# Preliminary findings of a questionnaire-based survey of a sample of teachers of Hawaiian in secondary- and tertiary-level institutions in Hawai'i

**R. Keao NeSmith**
Kawaihuelani Center for Hawaiian Language
Hawai'inuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
[kumukeao@gmail.com]

## Abstract[1]

As part of a research project involving aspects of the teaching and learning of Hawaiian as an Additional Language (HAL) in Hawai'i, I conducted a questionnaire-based survey of a sample of 30 teachers of HAL in first- and second-year classes in high school and tertiary-level institutions. Although some of those involved in the survey indicated that they had had some training in the teaching of additional languages, most did not. Furthermore, responses to a range of questions about aspects of their own teaching and about their own proficiency in Hawaiian language and that of their students suggests that many of these teachers have little knowledge of some significant developments in the area of the teaching of additional languages that have taken place since the 1970s. Given the fact that the survival of Hawaiian language and culture currently depends to a very considerable extent on the success of language teaching programs in secondary schools and tertiary-level institutions, these findings are of major concern.

## Introduction: Hawai'i, its people, its language and its culture

Hawai'i is the most isolated archipelago in the world. It consists of high volcanic islands and low-lying atolls and is located in the subtropic zone of the central northern Pacific Ocean. The aboriginal people of the Hawaiian Islands (*Kānaka Maoli*[2]) are Polynesians who are estimated to have first colonized the Islands between 300 and 800 CE[3] from the Marquesas or Society Islands, more than 2,000 miles (3,200 km) south, and brought with them their language, which evolved into what is now known as Hawaiian (*ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i*[4]). Prior to the start of the 20th century (and through the first two decades of the 20th century), *Kānaka Maoli* were Hawaiian monoglots.

In 1810, King Kamehameha the Great of Hawai'i Island conquered the eight inhabited islands of the archipelago and united them under his rule. In 1840, King Kamehameha III established the first Constitution of what was then called the Hawaiian Kingdom and formed the government as a Constitutional Monarchy whose political system was a hybrid of traditional *Kanaka Maoli* polity, European-style constitutional monarchy and democratic systems found in other States (see Preza, 2010, p. 56 and Moore, 2010, p. 291). In 1843, Great Britain and France became the first States to recognize the sovereignty of the Kingdom[5] and the Kingdom declared its neutrality by proclamation of Kamehameha III on May 16, 1854[6].

The vast majority of *Kānaka Maoli* were literate in the 19th century and were prolific writers and avid contributors to the over 50 Hawaiian language newspapers that were in regular circulation throughout the 1800s and early 1900s[7]. Nogelmeier (2010, p. 59) notes that,

> In the history of Pacific Island societies where the technologies of literacy were introduced, Hawai'i stands apart for its rapid adoption of literacy and zeal for



NeSmith, R.K. (2010). Preliminary findings of a questionnaire-based survey of a sample of teachers of Hawaiian in secondary-and tertiary-level institutions in Hawai'i. *He Puna Kōrero: Journal of Māori and Pacific Development.* 11(2), 77–104.
https://doi.org/10.15663/K10.14205

written production. Although the vagaries of archival methods make it difficult to accurately measure, it appears that the Hawaiian published writings also exceed the sum of what all other Polynesian societies generated during the 19th and early 20th centuries, largely due to the extensive newspaper production.

On January 17, 1893, a small group of white natural-born and naturalized Hawaiian subjects and foreign nationals living in Honolulu, supported by U.S. Minister John Stevens and a legion of heavily armed U.S. marines, revolted in a coup against the government of Queen Lili'uokalani and declared a Provisional Government against the will of the people, who were loyal to Queen. In 1895, the rebel government held Lili'uokalani in house arrest at 'Iolani Palace for one year (Lili'uokalani, 1898, p. 267). As U.S. troops prevented the Queen from arresting the coup perpetrators under threat of war, she was forced to temporarily assign her executive power to the American President in order to do an investigation of the actions of the U.S. diplomat and military commanders, remove them from Hawaiian territory, restore the government, and to reinstate the Queen (United States House of Representatives, 53rd Congress, Executive Documents on Affairs in Hawai'i: 1894-1895, p. 461).

Sanford Dole, a son of American citizens resident in the Kingdom, was named President of the Provisional Government, which a year later changed its name to the Republic of Hawai'i[8]. Pres. Grover Cleveland of the U.S., on March 9, 1893, accepted the assignment of executive power and charged James Blount with the duty of launching an official investigation into the events surrounding the coup. As a consequence of Blount's several reports on the matter, the U.S. Secretary of State, Walter Gresham, concluded that the participation of U.S. Minister Stevens and U.S. troops in the coup amounted to a violation of the treaties of friendship between the Kingdom and the U.S. (United States House of Representatives, 53d Cong., Executive Documents on Affairs in Hawai'i: 1894-1895, pp. 459-463). Negotiations between Queen Lili'uokalani and Pres. Cleveland resulted in a settlement in December 1893 whereby the President would restore Lili'uokalani and her government to power in exchange for amnesty for the coup insurgents. Two executive agreements emerged between the Hawaiian Kingdom and the United States, the first being the *Lili'uokalani assignment* and the *Agreement of restoration* (Sai, 2008, pp. 120-125). However, as a result of political stonewalling in Washington, the U.S. has, to this day, failed to enforce *Lili'uokalani assignment* that binds the President and his successors to administer Hawaiian Kingdom law, and the *Agreement of restoration*, which are considered under international law as treaties.

In 1898, the U.S. declared war on the Kingdom of Spain and moved to capture all of its overseas territories, including Cuba and Puerto Rico in the Caribbean and Guam and the Philippines in the Pacific. In violation of the Kingdom's neutral status, the U.S. used Kingdom territory as a military base from which it launched its attacks against Spanish-held Guam and the Philippines. The U.S. maintains several military bases and thousands of personnel in the Hawaiian Islands until this day (Sai, 2008, p. 130). Between 1894 and 1898, Republic leaders lobbied the U.S. Senate to annex the Hawaiian Islands unsuccessfully as a result of numerous protests by the Queen and tens of thousands of petitions of protest by Kingdom subjects (Coffman, 2009, p. 268 and Silva, 2004, pp. 145-159). In 1898, however, the U.S. Congress, under the presidency of William McKinley, issued a joint resolution (a unilateral action), known as the Newlands Resolution, in which the U.S. declared the Hawaiian Islands a U.S.

territory[9]. U.S. Congressman Thomas H. Ball (D-Texas) stated on the floor of the House of Representatives that the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands by joint resolution is (United States Congressional Records, 55th Congress, 2nd Session, p. 5975) "a deliberate attempt to do unlawfully that which can not be lawfully done."

Beginning in the first two decades of the 20th century, American citizens migrated in droves to the Hawaiian Islands, and in 1959, the U.S.-installed territorial government conducted a plebiscite in which those who participated (by this time resident U.S. citizens outnumbered Kingdom subjects[10]) voted to become a state of the United States[11] and the U.S. declared the Hawaiian Islands the 50th state of the United States.

In 2001, a 3-member arbitration panel of the Permanent Court of Arbitrations at the World Court at the Hague, Netherlands verified that the Hawaiian Kingdom to be an independent and sovereign State[12] (Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom, 2001, p. 566) and in March 2010, the United States District Court in Washington acknowledged the legitimacy of the *Lili'uokalani assignment* (Sai v. Clinton, March 9, 2010, pp. 2-3), although the U.S. continues to refuse to enforce the Assignment.

Among his conclusions, Blount (Foreign Relations of the United States, 1894, p. 825) reported the following opinion from the Reverend Dr. Charles McEwen Hyde, which reveals the ambition of the conspirators and supporters of the coup.

