenged with the task of getting to know all of the other youth that were staying at the home as well as the staff. (The staff and administrator at least had the familiarity of the home and each other to rely on.)

After a few days, however, the children knew each other better and felt more comfortable around the staff. As they felt more comfortable, the youth seemed to increase the amount and quality of the interactions between themselves and the staff. By increasing the level of interaction they had with others they increased the amount that they participated in the activities that existed at Kahua Ola Hou. Another way in which the children participated more fully in the Kahua Ola Hou program was by learning new terms and language that would help them to communicate with other youth and the staff.

_Symbols._ Symbols and language are associated with the activity and are used to share the meaning of interactions. During the activity settings, Hawaiian words and saying were commonly used to create a shared meaning between the staff and children. For example, the Hawaiian word `malama` (which means `to take care of`) was taught to the children by the staff then was used to encourage the children to participate in chores or complete work during another activity setting. More importantly, the children, staff, and parents at Kahua Ola Hou readily spoke Pidgin English, a dialect of English that was created as a result of the multitudes of cultures and languages that have emigrated to Hawai`i over the last 200 years. The use of Pidgin English seemed to increase the
meaning behind the interactions of the participants of the home. As one staff pointed out during an interview:

"I think it is easier for us to communicate with the kids because we all talk pidgin like they do. It is probably better than some haole guy in an aloha shirt who is trying to relate with them. I already relate to them, and I think it makes them more comfortable."

Language was constantly used to provide meaning for the concepts that were being taught at Kahua Ola Hou. Since Pidgin English was the language commonly used by the children in their everyday lives, the use of Pidgin English at Kahua Ola Hou helped to emphasize the importance of those concepts. In many ways, Pidgin English was one of the main catalysts used in the activity settings to bring about a higher level of intersubjectivity between the activity setting’s participants.

**Intersubjectivity.** As mentioned before, *intersubjectivity* is the extent to which the participants of an activity setting display similarity in the ways that they think about, experience, and describe the world. As intersubjectivity increases goals become more similar, more cooperation occurs, and there is greater harmony among the group. Over time the level of intersubjectivity can denote the level of success and meaning of a particular activity for its participants. Intersubjectivity is required for the six objective characteristics to work in unison towards the common goal of the activity setting.

Interaction with others is the place where intersubjectivity exists. At Kahua Ola Hou, interaction between the staff and the youth led the children to acquire new skills with regards to language, body positioning, and facial expressions. Each of these new skills was designed to enhance one area in the children’s life, the way in which they
interacted with others. Kahua Ola Hou felt that if they could just improve the youth’s ability to express how they were feeling to others in an appropriate manner then the detrimental behavior they displayed inside and outside the home would gradually decrease.

Intersubjectivity seemed to increase as the common language between the staff and the youth developed. For example, one activity that the youth and the staff participated in was where they each created a family tree. Much of the language used to describe the activity was described to the youth during previous activities. Some of the terms they used were ‘ohana (family), malama (to take care of), and kuliana (responsibility) that were previously described. Newer terms that they used were ancestry, genealogy, and history. The staff spent time at the beginning of the activity explaining these terms. Then, when it was apparent that each of the youth understood them, they went on to explain the activity.

During the activity itself, each of the youth was required to create a family tree. The staff participated as well, creating family trees of their own. During this time, the interaction between the staff and the youth changed from teacher to learner to co-participants. The youth and the staff were involved in a joint-productive activity where everybody was participating in the same task, regardless of the position they held. This form of reciprocal participation between the staff and the youth led to a high level of intersubjectivity that was not there at the beginning of the activity.

During the observation of activity settings throughout the course of the study, intersubjectivity routinely increased as the level of reciprocal participation in the activity
increased. Furthermore, each of the activities where intersubjectivity increased seemed to be meaningful for the participants at Kahua Ola Hou.

The observational data and the data from interviews with the staff, youth, and parents were analyzed using open coding procedures in order to allow themes to emerge. In all, seven themes emerged from the data where high levels of intersubjectivity were observed. These themes were: 1) ‘ohana (family), 2) forgiveness, 3) being Hawaiian, 4) malama (take care), 5) being pono (righteous), 6) Ho‘oponopono (making things right between two or more people) and 7) healing. Each of these themes seemed to support the main goal of the program; to create a family-like environment away from the child’s natal family that would teach the children what Kahua Ola Hou felt were fundamental Hawaiian cultural values. In each of the settings observed and for each of the participants interviewed, family was seen as a core component to Hawaiian culture. In all cases, interviewees felt that fixing the family environment would give the children the highest probability to stop using and stay away from intoxicating substances. In the following sections, some of the observational and interview data are presented to show how each of these themes existed and interacted with each other in context.

Themes

‘Ohana. In the Hawaiian language, ‘ohana means family. At Kahua Ola Hou, the staff, children, and parents/guardians of the children all stated numerous times that nothing was more important to them than their ‘ohana. ‘Ohana functioning was seen as a key link to healing the youth.

At Kahua Ola Hou, the activities reflected what the group home felt a properly functioning Hawaiian family should look like. Ideas like not leaving a child out of an
activity, waiting to eat until everybody was at the table, and social support between children was encouraged. For example, in one activity, a group session inside the house, one of the children refused to leave his room and join the group because he was having trouble getting along with one of the girls. It seemed that the girl was teasing him and in his mind getting others to gang up on him...namely his male roommate with whom he had made friends.

The two counselors that were about to run the group explained that they couldn’t start the group without the missing child, and that it would be up to everybody to help him come out of his room and join the group. He asked for suggestions as to how to get the boy out of his room. The girl with whom he was having problems offered to apologize to the boy for teasing him and getting his friend to gang up on him. The counselor then asked the rest of the group whether or not they thought it would be a good idea for the girl to apologize. They all agreed that it was. Then the counselor reminded the girl to just apologize and not to expect the boy to respond. She agreed to do this.

Under the supervision of the other counselor in the house at the time the girl walked to the boy’s room. She stood in the doorway and said, “I apologize for making fun of you and getting [the other boy] to gang up on you and I hope you can forgive me.” Almost immediately, the boy got up from his bed and said, “I forgive you,” to the girl. He then walked to the kitchen table. the area in the house where the vast majority of the groups took place, and sat with the group. Upon his arrival, everybody thanked him for showing up. In the words of the counselor at the time, “Thank you for coming to the group and making our ‘ohana complete.” The value of having a close family that
supported each other in times of need was taught to the group at this and other times throughout the three-week session.

Subsequent interviews revealed the importance of family to the staff. When asked why they thought substances were used by the children that came to Kahua Ola Hou, one staff replied:

Staff: “I think that...uh...eh...in our culture, family plays an important role. And I think that family values have been lost, and we’re not practicing it. I think a lot of Hawaiians don’t practice the values they were taught a long time ago and it diminished then. I think a lot of young men and women we are letting get away from it and we have to get back to the roots, back to the family values and start back up again. Because I think that as a culture we have lost [those values], yeah?”

