

DECOLONIZATION THROUGH INDIGENOUS INQUIRY:
NA MO'OLELO OF INDIGENOUS GRADUATE AND POST-GRADUATE SCHOLARS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

EDUCATION

DECEMBER 2014

By

Brandy A. Sato

Dissertation Committee:

Patricia Halagao, Chairperson

Julie Kaomea

Margaret Maaka

Michael Salzman

Jonathan Osorio

Keywords: Hawaiian, Indigenous, Education, Decolonization, Storytelling

Abstract

Colonialism radically transformed Indigenous societies and cultures by causing great psychological, spiritual, racial, political, social, and economic trauma. Although this ensued through multiple colonial institutions, none were more insidious than education. Despite this, Native teaching and learning, especially Indigenous inquiry, grew over the last two centuries. This study described ten Native graduate students' and post-graduate scholars' decolonizing experiences, including my own. These decolonizing experiences detailed our use of Indigenous inquiry, our learning of Indigenous inquiry within the university curriculum, and our application of Indigenous inquiry to benefit our Native communities. The study's design encompassed Native research features, such as the Hawaiian methodology of ha'i mo'olelo (storytelling). I weaved the results of my study into a metaphorical Hawaiian 'upena (net) that contained powerful mo'olelo (stories) of how we decolonized our research by exploring our cultural identities; by receiving support in using Native inquiry approaches from mentors, advisors, professors, friends, and others; and by reflecting on the painful research journeys that forced us to seek Indigenous methodologies and methods. Furthermore, our mo'olelo described how we chose Indigenous inquiry because it was personally relevant and beneficial for our communities; we had distinct cultural lenses; and we received inspiration from our ancestors. When we applied these research processes, we included traditions, protocols, and references to our cultural histories; incorporated stories; and made connections between and among our stories. These mo'olelo showcased how the next generation of Native scholars embraced culturally inherent research approaches to benefit their Native communities and are now advocates for the decolonization of university curriculum.

Table of Contents

Preface	8
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	10
Overview of General Problem	10
Study Focus	11
Purpose of Study.....	15
Research Questions	15
Study Importance.....	16
Inquiry Framework.....	17
Inquiry Method	18
Summary of the General Problem	20
Chapter 2: Literature Review	23
Overview of Literature Review	23
Literature Selection Process	26
Literature Review Process	29
Literature Quality	33
Major Works and Substantial Findings on Colonization	36
From Indigenous to colonial education	36
<i>Indigenous education</i>	36
<i>Societal upheaval</i>	39
<i>Colonial education</i>	41
Psychology of colonization and decolonization.....	46
<i>Psychological effects</i>	47

Colonial education decimated Native psychology..... 51

Decolonization reclaims Native identity..... 57

Major Works and Substantial Findings on Indigenous Inquiry in Academia 58

 Indigenous inquiry grows within the academy..... 58

 Indigenous university programs are created..... 60

 Defining the field of Indigenous inquiry 61

 Dissertation based on Indigenous inquiry 63

Summary of Literature Review 68

Chapter 3: Inquiry Framework 69

 Overview of Inquiry Framework 69

 ‘Ōiwi Framework and Paradigm 69

 Pono and Ho‘oponopono are Ontology and Axiology 79

 Hawaiian Epistemology 84

 Decolonizing Lens is Theoretical Perspective 89

 Summary of Inquiry Framework 93

Chapter 4: Methodology 95

 Overview of Methodology 95

 Indigenous Methodology 95

 Different types of Indigenous methodologies 97

 Role of Indigenous methodology in an Indigenous inquiry framework 97

 Promotes decolonization 98

 Benefits Native communities 99

 Indigenous Storytelling 99

Transmits and produces cultural knowledge 100

Role of Indigenous storytelling in an Indigenous inquiry framework 101

Place within Native communities 103

Decolonizes and emancipates Native Peoples 105

Differs from other methodologies and methods 107

Indigenous Scholars Use Storytelling in Research 109

Summary of Methodology 112

Chapter 5: Methods 113

 Overview of Methods 113

 Writing Style 114

 Primary Storyteller Kuleana 114

 Co-storytellers and Their Kuleana 115

 Profile of Co-Storytellers 117

 Relationships Between Storyteller and Co-Storytellers 119

 Authenticity, Credibility, and Relationality 121

 Indigenous Ethics 122

 Creating Mo‘olelo 123

 Dialogues and conversations 124

 Interactions with co-storytellers 126

 Actions following dialogues and conversations 127

 Mo‘olelo is decolonization 127

 Mo‘olelo is Indigenous knowledge 129

 Reflecting on Mo‘olelo 129

Different from Western-based analysis and interpretation 130

Indigenous reflective practices 131

Finding relationships in and among the mo‘olelo 134

Weaving together mo‘olelo 137

Sharing Mo‘olelo 138

Summary of Methods 139

Chapter 6: Mo‘olelo 141

Overview of Mo‘olelo 141

Learning About Indigenous Inquiry 141

 Exploring cultural identity..... 142

 Receiving support..... 146

 Struggling with Western approaches and the academy 150

Choosing and Applying Indigenous Inquiry 156

 Benefitting both the researcher and communities 157

 Possessing a distinct cultural lens..... 159

 Receiving inspiration from ancestors 161

 Including traditions, protocols, and history 162

 Making connections..... 164

Summary of Mo‘olelo 166

Chapter 7: Discussion..... 168

Overview of Discussion 168

Rediscovery and Recovery: Importance of Cultural Identity and Lens 168

Mourning: Decolonization of Storytellers Strengthened Indigenous Research Practices174

Mo‘olelo Decolonized Storytellers..... 176

Further Define Indigenous Inquiry 179

Dreaming: Promoting Indigenous Inquiry in the Graduate Curriculum 182

Study’s Limitations 183

Study’s Implications 184

Future Research 186

Summary of Discussion..... 187

Epilogue 188

References 190

Appendix A 196

Appendix B..... 209

Appendix C..... 218

Appendix D 227

Appendix E..... 233

Appendix F 242

Appendix G 251

Decolonization Through Indigenous Inquiry:

Na Mo‘olelo of Indigenous Graduate and Post-Graduate Scholars

Preface

As a woman of mixed ancestry, I feel immense pride in my uniqueness, yet insecure in identifying with my Hawaiian heritage because my family and educational experiences have privileged other cultures over my Indigenous culture. Although my parents shared an Indigenous heritage, neither of them learned the language nor practiced its customs or traditions. Their experiences during the twentieth century are illustrative of the familial disappearance of Indigenous languages, customs, and traditions similar to other Native Peoples around the world. This can be attributed to colonizing efforts that originated centuries before. Colonization is “both the formal and informal methods (behaviors, ideologies, institutions, policies, and economies) that maintained subjugation or exploitation of Indigenous Peoples, lands, and resources” (Wilson & Yellow Bird, 2005, p. 2). Colonial philosophies and behaviors are still perpetuated today through an educational system that privileges Western ways of knowing and being while ignoring and oftentimes discrediting Indigenous knowledge, customs, traditions, and language.

As an adult, I actively sought educational experiences to learn more about my Hawaiian customs and traditions as well as to strengthen my Native identity. However, I was not always interested in exploring this side of my heritage. While growing up I received no familial encouragement and guidance, as that cultural connection was severed many, many years ago. My elementary through secondary schooling focused primarily on developing the intellect, deepening my understanding of Catholicism and growing in my relationship with God, learning the histories and sciences of Western Europe and the United States, accepting the responsibilities of American citizenship, and preparing to pursue worthy academic endeavors in college in order

to land a successful job capable of supporting a family and living the American dream. It wasn't until I was in graduate school, reading research and taking classes from Hawaiian and Indigenous scholars, that I realized I lived a colonized life. My family's upbringing reflected a history of colonization. The elementary and secondary educational system we all graduated from taught colonial knowledge and beliefs as well as the language of the colonizer.

I also found this true in my undergraduate experience at the university. The classes I took did not teach Indigenous paradigms, ontologies, epistemologies, axiologies, theoretical perspectives, or research methodologies. I only became aware of this emerging field in graduate school as a doctoral student in the department of curriculum studies. It was during this time in my formal education that I became extremely interested in studying Indigenous research within an educational context. However, I noticed that the majority of my graduate classes still taught and privileged Western quantitative and qualitative knowledge and research approaches that were at odds with my and other classmates' Indigenous cultures. When I chose to approach my doctoral dissertation using Indigenous research principles, I struggled mightily. This dissertation is a testament to my challenges in applying Indigenous research approaches to my study.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

I believe my personal struggle through my many years of formal schooling, whose curriculum indoctrinated me in a Western paradigm and Eurocentric concepts of knowledge acquisition for the purpose of maintaining the neocolonial status quo in academia and the world, originated from the lingering effects of colonization.

Overview of General Problem

Colonialism radically transformed Indigenous societies and cultures by causing great psychological, spiritual, racial, political, social, and economic trauma. There are two types of colonialism: external and internal. External colonialism refers to the expropriation of aspects of the Indigenous world for the benefit of colonizers and often involves military colonialism (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Internal colonialism is the bio-political and geo-political management of people and land within the borders of an imperial nation (Tuck & Yang, 2012). The United States operates through both forms of colonialism (Tuck & Yang, 2012). In Hawai‘i, this colonialism literally and figuratively changed traditional society and culture in less than three generations (Osorio, 2002). It established long lasting political, economic, and social systems and institutions based on Western ideas and values that adversely affected the cultural fabric of Hawaiian society (Osorio, 2002). What happened here in Hawai‘i also occurred to other Indigenous Peoples around the world. Although globally Natives fought against colonialism through a variety of peaceful and violent means, it overwhelmingly subsumed their bodies, minds, and souls, eventually stripping them of their rights as Indigenous Peoples (Wilson & Yellow Bird, 2005). The biggest colonizing weapon was the “cultural bomb” (Ngugi, 1986, p. 3). It attacked the very identity of Indigenous Peoples, leading to the disregard of Indigenous names, languages,

environments, and heritages (Ngugi, 1986). Although this psychological warfare ensued through multiple colonial systems and institutions, none were more insidious than education, the schools and the universities that were responsible for shaping the very being of our children, adolescents, and young adults. Today, education continues to play a major role in the perpetuation of colonialism (Dei, 2012; Grande 2008; Wane, 2013) and it must be decolonized (Grande, 2008; Wane, 2013).

“Decolonization is the meaningful and active resistance to the forces of colonialism that perpetuate the subjugation and/or exploitation of our minds, bodies, and lands.

Decolonization is engaged for the ultimate purpose of overturning the colonial structure and realizing Indigenous liberation” (Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012, p. 3)

Study Focus

Indigenous scholars identified numerous challenges within educational institutions, particularly in the university, that perpetuate colonization and prevent the decolonization of academia (Alfred, 2004; Cruz, 2012; Swadener & Mutua, 2008; Wane, 2013; Wilson, 2004). The university, synonymous with the academy, continues to be a bastion of Whiteness. Indigenous scholars feel they need to compromise their culture and values upon entering the university or conducting research within the academy. They struggle with the academy's need for constant translation of their Indigenous research approaches into forms that are more acceptable to the perpetuation of the status quo. Some are conflicted by differing expectations from academia, the community, and others. Although many academics challenge the status quo, others unfortunately succumb to the pressures. Furthermore, Indigenous scholars are struggling with these challenges early in their academic careers, even upon entrance into the university. All of these challenges to one's Native identity make it extremely frustrating for an Indigenous scholar to be successful in academia.

Indigenous scholars are asked to translate their Indigenous inquiry approaches into forms that are more acceptable to the perpetuation of the status quo. They have to translate into dominant languages, logics, and technologies while fighting misunderstandings. If the translations are too different from dominant practices it is viewed as not valued and if it is too similar it is perceived as not additive of Eurocentric knowledge systems (Andreotti, Akenakew & Cooper, 2011). This adds to the complexity of understanding and promoting epistemological pluralism. Thus the need for continued critical engagement in order to translate across the abyss and make epistemic blindness impossible (Andreotti, Akenakew & Cooper, 2011). Indigenous scholars also have challenges with theoretical positionings such as post-positivism, post-modern, and post-colonial positionings that have marginalized and diffused sites of contestation (Kovach, 2009). They struggle with attempting to explain an Indigenous epistemology to Western-trained minds because the worldviews are so different (Kovach, 2009).

There are differing expectations of Indigenous scholars from their Native communities, the academy, and others that create habitual confusion and inner turmoil regarding research actions. As a Native scholar, one has to re-negotiate one's identity, choosing between a Native identity and a research identity, that creates a turbulent relationship with academic research (Grande, 2008). The "autonomy" (p. 146) and "freedom" (p. 146) Indigenous researcher Cruz (2012) expected clashed with the university's expectations to submit theoretical, methodological, and institutional works that were complicit with the colonality of power and accepted ways of knowing, being, and doing. Hawaiian scholar Kaomea (2001) also wrote about her internal conflicts as she struggled to meet the expectations of the academy and her own community. The academy expected research to be theoretical, detached, objective, and intellectual whereas the community expected her to speak from experience, build relationships that were intimate and

enduring, and participate in vigorous activism (Kaomea, 2001). Smith (2006) acknowledged that researchers who use Indigenous methodologies are often marginalized from their institutions, disciplines, and research communities for conducting such research. This can have a negative effect on their careers and they struggle with differing expectations from their communities and peer-reviewed publications (Smith, 2006).

Indigenous scholars, graduate students and recent post-graduates in particular, acutely experience this phenomenon at such a formative time in their academic careers that it leads to immense frustration, untold suffering, and deep questioning of their choice to remain in an environment that questions their very essence and being. Post-secondary education for Indigenous Peoples used to be educating a Native in order to erase his or her culture and to get him or her to a certain level of Whiteness (Kovach, 2009). This reflected the historical trend of exclusiveness and inclusiveness, only to the benefit of the status quo (Kovach, 2009). Wilson (2004) recalled how it was challenging for her to reconcile her Dakota worldview and knowledge contained in oral histories with the history of the colonizer. At one point in her academic career, she considered leaving her graduate program. However, she remained in order to be that Indigenous voice, to break down the barriers that allowed scholars in her field of history to dismiss Indigenous language, voices, and stories (Wilson, 2004). Kovach (2009) interviewed Cam Willet, Cree from Little Pine First Nation, about her experiences with inquiry. Willet replied, “first year you’re learning all this Western stuff, reading all these books that don’t have anything Aboriginal, and you’re the only Aboriginal person in these classes with no Aboriginal faculty. You start to feel alone” (p. 119).

Indigenous scholars have different experience with academia. Some Native scholars felt they needed to acquiesce to the colonial system in order to maintain their status and continue

their work within the academy. They play a role in perpetuating colonialism. They are unprepared to address it within the university. They insulated themselves in the academy. This is different from others who want to transform the university (Alfred, 2004). Cruz (2012) addressed those who are complicit by describing how they are wrapped up in this system and how they just do enough to display their indignation, but not enough to really rock the boat when it comes to decolonization and knowledge production. These accommodating Natives are powerless. They require survival strategies to persist yet do not want to lose the measure of the “good life” (p. 150) as seen on the television (Cruz, 2012). This is a painful struggle some Indigenous scholars endure.

Others come into the academy and despite obstacles persevered while connecting or reconnecting with their culture, even though the status quo looked unfavorably on these activities. Wane's (2013) search for African knowledge was the reclamation of damaged cultural thinking and the disruption of dominant power, politics, and worldviews. Wane (2013) wanted others not to suffer as she had in the Western academy. Wilson (2008) noticed the most successful people were graduate students as they attempted to apply an Indigenous epistemology to their research in the face of questions and criticism. Despite these select stories of perseverance, more stories expressed challenges with starting from a colonized place, the academy. Universities have one way of teaching and learning and do not allow for other ways of knowing and being (Wane, 2013). Kovach (2009) spoke with Kathy Absolon who expressed frustration and constraint because one is “forced to begin from a colonized place, and we are forced to begin from that place for two reasons. One is that we are colonized... The second reason is the academy reinforces that we are in that place” (p. 11).

Indigenous scholars felt they needed to compromise their cultures and values upon entering the university or conducting research within the academy. They felt compelled to translate Indigenous worldviews, epistemologies, and theoretical positionings into the dominant language of the colonizer. They were confused by the differing expectations they received from the university to conduct research that maintained colonial power structures, the community who expected relationship building and activism, and unique disciplines and publications that perpetuated the status quo. Young Indigenous graduate students and recent post-graduate scholars experienced intense colonization, loneliness, criticism, constraint, and forced assimilation towards Whiteness.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of my study was to examine Native graduate students' and post-graduate scholars' experiences on their use of Indigenous inquiry as decolonization, their learning of Indigenous inquiry within the university curriculum, and their application of Indigenous inquiry within Native communities. The results from my study included mo'olelo that I hope will empower Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars to embrace culturally inherent research approaches, produce new knowledge on how to conduct Indigenous research for Native communities, and provide specific recommendations for universities on how to decolonize their curriculum.

Research Questions

1. How did Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars learn about Indigenous research in university?

2. How did Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars decide upon and ultimately apply Indigenous research approaches as decolonization that ultimately benefitted themselves and their communities?
3. How can the university promote Indigenous research in the graduate curriculum?

Study Importance

Indigenous communities are asking how research can benefit their Peoples (Wilson, 2004). Indigenous scholars are responding by asking them for direction on how their research can add to the decolonization scholarship needed in academia in order to combat colonialism embedded within research and perpetuated within the university curriculum. Strengthening research for and with marginalized populations is critical to counter the marginalization of Indigenous Peoples (Smith, 2006). My research added to the other voices defending the rights and lands of Native communities.

In addition, this doctoral dissertation recovered and promoted traditional knowledge that can be used to decolonize research produced by the university. Indigenous researchers must challenge the academy, an agent of colonialism, by breaking down disciplinary silos using Indigenous knowledge to transform institutions (Wilson, 2004). That is why it is so important to continue to promote traditional knowledge in the academy and elsewhere despite the pressure Indigenous scholars feel to stay simply in disciplinary strictures (Wilson, 2004). Indigenous Peoples are now working within the academy to describe their own cultural processes for the creation and dissemination of knowledge in order to achieve self-determination in the academy (Nabobo-baba, 2008).

Furthermore, this study defined Indigenous inquiry inclusive of developing Indigenous research frameworks. There is a shortage of literature on Indigenous frameworks (Kovach,

2009). This must be addressed because research rooted in Indigenous paradigms can break down binary Indigenous settler research relations to open up new dialogue, research, theory, and action (Kovach, 2009). Lastly, my Indigenous inquiry advocated for the revision of current graduate curriculum to produce the next generation of Native scholars. All students should understand Indigenous histories, theories, knowledge, cultures, and futures and how Western knowledge and actions impacted these (Nakata, Nakata, Keech & Bolt, 2012). However, there are current challenges in accomplishing this within Indigenous Studies programs and other graduate programs: the limited number of Indigenous faculty members who can guide students in the area of Indigenous framework and epistemologies; the need for a supportive cohort system; the responsibility of faculty and administrators to actively recruit, retain, and mentor Indigenous faculty members; and the creation of space for this type of scholarship to flourish (Kovach, 2009). Kovach (2009) warned that we must not let Indigenous students lose their identity to another worldview via the academy. The academy is a site of resistance and we as Indigenous Peoples have a responsibility to defeat colonialism in the university (Alfred, 2004).

Inquiry Framework

This study was in keeping with Indigenous research principles and resulted in the creation of a metaphorical Hawaiian 'upena (net). Native scholars and leading advocates for Indigenous research design Kovach (2009) and Wilson (2008) inspired the overarching organization of the Inquiry framework that led to the creation of the 'upena. It was rooted in an 'Ōiwi (Native) paradigm and epistemology that included pono (goodness) and ho'oponopono (to mend) as its ontology and axiology all viewed through a decolonizing lens. Ha'i mo'olelo (storytelling) was the methodology chosen because storytelling transmits culture and produces new knowledge as well as emancipates and decolonizes Native Peoples. The method was

listening to mo'olelo from aspiring Native scholars through ha'i mo'olelo. These mo'olelo became the knots in the 'upena. The relationships within and between the various mo'olelo were identified through Indigenous reflective processes. These were the cordage that tightly linked all the knots together in the 'upena. Through a circular approach occurring at different places and times with different contributors to the study, the mo'olelo were woven together into a mo'olelo nui (larger story). This mo'olelo nui was the doctoral dissertation and the completed 'upena. This 'upena belongs to the community, was created through practices respectful of Native Peoples, and strengthened relational accountability with everything in the cosmos.

Inquiry Method

An Indigenous inquiry framework calls upon the use of research methods that align well with its paradigm, axiology, ontology, epistemology, and theoretical perspective. This alignment guides the use of methods and acknowledges that the method is valid because it benefits Indigenous communities (Wilson, 2008). This study's research method was listening to mo'olelo from Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars through ha'i mo'olelo and reflecting upon.

Story pays respect to the oral nature of Indigenous knowledge creation and transmission within Native communities and as such includes a conversational style that is open-ended, flexible, and accommodating (Kovach, 2009). Story places the control of the research processes in the hands of those who are participating in it (Kovach, 2009). In addition, the choice of method was personal and represented the social and cultural construction of my experiences influenced by my research journey (Kovach, 2009). That is why this study included my mo'olelo alongside the mo'olelo of others. This Native method addressed the call from Hart (2010) to further identify features of Indigenous research design. I believe we are at a place within the

evolution of Indigenous research that we can finally break away from using Western methods that are force-fitted into a Native inquiry framework or infused with Indigenous concepts yet are still grounded in colonizing research traditions. This dissertation advocated for more research, particularly educational research, employing Indigenous inquiry, inclusive of methods that are rooted in a Native paradigm, ontology, axiology, epistemology, methodology, and applied through a decolonizing lens.

Mo'olelo as a research method honors norms and protocols that respect Indigenous communities and strengthens relational accountability between the researcher and Native Peoples. The researcher has a responsibility to contribute to the community (Wilson, 2008). Smith (2006) encouraged researchers to embrace this necessary work with Indigenous communities because these communities are sites of possibilities. They offer opportunities for scholars to address structural relations of power, reinforce cultural values, and build the communities' own research capacity (Smith, 2006). The research thus becomes relevant to that community, grounded in the community's needs and not those of the university or the academy (Kovach, 2009). In this way, power is given to the community (Swadener & Mutua, 2008) and they lead this change (Wilson, 2008). In the end, the knowledge produced from stories is collaboratively used to benefit and improve the standard of living in the community (Lekoko, 2007) and belongs to the community (Andrae-Marobela et. al., 2012).

I accepted the kuleana (responsibility) associated with my choice of mo'olelo as an Indigenous research method within this Native study. The community in my study was not defined by a particular Native People, but was defined by those who contributed to the study as well as those Indigenous scholars in university graduate programs and new Native scholars within academia. I agree with Smith (2006) that the community is the source of the research. I

believe this study greatly benefited Indigenous scholarship by describing approaches to applying Indigenous inquiry in Native communities. This dissertation is relevant and included within its methods processes and protocols to collaborate with contributors to the study in a capacity that fosters relational accountability. Readers of this Native inquiry also have an expanded role. It is important that all involved in this dissertation, including its readers, see the “storied” (Lekoko, 2007, p. 84) nature of this unique community. By understanding one another through our shared struggles and successes, we strengthen our connections and thus develop relationships that not only improve our lives but the lives of others we touch each and every day.

Summary of the General Problem

This research began years ago as I struggled through our educational system wondering why Indigenous knowledge and inquiry were not part of the established curriculum. I discovered that our educational system was colonized and continued to perpetuate psychological, racial, political, social, and economic trauma. Natives teaching and learning in these educational institutions are challenged because schools and universities are bastions of Whiteness, resist decolonization, compromise Indigeneity, promote the methodologies and methods of the colonizers, and devalue and dismiss research that benefits Native communities. The purpose of my study was to examine Native graduate students' and post-graduate scholars' experiences on their use of Indigenous inquiry as decolonization, their learning of Indigenous inquiry within the university curriculum, and their application of Indigenous inquiry within Native communities. The results from my study shared mo'olelo that can empower the next generation of Native scholars to embrace culturally inherent research approaches and produce new knowledge on how to conduct Indigenous research for Native communities. This study defended rights of Indigenous Peoples, recovered and promoted traditional knowledge, defined Indigenous inquiry

as Native graduates and post-graduate scholars see it, and advocated for change in the graduate curriculum. Although my personal decolonizing journey began years ago, the generational damage originated centuries before. Knowing and reflecting on the origins of and psychological trauma from colonialism was crucial to understanding the purpose and focus of this doctoral study.

This dissertation consists of seven chapters. The first chapter provides a general overview of the problem, details the focus as well as the purpose of the study, presents research questions, communicates the study’s importance to academia, and introduces the inquiry framework and methods. The second chapter consists of the literature review. It describes the literature selection and review process. It also evaluates the current quality of the literature using specific criteria developed exclusively for this study. In addition, the second chapter highlights major works and substantial findings on colonization in education, the psychology of colonization, and the recent growth of Indigenous inquiry within academia. The third chapter offers an explanation of the ‘Ōiwi inquiry framework and paradigm, pono and ho‘oponopono as the ontology and axiology, Hawaiian epistemology, and a decolonizing lens as the theoretical framework. The fourth chapter describes Indigenous storytelling as the study’s methodology. The fifth chapter delves into the methods. It details the writing style in this study, the kuleana of the storyteller and the co-storytellers who participated in this study, the role of Indigenous ethics in the implementation of the study, and the creation of and reflection on the mo‘olelo created from this study. The sixth chapter focuses on sharing compelling reflections from the powerful mo‘olelo. The seventh chapter takes these reflections and places them in context within the current research literature. This chapter also makes recommendations for how the university can increase its promotion of Indigenous research in the graduate curriculum. The dissertation

concludes with appendices containing all the mo'olelo from those who participated in this research project.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Overview of Literature Review

This literature review served multiple purposes. It decolonized the traditional construction of a literature review as well as enhanced my personal decolonization. In addition, it explored the history and scope of the problem through literature authored by primarily Native thinkers, philosophers, researchers, and academics. It also provided the context of theory relating to the problem from an Indigenous perspective. Furthermore, it allowed me to make deep connections to the previous research through Native processes. All of these purposes led to deepening my own understanding of the problem as well as furthering my personal decolonization by strengthening my 'Ōiwi paradigm.

This literature review was based on Native knowledge and supported a decolonizing agenda. Scholars are actively decolonizing academia and how we conduct Native research within the academy. Bell et. al. (2005) acknowledged this by recognizing how Indigenous scholars see the academy as a site of resistance and continue to question the constitution of knowledge, teachers, pedagogies, research methodologies, and ethics. I saw the literature review within this dissertation as an opportunity to use a critical, post-colonial perspective (Kovach, 2009) that privileged Indigenous processes and knowledge. These research processes raised my consciousness (Wilson, 2008) and illustrated the importance of self in reflection through Indigenous knowledge that moves people forward (Kovach, 2009). I agreed with Sium and Ritskes (2013) who identified decolonization as a complex, multi-layered endeavor that is very personal and political, as well as immediate, relational, and spiritual. This Indigenous literature review was one strategy in my multi-strategic approach to decolonize my research and that of the

academy. In this way, this decolonizing scholarship is akin to ho'oponopono as I sought to restore, mend, build, and strengthen my relationships with (Chun, 2006) and understandings of Indigenous knowledge and inquiry approaches. This represented an evolving definition of ho'oponopono from Pukui's definition in 1957 that focused on mental cleansing (Chun, 2006) to a more specific and personal application within this literature review. The decolonizing aim of this literature review qualified it as a literature review based supportive of Native research design principles.

Another purpose of this literature review was to understand the history and scope of the problem through Native-authored literature. Native academics Wilson (2008) and Battiste (2013) took a historical and chronological approach to the review of literature within their recent publications. I took a similar approach by including within the review of literature a brief history of the transition from an Indigenous educational system to a colonial educational system in Hawai'i while making connections to other Indigenous authors who wrote about similar colonizing experiences within their communities. I also described the historical growth and current status of Indigenous inquiry and how it countered colonization within academia. Wilson (2008) considered this linear approach a true review of the literature as it is simply sharing the ideas, philosophies, beliefs, and experiences of others. The literature review, modeled after Indigenous authors who used a historical and chronological approach, adequately addressed the history and scope of the problem of colonization for this dissertation.

This literature review also provided the context of theory related to the problem from a Native perspective. I delved deeper into understanding colonization by focusing on its psychological effects through the empirical, conceptual, and theoretical literature written by well-known and contemporary Indigenous thinkers, philosophers, researchers, and academics. I

also examined how colonial education decimated Native psychology and institutionalized Western paradigms of being, thinking, and knowing. I investigated how Native education, particularly Native inquiry, emerged and evolved in the academy. This literature review focused on the context of theory related to colonization. It was unique because it embodied research and thinking from Native Peoples.

A final purpose of this literature review was to make deep connections to the previous research through Indigenous processes. I agreed with Wilson's (2008) critique of a literature review as an opportunity to criticize others' work. He believed that this does not fit within an Indigenous axiology congruent with relational accountability. Indigenous research is a sacred ceremony and one needs to build relationships with Native knowledge and bridge sacred spaces between and among them (Wilson, 2008). The selection and review processes within the five-step process used to create this literature review detailed the steps I took to ensure I understood the knowledge referenced and applied it to my research in a pono way. Locating Native knowledge, gaining a deep understanding and making connections with the knowledge through reflective processes, and applying those deep connections between and among the knowledge to this dissertation made this truly an literature review respectful of Indigenous Peoples.

This literature review served a variety of purposes. It primarily served as a tool for decolonization. It also explored the history and scope of the problem of colonization in education. In addition it provided the context of theory relating to the problem of colonization and its impact on education with its continued damaging effects on Indigenous minds today. Moreover it allowed me to build connections to the previous research through a five-step process, inclusive of identifying and selecting literature, that supported the further study of

Indigenous inquiry and its application in academia. All of these purposes were fulfilled in this literature review.

Literature Selection Processes

The literature review began with the creation of a five-step process, inclusive of identifying and selecting literature, that enabled me to understand the source of the problem, to investigate the scope of the problem, to provide the context of theory related to the problem, to build personal connections with previous research, and to make connections between and among the literature. The identification process was based on five well-defined review criteria. The selection process encompassed six detailed steps. These processes ensured that the literature contained in this dissertation was relevant.

A five-step process aided me in writing a literature review for this dissertation. The first step began with a search for literature. I looked into online databases, such as the Academic Search Premier (EBSCO Host), for relevant journal articles, books, and handbooks. I also examined Indigenous journals, consisting of electronic and Open Access journals, that I became familiar with throughout my graduate studies. I inspected published books and handbooks written by well-known and respected authors within the field of Indigenous Studies. Lastly, I mined Works Cited, Bibliographies and References at the end of journal articles, books, and handbooks for other sources that were cited or referenced most often. The second step in the process was the application of the review criteria followed by the third step of selecting the relevant literature. If the literature met the review criteria and made it through the selection process, I employed the fourth and fifth steps: summarizing and annotating each piece, noting connections to other specific pieces of literature or particular authors, and incorporating research from these pieces into my literature review and throughout my dissertation. If the literature did

not meet the review criteria or did not make it through the selection process, it was not included. I faithfully and successfully applied the five-step process in order to create and support this study.

One of the steps was the identification of literature using five review criteria. Each piece of literature had to address at least one, preferably more, of these criteria: colonization and/or decolonization; Indigenous and/or colonial education; Western-based research methodologies and methods; Indigenous inquiry inclusive of methodologies and methods particularly as it relates to working with Native communities; and Indigenous inquiry in academia. For literary pieces that addressed Indigenous and/or colonial education, I paid particular attention to those that referenced curriculum and instruction. For journal articles, books, and handbooks that spoke of Western-based or Indigenous research methodologies and methods, I kept an eye out for sources that applied them to research in academia or that mentioned their role within the university curriculum. These review criteria were necessary in order to better align the literature with the focus and purpose of this study.

The following selection process determined whether or not to include a particular literary piece in the dissertation. First, the literature had to link directly to the problem statement and the study focus while supporting or contributing towards the overall framework of this Indigenous inquiry. Secondly, I needed to be able to describe how the journal articles, books, and handbooks were empirically, conceptually, or theoretically based on Native criterion elements from Judy Atkins and Cora Weber-Pillwax as written in Wilson (2008). For empirical studies, I needed to understand if the research was approved by the Native community, included opportunities for reciprocity and responsibility, involved non-obtrusive and deep listening, had fidelity in relations, informed by learning and wisdom, connected to heart and mind, and included the

subjective self (Wilson, 2008). These Indigenous research principles were usually written up as a part of the actual study itself. Conceptual and theoretical literature had to have many of the following elements: foundation in Indigenous research; relationship and interconnection to living things; source as the heart and mind; basis in lived experiences; alignment with Indigenous epistemology and ontology; inclusivity of Native language and culture; and renewal of relationships with ancestors (Wilson, 2008). Third in the selection criteria was privileging literature authored by Hawaiians or others whom contributed towards deepening our understanding of the Hawaiian language or culture. In addition, a fourth selection criteria privileged global, Indigenous authors whom wrote literature addressing key topics of this study. Fifth, historical literature, that I classified as over twenty years old, needed to be those that were frequently referenced or cited as well as easily identifiable as major contributions to the field of Indigenous Studies. Lastly, contemporary literature, that I classified as published within the last six years, needed to illustrate and build upon the most recent developments within the rapidly growing field of Indigenous Studies. Nearly half of the works cited in this dissertation were published within the last six years. The development and subsequent application of the selection criteria was crucial in ensuring that this study had its roots in Indigenous knowledge and praxis.

The procedures for identifying and selecting relevant literature, housed within a five-step literature review creation process, provided assurance that the literature was relevant to this Indigenous study. The review criteria incorporated the main topics to be explored further during this dissertation all the while connecting with curriculum and instruction as well as research in the academy. The thorough selection process was an effective method for choosing literature aligned with Native ways of knowing and supportive of Indigenous inquiry.

Literature Review Process

The specific literature review procedures were the fourth and fifth steps in the five-step process. I summarized and annotated each relevant source. My reflections were unique because they served a personal decolonizing purpose within the entire dissertation process. In addition, I created a simple matrix that provided a quick, high-level view of the scope and major content of each source. This assisted me in finding initial connections between and among the literature. It was crucial that the literature review procedures incorporated Indigenous processes. In this way, the literature review aligned with this study's axiology and epistemology by honoring the integrity of its sources while identifying relevant literature for understanding this study's problem, shaping its focus, and supporting its inquiry framework.

The fourth step in developing this literature review was summarizing and annotating sources for inclusion in this Native study. I not only read each text in depth, but read it interactively, always keeping in mind this study's identification criteria and selection process. I summarized each relevant source following successful completion of the selection process by determining and writing the key points in a narrative. This helped me in understanding each text while building my knowledge base of the main topics under study. This summarizing process is similar to traditional ways of constructing literature reviews. Reflections followed summaries and included writing my thoughts, connections, and ideas as a result of reading each source. Summarization and reflections of the literature took place throughout the dissertation creation process. This process emphasized the importance of making text-to-text, text-to-self, and text-to-world connections. Both summaries and reflections were considered an important part of my research journal. The research journal also contained reflections on the current progress of my research and my journey towards decolonization, notes and graphics relating to my evolving

inquiry framework, and autobiographical vignettes pertaining to my colonizing personal and educational experiences.

Reflections in the research journal were everyday acts of decolonization. Viewed longitudinally, they represented my evolving thinking on Indigenous research and illustrated a growing Native paradigm. This aligned with the first three phases of decolonization as described by Laenui (2000). The first phase is rediscovery and recovery. An Indigenous person recovers his or her own history, language, and identity through a variety of means. For example, Laenui (2000) picked up a book written by Queen Lili'uokalani and discovered a history she didn't know. It raised her consciousness of Native history and issues. Similarly, I immersed myself in reading Indigenous research and literature in order to learn more about the culture, philosophies, beliefs, customs, and traditions of Native Peoples. The second phase is mourning. Indigenous Peoples lament their victimization as essential to the healing process and some move towards anger. Some mourning can take place in the first phase also (Laenui, 2000). Some of my reflections contained passages communicating my feelings of guilt for continuing to live and work in colonizing ways, anger and resentment towards an educational system that disavows Native ways of knowing and being, and grief for the seemingly hopeless and dire status of Indigenous teaching and learning within Eurocentric educational institutions. However, Laenui (2000) warned of getting "stuck" (p. 155) and dwelling in this phase of decolonization for too long. My reflections suggest I am currently in the third phase of dreaming, crucial to the decolonization process. This dissertation was representative of my dream, the decolonization of academic research and how it is taught within the university curriculum. In this phase, Indigenous Peoples debate, consult, and build dreams to become the "flooring for the creation of a new social order" (Laenui, 2000, p. 155). I created summaries and reflections representative of

literature from a wide variety of Indigenous thoughts and actions, representing some commonalities yet some differing perspectives. Reflections were crucial testimonies of my decolonizing journey and an important part in constructing this literature review.

A matrix provided a quick, high-level view of the scope and content of each source and assisted me in finding initial connections between and among the texts. I reviewed each piece individually and noted Indigenous affiliation (if mentioned), identified three to five main topics, noted connections to other research or authors, and classified each as theoretical, conceptual, or empirical. The matrix allowed me to easily make initial connections between and among the various journal articles, books, and handbooks for deeper reflection later. It provided enough of an overview to develop a fundamental understanding and gauge the historical and contemporary thinking within the fields of colonization and decolonization; Indigenous and colonial education; Western-based research methodologies and methods; Indigenous inquiry inclusive of methodologies and methods particularly as it relates to working with Native communities; and Indigenous inquiry in academia. I was careful to ensure the matrix did not reduce the rich Indigenous knowledge inherent in the literature into generalized information that would be viewed as extractive and harmful to Native Peoples by using approaches that are respectful to Indigenous knowledge and tribal epistemologies (Kovach, 2009). The matrix was a useful tool in making initial connections with the literature.

I made deeper connections to the literature through employing Indigenous practices. Once I made initial connections identified through the matrix, I re-read summaries and reflections. I called upon spiritual guidance to help me see the connections, understanding that knowledge is spiritual because it draws from our deep connection to our kupuna 'āina, oceans, language, rituals, and 'ohana (Meyer, 2008). Young (1995) also wrote of the important role of

spirituality, as well as mana (divine power), in the sources and the pono use of them in research. In addition, I sought the kaona (hidden meaning) within each source, especially those sources authored by Hawaiians. Kaona illustrated the high value placed on expressive and communicative functions within Hawaiian oral traditions (Au & Kaomea, 2009). I relied on all of my senses when recording, storing, and retrieving knowledge (Meyer, 2008) to write this literature review for this dissertation. I organized these deeper connections into distinct sections within this literature review and the entire dissertation in order to communicate the key ideas relating to the problem, study focus, and inquiry framework. It was equally important to keep the knowledge holistic and highly contextual. These actions were consistent with the recommendations of Bell et. al. (2005) who emphasized respectfully presenting Native ways of knowing as well as Kovach (2009) who warned against the creation of generalizations and promoted alignment with Indigenous epistemologies. I was able to make deeper connections between and among the literature because of these Indigenous practices.

The literature review procedures used to reflect on the sources contributing to this dissertation was based on Indigenous practices that strived to present Native knowledge in a way that was holistic, contextual, and relational. While summarizing text allowed for building an understanding of the main topics under study, annotating those same texts provided an opportunity for personal decolonization and led to developing my Native paradigm over time. The matrix was a successful tool to identify initial connections between and among the literature while solidifying those connections came through specific Indigenous processes. The creation of this literature review for this dissertation helped me to develop a disposition for inquiry and reflection (Nakata, Nakata, Keech, & Bolt, 2012).

Literature Quality

This dissertation contained highly relevant literature, met Indigenous criteria determining quality, and encompassed the appropriate scope in order to fully understand the source of the problem, investigate the scope of the problem, provide the context of theory related to the problem, build personal connections with previous research, and make connections between and among the literature. I frequently cited the literature from two Indigenous journals that majorly influenced the creation of this study. Significant Indigenous books and handbooks, that I deemed historical or contemporary, were represented and reflected the progression of curriculum development and Native research within education and academia over the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. This dissertation relied on Hawaiian and other global, Indigenous authors whose writings and research were not only the main sources of inspiration, but were the strong kahua (foundation) on which this dissertation stood.

Literature from two Indigenous journals was most often cited in this dissertation. *AlterNative*, a journal launched in 2005 by the NgāPae o te Māramatanga, New Zealand's National Institute of Research Excellence in Māori Advancement and Development, enhanced my understanding of Indigenous research. This peer-reviewed, interdisciplinary journal disseminates Indigenous knowledge from Native worldviews inclusive of Indigenous perspectives (NgāPae o te Māramatanga, 2008-2009). It promotes Indigenous dialogue and scholarship that describe historical colonization and recent globalization experiences as well as transformative resistance at the local, regional, and global levels (NgāPae o te Māramatanga, 2008-2009). In addition to *AlterNative*, the undisciplined, peer-reviewed, Open Access journal *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society* was another frequently referenced journal in this dissertation. Begun in 2012, this journal promotes decolonization within education.

Although this is a recently established journal, the journal reflects the emerging, innovative scholarship pushing the outward boundaries of Indigenous Studies. Literature from both of these journals greatly contributed to the development of this dissertation.

Accompanying Indigenous journals were the presence of historical and contemporary books and handbooks regarded as significant contributors to advancing Indigenous Studies. Historical sources hailed from renowned Indigenous authors from all over the globe. They included Africans Frantz Fanon, Albert Memmi, and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o; Māori Linda Tuhiwai Smith; Hawaiian Manulani Meyer; and Brazilian Paulo Freire. Contemporary literature was also global in nature and included two edited handbooks: the *Handbook for Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* and the second edited handbook focusing on decolonization titled *For Indigenous Minds Only: A Decolonization Handbook*. These handbooks joined books authored by Māori Russell Bishop, Plains Cree and Saulteaux Margaret Kovach, and Opaskwayak Cree Shawn Wilson. These historical and contemporary books and handbooks provided the solid research that supported this scholarship.

There was a great diversity of Indigenous authorship among the literature included in this review and throughout the dissertation. I was influenced and/or referenced authors from the Pacific Islands, Americas, and Africa. Native Hawaiians or those who wrote about Hawai'i included progenitors within the field of Hawaiian Studies Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo'ole, Manulani Aluli Meyer, and George Terry Kanalu Young; respected Hawaiian cultural historians George S. Kanahale and Malcolm Nāea Chun; and influential academics Julie Kaomea and ku'ualoha ho'omanawanui. Māori Russell Bishop and Linda Tuhiwai Smith as well as Fijian Unaisi Nabobo-Baba added to the Pacific scholarship. I included African knowledge and wisdom from Ghanaian George Sefa Dei, Maseko Ngoni Devi Dee Mucina, and Kenyan Njoki Wane.

Other Indigenous authors from the American continents included Tewa Gregory Cajete, Peruvian Sandy Grande, Fisher River Cree Michel Anthony Hart, Bear Clan Mohawk Taiaiake Alfred, Xicano Miguel Zavala, and Michael Yellow Bird from the Sahnish and Hidatsa Nations. Their research added to the many others referred to in this dissertation and illustrated the generations of Indigenous wisdom given by the cosmos and passed down by the ancestors to these scholars and emerging scholars like myself for application in contemporary ways that benefitted Native communities.

The literature cited was highly relevant and of superior quality as identified, selected, and reviewed through the five-step literature review process. The relevancy of the literature allowed me to see greater connections between and among the research as well as increased my capability to go further in my personal decolonization. The quality of the literature was superior as determined by Native criterion elements within the selection process in addition to Indigenous reflective practices within the review process. Nearly all of the literature came from Hawaiian and other Indigenous authors in an effort to comprehend the international impact of the problem, understand the global nature of the study focus, and show diverse support for an Indigenous inquiry framework. The majority of the literature selected for inclusion was theoretical or conceptual with a smaller amount I classified as empirical. This met the expectations of a literature review for Native inquiries because empirical knowledge is not stronger than cultural knowledge (Wilson, 2008). On the contrary, cultural knowledge is extra intellectual (Wilson, 2008). Young (1995) also commented on the sources for Native research countering that objectivism, the hallmark of many empirical studies, opposes Native intellectual contributions and relies on consensual, universal truth. He cited Sahlins's contention of the importance of metaphors to historical studies and Hanlon who encouraged the application of oral traditions,

frowning upon the use of imposing outside standards to define credibility of local sources (Young, 1995). The relevancy and quality of all the theoretical, conceptual, and empirical literature in this review were credible as deemed by Indigenous criterion and reflective practices.

The dissertation contained high quality literature that was relevant and appropriately scoped for the proposed study. Relevancy was evident through the citation of emerging research from two of the most innovative Indigenous journals and significant historical and contemporary books and handbooks; the diversity of referenced Indigenous authors; and the inclusion of the knowledge from theoretical, conceptual, and empirical texts. The identification, selection, and review processes not only determined the scope of this literature review but also aided in determining the overall direction and organization of the dissertation.

Major Works and Substantial Findings on Colonization

In order to understand the history and scope of colonization within education, one must have intimate knowledge of not only the differences between Indigenous and colonial educational systems, but also the violent societal upheaval that led to the disintegration of Native teaching and learning and the rise and current dominance of Euro-centric, formal schooling that continues the colonial indoctrination of Indigenous Peoples today.

From Indigenous to colonial education.

Indigenous education.

Traditional, Hawaiian education not only transmitted knowledge and skills orally from one generation to another, but also developed and nurtured mutually beneficial and long lasting relationships between kumu (teacher) and haumāna (students) that were grounded in the culture and the language of the people (Chun, 2011). This bonded relationship furthered socialization into Hawaiian society, beginning with the 'ohana (family). A child's introduction to societal norms and behaviors began with education conducted within the 'ohana, with children simply

observing and working alongside kūpuna (elders) (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Teaching and learning in these informal, familial settings as well as within more formal settings used the context of 'āina-based (land based) and place-based teaching and learning in order to meet the diverse yet practical needs of the society (Kana'iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). Thus education aimed to develop a strong cultural identity and to root haumāna in the 'āina (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). Haumāna deeply respected the 'āina as they learned valuable cultural knowledge and skills to mastery, eventually becoming kumu in relationship to others, hence repeating the cyclical, educational process (Kana'iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005).

Although there are currently few historical accounts of the exact teaching and learning processes involved in traditional, Hawaiian education, of the accounts that are known Chun (2011) identified five common, sequential elements: nānā (observing) incorporated the skill of deduction; ho'olohe (listening) required patience and attentiveness to the words of the kumu and the sounds of the environs; pa'a ka waha (reflecting) created opportunities to link observation and listening; hana ka lima (doing) allowed haumāna to actually do the task while providing for opportunities to learn from mistakes and celebrate success; and nīnau (questioning) permitted haumāna to ask the kumu questions following the learning experience. All throughout the process, kumu used tools from the 'āina when instructing haumāna, such as the papa 'ili'ili (table of pebbles) to graphically illustrate the human body and the 'umeke (calabash) in astronomy. This type of education strengthened the relationship between the kumu and the haumāna and fostered the self-teaching capabilities of the haumāna (Chun, 2011).

For those haumāna who exhibited special talents, more formal training took place that often lasted many, many years (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Kahuna (experts) conducted this formal training in specific fields of study that dictated strict adherence to rules and regulations and often

encompassed memorization (Kana'iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). The professional training of kahuna and young chiefly leadership are our best examples of this process in action (Chun, 2011). For haumāna learning the medical arts, na akua (gods) grounded the teaching and learning in spirituality and was the basis of a curriculum composed of a significant amount of memorization and chants that consisted of the knowledge of diseases, the art of saving lives, and the art of killing others (Chun, 2011). Chiefly education also had a strong foundation in spirituality as well as military and politics. Young leaders went to live with wise kahuna, often in poverty, to learn from tales of good and bad ali'i (chiefs) governance and perform tasks of bravery (Chun, 2011). After tutelage, haumāna proved their mastery in a myriad of ways, sometimes before the kahuna or an audience, such as a physical demonstration like the 'ūniki of a hula dancer, or perhaps through oral examination, such as the rigorous questioning endured by Hawaiian historian 'Ī'i by his uncle before the ali'i (Chun, 2011).

Traditional, Hawaiian education reflected many qualities of national and international, Indigenous, educational practices. According to Pewewardy (2005) of Comanche and Kiowa, before colonization Indigenous Peoples had largely informal, culturally responsive educational systems. Immediate as well as extended family members, tribal elders, and religious and social groups within the community held responsibility for educating the next generation. The Native tongue was the language of instruction and transmitted the cultural and social values, norms, and behaviors to the next generation. African scholar Ngugi (1986) recalls his own educational experience as a young boy when Gĩkũyũ was the language of both the home and his schooling. Gĩkũyũ instilled the values of cooperation and community. Storytelling was an instructional strategy that communicated these cultural values and mirrored real-world experiences (Ngugi, 1986). These traditional, Indigenous, educational practices would all but disappear as

colonization transformed the psychological, spiritual, racial, political, social, and economic lives of Indigenous Peoples.

Societal upheaval.

Prior to colonialism, Hawai'i had a complex social structure with distinct classes, each having its own mana based on each individual's mo'okū'auhau (genealogy) (Kana'iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). The kapu system, the religious codes and rules that defined relationships between the classes and between individuals, the careful stewardship of the 'āina, and the value of communal land ownership supported this structure (Kana'iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005; Osorio, 2002). Colonialism destroyed these traditional spiritual, political, economic, and social structures as struggles over land and self-determination resulted in Hawaiians becoming minorities in their own homeland (Kana'iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005; Osorio, 2002).

Traditional, Hawaiian society transformed during the nineteenth century. The diversity of leadership and the vibrancy of Hawaiian society began to wane with the suppression of the ali'i nui (high chiefs) by the powerful warrior Kamehameha and a diminishing Native population (Osorio, 2002). The 'ainoa (free or profane eating) broke many of the spiritual, social, and cultural customs and traditions that defined Hawaiian society (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994; Osorio, 2002). It disrupted the traditional relationship that linked members of the society together, especially the maka'āinana (commoner) to ali'i, and the ali'i to na akua, with the ali'i losing their divinity (Osorio, 2002). This corresponded with the arrival of the American Missionaries. Armed with their American elitism and influenced by the New Divinity Movement of the seventeenth century, early Calvinist missionaries arrived in Hawai'i aboard the Thaddeus with their heavenly mandate to sow the seeds of Christianity within the Native population (Meyer, 2004). The timing

of their arrival could not have been more favorable for their conversion of the ali'i and thousands of Hawaiians to the Christian faith filled the deep, spiritual void left from the abandonment of the traditional, spiritual kapu (Dotts and Sikkema, 1994; Meyer, 2004; Osorio, 2002). This ushered in new kapu and drastic changes to spiritual, cultural, and social life and relationships that further drove a wedge between the maka'āinana and ali'i, with the ali'i losing authority in many aspects of Hawaiian society (Osorio, 2002).

New political and economic systems and institutions brought remarkable change to Hawai'i. A constitutional government built on the rule of law and a new capitalist economy, beginning with the preeminence of the whaling industry and later sugar production, were markedly different from the traditional governance and subsistence economy that were hallmarks of traditional, Hawaiian society (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994; Osorio, 2002). Rights and laws changed the authority of the mō'ī (king) and the ali'i, replacing the traditional responsibility of land governance through ancient lineages to that of authority of law (Osorio, 2002). With this change in authority came a change of governance between the maka'āinana and ali'i, and between those ali'i of high and low births (Osorio, 2002). For example, the konohiki traditionally oversaw the 'āina of the ruling ali'i and ensured the maka'āinana who lived there were productive (Osorio, 2002). However the role of the konohiki changed as young, Western, Christianized Hawaiians, other than the conventional konohiki, became counsel to the mō'ī (Osorio, 2002). This strange, new Hawaiian elite illustrated the powerful transformation in Hawaiian ways of thinking and being following Western and Missionary contact (Osorio, 2002).