> The Americanization of the islands will necessitate the use of the English language only as the language of business, of politics, of education, of church service; and open the wide field of English literature.

Thus, prominent in the political agenda of the coup conspirators was the drive to transform Hawaiian speakers into English monoglots.

In 1896, the rebel Republic of Hawai'i government enacted into law Act 57 in which it refused to support Hawaiian-medium education, which resulted in the dwindling of those schools until all schools became English-medium schools by the first decade of the 20th century[13]. Throughout the governance of rebel forces, and through most of the 20th century under U.S. rule, Hawaiian language and culture were stigmatized through pro-American and pro-English legislation and social and political conditioning to the point that, by the mid-20th century, most *Kānaka Maoli* were ashamed to be known as Hawaiian-speakers or practitioners of numerous aspects of traditional Hawaiian culture (see Moore, 2010, p. 11), which led to the atrophy of Hawaiian-speaking communities and, by the last decade of the 20th century, a Hawaiian-speaking population of fewer than 1,000 – a near complete fulfilment of the aspirations of Reverend Dr. Charles McEwen Hyde. The political upheavals in the Hawaiian Kingdom that began in 1893 worked to completely transform the social, political and linguistic makeup of the Hawaiian Islands and are the greatest contributing factors that led to the near total depletion of native-speakers of Hawaiian and, coupled with innovations of second-language speakers of the last decade of the 20th century and the first decades of the 21st century, the greatest disruption in the natural evolution of the Hawaiian language among native speakers.

Privately owned Ni'ihau Island is the only place left in the Hawaiian Islands today where a community of native speakers of Hawaiian (numbering perhaps 200)

continues owing to restricted access to non-residents and the tight-knight, rural lifestyle of residents. In addition, Hawaiian-speaking families who are relatives of those living on Ni'ihau live primarily on the west side of neighbouring Kaua'i Island, particularly in the towns of Kekaha, Waimea, Kaumakani, and Hanapēpē, with a few more families and individuals scattered in other parts of Kaua'i and other islands in Hawai'i (possibly numbering just over 300 in total[14]). Apart from the Ni'ihau community, very few native-speakers exist, and the few that do are older than 60 years old and many of them have not had opportunities to use the language exclusively in decades resulting in many forgetting how to communicate exclusively in Hawaiian (see Reinecke, 1988, p. 124 and Schütz, 1994, p. 365). Thus, by the latter half of the 20th century, Hawaiian had become a foreign language to the vast majority of *Kānaka Maoli*. In contrast, English native speakers (including *Kānaka Maoli* and others) who have learned HAL and are able to converse in Hawaiian to some extent probably number between 2,000 and 3,000 in the first decade of the 21st century[15].

The 1970s marked the beginning of a Hawaiian Renaissance (Kanahele, 1982, pp. 10, 36). By the 1980s, enrollments in courses in HAL were rising steadily, with a boom in enrollments being experienced in the 1990s. In 1984[16], the first Hawaiian immersion preschool was opened in Kekaha, Kaua'i (Wilson & Kamanā, 2001) and Hawaiian immersion schools have now been established on every island except Lāna'i. However, the majority of teachers in these schools are not themselves native speakers of the language, but graduates who learned the language in high schools and/ or post-secondary institutions and many have majored in Hawaiian in tertiary institutions. As Wong (1999, p. 94) observes,

> It has become apparent that new speakers of Hawaiian exhibit a marked divergence from those speakers who acquired Hawaiian as a first language and who are generally considered to be speakers of "real Hawaiian".

It is therefore clear that the future of Hawaiian language and culture now depends, to a very considerable extent, on the teaching and learning of Hawaiian in schools and tertiary-level institutions. It is therefore important to know what is being taught in these institutions and how it is being taught. The survey reported here represents one part of a research project that explores the backgrounds and beliefs of HAL teachers and students using questionnaire-based and interview-based survey techniques, examines a range of relevant curricula and teaching resources and critiques a sample of Hawaiian language lessons that were recorded and then transcribed.

**Review of selected literature on language teacher cognition**

Research on language teacher cognition, which Borg (2006, p. 1) defines as "what language teachers think, know and believe – and . . . its relationship to teachers' classroom practices", is clearly central to "the process of understanding teaching". This brief review explores selected literature on language teacher cognition that relates to three central aspects of the survey reported here: (a) language teaching methodology and textbook use, (b) language proficiency, and (c) language teacher education.

***Language teaching methodology***

Communicative competence[17] and, associated with it, communicative language teaching[18], has occupied a very prominent place in the literature on the teaching and learning of additional languages for several decades. These concepts are significant in that they have played a central role in the gradual move away from (a) the translation-based methodology associated with grammar translation (which involved translation exercises, the memorization of long lists of vocabulary and the explicit presentation of named grammatical patterns (see, for example, Fotos, 2005, pp. 653-670; Howatt & Widdowson, 2004, pp. 326-327) and (b) the audio-lingual methodology (which focused on the gaining of grammatical competence through habit formation involving the imitation of decontetualized model sentences and drilling) that was associated with behaviourist psychology and linguistic structuralism). These concepts are also significant in that they are associated with (a) a range of meaning-centered approaches to the design of syllabuses for additional language (see, for example, Wilkins, 1976) that reflect some major developments in linguistics (including developments in the area of pragmatics and discourse analysis), and (b) a general move towards outcomes-based curricula that include a range of new approaches to the specification of achievement objectives/ learner outcomes, including, as well as *communicative outcomes*[19], both *cultural outcomes*[20] and *strategic outcomes*[21]. It is no doubt for these reasons that language teacher cognition research involving methodology has tended to focus on aspects of communicative language teaching (CLT).

Nunan (1987), Kervas-Doukas (1996), Sato and Kleinsasser (1999) and Sato and Kleinsasser (2004), who conducted research relating to language teachers operating in different contexts, uncovered considerable inconsistency between these teachers' beliefs about methodology, and, in particular about their beliefs in relation to CLT, and their classroom practices. All three of them observed that although the teachers involved in their studies had generally positive attitudes towards CLT, their classroom practices, with a few exceptions, deviated from the principles of CLT. In fact, the teachers involved in the study by Sato and Kleinsasser believed that there were serious problems associated with attempting to implement CLT, including lack of appropriate resources and excessive demands on preparation time (pp. 506-507). In addition, their beliefs about what CLT involved, while having *something* in common with what Howatt (1984, pp. 296-297) has referred to as a 'strong version' of CLT (which characterized much of the early literature in the area) had very little in common with the 'weak version' that largely superseded it.[22, 23]

Her (2007, pp. 144-190) and Wang (2008, pp. 79-126) conducted questionnaire-based surveys of teachers of English in Taiwan in which a number of the questions focused on CLT. Wang's survey involved 166 teachers of English in primary schools. Asked to indicate which of a number of entries was closest to their own approach to language teaching, 103 checked 'communicative'. Those who had checked 'communicative' were then asked to list three things that they believed to be primary characteristics of CLT. Only 83 did so, providing a list of 228 items. Of these, only 137 were judged by the researcher to be primary characteristics of CLT although the Taiwanese curriculum for English in schools recommends a communicative approach. Her's (2007) survey involved 66 teachers of English in tertiary-level institutions. Only 18 of the 66 participants in that survey (27%) indicated that they believed that CLT was possible in classes of 20 students or more. However, although almost all of the classes taught by all of the survey participants included 20 or more students, almost half of them (32/

48%) indicated that they believed that their own teaching could be described as 'communicative'.

Taken together, these responses suggest that there may be a disjunction between aspiration and reality so far as teaching methodology is concerned.

