

Christina Higgins*

The dynamics of Hawaiian speakerhood in the family

<https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2018-2003>

Abstract: While the majority of studies on *new speakers* focuses on language use in educational and community contexts, the family is becoming an increasingly relevant site since new speakers are now incorporating their languages into their home life. This article reports on how people of Native Hawaiian ancestry express their speakerhood with regard to their use of ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, or the Hawaiian language, in the context of the family. It explores Hawaiians’ stances towards different ways of speaking Hawaiian with regard to authenticity, an issue which has been found to be central among new speakers of minority languages in other contexts. Drawing on interview data with six Hawaiians, this article investigates Hawaiian speakerhood by focusing on how the participants view linguistic authority and *translanguaging* in family settings. The article offers insights into the range of linguistic practices and sociolinguistic authenticities in families that may enhance continued language revitalization efforts.

Keywords: new speakers, Hawaiian, authenticity, family language policy, translanguaging

1 Introduction

This article examines the various forms of “sociolinguistic stancetaking” (Jaffe 2015) that people of Native Hawaiian ancestry express with regard to their use of ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, or the Hawaiian language, in the context of the family. Family language practices have been found crucial to the maintenance and revitalization of indigenous and minority languages (Fishman 1970; Spolsky 2009), but little research thus far has examined how families use and view languages such as Hawaiian, which have experienced disruption and language shift to a majority language for one or more generations. Most speakers of Hawaiian today qualify as *new speakers*, or individuals who did not have significant exposure to the language in the home, but who learned it through language immersion or

*Corresponding author: Christina Higgins, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Honolulu, USA,
E-mail: cmhiggin@hawaii.edu

revitalization programs, most often as adults (O'Rourke et al. 2015). While this term is not widely used in an emic fashion among speakers of Hawaiian, most speakers are indeed second language learners who acquired the language as adults. New speakers are at the heart of Hawaiian regeneration, or the re-establishment of Hawaiian across as many domains of life as possible (Warner 1998). New speakers are often described as speakers of "University Hawaiian" or "College Hawaiian", terms which both refer to a way of speaking that can be associated with inauthenticity due to its origins in classrooms rather than home and community life. This variety of Hawaiian stands in contradistinction to the remaining elders' way of speaking 'Ōlelo Hawai'i. At present, it is estimated that there are approximately 1,000 *mānaleo*, a recently coined word that refers to native speakers of Hawaiian (NeSmith 2002), while there are over 18,000 speakers of Hawaiian in the State of Hawai'i, according to the U.S. Census (ACS 2015).

The concept of the new speaker is a helpful departure point for exploring Hawaiians' stances towards different ways of speaking Hawaiian with regard to authenticity and legitimacy, issues which have been found to be central to new speakers of minority languages in other contexts (e.g. Costa 2015; McLeod and O'Rourke 2015). Drawing on interview data, I investigate the ways that Hawaiian speakers make sense of their own Hawaiian speakerhood in the context of the family. The findings show an impressive array of speakerhood in family life, ranging from depictions of "fragmented Hawaiian", or speaking English and Hawai'i Creole infused with Hawaiian vocabulary, to the use of Hawaiian for specific cultural activities, to striving to speak Hawaiian in the style of the last remaining elders. In many minority and indigenous language contexts, traditional, monolingual forms of language that have been transmitted from elders without interruption are often viewed as having the utmost authority (Coupland 2003; Jaffe 2015; McCarty et al. 2006; Wyman 2012), and the same sentiments are sometimes found in the present study. However, it is also the case that language regeneration can lead to new registers, vocabulary, and other linguistic innovations that in turn illegitimate traditional, dialectal and rural forms of speech (Frekko 2009; McLeod and O'Rourke 2015; Woolard 2016). Moreover, additional dynamics emerge with regard to speakerhood because of the multilingual contexts in which speakers navigate their worlds. Like other multilingual speakers of indigenous and minority languages, Hawaiian speakers engage in *translanguaging*, or the use of all of their linguistic resources to participate in and make sense of their multilingual worlds (García and Li Wei 2013). For people who engage in translanguaging, discrete boundaries between languages are not necessarily evident or important, particularly in everyday interactions such as those in the home. This raises the question of how speakers of languages like

Hawaiian, for which there is a strong interest in reclaiming, revitalizing, and normalizing, view translanguaging.

As Jaffe (2015: 42) points out,

Deciding who ‘counts’ as a ‘new speaker’ or assuming a new speaker identity is an act of sociolinguistic stancetaking that is embedded in ideological formations, social projects, and imaginaries. These in turn are part of a larger process of defining and creating communities of minority language practices.

She goes on to explain that speakers may identify themselves as new speakers through a number of stances, including the expression of relative linguistic insecurity and deference to those who they consider to be native speakers with an uninterrupted linguistic proficiency in a given language. Other stances indexing a new speaker identity involve displays of persistence with regard to language learning and use, and the assertion of linguistic authority, often with reference to standardized forms of the language in question. New speakers can also be identified by others when their claims about language position the new speakers as inauthentic. Given the number of speakers who are reclaiming minority and indigenous languages around the world, it is important to better understand how speakerhood operates in the home since it is arguably a key site for intergenerational language transmission for future generations of speakers. This is especially true in Hawai‘i, where many graduates of the immersion education system that developed in the 1980s are now raising their own families in Hawaiian. While some of these families include members who are not ethnically Hawaiian, the majority of immersion students and immersion graduates are people who identify as having Hawaiian ancestry. The new speaker paradigm offers a new way of framing speakers who are increasingly common in today’s modern world due to dislocation, oppression, and marginalization, and economic, social, and political pressures which encouraged assimilation among previous generations to dominant and majority languages and cultures. Studies on new speakers are very recent and have mainly examined indigenous minority contexts in Europe, exploring how speakers of languages such as Galician (O’Rourke and Ramallo 2013), Basque (Ortega et al. 2015), and Breton (Hornsby 2015) negotiate the challenges of learning and speaking a language that was not used as a home language. Since people working to revitalize Hawaiian have focused on the family as a crucial site for its revitalization and transmission, it is useful to understand the nature of Hawaiian speakerhood in the family context, and what implications this may have for revitalization efforts at large.

2 Hawaiian: From past to present

Hawaiian is a Polynesian language that belongs to the Austronesian language family. It developed after people from the Marquesas settled on the Hawaiian archipelago in approximately 300 CE (Schütz 1994). Christian missionaries from the United States arrived in 1820, and their efforts to translate religious texts and convert Hawaiians to Christianity led to the growth of widespread literacy in Hawaiian, including the production of hundreds of Hawaiian newspapers. Though Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians alike valued opportunities to learn English, Hawaiian was the chief language used across the islands in schools, homes, and the community until the events of the second half of the 1800s (Wilson and Kamanā 2001). Ever since Captain Cook visited Hawai'i in 1778, the Hawaiian people had been devastated by foreign diseases, with an estimated 91% of the population decimated by the 1850s (Stannard 1989: 70). Ultimately, American businessmen who were the children of missionaries worked to acquire land, and in 1893, they schemed together with U.S. military forces to overthrow the Hawaiian monarch, Queen Lili'uokalani. After taking control of the government, the illegal regime made English the only medium of instruction in 1896, and in 1898, the Republic of Hawai'i was formed through annexation. At that time, Hawaiian was still the main language of everyday oral and written communication among Hawaiians, and many of the new residents who worked the sugarcane plantations and had come from China, Japan, Portugal, and elsewhere in the latter half of the nineteenth century learned Hawaiian to some degree (Bickerton and Wilson 1987). A pidginized Hawaiian also formed in the mid to late 1800s due to language contact from the shipping, whaling, and sandalwood industries (Roberts 1998). At the turn of the century, the plantation workers spoke this pidgin Hawaiian as a language of wider communication, and this language ultimately developed into the language known as Hawai'i Creole, which became a widely used and predominantly English-lexified creole. In the early twentieth century, Hawaiian continued to be spoken, and Hawaiian newspapers were published until the 1930s. Nevertheless, pressure to assimilate to an American way of life, coupled with the imposition of English in schooling, led the remaining families to no longer speak to their children in Hawaiian (Wilson 1998). After World War II, Hawai'i became the fiftieth state of the U.S., and all efforts that had previously supported the teaching of Hawaiian in public schools were discontinued. During these years, the Hawaiian language nearly died out completely.

