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Abstract

This research investigated how some indigenous ‘āina (land)-based Native Hawaiian organizations engage with tourism strategically to enable them to continue working towards sustainable self-determination in Hawai‘i. This research was explored through the experience of the Ka Welina Network made up of organizations who adopted a community-based host-visitor (CBHV) model that emphasized the sharing of meaningful experiences, guided by the traditional customs of ho‘okipa (hosting), such as reciprocity, kuleana (responsibility), mālama (to take care) and aloha (love). This research investigated the challenges that the organizations faced in implementing the values-based model within a predominant capitalist society highlighting how cultural practitioners must deal with the business of generating revenue to sustain organizational survival, while also remaining true to their Native Hawaiian values, goals, and way of life, aims that are often at odds with each other. Data were collected through participant observations, “talk-story” qualitative interviews, and secondary data. Research findings point to conditions under which hosted experiences may lead to transformations among visitors that contribute to host communities’ goals towards sustainable self-determination. Based on the case study analysis, a conceptual model of values-based host-visitor engagement is offered.
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Prefatory Remarks on Language and Style

A Note about Hawaiian and other non-English Words:

This work recognizes that the Hawaiian language is the native language of Hawai‘i, therefore, does not follow the conventional use of italics to identify and highlight all Hawaiian words. Other, non-English words however, are still italicized. Hawaiian and non-English words are parenthetically defined at first mention and translated in the Glossary (Appendix A) for reference.
Chapter I: Introduction

Reflections from the South Pacific: Tonga

I sat across from my father and stared out at the lagoon while Sāloite, the young girl working at the restaurant, poured our coffee and brought us brunch. The tide was coming in. I watched the water trickling in over the reef, slowly filling the lagoon and marveled at the beauty of the scenery in front of me. It was like a painting come to life. A lagoon, surrounded on both sides by cliffs covered in native forest and the far off island of ‘Otungaluvalu, loomed in the distance, separated from us by the reef and the open ocean beyond that. In my bird’s eye view, it was paradise. No man-made structures to be seen. No people on the beach. Only green covered mounds of islands, the blue-green hues of the ocean, big white fluffy clouds, and blue skies beyond the horizon. As we sat there looking at the ocean, I gazed in awe at this place that was my front yard as a child. My playground. It still looked the same today as it was then except with more patches of sea-grass beds dotting the lagoon.

This paradise was also my father’s livelihood. After my siblings and I had all grown up and gone overseas to attend university and followed our own paths in life, my father had returned to our family home after he retired from his government job and started a small eco-tourism venture. I found my father using the term, eco-tourism often to describe his business, a type of tourism that emerged in the United States of America and Europe in the early 1980s in response to the threats of conventional mass tourism. Initially founded on an ethic of respect for the environment and for local communities and cultures, this type of tourism still maintains an economic development-based framework. Such was the nature of how my father’s business was founded. He called the business, the ‘Ene‘io Botanical Gardens, a 22-acre property that surrounds the beach of ‘Ene‘io. The botanical gardens was a strategy for economic development
in a rural setting in the island of Vava’u, the second largest group of islands in the Tongan Archipelago which was far from any metropolitan business centers.

He had always dreamed of someday owning his own business and he started by putting what he knew best, to work. He created a botanical garden and it became a repository of native plants and the first and only botanical garden in the Kingdom of Tonga. He also built a small restaurant with a bar overlooking the ocean on the property which is where we would go for breakfast, lunch, and dinner, and be served like guests during our visit. As we sat there sipping our coffee, I asked him where the coffee came from and he gave me a detailed run down of the coffee situation in Tonga, giving away his passion—plants.

He had studied horticulture at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa in the 1970s where he met my mother. Upon graduating, he was among the few people in Tonga at that time, who had a university degree. He worked as an extension officer for the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry on this island, where he provided technical assistance to farmers about how to grow their crops. He later became the Director of Agriculture and Forestry for Tonga when I entered high school, so we had to move to the main island of Tongatapu for his job. He worked for the Tongan government for more than twenty years. During that time, my upbringing consisted of many farming experiments to test out new crops. Though his expertise was vanilla, different years brought different crops and experiences. One year it was watermelon that we exported to New Zealand. Another year, it was asparagus, then a certain yam bean, then sweet corn and it continued on over the years.

He described the local coffee as Arabica, formerly known as Royal Tongan coffee, which he sells at the gift shop in front of the restaurant in addition to a variety of products that are made at ‘Ene‘io from plants in the garden. These include vanilla extract, packaged vanilla beans, nonu
juice, taro and plantain chips, mango and papaya chutney, and scented coconut oils, used traditionally by Tongan women as moisturizers. The variety of locally-made products is impressive but the revenue generated from the sale of these products is supplementary income. The main money maker of the business is the garden tour. As a private entity, the botanical garden is not open to the public. To view these plants, one must join a pre-arranged tour.

These tours are done by my father, who alone, holds the knowledge about the plants in the garden. A natural story-teller, my father is the perfect tour guide where his professional and traditional knowledge of plants are combined to provide a powerful presentation of knowledge infused with humorous stories from his lived experience. The tour also includes displays and demonstrations of how plants are utilized in Tongan culture. These include demonstrations of how baskets are woven from coconut leaves, mats are made from pandanus leaves, and tapa made from the bark of the mulberry plant. These demonstrations are performed by my father’s close relatives who live in the village of Tu‘anekivale, situated a mile away.

Depending on the day, tours may end at the restaurant and visitors may partake in a Tongan feast with roast pig and a repertoire of traditional dishes, or a simple fish and chips lunch that has gained island-wide recognition. On certain days, a floor show with Tongan dances performed by youth from the village, is held to provide entertainment during lunch or dinner. Though fish and chips can be ordered any day, the Tongan feast and entertainment are held less frequently because it takes a tremendous amount of labor and planning, to set up and coordinate. Roasting a pig is no easy task and takes half a day or more to prepare. Staff are employed to cook a set menu and dancers comprise of at least five dancers. The staff and entertainers all come from Tu‘anekivale and most are our kin.
Savoring the flavor of this local brew, I mentally compared it to my usual morning Kona coffee and continued to reflect on the events of the last few days. My daughter and I had arrived just two days ago from Hawai‘i, a journey that took us through three different countries in two days. It was her first time in my homeland and my first time back home in six years. In those two days, my senses took in everything. Recalibrating. Relearning old memories and images. Noticing new patterns and rhythms that were different yet familiar such as the raw beauty of the natural world that somehow had become foggy in my memory of home— the sound of the waves crashing on the reef; the clouds turning different hues of orange and purple as the sun would set over the trees in the west; flying foxes spreading their wings above us, scouring their territory for food; the sound of crickets accompanying that cool breeze that would settle in as the stars peeped out of the sky when night would take over. These were among the many things that made this place home.

I was particularly fascinated by the daily ritual of women from the village wading through the water, casting dark silhouettes against the fading light as the sun would grow faint over the horizon in the evenings. It was beautiful to watch these women gathering pandanus leaves from the ocean after five days of soaking in the changing tides. The leaves were ready for the next stage of preparation to make them ready for weaving mats. Every evening, it was like clockwork. They would arrive at the beach at dusk. After all their chores were done and their families fed, they would come to gather their “gold” as one of the women called it. These leaves were the source of income for many women in the village who would transform them into beautiful mats that could each sell for several thousand Tongan pa‘anga to sustain their families. I was in awe of these women. In this day and age of modernization, they spent their days together on the traditional practices of weaving passed down through the centuries of time, to earn them their
livelihood. I on the other hand, sat behind a computer all day quietly typing thoughts into a screen to earn mine.

I had also become fascinated with my father’s business and his own way of carving a livelihood for himself that allowed him the luxury of doing what he loved in his own home, a million dollar setting, isolated from the reaches of civilization. I had a gazillion questions. His wife joined the conversation and we spent a good part of the morning talking about the business: How many staff are employed; how often they work; how much they get paid; the number of tours they conduct on a weekly, monthly and yearly basis; the cost of the different services and products they offer such as their tour, lunches, dinners, drinks, and Tongan feast; and the production and sale of the products they make locally and sell in their gift shop. They spoke of the success of their taro and plantain chips which sell for $10 pa‘anga and are in high demand by a variety of local vendors in town. Also popular, are the mango and papaya chutney they make which sells for $30 pa‘anga a jar and is served to guests to accompany the chips as dip. They acknowledged that increasing and focusing exclusively on the production for these products alone, had the potential of exceeding the profits earned from all other ventures at the garden.

My father was proud to talk about his business. He reflected on its evolution from the beginning when he first started out to its current operation then the conversation turned to the challenges they have faced over the years. Like many small-scale businesses in the tourism industry in the South Pacific, he felt that the greatest challenge to the operation of his small business was the difficulty in acquiring start-up funds such as the ability to take out loans. He explains that the lack of institutional support in this area is limiting because it hinders their ability to expand and make the necessary changes to improve the type of service and products they can offer. The government does not provide assistance of this type to local businesses such
as his though one year, he was able to acquire a government grant that brought electricity over the 1-mile stretch from the village to the beach. The installation of electricity, he says, was significant in making it much easier to run his business such as the ability to store food in a freezer and refrigerator.

I asked what improvements he envisioned for his business and he confided that he wanted to build high-end accommodations along the eastern-most cliff of the property overlooking the lagoon. He envisioned building five-star hotel accommodations offering luxurious spa treatment and fine dining like those along Fiji’s Coral Coast. He was aware of the natural beauty of ‘Ene‘io and its seclusion and isolation would provide retreat for wealthy visitors willing to make the trek across the Pacific in search for refuge. He felt that such an addition to his business would utilize the place well and attract a certain type of clientele.

The majority of visitors to the garden are foreign tourists. Therefore, my father’s business is greatly affected by any fluctuations of the tourism industry in Tonga. Though Vava‘u is a popular tourist attraction in Tonga, it is a remote island with expensive inter-island flights and additional travel costs to tourists. Cruise ships bring good business but these occur only several times a year. In 2014, only 6 cruise ships visited Vava‘u. Two days after I arrived at home, I was a witness to one of these cruise ship visits as everyone prepared for the largest group of visitors they had all year. It was the Pacific Pearl, a cruise ship from Australia en-route through several Pacific Island countries and 153 visitors visited the ‘Ene‘io Botanical Gardens. To make the group more manageable to host, the visitors were split into two touring groups with 101 in the morning and 52 in the afternoon. I was asked to be in charge of the visitor center’s gift shop so for that day, I put on my traditional Tongan wear and was part of the ‘Ene‘io Botanical Gardens staff.
Some of the challenges of running a small business in this industry came to light in preparing for the cruise ship tours. As I assisted my family in the preparations, I came to understand how much work it takes to operate such a business—the limited number of workers, the long hours that everyone works, and the strain that it puts on interpersonal and familial relationships. My father explained that it’s difficult to get good workers and also very challenging to work with family. In a place where kinship ties supercede everything else in life, it is a challenge to separate familial relations and cultural expectations from business operations and culture. Just prior to my arrival, several workers were let go and it was stressful because it involved family. At the same time, I saw family also as a strength of the business because my father could call upon his many relatives in the village for assistance on different things, especially on last-minute notice. These included things like additional servers, cooks, flower necklaces to welcome guests, green coconuts, and many other resources from outside the garden.

A variety of other challenges to running a business like my father’s were associated with the limited capacity of small businesses. My father explained the need for administrative training and also for better marketing and advertising, such as a good website to reach more tourists. Though someone was hired to construct a website for their business, the person hired was paid and disappeared without completing the website so the business operates with no formal website. A Facebook page has been established for the garden but it is not exclusively used for business operations and it is not used as an interface for tourists to use. My father explained that referrals from other business vendors in town affect their business and note that the addition of two tour operators to their network of people they work with has increased the number of tours to their business. As I listened, I was curious about the struggles of other small business owners in Tonga, as well as the larger Pacific.
A study on tourism and poverty reduction in the South Pacific shows that the nature of tourism development across the Pacific varies considerably (Sheyvens and Russell 2009). For some countries like Fiji, French Polynesia, Vanuatu, Cook Islands, and Samoa, tourism has become their major industry. In Fiji and Vanuatu, the tourism industry has followed the mass tourism trend of tourism development where the industry is mostly foreign-owned and centered around resort style development that caters to the needs of visitors. In contrast, indigenous people have greater control and ownership of tourism enterprises in other Pacific Island nations. Schilcher (2007) estimates that approximately 80 percent of tourism enterprises in Samoa are locally-owned and Milne (1997:292) found that in the Cook Islands, Tonga, Niue, and Kiribati, more than 70 percent of direct tourist expenditures went to local indigenous owners (Sheyvens and Russell 2009).

My father is one of those indigenous owners and while he enjoys the autonomy of making his own decisions as a business owner, does he really have autonomy? When the Pacific Pearl visited in October 2014, did he really have the organizational capacity to serve that many people at any one time with only two operating toilets? Regardless of his organizational capacity, could he really turn people away with the knowledge that this could possibly be the last cruise ship for the year? If the ship arrived on a Monday morning, how would hosting at this time affect his life and that of his workers? Sunday is holy and dedicated to God in Tonga so no work is performed on this day. However, given the tremendous amount of time that is needed to prepare ahead of time for one of his tours, a Monday tour would necessitate work on Sunday. Would he have to forgo the opportunity to host these visitors or would he have to overlook cultural norms and make the necessary sacrifices to ensure that he makes enough to look after his family financially?
In a place where one’s business is dependent upon visitors that are few to begin with, how much choice does one have in operating a business? How much compromise is one willing to make, to earn a living? For indigenous people whose cultural norms, lifestyles, and belief systems are often in contradiction with the culture of money-oriented capitalism within which tourism is embedded, how does an indigenous business owner reconcile the tensions between their own cultural values and identity and that of capitalism? For someone who is deeply spiritual and going to church on Sunday is a critical element of their identity and cultural practice, how does working on a Sunday instead of going to church and maintaining the sanctity of that day, affect their well-being?

Are there other ways that tourism can take form that are more natural for people like my father but where the act of hosting is not overwhelming and stressful that it takes a village to host? How can he continue to share the wealth of ancestral knowledge he holds and engage visitors to have meaningful experiences without taking so much out of him and his family? Are there other ways to host that will support the sustainability of his business despite the fluctuations of tourists visiting Tonga; engages local communities; and fits with the cultural norms so that workers can continue to make a living without compromising their customs and continue to go to church on Sundays? For tourists, what kind of activities and experiences would they find meaningful in the absence of staged dance performances and feasts that has characterized tourism in the Pacific? Is there a win-win situation for both hosts and visitors in creating meaningful experiences and what would that look like?

**Hawai‘i**

In search for answers to these questions, we travel north some 2,500 nautical miles across the Pacific Ocean, guided by the stars of Hānaiaakamalama (the southern cross) and Hokupa‘a (the
north star) to a group of islands that lay under Hokuleʻa’s (Arcturus) meridian, a place that the elders back home call, Vaihi, “a far off place.” This place is Hawaiʻi and where we find a community of people who call themselves the Ka Welina Network. This is a group of ten Native Hawaiian community-based organizations spread out on five of the main Hawaiian Islands who have tried to address some of these questions and dilemmas posed by tourism. The organizations are small, land-based enterprises that are community-based and culturally driven, much like my father’s garden.

The Ka Welina Network was formed to assist ten communities to develop and implement an indigenous alternative to mass tourism which offers host-visitor exchange experiences that nurtures sincere forms of Native Hawaiian cultural experience while contributing economically to their livelihoods. The experiences are intended to be mutually beneficial where visitors can learn about and gain a deeper understanding of Native Hawaiian culture while providing an avenue for hosts to perpetuate their culture through the daily practice of their traditions. Visitors are invited to experience the Native Hawaiian way of life in the 21st century by participating in host communities’ daily activities. The following quote, taken from the Ka Welina Network Conceptual Plan, describes the Ka Welina way of hosting: “This is not tourism. It is something much more meaningful for both hosts and visitors, where the outcome is not one of entertainment but is instead focused on learning, sharing, and making genuine connections with the place and its people” (Ka Welina Network Conceptual Plan 2012:4).

The network’s mission is: “To support and promote Hawaiʻi community-based host-visitor experiences that are culturally appropriate, socially responsible, environmentally sustainable and economically viable and that embrace and exhibit the Hawaiian values of aloha, pono, kuleana
and mālama” (Ka Welina Network Conceptual Plan 2012:9). The network’s hosting activities are
guided by a set of values which include the following:

- Communities taking control of their destiny;
- Creating a new community-based host-visitor model rather than an extension of mass tourism;
- Communities benefitting culturally, spiritually, socially, environmentally, and economically;
- Establishing relationships and activities that preserve communities’ dignity and integrity;
- Acknowledging protocols that respect and protect communities’ kaiāulu;
- Values-based management-based on aloha, pono, kuleana, and mālama;
- Inspiring visitors to take what they learn, including kuleana, and apply it back home;
- Moving visitors to want to keep in touch and support what Ka Welina communities do;
- Creating visitors like family, building lasting friendships, and extending the meaning of ‘ohana.

Currently, the ten organizations vary in size, capacity, and focus but all are characterized by a
dedication to stewarding the land, natural resources, and culture of Hawai‘i with an emphasis on
education and relationship-building. Table 1 shows a list of the organizations, their locations, and
focus. Each organization is located in a unique setting with cultural practitioners who have
specialized knowledge on different aspects of the culture.

I came to be associated with the Ka Welina Network in October, 2011. I was hired by Pasifika
Foundation Hawai‘i (PFH), Inc., as a planner to assist in developing a long-term strategic plan
for the network. The plan was intended to provide the roadmap to assist and offer some direction
in bringing the mission and expectations of the Ka Welina Network to life. Coincidentally, the
lead planner for the project turned out to be my academic advisor and graduate mentor, Karen
Umemoto. In discussing how the plan would look like, Karen suggested assisting each
community build their capacity as we worked on the plan. Subsequently, the strategic plan composed of an overall network plan that also included more specific individual plans for each of the ten organizations. Between October, 2011 and October, 2012, my academic advisor and I spent that year visiting and meeting with cultural practitioners and members of these communities on five of the main Hawaiian islands. We listened to community members and assisted them in the process of thinking through their host-visitor programs.

Table 1. List of organizations of the Ka Welina Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ‘Ahahui Malama o Kaniakapūpū</td>
<td>O‘ahu</td>
<td>Education program at site of King Kamehameha III’s summer place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ho‘oulu Lāhui</td>
<td>East Hawai‘i</td>
<td>Hawaiian education center on an ancient Hawaiian fishing village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ka ‘Ohana o Hōnaunau</td>
<td>West Hawai‘i</td>
<td>Immersion program that connects youth and families to their genealogy and history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kawai‘okalehua Foundation</td>
<td>East Hawai‘i</td>
<td>Program offering a multitude of traditional cultural practices of the Kapoho area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kipāhulu ‘Ohana</td>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>Education program centered around the restoration of an ancient taro farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Papakōlea</td>
<td>O‘ahu</td>
<td>An urban Hawaiian Homestead with a variety of community development projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sust-‘āina-ble Molokai</td>
<td>Moloka‘i</td>
<td>Grassroots organization working towards a more sustainable future for Moloka‘i Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Waipā Foundation</td>
<td>Kaua‘i</td>
<td>Education program focused around taro farming that utilizes ahupua‘a-based management principles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We spent an unforgettable 12 months visiting and meeting with the most remarkable and inspiring group of people that made up these communities, most of whom were cultural practitioners and leaders of their communities. Many of these communities lived in remote and breathtaking locales, hidden away from the reaches of modern life, each with their own unique character and aura much like my father’s botanical garden. This work took us on many adventures through bumpy back roads along lava-filled cliffs hugging rugged coastlines that stretched for miles, as well as wooded forests with trees that towered above us like cathedrals that drowned out the sunlight up above. Often, we would find ourselves in the middle of nowhere with no telephone reception and at other times, in the midst of Honolulu city life, fighting traffic to reach urban communities living on a homestead. In other places, we could walk along stretches of fine white sand and marvel at the beauty of place that extended all the way from the sea to the mountains. We even sat under a mango tree in an ancient men’s quarters and stared in awe at the remains of a Marquesian village built during the first migrations to the Hawaiian Islands and tried to imagine how it once looked. We also walked through many terraces of cultivated taro and at one site, followed a stream to a waterfall that dropped couple of hundred feet that flowed into the ocean.

Through our many adventures in the small space of our rental cars, hotel rooms, plane rides, talk story sessions on pandanus mats under mango trees, benches in backyards, picnic tables overlooking the ocean, and even interviews in the backseat of a moving car, we came to understand that small-scale community-based efforts such as these, are valuable assets to Hawai‘i. They are special places or kīpuka (oasis) of unique Native Hawaiian cultural resources, practices, values, and people, that educate, inspire, and instill hope within visitors about issues that are important to contemporary Hawai‘i. At these places, one is able to slow down, immerse
oneself in special experiences, vistas, and interactions that allow one to feel and appreciate, self-reflect on one’s life, and have conversations about culture, family, identity, politics, and place, much like in my father’s garden. Here, visitors are surrounded by a common set of ethics of taking care of ancestral knowledge, people, and of place.

Through our work, clear and consistent themes surfaced. Most obvious were challenges common to small enterprises that operate in remote areas with limited access to workforce, infrastructure, and time available to support hosting activities that my father also struggled with. While the foundation of the organizations lay in the assets of place and the people associated with them, particular challenges revolved around the administrative aspect of running a business. The technical know-how in managing a business was often undeveloped or neglected especially in establishing marketing and advertising strategies that are critical for attracting the appropriate visitors to these sites.

Also evident was that each participant we interviewed was passionate about and loved their work. All participants expressed a deep love and a sense of kuleana for the work that they do. Most were inspired to do what they do because they believe that their work helps to improve their communities and make Hawai‘i a better place. They were motivated and drawn to their work for larger purposes beyond making money. These included a desire to share and pass on cultural knowledge to youth and visitors, preserve special places and maintain their sense of place, build relationships, teach leadership and life skills, and build community capacity for self-determination. One gentleman on the island of Hawai‘i spent thousands of dollars of his own money, annually, providing free educational cultural workshops at his home on weekends where he also provided food and shelter for participants. Similar sentiments were shared among other
participants, who were uncomfortable charging visitors a monetary fee to participate in their programs.

**Tension Between Culture and Capitalism**

The behavior of working for reasons beyond making money that hosts exhibited seemed contradicting to the economic development framework of modern tourism where touristic experiences between hosts and guests have a monetary exchange value. A simplistic representation of the economic development model of tourism is shown in Figure 1, illustrating the perspective of hosts, where the ultimate goal of the host-visitor exchange is revenue generation. However, we discovered that Ka Welina communities are driven by core values that define them as individuals and as communities that differ from the economic development model of tourism in Figure 1. Instead, these communities prioritize activities that build community capacity over revenue generation. Some of the goals of these organizations include being able to pass on cultural knowledge to family, teach leadership and life skills to youth, preserve special places that support cultural practices and sense of place, build relationships to strengthen families and communities, encourage food security among local communities, and other activities that build community capacity. Sharing these activities with visitors by engaging with tourism, enables communities to achieve their ultimate purpose. An alternative model to tourism that represents the Ka Welina Community-Based Host-Visitor model is thus presented Figure 2.

However, a dilemma arises at the nexus where tradition meets capitalism. The ability to live by one’s indigenous values is ideal but Ka Welina communities function in a larger capitalist society, subject to the demands and expectations of the market economy where economic development is necessary for survival. At the end of the day, basic needs must be met such as
paying for one’s housing, children’s education, food, and other necessities. Within the Ka Welina Host-Visitor Model in Figure 2, it seemed that the introduction of money into the equation, as a medium of exchange for host-visitor interactions, was uncomfortable for hosts. It seemed that the discomfort was associated with the idea of charging for one’s culture almost as if they were fearful of exploiting their culture. However, I wondered how economic sustainability is achieved to ensure that they continue to function and grow yet maintain cultural integrity and buffer themselves against the commodification of culture. Similarly, I was curious about how Ka Welina communities negotiate the needs of the market and their own interests and what activities or behaviors they adopt individually and as organizations that demonstrate this negotiation or compromise. I wanted to understand how they balanced culture as a commodity for economic development and culture as a living practice.

It seemed that in both Tonga and Hawai‘i, there were underlying tensions between culture and capitalism but in different ways. In Hawai‘i, practitioners seemed to tread more carefully around the concept of charging for cultural knowledge and experiences but I did not get this sense from my father who seemed proud to entertain hosts through the display of cultural dances, food, and other aspects of life that were part of everyday life, in exchange for money. My father’s dilemma as I see it, was not in charging for experiences but in the opportunity costs associated with the practical need for financial stability. In Hawai‘i, there was also a sense of urgency about cultural preservation tied to the hosting and visiting experience that was absent in Tonga. Perhaps these differences are attributed to the magnitude of presence and history of tourism in each place. Tourism is less obvious and undeveloped in a country like Tonga with no colonial or historical links to metropolitan centers while Hawai‘i represents the extreme case in the Pacific of
economic dependence on tourism and the subsequent commercialization of its culture (Scheyvens and Russell 2009).

Figure 1. Mass Tourism Model
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Under this assumption, it would seem that Tonga and Hawai‘i represent different points along the continuum of the tourism development spectrum. Are Tonga and other less developed nations in the Pacific on their path to becoming what Hawai‘i is today in terms of tourism development? If so, are there lessons to be learned from Hawai‘i for communities to strategically engage with the visitor industry in ways that do not compromise culture through the process? The discussion on the best approach for tourism development in the Pacific is varied but some suggest that a focus on small-scale and alternative tourism development, rather than mass
tourism, is most appropriate for the unique cultures of these places and limited carrying capacity of small islands (Scheyvens and Russell 2009). However, models and case studies that demonstrate this idea are lacking. Therefore, the efforts of the Ka Welina Network present an opportune case study to understand the processes necessary to plan out, develop, and integrate alternative strategies of visitor engagement within a world deeply entrenched in mass tourism development.

To better understand this phenomenon, I pose the question, “How do Native Hawaiian communities working towards self-determination through the restoration of ʻāina-based practices strategically engage with the tourism market to further their own interests and needs?” I will explore this question by investigating the experience of four organizations of the Ka Welina Network. I am particularly interested in highlighting and understanding the planning processes that the Ka Welina Nework went through to develop its host-visitor model, investigating the different strategies that host communities chose to engage with the visitor industry to implement this model, and understanding the challenges they faced through that process. Some of these challenges were mentioned previously but this research will expand on the critical issues surrounding these challenge areas and how they interact to affect community-based operations. This research hopes to provide a model highlighting the conditions necessary for small ʻāina- and community-based organizations to successfully engage with the tourism industry to meet their interests and needs.

**Theoretical Framework**

Corntassel (2008:106) describes “sustainable self-determination” as a benchmark for indigenous people working to “[assert] visions of self-determination on their own terms to start
remembering the qualities of [the] ancestors and act on those rememberances.” The concept of “sustainable self-determination” shifts the focus away from being state-centric to emphasizing a more holistic approach that support indigenous economic independence, spiritual regeneration, and social health through the restoration and regeneration of indigenous livelihoods and territories (Goodyear-Kaopua 2009; Aikau 2012). According to Corntassel, the rights-based approach to self-determination is limiting and diverts the focus away from critical discussions regarding the reclamation of indigenous territories, livelihoods, natural resources, and the regeneration of indigenous languages and culturally based practices. He offers a solution to this dilemma by proposing that indigenous views of self-determination must be rethought and repositioned in order to meet contemporary challenges. My research explores how four organizations attempt to engage with tourism on their own terms to perpetuate their sustainable self-determination.

**A Values-Based Host-Visitor Model**

Traditionally, there is a custom of visiting and hosting that is common to many Pacific Island cultures. The act of hosting and visiting is guided by the values of ‘ohana (family) and aloha (love). When one visits another’s home, the host treats visitors like they are members of their own family. This is expressed through extending hospitality to the visitor to ensure that they are happy and comfortable as if they were in their own home. In exchange, the visitor returns this act of hospitality by exerting minimum burden on the host. This involves respecting the norms and rules of the host’s household and extending one’s service to help with household chores or work that needs to be done. The relationship is one of mutual respect and of reciprocity.
The host-visitor model is also kuleana-based, a core Hawaiian value commonly understood as responsibility but is defined in more detail in the next section. As hosts share aspects of their way of life with visitors, the host-visitor experience shifts the focus from staged performances in hotels that take hosts away from where the culture is expressed daily, to the site of the hosts instead. While visitors are in the host’s domain, hosts look after their visitors as they would traditionally. However, by entering the lives of hosts, visitors must in turn respect the customs of the host and abide by their protocols that set standards for behavior. Visitors are encouraged to participate in these protocols and minimize their burden on hosts by helping with activities and work that need to be done.

The host-visitor exchange assumes that such activities encourage positive behaviors of learning and respect, which leads to the development of relationships between people that come from exchanges of reciprocity. These exchanges provide opportunities for hosts to practice their way of life through sharing and education, and visitors help hosts accomplish the work that they need to do, for example, planting or harvesting crops. Visitors, on the other hand, learn about how others live and can understand the places they visit through the eyes of those who live there. Working together on activities creates opportunities for conversations to take place and for relationships to develop. Through this process, both visitors and hosts assume certain responsibilities and also abide by a set of guidelines and principles that come from the place that is visited. However, the extent and duration of how these relationships are felt might be experienced differently by local and outside visitors.
Defining Kuleana

The value and practice of “kuleana” is central to the host-visitor model. The term, kuleana, is defined by Pukui and Elbert (1986) as, “right, privilege, concern, responsibility, title, business, property, estate, portion, jurisdiction, authority, liability, interest, claim, ownership, tenure, affair, province; reason, cause, function, justification; small piece of property, as within an ahupua‘a; blood relative through whom a relationship to less close relatives is traced, as to in-laws.” Though the term is most commonly used in the context of “responsibility,” it is more complex as suggested by its varied definition. In other Pacific Island cultures, kuleana can be understood as synonymous to the term fatonga in Tonga. The literal translation of fatonga is, “duty, obligation” (Churchward 1959). The terms are associated with one’s position in society as a member of a cultural group and community, as well as one’s assets. Thus, kuleana is tied one’s identity.

Keikialoha Kepiki, of Ho‘oulu Lāhui, who has dedicated his life to building the capacity of Native Hawaiian youth in Puna on Hawai‘i Island, reiterates this idea by explaining what kuleana means to him:

[It’s about] of whom you are and when you came from. Of whom am I? Of my kūpuna (elders, grandparents). I came from these guys and I wouldn’t be here if it wasn’t for them. It is my reciprocity. It’s like consciously knowing that you have somewhat of an obligation, but in reciprocity, giving back that opportunity that your kūpuna bestowed upon you.

In the Pacific, identity is rooted in family and embedded in one’s cultural foundation, which grew from the places that our gods and ancestors embarked upon after navigating the vast Pacific Ocean. It was on these islands, that our first people built homes and propagated. Over millenia, they learned how to survive on the limited resources of our islands by studying and
understanding the processes of nature in the ocean, streams, land, mountains, and cosmos. They observed, listened, and tested out the wisdom of the elders.

Practices and knowledge that enabled survival grew into traditions that became time-tested over the generations, honed and altered through time. These became the foundations of our Pacific Island cultures that grew from a life dependent on the natural environment. That relationship became embodied in our language, our diet, the structure of our social systems, and our values governed the way we relate to each other, maintain relations, and keep order. We expressed our thoughts, feelings, and way of life in our songs and dances, and told our lives through stories that we taught and passed on to our children. These stories contain the history of who we are, our families, and the places we come from. This is the foundation of our Pacific Island identity, one that is rooted in family and place.

Kalen Kelekoma of Waipā Foundation, a cultural education center focused on taro cultivation and member of the Ka Welina Network, elaborates on the concept of kuuleia being tied to identity through his experience as a Native Hawaiian. He explains that though Native Hawaiians are the people of Hawai‘i, he acknowledges that he and other Native Hawaiians today are the descendents of those who survived the near extinction of his people from disease and the historical processes that contributed to those events. He feels that part of his identity of being a Native Hawaiian today comes with responsibilities. He explains: “So what does it mean to be a Hawaiian? It’s not [just] a privilege or you’re entitled to things. There’s a kuuleia that comes with that.” This sense of kuuleia to carry on the knowledge and practices of Hawai‘i, is one of the reasons behind Kalen’s work at Waipā Foundation.

Similarly, Keikialoha Kepiki is motivated to do the work that he does because of this sense of kuuleia. He explains:
[Why do I do this?] What is it? For me, different from the other guy. It’s not the money. Mine is to address my kuleana. The money is a bonus because it houses me, sustains myself so that I can fulfill my kuleana as I understand it in this temporal moment of time.

For master lau hala (pandanus) weaver, Lynda Saffery, of Kawaiokalehua Foundation, she shares her knowledge of weaving with others and is also driven by this sense of kuleana:

This one time in particular, Kamehameha Schools students had come and they had circled up for pule (prayer) and usually my eyes are closed when we pule and this time I opened my eyes and it was the closing the day prayer and I looked around and I could see, you know, the kūpuna behind all our kids. It’s like they had just come out of the bushes [laughs] and just circled up behind us. And they were all smiling. They looked so happy to have the kids there. And that’s what kind of did it for me. [laughs] I just wanted to keep doing that because it seemed like it made the village alive again. So happy that the kids were there.

In Hawai‘i, one often hears kūpuna express that it is their kuleana to teach the younger generations the knowledge they hold to ensure that it perpetuates. That sense of kuleana comes from the knowledge that they hold which tell the stories of identity; therefore, it is not just a responsibility to share that knowledge but it is also a privilege, as well as an obligation to keep ancestral knowledge alive that was passed down to them from their predecessors. One who holds this knowledge, is privileged because they were chosen to be the keepers of that knowledge, and it is their duty and obligation to ensure that the knowledge continues. Therefore, one is accountable to one’s ancestors as well as community to pass on the information and knowledge that evolved through time to ensure the well-being of one’s family and community. In this sense, kuleana is not just about possession of knowledge and assets, but also about membership in a group and the responsibilities that come with being part of that group.

Though kuleana is also a duty and an obligation, many kūpuna carry out their kuleana with a sense of joy and pride. Mahealani Cypher, a gifted story teller and counselor who manages the
Koʻolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club, explains that it is a “joyful” duty and enjoys sharing that knowledge with others:

I really feel that every single one of us [cultural practitioners of the Ka Welina Network] is called to do this work by our kūpuna. I don’t think we have a choice and it’s a joyful work. It’s not a burden. It’s a joy to do it and I’m glad that this is what I was called to do rather than be an accountant or something, you know? I’m glad I was called to tell stories and teach values.

Kuleana is not limited to just the kūpuna but to anyone in society with a specific knowledge base and a set of assets with an affiliation to a cultural group. Mahealani expressed that she would like to see more young people involved in the work that she does. Kuleana allows one to fulfill the expectations of that group and to contribute meaningfully to the well-being of that group whether it is one’s family, community, culture, or affiliation. Therefore, visitors become affiliated with Native Hawaiian communities through a host-visitor program that they may visit, and through this relationship, they too have certain kuleana to uphold.

Kuleana can also be defined temporally. Keikialoha Keipiki explains this through an analogy of throwing a rock up into the air and watching it fall. The time that it takes from when it leaves the hand, travel up in the air, and falls back down, is limited due to gravity. That period of time is specified but it defines the time that is available for someone to carry out their kuleana. Keikialoha explains:

It’s just like gravity. Watch. Tell me when it ends. [Throws a rock up in the air.] See? I cannot stop ‘um once the thing falling. I not controlling gravity but I can control how high I can throw ‘em. How long is it suspended? Based on how high I throw ‘um. But before the thing hit the ground, that’s the only the time I get. See how temporal it is?

Thus, the temporal aspect of kuleana also provides motivation to carry out one’s kuleana in the best possible way. While one cannot change this time period, one can control the effectiveness of executing that kuleana by one’s actions. Awareness of this limited time is felt by many kūpuna
who take it upon themselves to devote a significant amount of the time they have left, in fulfilling their kuleana.

Therefore, engaging visitors through a values-based host-visitor program obligates visitors and hosts to assume roles and responsibilities and are accountable for their actions when they participate in the act of hosting and visiting. This type of engagement also gives reverence to the place upon which visiting and hosting activities take place. Therefore, to better understand and develop the concept of a values-based host-visitor model in tourism, a deeper inquiry into the experience of these practitioners who have a strong sense of kuleana, in a setting where mass tourism is pervasive as it is in Hawai‘i, may be constructive. Through grounded theory, this paper hopes to develop a broader theoretical framework for a values-based host-visitor model that can hopefully contribute to the larger discourse on the participation of indigenous communities in the tourism industry.

**Research Design: Case Study of Ka Welina**

To explore how some Native Hawaiian communities in Hawai‘i are engaging with tourism to further sustainable self-determination, I chose a case study design to investigate this phenomenon in a real-life context. The Ka Welina Network, described in more detailed in Chapter 4, offered an ideal case study of multiple organizations that adopted and implemented the community-based host-visitor model. I selected four of the ten organizations of the Ka Welina Network for this study which included Kawaiokalehua Foundation, Hoʻoulu Lāhui, Koʻolaupoko Native Hawaiian Civic Club, and Waipā Foundation. All four organizations were among the original six members of the Ka Welina Network and all four were also land-based located on the islands of Hawaiʻi, Oʻahu, and Kauaʻi.
These four organizations were chosen specifically to provide an array of organizational diversity with different capacities at various stages of host-visitor program development. I chose Kawaiokalehua Foundation because it was one of the smallest organizations of the Ka Welina Network but also because the organization recently ceased its host-visitor program due to differences with its landowner. Since part of my research was to understand the challenges that many of these small community-based enterprises encounter, I was interested in the problems that attributed to the termination of Kawaiokalehua Foundation’s program. Also interesting about this organization was that the cultural practitioners were not compensated for their time at Kawaiokalehua Foundation and both were employed to earn their livelihood elsewhere. Therefore, this scenario provided the opportunity to understand how cultural practitioners managed and prioritized their time and also about how they felt about not being compensated monetarily for their time.

Hoʻoulu Lāhui, also located on the Island of Hawaiʻi, is also one of the smallest organizations of the Ka Welina Network, like Kawaiokalehua Foundation. I included Hoʻoulu Lāhui because though its host-visitor program still existed, it remained in limbo with only a few visits conducted during the year. I wanted to understand why the organization’s host-visitor program did not progress over a two-year period. Also, the charter school, Kua o ka Lā, was a product of Hoʻoulu Lāhui and though its host-visitor program is centered around an ancient village, the time and attention of the cultural practitioner had been focused exclusively on the development of the charter school. I wanted to understand the impact of time on the host-visitor program and Hoʻoulu Lāhui presented an ideal opportunity to study this phenomenon.

Koʻolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club was selected because its host-visitor program continued to be conducted consistently over a two-year period but with very little growth. I was interested
in this organization because it involved a much greater land area with multiple ahupua‘a on the most populated island with the most visitors in Hawai‘i. In addition, the cultural practitioner of this organization was retired and volunteered her time for the work of KHCC which provided opportunities to further understand the relationship between livelihood and host-visitor program performance. I also chose this organization because its cultural practitioner was a woman and I wanted both male and female representation in this study.

I chose Waipā Foundation as my fourth organization because it represented an organization that had significantly developed and expanded its host-visitor program organization over the years. I wanted to understand what factors contributed to the success of the organization compared to the other organizations. Though it is a relatively small scale enterprise, Waipā was the largest of all Ka Welina organizations in terms of size, workforce, and the number of visitors who visit the place, annually. Waipā also had access to its own ahupua‘a and resources that supports traditional Native Hawaiian methods of land management from the mountain to the sea. Waipā also received financial support for its host-visitor program from Kamehameha Schools. This organization is also located near Hanalei, the most popular tourist destination in Kaua‘i, with a surrounding resident community composed of many newcomers and vacation-oriented businesses that pose many challenges and opportunities for indigenous people in tourism.

Thus, the four organizations were selected to provide a broad range of organizational capacity and host-visitor program development, to compare the diverse strategies that communities adopt to implement host-visitor programs, as well as the challenges that they experience during this process. Since this work is also interested in understanding the relationship between money and culture in this context, case selection also considered the livelihood practices of cultural practitioners among the different organizations. Therefore, the
case study included a selection of practitioners whose livelihoods were not paid for by their host-visitor program, practitioners who volunteered their time but had alternative livelihood sources like retirement to support them, and practitioners who were paid full-time to carry out hosting activities.

**Research Methods**

To account for the many variables involved in the case studies, several different research methods were utilized. For this study, three methods were used—participant reflections, open-ended interviews, and primary and secondary materials. These methods are described in more detail below.