***Language proficiency***

There has been much debate about language proficiency and language proficiency testing over the past two decades. Although much of that debate is to be found in international journals such as *Language Testing* and *Language Assessment Quarterly* which are unlikely to be read by many language teachers, there are many sources of information in this area that are intended primarily for language teachers, including information provided on Internet sites by Ministries of Education which are struggling with the issue of proficiency benchmarking for various stages of language education. In this context, language teachers, especially those involved in tertiary-level institutions, might be expected to have a reasonable grasp of the concept of language proficiency.

In a survey conducted by Wang (2008) in which 166 teachers of English at primary level in Taiwan were asked to assess their own levels of proficiency in reading, writing, listening and speaking in English on the IELTS 9-band scale, only 14% of respondents indicated that they believed that they had an *overall* proficiency in English lower than band 6, and none that they had a proficiency level lower than band 4. In fact, 50 respondents (35%) placed themselves in bands 8 or 9 (the top two bands). That their self-assessed proficiency level is likely to be significantly higher overall than their actual proficiency level is evidenced by a number of studies of English language proficiency in Taiwan (see, for example, Chen & Johnson, 2004; Her, 2007, pp. 191-211). Butler (2004) conducted a survey in which 522 teachers of English (from Japan, Korea and Taiwan) were asked to assess their own level of competence in a number of areas (listening; oral fluency; reading comprehension; writing; vocabulary; grammar; pronunciation) and to indicate what level of competence in these areas they felt was necessary in order to teach English in primary schools successfully. In spite of the fact that the teachers' self-assessments were, overall, relatively high, the vast majority of these teachers (91% of the Korean teachers; 80.1% of the Taiwanese teachers; 85.3% of the Japanese teachers) rated their own level of competence to be lower than the level they considered necessary for successful teaching of English at primary school level (p. 258). The findings of these two studies, taken together, suggest that some language teachers may be less confident of their target language competences than is indicated in self-assessments. Furthermore, as Richards (1998, p. 7) observes, it is not only language proficiency *per se* that matters but also "how language proficiency interacts with other aspects of teaching skill".

***Language teacher education***

Calderhead (1988, p. 52) observed in the late 1980s that language teacher cognition research focusing on teacher education "promises to be of value in informing . . . policy and the practices of teacher educators". It is, however, important to be cautious about the interpretation of data and, in particular, to avoid generalizing on the basis of limited data. Thus, although Andrews (2006) has observed that discussion of grammar in a particular training course had little impact on the grammar-related beliefs of three

trainees, it may be that a similar study involving a different course and/ or different trainees would yield very different results. Equally, teachers' initial responses to questions about the training they have received need to be treated with circumspection. Although many respondents to a questionnaire-based survey conducted by Wang (2008, p. 39) indicated that they had had training that included a teaching practicum, it emerged during later semi-structured interviews that what they thought of as a practicum may have been "extremely limited in terms of scope" and/or may not have included "components (e.g. detailed feedback) that the researcher associated with the practicum component of training courses" (p. 117). In addition, it is important to relate what teachers say about their training to the actual nature of the training programs to which they have been exposed. Thus, although some researchers (e.g. Adams & Krockover, 1997) have concluded that teacher education can have a significant impact on the knowledge, skills and beliefs of teacher, others (e.g. Richardson, 1996) have argued that it may have little or no impact. It may be that different responses are a reflection of differences in the quality of the training provided.

What all of this indicates is that studies involving language teacher cognition should be considered in the context of as much additional data as possible. For this reason, the conclusions reached on the basis of the questionnaire-based survey should be regarded as tentative. The data have yet to be located in relation to data from semi-structured interviews with selected teachers, a questionnaire-based survey of students of HAL, evaluation of a selection of curriculum documents and textbooks and analysis of a sample of Hawaiian language lessons.

**Background to the questionnaire-based survey**

The overall aim of the questionnaire-based survey was to determine who teaches HAL in public high schools and tertiary educational institutions in Hawai'i and what are their beliefs about Hawaiian language and culture and the teaching and learning of Hawaiian are. The underlying questions were:

> What are the linguistic and professional backgrounds of a sample of teachers of Hawaiian in public high schools and tertiary educational institutions in Hawai'i and what are their reasons for learning and teaching Hawaiian?
>
> How proficient in the language do they consider themselves to be and what do they do outside of the classroom to further their linguistic and cultural knowledge and understanding?
>
> How do they decide what to teach, how to teach it and what resources to use and how effective do they consider their teaching to be?

It was decided to limit the target group to teachers of Hawaiian at first- and second-year levels in high schools and tertiary institutions. The decision to exclude teachers of the Hawaiian-immersion setting was related to the very different context in which they operate, one that inevitably has implications for approach and methodology. The decision to focus on teachers of first- and second-year courses only was related to consistency with other aspects of the overall research project in which the emphasis is on those courses that are required in order for students to proceed to more advanced study, courses that therefore have a major impact on students' long-term language goals.

The questionnaire was designed, trialled, revised and subjected to all of the appropriate ethics approval processes. It was then distributed, partly by surface mail (with pre-paid reply envelopes) and partly by hand-delivery, along with an outline of the research project and of the ethical protocols that applied, to all 81 teachers who had been identified as being involved in the teaching of HAL to first- and second-year classes in secondary schools and tertiary-level institutions in Hawai'i.

**The questionnaire**

The questionnaire (see *Appendix*) consisted of thirty-nine (39) questions in seven (7) main sections: *background information; language background and reasons for learning and teaching Hawaiian; interaction with native speakers of Hawaiian; words, concepts, domains and culture; language teacher training; teaching methodologies, teaching materials and assessment; proficiency in Hawaiian.* It ended with a question about how participants believed 'native speaker' could/ should be defined and an opportunity for respondents to make comments and/ or recommendations about the teaching of Hawaiian at first- and second-year levels and to add anything further that they wished.

**Overview of the survey data**

What is provided here is an overview of the survey data rather than a detailed breakdown of all of the responses.

***Background information***

Of the 81 potential survey participants identified, there were 30 respondents (a 37% response rate). Of those who did respond, the majority of whom were of Hawaiian ethnicity (87%), there were slightly more women (60%) than men. A majority taught in universities and/ or community colleges (77%) rather than high schools (23%) and had fewer than six (6) years experience of teaching HAL (57%).

***Language background and reasons for learning and teaching Hawaiian***

Eight (8/27%) of the respondents claimed to have been raised with Hawaiian and at least one other language. Twenty-eight (28/93%) indicated that they had attended Hawaiian classes at secondary and/or or post-secondary schools and two (2) that they had attended Hawaiian immersion pre-school or primary/ secondary schooling. Although only three (3/10%) indicated that at least one Hawaiian-speaking parent had had input into their learning of the language, a further seven (7/23%) referred, in direct responses to questions or in comments, to the fact that they had had contact with Hawaiian-speaking grandparents, elders or others, and one (1) to having used Hawaiian in singing and praying at church.

Over two-thirds of the participants gave as one of their reasons for learning Hawaiian the fact that they wanted to better understand native Hawaiian culture (25/83%), wanted to read old documents written in Hawaiian (24/80%), believed that it was important to perpetuate the language and culture of their ancestors (23/77%) or wanted to interact with native speakers (23/77%). Just under two-thirds indicated that one reason was a desire to interact with learners of HAL (18/54.5%) and almost half indicated that they wanted to become teachers of Hawaiian (14/47%). Among the additional reasons provided was a desire to pass on the language (2) and to understand the meaning of Hawaiian song and dance (2).

The most popular reason selected for wanting to teach Hawaiian was that respondents' enjoyed the language and culture (28/93%). This was closely followed by the desire to ensure that Hawaiian language and culture are perpetuated (26/87%) and the desire to raise awareness of Hawaiian issues (24/80%).