The Hawaiian government consisting of these new Hawaiian elite attempted to remedy Western encroachment, but was unsuccessful in preventing the rising tide of colonialism. Many Hawaiians viewed their own government's actions as furthering colonization, such as the

enactment of the 1848 Mahele and the Kuleana Act of 1850, an act designed to protect the interest of Hawaiians but ultimately benefited foreigners (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). These land privatization efforts caused immense social, economic, political, and cultural turmoil in the lives of Hawaiians by severing their strong, communal relationship to the ‘āina, and ultimately causing them to question their sense of identity (Osorio, 2002). The result was the disinheritance of a vast number of maka‘āinana from the ‘āina, with the mō‘ī, a few ali‘i, the Hawaiian government, and foreigners owning the most ‘āina in Hawai‘i (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994; Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005; Osorio, 2002). Concurrently, the Native population was declining, thus weakening the traditional land tenure system that was heavily dependent on a labor-subsistence economy (Osorio, 2002). Due to these events, foreigners filled the void left behind by these crumbling relationships among the Hawaiian people and gradually took over governance that culminated in the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian government in 1893; finances that transformed Hawai‘i into a capitalist-based, large-scale agricultural and later tourist and military-based economy; religion that replaced traditional spirituality with Christianity; and an educational system that effectively subjugated minds in order to perpetuate colonialism well into the present day.

Colonial education.

Western contact dramatically altered traditional, Hawaiian, educational practices (Au & Kaomea, 2009). American missionaries introduced their schooling and foreign ideas of literacy (Au & Kaomea, 2009; Meyer, 2004) while disparaging Hawaiian values, language, culture, and spirituality (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). According to the Missionaries, the purpose of school was converting the “heathen” (p. 27) and “savage” (p. 27) Hawaiians into civilized Christians (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005) who would live to serve the Christian God (Dotts &

Sikkema, 1994). They started over one thousand Hawaiian-medium schools (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005) focusing first on adult education and later educating young children (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). Laws supported this type of universal schooling with the first ones enacted in 1824 (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Village schools popped up across Hawai‘i with adults encouraged to attend. By the 1830s, adult enrollment waned and schools began to admit children. In 1840, Kamehameha III enacted general school laws that established common schools with a curriculum that stood in stark contrast to former, traditional, Hawaiian education (Au & Kaomea, 2009).

The common schools’ curriculum shifted the focus from the ‘ohana and Hawaiian societal needs to a classroom-based approach with a systematic focus on Western literacy and acculturation (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). The curriculum set a rigorous routine that was very different from the Hawaiian way of life (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). This created great distance between children and parents, as well as children from their Indigenous culture (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). Many felt conflicted between Christian and Western-based concepts and Hawaiian cultural ways of knowing and being (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). This was further exacerbated with the introduction of literacy.

Literacy played both an empowering and disempowering role in the lives of Hawaiians (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Europeans introduced formal processes of reading and writing that not only standardized the alphabet, but also led to an explosion of literacy among the populace following the proclamation by Kamehameha III instituting a government of learning (Chun, 2011). Although Europeans were instrumental in transforming the oral Hawaiian language into a written language, translation stripped much of the Hawaiian poetic and spiritual underpinnings (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). Nevertheless, thousands learned to read, write, and spell within six

months of Kamehameha III’s announcement under the authority of the ali‘i, who engaged in teaching and learning within their own households and subsequently sent out learned teachers to instruct others within their realm (Chun, 2011). Yearly hō‘ike (show) denoted major events for haumāna, young and old, to demonstrate their skills (Chun, 2011). Due to the high rate of literacy, newspapers, both disempowering Missionary-controlled newspapers and empowering Hawaiian-controlled newspapers, flourished. The Missionaries used newspapers to proselytize, civilize, and support the colonial, capitalist system, whereas Hawaiian-sponsored newspapers wrote of nationalist, anti-colonial resistance against the racism that underpinned the changing society (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Hawaiian-sponsored newspapers advocated for pride in culture and traditions, combatted the Western domestication of Native women, and challenged laws against traditional and spiritual practices (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Some Hawaiian historians, American eyewitnesses, and Europeans marveled at the high literacy rates and the proliferation of newspapers written for consumption by the people, but others expressed grave misgivings regarding the transformation of Indigenous education and the larger effects on the minds of Hawaiians.

Hawaiian historians, such as Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau and Davida Malo, captured this momentous change through their astute observations and writings. Kamakau and Malo witnessed this revolution with skepticism of Western culture and traditions (Osorio, 2002). Kamakau believed the new society created was inferior to the old, and noticed how the people struggled to cope and change and that the “young people are beginning to follow foreign teaching” (Osorio, 2002, p. 4). The young were educated in Western-based literacy and knowledge at schools, such as Lāhaināluna whose admission was based on Christian conversion (Osorio, 2002). At Lāhaināluna, haumāna re-interpreted their own people’s history and often

spoke of the “era of darkness” (p. 21) before the arrival of the Missionaries to Hawaiian shores (Osorio, 2002). They became the conveyors of Western knowledge and Christian theology to the maka‘āinana they subsequently instructed (Osorio, 2002). Although they helped to create a literate Hawaiian society, they also colonized future generations of Hawaiians.

All throughout the 1800s, traditional, Hawaiian educational practices faded away, replaced by colonial, educational institutions. This was not a smooth transition as several educational leaders of the time spoke out against this travesty (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994; Osorio, 2002), while others ushered in formal, Western-based education into the public school system (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). As the first education superintendent, Malo believed Hawaiians were in danger of losing their nation (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994; Osorio, 2002). On the other hand, William Richard, a superintendent who followed Malo’s tenure, held radically different educational views and goals: a Calvinist, moral education; standardized teacher training; English language instruction; adequate financing for schools; and the phase-out of common schools (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). He promoted agricultural and industrial training for work in commercial industries and the Western domestication of Hawaiian girls (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). High Chief Kekūanā‘a succeeded Armstrong and similar to Malo believed Hawaiians were losing pride in their culture (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). He resented Western values and the changing political, economic, and social systems (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). Yet Malo and Kekūanā‘a’s criticisms and warnings remained unheeded as formalist education firmly took hold in Hawai‘i.

The rich oral traditions found in legends, proverbs, poetical sayings and chants that placed a high value on expressive and communicative functions found in traditional, Hawaiian education (Au & Kaomea, 2009) disappeared over time, supplanted by a colonial, education

influenced by Missionaries and American businessmen whose influence ended Hawaiian medium schooling (Kana'iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005; Meyer, 2004). The elimination of these common schools dealt a deathblow to traditional, Hawaiian education, and shortly thereafter an 1897 law banned the use of the Hawaiian language from government activities and schools altogether. Many who spoke the language in school received physical punishments and felt ashamed for still speaking their Native language (Au & Kaomea, 2009). The law banning Hawaiian-medium education was only lifted in 1986 (Kana'iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005).

Schooling became progressively formalized and segregated into English-standard and other public schools (Kana'iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). The public schooling system became a two-tiered, classist system with Hawaiians marginalized in education (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). Unfortunately, the strong literacy rates among Hawaiians seen in the early nineteenth century declined over time due to a variety of reasons, including the lack of employment for graduating students who could not utilize their newly ascertained knowledge and skills and the waning authority of the ali'i over the people (Chun, 2011). Chun (2011) attributed the success of these early literacy efforts to overwhelming government support, encouragement and authority of the ali'i, culturally-based instruction, and early growth of Hawaiian-rich learning resources. All of this diminished by the colonizing force of Western education (Chun, 2011). The loss of a truly remarkable, traditional, Hawaiian education system was part of the larger colonial effort to disintegrate the social structure, the kapu system, the spiritual connection to the 'āina, and the cultural traditions of the past (Kana'iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005).

Pewewardy (2005) and Ngugi (1986) described similar historical atrocities in the transformation of Indigenous Peoples' education in the continental United States and in Africa

respectively. Post-contact Europeans created an educational system in the continental United States that indoctrinated Indigenous Peoples to forget their cultural identity and their historical significance in the world (Pewewardy, 2005). The colonial curriculum's focus on vocational and agricultural followed by mechanical and industrial education de-cultured and disconnected Indigenous Peoples from their tribal perspectives and worldviews (Pewewardy, 2005). Boarding schools separated children from their families and ancestral homelands, educating them in the practices and philosophies that supported the dominant power structure based on Euro-centrism, individualism, and materialism (Pewewardy, 2005). White policy makers, such as General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, Richard Henry Pratt, and Estelle Reel promoted the de-culturing of Indigenous children while promoting white hegemony (Pewewardy, 2005). This promotion took place in the colonial schools of Africa too, where the language of the home conflicted with the European languages in formal education (Ngugi, 1986). Ngugi (1986) recounted the humiliation and punishment of children who used their home language in schools, how schools and universities preferred and promoted students with English achievements, and literature published in the foreigner's language replaced traditional, African oratory and storytelling. The colonial language communicated Western values and beliefs and colonized children's view of their culture and their relationships to each other as well as to their Indigenous society (Ngugi, 1986). Thus, the African school and university system produced Native elites who could conspire with Europeans in maintaining colonialism well after post-colonial independence and liberation with the devastating, residual effects still felt today.

Psychology of colonization and decolonization.

Colonialism not only radically transformed the political, social, spiritual, economic, cultural, and educational landscape of Indigenous Peoples, but also profoundly altered Native psychology, the very essence of being and patterns and ways of thinking that contribute towards

a strong and healthy Indigenous identity. One is colonized through the experiences and circumstances of one's birth (Memmi, 1965). Ultimately, colonialism denies a person of his or her humanity (Fanon, 1963). The colonizer and the colonized psychology include patterns of domination and submission (Alfred, 2004). It is important to more deeply explore the psychological effects of colonization on Indigenous minds and then explore these further within the context of our present colonial education system because this study addressed the decolonization of Indigenous minds within the context of university and academia.

Psychological effects.

In order to comprehend the psychological effects of colonialism on the colonized mind, one must thoroughly understand that colonialism creates, defines, and maintains the dehumanizing relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. Colonization created a colonial apparatus that bankrupts the souls of the colonizer and the colonized (Memmi, 1965). This system is unsustainable because it is based on a destructive and oppressive relationship (Memmi, 1965). The unconstructive, negative thinking colonialism fosters further exacerbates the psychological effects of colonialism on the minds of both the colonizer and the colonized (Yellow Bird, 2012). This system privileges the colonizer and does not empower the colonized to think about colonization and strategies to decolonize this detrimental relationship (Memmi, 1965).

Colonialism ascribed certain negative attributes to the colonized that have seriously infected the collective psyche of our global society. These attributes are so pervasive that they have significantly altered the minds of the colonizers and the colonized and how the colonized see themselves and their roles and responsibilities in the world. Laziness is just one of the many false characteristics attributed to the colonized (Memmi, 1965). Another is the belief that the

colonized are inherently criminally negligent (Fannon, 1963). However, more insidious is the development of an inferiority complex within the colonized mind. The colonizer denies the colonized the liberty of being who they fundamentally are and thus the colonized move towards becoming objects in the world (Memmi, 1965). As objects, the colonized mentality embodies self-deprecation and thus the colonized feel they know nothing (Freire, 1970) and their culture is less than that of Western, Euro-centric culture (Cajete, 2012; Fannon, 1963). They believe their past is a “wasteland of non-achievement” (Ngugi, 1986, p. 3). The colonized lose confidence in their ancestral ways and Native institutions and thus place power in foreign ideas and beliefs (Osorio, 2002). This shameful belief in inferiority led many to think they are unworthy of Native knowledge because they do not know their own language or are too ashamed to ask because they are not good enough (Bell et. al., 2005). This inferiority complex caused confusion in the Native mind and was taught by the colonizer and many colonized to generations of Indigenous Peoples (Bell et. al., 2005). Thus, Indigenous youth feel alienated from their community because the value systems and ways of being are so very different (Bell et. al., 2005). This alienation makes them less likely to contribute to their Native communities. Unfortunately this is representative of “all kinds of dysfunction, twisted-up thinking that has become part of our identity (Bell et. al., 2005, p. 81).”

Colonialism is the root cause of Indigenous trauma. Indigenous communities, especially Hawaiian communities, and their youth have suffered moral outrage and great sadness originating from *kaumaha* (cultural loss) of their lands, knowledge systems, ecologies, economies, people and places due to colonialism. This created great social, health, and economic disparities for Hawaiians and their youth within our larger society (Trinidad, 2012). These disparities are dehumanizing (Trinidad, 2012) and are not only physically displayed in many

Indigenous communities, but caused psychological trauma (Fannon, 1963) that the colonized continue to endure. Psychological trauma manifested itself in a myriad of mental disorders, such as those experienced by Algerians during the colonial wars as documented by Fannon (1963). Others described this trauma as not only affecting Indigenous minds, but also hearts. This may explain the current spiritual crisis among Native Peoples (Alfred, 2004). The combination of trauma to minds and hearts, much of which was caused by the loss of language, worldview, oral traditions, values, relationships, ceremonial life, and land, led to Native Peoples walking around as simply hollow shells (Wilson, 2004). In particular, the loss of language and the prevalence of European languages as the prominent language of everyday discourse and academia is the colonizer's vehicle to hold the soul and the spirit hostage (Ngugi, 1986). Indigenous scholars and activists throughout the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries clearly documented and identified Indigenous trauma to minds and hearts as a result of colonialism.

Colonialism caused Indigenous Peoples to adapt to unnatural ways of living and being (Alfred, 2004). According to Fanon (1963), governmental and economic structures legitimized racial-cultural discrimination that caused the colonized to feel silenced. They were treated as "less than human" (Fannon, 1963, p. xxv). This resulted in depersonalization and bodily memories of disenfranchisement (Fannon, 1963). Thus, the colonized had to adapt through managing their outward images and protecting their bodies and spirits through unnatural means in order to survive in a colonized world. He often asked, "Who am I really (Fannon, 1963. p. 1)?" Indigenous Peoples drew less and less from their Native past and ultimately lost their cultural memories (Memmi, 1965). The colonized were told to avoid their own pasts, taught history that was not his or her own, and informed the world did not belong to them (Memmi, 1965). They become objects in history and forget their previous freedoms (Memmi, 1965). Thus

it separated people from their past, the past from their present, and newcomers from those who originally populated the land (Alfred, 2004). This unnatural adaptation had a profound impact on Indigenous identity and explained why modern man's identity has been disconnected from the natural world causing alienation, loss of community, and incompleteness (Cajete, 2012).

Colonization deteriorated the Native identity so profoundly that violence became a viable solution to fight systematic dehumanization. Colonialism bred a culture of fear, violence, and hatred between groups of people (Alfred, 2004). The colonizer viewed the colonized as a "wicked backward person" (Memmi, 1965, p. 7). Many colonized accepted this identity that was so far removed from their true selves that they fell into despair and despondency, begging for a death wish (Ngugi, 1986). Others turned to violence as the solution to reconstruct their Native identity and to further ground themselves in the national soil beneath their feet (Fannon, 1963). They engaged in horizontal violence against others who were oppressed (Freire, 1970). These perspectives, emotions, and actions expressed by the colonizer and the colonized originated from the broken relationships between people that was caused by colonization.

One of the unfortunate results of colonization is the colonized emulate the colonizer. Eurocentric mimicry caused untold emotional, psychological, mental, and material costs to individuals and the larger collective (Dei, 2012). The colonized can be attracted to the oppressors' way of life, especially the middle class (Freire, 1970). They imitated the colonizer's dress, language, and manners (Memmi, 1965). These oppressed became sub-oppressors by emulating the individualism and materialism of the oppressor because they had no models of liberation or humanity (Freire, 1970). When colonization is threatened, many times they were the first to speak up and defend it (Memmi, 1965). Those colonized who defended colonization do so because they escaped their conditions and ultimately took on the ideology and interest of the

colonizers (Memmi, 1965). They internalized the racism and ideologies of the dominant culture (Wilson, 2004). Renowned scholar Albert Memmi (1965) witnessed this as a non-Muslim, Jewish colonized man living in a European-colonized society in the mid-twentieth century. He saw his fellow Jews ascribe to be like the French colonizers, but with none of the colonizer’s privileges. He also questioned his own colonial identity through his reflective writings.

Colonial education decimated Native psychology.

Colonial education perpetuated colonialism’s psychological effects on Indigenous minds. For many Indigenous Peoples, colonial rule by the sword and bullets was followed by colonial rule through the chalk and blackboard (Ngugi, 1986). Although there are few European- or American-governed colonies in the twenty-first century, the former colonial education apparatuses enacted in previous centuries still strongly remain in many former colonies and continue to inflict extreme psychological damage on Native Peoples, creating “individuals without anchorage, without borders, colorless, stateless, rootless, a body of angels” (Fannon, 1963, p. 155). As Indigenous scholar Mucina (2011) observed, Whiteness endeavored to turn black minds against themselves and some had to forget their Blackness to survive. Indigenous Peoples from all over the globe understand this astute observation because they experienced this first hand, especially within colonial schools and particularly in colonial boarding schools. The following paragraphs describe in detail the psychological effects of colonial education on young Indigenous minds.

Colonial education created Native intellectuals and an Indigenous elite indoctrinated in Western ways of knowing and being. Osorio (2002) described how nineteenth-century, colonially educated Hawaiians became an integral part of haole (foreign) education and Christian missionary proselytization to the maka‘āinana. Indigenous scholars such as Malo saw the

confusing choices faced by the maka'āinana and although these students helped to create a literate Hawaiian society, they educated the masses in Western literacies, especially governmental and law practices, that set them apart from the culture of the older ali'i (chiefs) (Osorio, 2002). Their growing numbers and increasing influence radically transformed the Hawaiian nation, replacing decisions made that were grounded in Hawaiian ways of thinking and doing with ones based on Western approaches learned through colonial education practices.

Indigenous scholar Frantz Fanon (1963) described the rise of African Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite. Europeans colonized Africa and created a class of GrecoRoman blacks who wanted to be European. This Euro-centric mimicry caused “epistemological imperialism” (Dei, 2012, p. 105) amongst these privileged classes. Psychological colonization through education started from adolescence and “branded the principles of Western culture on their foreheads with red-hot iron, gagged their mouths with sounds, pompous awkward words that twisted their tongues” (p. xliii). These actions ensured that the colonized were inhibited in their thinking and actions and under the submission of the colonizers (Fanon, 1963). Thus, colonialism took away their dignity, especially among the intellectuals and the elite, so they became true products of colonization (Fanon, 1963).

The psychological damage continues to be inflicted from one Native intellectual generation to another as colonized educators develop curriculum from a Western paradigm. Ngugi (1986) pointed out the study of English literature reflected European values and experiences, especially a European bourgeoisie culture. Even English literary pieces about Africa characterized the continent in certain ways, whether portraying Africans as immature or promoting the African who helps the colonizer subdue his own people (Ngugi, 1986). This was only reinforced in other subject areas, such as geography, history, science, and technology. With

this type of education, colonizers inflicted psychological damage upon the next generation by continuing the practice of creating new Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite who conspired with the colonizer (Ngugi, 1986).

This is a dangerous cycle to break as many Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite benefitted from the colonial system. Some put on public displays of non-threatening indignation, but just enough to keep the contracts coming and prevent their own firing (Cruz, 2012). An older socialist and lawyer told Indigenous scholar Cruz, “don’t get me wrong, I’ve done well, very well, in the colony. I work towards decolonization helping poor people. But I have done real well in this system just as it is” (Cruz, 2012, p. 151). Many Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite realized they were products of colonization, products of Western culture, but stop short. They needed to progress further on their journey towards decolonization by reclaiming themselves totally from colonialism and genuinely renewing their contact with the people (Fannon, 1963). It was only through reclaiming their people’s past that change in their psycho affective equilibrium will occur (Fannon, 1963).

Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite want to be whole again. It is important to understand that the colonial education system built upon Western culture and ways shaped them. It takes time for them to see that they are indeed colonized and it is only at that moment of clarity that true decolonization can begin (Fannon, 1963). The days of the Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite as token prizewinners are over (Fannon, 1963).

The colonial education system also developed a colonized mentality that manifested itself in an intellectual dependence on the oppressor for the creation and perpetuation of knowledge. For example, the colonized relied heavily on a Western-based educational model that educates Native children through Western-trained professors and teachers, not even realizing that they

themselves were the source of their own knowledge (Freire, 1970). Growing up in Kenya, African scholar Wane (2013) recounted how it was common knowledge that community members felt nothing good came out of Embu, Kenya, and that was why children were sent away for a Western-style education. This forced young and impressionable Indigenous minds to be disconnected from the lands and cultures of their ancestors and led to confusion over what to do, read, learn, look, and feel (Alfred, 2004). Wane (2013) then had to unlearn and then relearn African Indigenous ways of knowing. It is difficult to shed one's Eurocentric perspective because the educational system ingrained such thinking and believing into its learners (Dei, 2012) but it must be the oppressed themselves that must unveil the realities of the world, know it critically, and then transform it through knowledge in order to be permanently liberated (Freire, 1970).

The loss of Indigenous languages as the medium of instruction in education not only severed relationships between the home and the school, it also caused Native youth to slowly lose their ability to speak and ultimately think in their own languages and this drastically altered the development of their cultural identities. In Hawai'i beginning in the nineteenth-century, literacy in the Hawaiian language was no longer taught in the schools, and those who did speak received physical punishment and shaming (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Hawaiian scholar ho'omanawanui (2010) lamented that the nineteenth-century banishment of the language led to the trauma that is still with us today. Children associated their language with low status, punishment, and humiliation with negative images of their own people affecting their cultural and political choices as Indigenous persons (Ngugi, 1986). Ngugi (1986), a Native language advocate and renowned African writer and researcher, struggled to write in his Native language and realized that the written language created by the missionaries was often difficult to use. This

form of cultural imperialism caused children to become alienated from their traditional social and linguistic environments with the devastating results seen today as many Native Peoples have lost their ability to speak in their Native languages, know very little of their cultural traditions and customs, and identify more with the culture and language of the colonizer (Ngugi, 1986). Europeans purposefully created educational systems that indoctrinated Indigenous Peoples to forget their cultural identity and significance in the world (Pewewardy, 2005). The curriculum, often taught in the colonizer's language, de-cultured and disconnected Indigenous Peoples from their perspective and worldview (Pewewardy, 2005). The loss of one's ability to speak and also learn in his or her Native language caused great psychological damage in forming a strong Indigenous, cultural identity.

Colonial education shaped young Indigenous minds so they easily assimilated into the dominant culture, a Western culture that is then viewed as superior to Native cultures. Assertiveness, competition, and individualism are prized attributes in Western society instilled in Indigenous youth taught in colonial educational institutions (Wane, 2013). Having these characteristics support the dominant power structure that is Euro-centric, individualistic, and materialistic (Wilson & Yellow Bird, 2005). This fits nicely into the well-known concept of the "American Dream" (Cajete, 2012, p. 145). Native American scholar Cajete (2012) wrote that the current goal of American Indian education is to create consumers of this dream who are enticed to pursue careers in Western thought and conditioning and to survive in the post-industrial American society. The dangerous effects from this indoctrination were prejudice, contradictions, narcissism, frustration, alienation, and unethical behavior (Cajete, 2012). Hawaiian scholar Kaomea (Au & Kaomea, 2009) wrote how the curriculum within schools prepared Native youth to fulfill the dominant society's aspirations. Historical, curricular texts were used for Hawaiian

and immigrant socialization of children to work on plantations (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Current texts are really no different because they align closely with the tourist industry as they emphasize the values of aloha and hospitality, further perpetuating the role of Hawaiians as exotic and ever-ready to care for the needs of tourists (Au & Kaomea, 2009). The unfortunate result of years of curriculum for assimilation was that many children are so far removed from their Indigenous past that they do not know their own people's Indigenous knowledge (Wane, 2013). Education for Indigenous youth is "objective" (p. 151) in that it is detached from their communities (Cajete, 2012). Even progressive education within democracy is still assimilationist pedagogy (Grande, 2008). Education is a site of struggle (Cajete, 2012) and contestations because it caters to reproducing colonial ways of knowing (Dei, 2012). Curriculum and pedagogies are so saturated in the dominant knowledge systems through Eurocentric paradigms and colonial specificities that they are assimilating Indigenous students into the dominant culture with the ill effects of negating students' own historical and cultural memories as well as denying their embodied knowledge (Dei, 2012) causing them to believe Western culture superior to their own Indigenous cultures.

The impact of colonial education on the mind can be so appalling that some Indigenous Peoples, including Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite, support the maintenance of the status quo and actively resist decolonization efforts. Colonialism is rooted in power and promotes an artificial culture that maintains complacency (Alfred, 2004). This complacency allows the colonized to work alongside the colonizers in maintaining the status quo because they have so deeply internalized the racism and ideology of the dominant culture (Wilson, 2004) ingrained in them through colonial education (Fannon, 1963). There are some Native intellectuals who play an important role in perpetuating colonialism and who are unprepared to

address this within educational settings, such as university, or who insulate themselves in the academy (Alfred, 2004). These untruths are so deeply embedded in the mind that they must be eliminated so that every facet and essence of being can be liberated (Fannon, 1963). The systemic oppressions felt by our Indigenous learners within our colonial educational system have led to a lack of mental, bodily and spiritual nourishment (Dei, 2012) that must be challenged through decolonization efforts.

Decolonization reclaims Native identity.

Decolonization begins first and foremost with critically reflecting on one's own psychological, mental, and spiritual colonization. Decolonization calls on Indigenous Peoples to assess deep rooted colonial claims through facilitated critical thinking that can occur within Indigenous communities (Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012). Yellow Bird (2012) created an analytical model that defines decolonization as both a process and an event. Decolonization as an event is when one reaches a level of critical consciousness and actively acknowledges one's own colonization (Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012). Decolonization as a process is the implementation of multiple and varied strategies towards liberation that includes restoring one's cultural practices, thinking, and beliefs to creating new ideas, thinking, lifestyles, and technologies used to empower and enhance one's Indigeneity. For Native scholars, decolonizing activities include engaging in praxis useful for Indigenous peoples, encouraging critical thinking skills, and developing culturally specific decolonization strategies relevant to Indigenous communities (Wilson & Yellow Bird, 2005). There are a variety of activities, such as decolonizing indigenous thinking, establishing tribal critical thinking centers, decolonizing through storytelling, and Indigenous education (Wilson & Yellow Bird, 2005). Our communities

are in trouble, violence happens and health is threatened. Using these decolonization strategies paves the way to liberation (Wilson & Yellow Bird, 2005)

Major Works and Substantial Findings on Indigenous Inquiry in Academia

Despite the overwhelming dominance of colonial education within Western-based schools and universities and the numerous challenges Indigenous Peoples face learning and working in educational institutions, Indigenous teaching and learning have grown, especially in the Pacific, over the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Indigenous knowledge originating from Native inquiry, especially methodologies, are now found within the university through the pioneering work of Indigenous scholars, such as Kovach (2009), Wilson (2008) and Smith (2000), whose research promoted the inclusion of traditional knowledge and the acceptance of methodologies built on knowledge from Indigenous People's own knowledge systems (Ray, 2012). These are now taught within Indigenous university programs of study. However, there is still much work needed in defining the field of Indigenous inquiry within academia and university programs of study.

Indigenous inquiry grows within the academy.

Indigenous inquiry grew over the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, especially in the Pacific. Wilson (2008) drew on the work of Martin (2003) to describe the rise of Indigenous inquiry in Australia in four distinct phases: Assimilationist, early Aboriginal research, recent Aboriginal research, and Indigenist research. The Assimilationist Phase (1940-1970) continued the exploitation of lands and resources but included research that examined the Aboriginal social structure, kinship structure, and mythologies as well as informed solutions to Aboriginal problems (Wilson, 2008). Aboriginal voices were silenced, with non-Aboriginals feeling qualified to pass on Aboriginal learning through their research (Wilson, 2008). The Early

Aboriginal Research Phase (1970-1990) continued this legacy of research on Aboriginal People. The Recent Aboriginal Research Phase (1990-2000) began to challenge governments for redress due to centuries of colonization (Wilson, 2008). Indigenous voices are now entering the Indigenist Phase (Wilson, 2008).

These phases, classifying the rise of Indigenous inquiry within Australia, mirrored other efforts in the Pacific. The call to decolonize research projects in the wider Pacific originated during the 1970s. Indigenous Peoples established their scholarly authority and called upon research to include more cultural framings and methodologies grounded in the Pacific to ensure greater validity (Nabobo-Baba, 2008). This corresponded with others engaged in counter hegemonic struggles (Nabobo-Baba, 2008). In the 1980s, the Māori challenged the reform agenda by making space within education for Māori knowledge, culture, and language with the launch of Te Kōhanga Reo (language immersion schools), Kura Kaupapa Māori, and Wānanga (tribal degree granting institutions). This revolutionized education, freed Māori minds from the colonizer, and allowed the Māori to exercise individual and collective agency (Smith, 2006).

However, the struggle continued with the advent of knowledge viewed as a commodity in the 1980s and 1990s (Smith, 2006). The narrowing definition of knowledge within the academy reflected a Eurocentric worldview that allowed one to treat knowledge as nothing more than a revenue generator (Greenwood & Levin, 2008; Meek, 2006). This commoditization of knowledge greatly affected universities, notably research universities, as they strived to develop a continuous means of cash flow to support operations (Greenwood, 2008), especially during these austere, economic times. This resulted in the creation of academic capitalism, where market-style approaches rewarded researchers who could both show profits from their research as well as add to the intellectual capital within their unique disciplines (Meek, 2006). Thus, the

sciences embraced entrepreneurialism by focusing more on generating applied research to validate further public and private investments while supplanting basic research (Greenwood & Levin, 2008). In addition, researchers in the social sciences, with the exception of high profile psychologists, economists, and sociologists, also became more positivistic in their research methodologies and methods in order to compete for limited resources. This influenced the way researchers work with graduate and post-graduate researchers (Greenwood & Levin, 2008), by endorsing more positivistic and often colonizing methodologies that are directly aligned with Western capitalist interests. Thus colonization continues its shameless perpetuation through the research of the next generation of scholars.

The progenitors of Indigenous inquiry Graham and Linda Smith as well as numerous others continued to conduct research well into the twenty-first century against the dominance of the capitalist academy that views knowledge as a commodity by focusing on Indigenous cultural aspirations, understandings, and practices. The Smiths' research designs did not address truth and authority as traditionally defined, instead epistemological validity was used that located power and control in Māori customs and traditions (Bishop, 2011). Smith (2006) described how ethical research on the margins using Indigenous cultural knowledge and values are very different from institutionalized research ethics based on Western moral philosophies that really only began in the mid-twentieth century. The remarkable growth of this research is now taught within Indigenous programs of study at universities.

Indigenous university programs are created.

Indigenous inquiry within academia is taught within Indigenous Studies in universities. In Canada, the 1996 Royal Commission Report on Aboriginal Peoples (RCSP) recommended Indigenous knowledge be integrated into post-secondary education. Indigenous knowledge is

important within the Western academy because it carries a history of struggle; it connects to culture, Indigenous rights, and higher education; and it brings Indigenous bodies of knowledge and actual Indigenous bodies to the academy (Kovach, 2009). So programs, such as the Bimaadiziwin/Atonhetseri:io option of the Trent University Native Studies Department PhD program, is part of a larger international movement to situate Indigenous knowledge, protocols, frameworks, relationships, and methodologies in research. It is part of an emerging scholarship occurring around the world that questions knowledge creation and the paradigm inherent in the Western academy (Bell et. al., 2005). In addition, Australian Indigenous Studies has had a political agenda of self-determination for well over forty years. However, there is tension regarding how to teach Indigenous Studies in higher education, particularly in the area of Indigenous contestation of Western knowledge systems, the role unique disciplines play in subjugating Indigenous knowledges, and the politics of knowledge production itself (Nakata, Nakata, Keech & Bolt, 2012). My dissertation explored and described this recent tension within Indigenous inquiry from the perspective of graduate and post-graduate Indigenous scholars whom these programs educate to become the next generation of Native thinkers.

Defining the field of Indigenous inquiry.

The field of Indigenous inquiry expanded over the course of decades within academia. Researchers are now able to rely very little on Western research techniques, including qualitative methods, within studies about and for Indigenous Peoples. However, the academy is currently wrestling with the crumbling of its previously homogenous environment and it is causing fierce discourse and great challenges. Some in the academy are actively resisting the change, others are not aware, and some wonder how to include Indigenous frameworks in their work (Kovach,

2009). This requires advancing the current scholarly and active work of decolonization addressed in my research.

In addition, a critical mass of professionals are getting their hands dirty and rewriting their own history (Cruz, 2012). Bell et al. (2005) challenged the notion of aboriginal epistemology as fixed or mono-epistemic because aboriginality by nature challenges the cognitive, epistemic, and relational violence of colonialism. They advocated for metaphors in curriculum design in higher education as pedagogy to address imbalances and historical trauma. Some academics felt frustrated because they cannot question traditional, community, or cultural forms as well as sources of counter narratives (Nakata, Nakata, Keech & Bolt, 2012). Some Indigenist theorists found themselves challenged and caught in a battle between coloniality and simplistic Indigenous analysis (Nakata, Nakata, Keech & Bolt, 2012). Indigenous inquiry is a field experiencing rapid growth and change because Indigenous scholars continuously explore its boundaries and are pushing beyond them.

Indigenous inquiry grew over the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, especially in the Pacific, despite the overwhelming view of knowledge as a commodity within the colonized academy. The research conducted by Wilson (2008) described the remarkable growth of Indigenous inquiry in Australia, which dovetailed with the rise of Indigenous inquiry in other Pacific scholarship. Indigenous inquiry is an emerging field of study now taught within academia. However with emerging scholarship came fierce discourse and great challenges. Indigenous scholars are broaching new frontiers, challenging the very nature of Indigenous inquiry itself, making it an opportune time for my decolonization scholarship to add to this exciting discourse.

Dissertation based on Indigenous inquiry.

My dissertation was based on the tenets of Indigenous inquiry. Although a relatively new phenomenon within the academy, Native scholars developed criterion elements and design features that further clarify Indigenous inquiry and set it apart from those found within qualitative studies. The primary difference is the focus on decolonization, countering hegemonic research that silenced Native voices in the past by creating a safe space to amplify those Native voices now and into the future. Relationships are also an important part of any Indigenous inquiry and must be maintained and strengthened during the entire study. These relationships also take into account one's personal relationship with the research as well as the wider cosmos. These Indigenous research principles were applied throughout the design, implementation, and evaluation of my study.

Through interviews with other Indigenous scholars, Wilson (2008) defined criterion for Indigenous research. Indigenous research is related to and connected with all living things. It continually renews our relationships with ancestors while maintaining fidelity with our present relations (Wilson, 2008). The Native community approves the research and in turn the researcher respects the community by adhering to protocols, such as non-obtrusive observation, deep listening, reflection, and non-judgmental thinking (Wilson 2008). Reciprocity and responsibility are guiding values when conducting research in Native communities (Wilson 2008). Indigenous research also includes culture and language and is based on Native ontology and epistemology (Wilson 2008). Its source can be found within the hearts and minds of both those creating new knowledge as well as those touched by the research results (Wilson 2008). Indigenous research is deeply rooted in learning and wisdom yet is based on lived experiences (Wilson 2008). The lived

experiences of the researcher are crucial and included in Indigenous inquiry. These criteria formed the basis of my research and are incorporated into the research design.

Indigenous research design within the academy continues to broaden current notions of inquiry. We have come a long way in research design as Ray (2012) referred to Smith's (1998) observations that research was previously thought of as objective with paradigms grounded in the Western academy. Scholarship today increasingly reflects inclusion of traditional knowledge and acceptance of methodologies built on knowledge from people's own knowledge systems (Ray, 2012). Ray (2012) contended that if we continued to use Western knowledge systems to inform our theories and methods under the guise of traditional knowledge systems, we were perpetuating colonial research frameworks. Kovach (2009) greatly added to our understanding of Indigenous research design concepts through her advocacy of Indigenous methodologies embedded in Indigenous research frameworks within academia. Even though she was raised outside of her culture, she used an Indigenous methodology based on her Plains Cree knowledge system. This research was crucial as it is a significant contributor to Indigenous communities as well as members of the academy, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous, particularly for young, Indigenous researchers like myself (Kovach, 2009). I too utilized an Indigenous methodology, which was ha'i mo'olelo based on Hawaiian epistemology, within my research design.

Indigenous research design must also benefit the Native community. A locally controlled research agenda best serves the community and its needs (Zavala, 2013). Smith (2006) encouraged Māori and other researchers on the margins to pursue their research using culturally appropriate processes and procedures that benefit their community. This will ultimately transform the way in which we conduct research, work within the academy, and assist marginalized communities in embracing their power, values, and culture (Smith, 2006). Sium

and Ritskes (2013) referenced Wilson's (2008) contention that research is ceremony, and ceremony holds an important place in Indigenous communities. The next generation of Native researchers is clearly defining the field through the lens of Indigenous scholarship and with the community's support and engagement (Ray, 2012). These Indigenous research design principles guided the creation of my study and were apparent within my inquiry framework.

Indigenous research, inclusive of its criteria and design, are markedly different from qualitative inquiry. Bishop (2011) claimed that qualitative research did not solve the problems for positivist and neo-positivist research. It too had a history of colonizing the discourse of the Other in addition to asking Indigenous researchers to stand aside from their identity which would be the ultimate victory of colonization (Bishop, 2011). Furthermore, qualitative inquiry can only travel so far, as it is not guided by Indigenous knowledge, but based on Western approaches (Kovach, 2009). Kovach (2009) asserted that it was better to view Indigenous and qualitative inquiry as having an Insider-Outsider relationship. Both share relational and evidence of process and content within an inquiry framework, however, the Indigenous paradigm is based on an animistic philosophy and relation to all forms of life (Kovach, 2009). Zavala (2013) strongly recommended a totally, Indigenous way of conducting research and I wholly support this recommendation. This doctoral dissertation strived to be Indigenous research as opposed to another example of qualitative research with Indigenous overtones.

Another major difference between Indigenous and qualitative research is the focus on decolonization. Indigenous research is decolonizing research that involves Indigenous motives, concerns, and knowledge (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). It allows for the close examination of economic, political, and social factors that affect communities (Wilson, 2008). It is performative and activist within communities (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). It recognizes the role of

colonization in research, resists this colonization, and finds ways to end the current oppression of silenced, excluded, and marginalized voices who lack agency in normative research (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). These voices are provided spaces for recovery, healing, and development through research strategies, such as the Māori whānau and comunidades de base in Latin America (Zavala, 2013). When these voices are heard, they are culturally framed in genres of research and methodologies that reflect the authentic experiences of Indigenous Peoples (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). The research is not static, but fluid because it embraces non-Western forms that promote epistemologies and Native languages and customs within the research process (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). My doctoral inquiry was not only a personal decolonizing journey, but had larger aspirations to promote decolonizing research within the academy.

Indigenous research must strengthen relationships, both academic and personal, as my dissertation did. Wilson (2008) embarked on his research journey to promote strong relationships between humans and the cosmos so we all can increase our level of consciousness and insight into the world. He described Indigenous research as a sacred ceremony that allowed space for Indigenous peoples to be “grounded” (p. 88) in their identity while creating an Indigenous perspective from the land. The molecular memory and intuition about culture and its foundations must be respected within research (Wilson, 2008). Similarly, Kovach (2009) explained how research must communicate a strong connection to self, community, memory, and reciprocity. Focusing on good relationships is an important component as well as experiential knowing, collective relevance, and a decolonizing purpose (Kovach, 2009). Both Wilson (2008) and Kovach (2009) designed frameworks that not only created new knowledge within the academy, but also honored and enhanced relationships with our world. Through my research, I

endeavored to strengthen relationships with my Hawaiian culture and language through personal decolonization as well as added to the growing body of Indigenous knowledge within academia. This addressed the plea for more Indigenous values within research.

The role of the researcher within Indigenous research is unique. Similar to Wilson (2008), I saw myself not as a researcher or an author but as a storyteller. As a storyteller, I had a relational accountability to the ideas generated from the research and a responsibility to connect with the reader. The reader should have seen the relationships unfolding and strengthening over the duration of the research (Wilson, 2008). Kovach (2009) also emphasized the importance of situating one’s self, one’s culture, and one’s purpose firmly within Indigenous research. My personal mo‘olelo played a critical role within my research and my personal decolonizing journey illustrated the growing relationship I have with my culture and language. I agreed with Wilson’s (2008) sentiment that “if research doesn’t change a person, then you haven’t done it right” (p. 135).

My dissertation was based on these tenets of Indigenous research. I incorporated Native design elements and features into my study that set my Native inquiry apart from other qualitative studies. This study was about decolonization that countered the contemporary oppression and colonization of Indigenous voices within the research process. Much of my dissertation highlighted a personal decolonization journey as well as the decolonizing experiences of other promising Indigenous scholars within academia. Maintaining good relationships with others within the community, academia, and the cosmos was a crucial component of my Indigenous inquiry framework. As a storyteller, I strengthened these relationships and ensured that all aspects of my inquiry framework, from my paradigm to my theoretical perspective, were in keeping with the wishes and aspirations of the Lāhui (Nation).

Summary of Literature Review

This literature review achieved its main purposes of decolonizing traditional literature review processes, exploring the history and scope of the problem of colonization, establishing the context of theory relating to the problem of colonization, and deepening my personal connections to previous research while furthering my personal decolonization. The five-step literature review process successfully identified and selected relevant literature that was included in this dissertation. The literature, from influential Indigenous journals as well as historical and contemporary books and handbooks primarily authored by Natives, provided the inspiration for and support of this dissertation’s inquiry framework. The literature reviewed the historical rise and maintenance of colonial education by colonizing minds at the expense of Indigenous educational systems in the nineteenth century. It also described the current state and growth of Indigenous inquiry in the academy. This dissertation added to this emerging scholarship and its burgeoning research literature. Although this concluded the formal literature review for this dissertation, it did not end the incorporation of research literature into all aspects of the dissertation. I followed Wane (2013) in interweaving the research literature with research examples all throughout this personal decolonizing journey, especially within the inquiry framework. This strengthened my ‘upena.

CHAPTER 3

Inquiry Framework

Overview of Inquiry Framework

My inquiry framework presented the theoretical, technical, and practical framework on which this doctoral dissertation rested. The structure of the inquiry framework included a Hawaiian paradigm, ontology, axiology, and epistemology, as well as a decolonizing theoretical perspective. Native scholars and leading advocates for Indigenous research Kovach (2009) and Wilson (2008) inspired the overarching organization of the framework. I began by defining the major elements and advantages of an Indigenous research framework and paradigm and how it aligned with my ‘Ōiwi framework and paradigm. Next, I explained ontology and axiology and linked both to my use of pono and ho‘oponopono. This was followed by an exploration of Indigenous epistemology and its connection with my Hawaiian epistemology. Lastly, I delved into the importance of having a decolonizing lens applied as the theoretical perspective throughout the entire research process. This strong kahua (foundation) supported the choice of my methodology and methods.

‘Ōiwi Framework and Paradigm

This Native inquiry stood on an ‘Ōiwi framework and paradigm. I began by describing how its creation mirrored Steinhauer’s (2001a) four stages of Indigenous research paradigm development as written in Wilson (2008). Major elements of an Indigenous research framework were identified and linked to my ‘Ōiwi framework and paradigm. I explained why it was important to utilize an Indigenous paradigm and framework in this study alongside examples of Indigenous frameworks and paradigms in modern research. I concluded with a detailed

description of my 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm inspired by both Indigenous and Hawaiian scholars.

My personal journey in creating my 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm reflected Steinhauer's (2001a) development of an Indigenous research paradigm as written in Wilson (2008). There are four stages. Stage one focused on the dominant system of research with Indigenous scholars separating their Indigenous lives from their academic endeavors (Wilson, 2008). All throughout my schooling until very recently I relied heavily on dominant research to inform my thinking and writing. I divorced myself from my culture, the very essence of my being, in order to conform to society's norms and expectations. Stage two included seeking an Indigenous paradigm and wanting to use culturally specific research models, but not wanting to be marginalized by the academy (Wilson, 2008). It wasn't until I was well into my doctoral program that I was exposed to Indigenous research. I yearned to incorporate aspects of Indigenous research into my thinking and writing but was hesitant because I was unsure if it would be acceptable by individual professors or by the academy as a whole. Stage three focused on the decolonization of Western methodologies and challenging Western models (Wilson, 2008). Over time, I gained more confidence in myself as well as my abilities to articulate my 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm. I grew intellectually through reading and reflecting on scholarly texts and interacting with Indigenous scholars and researchers. I came to the realization that I was thoroughly colonized and this ignited a passion to gradually move away from Western methodologies and models towards more Indigenous ones. The fourth stage described the full articulation of Indigenous paradigms, methods, and approaches to data collection and analysis (Wilson, 2008). This dissertation represented my decolonizing journey towards recognizing the

dire need for Indigenous research frameworks and paradigms to be located in the academy as well as taught in the university curriculum.

My 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm were based on the major elements of an Indigenous framework and paradigm. Wilson (2008) identified the fundamental components within an Indigenous inquiry framework: paradigm, ontology, epistemology, axiology, and methodology. A paradigm is a “set of underlying beliefs that guide... actions. These beliefs include the way we view reality (ontology), how we think about or know this reality (epistemology), our ethics and morals (axiology), and how we go about gaining more knowledge about reality (methodology)” (p. 13). This framework came to Wilson (2008) intuitively. Both Kovach (2009) and Wilson (2008) advocated that an Indigenous framework should be viewed holistically rather than discretely with each component inter-related to and inter-connected with another as well as circuitously rather than linearly with no beginning or ending components. Although inquiry frameworks privilege written thought, the structure of an inquiry framework can benefit Indigenous scholars and researchers (Kovach, 2009). It certainly contributed greatly to organizing my dissertation by providing the structure necessary to design my study.

My study's framework contained an 'Ōiwi paradigm. A paradigm is synonymous with worldview. Worldviews can be defined as cognitive, perpetual, and affective maps that an individual uses in order to make sense of the world and to find ways to accomplish goals (Hart, 2010). Every society holds dominant worldviews, however the tragedy is alternative, often Indigenous worldviews are marginalized and analyzed through a Eurocentric lens that affirms the colonists' mythology and further perpetuates colonization (Hart, 2010). The writing of Dei (2012) concurred with Hart's (2010) statement as he promoted an African-centered paradigm that creates a theoretical and pragmatic space to reflect and interpret experiences from

worldviews and understandings different from those that are Euro-centric. Worldviews are shaped by culture, agency, history, identity, and experience (Dei, 2012). That is why it is vital to promote an Indigenous research paradigm because it leads to a better understanding of Indigenous needs and fully integrates a Native worldview (Wilson, 2008). Hart (2010) referred to Simpson's (2000) seven principles of Native worldviews: knowledge is holistic, cyclic, and dependent; there are many truths; everything is alive; everything is equal; land is sacred; spiritual relationships; and human beings are the least important in this world. These principles of Indigenous worldview align with the tenets of Indigenous research. My 'Ōiwi paradigm incorporated these principles.

I chose an 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm within my inquiry for several reasons. By utilizing this Indigenous approach it broke down Indigenous-settler research relationships. It helped me grow in my own cultural identity as other Native scholars and researchers grew in their identities when employing Indigenous frameworks and paradigms. It is inherently political. Indigenous research frameworks and paradigms are grounded in Native knowledge and culture and as such belong to the cosmos. It represents a true transitioning towards research that is wholly Indigenous with little or no reliance on Western approaches. All of these reasons contributed towards my decision to utilize an Indigenous approach to my research.

An Indigenous research framework and paradigm breaks down the binary Indigenous-settler research relationship and opens up new dialogue, research theory, and action (Kovach, 2009). It can counter current Western research found within Indigenous communities that may align well with ethical and communal dynamics, but ultimately are based on Western epistemologies (Kovach, 2009). Wilson (2008) advocated that the decolonization of research methodologies are not enough and urged researchers to leave dominant paradigms behind for

Indigenous paradigms. He did this in his 2008 study by maintaining, transmitting, and clarifying Indigenous ways of doing and being in research that allowed for the further development of Indigenous theory and methods of practice. I built on this pioneering work to bridge this Indigenous-settler divide.

An ‘Ōiwi framework and paradigm strengthened my cultural identity similar to the experiences of other Native scholars and researchers who used Indigenous frameworks and paradigms. Dei (2012) started with an African lens and found it powerful in producing knowledge and strengthening identity. Influenced by African/Black scholars, such as W.E.B. DuBois and Franz Fanon, Dei (2012) articulated an “Indigenous anti-colonial” (p. 102) framework and when implemented it allowed Indigenous Peoples to be true to themselves. Kovach (2009) celebrated how cultural identity and one’s entire being are all part of one’s holistic worldview. An Indigenous paradigm is holistic by nature so the storyteller imparts his or her life experiences in the stories so that listeners and readers can filter through their own experiences and adapt the information so it is relevant to their lives (Wilson, 2008). My ‘Ōiwi framework for this study deepened my understanding of and connection with my culture similar to the research experiences of Dei (2012). The ‘Ōiwi paradigm in my study was unique to me and the mo‘olelo generated from the study bore my imprint.

One of the distinguishing features of an Indigenous research framework and paradigm is it is inherently political. Indigenous paradigms, especially, have a unique way of seeing the world that carries political implications (Wilson, 2008). Kaupapa Māori research is an example because research privileges Māori epistemological, theoretical, and methodological preferences and practices as well as focuses on the power of conscientization and politicization (Bishop, 2011). Its genealogy can be linked to the revitalization of Māori culture in the 1970s and 1980s

with stronger Māori aspirations, preferences, and practices expressed in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Bishop, 2011). Māori knowledge existed before European arrival and was protected by the Treaty of Waitangi (Bishop, 2011). Thus Kaupapa Māori research challenged the dominant Pākēha worldview (Bishop, 2011). So too the 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm of this study challenged the dominant research paradigm utilized in Hawai'i locally and added to this growing movement globally.

Another reason why I chose to utilize an Indigenous research framework and paradigm is that they are grounded in Native knowledge with this knowledge belonging to the cosmos. Dei (2012) described his anti-colonial framework as anchored in an Indigenous perspective grounded in knowledge and local, cultural knowing. Kovach (2009) constructed a tribal-centered framework, based on Plains Cree knowledge and methods, that integrated cultural knowledge with congruent methodologies for human subject research. Hart (2010) took this one step further in referencing Garroutee's (2003) radical indigenism as a key component to an Indigenous research paradigm because it focused on the reassertion and rebuilding of Indigenous knowledge as well as the importance of the spiritual and sacred. This Indigenous paradigm of viewing knowledge as spiritual and sacred is the antithesis of the dominant research paradigm that looks at knowledge as an individual entity, owned by an individual for individual gain (Wilson, 2008). In an Indigenous research framework and paradigm, knowledge belongs to the cosmos and the researcher is just the interpreter (Wilson, 2008). I saw myself as an interpreter of knowledge within the 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm. This opportunity happened because the framework and paradigm were grounded in Native knowledge.

The final reason why I chose an 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm within my inquiry is that it truly represented my transition to Indigenous research with little or no reliance on Western

inquiry approaches. I believe the field of Indigenous research within the last twelve years evolved in that researchers can rely very little on Western techniques and really come into our own by writing almost, if not exclusively, from an Indigenous framework and accompanying paradigm. The end of what I call “peppering” is near, with a critical mass of scholars promoting this and enough waves created within academia and particularly Indigenous studies so that research can be carried out with little if no references to Western-constructed research design. Evidence of this transition can be found in Bell et. al. (2005) as they examined the central tension between balancing Aboriginal and Western academic paradigms. A concern was raised that the upper years of the PhD program was too focused on Western theories and pedagogies and there was a need to ensure the program was grounded in culture rather than trying to blend Aboriginal and Western perspectives (Bell et. al., 2005). Hawaiian researchers, such as Kaomea (2001), used hybrid or multiple paradigms and methodologies in the past. However, I am confident that the field is advanced to the point where Hawaiian and other Indigenous paradigms, epistemologies, axiologies, theoretical perspectives, methodologies, and methods are more apparent in research and that we can recover from the “epistemological imperialism” (Dei, 2012, p. 3) of the past.