Following the American Indian Movement and the U.S. Civil Rights movements, a Hawaiian Renaissance emerged in the 1970s that led to the reclamation

of Hawaiian cultural practices previously banned by missionaries and the U.S. government, including ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, hula, voyaging, song, and Hawaiian medicine. Hawaiian became an official language of the state in 1978, and in 1983, the first ‘*Aha Pūnana Leo* ‘language nest’ immersion preschool was established by a group of parents on Kaua‘i (Kawai‘ae‘a et al. 2007), inspired by the Kōhanga Reo preschools for Māori in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In 1986, parents led the efforts to rescind the 1896 law that prohibited the use of languages other than English from public schools, and the following year, public Hawaiian immersion programs were established. There are now over 20 immersion programs operating as stand-alone and within-school programs, including public charter schools. Currently, parents who enroll their children in Hawaiian language preschools are encouraged to learn Hawaiian so that they can support their children’s language development, and classes for parents and gatherings are regularly held to this end. While many parents of children enrolled in immersion programs initially identify as lacking proficiency in Hawaiian (Yamauchi et al. 2008), the number of parents who identify as Hawaiian language speakers has visibly grown in recent years due to the number of immersion graduates who are now parents (Schultz 2014). These families are of multiple ethnic backgrounds, and the majority identify as having Hawaiian ancestry. Census estimates from a 5-year survey ending in 2013 report 18,610 speakers of Hawaiian in the state (ACS 2015), a figure that includes an estimated 100 people on the island of Ni‘ihau, an island that never lost Hawaiian as the dominant language in all domains of life, including schooling, since it became privately owned in the 1830s, before U.S. occupation.

Today, residents and visitors alike are regularly exposed to some degree of Hawaiian in the form of signage, greetings, address terms, and through participation in or observation of cultural practices such as hula, lei-making, outrigger canoeing, surfing, and Hawaiian medicine. Since place names and street names are often in Hawaiian (and a 1978 law has required new street names on O‘ahu to be in Hawaiian), residents are generally familiar with Hawaiian pronunciation norms, and all school children are required to learn about Hawaiian language and culture through “Hawaiiana” classes in public education. Hawaiian is widely taught as a second language in K-12 settings, and it is the most popular additional language in the University of Hawai‘i system. Even among local people who do not claim to know Hawaiian, Hawaiian vocabulary is infused into everyday interactions in Hawai‘i English, as in “Are you *pau*?” ‘Are you finished?’, and in Hawai‘i Creole, as in “*Da keiki* like eat” ‘the children want to eat’. Other than English and Hawai‘i Creole, the most commonly spoken languages in the highly multilingual state are Ilokano, Tagalog, Japanese, Spanish, and Hawaiian (ACS 2015).

The boundaries between languages are contestable, of course, and as the data show, this is especially true for Hawaiian and Hawai'i Creole, which is still referred to as Pidgin even though it is a creole. Pidgin has traditionally been seen as a marker of both working-class and non-white identity in Hawai'i, and it is also seen as a prominent language spoken by Native Hawaiians (Drager and Grama 2014). Pidgin is frequently meshed with English and Hawaiian in casual conversation, though it is often seen as a language that is subordinate to these languages.

3 The question of authenticity among new speakers

New speakers' linguistic repertoires are often marked by linguistic mistakes, language mixing, and second language features. These characteristics are often seen by new speakers and native speakers alike as markers of inauthenticity. This view of linguistic deficiency emanates from a *language rights* ideology in which a particular ethnic group is understood to have a natural, primordial link to a language, a shared culture, and a territory, and is part of an ideology that valorizes the native speaker by associating it with a historic and an authentic past, unmarred by disruption from other languages (May 2013; Woolard 2016). This ideology holds firm in Provence, France, where *néo-locuteurs* of Occitan are placed in a deficit discourse even in academic discussions of the language. As young, urban speakers who are reclaiming this language, they are seen as artificial with reference to older, rural speakers, for whom Occitan is the dominant tongue (Costa 2015). In the Gaelic new speaker context in Scotland, this "preservationist rhetoric" (McLeod and O'Rourke 2015: 153) shows up in attitudes among new speakers themselves towards their own second language accents. Similar tensions between linguistic insecurity and legitimacy have been reported among new speakers of Corsican (Jaffe 2015), who refrain from speaking in villages where Corsican was widely spoken to avoid embarrassment, and by new speakers of Galician in Spain (O'Rourke and Ramallo 2015).

Research on minority and indigenous languages has shown how common it is for speakers to engage in *translanguaging* (García and Li Wei 2013), or the use of all of one's linguistic and semiotic resources to engage in activities. In contrast with purist perspectives on language which involve policing the boundaries between linguistic codes, translanguaging is "the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially

and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages” (Otheguy et al. 2015: 283). While some studies have shown that parents and children alternate languages as a strategy to negotiate their power relations (e.g. Gumperz 1982; Li Wei 1994) other more recent work has shown how children and parents draw on family languages to engage in creative language play (Canagarajah 2012) and to support literacy development in home languages and in English (Alvarez 2014; Song 2016). Despite the reality of dynamic, translingual, and ever-changing linguistic practices among native speakers themselves, the ideologies circulating around new speakers are based on a concept of authenticity which is built on purism and essentialism (Bucholtz 2003: 400).

This language rights ideology that anchors language to history and to place is increasingly complicated, however, by competing forms of legitimacy. Some new speakers see themselves as simply a different kind of speaker altogether, compared to native speakers. Many are aware that the recently coined vocabulary they use (and which native speakers do not know), provides them with a form of linguistic capital often associated with being more highly educated and upwardly mobile (McLeod and O’Rourke 2015), and they defend the need to create new words in the name of modernization. New speakers also tend to take an activist role in language and culture revitalization, which can be less common among the native speakers, and this grants the new speakers a certain degree of cultural authority. One new speaker of Gaelic drew attention to the need for greater flexibility among both new speakers and native speakers, while still deferring to native speakers as the source of good models for language learning:

Native Gaelic speakers still aren’t sufficiently accustomed to learners of Gaelic and you can understand why, as it’s quite a new thing for people to be learning Gaelic [...]. But, on the other hand, as I said, there are misunderstandings on both sides. [...] learners are quite fond of new words and talking about things that older people – native speakers – wouldn’t often discuss in the language. And they use this new language in front of native speakers and that doesn’t work too well. [...] there’s a need for Gaelic learners for many reasons and learners need native speakers – they’re the people who have a good example of the language and it would be beneficial for both groups, I think, if there was less misunderstanding on both sides.

(McLeod and O’Rourke 2015: 168)

While such viewpoints can lead to an ideological cleavage between the types of speakers, it is clear that more, rather than less, dialogue and engagement with each other is needed. This raises the question of what dialogues have been taking place among various kinds of Hawaiian language speakers.