**A. Participant Observations**

Participant observations are dependent upon a close and intimate familiarity with a specific group of individuals such as a sub-cultural group or a particular community. My involvement with the Ka Welina Network for an extended period of time as a planning facilitator in developing the network’s long-term strategic plan, allowed me to work closely with each of the network’s organizations since 2011. During that time, I established rapport and good relationships with the members of the case study, and acquired intimate knowledge of the operations of each organization. My participation in this process can best be described as “moderate participation” where I tried to maintain a balance between “insider” and “outsider” roles (Schwartz and Schwartz 1955). This approach was necessary to provide a good combination of researcher involvement in the community but with a certain detachment that is critical for objectivity.
Participant observations used for this study were retrospective since my participation as a planning facilitator was completed prior to the fieldwork conducted specifically for this project. I accessed meeting notes, audio-memos and other materials that were generated while conducting the work in the synthesis of this research. Some observations had been audio-recorded following network-wide meetings and interviews in 2011 and 2012, in debriefing sessions to capture ideas and themes that surfaced during these meetings as part of my own reflective practice. Detailed notes were also taken which included observations on experiences, insights, and learnings. Recordings of debriefing sessions were used also to address the issue of researcher bias where I could compare my thoughts to those of other members of the planning team. This exercise helped me identify personal preferences and interpretations and kept me grounded and aware how these biases might influence my observations. Permission to use secondary data belonging to the network for this project was obtained from Ana Currie-Ramirez and Ramsay Taum.

B. Qualitative Open-ended Interviews

Open-ended interviews are often used to understand the experiences of others and how they view the world (Seidman 1998). The bulk of data collected for this study came from open-ended qualitative interviews which were flexible and exploratory in nature. The approach of this study was not to base findings on representative or randomly sampled data but to identify specific people who possessed characteristics or information that was relevant to my research question (Mays and Pope 1995). The questions that I asked were structured to allow participants to explain their behavior and thoughts and their underlying meanings in their own words.

The open-ended nature of the questions is the strength of this methodology as it allowed participants unrestricted opportunities to explore their thoughts and share their ideas unbounded by my own researcher biases. However, the method by which the interviews were conducted
significantly impacts the quality of interviews and the type of data collected. Several important factors that I paid considerable attention to while interviewing included the types of questions I asked, listening, and respecting participant boundaries. My questions tried to be more exploratory rather than probing to encourage participants to explore their ideas without feeling uncomfortable. Since some questions were personal, I tried to pay attention to participants’ comfort levels in discussing certain issues and let them proceed only with what they were comfortable with sharing (Seidman 1998).

Interviews were conducted with two target participants: 1) cultural practitioners of each organization and 2) members of the planning team who developed the Ka Welina Network. The content of these interviews are described in more detail:

1. **Interview Questions with Ka Welina Organizations**
   Open-ended interviews were conducted with cultural practitioners of each of the four organizations of the case study. Cultural practitioners were defined as individuals with specialized knowledge of certain aspects of Native Hawaiian culture and affiliated with the Ka Welina Network, thus, they were individuals with informed knowledge about culture, as well as the host-visitor program. Interviews were conducted at their home or place of convenience and they lasted about one and a half hours to two hours. Interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed. Though the interviews were open-ended, I used a set of questions to guide the interviews to ensure that I covered the relevant topics within my timeframe. These questions are listed in Appendix B and they covered specific themes that included a participant’s personal background, and their perceptions of Native Hawaiian culture, authenticity, and the different subcategories of the host-visitor programs such as visitor engagement strategies, challenges, changes, and lessons learned.
All interviews included questions that pertained to cultural practitioners’ demographic background particularly their family history, cultural expertise, and relationship to the respective organization of their affiliation. This information was important to establish each practitioner’s reference point and experience and how that knowledge base and relationship may impact their role within Ka Welina, their perceptions about culture and tourism, and the significance of a host-visitor program to their lives. These questions were also important because they facilitated a more personal and relaxed interview process that was less formal and structured.

A portion of each interview touched upon self-perceptions of different aspects of Native Hawaiian culture. These questions were important to understand what participants considered important about Native Hawaiian culture and their perceptions about traditions to understand fundamental differences between capitalism and culture. Questions pertaining to core Native Hawaiian values were important to understand what these values were and whether they were consistent with the values of the Ka Welina Network as a whole. This section also allowed practitioners to expand on the value of kuleana. Though not Native Hawaiian myself, I felt intuitively that the meaning of the term kuleana was not fully described and expressed by the English term, ‘responsibility’ that is often used to describe kuleana. Since many values are also important values in other places, I referenced my own understanding of ‘kuleana’ from another Pacific Island perspective to inform interpretations of the term kuleana.

Similarly, a series of questions pertaining to authenticity were included to understand what this term meant to each participant of the case study. In light of the varied definition of authenticity described in the literature review, it seemed important to understand hosts’ perceptions of authenticity and how these perceptions might affect the different strategies chosen
for the respective host-visitor programs. In addition to asking participants what authenticity meant to them, they were also asked to explain what was unique about their organization and host-visitor program and how it differed from others.

The involvement of each participant and their respective organization with the Ka Welina Network was also discussed to better understand the evolution of the network over time. Participants were asked to share their experience with and thoughts about the Ka Welina Network and the model that it represented. Also investigated was the impact that the network had on personal, as well as organizational development. More specific impact questions about certain interventions implemented by the network, such as the network website and long-term strategic plan, were also addressed.

Interviews also touched upon the process of commodification and how participants avoided this process during hosting activities. Surrounding this topic were key questions pertaining to how participants felt about charging for host-visitor experiences they offered. These questions were particularly important since most members of the Ka Welina Network expressed discomfort at charging a monetary fee for their programs in 2012. It was important to understand whether these perceptions about money exchange changed over time, and if they did, what factors accounted for these changes. Participants were asked to discuss their relationship with money, how they balanced culture as a commodity for economic development and culture as a living practice, and how they prioritized which was more important. Participants were also encouraged to share other parallels to the struggle around the tension between culture and making money that they experienced in their personal lives.
Participants were asked to describe changes to their host-visitor program since 2012, and to identify the major challenges experienced personally, as an organization, as well as a network during this time period. Participants were asked to reflect on their experience with the Ka Welina Network and share any insights they had about the process of developing the network, lessons learned from their experience, and what they would have done differently in hindsight. Participants were asked to discuss the future of the Ka Welina community-based host-visitor model, its feasibility in Hawai‘i, and recommendations about future directions. If participants did not voluntarily mention the role of government in supporting community-based initiatives in tourism, specific questions targeting the adequacy of government and its role in this process were raised.

2. Interview Questions for the Ka Welina Planning Team

The development of the Ka Welina Network was a process that took several years. During that time, several people were involved whose roles, responsibilities, and talents were key to this process. For this research, a selection of the planning team who were instrumental in the formation of the network included the following: Pasifika Foundation Board member and main proponent of the Ka Welina concept, Ramsey Taum, grant writer and executive director of Pasifika Foundation Hawai‘i, Ana Currie-Ramirez, lead planner Karen Umemoto, and marketing director Ikaika Hussey. Interviews were conducted with each of these people to better understand how the Ka Welina Network was formed, their respective roles and responsibilities, and the planning processes involved in the creation of the network. Data derived from these interviews were used to inform Chapter 4 of this document which describes the Ka Welina Network.
Interviews with these select individuals were guided by a set of questions that are also listed in Appendix B. These questions were targeted towards understanding the planning process that was involved in forming the network and the effectiveness of the approaches adopted. Therefore, interview questions revolved around the role of these individuals in the formation of the network, the challenges they encountered, and the perceived value of the Ka Welina Network to its members. Other program evaluation-type questions were asked to assess the effectiveness of the network. Also discussed were lessons learned and recommendations about future directions and how the network, as well as tourism of this type, could be improved.

**Interview Protocol and Informed Consent**

An interview protocol was followed for all interviewed conducted for this research. Prior to every interview, an informed consent protocol was also followed where participants were be informed about the purpose of the study, how the data collected from the interview would be used, request of permission to participate in the study, and request for permission to be audio-recorded and photographed. An informed consent form, in Appendix C, was reviewed and signed by each participant prior to their interview. Participants were also informed that recorded interviews may be transcribed. To ensure that this process did not harm or pose any threat to any individual, the interview protocol and interview questions above were reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa prior to the start of this project. The following includes a summary of the interview protocol to be used for each interview.

**Interview Protocol:**
I called each participant to discuss my research and invited them to participate in the study. If participants were willing to participate, a date was set for a two hour interview at a setting of their preference. As is customary in Pacific Island culture, I took gifts (makana) for every participant that I met with to show my appreciation for their time and knowledge shared. Prior to each interview, I described the purpose of my research and reviewed the consent form procedures. All participants granted their permission to participate in the study and to be audio-recorded through signing a consent form prior to the beginning of any interview. All interviews were conducted respectfully and in a manner that is culturally sensitive and posed no harm to any participant. I contacted participants via telephone or e-mail when questions arose and verification of findings were necessary.

C. Documents of Previous Research or Secondary Data

Documents of previous research, also referred to as secondary data, were data collected by someone else other than myself for this research. This method is useful because it provides other sources of information on this subject which saves time that would be otherwise spent gathering the same information. Secondary data is particularly useful when considering data collected over time that allows for understanding changes over time that would have been impossible to be collected by current investigations. This is true for this case study where secondary data collected before research for this project occurred, which contributed greatly to understanding the early stages of the program’s development.

Establishing the Ka Welina Network is an effort that took place over many years since 2006 and the individual organizations that belong to the network have existed for much longer. Therefore, data on these organizations, as well as the network, were utilized for this project. For example, the network’s long-term strategic plan is an in-depth study of the goals and plans to
realize the goals of the network to help communities become self-sufficient. This information was based on recorded interviews with the cultural practitioners of each of the ten Ka Welina organizations, field notes, and observations from that process. Approval to use this data in the synthesis of this project was granted by Pasifika Foundation Hawai‘i, and the individual practitioners where were interviewed.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Data analysis began as soon as data were collected though the majority of this process occurred after all data were collected. Qualitative data analysis focuses on text rather than numbers as the raw data. For this study, texts were mostly from interviews or notes from participant observations that relay how people think and feel about an issue or situation. A significant amount of text was generated for this research and most came from a total of 18 interview transcripts that averaged 15 to 20 pages each. Therefore, the bulk of the data analysis was concerned with describing and interpreting the meanings conveyed through these texts. Since text could be interpreted many different ways and influenced heavily by personal bias, this phase of the project tried to incorporate both literal, reflexive, and interpretive approaches as described by Crabtree and Miller (1999). This research emphasized the use of participants’ own words and terms to capture their personal perspectives so quotes were heavily used throughout the presentation of my findings.

A significant amount of raw data was generated from 18 two-hour interviews that amounted to several hundred pages of text. Data collected were organized by organization, by participant interviewed, and by date. Scrivener, a writing program, was used to manage and store data that could be analyzed more systematically. Specific themes emerged along the lines of the interview questions, which made data analysis much easier as each interview transcript had similar
formats. Sections of interview transcripts could be extracted and organized by theme for each interview participant.

A **grounded theory** approach (Bernard 2006) was used to further identify additional categories and themes that emerge from text. Topics that appeared repeatedly throughout interviews were identified and highlighted as potentially important observations particularly during the transcription phase of interviews. These observations and themes were listed in tables and compared across all cases to understand whether patterns existed. As more data were collected, concepts became tested over time and the process of conceptualizing continued repeatedly. Findings were then presented in a matrix and categorized by theme and by organization to condense and organize data more systematically.

Examining relationships is a critical and the final step in the analytic process. At this stage, I synthesized simple descriptions of the people and settings extracted from data, into explanations of why things happened as they did with those people in that setting. For this project, conceptual diagrams with flow charts and conceptual maps were used to visually present themes to understand possible causal relationships and models from the data. Visual presentation of data often times present data in a different way than text, which helps extrapolate relationships. This stage is particularly important in trying to understand what factors and mechanisms affect how hosts interact with visitors and how these factors are related to each other.

An example of how this process occurred surrounded the discomfort of cultural practitioners with charging visitors for cultural knowledge and experiences. This theme appeared consistently throughout all the different case studies. Upon closer examination, the data showed a dichotomy in visitor preference based on visitor characteristics. When this preference was presented
visually, it was easier to see a pattern in the data that also seemed to reflect patterns of connection to place and heritage. This pattern was suggestive of indigenous family values possibly influencing visitor preference, which in turn affects price determination and the structure and form of a host-visitor program.

Validity

Becker (1959) offers three criteria for assessing validity, which are: credibility of informants; spontaneity of responses to interview questions; and the impact of the researcher on the actions and statements of other group members. Since informants are a major source of information upon which conclusions are based, it is important to be aware of the credibility of that source. In this project, informants were Native Hawaiian cultural practitioners, chosen particularly for their expertise and experience in certain aspects of Native Hawaiian culture. They are well established in their community, dedicated to education and the perpetuation of Native Hawaiian culture, and have been involved in this type of work for a significant amount of time. Therefore, they are validated by their position in society as experts on cultural issues and as community leaders in areas relevant to this study.

The spontaneity of informant responses to interview questions may reflect what would have been said had the researcher not been present. Therefore, paying attention to and observing how participants respond to questions is critical. In this research, this phenomenon was considered by asking similar questions on a certain topic in different ways. Sometimes, questions raised in interviews may surface well after interviews or the data collection phase. To account for this, participants were invited to share that information if and when those circumstances arose.

Human beings react to being observed, therefore, reactions may account for some directly observed social phenomenon that may vary from reality. To account for this effect in this project,
participant responses were compared to previous data collected from informants. Hopefully, this effect was reduced by close relationships of trust that developed between the researcher and informants while developing the Ka Welina Network through a separate process that was not related to the purpose of this research project. During that time, working on a project intended to directly benefit and impact the performance of individual host-visitor programs, may have provided motivation for participants to overcome inhibitions and be more open and comfortable in sharing information. In general, I followed up with participants to clarify and verify data and findings.

**Anticipated Ethical Issues**

To ensure that this research did not pose any ethical threats to participants, an informed consent process was conducted. Prior to conducting this research, the proposal was reviewed and approved by the Internal Review Board (IRB) at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, to protect participants against harm. Despite the existence of these processes, these measures often fail to protect participants from being exploited in research. Therefore, it was my responsibility as a researcher to be sensitive to these issues, respect the wishes of participants, and to ensure that my research posed no harm to anyone. For example, people may not wish to be recorded and certain people may be too polite to voice their real sentiments about how their information is being used. As a precautionary measure, I discussed these issues at the beginning of every interview and encouraged participants to only share information they were comfortable in sharing.

**Organization of the Research**

The inquiry into the questions posed by this research in this introductory chapter is presented in the chapters that follow. Chapter 2 provides the historical, political and tourism background
within which the case study is embedded to understand the position of Native Hawaiians today in Hawai‘i and their quest for self-determination. This section provides an overview of the history of Hawai‘i since the arrival of Captain Cook with an overview of the impacts of colonization on Hawaiian culture followed by an overview of the history of tourism development in Hawai‘i.

Chapter 3 provides a review of the literature to inform previous scholarship in three areas which include: examples of local efforts in Hawai‘i at engaging tourism for self-determination; the challenges of small community-based enterprises in culture-based tourism, and also authenticity in tourism. Chapter 4 provides a detailed description of my case study which begins with the four organizations: Kawaiokalehua Foundation, Ho‘oulu Lāhui, the Ko‘olaupoko Native Hawaiian Civic Club, and Waipā Foundation. This section proceeds into a description of the Ka Welina Network and focuses on the processes that were taken to develop the network and its community-based host-visitor model, followed by a description of the different strategies that the case study pursued to implement the model.

Chapter 5 discusses the strengths and challenges with implementing a community-based host-visitor model by exploring the experiences of the case study. The information in the first part of this chapter is synthesized to produce a list of conditions that might lead to a successful host-visitor program. Chapter 6 presents new theory and conceptual models that developed from this research and summarizes the findings from this investigation to answer the inquiries presented Chapter 1.
Chapter 2: Colonization, Tourism, and Native Hawaiian Self-Determination

The Scorpion and the Frog

“Have you ever heard of the story about the scorpion and the frog?” Keikialoha Kepiki asks me from across the table with his fork in mid-air. I shook my head. He put his fork down, pushed his plate aside, and said, “Okay, I will tell you this story that explains what tourism is in Hawai‘i.”

In a little noisy Mexican restaurant in Puna, not too far from the home of the Goddess Pele on Hawai‘i Island, Keikialoha told me about tourism in Hawai‘i in his own words:

Okay, Big storm one time, up the river. It stormed for days. Flash flood in the river. Scorpion got washed down and got trapped. There was a rock in the middle of the river and the water jumped around it. The scorpion lucky. Bang! He landed up on the rock. He propped on the rock all tired, the water still rushing down. He starved but he no can eat because he don’t know how to swim. He see one frog coming down the stream. “Please, please, help me! Help me! Help me!” he says to the frog. The frog, he jump in the water, go up to the rock, “What’s the matter?” The scorpion replies, “I cannot get to the other side.” The frog says, “You know what, jump on my back.” In disbelief, the scorpion asks, “What?” The frog says, “Jump on my back.” So the scorpion jumps on the frog’s back and the frog, he jump and swims. They get to the other side and the scorpion jumps off. “You hungry?” the frog asks the scorpion. “Come with me. Follow me. I gotta take you to my house over there.” The frog takes the scorpion to his house and on the way, the frog tells the scorpion the mo‘olelo of the places they pass, the name of the streams, waterfall, ponds, mountain, the wind, the rain. Everything you’re supposed to know about that place. They reach his house and the frog introduces the scorpion to his ‘ohana. He bring ‘um in the house, introduce ‘um to his family, feed ‘um. The scorpion is tired and the frog is hospitable. Lets him rest. When the rain stopped, the frog bring ‘um up the river and takes the scorpion back to the other side of the river. Same way, on his back. Before the scorpion reach the other side, bang! The scorpion stung ‘um in the head. They reach the other side and the frog cries as he roll over, “Eh, what happen?” Now the venom was killing him. He cries to the scorpion, “Why you do this? I tell you the mo‘olelo of this place, eat in my house, meet my ‘ohana, share with you everything. Now I’m going to die.” You know what the scorpion say? “Don’t take it personally, it’s just my nature.”

After sharing his metaphor for tourism in Hawai‘i, Keikialoha ends by saying, “It’s the haole [the white man]. That’s their nature.” The story he shared resonates with larger sentiments about the impacts of American occupation and colonization on Native Hawaiians.
Overview

To fully comprehend the gravity of the impact of modern tourism on the position of Native Hawaiians in tourism and of tourism in Hawai‘i in general, an understanding of the larger historical and political history of Hawai‘i since the arrival of the Europeans in the islands, is necessary. Tourism does not exist in a vacuum, isolated from this context. Rather, the condition of Native Hawaiians today, represented by the frog in the preceding mo‘olelo, is a product of the historical dispossession of Native Hawaiians and exploitation of their land and resources throughout the nineteenth century that culminated in Hawai‘i being ruled as an American territory in the twentieth century (Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua 2014; McGregor 2006). The historical and political landscape is made up of events, decisions, and attitudes that have resulted in a diminished status of Native Hawaiians as decision makers in Hawai‘i’s economic future (Hawai‘i DBEDT 2004). It is in response to this history, that initiatives such as the Ka Welina Network were established to re-build a Native Hawaiian identity and sovereignty.

Therefore, it must be distinguished that the case study of this research is not just concerned about becoming effective tourist venues for economic development but that they engage with tourism as a means to enable the larger project of Ho‘oulu Lāhui, or the building of the Hawaiian nation to take form. Only within this context, do the goals of the organizations of the Ka Welina Network make sense. Therefore, this chapter provides an overview of the history of Hawai‘i since European contact and the impacts of colonization, the development of tourism in Hawai‘i, and the quest for self-determination among Native Hawaiians.

Hawaiian History

The Hawaiian archipelago is the most visited group of islands of the Pacific—a world-renowned tourist holiday destination, known for its idyllic tropical beaches of sun and surf, the
warm and welcoming aloha spirit of its native people, and graceful young native girls in grass-
skirts dancing hula in Waikīkī. At least, those are the images that the travel magazines portray of Hawai‘i and the slogans that people outside of Hawai‘i reference when they find that I live there. However, the Hawai‘i that I know is the birth place of my daughter. It is where her childhood memories are imprinted and where her roots have taken hold and started to grow, to extend those of her Hawaiian ancestry who came from the islands of Maui, Kaua‘i and O‘ahu. Hawai‘i, is my daughter’s home.

It is also home to approximately 289,970 Hawaiians who trace their ancestry to the Polynesians that first settled the Hawaiian Islands from Tahiti and the Marquesas, approximately 1000 years ago (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). On his third voyage of exploration of the Pacific, Captain Cook left Tonga in 1777 and a year later, came upon what he called the Sandwich Islands, otherwise known as Hawai‘i. Enamored by the hospitality he received in Tonga, Captain Cook had named Tonga “The Friendly Islands,” unbeknownst to him that his departure had saved him from his own assassination. A year and a half later, Captain Cook was killed by the Hawaiians in Kealakekua Bay on Hawai‘i Island, the same place my daughter was born but further up the mountain. The arrival of Captain Cook in 1778 in Hawai‘i, is referred to as “contact,” marking the beginning of the arrival of the first Europeans in the Hawaiian Islands and is often used as the reference point for the beginning of the modern era in Hawai‘i.

Following contact with European explorers, traders, missionaries, plantation farmers, and immigrants who settled in the islands, the indigenous culture of Hawai‘i experienced and continues to face numerous cultural transformations (Salzman 2001). Significant changes to land-based traditional lifeways occurred during the Post-Contact Era, which was characterized by an influx of new people, ideas, and technologies (Salzman 2001). Major events occurred
during this time that were turning points in the evolution of Native Hawaiian culture. These included a near extinction of the Native Hawaiian population from introduced infectious diseases; mass conversion to Christianity; abolition of the chieftain and kapu system; privatization of land that undermined Native Hawaiian access to natural resources; massive conversion of land from subsistence to commercial agriculture for plantations; the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom and colonization by America; and the prohibition of cultural practices like speaking the native language (Kamakau 1992; Kame'elehiwa 1992; Kauanui 1999; Malo 1951; Osorio 2001; Trask 1999). The subsequent loss of vital aspects of the indigenous way of life due to the cumulative effects of such events, is referred to by Brave Heart and Debruyn (1998) as creating a legacy of chronic trauma and unresolved grief across generations of indigenous people, challenging their ability to practice their indigenous customs and affirming their identity as a collective.

The colonial history of Hawai‘i has impacted Native Hawaiian culture and identity significantly (Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua 2014). Following the overthrow of the Constitutional Government and Kingdom of Hawai‘i on January 17, 1893, and the extension of U.S. control over the islands in 1900, the United States of America imposed policies of involuntary assimilation upon Native Hawaiians and the multi-ethnic peoples of the islands. Laws established English as the official language and prohibited Hawaiian language being spoken in the public schools and official governmental transactions. With the security of a stable and profitable market for Hawaiian sugar, thousands of new acres of land were cleared for sugar and natural flowing streams were diverted from taro cultivation to sugar production. These actions further alienated Native Hawaiians from the land and natural resources that sustained traditional livelihoods and the very practices that were central to their culture and identity.
The process of Americanization was so successful that in less than a century, the Hawaiian language neared extinction. Native Hawaiians became a minority in their own land and are among the most poverty-stricken of the ethnic peoples of Hawai‘i. During this period, Hawaiians formed organizations of self-governance and succeeded in having some of the former lands of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i set aside for homesteading, although the U.S. Congress defined a blood quantum of fifty percent or more Hawaiian ancestry to qualify for access to that land (Serna 2006; McGregor 2007; Kauanui 2008). Despite over a century fraught with struggles of American domination, Hawaiians have never relinquished their inherent sovereignty and right of self-determination. Osorio writes:

Native people cannot look to American law to define Nativeness... We know that we are a distinct people that was once protected by its own national government. We know that once that government was removed there was nothing to prevent the Americans from defining us however they wished, and nothing to keep us Hawaiian except our own determination. Perhaps the most surprising development is how Hawaiian we still are. ‘Ae, even in the face of a most determined effort to assimilate and quiet us, we persist. Of our own volition we have freely and lovingly mixed our ancestry with every available nationality. But the political solution for creating Americans of Hawaiians has failed to produce the desired “melting pot” effect, that is, eradicating a Native Hawaiian identity. (Osorio, 1991: 374-375)

Statehood in 1959, transformed the economic, physical, and social landscape of Hawai‘i that further alienated Native Hawaiians from land and natural resources (McGregor 2007). The economic base of Hawai‘i changed from a sugar plantation-based economy to one that relied heavily on tourism and military occupancy (McGregor 2007). The change was accompanied by an influx of people from the U.S. mainland settling in Hawai‘i and the development of a tourist industry that also brought new immigrants from Asia to support this industry. Agricultural lands previously used for sugar cane cultivation, became encroached upon for residential and commercial development particularly of hotels and resorts. Land evictions occurred, such as the
Kalama Valley eviction on O‘ahu in 1970, initiating Native Hawaiian protests for land rights. The protests extended to the bombing of the island of Kahoʻolawe by the U.S. military in the 1970s which “stirred the ancestral memory of Native Hawaiians and inspired the first cultural renaissance in Hawai‘i since the islands came under American control in 1898” (McGregor 2007: 249).

The 1970s became a period of political activism and interest in re-establishing and re-defining a Native Hawaiian identity was re-kindled (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua 2014). Kanahele (1986) points out that the movement was also associated with national and worldwide movements of ethnic minorities rediscovering and reviving their cultural pasts during the second half of the twentieth century. Civil rights movements in the 1950s and 1960s by African Americans in the United States generated an “ethnic fever” that spread to other ethnic groups like Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Native Americans, Japanese and other ethnic groups. By the late 1960s, the movement reached ethnic groups in Hawai‘i, including Native Hawaiians, which became manifested in a cultural revival known as the “Hawaiian Renaissance.” This was a period characterized by a renewed interest in mea Hawai‘i (things Hawaiian). These included a range of activities such as dancing hula kahiko (ancient hula), speaking Hawaiian language, and traditional wayfinding and navigation. The “Hawaiian Renaissance” was also characterized by the involvement of younger generations of Hawaiian activists who were educated, driven, and confident (Kanahale 1986).

The Renaissance was revitalized by two major events: land protests against the bombing of the island of Kahoʻolawe and the construction and successful voyage of the traditional sailing canoe, Hōkūleʻa, from Hawai‘i to Tahiti in 1976. Since World War II, the island of Kahoʻolawe
had been occupied by the U.S. military and used as a training site to prepare soldiers for military warfare and combat (Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana 1977). Protests against these activities gave rise to the Kaho‘olawe Aloha ‘Āina movement, an initiative started by a group of Native Hawaiians, including George Helm who played a major role in shaping the movement (McGregor 2007). The group sought guidance from Native Hawaiian kūpuna for stopping the bombing of Kaho‘olawe.

Informed by mo‘olelo shared by the kūpuna, research into the history of the island of Kaho‘olawe revealed that the island “had served as a refuge for Native Hawaiian spiritual customs and practices and that it was a center for training in the arts of non-instrumental navigation involving the sighting of heavenly bodies” (Mcgregor 2007:252). Kaho‘olawe was originally named Kanaloa, for the Native Hawaiian god of the ocean and was the only island in the Pacific to be named after the prominent god. The rediscovery of Kaho‘olawe as a sacred island dedicated to Kanaloa, revived the traditional Hawaiian value of aloha ‘āina, or love and respect for the land, a core value of Native Hawaiian culture (McGregor 2007:264). With origins traced to the great gods of Papa Hānaumoku, the earth mother and birth mother of the Hawaiian Islands; Wākea, the sky father; Kāne, the springs and streams; Kanaloa, the ocean; and Pele, the volcano, Native Hawaiians descended from the earth, ocean, sky, and natural life forces (McGregor 2007). That heritage also came with the responsibility for contemporary Native Hawaiians to protect the land and its resources for future generations.

George Helm elaborated on the Hawaiian value of aloha and its significance to the identity of Hawaiians and for the world at large at a press conference:
To me, national defense is in the spirit of the people. It’s in the heart. The people, no more the heart for defend their country, that’s bad already. So we gotta go restore those things. Restore by putting dignity and integrity into the hearts of people. That’s what national defense is. National defense is not killing. We’re spending a lot of money to kill people. That’s the trend. That has been the trend for 200 years. When are we gonna start changing it? What people have...the different things in their culture that can teach the other world what it means to love, the Hawaiians have it. (Kaho‘olawe Aloha ‘Āina video)

In essence, Helm was referring to the culture of Native Hawaiians and all its elements, as being the foundation of self-determination for not only Native Hawaiians but the world at large. Eventually, Kaho‘olawe Aloha ‘Āina grew into the Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana which later became recognized as the steward of Kaho‘olawe Island.

By 1980, a settlement was reached between the Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana and the U.S. Navy in a consent decree whereby the island would be jointly used by the Navy and the Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana (McGregor 2007). The decree allowed Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana to access the island for religious, cultural, and educational activities for four days in ten months out of the year. The Navy in turn became subject to the National Historic Preservation Act which mandated that the cultural resources of the island be surveyed and managed. Similarly, the Navy also had to comply with the National Environmental Protection Act which limited bombing to ten days a month and to a restricted area of the island; mandated eradication of feral goats; and required conservation programs to restore the soil and vegetation on the island (McGregor 2007).

The establishment of Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana as steward of the island, gave way to efforts to restore the environmental integrity of the island and as a pu‘uhonua (refuge) for Hawaiian culture which became supported by Native Hawaiians throughout the Hawaiian Islands. In 1982, the annual celebration of the Makahiki in honor of the Hawaiian god of
agriculture, Lono, was established. McGregor (2007: 270) described the significance of these practices:

The reestablishment of the Makahiki and other Native Hawaiian cultural and religious ceremonies and practices on Kanaloa was the most significant outcome of the movement to stop the bombing of Kanaloa. These ceremonies and practices reconnected a generation of Native Hawaiians with their ancestors and their soul as a people. The revival of these religious ceremonies deserves special attention.

Also significant, was the creation of the Protect Kaho‘olawe Fund which made possible the work of the movement in the 1980s and 1990s. It also funded and established grassroots organizations and projects for self-sufficiency for Native Hawaiians in a broad range of areas such as taro cultivation, fishing, research for water rights and kuleana lands, and supported litigation to protect cultural, natural, and agricultural resources from development (McGregor 2007).

At the same time, the voyaging sailing canoe, Hōkūle‘a, successfully completed the “Voyage of Discovery” in 1976 in which the canoe sailed from Hawai‘i to Tahiti for the first time in centuries using traditional methods of navigation without modern instruments (Finney 1994). Though much of the knowledge of navigation was borrowed from cultures of Micronesia, the voyage was among the most significant events of the Renaissance, as it symbolized the ability to revive the ways of old (Finney 1994; Finney 2003). It also demonstrated that traditional intentional wayfinding, targeting islands across thousands of miles of ocean was possible. Hōkūle‘a gave Native Hawaiians hope of reconnecting with their past ways (Tengan 2008).

According to McGregor (1989), the political movement of the 1970s coupled by the cultural renaissance, created and popularized “a new level of political and cultural consciousness about the history of Hawaiians… Every strata of the Hawaiian people identified with the political and cultural revival of the Hawaiians as a people”. By the 1980s and 1990s, the issue of Hawaiian
sovereignty became a priority and major sovereignty organizations formed to protest for the international right of self-determination for Native Hawaiians. This period consisted of demonstrations and protests for the return of native lands and of self-governance to the Hawaiian people. At the same time, academic research on issues surrounding Native Hawaiian history and identity gained momentum in the 1980s as a Center of Hawaiian Studies program became established at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. The program provided a place and space for young Native Hawaiians to learn about their culture and history. Since, many native scholars have dedicated their research to understanding Hawaiian history and what actually happened in Hawai‘i during and following the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

Interest in indigenous matters has burgeoned among native scholars supporting the premise that the Kingdom of Hawai‘i is illegally occupied by the United States of America (Sai, 2008). Consequently, the history of Hawai‘i is being re-written as these words are being formed on this paper, with new information that continues to be uncovered from archives of newspapers, court proceedings, land records, and journal accounts, written in the Hawaiian language that can now be readily translated and accessed. De-colonization is no longer a term reserved for academics only but is now common terminology among a lay population of Native Hawaiians, part-Native Hawaiians of mixed heritage, and residents of Hawai‘i, who are re-discovering their identity as a people and the power of citizen participation.

**History of Tourism in Hawai‘i**

Beginning in the early twentieth century, a corporate tourism industry developed that replaced the customary traditions of hosting and visiting in Hawai‘i. Modern tourism culture is concerned with economic development which is based on the premise that visitors pay for a service that is accompanied by certain expectations. The visitor assumes that they are entitled to
being pampered and that they can do as they please while hosts are expected to tend to their beck and call and provide exceptional service and authentic experiences. This mentality set the tone for tourism in Hawai‘i creating a service-oriented industry where hosts cater to the needs of visitors, perpetuating colonial ideas of ‘servants serving their masters’ that disempowers local communities (Bianchi 2002; Minerbi 1992; Britton 1982). Over time, a prevailing tourism business model catering strictly to the needs of a traveler seeking leisure, recreation, and entertainment grew to dominate the economy.

Today, tourism is the economic base of Hawai‘i (Hawai‘i Tourism Authority n.d. (a)). In 2013, tourism was the largest single source of private capital in Hawai‘i’s economy contributing to 1.5 billion dollars in total state tax revenue, and the largest generator of jobs among the major economic sectors, supporting 168,000 jobs in Hawai‘i (Hawai‘i Tourism Authority n.d.(a.)). In 2003, 1 out of every 5 jobs in Hawai‘i were attributed to the tourism industry, directly and/or indirectly (Hawai‘i Tourism Authority n.d.(b)). The majority of visitors to Hawai‘i come from the Continental USA and accounted for approximately 65 percent of visitors to Hawai‘i in 2011. The second largest group of visitors or 16.4 percent came from Japan. Approximately 60 percent of visitors to Hawai‘i are ‘repeat’ visitors who have visited Hawai‘i more than once (Hawai‘i Tourism Authority n.d. (b)). The average length of stay of visitors in 2011 was 9.47 days and most visitors remain on O‘ahu (45.8 %) of all the islands in Hawai‘i (Hawai‘i DBEDT 2006).

Though tourism is perceived as an important industry to Hawai‘i economically, the majority of the industry is owned by outside investors. As a result, a significant proportion of benefits from tourism do not remain in Hawai‘i nor do they reach the poorest communities. A closer examination of the history of tourism in Hawai‘i reveals a complex political economy with numerous threats to host communities and environmental resources from unequal access to
power and resources as a direct result of significant foreign investment dominating the tourism industry (Minerbi 1992; Hawai‘i DEBDT 2006; Bianchi 2002; Kim 1994). According to Kelly (1994) foreign investments in Hawai‘i date back to the early European traders who frequented the islands as far back as 1786 and exploited and disposed Native Hawaiians of their natural resources such as sandalwood, ferns, and land (Kelly 1994).

Tourism in Hawai‘i began during World War I (WWI). The war came to be seen as “Hawaii’s Golden Opportunity” for attracting affluent people to Hawai‘i to escape the war in Europe (Kuykendall 1928:91-92 In Kelly 1994). It was advertised as the world’s safest tourist resort as stated by the secretary of the Hawaii Promotion Committee in the following announcement:

A very large part of the $200,000,000 spent for tourist travel in Europe will be directed to the Pacific coast….This augurs well for our own business, as Hawaii is now the only safe tourist resort in the world, as I am advertising. (Kuykendall 1928:91)

Between WWI and WWII, the growth of tourism in Hawai‘i was problematic due to the world economy surrounding the wars but it increased after Statehood in 1959 (Kelly 1994). At this time, the sugar and pineapple plantation industry was declining in Hawai‘i as cheap labor became readily available elsewhere in areas like the Philippines, Southeast Asia, and Central America (Kelly 1994). Thus, tourism became the “new sugar,” a promising form of economic development for the islands. Gradually, formerly agricultural lands in Hawai‘i became urbanized and replaced by hotels and golf courses (Kelly 1994).

Capital to finance the tourism industry was initially provided locally or came from the U.S. and others resulted from profitable WWII contracts and lucrative partnerships (Kelly 1994). Local corporations with little capital but a lot of land partnered with capital-rich foreign investors
who mostly came from Japan. Subsequently, Japanese investments became successful due to resorts being filled by a plethora of Japanese visitors (Kelly 1994) and by the mid-1970s, more than 50 percent of all hotel rooms in Waikīkī were owned by Japanese investors. The most prominent foreign investor in Hawai‘i in the 1950s was a banking corporation called Osano and Kokusai Kogyo Co. from Japan who eventually came to own more than one third of the hotel rooms in Waikīkī by 1974 (Kelly 1994).

After supporting the establishment of the Central Pacific Bank of Hawai‘i in 1954, Kenji Osano became one of the most prominent investors in Hawai‘i (Kelly 1994). He purchased three primary Waikīkī hotels, the Princess Kaiulani, the Moana, and Surfrider and established Kokusai Kogyo Co. as the owner of the hotels (State of Hawaii 1991 In Kelly 1994). In 1972, he became a minority owner of the International In-flight Catering Co. at the Honolulu Airport and was the largest individual stockholder of Japan Airlines. He eventually purchased the Sheraton Waikīkī, Royal Hawaiian, and the Sheraton-Maui hotels. Between 1970 and 1984 Japanese-owned capital investments were approximately $1.5 billion and by 1990, they were over $9.3 billion (State of Hawaii 1991 In Kelly 1994).

By the 1980s, food and tour-bus companies were purchased to provide food services for Japan Airlines and transportation to take visitors between the airport and hotels. Japanese workers were employed to cater to Japanese tourists and Japanese visitors spent most of their money on products that were Japanese-owned. This phenomenon of leakage is clearly described in the following excerpt:

Tourists from Japan spend their money on round trip air fares on Japan Airlines, are taken by tour buses owned by investors in Japan, to resort hotels owned by investors in Japan, purchase their golf course memberships in Japan from resort owners, and make expensive purchases of foreign-owned produced items at hotel
gift shops that are owned by investors paying rent to Japan-owned hotels in Hawai‘i. How much of the tourist trade from Japan sloughs off and stays in Hawai‘i is debatable, and these facts suggest that only a very minor part of the income from the industry remains in Hawai‘i. (Kelly 1994:24)

Purchases extended towards residential and commercial properties particularly in the residential area of Kahala in O‘ahu and by 1988, 51 percent of the office space in downtown Honolulu was foreign-owned of which half of the investors came from Japan (National Association of Realtors, Dec 1988 Report, In Kelly 1994). Though Japanese investors are the most prominent in Hawai‘i, heavy investment also came from the U.S., Germany, Great Britain and China, to a lesser degree, in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Subsequently, between 1970 and 1979, these five countries owned over 95 percent of the total amount of known foreign investments which increased to 97 percent by 1990 (State of Hawaii 1991 In Kelly 1994). The rush by investors in Hawai‘i, particularly from Japan, led to rising prices of property which also raised the property taxes of existing residents. As a result, many residents are forced to sell their land and affordable housing, or lack thereof, is among the top social problems in Hawai‘i today.

The impact of tourism on the cost of housing is just one of a variety of negative impacts on host communities (Bianchi 2002). Hawai‘i became a place of opportunity for tourism where cultural forms became readily packaged as commodities to be sold. Components of Native Hawaiian culture were targeted, taken out of context, and used as selling points for marketing and advertising ‘authentic’ Native Hawaiian culture. This process created profound distortions of a proud and vibrant Native Hawaiian culture that came to be characterized by dancing hula girls and happy natives with an endless supply of aloha. Excluded from these images, is the oppressive history of American colonialism that has subjected Native Hawaiians to second-class citizens in their own homeland. Also, the spatial changes in Hawai‘i resulting from growth and
development due to foreign investments, is cause for concern (Kim 1994). According to Kim (1994), the loss of community values and important natural and cultural resources that have been long associated with Hawai‘i, is threatened by rampant growth.

Coupled by the history of exploitation and commercialization of Native Hawaiian culture in tourism, the numerous negative impacts of tourism has led to local mistrust of the industry and of outside visitors, creating tension between local communities and visitors. These sentiments manifest into a local disdain for visitors. Some of the tensions associated with tourism in Hawai‘i are reflected in a newspaper article featured in USA TODAY on February 2, 2010 titled, “Native Hawaiians say tourism industry distorts their culture” (Sample 2010). The article reports that while a random poll of the state indicated overwhelming appreciation for the benefits that tourism brings to Hawai‘i, the majority of Native Hawaiians surveyed disagreed that tourism “helps to preserve the Native Hawaiian language and culture.” Instead, the general consensus among Native Hawaiians is that the tourism industry “contorts their culture and uses it as a moneymaking device.” One participant from the survey explains, “The Hawaiian culture that tourists see is very tourist-oriented… Tourists don’t see the authentic culture. They put on leis and sing Tiny Bubbles” (Sample 2010). The study also found that Native Hawaiians are less aware of the industry’s cultural initiatives, and that it has a bad reputation for presenting Hawaiian arts authentically and accurately. In addition, the article reports that all ethnicities surveyed do not believe that tourism helps sustain Hawai‘i’s natural resources.