There are now more examples of Indigenous frameworks and paradigms for promising researchers like myself to reference and draw inspiration from as we create knowledge in the academy. The Fijian Vanua Research Framework (FVRF) created by Nabobo-Baba (2008) decolonized current framings in Pacific research and connected to other Indigenous research movements in the geographical region. Hart (2010) developed an Indigenous research paradigm for social work practice with Cree Peoples in north central Turtle Island. Kovach (2009) focused

on research utilizing her Plains Cree knowledge. These are just three examples of Indigenous frameworks and paradigms that influenced my own 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm.

The Fijian Vanua Research Framework (FVRF) is an Indigenous theoretical approach based on Fijian worldviews, knowledge systems, lived experiences, representations, cultures, and values (Nabobo-Baba, 2008). Kaupapa Māori research, Tongan Kakala Framing, and critical theory informed the FVRF (Nabobo-Baba, 2008). Nabobo-baba (2008) created the FVRF to decolonize research and methodologies and empower Fijians. FVRF addressed the concerns of Nabobo-Baba (2008) and other Indigenous scholars that research within the academy needed to include research agendas and paradigms that were democratic and inclusive of cultural knowledge, values, protocols, and principles (Nabobo-Baba, 2008). Although FVRF applies critical theory principles, an approach based on Western knowledge, I believe looking to other Pacific Island scholarship helped guide and inform my research practices. FVRF added to a growing understanding of Pacific Island research paradigms.

Hart (2010) developed an Indigenous research paradigm for his social work practice with Cree Peoples in north central Turtle Island. Due to his work within an Indigenous community, it was important for him to develop an Indigenous research paradigm based on the framework established by Wilson (2008) that included ontology, epistemology, methodology, and axiology (Hart, 2010). Hart (2010) advocated for this paradigm within his research because worldviews are often centered on Eurocentric perspectives that led to blinded colonialism resulting in marginalization. Worldviews are powerful within research because they affect belief systems, decision-making, assumptions, and problem-solving strategies (Hart, 2010). Reading Hart's (2010) description of the power of worldviews and its impact on all aspects of the research design and processes empowered me to reflect deeply on my cultural identity and enhance my

own Indigenous worldview so my 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm was influenced less by my colonized upbringing.

Kovach (2009) used Plains Cree knowledge in her research framework and it guided her use of methods. Her research centered on Nêhiyaw knowledges, Nêhiyaw methodology, and a decolonizing aim and tribal ethics. Kovach (2009) stressed that Indigenous researchers use Indigenous methods to communicate their epistemological positionings and that these methods must align with Native ways of knowing. She acknowledged that this is just one example of an Indigenous research framework and there is no standardized, external framework for all Indigenous research (Kovach, 2009). In this respect, my 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm was centered on my evolving cultural identity and deepening understanding of Hawaiian knowledge and can not be replicated or compared to other research designs or worldviews. However, through this dissertation, I added my 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm to the growing field of Indigenous research to inspire other promising Indigenous scholars and researchers to consider this choice in life.

Although inspired by the Indigenous frameworks and paradigms of Nabobo-baba (2008), Hart (2010), and Kovach (2009), my main influence came from Hawaiian scholar Young (1995). My 'Ōiwi paradigm incorporated Young's metaphor for privileging 'Ōiwi concepts and values, including spiritually, yet I focused more on including Indigenous research design principles as well as on decolonization. Inspired by Hawaiian scholar Kame'eleihiwa and African scholar Ngugi, Young (1995) articulated his 'Ōiwi paradigm in his doctoral dissertation asserting that without the use of Hawaiian terms and concepts there was no critical link to the 'Ōiwi past. His dissertation was bilingual conceptually. Young's (1995) metaphor for understanding history through a cultural context identified the reef as a point of departure with the valley as a

destination. However, the reef protects the beach from outsiders yet is a safe place for Natives to engage in foreign ideas (Young, 1995). The valley is the journey's end and requires much 'ike (knowledge) and ancestry. It is a place where non-Hawaiians are not welcome because they do not have ties to the kūpuna. Young (1995) understood this valley and that is why he chose to use 'Ōiwi concepts and values in his overall theoretical framework.

Young (1995) ensured that his 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm were based on spirituality. Along with relations to people and the land, one must also have spirituality infused within one's worldview when one is using an Indigenous paradigm (Young, 1995). Spirituality is personal, individual, and integral to connect one to the entire universe and is critical to one's mental, emotional, and physical health (Young, 1995). "Native people should have the right to formulate and apply a theoretical framework to interpret the past that is culturally compatible and consistent with Native worldview" (Young, 1995, p. 29). This indicated the important role of spirituality as well as mana in the sources and the pono use of sources (Young, 1995).

My 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm owed much to the innovative research of Young (1995). I understood his metaphor as I played on the reef with foreign ideas for most of my life, turning my back on and shunning my beautiful island home. However, there was always that pull, much like the currents, that encouraged me to go back. It wasn't until my adulthood that I decided to search for that valley. I am greatly honored that I have connections with the valley, yet am disappointed that it is such a foreign place for me. I lost much time. As I entered the valley, I rather humbly asked for guidance from Ke Akua (God). I am excited about this new world I am exploring. With each tenuous step into the valley, I deepened my relations with my people and the land as well as all aspects of my being- spiritual, mental, physical, and emotional. I noticed that my 'Ōiwi paradigm deepened and my voice grew more confident throughout this

research process. I took the progressive work of Indigenous scholars and researchers and made it my own. Although Young (1995) constructed his theoretical framework from select Western and Native scholars while incorporating Hawaiian language and concepts, I understood this was a strategic concession at the time. This dissertation illustrated Indigenous research design for the next generation and grounded much of the work that I did in Native scholarship in all its wonderful forms.

Pono and Ho‘oponopono are Ontology and Axiology

This study’s ‘Ōiwi framework included pono and ho‘oponopono as my ontology and axiology. Ontology is how people see the world and how this affects their understanding of what exists (Hart, 2010). It may be challenging to define an Indigenous axiology because values, principles, and beliefs are different and varied (Hart, 2010). However, there are commonly held Indigenous values. Recent scholarship, particularly from Kovach (2009), Shirt, Lewis, and Jackson (2012), and Dei (2012), described the importance of including ontology and axiology in Indigenous research. Indigenous definitions of ontology and axiology in addition to the scholarship of Native researchers, including Chun (2011, 2006) and Young (1995), informed my choices of pono and ho‘oponopono as my ontology and axiology within my inquiry framework.

Indigenous ontology and axiology is informed by relationships. The spiritual realm and its connection to the physical realm is an important component of an Indigenous research framework’s ontology (Hart, 2010). Our ontology, our reality, is influenced by our relationships with everything in the cosmos. The object or thing under study is not as important as the relationship that has gone into understanding the object or thing (Wilson, 2008). As Wilson (2008) summarized, “We could not be without being in relationship with everything that surrounds us and is within us. Our reality, our ontology, is the relationships (Wilson, 2008, p. 5).

Recent scholarship, particularly from Kovach (2009), Shirt, Lewis, and Jackson (2012), and Dei (2012) described the importance of including ontology and axiology in Indigenous research. Kovach (2009) viewed knowledge as not objectified, but in a process of being. Knowledge emphasizes respect, reciprocity, protocol, holistic knowing, relevancy, story, interpretative meaning, and experiences that are grounded in place and kinship systems (Kovach, 2009). Referencing Cree scholar Michael Hart, Kovach (2009) acknowledged that this knowledge is self in reflection, moving people forward. Shirt, Lewis, and Jackson (2012) also wrote how important ontology is in moving people forward with an eye towards the next generation. *Âtayôhkewina* (sacred stories) developed Cree ontology and connected Cree to the world through kinship, both through biological parents and grandparents as well as other relatives, such as Thunderbirds, Grandfather Wind, Bears, Eagles, and Horses (Shirt, Lewis & Jackson, 2012). This idea of kinship and connection linked with Dei's (2012) recognition of the power within the collective and the individual. Both are of ontological importance, especially when one considers how Indigenous ontology must exist outside of Euro-America hegemony (Dei, 2012).

Pono and ho'oponopono, my Hawaiian ontology and axiology, are grounded in place and Hawaiian kinship systems while connecting me with everything in the cosmos. However, pono became both my ontology and axiology and guided this research as it reflected the state of being Hawaiian and acting as a Hawaiian (Chun, 2011). Ho'oponopono joined pono as my ontology and axiology as its primary purpose is to restore, mend, build, and strengthen relationships (Chun, 2006). I considered my personal decolonization as ho'oponopono because it led me towards developing a stronger Hawaiian worldview that is influenced by my sense of being

pono. Hawai'i scholars Chun (2006, 2011) and Young (1995) researched the importance of pono and ho'oponopono to Hawaiian ways of being and knowing.

There are no Hawaiian definitions of ontology and axiology. There are no traditional words in Hawaiian for values, morals, and ethics. In a traditional Hawaiian worldview, the discrete Hawaiian values that we often refer to, such as aloha (love), lōkahi (unity), and ha'aha'a (humbleness) are interwoven into daily Hawaiian living (Chun, 2011). Yet scholars conducted research to explore the concept of Hawaiian values, ethics, and morals not only to distinguish the Hawaiian culture from others but also to help us rediscover this traditional knowledge and ways of being (Chun, 2006).

Pono was the guiding ontology and axiology for this study. Pono was such an important concept that celebrated Hawaiian scholar Davida Malo devoted an entire chapter in his book to pono (Chun, 2006). Actions are described as pono. One of the best examples of a Hawaiian who understood, knew, and appreciated pono is Kamehameha (Chun, 2006). Kamehameha, the great warrior mō'i, had knowledge of what it meant to be pono from studying the just actions of previous ali'i and applying this learning to his everyday actions (Chun, 2011). Hawaiian nineteenth-century historian Kamakau described many examples of the pono deeds of Kamehameha (Chun, 2006). However, Kamakau wrote of the disintegration of pono during his lifetime based on his observations of the growing influence of outsiders, oftentimes Americans and Europeans, on traditional Hawaiian society (Chun, 2011). Due to this disintegration of what is pono, there is a great need for ho'oponopono, a restoration and healing of life at the individual, family, community, and societal level (Chun, 2011).

Hawaiian research prominently featured pono. Young (1995) adhered to pono as he determined what to include or omit in his dissertation, as some knowledge was sacred and not

appropriate to be shared in this type of venue. Kame'eiehiwa's research featured the importance of pono as well and its direct link to the acquisition of mana (Young, 1995). Pono actions require mana (Young, 1995). Calvinism replaced traditional Native spirituality in Hawai'i and thus a new process of acquiring mana came into being (Young, 1995). However, these new processes severely damaged and ultimately colonized an 'Ōiwi paradigm replacing it with a distinctly American worldview. Thus, I along with many other up-and-coming Hawaiian scholars looked towards traditional concepts and ideas, such as pono, as a way to restore and reclaim a Hawaiian worldview (Chun, 2006). This restoration of pono, ho'oponopono, was also part of my ontology and axiology.

The primary purpose of ho'oponopono is to restore, mend, build, and strengthen relationships. The Hawaiian way of healing and restoring relationships has its roots in pre-Christian times, but evolved and developed into more contemporary forms used today in social work, group therapy, and psychological orientation (Chun, 2006). This traditional Hawaiian way of healing addressed mental issues first before addressing the treatment of the body because Hawaiians acknowledged that sickness and healing were complex processes with the healer using observation and dialogue with the family to arrive at a collaborative diagnosis that addressed root causes (Chun, 2006). Today, elements of ho'oponopono include hihia (entanglement), kukulu kumuhana (unifying force, pooling of strengths for shared purpose), mahiki (peel off), ho'omalū (period of peace and quiet), mihi (repentance), and kala (untie, let go, release) (Chun, 2006). I decided to use ho'oponopono as part of my ontology and axiology because it represented a culturally based, Hawaiian process for personal and collective decolonization. Through this research I endeavored towards being more pono through

ho'oponopono that allowed me to deepen my Hawaiian identity, connect to my culture, and understand who I am as an Indigenous researcher.

The decolonization process I underwent can be compared to the creation of an 'upena with cordage. This is a Hawaiian metaphor often associated with ho'oponopono (Chun, 2006). One creates an 'upena through individual strands of fiber that are twisted together to make strong cordage, that are then used to create a net through knots (Chun, 2006). Each knot is secured and tied tight. However, if knots are loose one must go back through previous knots to correct, similar to “untangling” (Chun, 2006, p. 27) problems by going through past events, correcting actions, and creating a new life (Chun, 2006). The strengthening of my 'Ōiwi paradigm was like the creation of an 'upena. I deepened my understanding of what it meant to be an Indigenous researcher by creating knowledge through this study. It was akin to creating a net. However, sometimes I had to go back, reflect and analyze my own actions as well as the colonizing historical events of my people, in order to re-knot and strengthen my net, my identity, my cultural knowledge, my ideas on education, and my educational experiences. Decolonization was an arduous process, yet it brought me closer to being pono.

My 'Ōiwi framework included pono and ho'oponopono as my ontology and axiology. Ontology and axiology were informed by relationships with everything that surrounds us. Recent scholarship promoted the inclusion of ontology and axiology in Indigenous research. Kovach (2009) recognized the importance of Plains Cree knowledge as a process of being. Shirt, Lewis, and Jackson (2012) described how âtayôhkewina developed Cree ontology. Dei's (2012) African/Black ontology was critical to challenging Western notions of being. These scholars, as well as Chun (2011, 2006) and Young (1995), inspired my decision to use pono and ho'oponopono as my ontology and axiology. As a colonized, Indigenous researcher, I must

continue to engage in ho‘oponopono as a decolonizing process in order to reclaim and restore my ‘Ōiwi identity. This strong ‘Ōiwi identity allowed me to more fully understand Hawaiian epistemology.

Hawaiian Epistemology

My ‘Ōiwi framework encompassed a Hawaiian epistemology. A Hawaiian epistemology is an Indigenous epistemology defined by language, place, and relationships. It was crucial for this study to have an Indigenous epistemology because it emphasized a larger struggle against hegemony present in today’s academia and advocated for more aboriginal epistemologies within research design. An Indigenous epistemology is personal to the researcher. Shirt, Lewis and Jackson (2012), Trinidad (2012), Kovach (2009), and Meyer (2008) influenced my Hawaiian epistemology yet it uniquely reflected who I am as a promising Indigenous scholar.

Scholars believe Native knowledge is the foundation of Indigenous epistemologies. An Indigenous paradigm’s epistemology is influenced by generations of knowing that are passed down through storytelling (Hart, 2010). It emerges through perceptual experiences and is subjective based on inward explorations, rituals, ceremonies, dreaming, visioning, and prayer (Hart, 2010). Epistemological questions are connected to Indigenous ways of knowing and being (Bishop, 2011). It is different from Western epistemology because it is interactional, interrelated, broad-based, whole, inclusive, animate, cyclical, fluid, and spiritual (Kovach, 2009). This is the foundation for an anti-colonial framework that addresses knowledge production, validation, interrogation, and dissemination as well as agency, politics, and resistance (Dei, 2012).

Indigenous epistemology is defined by language, place, and relationships. Language is important to a tribal-centered epistemology because language holds worldview (Kovach, 2009). It is powerful not only because it is non-binary and complementary, but also because it makes

abstract research findings relevant to Indigenous communities (Kovach, 2009). Place is another key feature of an Indigenous epistemology in that it gives Native Peoples a unique identity from other Indigenous Peoples while linking past with present (Kovach, 2009). Entire systems of relationships are inherent in an Indigenous epistemology, including those that are interpersonal, intrapersonal, environmental, and spiritual (Wilson, 2008). Native scholars acknowledged the relational, holistic nature of these epistemologies in use because they are action-oriented, holistic, values-based, and responsible for good relationships (Kovach, 2009). My Hawaiian epistemology was considerate of the language. It was based on my understanding of place and was informed by my relationships.

It is paramount that Indigenous scholars use Indigenous epistemologies in their research to counter hegemony present in academia. Indigenous studies as well as world systems and critical race theories critique epistemological dominance, especially in higher education (Andreotti, Akenakew & Cooper, 2011). Andreotti, Akenakew and Cooper (2011) said this struggle is not separate from the struggle for global “cognitive” (p. 42) justice. Political resistance must be paired with epistemological resistance and epistemological thinking must go beyond scientific knowledge and include a renouncement of general epistemology (Andreotti, Akenakew & Cooper, 2011). Indigenous knowledge is a site of epistemic resistance (Wane, 2013). Aboriginal epistemologies are not to be defined as fixed or mono-epistemic because aboriginality by nature challenges the cognitive, epistemic, and relational violence of colonialism (Andreotti, Akenakew & Cooper, 2011). My Hawaiian epistemology was a political statement because it added to the literature on Indigenous epistemologies within academia and promoted its usage among young academics. It was also a personal reflection of my growing cultural identity and how it was applied to this particular research endeavor.

One's epistemology is personal. Kovach (2009) advocated a resistance to pan-Indian epistemology and instead used a tribal-specific epistemology. As a researcher, she followed a process that centered her within her research to find her own belonging, *miskâsowin*. Her role reflected an inside/outside status that became part of her epistemology. One's research epistemology is congruent with one's life and research choices (Kovach, 2009). Including oneself in one's research is a way to honor one's particular Indigenous epistemology (Kovach, 2009). In this respect, my Hawaiian epistemology was particular to me at a specific moment of time in my life. It drew from Indigenous epistemological principles, yet it was personalized to reflect who I am as a storyteller. It was influenced by other scholarly Indigenous epistemologies as well.

Shirt, Lewis and Jackson (2012) and Kovach (2009) both utilized Indigenous epistemologies. Shirt, Lewis and Jackson (2012) described how *âcimowina* (stories) developed Cree epistemology and *âtayôhkewina* developed Cree ontology and both informed Cree axiology (Shirt et. al., 2012). *Nêhiyaw* epistemology guided Kovach's (2009) research methodology. She used Plains Cree knowledge to underpin her epistemology. The deeper Kovach (2009) understood a tribal-based epistemology, the more she was able to resist Western ways of knowing. This shift took place over time, was holistic, and was expressed cognitively within the research process (Kovach, 2009). I understood Kovach's (2009) sentiments as I grew over time in my understanding as to what an Indigenous epistemology is and how I could harness its incredible influence over my research. Shirt, Lewis and Jackson (2012) and Kovach (2009) informed my understanding of place-based Indigenous epistemologies, yet scholars Trinidad (2012) and Meyer (2008) increased my understanding as their research applied specifically to Hawai'i. Trinidad (2012) and Meyer (2008) influenced my epistemology for this inquiry by

deepening my personal understanding of the qualities of a Hawaiian epistemology. Trinidad (2013) did this by referencing Hawaiian scholar Kanahēle’s values as informing epistemology as well as ontology and axiology. Similarly, I utilized pono and ho‘oponopono as my ontology and axiology. Both played a crucial role within my overall research design and influenced my epistemology and choice of methodology and methods. Meyer (2008) also acknowledged the importance of epistemology to research and described Hawaiian epistemology within seven categories. Meyer (2008) is well known as the progenitor of defining Hawaiian epistemology within academic research.

Meyer (2008) understood that all people have a unique way of knowing and doing and that epistemology is specific to the place people reside. She organized Hawaiian epistemology into seven categories. The first is spirituality and knowing: the cultural context of knowledge (Meyer, 2008). It draws from our deep connection to our kūpuna, ‘āina, oceans, language, rituals and ‘ohana. The second category is that which feeds: the physical place and knowing (Meyer, 2008). The land is more than just a place for it contextualizes knowing and provides nourishment, sustainability, receptivity, and wisdom. Following this category is the cultural nature of the senses: expanding our ideas of empiricism. Meyer (2008) advocated for a maturing of objectivity in research towards subjectivity to incorporate all the senses. Another category is relationship and knowing: self through other (Meyer, 2008). Indigenous Peoples are an interdependent people, with one another and the ‘āina. Knowledge is gained through relationships. The fifth category is utility and knowledge: ideas of wealth and usefulness (Meyer, 2008). Ideas need to be useful and serve a function. Action needs to occur following theory. Another category is words and knowledge: causality in language (Meyer, 2008). Our thoughts create intention and thus lead to action. Lastly, the body and mind are both needed to build

knowledge (Meyer, 2008). Knowledge and intelligence come from the na'au (intestines bowels, guts). For Meyer (2008), all of this is made actionable through her process of triangulation, in which the body, mind, and spirit come together as a whole to change the culture of academia so that ancient ways of seeing the world are reflected in the research produced.

My Hawaiian epistemology was grounded in the research of Trinidad (2012) and Meyer (2008) and was informed by Shirt, Lewis and Jackson (2012) and Kovach (2009) yet was defined by who I am as a kanaka (person). My Hawaiian epistemology was based on my Indigenous knowledge and its contemporary application to my study. Through this study, my epistemological understandings blossomed as I learned more about my culture and my language. My Hawaiian epistemology encompassed my personal journey towards becoming more pono, a state of being that promotes the strengthening of my cultural identity. This epistemology informed my selection of a theoretical perspective, a decolonizing lens. My choice of methodology and method were rooted directly in my Hawaiian epistemology. This epistemology was a crucial piece of my inquiry framework.

My 'Ōiwi framework encompassed my Hawaiian epistemology. This epistemology was unique to me and was grounded in my language, my Hawai'i, and my relationships with others and all that surrounds me. As an Indigenous epistemology, it challenged the dominant epistemologies grounded in colonialism and cultural supremacy as well as challenges our current notions of fixed or mono-epistemic understandings. Shirt, Lewis and Jackson (2012), Trinidad (2012), Kovach (2009), and Meyer (2008) inspired my Hawaiian epistemology. Yet it was unique to me as a storyteller and a kanaka. It influenced everything in my inquiry framework, including my choice of theoretical perspective, a decolonizing lens.

Decolonizing Lens is Theoretical Perspective

A decolonizing lens is imperative within an Indigenous inquiry framework. It must address power relations and ensure that Indigenous voices are heard throughout the research process. A decolonizing lens addresses past colonialism but focuses on liberation and sovereignty. Its application throughout the study was a personal journey for me and reflected my everyday decolonizing experiences. It was messy, complex, and circular while involving all aspects of one's being. The choice of a decolonizing lens as the theoretical perspective within this study was inspired by the experiences of other Indigenous scholars and their communities who benefitted personally and collectively from its inclusion. It was a crucial part of my study's inquiry framework.

Decolonization must be included in an Indigenous inquiry framework centered on Indigenous epistemologies, life, and community (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012). Wane (2013) explored personal decolonization within the framework of understanding Indigenous knowledge production and resistance among Embu women in Kenya. Kovach (2009) applied a decolonizing lens as her theoretical perspective within her Indigenous framework and found it evoked change. Sium, Desai, and Ritskes (2012) concurred with Kovach (2009) in finding that decolonization was about change and wrote how decolonization reformulated human thoughts and acknowledged multiple epistemologies, ontologies, and axiologies. It required courage and imagination to envision a new future that may be unknown but can be attained through dialogue and discussion of shared goals and understandings (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012). I included a decolonizing lens in this study to advance change in the academy and expand its definition of research to include Indigenous knowledge as well as Native design and processes.

There are three ways a researcher positions a decolonizing lens within an inquiry. First, tribal epistemology is at the center with the least possible integration of a decolonizing lens and minimal coverage of documented historical experiences of colonialism (Kovach, 2009). Another way is to place the decolonizing lens at the center of the transformative research inquiry. It is aligned with Western critical research methodologies (Kovach, 2009). For example, Trinidad (2012) chose critical theory, a Western-based approach. A third way is to include the decolonizing lens within a tribal-centered methodology. This lens goes beyond the simple documentation of historic, colonial relations but seeks change. A decolonizing analysis is apparent throughout the research (Kovach, 2009). I chose this third approach and established my decolonizing lens firmly within my Hawaiian methodology. This approach was in keeping with my 'Ōiwi paradigm, ontology, axiology, and epistemology.

A decolonizing lens addresses power relations ensuring Indigenous voices are heard. Decolonization is the re-imagination and re-articulation of power, change, and knowledge (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012). Thus applying a decolonizing lens allows the researcher to effectively analyze these power dynamics for the purpose of change, personal agency, and resistance (Kovach, 2009). In research, a decolonizing lens works in tandem with epistemological change making visible institutional contradictions and bringing more Indigenous approaches out from the margins (Kovach, 2009). This application of a decolonizing lens is necessary for the decolonization of Indigenous Peoples, moving them from subjugation to liberation (Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012). It requires the resurgence of consciousness that can come about through an understanding of Indigenous knowledge (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012). Decolonization has revolutionary power and potential (Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012). The application of a decolonizing lens within this research made certain that Indigenous voices were heard. It

provided all who were involved in this study an opportunity to experience decolonization or share their decolonizing experiences as well as advocate for the decolonization of our educational institutions and our communities.

Moving from a colonialist paradigm towards liberation and ultimately sovereignty is possible when a research framework has a decolonizing lens. A decolonizing lens addresses the challenges Indigenous researchers face with theoretical positions that are positivistic, postmodern, and post-colonial because it is embedded within methodologies that are Native (Kovach, 2009). Native methodologies are based on local knowledge sources. This is imperative if one is to decolonize and develop anti-colonial intellectuality in order to change our colonial institutions (Dei, 2012). An anti-colonial intellectuality developed through decolonization ultimately leads to reclaiming and restating one's humanity that is different than Western-style humanism (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012). Decolonization is not only of the mind because it also encompasses a larger struggle over land and sovereignty over that land (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012). The land, sea, and mind are connected so one cannot decolonize without acknowledgement of the primacy of land (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012). Decolonization is a larger agenda for Indigenous Peoples that is all about the constant re-negotiation of lands, peoples, and methods towards sovereignty over land, seas, epistemologies, and other ideas (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012).

The application of a decolonizing lens within this study reflected my everyday experiences and the everyday experiences others. Many said decolonization is too theoretical and they can't wrap their minds around it, yet Indigenous scholars identified the act of decolonization as an everyday experience one encounters in different ways (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012). By immersing myself in my Indigenous reading and by my constant reflection through my writing, I

underwent decolonizing practices and bolstered that decolonizing lens within my research. Decolonization does bridge the divide between theory and action by maintaining that theory is created daily through everyday acts of Indigenous resurgence (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012). Dei (2012) applied this to education when he advocated for developing African/Black theoretical prisms or perspectives based on the lived experiences as well as transgressive pedagogies by way of Indigenous epistemologies to transform the learning of all students. Yellow Bird (2012) furthered our thinking on decolonization by creating an analytical model that defines decolonization as both a process and an event. Decolonization as an event is when one reaches a level of critical consciousness and actively acknowledges one's own colonization whereas decolonization as a process is the implementation of multiple and varied strategies towards liberation that includes restoring one's cultural practices, thinking, and beliefs to create new ideas, thinking, lifestyles, and technologies that empower Native communities (Yellow Bird, 2012). My efforts to decolonize my research actions reflected decolonization as a continuous process. I reached a place in my life where I am now more critically aware than ever before of my own colonization. This consciousness only enhanced my application of a decolonizing lens within this study.

A robust personal decolonizing lens is a complex, messy, and circular process. According to Waziyatawin and Yellow Bird (2012) decolonization begins first and foremost in one's mind and involves critically reflecting on one's own colonized psychology, mentality, and spirituality. Added to this is a multi-dimensionality that brings in both the personal and the political (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012). Moreover, it occurs constantly (Wane, 2013) in a circular, not linear, manner and within unique contexts so defining or codifying it cannot be done (Sium, Desai & Ritskes, 2012). The application of my decolonizing lens within my study reflected this dynamic

process as I progressed towards strengthening this lens within my ‘Ōiwi paradigm. I concurred with Nakata, Nakata, Keech, and Bolt (2012) in their argument that a simplified framework, referring to the binary nature of Western and Indigenous knowledge, is not beneficial to decolonization because it bypasses the complicated cognitive activity of thinking and navigating through contested spaces. In deference to Nakata, Nakata, Keech, and Bolt (2012) I created an ‘Ōiwi framework that allowed for this contentious exploration. This exploration reinforced my decolonizing lens and promoted further decolonization in others involved in this study. I shared this journey through my mo‘olelo and the mo‘olelo of others.

A decolonizing lens is critical within an Indigenous research framework. My decolonizing lens for this study was embedded in a Hawaiian methodology in keeping with my ‘Ōiwi paradigm, ontology, axiology, and epistemology. It ensured that the study promoted Indigenous voices and addressed the forces of colonialism that still reside in the places we live, learn, and work. This decolonizing lens was applied everyday in my research and in my life through a complex and messy process that was circuitous. This was the very personal nature of research within an Indigenous framework. However, sitting within an Indigenous framework also guaranteed that decolonization was not only an individual endeavor but also part of a larger political commitment towards liberation and sovereignty.

Summary of Inquiry Framework

This study’s inquiry framework, rooted in an ‘Ōiwi paradigm and epistemology that included pono and ho‘oponopono and viewed through a decolonizing lens, was an example of Indigenous research and not a qualitative dissertation. The ‘Ōiwi framework developed over time as I grew in my own cultural identity and understandings. It focused on strengthening relationships with oneself, others, and the larger world thus promoting an ‘Ōiwi paradigm. This

paradigm blossomed under the influence of Indigenous and Hawaiian scholars whose written works stressed the importance of an Indigenous ontology and axiology within research projects. As an emerging Hawaiian scholar, I continually strive to be more pono in my research actions. However, I acknowledge that I need to constantly engage in ho‘oponopono as a decolonizing tool to equip my eyes with a decolonizing lens in order to restore and reclaim my ‘Ōiwi paradigm. This will allow me to speak confidently in advocating for liberation and sovereignty in all its many forms and functions.

CHAPTER 4

Methodology

Overview of Methodology

An Indigenous inquiry framework must encompass an Indigenous methodology. Understanding the definition of Indigenous methodology is key to its application within a Native inquiry. Our scholarly understanding of Indigenous methodology expanded over time and it is more fine-tuned than ever before. Scholars continue to examine and describe its various roles within a Native inquiry framework, such as promoting decolonization and benefitting Indigenous communities. This dissertation used Hawaiian ha‘i mo‘olelo, an Indigenous form of storytelling, as its methodology. Storytelling transmits culture and produces new knowledge as well as decolonizes and emancipates Native Peoples. It plays a crucial role within an Indigenous inquiry framework and is unique from other methodologies. It allows Natives to talk about ourselves and in doing so it gives others opportunities to really understand us as a people as well as the social and cultural contexts in which we live. Noted scholars successfully used storytelling within their research efforts and this inspired my choice of ha‘i mo‘olelo as my Indigenous methodology.

Indigenous Methodology

Indigenous methodologies emerged within the academy through the pioneering work of Native scholars such as Wilson, (2008), Grande (2008), and Kovach (2009) and are continually defined by contemporary Native scholars such as Ray (2012). Wilson’s (2008) scholarship highlighted the rise of Indigenous research, including methodologies, over the centuries that contributed greatly to our historical and current understanding of Indigenous methodology. Grande (2008) explored the concept of Indigenous methodology within her own research and

gave it a personal definition of “ideas in motion” (p. 233). Her own personal experiences, her people’s experiences, and her ancestors’ experiences shaped her consciousness and contributed to the development of her Indigenous methodology (Grande, 2008). Kovach (2009) also focused on this personalization of methodology as she incorporated her own cultural ways and its intersection with her own life into her research and writing. She understood that methodology is relational and she honored this relationship by acknowledging as well as protecting her cultural knowledge within her research. Ray (2012) built on the work of these Native predecessors who laid the groundwork for greater clarification of Indigenous methodologies within research. She personally defined Indigenous methodologies as how Indigenous Peoples’ understand their world and use their understandings to guide the learning process all the while working within traditional ontological and epistemological learning processes (Ray, 2012). This was made actionable when theories and approaches were grounded or congruent to pan-Indigenous principles and experiences (Ray, 2012). Ray (2012) understood that we are on the precipice of moving away from culturally appropriate methodologies to more culturally inherent methodologies that recognize the importance of traditional knowledge, languages, and experiences. It is imperative that Native scholars clearly define Indigenous methodologies within the academy because they are unique and are very different from Western methodologies and as such should not be held up to the same standards within academia (Ray, 2012). My dissertation incorporated a Hawaiian methodology, ha‘i mo‘olelo, into the inquiry framework. It was grounded in Hawaiian knowledge systems and honored the values, experiences, and language of my people and those who contributed to this research effort. Ha‘i mo‘olelo, a form of Indigenous storytelling, was the Indigenous methodology that best described the phenomenon under study in this research.

Different types of Indigenous methodologies.

Ray (2012) clearly articulated two categories of Indigenous methodologies within research: strategic and convergence Indigenous methodologies. Strategic Indigenous methodologies are based on anti-colonial and anti-oppressive agendas that draw from contemporary experiences of oppression, colonization, and resistance. It could utilize traditional knowledge but does not have to (Ray, 2012). On the other hand, convergence Indigenous methodologies are guided by traditional knowledge systems and focus on decolonization and revitalization efforts. It works towards inclusion of traditional knowledge, but can employ Western techniques that are similar to traditional approaches (Ray, 2012). For this research inquiry, I used more of a convergence approach because this study was guided by traditional knowledge and had decolonization and revitalization of Native research as goals. It also aligned well with the 'Ōiwi paradigm, epistemology, ontology, and axiology within my research design. This inquiry did not utilize Western techniques but Indigenous methods. Similar to Ray (2012), I once believed that Indigenous methodologies were a singular approach that employed traditional knowledge systems prior to contact with non-Indigenous nations. My thinking evolved. My Indigenous methodology was grounded in my understanding of traditional knowledge but incorporated my and others' Indigenous experiences and contemporary cultural ways of knowing.

Role of Indigenous methodology in an Indigenous inquiry framework.

Indigenous methodology, regardless of how we define categorically, needs to be a part of an Indigenous inquiry framework. It is integrally linked to an Indigenous epistemology and thus aligned to tribal knowledge (Kovach, 2009). In addition, an Indigenous methodology ensures that people and ideas within the research are not objectified because the proper relationships are

solidified. It is important within a Native paradigm that there is integrity in the methodology, in other words respect, and usefulness of results, in other words reciprocity, for the community (Wilson, 2008). Native scholars like Wilson (2008) advocated that theory and methodology needed to be Indigenous. This is a statement I agreed with. However, Wilson (2008) was amenable to the inclusion of approaches that were non-Indigenous, but aligned with an Indigenous inquiry framework. This was where I disagreed with Wilson (2008) and saw opportunities and movement within the field towards an inquiry framework that was wholly Indigenous, especially because an Indigenous methodology promotes decolonization.

Promotes decolonization.

Having an Indigenous methodology embedded within an Indigenous inquiry framework promotes decolonization within research. Recent shifts in the research literature reflected the growing importance of methodology and political strategy over methods (Zavala, 2013). Indigenous scholars placed research methodologies squarely within the larger picture of anticolonial struggles (Zavala, 2013). This was crucial as colonization disrupted the knowledge production of Indigenous Peoples and caused a breakdown in cultural methodologies (Kovach, 2009). Swadener and Mutua (2008) wrote on the effects of colonization within a wide range of settings, especially within educational research. Due to this observation, they recognized the importance of decolonizing methodologies that promoted activist agendas, such as social justice, sovereignty, self-determination, and emancipation. There was no formula for decolonizing methodologies, but it included systematic approaches such as narratives and performative genres (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). Mo'olelo and narratives share similar characteristics. Oftentimes it is difficult for Indigenous researchers to include story as part of their research paradigm, but it is valuable and congruent with tribal epistemologies because it is decolonizing (Kovach, 2009).

Story is so important because they represent resistance that can inspire and connect others to Indigenous knowledge (Kovach, 2009).

Benefits Native communities.

An Indigenous methodology needs to be included in research within Native communities so it can inspire connections with Native knowledge. It allows a researcher to engage others in a research process that really allows them to be who they are (Hart, 2010). Relational accountability is a huge component of developing an appropriate methodology as well as a commitment to the Indigenous community and practical applications (Hart, 2010). Zavala (2013) used a Raza research methodology (RRM) aligned with the tenets of an Indigenous research methodology because it responded to local interests that benefitted the Indigenous and Raza communities. Similar to Zavala (2013), my study was responsive to the needs of Native scholars who wanted to promote Indigenous inquiry approaches in their own studies benefitting their communities.

Indigenous Storytelling

This inquiry used ha‘i mo‘olelo as its Indigenous methodology because Hawaiians and other Native communities hold Indigenous storytelling in great esteem. As a form of Indigenous storytelling it aligned with my ‘Ōiwi framework and paradigm. More importantly, Indigenous storytelling is highly valued in Native cultures. Wilson (2008) and Kovach (2009) both described different types of Indigenous stories. Wilson (2008) spoke with Cree Elder Jerry Saddleback to describe three levels of stories. The highest level is sacred stories told by those who are trained, tested, and authorized to do so. They never vary and represent a people’s history. The next level is legends, morals, events, and lessons that are shaped by the storyteller’s experiences yet the message is the same. The third style used in Wilson’s (2008) study was personal experiences and those experiences of others. Kovach (2009) closely mirrored these levels by describing two types

of stories: mythical and personal. These personal stories are less formal and more like conversations (Wilson, 2008). The stories told within these conversations lend to blending, influencing, and building of different ideas (Wilson, 2008). This is the relational aspect of Indigenous stories that are coupled with the spiritual aspects to create knowledge and scholarship (Sium & Ritskes, 2013). The stories are ceremonies that welcome dialogue, open-endedness, contestations, renewals, and recreation (Sium & Ritskes, 2013). Listeners need to come to hear the stories with open and honest hearts because these stories are trans-generational memories housed within stories of survival and continuance of Indigenous epistemic traditions (Sium & Ritskes, 2013). They reclaim Indigenous voice, land, and sovereignty (Sium & Ritskes, 2013). In this way they are different from narratives found in Western, qualitative research as they do not rely on linearity, but on this collective memory with Indigenous knowledge underpinning each story, its' telling and retelling (Kovach, 2009). This Native study's methodology of ha'i mo'olelo fell within the category of Wilson's (2008) third style and Kovach's (2009) personal experiences and those of others. The cultural understandings of the role and protocols of Indigenous storytelling was honored within this study's methods.

Transmits and produces cultural knowledge.

One of the most important roles of Indigenous storytelling is the distribution and production of Native knowledge. Stories produce knowledge, allow for philosophizing, and encode knowledge into our collective memory. It is a teaching tool that allows culture to regenerate itself time and time again (Mucina, 2011). Knowledge can even be generated from people's dreams and shared as stories or told to others through conversations (Wilson, 2008). Scholars are using more Indigenous methodologies, including storytelling, in their research with Native communities (Cidro, 2012). For example, Cidro (2012) explained how storytelling,

especially the celebrated trickster figure Nanabush, was utilized as an Indigenous methodology in contemporary scholarship. Nanabush is part of a tradition of *adisokan*, the role of storytelling in Anishinawbe societies. As an Indigenous female scholar, she identified herself as a modern *adisokan* fulfilling her role as a “culture carrier” (p. 28) in her society. *ho‘omanawanui* (2010) recognized the importance of storytelling in not only perpetuating Indigenous knowledge but as tools for active resistance to the destruction of language and the culture. *ho‘omanawanui* (2010) emphasized this point by quoting Edward Said (1993): “stories... are the method the colonized people use to assert their own identity and existence in their own history” (p. 210). Often the academy disregards the stories from colonized peoples and the use of visual arts within the course of research, thus silencing Indigenous voices (Kendall, Marshall & Barlow, 2013). However as Kendall, Marshall, and Barlow (2013) discovered, it allowed Indigenous women to regain ownership of their culture and their land. Wilson (2008) elevated the status of Indigenous storytelling as stronger than empirical evidence because cultural knowledge housed within Native stories is extra intellectual. Wilson (2008) and other Indigenous scholars are using Indigenous storytelling as a methodology within their inquiries because they acknowledged its important role in the distribution and transmission of cultural knowledge.

Role of Indigenous storytelling in an Indigenous inquiry framework.

Native scholars chose storytelling as a methodology in their Indigenous inquiry framework for a variety of reasons. Storytelling as methodology supports a Native paradigm, epistemology, ontology, axiology, and method. In addition, storytelling guides the use of protocols and research processes that are appropriate within Indigenous communities. For these reasons, I saw the deep connections between my choice of Indigenous storytelling as my methodology and other aspects of my Indigenous inquiry framework.

It is beneficial to have storytelling as the methodology within an Indigenous inquiry framework because it aligns with a Native paradigm, epistemology, ontology, axiology, and method. Kovach (2009) wrote how Indigenous research dictated that epistemology, methodology, and method. They are all relational and aligned within a framework (Kovach 2009). The use of storytelling contributed towards this alignment. Similar to Kovach (2009), other Native scholars wrote of the importance and effectiveness of storytelling within an Indigenous inquiry framework. When Kendall, Marshall, and Barlow (2013) honored Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing by choosing stories and narratives within their research in Native communities over more positivistic methodologies, they made a conscious choice within academia to promote pluralism. Pluralism encompasses valuing stories within research. They found this choice to be more effective in addressing global and local gaps in Indigenous health (Kendall, Marshall & Barlow, 2013). In addition, Shirt, Lewis and Jackson (2012) described how *âtayôhkewina* and *âcimowina* were important to Cree ceremonies as they created an epistemology tied to ontological knowledge. This epistemology created confidence and respect for the land and renewed stewardship responsibility. Both *âtayôhkewina* and *âcimowina* allowed the listeners and readers to understand Cree epistemology, develop Cree ontology, and live Cree axiology. Kendall, Marshall & Barlow (2013), Shirt, Lewis and Jackson (2012), and Kovach (2009) saw the benefits of storytelling as a methodology because of it fit well within their research.

Storytelling housed within an Indigenous inquiry framework comes with understandings that influence research processes. The use of story as a method is common as a knowledge gathering technique (Kovach, 2009). Questions associated with this methodology need to be open as there are specific implications for hearing others' stories (Kovach, 2009). Swadener and

Mutua (2008) observed that interviews transformed from participant-researcher to listening to stories and collecting necessary information needed for the research. They also included their own biographies in their research as an example of how stories are a decolonizing methodology (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). Similarly, Kovach (2009) wrote her own story alongside her research in a journal that she found instrumental. Research reporting is likewise influenced by this methodology as Nabobo-Baba (2008) found it can be done through “story-telling” (p. 142) and Kovach (2009) promoted a strong narrative as important to the method and the presentation of findings. Native scholars experienced in using storytelling as methodology found it guided their research protocols.

Indigenous storytelling was my methodology because it fit well within my Indigenous inquiry framework. The use of this Indigenous methodology by Native scholars influenced my choice. The literature supported its alignment with a Native paradigm, epistemology, ontology, and method. Research also touted its effectiveness and benefits in working through Indigenous paradigms to culturally transmit Indigenous knowledge as opposed to just gathering and distributing knowledge (Cidro, 2012). Native scholars also wrote of the specific research processes associated with using this methodology, including how to listen to stories, capture one’s own stories, and report stories. However, in order to truly understand storytelling as a methodology one has to know its important role within Native communities.

Place within Native communities.

A primary reason for choosing storytelling as the methodology for this study was its prominent role within Indigenous communities (Sium & Ritskes, 2013). As an up-and-coming Native scholar-researcher, it was imperative that I understood the importance of storytelling

within Indigenous communities and followed the examples of established Native researchers. Storytelling is a powerful tool that must be respectfully deployed as a research methodology.

Storytelling has a long, oral tradition within communities as the primary way to convey culture, experiences, wisdom, attitudes, feelings, ethics, and values to the next generation (Lekoko, 2007). It is the language of the home and communicates cultural values and mirrors real-world experiences (Ngugi, 1986). It also preserves Indigenous ways of knowing and being as well as creates inter-generational relationships (Lekoko, 2007). Stories can also be part of a healing process for the community where members share stories to explore social concerns and find ways to address problems (Lekoko, 2007). Thus the stories are participatory and agentic, binding communities together both relationally and spiritually (Sium & Ritskes, 2013) and transforming them into places of hope and resistance (Trinidad, 2012). In this way, storytelling can be very empowering (Lekoko, 2007). Mucina (2011) also found storytelling within communities to be powerful in maintaining cultural continuity and allowing for shared interpretations of experiences. "Storytelling is an important faculty for engaging critical regeneration and honest self-criticism while offering a collective vision for a community's manifest destiny" (Mucina, 2011, p. 7). Her scholarship described how individuals' fragmented stories created fuller stories of Black knowledge in the community (Mucina, 2011). Storytelling serves many purposes in Native communities, from cultural continuity to healing to Indigenous empowerment.

Native scholars need to understand these various Indigenous communal purposes of stories in order to appropriately utilize this powerful tool as a methodology. Indigenous scholar Wilson (2008) understood the importance of storytelling in Native communities and emphasized its respectful nature as a methodology as well as touted its ability within research to create

something lived. Dunbar (2008) also recognized storytelling's living qualities by using story in his research to connect with participants through similar lived and shared experiences. Due to these stories' holistic nature and Indigenous worldview, it allowed both the researcher and the participants to connect ontologically to the past, present and future (Dunbar, 2008). Mucina (2011) also described the interactive nature of storytelling, recognizing that the storyteller and the audience are in a reciprocal relationship that views stories as the embodiment of knowing and learning. These Native scholars thoroughly understood the communal purposes of stories and its necessity within Indigenous research. They would probably agree with the words of Indigenous Community Elder and co-researcher Lauraine Barlow as published in Kendall, Marshall, and Barlow (2013) when she wrote, "my story is similar to so many others- it's just an echo of so many others who have come before me and will come after me... I hope they don't have to work so hard to get recognition for their stories" (p. 266).

One primary reason why I chose storytelling, particularly Indigenous storytelling, as a methodology was its importance to Native communities. Storytelling within a Native community serves multiple purposes, from perpetuating culture to healing communal wounds to collectively understanding and creating Indigenous knowledge. Scholars recognized the capability of this tool and as such respectfully and appropriately used it as a methodology for research in Indigenous communities.

Decolonizes and emancipates Native Peoples.

Stories decolonize and emancipate Native individuals as well as their communities. Sium and Ritskes (2013) thought that it was under theorized and needed more attention but found that Indigenous communities are the hubs of this decolonization theory in action. Stories are not just methodologies and methods in and of themselves but are part of a broader agenda for

decolonization, emancipation, and empowerment of a people to displace Western empiricism and colonialism with Indigenous ownership of land, culture, and research (Kendall, Marshall & Barlow, 2013). Stories and the research containing those stories are then owned by Indigenous Peoples, thus undoing previous dehumanizing research practices towards decolonization and finally humanization (Dunbar, 2008). Sium and Ritskes (2013) focused on Indigenous storytelling as “decolonization theory in its most natural form” (p. II). These stories encompassed lived experiences of decolonization, shared long histories of resistance against colonialism, and reclaimed epistemic ground and Indigenous sovereignty (Sium & Ritskes, 2013). Dunbar (2008) agreed with the historied nature of storytelling by describing how one takes and understands their meaning from historical circumstances in order to counter the creation of knowledge from Western sources and create spaces where decolonization can occur. This was done through the power of reflection (Dunbar, 2008). The reflective power of storytelling for decolonization was present in the literature. Swadener and Mutua (2008) reflected on their own personal narratives to apply post-colonial theory and to discuss decolonizing research projects. Cruz (2012), an adjunct professor and brown colonial subject, resisted colonizing tendencies through her auto-ethnographic reflections that produced emancipatory knowledge. Mucina (2011) recognized the profound effects of decolonizing stories for herself personally and for others: “I was born into the story, I have gained from the story, I have added to the story, I am sharing this story with you and giving you this story which was given to me, because although I will leave the story the story will go on” (p. 12). These Native scholars saw storytelling as decolonizing and emancipating for Indigenous Peoples. Storytelling is the decolonization of words, thoughts, actions, and deeds and advises both individuals and communities to shake off the colonial yoke and the master narratives of the colonizer in favor of

the reclamation of Indigenous voices, epistemologies, languages, and forms (Swadener & Mutua, 2008).

Differs from other methodologies and methods.

Storytelling, especially Indigenous storytelling, is different from other research methodologies and methods. It does not fit neatly or exclusively within Western-based paradigms (Lekoko, 2007). It also differs significantly from oral histories and personal narratives as well as counter narratives found in critical race theory. Indigenous storytelling is unique amongst other research methodologies and methods and plays a pivotal role within an Indigenous inquiry framework

First of all, it does not fit neatly or exclusively within Western-based paradigms (Lekoko, 2007). As Kendall, Marshall, and Barlow (2013) experienced, it did not align within positivist models and frameworks. In the past, this was one reason why researchers ignored its use as a potential research tool (Lekoko, 2007). Although Lekoko (2007) saw how storytelling could be complimentary to well-established paradigms within the academy, it could also be a paradigm unto itself. I agreed with Lekoko (2007) in viewing storytelling, especially Native storytelling, as independent of Western-based paradigms because it placed Native Peoples at the center of the research. This methodological distinctiveness promotes the questioning and subversion of the current ways of knowing within the academy (Sium & Ritskes, 2013). Although scholars placed storytelling within other traditional frameworks, its role within an Indigenous inquiry transforms its purpose to benefit Native Peoples.

Secondly, Indigenous storytelling differs significantly from oral histories and personal narratives as well as counter narratives found in critical race theory. Indigenous storytelling is inherently political with an aim to counter the colonial's meta-narratives by taking away their

narrative power (Sium & Ritskes, 2013) whereas oral histories and personal narratives are not inherently political. On the other hand, the differences between Indigenous storytelling and counter narratives found in critical race theory are more nuanced. As opposed to oral histories and personal narratives, both Indigenous storytelling and counter narratives are very political. Counter narratives represent the voices of the Other and challenge the traditional paradigm of the academy (Dunbar, 2008). Indigenous storytelling does this as well. Counter narratives aim to subvert objectivity, neutrality, meritocracy, and color-blindness and build race consciousness towards liberation (Dunbar, 2008). This can also be said of Indigenous storytelling. Counter narratives are powerful pedagogical tools that nurture liberation within the oppressed and marginalized (Taylor, 2009). One can also say that the tenets of Indigenous storytelling align with these goals too. Counter narratives challenge the white experiential standard and paradigms used in order to create compelling, central, and validating data points (Taylor, 2009). This is where one can see the nuanced difference. Native scholars do not view Indigenous stories as data points but as holistic expressions of experiences, memories, and knowledge that are grounded in Native philosophies, epistemologies, and theories (Sium & Ritskes, 2013) in a way that oral histories, personal narratives, and counter narratives are not. These stories are beyond the multi-cultural “show and tell” (p. V), but are “archives of collective pain, suffering, and resistance, then to speak them is to heal; to believe in them is to reimagine the world” (Sium & Ritskes, 2013, p. V). Although Indigenous storytelling shares many similarities with oral histories, personal narratives, and counter narratives, its roots within Native ontology, epistemology, and axiology set it apart.

I chose Indigenous storytelling as the methodology within my inquiry framework because it was different from other research methodologies and methods. Its methodological

distinctiveness set it apart from being incorporated into Western-based paradigms. It differs significantly from oral histories and personal narratives because of its political agenda. Although closely allied with counter narratives, Indigenous storytelling’s purpose is different in its focus on keeping stories holistic and grounding them in the culture of Native Peoples. Framing Indigenous storytelling in this way was crucial in my research. It further defined the field of Native inquiry and scholarship.