3.1 Authenticity and Hawaiian

Framing the concept of authenticity as a social construct, Wong (1999) draws attention to challenges in Hawaiian language education by referring to what he calls liberal and conservative approaches. As an example of a conservative approach, Wong critiques the reliance on what he calls “book Hawaiian” from nineteenth century texts to create standards in university level classes for communicative competence among contemporary language learners, noting that such texts do little for meeting current learners’ communicative needs. He points out how the standardized forms of University Hawaiian differ from the ways native speaking elders speak the language, and he asserts that the deference to texts is a continuing form of colonization wrought by the missionaries and the forms of literacy they produced in Hawaiian. As an example of a liberal approach, he critiques the Hawaiian Language Lexicon Committee at the University of Hawai‘i, Hilo for inventing new words without the approval of native speakers, and for creating novel words through combining morphemes of existing Hawaiian words (e.g. *kawaūea* ‘humidity’ from *kawaū* ‘moisture’ and *ea* ‘air’) (1999: 106). He notes that authenticity is undermined with both approaches, and instead he encourages flexibility and dialogue among all types of speakers. He writes, “In the negotiation of what authentic Hawaiian is and will be, it is necessary to involve input from Hawaiian communities, whether they speak Hawaiian or not” (1999: 112).

The type of Hawaiian taught at university level featuring an array of new vocabulary is referred to as “neo Hawaiian” by NeSmith (2002), who details the differences between this variety and what he calls “traditional Hawaiian” (see Table 1 for examples).

Table 1: Sample differences in traditional and Neo Hawaiian (adapted from NeSmith 2002: 21–25).

| Linguistic feature | Traditional Hawaiian (TRAD) | Neo-Hawaiian (NEO) |
|--------------------|--|---|
| Phonology | final unstressed /i/ and /e/ distinct | final unstressed /i/ and /e/ homophonous (<i>hoihoi hoehoe</i>) |
| Lexicon | multi-word expressions common (<i>kapu holoi</i> ‘sink’) | newly coined words common (<i>kinika</i> ‘sink’) |
| Morphosyntax | verbs can be active and stative <i>maopopo ia’u</i> (‘It is known by me’) <i>maopopo au</i> (‘I know’) | some verbs are limited to stative form <i>maopopo ia’u</i> (‘it is known by me’) |
| Pragmatics | <i>ē?</i> or <i>ā?</i> to mark tag questions | <i>‘ēā?</i> to mark tag questions |

Growing up as a second language speaker of Hawaiian, NeSmith reports feeling deficient because of his neo Hawaiian speaking status, in spite of being a fluent speaker (2002: 10):

Today, however, despite being able to speak Hawaiian, whenever I interact with native speakers, I am often reminded of my limited knowledge of the language because I do not speak as they do. I know only a fraction of what my grandmother knew.

Still, he argues that Neo-Hawaiian speakers create their own speech communities with their own linguistic norms through interacting with one another, and he calls for more efforts to engage speakers of traditional Hawaiian with new speakers to reduce the linguistic divisions between the two groups.

In her research on new speakers, Snyder-Frey (2013) argues that for Hawaiian, the concept of *kuleana* ‘responsibility’ mitigates primordialist understandings of authenticity with regard to Hawaiian. Instead of worrying about the correctness or authenticity of their language, the young adult Hawaiian speakers she engaged with highlighted their responsibility to reclaim Hawaiian not just for personal reasons related to their own personal identity projects, but as “a connection to one’s *’ohana* [‘family’], in that acts performed out of *kuleana* are often specifically credited to the urgings of an elder or a discovery about one’s family” (2013: 7). Compared to western uses of the concept of responsibility, *kuleana* is not seen as a burden among Hawaiians, nor is it an action one takes as an individual. Instead, the *kuleana* of learning and using Hawaiian is part of an ongoing performativity of living a Hawaiian lifestyle and using the language to affirm connections to family, tradition and culture. Citing work by Hawaiian scholars (Meyer 2001; Osorio 2001), she explains that Hawaiians determine ethnic identity largely by genealogical criteria that is much more inclusive, and that being Hawaiian is also based on one’s behavior and practices that affirm Hawaiian values, including an emphasis on kin-based social groups, sharing resources, and generosity. This orientation to Hawaiian identity mitigates the importance of a single form of Hawaiian language authenticity and allows for more flexible forms of taking part in one’s *kuleana*. She illustrates this point with an example:

Standing on a pier in Hale’iwa with a group of Hawaiian students on a hot afternoon, I witnessed a suggestion to *lele kawa* (‘cliff jump into the ocean,’ a traditional practice for warriors before battle, and popular pastime among children) turn into a linguistic discussion. Both young men were advanced Hawaiian-language students, but used different terms for this activity – the other being *lele kaua*. Without judgment, they compared terms and sources, one having come from a native-speaking *kupuna* (‘elder’), the other from a nineteenth-century Hawaiian-language newspaper. Professors, books, dictionaries,

fellow students, and even Hawaiian-language media would also all be acceptable points of origin, and be accepted as backing for one's word choice. (Snyder-Frey 2013: 7)

These different perspectives on authenticity, correctness, and identity illustrate the complexity of speakerhood for Hawaiian language speakers. While primordialist notions of the native speaker circulate in schooling contexts where Hawaiian is taught and learned, it is unlikely that native speakers (whether they are *mānaleo* or graduates from K-12 immersion programs who identify as native speakers of Hawaiian) will have a central role in family language policy and practice simply due to their small numbers. Therefore, it is important to consider the dynamics of Hawaiian speakerhood among new speakers in particular in this key domain of social life.

3.2 Authenticity and new speakers in the family

This article contributes to current research on *family language policy* (FLP) (King et al. 2008), a field of study that explores language ideologies, language practices, and language learning outcomes for family members. Much FLP research has examined heritage language learning among minority languages in families with parents who make efforts to maintain heritage languages with their children (e.g. Curdt-Christiansen 2013; Lanza and Li Wei, 2016). However, research on families in which new speakers are engaged in regeneration is currently limited. Family life is briefly mentioned in this research, as in the case of Jaffe (2015), who notes that adult learners of Corsican are often motivated to learn the language in order to keep up with their children or grandchildren's Corsican-medium schooling. Pujolar and Puigdevall (2015) found that new speakers of Catalan generally reserved Catalan for interactions outside the home and reported a preference to promote bilingualism with their children by continuing to speak Spanish.

Smith-Christmas (2014, 2015) provides the most in-depth research on the dynamics of new speakers in FLP. Her research on Gaelic FLP in one family on the Isle of Skye, Scotland includes the use of the language by Peigi, a mother of two children who learned the language as an adult in spite of having Gaelic-speaking parents. Though Peigi and her native-speaking mother-in-law used monolingual varieties of Gaelic with the children at playtime and story time, the other family members, including their English-dominant father, created an impediment to this FLP through dual-lingualism, or the occasional use of Gaelic by adults and English by the children. The other family members did not initiate conversations with the children in Gaelic, and they communicated with one another in English as well. Smith-Christmas (2014) explains that despite the

avowed FLP that valued Gaelic, the practices of the second-generation adults modeled language shift for the youngest generation in the family.

Since thousands of new speakers of Hawaiian are now having children of their own and are encouraging greater use of Hawaiian in the home, it is important to investigate how authenticity is negotiated in these contexts, and to learn more about the different ways that new speakers use Hawaiian in the family. As the number of Hawaiian language learners continues to grow in school-based programs, we need to better understand how speakerhood is constructed in contexts beyond schooling and to consider the implications for Hawaiian language regeneration.