***Interaction with native speakers of Hawaiian***

All of the respondents indicated that they believed that interaction with native speakers was essential (23/78%), very important (5/11%) or important (4/11%) in terms of being effective as a teacher of HAL although several of the comments added by respondents referred to the difficulty of achieving this. Although over two-thirds of the respondents reported that they regularly engaged in reading Hawaiian language material at the time of the survey (21/70%), a considerably smaller number reported that they regularly listened to or viewed recordings of native speakers speaking Hawaiian (12/40%). Fewer than half of the respondents (11/37%) reported that they regularly engaged in conversations in Hawaiian with native speakers (although many more reported that they had done so regularly in the past). However, only eleven (11/30%) indicated that they did not find it difficult to meet with native speakers. Among those who indicated that they did find it difficult to do so, almost a quarter indicated that they did not know any native speakers (7/23%) or that those they knew lived far from them (8/27%). Among the comments was one that indicated that it would be good to have native speakers in the classroom from time to time.

***Words, concepts, domains, and culture***

Asked what they do when they do not know the word/ term for a particular concept in Hawaiian, almost half indicated that they would (presumably when other approaches failed) use an English term (13/45%). Asked when they used Hawaiian, fewer than half (13/45%) indicated that they always did so when speaking to other speakers of the language although the vast majority indicated that they believed it was essential or very important (27/90%) to use Hawaiian when speaking to second language Hawaiian speakers. Asked which of 12 listed aspects of Hawaiian culture they had experience of, or considerable knowledge about, only five (5) of the items in the list were selected by half or more than half of the respondents.

Only 12 (44%) of the respondents indicated that they had children. However, most of them indicated that they spoke to their children in Hawaiian for 50% of the time or more.

***Language teacher training***

Just under half (14/47%) of the participants claimed that they had a degree in second language teaching/ learning. However, the inclusion of 'learning' in the question made it ambiguous: some of those who responded in the affirmative may have done so because they had a degree that involved language learning. The number who indicated that their training had involved specific areas of language teaching may, therefore, be more reliable guide. In this respect, it is interesting to note that although just over half of the participants (16/53%) claimed that they had some training in language teaching methodologies, fewer than half, in most cases considerably fewer than half, indicated that they had training in any of the other areas listed, with only six (6/20%) claiming to have been involved in a language teaching practicum. Although most of the participants indicated that they believed that training in language teaching and learning was important for Hawaiian language teachers (25/85%) and indicated that they

believed that they would themselves benefit from further training, when asked which of eight (8) possible areas they might benefit from receiving further training in, the actual number who selected each area was very small, with, for example, only 2 selecting materials design and development.

***Teaching methodologies, teaching materials, and assessment***

That these Hawaiian language teachers might benefit from training in language teaching is evidenced by the fact that well over two-thirds of them (23/76%) claimed to use translation to explain meaning all of the time (7/23%), more than half of the time (15/50%) or about half of the time (1). Furthermore, although ten (10/33%) of the teachers indicated that they had received training in the area of communicative language teaching, and although the same number considered their teaching to be communicative, just under half indicated that they did not know whether it was or not (12/40%), indicated that it was not (2), and six (6/20%) did not respond to this question.

When asked to list two or three aspects of their teaching that they considered to be communicative, ten (10/33%) respondents provided 24 entries. These entries, however, did not indicate that all of them had any real understanding of what is involved in communicative language teaching (CLT).[24] Of the twenty-eight (28/93%) who responded to the relevant question, 22% indicated that they did not regard it as essential to include Hawaiian cultural elements in their classes. Just under half indicated that they did not refer to Hawaiian deities or the Hawaiian way of dividing time (46%) and over one-third that they did not refer to genealogy (39%).

When asked whether their courses were associated with a specific set of achievement objectives, a large number of respondents ticked both 'yes' and 'no' or both 'yes' and 'don't know', possibly indicating that some of them believed that the association of language classes with specific objectives was not relevant all of the time, but also suggesting that at least some of them were unclear about exactly what might be involved in setting specific objectives.

When averaged out over first and second year classes, only 9% of the respondents indicated that they spent 25% or less of their time in the classroom talking. Furthermore, two (2) of the five (5) respondents who provided comments at this point provided as evidence of student talking time the fact that their students repeated what they said.

More than half of the 28 participants who responded to a question about the amount of time they spent at the front of the class indicated that in the first semester of the first year they did so for 76% or more of the time (12/40%) or for between 51% and 75% of the time (7/23%). When asked how much of the time they spent speaking English in class, all 28 participants who responded indicated that they did so for more than 25% of the time in the case of first year, with 75% indicating that they did so for over 50% of the time in these classes. In the case of second year, second semester classes, only 39% indicated that they did so for 25% of class time or less.

Of the 28 participants who responded to the relevant questions, 60% signalled that their students spent 50% or less of class time in the first semester of their first year of study on pair work and group work and 34% indicated that they spent more than 50%

of their time at the front of the class in first year of classes, with only 39% indicating that they did so for 25% or less of the time in second year, second semester classes. A telling comment by one of the teachers was: *In the second year we tend to go through stories and translate them into English.*

Of the 27 participants who responded to a question asking whether they used textbooks, twenty-three (23/77%) indicated that they did. When asked why they used particular textbooks, all of the participants responded. However, overall, fewer than half (44%) indicated that they did so specifically because they liked the books.

Although many of the 27 who indicated the extent to which they regarded their courses to be successful selected 'very successful' or 'mostly successful', an average of 15% indicated that they regarded them as being only 'somewhat successful'. Of the seven (7) comments provided at this point, four (4) indicated dissatisfaction with what was being achieved and two (2) indicated that success was seen in terms of comparison with other teachers rather than the achievement of objectives.

***Proficiency in Hawaiian***

Asked to assess their own Hawaiian language proficiency on a scale from 1 (lowest) to 6 (highest), 28 responded. Of these, eleven (11) located themselves somewhere between bands 3 and 4.5 and seventeen (17) in bands 5, 5.5 or 6. Asked to indicate what proficiency level they regarded as being ideal for teachers of first- and second-year students, ten (10) selected bands 3, 4 or 4.5, one (1) selected 'from 3 to 6' and fourteen (14) selected bands 5, 5.5 and 6.

There was no overall agreement among the teachers when asked to indicate what they believed to be the average proficiency level of students on completion of different educational stages. Responses ranged through levels 1, 2, 4 and 5 for Year 1, Semester 1; 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 for Year 1, Semester 2; 1, 2, 3 and 4 for Year 2, Semester 1; and 2, 3 and 4 for Year 2, Semester 2. What this seems to indicate is that there is very little real understanding of the concept of proficiency among at least some of the respondents.

***Respondents' views about the concept of 'native speaker' and comments/ recommendations concerning the teaching and learning of Hawaiian***

Asked to select a definition of 'native speaker', ten (10) out of twenty-eight (28) respondents checked the following category: *Someone who has at least one parent/ guardian who learned to speak Hawaiian as a second language and raised them speaking Hawaiian since they were born.* What this suggests is the fact that the traditional definition of 'native speaker' is being replaced in Hawai'i by one that acknowledges/ accommodates the realities of a situation in which there are very few genuine native speakers left. This is something that will inevitably have an impact on the ways in which the language is thought of in the future.

Asked to provide comments or recommendations concerning the teaching of first- and second-year Hawaiian classes, eleven (11) participants responded. Among the comments provided were four (4) that emphasized the importance of culture and/ or native speaker input and two (2) that emphasized the importance of varied activities and/ or resources. However, among the comments was one (1) from a teacher with only one semester's teaching experience who recommended using English in teaching HAL.

Of the eight (8) participants who responded to an invitation to add any other comments they wished, three (3) indicated the need/ desire for ways of improving their teaching and/ or speaking skills, four (4) referred to some aspect of what one of them identified as a 'disconnect between language learning and culture', and one (1) referred to the need to ensure that the language was pertinent to every-day activities.