Indigenous Scholars Use Storytelling in Research

Native scholars inspired my choice of methodology and method, in particular how they harnessed the power of storytelling within their research design. Review of the scholarship indicated multiple approaches, representing great diversity of application of Indigenous research design principles. The field ranges from Native scholars who used storytelling that was methodologically based in Western knowledge systems to others whose storytelling demonstrated strong alignment with Indigenous paradigms and epistemologies. Both forms of scholarship informed my dissertation. It was purposeful in its advocacy for Indigenous knowledge production and transmission for cultural continuity, for inherent connections to an Indigenous inquiry framework, for clear benefits to Indigenous communities, and for the promotion of decolonization and emancipation.

Indigenous academics Cruz (2012), Kaomea (2001), and Young (1995) greatly added to our understanding of how storytelling as a methodology can be connected to Western-based philosophies and theories. Hawaiian scholar Young (1995) produced a mo‘olelo that was an evidence-based account of the ‘Ōiwi past that included both Native and Western methods of interpretation. Hawaiian academic Kaomea (2001) shared her mo‘olelo that reflected both Hawaiian and Western methodologies and traditional wisdom. Her mo‘olelo combined the work

of structuralists and post-structuralists, Foucault’s power of discourse, and Marx’s concern with material effects all the while privileging Hawaiian values and concerns. Cruz (2012) used auto-ethnography as a tool to deepen emancipatory practice. Her auto-ethnographic reflections on the colonality of academic institutions as well as her astute observations of the many Indigenous academics complicit within the colonial system and in need of emancipation resonated with me. Her use of auto-ethnography challenged the canonical way of research and representing others and allowed for new, personal ways of relating. This was a political and social act (Cruz, 2012). The scholarship of Cruz (2012), Kaomea (2001), and Young (1995) motivated my use of storytelling within my dissertation study and influenced my choice of methods. However, I deviated from their uses of storytelling as a methodology by purposefully grounding it in Indigenous ways of knowing and being throughout the entire research process and relying exclusively on the use of this methodology as understood by the epistemologies of the Hawaiian people. I saw this as part of the continuing evolution of Indigenous research.

Native scholars Bishop (2011), Mucina (2011), and ho‘omanawanui (2010) also used storytelling as their methodology and demonstrated strong alignment with Indigenous paradigms and epistemologies. ho‘omanawanui (2010) used the mo‘olelo of Hawaiian goddesses Pele and Hi‘iaka to support her arguments on how Indigenous stories are not only a transformative approach to multi-cultural education, but also significantly benefit Indigenous Peoples. Mucina (2011), a Maseko Ngoni, promoted storytelling as a research method for Ubuntu scholars and the larger Black community. Mucina (2011) explored how story is a research methodology, how one defines what is meant to be Ubuntu, the importance of Ubuntu Indigenous knowledge, and how Ubuntu storytelling worked as a successful methodology to produce such knowledge. Similar to Mucina (2011), Bishop (2011) effectively used stories within a Māori context to create new

knowledge. Whakawhanaungatanga, a collaborative meta-study of five projects, included the construction of collaborative stories that demonstrated connectedness, engagement, and involvement (Bishop, 2011). Through collaborative stories, researchers constructed their own storylines that defined the main influences on Māori educational achievement (Bishop, 2011). The storytelling methodologies Bishop (2011), Mucina (2011), and ho‘omanawanui (2010) utilized are examples of Native efforts to strongly connect their research to Indigenous paradigms and epistemologies.

Storytelling as methodology was apparent in Indigenous academics’ research endeavors. Some Native scholars, such as Cruz (2012), Kaomea (2001), and Young (1995), used storytelling as a methodology while making explicit connections to Western knowledge systems. Other Native scholars, such as Bishop (2011), Mucina (2011), and ho‘omanawanui (2010), engaged in storytelling strongly aligned with Indigenous paradigms and epistemologies. These multiple applications of storytelling as a methodology represent great diversity of the field. This study was indebted to all of these scholars and countless others for advancing the field of Indigenous research over time in order to make it possible for me to use storytelling as a methodology. This collective wisdom inspired me to employ Indigenous storytelling as a methodology within this study. Indigenous storytelling is unique compared to other forms of storytelling because it is grounded in a Native paradigm and epistemology within an Indigenous inquiry framework, purposeful in its production and continued transmission of cultural knowledge, beneficial to Native communities, and deliberate in its aims of decolonization and emancipation. It represents the advancement and further definition of Indigenous methodology within the field of Native inquiry while continuing the tradition of expanding the current boundaries of research within mainstream academia. Indigenous storytelling assisted me in answering my research questions.

Summary of Methodology

Indigenous methodologies need to be included in an Indigenous inquiry framework and linked to a Native paradigm, epistemology, ontology, axiology, and method. Native scholars chronicled the rise of Indigenous methodologies and continue to define its characteristics. These methodologies are unique because they promote decolonization and benefit Native communities by connecting members with Native knowledge and responding to local interests. I used a convergence Indigenous methodology in this study. This study’s Indigenous methodology was ha‘i mo‘olelo and was aligned with my ‘Ōiwi framework and paradigm, Hawaiian epistemology and axiology. Hawaiians and other Native Peoples hold Indigenous storytelling in great esteem. Indigenous storytelling plays a crucial role in Native communities by transmitting and producing cultural knowledge as well as empowering, healing, decolonizing and emancipating. It is unique from other methodologies because it is inherently political as well as holistic expressions of experiences, memories, and knowledge. Indigenous scholars took multiple approaches to applying Indigenous storytelling processes and procedures in research. Their approaches inspired me in how I used ha‘i mo‘olelo to guide my methods.

CHAPTER 5

Methods

Overview of Methods

This dissertation conducted dialogues with nine Indigenous graduate or post-graduate scholars and explored how Native scholars learned about Indigenous research in the university, how they decided upon and ultimately applied Indigenous research approaches to benefit their communities, and how the university can promote Indigenous research in the graduate curriculum. The study’s design encompassed Native research features in keeping with my Indigenous methodology of ha‘i mo‘olelo aligned to my ‘Ōiwi Inquiry framework and paradigm. The writing style was eclectic - made up of narrative, expository, descriptive, and analytical styles, that best supported the diverse nature of ha‘i mo‘olelo.

There was no “researcher” or “participant” in this study, as you would find in more conventional western-based research models. In using ha‘i mo‘olelo as a method, I was the storyteller and I worked collaboratively with co-storytellers. This was a different type of relationship compared to Western-based research. It was grounded in the Hawaiian concept of maintaining pono relationships between people. Western constructions of academic rigor, reliability, and validity were not standards adhered to in this Indigenous dissertation. Instead this study met the standards of authenticity, credibility, and relationality in keeping with Native ethics. Instead of gathering data, I brought together mo‘olelo from dialogues and conversations I had with co-storytellers. Instead of interpreting and analyzing data, I engaged in Indigenous reflective practices alongside my co-storytellers. The study was coupled with the work that had already been done thoroughly researching and extensively writing on the problem at hand along with the Indigenous literary support for this study. I committed to sharing the knowledge

generated from this dissertation with others in order to impact how future Indigenous research is taught within the university curriculum.

Writing style

This study utilized a variety of writing styles and forms. Similar to Kovach (2009) and Wilson (2008), I used narrative, expository, and analytical writing styles. In addition, I utilized descriptive writing. The writing styles were fluid as they ebbed and flowed from one to the other. This was a cyclical approach to research that represented differing levels of understanding (Wilson, 2008) and interactions with the Indigenous knowledge created. These writing styles manifested themselves in two forms of writing: traditional academic text and mo‘olelo. The mo‘olelo were both narrative and descriptive in nature representing the blending of imagination, intuition, and intellect. This was in keeping with how Hawaiians viewed knowledge found in the ‘ōlelo no‘eau (poetical saying) “lawe i ka ma‘alea a kū‘ono‘ono” (p. 211) translated as take wisdom and make it deep (Pukui, 1983). Narrative, expository, analytical, and descriptive writing styles were utilized in traditional academic text and mo‘olelo throughout the dissertation because it was the best way to communicate the knowledge created.

Primary Storyteller Kuleana

My role within this Indigenous inquiry was as a storyteller whose own mo‘olelo included how this research changed me as a Native person in my search for belonging and identity. Cidro (2012) described researchers as storytellers, modern day adisokans, who work through Indigenous paradigms as cultural knowledge transmitters as opposed to knowledge gatherers and distributors. As a knowledge transmitter, Cidro (2012) saw herself as sharing critical knowledge between communities on issues affecting those communities. The knowledge shared was culturally relevant and meaningful. Wilson (2008) also considered himself a storyteller, not a researcher or author, because it demonstrated his relational accountability to the ideas generated

from his research. It also connected him and his ideas with the readers of his research so they were able to see the myriad of relationships unfolding in the written text (Wilson, 2008). As an Indigenous storyteller, Wilson (2008) included himself in the text and described how the research changed him by internalizing the research process as well as making the implicit explicit in Indigenous research. The scholarship of Kovach (2009) agreed with the writings of Wilson (2008) on this account as she too included herself in the research. Her insider/outsider status led her to find her own belonging, or *mikâsowin*. This was in keeping with her research epistemology (Kovach, 2009). I too used this inquiry to deepen my understanding of belonging and identity. My role as a storyteller provided me the opportunity to do so. I was a full contributor to this study alongside others (Wilson, 2008). This identification as a storyteller as opposed to a researcher or author is just another example of the transformative power of using an Indigenous method to dramatically change how we view Native knowledge creation and transmission.

Co-storytellers and Their Kuleana

The study involved ten Indigenous graduate students and/or post-graduate scholars, including myself. There were four female co-storytellers and six male co-storytellers. Five of my co-storytellers were of Hawaiian descent, one was of Tahitian descent, and three were Native Americans from the North American continent. Three of the co-storytellers recently completed their doctoral degrees in Education. Another co-storyteller recently completed a Master's Degree in Education. Five of the co-storytellers are current doctoral students attending universities and colleges both in Hawai'i and on the North American continent. All co-storytellers except for one are currently enrolled in or are graduates of Education programs from major research universities and colleges. The other co-storyteller is in a history program.

I counted on my relationships with community members, family, friends, and professional colleagues to identify my co-storytellers. Other scholars used this approach. Lekoko (2007) emphasized the importance of community members in identifying individuals or groups who can share stories and are great sources of knowledge. Kovach (2009) met her participants through collegial relationships. Wilson (2008) also wrote how important it was for intermediaries to assist in establishing rapport between the storyteller and those assisting in his study. This process is different from the sampling techniques used in other inquiry traditions. The challenge with sampling is that it does not include the relationships that are fundamental to Indigenous inquiry as well as the reciprocal, respectful nature of working within the community (Kovach, 2009). Indigenous research design instructs scholars to use Native protocols in identifying those contributing to the study.

The University of Hawai'i at Mānoa was the primary location of this study because it was the institution I was at while working on my doctoral dissertation. It also attracts many Hawaiian and Indigenous graduate and post-graduate scholars who are drawn to the multicultural learning environment. All but three of the co-storytellers are current graduate students or are graduates of this institution. With this similar educational background, my co-storytellers and I were able to draw upon our first-hand, colonizing and decolonizing educational experiences within the graduate curriculum at the institution. However, I did not place specific institutional limits on co-storytellers as the experiences at other institutions can greatly add to our knowledge of the application and interpretation of Indigenous inquiry to benefit Native communities. This Native study was bound by time limitations and the convenient setting lent itself to fulfill the goals of the study within a specified period of time.

I met with six co-storytellers individually and three co-storytellers as a hui (group). The six co-storytellers I met with chose the time and location to meet that best fit their needs. We met on average for about one hour. The other three participants are from the North American continent. I met them through an online support group for graduate students engaged in Indigenous research. We have been communicating almost every week with one another via Google hangouts for approximately six months. Our time together was spent discussing Indigenous research, in particular our challenges and struggles. We called each other ‘brother’ and ‘sister’ because we have such a close relationship with one another. I could not have progressed as far as I have in my research without their support.

Profile of Co-Storytellers

Participant Listed in Order of Conversation/Dialogue	Gender	Ethnicity	Degree of Completion/ Current Program Enrolled In
‘Ekahi	Female	Tahitian	Doctorate
‘Elua	Male	Native Hawaiian	Master’s Degree
‘Ekolu	Male	Native Hawaiian	Current Doctorate Candidate
‘Ehā	Female	Native Hawaiian	Current Doctorate Candidate
Hui-‘Ekahi	Male	Native American	Current Doctorate Candidate
Hui- ‘Elua	Male	Native American	Current Doctorate Candidate
Hui- ‘Ekolu	Female	Native American	Current Doctorate Candidate
‘Elima	Male	Native Hawaiian	Doctorate
‘Eono	Male	Native Hawaiian	Doctorate and Current Law School Student

These individuals had experiences in Western-based academic programs of graduate study primarily in the field of education but some have other degrees in other disciplines. They also currently use or have used Indigenous inquiry in their approaches to research that benefitted or will benefit their Native communities. These scholars can be thought of as researching in the margins of the academy (Smith, 2006) or operating outside of the academy altogether. Their stories included successes and challenges in these endeavors.

These parameters were fairly similar to those of Kovach's (2009) published study on Indigenous methodologies. Her inquiry focused on Indigenous scholar-researchers' experiences in integrating cultural knowledge with congruent methodologies for human subject research. She chose six individuals who had a background in education or social work and experience in a Western academic doctoral program. The difference between this study and that of Kovach (2009) is that Kovach limited the reach of her study to those only in doctoral programs as well as those who were strong in their culture. This study was not limited to a specific level of graduate studies or those with only cultural expertise in order to expand the opportunity for many more scholars to contribute to this research. It also recognized that the next generation of Native scholars is not just enrolled in doctoral programs and may not be cultural practitioners, but are thinking about, interpreting, applying, and furthering the field of Indigenous inquiry to benefit their communities in their own ways. The diversity of their backgrounds and the richness of their unique experiences only deepened our understanding of this Indigenous inquiry for the twenty-first century.

As co-storytellers in an Indigenous study, they were more involved in determining how mo'olelo were created and how this knowledge was shared in order to promote Indigenous research that benefitted Native communities. Wilson (2008) inspired my definition of this

expanded role of contributors to this doctoral study. He wrote how his own experiences combined with his discussions with participants, who were his co-researchers, shaped his research ideas (Wilson, 2008). The more relationships one builds with ideas as well as participating others, the more one comes to understand and comprehend the research (Wilson, 2008). These co-researchers were also instrumental in analyzing his data and shaping research outcomes (Wilson, 2008). This engagement in analysis and outcomes concurred with Lekoko’s (2007) recommendation to clearly spell out ways that stories will be shared. Due to Wilson’s (2008) view of his participants as co-researchers and because their relationships were based on trust, consent was given to use their names in publication. This is in accordance with Indigenous ethics. Confidentiality is a Western-approach to ethical consideration and Indigenous Peoples are proud to share their stories, their truths, and their knowledge (Kovach, 2009). I provided this opportunity to my co-storytellers in this study. They did not choose to share their names. However, I understood that this important decision needed to be made by each individual co-storyteller. It depended on the type of relationship I had with each of them as well as where they were in their own journeys towards decolonization as the mo‘olelo shared included stories of pain, suffering, and grief as a result of life or educational experiences. I empowered my co-storytellers to make these crucial decisions because they were not seen as mere research participants, but full contributors to this Indigenous inquiry.

Relationships between Storyteller and Co-storytellers

Dunbar (2008) observed that there is a dominant, cultural model in research with canons and rules that define the relationship between the researcher and the research participants. This power dynamic affects the design of the research because the researcher’s sociocultural, economic, and political backgrounds influence how the research is conducted (Dunbar, 2008). I

did not follow the dominant cannons and rules that define the relationship between my co-storytellers and me. Instead, my relationship with my co-storytellers was pono in keeping with my ontology and axiology in my 'Ōiwi framework and paradigm. This pono relationship was developed and supported by the application of Indigenous values and principles such as reciprocity, respect, trust, and collaboration. All of my words, actions, and deeds during this period were reflective of being pono or contributing towards the strengthening of pono relationships with my co-storytellers.

Due to these pono relationships, my co-storytellers confided in me and shared their experiences within our educational system. They felt safe. They were supportive of these research efforts. Another reason why I believed co-storytellers shared their educational experiences was because I was forthcoming with my own personal journey. Before we began dialogues and conversations, I was upfront with the purpose of my study and my personal reasons for embarking on this work. This put co-storytellers at ease and created a safe environment for them to share their own stories.

Wilson (2008) believed research is a ceremony for improving relationships. He understood that research methods must be built on respectful relationships with self and with others (Wilson, 2008). This relational accountability must be reflected in all aspects of the Indigenous inquiry paradigm from the methodology (ha'i mo'olelo) and method (stories) to the more detailed aspects of how to collect, analyze and present data (Wilson, 2008). Kendall, Marshall, and Barlow (2013) elaborated on research relationships as Kendall and Marshall, two non-Indigenous researchers, learned from their Indigenous co-author Barlow that research was a respectful collaboration and negotiation and must be conducted at a personal level with relationships lasting beyond initial research intentions. These personal relationships also

emancipated the researchers as they learned to build trust through empathy and consideration of others and their unique circumstances (Kendall, Marshall, & Barlow, 2013). Research is no longer solely beneficial to the researcher as well as harmful to Native Peoples, as approaches are now grounded in Indigenous knowledge and tribal epistemologies (Wilson, 2008) centering on the importance of relationships. The research and experiences of Wilson (2008) and Kendall, Marshall, & Barlow (2013) both illustrated new ways of understanding and working with contributors to the research. Their insights supported my goals for building and maintaining pono relationships with co-storytellers during this Indigenous inquiry and beyond.

Authenticity, Credibility, and Relationality

Western constructions of academic rigor, reliability, and validity were not standards adhered to in this Indigenous study. Wilson (2008) believed rigor and validity held no real relevance within an Indigenous research paradigm and that instead authenticity, credibility, and relationality held importance. Kovach's (2009) writing concurred with that of Wilson (2008) on this account when she insisted that a scholar using an Indigenous research framework required a different take on the validity of the stories generated. Stories represent truths as understood between the storyteller and the researcher's relationship (Kovach, 2009). These truths are subjective, yet are valid based on one's relationship with the culture (Kovach, 2009). These stories need to be understood differently because they represent decolonization and resistance that can inspire others and connect others with Indigenous knowledge (Kovach, 2009). This dissertation empowered. Young (1995) spoke of this empowerment in the construction of his dissertation, a mo'olelo. Instead of applying Western-defined academic rigor, reliability, and validity, I used authenticity, credibility, and relationality as standards in order to align with my

‘Ōiwi paradigm inherent in this Native study. These research design standards were appropriate for my method while supporting decolonization that led to empowerment.

Indigenous Ethics

The decision to use authenticity, credibility, and relationality as research design standards originated from recent scholarship on Indigenous ethics and their role in research involving Native Peoples and their communities. Kovach (2009) noted how Indigenous principles, protocols, and guidelines were built within an Aboriginal worldview that honors relationships, collectivism, reciprocity, and sacred knowledge. This helps to decolonize harmful research relationships and to focus on issues of ownership, control, access, and possessions that build positive relationships (Kovach, 2009). In addition, Smith (2006) described how to ethically research on the margins using Indigenous knowledge and values that are very different from the institutionalized research ethics based on Western moral philosophies that really only began in the mid-twentieth century. They often involve Euro-American, socially constructed understandings of values and moral philosophies that include balanced principles, ethical universalism, and atomistic focus as opposed to consultation, negotiation, mutual understanding, respect, recognition, involvement, benefits, outcomes and agreements as stated in the Guidelines for Ethical Research in Indigenous Studies (Smith, 2006). She encouraged Māori researchers in the margins to pursue their research using respectful, cultural processes and procedures that benefitted the community. This will ultimately transform the way in which we conduct research, work within the academy, and assist marginalized communities in embracing their power, values, and culture (Smith, 2006). Authenticity, credibility, and relationality in addition to other Indigenous principles and protocols supported how I worked with my co-storytellers to bring together and reflect on mo‘olelo within this Native inquiry.

Creating Mo‘olelo

During this Indigenous inquiry, I kept a research journal that contributed towards my mo‘olelo in the dissertation alongside the mo‘olelo of my co-storytellers. This journal began at the outset of this dissertation years ago. It included summaries and reflections from my readings of various Indigenous texts, reflections on the current progress of my research and my journey towards decolonization, notes and graphics relating to my evolving inquiry framework, and autobiographical vignettes pertaining to my colonizing personal and educational experiences. There was precedence for the inclusion of a researcher’s narrative into an Indigenous inquiry. Kovach (2009) ensured that her intentions were clear, both personal and academic, and recorded them in a journal that highlighted her relationships to her research, thoughts, dreams, struggles, fears, hopes, reflections, observations, field notes, and anxieties. Kovach (2009) incorporated this narrative into her dissertation alongside insights from scholars regarding their thoughts on Indigenous methodologies. This holistic, personal journey situated her in a time, place, and context. Young (1995) also personalized his dissertation with his own mo‘okūauhau and with information from his own kūpuna and how they transitioned from the kingdom to the territory of Hawai‘i at the end of the nineteenth century. Cruz (2012) used auto-ethnographic reflections in her research that described her advocacy for universities, sites of neoliberal and hegemonic discourse, to be safe places for thinkers. Kaomea (2001) used ha‘i mo‘olelo to share her challenges as a young, Indigenous academic researcher working in the community. Unfortunately not all scholars had the opportunity to include personal narratives in their research due to indoctrination into the dominant cultural model of research (Dunbar, 2008). Since this was an Indigenous inquiry, it was crucial that my mo‘olelo be included in this dissertation and its

source originated from the summaries, reflections, notes, graphics, and vignettes in my research journal.

One of the most important features in my research journal was the autobiographical vignettes regarding my colonizing personal and educational experiences along with my reflections on my actions towards decolonization. They were crucial because they were reflective of my deepening 'Ōiwi paradigm. The vignettes also reflected Indigenous inquiry as ho'oponopono in my ongoing journey towards restoring pono in my life. They became my mo'olelo through a process that was akin to creating an 'upena (net). Creating these mo'olelo was an arduous task involving deep and critical reflection that caused spiritual, intellectual, emotional pain, hurt, anger, and embarrassment yet all were part of the ho'oponopono necessary for true decolonization. The mo'olelo was a great salve for all of this agony and led me towards healing and personal empowerment that can inspire others and benefit the larger Native community.

Dialogues and conversations.

This Indigenous inquiry did not collect or gather data as these are processes grounded in traditional, Western frameworks of research, but instead allowed co-storytellers to create multiple and diverse mo'olelo through ha'i mo'olelo, a method that honors Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies. The use of multiple and diverse mo'olelo aligned with Dei (2012) who advocated for the inclusion of multiple stories in order to better understand the whole. The mo'olelo included personal narratives that were autobiographical in nature as well as cultural metaphors, similes, and analogies as these are often used by Indigenous Peoples to illustrate thoughts, beliefs, experiences, and values. I recorded the mo'olelo with the permission of my co-storytellers.

I applied ha'i mo'olelo as my Indigenous method within this inquiry in similar ways, yet differentiated depending upon my relationships with my co-storytellers. Ha'i mo'olelo encompassed conversations and dialogues with my co-storytellers and were not interviews. Kovach (2009) was one Indigenous scholar who used unstructured conversations in her research efforts. She emphasized how they were not interviews because they combined reflection, story, and dialogue (Kovach, 2009). My co-storytellers and I came together individually or in a group and engaged in talk that encompassed opportunities for reflecting, sharing stories, and engaging in dialogues. I also met with a sub-set of co-storytellers to review mo'olelo in order to seek connections and relationships between the varied mo'olelo. I began each conversation with thanking the co-storyteller or co-storytellers for meeting with me. I explained how our time together was informal and conversational in nature inclusive of speaking freely and spontaneously from the na'au. Personal narratives, autobiographical in nature, were shared as well as cultural metaphors, similes, and analogies. I listened from my na'au and expressed warmth and compassion. I used the following prompts and other unstructured, open-ended questions to probe deeper: How did you become aware of your Indigeneity? How did the academy influence your Indigeneity? How can the academy foster an environment where Natives can truly be who they are? I sought to build understandings of Indigenous inquiry in all its forms and functions along with its role in decolonization and how it is applied to benefit Native communities.

Ha'i mo'olelo is a culturally based Indigenous method that honors Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies by using respectful processes, such as conversations and dialogues, to create Native knowledge. It may share similarities with qualitative inquiry, such as dialectical investigations and an exploratory approach, but it is different as it is rooted in

Indigenous ways of knowing and being. My use of ha‘i mo‘olelo was based on each of my relationships with my co-storytellers so it was informal and embodied a flexible, elastic approach as opposed to an interview style one may find in qualitative studies. It was the best method for this Native inquiry.

Interactions with co-storytellers.

The use of ha‘i mo‘olelo requires adequate preparation on the part of the one initiating the Indigenous inquiry as well as certain behaviors that are expected from that person during the conversations and dialogues. One of the first steps is for the storytellers to be mentally, physically, spiritually, emotionally, and intellectually prepared to undertake the journey of engaging in open and honest talk. For some co-storytellers, this included beginning with a pule (prayer) to Ke Akua in order to be present during the conversations and dialogues. During all the conversations and dialogues, I actively listened and attended to my co-storytellers; closely observed facial expressions, gestures and bodily movements; spoke with an invitational speech pattern to ensure a safe environment; reflected on the mana‘o (ideas) shared; and paused, questioned, acknowledged, clarified, and paraphrased as appropriate. I used appropriate Indigenous interactions when meeting with my co-storytellers. Several Indigenous scholars wrote about these proper interactions with others involved in research efforts as well as internal processes researchers underwent during the research process. Grande (2008) utilized active and close observation while wrestling with and understanding ideas through an Indigenous perspective. She gazed inward, outward, and throughout all the spaces in between in the development of her Red pedagogy (Grande, 2008). Hart (2010) described Indigenous values in research that included the following researcher actions: respect and safety; non-obtrusive observing; deep listening and hearing; reflective non-judgment; honor to what was shared;

connection between logic and feelings; self-awareness; and subjectivity. Wilson (2008) noted that the researcher respectfully listens, paraphrases and oftentimes does not use questions that hinder the building of relationships. He believed questioning ultimately doesn't happen until there was deep listening that led to meaningful exchanges (Wilson, 2008). Kovach (2009) also wrote of the researcher's actions that were different than those who conducted a typical, Western-style interview as the researcher must listen intently through an Indigenous process while understanding that stories are not extractive but holistic representations of relationships one has with others. Grande (2008), Hart (2010), Wilson (2008), and Kovach (2009) wrote about specific ways in which Indigenous researchers must conduct themselves when working with other Native Peoples. I incorporated these Indigenous ways into my conversations and dialogues with my co-storytellers.

Actions following dialogues and conversations.

There were several actions I took following the dialogues and conversations with my co-storytellers. Once again, I prepared mentally, physically, spiritually, emotionally, and intellectually to continue this journey by offering a pule for continued guidance. Transcribing most of the dialogues and conversations myself was powerful as it allowed me to relive the talk that makes research so transformative (Kovach, 2009) and decolonizing. This also included my personal reflections from the talks that were housed in my research journal.

Mo'olelo is decolonization.

The mo'olelo created during this dissertation were expressions of decolonizing research as a result of applying a decolonizing lens all throughout the entire study. In addition to my research journal, the creation of the mo'olelo from the dialogues and conversations was a transformative experience for me and I hoped for my co-storytellers as well. The results of

colonization left indelible imprints on the bodies, minds, and spirits of Indigenous Peoples (Fannon, 1963). Fannon (1963) described the physical violence that took place during the reclamation process. My storytellers and I may not have experienced this physical violence, but decolonization was spiritually, emotionally, psychologically, and intellectually violent. All of this pain was paired with healing. Chun (2006) understood that the traditional Hawaiian way of healing addressed mental issues first before addressing the body because Hawaiians acknowledged that sickness and healing were complex processes with the healer using observation and dialogue with family to arrive at a collaborative diagnosis that addressed root causes. Similarly, my co-storytellers and I engaged in a similar healing process through conversations and dialogues that addressed issues of the mind as well as the heart and spirit. This aligned with the Indigenous processes and procedures embedded in my method of ha'i mo'olelo. Fannon (1963) also acknowledged the pain and suffering associated with colonization and realized that the struggle and liberation of the people were the highest forms of art. Thus, this dissertation can be considered an artistic expression of freeing ourselves from our colonial chains. In addition to Fannon (1963), other Indigenous scholars shared their decolonizing journeys through their artistic writings that took the form of narratives. Swadener and Mutua (2008) shared their own decolonizing journeys as researchers and scholars and how they came to use decolonizing discourses and collaborative methodologies in their research. Personal narratives showed their struggles and resistance to society's ascribed identities (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). In addition, Wane (2013) used reflective narratives to analyze and challenge her own colonial education and its framework in her decolonizing journey to Embu, Kenya. Wane (2013) explored personal decolonization within the framework of understanding Indigenous knowledge production and resistance among Embu women in Kenya. Much of my research

journal mirrored Wane’s (2013) reflective narratives, but it was from an ‘Ōiwi perspective as I struggled in a Western-based educational system towards personal decolonization. These Indigenous journeys towards decolonization can be described as a “coming back to power” (Cajete, 2012, p. 147). It is an inward transformation with the goal of wholeness, self-knowledge, and wisdom (Cajete, 2012). The mo‘olelo I co-created with my co-storytellers represented new levels of self-knowledge and critical consciousness (Cajete, 2012). I also saw them as Indigenous knowledge.

Mo‘olelo is Indigenous knowledge.

The mo‘olelo created from this Native study is Indigenous knowledge. Originally from conversations and dialogues, my co-storytellers and I created Indigenous knowledge out of the pono relationships we have. I, nor others, owned this Indigenous knowledge as it belonged to no one individual, but to Ke Akua and the larger cosmos. This was supported by the research of Wilson (2008) who wrote that through stories and conversations, knowledge is generated. He acknowledged that it is created through social relationships and it cannot be owned because it was created and belongs to the cosmos (Wilson, 2008). The researcher is simply the interpreter (Wilson, 2008). Additionally, Ray (2012) recognized the cosmic origins and influence on knowledge creation. For example, Anishnaabe has a spiritual context to knowledge creation. A spiritual consciousness is important as well as the recognition of a personal and spiritual journey in knowledge seeking (Ray, 2012). This divine origin required an Indigenous approach to deepening understanding of Native knowledge that was significantly different from Western-based data analysis.

Reflecting on Mo‘olelo

Following the process of co-creating mo‘olelo with co-storytellers, I engaged in Indigenous reflective practices based on my ‘Ōiwi paradigm and the Indigenous paradigms of

co-storytellers that were aligned with this study's Native epistemology. These Indigenous reflective practices were different from Western data analysis and interpretation. They were inclusive of using intuition, inductive reasoning, and culture meaning making. It also encompassed identifying relationships within and among the various mo'olelo. The various mo'olelo were woven into a mo'olelo nui that was this dissertation. This was an example of decolonizing Indigenous research.

Different from Western-based analysis and interpretation.

Western research analysis does not align with Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies and poses challenges for Native researchers. Western research analysis uses logic that separates mind from heart and spirit and can discount cultures and traditions (Wilson, 2008). It encompasses linear logic that breaks down topics into smaller pieces for systematic analysis. Wilson (2008) noted that this breaks down ideas and knowledge into discrete parts and destroys the relationships that built them in the first place. Kovach (2009) also spoke extensively on the challenges of Western analysis in Indigenous research. Kovach's (2009) research agreed with Wilson's (2008) observation that Western research analysis does tend to reduce the whole to its respective parts in an attempt to explain phenomenon. It has also been associated with decontextualizing knowledge through the process of coding or arriving at analytical units (Kovach, 2009). Even qualitative research can be challenging as it oftentimes operates along an analytical ladder in a linear fashion (Kovach, 2009). When these techniques are applied to Indigenous stories, it results in generalizations (Kovach, 2009) that are inappropriate when one uses Indigenous methodologies grounded in the epistemologies of Native Peoples. Indigenous researchers Kovach (2009) and Wilson (2008) saw challenges in applying Western research practices to Indigenous studies and advocated for the use of more Native approaches.

Indigenous scholars promoted Indigenous approaches to Native research yet some made strategic concessions. Kovach (2009) acknowledged that Indigenous inquiry approaches concern self-in-relation to others, especially when using Indigenous stories in research methods. These stories are about the researcher and others' experiences and represent their subjective truths (Kovach, 2009). They are holistic understandings that should not be fragmented during the analysis of research and the presentation of results (Kovach, 2009). Yet Kovach (2009) did engage in data analysis and presentation of results that condensed stories into conversations with thematic coding as a strategic concession. Lekoko (2007) noted that stories are analyzed through a variety of means, including Western-oriented grounded theory. Although I recognized that some Indigenous scholars made concessions in the past, I believe that the field of Indigenous inquiry has grown within the last several years so promising Indigenous scholars like myself do not have to make these similar concessions. I used the Indigenous approaches to my study's stories as advocated by Kovach (2009) and Wilson (2008). I kept stories as holistic as I could so they honored Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies. I also included all mo‘olelo in the appendices.

Indigenous reflective practices.

This dissertation did not engage in data analysis that imposed a Western paradigm upon Indigenous research. Instead, it incorporated reflective practices based on my ‘Ōiwi paradigm and the Indigenous paradigms of co-storytellers aligned to this study's Native epistemology. The process encompassed intuition, inductive reasoning and cultural meaning-making all done through a decolonizing lens. Before rampant colonization, these reflective practices were a crucial component of Native psychology. Indigenous Peoples used these reflective practices on a daily basis. It was time to bring them back into academia.

Using intuition and inductive reasoning as reflective practices transforms conversations and dialogues into mo'olelo. Although I understood this skill takes a lifetime to develop (Wilson, 2008), this study provided me an opportunity to strengthen this part of my 'Ōiwi paradigm. Wilson (2008) described how Indigenous analysis uses all of the senses and aspects of being. Kovach's (2009) research expounded on this notion by noting the importance of observations, contextual knowledge, behaviors, and patterns as all processes within interpretive and inductive analysis. It requires the researcher to engage in analyzing self-in-relation, a process with relatively few examples in Indigenous literature (Kovach, 2009). This Native study added to the literature on self-in-relation within Indigenous analysis. Wilson (2008) and Kovach (2009) both contributed to deepening our understanding of intuition and inductive reasoning as reflective Indigenous practices. Their descriptions of this process were incorporated into this inquiry.

Cultural meaning making was another important part of my Indigenous reflective practices. For the purposes of this study, cultural meaning making included looking for kaona within mo'olelo. This was reflective of the high value that Hawaiians placed on expressive and communicative functions within Hawaiian oral traditions (Au & Kaomea, 2009). The application of kaona and other forms of cultural meaning making can be difficult because it is not widely understood and utilized in academia. This highlights the challenge in academic research of giving meaning to data in a cultural way that explains contemporary issues (Cidro, 2012). However, Cidro (2012) provided an example of how this can be accomplished through Nanabush, a celebrated trickster, as an adisokan and an analytic tool for research conducted with communities on Maitoulin Island. Storytelling through Nanabush helped Cidro (2012) and others understand behaviors, inadequacies, and strengths as well as analyze and transmit knowledge as part of a project to identify the formation and behaviors of First Nations women on Manitoulin

Island. Cultural meaning making works alongside intuition and inductive reasoning when an Indigenous scholar engages in Native reflective practices.

Co-storytellers and readers played a crucial role in this dissertation in using reflective practices. My co-storytellers and I engaged in quite a bit of listening and reflecting in order to find cultural meaning (Kovach, 2009) and the kaona within mo'olelo (Au & Kaomea, 2009). When reflecting, metaphors and symbolism may be used (Wilson, 2008) to further explore and explain our own understandings. Mucina (2011) explained this concept further. The Ubuntu storyteller never analyzed the story because each listener analyzed and gained something from its telling (Mucina, 2011). Ubuntu children were taught from a young age to analyze stories, thus responsible, self-expression occurs (Mucina, 2011). This concept was applied to my study through a circular view of applying Indigenous reflective practices (Wilson, 2008). A circular view is not triangulation, a Western-based concept of treating data (Wilson, 2008). Instead it involves the storyteller, the co-storytellers, and the readers in uncovering relationships within and among the mo'olelo so that all voices are reflected in the research. This is a cyclical process that occurs over time, at many places, and with different people. The readers of my Native study were in essence part of the Indigenous research process. This was in keeping with Indigenous scholar Wilson's (2008) assertion that one must show respect for the readers by allowing them the space to discover ideas within their own unique contexts. Both readers and co-storytellers were active contributors to this Native study and came into this research and will leave this research with their own unique understandings and knowledge.

As my co-storytellers, readers, and I engaged in Indigenous reflective practices, we learned more about and applied a decolonizing lens throughout the research. Research is more than just gathering, analyzing, and presenting data, but includes finding oneself in the research

(Kovach, 2009). As the storyteller, using these Indigenous reflective practices as ho'oponopono spurred my journey towards personal decolonization. As such I along with my co-storytellers looked at power and domination that informed our processes and procedures for dismantling colonial structures (Grande, 2008) and furthered the decolonization of our minds, our educational systems, and our research practices with Native communities. Kovach (2009) advised that decolonization should be apparent throughout the research. Readers may not be engaged to the extent that co-storytellers were, but their knowledge and awareness of decolonization and its processes and practices within Indigenous research were heightened after reading the dissertation.

Finding relationships in and among the mo'olelo.

Through Indigenous reflective practices, I found personal meanings in each mo'olelo and established relationships amongst the different mo'olelo. I drew no definitive conclusions from these mo'olelo and made no value judgments. I honored the reader's role in this research process to develop his or her own understandings of and relationships with the mo'olelo. I applied a decolonizing lens during this process. This was in keeping with my 'Ōiwi paradigm and contributed towards my personal decolonization. Uncovering the relationships within and among the mo'olelo was part of Indigenous reflective practices.

I joined other Indigenous scholars in looking at research as a whole system of relationships (Wilson, 2008). This was similar to creating the cordage that connected the knots of my net. Wilson (2008) wrote compellingly about the importance of building relationships with the ideas and knowledge generated from stories and conversations. He also applied this to how he built relationships with his co-researchers and involved them in the analysis process (Wilson, 2008). I too involved some of my co-storytellers in reflective Indigenous practices that

stressed discovering relationships amongst the thoughts and ideas as well as the feelings expressed in our conversations and dialogues to co-create mo‘olelo. I put the mo‘olelo in a relational context to make sense to the reader as Wilson (2008) had done. These actions strengthened relational accountability (Wilson, 2008). Building relationships was not only reserved for those contributing to this Indigenous inquiry, but also was done with the mo‘olelo created from conversations and dialogues with emerging Native scholars. These practices adhered to Indigenous research principles and were in keeping with my ‘Ōiwi framework and paradigm.

As an Indigenous researcher, I realized that I could not draw definitive conclusions from these mo‘olelo. As others read this dissertation in the future, they will need to develop their own relationships with the ideas and form their own conclusions (Wilson, 2008). Thus, I honored the reader’s role in developing his or her own understandings from and relationships with the mo‘olelo. Native scholars supported this research practice. Kovach (2009) structured her stories within her research in a way that allowed her readers to interpret the stories from their own perspectives. Wilson (2008) allowed his readers to make connections and establish relationships with stories in order to internalize knowledge gained (Wilson, 2008). He also understood that knowledge is not static and will evolve over time. The future readers of this dissertation will continue to reflect on the mo‘olelo and may possibly re-tell the mo‘olelo long afterward. The re-tellings may be different over time but this is in keeping with Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies. ho‘omanawanui (2010) praised the various mo‘olelo of Pele and Hi‘iaka as reflective of the diversity of thought within a robust culture. This was one example of how Hawaiian culture is not homogeneous, but is rich and deep. Future readers should conclude their readings of this dissertation not only with more knowledge on Indigenous inquiry, but also with

long lasting memories of an active experience of deepening understandings of and relationships with mo‘olelo.

I applied a decolonizing lens as I connected with each mo‘olelo and established personal relationships among the different mo‘olelo. This welcomed Indigenous agency (Nakata, Nakata, Keech & Bolt, 2012). I applied Indigenous agency in this Native study by truly seeing the historically layered, socially responsive, and traditionally grounded ways Indigenous Peoples engaged in de-colonality in their modern, everyday life (Nakata, Nakata, Keech & Bolt, 2012). Kaomea (2001) engaged in this Indigenous practice when she wrote her mo‘olelo from an Indigenous perspective. It contained cultural values and principles and addressed numerous power relationships that included her relationship to the academy and her relationship to the Hawaiian community. Similarly, my personal mo‘olelo addressed the power relationships apparent in my own academic journey in addition to detailing and reflecting on how they contributed towards my decolonization. Through my mo‘olelo, future readers will be exposed to how one applies a decolonizing lens and thus may engage in this very practice themselves as they build relationships with the various mo‘olelo in this Native study.

Indigenous reflective practices promote finding personal meanings in each mo‘olelo and establishing relationships amongst the different mo‘olelo. This dissertation was an ‘upena with the various mo‘olelo connected through identified relationships that acted as the cordage between them. I advanced no definitive conclusions from these mo‘olelo and made no value judgments in order to be respectful of my co-storytellers’ and their truths as well as to honor the important role of the reader in this process. A decolonizing lens was applied throughout in order to better connect mo‘olelo to decolonizing journeys. It was very much an Indigenous research

process that privileged relationships. These relationships were connections that were used to weave together a dissertation from multiple mo‘olelo.

Weaving together mo‘olelo.

Once I created the various mo‘olelo and identified the connections and relationships, they were seamlessly woven together into a mo‘olelo nui. This larger story was the dissertation. It was a Hawaiian ‘upena. As the primary storyteller, it was my kuleana to use different narrative, expository, descriptive, and analytical writing styles within academic text and mo‘olelo to make meaning, to identify the personal connections and relationships I and others saw between and among various mo‘olelo, and to organize the mo‘olelo in a way that readers could build their own relationships and begin their own personal journeys of Indigenous learning, deep discovery, and personal decolonization. There were no actions that were taken to assimilate them into a common context. I weaved them into a smooth and continuous mo‘olelo so when the future reader picks up the dissertation to when he or she finishes reading the last page. Techniques and approaches from other Indigenous scholars inspired this dissertation. It was built upon them in an effort to weave together impactful mo‘olelo.

Weaving the various mo‘olelo together required the ability to be open spiritually, emotionally, psychologically, and intellectually to working with multiple epistemologies. Although I entered this Native inquiry with an ‘Ōiwi paradigm grounded in my Hawaiian epistemology, I understood that my co-storytellers had different Indigenous backgrounds and came with their own unique worldviews and experiences shaped by their ontologies, axiologies, and epistemologies. In addition, these worldviews and experiences, including my own, have been historically and contemporarily affected by colonialism. All of us had unique experiences with decolonization and I was cognizant of this during this process. As I engaged in this weaving, I

was multi-epistemic. Andreotti, Akenakew, and Cooper (2011) wrote about this ability as an asset in really knowing and understanding the limitations and social-historical relations of power between Western and Indigenous epistemologies. I also included all the variations of epistemologies in between these distinct epistemologies. Andreotti, Akenakew, and Cooper (2011) compared one’s ability to be multi-epistemic with using a Māori fishing net. The ontologies were representative of the fishing grounds and epistemologies were the fishing nets and the different fish. When one weaved a net, they needed to have knowledge of the different fishing grounds, the kinds of fish that were most desirable for the communities, and thus needed epistemological pluralism because no one ground represented the entire sea of possibilities (Andreotti, Akenakew, & Cooper, 2011). Scholar Royal (2009) in Andreotti, Akenakew, and Cooper (2011) was quoted as saying this described knowledge weaving because it was “cross-disciplinary, cross-boundary thought, discussion, and knowledge (p. 14)”. I applied both Royal’s (2009) philosophical stance on knowledge weaving and Andreotti, Akenakew, and Cooper’s (2011) metaphor on the value of multi-epistemic understandings when weaving together the various mo‘olelo. This holistic approach aligned with the ‘Ōiwi framework of this Native study, enhanced my relational accountability to my co-storytellers, and communicated to readers the power of Indigenous reflections within academic research.

Sharing mo‘olelo

The entire doctoral dissertation was a mo‘olelo nui. The challenge in presenting the mo‘olelo in writing is that writing tends to fix ideas and knowledge as objects so they lose their ability to change and grow over time thus losing their relational accountability (Wilson, 2008). However, as the primary storyteller it was my kuleana to build relationships. I did this by imparting my own life experiences in mo‘olelo. In this way, future readers can filter through

their own experiences and can adapt information to make meaning from all the mo‘olelo (Kovach, 2009) and find relevance to their lives (Wilson, 2008). Through this engagement, they are encouraged to interact with Indigenous knowledge, make connections between their own knowledge and Native knowledge systems, and reflect upon how reading this dissertation will affect their future actions within academia. For Indigenous readers, this was a call to action that may start as awareness. For other Indigenous readers, it was a full acceptance of kuleana to advocate for Indigenous inquiry in the graduate curricula and application to benefit Native communities. These expectations bore some similarities to Bell et. al. (2005) who wrote about how student reflections included an opportunity to build bridges between knowledge systems by providing students with access to Indigenous knowledge that was otherwise not available in the academy, by presenting knowledge in a respectful way, by increasing the level of personal responsibility for students to do something with the learning, and by becoming future practitioners and keepers of knowledge. This dissertation was presented as an ‘upena of Indigenous knowledge composed of multiple, diverse, and strongly constructed mo‘olelo inclusive of my personal reflections. This dissertation should impact all those who will read it.

Summary of Methods

This dissertation conducted conversations and dialogues with nine Indigenous graduate or post-graduate scholars and explored how they learned about Indigenous research in the university, how they decided upon and ultimately applied Indigenous research approaches to benefit their communities, and how the university can promote Indigenous research in the graduate curriculum. This Indigenous inquiry did not collect or gather data in processes grounded in traditional, Western frameworks of research, but instead created multiple and diverse mo‘olelo from graduate and post-graduate scholars through ha‘i mo‘olelo, a method that

honors Indigenous epistemologies and methodologies. Reflection was embedded within Native methods respectful of others. Indigenous reflective practices kept stories holistic while the storyteller, co-storytellers, and readers engaged in intuition, inductive reasoning, and cultural meaning making through a decolonizing lens. As the storyteller, I used kaona as my cultural meaning making approach. Relationships were identified within and among the various mo‘olelo that were akin to the cordage that connected the knots in a Hawaiian ‘upena. I wove the mo‘olelo together to form a mo‘olelo nui, a Hawaiian ‘upena created by many hands and hearts.

CHAPTER 6

Mo'olelo

Overview of Mo'olelo

The mo'olelo shared below were the most powerful mo'olelo that best reflected the collective knowledge of my co-storytellers and me. What connected our mo'olelo together were our common experiences, perspectives, thoughts, ideas, and knowledge. I wove those connections together to form a metaphorical 'upena that was this research project. This 'upena linked directly to my first two research questions: How did Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars learn about Indigenous inquiry in the university? How did Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars decide upon and ultimately apply Indigenous research approaches as decolonization that ultimately benefitted themselves and their communities? My co-storytellers and I found that we learned about Indigenous inquiry by exploring our own cultural identities, by receiving support from others, and by struggling with Western approaches in the academy. In addition, my co-storytellers and I decided upon and ultimately applied Indigenous research approaches because we recognized they benefitted our Native communities and they aligned with our distinct cultural lenses. Ancestors inspired our choices. We applied these approaches not only by including cultural traditions, protocols, histories, and stories, but also by making connections.

Learning About Indigenous Inquiry

My co-storytellers and I found that there were many ways in which we learned about Indigenous inquiry in university. All of my co-storytellers described how exploring their cultural identities ultimately led them to learn more about this type of research. Furthermore, all of my co-storytellers described how mentors, advisors, professors, friends, and supportive others

encouraged them to delve deeper into understanding Native inquiry. However, five co-storytellers explicitly described painful research journeys that forced them to seek out Indigenous methodologies and methods because Western approaches were antithetical to who they were as Native persons.

Exploring cultural identity. The exploration of one's own cultural identity led many co-storytellers to learn more about Indigenous inquiry. For one of my participants ('elima), this journey began in high school. His undergraduate and graduate programs supported the development of his cultural identity. His current involvement in cultural activities continues to strengthen his identity:

“But it wasn't until I got to [this secondary school] where in the seventh grade where you began, you know, being told, you know, being taught Hawaiian language, Hawaiian culture. Then as I went through school, um, a funny story is, um, my sophomore year, we switched from, uh, we switched from a program from a registration by card to a computerized system. So I registered, I actually wanted French, continue French from seventh grade, eighth grade, ninth grade. I had French and we had, um, mandatory U.S. government, U.S. history, and something else. But something happened in the computer system and I was given Hawaiian instead of French. I was given Hawaiian history instead of U.S. history. I was given Hawaiian culture instead of American government or something like that. And that was sort of like fate, f-a-t-e for me. It was like, “Oh, I didn't go back... Well, okay, I guess. This sounds okay.” So I started it, and that was my path to really realizing the fullness and depth of Hawaiian culture. I went to school over here. I didn't want to go away. I wanted to go here to continue my language studies, you know. Although I, I eventually got my degree in teaching, you know. And it

is still a process, you know. Also when I graduated from high school, I learned I either went to look for a halau or a canoe club. But only I couldn't find a canoe club so I found a halau. And that started that path. You know so... you identify yourself as a Hawaiian. I believe everybody should, all Hawaiians, you should be able to speak your language. You should be involved. [Be]cause our culture is not a living culture that we can not most of us, the majority of us can not live it every day. In other words we can't go out into the lo'i and, you know, grow our own food. Or we can't, you know, we are far removed from the culture, but we can still participate in certain things. Like for me it's hula. For me, it's teaching, chant and things like that. So I would say that is pretty much is what has shaped and is shaping me. You know, by participating in a lot of this. And along the way, you know, you get these gestalt experiences, yeah? Like, "Aw, this is what that means. This is what that chant means." And I think that is the nice part about it. You're always receiving new knowledge and new information."

For others, the exploration of cultural identity did not happen until they entered the university. This was particularly true for my first co-storyteller ('ekahi) below who is just completing her doctoral coursework in education. She is an elementary school teacher working with Native Hawaiian students. I asked her if she structured her research differently because she currently works with Native Hawaiian students and is planning on conducting her research project in her classroom. She reflected upon her own cultural identity and how this influenced how she works with her students:

"So this is what I envisioned myself. Before, I was a great student to typical learner. [I got] knowledge in the traditional sense where the teacher is just speaking and I'm just taking down notes and able to regurgitate, basically, what they've told me, what they've

taught me, because, you know, I am an empty vessel. I had no thoughts whatsoever, supposedly, but I find myself struggling with that whole mindset because actually as I've worked with students and probably the shift in [the current school I am teaching at]. Ever since I started working at [this school] I started learning more about my own culture. I mean [through] classes at university, [I] was able to start to learn about how to speak Hawaiian and from there it really started to affect my mindset and seeing things differently. And you know the whole idea of mo‘olelo and how important mo‘olelo was and is important for our culture. I mean, then it became more difficult for me to sit in a traditional, Western... class and I started to have struggles within me to actually to counter in my brain what the professor was saying because I really did not agree necessarily with what he or she was saying. Because in Hawaiian ways you don't do that, and you don't say that, you don't believe that... I guess that's why it is important for me to still remain at [this school] so that I can work with my kids and instill what I have learned about my own self and my identity as a Hawaiian throughout the years so that way they don't feel like they're less than as they engage in those types of settings. Because it is so easy to get sucked into a Western mindset and I think that is the only [way].”