4 Methods

Since 2013, interviews were recorded with individuals from across the State of Hawai'i in the form of narrative histories of family language use, with attention to how and why various languages have been added, maintained, revitalized, or lost in each generation and among each family member. In addition to Hawaiian, the participants in this study typically reported languages such as English, Pidgin, Japanese, Filipino, and Cantonese in their families' linguistic histories. At the time of writing, 110 interviews have been collected with 27 participants identifying as ethnically (part) Hawaiian. All participants are multi-ethnic, typically identifying three or more ethnicities in their past three generations, the most common of which are Japanese, Filipino, Chinese, and Anglo-American. The interviews were carried out by a number of researchers including myself and a small team of research assistants. The research assistants were Lisa Houghtailing, Gavin Lamb, Bethany Schwartz, and Monica Vidal. Most participants were recruited through classes at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, and others were recruited through contacts in order to ensure more even representation of various ages and islands of residence. In preparation for the interviews, participants were asked to research the language history of their parents and grandparents. They were encouraged to ask their family members about their language histories. During the 30–60 minute interviews, the participants worked with the interviewer to sketch their linguistic family trees, making note of the linguistic repertoires used by each family member of up to five generations, including their own, their parents, their grandparents, their great grandparents, and their children and grandchildren, if relevant. If participants did not have children, they were asked what their preferences would be for their children, if they chose to have them. All participants were willing to provide answers to this question.

The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and coded according to demographic categories and language outcomes. Of the 27 Hawaiian participants, 17 qualify as new speakers of the language, having studied Hawaiian at the high school or university level. The remaining Hawaiian participants had either never learned Hawaiian or had only studied it briefly. According to the 17 new speaker participants, they achieved spoken fluency and written competence in Hawaiian through their educational experiences, though some of them have lost some of their proficiency over time. Several participants gained advanced proficiency due to advanced study of Hawaiian and through using the language as much as possible in the home and in educational and community settings. I selected six speakers who represent the spectrum of new speaker participants to explore the ways that they claim varying degrees of speakerhood (see Table 2). The analysis takes a comparative and thematic approach to the six interviews in order to examine the dynamic nature of speaking Hawaiian in the family. To analyze how authenticity is expressed in speakerhood, I consider the *sociolinguistic stances* (Jaffe 2015) that the participants project toward the various ways Hawaiian is used in their home contexts. Since the purpose of the article is to demonstrate the range of issues that speakers encounter with regard to

Table 2: Participants.

| Pseudonym | Gender | Age | Ethnicities | Raised | <i>Hwn lg</i> education | <i>Hwn</i> of previous generations |
|-----------|--------|-----|-------------|----------|---|--|
| Koa | M | 42 | A, H, J | O'ahu | Pūnana Leo (parent); B. A. Hawaiian | Father receptive knowledge; Grandparents fluent |
| Jason | M | 28 | A, H | Florida | B. A. in Hawaiian | Father "used phrases"; Grandmother fluent |
| Hi'ilei | F | 25 | A, F, H, P | Moloka'i | 3 years high school; B. A. in Hawaiian | Mother uses vocabulary; Grandparents fluent |
| Lori | F | 21 | A, C, H | Kaua'i | 2 years university | Grandmother fluent; Aunt learned as adult |
| Pualani | F | 20 | A, H, P | Moloka'i | 5 years junior high school; 1 year university | Mother uses vocabulary; Grandmother fluent |
| Gina | F | 20 | A, C, H | Maui | 2 years Pūnana Leo; 2 years high school | Mother, uncle learned as adult; Great grandmother fluent |

Note: A = Anglo; C = Chinese; H = Hawaiian; J = Japanese; P = Portuguese

Hawaiian language speakerhood, the analysis is thematic. When relevant, the discursive moves that participants use to display their stance (dis)alignments (Du Bois 2007) with particular forms of speakerhood are highlighted in the discussion of the data.

5 Findings

In examining the dynamic nature of Hawaiian in the family, I consider the participants' stances towards different kinds of speakerhood which emerged, guided by constant comparison analysis of the interview data (Glaser and Strauss 1967). After interviews were transcribed, a constant comparison across interviews with new speakers revealed three key themes linked to the question of authenticity: (1) translingual practice as normative; (2) a desire to separate Hawaiian, English, and Pidgin; and (3) conflicts between traditional Hawaiian, as spoken by elders, and University Hawaiian, the standardized variety. I examine the participants' views on authentic linguistic forms of Hawaiian, first focusing on how they respond to translanguaging. I then consider what responses they report on more monolingual, standardized, and prescriptive forms of Hawaiian, which are typically the effect of formal Hawaiian language instruction. Throughout, I pay attention to the FLPs that are enacted to encourage Hawaiian and to negotiate tensions between different expressions of speakerhood.

5.1 Hawaiian as translingual practice

Each of the participants described some members of their family, and sometimes themselves, as partially fluent in Hawaiian. Their stances toward translanguaging involving Hawaiian, English, and Pidgin varied across time and generation.

A first illustration comes from an interview with Koa, a 42 year old speaker of Hawaiian who was earning his degree to become a Hawaiian language teacher. He was a father of three, and his two youngest children were attending Hawaiian immersion at Pūnana Leo, a network of immersion preschools. Though Koa did not desire to speak Hawaiian as a younger adult, his experiences as a parent in the immersion community led him to have a personal reawakening that led him to study Hawaiian in pursuit of a new career; he had previously worked in the construction industry. He characterized the Hawaiian he encountered as

integrated with English and Pidgin in his childhood growing up in Wai‘anae, a rural town on the west coast of O‘ahu with a high Native Hawaiian population (see Appendix for transcription conventions).

- (1) 1 K: Mostly one word, like uh, *kau kau* ('eat'), *au au* ('bathe'), *moe moe* ('sleep'), just
 2 basic words I guess. I wasn't really like- wasn't where we could learn how to
 3 speak and understand Hawaiian, but we knew a bunch of different words.
 4 I: How do you separate words like *kau kau* and *au au* from Pidgin, or how do you
 5 feel about calling it Hawaiian versus Pidgin?
 6 K: See only now, I thinking about linguistics and language since I've been here. But
 7 for like most of my life I actually thought it was- I guess we live out in Wai‘anae
 8 so long, just surrounded by everyone. Most everyone speaks, spoke the same, so it
 9 wasn't like Hawaiian English or Pidgin, it was just how we spoke. So, but now
 10 thinking back for me, the Hawaiian integrated with Pidgin - was part of our
 11 Pidgin.

In (1), Koa explains how his way of speaking was a language infused with Hawaiian vocabulary but was also comprised of English and Pidgin. As a future Hawaiian language teacher, he has recently studied linguistics in college, and this new perspective on language has made him re-examine the language boundaries that he never questioned before, a way of speaking he describes as “just how we spoke”.

Lori, a 21-year old university student with primarily Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry, grew up on Kaua‘i with a maternal grandmother who was fluent in Hawaiian but who did not transmit Hawaiian to her own children due to anti-Hawaiian sentiment. Nevertheless, after interest in Hawaiian revitalization grew in the 1970s, one of Lori's aunts learned Hawaiian as an adult and became a hula teacher with her own *hula halau*, or hula school. Lori's aunt spoke only Hawaiian with her own son, who Lori described as “like a brother”. She spent a lot of time with this cousin, which gave her the opportunity to be exposed to Hawaiian in her home life while also studying Hawaiian at university. She reported that these family circumstances led to her ability to speak Hawaiian fluently.

Lori explained that she had practiced hula and learned ukulele from her grandmother. In describing how she stopped practicing hula as a child because she “got into other things”, the stance she expresses toward her knowledge of Hawaiian showed a clear restriction to the cultural domains of chanting and singing *mele* ‘songs’ in Hawaiian, practices that are part of hula.

- (2) 1 I: Did you ever do hula?
 2 L: Yeah I did when I was like five. But I stopped cause I got into other things.
 3 I: Do you remember learning Hawaiian through hula?
 4 L: Just the chanting and songs and stuff.

