



Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL)

Volume 1
Number 1 *Spring 1984*

Article 6

4-1-1984

Language Education Policy in Hawaii: Two Case Studies and Some Current Issues

Thom Huebner
University of Pennsylvania

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <http://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol1/iss1/6>
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Language Education Policy in Hawaii: Two Case Studies and Some Current Issues

Abstract

Any language policy (and even the absence of a formal language policy constitutes, in effect, a language policy) reflects the social, political, and economic context of public education. At the same time, the effect of that policy on society extends beyond the generation receiving direct services under it, for it influences what that generation brings to the task of educating its children.

The current study explores the relationship between language policy and non-linguistic, non-educational issues in two case studies, both set in Hawaii. The first involves the loss of Hawaiian, the indigenous language, to English, an immigrant language during the Nineteenth Century. The second involves the linguistic assimilation of the Japanese during the first half of the Twentieth Century. While both involve language loss, the long-term effects in each situation have been quite different.

The two case studies provide a historical backdrop for understanding the contemporary setting. The second part of the paper examines several current issues in language policy and language planning in Hawaii, especially as they relate to programs of bilingual education.

Language Education Policy in Hawaii:
Two Case Studies and Some Current Issues

Thom Huebner

University of Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Any language policy (and even the absence of a formal language policy constitutes, in effect, a language policy) reflects the social, political, and economic context of public education. At the same time, the effect of that policy on society extends beyond the generation receiving direct services under it, for it influences what that generation brings to the task of educating its children.

The current study explores the relationship between language policy and non-linguistic, non-educational issues in two case studies, both set in Hawaii. The first involves the loss of Hawaiian, the indigenous language, to English, an immigrant language during the Nineteenth Century. The second involves the linguistic assimilation of the Japanese during the first half of the Twentieth Century. While both involve language loss, the long-term effects in each situation have been quite different.

The two case studies provide a historical backdrop for understanding the contemporary setting. The second part of the paper examines several current issues in language policy and language planning in Hawaii, especially as they relate to programs of bilingual education.

1. Introduction

One problem which seems to be characteristic of many programs of bilingual education is the lack of a clearly defined vision for bilingual education as it relates to the general educational goals of the school systems within which they function. This may be a problem in either the interpretation or articulation of these broader educational policy goals. Perhaps too often, programs of bilingual education are viewed merely as programs designed to assist departments of education in meeting federal regulations.

This is an unfortunate legacy of bilingual education today, for it obscures the program's relationship to broader educational goals concerned with issues of language development, culture, academic achievement and the role of language education in society. Any language education policy (and even the absence of a formal language education policy constitutes, in effect, a language policy) reflects the social, political and economic context of public education. Furthermore, the effect of that policy on society extends beyond the generation receiving direct services under it, for it influences what that generation brings with them to the task of educating their children.

2. Two Case Studies

One goal shared by virtually all programs of bilingual education in the United States is English proficiency. In fact, most bilingual programs worldwide have as a major goal proficiency in a world language. But there are other linguistic goals, as well as psychological, cultural, social, economic, political, and educational goals for bilingual education and indeed for any language policy. These goals are not independent of each other.

Two case studies, both from Hawaii, illustrate how these goals interact in the determination of language policy. The first case study concerns the loss of an indigenous language, Hawaiian, to an immigrant language, English. The second involves the linguistic assimilation of the Japanese, an immigrant population. Although the two case studies entail different issues, they make interesting comparisons, since they share a common social setting, have overlapping histories, involve education in the native language, and have resulted in language loss. In one case, however, the vernacular was gradually dropped from a curriculum well before it had ceased to be the first language of the majority of the population. In the other, there was a strong political fight to preserve instruction in and through the ethnic language at least as long as that language was the first language of the children being educated. As in other language shift situations, notably the case of the Celtic languages of the British Isles, "the presence or absence of a political movement based on language issues seems to correlate with the nature of language shift." (Aqnew 1981:2)

The comparison suggests that linguistic factors such as language proficiency, and educational factors such as academic success, are not always the sole determinants of language policy. This is not surprising, since language plays such a powerful role in all aspects of society. Spolsky states, "Language is the primary means of socialization and the most sensitive image and effective guardian of the social system." (1977:2) An examination of the two situations together also provides insights into understanding existing conditions and deciding future directions.