I too struggled with cultural identity as I conducted my research. Here is an annotation I wrote in 2013 following my reading of Malcolm Nāea Chun's book on ho‘oponopono:

“How can I go about restoring this sense of pono, this tapping into cultural identity, connectedness to who I am, understanding who I am, if not through a process that restores pono. Thus, ho‘oponopono was chosen as something to complement this... What I found interesting that may be applicable, even thought about before, is to

incorporate the analogy of making an 'upena, that as I go about re-connecting and reflecting, I will be undoing a part of who I am and analyzing it. This may require me to undo some knots from the past. This may be past ways of thinking, past ways of knowing, and critically analyzing the past. Then, as I really analyze, reflect upon it, correct it in some way, and form, I will then re-knot so that it is stronger. Perhaps I can use this analogy to strengthen my identity, my ideas of education, my educational experiences in order to make the 'upena tighter and culturally blessed. I know blessed is not the right word, but it is what is on my mind at the moment. I need to find the courage.”

In addition, my first co-storyteller ('ekahi), who currently holds her doctorate in education, shared how her graduate experiences in a particular course really opened her mind up to exploring her cultural identity. She shared that it was a particular field trip in graduate school that made her really delve deeply into understanding her cultural identity:

“It was in [professor’s] multicultural education class and she took us to the Plantation Houses in Waipahu and it was beautiful. I don’t know if you have ever been there but it is just an amazing place and there’s these homes where Russian plantation workers lived and Filipinos and Chinese etc... and I started looking at around at all these different cultures and spaces and thinking that all these people came from various countries to make a home in Hawai‘i, yeah, that melting pot, you know, analogy, etc... And I realized that none of my ancestors were there. None of my ancestors were represented there. My ancestors came from Tahiti and from France and Italy. Yeah and there were no French or Italian immigrants to Hawai‘i, neither were there any Tahitian immigrants. So I realized that I wasn’t present. You know, so, like I said I always felt different. I’ve

never felt like I fit in with any category or any particular identity. But at that time I felt very proud as I always have been to be Tahitian. But I also accepted the fact that I’m a Tahitian American. Yeah, so, it was a long process though... Well, she’s [professor] always pushing us to really understand our cultural identity and how we defined ourselves.”

Receiving support. Mentors, advisors, professors, friends, and fellow graduate students encouraged my co-storytellers and me to delve deeper into understanding Indigenous inquiry while at university. The level of support varied from classroom-based curriculum and instruction for the duration of a course to long-term support provided through professional mentorship and relationships with peers. It is apparent through the mo‘olelo below that support did indeed lead to learning about Indigenous inquiry.

My fifth co-storyteller (‘elima) shared with me how it was important for advisors to support graduate students in a variety of ways. One way in which his advisor supported him was by allowing him to take courses outside of his discipline that supported his research and deepened his knowledge of Indigenous research approaches:

“The problem in academia is that there is a lot of gatekeeping. So you got to do this, you got to do that. And some worse than others. C&I [Curriculum and Instruction Program in the College of Education] is probably the more lax one. The more ‘olu ‘olu one... So my advisor said I can take [the Indigenous Research Methodologies] class. I said, “Wow, that was really good.” I loved that class. You know I wanted to go anthropology but they weren’t offering anything... You know, I can substitute this... I don’t know what research. I mean, we had to take so many bloody research, I’m sorry.”

He goes on to mention how his advisor further supported graduate students by organizing writing courses and introducing them to Indigenous scholarly writers.

“But like [my advisor] had like writing groups... You know, it was like if you wanted to come and write. I always went when I could. She invited people to writing seminars with other Indigenous groups. So it was those kinds of supports that you need for yourselves.”

He also highlighted how important it was for Native scholars to write so their knowledge can assist the next generation: “For Indigenous Hawaiians there’s a lot more of us been produced. The key is getting more to write. Just putting out more material.”

My second co-storyteller (‘elua) also experienced great support from a particular professor, a prolific Native writer, who ended up becoming his advisor. We met at his office after work one day and discussed his Indigenous research. I shared my questions with him ahead of time, but our conversation largely focused on his family and his educational and professional journey. Below, he described a particular professor who inspired him tremendously. She opened up his eyes to the varied possibilities of research. I took a course from this same professor and would agree with him on how this professor really respected culturally relevant research approaches:

“I guess when I started my graduate studies ... there was one particular professor that kind of had a real impact on me. I took several of her courses... She was an awesome teacher, and she was also my advisor when I completed my Master’s degree in Curriculum and Instruction. But in her course, you know, she kind of validated that you can research qualitative and quantitative, but qualitative research which sometimes requires talk story, the interview, the mo‘olelo. That’s all- it’s valid. It’s okay, you

know, according to our style and way of learning and capturing learning... from our kūpuna... That’s an important element. So it kind of validated that and it is natural to sit and talk story with others and listen to their mo‘olelo and mo‘okū‘auhau (genealogy). I... connect... we make connections. It makes any content so much easier to understand and then to kind of make connections that you value when you find others that value the same things or had the same experiences... Whether it’s in teaching because, of course, my studies was in education or in Hawaiian language or music or hula or something like that.”

He went on to add how a counselor referred him to another professor who could offer support.

He eventually became her assistant. This professor and my co-storyteller are friends till this day:

“One of my dear friends took me to see [her] one day when I was visiting. He’s a counselor in the College of Ed [Education]. He thought that she might be helpful. One, because she was one of the few Native Hawaiian faculty in the COE [College of Education] at that time and two, he knew she would be creating a cohort of teachers that would be teaching primarily Native Hawaiian students in the immersion schools or the Hawaiian focus charter schools or here.”

In addition, it was also beneficial when these professors were also advisors to graduate students, such as if they were members of doctoral committees. These professors helped focus graduate students on Indigenous methodologies. My first co-storyteller (‘ekahi) recalled: “As I got into my comps [comprehensive exams] and they wrote some amazing comp questions for me which really helped me to delve deep not only wide but really, really deep into what I was doing. That really helped me to understand things much better.” This first co-storyteller now encourages other Native graduate students: “And I think more people like me can encourage and

support Native Hawaiian students to succeed. Then they’ll be more people involved doing Indigenous research.”

This particular co-storyteller influenced me in my personal research journey. I first met her when she presented her research to a dissertation writing class I enrolled in at university. She shared her experiences using visual images as well as her own stories. She described her successes as well as her trials and tribulations in navigating the university, both professionally and in her personal research endeavor. This co-storyteller was open to meeting with me several times. She provided immense encouragement as well as agreed to participate in this research project. This co-storyteller inspired me to continue to use Indigenous research methodologies and methods in my own dissertation.

Fellow graduate students also played a major role in deepening their peers’ understanding of Indigenous inquiry. During a conversation with my hui, my female co-storyteller described how peer networking was crucial: “So we can’t lose each other. Stick with it, group. There’s a lot to learn from the people that actually make it through. Get that paper!”

I can relate to the mo‘olelo above because my graduate peer group has been most influential in my journey in understanding Indigenous inquiry. I met my hui online through the American Indigenous Research Association (AIRA). This organization’s mission is to “educate researchers and the public about the importance of Indigenous Research Methodologies and to promote incorporation of these methodologies into all research that engages Indigenous Peoples and communities” (American Indigenous Research Association, 2014, para. 3). The AIRA sponsors a graduate student online discussion forum where the next generation of Indigenous scholars comes together virtually to offer mutual support, provide each other encouragement towards graduation, and assist one another through sharing Native authored resources. My

yearlong membership has substantially increased my knowledge of Indigenous inquiry while providing professional connections with leading researchers in the field who have continued to inspire my thinking.

Mentors, advisors, professors, friends, and fellow graduate students encouraged my co-storytellers and me to delve deeper into understanding Indigenous inquiry while at university. Support included professors who created safe spaces for Native knowledge traditions. Some of these professors became mentors and advisors who helped guide Indigenous graduate students through the research processes and ultimately graduation. Friends and peers, both near and far, also offered support to my co-storytellers and me. This supportive network led to increased knowledge of Indigenous inquiry.

Struggling with Western research approaches and the academy. My co-storytellers and I found that our own struggles with understanding and applying Western research approaches led us to seek out and ultimately apply Indigenous processes of inquiry. Sadly, these struggles were often filled with frustration, uncertainty, pain, anger and sadness. In the end, six co-storytellers, myself included, felt a great sense of joy when we finally did return to our cultural knowledge and traditions to inform our research practices.

Our challenges became quite noticeable as we took courses that ignored and denigrated our cultural ways of being and knowing and interacted with professors who lacked understanding of Indigenous research methodologies and methods. The struggles began in the classroom and continued throughout coursework. They arose during courses taught by professors who were ignorant of or disrespectful of Indigenous knowledge and ways of learning. My sixth co-storyteller (‘eono) shared his challenging undergraduate college experience. He learned

differently than other students, relying primarily on his auditory senses to gain knowledge from his professors. On the other hand, his professors had different expectations for their students:

“College was another thing where I was out of place. You know, I was like, one of my professors used to say, “Why aren’t you writing anything I say down?” And then I’d say, “I’m listening to you.” So, I was always, was always a very audio kind of learner. So, every time I tried to write I would stop listening. And I couldn’t hear what you, and then I’d miss things so what I would do is that I would listen to everything he had to say and then I would go back and read what we read, what we talked about, and then take notes. But what was, what he was saying. And so he, he never, he was like, “That’s incredible, you know, like, there’s people, like seriously writing everything down and you’re just kind of listening to me.” [I replied,] “Isn’t that what I am supposed to be doing?” You know, but it was just. So I learned differently.”

As I reflected on his collegial experiences, it reminded me of the differences between Western and Indigenous acquisition of knowledge and skills. This co-storyteller learned through utilizing senses valued in traditional, Indigenous education. My fifth co-storyteller (‘elima) highlighted how crucial observing and listening are in acquiring Native knowledge and skills, particularly language:

“You know, you have to be really living with somebody to, to be able to speak like that. And you come across this when you are trying to teach. You know, like, um, pick a flower. In English you can say, “pick a flower.” “Pick an apple.” “Pick your nose.” But those in Hawaiian are all different words. Right? They are different words. You can’t use the same word pick for “pick your nose” or “pick an apple” or “pick a flower.” You have to know the words. Only way you are going to learn it is by observing and listening

to the older people. You, you, I mean, you don't have enough time to learn it in school. So that is the beauty of living and being with the older people, our kūpuna, is that they use the words, you know."

Unfortunately, Native students continue to struggle within the academy because their ways of knowing and being are not valued and respected. For some, this continued throughout the research process. Co-storytellers shared awful memories of failed research experiences using Western protocols and processes. One of the males ('ekahi) in my hui described the challenge of being in the academy, a place where a particular worldview continues to dominate both teaching and learning:

"Well, my thought is we're working from two different assumptions. You know, we, the Indigenous People, work under the assumption that there is nothing more important than our own way of looking at the world. And Native processes, Native thought processes, stuff and for me its more important than the haole (foreign) stuff, the ... stuff. To me it's not as important than Native stuff. Whereas the people in power they proceed from the assumption that their way is the best way. Even if they don't say it, that's how they live. They live in this arrogant, superior place. So what I see as people... to get the piece of paper from those people, uh, that's the problem. They can not understand because they do not live as we live. They do not think as we think. And so the frustration that comes on both sides is from not accepting that we are who we are and we're just as good as they. And they're not as accepting, you know, the same thing. So these are assumptions that are creating problems. The assumption that we can all be one big happy family [be]cause I don't believe it is possible."

Another co-storyteller ('ekolu) in my hui furthered this conversation by speaking about the choice of Indigenous methodologies and methods. She expressed frustration with others who continued to belittle these research approaches:

“I don't consider Indigenous research as a new paradigm, but if you think about how, um, qualitative research started to grow it didn't take this long to be considered acceptable. So, um, I'm not entirely sure of, even, even if I say I have some sort of expertise in Indigenous research techniques... um, I still hear from the academy that, well, okay that is fine but you still have to work, um, you still have to work with Western techniques. You still have to be proficient in Western techniques, because, um, that's just part of the sidelines, it's a hobby, it's cute. And, um, but it's nothing that is going to have some sort of staying power or going to, uh, get you anywhere in academia. So I have this similar personal struggle... This, this battle with the power holders and what do you do and how do you get over those mountains.”

Another co-storyteller ('elua) in my hui brought up a painful experience following a conference we attended together. All three members of my hui were excited about meeting leading Native scholars who pioneered work in Indigenous research methodologies and methods. We spent a lot of time talking about our dissertations and how we were going to incorporate our learning from the conference into our writing. He was sadly disappointed with his advisor after he shared his Indigenous approach to research with her:

“One of the things that is going to be a problem, is going to continue to be a problem is the way the design... the techniques being used... the biggest struggle is... my advisor and thinking how am I going to put it into words. So to her it seems foreign to her [be]cause she doesn't know. And then I think trying to use the Indigenous research

knowledge in my dissertation that I wanted to. And the other day I just kind of pitched it to her about the conference I went to and stuff like that and thinking that she'll be supportive and they'll be some kind of pride to the institution that I went to this conference to present, but I walked out of there thinking like, you know, when a school boy goes to the principal's office and gets scolded and say that, "You don't behave this way if you are going to graduate from our institute. You have to apply certain methods and certain thinking and that is why, you know, we try to teach you," she said. But then I was like as she was talking I kind of rudely interrupt[ed] her according to her standards. I said, "Well, if you guys really want us to think white, why do you guys teach multi-culture class and why do you guys teach sociology in education and why do you guys use these books that are about Indians and Native People and different Indigenous People around the world in your class? If you guys just want us to think a certain way, then why can't you guys use your own people, tell stories about your own people, and let us know how it is to be white, extra white." But at that point, you know, the conversation just kind of went right away differently. Ah, she became intransigent and I became more of an attacker... I think I just need to remove myself here and come back at another time. Another time when your heart is feeling well. So I think as a Native person we will continue to struggle with this Western perspective. I think. And I think maybe even in some tribal colleges, they really push that Western perspective, Western thinking, especially in on my reservation. The community college, they started off as more of a lot of cultural elements to the school. They still do the language and they even teach some kind of traditional blessing there, in one of their Navajo studies, and, but yet there is still that Western side of it they have to almost answer to get funding. Even though as a tribal

college you [are] suppose[ed] to have your own college, you know, on sovereign nation and that kind of thing that I’m starting to learn that some sovereign[ty] really doesn't exist with the Native People because you have the bigger people to answer to. So I think the same way is for me for education. That was my struggle.”

I struggled with Western approaches to research in the academy. This became abundantly clear as I moved from using Western approaches to incorporating more Indigenous approaches to my research. This is from my research journal following reading a book authored by Indigenous scholar Margaret Kovach:

“Kovach starts off with a story regarding a graduate student who wants to use Indigenous research methodologies but does not feel qualified to do so. This sounds very much like me! However, she encourages the student to pursue her aspirations further. I think that is why I need to keep going-keep on reading and writing. Even though I may feel that it [research] is “too Western” or “not Indigenous enough”. I need to keep moving forward. Sometimes it is hard to really say, “this is Indigenous,” or “this is Western”, because one is raised in that type of environment.”

My classroom teacher co-storyteller described the Western indoctrination that took place within her formal schooling: “See, because I was so used to just having just a Western framework that, I want to say, I was. What do you call it when your brain is, you’re brainwashed.”

My first co-storyteller (‘ekahi) turned to Indigenous research approaches when she became frustrated with using Western inquiry that included approaches not aligned with her paradigms, epistemologies, and axiologies. She was in the middle of her research when she discovered she had to completely change her research approach:

“I heard them share their hō‘ailona, the symbolic reflection of whatever artifact they brought. I was so moved by those powerful stories and those powerful hō‘ailona that I said, “I’m not doing this right. I need to approach this completely differently.””

She then went on to redesign her entire research methodology and method. This also included how she analyzed her data: “I threw out NVIVO... This is not working for me because Hawaiian mo‘olelo, storytelling, it is holistic. And it’s circular. And what NVIVO does is rips it apart into little bits of code and data... and that’s anti-Indigenous.”

All of the storytellers in this research project shared stories about how they came to learn about Indigenous inquiry in university. For all storytellers, encouragement from mentors, advisors, professors, friends, and supportive others forwarded their Native thinking and research capabilities. For two storytellers, the exploration of Native identities in university courses played a large role in how they learned about Indigenous inquiry. However, four co-storytellers described agonizing research journeys that forced them to seek out Indigenous inquiry because Western approaches did not align with their paradigms, epistemologies and axiologies. Yet regardless of the different journeys we all took, we all ultimately decided to use Indigenous inquiry in our research projects.

Choosing and Applying Indigenous Inquiry

Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars I spoke with described how they chose and applied Indigenous inquiry. All co-storytellers, including myself, decided upon Native research methodologies and methods because it was personally relevant as well as relevant for our communities. All co-storytellers chose these protocols and processes because they have distinct cultural lenses that informed how they sought and gained knowledge in this world. Two co-storytellers informed me that it was the inspiration from their ancestors that

informed their research decisions. In addition, there were distinct ways in which my co-storytellers applied Indigenous inquiry. Eight co-storytellers included traditions and protocols as well as referenced cultural history during the research process. Furthermore, one post-graduate scholar found it extremely important to include stories. Two co-storytellers sought to make connections with the world around them. The following mo‘olelo was illustrative of how graduate students and post-graduate scholars not only decided upon Indigenous inquiry, regardless of the many obstacles they overcame in making their research choices, but how they employed and interpreted Native methodologies and methods they learned at university.

Benefitting both the researcher and communities. My first co-storyteller’s (‘ekahi) dissertation greatly added to our understanding of Indigenous knowledge and contributed greatly to understanding the power within Native women:

“One of the things that I propose was a Native women’s theory which I just call NWT. And I propose that in my dissertation and it is to promote research by, for, and about Indigenous Peoples. I have a problem with non-Indigenous People doing research on us or about us. Right? Because usually it is for more non-Indigenous reasons and it doesn’t benefit the people. And so that is one of the things, that is one of the premises. And I want Native women’s theory to validate all forms of Indigenous Peoples knowledge that is used in scholarly work. Things such as, mo‘olelo, of course, hō‘ailona, mele, hula, talking circles, dream work, all of that. Those are all valid forms of Indigenous knowledge. And typically in scholarly work it tends not to be considered as rigorous as perhaps, right, but that is a valid form of knowledge. Also wanted to be such that, Indigenous researchers learn to really trust their na‘au (gut), and really go with their instinctual feeling that they have, right, in their na‘au. To really follow cultural traditions

and cultural practices and protocols as they do their research. Native women’s theory also supports the use of Indigenous languages in scholarly research and not only in research but also in the writing of a contract renewal or a dossier for promotion or for tenure. They should be able to write those in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i because this is in their native land, in their ‘āina. So I support those kinds of things and, you know, basically incorporating histories, cultures, traditions. All that sort of things. Native Hawaiian women’s theory also works to promote Indigenous knowledge system[s], Native women’s power, Indigenous values, and cultural integrity which is a really big part of my dissertation that I found that these women were so authentic in their Nativeness. In their Indigeneity. They are so authentic. I called it pono as one of my themes and that is what I really found. And one of the big things is I really want to invite current and future researchers like yourself to really embrace Native women’s theory, rework it, expound, expand on it, you know, that sort of thing to use it in serving the Indigenous community.”

My second co-storyteller (‘elua) reflected upon the advice he received from his very good friend, the professor he assisted a while ago. He smiled broadly and fondly recalled her words of wisdom:

“The research we do as Indigenous Peoples has to count and has to help our people and others who are pursuing the same things in life, so I think it was really powerful that she [supportive professor] was reminding me as a researcher or someone who thinks you’re just writing this paper to graduate, make it count. Make it something that will help other people. Make sure that the research really captures, that paints really who we are as a people, not just who you are as a person.”

My fifth co-storyteller ('elima) also shared similar thoughts and feelings about the importance of Indigenous research for the community. His research journey began when he was still in high school, exploring Hawaiian string figures. He recounted the importance of his research in order to preserve this particular cultural knowledge:

“I only wanted to do on Hawaiian string figures. Because it was so obscure. It was something that was on the danger of being lost and I felt a responsibility to find ways to perpetuate it, to teach it. I wanted to write a book for children. And I am just too busy. But I really need to do that as part of my kuleana or responsibility. And, um, so that's why I just thought of that. And I asked myself, “Oh, so what am I going to do with this?”

He connected his work to the purpose of Indigenous education and how this unique type of education instills responsibilities to one's community.

“So in terms of Indigeneity, the Hawaiian form of schooling you come with a set of accountabilities or responsibilities which is to perpetuate and pass on your culture. So in that way, that has more of an impact on me as I feel like I am returning back to my people. You know, I am continuing the cycle of knowledge.”

Possessing a distinct cultural lens. Three of my co-storytellers chose Native research protocols and processes because they have a distinct cultural lens that influences how they seek and gain knowledge in this world. My third co-storyteller ('ekolu) illustrated this through metaphor. In fact, this co-storyteller used a variety of metaphors, many of them with cultural references, and mo'olelo throughout our conversation together:

“I asked students, "Which balls could be used to play basketball? Soccer ball? Volleyball? Basketball? Or kickball?" The children had trouble answering the question. Why? All the balls are used to play basketball in their experience. As long as

the balls are round, they could be used to play basketball. After asking several statements like, "Soccer balls are used to play... soccer. Footballs are used to play...football. What balls could you use to play basketball?" The response was, "All of them?" Until one student said, "Basketball?" I answered, "Yes". Why did it take them so long to answer the question? It was because their schema of balls were generalized and not specialized because in their cultural practice of playing games, objects could be manipulated to fit other purposes such as the pohaku ku'i ai being used as a doorstopper."

There may be multiple interpretations of this metaphor. One interpretation is that without a distinct cultural lens, a researcher could consider all research methodologies and methods as applicable to a given study regardless of the background of research participants and the applicability of research results. However, when a researcher has a distinct cultural lens, the choice of research approaches narrows considerably. Other research criteria and considerations come into play. Culture indeed transforms one's research project. Another interpretation is Indigenous scholars have successfully utilized a variety of methodologies and methods in research projects with results that do benefit research participants. They have used the best available resources that fit their specific needs and customized these research approaches to meet community goals. Beneficial results occur regardless of the origin of the methodologies and methods. These two perspectives are illustrative of the complexity in defining and applying Indigenous research principles in our contemporary, global environment.

My sixth co-storyteller ('eono), who is a Hawaiian language and culture teacher with Native Hawaiian students, instills in his students the importance of having distinct cultural lenses. It was his cultural lens he used when he approached his doctoral research:

“Because I need to be able to walk in both worlds. [Be]cause this is what I’ve been handed to me. This is what’s been given. But in the back of my mind I always have this armor which is my language, my culture, traditions, kūpuna. And its my armor that keeps me strong in your world from what the bad that you have created in this system. You know. So this, this, this, the armor, the language is the armor that protects you from these negative things that get thrown on you.”

Receiving inspiration from ancestors. Two co-storytellers, one male and one female, informed me that it was the inspiration from their ancestors that informed their research choices. The mo‘olelo from the first co-storyteller (‘ekahi) is below:

“What I did was I began to... invite the wisdom of my ancestors as well as the kūpuna of my... wāhine to invite their ancestors as well to inspire me and I asked them, “What is it you want me to say? What is it you want me to see?” Right? And I also asked for the wisdom of Ke Akua [God] because I recognize that spiritual wisdom is far greater than human wisdom. And once I let go and trying to do everything myself, and I invited the ancestral wisdom and the spiritual wisdom. I literally felt like I was a vessel and this knowledge just flowed right through me and right onto the paper. Yeah, I really felt like it wasn’t me writing it all. It was just flowing through me, and so that was a very Indigenous approach because Indigenous knowledge is multifaceted. Right? There is not just one form of knowledge. It doesn't come from a book or a piece of paper. Right? Indigenous knowledge is just from so many different dimensions, right? And I had to be willing to accept that. And that was a real challenge for me. But once I did, I learned to really trust my heart and trust my na‘au and stop relying on my intellect. Stop trying to analyze everything but allow myself to feel. Just as I had done when I wrote my

mo‘olelo. When I wrote the mo‘olelo, I really tried to envision that I was each wahine. And I was telling the story through her eyes and I actually imagined myself sitting in her space. Looking through her eyes as though I was in her body and writing the story as she would write it, as she would tell the story. So rather than looking at them externally, I imagined myself within them looking out.”

My third storyteller (‘ekolu) also shared the importance of wisdom his kūpuna left for Native Hawaiians in the ‘āina:

“They [kūpuna] left in the ‘āina keys to unlocking that knowledge... everything has purpose, of its existence, of its interaction... and how that part was used in ceremony, in family, in cooking, in whatever, then gives us an opportunity to then understand.”

Inspiration from the ancestors, whether it is from spiritual guidance or through their imprint on the environment that surrounds us, played a crucial role in my co-storytellers’ choices in using Indigenous inquiry.

Including traditions, protocols, and history. Six co-storytellers told me that they included cultural traditions, protocols, and history within their research practices. My fifth co-storyteller (‘elima) engaged in prayer in order to figure out one of his Hawaiian string figures. Seeking spiritual assistance is a Hawaiian tradition. In this mo‘olelo, he shared how he was challenged with the technical language from a text he referenced in his research. His prayers were answered when he arrived at the solution through dreams, another Hawaiian tradition.

“So I couldn’t figure it out, by the, you know, just asymmetrical. Just the directions are so confusing. So I remember, and this is Indigenous way, I remember an elder saying, elders saying, “If you want to compose a song, pray.” That is true for anything Hawaiian. You want to learn how to do something, pule (pray). I did a little pule called e ho mai ka

‘ike. Um, that was taught to me a long time ago and a lot of people know it. E ho mai ka ‘ike mai luna mai e na mea huna no‘eau o ka hula e, e ho mai, e ho mai, e ho mai. So I did that. I went to sleep. Sorry, just backtracking. So one of our traditions ... is you can not do it at night. But so I would get home from work or maybe I was still in school at that time too, also work, school. I would get home and I would rush to my book. And the only preparation to meet this Māori guy for his, he wanted to do a little documentary. So I would go through it, and so, but at sunset I’d have to put it away. Just to respect that tradition. And then I’d go to sleep, do my prayer. And then I had this dream one night about a lady with you know a very shiny kīhei (cloak) walking over roots of a tree. That was my dream. You know, very surreal. Just walking over roots of a tree. You know, big roots over and above the ground. That was my dream. Right? The next day when I did this I went back to this lady in the moon one and I was like, just move my fingers like... Yeah, well, the initial moves, you know. It is always the initial moves. But, I, I knew how to do the initial moves then after that the other directions were easy and boom.”

Our dreams are often influenced by what we see and experience in our natural world. My third co-storyteller (‘ekolu) acknowledged the importance of being present, acknowledged the role our ancestors play in our lives, and recognized the inspiration from the natural world around us. I met him at a local McDonald’s restaurant. Over the course of an hour, we mainly discussed his family, his educational experiences, and his current research efforts, of which traditions and protocols played such a crucial part of his life:

“So, researching culture because there needs to be an understanding of protocol, of appreciation, of common practices but yet cultural perspectives of what to do and not to

do. What to say, not to say, when to say, and how to say. And, of course, there’s different places and times to do that. And, being married to my Japanese wife is definitely that cultural aspects of it. And then, being raised in Hawaiian side and understanding that cultural perspective and also noticing that, though today, they may call some things Hawaiian, recognizing that historical our kūpuna had passed. Where, historically 85- 95% of the kūpuna had passed away... So, learning how to listen not just to the person but to sea, to the sky, to the all ...around because everything gives a clue of its purpose, of its existence, of its interaction...everything has purpose and place and recognizing it from that cultural lens and how... we interacted with those different parts and how that part was used in ceremony, in family, in cooking, in whatever, then gives us an opportunity to then, understand.”

My fourth co-storyteller (‘eha) wanted to ensure that the values of her classroom were incorporated into her research: “The aloha (love) that we create, that I create, and we co-create in the classroom is I think very different from a Western way of schooling and then the kuleana (responsibility) that I hold to myself to perpetuate knowledge in a pono (right) manner.”

Traditions based on cultural values, Indigenous protocols that dictated proper behaviors and actions, and references that are historically based are all Indigenous practices applied by Native researchers.

Making connections. Three co-storytellers expressed how an Indigenous approach requires one to make connections, not only with what is occurring in the present but also with knowledge sources from our past. My second co-storyteller (‘elua) excitedly shared with me his graduate experience as he pursued his Masters degree in Curriculum and Instruction. Through

his research, he made connections to his own past and the historical past during a monumental time in Hawaiian history:

“[This research allowed] me to express or conduct my research [and choose] first a topic that I was most passionate about and that I could really connect to because it was so personal and allowed it to be academic enough that it would be valid enough for a paper. Yet suddenly the things that I incorporated into it that allowed me to firstly connect it back to all the stories that I’ve been sharing with you today as a student and being inspired by an adult or other teachers helped me to recount back and think of pivotal moments and times that I never thought of before in my career before. I started to do the research, back even further to incidents and then connect what was happening historically with Hawai‘i and the Hawai‘i Civil Movement – or just the Hawaiian Renaissance, you know. And the connection to what I was experiencing from childhood until high school. It made me appreciate and understand research from that standpoint because it was connected to me personally. So when it was more appealing to who I am and to my own life, and I could write it and include my own stories and it was valid. It didn’t seem like research any more. It was more like creating my biography.”

This mo‘olelo described the importance of making connections in Indigenous inquiry. Not only make connections beyond time and space to the knowledge of kūpuna, but also for their participants to do so as well.

My third co-storyteller (‘ekolu) reflected on the importance of including this type of meaning-making within one’s methodology:

“You got to know how they’re connected and the extent of their connectedness. Then, you find the uniqueness of... which makes them unique for that particular purpose. And

so, in my research, it’s to still hang onto that Indigenous foundational understanding of how our kūpuna taught, and what I mean by our kūpuna, is not limited to just our Native Hawaiian kūpuna, but kūpuna from all ethnicities, backgrounds. And seeing those connections, then, when we do a research, you know, in a doctorate study.”

In addition to prayers and dreams, my fifth co-storyteller (‘elima) made connections between the Hawaiian string figures he learned from kūpuna and recent texts to traditional mo‘olelo:

“Because Dickey’s book only has the directions. Maybe it has a small reference. This is about the lady in the moon. What lady in the moon? So I had to go back to the Hawaiian newspapers. Look for, you know, see if there was any reference. You know sometimes there was a big chant, sometimes there’s nothing. But you got to really research. Like there’s one about what they call hue wai. And it’s inverted. You know how the water spigot should be on top like this, but it is like this. So its like I had to research why is that... it doesn’t make sense. It’s inverted, but in the story... his brothers die so he has to find the waters of Kane to revive them. But the waters of Kane were hidden, taken by Kane, and put it on the ground. Right? So that the water wouldn’t escape... But you got to read this whole story to understand why the figure is made like this.”

Summary of Mo‘olelo

This ‘upena was strong due to the connections and relationships found among and between the various mo‘olelo shared to me by my co-storytellers. It included how powerful it was for Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars to learn about Indigenous research through exploring their cultural identities; by receiving support from mentors, advisors, professors, friends, and supportive others; and by reflecting on the painful research journeys that

forced them to seek out Indigenous methodologies and methods. Furthermore, it described how we chose Indigenous inquiry because we found it personally relevant as well as relevant for our communities. Having distinct cultural lenses and receiving inspiration from our ancestors also influenced our decision to pursue Indigenous inquiry. We applied these research processes by including traditions and protocols; referencing cultural histories; incorporating stories; and making connections. We collectively look forward to the day when universities will listen to our mo‘olelo and act upon our recommendations to promote Indigenous inquiry by elevating Native research to a prominent place within the formal curriculum; de-emphasizing Western research approaches; creating more supportive and safer environments; and beginning instruction in Indigenous inquiry much earlier in the educational system.

CHAPTER 7

Discussion

Overview of Discussion

This study was truly decolonization through Indigenous inquiry. The journey in producing this dissertation aligned with Laenui's (2000) first three stages of decolonization. The first stage is rediscovery and recovery. The mo'olelo highlighted how important it was for Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars to have strong cultural identities and lenses in order to effectively use Indigenous research approaches. The second stage is mourning. Co-storytellers shared mo'olelo of anger, sadness, and grief as we wrestled with not having strong cultural identities and lenses, or challenges in referencing Indigenous research and empirical studies in the literature for our research purpose, or borrowing from other traditions. The third stage is dreaming. The dream is to further define culture-centric ways of knowledge creation. This discussion also described the study's limitations, explored implications of this work, and recommended future research.

Rediscovery and Recovery: Importance of Cultural Identity and Lens

The mo'olelo revealed how important it was for Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars to have strong cultural identities and lenses in order to most effectively harness the power of Indigenous inquiry. Storytellers, including myself, spoke of the grave impact of colonizing educational systems on our cultural identities. Our personal, traumatic experiences were very similar to other Native Peoples' experiences found in the research literature (Adjei, 2007; Alfred, 2004; Au & Kaomea, 2009; Cajete, 2012; Cruz, 2012; Dei, 2002; Freire, 1970; Osorio, 2002; Ngugi, 1986; Trinidad, 2012; Wane, 2013; Waziyatawin & Yellowbird, 2012). In addition, our mo'olelo advocated for more opportunities within formal schooling to learn about

one’s culture (Adjei, 2007; Au & Kaomea, 2009; Cajete, 2012; Freire, 1970; Ngugi, 1986; Trinidad, 2012; Wane, 2013). Our advocacy supported recommendations by Indigenous scholars who want to transform our educational systems (Adjei, 2007; Au & Kaomea, 2009; Cajete, 2012; Dei, 2012; Dei, 2002; Freire, 1970; Ngugi, 1986; Trinidad, 2012; Wane, 2013).

Our collective mo‘olelo demonstrated the grave impact of the loss of Indigenous knowledge systems amongst Native Peoples. This was due to historical dynamics, social mobility, and migration as well as modernization, consumerism, greed, and domination by other cultures (Andrae-Marobela et. al., 2012; Cruz, 2012; Fannon, 1963; Freire, 1970; Memmi, 1965; Osorio, 2002; Pewewardy, 2005). Due to this, there are many Natives out there who have lost their languages, worldviews, oral traditions, values, relationships, ceremonial lives, and lands and are simply hollow shells (Mihe-suah, 2004). Storytellers shared painful mo‘olelo that supported this loss including the hollowness and emptiness we felt when an educational system does not support our cultures. Thus, educational institutions continue to colonize the next generation of Indigenous Peoples (Adjei, 2007; Cajete, 2012; Dei, 2012; Dei, 2002; Ngugi, 1986; Pewewardy, 2005). African researcher Adjei (2007) is one example of an Indigenous scholar who experienced this and wrote how colonization through education led to cultural confusion, social incoherence, and moral purposelessness. Adjei (2007) concluded that the more Western schooling and education one had, the more psychological and cognitive damage was done in removing the person from the local culture and Native upbringing. This caused loss of pride, identity, and heritage. Co-storytellers’ mo‘olelo affirmed Adjei’s (2007) observations and many are working tirelessly to strengthen their cultural identities and lenses.

Strengthening a cultural identity and lens is a form of decolonization. It is not the total reclamation of a romanticized, traditional past, but the cultivation and reclamation of one’s

Native essence that has always dwelled within each Indigenous person in order to apply it to one's present context (Wane, 2013). Decolonization is a challenging process as identities are complex and based on lived experiences, both in academia and in other contexts, that contribute to the formation of the self (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). I understand this challenge personally and have often fretted about the potential loss of privileges, employment opportunities, and social prestige that come with using Indigenous research approaches as opposed to Western-based quantitative and qualitative methodologies and methods. Adjei (2007) agreed and acknowledged that the colonizers used their power to impose their image on the psyche of the colonized to disempower and disenfranchise Native knowledge production. It made Ghanaian students afraid to acquire Indigenous knowledge because it did indeed threaten their attainment of social privileges in society. Cruz (2012) also spoke of this challenge when she addressed the complicity of those who are a part of colonial educational systems. They do just enough to display their indignation, but stop short of engaging in decolonization and Indigenous knowledge production. Cruz's (2012) contemporary scholarship on decolonization adds to our understanding of how colonization is not just something external, but is maintained within us: in our thoughts, beliefs, and actions. However, if Native Peoples do not engage in this reclamation process (Dei, 2012), they will continue to fall victim to Euro-centric mimicry (Cajete, 2012; Dei, 2012; Fannon, 1963; Memmi, 1965). That is why it is so important for current Indigenous scholars as well as the next generation of scholars to continue to promote decolonization and the learning of Indigenous knowledge in the academy and elsewhere (Mihehah, 2004). This led me to the conclusion that there needs to be more opportunities in our formal educational systems for Native students to engage in decolonizing practices that lead to the development of strong

cultural identities and lenses because they may not be receiving these opportunities in their own families.

My co-storytellers echoed the calls from numerous and diverse Native scholars in promoting more educational opportunities for students to learn about Indigenous knowledge, customs, traditions, ceremonies, and research approaches within formal schooling. This will prove challenging as many Indigenous Peoples are conditioned to see education delivered in one way, through one set of colonial lenses that has seeped into the depths of our consciousness (Cajete, 2012). Current educational institutions focus too much on the acquisition of academic skills and content, are devoid of morality and ethics, and do not serve the best interests of Indigenous youths or their communities (Cajete, 2012; Dei, 2012). Regardless, Indigenous scholars continue to advocate for a holistic educational experience that is complex and multi-faceted with a focus on how knowledge is cultural, political, emotional, and spiritual (Cajete, 2012; Dei, 2002; Grande, 2008). The goal for schools, then, is to create the conditions for an inward transformation with the goal of wholeness, self-knowledge, and wisdom (Cajete, 2012). In other words, the educational system needs to incorporate practices that decolonize the Indigenous minds of the next generation (Adjei, 2007; Grande, 2008; Ngugi, 1986). This requires critical teaching that integrates different and multiple knowledge systems and transformative pedagogies in order to position Natives as agents outside of Euro-American ideology (Cajete, 2012; Dei, 2002; Grande, 2008; Ngugi, 1986). Then graduates will have the expertise to see our connectedness with all that surrounds us in order to cultivate meaningful relationships, especially with our own Native communities (Dei, 2002). When this occurs, the reason for education becomes less about schooling for material or capital gains (Dei, 2002) and

more about preparation for the fulfillment of one's responsibilities as citizens towards building and maintaining strong communities (Cajete, 2012; Dei, 2002).

For example, Critical Pedagogy of Place (CIPP) aims to motivate youth and young adults to learn their cultural knowledge, values, and histories so they can be agents of social, cultural, and political change (Trinidad, 2012). This is especially crucial in order to create a strong foundation for self-determination, self-government, and tribal sovereignty (Cajete, 2012). CIPP puts the role of genealogy and place at the center of knowledge exchange and creation in order to foster Hawaiian values and epistemology (Trinidad, 2012). CIPP recognizes the primacy of 'āina (land) at the heart of Indigenous epistemology and how one's worldview is shaped by one's interaction with the 'āina (Trinidad, 2012). The 'āina then becomes the classroom for youth and they are able to see the interdependent relationships that demonstrate reciprocity, balance, and harmony with the land and with others (Trinidad, 2012). This is in agreement with Ngugi (1986) who advocated for schooling to focus on one's own cultural knowing and being first and foremost. It is at the core of all learning. It is then followed by the study of other cultures in relation to this core:

“We reject the primacy of English literature and cultures. The aim, in short, should be to orient ourselves towards placing Kenya, East Africa, and then Africa in the center. All other things are to be considered in their relevance to our situation and their contribution towards understanding ourselves” (Ngugi, 1986, p. 94).

Shirt et. al. (2012) wrote in agreement by recommending that it is through the examination and development of a deep understanding of *ācimowina* and *ātayōhkewina* embedded within land-based education that traditional knowledge can be applied to contemporary times. This firm

foundation and understanding is crucial as students matriculate through our formal educational system and are introduced to other ways of knowing and being.

Indigenous students in colleges and universities should be open to critical analysis, know their own locations and positionalities, engage in critical questions, reflect over time, and accept that not everything is going to be solved right away (Nakata et. al., 2012). Nakata et. al. (2012) addressed how they wanted students to understand the legacy of the contentious relationship between Western and Indigenous knowledge systems, that it is historically layered and contemporary within a given space. It should not be about blending the two knowledge systems together to form a corrupt amalgamation that is unrecognizable from its individual parts. We realize that there is epistemological pluralism (Bell et. al., 2005). Native students need to deeply understand the different knowledge systems and how they work in our contemporary world so they are able to expertly traverse between them while maintaining strong cultural identities and lenses. In addition, it is not about problem-solving or cause-and-effect, but really focusing on Indigenous arguments, understanding the conditions of Western theorizing, and developing that awareness of the limits of various positionalities (Nakata et. al., 2012). This will come about through a focus on our own thinking, or meta-thinking, that engages in one's own conceptual limitations (Nakata et. al., 2012). This deeper understanding of oneself and how one's own knowledge system is unique from others is crucial in order to truly understand why and how we are applying Indigenous research approaches, that may include Indigenous values, protocols, knowledge, processes, philosophies, and fluency in the dialect and languages of one's own community (Nabobo-baba, 2008). A strong cultural identity and lens can and should be developed all throughout formal schooling using frameworks such as CIPP in order for Native

students to develop the appropriate mindset and capabilities to best apply their own cultural research approaches while recognizing their uniqueness compared to others.

Mourning: Decolonization of Storytellers Strengthened Indigenous Research Practices

I am an example of how Native children are colonized through a colonial educational system. Many of my co-storytellers shared similar stories of matriculating through our educational systems without opportunities to learn about our cultures or speak our own languages or practice our own traditions. I was challenged in applying Indigenous research to my doctoral study because of my colonizing experiences. Decolonization for myself and some of my co-storytellers began by happenstance when we enrolled in graduate classes instructed by Indigenous professors who really took the time to get to know who we were as students and encouraged us to pursue research informed by our own cultural backgrounds. This dissertation was my personal attempt at decolonization, albeit in an academic setting.

It was so important for me to create an intellectual space where I could immerse myself in decolonizing practices, inclusive of delving into the Native literature, reflecting on the history of my family and my community, and interacting with other Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars who had similar experiences. This was a reflective process in which I personalized my own decolonization. It began with a thorough analysis of my own educational journey, of where my thinking began and where my thinking is currently. It was a painful experience, a nightmare really. However I discovered that my thinking and beliefs changed. The writing process was torturous as I committed to using these words in this dissertation. It was healing for me, for my co-storytellers, and will hopefully be beneficial for others. This is especially true for those in Native communities, who will read or will hear of this research and realize that it is a journey they must begin. They are not alone. They can be successful.

The research supported the creation of safe spaces in order to promote decolonization. Nakata et. al. (2012) spoke of how paramount it was to create this type of space for Native scholars. Decolonization of the mind needs to be coupled with an open space for scholars to analyze both Western-based and Indigenous-based knowledge systems. It is important to realize that decolonization may not simply start with the mind. Decolonization takes place within an environment where different knowledge systems are allowed (Andrae-Marobela et. al., 2012). Nakata et. al. (2012) believed that the current installation of re-generated Indigenous knowledge happens too quickly within Indigenous Studies programs and may be counter-productive in accomplishing de-colonial goals. Instead, they advocated for time devoted to learning about the complex intersection of Western and Indigenous knowledge systems and the creation of spaces where inquiry is welcomed so students can build the necessary tools for describing, analyzing, and engaging in decolonization. We should not force students into situations where they find themselves caught in a battle of coloniality and simplistic Indigenous analysis, but create spaces where they can truly engage in the difficult tasks of decolonization only through really understanding Western theories and Indigenous perspectives based on lived experiences in our contemporary world (Nakata et. al., 2012)

Decolonization is an everyday process. It is intricately linked with the constant formation of one's identity, which is a fluid process. The idea of reclaiming ourselves each day through deepening our understanding of Indigenous knowledge, culture, and identity is a powerful notion. Wane (2013) acknowledged that decolonization is a process. It does not have a single destination. We are constantly in the process of decolonizing and reclaiming our lost heritages. It is a political and cultural form of resistance (Fannon, 1963; Freire, 1970; Memmi, 1965; Nakata et. al., 2012; Ngugi, 1986; Sium & Ritskes, 2013; Sium & Ritskes, 2012; Swadener &

Mutua, 2008; Tuck & Young, 2012; Wane, 2013; Wilson, 2004; Zavala, 2013). Wane (2013) and other Native scholars appeared to be doing this through their research. Their research must be acted upon in educational institutions. This is enhanced through employing the right educational tools and strategies, such as critical anti-racist curriculum and pedagogy, that create decolonizing spaces for teachers and students to both share and create knowledge together (Au & Kaomea, 2009; Adjei, 2007; Freire, 1970; Grade, 2008; ho'omanawanui, 2010; Ngugi, 1986; Trinidad, 2012). This produces knowledge that is inherently political and advocates for decolonizing dominant forms of power.

Mo'olelo Decolonized Storytellers

By sharing our stories of pain, suffering, grief, successes, and challenges experienced within our educational systems and in particular at universities and colleges, my co-storytellers and I engaged in decolonizing practices. The decolonization we storytellers experienced through the sharing and creating of mo'olelo is similar to the experiences of how other Indigenous researchers engaged their own Native communities in the process of decolonization (Kendall, Marshall, & Barlow, 2013; Mucina, 2011; Swadener & Mutua, 2008). One notable link is to the research of Maseko Ngoni scholar Mucina (2011) who used storytelling in her research practices. She discovered, as I did, that storytelling engaged Native Peoples with one another beyond colonialism, by primarily focusing on our relational selves. My co-storytellers and I rarely referenced colonization specifically, but our mo'olelo spoke of our own personal experiences as a result of a colonizing educational system. Mucina (2011) went on to say that as a method, storytelling unearths fragments of Indigenous Black knowledge and brings them into consciousness (Mucina, 2011). The mo'olelo included in this Native study as well as others that were not selected to be written in this study highlighted the rich depth of Indigenous knowledge

within each of us and how we used this knowledge to inspire our research with our Native communities. In addition, Mucina (2011) also recounted how the stories she heard provided an opportunity to take traditional knowledge and apply this knowledge to best serve contemporary needs. I was impressed with how my co-storytellers used their knowledge systems, values, cultural traditions, and histories within the design and execution of their research studies to not only add to the research literature but also to more powerfully impact their communities.

It was apparent, through the conversations and dialogues, storytellers engaged in decolonization based on the process identified by Laenui (2000). She described five stages of decolonization, of which we have progressed through three stages. The first stage is rediscovery and recovery (Laenui, 2000). My co-storytellers and I recounted how we sought out to deepen our cultural identities and lenses throughout our lives, whether through familial relations, educational experiences, or personal endeavors. The second stage is mourning (Laenui, 2000). Indigenous Peoples lament their victimization as essential to the healing process, and others move toward anger. Mo'olelo highlighted traumatic childhood experiences and frustration with K-12 teachers and graduate advisors and a larger educational system that requires skillful navigation and many supports for Native students in order for them to be considered successful. The third stage is dreaming, crucial to the decolonization process in that Indigenous Peoples debate, consult, and build dreams to become the “flooring for the creation of a new social order” (p. 155). Each co-storyteller shared his or her own recommendations for the graduate curriculum. These recommendations are our collective dreams in order to make the graduate experience more successful for those currently in the university and college and those who follow in our footsteps. We still need to progress to stage four, which is commitment towards a

single direction, and stage five, which is consensus of commitment. These last stages require others to join in our conversations and dialogues to create new mo‘olelo.

Indigenous graduate students and post-graduate scholars who engage in this type of research are warriors. They take academic risks to meet the needs of their communities. These emerging scholars are forgoing the privileges of certain careers in our post-industrial, Euro-American society in order to live their culture, speak their language, and practice their customs and traditions (Cajete, 2012). They are lending a megaphone to amplify silenced voices, muffled by the status quo, in order to forward an activist agenda that promotes social justice, sovereignty, self-determination, and emancipation (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). They are innovators who expand our notion of what is research. They are using decolonizing methodologies and methods like storytelling and ceremony, not only to counter the existing colonial narratives but to add to our knowledge of how to best work with Indigenous communities (Sium & Ritskes, 2013). The success of Indigenous graduate students and post-graduate researchers within academia who use these methodologies and methods is the encouragement that the next generation of scholars and Indigenous leaders need in order to build better relationships with academia and research. This study, composed of these powerful mo‘olelo, is impactful indeed.

What I learned from this study regarding decolonization is that it is not just a theory; it happens in our words, deeds, and actions and is communicated best through our beautiful mo‘olelo. I agree with Sium and Ritskes (2013) that mo‘olelo are “beyond the intellectualization and mental response to challenge your heart and feet to action” (p. VIII). They are performative and activist (Swadener & Mutua, 2008) because these stories were performances of our lived experiences. No two stories were the same and they were never retold the same way. They were about shaking off the colonial yoke in favor of Indigenous knowledge. They were inspired by

our kūpuna and grounded in our ancestral lands. Indigenous storytelling helped decolonization. Used in research, our mo‘olelo countered the master narratives of the colonizers. They recognized the unique role of colonization, resisted colonization, and found ways to end the current oppression of silenced, excluded, and marginalized Peoples who lack agency (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). As Swadener described in Swadener & Mutua (2008), decolonization is a “messy, complex, perhaps impossible endeavor” (p. 36). However Swadener & Mutua (2008) as well as my co-storytellers and I recognized that it is still a laudable goal. It is through decolonization that we are going to actively resurrect our knowledge systems, languages, and cultures.

Further Define Indigenous Inquiry

The results from this Native inquiry suggested that although Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars defined qualities and characteristics of Indigenous inquiry for themselves that aligned with the literature, there is still much more clarity we can provide within this emerging field in academia. Next steps to further define Indigenous inquiry include more published works on Indigenous inquiry made available to scholars and students and further articulation of culture-centric forms of research to reduce of the number of simple generalizations of Indigenous research that can occur within academia that further discredit this inquiry approach.

It is crucial that there are more works written and published by Native scholars from diverse backgrounds focusing on Indigenous inquiry and how these research approaches were used in order to benefit their communities. The next generation of Native scholars who may not have strong relationships with elders, who don't speak their own languages, or even reside on their homelands can have opportunities to learn more about their cultures through these printed

resources. It may not be the best way, but it may be the only way or a starting point for Native children to begin their cultural journey towards embracing their ancestral knowledge. This is why documentation of Indigenous knowledge is so important, in order to preserve and promote Indigenous knowledge systems in ways that are not available in formal educational settings (Andrae-Marobela et. al., 2012). We also must find ways to protect and grant access to research findings that are not always written and can include arts, crafts, genealogical expositions, and songs (Nabobo-baba, 2008). Documentation is essential for Indigenous survival (Andrae-Marobela et. al., 2012).

Indigenous scholars and researchers need to further articulate culture-centric forms of inquiry to reduce borrowing from other cultures. There are numerous examples in the literature of research done on Indigenous Peoples and by Indigenous Peoples using approaches that are still grounded in Western research philosophies and practices. CIPP draws from standpoint theory, an anti-colonial stance, and from critical theory, a Western theory (Trinidad, 2012). So too, Fijian Vanua Research Framework was informed by the work of Kaupapa Māori Research and Tongan Kakala Framing but borrows too from critical theory (Nabobo-baba, 2008).

Indigenous scholars have embraced critical theory with its emphasis on emancipation, liberation, power domination, and empowerment. However, we forget that it has its beginnings in structuralism and Western philosophies, not Native knowledge systems (Nakata et. al., 2012).

In addition, Andrae-Marobela et. al. (2012) conducted their research on Indigenous knowledge in two distinct districts on the African continent using a consultative process embedded within a qualitative, explorative design in order to study phenomenon and test elements of an emerging theory (Andrae-Marobela et. al., 2012). There are far too many examples of Indigenous studies that still rely on Western approaches to build a case for acceptance within the academy. It is

time for Indigenous Peoples to rely on their own systems of knowledge to support their own research to benefit their communities.