Lori's comments resonate with the limited domains of use for diasporic Tamil that Canagarajah (2013) found as well. In some cases, young speakers could recite songs but did not necessarily understand them, and they lacked conversational abilities in the language. In spite of Lori's limited conversational ability in monolingual Hawaiian, her strong connection to her grandmother also meant that she learned Hawaiian words and phrases outside the world of hula, which formed part of her family's translanguaging practices. In (3) she discusses her grandmother and mother's use of Hawaiian mixed with English.

- (3) 1 L: She would use like words, sometimes, I don't know if it was slang cause, some of
 2 the Hawaiian words she taught us doesn't actually mean like what she said it
 3 meant.
 4 I: Can you think of an example?
 5 L: Okay this is kind of a weird example. But like my mom and my grandma always
 6 used to describe girls who are slutty as *mane'o* which literally means itchy. So
 7 like my mom would say that girls are always dressed so itchy right now. Which
 8 means slutty, and she would use it like *mane'o* but in actuality it does not mean
 9 slutty at all it means itchy. So stuff like that.

In (3), Lori describes her family's use of Hawaiian vocabulary, giving the example of *mane'o*. While dictionary definitions describe this word as 'itchy', Lori explains that her family used it euphemistically, and that this usage was inaccurate if related to standard Hawaiian.

Gina, a 20-year old who grew up on Maui, expressed positive stances towards translanguaging in discussing the ways that her sister was teaching her niece Hawaiian vocabulary through mostly English and Pidgin utterances. Gina had learned Hawaiian herself in immersion preschool and later in high school but had since lost proficiency in the language and had even chosen to study other languages in college. Though Gina no longer cultivated her Hawaiian language abilities, she described her older sister's home language practices as strongly connected to her investment in Hawaiian identity and Hawaiian culture, which Gina explained was the reason for her sister's FLP of speaking as much Hawaiian as possible, mixed into English and Pidgin. Her older sister had not experienced Hawaiian immersion as a child. Nonetheless,

her circle of friends in high school was strongly Hawaiian-identified, which in turn led her to earn a degree in Hawaiian studies, where she focused on *lā'au lapa'au* ('Hawaiian medicine'). Gina highlights her sister's translanguaging practices when illustrating how she talks to her two-year old daughter.

- (4) 1 G: She speaks Hawaiian every once in a while. She's not fluent. She actually is uh,
2 she teaches her daughter in Hawaiian, little things like so you'll tell "oh Leilani
3 where's your *lima*" like instead of hands.

Gina reported that her sister intends to enroll her daughter in Hawaiian immersion, and that she and her partner try to speak as much Hawaiian as possible in the home. In interpreting her sister's commitment to Hawaiian, Gina makes a connection between the language and a commitment to Hawaiian culture, which entails staying on the islands.

- (5) 1 G: I think it's just like the kind of person that she was like, she started in like high
2 school when she went to public school and hanging with like this, a group of
3 friends and she realized the importance of Hawaiian [...] now that's what she is
4 like she hangs out with people that are (.) like that. But like they came to college
5 to stick to like Hawaiian. Cause they didn't like branch out. [...] On Maui, a lot of
6 the Hawaiian immersion kids like stayed home and they like live at home and
7 they do like their Hawaiian stuff there.

While her stances towards her sister's translanguaging practices in (4) are supportive, her stances toward her sister's life choices in (5) contain negative evaluative language, as she portrays people like her sister as people who don't "branch out" but who anchor themselves where they grew up. This portrayal of people like her sister differed from Gina's reported future goals of living on the mainland in the future.

While Gina associated efforts to speak Hawaiian and practice Hawaiian culture with a restricted, island-bound way of life, others noted that translanguaging involving Hawaiian was an act of expressing sophistication. Given the changes in societal stance toward the value of Hawaiian since the 1970s, the parents of the new speakers in this study had opportunities to take up new stances toward Hawaiian that were possible because of their children, who were more fluent. This was apparent in the interview with Pualani, a 20-year old from the island of Moloka'i, which is one of the smaller and least populated islands in the state. Moloka'i is the island with the highest proportion of Native Hawaiian residents, with over 60% of the population identifying as Hawaiian (State of Hawai'i Department of Business Economic Development & Tourism 2011).

Though her grandmother spoke Hawaiian, her mother was not taught the language, and Pidgin was the primary language of the home and community, while English was the official language of schooling. Pualani learned Hawaiian in middle and high school for five years, and she majored in Hawaiian studies in college, where she became an advanced speaker. In describing her mother's linguistic repertoire, she commented that her mother only knows Hawaiian vocabulary, and she sees her mother's use of Hawaiian as an attempt to participate in Hawaiian FLP. While Pualani is a fluent speaker, it is clear from her report of her family dynamics that her mother makes an effort to participate in speaking Hawaiian in the form of translanguaging.

- (6) 1 P: She knows little bit like Hawaiian words but [...] But not sentences like nothing.
 2 I: Okay, some basic Hawaiian maybe.
 3 P: Yeah, you know so she can act cool and throw in some words here and there. And
 4 we're like "okay Ma, got it."

Here, we see an effort by Pualani's mother to participate in the communicative practices of her children and the younger generations of the family who are fluent in Hawaiian. Pualani portrays her mother as attempting to "act cool", though the response that she illustrates of "okay Ma, got it" reveals a more ambiguous and even dismissive stance. Since Pualani, her cousins and many of their children are fluent in Hawaiian, her mother's limited Hawaiian is treated as less than impressive.

In terms of translanguaging, we see how perspectives are formed by the speakers' experiences with Hawaiian in the home and their current degree of fluency in the language and knowledge about language as well. While Koa's childhood involved a very normative translingual repertoire, his knowledge of linguistics and study of Hawaiian has reframed his view of translingual practices as marked. Lori and Gina learned Hawaiian as children, but their lack of fluency later in life appears to give them a foundation for appreciating any effort to use Hawaiian, even if it is "wrong", so to speak. For speakers like Pualani, who have advanced proficiency in Hawaiian, translingual uses of the language are appreciated but with some degree of skepticism. In sum, translingual speakerhood in the family is tolerated, but the speakers evaluated it in accord with their own Hawaiian language proficiency.

5.2 Separating Hawaiian from English and Pidgin

While translingual practices are granted some degree of normative or authentic status for members of their own generations and family members older than them,

these practices were generally treated as problematic for the youngest generations, particularly among new speakers who had developed advanced fluency in Hawaiian. One such person is Hi'ilei, a 25 year old from Moloka'i. She was inspired to study Hawaiian after her older sister began learning the language in school. She follows suit and studied Hawaiian for three years in high school, and then went on to major in Hawaiian at the University of Hawai'i, Hilo, which has a well-known immersion program that now includes both master's and doctoral level studies entirely in Hawaiian. Her decision to major in Hawaiian was influenced by her grandmother, who was a fluent speaker but who did not transmit Hawaiian to her children. She explained that her own learning of Hawaiian in school led to a home connection that encouraged her to commit to learning Hawaiian.

- (7) 1 H: Literally right before she passed away, my cousin and I were at her house doing
 2 our Hawaiian language homework from high school. So, we're practicing with
 3 each other and saying little sentences and my grandma was- she was on her
 4 deathbed by this point, and she just sat up and she said, um and in Hawaiian, she
 5 said that, um, just "*ho'omau*" or to continue, and just keep saying that. And then
 6 that was at least our, our responsibility after, or at least that's how I felt it was it
 7 was. It was my *kuleana* ('responsibility') to, to keep the language alive in my
 8 family. (.) So that's why I went that route.