There are some common milestone dates which both case studies share. One such date is 1894, the year in which the Hawaiian monarchy was overthrown and the Hawaii Republic was established. Another is 1900, the date of the incorporation of Hawaii as a U.S. territory. A third is 1959, the year of statehood for

Figure 1: Some Milestone Dates in the History of Language Education Policy in Hawaii

- 1778 - Population of Hawaii estimated at 300,000
- 1820 - Arrival of the first missionaries and Hawaiian medium schools
- 1830 - 85,000 Hawaiians literate in Hawaiian
- 1840 - Compulsory Education Act
- 1850 - Population of Hawaiians at 85,000
- 1853 - First English medium schools for Hawaiians
- 1864 - Budget in Hawaiian and English
- 1876 - Reciprocity Act
- 1882 - One-third of students taught in Hawaiian
- 1885 - First large-scale immigration of Japanese
- 1887 - Hawaiian, English or other European language required to vote; 16% of students taught in Hawaiian medium schools
- 1896 - Establishment of the Hawaiian Republic; Three percent of students taught in Hawaiian medium schools
- 1900 - United States annexation of Hawaii as a territory
- 1909 - Labor strikes
- 1910 - Asians constitute the largest group in Hawaii
- 1917 - Majority of Japanese students in Japanese schools
- 1919 - Hawaiian reintroduced as a subject of study in high schools and normal schools
- 1919 - Call for licensing of teachers
- 1927 - U.S. Supreme Court decision: Farrington vs. Takushige
- 1942 - Japanese language schools closed
- 1943 - Law restricting language schools
- 1947 - Federal District Court decision in favor of language schools
- 1959 - Statehood for Hawaii

Hawaii. The history of the language shift of the Hawaiians, however, dates back to 1820, with the arrival of the missionaries and covers the next century. The history of the Japanese language schools begins with the arrival of the first Japanese indentured laborers in 1885. (See Figure 1 for some milestone dates.)

2.1 Hawaiian and the Public Schools

The history of Hawaiian education during the 124 years from the arrival of Captain Cook in 1778 until the annexation of the Islands by the U.S. government in 1900 must be viewed within the framework of a dramatic decline in both the number and the percentage of Hawaiians in Hawaii due both to lack of immunity against unfamiliar diseases and the lure of the whaling industry for many of the eligible males. It has been estimated that in 1778, the population of Hawaii was around 300,000. By 1840, the total population of Hawaiians had fallen to 82,000 (Kloss 1977:202). In 1872, the population of the Hawaiian Islands was estimated at 57,000, 5,000 of whom were foreigners (Kuykendall 1926:242). In 1876, over 10% of the population of Hawaii was foreign. By 1900, the population of Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians in Hawaii had dropped to 37,656 (only 26% of the total population of the new territory).

The first language of formal education in Hawaii was the mother tongue. The first Europeans to visit Polynesia found that many of the local inhabitants had been:

trained in schools or under the direction of selected teachers. The young man who was to be a chief or leader studied astronomy, law, geography, and particularly history and language. Besides his regular studies, he must be trained as a warrior and a speaker and taught to read the meaning of the habits of the fish, the blossoming of trees, the flight of birds, and the movement and shape of clouds. In some Polynesian islands each young man learned some trade, such as house builder, wood carver, fisherman, sailor or farmer..." (Kuykendall 1926:41-42).

The arrival of the first missionaries in 1820 continued the tradition of education in the vernacular, but shifted the control of education to the American Protestants, who introduced a Christian curriculum, including native language literacy "to make [the Hawaiians] acquainted with letters; to give them the Bible with the skill to read it..." (Kuykendall 1968a:101). In 1824, work was begun on a translation of the Bible into Hawaiian. By 1832, the New Testament was completely translated; by 1939, the entire Bible was available in Hawaiian (Kuykendall 1938:107). Furthermore, by 1826, there were 400 native teachers in the common schools of Hawaii (Kuykendall 1926:131).