## Conclusion

The overall picture provided by the questionnaire data is one of a fairly representative sample of teachers of Hawaiian, most of whom are of Hawaiian ethnicity, but many of whom appear to have had little contact with Hawaiian language and culture prior to their secondary- or tertiary-level educational experiences. Although these teachers appear to be deeply committed to the maintenance of Hawaiian language and, in many cases, also to Hawaiian culture, not all of them believe that interaction with native speakers is essential. Although many of these teachers indicated that they had had some training in language teaching, their responses to a range of questions about aspects of their own teaching and about their own proficiency in Hawaiian language and that of their students suggests that many of them have little knowledge or understanding of changes and developments in the teaching of additional languages that have taken place since the 1970s. One indicator of this is the extent to which they reported that they relied on translation to convey meaning. Another is the difficulty they clearly had in benchmarking the expected proficiency levels of their students. It is important to emphasize, however, that these conclusions are provisional ones: the questionnaire data needs to be carefully considered in the context of other aspects of the overall research program, some of which are still under way.

## Endnotes

**1.** ***Acknowledgment.*** I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr Winifred Crombie, my chief PhD supervisor (School of Māori and Pacific Development at the University of Waikato), as well as my other supervisors, Dr Diane Johnson (Linguistics Department of the University of Waikato), Dr Hēmi Whaanga (School of Māori and Pacific Development at the University of Waikato) and Dr Victoria Anderson (Linguistics Department of the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa) for their diligent and proactive supervision and mentorship. I also want to thank Dr Rapata Wiri, who introduced me to the University of Waikato and my supervisors. This work is a tribute to my grandmother, Annie Kealoha Kaaialii Kauhane, and my uncle, Dr Hector Tahu (Ngāpuhi).

**2.** '*Kanaka Maoli*', with no initial long 'a' is the singular term and '*Kānaka Maoli*', with the long initial 'a' is plural.

**3.** CE = Common Era, a designation for the world's most commonly used year-numbering system.

**4.** Green (1966, p. 34) classifies the Hawaiian language as a branch of the Proto-Marquesic group of eastern Polynesian languages.

**5.** By the end of the 19th century, the Hawaiian Kingdom had entered into treaties with seventeen (17) countries, had over ninety (90) legations and consulates around the world, and was the first non-European member State of the Universal Postal Union (Thrum, 1892, p. 140).

**6.** Provisions of Hawaiian neutrality were also incorporated in the 1863 Hawaiian-Spanish treaty and 1852 Hawaiian-Swedish/Norwegian treaty (Sai, 2008, p. 75).

**7.** See http://www2.hawaii.edu/~speccoll/hawaiinewspapers-date.html for a listing of different Hawaiian language newspaper titles and their years of circulation.

**8.** A republic in name only.
**9.** As a unilateral action, a joint resolution has no effect outside the borders of the issuing State, therefore having no effect in the Hawaiian Kingdom, having been acknowledged as a sovereign State by the U.S. in multiple bilateral treaties with the Kingdom.
**10.** See Sai 2008 (p. 133) regarding how the U.S. began counting Kingdom subjects as U.S. citizens.
**11.** As an occupied territory, the U.S.'s installation of military bases, its movement of U.S. citizens to the Kingdom without regard for international protocols, and its conducting of a plebiscite, inter alia, constitute clear violations of the Fourth Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 1949, as a state of war persists as a consequence of establishing military bases in the Hawaiian Islands to support the U.S.'s war with Spain.
**12.** Matthew Craven (2002, p. 5) stated, "the continuity of the Hawaiian Kingdom . . . may be refuted only by reference to a valid demonstration of legal title, or sovereignty, on the part of the United States." Lacking a bilateral treaty of cession between the Hawaiian Kingdom and the United States of America, the U.S. has not been able to produce such a valid demonstration.
**13.** Act 57, Sec. 30 of the 1896 Laws of the Republic of Hawai'i: "The English Language shall be the medium and basis of instruction in all public and private schools, provided that where it is desired that another language shall be taught in addition to the English language, such instruction may be authorized by the Department, either by its rules, the curriculum of the school, or by direct order in any particular instance. Any schools that shall not conform to the provisions of this section shall not be recognized by the Department." [signed] June 8, 1896, Sanford B. Dole, President of the Republic of Hawai'i.
**14.** Owing largely to their relative isolation, many elderly among the Ni'ihau community do not speak English very well.
**15.** Taking into account students and teachers of Hawaiian immersion schools and mainstream schools and institutions.
**16.** The same year that Act 57 was finally repealled by the U.S. installed government.
**17.** Notions of **communicative competence** were initially outlined by Campbell and Wales (1970). For them, communicative competence involved (a) knowledge of rules (formal possibility); (b) understanding of the constraints on the application of these rules in particular contexts (implementational feasibility); (c) appreciation of contextual appropriacy; and (d) understanding of the performative role of utterances (i.e. the illocutionary component of speech acts). There have been many other accounts of communicative competence/s (see, for example, Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei and Thurrell (1995); Council of Europe, 2001; Habermas (1970); Hymes (1971); Jakobovits (1970)).
**18. CLT** has been described in different ways (see, for example, Bachman, 1990; Beretta, 1998, p. 233; Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1997; Howatt, 1984, pp. 296-297; Kumaravadivelu, 1994, p. 35). Thus, for example, Littlewood (1981) identified four (4) broad skills associated with CLT: manipulation of the language system; ability to relate form and communicative function; understanding of the social meanings of linguistic forms; and strategic control in the use of language to communicate effectively in specific situations (p. 6). He also identified three general principles: *the communication principle* (involving the belief that activities that engage genuine communication promote learning); *the task principle* (according to the extent to which language is used to carry out meaningful tasks is regarded as important to language learning); and *the meaningfulness principle* (according to which the learning process is supported to the extent that language is used meaningfully) (pp. 6, 77 & 78). What is common among the various descriptions is the emphasis on "teaching that encourages learners to engage in meaningful communication in the target language – communication that has a function over and above that of language learning itself" (Ministry of Education (New Zealand), 2002, p. 16).

**19.** ***Communicative outcomes*** involve the ability to understand and use language to achieve specified communicative goals such as, for example, communicating about likes and dislikes or about habits and routines.

**20.** ***Cultural outcomes*** involve knowledge and understanding of specific aspects of cultural knowledge and understanding and the ability to make use of this knowledge and understanding in communicative contexts.

**21.** ***Strategic outcomes*** include, for example, the ability to use a range of language learning strategies.

**22.** Howatt (1984, pp. 296-297) noted that there was both a 'strong' version of CLT and a 'weak' version. Only the strong version rejects communicative activities that include any type of structural focus.

**23.** Thompson (1996) notes that two common misconceptions about CLT among his colleagues were (a) that it focuses exclusively on speaking, and (b) that it involves the rejection of any focus on form.

**24.** Thus, for example, at least four (4) of the entries are wholly inappropriate and at least nine (9) appear to be predicated on the belief that CLT focuses exclusively on listening and speaking skills. The items that seem most relevant refer to 'the written and oral engagement of students' and 'the immediate application of learned materials'. However, there is no indication of what is involved in ensuring that this engagement/ application takes place. Furthermore, the three (3) comments provided in connection with this question indicate that at least some of the respondents confuse CLT and direct method.

## References

Adams, P. E., & Krockover, G. H. (1997). Beginning science teacher cognition and its origins in the preservice secondary science teacher program. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34,* 633-53.

Andrews, S. (2006). The evolution of teachers' language awareness. *Language Awareness, 15*(1), 1-19.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beretta, A. (1998). Attention to form or meaning? Error treatment in the Bangalore Project. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*, 283-303.