A 2002 Survey of Resident Sentiments on Tourism in Hawai‘i indicate that a significant percentage of participants surveyed felt that tourism negatively impacts traffic (54 %), increases crime (41 %), and impacts the cost of housing (30 %) (Hawai‘i Tourism Authority n.d.(b)). Furthermore, tourists consume a significant amount of Hawai‘i’s natural resources particularly
energy, water, and land. Transportation, accommodations, and activities that support this industry require energy that is supplied mostly by fossil fuels that is imported to O‘ahu (Asante et al. n.d.:5). Approximately, an estimated 40 percent of water consumption in the State of Hawai‘i is attributed to tourist consumption (Tabatchnaia-Tamiris et al. 1997). Also, a significant amount of land is used for tourism for large development of accommodations, airports, roads, visitor centers, landfills, golf courses, shopping centers, and other structures (Klasner and Mikami 2003).

Nevertheless, tourism remains Hawai‘i’s economic base since 1959. Data in Figure 3 illustrate that between 1952 and 2002, tourism grew exponentially until 1991 when the number of visitors declined and stabilized at a certain point until 2002. The decline in 1991 is thought to have been attributed to a combination of events such as the Asian market crisis, the Gulf War in 1991, Hurricane ‘Iniki that struck Hawai‘i in 1992, and increased global competition (Hawai‘i Tourism Authority n.d. (b)). The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York in 2001, the Iraq War, concerns over the spread of diseases like SARS, and other global phenomena, such as advances in technology, has further impacted consumer preferences, the airline industry, and other aspects of the tourism industry globally. Threats to the safety and security of travelers and nation states, particularly from terrorism, has led to increased use of alternative modes of transportation and accommodations such as timeshares, vacation rentals, and cruise ships (Hawai‘i Tourism Authority n.d. (b)).

Advances in technology have particularly affected tourism habits. Internet access has allowed tourists to plan vacations conveniently out of their homes and more choices have become available this way. It has also allowed businesses within the tourism industry to advertise and market themselves without the need to go through tour companies, thereby, cutting out the
middle man. Internet access through mobile telephones has also impacted the way that people make choices. Whereas previously a potential tourist may have been more inclined to spend more time researching destinations and making travel plans through a computer, this option is less appealing for mobile telephone users of much smaller devices. For this population of users, information that is easy to access, understand, and appeal immediately, affect the choices made which in turn affects the culture of marketing and advertising requiring businesses in tourism to have a certain technical capacity to meet and adapt to changing consumer patterns.
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**Figure 3.** Visitors (Number of Arrivals by Air) to Hawai‘i between 1952 and 2002

Awareness about the damaging impacts of the current prevailing tourism model to Hawai‘i is reflected in the Hawai‘i Tourism Strategic Plan 2005-2015, produced by the Hawai‘i Tourism Authority (HTA). The vision for Hawai‘i tourism, as stated in the plan, is to “honor Hawai‘i’s people and heritage; value and perpetuate Hawai‘i’s natural and cultural resources; engender mutual respect among all stakeholders; support a vital and sustainable economy; and provide a
unique, memorable and enriching visitor experience” (Hawai‘i Tourism Authority n.d. (b):6). The plan is rife with many visions of incorporating aspects of Native Hawaiian culture into Hawai‘i’s tourism, suggesting a desire to move away from past tourism development trends towards a future that is more socially and environmentally just for Hawai‘i. However, it is unclear how this process would be implemented and what kinds of institutional arrangements would be created to facilitate a shift towards a process that encourages, supports, and allows local communities to participate equitably in a tourism industry where they have been historically exploited.

Considering the social and economic problems posed by foreign investments in Hawai‘i, Kim (1994) recommended that the State of Hawai‘i play a greater role in providing alternative development schemes. He highlighted the need for community development corporations, land banks, non-profit housing organizations, and other approaches to economic development and proposed the creation of a new social contract between the different strata in society: between the government and its people, corporations and communities, and between the rich and poor. Kim partly attributes the demise of the system of representation to the growing divide between the have and have nots and for this reason, welcomes the Sovereignty movement as a political development that has forced the re-examination and re-definition of the rights and responsibilities of the people of Hawai‘i.
Chapter 3 Literature Review

Overview

The previous chapter illustrated the devastating impact of colonization and extended American occupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom on the status of Native Hawaiians and how the development of modern tourism further dispossessed them of their land and traditional practices. However, out of this oppression, grew a cultural renaissance in the 1970s that rekindled a collective movement to reclaim a Native Hawaiian identity and rebuild a Hawaiian nation. This period was characterized by a revival of Native Hawaiian traditions, practices, and epistemologies, which Corntassel (2008) posits as the foundation of sustainable self-determination for indigenous people. However, Native Hawaiians of the 21st Century must operate within a capitalist society dominated by an economy driven by modern tourism. Therefore, how might communities working towards self-determination, such as this case study, leverage and take advantage of tourism to further their own sovereignty.

In this section, I present a review of the literature in three main areas to better understand the underlying challenges that communities of this case study might encounter in attempting to engage with tourism towards self-sufficiency. These include exploring: examples of other communities in Hawai‘i who have attempted to engage with tourism for this purpose and the struggles that they face; the challenges experienced by small community-based organizations in culture-based tourism; and of authenticity in tourism. While the first two parts of the review focus on identifying challenges relating to engaging with tourism previously described in the literature, the latter part of the review is concerned with how previous scholarship view and define authenticity to inform how authenticity might apply to a host-visitor model.
Engaging Tourism for Sustainable Self-Determination

As described previously, tourism is important to the economies of small island nations of the Pacific that are often faced with restricted development opportunities due to limited natural resources, isolation from major metropolitan centers, and experience significant out-migration of educated people (Briedenhann & Wickens, 2004; Fuller et. al 2005; Rogerson 2005, Harrison 2004). As such, the industry is often the economic base of many small Pacific Island states like Hawai‘i. However, the economic prospects are accompanied by numerous threats to local customs particularly in Hawai‘i where tourism has developed out of significant commercialization and exploitation of its indigenous culture (Harrison 2004; Sheyvens and Russell 2009). Thus, tourism is likely to remain a significant part of the economy of small islands due to financial dependence (Harrison 2004). Considering both the opportunities and threats of tourism, the following examples describe and critique local efforts by other Native Hawaiian communities of engaging with tourism in ways that builds their capacity towards sustainable self-determination while minimizing negative impacts.

Corntassel (2008) postulates that states and global/regional forums have threatened the well-being of indigenous people by framing indigenous rights that de-emphasize and take away from the responsibilities and relationships that indigenous people have with their families and the natural world. In A Chosen People A Promised Land –Mormonism and Race in Hawai‘i, Hokulani Aikau (2012) reiterates this point by drawing on the work of Weber whose view of the paradox of capitalist modernity lies within the institutions created to make human life more ordered. According to Aikau (2012), these very institutions actually produce less autonomy and self-control for indigenous people and the example of institutions like groceries stores that replaced the land as a source of food supply, have diminished Native Hawaiians’ ability to
depend on the land and sea for survival. Aikau reframes this paradox by questioning instead how indigenous people can engage with modernity and take advantage of institutions to further their own self-determination; how meaning is made; and how tradition is expressed through this process. In order to debunk colonial and racial frames that define native people as anachronistic, Aikau proposes that the co-presence of settler and native must be acknowledged. Through this approach, tourism as an institution of modernity thus becomes perceived not for its negative impacts on indigenous people but on how tourism can be repositioned and strategically accessed to benefit the condition of indigenous communities working towards self-determination.

Aikau describes how Native Hawaiians attempted to achieve self-determination and further their own needs in the Mormon church. As the church became a more capitalist corporation, land previously used by Native Hawaiian members of the church for kalo (taro) cultivation and subsistence purposes were used for economic development projects, such as the commercial cultivation of sugarcane as a cash crop during the Plantation Era and the construction of the Brigham Young University and of the Polynesian Culture Center (PCC) in the latter half of the twentieth century. The struggle that many Native Hawaiian members had with this transition was continually being “forced to choose between two competing meanings of land: that of land as ‘āina, our older sibling and the source of nourishment for our bodies and spirits, and that of land as commodity” (Aikau 2012:88). Thus, the price they paid for the privileging of development over mālama ‘āina [taking care of the land], was the connection and relationship of the people to the land.

Though the PCC has been heavily criticized as an entity that capitalizes on cultural forms of the different Pacific Island cultures at Brigham Young University-Hawai‘i to generate economic
wealth, Aikau argues that the PCC served as a refuge for traditional cultural practices, or at least a narrow array of practices, for its Polynesian members. With the development of PCC, the practice of culture among Native Hawaiian members of the church shifted from subsistence lifestyles of farming and fishing to cultural performances for tourists. Aikau demonstrates how PCC provides a space and place for cultural perpetuation and education to take place through: a young Maori who reconnects with his cultural roots and identity through learning the art of carving from an older Maori teacher at the center; a Fijian man who fulfills his responsibility for passing on his knowledge by teaching young students at the PCC; and alumni who fondly recall how the PCC created a collective sense of identity as Pacific people through the times spent together to perform for tourists. A Hawaiian Studies program at the university was also created as part of a movement to give greater control to Hawaiians over making decisions about what is important for students to learn at the university and how the information will be taught. The program emphasizes Native Hawaiian protocol, values, and practices, which Aikau writes, is intended to provide a cultural foundation that allows students to enhance their religious foundation.

The PCC also provides opportunities and spaces for Pacific people to express themselves and practice aspects of their way of life with others, while at the same time earning a university education to succeed in a capitalist economy. However, the PCC has been unable to reconcile some of the tensions that its members have struggled with posed by tourism described previously. Aikau questioned the role of the PCC as a repository of Polynesian culture and finds it problematic that the institution be framed or viewed as such because of the contradicting goals and needs of global tourism and those of the Native Hawaiian movement towards self-determination. Thus, when Iosepa, a double-hulled canoe that was built in the aftermath of the
establishment of the iconic Hōkūle‘a—a symbol of the revival of Hawaiian culture— was housed at the PCC, Aikau questioned whether the institution was an appropriate home for the canoe.

In contrast, the residents of Moloka‘i Island, who are predominantly Native Hawaiian, have approached self-determination through prioritizing the way of life of Native Hawaiians and resisting the co-existence of the settler and native population by emphasizing the importance of maintaining the integrity of place. Over the last several decades, Molokai residents have actively rejected and protested large-scale development projects, and opting for a space with the natural resources to allow Native Hawaiians to continue their subsistence lifestyles (Aikau and Spencer 2007; McGregor 2006). The island successfully resisted large-scale development proposals such as the interisland Super Ferry project to increase tourism to the island and mass development plans for Lā‘au Point. As a result, Moloka‘i has earned the reputation of being the last remaining Native Hawaiian island.

In 2006, residents of the island came together and collectively created a community-based visitor plan for the island. Its members identified community tourism as the type of tourism development most appropriate for increasing job opportunities in the island. Their model of community tourism is defined as: “a process by which a community is empowered to share its greatness while preserving its dignity. It is small in scale and driven by a genuine desire of a community to share itself, its history, traditions, and customs with strangers, as a means by which to support economic growth” (McGregor 2006). The Moloka‘i community’s visitor plan points out several characteristics of community tourism which includes the following:
• Involves travel-related offerings created and operated by local, traditional, or indigenous populations to enhance their quality of life, protect and restore the environmental and cultural assets and engage visitors on terms defined by the area’s inhabitants;
• Activities evolve as a solution to economic, environmental, social, educational, and cultural growth challenges;
• Yields a fair exchange of value between the host and the hosted;
• Preserves the community’s sense of place, and brings dignity and pride to the host;
• Invites far more intimacy in the relationship between host and guest than is normally afforded by other tourism business models;
• Features far more authentic and genuine activities for the guests, because the activities are for the community and not constructed specifically to entertain a stranger;
• Shares its real culture by the people who practice it; and
• Places boundaries and limitations on how many visitors can be accommodated so that the sense of place is not overwhelmed by large scale tourism, and the ratio between the local population and the visitor count remains in balance. (McGregor 2006:6)

Despite the prevalence of tourism to Hawai‘i, Moloka‘i residents have not rejected tourism but strategically created a method to guide them as they engage with tourism in a way that meets their interests and needs culturally, while still contributing economically to their livelihood. Through this process, residents of the island struggle with higher unemployment, education opportunities, and access to technology and amenities of convenience that other islands in Hawai‘i enjoy. However, to date, this process has allowed Moloka‘i Island to maintain the integrity of its natural resources, cultural practices of subsistence, and sense of place. The success of the island of Molokai in this area has been attributed among other things to the
presence of strong leadership and communal relationships that nurture cohesive collective action. Therefore, the host-visitor model upon which this research is based may be an attractive strategy for the island of Moloka‘i looking to engage with tourism but in a way that does not override the resources of its place and people.

Ty Tengan’s (2008) work, in *Native Men Remade*, brings to light that in the process of working towards self-determination, culture, place, as well as gender are deeply intertwined and cannot be separated. Tengan builds on Haunani Trask’s (1984) critiques that the articulation of masculine power and authority in the Sovereignty movement of the Hawaiian Kingdom heavily marginalized Native Hawaiian women. Trask (1984) criticized Native Hawaiian male leaders for a patriarchal brand of activism that subjected Native Hawaiian women in the Sovereignty movement to a “double colonization,” marginalized by both white society and Native Hawaiian men. Tengan argues however, that the colonization of Hawai‘i has disempowered and emasculated Native Hawaiian men:

Hawaiian men in general, have lost their place and role in society. Often, they link this to the loss of the old ways, the religious formations, political systems, cultural practices, and relationships to the land that our ancestors knew. (2008:5)

Tourism has added to this distorted sense of masculinity by the images produced to represent and stereotype Hawaiian men that have often been feminized images of Native Hawaiians. In response, a group of Native Hawaiian men on the island of Maui formed an organization called the Hale Mua to re-define and assert their own masculine identities. Tengan highlights the efforts of the Hale Mua in resolving existing anxieties among Native Hawaiian men about masculinity by reconnecting with the masculinity of their ancestors and of their Polynesian brothers through
traditional practices of lua (martial arts), woodcarving, and cultural ceremonies. This effort illustrates how identity is re-defined and re-imagined through the restoration of traditional cultural practices. However, the men of the Hale Mua continued to struggle between performing for others and for themselves as seen in their experiences of re-enacting cultural practices at Pu‘ukoholā in Hawai‘i Island.

Tengan’s work reiterates the importance of gender in Pacific customs which has been re-defined by colonization and democratization processes. Traditionally, cultural practices of the Pacific were gender-specific and defined male and female roles in society. Gender roles were devised by predecessors of the Pacific which maximized efficiency within a communal context, encouraged interdependence, and nurtured values of reciprocity through the sharing of male-female assets and abilities. Though gender roles remain in many parts of the Pacific, they have largely diminished in Hawai‘i. Remembering the traditional roles of gender is constructive in selecting strategies that best use the assets of community members in engaging with the tourism industry as well as perpetuate more accurate representation of cultural traditions. Thus, the host-visitor model might learn from this work in creating meaningful identities in relation to the larger political forces by remembering the wisdom of the old ways.

*The Challenges of Small-scale Enterprises in Culture-based Tourism*

A review of the literature on some common features shared by small family businesses by Zhao (2009) suggests that most failures and poor performance of small businesses in culture-based tourism are a function of the limited resources and capacity of the small-size of these businesses. The most common characteristics include the following: shortages of skilled staff, limited access to business expertise, limited training in management, lack of financial resources,
a simple “owner-manager” organizational structure that dictates an informal managerial practice; and irregular and simplistic strategic marketing activities (Zhao 2009; Page et al. 1999; Becton and Graetz 2001; Augustyn 2004; Ateljevic and Doorne 2004; Getz et al., 2005; King et al. 1998; and Friel 1999). Zhao (2009) also points out that family-run businesses put strain on family relationships due to business demands on personal time which often lead to internal conflicts.

However, not all small-scale businesses are created equal. Rogerson (2005) points out that in South Africa, small scale businesses can be divided into three tiers of small, medium, and micro enterprises (SMMEs). Rogerson further distinguishes the heterogeneity of SMMEs as either established or emerging. In South Africa, established SMMEs dominate the local tourism market and are predominantly white-owned, run by an older population who are 50 years of age and older, and by those who choose a certain type of lifestyle over making money. Emerging SMMEs on the other hand are black-owned and are at the bottom of the three-tier of SMMEs.

Both types of SMMEs complained of poor access to national government supported programs, as well and marketing constraints. However, the most significant concerns of established SMMEs were related to national and provincial decisions impacting tourism, such as: the under-marketing of tourism products limiting the province from reaching its full potential for tourism; excessive and unnecessary regulations at the national, provincial, and local levels for tasks such as regulations for signage, labor, and zoning applications; difficulty in accessing national government support programs due to bureaucratic red tape; and inadequate human and physical infrastructure, as experienced by many remote and small businesses. Though access to start-up capital was not a constraint for this group, marketing and generally getting known was a core problem. In contrast, competition from both large and established SMMEs was the largest
constraint to the development of emerging SMMEs, as well as lack of access to start-up capital. In 2000, the Tourism Enterprise Programme (TEP) was set up by the South African government to address these barriers. Thus, understanding the specific needs of different types of SMMEs instead of treating them as homogenous organizations, allows programs such as TEP to address organizational needs more effectively.

Assistance from the government such as the TEP in South Africa, points to the importance and role of government in supporting the development of small businesses in tourism particularly in rural areas (Rogerson 2005). Local communities can be encouraged to have greater participation in the tourism industry through government policies and programs. Some examples include the Black Economic Empowerment initiative that the South African government promulgated to transform the ownership structure of a predominantly white dominated tourism industry. Similarly, the Australian government instituted the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Tourism Industry Strategy (NATSITIS) to promote the growth and development of indigenous owned and managed businesses in tourism as many indigenous aboriginals tend to live in remote areas. However, though government assistance packages are available to indigenous people, most of these programs are complicated and difficult to access (Fuller et al. 2005).

Similarly, the State of Hawai‘i created a program called the Hawai‘i Alliance for Community-Based Economic Development (HACBED) in 1989 to formulate strategies for the State of Hawai‘i to support community-based organizations wanting to develop economic development initiatives. These efforts lead to Act 111, SLH 1991, codified as Hawaii Revised Statute (HRS) Chapter 210D which resulted in the creation of a Community-Based Economic Development (CBED) program within the Department of Business, Economic Development &
Tourism (Hawai‘i CBED d.u.). The CBED program offers a revolving fund to assist eligible community-based organizations with financial and technical assistance. Though these government programs exist, it is unclear how much they are utilized or accessed by local communities adopting a values-based host-visitor approach.

Government also has opportunities to play a greater role in establishing policies and mechanisms that protect the cultural and natural resources of communities where tourism product development surrounds a people’s past way of life. Ondimu (2002) highlights this issue among a community of Gusii in Kenya who struggled over the lack of government support for the preservation of their heritage and cultural resources. The community took it upon themselves to identify the cultural and heritage elements they believed were most important and interesting to them and a heritage inventory was conducted of the cultural resources of the community. The inventory better informed the community on how to develop their tourism product.

Other strategies to assist SMMEs to increase their capacity include networking and partnering with other entities. Briedenann and Wickens (2003) write that the shift in tourist trends from standardized mass tourism for more meaningful experiences in the last decade, offers opportunities for small rural business operators to establish networks of different service providers to maximize opportunity and offering a greater range of activities. Therefore, there is a need for rural operators to develop their product to satisfy the demand for tourism so that tourists stay longer and return in the future. Briedenann and Wickens (2003) also suggest a variety of ways to stimulate entrepreneurial opportunities such as: clustering of activities and attractions, user-friendly signage, establishment of easily accessible information offices, the development of rural tourism routes, and of ancillary services. Briedenann and Wickens (2003) point out that tourism routes have been long realized in developed counties and fully implemented in different
regions of the world. These are networks of routes crossing one or more countries or regions organized around cultural and historical sites that stimulate awareness over cultural and heritage sites, such as the series of European Cultural Routes, heritage trails in the United States, the Queensland Heritage Trails Network in Australia, and Open Africa Network in South Africa.

Open Africa is an example of a large network involving many partners that crosses international borders and based around Africa’s natural and cultural resources, also known as Afrikatourism. Open Africa was established in 1995 by a diverse group of people with the goal of optimizing tourism, conservation, and creating jobs in Africa. The group included scientists, sociologists, conservationists, business people and tourism experts and also came under the patronage of the late President Nelson Mendela (Briedenann and Wickens 2003). In 2014, the foundation consisted of 63 travel routes in six countries, with 2,482 participating businesses, and 28,497 employees (Open Africa n.d.). These countries are South Africa, Zambia, Namibia, Mozambique, Lesotho and Swaziland. However, conflicts among the different stakeholders involved in partnerships are potential challenges of this approach particularly when benefits remain in the hands of only one segment of the community.

The pressure to maximize profits and provide employment, particularly in rural areas, often leads to lack of planning and consultations with indigenous communities. However, cultural values and practices are often more pronounced in rural areas and differ significantly from the culture of profit-driven economics. Fuller et al. (2005) point out that the success of small-scale businesses must consider factors outside profitability, such as indigenous control, authenticity of the product, level of community involvement with tourists, and the consideration of cultural and spiritual values. On Taquile Island in Peru, community awareness, unity, and power, were key in the planning and implementation of a community-based tourism program surrounding traditional
textile weaving (Mitchell and Reid 2001). Greater community awareness about their current situation and possibilities for tourism, solidarity in their collective interest to participate and manage a set of activities, and greater participation in the planning and decision-making process of tourism planning, resulted in positive economic outcomes and impacts of the local tourism industry. Mitchell and Reid (2001) also point out that success of community-based tourism can also be attributed to the influence of catalysts or key people in leadership roles in turning community awareness into a tourism product at the community-level. Similarly, adherence to and a respect for customary laws allowed for transparent and consensual decision-making process that facilitated a more participatory decision-making process.

The review indicates that a variety of different challenges affect small community-based business enterprises trying to participate in the tourism industry through the sharing of cultural knowledge and resources. Organizational size and experience affect the capacity of small community-based enterprises and Rogerson 2005 point out that not all SMMEs are created equal and that established SMMEs are better abled than those that are newly established. The review also highlights the impact of under-marketing and limited advertising and business performance. Some of these studies showed that national governments played a significant role in supporting indigenous groups in the tourism industry, through policies and mechanisms that encourage their participation. However, bureaucracy seemed to hinder these efforts despite their positive intentions. Networks, clustering, and forming partnerships were identified as supportive mechanisms and strategies to improve the capacity of small-scale enterprises. The review also highlights factors that affect community cohesion and dynamics that characterize community-related work, as well as concerns over the protection of cultural resources and assets, elements central to tourism.
**Authenticity in Tourism**

Tourism practices and ideologies are informed by conditions associated with modernity, which includes the capitalist economy (Chambers 2000:94). In a capitalist economy, goods and services that did not have an economic value previously could now be packaged, transferred, and sold as a commodity. In tourism, the tourism experience itself becomes a commodity. This process is called commodification and in modern tourism, the commodification of culture and heritage make up a major segment of the tourism industry which operates based on the sale of activities and resources associated with the heritage of a group of people, such as indigenous art and crafts, festivals, rituals, and dances. A historic property that was once used and may still be used and freely accessed by local communities for their religious rituals, can now be packaged as part of a tour where visitors pay an agent to experience the property.

Unfortunately, the commodification of culture in tourism has resulted in the exploitation of many indigenous cultures and peoples (Bianchi 2002). Through this process, suppliers of the tourism experience have benefited from capitalizing on the way of life of indigenous people while few or very little benefits filter down to the actual owners of the cultural resources and practices themselves. From an ethical perspective, this doesn’t seem quite right. Furthermore, during the commodification process of packaging cultural resources and practices for an experience paid for by a tourist at a certain time and place, how are the cultural resources and practices of a people presented and understood when these activities are taken out of the very context that give them meaning for the purposes of a touristic experience? Do tourism activities correctly represent the culture in question and how does this representation affect the objectification of cultural groups by outside visitors as well as those within these cultural groups? To further our understanding of the significance of authenticity to the types of
experiences offered by the Ka Welina Network and the case study for this research, the concept of authenticity is explored in more detail.

Authenticity has been well-studied but the term has become an ambiguous concept with multiple definitions, infused with an array of philosophical, psychological, and spiritual meanings (Steiner and Reisigner 2006). Within the tourism literature, the term is particularly confusing because as Steiner and Reisigner (2006) point out, authenticity is used in two distinct contexts—“authenticity as genuineness or realness of artifacts or events, and also as a human attribute signifying being one’s true self or being true to one’s essential self, otherwise known as existential authenticity.” The lack of a consensus on an agreed-upon concept of authenticity has led many scholars to abandon the usefulness of the concept of authenticity in tourism studies (Cohen and Cohen 2012; Reisinger and Steiner 2005) while some still believe there is hope in reconciling these different perspectives (Lau 2010).

The question of authenticity became the topic of much debate in tourism studies over the last quarter of the 20th century following the work of Boorstin (1964) and MacCannell (1973) concerning the generation of pseudo events and “staged authenticity” by mass tourism. MacCannell (1973) wrote that modern man is motivated to seek out authentic experiences to escape the shallowness of everyday life. In other words, authenticity is thought to be non-existent in modernity, to be found only in primitive places away from the reaches of capitalism. Therefore, tourists are motivated to seek authentic experiences and locals stage the experience for them. At the same time, this argument lends legitimacy to the development of values-based host-visitor programs in Hawai‘i that are uniquely Hawaiian, hosted by Native Hawaiians, and offering meaningful experiences from a Native Hawaiian perspective.
MacCannell elaborates on structural division of social establishments into what he calls “front” and “back” regions where front regions are where staged performances occur for tourists while the real happenings of local life occur in the back regions. MacCannell (1976) suggests that hosts deal with tourists by performing only certain practices for them in front regions while the more important and meaningful cultural practices are not shared in the back regions. MacCannell (1973) claims that the very existence of a back region generates the belief that there is more than meets the eye that is kept hidden from tourists. Thus, the commodification of culture changes the meaning of cultural practices that they cease to be meaningful to producers. Under this view, the commodification of culture for consumption produces inauthentic practices. If MacCannell’s claims that more meaningful cultural practices are not shared with visitors, how then are meaningful experiences of a values-based host-visitor model shared and maintained?

Many critics question MacCannell’s concept of staged authenticity as the idea fails to account for many tourist motivations such as, visiting friends and relatives, Disneyland, or nature tourism (Cohen and Cohen, 2012). Authenticity became the focus of study in tourism research exposing the limitations, ambiguity, and multiple meanings of the term (Cohen and Cohen 2012). Wang (1999) conducted a literature survey on authenticity and writes that the issue of authenticity in tourism can be divided into two areas—authenticity of tourist experiences and that of toured objects. The discourse on authenticity became split into three categories based on the three different definitions of authenticity identified by Wang (1999) as “objective” (object), “constructed,” and “subjective or existential” authenticity.

Objective authenticity recognizes that original objects are authentic so even if tourists believe they have an authentic experience, these perceptions may be deemed false or inauthentic if the object is not the original or what MacCannell (1973) calls, staged authenticity (Reisinger and
The term authenticity was originally used in the context of objective authenticity in museums to refer to original works of art. Trilling (1972:93) writes that: “Where persons expert in such matters test whether objects of art are what they appear to be or are claimed to be, and therefore worth the price that is asked for them—or, if it has already been paid, worth the admiration they are being given.”

Constructive authenticity on the other hand, is characterized as “a socially constructed interpretation of the genuineness of observable things rather than as a real and objective phenomenon discernible empirically” (Reisinger and Steiner 2006: 69; Cohen 1988; Taylor 2001). Constructive authenticity is projected onto toured objects by tourists or tourism producers in terms of their imagery, expectations, preferences, beliefs, and powers (Wang 1999; Cohen and Cohen 2012). This type of authenticity assumes that reality is based on personal interpretation so the experience of authenticity is pluralistic. Therefore, an object initially considered to be inauthentic may emerge as authentic if that object has symbolic meaning to the interpreter.

Constructivists view culture as emergent and dynamic based on the idea that culture is an ongoing human creation. Also known as the ‘cultural invention’ theory, advocates of this idea posit that traditions, Western or Indigenous, are inherently invented because they are symbolically constructed in the present, reflecting contemporary concerns and purposes that may carry different meanings and interpretations from their previous representations (Wagner 1975; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; and Hanson 1989). Handler (1986) considers authenticity a cultural construct of the modern Western world and points out that authenticity ceases to exist when tradition is viewed as a wholly symbolic construction and an ongoing process of human creation.
Existential authenticity, on the other hand, is a potential state of being that is activated by tourist activities. Thus, people may feel that they have an authentic experience simply because they are engaging in non-ordinary activities. This type of authenticity would account for experiences that have nothing to do with culture such as adventure travel or nature tours. Thus, existential authenticity can also be felt while visiting and experiencing sites that may be categorized as objectively authentic due to the originality of those sites or objects.

The varied definitions of and conflicting views on authenticity suggests that while modernists like Boorstein and MacCannell were concerned with the idea of authenticity, constructivists and postmodernists do not have a problem with inauthenticity. The lack of a consensus on an agreed-upon concept of authenticity has led many scholars to abandon the usefulness of the concept of authenticity in tourism studies (Cohen and Cohen 2012; Reisinger and Steiner 2006) while some still believe there is hope in reconciling these different perspectives (Lau 2010). Some scholars are calling for the replacement of the term authenticity with less ambiguous words like genuine, actual, accurate, real and true when referring to judgements made about tourism activities and objects (Reisigner and Steiner 2006). Taylor (2001) uses the term, “sincerity” to describe how local Maoris in New Zealand have responded to non-Maori portrayal of Maori culture by providing their own cultural interpretations of their culture, which he considers to be more sincere. Thus, use of the terms “meaningful experiences” in lieu of “authentic experiences” might be more appropriate terminology for a values-based host-visitor program.

Cohen and Cohen (2012) suggest a shift in the discourse of authenticity to instead focus on the process of authentication or how an object or activity becomes labeled authentic. Of particular interest in the area of authentication are the questions of: Is there only one or are there several ways by which authenticity is established in the tourism domain? Is there a difference between
the processes through which objective, as against existential, authenticity is established? Who has the power to endow tourist attractions with authenticity (Cohen and Cohen 2012)? While these questions surrounding the authentication process divert from the focus of this research, the use of the term “authentic and or authenticity” is so widely-used that perhaps this is an area that deserves further attention in the future.

Review of the literature highlights the complexity of ‘authenticity’ in scholarly terms yet, the term continues to be used regularly by visitors and hosts alike, including hosts of the Ka Welina Network. Therefore, this research explores the notion of authenticity and how it is understood by hosts of the case study. The question, “What does authenticity mean to you?” will be posed to hosts of this case study to better understand their perception of this concept and how those ideas might influence the type of experiences they offer in their host-visitor programs. Also important, is understanding how hosts ensure that the experiences they offer remain real and sincere over time.
Chapter 4: Case Study Background

Overview

The Ka Welina Network was developed to create and implement a community-based host-visitor (CBHV) model to address some of the issues posed by modern tourism highlighted in the previous chapters. The project was initiated by the Pasifika Foundation Hawai‘i, Inc (PFH) a non-profit organization focused on strengthening connections among Pacific Island nations and cultures, including Hawai‘i. The creation and implementation of the network occurred in five different phases and the first four phases were funded by the Association for Native Americans (ANA). Phase I began in 2007 and it involved developing the community-based host-visitor model, which resulted in the publication of “A model for a community-based host-visitor program in Hawai‘i,” which laid the foundation for what later became the Ka Welina Network. The project continued into Phase II in 2008 and involved a survey to capture and understand the status and condition of community-based and culturally driven operations in Hawai‘i that were hosting visitors throughout the different islands. Based on the data collected, six organizations were chosen and they became the first members of the Ka Welina Network. These organizations included Waipā Foundation, Kipāhulu ‘Ohana, Papakōlea, Ko‘olaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club, Ho‘oulu Lāhui, and Kawaiokalehua Foundation.

Phase III was comprised of a two-year pilot project to develop and test out an operational model for a community-based host-visitor network. This phase focused on three main areas: 1) Developing a planning and governance template for hosts; 2) Developing a curriculum for visitors; and 3) Creating a web-based interface through which hosts and visitors could interact. The chosen 6 organizations worked to formally host visitors and implement the CBHV model.
Phase IV built upon the foundation created in the previous phases and focused on transitioning into becoming a fully operational CBHV network. Four more organizations were invited into the network, forming a total of 10 organizations that made up the Ka Welina Network. The additional four included Sust‘āina’ble Molokai, Hālawa ‘Ohana Lo‘i Kalo Cultural Learning Center, ‘Ahahui Mālama ‘o Kaniakapūpū, and Ka ‘Ohana ‘o Hōnaunau. These four organizations expanded the geographical reach of the network to become a statewide network. Of the 10 organizations that made up the network, three were located in O‘ahu, three on Hawai‘i, two on Moloka‘i, and one each on Kaua‘i and Maui.

The organizational structure of the network was rather loose and informal and the initial discussions around the possible structure of the network occurred in 2012. Network members met and exchanged ideas about how to become a self-sustaining entity, independent of Pasifika Foundation Hawai‘i. Some of the ideas discussed revolved around how the network would be supported financially. While some welcomed the thought of each organization contributing a certain percentage to maintain the network, others were not excited about creating more administrative work for their respective organizations. Since most organizations of the network struggled with administrative and technical support, many felt that creating a central hub with a paid administrator to handle administrative logistics for all members of the network would be beneficial. Discussions halted as further funding was being sought to continue to support implementation of the project.

**Case Study**

Four of the ten organizations of the Ka Welina Network were chosen as case studies for this research. These include two organizations from Puna on the eastern side of Hawai‘i Island, Kawaiokalehua Foundation and Ho‘oulu Lāhui, respectively, the Ko‘olaupoko Native Hawaiian
Civic Club on O'ahu Island, and Waipā Foundation on the island of Kaua'i. The following section provides an overview of the background of each organization. Also, a brief description of the cultural practitioners associated with each organization who were interviewed for this project, is also included under each organization as these individuals contribute significantly to the operation and nature of their respective organizations.

**Kawaiokalehua Foundation**

Kawaiokalehua Foundation was founded in 1999 when families from Puna were approached by Kamehameha Schools to assume the kuleana of taking care of Kahuwai Village, an ancient Hawaiian fishing village settled by Polynesians during the early migrations from the Marquesas to Hawai'i. The village hugs the coastline of Kahuwai and is accessed by a dirt road that is lined with pandanus, kamani, mango, and a forest of coastal plants. The ancient village is made up of 114 acres and consists of remnants from the settlement which include a hale mua (men’s house), a hale peʻa (birthing house), pōhaku o Kāne (Kane’s stone), pōhaku wai (water collection rock), a hale wa’a (canoe shed) near the ocean, and a trail system that traverses the property.

Associated with Kawaiokalehua Foundation, is Kumukahi, a significant and special place to the people of Puna because it is where the sun rises and signifies the beginning of the day and of life. Kumukahi is a 15-minute drive from Kahuwai. Kumukahi is also important because it was a place of healing with two healing platforms near the ocean and along cliffs nearby. When people were sick physically or spiritually, they came to these places and a kahuna (priest) would carry out the healing rituals there. Kukiʻi Heiau, also located at Kumukahi, was a place to learn astronomy and navigation. The foundation stones of this heiau were removed to build ‘Iolani Place in O’ahu. Also taught here, was the art of poisoning people and animals. Other moʻolelo such as those of Pele, the goddess of the volcano, are associated with the heiau (temple).
Figure 4. Map showing location of Kawaiokalehua Foundation, Hawai‘i Island
Kawaiokalehua Foundation is dedicated to providing and promoting the education of Native Hawaiian history, culture, and heritage through sharing the cultural practices, beliefs, and values, such as mālama and aloha ‘āina, that is unique to Puna. Kamehameha Schools appointed a local Native Hawaiian who was also a trained archaeologist, to assume the kahu (caretaker, guardian, master) position of Kahuwai and take care of its ancient Marquesian village. The kahu approached Lynda Saffory about working with him at Kawaiokalehua Foundation and teach lau hala workshops while he provided workshops on heiau-building and restoration, hōlua sled making, and taught children how to make maps. With their expertise combined, they were able to provide tours of the village, share mo`olelo of Puna, and their cultural knowledge. Their education programs were targeted towards local schools like Kamehameha Schools, and Native Hawaiian communities who expressed interest.

Lynda Saffery, a master lau hala weaver and cultural practitioner who also teaches lā‘au lapa‘au (traditional medicine), lived about an eighth of a mile from Kahuwai. Her family would go fishing down at Kahuwai so she came to know the place well. Her eyes softened as she spoke of Kahuwai, “I had always loved Kahuwai because how can you not love it. I mean, ancient village. First migrations. It’s such angels,” she said. While she lived in Puna, she learned to weave from Aunty Minny Ka‘awaloa from Kalapana. Her learning was supported by State Foundation on Culture and Arts grants which allowed her to eventually become a master weaver. During this time, she spent much of her time in Kalapana and Pāhoa where she became indoctrinated into the Kalapana and Puna styles of weaving. She thought back to those times and smiled:
Well, I started off with simple things like the apo lima (bracelet). Then I learned the ‘eke, basket. All different styles. The very first thing I learned how to make was a Christmas star. It was Christmas time when I first started weaving with aunty at Pāhoa School. I learned to make the star and then she told me, “Oh, Lynda, next weekend we’re gonna have a basket-making class. Why don’t you come down and learn to make baskets”. For some reason, I just learned it so fast. The other people were still struggling and you’d hear them, going, “Ho, Aunty Minny, Aunty Minny” They all wanted help and Aunty saw that I got it already. Then she she’d say, “Lynda, can you please help her?” And I would help them and from then on, I was hooked. It was just like, I had a new life. Then we got a grant to make the pāpale, the lau hala hat and got a grant to do the moina pu’ana kalua the double weave mat, and then I was weaving with her all the time. We’d get together and we’d weave and I’d help her prepare for her classes and to do her weaving classes. We’d go to Volcano National Park and Pu‘u Honua o Hōnaunau, Pu‘u Koholā. Within the national parks we’d do workshops and then she wanted to start a club so we started a club called, ‘Aha Puhala o Puna. Yeah it’s just been a way of life. I started teaching in the schools to weave lau hala and it’s been a journey.

Figure 5. Lynda Saffery demonstrating lau hala weaving at Kahuwai (Source: Kawaiokalehua Foundation n.d.)
Kawaiokalehua Foundation expressed two main goals for their Ka Welina Host-Visitor Program: (1) To provide and promote the education of Native Hawaiian history, culture, and heritage and (2) To be financially sustainable so that practitioners could continue the work they
do. The program envisioned that sharing knowledge of the culture would in turn be shared by visitors with others and the organization offered three opportunities to share with visitors.

**Ho'oulu Lāhui**

Ho'oulu Lāhui, also known as the Pu'ala'a Educational Learning Center, is a non-profit organization that was established in 1994 for on-going stabilization of the ancient coastal village and the sites of Pu'ala'a in the rural district of Puna, one of nine districts on the island of Hawai‘i. The site is composed of 600 acres of land located adjacent to the ocean which surrounds an “intact” ancient coastal village with important archaeological features, as well as brackish water ponds and wells, offering a unique and dynamic outdoor learning environment. However, in recent years, many newcomers from the continental USA and from Micronesia have settled in Puna, creating a settler population with little knowledge of Native Hawaiian culture or traditional stewardship practices. Many visitors are attracted to Puna because of the volcano nearby. Over the last two decades, the organization has hosted thousands of visitors of all ages locally, statewide, and internationally to educate them about Puna and Native Hawaiian culture.

Ho‘oulu Lāhui was founded by Mr. Keikialoha Kepiki and Ms. Susie Osborne, along with several close friends, to protect Pu'ala'a, its historic sites, and significance. The organization was formed in response to the exploitation and destruction of Native Hawaiian cultural resources in the Puna area. Native Hawaiians believe that iwi (bones) of the dead are sacred and the most cherished possession because they contain a person’s mana (divine power). However, many burials in Pu'ala'a were being dug up and human remains stolen and dishonored. Keikialoha Kepiki witnessed this damage and felt compelled to do something to end the desecration to the cultural resources and ancestral burials. In the process of researching and finding the families related to the burials in the area, he discovered his own geneological ties to Pu'ala'a and found
himself called to carry out the kuleana of protecting the resources. As one of the oldest kupuna of the place passed away, she said to Keikialoha, “You going mālama them [burials].”

Figure 8. Map showing location of Ho’oulu Lāhui on Hawai‘i Island
Keikialoha explained in his own words how the organization formed:

The basis of forming a nonprofit was not so much for make one school. No. We put it in place for the families to actually mālama their families. So it’s all about that. Taking care of kuleana. Our mission is to make sure that all the families are not gonna have to go through that traumatic experience and that they [burials] would be preserved where they were intended to be preserved.