By 1830, one-third of the population, predominantly adults, were enrolled in schools. (Kuykendall 1926:131) By that same year, 85,000 individuals, mostly adults, were able to read the Hawaiian language (Wist 1940:22-23; cited in the Molokai Report 1979:32). The function of literacy in Hawaiian was restricted almost exclusively to education and religion.² Although the first two Hawaiian language newspapers (Ka Lama Hawaii and Ke Kumu Hawaii) were published in 1834, they were controlled by the missionaries. Other publications from the same missionary presses included laws, proclamations and port regulations for the government, small jobs for businessmen, and a small "textbook" of eight pages (the Pi-a-pa) containing "the alphabet, Arabic and Roman numerals, punctuation marks, lists of words, verses of scripture and other reading matter, including a short poem giving the thoughts of Kings Iolani and Kaumalii in reference to Christianity" (Kuykendall 1938:107). Although 190,000 copies of this last work were printed, it was reported that as late as 1832 the majority of the schools in the islands had nothing but this to read.

The Hawaiian literacy situation was enhanced by the compulsory school law of 1840. By that year, 15,000 students were enrolled in three kinds of schools: (a) boarding schools for adolescents of promise; (b) mission stations which both

taught students and prepared Hawaiians to teach; and (c) common schools, staffed by native Hawaiians (Kuykendall 1926:133). The vast majority of the students were of the last type. By 1850, "the entire [adult?] population was able to read and write in their mother tongue" (Kloss 1977:204). It is not clear to what extent literacy skills were developed. One might suspect that there was a wide range in the levels of literacy attained. Furthermore, if the population and literacy figures cited here are accurate, it would suggest that although the percentage of Hawaiians with some degree of literacy in their native language was high, because of a declining population, the net number of Hawaiians literate in Hawaiian may actually have declined from 1830 to 1850. Nevertheless, the language of primary emphasis in the schools during this time was the mother tongue.

By the 1850s, a number of social and economic changes had occurred in Hawaii. By that time, foreigners had become landholders. In 1841, for instance, American sugar producers obtained a franchise from the King that "gave them the privilege of leasing unoccupied land for 100 years at a low rental" (Dole 1895:577). English speakers were gaining influence not only in religious and educational aspects of Hawaiian life, but, perhaps more important, in the economy of the islands. The growing importance of the English language in economic spheres was also reflected in Article 44 of the 1864 Constitution, which specified that the Ministry of Finances present the budget in Hawaiian and English (Kloss 1977:207). Those economic ties to English-speaking, specifically American, interests were consummated with the Reciprocal Trade Treaty of 1876 which had the effect of dramatically increasing the amount of sugar exported to the United States.

The influence of English was also being widely felt in government. In 1834, the Reverend William Richards became advisor to the kings, "to instruct them in matters of government" (Kuykendall 1926:137). In 1846, Richard Armstrong, an American Protestant missionary, was appointed Minister of Education and later, President of the Board of Education. At the same time, there was strong sentiment

among the growing foreign-born population (mostly Americans) and among some Hawaiians for education in English (Kuykendall 1938:361). With the United States' acquisition of California and Oregon during the same period, American Protestant missionaries, who had previously promoted Hawaiian medium schools, also changed their position. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, an interdenominational body from New England which oversaw the administration of the mission schools, devised a plan in 1848 to stop the "homeward current" (Kuykendall 1938:340) of the missionaries in the islands, many of whom now had families. The plan included the granting of lands and houses held by the board to missionaries and their families. The missionaries were also encouraged to become Hawaiian citizens. The effect of these changes was that "the American missionaries and their families became an integral part of the Hawaiian body politic" (Kuykendall 1938:341).

Educational change followed on the heels of these social and economic changes. The first English medium school was the Royal School, administered by appointees of the mission and supported by Hawaiian chiefs for the education of their children. In 1849, the school was opened to children of Haole (Caucasian) residents of Honolulu. By 1853, Haoles constituted 79% of the enrollment of that school. In the same year, the Hawaii legislature appropriated funds for the establishment of English medium schools for Hawaiians. By 1856, 758 native Hawaiian students were enrolled in such schools.