Responses to this question were similar from the youth. One of the children said:

Youth: “My mom’s was always high on drugs. On ice. She always brought a lot of bad people around. you know? She says she stopped but I’m going to see a lot of those same people. They all smoke [marijuana], so I know I’m going to be around it. If I didn’t have that to deal with I would probably stop.”

Finally one of the parents described why they thought their child abused substances:

Parent: “I think [my child] started using as a band-aid. Her step-father, my second marriage, not violent but...alcoholic. He gets loud. He
starts swearing...she seen it...us fighting. So I think that just, alcoholism
has been around, and she turning to it now."

In each of these cases the staff, children, and parents all agreed that the reason
that the child started abusing substances was because of problems with the family at
home. More specifically, the staff, children and parents all thought that the children were
doing the same thing as their family members. They felt that the drugs or drinking was
around, and the children participated in these activities because they were available. They
also felt, like the parent seen above, that a model of drinking behavior was displayed
which led to a dysfunctional family dynamic. Overall, the level of intersubjectivity with
respect to the importance of ‘ohana was very high.

Forgiveness. The lesson learned by the children during the activity setting
described above was that forgiveness was a key component to resolving differences
between two people. Further observational data showed that forgiveness was used to help
the child heal the wounds between their selves and their ‘ohana. In one group activity the
children, with the help of the staff, were encouraged to write forgiveness statements that
gave forgiveness to their families. Later in the forgiveness statement the children were to
ask for forgiveness for the things they had done to hurt their families. The children wrote
their forgiveness statements in this order because the staff at Kahua Ola Hou told the
children that they needed to be able to give forgiveness to somebody else before they
received it.

These statements seemed to prove to be invaluable in later group activities,
especially Ho‘oponopono. It should be noted that while the children were writing their
statements to their families nobody made fun of each other and seemed to take the subject
quite seriously. Each person observed and interviewed all seemed to believe in the importance of forgiveness. Each of the children worked independently on their own statement and encouraged other group members to try to write their forgiveness statement, even if they didn’t want to. They all understood from the counselor running the activity that their activities in the future would depend on this statement. Furthermore, they all seemed to buy into the idea of forgiving others before they asked for forgiveness themselves.

Interview data seemed to talk about the theme of forgiveness as well. One staff said:

Staff: “Forgiveness is the key, brah. People don’t want to forgive, but we have to. Everybody’s going to make mistakes so they know they going to be asking for forgiveness. It’s easier to get forgiveness from somebody who already got it from you.”

One of the children said that:

Youth: “Forgiveness is everybody’s responsibility. I have a hard time doing it though. I think this place will make it better.”

A parent described forgiveness in a different way:

Parent: “I forgive my child, but [they] don’t believe it. I forgive [them], because a lot of why [my child] is how they is is my fault. I should have been better, but [my child] can’t do nothing about that.”

This parent was experiencing guilt for a perceived fault they caused their child. For the most part, the kids tended to blame their parents and themselves for getting into trouble whereas the parents seemed to blame only themselves. The child’s act of offering
forgiveness to their parents seemed to help the parents to get over the guilt that they felt for their perceived or actual faults. The intersubjectivity of the activities regarding forgiveness seemed very high.

*Being Hawaiian.* Demographic data provided evidence that the participants of the group home all felt a strong identification and dedication to Hawaiian culture. The first indication that the participants felt a strong identification to Hawaiian culture was in the demographic surveys. 15 out of 16 of the participants felt that they identified with Hawaiian culture the most. It is interesting to note that although the differences cannot be found to be statistically significant, the Staff rated themselves as identifying with Hawaiian culture at a higher level than did the parents or children. What is important to take from this is that Kahua Ola Hou’s idea that the children and parents were less attached to their Hawaiian roots seemed to be supported. Also, maybe because the surveys were administered to the children towards the end of the three-week period, their cultural identity scores were higher than their parents. This seemed to strengthen Kahua Ola Hou’s idea that working with the families during the session was as important as working with the kids. (See table 1)

During the interviews, one staff described why being Hawaiian was the most important aspect of his life:

Staff: “I think about it like this. My ancestors taught my great-grandfather, who taught his father, who taught my father, who taught me how to be a Hawaiian. Even though everything is different now, I still know that I am Hawaiian. I want these children to know that they are Hawaiian too,
because once they do they will try to act right to show respect their ancestors.”

Observational data showed the same emphasis on being Hawaiian. Each day the children learned a new Hawaiian word. They also learned how to chant an ol‘e, or a Hawaiian poem or prayer. It was explained during one of these activities that Hawaiians believed that the breath or speech that you give to others is the greatest gift you could give, so ancient Hawaiians came up with ol‘e’s that they could give to others in times of need. The staff all said that it was a way to get the children to better understand and respect their Hawaiian roots.

Other activities also emphasized what it meant to be Hawaiian to the children. On the day the children arrived, they all sat around the kitchen table and discussed the rules of the house. After that, one of the staff talked about some of the differences between Western culture and Hawaiian culture. The topic of eye contact between youth and elders was discussed. The staff talked about how in Western culture it was rude to listen to your elder without making eye contact because it showed that you weren’t listening. They then talked about how in Hawaiian culture it was rude to look your elder in the eye when they were talking to you because it showed that you were holding contempt for what they were saying.

The staff then opened up the discussion to the group to see what their thoughts were on the subject. One of the youth said that they would get in trouble at school when they didn’t look at their teachers when they were talking to them, but at home they would get lickings (a common term used for disciplinary action) from their father if they looked him in the eye while talking to him. This discussion went on for a short time with each of
the youth sharing an experience where they felt like they were scrutinized for not giving eye contact to an elder who was brought up with Western cultural values.

The staff then talked about how this was an example of the misunderstandings that can happen between two cultures. The staff went on to say that these misunderstandings happen quite a bit, and that neither side is ever right in these circumstances. Finally, they summed up the discussion by emphasizing that the youth should be proud of who they were as young Hawaiians, even if they felt that they were being scrutinized by somebody from another culture. The intersubjectivity for being Hawaiian was extremely high for this activity. At the end of the activity, they were told that they needed to malama themselves because they were the future of the Hawaiian culture.

*Malama.* Malama means to take care or to be respectful. At the beginning of the three-week period this word was defined for and explained to the children. Thereafter, the word was used in lieu of taking care of or respect. For example, a child with a messy room might be told by a staff, “You need to malama for your room,” or “you need to have malama for your room.” Malama was a constant idea that the staff tried to teach to the children so that the children would buy into the idea that taking care of and respecting others is what ancient Hawaiians did and is what they should do to.

For the most part it seemed that the youth responded well to the idea of malama. Each day there were chores assigned to the youth that they would be charged to perform. Some examples of chores were preparing meals, cleaning up after meals, cleaning the house, cleaning the yard, and as mentioned before cleaning their own rooms. Before any
of these activities commenced the staff would remind the youth that they needed to malama their environment.