Initially, Keikialoha became connected to Pu‘ala‘a in the 1980s when he was attending Hilo Community College. While at the college, he met Ed Kanahele who encouraged him to work with Native Hawaiian youth, who at the time had high rates of incarceration. Keikialoha worked for YWCA Hilo, a non-profit organization dedicated to empowering women, eliminating racism, and promoting peace and justice. During this time, he ran a rehabilitation program with adjudicated youth that was modeled after the outdoors challenge program, Outward Bound. He would take the youth to Pu‘ala‘a on Wednesdays for a backcountry experience and they would swim and camp overnight in the bushes then return to Hilo in the morning. His work transitioned into Ho‘oulu Lāhui and subsequently, continued to build the capacity of the Puna youth through Kua o Ka Lā Charter School. With decades of service to assisting communities in Puna, Keikialoha is truly a community leader who is rooted in his culture and has a deep sense aloha and kuleana for Hawai‘i.

Ho‘oulu Lāhui became associated with the Ka Welina Network in 2007 through ties with Ola Hawai‘i. Keikialoha was part of a program designed by Ola Hawaii to train 21 people throughout the State of Hawai‘i using a curriculum intended to improve the hospitality services of the visitor industry. The program attempted to address how hosts could better deal with the impact of development on Hawai‘i and how they could sustain themselves, maintain their identity, values, and customs without being overwhelmed. The program was created by some of the same people who initiated the Ka Welina Network and it was through this connection that started the relationship with the network. Therefore, Keikialoha was already familiar with exploring
alternative tourism ideas to support local communities in Hawai‘i by the time he was approached to join the Ka Welina Network in 2008.

Figure 9. Rock wall of ancient village at Pua‘ala‘a (Source: Ho‘oulu Lāhui n.d.)

Figure 10. The site at Pu‘ala‘a upon which Ho‘oulu Lahui developed around. (Source: Ho‘oulu Lāhui, n.d.)
Figure 11. Brackish water ponds around Puʻalaʻa (Source: Hoʻoulu Lāhui n.d)

**Koʻolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club**

The Koʻolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club (KHCC), shown in Figure 12, is a non-profit civic and community organization dedicated to the perpetuation of Native Hawaiian history, culture, and heritage. Its mission is “To mālama the members, the families, and the communities in which we live.” The KHCC was established in 1937 by a group of kamaʻāina (Native-born, host) in the Koʻolaupoko area. It became chartered with the State Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs at the association’s first annual convention in 1959, the same year that Hawaiʻi became an American state. Initially, club membership numbered in the thousands and the club’s geographical area ranged from Makapuʻu to Waimea Bay but the area decreased to the nine ahupuaʻa between Kāneʻohe and Kualoa that surround Kāneʻohe Bay. These include Kāneʻohe, Heʻeia, Kahaluʻu, Waiheʻe, Kaʻalaea, Waiʻahole, Waikane, Hakipuʻu, and Kualoa.

The Koʻolaupoko District is among the most culturally and historically rich areas in Oʻahu, blessed with many cultural and archaeological sites that extend mauka-makai (from the mountain
to the sea). Archaeological features are abundant such as heiau, house sites, battlefields, burial grounds, and fishponds and each ahupua‘a has numerous wahi pana and mo‘olelo that give meaning to the cultural and physical landscape of the place. Thus, the Ko‘olaupoko District itself serves as a living classroom from which people can learn, understand, and appreciate Native Hawaiian cultural practices, resources, beliefs, and ways of thinking.

The KHCC is the only club of 67 civic clubs nationwide that has its own office, a testament that they work hard to have one and also to maintain the membership of the club. The KHCC has two main goals—to support and facilitate the perpetuation of Native Hawaiian culture and heritage through an array of different activities that attracts a variety of people and to promote No‘ono‘o Hawai‘i or thinking through a Native Hawaiian epistemological lens. Club activities include but are not limited to cultural interpretive tours, service learning stewardship programs, educational workshops, cultural consultations, community outreach projects, meetings, testimonies, and many social activities that bring people together. These activities are intended as vehicles to educate the people of Hawai‘i and of the world about Hawaiian culture, to understand the Native Hawaiian worldview, be in harmony with Native Hawaiian core values, and share aloha with one another.

Mahealani Cypher was born and raised in this district in the ahupua’a of Kāne‘ohe. She has a large extended family with ancestry from Hilo on Hawai‘i Island and Hana from Maui, but many of her family live in and around Kāne‘ohe Bay between Kāne‘ohe and Kualoa. She learned from her kūpuna the cultural knowledge and values she practices, as well as her family mo‘olelo and that of the places connected with her family. When she was a child, her grandparents adopted her and her sister. Her grandfather was a policeman for the whole windward side of Oahu so he would traverse the coast from Makapu‘u to Waimea daily. When he retired, he did the same
thing for the Star Bulletin so growing up, they traveled with him on his truck often. She reminisced about those childhood memories fondly and said, “we’re so fortunate to have been blessed with their knowledge, values, and teachings they gave us about life and about our part of this world.”

![Map showing location of Koʻolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club, Oʻahu Island](image)

Figure 12. Map showing location of Koʻolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club, Oʻahu Island

Mahealani’s relationship to the KHCC dates back to her grandfather, George Cypher, who was one of the founders of the club in 1937. During the 1970s, 80s, and 90s, the club went through many transitions with different leadership and her family was not directly involved except through the club’s scholarship program. In the early 2000s, the older members of the club asked the younger generations to get involved and reactivate the club. Mahealani came together
with some of the younger members and revived the Kualoa-Heʻeia Hawaiian Civic Club which had broken away from KHCC for some time. In 2005, the two clubs merged into the KHCC and since, the club has been very active. Her involvement with the club also stems from a deep love for Kāneʻohe and where she was raised:

The love is so deep. No matter where I’ve gone in the world, and I have been to many places elsewhere, but I’m always here, no matter where I am. You can take the girl out of Kāneʻohe but you can never take the Kāneʻohe out of the girl. You cannot even take the Koʻolau out of the girl so we have a slogan for our club, “No Koʻolau Mai Au, I am rooted in Koʻolau” because that’s where our roots are. It’s the homeland for me, this Hawaiian anyway. And every Hawaiian, wherever they call home, that is their homeland. No matter where they go, they’re always gonna feel, this is where they belong. So, the brief times that I have lived on the mainland, I really missed the islands so I’m happy that I’m able to survive and sustain myself and my family here.

In the 1970s, Mahealani was a news editor for the Pali Press, which became the Sun Press Community Newspaper, a chain of five newspapers operating in suburban areas around Oʻahu. One of the news stories in 1972 was the controversial H3 Highway and whether it should be built. The highway would cut through the Koʻolau Mountains from Kaneohe to Honolulu. “I kind of scoffed at the controversy and wondered why everybody was making such a fuss. It’s just a highway, big deal,” she said but as the reporters started bringing in the stories for her to edit, she had to research and understand the issues to confirm the information she reviewed. During that process, she learned a lot about an issue that greatly impacted her life. She explained how that experience transformed her life:

I started reading the environmental impact statements. There were 13 volumes. I ended up reading all 13 volumes and I was greatly alarmed by what I found. The social impacts on Koʻolaupoko were devastating to the people and the places. To the ʻāina and the ocean. I was deeply concerned about the changes it would bring into the communities that I loved. So, I became a strong advocate for protecting Koʻolaupoko from the adverse impacts of developments like H3. And so I spent over 30 years writing editorials, being involved in projects and activities, planning, things like that.
During that time, she befriended Earl Buddneller, who was at that time the state archaeologist for the Department of Land and Natural Resources. He helped her understand the potential impacts of the highway on the cultural resources, historic sites, and sacred places especially of the ahupua‘a of Kāne‘ohe, He‘eia, and Hālawa as well, from the Honolulu side of the mountain. Conversations with key kūpuna helped her understand that she had to help mālama, preserve, and perpetuate the importance of all these places. She explained:

From then on, that became sort of a calling for me and the kūpuna constantly come back and tell me things. Even though some of them have passed on I still get the visitations, I still get the education. It never ends and I have enjoyed building on that knowledge with other information. Many people came to me when the Highway H3 was being built. Many people came to me and gave me stories about what was happening. People died during the building of that highway. People had visitations during the building of that highway from the kūpuna whose resting places were disturbed by the construction work. So, I have become a collector of knowledge about the stories around the lands affected by H3 and I have become one of the strongest and longest lasting advocates for preserving the history and heritage of those lands and telling the true story about what happened with the building of H3. That’s part of what I do but most of what I do is just tell the mo‘olelo of the wahi pana around Kaneohe Bay. I take people out on the glass bottom boat and I teach. Local residents don’t even know these stories. I teach them the mo‘olelo and some of the history of these areas and I found a willing audience. Everybody seems to want to know what was here before. What was at Na‘ole a Na‘a. What was at ‘Iole Ka‘a. What was at Kualoa. All those things, people really are grateful to learn. Along the way, there have been visitors from other places that come along too and they just love it.

Mahealani is currently, the executive director of the KHCC. She describes herself as cultural interpreter, who raises awareness about the rich history and heritage of the people and places of Ko‘olaupoko through storytelling. “So much of what I do is to educate our members, our communities, about the history, culture, and the Hawaiian values,” says Mahealani. She elaborates on the meaning of her work:

I really feel that one of the things that we do as cultural interpreters, is to help lift up the spirits of Hawaiian people. Lift up the spirits of non-Hawaiians as well by helping them understand, appreciate, and embrace Hawaiian values because the
core values of the Hawaiian culture, are core values in many native cultures. They can help all of us deal with the challenges of life and maybe help the whole world eventually. So I think that all of us Hawaiians who help teach others about Hawaiian culture, about Hawaiian values, that is our calling. We are there to not just tell a story but teach a value and hopefully connect nā‘au to nā‘au. Spirit to spirit so that people realize that the solution to the problems of the world, is to practice the culture. Practice the values of balance, of pono. Balance in all things. Universal balance is pono where we live in harmony with our ‘āina, with the environment, the world around us, with each other, and live in harmony with our gods, whoever they may be. That’s pono to me. I think many cultures that have other words for it but the only way to survive on this planet, is to live in pono. In balance. That’s what I think our role is.

She also spends much of her time counseling people about how to deal with life. She teaches them about mana and how to restore their mana, to keep it strong because it helps one deal with the challenges of life. She feels that more young people should assume this role. While the kupuna and older generation are expected to be role models, she cautions that kupuna should ‘help keep the ship on course but it shouldn’t just be about old folks.’ She is saddened that many kupuna themselves don’t know their way and are unable to set good examples for their children and grandchildren. Figures 13 to 15 illustrate some KHCC activities and vistas of the Ko‘olaupoko District.
Figure 13. Hiʻilaniwai Waterfall in Kāneʻohe (Source: KHCC n.d.)
Figure 14. Volunteer work day in Ko‘olaupoko (Source: KHCC n.d.)

Figure 15. View of Kāne‘ohe Bay (Source: KHCC n.d.)
Waipā Foundation

Waipā Foundation is a community-based 501-©-3 non-profit cultural learning center dedicated to restoring the health and abundance of its lands through applications based upon Native Hawaiian values and practices; empowering local communities to be self-sufficient; and food sustainability. Waipā Foundation sits on approximately 1,600 acres of land, which makes up almost the whole ahupua‘a of Waipā, located on the outskirts of Hanalei town on the north shore of Kaua‘i. The organization is preceded by The Hawaiian Farmers of Hanalei, who have been managing Waipā Valley since 1986 through the cultivation of taro and application of traditional knowledge and management systems. Over time, Waipā Foundation has grown into a model community-based cultural learning center that promotes education through sharing knowledge and engaging visitors in its daily activities.

Waipā Foundation strives to be an example of a living and thriving ahupua‘a. In ancient times, ahupua‘a were sustainable communities that originated in the interdependence between the ‘āina and its inhabitants. Such was a mutuality in which use of land, water and economic, social and cultural choices flourished in balance. The organization’s access to almost the entire ahupua‘a that extends from the mountains to the sea, provides the organization with an outdoor classroom that allows for experimentation and continuous growth through adaptive management and innovation. Today, Waipā is a place where Native Hawaiians and communities can renew ties to the ‘āina, the culture, and a more traditional lifestyle; a place to create assets and opportunities for more culturally relevant teaching, sharing, learning and living; and a place to work toward bringing health, vibrance, and pono (correct, prosperity) to our land, resources, and communities.
Waipā Foundation is home to Kalen Kelekoma who lives on-site but who also serves as the organization’s special programs manager and oversees the organization’s many projects. Kalen is from Honomalu, Kaua‘i, but his family moved to Anahola in the 1970s where he grew up and lived for most of his childhood. He became associated with Waipā in 2007 when he and his daughter participated in Poi Day that’s held at Waipā every Thursday. He returned the following week to volunteer and since, Waipā became part of his life. He recalls that initial visit and what drew him to Waipā:

We showed up late to Poi Day and they were bagging [the poi]. Everybody was like, “Hey, Aloha!, Howzit!, This is what we do.” They gave us some poi and said to come back next week. We came back the following week, helped, ate lunch with everyone there, and I was hooked. It was the food. Aunty Penny’s fried fish but I think that it was the community that was there. That ‘ohana style. I came back again and again. Started volunteering and got involved… But it was the
community that was there, not just one person or one family. It was all those things, the place, the food, the people.

At that time, Kalen worked as a retail manager at Cost-U-Less and had been in retail management for 15 years. He kept long hours and worked the night shift in a building with no windows. “I’d come out here [to Waipā] and have open space. It was like, Wow!” Kalen explains. He kept volunteering at Waipā until an opportunity to join the Waipā Foundation staff on a 1-year grant emerged. He quit his job and joined the foundation. He explained how the transition changed his life:

It was definitely life-changing, health-wise, attitude, having to be patient, being grateful. Coming to this place, because we garden, I learned where my food comes from and became more conscious about what I eat. I got more connected. .. For 15 years, I worked in a building with no windows and it was just day-to-day grind work. I wasn’t even swimming. Everyday was just treading water. Whereas, here, the work is more meaningful… I believe that I’m making a positive difference and it’s not my ego trying to be selfish but I believe that I’m doing good. It’s just a sliver but if I can help somebody along the way through their journey, that’s terrific. I’m able to do work like that. When kids come out, I get to share stories with them of this place, make poi, work in the lo‘i, or plant. Giving myself. My energy. My good energy.

To accomplish the organization’s mission and goals, Waipā Foundation developed and restored learning sites and physical assets throughout its property and also created a variety of programs, curriculum, and activities that utilize and maintain these learning sites with an emphasis on kalo cultivation. Though most of Kalen’s time was devoted to managing the various programs, he also led and hosted education groups that visited the site in these different activities. The work at Waipā is made possible by a cadre of committed volunteers with specific kuleana on a regular basis, as well as a staff of about 12 of whom 6 were full-time paid workers. The Figures 17-19 below depict Waipā, making poi at Waipā, and delivering poi to local communities.
Figure 17. Waipā (Source: Fa‘anunu 2015)

Figure 18. Making poi at Waipā (Source: Fa‘anunu 2015)
The Emergence of Ka Welina: A Collaborative Process

The development of the Ka Welina Network began in 2006, five years prior to my involvement in the project though the efforts culminating in the Ka Welina Network is the sum of a lifetime of experiences of individuals who have dedicated their lives to improving the wellbeing of communities in Hawai‘i and the Pacific Islands. Therefore, to understand the history of some of the planning processes that occurred in creating the Ka Welina Network, my research involved consultations with key people who were part of a taskforce of a passionate and dedicated group. These people were behind the development of the CBHV model, the formation of the Ka Welina Network, and the subsequent integration of the model from a concept to an operational model that communities could adopt, modify, and operationalize to host visitors. These individuals included the primary organizers Ramsay Taum and Ana Currie-Ramirez, along with Karen Umemoto and Ikaika Hussey who assisted with planning and marketing,
respectively. Other individuals who contributed to the development of the Ka Welina Network included the board members of the Pasifika Foundation.

The information gathered from these individuals was supplemented by consultations with individuals from the organizational members of the Ka Welina Network along with a review of detailed notes of meetings held by PFH, communities, and the network, as well as various reports conducted as part of the network’s development. This section reports on the findings of that research and it is organized by the different stages of this process, beginning with the formation of the CBHV concept, the identification and involvement of communities in the process, and the integration of the concept into different strategies for implementation. These sections are followed by the challenges endured through this process to provide lessons learned for adaptive management. These challenges are divided into three main sections which are: the conflict between money and culture, authenticity, and marketing and advertising.

**Creating the Community-Based Host-Visitor Model**

Initial conversations that gave birth to what is now known as the Ka Welina Network, began in 2006 among board members of Pasifika Foundation Hawai‘i who were Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders and also devoted sovereignty activists in their own ways. Conversations were spurred by several questions, “What would Hawai‘i look like, should she regain her independence as a sovereign nation? Would the Kingdom of Hawai‘i maintain its current affairs based on the Western values and perspectives that the foundations of modern Hawai‘i was built upon, or would different values come into play? How much would this new nation of Hawai‘i reflect the Native Hawaiian worldview?” The conversations touched upon many areas but kept coming back to the topic of tourism, an industry that generates significant revenues for Hawai‘i,
yet most of it leaves the island. The high revenue leakage from a largely foreign-owned industry, coupled with the effects of profound inaccurate misrepresentation of Native Hawaiian people and culture, pinpointed tourism as a priority subject of discussion.

Simultaneously, the University of Hawai‘i’s School of Travel Industry Management (TIM) was studying small, medium-sized enterprises and looking at self-sufficiency of local communities. Historically, the visitor industry had exploited local communities without giving back much and at the same time, communities were not interested in mass tourism models. The school was interested in exploring the possibilities of linking these enterprises to the visitor industry to provide them with a stream of revenue to improve their self-sufficiency. While historically, Native Hawaiian culture and its people had been associated with the worst demographics across all ethnic groups in Hawai‘i, the assets of Native Hawaiian culture had been under-explored. Thus, linking communities to the visitor industry offered opportunities to explore the cultural assets of Native Hawaiian culture, which were of great value to the industry.

Common interests led to collaboration between TIM and PFH to further explore the relationship between local communities and the visitor industry. Ramsey Taum, a faculty member at TIM at the time, was also as a board member of PFH, and played a major role not only in making this collaboration possible, but in facilitating the development of the Ka Welina Network. A taskforce was developed, composed of PFH board members, key people from TIM, and others with specialized technical knowledge to begin the discussions on this topic and identify opportunities to leverage cultural assets in a contemporary space for the benefit of Native Hawaiian communities. In light of the political context of Hawai‘i, this collaboration was driven by a desire to create new and alternative ways of thinking about tourism in Hawai‘i that challenged the existing framework and placed the well-being of local communities, resources,
and culture in the forefront. This desire rested on the assumption that Native Hawaiians are naturally hospitable people with centuries of experience as hosts in their own homeland.

The initial steps in developing the CBHV model was to identify and formulate the process that PFH and involved communities would follow in the creation of this project, as well as defining roles and responsibilities of the different actors in carrying out that process. The group recognized that first and foremost, it was necessary to frame the project in a larger context of a shared vision, which came to be defined collectively as self-determination. This represented the ability of Native Hawaiians to define for themselves the type of life that they wanted to live as sovereign individuals in their own homeland. Self-determination itself was seen as however individuals and communities chose to define self-determination. With self-determination as the goal, a process was needed that would encourage, promote, and develop the capacity of individuals and communities to become self-sufficient and empowered individuals and collectives.

In trying to create new and alternative knowledge about tourism, a fundamental question surfaced, “How would Native Hawaiians treat visitors in the absence of the Western tourism model?” To understand and revisit traditional ways of visiting and hosting, the taskforce looked at others who were hosting in the South Pacific, in places where tourism was operated mostly by indigenous people, was culturally-focused, and took a community-based approach. Moelagi Jackson’s Safua Hotel in Samoa was a good representation of that approach where the hotel was located in the middle of the village of Savai‘i, therefore, visitors were not insulated from village life like hotels in Hawai‘i. The hotel was very basic and it was run by members of the Jackson family and people of the village. Staying at the hotel exposed visitors to village life and those who wanted a deeper understanding and experience in Samoan culture, could set up home stays
with Samoan families in the village. The experience allowed visitors to experience Samoan life while at the same time, villagers financially benefitted directly from the presence of visitors in their village.

The taskforce felt that these types of experiences offered real value to tourism and thought to explore what could be done with such approaches in Hawai‘i. This prompted the Phase I of the Ka Welina Network project which brought together community-based hosting practitioners from Samoa, Tonga, and Aotearoa (New Zealand) in a series of gatherings to share their experiences and knowledge. The meetings shed light on how host-visitor programs were undertaken in these places, the cultural content of those programs, and how cultural assets are protected and managed. The meetings informed the taskforce of what they did NOT want the initiative to become which was to function as another mass tourism operation. Instead, they wanted to form a program that more closely represented Pacific values as reflected by the examples shared from the South Pacific. These values of hosting are based on extended family relationships and networks where hosting depended on an existing relationship between the host and the visitor, either through a pre-existing relationship or association with family and networks of the host.

The meetings highlighted a custom of hosting and visiting in the Pacific that is guided by the value of ‘ohana or family. When a person visits another’s home, hosts treat visitors like they are members of their own family. This is expressed through extending hospitality to visitors to ensure that they are happy and comfortable as if they were in their own home. In exchange, the visitor returns this service by exerting minimum burden on the host. This involves respecting the norms and rules of the host’s household and extending one’s service to help with household chores or work that needs to be done. The relationship is one of mutual respect and of reciprocity
where both the host and visitor assume responsibilities. These ideas formed the foundations of a model for a community-based host-visitor program in Hawai‘i which became published in 2007.

While it was clear to the taskforce that the initiative would not be another tourism operation, it was unclear how communities would perceive the CBHV concept. The taskforce felt that a network of Native Hawaiian, community-based organizations implementing the CBHV model, would be worth exploring as a means to build the capacity of individual organizations and collectively as a network of communities with similar goals. It was also unclear whether communities would also want to participate in the network to implement the CBHV model. Therefore, a series of community meetings to introduce the CBHV model were conducted in 2009. The meetings generated discussions with local communities about how the CBHV model and the formation of a network of organizations to implement the model might assist communities in meeting their own goals and objectives for health and sustainability.

The next step was to understand local communities, who they were, whether they wanted to be connected to the visitor industry, and what they were willing to share with visitors. This step was critical given the visitor industry’s history of exploiting Native Hawaiian culture and of Native Hawaiians’ mistrust of the industry. Identifying assets that communities were willing to share with visitors and which of those assets would appeal to visitors, was necessary to pinpoint areas of mutual ground that could be developed for building meaningful bridges between communities and visitors. The existing bridge was represented by large corporations expecting large commissions, which favored expensive vendors offering inauthentic experiences, over local communities. Therefore, re-framing the relationship of communities with visitors was necessary.

A series of six community meetings were held between 2008 and 2009 in Kaua‘i, O‘ahu, Molokai, Maui, and Hawai‘i Island. In these meetings, the respective communities from these
places shared their visions and values, as well as issues and concerns they had about potentially hosting visitors. A variety of different concerns were raised but they included some of the following concerns: the potential impact of visitors on the land, culture, and communities visited; the type of visitor they would want to host, how to reach those visitors and ensuring that they visit and come back; the factors that affect hosting capabilities such as infrastructure, marketing, and how to run a business; concerns over how to charge for culture, commodification of culture and issues of authenticity; the need for communities to understand and define who they are; how to address land development issues, safety, as well as policies and practices that limit and alienate Native Hawaiians communities from land and natural resources. Solutions were also offered in the meetings.

The taskforce used the feedback from community meetings to develop an assessment tool that would allow communities to evaluate the various elements of their own existing or prospective host.visitor projects. The assessment tool was intended to address the concerns raised in the meetings through a detailed list of questions divided into three portions composed of a pre-planning process, a self-assessment, and a visitor curriculum which is shown in Appendix D. Pre-planning process questions were intended to assist communities identify their perceived potential impacts of the CBHV program on their individual programs and whether the goals of the CBHV initiative would be consistent with those of their community. The self-assessment consisted of an exhaustive list of questions with target areas to assist communities to think through their existing or potential host.visitor programs, to gain a better understanding of their capacity to carry out such a program, and whether participating in a CBHV endeavor would be beneficial for them. The target areas of the self-assessment included the following:

- Goals and objectives of the CBHV project for the organization/community;
- Project ideas (assets and capacity);
• Distinguishing the CBHV project from mass tourism;
• How visitors will be invited;
• Medium of exchange for the host-visitor experience;
• Protocol;
• Decision-making;
• Risk assessment and mitigation of potentially negative impacts imposed by CBHV;
• Safety and liability;
• Feasibility assessment and business plan;
• Measures of success;
• Legal/Political challenges to implementing a CBHV model;
• Conflict resolution plan;
• Adaptive management and learning;
• Marketing and website interface;
• Research and technical assistance needs;
• Timeline.

The last stage of the assessment tool was a visitor curriculum. Organizations or communities who wanted to create a CBHV program based on their pre-planning process and self-assessment, were recommended to create a visitor curriculum. This was a personalized curriculum for visitors covering the following areas:

• History of the place;
• History of organization/family;
• Mo’olelo to share;
• Resources like books, photos, videos to share online or elsewhere;
• Significance of work;
• Important people, sites, and events in community;
• Types of initiatives to launch;
• Protocol for visitors to follow;
• Community needs.

The assessment tool helped identify those organizations or communities who were best prepared to carry out a CBHV program and who were willing to participate. The taskforce agreed that a pilot project to test out the CBHV model would be constructive and a select group of organizations would be chosen to create this network.

**Ka Welina Network Membership**
Forming the initial group that made up the Ka Welina Network was also informed by experiences shared by others with similar endeavors in the South Pacific. Groups in Aotearoa who had tried to set up something similar found that in the initial phases of network development, their network grew fast in the beginning when it consisted of like-minded organizations rooted in Maori culture. Shared similarities made working together easier and enabled the network to progress rapidly. As the network grew and became successful, more opportunistic organizations wanted to join the network who did not necessarily share the same cultural foundation and core values of the network. The question of what was Maori culture and who was truly offering authentic Maori cultural experiences surfaced and became a challenge in determining membership into the network.

The decision of whom to include in the Ka Welina Network was critical as it would set the tone for the identity of the network, as well as its success. Since the Ka Welina Network was to implement an alternative model to mass tourism to create new ways of thinking about tourism, it was important that the network consist of communities who reflected the goals of this model. These included communities who were rooted in Native Hawaiian culture and were dedicated to the education and preservation of the culture. They also had to be non-profit organizations who were not motivated by making money but who were invested in building community capacity and well-being. The community assessment survey helped demonstrate who exhibited these attributes most clearly. Another basic criteria for choosing the initial set of organizations of the Ka Welina Network, was having a land-base. A variety of different types of organizations focusing on different aspects of Native Hawaiian culture applied to be part of the network but only those attached to a physical location were included. The underlying assumption was that land-based organizations would have more stable connections to a certain place and would have
a better foundation to move forward in any community-based initiative. Other types of communities could be added later on, but forming a solid core of organizations that could likely succeed was imperative. The ten organizations that were eventually chosen were located in special places with unique resources and mana.

**Distinguishing the CBHV Model from Mass Tourism**

**Terminology**

Community meetings also highlighted tendencies of shifting back towards representing the corporate model of mass tourism because it was familiar, for example, it was suggested that a Hawai‘i Tourism Authority for Native Hawaiians in Hawai‘i be established. However, the taskforce did not want the model to be another mass tourism project targeting Native Hawaiians, therefore, it was important to clearly distinguish the CBHV approach from tourism. Several strategies were adopted to reinforce this difference, which started with re-defining terminology that more accurately described the CBHV model. The inability of the English language to adequately describe and address concepts in the cultural context of Hawai‘i within which the CBHV model is embedded, was clear.

Thus, the term “visitor” replaced “tourist.” The term “visitor” was much more inclusive of the network’s target population, which prioritized local residents and Native Hawaiians. The term “visitor” implied that the person visiting is not from the place visited but a “visitor” could be anybody who could be from the next ahupua’a, island, or outside Hawai‘i. The term “visitor” is also less concerned with the financial interests of the person visiting but addresses their spiritual, emotional, intellectual interest in the community. “Visitor” also changes the network’s currency of operation, which shifts from the ability of a person to afford to pay for a service to whether they could make a contribution. The distinction is important because making a
contribution through reciprocity is dependent on the values of aloha and ‘ohana. This value is about sharing and giving back to communities. In contrast, the contemporary corporate model of tourism is focused on extraction—of resources, talent, and money. The term “tourist” represents the concept of taking from communities with very little filtering back and staying in communities, which contrasts to and does not represent the CBHV model.

**Purpose**

Defining the shared vision, values, and principles of the Ka Welina Network also set it apart as an entity that was not tourism. The PFH taskforce facilitated network-wide meetings where community members came together and shared their collective vision for the network and the values and principles that they wanted the organization to reflect. The vision of the Ka Welina Network was defined as: “Living pono in our sovereign land in a world that shares aloha.” The STEPPEE model, described in more detail in the next section, was also adopted and a vision for each of the different subcategories that represented their communities was determined and shown below:

1. **Cultural and Spiritual Well-being**: We live true to our spiritual and cultural beliefs and values as we grow aloha and connect with visitors na‘au to na‘au towards mutual respect for our rich cultural heritages;

2. **Social and Family Relations**: We build relations that help us mālama the ‘āina and honor our kūpuna so that we can create healthy communities, cohesive families, and close relationships amongst us;

3. **Environmental Responsibility**: We nurture kuleana to mālama the ‘āina, po‘e, and kai through sustainable practices rooted in the knowledge of our ancestors;
4. **Political Support and Self-Reliance**: We build respect in our communities and around the world for Hawaiian knowledge and values as maka‘āinana, people of the land, while moving towards greater self-sufficiency and self-governance;

5. **Economic/Livelihood Opportunities**: We create abundance through volunteerism, sharing, new jobs and business opportunities, and caring for the land that provides for us;

6. **Communications Technology**: We learn and apply new technologies to document our histories, communicate with others, and extend our network of relations.

The above visions became further defined as a network mission to be operationalized as the following:

To support and promote Hawai‘i community-based host-visitor experiences that are culturally appropriate, socially responsible, environmentally sustainable, and economically viable and that embrace and exhibit the Hawaiian values of aloha, pono, kuleana, and mālama.

**Establishing a Relationship between Host and Visitor Prior to Visiting**

Another strategy to distinguish the CBHV model from mass tourism was an attempt to create relationships between hosts and visitors prior to the arrival of visitors on-site. This concept was adopted since hosting in the Pacific is done for people that one has a relationship with, whether directly or indirectly through friends and family. This idea took form in the requirement that visitors must contact hosts first and ask to be invited to visit their site. A website would act as an interface between the host and visitor where everything could be handled online. To do this, an interested visitor had to sign up online and provide personal information to the host, the host would decide whether they were willing to host, extend an invitation, and send the necessary materials such as an orientation package about the site and their expectations to the visitor. This requirement was intended to establish a relationship between the two parties prior to the
experience. However, practitioners admitted that the process of having to sign-up to access the website, was too cumbersome and prohibitive so the idea was revised to be more user-friendly.

**Facilitation and Approach**

One of the initial steps in developing the CBHV model was identifying and formulating the process that the PFH taskforce and involved communities would follow while working on this project together. This process also defined roles and responsibilities of the different actors. The PFH taskforce established their protocol and defined terms at one of their initial meetings. Of particular concern was defining the role of the PFH taskforce as a facilitator and defining the type of facilitation that would occur. The group discussed the “taking” culture that still exists in facilitation and agreed that their facilitation would not take that form. It was important that facilitation would be based on a sharing experience where communities share their knowledge and concerns and that PFH would also give back as part of the process.

The analogy of a shared journey was proposed, in one of the meetings, to create a process based on the journey of going through the experience of creating the network. That process would then be considered PFH’s contribution. Questions of what “giving back” would look like were asked and some suggestions about specific deliverables were offered such as creating a web-based product for communities to be able to communicate with each other. From the discussions that ensued, an overarching goal of the PFH taskforce was to create a community-based framework that could be used as a template for the future. It was also highlighted that since it was a community-based effort, communities needed to define the tools that they wanted to use which would in turn affect PFH’s approach.
The group acknowledged and discussed the difference between working linearly within the PFH taskforce as a group and working with the communities of the Ka Welina Network. The group was particularly concerned about how to share information and how to engage communities. Thus, it was important to work out of a cultural framework. The analogy of a healthy garden was used and the following questions were asked. What does a healthy garden look like? What does it need to grow? How do we get there?

It was also important that the approach be upfront, honest, and principles-driven. The social/spiritual, economic, political, philosophic, technical, ecological/environmental, and ethical (SEPPTEE) model was introduced which is adopted from Susan Guyette’s (1996:3) model for achieving balanced and sustainable development. SEPPTEE are subsystems considered important for balanced development to occur. The premise behind this model is that a healthy and well-balanced community is one where all the SEPPTEE needs are met. Therefore, development should not focus and prioritize one specific aspect of society like economics but rather, the more subsystems that are impacted positively by a development action, the more successful the development.

Throughout the meetings held by the PFH taskforce, a recurrent theme was the understanding that the process needed to be community-based and driven by the respective communities of the network. Members of the taskforce were well-experienced in working with communities and were well-aware of the pitfalls of approaches that steered away from bottom-up approaches. It was crucial that the PFH taskforce’s role as facilitators throughout the whole process was understood as providing assistance and creating opportunities for communities to make decisions such as setting the rules for their host-visitor programs. Thus, the PFH taskforce’s role meant providing the ingredients and information that communities needed to inform the decision-
making process. Also, the approach needed to be inclusive and respectful of everyone involved to acknowledge the diversity of communities involved.

It was also just as important that communities of the Ka Welina Network also understood PFH’s role as a facilitator and the boundaries of their responsibilities. Since the project was grant-based, the timeline of project goals and expectations were defined by grant periods. Over the duration of the project, the PFH encouraged the Ka Welina Network to become a self-sustaining entity that would function as its own, with its own organizational and governance structure, and financial regime, independent of PFH. During the middle of 2012, the transition to becoming self-sustaining was emphasized through network-wide meetings. However, the grant ended before the structure took form and the follow-up grant proposal to continue the process was not funded.

It was also important to define the role of the Ka Welina Network. A list of roles was collectively decided by the network’s ten communities in a series of meetings. This list is shown below and is taken directly from the network’s conceptual plan:

- **Capacity Building**: Build internal capacity to host through training, technical assistance, resources sharing (e.g., accounting services, insurance coverage, branding), and learning from successes and challenges.

- **Job Creation and Business Development**: Create opportunities for Native Hawaiians through the establishment of sustainable employment opportunities and small businesses through Ka Welina Network hosting activities and support services.

- **Networking**: Strengthen and expand the network of Ka Welina member organizations while creating partnerships with supportive organizations.
• **Planning**: Further develop this paradigm that is an alternative to mass tourism based on community and cultural values and plan accordingly.

• **Public Relations**: Introduce interested people to the work of Ka Welina member organizations and communicate with potential visitors we would like to invite.

• **Web Development**: Create a web interface that allows people to learn more about us, inquire about a visit, request an invitation, and keep in touch with us.

• **Coordination**: Maintain healthy and strong relationships and communication among our network of ‘ohana so that we can share lessons and ideas, help each other solve problems, and realize the benefits of working together.

The Ka Welina Network and the network’s working model, is the product of a collaborative, bottom-up approach that was culturally-based and driven by community. The development of the network is an example of a process that truly allowed the communities involved to take ownership of the process and shape the network to reflect their values and visions. This approach was made possible by the involvement of key facilitators with lifetimes of experience working with communities and who were committed to ensuring the network came from its communities rather than from outside forces. To achieve this, facilitators assisted communities to plan out, discuss, share results, and ultimately make decisions themselves about how the network should be. Though the planning process has spanned almost a decade to date and continues to be ongoing, the length of time it took was necessary to allow for relationships and trust to be established, the development of a safe space for thoughts to be expressed, discussed, and marinade, and for learning and adaptation to new thoughts to occur. This process did not cut
corners but took the time to plan, allowed communities to lead the initiative, and let the process itself build the capacity of each community to achieve their goals.

**Strategies For Implementing the CBHV Model**

A pilot project to test out an operational model for a CBHV network took place over a two-year period between 2009 and 2011. During this time, six organizations, Kawaiokalehua Foundation; Hoʻoulu Lāhui; Koʻolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club; Waipā Foundation; Kipāhulu ‘Ohana; and Papakōlea, concentrated on developing the content of their host-visitor programs. This included developing: (1) a planning and governance template for hosts; (2) a curriculum for visitors; and (3) a web-based interface where hosts and visitor could interact. Towards the end of 2011, the pilot project transitioned into the formation of an operational CBHV network. Pasifika Foundation Hawaiʻi facilitated this process and added four more organizations, ‘Ahahui Malama o Kaniakapūpū; Hālawa ‘Ohana Loʻi Kalo; Ka ‘Ohana o Hōnaunau; and Sust-ʻāina-ble Molokai, to form the 10-member Ka Welina Network. In the year that followed between October 2011 to September, 2012, PFH offered technical assistance to each organization of the network to build their capacity by focusing on three target areas: (1) developing a long-term strategic plan for each community and for the network as a group; (2) improved the web-based interface to create a network website with a page on each organization; and (3) held network meetings to build relationships with other members and to learn more about the concepts and issues surrounding the CBHV model.

The organizations that joined the Ka Welina Network had already been conducting host-visitor programs in their own ways but being part of the network helped many of them to improve and develop their individual programs and to understand their work from a more broadly formulated framework. The following section describes some of the different strategies
that members of the Ka Welina Network adopted to implement the CBHV model. I focus on four organizations that represent the variety of organizational focus, capacity, and experience developed to host visitors. These include two organizations from Puna on the eastern side of Hawaii Island, Kawaiokalehua Foundation and Ho‘oulu Lāhui, the KHCC on O‘ahu Island, and Waipā Foundation on the island of Kaua‘i.

The most common strategies chosen by the organizations to implement the alternative model to mass tourism, were cultural interpretive tours, educational workshops on certain aspects of the culture, and volunteer stewardship programs (Table 2). Within the case study, Waipā Foundation is the only organization out of the case study that expanded beyond these three strategies to focus on activities to encourage and support food sustainability, for example, a Farmer’s Market, making poi, festivals on taro and mango, and future plans to expand dining opportunities. Waipā also partnered with other entities to carry out projects jointly such as its leadership high ropes course and offered simple camping opportunities that allowed for some income-generation with minimum burden on the organization. The strategies adopted by each of the four organizations for their host-visitor programs for are described in more detail below.

Table 2. Different strategies Implemented by each case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host-Visitor Program Content</th>
<th>Kawaiokalehua Foundation</th>
<th>Ho‘oulu Lāhui</th>
<th>Ko‘olaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club</th>
<th>Waipā Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural interpretive tours</td>
<td>•Cultural interpretive Tours (short and long)</td>
<td>• Cultural interpretive tours</td>
<td>• Short Education Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Workshops</td>
<td>• Volunteer Projects.</td>
<td>• Volunteer projects</td>
<td>• Extended Education Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Volunteer projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural educational workshops</td>
<td>• Poi Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Ohana Volunteer Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership/Team building program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Farmer’s Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Waipā Kalo Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Waipā Music and Mango Festival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cultural Interpretive Tours

In 2012, the most common host-visitor strategy was cultural interpretive tours, which were normally conducted around the assets of each respective community. At Kawaiokalehua Foundation, there were two types of tours—a short and a longer tour. The short tour was approximately 2-5 hours and it was the most frequently conducted tour. It centered around Kahuwai Village but the experience would usually begin off-site at Kumukahi and Kuki‘i Heiau because of the significance of these sites to the history and culture of Kahuwai. Located 15 minutes away by car from Kahuwai, visitors would learn the history of the place and the significance of every site visited. Often, visitors would be taken to Kumukahi and then to Kuki‘i Heiau, where they might give back by volunteering their time to restore the heiau. When pressed for time, the trip to Kumukahi might be skipped and visitors would go directly to Kuki‘i Heiau where they would volunteer.

Visitors would continue to Kahuwai afterwards where they would conduct protocol, have lunch, and proceed to a short workshop where visitors had the opportunity to participate in the learning experience. Groups of 40 or more people were often divided into two groups with one group experiencing the tour while the other participated in the workshop offered, then the groups switched off. In contrast, the long tour was about eight to ten hours and occurred less frequently. This tour was held particularly around Merri Monarch, the annual hula dancing festival in Hilo, with visitors from Japan. During this time, Kawaiokalehua Foundation partnered with tour companies from Japan and provided visitors a longer tour that included destinations outside of Kahuwai. Other locations visited on this tour included Volcano, Pu‘ukoholā Heiau in North Kohala, and King Kalākaua’s hōlua (slide) in South Kohala. In the past, tours reached up to 65 visitors per tour.
Not too far away from Kahuwai, Ho‘oulu Lāhui also carried out a similar cultural interpretive tour centered around the features of its ancient village which also overlaps the ahupua‘a (traditional land division) of Keahialaka. The tour is an experiential walking tour of moderate difficulty along trails connecting the different features on the property. Tours are usually scheduled for a weekday morning and depends on the availability of staff. During these tours, visitors learn about the history of these sites. Along the way, visitors may also learn and experience the various ways that plants along the route are utilized. These include native, exotic, and ‘canoe’ plants that the early Polynesians introduced and are of special importance to the Native Hawaiian culture. Also shared, are the many mo‘olelo unique to Pu‘ala‘a and the Puna District, particularly as it is home to Pele, a deity of Hawai‘i manifested as the volcanic lava that is more commonly known outside Hawaii as Kilauea Volcano.