Not all Hawaiians, however, welcomed this change. By 1860, Armstrong had died and King Kamehameha IV appointed his own father, Matai Kekuanoa, President of the Board of Education. In 1864, Kekuanoa warned the legislature that

The theory of substituting the English language for the Hawaiian, in order to educate our people, is as dangerous to Hawaiian nationality, as it is useless in promoting the general education of the people.... If we wish to preserve the Kingdom of Hawaii for Hawaiians, and to educate our people, we must insist that the Hawaiian language

shall be the language of all our National Schools, and the English shall be taught whenever practicable, but only, as an important branch of Hawaiian education. (Biennial Report of the President of the Board of Education to the Legislature of 1864, cited in Kuykendall 1968b:112.)

Though his sentiments were shared by many, there was no organized attempt to prevent the introduction of English medium schools, and in fact, demand for them continued.

In 1854, there had been 412 common schools with a total population of 11,782 pupils, who received instruction in Hawaiian by Hawaiian teachers. (Kuykendall 1968b:109) By 1874, the number of common schools declined to 196, with only 5,522 students enrolled (71% of the student population). By 1878, 61% of the students were still enrolled in Hawaiian medium schools. By 1882, that figure had dropped to 33% (Kloss 1977:204). By 1888, less than 16% were found in such schools, with the number of common schools falling to sixty-three (Wist 1940:72). Only seven years later, in the year of the overthrow of the Lili'uokalani government by Americans in the community, the enrollment in Hawaiian medium schools had dropped to less than three per cent of all students in public schools in Hawaii.

In 1896, English became the language of instruction for all public elementary schools, and Hawaiian was not reintroduced into the curriculum until 1919, and then only as an elective subject in normal and high schools. For a generation, the language of the land was banished from the schools. That banishment was preceded by 80 years of changing economic, political and social conditions which influenced that language policy. Long before English became the official language of instruction, it had already replaced Hawaiian as the language of economic politics, and consequently education. The majority of the Hawaiians educated during the last quarter of the nineteenth century were taught neither content nor literacy skills in their own language but rather in a second language, English.

There is reason to believe, however, that the loss of Hawaiian as a first spoken language of Hawaiians was not widespread until the turn of the century. The existence of a Hawaiian-based pidgin until that time (Reinecke 1969, Bickerton and Givón 1976) suggests that Hawaiian was until then the first language of Hawaiians. The appearance of an English-based pidgin around the turn of the Century (Bickerton and Odo 1976) suggests that Hawaiians may have been shifting to English, or, more likely, Hawaiian Creole English (HCE) as a first language around the same time that English officially became the medium of instruction. What Hawaiian did survive as a native language through that period of banishment from the educational setting did so through the efforts of grandparents and a few churches. For the twenty-five years from 1896 to 1919, no Hawaiian students received any support from formal educational institutions for the development of the native language, and prior to that, the support had been far from universal. During that period, enormous political, social, and economic changes had taken place which resulted in a change in language policy. The change in language policy, together with the social, political, and economic changes eventually resulted in what Day (in press) has termed "language genocide".

2.2 Japanese Language Schools

The second case study involves the fight for the maintenance of language schools by the Japanese immigrants to Hawaii from the late nineteenth century until World War II. In 1887, two years after the first large-scale importation of Japanese indentured laborers to meet the growing demand for labor on the sugar plantations following the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, the first Buddhist Honkwanji mission was established in Hawaii. This and other Japanese missions were the bases for the establishment of schools for the children of these immigrants. Similar schools were established by the Chinese and later the Korean communities.

The Japanese elementary schools were supplementary to and autonomous from the public schools of Hawaii, which all children were required to attend. Classes were conducted in the late afternoon, the curriculum was based on that of the Japanese Ministry of Education and instruction was in Japanese. Support for the schools came not only from the missions and the community, but also from subsidies from plantation owners, who "were firm believers in the transformational power of education and sought to isolate the Japanese (and other Asian laborers) from the mainstream educational system, and by extension, from access to political and economic power" (Hawkins 1978:46). Thus, two segments of society (the Japanese workers and the Caucasian bosses) supported the same institution, but for very different goals (language maintenance versus linguistic isolation).