An example of this occurred during one activity where the youth went on a field trip to Moʻomomi beach, a Native Hawaiian fishing ground on the north shore of Molokaʻi. Before they left and on the way there it was continually emphasized that before any of the youth were allowed to go swimming in the water they were to malama Moʻomomi. When they arrived, the staff took the youth past the beach to an area that was overgrown with weeds. They were then told to pick the weeds and malama Moʻomomi. The staff and youth then began picking the patch of weeds until it was gone. The level of cooperation between the children and the staff was as if there was no separation between them. They were involved in a true joint-productive activity with all of the participants working towards the same goal. The level of intersubjectivity seemed very high. Finally, after the work was completed, the youth were allowed to go swimming.

The lesson learned during this experience and during other times of malama was not just the meaning of the word malama, but they seemed to learn that showing malama for their environment was important for them to do. Subsequent interviews with the youth and staff seemed to confirm this. One youth said of the trip to Moʻomomi:

Youth: “When we got to the beach I didn’t think they were serious about cleaning. Then, after we did it, I thought I better clean something every time I goes to the beach.”

One of the staff described the experience in his own words:

Staff: “Moʻomomi is a very sacred place to the people of Molokaʻi. We used to have to get licenses to fish here, but [the people of Molokaʻi]
worked hard to preserve it as one Native fishing grounds. We explain this
to the youths so they understand it can be taken away if we don’t malama
Mo‘omomi.”

In this sense, malama was looked at as an integral part preserving Hawaiian
culture. The message of malama was not just for chores, however, showing malama was
seen as a way to make the youth feel as if they were not merely taking advantage of the
land. Showing malama was, to Kahua Ola Hou, one of the ways in which the youth could
become pono, or righteous.

**Being Pono.** For the children, displaying malama was often accompanied by
praise. When the children were successful in malamaing their room or some other chore,
the staff would tell the child, “That was pono,” or, “You are acting pono.” Pono, or
righteousness, is the idea that the child is leading or attempting to lead a balanced life. It
was also made clear that being pono was a personal journey, and that only the child can
really take the steps to make themselves pono. Kahua Ola Hou continually emphasized
the idea of being pono with the youth, and had even named their curriculum for the three-
week program the Pono Curriculum. This curriculum was seen as being the centerpiece
of the program, the guide that would help the staff deliver the message of Kahua Ola Hou
to the youth.

The Pono Curriculum is based on the child learning a metaphor that they can use
to describe the problems they are having in their lives. The metaphor is culturally specific
to Hawaiians and individuals that grew up in Hawai‘i because it uses a traditional six-
man Hawaiian outrigger canoe.
In ancient times, the Hawaiian outrigger canoe was the main method that Hawaiians used to travel from island to island or to fish for food. Nowadays, the Hawaiian outrigger canoe is used for sport, recreation, and as a way for some Hawaiians to stay in touch with their ancestral roots. Nearly every town near the coast on all islands has one or more canoe clubs with both male and female members ranging in age from young children to senior citizens. They each pay their dues, practice regularly, and compete in races throughout the paddling season. Needless to say, the Hawaiian outrigger canoe is an easily recognizable symbol that the children readily understand.

The metaphor is that the child is a canoe, and that they have six major components in their lives that are represented by the six individuals that paddle the canoe. Each of the roles that are played by the six paddlers while paddling the canoe is attributed to the six major life components that they represent.

Going down the list, the real role of the #1 seat in a canoe is the Stroker, the individual who keeps the pace of the canoe. The child’s friends hold the role of the #1 seat in the canoe of the child’s life. This was because the friends keep pace in the child’s life by asking them to do things with them, and influencing the choices that they make. The #2 seat in a real canoe is held by the caller, the individual who calls out when it is time for paddlers to change which side they are paddling on so that the paddlers do not get tired. For the child, the #2 seat was the child’s body and mind since the body and mind were the parts that told the child when they were tired or needed a change. Since the #3 seat is in the middle of the canoe it is held by the powerhouse; the heaviest, strongest individual in the canoe. The same is true for the individual who holds the #4 seat. For this reason the #3 seat is held by the family, the strongest powerhouse in the child’s life, and
the #4 seat in the child’s life is represented by the Community the child is from. The Hana-hana, or worker holds the #5 seat on the canoe. Therefore, the child’s school, work, chores, or all three represented the #5 seat in the child’s life. Finally, the Steersman, the individual who steers the canoe, holds the #6 seat. In the child’s life the #6 seat is represented by Spirituality or values since knowing right and wrong would help steer the child through life.

Each of the aspects of the Hawaiian outrigger canoe metaphor were broken down for the children in a series of group activities that the child participated in over the course of their stay at Kahua Ola Hou. The first few days are spent explaining the overall canoe metaphor, then the following three weeks spend a few days each on the child’s friends, their body and mind, their families, the community they are from and live in, their school/work/chores/other responsibilities, and their spirituality/values. It was Kahua Ola Hou’s belief that the youth could become pono after working their way through the Pono Curriculum.

One activity based on the Pono Curriculum was for the #3 seat in the canoe, the family or ‘ohana. The activity took place around the kitchen table, as the majority of the activities did. The youth were asked by the staff to describe what family meant to them. After each of the youth gave their explanation of what a family meant to them, the staff running the group described to the youth that the ancient Hawaiians kept detailed genealogy charts that would link them to their ancestors in order to preserve their place in Hawaiian history. Then, the youth were all handed a large sheet of poster paper, about 24” x 36”. They were then told to write down their family tree as best as they could remember, with themselves at the bottom of the tree.
After the youth completed this project, they were asked to list the substances they had witnessed or heard about their family members using. They also were asked to write down the educational level that each family member had obtained. After they completed this task, each of the youth was asked to stand up and describe their family tree to the rest of the group.

The activity showed that the youth were not alone in their quest to stop using substances. For most of the youth, the tree showed them that they had been exposed to substances long before they ever contemplated using them. The joint productive activity of creating the family tree and showing it to the group seemed to be very powerful to the youth in that it showed them that being pono was their responsibility, but that it also required the help of their family.

One of the youth described what being pono meant to them during one of the interviews:

Youth: “I learned about pono, to make families, to make right. I learned about pono friends and bad friends, and all that. I learned about the canoe, and how to be pono. I learned too that I like being pono, and that drugs aren’t pono. I think I like be pono from now on.”

A staff described pono like this:

Staff: “Pono is in the heart, not in the mind. The mind and the heart are different, and pono is in the heart. The mind can analyze things and figure things out, but the heart knows right and wrong. Being pono is knowing right and wrong. The mind can then make decisions based on that.”
The level of intersubjectivity for being pono was very high for the children and staff at Kahua Ola Hou. At first, the children seemed a bit put off by it. After a while, however, being pono was the goal that all of the children had in mind. But what did the child do when the process of making himself or herself pono required the cooperation of the people they were closest to?