Borrowing from other cultures and the simple generalizations found in Indigenous research that can occur within academia may further discredit this approach to research. Two of my co-storytellers shared mo'olelo of their own personal journeys from using Western-based approaches to more Native-based approaches. Andrae-Marobela et. al. (2012) noticed that there are numerous definitions of Indigenous knowledge and yet few of these definitions originate from the Native Peoples themselves and their communities. Definitions come from academics and are often decontextualized or oversimplified (Andrae-Marobela et. al., 2012). This adds to the beliefs that Indigenous inquiry is not definable (Andrae-Marobela et. al., 2012). What then becomes Indigenous inquiry can be “easily translatable” (p. 129) within the academy and trivialized, distorted, romanticized, misused, and misunderstood (Nakata et. al., 2012). That is why it is so important for Native Peoples to further define their own forms of inquiry that are applicable to them and their communities.

The field of Indigenous inquiry is currently wrestling with clearly defining itself as an emerging field within academia. A few of my co-storytellers acknowledged strategic concessions made in order to graduate from university. These co-storytellers used Western-based approaches embedded within an Indigenous research design in order to accomplish their larger goals. They utilized various sources in their inquiry to enhance the wellbeing of their families, communities, nations, and the world. I have experienced this struggle myself as a young researcher. In my quest to create and carry out a truly Native study I had to wrestle with how this can be done given the strong influences of Western research and my own personal educational journey and experiences. To the best of my knowledge, I have connected as much of

this project to my culture through an 'Ōiwi paradigm. These are challenging times, yet exciting times as my co-storytellers and I have a unique opportunity to add to the understanding of Indigenous inquiry within academia.

In order for Native inquiry to grow as a field of study to benefit Indigenous communities, it needs to be further defined as a unique field of research. This includes more published works that define the qualities and characteristics of Indigenous inquiry. In addition, there is still much more clarity needed in further articulating culture-centric forms of inquiry to reduce borrowing from other cultures that de facto colonizes Indigenous inquiry as a sub-set of other cultural research traditions.

Dreaming: Promoting Indigenous Inquiry in the Graduate Curriculum

Storytellers advocated for Indigenous inquiry to have a greater presence within the graduate curriculum. This is one decolonizing action the university can take. A major recommendation is for Indigenous research to be elevated to its own coursework while de-emphasizing Western inquiry within the overall curricular program. Another significant recommendation is for universities and colleges to become safer spaces for Natives to be who they truly are. A third innovative recommendation is to actually start instruction in Indigenous inquiry earlier in formal education, definitely within undergraduate programs and even into K-12 educational programs.

Indigenous inquiry needs to become a more formalized part of the graduate curriculum. This would take the form of specific coursework to focus exclusively on Indigenous approaches. Universities and colleges need to de-emphasize the use of Western research approaches. In order for universities and colleges to de-emphasize Western research approaches and increase opportunities to learn about and apply Indigenous inquiry, they need to be safer spaces for Native

scholars. Similarly, co-storytellers and I wanted more intellectual freedom. Indigenous inquiry should not only be a significant part of the graduate curriculum, but also for undergraduates and K-12 students so we may all embrace culturally relevant research approaches. This starts with opportunities to develop a strong cultural identity.

We as storytellers made several major recommendations for the promotion of Indigenous inquiry at universities. They included making Native research approaches a more formalized part of the graduate curriculum, de-emphasizing Western inquiry, creating safer spaces for Indigenous scholars, and beginning this teaching earlier within one's educational journey. According to storytellers, as these recommendations are implemented, there will be an increasing number of Native scholars utilizing cultural approaches to research as well as more of them moving into higher levels of education.

Study's Limitations

There were several limitations to this study. First, this research focused on sharing the mo'olelo of a small number of co-storytellers. Those who read the study should not make generalizations from these mo'olelo to the wider population of Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars who used Indigenous inquiry, learned about Indigenous inquiry within the university curriculum, and applied Indigenous inquiry within Native communities. Another limitation of this research was the majority of these co-storytellers attended the same institution. Many of these individuals are graduates or are currently enrolled in the same graduate program of study. Thus, there may be more common experiences among these co-storytellers compared to other co-storytellers who currently attend or have attended colleges and universities on the North American continent. A third and final limitation is my own lack of experience in understanding Indigenous research methodologies and methods at the onset of this research

study, yet choosing to use these principles and practices in my doctoral inquiry. I applied Indigenous inquiry protocols and processes to the best of my knowledge. Over the course of this research project, my knowledge and capabilities have grown tremendously and evolved over time. There may be different understandings among those who read this doctoral study if this is indeed an Indigenous inquiry. This is an example of where I believe the field is regarding decolonized research for Native Peoples. The small number of co-storytellers, the fact that many of them were from the same institution, and my own lack of expertise in understanding Indigenous inquiry early on are all limitations to this study, yet should not detract from the wealth of knowledge generated from the mo'olelo shared by Native graduate and post-graduate scholars.

Study's Implications

There are three major implications for this Indigenous inquiry. First, universities and colleges need to decolonize their curriculum to be more inclusive of Indigenous Peoples' knowledge systems. Second, they need to be more respectful of Indigenous Peoples' cultures, traditions, languages, and histories. This is inclusive of providing Native students more support and encouragement to navigate a Western-based system as well as acceptance of Indigenous research protocols and processes. This will ultimately lead to a safer environment for students to be Native. Third, universities and colleges who have curriculum that includes Indigenous inquiry, who instruct through Native pedagogical practices, and who graduate students who are successful in producing this type of scholarly work have a responsibility to further advance the field.

Universities and colleges need to include more opportunities for all students to learn about Indigenous inquiry within the required curriculum and to instruct in ways that encourage

and support the use of these methodologies and methods. Ideally, this would include more specific courses on Indigenous inquiry. A curriculum would need to be developed to best teach these Native methodologies and methods. More textbooks need to be created and more resources would need to be made available to all professors and their students. The curriculum should also include multiple opportunities for students to make connections to their lands, cultures, and languages outside the four classroom walls. The curriculum would also include more opportunities for students to explore and use these research processes under the direction of knowledgeable Indigenous professors, Native practitioners, or tribal elders. Exposing all students to more and different worldviews, epistemologies, ontologies, and axiologies allow them to greater appreciate the uniqueness of each human being. When students are encouraged to develop their own understanding of themselves and their own cultures in relation to those of others, they become open-minded researchers and reflective practitioners. This study implied that it is time for universities and colleges to include more Indigenous inquiry, inclusive of instructional strategies and hands-on learning, to be integrated into the curriculum.

Colleges and universities should provide additional support to Indigenous Peoples within academia. This support is inclusive of providing Native mentors, sponsoring research support groups, forming student cohorts, increasing the number of Indigenous faculty members, and offering financial support. The most impactful support comes in the form of creating safer environments for Indigenous students. Colleges and universities need to promote academic spaces where Native students' distinct worldviews, epistemologies, ontologies, and axiologies are welcomed and respected. They should also offer more professional learning opportunities for faculty and staff to deepen their understanding of place, especially where their colleges and universities reside and the rich histories of the Native Peoples who live there. Numerous forms

of support would provide a safer environment for Indigenous graduate and post-graduate scholars to not only use cultural methodologies and methods, but to thrive culturally, physically, spiritually, emotionally, and intellectually.

Furthermore, universities and colleges, who have curriculum that includes Indigenous inquiry, instruct through Native pedagogical practices, and graduate students who are successful in producing this type of scholarly work, have a responsibility to further advance the field. They must reach out to other universities and colleges and form strong partnerships and collaborations to mutually forward Indigenous views and perspectives. This may take the form of providing more opportunities for networking to share knowledge, engaging in professional ventures together, and co-funding and co-sponsoring research projects that benefit Native communities. Tribal colleges and universities can be particularly called upon to collaborate with other universities and colleges.

Future Research

There are a variety of opportunities for future research. The scope of this work can increase to include more co-storytellers as well as more diversity of graduate students and post-graduate scholars from other Native Peoples, particularly other Pacific Islanders whose voices are not necessarily reflected in the current body of literature. Another area of prospective work is to include more opportunities for co-storytellers to collaboratively build their stories together using cultural protocols and processes. This would greatly add to the research on Indigenous methodologies and methods. In addition, it may be beneficial to compare and contrast the perceptions of Indigenous research among different demographics, particularly elders, professors, and students. This may illustrate the unique understandings that each brings into the field of Indigenous inquiry. Furthermore, it may be valuable to explore the differences in

applying Indigenous research approaches amongst graduate students who attended tribal colleges and those who attended non-tribal colleges and universities. This may show the differences actual institutions and environments make in promoting this type of scholarship. Additionally, it may be worthwhile to continue to deepen our understanding of Indigenous inquiry in practice by further exploring particular aspects of the process, especially the use of epistemologies, methodologies and methods. There is still more that can take place in these key areas to further define the field for future Native scholars.

Summary of Discussion

The 'upena is finished. I created it by weaving together my mo'olelo along with all of the mo'olelo from my co-storytellers. I identified the connections and relationships between and among the mo'olelo. They are the strong knots within the net that hold it all together. I further strengthened the 'upena through discussing how this net is important to the wellbeing of a family, of a community, of a nation. It is ready to be cast out into the sea to feed the current and next generation of Native Peoples.

Epilogue

The creation of the 'upena represented one way of conducting Indigenous inquiry within the academy. The methods described here cannot be replicated exactly in future studies, nor is it meant to as the implementation of these methods are wholly unique due to the co-storytellers involved and the readers who will be reading the dissertation in the future. I classified this 'upena as a written, oral-narrative as described by Mucina (2011). Its creation will live on even after I engaged in conversations and dialogues with co-storytellers, I noted observations or reflections in my journal, I co-created mo'olelo with others, and I put my words to the page in the actual written dissertation. Unfortunately, co-storytellers and readers could not be there during all of these performances so it was captured in the written 'upena for the knowledge to be transported around the world with the power to change lives (Mucina, 2011). I cannot emphasize enough how this 'upena represented decolonizing research, on a personal and communal level, as well as for the academy.

This dissertation was a challenge for me personally because I am still coming to grips with my colonized familial and educational past. I am still lacking strong knowledge of my culture and have a very rudimentary understanding of my own language. I am still figuring out what are Indigenous approaches to research. Yet I was adamant that I wanted this dissertation to be the start of a longer journey towards reclamation of my cultural heritage and my ancestral ways of knowing and being. I wanted to highlight how everyone's story, including those from Native graduate students and post-graduate scholars who felt and still feel isolated and frustrated within our current educational system, matters. These stories not only shed light on our own complicities within a colonial system, but inspired us to not only connect with our ancestral knowledge and lands, but to create new knowledge for future generations.

This dissertation, this mo'olelo nui, was a means of decolonization towards the end of colonization in its various shapes and forms. I ended with an reflection I wrote following my close reading of Shawn Wilson (2008). It highlighted the struggle I endured during the writing of this challenging dissertation and the paradigm shift I needed to make in order to bring this story and many others to light. It was a shift I am still making.

“Through the Wilson study, I learned a lot about relationships, relationships, and relationships apparent everywhere. I think I need to dive deeper into the Indigenous analysis part- intuitive analysis, circular argument, keeping ideas holistic and together, condensed conversations. Far cry from what I originally wrote up. Do I dare abandon grounded theory? Okay, let's do it! However, much, much more is needed in this area. I also would need to really strengthen my argument for this type of analysis and data presentation- little judgment or conclusion but sharing my own. Will this fly? I think I will give it a try in highlighting this in my methods. Could this possibly be a future area of Indigenous research- really delving into this?”

References

- Adjei, P. (2007). Decolonising knowledge production: The pedagogic relevance of Gandhian satyagraha to schooling and education in Ghana. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 30(4), 1046-1067.
- Alfred, T. (2004). Warrior scholarship: Seeing the university as a ground of contention. In D. Mihesuah & A. Wilson (Eds.), *Indigenizing the academy: Transforming scholarship and empowering communities* (pp. 88-99). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- American Indigenous Research Association (2014). Retrieved October 27, 2014, from <http://americanindigenousresearchassociation.org>
- Andrae-Marobela, K., Okatch, H., Masizana-Katongo, A., Ngwenya, B., & Monyatsi, K. (2012). The dialectics of Indigenous knowledge. *AlterNative*, 8(2), 149-162. Retrieved from <http://www.alternative.ac.nz>
- Andreotti, V., Akenakew, C., & Cooper, G. (2011). Epistemological pluralism: Ethical and pedagogical challenges in higher education. *AlterNative*, 7(1), 40-50. Retrieved from <http://www.alternative.ac.nz>
- Au, K., & Kaomea, J. (2009). Reading comprehension and diversity in historical perspective: literacy, power, and Native Hawaiians. In S. Israel & G. Duffy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (pp.571-586). Florence, KY: Routledge.
- Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. Saskatoon, Canada: Purich Publishing Ltd.
- Bell, N., Davis, L., Douglas, V., Gaywish, R., Hoffman, R., Lambe, J.,... Williams, S. (2005). Creating indigenous spaces in the academy: fulfilling our responsibility to future generations. *AlterNative*, 1(1), 65-84. Retrieved from <http://www.alternative.ac.nz>

- Bishop, R. (2011). *Freeing ourselves*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Cajete, G. (2012). Decolonizing Indigenous education in a twenty-first century world. In Waziyatawina & M. Yellow Bird (Eds.), *For Indigenous minds only: A decolonization handbook* (pp. 145-156). Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Cajete, G. (2006). It is time for Indian people to define Indigenous education on our own terms. *Tribal College Journal*, 18(2), 56-57.
- Chun, M. (2011). A'o. In M. Chun (Ed.), *No nā mamo: Traditional and contemporary Hawaiian beliefs* (pp. 84-114). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Chun, M. (2011). Pono. In M. Chun (Ed.), *No nā mamo: Traditional and contemporary Hawaiian beliefs* (pp. 1-13). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Chun, M. (2006). *Pono: the way of living*. Honolulu, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa College of Education: Curriculum Research and Development Group.
- Cidro, J. (2012). In D Hikuroa (Chair). Storytelling as Indigenous knowledge transmission. In Ross, H. (Eds.), *International Indigenous Development Research Conference 2012 Proceedings* (pp. 27-31). Retrieved from <http://www.maramatanga.ac.nz>
- Cruz, M. (2012). Ni con dios ni con el diablo: tales of survival, resistance, and rebellion from a reluctant academic. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 141-157. Retrieved from <http://decolonization.org/index.php/des>
- Dei, G. (2012). Indigenous anti-colonial knowledge as 'heritage knowledge' for promoting Black/African education in diasporic contexts. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 102-119. Retrieved from <http://decolonization.org/index.php/des>
- Dei, G. (2002). Spirituality in African education: Issues, contentions and contestations from a Ghanaian case study. *International Journal of Children's Spirituality*, 7(1), 37-56.

- Dotts, C., & Sikkema, M. (1994). *Challenging the status quo: public education in Hawai'i 1840-1980*. Honolulu, HI: Hawaii Education Association.
- Dunbar Jr., C. (2008). Critical race theory and indigenous methodologies. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln & L. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 85-99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Fannon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Grande, S. (2008). Red pedagogy. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln & L. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 233-254). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Greenwood, D., & Levin, M. (2008). Reform of the social sciences and of universities through action research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research third edition* (pp. 57-86). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hart, M. (2010). Indigenous worldviews, knowledge, and research: the development of an indigenous research paradigm. *Journal of Indigenous Voices in Social Work*, 1(1), 1-16.
- ho'omanawanui, k. (2010). Mana wahine, education and nation-building: lessons from the epic of Pele and Hi'iaka for Kanaka Maoli today. *Multiple Perspectives*, 12(4), 206-212.
- Kana'iaupuni, S. K., Malone, N., & Ishibashi, K. (2005). Part one: Synopsis of Hawaiian history, population, and education. In S. Kanaiaupuni, N. Malone & K. Ishibashi (Eds.), *Ka huaka 'i 2005: Native Hawaiian educational assessment*. Honolulu, HI: Pauahi Publications.

- Kaomea, J. (2001). Dilemmas of an Indigenous academic: a Native Hawaiian story. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 2(1), 67-81.
- Kendall, E., Marshall, C., & Barlow, L. (2013). Stories rather than surveys: a journey of discovery and emancipation. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 12, 258-269.
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Laenui, P. (2000). Processes of decolonization. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 150-160). Vancouver, CA: UBC Press.
- Lekoko, R. (2007). Story-telling as a potent research paradigm for indigenous communities. *AlterNative*, 3(2), 83-95. Retrieved from <http://www.alternative.ac.nz>
- Meek, V. (2006). Research management in the postindustrial era: Trends and issues for further investigation. In V. Meek & C. Suwanwela (Eds.), *Higher education, research, and knowledge in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 214-234). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Memmi, A. (1965). *The colonizer and the colonized*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Meyer, M. (2008). Indigenous and authentic: Hawaiian epistemology and the triangulation of meaning. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln & L. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 217-232). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Meyer, M. (2004). *Ho'oulu our time of becoming: Hawaiian epistemology and early writings*. Honolulu, HI: 'Ai Pōhaku Press Native Books.
- Mucina, D. (2011). Story as research methodology. *AlterNative*, 7(1), 1-4 . Retrieved from <http://www.alternative.ac.nz>

- Nakata, N., Nakata, V., Keech, S., & Bolt, R. (2012). Decolonial goals and pedagogies for indigenous studies. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society*, 1(1), 120-140 . Retrieved from <http://decolonization.org/index.php/des>
- Nabobo-baba, U. (2008). Decolonising framings in Pacific research: Indigenous Fijian Vanua research framework as an organic response. *AlterNative*, 4(2), 140-154. Retrieved from <http://www.alternative.ac.nz>
- Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga (2008-2009). *AlterNative An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples: About the Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.alternative.ac.nz/about-journal>
- Osorio, J. (2002). *Dismembering lāhui: a history of the Hawaiian nation to 1887*. (pp. v-73). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Pewewardy, C. (2005). Ideology, power, and the miseducation of Indigenous Peoples in the United States. In W. Wilson & M. Yellow Bird (Eds.), *For Indigenous eyes only: A decolonizing handbook* (pp. 139-156). Sante Fe, NM: School of American Research.
- Pukui, M. (1983). *Ōlelo no 'eau: Hawaiian proverbs & poetical sayings*. Honolulu, HI: Bishop Museum Press.
- Ray, L. (2012). Deciphering the 'indigenous' in indigenous methodologies. *AlterNative*, 8(1), 85-98 . Retrieved from <http://www.alternative.ac.nz>
- Shirt, M., Lewis, K., & Jackson, W. (2012). In D Hikuroa (Chair). Cree ontology, epistemology and axiology research. In Ross, R (Eds.), *International Indigenous Development Research Conference 2012 Proceedings* (pp. 205-2011). Retrieved from <http://www.maramatanga.ac.nz>

- Sium, A., Desai, C., & Ritskes, E. (2012). Towards the 'tangible unknown': decolonization and the indigenous future. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), I-XIII. Retrieved from <http://decolonization.org/index.php/des>
- Sium, A., & Ritskes, E. (2013). Speaking truth to power: indigenous storytelling as an act of living resistance. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 2(1), I-XX. Retrieved from <http://decolonization.org/index.php/des>
- Smith, L. (2006). Researching in the margins: issues for Māori researchers a discussion paper. *AlterNative*, 2(1), 5-27. Retrieved from <http://www.alternative.ac.nz>
- Smith, L. (2000). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Swadener, B., & Mutua, K. (2008). Decolonizing performances: deconstructing the global postcolonial. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln & L. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 31-41). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Taylor, E. (2009). The foundation of critical race theory in education: an introduction. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 1-13). Oxfordshire, United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis.
- Ngugi, J. (1986). *Decolonizing the mind*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Trinidad, A. (2012). Critical indigenous pedagogy: a framework to indigenize a youth food justice movement. *Journal of Indigenous Social Development*, 1(1), 1-17.
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society*, 1(1), 1-40. Retrieved from <http://decolonization.org/index.php/des>

- Wane, N. (2013). [re]claiming my indigenous knowledge: challenges, resistance, and opportunities. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society*, 2(1), 93-107. Retrieved from <http://decolonization.org/index.php/des>
- Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, M. (2012). Introduction: decolonizing our minds and actions. In Waziyatawin & M. Yellow Bird (Eds.), *For Indigenous minds only: A decolonization handbook* (pp. 1-14). Sante Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Wilson, A. (2004). Reclaiming our humanity: decolonization and the recovery of indigenous knowledge In D. Mihesuah & A. Wilson (Eds.), *Indigenizing the academy: Transforming scholarship and empowering communities* (pp. 69-87). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. (pp. 5-144). Halifax, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.
- Wilson, W., & Yellow Bird, M. (2005). Beginning decolonization. In W. Wilson & M. Yellow Bird (Eds.), *For Indigenous eyes only: A decolonizing handbook* (pp. 1-7). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Yellow Bird, M. (2012). Neurodecolonization: Using mindfulness practices to delete the neural networks of colonialism. In Waziyatawin & M. Yellow Bird (Eds.), *For Indigenous minds only: A decolonization handbook* (pp. 57-84). Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Young, G.T. (1995). Mo'olelo Kaukau Ali'i: The dynamics of chiefly service and identity in 'Ōiwi society. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Hawai'i: Honolulu.
- Zavala, M. (2013). What do we mean by decolonizing research strategies? Lessons from decolonizing, Indigenous research projects in New Zealand and Latin America.

Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society, 2(1), 55-71. Retrieved from
<http://decolonization.org/index.php/des>

Appendix A

'Ekahi

B=Brandy Ann Sato

E=Co-Storyteller ('Ekahi)

B=I just want to thank you for your time, in terms of, uh, talking story with me about Indigenous inquiry and some of the goals of my research are to really capture, uh, your mana'o, um, you know, hear from your knowledge base in terms of, uh, your thoughts on Indigenous inquiry, particularly research methods and methodologies. Uh, my overarching goal is to share what you and others have to say, uh, in order to really, uh, promote that within the graduate curriculum.

E=Okay.

B=Yeah.

E=Will you be doing any group work or will these all be individuals?

B=At this point in time they will all be individuals. I have one small group that I'll be putting together. We actually don't live on the same island. So I actually have been engaged with them just talking about this particular topic, oh gosh, for about six months now.

E=Okay.

B=So they are a good support group for me.

E=Okay.

B=And so I'm going to talk story with them again, um, this weekend.

E=All right. Okay. All right. Well, I'm happy to help.

B=Ah, thank you. So I just wanted to start off just by kind of looking at the broad picture in regards to, um, how did you become aware of your Indigeneity, your identity as a Native person?

E=Well, I am Tahitian. I, ah, lived in Tahiti as a young child. Um, after my parents were divorced my, um, my dad and my brother and I moved to, um, Hawai'i. I attended schools here: Lincoln, Stevenson, Kalani, etc... and so I've always considered myself a Tahitian. However, um, coming here, um, to Hawai'i, I felt I didn't have a place here. Although Tahitians and Hawaiians are very similar culturally, etc... I wasn't Hawaiian. Right. And so it was, that's always been a sort of a challenge for me. I've always been struggled with my identity and I don't think it was until graduate school that I really recognized who I was and accepted myself as a Tahitian American since my upbringing has been mostly here in Hawai'i in the United States-based curriculum etc... I consider myself American in that respect so it wasn't until

graduate school that I finally came to that reckoning of understanding who I am as a Tahitian American.

B=What was it about your experiences in graduate school that really opened that up for you?

E=It was in [one professor's] multicultural education class and she took us to the Plantation Houses in Waipahu and it was beautiful. I don't know if you have ever been there but it is just an amazing place and there's these homes where Russian plantation workers lived and Filipinos and Chinese etc... and I started looking at around at all these different cultures and spaces and thinking that all these people came from various countries to make a home in Hawai'i, yeah, that melting pot you know analogy, etc... And I realized that none of my ancestors were there. None of my ancestors were represented there. My ancestors came from Tahiti and from France and Italy. Yeah and there were no French or Italian immigrants to Hawai'i, neither were there any Tahitian immigrants. So I realized that I wasn't present. You know, so, like I said I always felt different. I've never felt like I fit in with any category or any particular identity. But at that time I felt very proud as I always have been to be Tahitian. But I also accepted the fact that I'm a Tahitian American. Yeah, so, it was a long process though.

B=So, what were some of, I guess, the, um, particular aspects of that class, um, in addition to that field trip experience that really...

E=Well, she's always pushing us to really understand our cultural identity and how we defined ourselves. There were many, um uh, students in that class that were Native Hawaiian but didn't define themselves as Native Hawaiian. They were born in California, or they were raised by non-Hawaiians you know kūpuna or something of that sort and they didn't define themselves as Hawaiian and yet they were by presence very much so. For me, physically I don't appear to be Polynesian and yet my upbringing my cultural is very much Tahitian. And of course I married a Hawaiian. He was my high school sweetheart and he's nearly full-blooded Hawaiian. That's a picture of him there. My daughters are Hawaiian, my grandson is Hawaiian. We live on homestead land and so we're surrounded by a Hawaiian community and that's been my experience my whole life being surrounded by Native Hawaiians. And so it's really interesting that in... class there were people who struggled with their identity. I had one who was Hawaiian. She went away to college in the mainland and they told her that she needed to be white. And yet when she was here in graduate school with me, we actually did our undergrad together as well, she said that, um, she wasn't Hawaiian enough. Because she didn't 'ōlelo Hawai'i (Hawaiian language). She's very Hawaiian in appearance, but because she couldn't 'ōlelo Hawai'i you are not Hawaiian. You don't know how to work in a lo'i, you're not Hawaiian. You don't know how to pound kalo, you're not Hawaiian. So she struggled with the way Hawaiian is identified. That it is just not a blood quantum it seems to be a certain knowledge of culture and not only the knowledge the practicing of those cultural traditions. So its something that I think all of us struggle with because identity is fluid.

B=That is true.

E=It is very, very fluid. It is always changing.

B=So I know that from when you visited, um, [another professor's] class when I was a student you had shared, I think at that point in time you were approaching graduation or you had just graduated and you had shared about the, um, Indigenous research practices that were embedded into your dissertation. So how did you come to, um, learn how to use those practices or what decisions did you have to choose that for your research.

E=It was interesting. I always knew that I wanted to, um, study Native Hawaiians and I was advised when I first started graduate school choose a topic and stick with it and all your research and write all your papers related to that topic. So I always knew it would be Native Hawaiians and as I went through the, um, the process I narrowed it down to Native Hawaiian women and because I had gone through that tenure experience and really struggled with it as a Polynesian woman I wanted to look at their tenure experience. But when I initially designed my study I, like, looked at my proposal this morning and I thought, "Oh my gosh, this is nothing like my dissertation at all. This is a very Western-based proposal because I proposed a qualitative, case study design using semi-structured interviews and I planned to use NVIVO to evaluate my data." I was like, "How Western is could it possibly be?" And so I had no intention to write a whole chapter on mo'olelo and a whole chapter on ho'ailona. Those words were not even in my proposal. So what happened as I structured my interviews to have three interviews with each wahine and that was in order to develop relationship for them to get to know me and for me to get to know them so I could establish Native Hawaiian protocol and develop pilina, that relationship. But what happened as I sat there and I listened to their stories and I heard them share their ho'ailona, the symbolic reflection of whatever artifact they brought, I was so moved by those powerful stories and those powerful ho'ailona that I said, "I'm not doing this right. I need to approach this completely differently." And so I went back and I changed my entire methodology. I used narrative inquiry to make a bridge to mo'olelo and then I used arts-informed research to make a bridge to ho'ailona to reflect on those symbolic artifacts. And so it completely flipped everything around. Everything changed. My methodology, my methods, even the way I collected the data and the way I analyzed the data. I threw out NVIVO. I tried using it. And I, uh, my friend, we are study buddies, and he and I both tried using NVIVO and I just said, "This is not working for me because Hawaiian mo'olelo, storytelling, it is holistic. And it's circular." And what NVIVO does is rips it apart into little bits of code and data, yeah, and that's anti-Indigenous. And then I realized why I was struggling to interpret the data even after I had written the mo'olelo and after I had written the ho'ailona chapters. I was still struggling with how do I analyze this? The NVIVO just didn't work for me but that is what I was trained to do. Because there is no training, there is no curriculum at least in Ed Admin [Educational Administration] in Indigenous research. Zero. Not one single class not one topic was ever covered at least in my experience. And so I struggled with that and it was only when I... See I am a very linear person. Very well organized, as you can see I have all of my notes typed out

and very methodical in that sense. And so I was trying to analyze this Indigenous data using a Western approach. And I realized it wasn't working for me. So as I struggled with it I realized I just needed to let go of all my Western training and I needed to truly embrace an Indigenous approach to looking at this rich, beautiful data that I had in front of me. And what I did was I began to, um, was invite the wisdom of my ancestors as well as the, um, kūpuna of my, um, na wahine (women) to invite their ancestors as well to inspire me and I asked them, "What is it you want me to say? What is it you want me to see?" Right? And I also asked for the wisdom of Ke Akua because I recognize that spiritual wisdom is far greater than human wisdom. And once I let go and trying to do everything myself, and I invited the ancestral wisdom and the spiritual wisdom. I literally felt like I was a vessel and this knowledge just flowed right through me and right on to the paper. Yeah, I really felt like it wasn't me writing it all. It was just flowing through me and so that was a very Indigenous approach because Indigenous knowledge is multifaceted. Right? There is not just one form of knowledge. It doesn't come from a book or a piece of paper. Right? Indigenous knowledge is just from so many different dimensions, right? And I had to be willing to accept that. And that was a real challenge for me. But once I did, I learned to really trust my heart and trust my na'au and stop relying on my intellect. Stop trying to analyze everything but allow myself to feel. Just as I had done when I wrote my mo'olelo. When I wrote the mo'olelo, I really tried to envision that I was each wahine. And I was telling the story through her eyes and I actually imagined myself sitting in her space. Looking through her eyes as though I was in her body and writing the story as she would write it as she would tell the story. So rather than looking at them externally, I imagined myself within them looking out.

B=Oh, that is beautiful.

E=Yeah, and that is how I was able to tell the stories the way I did. You know starting with a particular incident in their life, and then weaving it around, and coming back in a circular way. As opposed to the linear way that I've been trained. You start here from birth and you end here from wherever they are at. Right, so a total, epistemological transformation. The study itself transformed me in so many ways.

B=Wow, that's amazing. And I remember you talking about this a few years ago to our class but I have a new appreciation for it.

E=Because it wasn't designed that way. I didn't even realize it until I looked at my proposal and "oh my gosh that is so Western." That is how I was trained. That is how I was told to do. And even when I told my advisor that I would like to do mo'olelo and ho'ailona she said, "How are you going to get that past the dissertation committee?" And so I said, "I am doing Indigenous research on Indigenous people why shouldn't I be able to use Indigenous methods?" And at that time she said, "Well, I really would advise you to form some sort of a bridge." Now I really oppose.

B=The narrative inquiry.

E=Yeah. I really oppose having to preface it with that. I feel that as a Polynesian woman I should have just been able to say this is mo'olelo, storytelling is an integral part of Hawaiian culture, and knowledge, etc... I should have been able to do that. But at that time she said, "You know, you to really sell this to your committee you have to form this bridge from narrative inquiry to support mo'olelo and then you have to look for something to support your use of artifact. And so I found this arts-influenced research which was fabulous and I made a direct connection to ho'ailona. But I think I hope that future researchers would not have to form that bridge. And that they could just use Indigenous methodologies. Yeah, without any Western connections.

B=Wow. And you know what, I'm just going to interject because part of what I wrote, um, in my chapter 2, my literature review, is to just privilege the use of Native sources or Native-authored journal articles or books.

E=See that is something I wasn't able to do either. I used post-structural feminist theory as well as some Indigenous theory. But because I was working with women they really wanted to look at all the struggles and challenges of women in general. And so I used the post-structural feminist theory. And so there are a lot of Western values in that. It's a very Western approach. But tried to merge it together with Indigenous research. But I totally support a fully Indigenous lit review.

B=Well, I still had questions in regards to my proposal defense, um, last semester questioning the rigor. So was that something you were asked? Or something that you thought about?

E=In the literature review?

B=In the lit review or approaching the research is rigorous enough?

E=Not at the proposal level because at the proposal level it was still very Western based. Yeah, and so they just flew with it because it was the standard approach. As I evolved, as I got into my comps and they wrote some amazing comp questions for me which really helped me to delve deep not only wide but really, really deep into what I was doing. Um that really helped me to understand things much better. But they never questioned the rigor of my study. Because, I mean, I had 2 methodologies. I had 2 methods. I had 2 different approaches to everything, right, so they never questioned the rigor.

B=So, um, how did this research affect you as a Native researcher? As a Native person? Now that you are a doctorate.

E=Well, like I said, it changed me in every way. Which one are you looking at now? You talking about?

B=My second question.

E=Um, okay. It allowed me to, um, understand multiple ways of knowing and to look at things from multiple perspectives. Prior to this I felt like I was very linear. And this research, working with these Native women really changed my perspective to more of a makawalu perspective. You know, looking at things from multiple perspectives. And being able to accept multiple ways of knowledge. That it is not just from a particular source. But these women's beautiful stories and their experiences. This is all forms of knowledge. And the way they received this knowledge, um, it came from many, many different sources. So the research really transformed me. It really did in so many ways. My approach to things. The way I wrote things. Um, my approach, even with my counseling. You know it changed my approach even when I counsel with students. You know, for example, prior to doing this study. If a student were to come to me, say a Hawaiian student, were to come to me and say, "You know I am having trouble understanding this particular course." Especially if it were in Hawaiian Studies or Hawaiian language, I would have gone through the traditional stuff, well, how many hours are you studying, how many hours are you working, do you have a tutor, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. I would have gone through the usual. After this, I would approach that student and I would say, "You know, that this knowledge, this 'ike, it's already in you. It's already in your DNA. And it comes from your ancestors. And you already know it. You just have to tap into it. You just have to access this knowledge. I said it is in your 'ōiwi, in your bones." And so I said, "Accept the knowledge. Ask your ancestors to bless you, to open up your mind, to allow you to receive what you already know because it is part of your ancestral memory. You just have to tap into that." And they'll be just like, and they never expect it. Never expected that, you know. But that is what I learned, that is what I experienced through this study. It's part of the DNA. Especially for women, mana wahine, that innate power that Native women have. Absolutely, it really changed my entire approach not just how I did the study but how I do my work now.

B=Oh, that is so amazing.

E=Yeah, so very different.

B=So how can we replicate this journey that you've been on through the educational curriculum and programs that we have. Um, not only just in graduate education but just education in general. What are some recommendations that you have that the academy can enhance and promote Indigenous research? And sees it as a viable option.

E=I think that courses should be taught expressly in Indigenous research. It shouldn't be, like, for example, if you take a qualitative research course, I don't think that a component of that should be Indigenous research. I think there should be an Indigenous research course that is taught at graduate school that encompasses a fully Indigenous lit review, fully Indigenous methodologies methods, um data collection, forms of analyses. All of that should be an Indigenous approach. That doesn't exist, yeah. And even at the undergraduate level, allowing students to embrace Indigenous research and use Indigenous methods to do so. And not have to

conform to Western ways of doing things. If we are truly a Hawaiian serving institution, the University of Hawai'i, why aren't we accepting more Indigenous approaches to research?

B=Do you see there is some movement in change? Or is it not quick enough?

E=I haven't seen it. I haven't seen it. I mean I just graduated a year ago and I hadn't seen any up until that point in any of my courses, not, I mean even as I struggled with doing, my data, the um committee still wanted to me to do that bridge, still wouldn't allow me to use just a fully Indigenous method. But my hope is that as more Native Hawaiian students and other Polynesian students graduate and earn their PhDs etc... they're allowed to um embrace an Indigenous approach to their research and to further work that they do at the university. Like one of my wahine would tell me that in order to get where they are they followed the recipe. That's what they would say. They did what they were told to do, um, did their studies, followed that Western approach, and you know once they became tenured professors etc... then they were allowed to conduct the Indigenous research they wanted to do. But I would like to move that back and say, "Let's not embrace a Western approach at all as undergrads or graduate students. Let's begin early on, and begin to do things in an Indigenous way. If this is a Native Hawaiian serving institution, then let us do what we need to do."

B=Right.

E=And that could trickle all the way down to elementary school, embracing Native Hawaiian values, and culture, you know. For example, I, um, am participating in a preschool program for my grandson all based on Native Hawaiian values. It's a Montessori based program, but it is all integrated in Native Hawaiian values and 'ōlelo Hawai'i. All of that. Yeah, the mele and everything all in Hawaiian to teach our keiki. So we can start at that level, right, and introduce Hawaiian culture and values and traditions and language all the way up from keiki all the way up to grad school.

B=So just to conclude, what do you think the future is for Indigenous research?

E=I think it's going to be great. I think as we encourage, that's my job here. My job is to um help our Native Hawaiian students to finish their AA degree, move on to Mānoa or the university of their choice and then encourage them to go beyond that to their Masters and their PhDs. And I think if more people like me can encourage and support Native Hawaiian students to succeed, then they'll be more people involved doing Indigenous research. So it starts at our level, even far beyond us, even at this level I really push students and I plant in their mind the seed. I said, for example, many counselors would just say, "Okay, so do you want to get an AA degree in liberal arts? Okay, that's great. Here's how you do it." But I say, "Okay, once you are done with this AA in liberal arts, what do you plan to major on for your bachelor's? Okay, that's great. And then what are you going to do for your Master's? And for your PhD? And they just look at me like, "I can do a Master's? I can do a PhD?" I'm like, "Of course, I expect you to. Why not?" Yeah, that's the way you are going to advance the culture. That's the way you are

going to promote Native Hawaiian culture, and values, and traditions by you getting into higher levels of education. And so they are just amazed by that because no one has ever given them that concept to think about. They just figured an AA is just as good as I'm going to get in my family. You know, Bachelor's I'll be lucky to do that. But I plant that seed and I say, "You know what are you thinking about doing for your Master's? And where are you going to go for your PhD?" And so, you start planting that seed early and it gives them that hope, that possibility.

B=I'm so overwhelmed and inspired. I could listen to you all day.

E=Well, that's what I feel my job is and that's why I try to support students with Native Hawaiian scholarships. As many as possible to facilitate that journey for them. Absolutely, because that's one of the biggest hurdles, the finances, yeah. Absolutely.

B=Yeah we talk about that. I am at Kamehameha Schools. So we talk about, um. In terms of, um, post-secondary achievement and what are some of the barriers to that. A lot of um the focus group data from young alumni is financial reasons. It's huge. It's huge. Wow.

E=So, I try to get them to apply for 5 or 6 different Hawaiian scholarships. Don't just settle on just one because if you apply to 5 and you only get 2, that's 2 that you wouldn't have had. 2 is better than 0.

B=Yeah, that's true. That's true. Don't just apply to one and say that assume you are going to get it. You may not, right. So I help them do as many as possible. But I really think it's important to plant the seed. I think that's how we are going to increase the number of Indigenous researchers, um, down the road. You have to plant the seed early. And that's why here at Windward we start working with elementary school kids and we actually bring them onto campus and expose them to classes and have them meet teachers and counselors. We take them into our labs and into the astronomy center, etc... and we say, "This is where you gonna be when you finish high school." So they already have a sense of place and a sense of belonging. It's not like, um, "I'm here. This Hawaiian kid, live out in Waimanalo, and I go to this particular school and there's Windward Community College way out there. It's like, "Oh, when I finish at Kailua or Kalaheo, etc..., I'm going to Windward. Yeah, they already know that is a possibility.

B=Right, right.

E=It starts early.

B=Do you have any other questions for me? Or final words of wisdom or seeds you want to plant in me? The one thing. Is that your last question? I have notes that you can take with you to look at. But the um the one question where you asked about how can the academy enhance its teaching of Indigenous research within the curriculum? One of the things that I propose was a Native women's theory which I just call NWT. And I propose that I my dissertation and it is to promote research by, for, and about Indigenous Peoples. I have a problem with non-Indigenous

People doing research on us or about us. Right? Because usually it is for more non-Indigenous reasons and it doesn't benefit the people. And so that is one of the things, that is one of the premises. And I want Native women's theory to validate all forms of Indigenous Peoples knowledge that is used in scholarly work. Things such as, um, mo'olelo of course, ho'ailona, mele, um, hula, talking circles, dream work, all of that. Those are all valid forms of Indigenous knowledge. And typically in scholarly work it tends not to be considered as rigorous as perhaps, right, but that is a valid form of knowledge. Um, also wanted to be such that, um, Indigenous researchers learn to really rust their na'au, and really go with their instinctual feeling that they have, right, in their na'au. To, um, really follow cultural traditions and cultural practices and protocols as they do their research. Um Native women's theory also supports the use of Indigenous languages in scholarly research and not only in research but also in the writing of a contract renewal or a dossier for promotion or for tenure. They should be able to write those in 'olelo Hawai'i because this is in their native land, in their 'aina. So I support those kinds of things and um you know, basically incorporating histories, cultures, traditions. All that sort of things. Uh Native Hawaiian women's theory also works to promote Indigenous knowledge system, Native women's power, Indigenous values, and cultural integrity which is a really big part of my dissertation that I found that these women were so authentic in their Nativeness. In their Indigeneity. They are so authentic. I called it pono as one of my themes and that is what I really found. And one of the big things is I really want to invite current and future researchers like yourself to really embrace Native women's theory, rework it, expound, expand on it, you know, that sort of thing um to use it in serving the Indigenous community.

B=I love that idea of Native women's theory. That's great.

E=Yeah, it really works at the issues at the issues that are facing Native women. And I really want researchers to be respectful of culture and protocol and traditions and history and mo'olelo, mo'okū'auhau. All of these things, right to be aware of these and be respectful of these. Basically, using Native women's theory in working with Native women.

B=And I think that is just so beautiful in terms of, there is definitely um a female perspective that permeates everything that we do so that isn't necessarily adequately represented that Indigenous research can be "genderless" but it's really not.

E=No, I don't think so. And what I also learned through my work is that um Native women are so powerful. And they have always been powerful. I mean from the beginning of time. You know, from pō, they have been extremely powerful. If you look at all of the legends and you know Native Hawaiian women are the ones who had all this mana. And I think women nowadays tend to feel very powerless, especially women who are abused you know in domestic violence situations. They have come to feel that they have no power in the world and they have lost touch with their mo'olelo, with their ancestors, you know with their mo'okū'auhau because if they looked back at their and seen all of these powerful women in their genealogy they would

realize that that's still in them. That they have that power, they have that mana wahine within them and I think many of our Native women have lost touch with that.

B=Do you think that losing touch was a result of the colonization of the islands?

E=Absolutely, oh yeah. And men also feeling emasculated, not being able to perform their duties as a kāne within the hale anymore or within the 'ohana. Having to go out and do manual labor jobs. Not being, um, you know, um encouraged to get a higher education but be encouraged to labor positions in order to support the family and so on so they've really been, they've lost touch with their own Hawaiian culture. Yeah, they haven't embraced it as much and so they developed more of a Western approach yeah that I think has facilitated some of the abuse that we've seen both with drugs as well as with domestic violence. So this is just my proposal is to promote Native Hawaiian women's theory.

B=Do you mind if I share that with some of my colleagues?

E=Oh, I would hope so. I would hope so, that's the whole idea. Like one of the things I've said is to I like to encourage a Native women's perspective to the study of math or oceanography, or astronomy, or history. Yeah. You think about any discipline. Imagine how that discipline would be different if it came from Native women's perspective Right? It would be a totally different approach. So I would like to see those kinds of things in the academy as well as applying it to research.

B=That's so great.

E=I have all of my notes here, so you could, um, take a look at it.

B=Thank you. I'm going to share that. As I've mentioned before I have that little hui, um support hui, and you know all across the continent and just a few of us routinely meet um every week so I'd love to share with the organizer of our little group, Native women's theory.

E=Yeah, yeah, absolutely.

B=And I think I've run across something to that affect.

E=I've never.

B=It's a hybrid. You know, feminism with the overlay of Native paradigms.

E=Absolutely and it came from the themes that came out of my study to the Indigenous authenticity and the mana wahine and the pōhaku, the barriers that women faced. So because as I thought about those themes and everything this theory just kind of evolved from it so if we can start looking at it, issues in society, looking at issues in education looking at research, looking at politics from a Native women's perspective the things will be different. Yeah, things would be very different.

E=For me, my research was transformative for me. It was very empowering for me as a Native woman and it changed the way I think, the way I looked at the world. For a researcher to have that kind of transformative epistemological experience, that's massive, that's huge. You don't expect to be changed that way as your doing the research you expect to gather other this data and come up with these findings and produce this lovely dissertation but you don't expect to undergo this massive personal, emotional transformation and that is really what happened for me. Yeah, it was just incredible cause the way I look at things, my perspective on life, the way I analyze situations, the way I interact with people, the way I describe things, everything has been changed through this experience.

B=Well, you know it is interesting that you mentioned that and I read somewhere in my articles if you are not changed by the research that you do you are not doing it right.

E=Very good. Absolutely. Absolutely.

B=So you did it right.

E=I guess so because everything completely changed for me so yeah. It was an amazing experience so I wouldn't change it for the world.

B=Oh my gosh.

E=People always ask me, "How did you feel about doing three interviews?" I said, "It was insane. It was so time consuming. It took 6 or 7 months of constant work. Right.

B=Yeah.

E=It was so tedious, you know, doing the transcribing the interviews but I wouldn't change it for anything in the world because every interview I gained experience. I learned new things. I was touched in a new way. I developed a different relationship, you know, each time right. Just so amazing that although it was very time consuming at the time I wouldn't change it for anything. It was invaluable, absolutely invaluable.

B=And it just changed you in terms of, um, leading you to the approach that you ended up sharing.

E=Yeah, yeah, absolutely. Yeah. Okay, I think we are done.

B=Thank you so much.

Appendix B

‘Elua

B=Brandy Ann Sato

E=Co-Storyteller (‘Elua)

B=The purpose of my research is to explore Indigenous inquiry. What I really want to do is impact the academy and the curriculum. How can we really promote and encourage our people and other Native people to use Indigenous inquiry with their research? So I just want to probe your mind a little bit in terms of what are your thoughts about Indigeneity and Indigenous research and how the curriculum and schooling could better promote that?

E=I’ve never heard that word Indigeneity.

B=It’s interesting because people kind of use different terms. Aboriginal, Native, Indigenous, you hear all sorts of different terms.

E=I don’t think I use the word Indigenous as often as I do now. When I started my work with the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and then Director of Education, being in circles where we’re often not just talking about Hawaiian and Hawaiian people but other Native people and other Indigenous people around the world, for example, Alaskans and Native Americans. Then the term just started to become a buzzword and a common word in everyday talk with reference to education and culture. So it kind of causes me to think of how we determine the use of all of these terms: Native, Aboriginal. I think it has political implications to it, and I often think Indigenous often leans more toward the political relationships or how the Western world views everyone else. I’m not sure but that’s my understanding and interpretation of it... I used to use it regularly, but before working in an agency that engages a lot with different people, Indigenous people. I probably would use the word Native Hawaiian probably when talking about our selves. Yeah, so, what’s the question? That is just an observation and a comment about the word

B- Yeah. Right. You know I think it’s important because what I’ve been trying to do personally in reconnecting with my culture.

E= The Japanese culture? Hawaiian and Portuguese cultures?

B=Yeah, we’re all chop suey here. Though to try to connect with my Hawaiian roots and just kind of exploring what does it mean to research from that kind of perspective. You know, when they’re having so many different cultural influences and life experiences that I have had. I know for myself it’s kind of been like a personal journey in terms of how to use approaches to “research” that are authentic and also valuable for people. Because, I think research kind of causes hesitancy in certain groups so how to best go about allowing research to be an opportunity for people to kind of share their stories.

E=I think exactly what you said. When I think of research, I often think of a more academic setting and expectations and rules, and yet, in higher education research it does require the

procedures and processes you follow just as you're doing now and how you're doing this and how you're going to transcribe all this and then synthesize it into whatever you need for your research. But I guess when I started my graduate studies at the [university] there was one particular professor that kind of had a real impact on me. I took several of her courses, and that was [professor] that was a graduate of [private school] 1985. She was an awesome teacher, and she was also my advisor when I completed my Master's degree in Curriculum and Instruction. But in her course, you know, she kind of validated that you can research qualitative and quantitative, but qualitative research which sometimes requires talk story, the interview, the mana'o (ideas), that all it's valid. It's okay, you know, according to our style and way of learning and capturing learning from our kūpuna and those people. That's an important element. So it kind of validated that and it is natural to sit and talk story with others and listen to their mana'o and mo'okū'auhau. I make connect, where we make connections, it makes any content so much easier to understand and then to kind of make connections that you value when you find others that value the same things or had the same experiences. Whether it's in teaching because, of course, my studies was in education or in Hawaiian language or music or hula or something like that.

B=So what experiences have you had that influenced your identity?

E=As a Native Hawaiian?

B- Yeah.

E= My Hawaiian identity. I don't know if I ever told you this story. It was when I was in, I think I always as I grew up, I was proud of being Hawaiian. I was never ashamed of it, but I really started to appreciate my culture when I became a teenager, and it was through music. My family was always surrounded by music. My mother sang, my father sang pretty well too. My mother was a professional Hawaiian musician. She would entertain and perform with all the noted Hawaiian musicians during my childhood. So we were always exposed to that lifestyle, being around music, and just from that I was being proud of who I was and loving music and as I grew older in high school I started to want to learn more, to learn the language and hula. I was fortunate that the school I went to [public school] they had a hula program and a Hawaiian club, and I joined, and it was sort of a turning point in my life because there was a point when I wasn't quite sure what I wanted to do, and there were a lot of personal trials in our family that I almost wound up I didn't want to complete my education. I wanted to drop out of high school. But when I found my nitch thru Hawaiian things... and culture and language that became... I knew that that would probably be my pathway in life, my career pathway. Not just career, but what, because what made me happy and because I was already comfortable and content with my identity as Native Hawaiian. It just seemed to affirm and strengthen that. When I was a junior in high school... let me back up a little bit. So in the freshman summer of my sophomore year, I attended, I took a summer school course, a class here at [private school] and I decided to study Japanese because I was really enamored with the tourist industry because I could see music aligning nicely with tourism. And so I took Japanese. I did really well. I loved it, so I decided to continue my study of language, Japanese language, through sophomore and junior year in high school. I did well up to the third, fourth level. When I was a junior my Japanese teacher [teacher] of my public high school said to me, "What do you plan to do with all this Japanese your

learning?” “Work in travel industry, maybe I’ll be a teacher.” “Oh that’s good, but have you thought of learning your own language, Hawaiian? You’re Hawaiian. You’re the only Hawaiian student in the class.” And, he said you should think about learning your own language too, maybe teaching it. I was so ashamed and I felt kind of discriminated when I’m such a good Japanese student. I can use it. It’s going to be practical one day. I can actually see myself in that industry, but he planted a seed, that teacher. So I enrolled in Hawaiian the next year and the first day of class there was no one, no kumu. There was a class full of us waiting for the teacher to show up. So after about half way through the period when we’re about ready to stand up and leave, this Japanese woman walks into the classroom. She walks in and she looks very Japanese. She’s all dressed up, and she speaks Japanese to us. “Oh no, this is Hawaiian language,” and she stops and she takes her hair down and it goes all the way to her ankles... she has a beautiful Hawaiian blouse and slacks. She starts to speak Hawaiian to us. What? No way! Japanese woman speaks Hawaiian, what’s wrong with this picture? And she goes on and on and weeks and weeks go by and she’s like, she’s serious about teaching the language and she has stories about her own family. She was married to a Hawaiian man. They were divorced. She was recently divorced. Single parent with two children, but her husband was Hawaiian. Her daughter, her children are Hawaiian, but he was never proud to be Hawaiian, can’t speak his own language and shame on him, you know... But the point was that, “I’m not Hawaiian. I’m not an ounce of Hawaiian blood. Yet I care about the culture and my children especially who are Hawaiian. I want to make sure that it lives and that it’s perpetuated.” So, that made an impression on me, and I know that I’m sure it did on others. There were other Hawaiians in the class, and it was a mixed class, like any other multi-ethnic class in school, but there were a few of us who were Hawaiian. There were a few Samoans, a few non-Hawaiians in that class that loved Hawaiian language. That was an inspirational point. I was proud to be Hawaiian, but it also made me realize that I had a responsibility. That Japanese teacher, [teacher], had put the charge to me that why can’t you learn your own language and culture and that I had to learn it well... and that one day probably should be teaching it to other Hawaiian kids and to others who wanted to learn about my language and culture. And that was the turning point in my life in high school. And until today, I still have a close relationship with that teacher. She’s teaching at [private school].