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice.* London: Continuum.

Butler, Y. G. (2004). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL? Case studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(2), 245-278.

Calderhead, J. (1988). The development of knowledge structures in learning to teach. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Teachers' professional learning* (pp. 51-64). London: The Farmer Press.

Campbell, R., & Wales, R. (1970). The study of language acquisition. In J. Lyons (Ed.) (1970), *New horizons in linguistics* (pp. 242-260). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, *6*(2), 5-35.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1997). Direct approaches in L2 instruction: A turning point in communicative language teaching? *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(1), 141-152.

Chen, M., & Johnson, D. (2004). Graduation English language proficiency benchmark in Taiwan – Issues and problems. In *Proceedings of the 2004 International Conference and Workshop on TEFL & Applied Linguistics* (pp. 136-147). Taipei: Minchuan University.

Coffman, T. (2009). *Nation within: The history of the American occupation of Hawai'i.* Kīhei, Hawai'i: Koa Books.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference: Learning, teaching, assessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Craven, M. (2002). *Continuity of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Reader in international law SOAS.* London: University of London.

Fotos, S. (2005). Traditional and grammar translation methods for second language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 653-670). New York: Routledge.

Green, R. (1966). Linguistic subgrouping within Polynesia: The implications for prehistoric settlement. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society, 75*(1), 6-38.

Habermas, J. (1970). Toward a theory of Communicative Competence. *Inquiry, 13*, 360-375.

Her, J-H. (2007). *The globalization of English: Its impact on English language education in the tertiary education sector in Taiwan.* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Waikato.

Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howatt, A. P. R., & Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *A history of English language teaching.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hymes, D. H. (1971). *On communicative competence.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jakobovits, L. (1970). *Foreign language learning: A psycholinguistic analysis of the Issues.* Rowley., Mass.: Newbury House.

Kanahele, G. S. (1982). *Hawaiian renaissance.* Honolulu, Hawai'i: Project WAIAHA.

Kervas-Doukas, E. (1996). Using attitude scales to investigate teacher' attitudes to the communicative approach. *ELT Journal, 50,* 187-198.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The post method condition: emerging strategies for foreign/second foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*, 27-48.

Lance Larsen v. Hawaiian Kingdom, (2001), 119 INT'L L. REP.

Lili'uokalani (1984). *Hawai'i's story by Hawai'i's Queen.* Rutland, Vermont: C.E. Tuttle Co.

Littlewood, W. T. (1981). *Communicative language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ministry of Education (New Zealand). (2002). *German in the New Zealand curriculum.* Wellington, N.Z.: Learning Media.

Moore, P. K. (2010). *He Hawai'i kākou: Conflicts and continuities of history, culture and identity in Hawai'i.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Nogelmeier, M. P. (2010). *Mai pa'a i ka leo: Historical voice in Hawaiian primary materials: Looking forward and listening back.* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: Making it work. *ELT Journal, 41*, 136-145.

Preza, D. (2010). *The emperical writes back: Re-examining Hawaiian dispossession resulting from the Māhele of 1848.* Unpublished MA thesis, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Reinecke, J. E. (1988). *Language and dialect in Hawaii: A sociolinguistic history to 1935* (S. M. Tsuzaki, Ed.). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawai'i.

Richards, J. C. (1998). *Beyond training.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery & E. Guyon (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan.

Sai, D. K. (2008). A slippery path towards Hawaiian indigeneity: An analysis and comparison between Hawaiian state sovereignty and Hawaiian indigeneity and its use and practice in Hawai'i today. *The Journal of Law and Social Challenges, 10*(1), 101-166.

Sai v Clinton et al., (March 9, 2010), United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 10-899 (CKK).

Sato, K., & Kleinsasser, R. C. (1999). Communicative language teaching (CLT): practical understandings. *Modern Language Journal, 83*, 494-517.

Sato, K., & Kleinsasser, R. C. (2004). Beliefs, practices, and interactions of teachers in a Japanese high school English department. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*, 797-816.

Schütz, A. (1994). *Voices of Eden: A history of Hawaiian-language studies.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Silva, N. K. (2004). *Aloha betrayed: Native Hawaiian resistance to American colonialism.* Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Thompson, G. (1996). Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching. *ELT Journal, 50*, 9-15.

Thrum, T. (2006). *Thrum's almanac and annual.* Honolulu: SRSC Press.

United States Congressional Records. (1897-1899). *Fifty-fifth Congress.*

United States Department of State Foreign relations of United States. (1894). *Affairs in Hawaii House ex. doc. no. 47, fifty-third congress, second session.*

Wang, W-P. (2008). *Teaching English to young learners in Taiwan: Issues relating to teaching, teacher education, teaching materials and teacher perspectives.* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Waikato.

Wilkins, D. A. (1976). *Notional syllabuses.* London: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, W., & Kamanā, K. (2001). Mai loko mai o ka 'i'ini: Proceeding from a dream: The 'Aha Pūnana Leo connection in Hawaiian language revitalization. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.). *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice* (pp. 147-176).San Diego: Academic Press.

Wong, L. (1999). Authenticity and the revitalization of Hawaiian. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 30*(1), 94-115.

***Appendix*: Survey for teachers of first and second year Hawaiian in public high schools, community colleges and universities in Hawai'i**

THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
*Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato*

## Survey for teachers of first and second year Hawaiian

## in public high schools, community colleges and universities in Hawai'i

This teacher survey is part of a research project conducted by Keao NeSmith for a PhD degree in Applied Linguistics in the School of Māori and Pacific Development at the University of Waikato in New Zealand (www.waikato.ac.nz). There are three phases to the survey and you have the freedom to participate in any, all or no part of it. Phase One is the attached questionnaire which takes about 20 minutes to fill out. Your students may also be invited to participate in a student survey (community college and university students only).

The overall aim of this research project is to investigate how Hawaiian language and culture are taught in public high schools, community colleges and universities in the first two years of study and to identify areas of best practice. It is hoped that the outcome of this research will be useful to all Hawaiian language teachers.

**If you do not wish to participate, that is not a problem.** If you do, please fill out the attached questionnaire (Phase One) as requested. Phases Two and Three are explained on the last two pages. Please fill in your contact information in Phases Two and/or Three ONLY IF you are willing to take part in either of those phases. Please do not fill in your contact information if you do not want to participate in Phases Two and/or Three.

The identity of participants will NOT be made available to anyone other than the researcher and his supervisors. Participants will NOT be named or identified in any way in the reporting of the research. A code will be created for the final report to represent each survey participant and their school to ensure anonymity. If you choose to participate in Phases Two and/or Three, and are selected for participation in them, your school will be provided a copy of the report after it is completed. **Please provide the mailing address of your school <u>only</u> if you wish to participate in Phases Two and/or Three.**

**Instructions/Information**

• Please place *either* a check in the appropriate boxes *or* provide a written response (in English or Hawaiian).
• If you are uncomfortable with any particular question, *please feel free to skip it* and move on to the next question.
• At the end of the questionnaire, you are asked to add any comments that you believe may be relevant to this research project.

**Part 1: Background Information**

1. What is your gender?
   Male ☐
   Female ☐

2. What is your ethnic background?
   Native Hawaiian ☐
   (i.e. having at least one ancestor who was born in the Hawaiian Islands before 1778)
   Other than Native Hawaiian ☐

3. How long have you been teaching Hawaiian?
   _____ year(s)
   _____ semester(s)

4. What level school do you currently teach at?
   High school ☐
   Community college ☐
   University ☐

5. What Hawaiian language course(s) do you teach? Please check all that apply.
   First year 1st semester (eg. 101, 1100, etc.) ☐
   First year 2nd semester (eg. 102, 1200, etc.) ☐
   Second year 1st semester (eg. 201, 2100, etc.) ☐
   Second year 2nd semester (eg. 202, 2200, etc.) ☐

**Part 2: Language Background and Reasons for Learning and Teaching Hawaiian**

6. What language(s) were you raised with from birth (i.e. the language used to communicate whole/complete thoughts, *not just words*)? Please check all that apply.