Ho'oponopono. Ho'oponopono is an ancient Hawaiian method of solving disputes between two people. It was described that the literal translation is making right, right. At Kahua Ola Hou, ho'oponopono sessions are scheduled for the second week. The session participants include a neutral mediator called the Haku, and the two parties that are having the dispute. At Kahua Ola Hou, the two parties were the parent(s) or guardian(s) and the Haku was the director of the home. The Haku makes all of the rules for the session and can stop the session if it gets out of hand.

As mentioned earlier, each of the children were required to write a statement where they forgave their ‘ohana for any transgressions they perceived and ask for forgiveness for anything they did wrong. During the ho‘oponopono sessions the children each read this statement to their parents. After they did this, each of the parents seemed genuinely touched and moved, most of them to tears. The children were moved too, and for each of the child-‘ohana dyads the ho‘oponopono session turned out to be the most satisfying aspect of their experience. The major outcome of these sessions was that the healing process between the ‘ohana and the child seemed to begin.

Five ho‘oponopono sessions were witnessed during the research period. For each of the sessions the Haku asked that no notes be taken while the session was occurring and that all documentation of the session is done when the session was over. Furthermore,
each of the parents/guardians and the youths were asked if they felt comfortable with a researcher being present. Five dyads agreed to let their sessions be observed and documented.

Each of the ho‘oponopono sessions opened up with the youth saying a prayer. The prayer seemed to set the tone of the session in that everybody present, including the researcher, would need to give their undivided attention to the ho‘oponopono session that was about to occur. After the prayer, the Haku would explain the rules of the ho‘oponopono session. In so doing, the Haku was able to establish himself as the leader of the ho‘oponopono session. The first rule was that the Haku had control to end the session if it were to get out of hand.

The Haku explained that ho‘oponopono had been used by Hawaiians to solve disputes for centuries before any of them were born and that he himself had been certified by a Kapuna (an elder, spiritual leader) to perform ho‘oponopono. The Haku even used a power point slideshow to illustrate the rules for the family and the youth present in the session. As he scrolled through the slides he read each rule and explained why the rule was in place. One of the rules was that the youth and the parents needed to listen to the other party finish speaking before they began to speak. Another rule was that the youth was in control over what would be talked about in the meeting. Finally, the Haku explained that the ho‘oponopono session only worked if everyone present agreed to forgive each other for their perceived transgressions. Again, the Haku explained that all these rules were necessary in order for the healing process between the two parties to begin. In each session that was observed, all of the rules were agreed upon and followed
by all parties. The intersubjectivity with regards to the following of the rules of ho‘oponopono was very high.

One such session included a female youth and her mother and stepfather. The session began as the others had, with the youth opening up the ho‘oponopono with a prayer and the Haku explaining the rules of the session to the parents and the youth. Once this was done, the Haku turned to the youth and said, “Time for you to begin.”

Just like the other four sessions that were observed, the youth read their forgiveness statement that they wrote the week before to their parents. The forgiveness statements all began the same way, with the youth asking their parents forgiveness for what they had done wrong. This session the youth asked her parents to forgive her for not feeding the dog, for not cleaning her room, for drinking and smoking pot with her friends, for stealing her step-father’s cigarettes, for not listening to them, for staying out late, and for doing bad at school.

Even though the Haku had asked that nobody interrupt, the parents both interrupted the girl at this point and told her that they loved her and of course that they forgive her. The youth’s stepfather even said, “I do not care about the dog. I worked late that day baby-girl, one sixteen hour-shift. I love you and forgive you with all my heart. I hope you can forgive me for yelling at you.”

The girl replied, “I do.” She then proceeded to read her forgiveness statement, this time telling her parents what she thought of the way they had treated her. The girl told her stepfather that she didn’t like how he yelled at her sometimes and it makes her sad. She also told her mother how she didn’t like to be yelled at. She described that it was hard to stop smoking (cigarettes) when they were always around and that she wanted them and
her to stop. The girl listed off more complaints for her parents, then told them that she forgave them for what they did wrong to her. At this point she stopped speaking to see their reaction.

The parents, both of them fighting back tears, replied to the girl by telling her that they loved her and all they ever wanted was to see her do good. They told her that they were trying to teach her right and wrong. The girl said that she understood this and that she wanted to stop using pot and alcohol. The parents responded in a supportive manner to each of the girl’s statements.

After a time, the Haku talked to both the girl and the parents about how they could do ho‘oponopono on their own after the girl left Kahua Ola Hou if they wanted it to. Then he asked them both when a good time to have ho‘oponopono would be. They all responded that they could do it anytime, but dinner was the time that they were most likely to be together.

The Haku then told them that he would like them to have ho‘oponopono everyday for about a month, then once a week from then on. He explained to the parents that the youth needed a lot of love and support and asked if they could give it to her. They both responded that they could. He then explained to the girl that she would need to listen better to her parents and to follow through with changing the things she said she would change. The girl agreed to do this as well.

It should be noted that the girl and the parents were all sobbing as they spoke and that they had been since the girl had read her forgiveness statement. The tears seemed genuine, and each party seemed genuinely touched by the ho‘oponopono experience. At this time, the Haku said that the ho‘oponopono was over and that he would like
somebody to end the session with a prayer. The girl volunteered to say a prayer to end the session.

When the youth was done saying her prayer she spent the next hour walking around the property with her parents talking to them. To an outside observer, the ho'oponopono session seemed to bring the parents and the youth together in a way that had been missing for some time. Furthermore, the idea of ho'oponopono seemed to be a concept that the parents and the youth could both buy into. Subsequent interview data with the youth revealed the importance of ho'oponopono to the youth in this scenario.

Youth: “Ho'oponopono helped me with my family, because we don’t really communicate. And my dad, he used to take a lot of things out on me, and that’s my stepdad, and it’s hard for me cause he calls me all kinds of names and everything. But, thanks to this program, we actually got ho'oponopono and sat down, and actually talked about everything that’s been bothering me, and ask for forgiveness and all that. Now thanks to this program, my family and me have been really, really close. My dad would hardly ever say I love you to me, but now, when we talk on the phone, he say I love you girl and stuff.”

The youth was not the only person touched by ho'oponopono. The parents seemed to benefit from the experience as much as the youth did. Also, for each of the parents that were interviewed, they had all heard of ho'oponopono before. It seemed that the parents’ familiarity with Hawaiian culture led them to understand what ho'oponopono was going to be and helped them to support the experience they ant their child were about to have. Interview data for one of the parents mentioned that:
Parent: “My tutu used to do ho‘oponopono with my brother and I when we was growing up. We used to argue all the time, and she made us talk, and listen to each other. It helped a lot. [The Haku] acted a lot like she did. I think that having someone else there who knew Hawaiian culture helped us to talk. The ho‘oponopono gave me and my husband hope that [our child] would be OK.”

The staff also had positive feelings towards ho‘oponopono.