KHCC on the other hand, had the most number of tours of the case study. In fact, KHCC specialized in tours and offers nine different cultural interpretive tours that visit historical sites in Koʻolaupoko (except the Makaha tour). These tours are experienced either by foot, vehicle, or boat. They vary in length and target different locations. These include Na Wahi Pana o Kāne‘ohe or significant storied places in Kāne‘ohe; Nu‘uanu Pali where the Battle of Nu‘uanu took place; Likeke Trail that includes Hi‘ilaniwai waterfall and Maunahuia Heiau; Waihe‘e Ahupua‘a; the majestic Lulumahu Falls in Nu‘uanu Valley; and a day-long tour of cultural sites in Makaha located outside of Koʻolaupoko District. A cultural boat tour of Kāne‘ohe Bay takes visitors on-board a glass-bottom boat that begins at the He‘eia Boat Harbor and travels around the bay to Moku o Lo‘e Island where they learn about the mo‘olelo of these places. The experience is complemented by Jerry Kaluhiwa who shares his knowledge of the marine ecosystem and how to better manage these
**Education Workshops**

In contrast to the other case studies, Waipā Foundation did not list tours as part of their host-visitor program. Instead, Waipā seemed to focus more on hands-on education programs that allowed participants to experience through doing. These workshops appear as Short Visits and Extended Visits in Table 2. Waipā regularly hosts organized visits from various organizations such as schools, civic clubs, hālau hula, youth programs, and other community groups. Short visits are usually several hours and entail spending time working in the lo‘i (irrigated taro terrace), making poi, planting native plants, cleaning ‘auwai or irrigation canals, and restoring the loko i‘a (fishpond). Waipā has the capacity to accommodate different sizes though prefers a 10:1 ratio of participants: team leader. Larger groups are usually divided into smaller groups that rotate through different activities. For example, a group of 150 may be divided into 5 smaller groups of 30 and each group might focus on different activities. If time permits, groups may rotate through the different activities to gain experience in more than one program area.

Waipā Foundation also hosts extended visits that span multiple days. These visits usually occur during the summer months and school breaks and groups often camp at Waipā while carrying out their volunteer service work and cultural activities, such as those described for the short visit. Waipā offers several campsites along its shoreline property adjacent to Hanalei Bay and provides basic camping amenities such as a group shelter, portable toilet facilities, potable water, picnic tables, and cold showers. Groups are encouraged to bring their own tents and utensils for cooking. Waipā has a long range master plan for a bunkhouse to accommodate campers but it has not been developed.

Waipā Foundation also carries out Poi Day, which can also be considered an educational workshop activity. Poi Day began more than 20 years ago by Native Hawaiian families from
Kaua‘i’s north shore to feed their families and promote the availability of affordable poi. Poi Day occurs every Thursday from early morning until lunch time where volunteers make poi utilizing a style developed about 70 years ago. The poi produced is shared among volunteers and distributed to over 120 families throughout the island. Waipā poi sells at $3 per pound, which recently increased to $4 per pound, and is discounted for kupuna at $1 per pound. These prices are significantly cheaper than poi in the stores that average $8 per pound, statewide. It is a great opportunity to learn how poi is made as it is processed from cooked taro into poi, as well as to learn about the work at Waipā and mingle with others from communities nearby. This activity is run almost exclusively by volunteers and kupuna who assume certain responsibilities for the day.

Kawaiokalehua Foundation offered a variety of cultural educational workshops on various aspects of Hawaiian culture which occurred either as part their short tour or as extended workshops that focused exclusively on a particular topic. The duration of these workshops varied depending on the tasks that need to be accomplished. For example, the workshop component of the short tour might only permit an hour and a half to learn about lau hala weaving so visitors were exposed to simple tasks like weaving a bracelet that they could complete during that time. In contrast, the extended workshops involved a more in-depth experience where participants learned how to prepare the hala (pandanus) leaves prior to weaving.

The extended workshops offered occurred throughout the year and were normally longer events that ranged from one to several days that focused in more detail on a certain topic. Guest practitioners were often invited to share their mana‘o (knowledge) and offer opportunities for participants to learn through hands-on experience. For example, a workshop on hōlua building and practice might cover presentations on how sleds are made followed by participants building their own and then traveling to a hōlua, located elsewhere, to test their sleds. Previous workshops
included hōlua-building and practice; lau hala weaving; hale (house)-building; lei-making; plant dyes; awa planting and preparation; lāʻau lapaʻau; mahiʻai (traditional planting techniques); building pahu drums; making kūlolo; and kuhikuhipuʻuone (heiau architect design and construction). In the past, sponsored workshops spanning several days were held over the weekend and the organization accommodated up to 150 people for several days. At these events, lunch was often provided and tents were available. Amenities to support camping at the site were also available and the Kahuwai caretaker’s garage was usually converted into a kitchen that participants could use for cooking during these times.

The KHCC also offers cultural educational workshops on various aspects of Hawaiian culture every quarter in Kāneʻohe. Workshops are two to four hour-long sessions, usually held at Naʻonealāʻa (Kāneʻohe Beach Park), where participants learn how to weave lau hala, design and dye kōnane boards (Hawaiian checkers), prepare and blow the ihuʻohe (Hawaiian nose flute), lei-making, learn the hula, or learn Hawaiian chants and/or moʻolelo. Fees may be charged based on: length of time of the workshop (number of hours); whether supplies are provided; and lunch and refreshments are included. All workshops are open to the public but arrangements to participate must be made ahead of time.

**Volunteer Programs**

A host-visitor activity that was common to all organizations of the case study, were volunteer programs. At Kawaiokalehua Foundation, visitors could participate in volunteer projects at Kahuwai. Often, visitors who would participate in the tours were given opportunities to give back by helping to maintain Kukiʻi Heiau. Visitors were also welcome to volunteer their time to clear and maintain Kahuwai Village. With 114 acres of land, help is always needed to maintain
the property. For example, a charter school would regularly volunteer every week and help with clearing the area. In exchange, lunch would be provided for them and education workshops were offered.

At Hoʻoulu Lāhui, visitors can give back by helping with the various projects at the center. These activities provide opportunities for visitors to spend time working side by side with local Native Hawaiians who are practicing their culture and also to get a feel for the place through hands-on experience doing what the locals do. Volunteer projects at Puʻalaʻa may include maintaining and restoring the trail system on the property, as well as restoring fishponds. There are also land management projects that may include weeding, removal of invasive species, building feral animal control fencing, and small construction projects. Planting opportunities may also be available if plants need to be planted or harvested. Visitors are expected to come prepared to work, be flexible, and flow with the experience.

Visitors to the KHCC can also work with local Native Hawaiians on stewardship projects to mālama the ʻāina while learning the significance of wahi kapu and the cultural landscape of the place. Volunteer projects may include the following: clearing of alien vegetation and planting of native Hawaiian lāʻau (plants); constructing access ways to sacred and important historic sites; clearing roadways of overhanging branches; cleaning debris and glass from the OMEGA station; trail maintenance; and restoring the Mahuahua Ai o Hoi-Heʻeia Loʻi.

At Waipā Foundation, enough volunteers show up every month to help with projects on-stie, that an organized volunteer day called ‘Ohana Days are held at Waipā once a month. These used to be held on the second Saturday of the month but it also depends on the schedule of activities at Waipā. These days are usually oriented to also include families with children. The work day usually begins at 9am and lunch is provided for all volunteers from local produce and ingredients
grown at Waipā. These are volunteer opportunities for anyone interested in connecting with and learning about work at Waipā through helping with projects on-site. The experience fosters building relationships, promotes locally grown food and healthy lifestyles, and provides opportunities for people to give back and connect with nature.

**Leadership/Team Building Program**

Waipā Foundation partners with Kaua‘i Team Challenge to work with groups interested in leadership and/or team building exercises. Kaua‘i Team Challenge offers a high ropes and low ropes course that is located at Waipā near the coast along Hanalei Bay. The course attracts student groups, families and businesses. Waipā often caters lunch and provide outdoor meeting spaces for groups that need or want to incorporate retreat or meeting sessions. Coordination of this program can either be organized through Waipā Foundation or Kaua‘i Team Challenge.

**Farmer’s Market**

The Waipā Farmer’s Market is a popular event and attracts many visitors to Waipā. It is held every Tuesday at Waipā to promote the production and consumption of local foods—the ideas of BUY LOCAL, EAT LOCAL, and LIVE LOCAL. The Farmer’s Market attracts local farmers to sell their produce enabling visitors to buy fresh and locally-grown food. With many high-end development and timeshare holders along the north shore of Kaua‘i, the Farmer’s Market is a venue that attracts not only locals but many visitors to Kaua‘i. Kalen Kalekoma also points out that since he started working at Waipā Foundation, there has been a noticeable shift in the behavior and habits of visitors staying in hotels and timeshares that has created a need for the Farmer’s Market. He explains that these tourist preferences:

> They’re a little bit more self-sufficient. They’re shopping at the stores here. They’re going to the local markets. They’re preparing their own food at home.
They’re not at the mercy of the hotel and the restaurants. They’re on vacation but they have all the amenities of home. So, I think that’s why they’re venturing out to do something a little bit more meaningful besides helicopter tours and a boat ride.

**Festivals of Kalo, Mango, and Music**

Waipā also hosts separate taro and mango festivals. Each event is a one-day, all-day event held once a year. The Kalo Festival was initially held in 2010 to celebrate kalo as a foundation of Hawaiian culture so it is intended to be a family oriented event that attracts local families. It has now become Waipā Foundation’s annual signature event and in 2014, it attracted 18,000 to 20,000 people. Simultaneously, Waipā started its mango festival in 2010 as a pilot project to prepare for the kalo festival and it continued on to also become an annual event called the Waipā Mango and Music Festival. In 2014, approximately 16,000 to 18,000 visitors attended this event. Therefore, the festivals that Waipā host have turned into extremely successful events.

Currently, a certified community kitchen is being established that would open doors to a variety of different opportunities to expand and diversify Waipā’s host-visitor program. Kalen Kelekoma explains visions for the kitchen:

> This particular building, it’s a small business incubator. I picture the place running 24-7 having different activities and literally opening up the doors. There’s people who wanna use the facility for developing their products. It’s a great place. It’s all about food. It’s having that, people come here, whether it’s the top chef or the chef who likes to cook in the back yard. Having a place to do something and sharing that with others yah? So that’s exciting…
Chapter 5: The Characteristics and Challenges of the CBHV Model

Characteristics: Core Principles and Values of the CBHV Model

The case study indicated that all four organizations shared similar characteristics in how organizations expressed their purpose, values, principles, measures of success, medium of exchange, and protocol. The case study is distinguished by a set of common core principles and values that were defined and adopted by the participating member communities of the Ka Welina Network. These principles and values are common to all communities but each community may choose to build and focus on one or more principle(s) or value(s) depending on the nature and focus of their organization. Therefore, regardless of the size, capacity, and focus of an organization, its operation and membership may be guided by the same principles and values. Thus, an urban Native Hawaiian homestead in Honolulu and a cultural education center in a rural setting that focuses on taro cultivation, may be very different organizations with different practices yet they exhibit and operate using the same core principles and values. These common characteristics are described in more detail below:

Purpose

All four organizations of the case study are not-for-profit, community-based, and culturally driven and they were created in response to a need for improving the well-being of communities or to protect and preserve cultural and natural resources. They are committed to the education of the youth and nurture and value relationships. Table 3 presents the goals of each of the four organizations of the case study which shows that all organizations share the common purpose of perpetuating Native Hawaiian history, culture, and the value of place. Other goals included building relationships, restoring the health of the land, building community capacity, and
enhancing economic and environmental self-sufficiency. While financial sustainability is important to the operation and function of these entities, the overarching purpose of self-sufficiency and building capacity remains the foundation of these communities.

Table 3. Goals of each case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Kawaiokalehua Foundation</th>
<th>Hoʻoulu Lahui</th>
<th>Koʻolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club</th>
<th>Waipā Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide/Promote education of Native Hawaiian history, culture, and heritage.</td>
<td>• Educate visitors about Puʻalāʻa, value of place and Hawaiian culture.</td>
<td>• Perpetuate Native Hawaiian history, culture, and heritage.</td>
<td>• Restore health and abundance of organization lands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be financially sustainable so practitioners can do what they do.</td>
<td>• Provide learning experience for students.</td>
<td>• Spread Noʻonoʻo Hawaiʻi or Hawaiian way of thinking.</td>
<td>• Empower and build capacity of local communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Raise funds for non-profit and create enterpreneurial opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Build relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Be sustainable environmentally and financially.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Native Hawaiian Values**

The Ka Welina Network is driven by Native Hawaiian values that can be categorized into four main core values of aloha (love), kuleana (responsibility), mālama (to take care of), and pono (achieving balance). These values were collectively identified by members of the Ka Welina Network that are central to and guide the function of each organization. These values are presented in Table 4 which summarizes actions that reflect those values. The actions that correspond to the values in Table 4 could also be classified under other values. Mahealani Cypher of KHCC explains the importance of core Native Hawaiian values:

I really feel that one of the things that we do as cultural interpreters, is to help lift up the spirits of Hawaiian people. Lift up the spirits of non-Hawaiians as well by helping them understand, appreciate, and embrace Hawaiian values because the core values of the Hawaiian culture, are core values in many native cultures. They can help all of us deal with the challenges of life and maybe help the whole world.
eventually. So I think that all of us Hawaiians who help teach others about Hawaiian culture, about Hawaiian values, that is our calling. We are there to not just tell a story but teach a value and hopefully connect nā ‘au to nā ‘au. Spirit to spirit so that people realize that the solution to the problems of the world, is to practice the culture. Practice the values of balance, of pono. Balance in all things. Universal balance is pono where we live in harmony with our ʻāina, with the environment, the world around us, with each other, and live in harmony with our gods, whoever they may be. That’s pono to me. I think many cultures that have other words for it but the only way to survive on this planet, is to live in pono. In balance. That’s what I think our role is. You cannot order people to be pono but a lot of our mākuʻa and our elders who are not practicing the values, have become so traumatized by life that I guess their reaction is Western. Anger. Frustration. Resentment. A depletion of aloha. Lack of compassion for the homeless, the sick, the helpless, and the people who are camping on the roadsides. That’s the sad thing is that the kūpuna don’t have as much compassion as they used to have. To me, the reaction is Western. It’s not, native.

Table 4. Core values of the Ka Welina Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pono</th>
<th>•Mālama Pono—respect each other, mālama the land, and be pono with everyone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Respect our kūpuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Maintain cultural integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Listen, share our manaʻo, and maintain good communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Keep perspective and “keep the main thing the main thing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Take away those ills internally and externally that keep us oppressed and unequal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Nānā i ke kumu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloha</td>
<td>•Be one ʻohana and care for one another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Take care of kūpuna•Spark the joy of sharing and sharing our joy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Create many avenues for people to share their gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Reconnect spiritually, emotionally and physically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Put a mango in front of your house and see that you will have friends (Mālama kekahi i kekahi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Be open to those who many not always see things as we do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuleana</td>
<td>•Make sure everyone understands their kuleana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Encourage mutual learning between hosts and visitors as well as among hosts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Cultivate life-long learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Unify our community efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Be open to suggestions on how to enhance what we do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Serve and empower our communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Preserve and strengthen community values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Nurture our future leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Know that what affects one of us affects all of us and no one is free until we are all free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālama</td>
<td>•Remain flexible and weave together the different ways that groups may have of doing things •Mālama ʻāina a me kahakai (Take care of the land and the sea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Manage our resources wisely•Be one ʻohana and care for each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Native Hawaiian Principles**

‘Ōlelo no‘eau or proverbs, reflect Native Hawaiian pedagogy that influence the way that people behave in everyday life in matters that pertain to their personal lives and families, their work, how they relate to other people, and how they relate to and manage their resources. The organizations of Ka Welina incorporate many Native Hawaiian ‘ōlelo no‘eau to reflect Native Hawaiian values and ways of doing things that are unique to Hawai‘i. Some common ‘ōlelo no‘eau used are listed below that organizations of Ka Welina incorporate into their activities:

I ka nānā no ike; We learn by observing.
I ka hana ka ike; We learn by doing.
Pa‘a ka waha; Close your mouth [and observe and listen].
Ho‘olohe; Listen.
Mālama kekahi i kekahi; Take care of others and others will take care of you.
Mālama Pono; Take care.
Nānā i ke kumu; Look to the source.

**Measures of Success**

Table 5. Measure of success of each case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Success</th>
<th>Kawaiokalehua Foundation</th>
<th>Ho‘oulu Lahui</th>
<th>Ko‘olaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club</th>
<th>Waipā Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Having a positive impact on people’s lives</td>
<td>• Ooh, Aah, Wow Effect</td>
<td>• Not based on money</td>
<td>• Number of people visiting Waipā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not based on money</td>
<td>• Not money but transformational change making visitor more aware</td>
<td>• Success is positive feedback from visitors after experience</td>
<td>• Individual satisfaction with experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Success was measured by asking people to share their experiences afterwards</td>
<td>• Wanting to return</td>
<td>• How much visitor incorporated the knowledge and experience into their heart, nā‘au, and lives</td>
<td>• Lessons learned from experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Feedback gathered through visitor surveys</td>
<td>• Visitor information is tracked with post-visit surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Making new relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 illustrate that organizations measured success not by how much money is made but by how much experiences and information have been internalized by visitors to alter the way that they may think and ultimately behave. Success is when information shared leads to transformational change. Indicators of success included “embodied experience,” visitors being able to articulate the knowledge gained by the experience; visitors experiencing “wow!” moments; relationships developed with visitors; and visitors returning to visit in the future. Success is often reflected by frequent participation of local communities in organizational activities and also positive impact in capacity building. A child who learns how to plant taro or weaves mats is success because knowledge gained from information imparted through a host-visitor program may impact that child’s life in positive ways. The following illustrates what success means in each of the case study organizations.

Success for cultural practitioner, Lynda Saffery of Kawaiokalehua Foundation, is when they have positive impacts on people’s lives. Therefore, being successful was not measured by how much money is generated, but on impact on visitors. Aunty Lynda described success as being embodied in moments like these:

I had an aha moment in [Kapuha on South Kona, at King Kaläkaua’s slide. It’s about 820 feet around]...Keone took us down there. The kids had made their sleds and their lohaua mats and then we took them to ride them. It was that picture I showed you when they were all standing up at the top before they came down and they stood there for a long time oiling up their wheels, looking down the slide. Keone explained to them that it hadn’t been ridden in 446 years. It was Kaläkaua’s favorite. So then this one boy came down, his name was Keola. He came down, and I was on the bottom taking pictures. I said, “Wow Keola, what were you thinking up there? Standing up there right before you came down?” He said, “Oh Aunty, I was thinking that I’m a link on the chain”, and he was crying. I [cried]. It was such a chicken skin moment for me. That made it. Having a 17-year-old boy crying and telling you that he realizes he’s a link in the chain.

Success was also measured by asking visitors to share their experiences at the end of each visit. This was usually done by allowing each person to share their knowledge that they learned
during their experience. Visitors were also encouraged to e-mail and express their thoughts after
their experience. Though a visitor questionnaire existed, they were not usually filled out due to
time constraints and their completion didn’t normally fit into the flow of the day. With students,
a “reflection time” was conducted before they’d leave and teachers would send the organization
copies of their reflections. Feedback from visitors was valued because they allowed the
organization to understand what needed to be improved.

Keikialoha of Ho‘oulu Lāhui measures success by what he calls, the “OOH AAH WOW”
effect. This is when visitors leave Ho‘oulu Lāhui saying, “Ooh, I understand,” “Wow, I want to
go back,” and the “Aah” as the “digestive pang.” In other words, the “OOH AAH WOW” effect
is the result of when information or the experience shared through the host-visitor program is
understood by the visitor and appreciated that they want to go back again. Thus, success is not
measured by how much money is generated by the host-visitor program but by transformational
change within visitors that makes them more aware and informed individuals. A visitor’s desire
to return for another experience is an indicator of success.

Similarly, success at KHCC is measured not by how much money the club can generate but
by how much positive feedback is received from visitors after an experience. Positive responses
through telephone calls or e-mails after the experience, suggests that visitors were transformed in
a positive way from the interaction. Visitor feedback is also gathered through visitor surveys that
continue to be distributed. Mahealani explains what success means to her:

The value is not in the money but in how much the person incorporated [the
knowledge] into their heart, into their nā ‘au, into their lives. To me, that’s more
valuable than any exchange of cash.

Success at Waipā Foundation is measured both quantitatively and qualitatively. The number
of groups and individuals visiting Waipā is tracked, as well as how satisfied they were with their
experience, what lessons they learned, and the experience they gained. This data are usually tracked through evaluations visitors are asked to fill at the end of their visit. The amount of work gained that is contributed through volunteer time from visitors, is also another measure of success for the organization. As a staff member at Waipā, Kalen shares what success means to him personally:

Just going to the store, and there’s this little kid, “Uncle, remember me?” and I’d be looking at this eight-year-old and trying to remember him. I’d say, “Did we make poi?? He says, “Yah!” And I’d be, ‘Alright!’ That’s rewarding and it makes it so worthwhile. You cannot put a value a monetary amount on, “Uncle, remember me?” Yeah. It’s that.

Table 6. Forms of exchange used by each case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Forms of Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kawaiokalehua Foundation</td>
<td>• No fee structure&lt;br&gt;• Open to public and free of charge&lt;br&gt;• Donations accepted&lt;br&gt;• Labor in exchange for experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho’oulu Lāhui</td>
<td>• No fee structure&lt;br&gt;• Open to public and free of charge especially locals and Native Hawaiians&lt;br&gt;• Donations accepted&lt;br&gt;• Desire to set up fee structure&lt;br&gt;• Fee structure to depend on visitor, purpose of visit and ability of visitor to pay&lt;br&gt;• Open to non-monetary exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko’olaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>• Open to public&lt;br&gt;• Does not charge&lt;br&gt;• Donations accepted, suggested donation schedule of $10 per person for boat tour and $20 per person for all other tours&lt;br&gt;• Accepts gift exchange&lt;br&gt;• Fees may be charged for workshops to cover supplies, food, and compensate instructor for time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipā Foundation</td>
<td>• Education programs are free targeting students and children, lunch is negotiated and may cost $3-$5&lt;br&gt;• $10 per person per day to camp• $5 per adult for kalo festival&lt;br&gt;• $10 per adult for mango and music festival&lt;br&gt;• No fee schedule in place for individual visitors• Those willing to work are always welcomed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Medium of Exchange**

A unique characteristic shared among all organizations, was the acceptance of alternative forms of exchange for visitor experiences (Table 6). These included native forms of gift
exchange such as bartering one’s labor and other non-monetary gifts in exchange for cultural knowledge and experiences. Of the four organizations, only Waipā Foundation consistently charged fees for some of its programs and KHCC occasionally charged a small fee for some of its workshops. However, though monetary exchange is accepted, prices are kept low to encourage participation, for example, Waipā Foundation charges $10 for use of their campsite compared to the YMCA at $15. Unlike most typical tourism entities, members of the Ka Welina Network may accept any or all forms of exchange for the experiences they offer.

Protocol

Members of the Ka Welina Network are also characterized by valuing Native Hawaiian protocol or customs of etiquette and regulation. These include welcoming protocol for entering property or a new place, pule or prayer to begin or close activities, and protocol of conduct while being at a place. Protocol allows visitors to ask the question of, “What do I need to do to participate?” instead of “How am I going to get there?” Protocol reinforces actions that promote awareness and sensitivity to cultural norms that show respect to host communities and their way of life and give reverence to place. In all four organizations, protocol is consistently practiced and visitors are encouraged to participate.

The Value of Place

The content of the host-visitor programs was tied to the assets and place of each organization. At Kahuwai, the ancient Marquasian village and the surrounding structures associated with that place is its greatest asset. Therefore, it makes sense that its host-visitor program is centered around the history, practices, and stories associated with these features through the cultural interpretive tours. The experience is complemented by workshops that utilize the cultural and
natural resources of the place such as workshops teaching lau hala weaving and heiau-building. Puna is known throughout Hawaii for the art of lau hala weaving and the abundance of hala (pandanus) throughout the district and at Kahuwai, is testament to its reverence. In addition, the prevalence of heiau in the area provide the ideal environment for learning.

Table 7. Protocol and access of each case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol &amp; Access</th>
<th>Kawaiokalehua Foundation</th>
<th>Ho’oulu Lāhui Hawaiian Civic Club</th>
<th>Waipā Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open to public</strong></td>
<td><em>Open to anyone who asks for permission</em></td>
<td><em>Visits open to public</em></td>
<td><em>Cultural protocol depends on visitor/group</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourages Native Hawaiians and locals</strong></td>
<td><em>Visits based on cultural practitioner availability</em></td>
<td><em>Scheduled based on cultural practitioner availability</em></td>
<td><em>Welcoming oli with Hawai‘i-based education groups</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tours based on schedule of practitioners</strong></td>
<td><em>Opening protocol with oli, pule, introductions, orientation to place</em></td>
<td><em>Orientation package sent with organizational protocol, expectations, safety briefing, what to bring</em></td>
<td><em>Brief orientation to Waipā, with rules and expectations</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visiting arrangements made ahead of time</strong></td>
<td><em>Orientation package sent with protocol of rules</em></td>
<td><em>Respectful conduct-ask for permission for activities on-site, to go anywhere, to take pictures</em></td>
<td><em>Respectful conduct</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation of what to expect is sent ahead of time</strong></td>
<td><em>Plan ahead</em></td>
<td><em>Native Hawaiian groups and education groups encouraged to visit</em></td>
<td>* Waipā*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No drop-in visits</strong></td>
<td><em>Come dressed to work and get dirty</em></td>
<td><em>Work first, talk later</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respectful conduct</strong></td>
<td><em>Waivers necessary</em></td>
<td><em>Work first, talk later</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No alcohol, drugs, swearing, smoking, littering, and spitting</strong></td>
<td><em>Respectful on property</em></td>
<td><em>Work first, talk later</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turn off telephones</strong></td>
<td><em>No drugs, alcohol, swearing, smoking, littering</em></td>
<td><em>Waiver forms required</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nobody forced to do anything they don’t want to do</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, Ho’oulu Lāhui’s host-visitor program also utilizes its ancient settlement village features for cultural interpretive tours. The proximity of Pu‘ala’a to Pele, or the goddess of the volcano at nearby Halemaumau, also enriches the visiting experience with many mo‘olelo associated with Pele. The foundational origins of the organization in Pu‘ala’a as a response to the desecration of the sacred sites along the coastal areas of Pu‘ala’a, is built into the curriculum of the tours and an opportunity to infuse the visiting experience with concepts of land stewardship.
that is rooted in Native Hawaiian values. The concept of ahupua’a management is also highlighted and shared through the efforts being undertaken at the site.

In Koʻolaupoko, the scenic beauty and the rich cultural history of the district as a major political seat in Hawai‘i of old, is utilized to teach and educate visitors about Hawai‘i. The use of storytelling to tell the stories of the different places, is applied to also teach about Native Hawaiian values and about no‘onoʻo Hawai‘i or the way that Native Hawaiians think. Since stewardship practices of land management, and concepts of taking care of family and community are driven by core Hawaiian values of aloha, pono, kuleana, and mālama, these values and way of thinking are incorporated into the tours and the educational activities of the host-visitor program. These stories of connecting visitors to Native Hawaiian culture, places, and past, help elucidate and put into context the larger political struggles of the Native Hawaiian people against the oppression and devastating impacts of colonization.

Waipā Foundation has particularly utilized the assets of place to shape its host-visitor program. Historically, the north shore area of Kauaʻi that surrounds Hanalei, was prime grounds for taro cultivation, made possible by the abundance of water flowing seaward from the mountain ranges of this region. The legacy of taro farming in the region remains today with over 80 percent of poi production for the State of Hawaiʻi coming from Hanalei. Located on the outskirts of Hanalei, Waipā’s own mountain range and ahupuaʻa, enables the continuation of this traditional practice to thrive. The organization has utilized the knowledge of its founders, taro farmers from the area, to farm taro and make poi. This knowledge, practices, and values tied to taro cultivation are shared in the various activities of their host-visitor program.
Unlike the other three organizations, Waipā has been successful at diversifying its programs beyond cultural interpretive tours and education, to include food production. The ability to specialize in taro and poi, the staple of the traditional Native Hawaiian diet, is one of the greatest assets of the organization. The food dimension allows Waipā to expand and appeal to a larger clientele who are not necessarily interested in culture but in the basic need for food consumption. Waipā has wisely used taro and poi as a platform to promote local food production. With the near completion of their on-site certified kitchen, the opportunities to expand its host-visitor program are promising. The success of its festivals promoting local food production and consumption at attracting close to 20,000 people to Waipā in one day, is testament that Waipā offers experiences that fulfills a public need.

The places that each organization is attached to, the resources they contain, and the people and their practices associated with them, are the greatest assets of the organizations of this case study. From the Marquesian stone walls of Kahuwai, the makani that blows at Pu‘ala’a, to the majestic Koʻolau Mountains of Koʻolaupoko and the mist that hugs the mountain tops of Waipā that will later water the farm’s taro patches. These places are alive with mana that give life to the sense of place of each site that evokes human emotions. These emotions are often overpowering and unforgettable, leaving visitors filled with awe and wonder as their senses are awoken. The power of place draws many visitors to these places. Lynda Saffery speaks to the transformative impact of place on visitors:

I think that place is very connecting. Kahuwai, Kalua o Pele, Haʻe haʻe, Kukiʻi. All those places are first migration places and I notice it when we take people there. They could be laughing and talking and just in their own world while they’re getting there and even getting out of their cars and walking and they’re still talking to each other, but as soon as they see the stones, it all stops and everybody gets quiet...It’s so connecting especially for kids in that area. To just be able to connect with that place. It brings it all home for them... The place just
demands your attention. Demands your awe and nobody has to say anything. You know innately that this is something special. That’s just my thoughts but I saw it over and over again.

At Pu’ala’a, Keikialoha Kepiki explains that the value and reverence of place is reflected in the Native Hawaiian tradition of asking for permission when one enters a place that is not one’s own. This custom of asking for permission is usually done through the chanting of an ‘oli when one enters a new place that expresses respect for the hosts of the place, the ancestors, and the physical and spiritual beings that inhabit the place. The ‘oli establishes one’s heritage and place of origin, as well as acknowledge the place one is about to enter. It allows the host to consider whether they will grant you permission to enter their property. To illustrate what he means, Keikialoha chanted an ‘oli as he entered a sacred site on the property. The chant acknowledged the place of Pu’ala’a as the realm of Laka, as the resources that extend from Pu’ala’a all the way to Mauna Loa is the domain of Laka. The protocol of asking permission to enter a new place is central to and implemented in the host-visitor programs of all four organizations.

In Ko’olaupoko, Mahealani Cypher reiterates the power of place through first-hand experience that children learn better and faster when they are on a field-trip than from talking to them for hours in a typical classroom. “I think that places do have a power of influence on the experience that anybody has there, whether they’re visiting or living there,” says Mahealani. She believes that the ‘āina and the ocean are more effective classrooms that provide visual images, memories, smells, and feeling of the place. She particularly emphasizes the presence of the ancestors who still inhabit those places as living spirits and their presence continue to contribute to the feeling, essence, and teachings that come from those places. She touches upon the process that she uses to help visitors connect with the places she takes them to:
I don’t know if there’s an effective way but basically it’s taking them to places themselves. When we go on huaka‘i like to the mountains, I talk about the different things, the cultural things and whatnot. I tell them first to listen because the ‘aina will speak to you and teach you. The kūpuna are there. They will teach you. Not everything you’ll learn is from me. The places will teach you too so I help them learn to be quiet and just absorb. I feel that that connects them better and sometimes I will say or introduce them to something that just clicks in their minds and then they’ll kind of change. They’ll notice a shift in their body language. Whatever else they’re thinking about, I try to get them to focus. To go deeply into the place they’re visiting and not be thinking about their next lunch, whether they’re gonna have lunch this afternoon, what they’re gonna do that night. Trying to get them to focus on where we’re at.

Kalen Kelekoma describes that one of the feelings evoked when one visits Waipā is “magic.” He describes the experience of visiting Waipā as “stepping back in time.” “When you’re driving next to the lo‘is and the mountains are right there and waterfalls are just 3,000 to 4,000 feet high, I think it taps something inside all of us, [and] that there’s no concrete buildings,’ he says. He remembers that it was ‘the place, the food, [and] the people’ that captured him initially, suggesting that the meaning of a place extends beyond its physical attributes to include its inhabitants and the practices they carry out in that space. He considers Waipā to be a place of healing. He spoke from personal experience of how Waipā had changed his life allowing him to be more connected and having a more meaningful life through spending his days on the land and helping people.

For hosts, the meaning of place extends beyond its physical attributes to embody the essence and presence of one’s identity. Pacific Islanders trace their origins to specific places where their ancestors laid down their roots to the land. This land gave life to one’s familial communities spatially and provided the space and natural resources for the expressions of their way of life. The connection to this geneology is embodied in various ways but particularly in the stories associated with those places, the knowledge and practices that have been passed through the
generations, and the burial of kupuna iwi (ancestral bones) in those places. Mahealani illustrates how place shapes her identity and concepts of home:

No matter where I’ve gone in the world, and I have been to many places elsewhere, but I’m always here, no matter where I am. You can take the girl out of Kāne‘ohe but you can never take the Kāne‘ohe out of the girl. You cannot even take the Ko‘olau out of the girl so we have a slogan for our club, “No Ko‘olau Mai Au, I am rooted in Ko‘olau” because that’s where our roots are. It’s the homeland for me, this Hawaiian anyway. And every Hawaiian, wherever they call home, that is their homeland. No matter where they go, they’re always gonna feel, this is where they belong. So, the brief times that I have lived on the mainland, I really missed the islands so I’m happy that I’m able to survive and sustain myself and my family here.

**Access and Property Rights**

The cases show that place is key to the visiting and hosting experience. Therefore, organizational access to special places, as well as the ability to manage the decisions that occur over the resources in those places, is critical. Ribot and Peluso (2003) define access, as “the ability to benefit from things—including material objects, persons, institutions, and symbols…[it is about] the multiplicity of ways people derive benefits from resources” as an organization may benefit from the assets of a place for a host-visitor program. Access is shaped by several mechanisms such as rights and structural and relationship mechanisms like technology, capital, markets, knowledge, authority, social identities, and social relations (2003). Types of property rights vary and are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5. Thus, while the Kawaiokalehua Foundation offered the potential of a unique host-visitor program around its Marquesian village, the program closed down due to decisions made by Bishop Estate, the lessor of the lands of Kahuwai.

The ability to have different types of property rights, also referred to as a bundle of rights, for access to land and natural resources, likely affects the ability of an organization to diversify
and expand its host-visitor programs. It also allows hosts the ability to have more control over the protocol and rules that can be enforced and implemented in a host-visitor program, for example, the KHCC has access rights to certain cultural and natural resources of the Koʻolaupoko District. However, the organization does not have management rights to these resources. Therefore, the options to expand the host-visitor program are limited to cultural interpretive tours and education-related activities, whereas at Waipā Foundation, more bundles of rights associated with the land, offers more potential for a broader range of activities.

The case study suggests that the ability to create host-visitor programs that grow from the natural and cultural resources of a place, is not only possible but are meaningful and appropriate for those places. Therefore, the CBHV approach is rooted in the foundation that hosts can offer amazing experiences by being themselves and utilizing the resources within their means and what they know best without imposing outside interests to shape the experience. The focus of development from within promotes the use of local resources which in turn encourages growth and development more in line with local cultures and environments. This approach differs considerably from the often uncontrolled and “sprawl-type” development associated with mass tourism (Kim 1994).

**Challenges of Implementing the CBHV Model**

Between 2012 and 2014, the four organizations of the case study experienced numerous challenges in implementing their host-visitor programs. Over the two-year period, Kawaiokalehua Foundation ceased its host-visitor program due to difficulties with its landowner. Other challenges the organization encountered were a limited workforce and infrastructure to support a host-visitor program, attributes common to small organizations. As a result, the number of visitors and frequency of visits to the site were constrained by the availability of cultural
practitioners to host visitors and the lack of administrative and technical assistance to take care of the marketing and logistical aspects of the business. The limited workforce also put a strain on inter-personal relationships within the organization. Similarly, the lack of monetary compensation for cultural practitioners’ time in hosting visitors also affect the time they devoted to Kawaiokalehua Foundation as the need to work at full-time paid jobs to support their livelihood, took precedence over volunteer activities at the organization.

Ho‘oulu Lāhui and the KHCC also shared similar challenges common to small businesses. However, these two organizations highlight the importance of time to the development of a host-visitor program. At Ho‘oulu Lāhui, the work of the charter school took all the time and attention of its workforce so the non-profit became secondary and its host-visitor program remained in limbo. Similarly, though the KHCC continued its host-visitor program consistently, the cultural practitioner had so many responsibilities that there was no time to train the volunteers necessary to expand the program and take it to the next level. Mahealani’s time was devoted full-time to the work of the KHCC and she was able to do so because her retirement supported her livelihood. However, she had so many other responsibilities that limited her ability to spend time on the host-visitor program, much like the cultural practitioners of Ho‘oulu Lāhui and Kawaiokalehua Foundation.

Comparatively, over the two-year period, Waipā Foundation expanded and diversified its host-visitor program. The growth was also accompanied by financial growth due to revenues generated from charging fees for its host-visitor program. The capacity of Waipā to host visitors was more developed than any of the other organizations in the case study, particularly in the organization’s workforce. Waipā had about a dozen paid workers of which half were full-time workers whose professional priority, was carrying out the work of the foundation. Similarly,
committed volunteers supplemented the organization’s workforce. Waipā’s workforce also had the cultural, technical, and administrative know-how to carry out the work necessary to support and develop the different aspects of its host-visitor program. In addition, Waipā’s infrastructure was the most developed of the case study and it continued to build infrastructure to support future growth, like its certified community kitchen.

Table 8. Challenges of each case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kawaiokalehua Foundation</th>
<th>Ho’oulu Lāhui Hawaiian Civic Club</th>
<th>Ko’olaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club</th>
<th>Waipā Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Limited capacity of small size eg., only two cultural practitioners busy with no time to host.</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>Lack of fee structure for independent visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No transportation to shuttle people back and forth.</td>
<td>Limited workforce, only one cultural practitioner</td>
<td>Concerned with ensuring visitor expectations is aligned with host expectations and customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted by advertising and marketing capacity. Attempted to go virtual with Facebook but unclear on success this venture</td>
<td>Charter school takes up all the time</td>
<td>Concerned with ensuring staff are happy in their work of hosting visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discomfort with charging people for money</td>
<td>No administrative personnel</td>
<td>Transportation limitation. Waipā far away from airport and Hanalei bridge cannot accommodate large buses. Large groups must be shuttled back and forth from bridge to Waipā in smaller groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressed interest in creating website interface where people could donate directly to instead of paying in person</td>
<td>No business background to set fee schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No transportation to tap into cruise ship visitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard to find compatible workforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Different value system between organization and charter school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited advertising and marketing capabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational capacity to host</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited workforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard to find volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No time to train volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No reliable transportation system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing and advertisement constraints (has brochure, website, and newspaper ads but want to improve)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discomfort with receiving money directly from visitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workforce**

A workforce to carry out the work necessary to support a host-visitor program is important.

With the exception of Waipā Foundation, all other three organizations identified the lack of a workforce, as a limiting factor to the growth of their host-visitor programs. Between 2012 and
2014, only Ho’oulu Lāhui had an administrative assistant while the host-visitor program at Kawaiokalehua Foundation and KHCC was carried out exclusively by the cultural practitioners. One of the reasons for the lack of assistance is not having the financial capacity to hire new workers but also the lack of potential workers who would be compatible with the type of work that the CBHV requires. Interest in volunteers was expressed by all three organizations but it was a challenge finding qualified, responsible people who were eager to learn and who fit the position.

In contrast, Waipā Foundation, did not share the same difficulty. Waipā Foundation is a larger organization with approximately 15 workers. Of that total, about 6 are full-time paid employees. Therefore, the organization has a much larger pool of people to support hosting of large groups and of diverse activities. In addition, the workforce at Waipā is supplemented by a cadre of dedicated volunteers from the surrounding communities who play a major role in running some of the organization’s programs. Poi Day is an example of an activity that is operated almost exclusively by volunteers. Kupuna play a major role in this event and not only assume leadership positions during the event but their presence also attracts community involvement.