B=It sounds, as if, from what you’re describing to me that the educational experiences that you had in high school really kind of made you realize the responsibility you did have.

E=You know, it’s unfortunate because I was in high school in the 80’s, the early 80’s so it was right before the renaissance. It was in the renaissance, actually, but before the Hawaiian language became emergent, became even an offering, before that whole concept was ever thought of in the mid 80’s... the Maori and other Indigenous people. But I think I was proud because of the renaissance, and we were seeing the revitalization of our arts, music, hula, especially... canoe paddling and of course Hōkūle‘a was already ten years into its voyages by the mid-80’s. It was a big decade. So you had many things to look at and say. I mean, and then, the political strife, sovereignty and all that was just kind of taking root at that time, the 80’s, so I think all of those things had an impact and influence on my decision and my values. I think even though it was not blatantly endorsed in my own family, at home, but it was okay whether you did it or didn’t, it was never discouraged by my mother. Well even my father and my grandparents

at that time. I did have, I was almost discouraged by the same teacher who inspired me, the Japanese teacher, and this is my Hawaiian language teacher. I'll never forget when I was a senior and she always remembers, and she reminds me of this too. I think it was a painful memory, incident in my life. It was right before graduation. I went to visit her in her classroom one day and said to me, "Think about what you're going to major in in college. Maybe you should find a double major because I'm not sure Hawaiian is going to sustain you. I look at my own life. I've had so many struggles as a Hawaiian language teacher with the principal of this school. You may have to fall back on something else that you can teach or any other subject you know." ...to encourage me and help me be realistic about whether or not I would be successful. And, I left that afternoon feeling really discouraged. The one person I really looked up to and thought she would be the most supportive was discouraging me from following that route. Which now in retrospect I realize after all these years that we talked and worked together and she's told me so many times that because of my own personality it helped me. It charged me to want to disprove that. I will teach what I want to teach. It's my passion and I'm going to be good at it, wait and see, and I think secretly to myself. She was always telling our students, and she and I team-taught for in the summers for twelve years the Hawaiian language class... She'd always say that. She'd tell this story the first day to impress the children how important it is to continue to learn as much Hawaiian as they could beyond that week they left us, but to know there are possibilities when I share that story... And she was not even Hawaiian and was the one who inspired me, and you can do the same. You can learn more. And so she would say, "And I want you guys to learn that my student excelled and went way beyond what I could ever do in his teaching career and all the things that he does now. And I told him he should find something else to do because I discouraged him. Yet he followed his dream and his passion, and he did it well." So she would re-affirmate that. I think it was more a service than a disservice when she tried to discourage me... You're not going to know much if you rely on Hawaiian, and I disproved that because my whole life has been sustained by Hawaiian language. The things that I do, which naturally led to how I met my wife and our family and all that we do... It's a line to who we are and where we live, what we work, we live, it's all the same. So I don't know if that answers your question.

B=In spades. In storytelling, I think it's actually an important part of how you communicate knowledge, you know.

E= I like talking story, you know.

B=You do. You tell really good stories. So tell me a little bit about the research you did when you were a Master's student.

E= So I, [supervisor] and I were talking this morning. [Supervisor] my supervisor now. He's a dear colleague, and he and I pretty much taught the Hawaiian language at the same time. He's a little bit older than me and probably is a mentor, someone I always look up to be, very kind, very patient, very thoughtful teacher and yet very passionate and a strong advocate for Hawaiian language. Well, we were having a discussion this morning in our little team about how important

it is for us to evaluate our own supervisor just as much as he would evaluate us on certain factors. He values our evaluations of him, so he gave us an opportunity to do our own evaluations. Then he reports back to us the findings of our response to him the things we encouraged him to do, and he shares those things very openly with us and shares those with us any comments very openly and someone in the group said, who is a lecturer at the university, one of the team members in our department said that, "I don't give a damn what my students think about me. I don't really look at their evaluations." "You know, just joking," he says that I think. So [supervisor] says, "When I was a teacher in high school I would have my students evaluate me in every class, every semester, every year, and sometimes it's hard to read their comments and critiques, but you know, I really grew and learned from that, and as colleagues and professionals we have to give our students and our direct reports that opportunity. And I would encourage my colleagues and other managers and directors to do the same to have that trust and so on. Then I reminded him I said that I did too. I would have my students evaluate me all the time. I think mostly because it would inflate my ego because I knew I was good teacher, and I think maybe I wanted to hear them say it. I wanted to see it on paper all the time. So, I started to share with him, and I did which triggered that my paper was all about that... The tree flourishes, the branches of any tree thrive and flourish because of the nourishment it receives from the trunk of the tree, from the tree itself. That's the metaphor that I have for a healthy tree with healthy branches. The underlying meaning of all that, that is a healthy family or students, children thrive and are healthy and are strong because of the source of the nourishment they receive from their kumu, from their parents. So it just reminds us that a healthy system and healthy future is relying on a healthy and good teacher or a good source. And so what I was most interested in back in 2002. In 2001, right after the HSTA (Hawai'i State Teachers Association) union strike, we went on strike that year. It became more apparent to me that I had been a teacher for about twelve or thirteen years that year, and I had mentored a lot of student teachers who had graduated and gone on and had their master's degree, and here I was, I hadn't obtained my master's and I was working in the trenches. I started teaching right out of college. I was twenty-two when I started my teaching career and although I was mentoring all these teachers in their practicum, and they went on to be great teachers. And, I was busy. I was department chairperson of our department, and I was advising student activities and clubs, but I wasn't really growing professionally, on the pay scale... and I wasn't advancing. I thought, "It's not fair. All these years of experience I've contributed, so that pushed me to go for my sabbatical, and I was granted sabbatical for a whole year and I decided... and I went back to the university to start my coursework toward my masters degree. And, at that same time, what I was curious to know how I was as a teacher. How my students perceived me, especially my Hawaiian students, my ethnically Hawaiian students. How effective I was as a teacher. I wanted to know that. I wanted to know if I was making a difference in their lives rather than just teaching a fun course to be in or a cool teacher. I wanted to know what was there about me that made their experience memorable or outstanding and led to their achievement. What was most outstanding in their achievements and in their outcomes about what was it that I did and what

made me different from other teachers. And so it kind of got me thinking and what I didn't realize that what I was thinking about in at that point, 2002, was just a few years later was becoming this great pocket and trend in research, especially in the case of [private school] which was best practices is Hawaiian education, in education that allowed for Native Hawaiian children to be more successful in education and in educational outcomes. It was already a trend, but I was unaware of all that. I was more concerned with my little classroom, my little career, my self-assessment. So what I did is I surveyed and I polled my students. All the students that I taught over a period of two years, and I had them give me input about the learning that mattered to them. What were my qualities or my characteristics that were most valuable? I used that data to build quantitative and qualitative arguments that I discovered that the elements that I possess that I had that made their education more successful... not that I was ethnically Hawaiian, which I definitely thought that it would be because I was Hawaiian and male. It was the fact that I taught with compassion when I taught. I taught with aloha. So, that's a theme that came up, that I was very kind and compassionate. In other words, that I knew my stuff. I knew what I was teaching, and it was obvious that teaching Hawaiian, and history, and everything. Hawaiian culture was natural for me. I wasn't just teaching it because it was content. I was teaching it because I lived it. In essence that's what they were saying, and I know my knowledge made them want to have the same passion. And other factors, of course, were the way my methods of teaching are not just the traditional Western lecture, but allowing for the other kinds of activities. So my research just kind of validates what we know about what makes successful ethnic-culture based education work best for Hawaiian kids... So that was my research. That's what I did. And that was twelve years ago, which I didn't finally finish it until two years ago. My advisor [advisor] said that even though the data is ten years old, that it's fascinating and it could be even more fascinating and could be another paper if I decide to do a dissertation. It would be in fascinating to see where those kids are today because I do know that some of them have become teachers...

B=Do you think when you were conducting your research or thinking about how to put your project together, do you think your identity, your culture, your essence and your being influenced how you wrote?

E=Oh yes, definitely. That's a fascinating question because I think the fact that [advisor] allowed for me to express or conduct my research and to, well, first a topic that I was most passionate about and that I could really connect to because it was so personal and allowed it to be academic enough that it would be valid enough for a paper. Yet suddenly the things that I incorporated into it, that allowed me to firstly connect it back to all the stories that I've been sharing with you today as a student and being inspired by an adult or other teachers, helped me to recount back and think of pivotal moments and times that I never thought of before in my career before. I started to do the research back even further to incidents and then connect what was happening historically with Hawai'i and the Hawai'i civil movement, or just the Hawaiian renaissance, you know. And the connection to what I was experiencing from childhood until high school. It made me appreciate and understand research from that standpoint because it was connected to me

personally. So when it was more appealing to who I am and to my own life, and I could write it and include my own stories, and it was valid, it didn't seem like research any more. It was more like creating my biography. With the end product being so who am I, this teacher, who has grown and flourished? My research helped me to see I was concerned about what my students were thinking about me, but maybe it was more about me reflecting on what were those qualities that made me become a teacher or made me successful as a young Hawaiian but then influenced me to become the teacher that I am today. So I started to look generation to generation which is very Hawaiian. It's very Hawaiian, to think about lineage. You start to think about inherited traits or things you have learned because of others or what others have learned. It helped me to be appreciative. As I think we are as Indigenous people, the relationship we have with our kumu. We have great respect and regard and aloha for our kūpuna and our kumu. You wouldn't think to talk back to them or you wouldn't think of being disrespectful in your classroom because you have an understanding that there is a connection. It's almost as if they're your 'ohana, your parents or your grandparents. You wouldn't treat them poorly. Why would you behave that way in a Western classroom setting at that type of school? I don't know if that answers your question.

B=No, I think, I think, it does, you know, it kind of highlights the point that research is personal. That you draw upon your own past experiences to really kind of shape the research project and the student that provided you with their, and their feedback it really helped you and touched your heart.

E=And you know what else? One of my mentors, college advisors when I started my grad[uate] schooling, my first advisor was [advisor]. One of my dear friends, [counselor], took me to see [advisor] one day when I was visiting. He's a counselor in the College of Ed[ucation]. He thought that she might be helpful, one, because she was one of the few Native Hawaiian faculty in the COE at that time, and two, he knew that she would be creating this cohort of teachers that would be teaching primarily Native Hawaiian students in the immersion schools or the Hawaiian focus schools or here at [private school]. So the whole triangulation that we're talking about in our new strategic plan and in that goal of working with Native Hawaiian schools, this was back in 2002 and she was already thinking about the training of us as well as others and preparing prospective teachers. So while I was considering coming back to school as a graduate student, she was looking for someone who could serve as a graduate assistant to the student cohort. So she was my advisor while I was serving her, working with her as a graduate assistant. Something she said to me when I was going to start writing the paper. I was writing papers in other different classes that were reflective about my career and my classes. She said to me, "You shouldn't have to be recreating or doing more work. You should compile these things that will become your final research paper. Two, that final product shouldn't be something that you're doing just to get that degree that winds up on a shelf somewhere. Make it worthwhile. Something that helps you grow professionally or that will be helpful to someone else." So the research we do as Indigenous people has to count and has to help our people and others who are

pursuing the same things in life. So I think it was really powerful that she was reminding me as a researcher or someone who thinks you're just writing this paper to graduate, make it count. Make it something that will help other people. Make sure that the research really captures, that paints really who we are as a people, not just who you are as a person. But of Indigenous education altogether. So make sure it's not something that's just going to sit on the shelf and that doesn't matter.

B=Yeah, right, and that is not self-aggrandizing. That it's not for you as individual to get a degree, it might actually forward...

E=So, it's a good reminder and I've always kind of kept that kind of thing in my mind all of those years.

B- And that became part of the impetus for you to finally finish?

E=Well, I can tell you why I didn't finish. The coursework is easy to complete. I love the classes. I love going there in the evening and those professional relationships that you develop. I love that engagement, especially after the end of a busy day of teaching and engaging with kids all day long. It's nice to have those professional conversations with adults. Okay, now you're going have to break, because life happens, you know. Here's something interesting that happened related to indigenous research. At the same time I pursuing that my children were graduating from high school and planning to go off to college. So for the first time now I'm a parent thinking about higher education for my children. This is a new tier of experience for us as a Hawaiian family. Secondly I was going thru the process of becoming a kumu hula. At the very same time I was working on my master's degree. So balancing family, a full time teaching career, and teaching hula at clubs and afterschool activities and summer and evening and spring activities and teaching outside of my regular job. Then I was told to complete that journey that I'd begun when I was a sophomore in high school and complete the study of hula. Then somebody said to be validated as a teacher of hula you need to go through the ceremonial processes, so all of this was going on. Then there was the career change. I thought I'd be teaching until I retired. I never thought I would leave teaching to go to work at the Bureau of Hawaiian Affairs which was a promotion for me. Financially it was better for my family, but it was a way to grow to really be in a leadership position, to look at the greater landscape of Hawaiian education, Indigenous education. From that political organization, I was in a position where I quickly learned a whole lot about the whole spectrum of Hawaiian education, from early childhood to post high school. All my life I'd been in that one classroom, that one school, and I'd never much thought, besides with my children experiencing immersion and being involved in that, but I'd not much thought about what others were doing in other schools. What's a Hawaiian focus charter school? And I learned very quickly... so that helped me to grow, but it also forced me to put aside my own personal things including completing that paper. So I did, and it was only when I came back to [private school] that opportunities came back to me. It was now relevant to the work I was doing on Hawaiian Culture-based Education Department,

managing again those programs and developing and using and implementing curriculum which I know very well. It just helped finish unfinished business and [private school] is really good about that, giving opportunity because they sponsored half of that...

B=Maybe that was meant to be. Maybe you had to go through that other professional path of life.

E=And that's true, I thank the Lord because I think spiritually, that's another aspect of the whole.

Appendix C

‘Ekolu

B=Brandy Ann Sato

E=Co-Storyteller (‘Ekolu)

B: I just wanted to take the opportunity to again, thank you for coming.

E: You’re welcome.

B: And spending some time with me. The purpose of my research is really to go ahead and meet with fellow Native Hawaiians or people of other Indigenous backgrounds and talk about Indigenous inquiry, Indigenous research. I just want to take the opportunity to listen to your story in terms of your thoughts about what Indigenous research is, practices, techniques that you’ve used within the work that you do. My overall goal is to really impact the academy and education, to have more opportunities for the curriculum to introduce those concepts to students.

E: That’s a lot of things.

B: I know! It’s a lot of things, you’re exactly right. So, I guess I just want to start off with just a few questions in terms of who you are, what experiences have helped to develop your identity?

E: So who I am? I am [first, middle, last names]. [First name] because my mom named me after the Bible, or from the Bible. And her reminders to me have always been I named you [first name] because [first name] was a preacher and a teacher. So, today I’m a preacher and a teacher...so my mom’s vision for me... and then [middle name] came from my dad’s side. My grandmother’s name is [first and last names]... so [middle name] was meant as a carrying on of the family but then again, you have [grandmother’s last name] that we connect back to... one of the islands back in the Marquesas. So, my mom originally wanted me to have a name from her side of the family because of the generations going back. I think ninety-seven generations, so she wanted a name from there. She went to ask my uncle and my uncle said, “Why you asking me so late?” She said, “Never mind.” So, they looked on my dad’s side and also my...so that’s the [last name] side, that’s my dad’s, that’s where that comes from but the [last name] is not the Hawaiian [last name], it’s the Chinese. It should be [last name] not...actually it would’ve been [last name].

B: Oh, they Hawaiian-fied it!

E: They Hawaiian-fied it, and so that’s how they said when they came off of the boat, which I think was my great, great grandfather from [last name], came [last name], so though I am about seventy-five percent Hawaiian, so are both my parents. My dad’s mom was pure Hawaiian. My dad, my grandfather, was half Hawaiian, half Chinese. And my mom’s side was the same. My grandfather was pure Hawaiian. My grandmother was half Hawaiian, half Chinese and a little

bit of French. But so, part of my identity of who I am, of course, came from my Chinese side. So we collect a lot and then from the Hawaiian side, which is we share a lot. And, so being raised, being raised Chinese would've been a favorite of my daddy and mommy, doing lū'au so we were always around and we could put on our own... we could make our own food and everything but we basically served all the lū'au line and things like that. So identity wise that was my Hawaiian side and my Chinese side was again the collection and going to eat Chinese food and celebrating Chinese New Year's and not totally being Chinese.

B: Sounds like you had a firm familial grounding in your heritage

E: And yet Chinese heritage side wasn't as strong as the Hawaiian side. And yet on the Hawaiian side, both parents were educated. So my mom graduated from McKinley, my dad from St. Louis.

B: What year did your dad graduate from St. Louis?

E: 20 – wait, no, no...45 maybe?

B: My grandfather, who's ninety-two years old now, graduated from St. Louis around that time. His name is Joseph Alves.

E: Hmmm, my dad would've been...

B: His brother is Henry Alves.

E: Huh...

B: Yea, probably around the same time...

E: Possibly, a few years, a few years difference. So, my daddy was one of the ones that were allowed to go to school. The others, my grandfather, put them to work, because they didn't look like they'd be promising in school. And my dad actually did well and I think of all his brothers and sisters, he was the one that was allowed to become educated of the boys. The others had to go to work. And so, yea, that's my Chinese Hawaiian side. My mom's side was more of how can we say, because they knew their genealogy, they knew their heritage and so, they carried a lot of the artifacts in their family – the kapa – the talk about their pohaku ku'i'ai – poi pounders – and how to use them as doorstops. And you know, some of the bowls that were used at meals, because when they had their meals, they had all their bowls, all their umeke, with the poi and whatever else, and when they were done, they took it home. So, my great-grandmother had a collection of bowls and things. So my Uncle was a keep of all those things... and so some of those have been passed down, passed down, passed down... that my tutu made.

B: That's wonderful.

E: So, there were some cultural practices and things at that time...

B: Yea, very strong...

E: I guess, I guess....

B: How did formal schooling affect your identity?

E: Formal schooling is interesting. I went to [public elementary school], which is on homestead land so it catered to all the homestead children. Basically, Native Hawaiian, maybe ninety-eight percent of the population at the school. So, they basically had Hawaiian studies programs and things, music, art, and so education and the public school in Waimanalo, for me, was fine. We're dressed well going to school. Had shoes, nice pants, nice shirt. When I arrived at school, I took off my shoes and ran barefoot the rest of the day. And then returning home, my mom would say, "Where's your new shoes?" and I would say, "Somebody stole it." "What!?, Those are your new shoes! Get to school and talk to the teacher." And the teacher and the teacher would say, "Oh, you mean the shoes right at the door?" "Uh huh..." "Oh, I thought you said..." So, being raised at school was a lot of fun, playing marbles and games. I remember books that said "See Jane run. Run, jane, run." So, we had some of those. So that was from K through second grade. Third grade, got invited to [private school] so mom came down, really excited. The teachers involved – "Does [first name] want to go?" So, I would of never thought of asking. So, she asked me and I was like, "I don't know, the friends..." She was like, "That's okay, your sister's up there..." I'm like, "Ahhh... The lunch is good..." "Oh, ok..." So, I think the lunch was my deciding factor.

B: And the lunch is still ono (good) today...

E: Ah, no, it was way better back then. That lunch was delicious, Spanish rice...we had some good meat loaf. Yea, so we had some great food. So, at [private school] what impressed me the most and I didn't realize until I was in college...College of Ed [ucation] that I looked back and noticed what [private school] did back then was take care of all of my needs. We were on scholarship. I think the Western system's called welfare, but they provided for us, like school supplies and I think even a set of uniform, all my books, paid for all my meals, all the field trips so the only thing that was left for me to do was learn. I didn't have any worries and that was great. I enjoyed school, loved school. Just the opportunities [private school] offered was tremendous, really appreciated going on a field trip to the neighbor islands. That's when the sixth grade would do their 6th grade trip.

B: They still do a huaka'i (trip) to Hawai'i island...

E: And so, loved it, middle school...I was in band in the elementary, joined orchestra, band, because that was required, learned the piano. Oh, then of course had Hawaiian studies.

B: Oh my gosh, wow...

E: ... I think because my schooling was at a public school on homestead land my relationship with all the others were common, as when I went to [private school], although we all different walks of life around the island they still instilled in us they still instilled in us our identity of Native Hawaiians – studied songs, music, dance, and giving us an opportunity to sing, to play. And, yet we never went into the lo‘i (taro patch), that was not a part of our learning.

B: Why do you think that is?

E: I kinda think because they were looking at our needs in the way of getting to college, going to get a job and that was not a marketable skill. So, back then, the thing was that after school we should be going to college, so we can do something with our life, become somebody, do something. And that was instilled all the way through, a sense of [private school] and appreciation to [founder of private school] that when we graduated that we would have the – not really responsibility, but the opportunity to give back. And the comment was – and I say there – because that was the whole feeling of everyone... - that we would give back to those that were less fortunate, who didn't have the opportunity of ... So I remember when we reached graduation, we knew we were going to go to college, to be someone to come back and ...the community, so here in Waimanlo, giving back. I think if that's the ...taught at the younger age. I think that's the foundation for me. And of course, going to church. And it was at a Hawaiian church, so we learned how to... the poi and then, how to do everything – lomi salmon, the poke, the 'uala, do the imu. Haupia was my grand aunt's special, so she did that. Imu was our specialty so my daddy was in charge of the imu every year.

B: So your spiritual life played a very important role in your upbringing?

E: When I was little we attended church. I often went to Sunday school and we went to Hawaiian church. Raised in Sunday school, youth group...I was basically groomed to be a leader within the church and eventually became the vice moderator, which is like the vice president of the church. So, various positions as chairperson so I'm not sure if it was my presence of [private school] or just because I had qualities. I'm not sure. But it was fun because I think my parents, we rather humble people. They looked at me when I was like fourth, fifth grade and they made my peers. And they asked, "What school do you go to?" and I said, "[Private school]," and they looked at me and it's like, "Not!" and I kinda questioned it, "What do you mean, not?" "Yea, you don't go to [private school]." "You know, whatever, you can believe it or not." And then when they found out I did, they're like, "Wow, you smart!" I'm like, "I don't know and I don't think so." Because even at [private school], I was put into a remedial class, not knowing what remedial was. Remedial was because my ability to speak and my ability to write wasn't up to par. My math skills were great. I had great math skills. I had to go to speech class. Raised local, Waimanalo...I think my speech class was because I stuttered. So I had to learn how not to stutter. Of course when I got excited, I stuttered a whole lot. So, stuttering and speaking appropriate standard English was the reason I was going to speech. ...say the ah sound...with the how to say the "t" and the "s" and the "s" and the "t" and "s". And of course, [private school]

groomed us so that we can time for announcements... From being in the church, and using what I learned at [private school] to improve the...made college easy.

B: And when you were in college, you studied...

E: I took liberal arts. I was thinking of getting into business but I wasn't sure. I wanted to have my own business. In fact, it was because I was...into the disc jockey so already being part of a mobile...back in the day. And so, I thought maybe I'll do business. So did that part-time while going to college, and of course went to work selling shoes, went to college and then had a variety of other jobs while going to college. Working at the district park. But getting into education wasn't my initial choice.

B: How did that happen? Especially, 'ōlelo Hawai'i

E: Well, it wasn't...in fact, it's my family speaks more Hawaiian than I do so I would be rebellious...I went to marry my wife, who of course... speaks fluent Hawaiian, pure Japanese, I was impressed by her and I thought, "Maybe it'll rub off", and it kind of did. But all my children went through the formal process of learning 'ōlelo Hawai'i. I'm going through another process learning it in that way.

B: Oh, wonderful.

E: Yea, I think I get to have the essence of the kūpuna rather than a formalized, Western format of Hawaiian language. And so, yep, that was my thing...getting into education, however, was, how can I say, was because it was the easiest degree. I had all my liberal arts and looked and said, "Ok, I got to declare a major, what do I want to do? Ahhh... I got almost everything education, maybe I should do that." All I needed was a few more credits in math and I could be a math teacher. I was already a math minor. And I couldn't go into high school and been a math teacher but I wanted to figure out what is it that they're teaching in middle and elementary school so I thought I'd circle to the beginning. And in the beginning, what is the foundational experiences in learning so when they get into high school then I know all the different...if I wanted to be a math teacher. It would of taken me another semester maybe because by then had calculus 205, 206. I just needed 231, 232 and the other methods courses... The other side of it, I realized years later when they asked so why did you get into education and I really looked at it and it was more the journey of my dad, who was always teaching...Kinda of a "let me show you how to do this. Come here, let me show you how to do this. Let me show you how to do this... Here's how you drive. Here's how you back up. Look at this. Look at that."

B: So, the thing I am passionate about and discovering more about it how to inquire with Hawaiian lens, or a Hawaiian worldview. How to go about and approach research from a cultural perspective and I'm just wondering some of your thoughts in terms of what you think Native research, or Indigenous research is.

E: I think the approach would be to, and just looking at all the others... all those who helped to...from the ...and many others who are basically non-Hawaiian who've set the foundation for what we have today as a Hawaiian language school. And that was to immerse themselves into the culture and be an observer and a participant and not bringing in your own perspectives or your own understanding, or your own inquiry but more of understanding through the eyes, through the walk, through the talk of the others. Of which, could otherwise be foreign, but I think in my studies, in my research, the discovery was really making the connections of learning through how learning takes place. And the commonalities of those criteria, or methods, that make the connection between one culture or another...like, "Oh, we do it this way, we do it this way." The same research within a cultural lens. And, with that, comes an appreciation I think. So, researching culture because there needs to be an understanding of protocol, of appreciation, of common practices but yet cultural perspectives of what to do and not to do. What to say, not to say, when to say, and how to say. And, of course, there's different places and times to do that. And, being married to my Japanese wife is definitely that cultural aspects of it. And then, being raised in Hawaiian side and understanding that cultural perspective and also noticing that, though today, they may call some things Hawaiian, recognizing that historical our kūpuna had passed. Where, historically 85-95% of the kūpuna had passed away. So there's only limited left to teach whatever there's left and also the `āina is still left to teach, and how they left in the `āina keys to unlocking that knowledge. So, learning how to listen not just to the person but to sea, to the sky, to the all ...around because everything gives a clue of its purpose, of its existence, of its interaction...everything has purpose and place and recognizing it from that cultural lens and how we, how we interacted with those different parts and how that part was used in ceremony, in family, in cooking, in whatever, then gives us an opportunity to then, understand...because you know Kawena Pukui was ostracized...the Hawaiian dictionary. He says, "How dare you put it down because that's not all of it." But if I understand it from another perspective, if she didn't put it down, then we wouldn't have any understand. And it still gives places to add in meanings, with that, with what little she had place into the dictionary, gave at least a foundation to study. And that's where, you know, they get into... there's layers of understanding that can be, clearly be seen through cultural lenses compared to Western lenses, basically linear. And seeing it, and knowing that our kūpuna spoke in cultural levels, the kaona levels, not only did it never go down, it went up...so, when word had a master...meanings...

B: It seems like you approach life in that way...

E: I do...

B: So, as you move forward in your education journey towards your doctorate, is that something you want to bring into your research, seeing those multiple levels, those connections?

E: I basically call them the dimensional levels because in the Western, there's linear, starting from a,b,c,d,e, and g and following a sequence of progress. But, we're finding in educational today, that it's more of a two-dimensional so you can apply it in different areas. And then you

get into the cultural lenses, which is more of the three-dimensional levels and yet in the three dimensional levels, are other dimensions and in Makawalu ...you know papakū makawalu, Auntie Kanahale had initiated, listen to her speak and just a little, when she said makawalu, then I was able to see it from my eyes. Then I was able to see it from a culture eyes and that’s what my research study did... into the culture perspective of makawalu and so part of my studies has been in Indigenous education. And I say Indigenous in the greater sense, rather than the Hawaiian sense. But I can only see it through my eyes, so the greater research would looking at other culture eyes and allowing them to speak to me in their language where all those connections can be made.

B: How are you envisioning presenting that?

E: So, I started in my master’s, which was called ICED T: Indigenous Curriculum Evaluation Development Tool.

B: Oh, okay not the drink...

E: Oh, but there is the drink. And that’s what makes it Hawaiian. That’s why ICED T was a nice, not an analogy but a...

B: ...like a metaphor.

E: ...a metaphor. Perfect metaphor. That helped to explain that concept, makawalu. And makawalu being eight eyes...if you look makawalu, eight eyes, the original intent was to look through the eyes of the learner. So you have the eyes of the teacher, the eyes of the learner, the eyes of the, how I can I say... because also the eyes of akua. Oh I know, so the teacher, the learner, but within that are also the past, the foundation, the present and the future and then with that you have the eyes of akua, who sees everything, all together as one. So that created one side of the concept of makawalu but the other concept was of how our kūpuna would use makawalu in this sense. That, if you spilt the quadrants... So, Nainoa Thompson did the...

B: Star compass...

E: Yes, and so he had the houses and if you count, there’s eight houses, so he used the eights. Ali‘i had eight, the... the Mauna ‘Ala has eight... the crown... the Hawaiian flag. So, eight was a significant number. And, in our ability to understand life, when they navigating they went to four directions – north, south, east, west and all the different houses and they navigated based on what they say. And that’s just the visual side but they also knew there was a side they couldn’t see. So, though they navigated here, they knew that this existed. So, there was the pō, the darkness and everything else. And pō wasn’t seen as evil, pō was just the depth, the darkness and then there’s lava light. So, what we say in the light is the only thing we could see but there’s a part that we can’t see and that’s where our kūpuna was able to speak, from what they saw to what they didn’t see. And so, in the depth of that, came the deeper understanding of life. So,

when they spoke they spoke on levels. And they could grab stuff from within the depth of darkness and bring it to the light and show you – here it is – and place it back.

B: Do you believe we still have that type of knowledge and skill set?

E: It is still present. Partly, because we unknowingly operate in it through the generations, through the gifting. So, my ‘ohana, ...we believe Holualoa is the navigator. So, everything that goes along with navigation is the way they lived their life. They planned their trip, know where they’re going, things encountered, how they handled it, and how they would respond. So that is passed on generational, whether or not we knew it. Speaking with this woman from Norway, her Norwegian, her... background, she hooked up with another canoe paddler and they created a relationship but the relationship was based on the maritime experiences and they connected because of what they related to, not knowing that they were connected in that sense. So, you talk about Indigenous connection as people who were seen as foreign. They’re not because that’s the ICED T part of it... in fact, I didn’t even explain to you what ICED T was...so, ICED T works on this premise that in every culture, there’s a tea and the common thing in tea is every tea has...

B: I don’t know...I don’t know...

E:...every tea has water.

B: ...oh water.

E: You’re thinking too deeply...

B: You are right, I am a deep thinker...Yes, you’re right, every tea has water, correct.

E: ...yes, every tea has water.

B: ...that’s how steep the tea, in water.

E: What makes the water unique is what you put into it. That’s what makes it the tea. Japanese have theirs, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Hawaiian, all the different cultures have their own tea. The commonality of them is water. That commonality is my foundation in education. That you look at every culture, they have values, they have `ōlelo...they have their practices, they have their artifacts. The artifacts are what carries on in the culture the knowledge that passed down generational. So within the family, we have artifacts. We have a bit of that knowledge passed on and yet families don’t recognize that. They don’t know that, partly because they’ve delved into understand. That’s part of the research in ICED T, Indigenous curriculum evaluation development tool, is the foundation. Not just in education in the way of Indigenous knowledge, but in it’s businesses. They all have the common so that tool, is versatile. It’s not limited to education. It’s not limited to a particular culture. That makes it a universal tool by which everybody learns. So when I started making the connection Western construct or standards, or methodologies for teaching, and lining them up with our Indigenous cultural practices, we found

that we had more intentional methodology and criteria than the Western side. And the Westerners were limited. What Westerners lacked in their teaching, which they started... more, was music, so they do a lot of singing. So, you look at all the educational classes and they're having songs to go along with learning and math concept, reading concept, and all of that. The other thing was about ...like today, what is your essential outcome? What is the big "aha" or whatever, values. What's your methods? In our cultural methodology, those come storytelling - music, hula, 'ōlelo no'eau.

Appendix D

'Ehā

B=Brandy Ann Sato

E=Co-Storyteller ('Ehā)

B=Okay, E, thanks for spending time with me this afternoon. Um, we're just going to talk story a little more about um Indigenous inquiry and how you've used Indigenous inquiry in your research to benefit your community and my ultimate goal is to encourage the academy to um include more opportunities for Native students to use Indigenous inquiry in their research. So I just have a few questions and my first question is what life experiences influenced you to develop your Native identity?

E=I can not recall standout experiences that but more along the lines of snippets and feelings experienced over time. For example, when I was little I remember my mom sharing stories of her background of growing up in Hanamaulu with her family and um how she would actually speak Hawaiian. Um, she was a fluent speaker but she lost that ability to speak fluently because over time and I'm thinking it was because of Western views and schooling and she stopped doing that. Um, anyway, she was always kind and gracious and loving and so she had a very different kind of way about her as opposed to say my father who was very Asian, Japanese Okinawan, and his style was very traditional, bushido type. Um, another personal, I'm gonna say basically people who influenced me was my mother-in-law. Um she grew up on Moloka'i and she shared lots and lots of stories of what it was like to grow up on Moloka'i. She shared a lot of her culture. Um, actually she shared more of what it was to be Hawaiian to her than my mother did. My mother was really quiet. My mother-in-law, um, was very proud I suppose not to say that my mother wasn't but my mother-in-law was very proud to share her dancing hula when she was young and what her kumu taught her about plants and so forth and um kahunas. I think that really influenced me in remembering a lot of stories that my aunty and my mom actually shared. Um my aunty. My mom was hanaied and my mother-in-law was also hanaied and my husband is also hanaied. And actually my son is hanaied as well to my parents. So, I don't know, I feel like it was always around us or around me, but um, it wasn't any particular experience that developed my identity as a Hawaiian.

B=So how did, um, formal schooling affect your Indigenous identity?

E=I wanted to clarify, that, I mean, when you say formal schooling experience do you mean even from elementary grades? Okay, so, referencing elementary school years, uh, I was influenced a lot by how the teachers looked at the Hawaiian students and part-Hawaiian students. If you were Hawaiian, I feel like they looked at you, as you were on the lower rung reading writing and math groups. In fact you were the one in the Special Ed class, in other words, to me you were the dummy if you were the Hawaiian. Because most of my teachers were of Hawaiian ancestry, I

can only recall 2 that weren't, um, maybe 3, um, but they were so polarized. Even they were super nice or super strict. There was no in-between. Um, and the Asian teachers actually, I remember one teacher in particular, she was the one telling me how to pronounce Hawaiian words and when I told her how to pronounce, like this is a direct example: the bird elepaio because we were talking about what street was close to where we lived and so I said elepaio. And she said, "No, that is incorrect. It is elepa'i'o." I know is incorrect, but here was a non-Native speaker and non-Native from Hawai'i telling me who is part-Hawaiian how to say my own words. I thought that was kind of wrong. Um, anyway, being of Hawaiian descent would always be the last thing I wrote on any kind of form at school that indicated ancestry. Um, I would write it like Japanese, Chinese, and then Hawaiian. Hawaiian was always last because in a way I felt embarrassed that I was part-Hawaiian and didn't really want to showcase that aspect of my being supposedly the Japanese and Chinese were the smarter ones. The ones that had more value.

B=So I just want to delve a little deeper into how the academy, the university, um influenced your Indigeneity. So to you, what is, um, doing Indigenous research and how did you learn how to do it.

E=So I took a whole bunch of different classes over the years from awesome UH professors, such as Juilie Ka'omea, Rich Johnson, even Doris Christopher. Um she's actually an ESL professor. Patricia Halagao, of course Donna Grace, my PETM Professors. I started a teacher program a long time ago because I was um involved in a group program called PETM that stands for Pre-Service Education, Pre-Services Educators of Teachers of Minorities or something like that. Um, sorry, I don't remember exactly. Anyway, they really set the bar for making me really think and examine who I am as a Hawaiian first and then how does that relate to the kids that I teach. And you know my background is, I've been teaching for 20 years now and it's been in 99% in schools that have Hawaiian students primarily. Um, I think, I'm sorry. What was the question?

B=So, um, what do you think, um, it is to do Indigenous research and how is that, um, how is that different, I guess, from Western-based research?

E=Kay, I wish I had that answer right here. I'm sure my professors would be sorely disappointed if I don't have it straight off the top of my head. I do know that, I mean. Kay, this is who I think of, like, Linda Tuhiwai Smith. That's what I think of for Indigenous education. Even, um, Paulo Freire because he was for critical, well, I want to call it, to me, Indigenous education period. You know, not that we learned differently, like so extremely. Like, I'm going to stop, that way, you don't have to.

B=Whatever you think it is.

E=Ladson-Billings. To me, Indigenous research is basically research done by Indigenous People on his or her own people. And the reason why this is done is because is to ensure that the

dominant culture in society does not continue to perpetuate incorrect, misleading, misconceptions of our People. It is done by Indigenous researchers or, um, their community, or students, or however it is.

B=So, um, let’s see, what are some of the challenges and complexities that you encountered, maybe in understanding this type of research, or applying this type of research, cause I know that you know, you are going to be, um, for your doctoral dissertation, you’re going to be working with your Native Hawaiian kids. So what are some of the challenges that you’re thinking about as you’re putting together your research design for working with that population?

E=Kay, I’m at the baby steps of my research. I’m only now beginning to formulate my research question, and, um, it all seems overwhelming to me. I know that I have the students in mind, but perhaps some of the hesitation may come from the parents as I try to get approval from the parents. I think kids are just open-minded and they are just willing to participate in anything that the teacher puts out there. Sure, they want to help the teacher, sure they want to help their own people but it is the parents who might think that I am, I might misuse the information that I gained from their children. I’m also worried that the school that I work at might not approve the kind of research that I want to do. Um, I’m really not sure of what other, I’m sure there are many, huge boulders that might be ahead of me at all. So.

B=Do you think, um, do you think because you are working with Native students how you would structure that work would be different compared to if you are working with other students who are not of that cultural background?

E=That’s a good question. I’ve been thinking about that for a long time because in my mind best practices should be easily applied to any child, any student, in any setting, but is that really true and if so, and if not, what does it. So, what are the subtle differences as I look at Hawaiian students in a Hawaiian setting and so forth.

E=So this is what I envisioned myself, before, I was a great student to typical learner, get knowledge in the traditional sense where the teacher is just speaking and I’m just taking down notes and able to regurgitate, basically, what they’ve told me, what they taught me, because, you know, I am an empty vessel, I had no thoughts whatsoever, supposedly, but I find myself struggling with that whole mindset because actually as I’ve worked with students and probably the shift in Kamehameha. Ever since I started working at Kamehameha I started learning more about my own culture. I mean to classes at university, um was able to start to learn about how to speak Hawaiian and from there it really started to affect my mindset and seeing things differently. And you know the whole idea of mo‘olelo and how important mo‘olelo was and is important for our culture. I mean, then it became more difficult for me to sit in a traditional, Western, UH class and I started to have struggles within me to actually to counter in my brain what the professor was saying because I really did not agree necessarily with what he or she was saying. Because, um, in Hawaiian ways you don’t do that, and you don’t say that, you don’t

believe that, and, um, anyway. I guess that's why it is important for me to still remain at Kamehameha so that I can work with my kids and instill what I have learned about my own self and my identity as a Hawaiian throughout the years so that way they don't feel like their less than as they engage in those type of settings. Because it is so easy to get sucked into a Western mindset and I think that is the only way.

B=Right, right.

E=I was thinking about how my research would and is different from a Western way of doing things and I was thinking of the values, actually. So the aloha I actually creating within my classroom and like I said I'm going to be interviewing, using my students work. Well, I hope to be using my students' work and interview them and possibly their parents, I am not sure to the extent at which it will encompass, extent. Um, but the aloha that we create, that I create, and we co-create in the classroom is I think very different from a Western way of schooling and then the kuleana that I hold to myself to perpetuate knowledge in a pono manner. I know that I speak of that within the classroom and with my kids. Not me, only being pono as a teacher in a way that I interact with them but they also being pono back with each other and with me and all that they, all people that they encounter as they go throughout the day. And we talk about mihi, of course, you know respect, being respectful of themselves too, not just of others but being respectful to themselves because I think they know they are suppose to be nice and kind and gracious and so forth, but on the other hand they don't realize they need to be kind and gracious to themselves as well instead of looking down on themselves that they really need to bring themselves up and they you know be proud of who they are. That too, I'm trying to think, um I always try to emphasize collaboration with one another so that together. And we always do talk story. Okay, now, this is something that always drives me crazy. On the one side, I love having kids pipe in and out as we have discussions. But then on the other hand, it drives me crazy because, um, we're trying to start a frame of thought and we have side-bar conversations but then that is how typical of what we do as Hawaiians too. If you go to a luau or just a party, and you know, everybody is just having side-bar conversations then they get back together again. And perhaps I need to allow myself the freedom to not just be that teacher who is supposed to have full control over their classroom at all times that freedom to co-create that space. But I do always wonder am I being Western here, or am I being Hawaiian there. In the end, isn't it true that we as Hawaiians adopt and use parts of other cultures within ourselves and it still is all Hawaiian, right? So, anyway, I am still having through that.

B=Well I like how you know, you mention that, you create a classroom of aloha with your kids, and that you have that pono relationship with them. So I could easily see that as you embark on your research that is so crucial. Um, and just adds to, um, you know how rich your research results are going to be. And then as you were talking about working with the kids and interviewing them, you know, sometimes the circuitous nature of the conversations can have all of these side-bars and take you in different directions but it is very cultural that sometimes the

road is not always paved in a straight line and it may take you somewhere totally different and you may discover something that you never discovered before.

E=So it’s all about mo‘olelo and how it unfolds. You know, it reminds me a lot of ‘ōlelo no‘eau too I mean, really, if you think about it. This is one more thing I always tell the kids. At the beginning of the year, I tell the kids a‘o, which I love because it is all about teaching, you know, and learning. So, I tell them, I tell the kids at the beginning of the year that they will learn from me as much as I will learn from them so I feel like they kind of get it as we go throughout the year and so, that too, reminds me of living that ‘ōlelo no‘eau.

B=So, I just want to conclude our conversation by talking about, um you know the “to be” state, the vision, and um, how the academy can foster an environment where researchers like us can truly live our values and be comfortable. So, how could the academy, I mean, or the university, enhance its teaching of Indigenous research within the curriculum?

E=Kay, so I finally remembered that program that I was in when I first started back in 1992 in the university. It was called Pre-Service in Education for Teachers of Minorities and it was awesome and it really set me on the road to understanding Indigenous ways of knowing. See, because I was so used to just having just a Western framework that, I want to say, I was. What do you call it when your brain is, you’re brainwashed. So brainwashed that I thought that was the only way to go. Um, so I think actually the university could continue to promote cohorts like that. Specifically geared towards understanding how best to work with Indigenous populations and encouraging Indigenous Peoples to actually be in those programs. I think that would be great, um, and you know professors like you know like Patricia Halagao, and Julie Kaomea. You know, they are so forward thinking in many ways, and promoting Indigenous knowledge, and, um, creating a space for us to fine with who we are and really continue to explore, um our identities.

B=And what do you think the future of Indigenous research is in the academy and in Native communities will be?

E=So I was thinking that at the university level, I’m not sure if it will affect much change, but I feel like the school I am working at there is more potential for that change to occur because it’s the way in which we are raising our kids, um, to know and to realize who they are as Hawaiian people and they are the ones when they grow up they already have that mindset so it won’t be any stretch out their imagination so things should be a certain way, that, are. Actually, I hate to use the word empower but, just to sustain the language, the culture, the heritage of Hawaiian people. It will be just because it is. It is not something that has to be fabricated in any way or to be fought. It will be, that’s, that is the future. That the kids will be there.

B=So, just to wrap up, how do you continue to strengthen and deepen your identity and those that you interact with in your community?

E=That's an easy one. I have many, many friends who are so smart and they always teach me and actually of course like the kids and you know going on huaka'i. And I work at an awesome school. They provide continuous cultural development. Um, cultural classes. At the university there is Hawaiian language. The school is so supportive of who I am as a Hawaiian educator. That's a no brainer. I'll continue to learn because of Kamehameha. So much to be thankful for. And people like Brandy who constantly has conversations with me and, yeah, commiserate too, but that's all good cause in the end we are better people for it.

B=Well, thanks for your time this afternoon. I really appreciate it and it's always nice seeing you, and, um, thank you so much.

Appendix E

Hui

B=Brandy Ann Sato

EKA=Co-Storyteller (‘Ekahi)

ELU=Co-Storyteller (‘Elua)

EKO=Co-Storyteller (‘Ekolu)

EKO=It sounds like me talking.

B=Oh really. So what aspects of story really resonated with you?

EKO=I think the very first statement I highlighted was, “to me you’re a dummy...” Always feeling like you’re less than or your point of view doesn’t count and how um school seems to perpetuate that it’s because of your cultural background you automatically start behind the starting line.

B=And what’s interesting is that she taught at that school as an adult.

EKO= And it looks like she is continually worrying that if she does try to use Indigenous lines of inquiry it is still won’t count. That she’s worried that the school where I work might not approve of the kind of research I want to do so it’s constantly trying to justify herself and ourselves um as having legitimate ways of thinking.

B=Yeah, it’s interesting because um we do work for a Hawaiian serving institution um for Native Hawaiian kids and so I just went to a meeting yesterday when we were talking about um performance tasks or assessments for our kids and what type of evaluative criteria and um there was a disconnect for me just personally in regards to how we go ahead and we evaluate through these Western lens. Really rich artifacts and experiences that are very culturally imbued and so I just noticed and I told one of the ladies who organized the event, I said, “You know, if I were to look at this criteria, this criteria could be used in any school anywhere across the nation. So what really makes this culturally relevant to our kids?” So I can understand her struggle. What do you think?

ELU=Um, just from what I read, I think this individual is kind of struggling with his identity or her identity. Um, even though the individual knew the person was, what was he again, Tahitian.

B=Oh, Tahitian. She’s Tahitian.

ELU=Tahitian, yeah. He considers himself a Tahitian but then he’s always um, one of the things was, in that very first part he kind of says, “I felt I don’t have a place here.” And then looking at the Indigenous knowledge, and that main one is having that sense of place. So I think with this

one he pretty much tried to find. He knew who he is but trying to find his sense of place in that part of society or in that part of the country, land. And its been a challenge for him to kind of sort out what, who, who is she really is. And also he stated again and I can uh. Okay, "I was in Hawai'i, right, was that it's always been sort of a challenge for me. I've always been struggling with my identity." And then he goes into when he took a class in the graduate school, the multi-cultural class, where he learned a lot of stuff about um ... coming to the island and that was. Pretty much at this point his identity, trying to find that cultural identity of who you are as individual but yet you kind of know in the back of your head or somewhere in there you're supposed to be this Indigenous person. But yet sometimes I think he was talking about his wife. Right?

B=Oh, right, right, right.

ELU=She was kind of told, because she didn't do a certain cultural practice or certain tradition or speak a similar way or she didn't look um didn't have that attributes physically that she was told that she was not Hawaiian enough. So I think there is a lot of cultural identity kind of playing out what this individual and where um and it's also. You know some of the things that are playing in its like blood quantum, knowledge of culture, practice of those cultural traditions, and yeah. So this person is really, really, struggling I think kind of sort of trying to piece all that cultural identity together to really feel comfortable with who he is. And then in even writing his proposal, when he started writing he kind of mentioned that it was starting to sound like very Western thought and he wanted to know if he could write it in his language? Was it? Yeah, something like that. So its more of a cultural identity struggle, finding who you are and your sense of place.

B=Well, you know it is interesting you bring that up because I'm wondering if um in order to be an Indigenous researcher or in order to um engage in Indigenous research you have to have that strong cultural identity? And maybe if you don't have that strong cultural identity it is a struggle in terms of knowing the culture, knowing the language or the practices or protocols. So what happens when you do have Indigenous researchers, especially here in Hawai'i, many of us are of mixed backgrounds and had different cultural influences trying to utilize these methodologies and methods?

EKO=I saw a little bit of the same thing here when she says that um when she first started working at... she started to learn more about her own culture and how much and that type of contrasted to the Western ways that she is learning in school... and how she has to practice ...awkward for her. Um... Because she doesn't know a lot about her own culture and she's trying to navigate Western culture...

B=Yeah, and so when I talked to both [co-storytellers]... one thing I noticed, um [one co-storyteller] is almost done with her coursework so she's in the stage of formulating her research design and [another] had just finished um about a year ago I believe and she had concluded her

process. And both women it seems that their research is evolutionary and they're kind of searching perhaps for how to uh best work with those who are assisting in their research.

EKO=One of the things she said that kind of struck me is um she said she felt brainwashed. And so it is really a painful personal struggle to try to um to use a Western framework with an Indigenous mind. And she was talking a lot about how to um give herself the freedom to have control over her classroom and her research, her research lines of inquiry. And its just its really hard and I think that might be very similar to the identity struggles is figuring out who you are and how do you assert yourself in your research so that it has a personal meaning to you and that it is still um you're still motivated by it. And if its so disconnected from what you know to be true, then it's really hard to be connected to your research.

B=I think that's a good point and it seems as if perhaps all of us and maybe those who have contributed to our online discussions maybe feel that way. Maybe they feel as if it is so hard to um communicate in a way that is different than how you think and who you are as a person.

EKO=One of the comments she said is, "I'm sure my professors would be sorely disappointed if I don't have the answer straight off the top of my head." And so that clash of how you think and the pace in which you think versus what's required of you in order to get the work done is pretty striking.

B=What do you think in terms of the little of what you've heard and then kind of linking it to some of the conversations we've been having over several months.

EKA=Can you hear me okay, Brandy?

B=Yes I can, thank you.

EKA=Is the microphone working okay?

B=Yes.

EKA=Well, my thought is we're working from two different assumptions. You know, we, the Indigenous People, work under the assumption that there is nothing more important than our own way of looking at the world. And Native processes, Native thought processes, stuff and for me its more important than the haole (foreign) stuff, the ... stuff. To me it's not as important than Native stuff. Whereas the people in power they proceed from the assumption that their way is the best way. Even if they don't say it, that's how they live. They live in this arrogant, superior place. So what I see as people... to get the piece of paper from those people uh, that's the problem. They can not understand because they do not live as we live. They do not think as we think. And so the frustration that comes on both sides is from not accepting that we are who we are and we're just as good as they. And they're not as accepting you know the same thing. So these are assumptions that are creating problems. The assumption that we can all be one big happy family cause I don't believe it is possible. Did that make any sense?

B=No, that definitely does. So, um, and I think [one co-storyteller] talks about this in terms of what she had written about. She started off using qualitative inquiry and case studies and then when she started talking to Native women going through the tenure process she realized that the original design of her research wasn't working. And so she decided to use storytelling, mo'olelo in Hawaiian, and ha'ilona, use of artifacts, in order to really reflect upon who we are as a person and your personal life journey and she said the research just kind of flowed from her but she still had to do this hybrid method and methodology in her final doctoral dissertation. So she said she was really against that but it was something she felt she needed to do to get that piece of paper and to satisfy the powers that be.