Staff: “By far, the best thing about my job is seeing the kids be able to talk to their parents during ho‘oponopono. They get strength from it, and that helps them later on. This is only one 21 day program, so we not going to change anyone while they are here, but we give them the tools to help them succeed after they leave. Ho‘oponopono is one of those tools. The kids can leave and do ho‘oponopono when they need to on their own.”

Virtually all of the individuals who went through ho‘oponopono seemed to believe it was working, adding to the intersubjective nature of the activity. The high level of intersubjectivity observed during ho‘oponopono seemed to make the idea that the child and the family could heal the wounds between each other a possibility. This idea, the idea that the child and the parents can begin the healing process after they leave was another theme of Kahua Ola Hou.

Healing. According to the staff that were interviewed the main idea behind Kahua Ola Hou was to help the children heal their emotional wounds between themselves and their ‘ohana. The method they believed was most valuable was to turn the children into
healers themselves. As it turns out, the ho'oponopono sessions were not designed to only open up a new dialogue between the parent and the child. The ho'oponopono sessions were designed to open a new dialogue and teach the children to become proficient in using ho'oponopono so that if they have problems with other people again in their life they can use the ho'oponopono method to sit down and discuss those issues with the person or persons that they are not getting along with. As the group home administrator and two of his staff said, the children were being trained to become healers so that they can go home and heal the problems between themselves and their 'ohana.

Administrator: “We like teach the children to become healers. This way they can go home and ho'oponopono their problems with their brothers, sisters, aunties, uncles, parents, whoever. They not going to be good at it at first, but they will at least know that they can do something about their problems...even if they are not successful solving them.”

Staff: “Ho'oponopono can happen anytime. Ho'oponopono should be done by someone who is experienced, but really anyone can do it. You can do it too if you want to. You don’t need to be one Hawaiian to do ho'oponopono...you just need to be willing to listen and forgive. Then you can become one healer.”

The concept of healing was continually talked about during the activities that took place in the home, but not in a direct manner. When the staff saw the kids solving their own problems with each other they praised the children by telling them that they were becoming healers already.
For example, recall the activity where the boy refused to join the group because he felt one of the girls was picking on him. The girl with whom he had a problem apologized to the boy and asked his forgiveness. The boy then joined the group and was thanked for making the ‘ohana complete. Later, in that same group, the girl was praised for apologizing to the boy and for asking his forgiveness. The staff used her as an example and talked about how this is what a healer does. He said, “Healers are humble. They want like peace between two people. When you went to [the boy’s] room and apologized to him, you were humble. When you asked for forgiveness that was humble. That’s what healers do. They like be humble so others can talk with them.”

Healing was also talked about in relation to substance abuse. One staff described the healing process like this:

Staff: “When kids using substances they just trying to heal themselves. They just using the medication they know, to like, forget or something. They just want peace and they think, ‘Hey, I know I can do this and feel good ‘cause I don’t feel good right now.’ We try like teach them to heal themselves in a pono way.”

During a different interview with a different staff, healing was described in this way:

Staff: “Healing comes from being pono. You cannot heal yourself or others unless you pono yourself. If you like stay pono, then you then you can heal. If not, then you cannot. They go together, pono and healing. [The group home administrator] is pono, so he can heal the wounds between the parents and the child. He is really good at it too.”
Finally, at the end of the three-week session, the children went through a graduation where the administrator in a small ceremony in front of the staff, the other youth, and the parents praised them. During this graduation, the children were all told that after going through the three-week program they all had a new skill...they could heal themselves and others. They were all told how they could heal by forgiving others, by doing ho'oponopono, or just by listening to somebody else’s problems. They were reminded to be pono in all that they did in order to show respect to themselves and their Hawaiian ancestry, because that way the could heal.

The level of intersubjectivity for this concept seemed high. In fact, the success of the ho'oponopono sessions depended on all parties buying into the idea that they could heal themselves and others through dialogue. Each person living at, working at, or who had a child at Kahua Ola Hou thought that healing themselves and others was the sole purpose that they were there in the first place. For this reason, the idea of healing was present in every activity. The staff constantly told the children and parents that once they were able to heal they would be able to stop using substances.

Discussion

Native Hawaiian history is over 1,500 years old yet the vast records documenting the history were not written until white settlers arrived in the late 1700’s. During the 1800’s through the 1970’s, Native Hawaiian history was studied, documented, and interpreted by outside settlers to the islands, except for some by Hawaiian royalty. Psychology was thought not to exist in Hawaiian culture. To outsiders, Hawaiians seemed to have a philosophy of living, but not a scientific study of thought and behavior or a way to treat individuals within the culture who were in crisis. This misinterpretation
occurred because outsiders looked at Hawaiians and Hawaiian culture in comparison to their own, rather than understood for itself.

For this case study, it was important to look at the way Kahua Ola Hou was treating children from Kahua Ola Hou's perspective. A way was needed to look at how people interacted in Kahua Ola Hou that would not be biased toward any one culture. For this reason activity settings theory was used to understand the people, their roles, the resources needed, physical environment, timing, symbolic representation, goals, and level of intersubjectivity of the settings at Kahua Ola Hou.

An activity settings perspective guided data collection on these variables and allowed the researcher to examine the reason and meaning for the setting's existence. Therefore, interviewing the participants and observing the activity settings were the main methods used to discover the meaning of Kahua Ola Hou's practices.

The seven themes that emerged from the data ('ohana, forgiveness, being Hawaiian, malama, being pono, Ho'oponopono, and healing) showed that the practices used to treat substance abuse at Kahua Ola Hou are derived from Native Hawaiian theories of psychology that have been passed down from generation to generation. The theories and practices fit in well with the individual psychologies of the people that work at Kahua Ola Hou, the parents/guardians with children at Kahua Ola Hou, and the children themselves. Although there were many similarities to traditional Western psychological practices and theories within Kahua Ola Hou, it is important to refer to the practices and theories that existed within the Kahua Ola Hou as being Native Hawaiian, because that is what they are.
Etiology of Substance Abuse

This case study was conducted to discover the meaning, values, and goals for the individuals working at and living in Kahua Ola Hou. The first important consideration was to find the criteria for normal substance use and abnormal substance use for the individuals working at Kahua Ola Hou. Kahua Ola Hou’s staff stated that normal substance use was when a person could use a substance without destroying their life. They described abnormal substance use as when an individual used a substance to the point of destruction of their life.

Another important idea that the majority of staff mentioned was that abusing substances to alter the way your mind perceived the world was a Western concept brought to Hawaiians during colonial times. They felt that Hawaiian culture was drug free and that the closer the children were to Hawaiian culture, the farther they would be from illegal and harmful substances. For this reason, transmitting Hawaiian cultural values to the children was the backbone of the program at Kahua Ola Hou.