Hi'ilei married a Hawaiian immersion graduate from Moloka'i who is now a Hawaiian language teacher at an immersion school, and Hawaiian is the language of their home. They have a son and a daughter under the age of five. While living in Hilo with her husband, Hi'ilei lived in a mostly Hawaiian-speaking environment due to the resources of the university and the student population there studying advanced levels of Hawaiian. Her first child was born while she was a student, and because he attended Hawaiian immersion daycare and preschool, he was not exposed to English until after age two. Upon graduation, Hi'ilei decided to continue her studies at a university on O'ahu, where she had her second child. Her mother moved from Moloka'i to O'ahu to help take care of Hi'ilei's daughter, and because her mother did not speak Hawaiian, this reconfiguration of family life made Pidgin the main language in her daughter's environment. This led to language mixing as a primary means of expression for her daughter.

- (8) 1 H: My options for childcare were very limited and instead of having her go with
 2 somebody else, we had my mom come here, and my mother isn't fluent in
 3 Hawaiian and [...] and so my mom talks to her in Eng- or Pidgin [...] and we talk

- 4 to her in Hawaiian and her words come out “*heloha*.” ((laughs)) [...] so we don’t
 5 know like what does that mean, like what’s her first language. But at this point
 6 she’s catching on quicker to Pidgin English words than Hawaiian.

Her daughter’s production of “*heloha*” is a blending of English “hello” and Hawaiian “*aloha*”, which represents the kind of language mixing that she notices her daughter producing. In describing how her daughter is learning to speak, Hi’ilei frames the context as one in which she does not have much control and which is restricted in many ways. She describes her options as “very limited” and her mother as someone who “isn’t fluent in Hawaiian” as the explanation for her daughter’s lack of Hawaiian proficiency.

Since Hi’ilei’s husband works at an immersion school on Moloka’i, their son lives with him there, and attends Hawaiian immersion school with other children who often speak English to one another. Though he speaks Hawaiian with his father at home, his exposure to English at school has led her to also worry about threats to their son’s Hawaiian fluency.

- (9) 1 H: So, he’s using more English words and I don’t want to have to force him to talk
 2 just Hawaiian because that’s gonna make him wanna learn more English [...] Um
 3 but I’m worried about that. Like that is my biggest concern right now. Because
 4 he sees English as like this um forbidden language so, of course “I wanna eat
 5 from that fruit right?” So I, I’m trying to make it seem like “okay it’s alright for
 6 you to talk English son but just know that you’re you know um that Hawaiian is
 7 the language in this house” type thing. And I’m trying to- I’m really struggling to
 8 bring more Hawaiian back into his, his daily speech.

Here, Hi’ilei frames English dangerously as a “forbidden fruit” that she allows her son to use, but very cautiously. In conveying how she handles this situation, she reports that she conceals her anxiety from her son, stating “I’m trying to make it seem like ‘okay it’s alright’.” She presents herself as treating English as an acceptable language for her son, but she also reports making it very clear to him that Hawaiian is expected in the home.

Koa also took action to impose more strict boundaries around Hawaiian and English in his home. Though he had grown up with a very fluid repertoire, he felt that charting out spaces for Hawaiian was needed with his own family since he experienced challenges in terms of linguistic authority with his children, even though they attended a Hawaiian immersion school. He responded to his youngest daughter’s interest in English-medium storybooks as an opportunity to

enforce the learning of Hawaiian in his home by imposing Hawaiian books as a prerequisite to the English stories that she requested.

- (10) 1 K: For some reason she's, she's, she's pushing me to teach her to read more English.
 2 So what I do, "okay you gotta read this Hawaiian book" because I have a lot of
 3 children, Hawaiian, Hawaiian children books. "You read this and then I'll read
 4 you this other book." So she- it works out good. She read em fast. "Okay now you
 5 gotta read my book."

His stance toward his daughter's interest in English is presented as counter to expectation ("for some reason"), and in the interview, rather than comment on his daughter's interest in English, he expresses how many Hawaiian children books that he can offer her. It is telling that Koa describes the English books in neutral terms but refers to the Hawaiian books he wants his daughter to read as "my book". His comments convey his strong support for Hawaiian as the key language of the home even though English is also permitted.

Later in the interview, Koa explained that he has created a FLP of having 'Ōlelo Hawai'i Fridays, a practice promoted by immersion programs for support of the language. In response to the question of whether his children who attend Hawaiian immersion take their own initiative to speak Hawaiian to one another, he describes how he enforces Hawaiian FLP on occasion. He also notes how his own children challenge his linguistic authority, drawing on their own understanding of Hawaiian grammar from their immersion schooling. Koa's Hawaiian grammar is still largely influenced by Pidgin and by the translingual norms of Hawaiian-infused Pidgin that he grew up with. In acknowledging that linguistics is important for learning a new language, Koa implicitly rejects the more natural and translingual ways of using Hawaiian from his home community and embraces a more academic basis for authentic speakerhood.

- (11) 1 K: I always try to enforce it. Sometimes I'll do like 'Ōlelo Hawai'i Fridays or
 2 whatever, a whole evening where the kids speak Hawaiian. (.) My daughter won't
 3 speak.
 4 I: Okay, yeah.
 5 K: So I don't know, but she's at that age. She tell me that we all speaking it wrong.
 6 Well, I speaking it wrong. My Hawaiian is kind of like, I call it Hawaiian Pidgin
 7 it doesn't follow the correct, what's that word, syntax, word order. I kind of use
 8 like subject verb object.
 9 I: It's like English=

- 10 K: =With Hawaiian words instead of Hawaiian, verb subject object. I just learned,
 11 they kind of told us in Hawaiian 101 but it never really sunk in til I took
 12 linguistics. I was like “ah you know if you like learn a new language you should
 13 take linguistics first.”

Here, Koa notes how his own Hawaiian is still influenced by his more dominant languages. His daughter has learned Hawaiian from a young age at immersion school, and hence, her Hawaiian is not noticeably influenced by English and Pidgin. The two ways of using Hawaiian are in conflict in the home, and the daughter uses the difference to resist the FLP of ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i Fridays. Koa’s comments in lines 10-13 indicate that he views his daughter’s point as valid, and that he now sees his own English and Pidgin-influenced Hawaiian as incorrect.

5.3 The limits of prescribed linguistic authority

While new speakers made efforts to preserve the use of Hawaiian in the home, they also commented on the complexity of which kinds of Hawaiian should be promoted in the home, as compared to in schooling contexts. Similar to NeSmith (2002), they reported feeling conflicted by the standardized University Hawaiian that they were taught since it was quite different from the Hawaiian of elders who were considered native speakers of the language. Jason, a new speaker who was born and raised in Florida, but who came to the University of Hawai‘i, Hilo to learn and major in Hawaiian, recognized this conflict after only three years of learning the language. His interest in better understanding the political battles of his family’s past generations over rights to land and to self-governance led him to research Hawaiian history from newspapers, and he had spent many hours during his studies reaching out to elders to learn more about their experiences.

- (12) 1 J: One concern that we definitely have is pronunciation and making sure that we’re
 2 trying to be as close to the native speech of our *kūpuna* (‘elders’) as possible.
 3 However, sometimes um that I mean it’s clear that we see nowadays that [being a
 4 University Hawaiian speaker] is a problem that we have to the point where that’s
 5 identifiable where people say “that’s not the Hawaiian I grew up with.”
 6 I: Is that okay sometimes or is it always a problem?
 7 J: ((sighs)) It’s, it’s both because on level, we’re living in a new time and Hawaiian
 8 has been gone for- almost gone to such an extent that we’re having to build, not
 9 only are we rebuilding the language but we’re also rebuilding context for the

10 language. So, you know nowadays we have newscasters who speak Hawaiian like
 11 Amy Kalili, uh and you know her pronunciation is very clear, her pronunciation
 12 is very um, it's correct, it's exact, but it's sometimes criticized as University
 13 Hawaiian. Because it has that sound. It doesn't sound like the kind of Hawaiian I
 14 want to speak.