**Infrastructure**

The presence of infrastructure significantly affects the capacity of a host-visitor program. Infrastructure refers to amenities that support the hosting experience such as electricity, access to potable water, toilets, accommodation, equipment for cooking, and transportation. The KHCC and Ho’oulu Lāhui had the least number of amenities of all organizations. Both organizations focused mostly on tours that lasted a few hours with the exception of KHCC’s Makaha tour
which occurs outside of the organization’s district. Though Kawaiokalehua Foundation also had limited amenities, the availability of a house and temporary tents on-site, made it possible to accommodate visitors for overnight and 3-day weekend workshops. Workshops on specialized topics such as heiau-building and construction of hōlua slides, are activities that take a certain time period. They are not commonly available so the ability to support overnight accommodations allowed the organization to teach specialized knowledge.

Waipā Foundation on the other-hand, has the most amenities of all the organizations and also has the most diverse activities for its host-visitor program. The organization is also investing in building its infrastructure such as the construction of a new certified community kitchen that will diversify its enterpreneurial opportunities. Though its camping amenities are basic, overnight camping is available so it is able to accommodate groups seeking extended workshops over multiple days. Waipā has plans for a bunkhouse to improve its camping accommodations but the building has yet to be established.

Transportation was also identified by all organizations in the case study to be an amenity that is especially limiting. Since all organizations are located in remote and isolated locales, transportation is key to bringing visitors to the sites and several tours also depend on shuttling visitors back and forth such as taking visitors to Kumukahi Heiau from Kawaiokalehua Foundation which 15-minutes away. Similarly, Waipā Foundation has the capacity to host hundreds of people at one time but the inability of large buses over the capacity of 15-passengers to pass through the Hanalei Bridge, is limiting. Thus, investing in a reliable transportation system is critical for this type of business.
Tensions Associated with Money

The case study also showed that although all organizations were open to both monetary and non-monetary forms of exchange for their host-visitor programs, each organization struggled with this issue in a variety of ways highlighting an inherent tension when cultural knowledge and experiences are valued monetarily. A pattern also arose showing all three organizations that did not diversify their activities significantly over the two-year period, also did not charge monetary fees for their programs. In contrast, Waipā Foundation is the only organization that seemed to have overcome this tension. An organizational awareness that financial sustainability is necessary to cover the operational costs of the organization to continue to function and carry out its organizational mission and goals, has guided the organization to find ways of ensuring that financial costs are met. This tension between money and culture are discussed further.

Between 2012 and 2014, cultural practitioners’ perception of money exchange for the host-visitor experience, changed. While the extent to which this change was reflected in the host-visitor programs varied, a shift in the way that they thought about money within the host-visitor experience, was apparent. Initially, there was a general discomfort associated with charging visitors a monetary fee for the sharing of cultural knowledge and experiences. However, after two years, all cultural practitioners were more comfortable with the idea of charging fees and all shared the understanding that monetary compensation was necessary for organizational, as well as personal survival. Though all cases were open to exploring alternative means of non-monetary exchange for the host-visitor experience, there was a general awareness that non-monetary means of exchange do not ensure personal and organizational financial sustainability.

The case study provided further insight into the role money plays in the host-visitor model and how it affects human behavior in the hosting and visiting process. Though capitalism is
prevalent in Hawai‘i, traditional values particularly of aloha, pono, kuleana and mālama, seemed to be the driving force and motivation behind the work of these communities that superceded monetary gains. All individuals were involved in their host-visitor programs, whether they did so for a living or voluntarily, because they care deeply about their culture and dedicated their lives to perpetuating the culture through sharing the knowledge they hold. All participants were drawn to their line of work from a strong sense of kuleana that they not only had a responsibility to perpetuate the knowledge they held but also felt obliged to do so as leaders of their communities, keepers of native knowledge, caretakers and stewards of the land, and as Native Hawaiians. Most felt that it was their destiny to be cultural practitioners and that they were called to do what they do. The following section provides examples from the respective organizations of the case study to illustrate the challenges that they faced and how they reconciled the critical issues surrounding the idea of charging money for cultural knowledge and experience.

Lynda Saffery of Kawaiokalehua Foundation shared her experience and explained that though the organization did not charge visitors, she would have done things differently in hindsight:

I would have charged people. I think there’s a difference between charging for culture and charging for time. I gotta make a living. I cannot just do everything by aloha all the time so I think that you needed to charge people… you gotta charge for your time. [It takes] time…to do this. If you don’t charge for culture, what does that say? If you don’t charge somebody to learn culture, like have a lau hala class, that would tell them that there’s no value to it… If you devalue it yourself, then they gonna devalue it. Money is what makes the value… People would bring gas or whatever but gas doesn’t pay the practitioners. There’s more to keeping something going than just have gas for your generator or tools for cleaning things. I understood that [my counterpart] didn’t want to charge for culture [and maybe]…that was a way to keep the community from grumbling. [Visitors] would bring food and stuff like that but [we] didn’t actually charge them a fee. There was no way for us to really make money. I don’t know what he [her counterpart] was getting from Bishop Estate…to caretake this place. Maybe he thought that was enough? I don’t know and I felt funny because he knew I needed money. Kamehameha Schools would pay us but it was hard to get money to us.
[Reimbursements] would be so late, it would be months after the fact. You had to spend more effort to get money out of them than to actually do the project.

While Lynda was able to distinguish culture and time, she continued to teach and share her knowledge with others for free. She explained her perspective on the situation:

I do a lot of free stuff with culture, with people like my alaka‘i girls. They can’t afford to pay but I know they value it and I know they’re gonna perpetuate it. That’s the difference. That’s why I do stuff for them for free because I teach them to perpetuate it. They bring me food. They come and clean my yard for me sometimes if they come and they see that something needs to be done, they’ll help me do something. So they pay me in their own way, just not in dollars.

Her advice to others based on her experience with Kawaiokalehua Foundation, was to “charge for the experience and have a base fee for everyone that comes because that shows there’s a monetary value to it. If you want to honor culture, you gotta honor your cultural practitioners too.”

Similarly, one of the barriers in moving forward with their host-visitor program at Ho‘oulu Lāhui, was the absence of a fee structure which Keikialoha attributed to lack of business experience in translating the cost of an experience into prices, as well as discomfort over the idea of charging money for the visiting experience. The discomfort surrounds the idea of charging certain people, specifically the local people of Puna, Native Hawaiians, and kūpuna (elderly).

Keikialoha pointed out that in Native Hawaiian culture, exchange is achieved through other ways that do not have a monetary value:

Because of the value of mea ho‘okipa in the ‘ohana system, if you work with this kūpuna, from an outside island, sooner or later, someway, you’re gonna understand you’re related or know somebody, extended. And [that’s] the exchange, you might end up on an island, THAT, island and [now you] get another network [and they take care of you]. The network process is worth more than money, eh?

The purpose of the visit also seemed to matter. Keikialoha explained that he wouldn’t want to charge visitors interested in learning and education, such as student groups. However, he did not
feel the same way about visitors who were on Hawai‘i for a short amount of time on vacation, such as visitors arriving on the cruise ship who are in town for the day. In these incidences, he explained that it would be ideal to have a fee structure that depends on the range and extent of experiences the visitor prefers, for example, the visit might have a base fee and additional experiences such as a tour and/or an ‘imu (underground oven) would be charged so a range of packages could be created.

In 2014, the KHCC still had not charged for experiences though the organization had a recommended donation schedule. Mahealani felt discomfort initially about receiving money directly from visitors and addressed this problem by having someone else accompany her who would take over that responsibility. However, she still takes visitors on her own at times and when they ask her how much they should pay, she responds, “Well, whatever you feel it’s worth.” Though they have recommended donations, “I don’t ask for money,” said Mahealani.

She explained the motivation behind the work that she does:

I don’t get paid for the work that I do... I do it because I enjoy doing it. I like the exercise too so it has a benefit for me...I do this for the love of the ‘āina and the places. I do this because it IS a calling. I have to teach people about the important, famous and sacred places of Koʻolaupoko. That’s part of what I do and about the values. We need to colonize the world with Hawaiian thinking and I think it will help even Native Hawaiians to embrace it more. They have become Westernized so much. We need to bring our people back to Hawaiian thinking and core values because if they do that, they can help the whole world. I really truly believe that Hawaii can help the whole world...If Hawaiians could become role models for the world by practicing living their cultural values, looking for balance, looking for pono, we can help the whole world deal with all kinds of problems. It starts with one person to one person connecting, nā ‘au to nā ’au. That’s how it starts. You don’t have to change a whole thousand people at a time. Change one at a time. That person then can change another person and continues like ripples in the water. Yeah?… We need for the world to know [about our Hawaiian values and way of thinking] because the world needs us. They need us.
Mahealani is retired and her pension and benefits support her which enables her to volunteer her time. Though she doesn’t charge for her services, she understands that others must charge for money to be able to make a living and support their families. She shared in her own words the exchange between hosts and visitors from the perspective of traditional gift exchange, for example, the knowledge she shares as a host may be exchanged with gifts from visitors in whatever form they feel is worthy:

Like a doctor, you pay the doctor in exchange for his services. In the old days, in the traditional times, you gave the kahu, the kahuna lā ‘au lapa‘au or whoever treated you for an illness. You gave him whatever you could from the products whether you’re a fisherman or farmer. You gave them products. So the same thing happens today. Our people, are teachers. They have value in the knowledge they share and if someone is willing to exchange for that knowledge, something they have from the work of their hands, then they should be compensated but it’s not in the western concept. It’s more of a traditional exchange of our gifts. Yeah? So I exchange my gift of knowledge of Hawaiian culture and history and value and someone may exchange something they have earned from their living, whether it’s cash or land or products that they made. To me, that works well. For our civic club, people donate to our civic club in exchange for the tours that we give, the cultural programs that we do. And for the other Ka Welina network people, I think they are given something in exchange for the work, the knowledge that is given to them so it works well and it’s all kind of a modern way of that native exchange from ancient times.

However, she cautioned about the dangers of losing sight of the main purpose of one’s work of helping people and the world, through education and sharing knowledge. She felt that the western concept of money exchange distract people from the greater purpose of one’s work and become focused on making money as the end result instead. She explained:

We just have to be careful though that we are not doing it just for the exchange for money. That we as Ka Welina people need to be careful that we are doing it because we need to help the world. Lift up our own people, lift up other people, through understanding Hawaiian knowledge and Hawaiian culture and Hawaiian values. If we’re not careful, we are being colonized ourselves by the Western value system of monetary value which is NOT the same as native exchange and values. It’s not. It becomes so all-encompassing and obsessive. Some people become obsessed about raising money. Making money. The western economic
system I feel is not healthy for them or for the world. It’s all about ‘me first’ and that’s not a balance. That’s not pono. That’s not gonna help keep the person and community or the world healthy if everything is about how much you can make…You can change the world if you can change the value system. You can’t change the world if it’s only about money. You can’t. Actually, the world will end if you only think about money.

Kalen Kelekoma of Waipā Foundation reiterated this point and quoted cultural practitioner, Mahealani Cypher of the KHCC, “As Mahealani points out, “The purpose of what you do, is the whole difference. When the money becomes the focus, it takes away from the whole point.” To demonstrate this idea further, he explained that when tours come to the lo‘i at Waipā. “You have one lo‘i but if you have ten buses of people looking at one lo‘i, we want to make sure that we are not going that way but stay true to our mission statement,” he said. Thus, the value at Waipā was being able to carry out their educational programs and achieve its mission in a way that does not overwhelm or exceed the carrying capacity of the organization’s physical and human resources. There is an awareness that focusing too much on making money might confound and deter the organization from its values and mission.

One of the main goals at Waipā is to serve its own local community. An example of how they institute this value into their organization is through the establishment of a suggested sliding fee scale for visitors to use their campgrounds. The campsite is on the portion of their property that is adjacent to the ocean and it has portable toilets, showers, access to running water, and it is beautiful and private. Initially, the suggested fee for camping was $5 per person which they have gradually increased over time to $7 and then $10. The fee is not required but it is a suggested fee and if one cannot pay, donations are accepted. The sliding fee scale was modeled off of the YMCA which charges $15 per person. Comparatively, Waipā is cheaper and teen adventure travel companies take advantage of this service for that reason.
In Hanalei, many outsiders have bought the land along the shoreline of Hanalei Bay and built multi-million dollar mansions, businesses, and other developments that make it more difficult for local residents to access the shoreline and the ocean. Waipā offers local families a space and place to access these resources of their place, particularly on holidays, when the beaches at Hanalei are packed with visitors and people. Local families, particularly from the surrounding areas, are not charged a fee but they can donate if they are able to. Kalen explains:

Because of all these million dollar houses along the bay, there’s beach access here and there for people at the county parks like at Black Pot, but they’re crowded. Here, because we don’t have development on the beach, it’s open space so this is a place where folks from here can go and they’re not gonna get bombarded or crowded by everything.

What we’re trying to do is to provide a place, charging local people less to provide the people of the place a space to appreciate what is theirs in the midst of development. Waipā serves as a “kīpuka” and space that allows families to perpetuate their activities and practices that helps build healthier communities for the families from here because with all the development, people are pushed into other areas and they don’t have access to the beaches like before. The families from here, they appreciate that they can hang out at the beach how it was like before.

Another example of putting their community first is through the delivery of poi to the kūpuna (elderly) of communities surrounding Waipā at discounted rates. Every Thursday on Poi Day, volunteers at Waipā make poi. Community members can order poi from Waipā ahead of time for $3 per pound. Since this interview was conducted, the price of poi at Waipā increased to $4 per pound. Poi sold in the stores, such as Hanalei Poi, average about $8.00 per pound. However, kūpuna are only charged $1 per pound. Kalen explained:

Those who are paying $3 are offsetting the cost for the kūpuna. Charging kupuna $1 per pound and regular people $3 per pound when the state average for poi is about $8 per pound, is not about trying to make money but to help people eat healthier and eat their traditional foods. The discount for elderly is to take care of them and aloha them, a Hawaiian value of take care of the elderly. We explain to our kūpuna that this poi is for them. They may love their mo’opuna (grandchildren) and may want to feed them and their families but, it is meant for
them. If they want to feed the rest of their ‘ohana, then it’s $3 a pound. We help them draw the line. In times when we’re short on poi, someone whose getting 5 pounds a week gets cut down to 2 pounds but they appreciate it.

He continued:

We need to look at financial sustainability so our discussions are shifting. We want groups to come here and we want to be able to provide those educational experiences for them but we need to find sources of income that will allow us to do that. Our community, that’s our first priority but if we can do something that will help us continue to do that, that’s where we’re headed. We don’t want to be running tours and going crazy. I think that is one of the things we had talked about in Ka Welina is being aware of the fine line between making enough and going crazy.

In 2012, Kamehameha Schools funded education activities targeting school groups and children. Around that time, Waipā had just started experimenting with charging small fees for some of the activities they held, such as their kalo and mango festivals that began in 2010 but it was undeveloped. In 2012, Kalen had expressed some discomfort around the idea of charging visitors to participate in their programs because they were interested in building relationships with visitors rather than on the money exchange for the experience. Therefore, Waipā was open to discussing and accepting alternative forms of exchange, such as labor, for their host-visitor program. At the same time, he expressed interest in developing a fee schedule for independent visitors such as individuals or couples who were not part of larger education groups.

In 2014, Kalen admitted that his perspective on charging visitors has changed over the last two years. “My feeling has change,” he said. “Charge ’em! If they can pay, charge ’em because that would offset the [cost for the] ones who cannot.” He explained that other practitioners in the network were uncomfortable with charging initially because money is not part of Hawaiian culture. Though non-monetary items were suggested as possible forms of exchange for an experience at Waipā, he points out that one cannot survive on that kind of aloha and these items
do not pay the electric bill or put gas in the car. In trying to explain what led to his change of perception, he said, “I keep hearing Ramsay in my head.”

He pointed out that Ka Welina practitioners tend to undercut themselves and not charge for their services but they shouldn’t because it takes a lot of effort to host so the price for those efforts should be fair. He highlights how other businesses charge for experiences they claim as “authentically Hawaiian” such as ho’oponopono, lomilomi, and hula, and take advantage of visitors by charging them a lot of money. He explained that the caveat of paying for a good or a service, is having certain expectations which affects hosts because charging a certain price becomes a toss-up between covering costs and meeting people’s expectations. He explained how this dilemma is reconciled at Waipā:

Here, we try to be what’s fair. We want to cover our costs, and if we make a little extra money, then better yet but we are not here to exploit and take advantage of people. You and I can start up a bullshit operation and say, “Oh, come and stay with us, we’re gonna teach you our culture. We’ll give you a Hawaiian name, blah blah blah, come play in our ‘āina, we’ll give you one piece of paper, and by the way, it costs $1,000 per week. We’ll feed you though.” That’s not cool. That’s not us. Most of the time when we have people here, it’s just for a few hours. Whether they’re here for the Farmer’s Market or they come on a fieldtrip. We don’t charge them. We spend a little bit of time with them and hopefully they come back or that they give back by doing something in their community to help. When we do our community work days, it’s all volunteers. Like Poi Day. We don’t charge but we make lunch and everybody gets to take home poi for helping and then we have lunch. Lunch brings us together.

Though Waipā doesn’t charge school groups for fieldtrips, some schools may pay if they can afford it and the foundation accepts the donation as the funds help cover their costs. The meals provided on these excursions are underpriced at $3 to $5 per lunch. While Waipā could charge significantly more and make more revenues from these lunches, they don’t because their priority is providing affordable experiences. They want to continue that tradition but Kalen is aware that they also cannot undermine their own operation. He explains that basic operational costs of the
organization must be met which are not satisfied by non-monetary compensation so consistent cash flow sources are necessary. This awareness has changed and shifted internal discussions within the organization towards exploring more creative and innovative ways of generating revenues. Kalen explained how they have experimented with charging fees for some of their programs.

In 2010, Waipā experimented with holding a kalo festival in the month of December. To prepare for this event, they held a mango festival several months earlier in July, to serve as a pilot project to help them plan for the kalo festival. The mango festival was small with a few vendors, a couple of farmers, a class and cooking demonstrations on recipes with mango, and a fruit tree grafting class. Except for a $20 charge for the grafting class, the festival was free. It was held from 11am to 3pm on a Sunday evening and it attracted about 180 people. With the knowledge from that experience, the organization planned its first kalo festival in December. The festival charged $3 per person and it attracted about 750 people. Over the years, Waipā honed their festival and diversified the event and it has become the organization’s signature annual event that is held on the first Sunday of December. The festival celebrates kalo as a foundation of Hawaiian culture so it is intended to be a family oriented event that attracts local families. More vendors and activities were added over the years and by 2014, the festival was attended by approximately 18,000 to 20,000 people and supported by approximately 45 vendors. By 2014, the price to participate in the festival increased to $5 per adult and $1 per child aged 12-18 and vendors donated 10 percent of their profits to the foundation.

Simultaneously, Waipā also developed its mango festival. The event is now called the Waipā Mango and Music Festival and it is also held annually in the month of August. Since 2010, the festival has been held every year except for 2011 due to a bad mango season. Over the years, this
festival also developed with a music component with musicians throughout the Hawaiian Islands playing all day. In 2012, the festival charged $1 per person for entry and by 2013, it increased to $10 for adults and $1 for children. In 2014, the Waipā Mango and Music Festival was attended by approximately 16,000 to 18,000 people.

On a single day, both the kalo and mango events in 2014 independently generated between $20,000 to $50,000 with a significant percentage of proceeds coming from vendors. Additional funds were also generated through the sale of Waipā apparel that showcases the organization logo, name, with art that represents the organization. Waipā clothing is in popular demand and generates a modest amount of revenues for the organization. The clothing is available for purchase at the site throughout the year but the organization also designs and sells event-specific T-shirts at its events. These festivals alone, allows Waipā to build its financial sustainability and wean itself off dependence on grants and funding from outside sources. As the organization experiments through trial and error over time, these events will continue to develop.

Kalen reflected on the value of money and the role that it plays in their organization, their values, and the things that they do:

> When we try to live up to other’s expectations, you deny who you are. Ka Welina, is about self-determination. Being solid in our identity and being okay with who we are. Our sovereignty. Identity, and not needing to perpetuate the colonial mentality that extends to tourism of being servants to the system. Serving customers instead of prioritizing our own needs. When we prioritize our needs, this means, our health, our values, our way of life. When money becomes the focus, it takes away the focus from who we are. Money is not part of our culture. Who we are, is taking care of our community. This comes first. Taking care of our local people, of our kūpuna, our families, our kids. It’s not about making the most bang out of our buck but just making enough to cover the cost of operating things and a little bit extra to help but not to exploit people. The struggle with this is not getting carried away and crossing that line. Always having a self-check is important so being around like-minded people doing the same thing helps solidify this and validates that what we are doing is important and worthwhile.
With this awareness, it seems that Waipā selectively chooses ventures and activities that more accurately represents their identity— their mission, goals, and values. Waipā reflects an independent and self-sufficient organization that is able to decide which programs to keep or forgo. However, the organization remains open to new ideas, projects, and partners and constantly test them out to see how they work and may fine-tune their product through experience. The following is an example of one such initiative.

Recently, Waipā explored a joint venture with another local entity to host a high-end farm to table tour. The experience included a tour of Waipā followed by a formal outdoor dinner near the beach fronting Hanalei Bay. Waipā provided the food and the fine dining arrangement while their partner organized visitor bookings and bringing visitors to Waipā. The activity cost $130 per visitor and Waipā received about 60% of revenues generated for each event. However, preparing for these events at Waipā was often stressful because of last-minute bookings and Waipā staff were not usually given sufficient time to prepare for events so Waipā staff were often rushing at the last minute to deliver.

Eventually, Waipā terminated the program because the stress on staff was not worth it and the intent of the program did not match with their organizational mission and values. As they labored over trying to meet the expectations of fine dining and catering to visitors who were mostly from outside Hawai‘i, they realized that the white table cloths near the lo‘i did not reflect Waipā as a community and culture-based organization. At the same time, the experience roused thoughts of providing something similar but less expensive for their own local residents to experience. Staff discussed possibilities of providing local residents a high-end dining experience at a lower price in exchange for their labor to work in the lo‘i. For example, instead of $75 for
lunch and a walking tour, local residents could pay $20 and make up the difference by working in the lo‘i before lunch. Though the idea was never implemented, the thoughts and the conversations among staff reflect the desire to provide local communities with unique experiences that they otherwise could not afford.

The case study also illuminates that though money is not part of traditional Native Hawaiian culture, it is part of contemporary Native Hawaiian culture and it is necessary for the survival and well-being of individuals as well as organizations. The case study shows that the growth of a host-visitor program is associated with various factors which include time that is devoted to managing and implementing the activities of the program. Though the smaller host-visitor programs of Kawaiokalehua Foundation and Ho‘oulu Lāhui were dedicated to their programs and mission, the need for paid employment to support livelihoods forced cultural practitioners to work at jobs outside of their organizations. While the organizations could continue to operate this way on the limited time of its workforce, growth may be slow. Also, the well-being of the practitioners become compromised from being over-worked from working full-time at a job and volunteering during their free time. In comparison, Waipā Foundation was able to employ and support the livelihood of its workforce who were able to devote significant amounts of time to the development of its program.

At the same time, additional benefits come from earning livelihoods through monetary compensation for host-visitor experiences. Opportunities to host visitors through the sharing of cultural knowledge, allows workers to spend their days practicing and living their culture on a daily basis that they would otherwise spend at another job that may not foster this lifestyle. As seen through the experience of Kalen Kelekoma at Waipā Foundation, he spent 15 years in a job where he worked in a building with no windows that was unsatisfying. The transition to Waipā,
changed his life to be more meaningful. His work allowed him to practice his culture on a daily basis, eat healthier, and commit his time to building the capacity of communities nearby and to protect and maintain the natural and cultural resources at Waipā. These benefits give reason for charging fees for the host-visitor program.

Awareness about the importance of financial sustainability for organizational and individual well-being accounted for the marked shift in perception amongst cultural practitioners about receiving monetary compensation for sharing cultural knowledge and experiences. After the two-year period, Lynda Saffery of Kawaiokalehua Foundation made the distinction between the cultural practitioner’s time and culture. She explained that money exchange compensates for the time of the cultural practitioner, which is valuable. Also, she explained that while money may not have been part of traditional Native Hawaiian culture, the contemporary system of capitalism valuates goods and services through a price. Therefore, under this system, not charging for cultural knowledge and experiences suggests that culture is not valuable.

For Mahealani Cypher of the KHCC, understanding monetary exchange from the perspective of traditional gift exchange helped her accept the notion of monetary compensation in the host-visitor program. She explained that the knowledge she shares with visitors is a gift that can be exchanged with products visitors feel is appropriate. In contemporary society, money is the product that is earned from the fruits of someone’s labor, just as fish may be the result of a fisherman’s efforts, traditionally. Therefore, if visitors want to exchange the gift of cultural knowledge and experience with money that represents their own gifts, Mahealani considered the exchange appropriate from a traditional perspective. To date, Mahealani does not have an established fee schedule and continues to receive donations using a suggested donation schedule.
It is curious whether she would charge fees if she was not retired and her livelihood depended on paid employment.

At Waipā Foundation, the tension between culture and money is addressed by ensuring that the mission and purpose of the organization is prioritized over making money. Though financial sustainability is necessary, it is recognized that the value of achieving the organization’s mission and goals of taking care of its lands, building the capacity and well-being of communities, and promoting sustainability, supercedes the value of making money. The organization maintains this ethic by offering prices that are just enough to cover operational costs but affordable for people to continue to visit the organization. The challenge is not being carried away with making money because when making money becomes the purpose, it dictates the nature of the host-visitor program and it affects the activities and partnerships that are chosen.

As Waipā Foundation prioritizes its organizational mission and purpose above making money, it buffers against the need to meet outside expectations and remain true to its organization’s values and identity. As seen through the farm-to-table tour venture that Waipā explored, the venture was discontinued because of the stress on employees to meet certain expectations. Also, the value and purpose of the venture, did not reflect or represent Waipā Foundation. Though the venture was economical, prioritizing organizational values to maintain its identity allowed Waipā to choose partnerships and projects wisely. However, it did not deter the organization from trying new ideas, projects, and partnerships, because learning happens through risk-taking and making mistakes. For example, though Waipā discontinued the venture, the experience introduced new ideas for creating affordable farm-to-table experiences in the future.
However, Waipā Foundation may be able to choose its activities and partnerships carefully because it is financially self-sustainable. An organization with less capacity financially, may not be as abled or have the choice to make such autonomous decisions. Therefore, maintaining the balance between achieving organizational goals and making money is critical but a challenge. Kalen Kelekoma shares that maintaining that balance is challenging but being surrounded by like-minded individuals and organizations such as the other cultural practitioners of the Ka Welina Network, helps keep one in check and maintain self-awareness.

For Mahealani of the KHCC, being pono or keeping balance on a personal level means being aware of the choices that one makes; constantly watching oneself to not be harsh with people; but also recognizing that human beings make mistakes and despite all the challenges in life, one has to keep trying and not give up. Being in harmony with all things in life, she says, also requires keeping oneself healthy. A healthy mind allows one to be clean and healthy with other people, therefore, one must mālama and love oneself to be able to reciprocate love for others. For Mahealani, the knowledge that her kūpuna are watching keeps her in check and reminds her to constantly be aware of her decisions, actions, and behavior.

**Authenticity**

Throughout the course of this research, the question of authenticity crept into conversations time and time again. After all, the Ka Welina Network prided itself on providing authentically Hawaiian experiences that distinguished them from other tourist entities, particularly, non-Hawaiian entities. I was especially interested in this topic because researching the literature indicated that authenticity has such a varied definition, that many academics have abandoned the usefulness of the concept of authenticity in tourism studies (Cohen and Cohen 2012; Reisinger and Steiner 2006). Yet, tourism thrives on the concept of “authentic” experiences and tourists
continue to use the term to describe their experiences. I was curious what this term meant for the members of my case study so I asked.

“What does authenticity mean to you,” I asked Lynda Saffery of Kawaiokalehua Foundation. She answered:

It just means, the real thing. Not some contrived replica. It IS the real thing. That place [Kahuwai] is ancient and it always has been authentic and it always will be as long as it’s cared for… [It’s the real thing] because we practice the things that were done in Puna the way it was done in Puna—the growing [cultivation] styles, the style of weaving, the lā‘au lapa‘au [traditional medicine], the way of building things. It’s all Puna practices. I think every district has their own way of doing things.

She compared being at Kahuwai to being at a hotel and explained, “There’s a lot more sharing of the knowledge of your place than [going] to a hotel and just seeing the practice at a hotel.” To illustrate her point, Lynda took out her cellphone and scrolled through her pictures until she found the one she wanted to show me. She pointed the screen towards me and said, “Here are some of our mats. This is Puna style.” She showed me a picture of a woven mat from brown-colored lau hala with lighter strands woven into triangular shapes. She pointed to one of the shapes and explained:

That one symbolizes our mountains. That’s what the white is. Mauna Kea, Mauna Loa, Hualālai, Kohala.

She named all the mountains of Hawai‘i Island. “That is authentically Puna,” she said proudly. She continued to scroll through her photos then stopped to show me a series of breathtaking shots of the sunrise. She explained:

This is authentically Puna too. I wanted to show you this because I love to take people to greet the sunrise at Kumukahi [a place in Puna, Hawai‘i]. This is “Ke ala ‘ula‘ula a Kāne” [the red path of Kāne, god of the sun], that red band I was telling you about. That’s before sunrise. It’s like about an hour before sunrise. It’s the transition of pō (night) to lā (day), from night to day or darkness to light and then the gold comes in. That takes over the red. The gold color is “Ke ala ka lā a
Kāne” and this is still “Ke ala ka lā a Kāne” but a little bit later and then this is “Ahua lani,” the blossoming heavens. This is what I named my first granddaughter. You can see where the sun is going to rise. It hasn’t risen yet. And then this is… You see it’s gold? The sun is gold there? When the sun turns white like this, this has a name too for the time of day. It’s called, “Ka wela hea.” It means the spreading of the warmth. It’s when the sun starts to warm up the Earth.

Lynda also explained the importance of mo’olelo or stories to authenticity:

What brings it alive I think are the mo’olelo about the places. I really like to take people to Ha’eha’e, [which are stones used to measure the seasons]. If you go there during the time [of year] it’s happening, then it helps to bring [it alive]. Some of the mo’olelo of Puna all have to do with sunrise because that’s where the sun rise[s] first in the whole Hawaiian archipelago.

As I remembered this conversation, Lynda’s descriptions of Puna, took me to my own home at my father’s garden, stirring memories of the distinct features of the lagoon of ‘Ene‘io that belongs only to that place and nowhere else. The daily rituals of the natural environment that characterizes that place, produces that sense of place that can only be felt in that place. Such a feeling, is lost in the hustle and bustle and the tall cement buildings of Waikīkī and on the light illuminated stages of hotels. Taken out of context, the meaning of a place is lost, and with it, its authenticity.

Further down the road from Kahuwai at Pu‘ala’a, I asked Keikialoha of Ho‘oulu Lāhui the same question. He looked at me and laughed:


He motioned for me to follow him and we proceeded to walk towards what looked like bush with overgrown hau trees intermingled with milo. He brushed branches aside and I followed closely behind him. As we walked into the mass of trees, we entered a different realm. The trees had formed a canopy up above shading us from the sky so it was darker and cooler. I could hear a bird chirping and the fallen branches on the ground snapped as we trampled on them. We finally
reached a spot with moss-covered rocks shaped in the form of a wall. Keikialoha turns around and says:

Okay, this IS the village. This is the authentic, genuine village of Pu‘ala‘a… Authentic. The site, it’s laid out. It’s here. I just gotta redo ‘um. Right? Authentic experience. I get the pond, I get the village, and then I get the site. But the authentic experience is real eh? So what does authentic mean? To me? To be as real as possible.

I probed him and asked, “But everybody will try sell you real, right? So what makes yours more real than the other guy’s?” Keikialoha chuckled, grinned at me, and explained:

I’m a dramatic instructor. Mine is experiential education. Touch ‘um, taste ‘um, feel ‘um, to experience it. Because if you experience that, then you going know, and you’ve convince yourself, was that, Oooh, ahh, woowow! Was that for real? Did that really happen? Okay, classroom. Is classroom authentic? Get a classroom right here. See ‘um? See the sights? Get the real deal now. You’re in the place eh? So if you come inside, what do you want to experience when you come as a guest? What is authentic? The first thing you do is, you ask permission.

As is customary in Hawaiian culture to enter a new place, Keikialoha broke into a chant, asking permission to enter the place. He explained the significance of the chant and acknowledged that it is common protocol. Keikialoha pointed to the fallen trees and debris surrounding the rock wall. He explained that the storm that hit Puna earlier in the year, had changed the landscape which also changes the mo‘olelo of the place:

This is partially man-made and the story is one of disaster. What you’re looking at, hasn’t been touched after the storm. All this is how it was. So, are we looking at an authentic village? This is how nature lives. Once I redo a section of this place, it actually is not the real site. Maybe it’s a re-creation but [to me, authenticity] is as long as you’re along the lines of being AS authentic as possible. Even to the part of rebuilding that.

This site is where we started back in ‘95. This was the first site. We mapped it. The thing is gold— valuable now because it can be confirmed. The archaeology report affirms authenticity by the guy that passed this document which is one tangible thing. I can bring you to this site and then we’re moving some stuff and you look at the map, then you can actually see that underneath there, this is actually this site.

Keikialoha also goes on to discuss authenticity in terms of spontaneity:

As a host who takes visitors for experiences, Keikialoha explains that he tries to maintain authenticity by just being as real as possible and being honest:

“If you’re going tell ‘em [visitors] something, it has to be affirmed. Most visitors nowadays, will try study up first. Right? So you try to stay as real as possible. Even to the point when they say, “oh, what is this? [If I don’t know] what it is, rather than being caught and being defensive, it’s hands up and say, “I’ve never heard that. I’d like for you to share that with me and with the group.” That’s being real.

Mahealani Cypher adds another dimension to the definition of authenticity by explaining that when it comes to Hawaiian culture, authenticity has to do with where the knowledge comes from and also ancestry matters:

Authenticity means that I am practicing and living the culture, best I can and that I have been taught by people, kūpuna, who are native. I have done my research so that I can verify and validate many of the things that I have learned from other people and that I’ve heard the same information repeatedly from various cultural experts in Native Hawaiian culture that I feel confident that the information I’m sharing is correct and I am actually, born and raised and I am of the koko [blood]. To me, all those things are part of being authentic. You can have a non-Hawaiian tell these stories, like Sam Gong for example. He’s not Hawaiian, and I would always say, he’s only as authentic so long as he validates that his knowledge came from his kumu [teacher] because the authentic person is the kumu, and his student is the one that is now teaching Hawaiian culture. He’s not Hawaiian but he does it very well because he learned well from his kumu. So, the authenticity depends on where your knowledge came from and if you’re non-Hawaiian, you have to say that. If you’re a hula dancer, you have to say, I am a student of Kauai Zudemister. THAT gives it authenticity and it also informs your listener that you may not be of the koko and this is the authentic person you learn from so it gives them some understanding that this is good native knowledge. It’s just coming from a non-Native... You have to be honest. That’s part of being pono. If you love all people,
then you want to be straight with them. You don't want to make them think you’re Hawaiian [if you’re not].

Mahealani spoke to the importance of authenticity and how it is manifested and reflected in the work of the Ka Welina Network. She illustrates how many tour operators provide false information about Native Hawaiian culture and history and the impact on Native Hawaiians, as well as on visitors, when everyone claims authenticity:

I just feel that Ka Welina needs to focus on what we do and do the best we can and I think that Ka Welina...is trying to do our best to educate the world on Hawaiian culture and Hawaiian values. I really think that everybody does that. There are many websites that promote the Hawaiian experience but they’re not authentic. I was giving a huaka‘i for a group of people on the Keiki Trail below the Pali and I’m telling the stories of the areas alongside the trail and there’s this eco-tourism tour coming through. The guy, non-Hawaiian, is giving the talk about the waterfall up there [and] giving false information so I was really offended by that. I called his company and complained to them. I said, “your people are giving out false information to the tourist about this area and I would really appreciate if you would correct him on it.” I left it at that because they’re not authentic and if people want to buy that non-authentic thing, it’s their choice, but if you really want an authentic Hawaiian connection, because the experience is supposed to be a connection with the mana of the place and the people, then you go look for the right people. I just don’t know how you’re gonna steer people to come to Ka Welina, because everybody’s gonna claim authenticity.

I wanted to start a business called, “Through Hawaiian Eyes” which is giving people the visitor experience as seen through Hawaiian eyes. Maybe that would be more authentic because you have a Hawaiian giving the talk and it’s a Hawaiian point of view...we need to get Ka Welina to say, we have our experiences offered through Hawaiian eyes from a Hawaiian perspective so that people will know, this is not somebody from San Diego, giving the talk. It’s somebody from Hawai‘i giving the talk.

She felt that the type of work that Ka Welina represents has positive effects on society and should be promoted, particularly by the State through tax exemptions. Similarly, the value of understanding Native Hawaiian culture and values for people living in Hawai‘i is priceless and should be encouraged:

I really believe that we native people, this is our homeland, this is our native land. We’re trying to teach others about the practices, the culture, history of our people
and the values of our people. Those kinds of things, transcend the monetary classification and should be embedded in every single person that comes and sets foot on these islands. This should be like a required orientation before anyone can even be in these islands, to have this orientation. I think that those things should be exempt from regulation or taxes.

She also felt it was important to differentiate what is authentically Hawaiian, such as groups like the Ka Welina Network, from the “mob of operators” capitalizing on the label.

For Kalen Kelekoma of Waipā Foundation, defining authenticity is more subjective. “It’s what you do in your place that’s unique to you,” he explained.

What is authentic? That’s the question and it comes to mind every so often. We do what we do. Is it traditional? I don’t know but we do it so it’s traditional to us. Right? An example is, we make poi with a hamburger grinder. It’s authentic to us. [Authenticity] is whatever you do [and] it’s not for me to judge [what is authentic and what isn’t].

He explained further that others may not feel that making poi using the method they use, is authentic. However, if one is to ku‘i (pound) poi the way his grandparents did, would the process be less authentic if the implements used, such as the poi pounder and board, are made using modern equipment like a chainsaw to cut the wood and a machine to shape the poi pounder? He considers authenticity to be subjective rather than dependent on ancestry and source of knowledge. In this sense, his definition of authenticity falls under the category of constructive authenticity.

Review of the literature on this topic suggests that the varied definition of authenticity is problematic. This variation in perception is reflected by this case study which show that authenticity falls into all the three different categories of objective, constructive, and existential authenticity. The view that authenticity is defined by the places where the original Hawaiians lived, as evidenced by the Marquesian village of Kahuwai and at Pu‘ala‘a, highlights the objectification of authenticity which contrasts with Kalen’s constructivist view that authenticity
is self-defined. Yet, authenticity is also seen as existential as Keikiahloha described through a spontaneous state of being. Of particular interest about this case study is the role that moʻolelo have in bringing to life the ‘authenticity’ of a place. Thus, within the context of this paper, addressing issues of authenticity as it relates to host-visitor experiences may be problematic particularly as the Ka Welina Network grows.

Therefore, it may be more constructive to use terms like, “meaningful experiences” or “experiences through Native Hawaiian eyes” in lieu of “authentic experiences.” Kalen Kelekoma pointed out that Waipā Foundation is distinguished from other tourist entities because they offer this type of meaningful experience. He explains:

> We have something that the people [who come here] already have inside them yah? We just kinda get them to tap into it. [When you come here] and you’re driving right next to the loʻis and the mountains are right there and waterfalls are 3,000, 4,000 feet high, you’re just like, wow, it’s green yah? So I think it taps something inside of us. I think that’s part of the magic or stepping back in time or being authentic. Something happens to the person, inside.

Despite the dilemmas posed by the varied definition of authenticity, Mahealani highlights critical issue concerning widespread use of the term and claim to authentic Native Hawaiian experiences, particularly by non-Hawaiian entities. The commercialization of culture through tourism and the issues surrounding incorrect dissemination of cultural information, as well as intellectual and cultural property rights pertaining to Native Hawaiian culture, raises concern over the processes of hosting and visiting in Hawaiʻi and qualification of hosts. The findings of this study illustrate that Native Hawaiian culture is one that grows out of a connection to land and community, therefore, I question the validity of those who host without this background in being able to convey cultural content accurately.
**Advertisement and Marketing**

The dilemmas of authenticity extend to advertising and marketing of tourism in Hawai‘i where the claim to ‘authentic’ experiences is extensive. Within this maelstrom of tour companies flooding the market with many advertisements, how are visitors able to distinguish the different types of potential experiences? Advertisement and marketing strategies play a key role in attracting visitors to a place and to the success of the CBHV-based programs. This is particularly important for organizations that are set in remote locations and for attracting the type of visitor who would be interested in host-visitor experiences. Tourists visit places for different reasons and not all are interested in host-visitor experiences, therefore, being able to market strategically is important to target the right audience. While most organizations expressed the need to improve their advertisement and marketing strategies, Waipā Foundation seemed to be well-established and the need for assistance in this area was not identified as one of their organizational challenges.