Internal and external representations of Hawaiian culture affected the way substance abuse disorder was thought to begin. ‘Ohana (family) was continually mentioned as the reason children abused substances, when the staff, parents, and children were asked. Although family plays an important role in all cultures, Hawaiian culture embraces the concept of ‘Ohana as the central unit in an individual’s life. According to Kahua Ola Hou, family is the powerhouse seat in the Pono curriculum’s canoe analogy, the strongest force in the child’s life. Kahua Ola Hou staff believed that if the child’s family abused substances, the child would end up abusing them too.
Some staff and children mentioned friends as a reason why the children started abusing substances. Even so, the concept of ‘ohana was so strong amongst the staff and children at Kahua Ola Hou, that the reason children stayed friends with those who introduced them to substances was that the family structure was off in some way. Some mentioned that the parents might be too intimidating, making it difficult for the child to talk to them about abusing substances. Others mentioned that it was because the parents were too apathetic about where their children were, whom they were with, and what they were doing. No matter the reason, Kahua Ola Hou staff and children thought that the ‘ohana was the number one reason children abused substances.

Transmission of Hawaiian Culture

The transmission of Hawaiian cultural values occurred in Kahua Ola Hou’s activity settings. Internal and external representations of Hawaiian culture were transmitted to the children by the staff during the activity settings via the use of language and common meanings. The example of how staff encouraged positive behavior by calling the children pono (righteous) also serves as an example of how the use of a common language with a shared meaning emphasizes the Hawaiian cultural value of being pono. Other activity settings, such as where the Pono Curriculum was taught, transmitted culture to the youth through lessons that the staff taught or that the children read. At these times the children understood the lessons best when the staff were more involved and the level of intersubjectivity within the group was high.

Hawaiian Culture as Treatment

As mentioned, Hawaiian cultural values were the backbone of the treatment plan at Kahua Ola Hou. Internal and external representations of Hawaiian culture affected the
treatment milieu for substance abuse at Kahua Ola Hou. The Pono curriculum is a good example of how Hawaiian cultural values were used to promote a substance free life. Hawaiian cultural values, such as respecting your ‘ohana, malama, pono, and ho‘oponopono, were taught to the children via the activity settings. These concepts were taught because they were Hawaiian cultural values they could use as tools to help them function without substances in their everyday life.

Since Kahua Ola Hou believed the child’s experimentation with substances stemmed from a lack of family structure, much of the treatment plan included activities designed to get children and parents to think about their family structure and how they could improve it. The concept of forgiveness was used to help children and parents heal the wounds between them. Ho‘oponopono was used to help them communicate more effectively. Children were taught to be pono and to have a sense of malama towards their parents, their living space, and the rest of their family. Each of these values emphasize being Hawaiian.

The role of internal and external representations of Hawaiian culture for the individuals working at Kahua Ola Hou was central. They all mentioned that they identified with Hawaiian culture over all other cultures in their everyday lives. Each of them discussed the importance of Hawaiian culture for them. Some mentioned that Hawaiian culture was who they were. The staff practiced, thought about, and used Hawaiian cultural values at home, in their community, and at Kahua Ola Hou everyday so they no longer consciously thought about how they could be Hawaiian. They just were. The staff surrounded themselves with individuals who practiced Hawaiian cultural values and shared a common meaning about what Hawaiian culture should be.
For this reason, the degree of intersubjectivity present amongst the participants of the activity settings of Kahua Ola Hou was very high. The staff looked to each other to make sure they were teaching the same Hawaiian values to the children. The children saw how the staff truly believed in the values they were teaching them. They also saw how the staff cooperated with each other and worked together. The children clearly saw the staff as role models and would try to emulate them. As the shared meanings of the values taught to children at Kahua Ola Hou increased, the level of intersubjectivity during subsequent activity settings also increased. The staff knew the children better and the children felt more comfortable around the staff, supporting one of the main concepts of activity settings theory: intersubjectivity is required for activity settings to serve their purpose.

*Support for Activity Settings Theory*

In Kahua Ola Hou, the purpose of activity settings was to transmit positive Hawaiian cultural values that would promote living without using substances. One psychological concept that was fundamental to Kahua Ola Hou was that to live a good, happy life an individual should be pono. As described before, to be pono means to be righteous. This righteousness is to be displayed when interacting with friends, family, and the community, going to work, taking care of body and mind, and utilizing one's spiritual or moral compass.

The activity settings perspective helped to show how the psychological concept of being pono was used to help treat the children for substance abuse at Kahua Ola Hou. It also showed how pono loses its connotative meaning when translated literally. Being pono invoked the idea that being “righteous” was a way in which the youth could interact
with and respect Hawaiian culture. Once the word pono was used enough, the word righteous seemed to take on a lesser meaning. The children wanted to be pono after they had been at Kahua Ola Hou for a few days. Furthermore, all of the staff and children used the word to describe everyday expectations they had for themselves. Being pono emphasized that the child could not change other people, but that they could change themselves. It emphasized the treatment of the individual through intersubjectivity.

An example of a Native Hawaiian psychological practice based on the idea of being pono that was fundamental to Kahua Ola Hou was ho‘oponopono. At Kahua Ola Hou, ho‘oponopono was used to treat problems between the children and their families, so they could both begin the process of healing the emotional wounds that existed between them. Ho‘oponopono, like pono itself, is a Native Hawaiian psychological treatment tool that has been used for generations. Activity settings theory helps us to understand the history and meaning of this Native Hawaiian psychological treatment.

The goal of this case study was to find the meanings the participants attributed to each of the activities in which they participated. Activity settings theory provided a means to find and analyze the goals and meanings of the activity for each of the participants. In this case study, the goals and meanings for each of the activities were clearly defined for each of the participants and for the collective entity that is Kahua Ola Hou. Furthermore, the cultural meanings behind the practices were illuminated.

Through using activity settings theory, this study showed how Native Hawaiian psychology is used as a treatment for substance abuse. These findings may apply to other group homes. These results suggest that these homes can and, most likely, should incorporate the natal values of the children into their treatment program to be most
effective. Incorporating natal values, language, practices, philosophies, and psychologies were effective ways to increase the level of intersubjectivity among the individuals in the group home and, by so doing, increasing the quality and effectiveness of the activity settings in which the individuals participated.

Limitations and Future Directions

The limitations to this case study are first and foremost that it is a case study. This means that the findings cannot automatically be generalized to other group homes that provide substance abuse treatment. Replication of this study in other group homes is needed. Another variable of possible importance is that data was collected during the weeks just after Thanksgiving and before Christmas. This time of year could have skewed the behavior of the children and parent(s)/guardian(s) who might have missed each other more and were willing to work harder to be together than they would have at another time of year.

In the future other studies could be done on multiple group homes from different cultural, socioeconomic, and geographical settings using activity settings theory to learn the similarities and differences of the meanings and practices of these group homes. Are there similarities that transcend cultural, socioeconomic, and geographical differences? Do other differences matter more?