Though he acknowledged the legitimacy of new speakers of Hawaiian, Jason took the stance that the Hawaiian of the elders was the most authentic, and at a personal level, he strived to speak as they did, particularly with regard to pronunciation.

In contrast, Hi'ilei explains that she struggled to accept the logic behind the standardized form as a means of working to preserve the language for a larger community since her own native-speaking grandmother spoke Hawaiian differently than how she was taught. It is clear that she still has qualms about this logic since she questions the negative responses that standardized Hawaiian speakers (in Hilo) have toward any form of linguistic deviation.

(13) 1 H: I struggled through this all throughout college, language standardization, because
 2 there I was forced to College Hawaiian. Very structured, very “this is how you
 3 say it.” And, it didn't necessarily jibe with the way I heard my grandmother say it.
 4 And then I learned that in order to revitalize the language and to get people on the
 5 same track, you need to learn it in a standard form and then you can go back and
 6 change it. [...] Which I had a hard time like dealing with because my whole thing
 7 was “as long as Hawaiian is being spoken, we should be happy.” You know what
 8 I mean. Then there's this people in Hilo where you say one wrong verb and
 9 they're like- they're looking at you like “what are you saying?” They cringe.
 10 Yeah they cringe. You're butchering the language. But, and then there's, you go
 11 and you talk to the *kūpuna* ('elders') and they don't know what you saying
 12 because you speaking College Hawaiian. And they're like, “you're speaking, like
 12 a proper English to somebody who speaks Pidgin.” It's that same relationship.

Hi'ilei narrates her experience of being caught between multiple norms and standards. She expresses the value of all speakerhoods, and reports her own difficulty in embracing a unified, standardized form. She expresses a doubtful stance toward standardized Hawaiian as the only valid form by remarking on the *kūpuna*, or elders, who in turn offer a correction based on the idea of social appropriateness. By comparing University Hawaiian to the misuse of “proper English” to a Pidgin speaker, Hi'ilei also invokes the subordination often

experienced by Pidgin speakers in Hawai'i with reference to English. English was imposed as the language of prestige by Caucasian outsiders, and Pidgin in turn became the language of the underclass. Her comment overtly suggests that speaking University Hawaiian to elders is therefore a similar act of subordination.

The pressure of speaking Hawaiian correctly or perfectly also emerged in Pualani's account of her younger cousins' linguistic practices, all of whom attend Hawaiian immersion and live near each other on Moloka'i. She explained that when they were encouraged to speak Hawaiian in the home, they hesitated to speak, and she believed this was out of fear of making mistakes.

- (14) 1 P: And it's so weird like we have um a bunch of my younger cousins, they're all
 2 learning Hawaiian like so they're all in immersion now. But when they're
 3 together, and my cousin is like, "okay 'ōlelo Hawai'i wale nō" ('only speak in
 4 Hawaiian') just talk Hawaiian, they're like- they're shame.
 5 I: Really?
 6 P: Or they no like talk. And, ((whispers)) I don't know why. Like it's still like- why?
 7 maybe they're scared they're going to say something wrong.

In sum, while the new speakers acknowledged the benefits of having a standardized Hawaiian to draw upon to assess their own proficiency and to create a community of speakers, they also acknowledged some tensions that older and younger generations felt by trying to live up to a very exacting standard. They expressed an interest in respecting multiple varieties, but reported feeling compelled to choose one way to speak, or to adapt their Hawaiian to the norms of the community they were in. Their comments draw attention to the lingering question of authenticity in spite of having achieved advanced linguistic proficiency in Hawaiian. The reality of Hawaiian speakerhood is that these new speakers are in fact the majority and their linguistic repertoires contain a good deal of variation, including influence from Pidgin and English, standardized Hawaiian, and native speaker Hawaiian. However, their comments reveal a strong imposition of monolithic norms, which leads to linguistic anxiety. This finding resonates with other research on new speakers who also report shame and embarrassment in the vicinity of native speakers (Costa 2015; Jaffe 2015). In the case of Hawaiian, the speakers seem to be caught in an even more multifaceted struggle where not only native speaker models leave them feeling deficient, but also where the imposition of standardized Hawaiian causes them to struggle to feel confidence in their own speakerhood, particularly if they grew up with some degree of Hawaiian in the home or community.

6 Implications

García (2011: 7) describes *language sustainability* as “the capacity [of languaging] to endure, but always in interaction with the social context in which it operates”. In the context of indigenous languages like Hawaiian, the maintenance, loss, or reclamation of the language is therefore always enmeshed within social, economic, and political conditions. Language sustainability offers a highly contextualized framework for exploring how whether and to what degree speakers invest in Hawaiian, and how new generations of speakers relate their language use to the expression of a Hawaiian cultural identity. This is particularly important since research on indigenous languages and youth has shown that the language learned and used by young people and new generations of speakers is often seen as problematic since it differs from the more traditional ways of speaking of past generations and elders (McCarty et al. 2013; O’Rourke 2015; Wyman 2012).

For the new speakers in this study, the use of Hawaiian within translanguaging was viewed as a natural and normal form of language sustainability in narratives of their past, and it was also framed as a form of *cultural continuance* (Ortiz 1992), or a way of understanding how people not only maintain languages, but also how they continue their linguistic and cultural practices with new forms and functions. The participants’ and their family members’ partial knowledge of Hawaiian was portrayed as an authentic way of being Hawaiian in a social and political context that had made it almost impossible to maintain the language. No contemporary or previous generations were depicted as less Hawaiian due to a lack of language abilities. Nonetheless, the interviews revealed the high level of scrutiny the new speakers felt if the Hawaiian that they spoke in the present differed too much from the more standardized, College Hawaiian. The authority of their speakerhood is ironically more difficult to achieve in the present, as is the authority of the speakerhood of their children, who they see as ultimately responsible for Hawaiian regeneration.

At the present, there is little discussion of whether and how varieties of Hawaiian might be given a place in Hawaiian language education. It is acknowledged that College Hawaiian and the Hawaiian of the elders differs, but the speakerhood accorded the most power currently is the variety that has been standardized among new speakers and which disallows translanguaging. In the field of language teaching, there has been increasing attention to the nature of language variation at social and regional levels with regard to global languages such as English (McKay and Bokhorst-Heng 2008), and with reference to heritage language education on languages such as Spanish (Leeman 2014). In addition, there has been a great deal of research on translanguaging in language

teaching and learning contexts which has powerfully illustrated the benefits of allowing speakers to draw on all of their linguistic resources when engaging in learning activities (Creese and Blackledge 2015). It is possible that Hawaiian language education can also consider these directions, though due to the continuing status of Hawaiian as an endangered language that is still at the early stages of revitalization and normalization, it is understandable that such ways of thinking about language are not yet taking center stage. At the same time, since Hawaiian language learning in schools is increasingly linked to family life, where new speakers are raising children with attachments to both University Hawaiian and their grandparents' ways of using the language, these issues will become increasingly necessary to address.