   Standard American English ☐
   Pidgin ☐
   Hawaiian ☐
   Other language(s) (please specify): ☐

7. Which of the following apply to you? Please check all that apply.

At least one of my parents/guardians raised me speaking Hawaiian since I was born, *and they were also raised in the same way.* ☐
I learned to speak Hawaiian by being raised by at least one parent/guardian *who learned to speak Hawaiian as a second language.* ☐
I learned to speak Hawaiian at Pūnana Leo. ☐
I learned to speak Hawaiian at a Kula Kaiapuni Hawai'i. ☐

I learned to speak Hawaiian by taking courses at an English-medium high school. ☐
I learned to speak Hawaiian by taking courses at a post-secondary school (i.e. community college or university). ☐
Other (please specify): ☐

8. What was your reason for learning Hawaiian? Please check all that apply.

Hawaiian is the primary language of my family. ☐
I am native Hawaiian and I believe that it is important for me to perpetuate the language and culture of my ancestors. ☐
I am not native Hawaiian, but I want to help preserve Hawaiian language and culture. ☐
I wanted to be able to interact with native speakers of Hawaiian in their language. ☐
I wanted to be able to interact with other second language learners of Hawaiian in the language. ☐
So that I can read old documents written in Hawaiian. ☐
To become a teacher of Hawaiian. ☐
To better understand native Hawaiian culture. ☐
Other reason(s) (please specify): ☐

9. What are your reasons for teaching Hawaiian? Please check all that apply.

I want to raise awareness about Hawaiian issues, including political and language issues. ☐
I enjoy teaching Hawaiian language and culture. ☐
I want to make sure that the Hawaiian language and culture are perpetuated. ☐
Other reason(s) (please specify): ☐

**Part 3: Interaction with Native Speakers of Hawaiian**

10. How important do you think it is to interact with native Hawaiian speakers in order to be an effective language teacher?

Essential ☐
Very important ☐
Important ☐
Not important ☐
Comment, if any:

11. What have you done *in the past* and what do you do *these days* to help you become more native-like in the way you speak Hawaiian?

| | In the past | These days |
|---|---|---|
| *Sometimes* listen to or view recordings of native speakers speaking Hawaiian. | ☐ | ☐ |
| *Regularly* listen to or view recordings of native speakers speaking Hawaiian. | ☐ | ☐ |
| *Sometimes* engage in conversations in Hawaiian with native speakers. | ☐ | ☐ |
| *Regularly* engage in conversations in Hawaiian with native speakers. | ☐ | ☐ |
| *Sometimes* read Hawaiian language material (eg. newspapers, books, websites, etc.) | ☐ | ☐ |

*Regularly* read Hawaiian language material (eg. newspapers, books, websites, etc.) ☐
Other activity (please specify): ☐

12. Is it difficult for you to get together with native speakers to engage in conversations in Hawaiian?

Yes ☐ No ☐

• If you answered 'yes', what is/are the problem(s)? Please check all that apply.

I don't know any native speakers that I can meet and carry on conversations with in Hawaiian. ☐
I know native speakers that I can carry on conversations with in Hawaiian, but not well enough to feel comfortable meeting with them during off-work hours. ☐
I don't have the time to meet and carry on conversations with native speakers. ☐
I am embarrassed to engage in conversations with native speakers in Hawaiian because I am afraid of making mistakes when I speak the language. ☐
Conversation topics are limited to topics I am not very interested in. ☐
The native speakers I know live far from me. ☐
Other problem(s) (please specify): ☐

**Part 4: Words, Concepts, Domains and Culture**

13. If you come across a concept or term that you don't know how to express in Hawaiian, what do you do? Please check all that apply.

Ask a native speaker. ☐
Ask a colleague. ☐
Search the Hawaiian language dictionaries. ☐
Use the English term. ☐
Create expressions/terms myself. ☐
Other (please specify): ☐

14. When do you use Hawaiian? Please check all that apply.

In class and at faculty meetings. ☐
Always with other Hawaiian speakers.
More than half of the time with other Hawaiian speakers.
Occasionally with other Hawaiian speakers.
With family members who speak Hawaiian. ☐
To compose oli/mele.
To read and write.
Other occasion(s) (please specify):

15. How important do you think it is to use Hawaiian when speaking to second language Hawaiian speakers?

Essential ☐
Very important ☐
Important ☐
Not important ☐
Comment, if any:

16. Which of the following elements of Hawaiian culture do you have experience in or considerable knowledge about?

- ☐ Preparation of traditional Hawaiian foods (eg. 'ō'io lomi, kō'elepālau, laulau, kālua imu, etc.)
- ☐ Putting together pā'ina, 'aha'aina, knowledge of customs associated with feasting, feasting occasions, etc.
- ☐ Fishing
- ☐ Farming (kalo, mai'a, vegetables, plants, etc.)
- ☐ Hula/oli/music
- ☐ Surfing/canoe paddling
- ☐ Fiber crafts (eg. lau hala weaving, kapa making, coconut leaf weaving, cordage making, etc.)
- ☐ Lei making
- ☐ Traditional Hawaiian tattoo
- ☐ Traditional Hawaiian wood or stone carving
- ☐ Rock wall or platform construction
- ☐ Lomilomi
- ☐ Other (please specify):

17. Do you have children?

Yes ☐ No ☐

• If you answered 'yes', approximately what percentage of the time do you speak Hawaiian to them? _____%

Comment, if any:

**Part 5: Language teacher training**

18. Please check the box or insert a number if any of the following statements applies to you.

| | |
|---|---|
| I have a degree (please circle those which pertain to you: Certificate, Associates, Bachelors, Masters, PhD) in second language teaching/learning. | ☐ |
| I have qualifications in teaching that included second language teaching. | ☐ |
| I took *at least one* course in second language teaching or TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language) as an undergraduate or graduate student. | ☐ |
| As part of a course I have completed, I was involved in a practicum (i.e. a course that involved teaching a second language to real students under the supervision of a trainer). | ☐ |
| I have attended in-service workshops and/or conferences on second language teaching. | ☐ |
| How many in-service workshops on second language teaching have you attended? | _____ |

19. Which, if any, of the following areas relating to second language teaching/learning have you had some training in?

| | |
|---|---|
| How students learn second languages | ☐ How much training? _____ **circle one:** hrs/days/semesters |
| Materials design and development | ☐ How much training? _____ **circle one:** hrs/days/semesters |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Specification of achievement objectives | ☐ | How much training? _____ **circle one:** hrs/days/semesters |
| Language teaching methodologies | ☐ | How much training? _____ **circle one:** hrs/days/semesters |
| Critical evaluation of methodology | ☐ | How much training? _____ **circle one:** hrs/days/semesters |
| Textbook and materials evaluation | ☐ | How much training? _____ **circle one:** hrs/days/semesters |
| Assessment | ☐ | How much training? _____ **circle one:** hrs/days/semesters |
| Communicative language teaching | ☐ | How much training? _____ **circle one:** hrs/days/semesters |

20. Do you feel that you would benefit from training/further training in any of the above areas listed in Question 19?

    Yes ☐ No ☐

    • If you answered 'yes', in which of these areas do you believe you would benefit from training?

21. Do you feel that training in some or all of the areas listed in Question 19 above is important for Hawaiian language teachers?