The first Japanese elementary schools were established at a time when English was in the process of being institutionalized through constitutional and educational change. These institutional changes were clearly discriminatory and kept the Japanese and other Asian immigrants out of the political process. However, by 1900, although Hawaiians still constituted a majority at the polls and the Caucasians were the dominant political, economic and cultural force, Japanese and Chinese immigrants and their children constituted 56.4% of the population, compared with 18.7% Caucasians, and 24.4% Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians (Gardner and Nordyke 1974:20). Moreover, their strength in the labor force was felt in the plantation strikes of 1909 and again in 1920.

Until 1916, the Japanese elementary schools used Japanese Ministry of Education textbooks and curriculum. Students observed Japanese holidays, and "were at those times absent from the American public schools, which according to law they were required to attend" (Hawkins 1978:42). However, increasing criticism of the Japanese elementary schools from American educational authorities provoked curriculum changes within the schools themselves. The Japanese Ministry of Education curriculum was discontinued and the names of the schools were changed

from "elementary schools" to "language schools" (Hawkins 1978:43). Despite these changes, the Japanese community continued to maintain control of them and to support them. And the mother tongue continued to receive strong support and was the first language of literacy.

By 1917, the majority of Japanese school-age children were attending both English medium schools and Japanese language schools. By that time, moreover, the vast majority of these students were American citizens by virtue of their birth. Kuykendall describes the demographics of the times:

In the early days many people supposed that these immigrant laborers from the Orient would not become permanent residents.... In the days of the monarchy several hundred Chinese were naturalized, but since that time the naturalization of Chinese and Japanese has not been permitted. But all the children born in Hawaii are American citizens. The result is that while the Japanese and Chinese make up almost half of the total population of Hawaii, less than half of them are aliens. Considerably more than fifty percent of the Chinese and Japanese in the Territory are American citizens by reason of the fact that they were born in Hawaii. This proportion will increase as time goes by. Not only are they citizens, but they are becoming voters and will help shape the political future of Hawaii. In 1924 there were 3,700 registered voters of Chinese or Japanese ancestry. This number will also increase with the passing years. (1926:324)

The Americanization of this large and growing segment of the population became an important educational goal.

The existence of the language schools was viewed as an impediment to that goal and political pressures against the schools grew. An attempt to undermine the financial base of the schools involved a resolution from the Committee of the Japanese Section of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association to discontinue plantation subsidies to non-Christian language schools. The American media and government reports stressed the need for monolingualism on nationalistic grounds, both in the Territory of Hawaii and on the U.S. mainland. By 1919, legislation began to appear which called for the licensing of teachers. All teachers would have to possess what were called the "ideals of democracy" in addition to a knowledge of English. These proposals were viewed by the Japanese as attempts to take control

of the schools. Both the Japanese Education Association and the Hongwanji Educational Home Committee submitted requests to withdraw the legislation. Petitions and threats to strike came not only from the Japanese community but also from the Chinese and Korean communities (Hawkins 1978:45).

One attempt at compromise legislation was Act 30, supported by moderates in both the legislature and the Japanese community, which permitted the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to regulate but not prohibit the foreign language schools. Before it was voted on, however, a clause was inserted which restricted the enrollment in Japanese language schools to students who had reached the third grade. Again this was viewed as an attempt to regulate and eventually shut down the schools. Before the signing of the Act, the Japanese Society of Hawaii had brought a law suit against the Governor's Office challenging the constitutionality of the Act. Although the Hawaii Circuit Court upheld the Act in 1923, in 1927 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled it unconstitutional, based on a similar case (Meyer vs. Nebraska), in which the teaching of reading through German was protected from state intervention under the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution (Kloss 1977:73-74).

The language schools continued to operate with strong community support, reinforced by the inaccessibility of the English Standard schools to the Japanese Community (Sato, in press). By 1936, there were 178 Japanese, 12 Chinese and 9 Korean language schools in Hawaii (Kloss 1977:210). Despite political and economic assaults on the schools, the generation educated between 1917 and World War II received instruction in the primary language, as well as in the second language.

World War II marked the beginning of the decline of the language schools and the beginning of English monolingualism among the third generation. During this war between Japan and the U.S., the language schools were closed, the textbooks burned, and the teachers sent to relocation camps on the mainland.