Appendix: Transcription conventions

| | |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| - | cut-off |
| = | latched speech |
| <u>text</u> | emphasis |
| “text” | reported speech |
| [...] | transcription edited for length |
| ? | sentence-final rising intonation |
| I: | interviewer |
| ((text)) | paralinguistic and non-verbal actions |

References

- Alvarez, Steven. 2014. Translanguaging *tareas*: Emergent bilingual youth as language brokers for homework in immigrant families. *Language Arts* 91(5). 326–339.
- American Community Survey. 2015. US census. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs>.
- Bickerton, Derek & William Wilson. 1987. Pidgin Hawaiian. In Glenn Gilbert (ed.), *Pidgin and creole languages*, 61–76. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Bucholtz, Mary. 2003. Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(3). 398–416.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 2012. Styling one's own in the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora: implications for language and ethnicity. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 11. 124–135.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. 2013. Reconstructing heritage language: Resolving dilemmas in language maintenance for Sri Lankan Tamil migrants. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 222. 131–155.
- Costa, James. 2015. New speakers, new language: on being a legitimate speaker of a minority language in Provence. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 231. 127–145.

- Coupland, Nikolas. 2003. Sociolinguistic authenticities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(3). 417–431.
- Creese, Angela & Adrian Blackledge. 2015. Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 35. 20–35.
- Curdt-Christiansen, Xiao-Lan. 2013. Family language policy: Sociopolitical reality versus linguistic continuity. *Language Policy* 12. 1–6.
- Drager, Katie & James Grama. 2014. “De tawk dakain ova dea”: Mapping language ideologies on O’ahu. *Dialectologia: Revista Electrónica* 12. 23–51.
- Du Bois, John W. 2007. The stance triangle. In Robert Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*, 139–182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1970. *Sociolinguistics: A brief introduction*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Frekko, Susan E. 2009. “Normal” in Catalonia: Standard language, enregisterment and the imagination of a national public. *Language in Society* 38(1). 71–93.
- García, O. 2011. From language garden to sustainable languaging: Bilingual education in a global world. *Perspectives* 34(1). 5–9.
- García, O. & Li Wei. 2013. *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Glaser, Barney G. & Anselm Strauss. 1967. *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornsby, Michael. 2015. The “new” and “traditional” speaker dichotomy: Bridging the gap. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 231. 107–125.
- Jaffe, Alexandra. 2015. Defining the new speaker: theoretical perspectives and learner trajectories. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 231. 21–44.
- Kawai’ae’a, Keiki, A. K. Alohalani Housman & Makalapua Alencastre. 2007. Pū’ā i ka ‘olelo, ola ka ‘ohana: Three generations of Hawaiian language revitalization. *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being* 4. 183–237.
- King, Kendall, Lyn W. Fogle & Aubrey Logan-Terry. 2008. Family language policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2(5). 907–922.
- Lanza, Elizabeth & Li Wei. 2016. Multilingual encounters in transcultural families. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 37(7). 653–733.
- Leeman, Jennifer. 2014. Critical approaches to teaching Spanish as a local/foreign language. In M. Lacorte (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Hispanic Applied Linguistics*, 275–292. New York: Routledge.
- Li, Wei. 1994. *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- May, Stephen. 2013. *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*, 2nd edn. New York and London: Routledge.
- McCarty, Teresa, Mary Romero, Larissa Warhol & Ofelia Zepeda. 2006. Reclaiming the gift: Indigenous youth counter-narratives on Native language loss and revitalization. *The American Indian Quarterly* 30(1). 28–48.
- McCarty, Teresa, Mary Romero, Larissa Warhol & Ofelia Zepeda. 2013. Genealogies of language loss and recovery: Native youth language practices and cultural continuance. In *Indigenous Youth and Multilingualism: Language Identity, Ideology, and Practice in Dynamic Cultural Worlds*, 26–47. Taylor and Francis.
- McKay, Sandra & Wendy Bokhorst-Heng. 2008. *International English in its sociolinguistic contexts: Towards a socially sensitive EIL pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.

- McLeod, Wilson & Bernadette O'Rourke. 2015. "New speakers" of Gaelic: perceptions of linguistic authenticity and appropriateness. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6(2). 151–172.
- Meyer, Manulani A. 2001. Our own liberation: reflections on Hawaiian epistemology. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13(1). 124–148.
- NeSmith, Richard Keao'ōpuaokalani. 2002. *Tūtū's Hawaiian and the emergence of a neo Hawaiian language*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- O'Rourke, Bernadette & Fernando Ramallo. 2013. Competing ideologies of linguistic authority amongst new speakers in contemporary Galicia. *Language in Society* 42(3). 287–305.
- O'Rourke, Bernadette, Joan Pujolar & Fernando Ramallo. 2015. New speakers of minority languages: The challenging opportunity—foreword. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 231. 1–20.
- O'Rourke, Bernadette & Fernando Ramallo. 2015. *Neofalantes* as an active minority: understanding language practices and motivations for change amongst new speakers of Galician. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 231. 147–165.
- Ortega, Ane, Jacqueline Urla, Esibaliz Amorrotu, Jone Goirigolzarri & Belen Uranga. 2015. Linguistic identity among new speakers of Basque. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 231. 85–105.
- Ortiz, Simon J. 1992. *Woven stone*. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Press.
- Osorio, Jonathon K. 2001. 'What kine Hawaiian are you?' A mo'olelo about nationhood, race, history, and the contemporary sovereignty movement in Hawai'i. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13(2). 359–379.
- Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García & Wallis Reid. 2015. Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review* 6. 281–307.
- Pujolar, Joan & Maite Puigdevall. 2015. Linguistic mudes: how to become a new speaker in Catalonia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 231. 167–187.
- Roberts, Sarah J. 1998. The role of diffusion in the genesis of Hawaiian Creole. *Language* 74. 1–39.
- Schultz, Kukea & L. Pōhai 2014. *Kuleana 'ohana kaiapuni: A story of agency and Hawaiian immersion families*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Schütz, Albert J. 1994. *The voices of Eden: A history of Hawaiian language studies*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Smith-Christmas, Cassie. 2014. Being socialised into language shift: the impact of extended family members on family language policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 35(5). 511–526.
- Smith-Christmas, Cassie. 2015. *Family language policy: Maintaining an endangered language in the home*. New York: Springer.
- Snyder-Frey, Alicia. 2013. He kuleana kō kākou: Hawaiian-language learners and the construction of (alter) native identities. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 14. 231–243.
- Song, Kwangok. 2016. "Okay, I will say in Korean and then in American": Translanguaging practices in bilingual homes. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* 16(1). 84–106.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2009. *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stannard, David E. 1989. *Before the horror: The population of Hawai'i on the eve of Western contact*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- State of Hawai'i Department of Business Economic Development & Tourism. 2011. Island population and housing units, State of Hawaii: 2010. http://files.hawaii.gov/dbedt/census/Census_2010/Info_release/2010_Census_Report_3_Informational_Release.pdf.

- Warner, Sam No'eau. 1998. Hawaiian language regenesis: Planning for intergenerational use of Hawaiian beyond the school. In Thomas Huebner & Kathryn Davis (eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA: Studies in bilingualism*, 313–331. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wilson, William. 1998. I ka'ōlelo Hawai'i ke ola, 'Life is found in the Hawaiian language.'". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132. 123–137.
- Wilson, William & Kamanā Kauanoē. 2001. Mai loko mai o ka 'i'ini: proceeding from a dream": the Aha Punana Leo connection in Hawaiian language revitalization. In Leanne Hinton & Kenneth Hale (eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, 147–176. Leiden: Brill.
- Wong, Liana. 1999. Authenticity and the revitalization of Hawaiian. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 30(1). 94–115.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 2016. *Singular and plural: Ideologies of linguistic authority in twenty-first century Catalonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wyman, Leisy. 2012. *Youth culture, Language endangerment and linguistic survivance: Legal, historical and current practices in SEI*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Yamauchi, Lois A, Jo-anne Lau-Smith & Rebecca. J. I. Luning. 2008. Family involvement in a Hawaiian language immersion program. *The School Community Journal* 18. 39–60.