EKA=Well I understand where [another online member of the AIRA support group] is, because she knows in her school she has to jump through their hoops because they are never going to assist her and support her whereas other people might get lucky and have open-minded, and open-minded committee or university that will allow it but its like its just the luck of the draw whether we get people who are willing to drop their assumptions, superiority. We can't force them to drop their assumptions. I don't think. We have no power. They give out the pieces of paper.

B=So what are some ways that you think and I know this has been the crux of my dissertation is how can we change at least the graduate curriculum or maybe the graduate environment in order to um in order to be successful? And just like ... not having to beat ourselves up and feel horrible going through this process. No, but I wanted to ask you what do you think would be the solution to this universal problem that we are all facing in regards to changes that can be made within the graduate curriculum or experience?

EKO=Can you hold on for one second. I think we are getting feedback and I can't hear the questions very well.

EKA=How about now?

EKO=Yeah, I can still hear myself talk through the computer.

B=So I'm wondering, um, how we could go ahead and change the graduate curriculum or the environment to best support Native students like ourselves knowing that we are battling against these assumptions?

ELU=One of the things that is going to be a problem, is going to continue to be a problem is the way the design... the techniques being used... the biggest struggle is... my advisor and thinking how am I going to put it into words. So to her it seems foreign to her cause she doesn't know. And then I think trying to use the Indigenous research knowledge in my dissertation that I wanted to. And the other day I just kind of pitched it to her about the conference I went to and stuff like that and thinking that she'll be supportive and they'll be some kind of pride to the institution that I went to this conference to present, but I walked out of there thinking like you

know when a school boy goes to the principal's office and gets scolded and say that, "You don't behave this way if you are going to graduate from our institute. You have to apply certain methods and certain thinking and that is why, you know, we try to teach you," she said. But then I was like as she was talking I kind of rudely interrupt her according to her standards. Um, I said, "Well, if you guys really want is to think white, why do you guys teach multi-culture class and why do you guys teach sociology in education and why do you guys use these books that are about Indians and Native People and different Indigenous People around the world in your class? If you guys just want us to think a certain way, then why can't you guys use your own people, tell stories about your own people, and let us know how it is to be white, extra white." Um, but at that point, you know, the conversation just kind of went right away differently. Ah, she became intransigent and I became more of an attacker. Um, but, I think I just need to remove myself here and come back at another time. Another time when your heart is feeling well. So I think as a Native person we will continue to struggle with this uh Western perspective. I think. And I think maybe even in some tribal colleges they really push that Western perspective, Western thinking, especially in on my reservation. The community college, they started off as more of a lot of cultural elements to the school. They still do the language and they even teach some kind of traditional blessing there, in one of their Navajo studies, and, but yet there is still that Western side of it they have to almost answer to get funding. Even though as a tribal college you suppose to have your own college, you know, on sovereign nation and that kind of thing that I'm starting to learn that some sovereign really doesn't exist with the Native People because you have the bigger people to answer to. So I think the same way is for me for education. Um, that was my struggle.

B=I think you bring up so many good points and they're just so interconnected in regards to if you have to rely on outside funding from another colonizer, another nation, you're not necessarily truly sovereign and you make compromises within your own educational program in order to just survive. And that's just, that's just so heartbreaking in terms of, in terms of how we have to denigrate ourselves to a certain level in order to just survive. And um, maybe this just proves... point correct in regards to the frustration that people feel in order to get that piece of paper and maybe the worldviews are just so different that its just nearly impossible to have a reasonable conversation to accept where another person is coming from and maybe that's due to lack of respect, or lack of understanding, or lack of awareness, so... I don't know, what do you two think?

EKO=Um I think that.

EKA=May I go first? Go ahead... I can wait.

EKO=We have, competing mutes. Um I think that, um... point about the power struggle it's always us going to them and never them coming to us and never acknowledging that um ... to making their assumptions um just as we do. And that just comes with privilege of power and you don't really have to do anything. It's other people coming to ... When I finally get that

sheet of paper and I feel I suddenly have authority I'm sort of disillusioned and decided about what sort of power that is going to give me because the overarching structure is White and Western. So I jump through their hoop in order to write the dissertation ... I use their methodology and their methods that they told me. I got their piece of paper and then what? I'm still stuck in the same situation. Where we don't have funding, we don't have critical mass, we don't have um widespread discrimination techniques for ... hear about us and I'm trying to think of another paradigm that was... I don't consider Indigenous research as a new paradigm, but if you think about how um qualitative research started to grow it didn't take this long to be considered acceptable. So, um, I'm not entirely sure of, even, even if I say I have some sort of expertise in Indigenous research techniques... um I still hear from the academy that, well, okay that is fine but you still have to work um you still have to work with Western techniques. You still have to be proficient in Western techniques, because um that's just part of the sidelines, it's a hobby, it's cute. And, um, but it's nothing that is going to have some sort of staying power or going to uh get you anywhere in academia. So I have this similar personal struggle that... was articulating. This, this battle with the power holders and what do you do and how do you get over those mountains.

ELU=Start our own school?

B=But you know, it's interesting that because I would have thought that at tribal colleges there would be more autonomy. I mean, of any of any place that would welcome Indigenous research it would be at a tribal college on sovereign land. And I guess I'm understanding from you the powers that be still reach into and control that educational program because they control the almighty dollar. That is so sad to me.

ELU=Yeah, I mean, I think that's what you would think it'll be a very safe haven or a safe place for Indigenous research knowledge to exist or any kind of Indigenous knowledge to exist. I think to a certain point to push the line, you know, as far as they can go. They do it, and then that's that you know the power that be kind of takes over. I was just thinking in most cases people in control of that tribe even though they're suppose to be locally, um have that Western training so they kind of start to think and run and operate things that way. That's what I'm thinking. Um, it'll be interesting to see how especially within the next year or two years how the Navajo nation is going to turn out because if this younger person wins who is a military officer, was, he's got a law degree, and he was a state representative and I'll see how he runs the tribe compared to how it was run previous years because he's primarily Western trained so was the majority of his education. It'll be interesting how he tries to run this big nation that has predominantly still Indigenous, you know, knowledge, practice, language are being practice. So.

B=It just goes to show how um how education is the master colonizer. Right? I think I was reading, I don't know if it was um it was in Fannon um but you know first, the first steps of colonization was through guns and swords and the next step of colonization was through chalk and the chalkboard.

ELU=Wow.

B=What do you think?

EKA=My thought is this: we are, um, we are, I believe, we are revolutionaries. Everyone who was there in Polson except those people from Washington D.C. Everyone else is part of a revolution. And it's going to be an organic process. I don't think we yet know how it will happen and what is going to work, but, but I think it's going to be the rest of my life trying to move our revolution forward. But I have no answers yet. I just know what I am committed to. Not very helpful, huh?

B=No, that's wonderfully helpful. It's a different way of, you know, looking at the overarching cause is it's definitely a revolution and revolutions are supposed to be messy, and they're supposed to be challenging, and they're supposed to be a struggle and that's what makes it so empowering um because it just strengthens us over time.

ELU=So, I have a question. Um, once everybody has their PhD, are we gonna, you know, continue to meet like this and then try. You know I think, one of the things I was thinking was, this is my alternative thinking though, is that to go ahead and jump through the hoops, do what I need to do, and then once I'm done then really dive into Indigenous knowledge research because at that point I should be in control of my thinking. Right? And I should have, I should be able to have enough support and at that time, maybe by that time Indigenous research knowledge would still be moving forward. It's going to move forward. I think right now it's just this hard push to move... and maybe we can all, you know, what... was saying revolutionize the research methods and then write freely. I mean, its, I can, at a certain point I can really relate to some of your... interviews. Um, and how when you write a proposal or the research methods section even the literature review, um, how certain committee members or professors respond on what you are trying to say, because to them everything has to be cited, pretty much. And then when you mention some kind of oral tradition or traditional ceremony or certain things like the only people who wrote about those kinds of ceremonies or practice are pretty much missionaries. And you don't want to cite those people because it's our way of life and how we did things daily that they're writing about it. One of the interesting... there's this book called Native American Origin Tradition and uh one of the chapters I am reading is about a collaboration of social linguistic research among ... where these two researchers teamed up. One's a Native and one's not a Native. But the Native woman is from the ... tribe and one of the things she wrote is that, "This is the first time I've ever met individuals whose job was to study and describe the life of ... my tribe. They were writing the thoughts of us for mostly non-... people. They were anthropologists and one was even a missionary. So, I mean, there's people out there who made a living talking about our Indigenous knowledge, but yet we as Indigenous Peoples can't even use it in our research. I mean, isn't that kind of, not weird, but kind of how the power plays. Yeah, so it's just, I don't know. I guess that was just my alternative side of thinking.

B=Well you bring up a great point because even in Hawai'i, the American missionaries, um, you know had come. And you know worked in creating a written language from an oral language and so those types of journals and translations were imbued with their worldview so you know those are the written sources that we have to go to or some of them are the only sources of a certain period of time. So its challenging um because you know that you are citing something that is not from an Indigenous perspective but you feel you have to because Western research privileges things that are in writing and it really makes me question, well, you know what is Indigenous research then? Have we just been so colonized over centuries that it may not necessarily be as "pure" as we want it to be. I don't know.

EKO= Well one of the things I struggle with is that... research is inferior to myself. And that you are always researching towards something else besides you. And because their goal is to describe something exterior or something universal. And I have a hard time with that. I think it goes back to um whether or not the research is pure or if its because we are always constantly going back to this reference point and somebody has to have written it down for us to be able to cite for it to be true. It is not true until someone else wrote it down and I feel I am also participating in that game. What I do isn't true until I write it down and then we can move forward. But um it's really hard. It's really hard um to to work within a system that doesn't um that always sees research as exterior. A moving away from the self. And and up into the heavens or something or some broader understanding. I don't know what to do with that. And um I hope that when we all get our piece of paper... then we can start the revolution. Get your paper first and then start the revolution. But ah gosh I just don't know what that looks like? I can't even imagine what it looks like.

B=I would definitely love to just continue talking to all of you, you know, into next year 2015 and I'd love to know when all of you graduate and just send you my best wishes and my love and my aloha and you know ah hopefully by then the shackles will be off and we'll be more free to really express our points of view and maybe it is a matter of just infiltrating the academy and just getting to positions of power and influence and kind of making a safer place or paving a better road for those who come after us.

EKO=Well, I hope that everyone even if they get their PhDs will not feel they need to stop talking and stop participating um just f.y.i... is defending on Monday at ... their time. Yes. Yes. So.

ELU=Nice.

EKO=So we can't lose each other. Stick with it, group. There's a lot to learn from the people that actually make it through. Get that paper.

ELU=Wow.

B=Well, I know its about 8:00 am my time and I just want to mahalo you for your time today. Um, do you have any last words of wisdom for all of us?

EKA=Brothers and Sisters, I truly believe the revolution has already started. It's it's up to us to see where it goes, but we are already in it I think. We are in it. So that makes me feel good. That makes me feel we can be true to ourselves and our hearts even if we don't know how to relate to the people who have the money and the guns. Bob Marley said this, it starts when we free our minds. As we quoted in our paper.

B=Oh, that's a beautiful way to end. It kind of really takes us back to the beginning when we first started writing that proposal to present at the conference recently. Well, um, I think I have a lot of transcribing to do and a lot of writing and reflecting to do but just mahalo all of you for your time and hopefully... will pull us together for our next adventure.

EKA=I want to say one more thing, Brandy, I love all of you guys. I really love all of you guys. You're great.

B=Me too.

ELU=I'll play a song for you guys, hang on.

Appendix F

‘Elima

B=Brandy Ann Sato

E=Co-Storyteller (‘Elima)

B=How was your identity shaped throughout your lifetime?

E=Okay, so, I’m Hawaiian. I just consider myself Hawaiian. However growing up I know I remember asking, “What am I, mom?” And she would say, “Oh, you’re Japanese, Hawaiian, Chinese, and Spanish.” So just that listing. Right? Because my mom is Japanese so always grew up saying, “I am Japanese, Hawaiian, Chinese, and Spanish.” With Japanese given primacy. But it wasn’t until I got to Kamehameha where in the seventh grade where you began, you know, being told, you know, being taught Hawaiian language, Hawaiian culture. Then as I went through school, um, a funny story is, um, my sophomore year, we switched from uh, we switched from a program from a registration by card to a computerized system. So I registered, I actually wanted French, continue French from seventh grade, eighth grade, ninth grade I had French and we had um mandatory U.S. government, U.S. history, and something else. But something happened in the computer system and I was given Hawaiian instead of French. I was given Hawaiian history instead of U.S. history. I was given Hawaiian culture instead of American government or something like that. And that was sort of like fate, f-a-t-e for me. It was like, “Oh, I didn’t go back... Well, okay, I guess. This sounds okay.” So I started it, and that was my path to really realizing the fullness and depth of Hawaiian culture. I went to school over here. I didn’t want to go away. I wanted to go here to continue my language studies, you know. Although I, I eventually got my degree in teaching, you know. And it is still a process, you know. Also when I graduated from high school, I learned I either went to look for a halau or a canoe club. But only I couldn’t find a canoe club so I found a halau. And that started that path. You know so... you identify yourself as a Hawaiian. I believe everybody should, all Hawaiians, you should be able to speak your language. You should be involved. Cause our culture is not a living culture that we can not most of us, the majority of us can not live it every day. In other words we can’t go out into the lo‘i and, you know, grow our own food. Or we can’t, you know, we are far removed from the culture, but we can still participate in certain things. Like for me it’s hula. For me, it’s teaching, chant and things like that. So I would say that is pretty much is what has shaped and is shaping me. You know, by participating in a lot of this. And along the way, you know, you get these gestalt experiences, yeah? Like, “aw, this is what that means. This is what that chant means.” And I think that is the nice part about it. You’re always receiving new knowledge and new information.

B=How long did it take you to become a fluent speaker? Because I get the impression it was not the language spoken in your home.

E=It was not. So I had three years in high school. And then in university I took a placement test and I skipped first year. And then, second, third, and fourth year. So that was six years of formal education. And when I got out, I spent about four years teaching elementary school. And I didn't really use it, except for being involved in a Hawaiian language association Lāhui 'Ōlelo Hawai'i. That's pretty much it. But during that period of time we were going to the legislature, trying to make Hawaiian our official language. Then later on, um, other kinds of things. You know, changing our, uh, changing our laws so that, uh, we incorporate, uh, Hawaiian... and the spelling of Hawaiian. More advocacy kind of work. It wasn't really until I became a resource teacher and I met with kūpuna that I started using that. Right? But it wasn't really... The fluency part, you know, being able to just keep on speaking, speaking, was when I became a teacher in the Hawaiian language immersion program. Where you had to speak it everyday.

B=Everyday

E=Everyday. You know, you had to think, live, and breath in Hawaiian.

B=Wow.

E=And then, I also was working with Manaleo, most of their more elderly, Native speakers. Then, you know, that helped too. Get really the natural language, yeah? Yeah, because how they speak is not how we learn, really. We learn grammar, right?

B=Right, how is it different? Other than, maybe the grammar, syntax?

E=It's words that they use, and you know, it's not really... It's more idiomatic. Right? So, most of language, ninety percent of language is idioms, like in English. That's what makes English difficult because it is idiomatic. It's not really grammatical. Right? Nobody speaks grammatical English.

B=That is true.

E=So it's the same for Hawaiian. The bulk of it is idiomatic.

B=Why did they not teach it that way?

E=Um, I guess it's hard to teach. You know, you have to be really living with somebody to, to be able to speak like that. And you come across this when you are trying to teach. You know, like, um, pick a flower. In English you can say, "pick a flower." "Pick an apple." "Pick your nose." But those in Hawaiian are all different words. Right? They are different words. You can't use the same word pick for "pick your nose" or "pick an apple" or "pick a flower." You have to know the words. Only way you are going to learn it is by observing and listening to the older people. You, you, I mean, you don't have enough time to learn it in school. So that is the beauty of living and being with the older people. Our kūpuna, is that they use the words, you know. Like I, I just taught this bunch of guys in Wai'anae how to clean fish. So I remember

what the kūpuna said. You know, you stick your thumb in the 'ōkole and you just... rip like that, rip like that... But you are not going to learn that word unless you actually do it with them. Right? You are not going to know what this is... then you take out the pihapiha unless you see, you say. Then you not going to know what the word for rinse is which is kaka. It's not ... wai or whatever it's kaka. You are not going to know that unless you are going to kaka the fish. And then, you know, you are going to kāpī. You're going to sprinkle. So those words, concepts, you're not going to know unless you hear it. And then that's just vocabulary. So there are different levels.

B=So it seems as if, you know, cause I remember when I was taking 'ōlelo Hawai'i classes, even though I had a great teacher who stressed conversation, um you learn those types of things. Oh, what's her name. Shucks.

E=Where?

B=Uh, I was at Chaminade University. She was an adjunct. I think she's at the Archives now. And she writes, she writes articles.

E=Oh, yeah. Carol Silva

B=Yes! Carol Silva

E=Yeah.

B=Yeah, she's such a wonderful wahine, but... And it was all conversational. It was very much, we are just going to talk the whole entire time. But that's not how language instruction is. Cause you're combining the actions with the vocabulary. Right?

E=Right, right.

B=Which is different from learning it from a book. But, um, how did your formal schooling affect your Indigeneity?

E=That's interesting. I don't think it had as much impact as um so in Hawaiian formal schooling we have um like in hula we have a process of um going through different phases... and you graduate in a in a ritual called 'ūniki. Well, the ritual is actually 'ailolo. Then you graduated and that is called an 'ūniki. So there is a certain process. And at the end of that I received a kīhei and I can now become a kumu hula and teach. To me, that was, that's more important to me than when I got my Master's or my Ph.D.

B=Wow.

E=Yeah. The PhD is helpful in the academia. That's why it is helpful. And maybe, and, it's not so helpful in my job. I mean I don't get paid more. You know what I am saying. I don't really. I'm not really dependent. I don't have to teach classes or produce articles. Although I have.

B=Right.

E=You know, I don't have to. But, my title as kumu hula I have a kuleana to pass it on. Right? Whereas I don't have a kuleana as a Ph.D. to pass it on unless I am in a Western institution. I don't have that kuleana. So in terms of Indigeneity, the Hawaiian form of schooling you come with a set of accountabilities or responsibilities which is to perpetuate and pass on your culture. So in that way, that has more of an impact on me as I feel like I am returning back to my people. You know, I am continuing the cycle of knowledge. So I would say that Western formal education, um, it's impact has been, well you know, I love learning anyway. You know, so, but in the ways of learning how to learn in the Western way which is important because those methods can help you. You know, discover things. But for the most, and ah yeah, I could say that if I didn't learn Hawaiian through school I wouldn't be able to access a lot of what I needed you know, through, you know but these are through my Hawaiian teachers, right, I wouldn't be able to access a lot of things, so.

B=So I just want to ah, you know, transition into some of the research that you have done and some of the articles that you have written. And how did you go about, ah, researching you know through your cultural perspectives. And what are your thoughts in terms of what Indigenous researcher, research done by Hawaiians for Hawaiians really is?

E=So my research was mainly... and I only wanted to do on Hawaiian string figures. Because it was so obscure. It was something that was on the danger of being lost and I felt a responsibility to find ways to perpetuate it, to teach it. I wanted to write a book for children. And I am just too busy. But I really need to do that as part of my kuleana or responsibility. And, um, so that's why I just thought of that. And I asked myself, "Oh, so what am I going to do with this? So how do I, how did I learn this?" So I set about, you know, how did I learn this and sort of the same questions. You know, "who were my teachers?" And then, through that I had questions like, "You know, for me as an Indigenous person, there are more ways to learn than just through books." So I did an article on spiritual learning. So I had to read a lot of these, you know, what other people were saying because I was like, "Wow, how am I going to talk about this?" Cause I know that I feel in my heart and I've learned that I've learned learn that you can learn through the spirit through the 'aumākau through whatever, but how am I going to present this in an academic way? So I read other people, ah, you know, some Canadians, some Australians, some Maori, and then, um, like Linda Smith, for example, you know, what they are saying about spiritual learning. That means through dreams, through DNA, etc... I know, cool, we're kind of all saying the same thing. Yeah? That we can learn from dreams cause we have this idea we can... learn from dreams. We can learn and so a lot of the string figures that I learned, there is not a lot, I'll say only three. But I've learned through dreams. In other words, I couldn't figure it out because of a lot of it. I only learned four, three or four from a kupuna. Yeah? And she said, "Go out and." This is when I was like a sophomore from high school. She said, "go find this book and, uh, String Figures of Hawai'i by Lyle Dickie. Go research that book if you want to learn and then you learn some more." So I learned maybe one or two more. The writing was

so technical, I couldn't. And then it was only, like, maybe, wait, 2008 or 9 a Maori person asked me if I knew people who knew this in Hawai'i. So I said, "okay." I referred him and everybody said, "no, they didn't." And then I went, "What!" So I said, "Okay, I, I know about four and then I'll show you." And then I was motivated okay no so maybe I can, maybe I am smarter now so I can figure out what Dickie is saying and you know, he's just like, "you know, move the first finger, the proximal to the distal." You know, he's very technical, very technical language. And some moves I just couldn't figure out. You know, that I wanted to do. So like one, I know I kind a little bit straying from your topic. But one figure was called Lonomuku, the lady in the moon. So there's a story that a woman is mistreated by her husband and she flees to the sun, she gets burned. She flees to the stars, and they laugh at her. And finally she gives up and goes to the, calls on the rainbow that takes her to the moon. And the husband wants her back, so she grabs the lei and it comes off. So she is laying, but she eventually makes it to the moon with some of her children and that she turns into ipu gourds. And so those are round gourds you still see in the moon today. And her limping causes the phases of the moon.

B=Oh my God.

E=But there is a string figure for that. So I couldn't figure it out, by the, you know, just asymmetrical. Just the directions are so confusing. So I remember, and this is Indigenous way, I remember an elder saying, elders saying, "If you want to compose a song, pray." That is true for anything Hawaiian. You want to learn how to do something, pule. I did a little pule called e ho mai ka 'ike. Um, that was taught to me a long time ago and a lot of people know it. E ho mai ka 'ike mai luna mai e na mea huna no'eau o ka hula e, e ho mai, e ho mai, e ho mai. So I did that. I went to sleep. Sorry, just backtracking. So one of our traditions ... is you can not do it at night. But so I would get home from work or maybe I was still in school at that time too, also work, school. I would get home and I would rush to my book. And the only preparation to meet this Maori guy for his, he wanted to do a little documentary so I would go through it, and so, but at sunset I'd have to put it away. Just to respect that tradition. And then I'd go to sleep, do my prayer. And then I had this dream one night about a lady with you know a very shiny kīhei walking over roots of a tree. That was my dream. You know, very surreal. Just walking over roots of a tree. You know, big roots over and above the ground. That was my dream. Right? The next day, when I did this I went back to this lady in the moon one and I was like, just move my fingers like...

B=You figured it out.

E=Yeah, well, the initial moves you know, it is always the initial moves. But, I, I knew how to do the initial moves then after that the other directions were easy and boom. Oh my God, I was, I was, you know later on, at that time I was I didn't see the connection, but, oh my my God, that was, that dream was giving me information for my fingers to move. You know. And so as a Hawaiian, or an Indigenous person, you got to recognize, you got to be able to recognize that. There's no science. You know, I mean I guess, you could, you know, but what is that called?

The subconscious, right? The subconscious teaches. I guess you could find a way to just, um, explain it to Western Science.

B=Right, neuroscience.

E=Yeah, neuroscience. To me it doesn't matter.

B=Right.

E=Right. My connection was that was a dream from my kūpuna. And I've actually had different kinds of dreams like that. Not as often as I probably should, but that was one where I received the dream that helped me to make and finish the move. And I think there was two others where I got dreams. One dream was that I couldn't get this, this, this piece, called Pae Mahu. This means string of mahu. I couldn't.

B=Okay.

E=I know. But part of it was my dream was, no, your attitude, no your attitude is wrong. Your attitude is wrong. You're too ho'okano (haughty) and you just want to learn this because you want to learn this. No, you got to, you got to change your attitude. You got to be humble. You know, that's all it was. And once I did that, yeah, that's true. I'm being arrogant because I have to learn that, I got to learn all of these.

B=It wasn't the right time.

E=It wasn't the right time. As soon as I did that I could. Boom. I got it. You know? So, just things like that. That's one way of approaching. But the stronger way and the other way is through stories.

B=Right.

K-Right. So there's this moon, the lady in the moon story. So I have to research that story, right? Oh, what exactly was this story? Because Dickey's book only has the directions. Maybe it has a small reference. This is about the lady in the moon. What lady in the moon? So I had to go back to the Hawaiian newspapers. Look for, you know, see if there was any reference. You know sometimes there was a big chant, sometimes there's nothing. But you got to really research. Like there's one about what they call hue wai. And it's inverted. You know how the water spigot should be on top like this, but it is like this. So its like I had to research why is that... it doesn't make sense its inverted but in the story... his brothers die so he has to find the waters of Kane to revive them. But the waters of Kane were hidden, taken by Kane, and put it on the ground. Right? So that the water wouldn't escape... But you got to read this whole story to understand why the figure is made like this.

B=How interesting.

E=Yeah, right.

B=Did digitization help? The nūpepa? Or were you there in the archives?

E=Both. Well a lot of things are available, now, yeah. So a lot of those stories are on ulukau. You know, and that was. Luckily I have the volumes. For me, it's easier on the eye if I have the books.

B=Yeah. Where do you get the books from?

E=Some are given, some are bought. So my library is here and there.

B=So, have you experienced any challenges conducting um that research, presenting that research within academia?

E=No, not really. Because my advisor was very supportive. You know, if she was. You know I don't know about other people in curriculum or instruction. My advisor was ... yeah? So, she was very supportive of what I wanted to do. I didn't want to do anything else, like I told you.

B=Yeah, it seems like you were thinking about this since you were in high school. A sophomore in high school?

E=Well, that's language, but, no, I just wanted... well, yeah, that's where I started.

B=Right, right, right.

E=But I always knew that, um, you know, look for something that you have a passion for. And that is what I tell students. Yeah, I wouldn't have had a passion to do a qualitative or quantitative study. Although I like qualitative research. But, I don't want to do that. Yeah, you have to have a passion for something or you're not going to stick with it.

B=So I just wanted to kind of wrap up over conversation with talking about how can academia or the academy enhance its teaching of Indigenous research because my experiences have been that there aren't many people who have supportive advisors like yourself for you know who have that type of knowledge or access to those types of sources in order to know that it is an option other than qualitative or quantitative research approaches.

E=Well, academia, if they had. The Maoris they have whole divisions. Right? Indigenous research and tribal colleges in North America. You don't really have that. So if you had that I would be easier. Um, you just have a few advocates like... who else might be... You just have a few who would advocate and support, support you. But uh there is like an Indigenous kind of college. So a friend of mine... is putting together a tribal college for the Pacific region. I don't know what they are calling it, but sort of a college for Indigenous Peoples of the Pacific region except for Australia and New Zealand.

B=Why is that?

E=Cause Australia is big. They have a lot of these already and New Zealand too.

B=Is it mostly online? They're looking at offering mostly online.

E=That's what they want. That's what they need to do. But UH Mānoa ... has a lot of stuff aligned with Micronesia and the South Pacific so. And those are mostly undergraduate courses... They're looking at um for the doctorate... for the doctoral program.

B=And what do you think the future of Indigenous research is? Where do you see it five years from now or ten years from now or a generation from now?

E=For Indigenous Hawaiians there's a lot more of us been produced. The key is getting more to write. Just putting out more material. So the beauty of being at a university system is that you are forced to write. You have to put out the book. You need to put out, you know what I am saying? Like for me I don't really have a need to, you know, but I challenge myself every year to do something so are you going to be going to AERA? American Education Research.

B=You know what? I toyed around with it, but, I don't know. It's one of those things where I guess I'm a little intimidated because it is huge and I just really want to focus on the Indigenous stuff.

E=No, there's an Indigenous, there's an Indigenous Peoples of the Pacific what they call special interest group.

B=Oh, the SIGs.

E=The SIGS, yeah. There's two. Yeah, it's Indigenous Peoples of the Pacific. She started it with Linda. I don't know who the chairman is right now.

B=Oh, okay.

E=I don't know. But I challenge myself to go.

B=Does... support you in going?

E=Last year they did because I presented on our, um, on our reorganization. This year, I haven't heard if I'm accepted or not. I just rushed my proposal so it wasn't very good. But I wanted to do a a a study of actually ceremony as research. I took my experiences in hula and I chose certain components and how actually that ceremony and research is a way of not only informing but of passing on knowledge and then the more. I guess there's a I developed a, I don't want to say model, but I developed a metaphor for how you go from you know like very informal and the more formal some studies become like hula is formal, the university would be formal. The more formal something is the better the chance is that area to be perpetuated and passed on. The less

formal, the less chance. So the idea for us is that in the business of perpetuating Hawaiian culture, language, is to actually make things formalized. So that's why schooling is important in a way. It formalizes a lot of things, right? The problem in academia is that there is a lot of gatekeeping. So you got to do this, you got to do that. And some worse than others. C&I is probably the more lax one. The more 'olu 'olu one.

B=They have been very accommodating to me.

E=So [my advisor said] you can take Jon Osorio's class.

B=Yeah, I did so too. Yeah.

E=I said, "Wow, that was really good." I loved that class. You know I wanted to go anthropology but they weren't offering anything... You know, I can substitute this... I don't know what research. I mean, we had to take so many bloody research, I'm sorry.

B=But that's okay.

E=Research courses. So there is no fudging on that. Other requirements. We use this as so.

B=So I think it's important, and I've heard this before, from other people I have talked story with, how the support and encouragement from mentors and advisors are really crucial for the success of people in these programs.

E=Oh, yeah, yeah. I, I believe so. You know, I've read other kinds of Indian mentor programs for graduate students that mentorship was a key feature. Mentorship, um also.

B=Cohort?

E=Cohort. Were the, what really helped them get through. Those were the two things. Because the mentors really, they don't, their advisors don't have to do anything. Really. And some don't do... You know. So it's really terrible. But like [my advisor] had like writing groups. I know some people who had a lot of problems with [my advisor], but she put on writing groups. You know, it was like if you wanted to come and write. I always went when I could. She invited people to writing seminars with other Indigenous groups. So it was those kinds of supports that you need for yourselves. Other graduate, you know, writers. Other writers, you know, like Ray Bradbury. Talking to them, you know what I am saying? People who are involved in the field. I would like to meet more of them. But at AERA they pretty much are the same people. The Maoris and the American Indians.

B=Right,right,right.

E=You really got to go to the... you have to belong to both SIGs.

Appendix G

'Eono

B=Brandy Ann Sato

E=Co-Storyteller ('Eono)

E=I guess, I guess the question is more like when did you feel that you were different from what you were already living in? And, like, that would be elementary. Right? Just like where I would go to school and I always felt like at Makaha Elementary I felt like I remember wishing I was Japanese because the teacher was Japanese. The kids were Japanese, most of them. And the smart kids were Japanese. And she would praise the Japanese kids. For having all of their work done and doing it right, the way they wanted it. And, and I was always getting, not getting it right. Not doing right. So it was very vivid in my mind that I wanted to be Japanese. I remember going home, and I was like, "Mom, why am I not Japanese?" Japanese kids are smarter. You know? And then it was my grandmother who told who was Hawaiian she said, "They're not smarter. They're just working harder than you are." You know? And I, I didn't, I agreed with her if I look back at it now, but I also disagree with her. Because I agree that, I don't agree with the part that says that they are working harder than me. Cause I was still working as hard as they were. It's just that I wasn't, um, that model of education was difficult for me to understand and I was working really hard to try to be as good as they were. And I was coming up short. And, and, and so it was always, that was always in the back of my mind. And then when I moved to another school. I had the same kind of feelings. Like, but this time, um, a white student. Where I was in the lunch line and I was first in line, cause it's all about being first in line, right? You're like the fastest. I run up to the front of the line. This kid jumps in front of me. He grabs me. He has blond hair. And he pushes me back. And he takes the first, the first um place in line and I was like, maybe, in the third grade or so. And I grabbed the kid. And I just beat him.

B=Oh my gosh.

E=I pulled him out of the line and I started punching him in the face. And then I remember going to the person to the doctor or the nurse, school nurse, and she said, "You know, you kids, from Wai'anae, you guys are just a bunch of fricken animals. But she didn't use fricken she said f'n. You know? What judgment. You know? On me. And I know I was the only brown kid in town. You know? I mean, it's like, um, it's just the, those kinds of moments like they're just parts of your life where you are like you don't, you don't think about um the system and what kind of things it does to Hawaiians until now I am an educator. I have a doctorate. I can look back at that kind of stuff and take it apart, and analyze it, and stuff. But when you are a kid. You kind of like, don't really understand. You know, and then when I went to college. College was another thing where I was out of place. You know, I was like, one of my professors used to say, "Why aren't you writing anything I say down?" And then I'd say, "I'm listening to you."

So, I was always, was always a very audio kind of learner. So, every time I tried to write I would stop listening. And I couldn't hear what you, and then I'd miss things so what I would do is that I would listen to everything he had to say and then I would go back and read what we, read what we talked about and then take notes. But what was, what he was saying. And so he, he never, he was like, "That's incredible, you know, like, there's people, like seriously writing everything down and you're just kind of listening to me." "Isn't that what I am supposed to be doing?" You know, but it was just. So I learned differently. I thought then most kids and then, uh, and then I struggle with writing too. Because I actually had to learn how to write properly. Because in my school, in my high school I didn't have good English teachers who knew how to teach expository writing. So I just had really bad teachers. Just, I had some good math teachers, but I had some really bad English teachers, you know? So, it was just huge gaps when I finally got to college and I had to write. I, for my Bachelor's I just would take girls out. Where do you want to do? You want to go have dinner? I'll take you out to dinner. I'll take you to a movie. Whatever you want. There's a girl who, who would write my papers. Like I would, she wouldn't write them for me. Like I would sit with her and talk with her and she would write everything down. And I passed. And that's how I passed. And I was a sophomore in college.

B=That's a strategy.

E=Right. And so, the next year she was gone cause she wasn't. She wasn't. She moved back home because she was from California or something. So, then I found another girl to help me. This girl was like, "No. No. I'm not going to sit here and listen to you tell me your paper. But I will teach you how to write. And she was a girl that came to this school. Yeah. And, um, she was actually the valedictorian of this school. So, she went and showed me how to write. How to write a topic sentence. How to write a thesis. How to, there are three main points and give. What do you call? Structure to what I was thinking. And so she, I credit her with, kind of like, teaching me how to write. And then it just got better. Progressively. As I started to, like, understand that writing is a process. So by the time I was a senior, I was writing my own papers. In my undergraduate, I guess, the fourth year. Well, fifth year. Maybe, sixth year. Yeah, I mean, I think it took six years. But, you know, it was like, um, and that's what Hawaiians struggle with now. Is that they don't have the social capital to like. The people aren't there to stop and say, "Brah, you have gaps here." And they don't have the strategies, to like, to navigate and they end up just giving up on it. And I never understood that writing is not something you are born with. It's, it's a process. It's like, you do, you put something on paper and I give it to you. You look it over, you give me feedback. I go over it again. I look at your feedback and I incorporate. Then I give it back to you and then you look at it again. Okay. "You're almost there, but maybe this is not." And it's that, that process. Of going, of showing you how to write. That helps. But I mean, um, and then that's just with schooling when I was aware that I was different. And then the other thing was through my own family. Like my dad, we used to go fishing and we used to lay net and catch fish. And so one day we lay the net and we caught a lot of fish. And then we had fish for everybody. Fish for our family. Fish to eat. Fish for the

neighbors. And then my friend came over and he was like, "Oh, let's go lay net again." And we, and we, without my dad's permission. We took the net and we lay the net again. And this time we had no fish in the net and a shark was in the net. So, my dad was like. I remember he was so disappointed that we killed the shark. And he's like, "The shark is our 'aumakua. You guys took when you guys didn't need to take. We already had fish. We already had too much fish." And my dad used to say, "If you have fish in the freezer, you took too much." And there was fish in the freezer, so. He said, "You guys have been wasteful. And then your greed, you've killed, you've killed a family member." You know. And so I was like, and so that was another point where I was like, "Oh, I'm different." As far as like what other people think. People think, "Ho, you got a shark. Wow. Cool." You know. And it was, um, so, and then lastly, probably, when I went to New Zealand in 2005 for the World Indigenous Peoples' Conference. So that was another way I kind of looked, and kind of saw the future. You know, that's it. We could be like this. Where we can have our own university. Our own tribal lands. Our own tribal economy. Our own TV shows. Our own radio stations. You know, we have. If they can do it, we can do it too. You know, so. That was another way not just to look behind, but just to look. What is the future? Where are the Hawaiian people going with this Indigenous kind of model? And what they've had to do. They've had to control their own educational system. And say, "We feed our kids. We are the ones that decide what is important." And they don't go to school saying, "You know, I have to learn my language and culture in a class." School is language and culture. It is all of those things. It's not something that you compartmentalize. "Oh, this is Hawaiian I. This half semester is Hawaiian culture." It's like from the Kōhanga Reo all the way to the university. It has Indigenous aspects all the way through.

B=And many times, from when I visited, it's in the same place.

E=Yes, right, so you can see exactly where. And the people who have problems on the top can go to the people in the middle and say, "This is what we're seeing. This is what we need. Can you, can you give more of this to our kids?" And they can have conversations with them. "Well, you guys need to build that so we have something we can step into." You know what I mean? That conversation between, what, I guess you call, I don't know, articulation, mapping, or how we go through everything.

B=But it's more fluid.

E=It's more fluid, yeah.

B=And then, and what I notice also is the presence of elders and kūpuna. You don't necessarily see in American schooling.

E=And kūpuna are not in a place where they can come into the educational system to give feedback. Like, over there, over here, the school is not a welcoming place and maybe that goes back to when they were in school themselves and they were told they couldn't speak Hawaiian and they couldn't do this and they were really ridiculed for. And back then it was corporal

punishment for what I was going through. You know. If I had been born, before, in my grandmother's time not only would I been made to feel like I was stupid like I also would have been hit. And hit with a stick in school. You know what I mean?

B=Or ruler.

E=Or ruler. Or whatever they had.

B=I had rulers.

E=Yeah. Broomstick.

B=Oh, man.

E=Yeah. And it, huh, it's like. So for me, it's like, uh, the Indigeneity is the what. What am I? You know. Who am I? You know. Why is everything different? You know.

B=But here's a question for you. And I was thinking about this. Um, um, Sunday, yesterday, so what does it mean to be a Hawaiian? Um, is it just, you know, your DNA? What you're born with? Is it a certain depth of knowledge, customs, and traditions? Is it 'ōlelo Hawai'i? Speaking the language? Is it all of those things?

E=I do this with my students as an exercise. Like, um, I used to do it when I used to teach culture. And I say. And I'd have them blindfolded in a field. So, and then I'd say, "If your, if your grandparents live in your home take a step forward." And then the kids take step forward. And then I say, "If your grandparents live in a foster, in a, in like a care home, you know, take a step back. If you buy fish from the supermarket, take a step back. But if you catch, catch your own fish for your family, take two steps forward. You know, if you if Hawaiian is your first language in your home, you know, take three steps forward. Um, if this is the first time in your experience, take a step back." Now, if, um, you know, then, I had a whole list of questions. And then I say, "Okay, now take off your blindfold." And then, and then they would see where they are at. You know. Then the people, and some days, some years I would switch it. Where the positive, where, you know, I would say stuff like, um, "Uh, if you watch football every Sunday, take a step forward. Uh, if you surf every Sunday, take a step back." And if you, and then, and then the Hawaiian would be the one going all the way back and then, and then I sometimes I take a blindfold off and then you would always have be on the field over here. You know the, um, in front of Keoua, that little field, and some of them would be in the bushes, in the ti leaves, and then some of them would be all the way by the flag pole. And then I try to impress upon them, like, um, "Some of you guys start from different places. As far as your Hawaiianness. But it's not really about where you're at. It's about the journey. You know. And it's not, um, you may think that, well, I'm behind because there are all these people in front of me. You know. Well, that can be taken two ways. That can be, either be, that I need to get moving on this. But that would only be true if it was important and of value to you. Some of you are exactly fine saying

that, “No, this is what I am. This is what I want. You know. And we have that kind of discussion. And then we put it on the board and then we say, “Okay, what is the ideal Hawaiian?” And we list, we brainstorm. They speak their language. And the kids actually come up with some really nice ideas. You know, like a what they think a Hawaiian would look like. And then, and then, on the other side we say, “Okay, what do we do now?” And then we brainstorm and stuff like that. So it’s, it’s, um, so I tell the kids it’s not about the destination. And me being way over there with those kids are. It’s about the journey. And if I decide that if this is important to me then I’m going to do something about it. That is, that is way more powerful is that you understand, eh, this is where I’m at. Cause some people don’t even know. They have, they don’t even think about that. They don’t even think about my Hawaianness. You know? And then genealogy is a part of it. Um, so going back to your question, what is an ideal Hawaiian? Is someone who doesn’t have to take a class to figure it out. They just are. You know. And then culture is something that happens at home. And the when I learn at school, I learn what you guys, you who are in charge, I will learn what you have to say. Because I need to be able to walk in both worlds. Cause this is what I’ve been handed to me. This is what’s been given. But in the back of my mind I always have this armor which is my language, my culture, traditions, kūpuna. And it’s my armor that keeps me strong in your world from what the bad that you have created in this system. You know. So this, this, this, the armor and the language is the armor that protects you from these negative things that get thrown on you. You know, so I tell the kids, “You guys, we’re preparing ourselves for the life that right now is dictated by America and what they do. So, you know, America is going to tell you, that, this is the way it is. This is the kind of degree you’re going to get. This is the language that you will speak. And when you go to court, you’re going to have to sit in our court. You know. But what I’m telling you is, if you have your armor and you have your ‘ike and if you do your homework and you have this understanding you don’t have to accept those answers. You can make your own decisions about what is important. But the sheep will always go with whatever they are told. Like, oh yeah, just go, go, just go inside the fence. You know what I mean? It’s like my daughter. It’s like I try to put her in to play yard, she’s already understood that I don’t belong here. Because I’ve already... Because the first time you started putting me down, this fence wasn’t here. Now you put it up. If you really wanted me to believe that this fence was appropriate, you would have never put me down on the ground and let me crawl around. Cause now that I’ve crawled around, I don’t want to be inside your little yard. I want to live. I want to do my own thing. So now we put her down in the play yard. She’s only seven months, six months. You know that. So my dad’s like, “Just leave her in the yard and then she’ll get used to it.” No. She never got used to it. She just, even if I left her in there a long time she just knows that, that, uh, there is something better for her. You know.

B=Yeah.

E=The kids are the same thing. It’s just like, we try to, um, you know, we try to... we have this fence built and we put them in and we close the fence we have. And we say, “This is your

world. This is it.” You know. But when, if you start off when you teaching them their culture and their language, you’re going to have to try and build a fence around them. Cause they’re moving. And that’s going to be really hard for you to do. Yeah? Because they’re all over the place, you’re going to have to run around. You’re going to have to catch them. You’re going to have to herd them in there. They’re going to bite you. They’re going to get loose. They’re going to run around. And then you’re going to like, here, your fence isn’t going to have four corners. You’re going to have to build it like... you know, because, they know better. You know, and that’s it. I try to tell the kids, like, don’t accept what I say. That’s the truth, the gospel. It’s like, you guys have Kū if you don’t believe me. Go ask Google map. You know, like, your teachers tell you one thing and you know in your heart it’s not true. Ask him. Or ask her. You know. Question authority. That’s democracy. If we believed democracy exists. I’m in law school, it doesn’t exist. If you have money it exists. Or if you’re a corporation it exists. In fact, corporations are actually people. Did you know that? Protected. Yeah? They have rights. Corporations have rights. Just like people. In fact, they have more rights than people have rights.

B=That’s true. Unfortunately.

E=So.

B=But, a couple of things that you mentioned resonated with me. You know, one thing that resonated with me is, um, the idea that sometimes the process is very important. So I know that, you know, for me personally when I first started thinking about research it was all about, you know, the outcomes and where I needed to be. And it was just straight lines. You know, I have my design. I have my plan. And at the end of this certain time I’m going to get here. And I already had a vision of what it was going to look like. But now since I am delving more into that field, it’s more of a journey and it’s more of a process and it’s more of a discovery and I think that for me, you know, um, Indigenous research is more organic and evolutionary and it’s about the people and what the people find relevant.

E=Yes.

B=So what are some of your thoughts in terms of what Indigenous research is, or how to, um, work with Indigenous People?

E=Sabbatical is the perfect example. Like, like, um, we have deadlines. We have, we have a format of what we want our Sabbatical to look like. We have, um, an approval process where things get signed and we have to have conversations with people. But I learn more in the process of it than actually the proposal itself and that’s only because, um, it’s like you said it’s organic. But, it doesn’t always fit in the process. In, in, in the, in how we set it up to happen. You know, like, if a good idea is a good idea, let’s make it happen. You know? A deadline shouldn’t be a barrier for me. But, um, at the same time I understand what deadlines are about. But, it’s like, um.

B=It's about the people.

E=It's about the people. Yeah.

B=And the process should revolve around the people.

E=Yes. You know. How you were, you were like, "oh, yeah, we can make it happen." You know. That's, that's, that's a very... Instead of saying, "Nope, cause the deadline was da kine. You didn't make the deadline." But, instead, you were like, "Let's see what we can do." And this is what. This is the parameters of what we can do and what we can't do. Like, that's a way better thing than slamming the door shut on an idea. Right? Just say, "Okay. This probably won't happen but we can ask. We can say and then good people will hear." And just like... she heard my intent. She liked it. So she was trying to move and trying to help and you know that's way more valuable I think and, and what I got out of it in not just the week, was, so in that week that I learned a lot. Just from the process. But, um, but for us the Indigenous, um, what was your original question? Sorry.

B=Indigenous research and how Indigenous Peoples engage in research. And, you know, I think it's different than Western-based approaches or how other people engage in research.

E=Yeah. I think what has been valuable to me has been more mentoring. Mentoring and also apprenticeship which is more of an Indigenous model. Apprenticeship, like, in the old days if you wanted to be a fisherman, you would go live with the fisherman. You would learn what the fisherman eats, you rise with the fisherman. You walk to the ocean when the fisherman walks. You know the weather. The current. The pattern. You eat fish. You eat the kind of fish he catches. You know the ground. You know, it's like. And it's like that in the class I'm taking in law school. It's um, it's called defense clinic. So, it's like, it's basically the best class I've taken in law school. Cause it's like you sit there and here is this guy and it's real because he's right there. And he's trying to avoid thirty days of jail. So, and it's the same if um we had classes here where we could learn how to build houses. You know. And learn how to. I've always been one, to like, or go to the courthouse, to the district courthouse, and see Hawaiians in chains. You know, have them go and, or go to Kaho'olawe and dive and see all the other kinds of fish that don't belong there. That have taken over the environment.

B=Wow, even there.

E=Oh yeah. That's part of the study that we want to do. Is to find is, all the rois... are basically eating all the babies of all the other fish and there's whole fish inside their stomach. Babies like this, that swallow them whole, the roi. We found a roi with a kampachi in his stomach. It's mean. But it's, but I think those kinds of classes would be very meaningful for our kids. Our going to the leg[islature], and following a legislature and working in the office and like, with their paperwork, sitting there and listening to constituents come in and, and argue their case and the lobbyists or whatever. Just being in law school I got to, like, go to the leg[islature] and, like.

We're fighting for food security, you know, like labeling and GMO stuff and we want our food to have labels on it so. And there are people who are right in the senator's office and the guy, who on top his mantle, is an award Geoscience Politician of the Year. This is a GMO guy, brah. Like his campaign is well-financed. And on the other side you have a mother who has a, who is pregnant and she's like, "Doc, I want to just be able to just have the choice of what I'm feeding to my daughter. Just to know. Can I just have that choice to make that decision that I know what's in this and where it came from and why are you hiding? You know, and then, those guys are so bad. But like, you know, those kinds of experiences, that's why law school is so expensive. It's a gate. That was sad. It's a gate. That gate is locked and guarded tightly. Then after you pass the LSAT, law school is hard. It's super hard. Just to think like that. You have to learn how to think differently. And then, finally, now it's the practice of law. Now, you see, like, it, the power of it. You know, in this, in this Western society. Like how it governs everything that you do. From the decisions you make in the morning, the food that you buy, the bills that you pay, whether you pay them or not. You know, it's like, you can always point it back to some law, somewhere. Contract, business, Hawaiian rights. Everything is back to this palapala. You know?

B=Do you think that, you know, as a Native person it was challenging to think that way?

E=Ho, brah, it was the hardest thing. I still struggle. And then the people in the law school, they're like, they're like, "you have to change." Some of them. Just when I come in, and I'm like, compassionate, as a public defender, and I watch all these people. Guilty. Guilty. Guilty. Guilty. Guilty. Guilty. Guilty. And I'm like, but some of them were not guilty. And then, I had my classmates come up to me, and they were like, "You're not going to last long in this profession if that's how you feel." But then some people came to me and said, "No. It is your compassion that makes you valuable in this profession. You know. Because the guy that says that, he's going to be here for a year and then he's going to become a private lawyer. And he's going to do it for money. But the people like you who care about these people. You are a true value to this office." You know, whatever. So, but you don't get paid. It's like teaching, you know, it's like teaching, it's exactly like teaching. So, I was like, "Oh, it's kind of like teaching, then." Yes, public defenders, they get paid like teachers. In fact, teachers probably get paid better than public defenders.

B=But do you think, because, um, do you think your compassion stems because you're looking at defendants who are like you?

E=Yes. That's exactly. And there aren't a lot of people like me in the practice. I think my opening class of one hundred twenty students there were six Native Hawaiians, seven, maybe, in my opening class, the class that I came in three years ago.

B=I'm really shocked.

E=Maybe seven out of a hundred.

B=Why do you think that is? Is it because of those gates?

E=It's the gates, yeah. You definitely. I don't know how I did it, actually. A lot of friends, girlfriends, and just your parents telling you that you are valuable. And that what you, that you can do it.

B=That encouragement and support.

E=Encouragement and support is clutch. My mom would always say, "You're the best. You're the smartest. You're the brightest." You know. My dad would say, "Go outside. Rake up the leaves. Pick up the dog shit. You know. Go kiss your mom. Do your homework." Not necessarily in that order. But this is a different, you know, but that's what good about my upbringing that's different from a lot of Hawaiians is that I have a mom whose German who, who really grew up post World War II, who basically helped rebuild the country without men because a lot of them were killed in the war. So she really says there's mostly women who rebuilt the country after World War II. And, and the women were had to cook and to clean and she's like, she's like, "When the winter came, if, if you, and you didn't have your house built, you die in the snow." She always used to tell us that, when we were, she's like, "You guys lazy, huh? Where I come from, if you don't get enough firewood and you don't get this, brah, you going to die in the snow." You know, and it's like. And then my dad is way on the other side. He's like, love. 'Ohana. You know. Those are the most important things. You know. And, um, So I had like my mom was very, like, work ethic and my dad was very family oriented. Love the family. And my mom, she's very, so I have really good balance. A lot of Hawaiians, they live out of balance which is what the biggest obstacle is. Plenty love. No discipline. You know. Plenty, you know, a lot of play, not enough work. You know, but, my mom was very, like, strict about everything. My dad, well. [He said,] "I value education, but remember, I have barely a high school education." You know, so, but my mom was the one who held us to the fire.

B=And told you that you could do anything.