Future research could also follow up with the youth at Kahua Ola Hou to see the long-term effects of their stay at Kahua Ola Hou. One of the questions would be whether the messages of Kahua Ola Hou continued to affect their lives. For example, did any of the youth use ho'oponopono after they left Kahua Ola Hou?
Also, it would be important to see if any of the friendships that were formed between the youth during their stay continued on after they left and whether the friendships that were formed between the youth were positive, appropriate friendships or whether they were instances of deviancy training, where the youth would exchange ways and methods to get away with using substances in the future. The peer networks of youth are major mediators of their behavior and developing friendships among at-risk youth can be harmful (O'Donnell, 2005; O'Donnell, Manos, & Chesney-Lind, 1987).

In psychology, there has been much research on acculturation, the process of moving from one culture and adjusting to a new culture. This literature could be used to assess the similarities and differences of the experience of strong identification with Hawaiian culture and the experience of immigrants. In this study, the question would be if the youth experienced the same struggles with old and new cultural values as do immigrants who come to the United States? Are they able to practice the new cultural norms once they leave Kahua Ola Hou?

According to the 2007 Biennial Report of the Hawai‘i Department of Health, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Division (Chorpita & Daleiden, 2007), the most effective treatment strategies for youth with substance abuse problems were family therapy, cognitive behavior therapy, contingency management, and family systems therapy. It would be interesting to compare ho‘oponopono to these established treatment methodologies to see how Hawaiian psychology exists and thrives within Hawaiian culture in the United States.

Finally, another research question is how can activity settings theory could be used to find natal psychological practices of cultures in settings other than group homes?
It is clear from this study that analyzing cultural activity settings can contribute to our understanding of the activities, why they are happening, the history of the practice, and how the practice occurs. The more knowledge psychology gains from discovering how people from differing cultures conceptualize the idea of psychology, the more culturally sensitive decisions will be with regards to people from cultures that aren’t familiar.
Table 1

*Self-reported Demographic Information for Staff, Children, and Parents at Kahua Ola Hou*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity most identified with (EI)</th>
<th>Cultural Identity most identified with (CI)</th>
<th>Strength of CI (0 = low, 10 = high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HI* - 1</td>
<td>HI - 6</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part HI - 5</td>
<td>Part HI - 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tahitian - 0</td>
<td>Tahitian - 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HI - 0</td>
<td>HI - 2</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part HI - 4</td>
<td>Part HI - 2</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tahitian - 1</td>
<td>Tahitian - 1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HI - 0</td>
<td>HI - 5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part HI - 5</td>
<td>Part HI - 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tahitian - 0</td>
<td>Tahitian - 0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>HI - 1</td>
<td>HI - 13</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part HI - 4</td>
<td>Part HI - 2</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tahitian - 1</td>
<td>Tahitian - 1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* HI stands for Hawaiian.*
Figure 1

The Target Activity Setting in Context (O'Donnell & Tharp 1990, pp. 259)

- Authority Activity Setting
  - Policy Perimeter
- Parallel Activity Setting
- Target Activity Setting
  - Positions
  - Physical Environment
  - Funds
  - Symbols
  - Time
  - People
- Constituent Activity Setting
- Resource Activity Setting
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Informed Consent

Staff

My name is Andrew Grant and I am a graduate student at the University of Hawai‘i. I would like you to be a part of my study. I am trying to find out what Kahua Ola Hou is like to live in, work at, and have a child at. Because you are a staff member at Kahua Ola Hou, I could use your help. This study may not directly benefit you, but could provide useful information to benefit the Kahua Ola Hou program.

Specifically, I would like to have you do three things. The first is to answer a short five-question demographic survey. The second is to participate in an interview with me (45 minutes-1 hour). I will be asking about your work at Kahua Ola Hou. Finally, I would like to observe the activities that you participate in at Kahua Ola Hou.

The records of the conversations and activities that you engage in during the observations and your responses to the survey and interview will be kept completely confidential to the extent allowed by law. All records will be kept in a locked cabinet and destroyed when the study is completed. I am the only one who will have access to the cabinet. If you do choose to grant permission for your participation, you are free to withdraw your permission at anytime for any reason without consequence. Whether or not you give permission will in no way affect your participation in the group home.

Participation is not expected to cause you any stress, but if you feel stress when talking about your personal experiences or do not feel comfortable with the interview at any point, you may take a break or withdraw from the study at any time.

If you have any questions, please call me, Andrew Grant, at (808) 383-2761. You can also email me at andrewgr@hawaii.edu. If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: Committee on Human Studies, 2540 Maile Way, Spalding Hall 253, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822. Phone: (808) 539-3955. E-Mail: uhirb@hawaii.edu

I have read and understand the above, and have received satisfactory answers to my questions. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the Principal Investigator from liability for negligence. I also understand that I may keep a copy of this form.

______________________________  __________________________
Signature of Staff Member       Date of Signature
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Informed Consent
Parent(s)/Guardian(s) Consent

My name is Andrew Grant and I am a graduate student at the University of Hawai‘i. I would like your child to be a part of my study. I am trying to find out what Kahua Ola Hou is like to live in, work at, and have a child at. Because your child is living at Kahua Ola Hou, I could use your help. This study may not directly benefit your child, but could provide useful information to benefit the Kahua Ola Hou program.

Specifically, I would like to have your child do three things. The first is to answer a short five-question survey about age, gender, and ethnicity. The second is to participate in an interview with me (45 minutes-1 hour.). I will be asking your child about his or her life at Kahua Ola Hou. Finally, I would like to observe the activities that your child participates in at Kahua Ola Hou.

The records of the conversations and activities that your child engages in during the observations and their responses to the survey and interview will be kept completely confidential to the extent allowed by law. All records will be kept in a locked cabinet and destroyed when the study is completed. I am the only one who will have access to the cabinet. If you do choose to grant permission for your child to participate, you are free to withdraw your permission at anytime for any reason without consequence. Whether or not you give your child permission will in no way affect your child’s status or ability to participate in the group home.

Participation is not expected to stress your child, but if your child feels stress when talking about his/her personal experiences or does not feel comfortable with the interview at any point, he/she may take a break or withdraw from the study at any time.

If you have any questions, please call me, Andrew Grant, at (808) 383-2761. You can also email me at andrewgr@hawaii.edu. If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: Committee on Human Studies, 2540 Maile Way, Spalding Hall 253, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822. Phone: (808) 539-3955. E-Mail: uhirb@hawaii.edu

I have read and understand the above, and have received satisfactory answers to my questions. I voluntarily agree to allow my child, __________________________, to participate in this study with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the Principal Investigator from liability for negligence.

______________________________  __________________________
Signature of Parent(s)/Guardian(s)  Date of Signature
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Informed Consent

Parent(s)/Guardian(s)

My name is Andrew Grant and I am a graduate student at the University of Hawai‘i. I would like you to be a part of my study. I am trying to find out what Kahua Ola Hou is like to live in, work at, and have a child at. Because you have a child who is living at Kahua Ola Hou, I could use your help. This study may not directly benefit you, but could provide useful information to benefit the Kahua Ola Hou program.

Specifically, I would like to have you do three things. The first is to answer a short five-question demographic survey. The second is to participate in an interview with me (45 minutes-1 hour.). I will be asking about your child's life at Kahua Ola Hou. Finally, I would like to observe the activities that you participate in at Kahua Ola Hou.