    Yes ☐ No ☐

    Why or why not? (please explain)

**Part 6: Teaching Methodologies, Teaching Materials and Assessment**

22. How often, if at all, do you use translation to explain the meaning of new words, phrases and constructions to your students in your first and/or second year level Hawaiian course(s)?

    All of the time ☐
    More than half of the time ☐
    Occasionally ☐
    Never ☐

23. Would you describe your teaching as 'communicative language teaching'?

    Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know ☐

    • If you answered 'yes', what are two or three aspects of your teaching that you consider to be communicative?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Comment, if any:

24. Do you use one or more textbooks in teaching Hawaiian?

Yes ☐ No ☐

• If you answered 'yes', please give the title(s) and/or author(s) of the text(s) you use for the first and/or second year level course(s) you teach.

| | |
|---|---|
| First Year, Semester 1 (eg. 101, 1100, etc.) | Title/author of Text 1: |
| | Title/author of Text 2: |
| First Year, Semester 2 (eg. 102, 1200, etc.) | Title/author of Text 1: |
| | Title/author of Text 2: |
| Second Year, Semester 1 (eg. 201, 2100, etc.) | Title/author of Text 1: |
| | Title/author of Text 2: |
| Second Year, Semester 2 (eg. 202, 2200, etc.) | Title/author of Text 1: |
| | Title/author of Text 2: |

25. If you listed one or more textbooks in response to Question 24 above, why do you use this textbook/these textbooks? Please check all that apply.

| | Text for First Year, Semester 1 (eg. 101, 1100, etc.) | Text for First Year, Semester 2 (eg. 102, 1200, etc.) | Text for Second Year, Semester 1 (eg. 201, 2100, etc.) | Text for Second Year, Semester 2 (eg. 202, 2200, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| It is/they are required by my department. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| It was/they were used by my Hawaiian language teachers. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| It is/they are used by my colleagues. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| I think it is/they are good. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| I don't like it/them, but I can't find a textbook that I do like. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Other reason(s) (please specify): | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

26. On average, how much time do you spend talking in your first and/or second year Hawaiian course(s)?

| | First Year, Semester 1 (eg. 101, 1100, etc.) | First Year, Semester 2 (eg. 102, 1200, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 1 (eg. 201, 2100, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 2 (eg. 202, 2200, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 76% of the time or more | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| between 51% and 75% of the time | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| between 26% and 50% of the time | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 25% of the time or less | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Comment, if any: | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

27. On average, how much time do you spend at the *front* of the classroom teaching (as opposed to any other location in the classroom) in your first and/or second year Hawaiian course(s)?

| | First Year, Semester 1 (eg. 101, 1100, etc.) | First Year, Semester 2 (eg. 102, 1200, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 1 (eg. 201, 2100, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 2 (eg. 202, 2200, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 76% of the time or more | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| between 51% and 75% of the time | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| between 26% and 50% of the time | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 25% of the time or less | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Comment, if any: | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

28. On average, how much time in class do students spend doing pair or group work in your first and/or second year Hawaiian course(s)?

| | First Year, Semester 1 (eg. 101, 1100, etc.) | First Year, Semester 2 (eg. 102, 1200, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 1 (eg. 201, 2100, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 2 (eg. 202, 2200, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 76% of the time or more | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| between 51% and 75% of the time | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| between 26% and 50% of the time | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 25% of the time or less | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Comment, if any: | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

29. How much time do you spend speaking English in class?

| | First Year, Semester 1 (eg. 101, 1100, etc.) | First Year, Semester 2 (eg. 102, 1200, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 1 (eg. 201, 2100, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 2 (eg. 202, 2200, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 76% of the time or more | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| between 51% and 75% of the time | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| between 26% and 50% of the time | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 25% of the time or less | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Comment, if any: | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

30. What Hawaiian cultural elements do you teach in your Hawaiian language classes? Please check all that apply. Please see Question 16 for suggestions on cultural elements that you may list below.

| | First Year, Semester 1 (eg. 101, 1100, etc.) | First Year, Semester 2 (eg. 102, 1200, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 1 (eg. 201, 2100, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 2 (eg. 202, 2200, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Behavior (eg. body language, cultural morés, values, difference between traditional and modern norms, etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Time division (eg. names of the moon phases, planting seasons, using the traditional Hawaiian calendar to mark special events, etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Genealogy (eg. ali'i of the various islands, students' families, patrilineal/matrilineal significance, etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Using Hawaiian values for problem solving (eg. political, legal, financial issues, traditional vs modern needs, etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Hawaiian deities and traditions associated with them, shift from traditional to modern belief systems, etc. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Other (please specify):

31. How important do you think it is to include Hawaiian culture in first and/or second year Hawaiian language course(s)?

Essential ☐
Very important ☐
Important ☐
Not important ☐
Comment, if any: ☐

32. Is there a specific set of achievement objectives for the first and/or second year Hawaiian course(s) you teach (in terms of what students should be able to do using the Hawaiian language at the end of the course, eg. being able to communicate about habitual or regular activities)?

| First Year, Semester 1 (eg. 101, 1100, etc.) | First Year, Semester 2 (eg. 102, 1200, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 1 (eg. 201, 2100, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 2 (eg. 202, 2200, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know ☐ | Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know ☐ | Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know ☐ | Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know ☐ |

• If you checked 'yes' for any of the above courses you teach, who establishes these objectives? Please check all that apply.

Hawai'i State Department of Education ☐
Your Department ☐
You ☐
Someone else/some other office (please specify): ☐
Comment, if any:

33. In your opinion, how successful is the teaching of first and second year Hawaiian in your department?

| | First Year, Semester 1 (eg. 101, 1100, etc.) | First Year, Semester 2 (eg. 102, 1200, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 1 (eg. 201, 2100, etc.) | Second Year, Semester 2 (eg. 202, 2200, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very successful | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Mostly successful | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Somewhat successful | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Not successful | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Comment, if any: | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | |

**Part 7: Proficiency in Hawaiian**

Please use the following 6-point scale (**one** being *least capable* and **six** being *most capable*) to answer Questions 34-36:

1 **Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type.** (eg. can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.)

2 **Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance.** (eg. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment. Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate relevance.)

3 **Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc.** (eg. can produce simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes and ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.)

4 **Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialization.** (eg. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.)

5 **Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognize implicit meaning.** (eg. can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organizational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.)

6 **Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read.** (eg. can summarize information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations.)

34. How do you rate your level of proficiency in Hawaiian? Based on the scale provided on the previous page, please circle the appropriate number:

| *Least* | | | | *Most* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Capable* | | | | *Capable* | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |

Comment, if any:

35. How proficient do you believe a teacher of first or second year Hawaiian should ideally be? Based on the scale provided on the previous page, please circle the appropriate number:

| *Least* | | | | *Most* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Capable* | | | | *Capable* | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |

Comment, if any:

36. Approximately how proficient do you believe average students are who complete your first or second year Hawaiian courses? Based on the scale provided on the previous page, please circle the appropriate number:

| | *Least Capable* | | | | | *Most Capable* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| First year, 1st semester (eg. 101, 1100, etc.) | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| First year, 2nd semester (eg. 102, 1200, etc.) | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| Second year, 1st semester (eg. 201, 2100, etc.) | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| Second year, 2nd semester (eg. 202, 2200, etc.) | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |

Comment, if any:

**Part 8: Your Views**

37. Which of the following would you classify as a native speaker of Hawaiian? Please check all that apply.

Someone who has at least one parent/guardian who raised them speaking Hawaiian since they were born, *and was/were also raised in the same way.* ☐

Someone who has at least one parent/guardian *who learned to speak Hawaiian as a second language* and raised them speaking Hawaiian since they were born. ☐

Some other definition (please explain): ☐

38. What comments or recommendations do you have regarding the teaching of first and second year Hawaiian?

39. Is there anything you would like to add to the responses you have already supplied?