

## **Revitalization and renormalization of Hawaiian language: Challenges and possible contributions to the revitalization of other languages**

Yumiko Ohara  
Ka Haka 'Ula o Ke'elikōlani  
University of Hawaii at Hilo

Discussion concerning the theoretical orientation of one's research is generally seen as an important consideration. It is more so in this presentation at this venue as a part of this symposium: "Approaches to Endangered Languages in Japan and Northeast Asia: Description, Documentation and Revitalization". In the title, there are three parts, description, documentation, and revitalization and this presentation focuses on the last part, revitalization. Thus this is not just purely descriptive study of language structure or a work to document a language but the presentation deals largely with language issues from a socio-political perspective. In short, this presentation will attempt to illuminate language ideology and language and identity while examining language revitalization of Hawaiian language. In particular, I will be focusing on three significant education programs of the language revitalization movement: namely Pūnana Leo (Hawaiian medium pre-school), ke kula 'o Nāwahīokalani'ōpu'u (Hawaiian medium elementary to high school), and Ka Haka 'Ula o Ke'elikōlani (College of Hawaiian Language at University of Hawai'i at Hilo).

After brief historical background information, the presentation indicates the extent that all instruction at all grades, preschool through 12, in those programs is through Hawaiian and the curriculum at each level incorporates many daily and annual school rituals. These programs have been labeled as very successful due to their high academic achievement as well as healthy ethnic identity development (Grenoble and Whaley 2006, Stiles 1997, Wilson & Kamanā 2009). It is also possible to observe how ideologies of the Hawaiian language in various sites within the current revitalization movement contrast with previously held ideologies which were prevalent when the language shift to English was taking place. Older ideologies behind the language shift, in particular that speaking in Hawaiian was seen as something that needed to be terminated for the sake of young people's future, is an idea familiar to many, if not all, indigenous languages of the world. However, more recent language ideologies, which concern the value of the Hawaiian language as a code, the value of engaging in the Hawaiian language revitalization movement, and the value of the Hawaiian language as a commodity, attach a positive worth to the language (Ohara 2016). This is of course not an issue only for the Hawaiian language movement; indigenous people all over the world struggle to find ways to maintain traditional language practices while attempting to ensure intergenerational transmission.

References

Grenoble, Lenore A. and Lindsay J. Whaley. 2006. *Saving Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ohara, Yumiko. 2016. Re-inventing Hawaiian identity: Conception of ethnicity and language in the language revitalization movement. *Internationales Asienforum*, 47, 1-2: 57-80.

Stiles, Dawn B. 1997. Four successful indigenous language programs. In Jon Reyhner (ed.) *Teaching Indigenous Languages*. Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University. 148-262.

Wilson, William H. and Kauanoe Kamanā. 2009. Indigenous youth bilingualism from a Hawaiian activist perspective. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 8: 369-375.