The records of the conversations and activities that you engage in during the observations and your responses to the survey and interview will be kept completely confidential to the extent allowed by law. All records will be kept in a locked cabinet and destroyed when the study is completed. I am the only one who will have access to the cabinet. If you do choose to grant permission for your participation, you are free to withdraw your permission at anytime for any reason without consequence. Whether or not you give permission will in no way affect your child’s participation in the group home.

Participation is not expected to cause you any stress, but if you feel stress when talking about your personal experiences or do not feel comfortable with the interview at any point, you may take a break or withdraw from the study at any time.

If you have any questions, please call me, Andrew Grant, at (808) 383-2761. You can also email me at andrewgr@hawaii.edu. If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: Committee on Human Studies, 2540 Maile Way, Spalding Hall 253, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822. Phone: (808) 539-3955. E-Mail: uhirb@hawaii.edu

I have read and understand the above, and have received satisfactory answers to my questions. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the Principal Investigator from liability for negligence. I also understand that I may keep a copy of this form.

[Signature of Parent(s)/Guardian(s)]
[Date of Signature]
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Assent Form
Children

My name is Andrew Grant and I am a graduate student at the University of Hawai'i. I would like you to be a part of my study. I am trying to find out what Kahua Ola Hou is like. I could use your help because you live at Kahua Ola Hou. This study may not directly benefit you, but could provide useful information to benefit the Kahua Ola Hou program.

What I would like to have you do is three things. The first is to answer five simple questions about your age, sex, and ethnicity. The second is to participate in an interview with me (45 minutes-1 hour). I will be asking you about your life at Kahua Ola Hou. Finally, I would like to observe the activities that you participate in at Kahua Ola Hou.

All of your answers and my observations will be kept completely confidential to the extent allowed by law. All records will be kept in a locked cabinet and destroyed when the study is completed. I am the only one who will have access to the cabinet. If you do choose to participate, you will be free to quit at anytime for any reason without consequence. Whether or not you participate in this study will in no way affect your life in the group home.

Participation is not expected to cause you any stress, but if you feel stress when talking about your personal experiences or do not feel comfortable with the interview at any point, you may take a break or withdraw from the study at any time.

If you have any questions, please call me. Andrew Grant, at (808) 383-2761. You can also email me at andrewgr@hawaii.edu. If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: Committee on Human Studies, 2540 Maile Way, Spalding Hall 253, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822. Phone: (808) 539-3955. E-Mail: uhirb@hawaii.edu

I have read and understand the above, and have received satisfactory answers to my questions. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the Principal Investigator from liability for negligence. I also understand that I may keep a copy of this form.

______________________________  ____________________________
Signature of Child          Date of Signature
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Demographic Information

1) Age: ______

2) Gender: Male_______ Female _______

3) Ethnicity (such as Japanese, White, African American, Samoan, Chinese-Hawaiian, etc.)

_____________________________________________

4) Culture you most identify with (practices you participate in the most)

_____________________________________________

5) Please indicate how much you feel you identify with Hawaiian culture: (circle one)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all Completely
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Questions and Prompts for Children

Tell me what you think “substance abuse” means.

What do you think some of the reasons are that you abused substances?

How did you end up at Kahua Ola Hou?

-Who diagnosed you? Do you know how did they come to their diagnosis?

What do you think some of the goals of the treatment program are at Kahua Ola Hou?

What have you learned about Hawaiian culture at Kahua Ola Hou?

-Describe any activities, artifacts, tools, or other external representations of Hawaiian culture that you have learned.

-Describe some of the values of Hawaiian Culture that you have learned.

Do you think that learning about Hawaiian culture will help you to stop abusing substances? Why or why not?

Do you have a role in the planning and implementation of activities at Kahua Ola Hou? What (if any)?

-What are some examples of activities you participated in? What did you do?

-Is there anything you have done to help make the activities you are involved with better?

Describe what you like the most about living at Kahua Ola Hou.

Describe what you like the least about living at Kahua Ola Hou.
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Questions and Prompts for Staff Members

How do you define “substance abuse?”

What do you think some of the reasons are that the children at Kahua Ola Hou have abused substances?

What is the typical route that a child goes through to end up at Kahua Ola Hou?

- Who diagnoses the children? How do they come to their diagnosis?

What are some of the goals of the treatment program at Kahua Ola Hou?

What is the role of Hawaiian culture is at Kahua Ola Hou?

- What aspects of Hawaiian culture are taught to the children at Kahua Ola Hou?

  - Describe the internal values that you teach.

  - Describe any activities, artifacts, tools, or other external representations of Hawaiian culture that you teach.

  - Why are those aspects of Hawaiian culture taught to the children at Kahua Ola Hou?

- What is the role of Hawaiian culture in the treatment of substance abuse at Kahua Ola Hou?

  Do you think that learning about Hawaiian culture will help the children to stop abusing substances? Why or why not?

What is your role in the planning and implementation of activities at Kahua Ola Hou?

- Give some examples of the activities you participate in.

- What are some of the things you do to help make the activities you are involved with successful?

Describe the most rewarding aspect of your job.

Describe the least rewarding aspect of your job.
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Questions and Prompts for Parent(s)/Guardian(s)

How do you define “substance abuse?”

What do you think some of the reasons are that your child abused substances?

What was the route that your child went through to end up at Kahua Ola Hou?

-Who diagnosed your child? How did they come to their diagnosis?

What do you think some of the goals of the treatment program are at Kahua Ola Hou?

What do you think the role of Hawaiian culture is at Kahua Ola Hou?

-What aspects of Hawaiian culture do you believe are taught to your child at Kahua Ola Hou?

-Describe the internal values that are taught.

-Describe any activities, artifacts, tools, or other external representations of Hawaiian culture that is taught.

-Why do you think those aspects of Hawaiian culture are taught to the children at Kahua Ola Hou?

-What do you think is the role of Hawaiian culture in the treatment of substance abuse at Kahua Ola Hou?

Do you think that learning about Hawaiian culture will help your child to stop abusing substances? Why or why not?

Do you have a role in the planning and implementation of activities at Kahua Ola Hou? What (if any)?

-Are there examples of activities you participated in? What (if any)?

-Is there anything you have done to help make the activities you are involved with successful?
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Activity Setting Observation Checklist

Date ____/____/____

Brief Description:

Section 1 - Describe the six characteristics of the activity setting:

1) Time Start/End (Total)

2) Physical Environment

3) People

4) Roles

5) Physical Resources

6) Symbols
Appendix J

Section 2 - Describe each of the following in narrative format:

Describe how the activity setting begins.

Describe the joint productive activity.

Describe the external and internal aspects of Hawaiian culture that are taught.
External:

Internal:

Describe how the activity setting ends.

Describe signs of intersubjectivity.
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Master Code Sheet

*This sheet must be destroyed upon completion of the study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Staff/Child/Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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