Waipā Foundation had a well-established website that was informative and user-friendly. The organization also had a Facebook page and took advantage of social media to broaden its reach. Waipā Foundation’s reputation preceded itself as a model cultural learning center state-wide and evidenced by the popularity of Waipā clothing in Hawai‘i. The other three organizations were less visible and had more difficulty in marketing themselves. This problem was attributed to the lack of trained personnel with expertise in website development and marketing. The limited capacity of the organizations to hire and train staff to maintain a website was constraining. In 2012, the Pasifika Foundation Hawai‘i, provided technical assistance to all members to develop a network website with a page for each of its members. Though a website was developed, none of the participating organizations utilized the website. Most were unaware of the website’s
existence and others just did not have the staff or the technical knowledge to maintain the website.

Lynda Saffery shared that nothing changed at Kawaiokalehua Foundation because her counterpart, who was in charge of the website, did not have the time to utilize the website to its fullest potential. “I put things on the website but we really didn’t get that much response and if we did, he didn’t reply to it,” she explained. She pinpointed time as a problem, explaining that her counterpart did not have the time to spend on the website because he had many other projects that kept him busy so he couldn’t spend much time on the website. Lynda recalled the beginning stages of the development of the website and shared some of the difficulties she experienced:

I think it [the website] changed a couple of times in the beginning. The first year, it was hard enough to navigate. I think that’s why [we] went to Facebook then because it was hard to get people to sign on…[People] had to go through all this stuff before they could even [sign on]… I put up most of the stuff [on the website]…and I thought that they would post his hōlua slide. He made a website on Facebook of the hōlua stuff. I really liked how the website looked and everything but it seemed to take awhile. I did it up to where it was usable and I was hoping [we] would use it more.

When asked whether she would have taken on the responsibility of managing the website, she laughed and said, “Then it would have just been more work for free for me.”

At Hoʻoulu Lāhui, Susie and Keikialoha were not aware that the website was still available on-line and were surprised to learn of its existence. Keikialoha recalled hiring someone to maintain the website and who received training from the web designer provided by the network but remembered that their staff had trouble with computers and navigating through the website. Eventually, no-one was managing or utilizing the website at Hoʻoulu Lāhui. Similarly, the KHCC did not utilize the Ka Welina website that was designed to help with advertising. Mahealani at the KHCC, admitted that one of their greatest organizational struggles continues to
be in marketing and advertising on-line. Not a “techy” person herself, updating and keeping up with website-related work is “one of the things I do worst,” she admitted and needed a staff member to oversee this responsibility.

Hosts did not utilize the Ka Welina website also because the website had not been marketed. As grant funding ended, efforts to market the network halted but the process of developing the website was a learning experience. The Ka Welina Network initially required visitors to contact hosts of the network before visiting a site partly to develop and nurture relationships but also to allow hosts to monitor who visits as a way of maintaining the integrity of place. However, one of the main criticisms that arose was that the requirement to make contact with the host prior to visiting contradicted the existing cultural norm of tourism where visitors are used to making bookings without having to divulge personal information on-line. Concern was expressed that the cultural difference would deter visitors from signing up and visiting.

Similarly, there was also concern over how experiences would be marketed if a web-interface was used through which visitors and hosts could interact. Some expressed that it was important that the information on the site accurately communicated to visitors the type of experience that they would have so that visitors would know what to expect upon arrival, for example, short video clips highlighting some of the activities offered. It was felt that accurate visitor expectations upon arrival at the site, would attract the right type of visitors who would enjoy and appreciate the experiences offered. At the same time, advertising and marketing must also adjust to and develop along with technological advances and changing consumer behavior patterns, for example, people access the internet mostly through mobile telephones nowadays compared to
before. Therefore, advertisements must appeal to consumers instantly who do not have time and the leisure to spend researching thoroughly on small hand-held devices.

**Conditions for a Successful Host-Visitor Program**

The previous sections of this chapter explained the characteristics of the CBHV model as well as highlighted the main challenges encountered in implementing the model. Based on that information and the lessons learned from the experience of the Ka Welina Network since its formation in 2006, a list of conditions are presented in this section that might assist organizations in creating more successful host-visitor programs. These conditions are summarized in Table 9 and fall into six main categories which include an organization’s: place (natural or cultural resources), organizational capacity, social capital, financial resources, governance structure, and external environment. While the list does not include all the conditions necessary to create a successful host-visitor program, it emphasizes important areas of program development to consider in setting up a host-visitor program. The development of the Ka Welina Network itself took into consideration these priority areas which were incorporated into the initial community assessment survey (Appendix D) that was used to assess the capacity of communities interested in joining the network. Hopefully, this list can provide assistance to other small emerging organizations wishing to implement a host-visitor program.

While cultural practitioners of the case study defined “success” by the transformative impact of meaningful experiences they offer visitors rather than by how much money is made from the host-visitor experience, the findings of this research indicate that financial sustainability is a key factor in the ability of an organization to carry out its mission and goals. Therefore, a
“successful” values-based host-visitor program is defined here as one that is able to achieve both meaningful experiences, as well as financial sustainability.

This list in Table 9 is geared towards small community-based organizations working towards self-determination through the restoration of ‘āina-based practices using an education and culturally-based approach. Rogerson (2005) points out that not all small enterprises are created equal but distinguishes between emerging and established SMMEs. According to Rogerson, established enterprises dominate the local tourism market and are often operated by those who choose a certain type of lifestyle over making money while emerging enterprises are usually at the bottom of the tier of enterprises struggling to make a foothold in the local tourism scene. Established enterprises often have had the experience and opportunities to work out the challenges that emerging enterprises face, thus, these two types of enterprises might have different sets of goals and challenges. Comparatively, the goals and challenges of Waipā Foundation differed from those of the other three organizations of the case study and thus, might be considered an established small enterprise rather than an emerging one. Therefore, the following section may be more informative for small and emerging enterprises.

**Capacity of Place**

Place, as illustrated in the case study, is one of the most valuable assets of a host-visitor program. Place consists of natural or cultural resources on land and/or sea, that an organization has access to for hosting visitors. These resources support activities and practices that facilitate the expression of knowledge. It is the ideal classroom where traditional knowledge can be shared through hands-on experience and application and the stories of these places can be shared that orient and give meaning to the physical landscape.
Table 9. Conditions to consider in a values-based host-visitor program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Capacity of Place</td>
<td>Host Access</td>
<td>Bundles of property rights over resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Integrity</td>
<td>Management/restoration plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Capacity</td>
<td>Engagement Strategy</td>
<td>Meaningful experiences, Diverse products/experiences, Considers local people and economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Transportation, Electricity, potable water, bathroom facilities, accommodation, food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>Skilled workers, Paid workers/livelihood, Adequate number of workers, Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive Management</td>
<td>Self-evaluations, Visitor evaluations, Measure of success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Web Interface</td>
<td>Structure in place e.g., web site, Infrastructure to support marketing, Workforce to support marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social Capital</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Connection to local community, Connection to other entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Norms</td>
<td>Shared vision, mission, goals, and guiding principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Presence of committed person(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Financial Capital</td>
<td>External Sources</td>
<td>Grants/Aid donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal Sources</td>
<td>Fee structure in place, Donations, Non-monetary exchange scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional Arrangements/ Governance</td>
<td>Rules (Protocol)</td>
<td>Operational rules; conflict resolution; accountability communally defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. External Environment</td>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>Local and non-local visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State/Private Industry</td>
<td>Policies &amp; partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, place becomes the venue where education can take place more efficiently and effectively as the senses are stimulated in positive ways. As shown in the case study, the place
and the natural resources it contain, plays a significant role in how the hostvisitor experience is expressed and that greater access to a place leads to greater potential for an organization to develop and diversify its host-visitor experiences.

**Access & Property Rights**

Ribot and Peluso (2003) define access, as “the ability to benefit from things—including material objects, persons, institutions, and symbols…[it is about] the multiplicity of ways people derive benefits from resources” as an organization may benefit from the assets of a place for a host-visitor program. Access is shaped by several mechanisms such as rights and structural and relationship mechanisms like technology, capital, markets, knowledge, authority, social identities, and social relations (2003). A “rights-based” approach is one where a claim is recognized by law, custom, or convention. Schlager & Ostrom (1992), Agrawal & Ostrom (2001), and Rocheleau & Edmunds (1997), propose that more bundles of rights and greater participation in decision-making, leads to greater access to resources and improved capacity to manage resources.

Table 10. Bundles of Rights Associated with Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Proprietor</th>
<th>Claimant</th>
<th>Authorized User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Withdrawal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Schlager & Ostrom: Property-Rights Regimes)
Individuals and institutions are positioned differently in relation to resources, therefore, each can draw on a range of powers that affect how people gain, control, and maintain the ability to benefit from resources. Schlager and Ostrom (1992) identify four different types of property rights (first column of Table 10) and the classification of four types of resource users based on the bundle of property rights that users possess, as shown on the top row of Table 10. Property rights are classified as: access and withdrawal, management, exclusion, and alienation. Types of users are owner, proprietor, claimant, and authorized user.

Collective-choice actions of management, exclusion, and alienation, allow for higher participation of an organization in the decision-making process about actions at the operational level. Management has the right to regulate internal use patterns and transform the resource by making improvement such as devising limits on resource extraction. Exclusion is the right to determine who will have the right of withdrawal and how that right may be transferred. Alienation, on the other hand, is the right to sell or lease withdrawal, management, and exclusion rights. As shown in Table 10, owners have the most rights followed by proprietors, claimants, and authorized users have the least. An individual or institution with operational-level rights but lacking collective-choice rights, such as authorized users, cannot participate in the formulation of operational-level rules that determine access and withdrawal rights.

According to Schlager and Ostrom, (1992:256), “different bundles of property rights, affect the incentives individuals face, the types of actions they take, and the outcomes they achieve.” The right of alienation that owners possess, provide incentives for long-term investment in a resource such as investing in the physical structure of resources that maintain or increase the productivity of the resource. Similarly, the right of exclusion creates strong incentives among
owners and proprietors to make current investments in resources because they are able to
dermine who has access to resources. Claimants have stronger incentives to invest in legal
support and protection of their resources than authorized users because of their right to manage
their resources. Authorized users have no rights to determine rules of access and withdrawal and
must follow rules created by others.

As noted above, a common challenge among organizations is that none of them are property
owners. Three of the organizations, Kawaiokalehua Foundation, Ho‘oulu Lāhui, and Waipā
Foundation, were proprietors who all leased land from Bishop Estate and the KHCC only had
withdrawal and access rights. As an authorized claimant, they have no decision-making rights to
determine rules of access and withdrawal. These different property rights frameworks meant that
the three organizations who operated on Bishop Estate lands could and have the potential to
diversify their host-visitor program by investing in the establishment of physical structures, such
as bathrooms, community kitchen, accommodation, and other facilities to host visitors. However,
the KHCC is limited to tours in the places it is associated with because of its limited access to the
use and management of its resources. None of the four organizations of the case study are
owners, and thus run the risk of losing access to the resources upon which their host-visitor
programs depend, as experienced by Kawaiokalehua Foundation whose program was terminated
due to disputes with the landowner. Therefore, greater bundles of rights, particularly over
decision-making rights, ensure greater access to resources to support host-visitor programs.

The ability to have bundles of rights not only for access to land but for decision-making
affects the ability of an organization to diversify and expand its host-visitor programs. It also
allows hosts the ability to have more control over the protocol and rules that can be enforced and
implemented in a host-visitor program. For example, the KHCC has access rights to certain cultural and natural resources of the Koʻolaupoko District. However, the organization does not have management rights to these resources. Therefore, the options to expand the host-visitor program are limited to cultural interpretive tours and education-related activities, whereas at Waipā Foundation has more bundles of rights associated with the land, offers more potential for a broader range of activities.

Gaining access to land and special places in contemporary Hawaiʻi, is difficult. With encroaching urbanization and overpopulation, the special places and spaces of Hawaiʻi are becoming compromised and have decreased significantly. The price of land is also among the highest in the nation making it difficult for local Native Hawaiians and families with the desire to pursue land-based host-visitor initiatives independently. Three of the four case studies were all dependent on partnerships with Bishop Estate for access to the land for the operation of their organization. Thus, Bishop Estate, one of the largest land-owners in Hawaiʻi, is a potential partner for community groups wishing to pursue this avenue. Bishop Estate has an educational mission to achieve and a significant amount of land in Hawaii to manage. Therefore, partnerships with local communities in CBHV efforts offer win-win situations for both parties. However, the process of acquiring lease agreements is daunting and not always positive such as the experience of Kawaiokalehua Foundation.

Resource Integrity

The more bundles of rights for access that a user has also translate into greater control over the management of the resources of the place which directly affects the health and integrity of resources. Tourism is based upon the attraction of a place or activity, therefore, the integrity of
the features of a place is vital to the business of tourism. However, use intensity of resources is directly related to resource integrity (Farrell and Runyan 1991), thus, the ability to manage how resources are used, who uses them, and how often, is critical to ensuring the carrying capacity of the environment is not exceeded. Therefore, 1,000 visitors accessing a resource system like a beach or a lo‘i will have significantly more negative impacts on the system than 10 visitors, therefore, the ability to make decisions that limit access is key.

Efforts to restore and maintain the health and well-being of the resources of a place are critical for ensuring resource integrity, and activities that achieve this should be a priority for an organization. An example of how this was achieved in the case study, were volunteer restoration programs set up for visitors and local communities to help organizations to restore and maintain the health of the different places. Maintaining trails and ensuring that sites are not overgrown, play an important role not only in the attractiveness of a place to visitors but also in providing a safe environment for visitors. Therefore, a management plan that is implemented to take care of the resources of a place regularly and systematically is important to the success of a host-visitor program.

Organizational Capacity

Place provides the setting and venue for a host-visitor program but a community must also have the organizational capacity to implement and maintain a host-visitor program. The case study showed that organizational capacity was a significant limiting factor for the progress of their host-visitor programs. This section discusses organizational capacity as: the strategies for engaging visitors, the infrastructure to support visitors during visits, the labor required to host, and marketing strategies to attract visitors to a host-visitor program.
Engagement Strategies

The strategies to engage visitors using a values-based host-visitor approach, is one of the most important aspects of an organization because the premise of this approach is providing meaningful experiences. To achieve this type of experience, hosts must be knowledgable, willing to share their knowledge and aspects of their lives with visitors, and captivate their audiences through the process of delivery, for example, through storytelling, food, learning a new activity hands-on, or through conversation. Thus, at the root of developing meaningful experiences is finding experiences, knowledge, practices, and resources that a community is willing to share with visitors that visitors in turn find interesting and engaging.

According to Sirgy and Wu (2007) meaningful experiences are those that serve a larger purpose beyond the self’s pleasures and desires. Thus, the emphasis of personal leisure and entertainment through tourism may not produce the same type of meaningful experiences offered through a values-based host-visitor program. Creating meaningful experiences successfully also involves innovation, creativity, being open to new ideas and risk-taking. Waipā Foundation experimented with festivals, which proved to be successful as there are no other types of these festivals offered on the island. This venture illustrates how risk taking and trying new ideas turned out to be the most attended host-visitor program that Waipā Foundation ever hosted at any one time through its annual kalo and mango and music festivals. Over time, the quality of an experience may improve as hosts learn through trial and error. However, hosts must be willing to undergo self-evaluations regularly, collect feedback from visitors, and implement changes to their delivery to keep improving. Mahealani Cypher noted that being able to host and offer meaningful experiences effectively is a gift but one that pays close attention to how hosts interact with visitors and bring them into the experience.
An organization may also be more successful at attracting and engaging visitors with a broader range of experiences that visitors can choose from. People travel for different reasons, therefore, offering a range of experiences that allure to different strata of the population is important, for example, a visiting group may include elderly for whom a hike would not be appropriate, but workshops where they can sit down and learn from a practitioner may be more appealing. Waipā Foundation was able to provide a wide range of experiences particularly as they explored different aspects of food production. Developing different strategies of utilizing kalo for consumption, opened up endless opportunities for the organization to pursue because their target audience expanded as not everyone may be interested in culture but food is important to everyone. The diverse experiences Waipā Foundation created, allowed the organization to carry out certain programs on different days of the week, such as Poi Day on Tuesdays and Farmer’s Market on Wednesdays, which creates a sense of place and an interesting place to visit.

A more successful program may also tailor its experiences to accommodate both local and outside visitors. While outside visitors may be interested in different experiences from local visitors, it is important to engage the latter in the activities of an organization. Local visitors contribute to the operation of an organization in different ways and may provide significant financial and organizational stability despite fluctuations in the tourism market. The weekly demand for poi at Waipā is from the local community which generates some financial revenues for the organization. Buying kalo from other local farmers for poi production, also helps stimulate the local economy and benefits communities locally. Therefore, strategies for engaging local visitors should be in place.
Infrastructure

In order to support host-visitor programs, a certain amount of infrastructure is necessary. Infrastructure refers to amenities that support the hosting experience such as electricity, access to potable water, toilets, accommodation, equipment for cooking, and transportation. These amenities determine how long visitors can remain on-site, therefore, infrastructure affects the quality and the type of activities that can be offered through the host-visitor program. Therefore, infrastructure is key to the ability of an organization to expand and diversify its program. As seen through the case study, organizations with limited infrastructure tend to focus on tours or short experiences that last a few hours while those with more amenities support a greater diversity of activities. Emerging enterprises might focus on establishing basic infrastructure such as electricity, access to potable water, and toilets, while more established enterprises might pursue accommodations and kitchen facilities to encourage visitors to stay longer.

A necessary amenity for host-visitor programs is a reliable transportation system. This is important particularly for isolated locales, to be able to take visitors to remote places. All organizations of the case study were located far away from the airport and from town and were not easily accessed by visitors on their own. Also, transportation enables access to weekly events such as the arrival of cruise ships, thus, taps into a steady supply of visitors that otherwise may not be available. A reliable transportation system, also allows an organization to create set timetables for hosts to plan their days more easily.

Labor

An adequate supply of skilled and good workers is necessary for a successful host-visitor program as they provide the labor to carry out a program. The experience of the case study
highlighted three main issues surrounding labor that are important but often underdeveloped: 1) the skill-level of workers, 2) compensation of workers, and 3) adequate number of workers. With the exception of Waipā the other three organizations of the case study had difficulty addressing these three areas which are associated with limited financial capacity to pay workers, provide training, and hire an adequate number of workers to carry out the work necessary to achieve organizational goals. Though the Ka Welina Network encouraged volunteer work exchange for experiences which also assisted organizations carry out their work, the findings of case study suggested that financially compensating workers adequately to secure their livelihood is a determining factor in the success of a host-visitor program.

The establishment of paid positions affords organizations workers who have time to devote to developing a host-visitor program. As a result, an organization can set goals and plan to act because workers are available to carry out the necessary work. Except for Waipā, the three other organizations of the case study lacked consistent workers, a likely explanation for why their host-visitor programs remained undeveloped. Though Waipā depends on a cadre of volunteer workers, the core employees of the organization were compensated financially, therefore, the work of the organization is accomplished whether or not volunteers are available.

Emerging organizations, particularly in remote locations, may also be challenged in finding workers who are adequately skilled and match the values and culture of the organization. The Ka Welina Network consisted of organizations with expert cultural practitioners in their areas of focus, but technical and administrative skills were often lacking or undeveloped. The Ka Welina Network acknowledged this limitation by providing short-term technical assistance to the group for planning, web design, and marketing. To address this need on a long-term basis, the network
proposed the creation of a paid position, collectively paid for by members of the network, to take care of the technical and administrative aspects of each organization. Therefore, emerging organizations may address labor challenges by forming networks with other entities and aggregate their resources to assist each other.

**Adaptive Management**

Adaptive management is a process based on the concept of learning through experience (Holling 1990), whereby lessons learned from an experience are used to improve upon current practices. Since small and emerging enterprises may have little experience in operating a host-visitor program, this process might be instrumental in their progress and development. Organizations of the case study regularly conducted evaluations through visitor surveys to provide feedback about the quality of their hosting activities to identify areas for improvement. To better inform this process and guide communities in evaluating their performance, each community defined what success meant for them to clarify the purpose of their work. Therefore, setting up a consistent method of evaluation, such as a short survey for visitors to fill out at the end of their experience, would provide feedback to improve a host-visitor program.

**Marketing and Web Interface**

Though marketing is achieved in a variety of ways, the internet has increasingly provided small Pacific Island states and communities within them the potential to disseminate information about tourism more accurately, quickly, and at relatively lower costs (Milne & Nowosielski 1997). This is important particularly for the isolated location of Pacific Islands and for organizations in remote locales. Web sites can provide detailed information that is more up to
date and accurately reflects programs that an organization may offer, as well as the culture and the people of a place. In addition, the internet offers smaller organizations opportunities to tap into a tourism market that has traditionally been dominated by metropolitan corporations who have significantly shaped tourist expectations with corporate advertising strategies (Levinson & Milne 2004). Also it is cheaper to use social media than it is to place an ad in a magazine or get into a tourist guide.

The Ka Welina Network pursued this opportunity by exploring a web-interface but their experience highlighted several challenges associated with this process including: 1) how to accurately disseminate information on-line so that visitors are correctly informed about the experiences offered and 2) having adequate technical skills to set up, maintain, and update a site. Though the Ka Welina Network tried to address these challenges by providing a network website and technical assistance to train Ka Welina members, ultimately, none of the members of the case-study utilized the web site largely due to the lack of trained staff. According to the marketing director of the Ka Welina Network, a consumer trend of accessing the internet from small hand-held mobile devices have increased, therefore, web sites must be less wordy and easy to navigate (Personal contact). Therefore, the marketing capability of an organization is dependent upon adequate infrastructure and workforce to meet rapid changes in technology and consumer patterns.

**Social Capital**

**Relationships**

Relationships with people and place are central to Pacific Island cultures, and are at the core of a values-based host-visitor program. In all four organizations of the case study, each
organization had strong ties with a local community and the goals of the organizations often surrounded building the capacity and well-being of local communities nearby. Thus, the organizations could call upon their relationships with others in the community to assist with the hosting of visitors. The presence of many community volunteers at Waipā Foundation is evidence of the value of these relationships. Waipā Foundation, nurtured this relationship by regularly hosting events to thank and acknowledge volunteers. Therefore, small, emerging, community-based organizations with limited resources might consider investing in building and maintaining strong and trustworthy relationships with local communities.

**Shared Norms**

Similarities unite people and create more ideal conditions for collaboration, therefore, identifying and establishing shared norms formally or informally among members of a community, is an important process (Ostrom 1990; Singleton 2002). The Ka Welina Network created a long-term conceptual plan with a vision, a mission, values, guiding principles, and goals that were determined collectively to guide the modus operandi of the group. Regular network-wide meetings were held for members to meet, share experiences, learn from each other, and support each other’s endeavors. Though relationship-building processes such as these may take time, it is an important step and investment in future collaboration. Thus, the establishment of networks with like-minded entities, and implementing activities to nurture relationships, are strategies that organizations might adopt to improve their likelihood for success.
Leadership

Another key attribute of a successful values-based host-visitor experience is the presence of good leadership to ensure project sustainability (Mitchell and Reid 2001). Leaders must believe in the work that they do and be connected to the local community (Baland and Platteau 1996; Singleton 2002). Program development may take an extended period of time, therefore, good leadership to guide growth in the right direction is key. Continuity in leadership over time fosters growth and buffers against the impact of changing internal environments that may occur within an organization temporally. Leaders must also be innovative, open to exploring new ideas, and willing to take risks. The diversification of the host-visitor program at Waipā reflected leadership that was willing to explore new ideas which led to the creation of Waipā’s festivals, the most lucrative of its host-visitor program. Leaders must also be available, approachable, and have time to work with other members of the organization and address issues that arise. As highlighted in the case studies, frustrations with leadership affected internal organizational relations and performance.

Financial Capital

External Sources

The findings of the case study showed that financial capital is a critical element of a successful host-visitor program. Many non-profit organizations depend on grants and aid donations for financial support but these sources are usually temporary and often come with many stipulations. They are also not always consistent as grants end and aid is dependent on the goodwill of others. In addition, grant applications are often time-consuming, require a certain degree of skill and management, and funding is never guaranteed. Grants and aid might generate
revenues to facilitate the operation of a program but it is challenging to plan the long-term sustainability of an organization on such sources alone. Therefore, creating a financial structure to generate revenues internally from within an organization is an important aspect of ensuring long-term sustainability. Within the case study, Waipā Foundation received financial support from Kamehameha Schools annually to support education programs for youth.

**Internal Sources**

Waipā Foundation differed from the other three organizations of the case study in that it was financially more secure. Though the organization received external financial support annually from Kamehameha Schools to carry out education programs for youth, as well as grant monies from other sources, Waipā also supplemented this income with fees collected from host-visitor programs, donations, and also non-monetary exchanges like labor for an experience. The diversification of its host-visitor program created significant financial opportunities, such as its festivals, which bodes well for the organization’s financial future as it hones its host-visitor program. The organization could expand because of the financial means to pay its workers, hire an adequate workforce, and build its infrastructure, such as a new community kitchen that would bring new opportunities.

Therefore, developing a financial structure to generate revenues internally is important. Revenues generated from fees from a host-visitor program may not on its own be sufficient to cover the operating costs of an organization, but it is one strategy to generate revenues internally. Though cultural practitioners may be hesitant to charge fees for their host-visitor programs for fear of exploiting their culture, having adequate funds to cover operating costs is necessary for organizational survival. Waipā Foundation dealt with this situation by charging enough to cover
their costs but kept fees affordable for visitors. To achieve this, understanding an organization’s operating costs is critical and administrative and managerial skills are necessary to keep accurate accounting of business transactions. Organizations might also experiment with the prices they set to ensure that they are reasonable for their target audiences.

**Institutional Arrangements/ Governance**

Though small communities with shared norms have been noted as precursors for successful community-based operations (Ostrom 1990) Agrawal and Gibson (1999) acknowledge the multiple interests and actors within communities and how these actors influence decision-making. In light of this heterogeneity, Argawal and Gibson (1999) emphasize the importance of the processes through which these actors interrelate and the institutional arrangements that structure their interactions. Institutions are defined as formal and informal rules and norms that shape these interactions, therefore, who exercises the authority to make the rules, as well as the content of the rules, are critical. Rules must be simple and easy to understand, locally devised, have low cost adjudication, easy to enforce, and a system of enforcement (Baland and Platteau, 1996; Ostrom 1990, and Wade 1988) According to Arnstein (1969), greater participation in the decision-making process, such as rule-making, is associated with greater success. Therefore, rules might be more effective with greater participation in rule formation from all members of the community involved.

Within a host-visitor program, rules or protocol for how visitors should engage with hosts, as well as rules that visitors must adhere by while participating in a program, are necessary. This process is important considering cultural differences and way of doing things that visitors bring and who may not be familiar with local customs. A governing structure for members of a host community, should also be instituted. Community-based initiatives that are deeply embedded in
cultural values might benefit from incorporating customary norms that community members understand and are familiar with, for example, the traditional form of conflict resolution known as ho‘oponopono, often practiced by many Native Hawaiian communities.

**External Environment**

The conditions mentioned previously involve the internal operations of an organization but an organization’s external environment is also important as hosts interact with visitors in the larger context of tourism (Ostrom 1992; Wade 1988). The external environment is defined in this section as visitors and other major entities in the tourism industry, such as the government and the private industry. The limited capacity of small emerging organizations may be more easily affected by its external environment compared to more established organizations. Therefore, this section highlights situations, practices, and approaches that small emerging organizations might consider to improve their likelihood of success.

**Visitors**

Visitors provide the basis for a host-visitor program, therefore, the number of visitors, the type of visitors, and experiences they seek, greatly shapes a program. Thus, fluctuations in the visitor industry may significantly affect business operations due to dependence on visitors. However, small emerging organizations can adopt strategies to buffer themselves against these effects to build their capacity for long-term self-sufficiency. The efforts of the Ka Welina Network, the case study, and other examples in Hawai‘i, highlight the importance of the profile of a visitor to the success of host-visitor programs. Therefore, paying attention to the type of visitor that may be interested in host-visitor experiences and those who help accomplish the goals of an organization most effectively, is important. This means having a better understanding
of potential visitors, creating diverse and interesting strategies to engage them, and creating marketing strategies that effectively reach target visitors.

A preference for local visitors from Hawai‘i and the Pacific, Native Hawaiian, youth, and those interested in education was consistent among hosts of the case study. The interests of these visitors generally supported the goals of the host-visitor programs. Though outside visitors are also important target visitors for host-visitor programs, the interests of local and non-local visitors often differ, for example, outside visitors might find touring a lo‘i an exciting authentic experience while the same experience may not appeal to local farmers who plant taro for a living. Therefore, adopting and developing diverse strategies that engage both locals and non-locals are important. Waipā Foundation addressed this issue by providing different experiences for different target audiences such as: education programs for school children; a Farmer’s Market that appealed to everyone, particularly outside visitors to Hanalei interested in organically grown local food; poi production, as well as a community kitchen that would bring cooking classes and venues for local communities; and festivals that appealed to everyone.

Attracting local visitors to a host-visitor program is important. As discussed previously, local visitors bring different benefits to a program and they play an important role in perpetuating the local culture and special spaces necessary to support cultural practices. Local communities may also support a program economically in a variety of different ways that may alleviate dependence on an outside visitor industry, stimulate the local economy, and perpetuate local environmental as well as financial sustainability. This phenomenon was evident at Waipā Foundation where the local community created a consistent demand for poi and made up the majority of attendees at its annual kalo festival. Therefore, concerted efforts should be made to appeal to this population and
engage them in program activities. Incentives to engage participation from local communities include offering free or ‘kama‘aina’ opportunities that allow local people to identify with the organization and where they can feel valued and prioritized.

Attracting outside visitors is also important but challenging. People travel for different reasons and not all are interested in the types of experiences offered at host-visitor programs that emphasize culture and education. Therefore, marketing strategies that can target this segment of the visitor industry and accurately portray the experiences offered, are key. This area has not been fully explored by the Ka Welina Network yet but understanding the visitor profile of this segment of the visitor industry will inform how marketing strategies take form and which visitor countries to explore. Conversations around the general interest of Japanese visitors in hula and Hawaiian culture, European travelers, and older travelers, have surfaced as potential target populations but more research is needed to better understand target populations to develop marketing strategies more effectively.

**Government and Private Sector**

As discussed in Chapter 3, local governments can play a significant role in supporting local efforts to engage visitors in tourism in ways that further their self-sufficiency. Considering the many benefits that values-based host-visitor programs offer, members of the case study and the Ka Welina Network felt that the State of Hawai‘i needed to provide more support towards the network and other similar organizations. Though the State of Hawai‘i offers assistance to community-based organizations through its CBED program, it is unclear whether this resource is utilized by members of the Ka Welina Network. However, there is hope for future collaboration with the State of Hawai‘i as the vision of the State’s strategic plan for tourism in Hawai‘i for
2005-2015 is to: “honor Hawai‘i’s people and heritage; value and perpetuate Hawai‘i’s natural and cultural resources; engender mutual respect among all stakeholders; support a vital and sustainable economy; and provide a unique, memorable and enriching visitor experience (Hawai‘i Tourism Authority d.u. (b): 6).

Marketing and advertising is an area that small organizations like those of the case study can greatly benefit from through partnerships with other established agencies within the government and businesses in the private industry. Partnering with tour companies, hotels, and other established organizations within the visitor industry, might provide small organizations with a steady flow of visitors while at the same time, offering opportunities for visitors looking for more meaningful experiences. Brochures at hotel lobbies and links to host-visitor programs on the websites of other organizations are some examples of ways to utilize these partnerships. In the future, host-visitor programs might explore this option through a link on the Hawai‘i Tourism Authority website that could direct visitors and businesses to these organizations. A network that could act as a point of contact for ‘āina-based organizations like the Ka Welina Network, might be an effective avenue to connect small organizations with limited resources. Therefore, banding together with other small community-based organizations through networks such as the Ka Welina Network, strengthens the assets and voice of small communities, creating more opportunities to attain assistance from and develop partnerships with other entities.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

This research was a quest to understand how some indigenous ‘āina-based organizations engage with tourism strategically to enable them to continue working towards sustainable self-determination in Hawai‘i. The experience of the Ka Welina Network and the findings of this research indicate that a values-based host-visitor model for engaging visitors may be a promising model for such communities. However, implementing an indigenous values-based model to share cultural traditions meaningfully with visitors within the context of a larger capitalist-driven society, is fraught with a variety of challenges and contradictions. I studied these struggles at the level of the organization and focused on how cultural practitioners must deal with the business of making money to sustain organizational survival, while also remaining true to their Native Hawaiian values, goals, and way of life, projects that are often at odds with each other. In this conclusion I review key findings from the research in order to assess other Pacific Island nations, such as Tonga, where my father has an emerging eco-tourism business, might integrate the lessons learned from Hawai‘i. How can other Pacific Island communities strategically engage with the visitor industry in ways that do not compromise culture and their core values in the process?

A Conceptual Values-Based Host-Visitor Model For Visitor Engagement

Though the custom of hosting and visiting in the Pacific has been described previously, we re-visit this concept briefly to distinguish the fundamental differences between a values-based host-visitor model and modern tourism which include: (1) the purpose of the act of hosting and visiting; (2) the medium that drives the exchange; and (3) how hosts and visitors are positioned relative to each other. In Hawai‘i, the custom of hosting and visiting is referred to as mea hoʻokipa or things relating to hospitality, guided by the values of ‘ohana, aloha, kuleana, and
mālama. Visitors are treated by hosts like members of their own family and visitors reciprocate by exerting minimum burden on the host, respecting household rules and norms, and helping with household chores. The relationship is one of mutual respect and of reciprocity. Under this framework, hosts and visitors are positioned equally and placed laterally to each other to reflect this relationship of equal power, as shown in Figure 20.

Figure 20. Pacific Custom of Hosting and Visiting - Reciprocity

The culture of modern tourism, on the other hand, has disrupted the nature of this relationship, excluding cultural norms of visiting and hosting from the process. Over the last half century, a corporate tourism industry developed that dramatically transformed the customary traditions of hosting and visiting in Hawai‘i. Modern tourism culture is concerned with economic development which is based on the premise that visitors pay for the service of being hosted. Whereas previously, the business of visiting and hosting was based on a customary relationship
of mutual respect and reciprocity between host and visitor, the introduction of money into tourism, changed the interaction from a relationship of reciprocation to a transaction relationship of money exchange. Under this concept of tourism, the balance of power shifts to the visitor, altering the relationship between the host and visitor. This translates into newly defined expectations of behavior for both the visitor and host and how they relate to each other. The visitor assumes that they are entitled to being pampered and that they can do as they please while hosts are expected to ‘tend to their beck and call’ and provide exceptional service and authentic experiences.

Figure 21. Tourism Custom of Hosting and Visiting- Transaction of money exchange

Visitors in the modern tourism model in Figure 21 are graphically placed above hosts to illustrate the power dynamics of visitors’ interests and well-being being prioritized over hosts. In
this model, linear arrows between the visitor and host are used to represent monetary transactions for service that suggests a clear and rigid beginning and end to that relationship. In contrast, arrows between the values-based host-visitor model are curved to reflect the more flexible and malleable nature of relationships of reciprocity. Rooted in values such as ‘ohana, aloha, kuleana, and mālama, relationships of reciprocity are intangible and difficult to quantify. Thus, this relationship is better represented by curved arrows compared to the fixed and quantitative valuation of money.

The value of ‘ohana to the hosting and visiting experience, is reflected through the case study in host tendencies to offer free experiences to Native Hawaiians, local residents of Hawai‘i, and other Pacific Island visitors while they were more inclined to charge visitors from outside the Pacific a monetary fee. Hosts of all organizations expressed a general pattern of visitor preference in the following order from highest to lowest preference: Native Hawaiians, residents of surrounding communities, residents of the island, residents from Hawai‘i, Pacific Islanders, then visitors from outside the Pacific. This preference is illustrated in Figure 22 with the darkest shades representing Native Hawaiians from the place of the site visited which correspond to the type of visitor most preferred by hosts. This preference decreases in color with distance from place. Visitors in the white shaded area in Figure 22 correspond to visitors outside of Hawai‘i and are the least preferred visitors.

Cultural practitioners of the case study expressed a desire to create a sliding fee schematic that does not charge Native Hawaiians, local people, and Pacific Islanders (shaded regions of Figure 22) for these experiences. The motivation behind this preference is likely an extension of the concept of ‘ohana that is central to Native Hawaiian and Pacific Island culture, as expressed by Keikialoha Kepiki. In the Pacific, ‘ohana is the foundation of one’s existence and taking care
of one’s ‘ohana is a core value. ‘Ohana represents one’s heritage and relatedness genetically but also in the shared customs embodied in one’s culture which is usually demarcated spatially. Hosts of all organizations expressed a general pattern of visitor preference in the following order from highest to lowest preference: Native Hawaiians, residents of surrounding communities, residents of the island, residents from Hawai‘i, Pacific Islanders, then visitors from outside the Pacific. This preference is illustrated in Figure 22 with the darkest shades representing Native Hawaiians from the place of the site visited which correspond to the type of visitor most preferred by hosts. This preference decreases in color with distance from place. Visitors in the white shaded area in Figure 22 correspond to visitors outside of Hawai‘i and are the least preferred visitors. Thus, those living in closer proximity to each other geographically, are more likely to share more similarities and sense of ‘ohana than those living further away. Therefore, visitors from outside the Pacific are less likely to share the same heritage and are outside the concept of ‘ohana which may explain why hosts are okay with charging outsiders monetarily.

The case study suggests that the preference for visitor type may also be a function of the likelihood of the visitor to contribute and give back to the purpose of the host organization. As Lynda Tu‘a pointed out, those living in a place will care most about that place, stimulating stewardship tendencies. This assumption motivates organizations in the case study to focus on education and prioritize Native Hawaiians and local residents. Though practitioners may not gain monetarily and immediately from the exchange with local people and those living nearby, the exchange is an investment in this target population by building relationships and capacity through education. The benefits of this investment may be long-term, expressed in the form of altered behavior that perpetuates cultural knowledge and protects special places. This type of
exchange is less likely with visitors outside the Pacific. However, visitors outside the Pacific may still contribute to stewardship practices but on a more global level rather than locally.

Figure 22. ‘Ohana value at core of visitor preference of hosts

In addition, the case study showed that hosts’ decisions on how much to charge visitors for experiences may not only be affected by who the visitor is in terms of their cultural heritage and place of origin but also the purpose of the visit, as well as the ability of a visitor to pay. Hosts of the case study were less inclined to charge visitors who visited for educational purposes compared to those who were on vacation and visited for leisure. Similarly, hosts were also willing to forgo monetary payment for those who could not afford, thereby prioritizing the goal of education over making money. As noted above, these financial decisions have significant impacts on the fiscal sustainability of the organizations. Although hosts expressed certain kinds
of preferences, they often had to make decisions based on economic need rather than preference. These preferences are depicted in Figure 23 which highlight a fundamental difference with tourism where the price for goods and services are fixed regardless of who the visitor is, the purpose of their visit, and their ability to pay.

Figure 23. Factors that cultural practitioners felt should be considered when charging visitors

Considering the value of ‘ohana in this model, particularly in relation to place, ‘āina-based programs of this nature might consider developing their fee structure around the spatial units presented in Figure 22. Thus, the relationship between an organization and those in the shaded regions, represented by Native Hawaiians, Pacific Islanders, and residents from a place, might be strengthened and encouraged by waiving or providing discounted entry fees for this population or dedicating a certain day out of the week or the month to them where they can visit the organization free of charge. The Limahuli Botanical Gardens in Kaua‘i, for example, recognize and acknowledge the importance of local people by offering a free kama‘āina (local) day for local residents on Saturdays. A similar scheme could be developed with visitors with educational
interests and those who cannot pay, through a labor exchange program. As discussed earlier, although entry fees may be waived for these groups of people, they may give back to the organization in other ways that are not always measured monetarily. Revenues can continue to be generated by outside visitors through regular entry fees to participate in an organization’s programs.

**Meaningful Experiences and Transformational Change**

Providing meaningful experiences is a distinguishing aspect of the values-based host-visitor model. The term “meaningful” experiences was used to reflect the type of host-visitor exchange offered by the Ka Welina Network and the case study which were commonly manifested through sharing and “learning by doing” or experiential learning. According to Kolb (1984:38), “learning is a process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience.” Kolb posits that learning is cyclical and involves four stages which he refers to as concrete experience (CE), reflective observation (RO), abstract conceptualization (AC), and experimentation (AE) as shown in Figure 24. The four-stage model portrays how the experience of doing something in CE is translated through reflection (RO) into concepts (AC) that act as guides for active experimentation and new experiences (AE). This same cycle of learning can be applied to experiences in a host-visitor program which rests on the premise that genuinely sharing cultural knowledge with visitors result in meaningful experiences that may alter the state of mind of visitors and lead to transformational change.

Kolb’s cycle of learning may be applied to hosts sharing with visitors their way of life (AE), such as visitors helping a kalo farmer plant kalo. Through the experience, visitors learn what it feels like to plant kalo through a concrete experience. During that time, visitors may be absorbing a significant amount of sensory information from the surrounding environment that
may add to the experience of learning about the culture and the place, achieving RO. These experiences might include the feel of the sun, the mud beneath their feet, the feel of the makani (wind) on their face, the sound of rustling leaves as the breeze makes its way through the trees nearby, conversations with hosts, and observations of their interactions with others while working.

Figure 24. Kolb’s model of experiential learning

The cumulative impact of CE and RO may lead to AC in Figure 25, resulting in an altered state of mind of greater awareness and appreciation. As seen through the case study, cultural practitioners reported that the experiences often left visitors filled with awe and wonder as their senses are awoken. Perhaps these experiences lead to transformational change within visitors of wanting to contribute and give back for the experience which may manifest in actions (AE) that give back to host communities. In addition to paying a fee for the experience, visitors may give back in a variety of different ways, that help build the capacity of communities. The most common ways that visitors have contributed have been through money donations; recommending a program to friends and family; volunteering to restore and maintain the environmental and
cultural resources of places; assisting organizations with necessary work; adopting more respectful and appropriate behavior towards other people and resources; developing relationships and friendships with hosts; and returning to visit. Through these actions, visitors help organizations build the capacity of their places through volunteer work, build organizational capacity through word of mouth advertising and providing labor; build social capital through relationship-building; add to financial capital through donations; and improve governance due to more culturally-appropriate behavior. The satisfaction of visitors with these types of experiences reflects well on Hawai‘i and in turn, may lead to greater support from government and private entities that create a more favorable external environment to work within.

Figure 25. Feedback Mechanism of A Values-Based Host-Visitor Model

Another direct benefit that a values-based host-visitor model in Figure 25 does not reflect is the temporal effect of hosts being able to practice their traditional customs through sharing them with visitors. Spending time to share their traditional practices and knowledge with visitors,
allows hosts to spend time carrying out activities that build their own capacity for self-
determination. As presented by Cortassel (2008:106) and Taiaiake (2005), remembering and
carrying out traditional cultural practices and knowledge, is necessary for indigenous people to
assert visions of self-determination on their own terms. The ability of a host to create set hosting
schedules at their convenience, also provides opportunities for better time management.
However, the experiences that hosts share with visitors should be limited to those that they are
comfortable in sharing with outsiders.

Figure 26. A Tourism-Based Model, Not a Feedback Mechanism

In contrast to the values-based host-visitor model presented in Figure 25, modern tourism
does not produce the same feedback mechanism that helps maintain the integrity of host
communities and place, depicted in Figure 26. Instead, when the foundation of tourism is
economic development and the end result is monetary profits, visitors are less likely to
experience transformational change because most often, information about culture and place
provided by hosts is staged and superficial. These types of experiences are commonly seen at resorts and hotels offering entertainment dance performances and Hawaiian lū’au. Thus, applying Kolb’s model of learning to tourism of this type, the experiences in CE may be leisure-oriented emphasizing entertainment activities that are more often self-centered rather than educational and informative about the culture and place of others.

Among the case study for this research, educational workshops offered by the Ka Welina Network about the value of providing meaningful experiences among cultural practitioners helped practitioners be more conscious about the way that they hosted. Mahealani Cypher expressed that greater awareness derived from these workshops changed the way that she hosted from conducting tours to offering more meaningful experiences through sharing and teaching. Therefore, periodic workshops of this type to remind hosts of the value of their work, may assist in countering the “staged performance” dilemma. Also, being in touch with others doing the same type of work regularly, as expressed by Kalen Kelekoma, helped practitioners be more conscious of their work and their actions. Thus, networking with other similar organizations, formally or informally, assist hosts maintain their vision towards achieving their goals of sustainable self-determination.

Thus, a values-based host-visitor model reflects a management system that feeds back to maintain the health and integrity of the host community, culture, and place. In theory, tourism that resembles this model has the potential to create a win-win situation between visitors and host communities leading to more positive experiences associated with tourism in Hawai‘i. However, more research to understand the relationship between meaningful experiences, transformative change, and feelings of wanting to give back to host communities is warranted to further develop this idea. While the prospects of this concept is promising, attention also needs to
be paid to the delivery of meaningful experiences to ensure that hosts do not fall back into the dilemma of providing “staged performances” (Tengan 2008).

Thus, a values-based host-visitor model appears to be a management system that feeds back to maintain the health and integrity of the host community, culture, and place. In theory, tourism that resembles this model may create a win-win situation between visitors and host communities leading to more positive experiences associated with tourism in Hawai‘i. However, more research to understand the relationship between meaningful experiences, transformative change, and feelings of wanting to give back to host communities is warranted to further develop this idea. While the prospects of this concept is promising, attention also needs to be paid to the delivery of meaningful experiences to ensure that hosts do not fall back into the dilemma of providing “staged performances” as experienced by the men of the Hale Mua in Ty Tengan’s work. While men of the Hale Mua pursued sustainable self-determination through the re-enactment of cultural traditions, they struggled to differentiate performing for themselves and performing for tourisms through their performances at Pu‘ukoholā.

Among the case study for this research, educational workshops offered by the Ka Welina Network about the value of providing meaningful experiences among cultural practitioners helped practitioners be more conscious about the way that they hosted. Mahealani Cypher expressed that greater awareness derived from these workshops changed the way that she hosted from conducting tours to offering more meaningful experiences through sharing and teaching. Therefore, periodic workshops of this type to remind hosts of the value of their work, may assist in countering the “staged performance” dilemma. Also, being in touch with others doing the same type of work regularly, as expressed by Kalen Kelekoma, helped practitioners be more conscious of their work and their actions. Thus, networking with other similar organizations,
formally or informally, assist hosts maintain their vision towards achieving their goals of sustainable self-determination.

**Challenges**

*Financial Sustainability*

This research identified several challenges associated with implementing values-based host-visitor programs. These challenges are summarized in Table 9 but one of the most pressing challenges encountered by the case study, was achieving financial sustainability. Though monetary transactions were not a part of traditional Pacific Island cultures, this study showed that money is an important and necessary aspect of contemporary society in the Pacific. Financial sustainability is important because it builds the capacity to be independent through greater control over decision-making. From an organizational standpoint, financial sustainability allows organizations to be self-reliant and not dependent on outside entities to carry out an organization’s activities. This leads to the ability of an organization to establish and develop its own identity, which translates into the ability to choose projects and partnerships that align with organizational goals and values rather than being forced into commitments out of financial necessity, as seen through the experience of Waipā Foundation and its farm-to-table venture.

Tendencies to compromise values and ways of doing things begin to occur as organizations depend on outside entities for financial support, which often shifts decision-making power outside the organization. Therefore, maintaining organizational financial sustainability is critical to maintaining organizational identity and independence.

However, achieving and maintaining financial sustainability was one of the greatest challenges of the smaller organizations of the case study, due in part to a lack of business
expertise for valuating the cost of experiences and to fear among cultural practitioners of exploiting their culture by charging visitors for sharing their cultural knowledge and practices. This fear dissipated once practitioners understood the difference between financial sustainability and opportunistic exploitation for personal financial gain. As cultural practitioners of the case study understood that financial sustainability was dependent upon meeting basic operational costs necessary for organizational survival, they understood the necessity of charging visitors fees in exchange for experiences. This change in perception seemed tied to the idea that charging money as a means to carry out the work of perpetuating cultural knowledge and practices was acceptable while it was problematic to capitalize on cultural experiences for personal financial gain.

At the individual level, financial sustainability corresponds to compensating employees financially for their work and providing them with a livelihood to afford the cost of living in a capitalist society and maintain a good quality of life. Compensating hosts for the cultural knowledge they hold must also become a universal norm to recognize the value of traditional knowledge as equal to western knowledge. This action restores the value of culture and the assets of host communities as critical components of destinations. It also breaks down mentalities of colonial superiority over colonized territories. Restoring value to indigenous cultural knowledge and way of life through economic valuation, is a form of decolonization that builds the capacity and ideas of self-worth of indigenous individuals and communities in capitalist terms.

Perhaps one of the greatest challenges for achieving financial sustainability while prioritizing individual and organizational values and purpose, is understanding the threshold of making just enough money to meet basic operational costs of a business without becoming obsessed about
making money. To achieve this, good financial management and administrative skills are necessary to understand this threshold. While a variety of strategies help people keep themselves in check and maintain self-awareness, having a supportive network of people, such as the Ka Welina Network, who share similar values and purpose, also helps serve this purpose, as expressed by Kalen Kelekoma. Kūpuna, alive and in the spirit world, also guide some practitioners, such as Mahealani Cypher, in staying true to their values, therefore nurturing familial and communal relationships is important. The support system provides guidance and inspiration to individuals and organizations that they are not alone in their endeavors and also learn from each other’s experiences. A network might also aggregate resources to support individual organizations with collective challenges, such as providing technical services such as financial advisors, website designers, and other issues that arise for members.

This research indicates that for ‘āina-based communities working towards sustainable self-determination by engaging with the tourism industry through a values-based host-visitor model that does not compromise values, the business of making money must never supercede individual, cultural, and organizational values and goals. Instead, lessons learned from Waipā Foundation suggest that the success of the organization was rooted in its ability to prioritize the values and goals of the organization over profiteering while at the same time, meet the organization’s operational needs and costs. To achieve this, small, emerging organizations working towards sustainable self-determination must understand the importance of charging fees for their host-visitor programs to generate internal sources of revenue, determine the operating costs of the organization, and base their visitor fees to cover those costs. This approach eliminates the element of cultural exploitation and allows organizations to focus on carrying out and developing their programs that reflect and perpetuate their core values.
Though the internet offers opportunities to attract more visitors to small, emerging organizations in remote locations (Harrison 2004), utilizing this resource effectively to meet the goals of a host-visitor program can be challenging as seen through the experience of the case study. In addition to the technical skills that are often lacking in small organizations and the ability to market and advertise a values-based host-visitor program accurately, the findings suggest that establishing a pre-existing relationship between hosts and visitors prior to the visiting experience whereupon visitors must be invited by hosts, might be limiting. The cross-cultural difference in expectations about how visiting is conducted between potential visitors and hosts of values-based host-visitor programs, might be a barrier that deter potential visitors from visiting. While a web-interface may enable hosts and visitors to make contact and form some kind of relationship prior to the visiting experience, this method of relationship-building may not be as effective in reality particularly when cultural practitioners are not tech-savvy. Also, more time spent in front of a computer takes away from time otherwise spent on carrying out cultural activities that perpetuates and encourages the idea of sustainable self-determination, which defeats the purpose of the host-visitor model.

Though the values-based host-visitor model is based upon Pacific customs of hosting and visiting that depend on pre-existing relationships between hosts and visitors with mutual understanding of cultural values by both parties, it is unclear whether a web-interface creates the same desired outcomes between hosts and visitors. Due to the commonly superficial nature of electronic exchanges, the process of establishing and building relationships between hosts and visitors may not be ideally represented by web-based interactions. Instead, the relationship-
The building phase might be better explored in person through a two-step process when visitors and hosts first meet. The first step might involve a short meet-and-greet orientation session where expectations are established and where visitors can decide whether they want to participate in a program’s activities. Visitors who want to participate might then proceed to step two where they might be formally invited by hosts to join and participate in the activities of the program.

The elimination of a relationship-building process from a web-interface might allow hosts to utilize the internet more effectively for advertising and attracting visitors to a program. This also eliminates the need for workers to constantly respond to e-mail enquiries in an environment that might already have limited capacity. Instead, host-visitor programs might allocate the time investing in developing more effective web-based advertising strategies that match and keep up with changing technology and visitor behavior patterns. These include simple, easy to navigate websites that appeal to fast-paced user-groups and captures the essence of a host-visitor experience at first glance, such as websites like Airbnb that advertises places to stay from local hosts in over 190 countries.

**Conditions for Organizational Success**

Based on the experience of the case study and on existing scholarship, small emerging community-based organizations face a variety of different challenges that stem from the limited resources and capacity of small organizations beyond financial sustainability and advertisement constraints (Zhao 2009). These challenges were discussed in Chapter 5 and formed the basis for the development of a list of conditions that small emerging organizations pursing a values-based host-visitor model might consider in the development of their host-visitor programs. Summarized in Table 9, these conditions include: capacity of place upon which hosting occurs; organizational capacity; social capital; financial capital; institutional arrangements; and the external
environment within which the community operates. While these are not the only conditions necessary for success, this list highlights important factors that may improve organizational performance. It is also important to note that a distinction must be made between established and emerging organizations as they are faced with different sets of challenges (Rogerson 2005). Generally, the former have had the time and resources to work out many of the challenges of starting a host-visitor program and may be more focused on fine-turning their product, improving their marketing strategies, and focusing on developing financial sustainability, while the list of conditions in Table 9 might be more applicable to emerging small community-based organizations.

**Collaborative Process**

The process or approach that organizations adopt to implement their work is vital to the function and sustainability of organizations (Slocum et al. 1995). This is particularly important when many entities are involved with a variety of different goals, interests, and values (Umemoto 2001). Host-visitor programs attract visitors from all over the world who come with diverse cultures, backgrounds, and expectations. Similarly, within an organization, staff may have different backgrounds and experiences. Being able to address this diversity within and outside an organization, necessitates focus on planning processes that build and maintain relationships, bridge gaps in information, communicate, reach consensus, and resolve differences among different stakeholders. Often, process is eliminated or forgotten and may be viewed as time-consuming and costly particularly if a project extends over a lengthy duration of time. However, though the process might be time-consuming initially, it plays a significant role in the long-term sustainability of a project and of an organization.
The process that the Ka Welina Network adopted in developing host-visitor programs for its members, might be instructive for emerging small community-based organizations wishing to pursue a host-visitor model. Organizations of Ka Welina went through a pre-planning and pre-assessment survey phase that addressed the different factors in Table 9, to assess whether they had the capacity to host and implement a host-visitor program. Communities that passed the pre-assessment phase continued on to develop a host-visitor program curriculum. The process was a community-based collaboration that took on an adaptive-management approach to continuously improve performance based upon experience. The process extended over several years, multiple phases, and integrated the ideas, knowledge, and experience of other Pacific Island communities from the South Pacific, communities throughout Hawaii, and experts in different fields. Forming a network with other similar organizations also provided support for small communities through aggregating their resources, learning from each other’s experiences, and providing moral support through the process.

In summary, a values-based host-visitor model is one that aims to restore equity to ‘āina-based communities working towards sustainable self-determination through meaningful exchanges with visitors where hosts can share their culture, history, and way of life with visitors in ways that preserves the cultural integrity and dignity of their communities and special places. At the same time, a values-based host-visitor model allows visitors to experience more genuine forms of the host culture while providing indigenous communities some economic benefits to sustain a lifestyle that would put them in daily contact with their traditional way of life in a way that comes naturally instead of staged. Visitors also have opportunities through these experiences to give back to host communities in various ways that help to maintain the integrity of that place. This type of visitor engagement is driven by a unique set of values and principles that build.
relationships, fosters education, preserves the integrity of culture and place, and strengthen community capacity instead of simply making money. This approach is intended to re-frame the relationship between hosts and visitors and change the way that people think about and benefit from tourism in Hawai‘i. Some may argue that the non-monetary foundation of a values-based host-visitor model is not tourism at all but something entirely different that deserves its own terminology.

**My Father’s Garden and Beyond**

The experiences of the Ka Welina Network in Hawai‘i and the findings of this research might be instructive for tourism development and visitor engagement in Hawai‘i and the greater Pacific. While the goals of my father’s business of economic development differs from the quest for sustainable self-determination towards the greater project of Ho‘oulu Lāhui or building of the Hawaiian nation by the Ka Welina Network community in Hawai‘i, all communities involved engage with visitors who impact the resources and life of small island communities with limited and unique resources. As such, the process of engaging with visitors is important to maintain and preserve the integrity of small Pacific Island communities.

In general, small Pacific Island countries like Tonga that are isolated from metropolitan business centers, depend heavily on tourism for economic development. As described earlier, one of the greatest challenges for my father’s small business was access to start-up funds to develop his business. Though loans are limited, they enabled him to begin his venture and a pension as a retired government worker provided some consistent financial support which are important particularly during the lull periods when tourism is slow. My father also explored other avenues of revenue generation such as grants for community projects and consultancy projects throughout the Pacific that utilizes his expertise and experience in agriculture. He
pursued a variety of different strategies outside of running his small business in a remote location, to sustain year-round financial stability.

Lessons from Waipā suggest that the development of strategies for greater engagement of local visitors, is an avenue that father might pursue more vigorously. Like Waipā Foundation, my father has the ability to explore food production to a greater extent. The success of taro and plantain chips sold through his business could be developed further that also stimulates the local economy, supports local farmers, and creates healthier food alternatives to imported processed food. Similarly, building small traditional Tongan fale in lieu of resort-style hotel accommodations common to mass tourism, might be more fitting for the natural environment surrounding my father’s garden. Offering traditional Tongan accommodations is also inexpensive, perpetuates the traditional art form, and can be incorporated into the botanical tour of how coconut leaves from the garden are utilized in Tongan culture. This strategy of offering traditional accommodations is well established and popular in Samoa and could be more widely adopted throughout the Pacific.

The ability to use local resources to shape the products offered through my father’s garden, as shown through the case study from Hawaiʻi, would allow him to continue to offer uniquely Tongan experiences that have little or no cost to produce. In the long term, development from within would allow him to generate revenues that would buffer him financially from fluctuations in the tourism industry. This approach, might also reduce the need to host large numbers of tourists visiting Tonga on cruise ships through staged dance performances and feasts that are time consuming and stressful to produce. In offering these types of experiences that come easily and naturally with also less impact on the natural environment, the hosting experience would be much easier, and generate year-round financial yields. As a result, my father and his workers
could continue making a living without compromising their customs and go to church on Sundays. By offering these types of experiences that are based on the resources of the place and strengths of the culture, visitors in turn, leave with a greater awareness of that place.

The value of a host-visitor model as a strategy for visitor engagement to the Pacific Islands has much potential. Approximately 60 percent of visitors to Hawai‘i are repeat visitors who have visited Hawai‘i more than once and are more likely interested in more meaningful experiences (Hawai‘i Tourism Authority n.d.(b)). Changes in touristic behavior as witnessed at Waipā Foundation over the last decade with visitors venturing out for more meaningful experiences outside of hotels and resorts, suggests that a need exists for a host-visitor model in places like Hawai‘i. It is my hope that this research may be useful in developing tourism approaches that are more suitable for the cultures and geographies of small islands that empower local communities and maintain the integrity of communities, cultures, and special places. The community process of forming the Ka Welina Network provided in this paper may also hopefully serve as a template for communities who may want to implement this type of venture.
**Appendix A: Glossary**

To highlight the various and complex meanings of Hawaiian words, the complete translations from Pukui and Elbert (1986) are used unless otherwise noted. Diacritical markings used in the Hawaiian words are the ‘okina (‘) and the kahakō (ā, ē, ī, ō, ū). The ‘okina, or glottal stop, is only found between two vowels or at the beginning of a word that starts with a vowel. A break in speech is created between the sounds of the two vowels. The pronunciation of the ‘okina is similar to saying “oh-oh.” The ‘okina is written as a backwards apostrophe. The kahakō is only found above a vowel. It stresses or elongates a vowel sound from one beat to two beats. The kahakō is written as a line above a vowel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hawaiian Word</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘ae</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahupua’a</td>
<td>Land division usually extending from the uplands to the sea, so called because the boundary was marked by a heap (ahu) of stones surmounted by an image of a pig (pua’a), or because a pig or other tribute was laid on the altar as tax to the chief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘āina</td>
<td>Land, earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alaka‘i</td>
<td>To lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aloha</td>
<td>Love, affection, compassion, mercy, sympathy, pity, kindness, sentiment, grace, charity; greeting, salutation, regards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aloha ‘āina</td>
<td>To care for the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘auwai</td>
<td>Ditch, canal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awa</td>
<td>The kava plant <em>Piper methysticum</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘eke</td>
<td>Bag, basket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fatongia</td>
<td>Duty, obligation in the Tongan language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hala</td>
<td>The pandanus or screw pine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hale wa‘a</td>
<td>Canoe house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haole</td>
<td>White person, American, Englishman, Caucasian; American, English; formerly, any foreigner; foreign, introduced, of foreign origin, as plants, pigs, chickens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hau</td>
<td>A lowland tree, <em>Hibiscus tiliaceus</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heiau</td>
<td>Pre-Christian place of worship, shrine; some <em>heiau</em> were elaborately constructed stone platforms, others simple earth terraces. Many are preserved today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hōlua</td>
<td>Sled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ho‘okipa</td>
<td>To entertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ho‘oponopono</td>
<td>To correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huaka‘i</td>
<td>Trip, journey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hula kahiko</td>
<td>Old ancient dance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ihu‘ohe</td>
<td>Nose flute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘imu</td>
<td>Underground oven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwi</td>
<td>Bone; carcass (as of a chicken); core (as of a speech). The bones of the dead, considered the most cherished possession, were hidden, hence there are many figurative expressions meaning life, old age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kahuna</td>
<td>Priest, sorcerer, magician, wizard, minister, expert in any profession. <em>Kāhuna</em>—plural of <em>kahuna</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kai</td>
<td>Sea, sea water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaiāulu</td>
<td>Community, neighborhood, village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalo</td>
<td>Taro, <em>Colocasia esculenta</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kamani</td>
<td>A large tree <em>Calophyllum inophyllum</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kama‘aina</td>
<td>Native-born, one born in a place, host; native plant; acquainted, familiar, Lit., land child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapu</td>
<td>Taboo, prohibition; special privilege or exemption from ordinary taboo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kīpuka</td>
<td>Variation or change of form as a calm place in a high sea, deep place in a shoal, opening in a forest, openings in cloud formations, and especially a clear place or oasis within a lava bed where there may be vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koko</td>
<td>Blood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>könane</td>
<td>Ancient game resembling checkers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku'i</td>
<td>To pound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuleana</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian land rights (common). Right, privilege, concern, responsibility, title, business, property, estate, portion, jurisdiction, authority, liability, interest, claim, ownership, tenure, affair, province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>külolo</td>
<td>Pudding made of baked or steamed grated taro and coconut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumu</td>
<td>Teacher, tutor. <em>Kumu hula, hula</em> teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kupuna</td>
<td>Elders (common). Grandparent, ancestor, relative or close friend of the grandparent’s generation, grandaunt, granduncle. <em>Kūpuna</em>—plural of <em>kupuna</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lā</td>
<td>The sun, day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lā’au lapa’au</td>
<td>Medicine (herbal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lau hala</td>
<td>Pandanuus leaf, especially used in plaiting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lei</td>
<td>Garland, wreath, necklace of flowers, shells, ivory, feathers, or paper, given as a symbol of affection; any ornament worn around the head or about the neck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo‘i</td>
<td>Irrigated terrace, especially for taro, but also for rice; paddy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loko i‘a</td>
<td>Fishpond (common).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lomilomi</td>
<td>Redup. of lomi; masseur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lua</td>
<td>A type of dangerous hand-to-hand fighting in which the fighters broke bones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mālama</td>
<td>To take care of, tend, attend, care for, preserve, protect, beware, save, maintain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maka‘āinana</td>
<td>Commoner, populace, people in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makai</td>
<td>Seaward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makana</td>
<td>Gift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mākua</td>
<td>Parent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mokupuni</td>
<td>Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘aloha ‘āina</td>
<td>To care for the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana</td>
<td>Supernatural or divine power, miraculous power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana‘o</td>
<td>Thought, idea, belief, opinion, theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mauka-makai</td>
<td>From the mountain to the sea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mea</td>
<td>Thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mo‘olelo</td>
<td>Story, tale, myth, history, tradition, literature, legend, journal, log,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yarn, fable, essay, chronicle, record, article; minutes, as of a meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(From mo‘o ʻōlelo, succession of talk; all stories were oral, not written).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mo‘opuna</td>
<td>Grandchild.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nā‘au</td>
<td>Intestines, bowels, gut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonu</td>
<td>Tongan word for for noni or the Indian mulberry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no‘ono’o</td>
<td>Thought, reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ohana</td>
<td>Family, to gather for family prayers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ōlelo no‘eau</td>
<td>Proverb, wise saying, traditional saying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oli</td>
<td>Chant that was not danced to, especially with prolonged phrases chanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in one breath, often with a trill at the end of each phrase; to chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa‘anga</td>
<td>Tongan currency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pahu</td>
<td>Drum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pāpale</td>
<td>Hat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pō</td>
<td>Night, darkness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>po‘e</td>
<td>People, persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pohaku o Kāne</td>
<td>Stone of the god, Kāne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pohaku wai</td>
<td>Water-carrying stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poi</td>
<td>Poi, the Hawaiian staff of life, made from cooked taro corms, or rarely breadfruit, pounded and thinned with water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pono</td>
<td>Goodness, uprightness, morality, moral qualities, correct or proper procedure, excellence, well-being, prosperity, welfare, benefit, behalf, equity, sake, true condition or nature, duty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pule</td>
<td>Prayer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puʻuhonua</td>
<td>Refuge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapa</td>
<td>Tongan for kapa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waʻa</td>
<td>Canoe, rough-hewn canoe, canoemen, paddlers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wahi pana</td>
<td>Storied place (common). Legendary place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wahi kapu</td>
<td>Sacred, forbidden place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B: List of Interview Questions

I. Interview Questions for Cultural Practitioners:

Demography

1. Can you tell me a little about yourself—where you come from, your family history, and how you are connected to this place?
2. Can you describe your profession and the kind of work that you do with your organization? Can you describe your kuleana as a cultural practitioner?
3. How did you become a cultural practitioner and what drew you to this type of work?
4. How much of your livelihood depends on the work that you do with _____?
5. On an average week, how much of your time is spent on this work that you do?

Perceptions of Native Hawaiian Culture

1. Do you consider yourself a Native Hawaiian? Why or why not?
2. Can you describe what it means to you to be Native Hawaiian?
3. Can you describe what Native Hawaiian culture means to you?
4. What draws you to this idea of culture being an important thing?
5. What aspects of Hawaiian culture are most important to you and why?
6. What aspect/s of Hawaiian culture would you like to be passed on to your children and grand-children? Why is it important to you that cultural information is passed on?
7. In any given week, what aspects of Hawaiian culture do you practice and how often? Are there certain parts of Hawaiian culture that you identify with more than others and why?
8. Are there cultural aspects that you don’t currently practice and would like to? What things limit you from practicing these other aspects of Hawaiian culture?
9. What are the values of traditional Hawaiian culture? What are the values that are most important to you and why?
10. Are there core characteristics (traits) that are essential to the Native Hawaiian identity?
11. Please rank these values in order of importance from most to least important.
12. How much are these values (in #11), (and the way people think about themselves as expressed in their relationships to others) tied to the physical landscape? Tied to livelihood?
13. How are these values (in #11) lived out in your everyday life?
14. Are these values only specific to Hawaii? Are these values tied to a place/are people as strict with these values elsewhere?? If so, how (in what ways) are they only specific to Hawaii? If not, how are they similar in other places?

15. Are you satisfied with your position as a Native Hawaiian doing the things that you do? Please explain.

**Authenticity**

1. Do you consider what you do in this work here to be authentic? Why? What does authenticity mean to you?
2. Is it important that other people experience authenticity in the work that you offer at _____? Why?
3. What’s unique about your organization? How is it different from other tourist experiences out there and what do visitors get out of their time with you that is most valuable in your eyes?
4. How do you see this work that you do as related to your family, community, Hawaiian culture, livelihood, individual well-being, and the environment?

**Ka Welina**

1. Can you describe your involvement with the Ka Welina Network?
2. Why is Ka Welina important to you? What is the significance of Ka Welina? What contributions do you see Ka Welina having to Hawai‘i?
3. How does Ka Welina differ from the prevailing tourism model in Hawai‘i?
4. Does your work at Ka Welina allow you to practice your traditional values and practices? If so, in what ways does it do that? If not, why hasn’t Ka Welina helped you do what you do?
5. Since you joined Ka Welina, how has the network impacted you or your work?
6. Can we talk a little about the website/long-term strategic plan? How have these affected your organization?

**Challenges**

1. Can we go over your Ka Welina plan from our long-term strategic plan and see what things have changed or not changed over the past year? What are the major challenges do you struggle with as an organization that stop you from reaching the goals you stated in your strategic plan?
2. You were involved in the process of beginning to develop the Ka Welina Netowrk. Can you share any insights you had about that process? What were things that happened that you liked or did not like? What are/were the main challenges do you see in developing such a network like Ka Welina in Hawai‘i? What resources, support, or steps were useful to you and what other resources, support, or steps do you see are crucial for something like this to work?
3. What challenges do you face on a personal level in the type of work that you do?
4. Your work involves the sharing of cultural resources and practices. In this exchange between you as a host and visitor, how do you ensure against the commodification of
culture in the work that you do? What makes you different from other ventures such as the Polynesian Culture Center?

5. In your strategic plan, you explained that talking about money and deciding a price for the experience you offer was uncomfortable. Can you tell me more about this experience and how it made you feel?

6. When a price is put on the exchange of your host-visitor experience, how do you balance culture as a commodity for economic development and culture as a living practice? How do you prioritize what is more important to you? How does this relationship with money affect your personal life?

7. Are there other parallels to this struggle around the tension between your culture and capitalism? How do you reconcile being an indigenous person in modern Hawai‘i?

Lessons Learned

1. Do you think it is possible for indigenous people such as yourself to participate in the tourism industry without the risk of “selling out”? How do you manage that? What are the challenges/obstacles you see that prevent indigenous people from “being themselves” in this economy of mass tourism?

2. Is the Ka Welina model feasible in Hawai‘i today? Please explain how you feel about this and the directions that should be taken.

3. What role does the government (city/state/federal) play in supporting the type of work that you do? Are they providing any/adequate resources or support to promote organizations such as yours? Please describe.

4. Are there any other insights, observations, or thoughts that you would like to add or share with me?

II. Interview Questions for the Planning Team:

1. Can you tell me a little about yourself—where you come from, your profession and the kind of work that you do?

2. Can you explain in your own words what the Ka Welina Network is and what it means to you?

3. Can you tell me more about when and how you got involved with the Ka Welina Network?

4. Can you describe in detail your responsibilities and the role that you played in the development of the network?

5. Did you achieve what you were tasked to do? If you did, please explain what success means to you? If you did not, why not?

6. What were the main challenges you faced in your work that you were tasked with for Ka Welina on an organizational level? On a network level?

7. What do you think are the challenges that people face in implementing the Ka Welina model?
8. How do you think the Ka Welina Network has impacted the organizations involved in this network?

9. What are your thoughts on the planning process that occurred in the development of the Ka Welina Network?

10. Looking back on your experience, what are lessons learned? How would you have done things differently?

11. What would be your advice to others who want to pursue community tourism initiatives like Ka Welina?

12. Looking into the future, in your belief, what are the next steps in the development of Ka Welina?

13. Do you think the Ka Welina model and the type of community-based tourism it represents is feasible in Hawai‘i? Why or why not?

14. What kind of resources, institutional arrangements, and supportive systems are needed to implement community tourism successfully in Hawaii?

15. How can the State/Federal/County governments, private industry, and non-profit organizations contribute to a more successful implementation of community tourism in Hawaii?

16. How would you describe the type of experience you had working with the different people, communities, and organizations through this process?
Appendix C: Consent Form

University of Hawai‘i

Consent to Participate in Research Project: Challenges of Indigenous Community-Based Tourism in Hawai‘i

My name is Angela Faʻanunu and I am a Ph.D. student at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa (UHM), in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning. My dissertation research investigates the challenges that many indigenous communities in Hawai‘i face in trying to participate in community-based tourism in Hawai‘i in a way that allows them to remain true to their values. I am asking you to participate in this project because you or an organization you are involved with actively participated in the Ka Welina Network.

Activities and time commitment: If you participate, I will interview you once in person, for approximately 2-3 hours. If you permit me, I will use a digital audio-recorder to record the interview so I can later type a written transcription at which point the audio recording itself will be deleted. You have the right to review or ask that I delete/destroy all or part of any recording of you at any time. If you do not wish to be recorded, I will instead take handwritten notes. At the end of your interview, you will be asked if there are any quotes or information that you provided that you wish to be excluded from this project. If you permit me, I would also like to take photographs of you and of your site to be included in this project. You have the right to refuse this request at any time.

Benefits and Risks: Participation in this research project is voluntary. There may be direct benefits to you in participating in my research project. The results of this research may be utilized to improve the operation of your organization. The results of this project might also help me and other indigenous communities in Hawai‘i better understand the challenges that indigenous communities encounter in participating in the current mass tourism industry in Hawaii, and how they can participate in ways that allow indigenous people to remain authentic. There is a possibility you may become uncomfortable or stressed by answering an interview question or questions. If that happens, we can skip the question. You may also withdraw from the project at any time.

Confidentiality and Privacy: I will keep all information from the interviews in a secured place. I would like to include your name and that of your organization in my dissertation and any other written materials or presentations on this project. However, if you prefer, you may also remain anonymous and disguise any other identifying personal information in my dissertation and any other written results or presentation. If you would like a copy of my final report, please let me know at the end of this interview or contact me at the number listed near the end of this consent form.

Questions: If you have any questions about this project, please contact me via phone (808) 227-8855 or e-mail (faanunua@gmail.com).
If you agree to participate in this project, please sign the following signature portion of this consent form.

**Signature(s) for Consent:**

☐ I agree to join in this research project. I understand that I can change my mind about being in this project, at any time, by notifying the researcher.

☐ I agree to have this interview recorded with a digital audio recorder. (optional)

☐ I agree to have pictures of myself and of my organization site taken for use in this project. (optional)

☐ I agree to have my name and that of my organization included in the write up of this project or presentations and written material for this project.

☐ I prefer to have my name remain anonymous in the write up of this project or presentations and written material for this project.

**Your Name (Print):** _____________________________________________

**Your Signature:** _____________________________________________

**Date:** _____________________________________________

**Email address:** ________________________________ (optional)
Appendix D: Assessment Survey

Community-based Host-Visitor Project

Planning Process for Pilot Projects

This list of pre-planning, self-evaluation, and visitor curriculum questions and issues were created with the intent of helping potential CBHV hosts to plan and get a better understanding of how you might proceed from here. Collectively thinking through and discussing the various options may help to start your project on a firm and unified foundation. There may be additional questions and issues you want to consider including depending on your particular situation or location.

Pre-planning Process

1. Identify potential impacts of CBHV program (adopted from Guyette)

2. Goals for CBHV project consistent with your vision?
   a. Clarification of how the CBHV project might align with your community/organization’s vision, mission and goals.
   b. Anticipated outcomes of a CBHV project
      i. What are the most important outcomes for you?
   c. Anticipated expectations
      ii. What would you need to do to make your project successful?
iii. What would you need from the Pasifika team or other entities?

d. Reviewing the Self-Assessment and Visitor Curriculum questions and issues

iv. Who do you want to include in the process to discuss the questions?
v. What would the best process be in terms of meetings and activities to get the ideas and commitments needed?

Self-Assessment

a. Identifying goals and objectives of CBHV project for the organization or community

i. How can your CBHV project help you come closer to your vision, mission and goals?

ii. Are you interested in exploring alternative models for host-visitor exchanges, such as long-term hanai relationship with visitors? If so, what would you like to see grow out of these relationships over the next several years?

iii. What knowledge, skills, capacity does your community/organization/members want to gain through this project?

iv. What relationships do you want to build or strengthen through the project?

v. What resources do you want to preserve or grow?

vi. What tangible benefits do you want to see?

b. Project ideas

i. What would be open for sharing in terms of knowledge, cultural arts and traditions, resources, access to places, etc.?

ii. What kinds of activities do you have to offer?

iii. Who can share/host and what can each share?

iv. When and how often would you want to host?

v. Where will your activities occur?

vi. How would it be coordinated?

vii. What are possible itineraries that you would like to make available or to customize for visitors?

c. Distinguishing your CBHV project from mass tourism

i. Most of us live within the existing model of tourism. What does this look like in your community and how would your project be different?

ii. What do you dislike about tourism and how can you avoid those aspects in your project?

d. Invitations and requirements

i. Will visits be open to anyone? If not, how will the group decide who to host? If you have certain requirements, how would you like to screen potential visitors?

ii. After screening, how do you want to extend invitations to visitors?

iii. Do you have age, language, residency or other requirements for your potential visitors?

iv. What is the preferred duration for hosting visitors?

v. How many visitors can you accommodate while maintaining your lifestyle?

vi. Will visitors be housed? If so, what can you provide in the way of accommodations and sustenance?

vii. Is transportation needed? If so, how will it be provided?

viii. Will food be served? If so, what types of food and who can provide it?

ix. Are facilities needed and are they available?

x. Is equipment needed and is it available?
xi. Are there other logistics and infrastructure needs?

e. Reciprocity and what is needed
   i. In reciprocity to the host, what can visitors contribute? Choices may include physical and/or financial help with projects, exchange of ideas and knowledge, monetary compensation, reverse visits, etc.
   ii. How will any exchanges of services, donations, etc. be made?
   iii. Are you interested in alternative models of money exchange with visitors? For example, visitors cover the cost of their visit and then can contribute to a trust, co-op or non-profit organization, which uses the funds for community services and projects or to make loans or grants to individuals? What ideas do you have that might work for you?

f. Responsibilities and Protocols
   i. What are your rules of protocol as a host?
   ii. What are your rules of protocol for visitors?
   iii. What kapu applies to hosts?
   iv. What kapu applies to visitors?

g. Decision-making
   i. What entity will oversee the project?
   ii. Who will be responsible for decision-making?
   iii. How will decisions be made?
   iv. Who will coordinate the visits?
   v. What help will they need? Is needed help available?

h. Risk assessment and mitigation
   i. What are potential negative cultural impacts?
   ii. What are potential negative physical and natural resources impacts?
   iii. How might the project affect social relations within our community?
   iv. What may be the long-term impacts or unanticipated consequences?
   v. How can we address any of the above? Are there ways to avoid negative impacts?

i. Safety plan and liabilities
   i. Are there any safety risks? If so, what are they?
   ii. How can they be dealt with in a responsible way? Are there safety precautions that need to be made? If so, who will be responsible and how will risks be managed?
   iii. Is this activity covered by liability insurance? If not, what would this entail?

j. Feasibility assessment and business plan (non-monetary included)
   i. What are the social, material, economic, environmental or other costs?
   ii. What are the social, material, economic, environmental or other benefits?
   iii. Considering the above costs and benefits, is the project worth pursuing?
   iv. If yes, do you have a business plan or require assistance to create a business plan?

k. Evaluation metrics:
   i. What is your idea of a successful host-visitor experience?
   ii. Some of the issues you might want to consider in your evaluation process are included in the SSEPPTEE Impacts Model:
      a. Social
b. Spiritual

c. Economic

d. Political

e. Philosophic

f. Technical

g. Ecological/Environmental

h. Ethical

l. Assessment of legal requirements or political hurdles and strategies to address them
   i. Are there existing laws, legal requirements or political hurdles that potentially inhibit the success of your project?
   ii. What is the best way to get through the political process?

m. Conflict and problem-solving plan: hoʻoponopono
   i. What are possible problems or conflicts that may arise?
   ii. How will community conflicts and host-visitor conflicts be addressed?
   iii. Do you have people who can help mediate conflicts if necessary?

n. Learning community comprised of other projects
   i. How can we learn from each experience so we can continually improve the projects?
   ii. How can we build a learning community with other projects to share lessons?
   iii. Would you like to network with other Hawaii host communities?
   iv. Would you like to network with other host communities beyond Hawaii?

o. Marketing and web interface
   i. Would you like to share information about your community and your CBHV project on the Internet?
   ii. How do you want to present your organization or entity and what information and images do you want to make available to the public?
   iii. Would you like potential visitors to share what they are seeking from you?
   iv. What do we want to know about those who visit our site or receive our materials?
   v. How do you want to communicate with potential visitors and what kinds of information do you want to exchange?
   vi. What kind of web interface do we want for communicating, including making logistical arrangements and monetary or other resource exchanges?

p. Identify further resource and technical assistance needs
   i. What kind of assistance, if any, would be most useful as we proceed with the project?
   ii. Which people/organizations/community can you rely on for assistance as the project moves forward?
   iii. What do you need so that your project can become self-sufficient in the long-term?
   iv. Do you require financial assistance in order to proceed? If so, please explain.

q. Timeline
   i. When do you think you would be ready to get everything you need in place to host your first visitors?
The pre-planning and self-assessment sections will assist you in determining if you want to proceed with creating a CBHV project. If you have determined that you do want to create a CBHV program we suggest that you proceed with developing a personalized visitor curriculum for your program. For example, your visitor curriculum may include some of the following topics as listed below, as well as additional topics that you might want to include:

- History of the place
- History of your organization or family
- Description of activities you may want to offer
- Legends and stories you may want to share
- Books, photos, videos or archives you may want to share online or elsewhere
- The significance of what you are doing and why
- Important people, sites, and events in your community
- Types of initiatives you are trying to launch
- What protocols you expect your visitors to follow
- The needs of your community
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