In 1943, a territorial law restricting language schools was again passed, "according to which foreign language instruction of any kind (1) could only be given to students who had completed the third grade and (2) in cases of students under 15 years old, could be given only by teachers who had a good command of English" (Kloss 1974:211). This time, the legislation was challenged in the courts by the Chinese community. In 1947, the Federal District court in San Francisco struck down the legislation.

By the time of that decision, however, the language schools had already performed an important function by providing opportunities for students from homes in which English was not spoken to add native language literacy as well as to develop new uses for their oral proficiency in the first language. The products of these schools were a generation of Asian-Americans who are bilingual and biliterate in their home language and English or Hawaiian Creole English (Reinecke 1969:125, 129). Although opportunities for contact and interaction with native speakers of standard English were limited for this group (Sato, in press), one can speculate that the opportunity for first language development among first generation Hawaii-born Japanese enhanced the development of the second language.

That same generation, however, educated between 1917 and the beginning of World War II, viewed the language school experience less favorably than their parents did. In 1947, twenty years after the Supreme Court decision in the case of Farrington versus Tokushige, and two years after the end of the war, an attitudinal survey revealed that first generation Japanese still viewed the Japanese language schools as promoting links between generations, good will, Americanization, and moral training. Second

generation Japanese, however, viewed the schools as causing stress, being too small and inefficient, and not teaching language effectively (Hawkins 1978:52). The offspring of that generation are predominantly monolingual in English, with strong, though perhaps diminishing, ties (Glauberman 1984) to their cultural heritage. The transition to English took three generations.

By the time of Statehood in 1959, the process of linguistic assimilation of both the Hawaiians and Japanese was virtually complete. At least the loss of the language of heritage was widespread enough for bilingual-phobes to feel secure. "Americanized" at last, Hawaii was granted statehood.

It may be said with some degree of certainty that Hawaii would not have been granted statehood if its inhabitants had not given up their old languages to a large degree, i.e., if they had remained alien not only in their race but also in their language. That Hawaii, which was alien only in race, became a state but Puerto Rico, which was alien only in language, became an associated state could easily stimulate speculations about the relative importance of racial and language factors in the subconscious of the Americans. (Kloss 1977:207)

Mike Forman (personal communication) has called this characteristic of American culture "linguistic paranoia".

3. Discussion

These two case studies share a common setting and have overlapping time frames. Both cases involve policies concerning education in the vernacular, and both involve language loss over a period of approximately three generations. In both cases, the mother tongue was widely spoken (almost to the exclusion of other languages) by the first generation to receive instruction through the medium of English both at home and within the immediate community.

The differences between the two situations, however, are more striking. The success rate of local Japanese students in the public schools is in sharp contrast to that of the native Hawaiians. The educational programs that were available to the second generation Japanese and to the Hawaiians of the late nineteenth century differed. These, in turn, were affected by non-educational factors.

The shift from Hawaiian to English or Hawaiian Creole English as a native language around 1900 was aided at least in part by a decline in both the net number of Hawaiians and the percentage of Hawaiians making up the total population of Hawaii. However, institutional support for use of the language was also decreasing, first in business, then in government, and finally in education. Literacy skills in Hawaiian had only recently been introduced. That involved the development of an orthography, dictionaries, grammars, a literature (primarily the Bible and religious texts), and a full curriculum. Furthermore, outside of the church and government, there had not developed other functions for literacy in Hawaiian. And even within the institution of Christianity (which itself was only recently imported), the Bible was available in English. With the erosion of Hawaiian in these spheres, there was little perceived need to learn it formally. After all, one can almost hear the argument, Hawaiian students already knew how to speak Hawaiian, so there was no need to teach it to them. Furthermore, the education which Hawaiian children were receiving was not providing them with access to the new economic life around them. Gradually, both the number of Hawaiian medium schools and the enrollment in them declined, as proficiency in English became a major linguistic goal of the school system. First language literacy had not been supported in the schools (nor, it can be assumed, at home) for the majority of the

Hawaiians for twenty years before the official dropping of Hawaiian as a medium of instruction. The subsequent loss of native language literacy skills and eventually the native language, was not foreseen, however, just as it is often unforeseen today.

By contrast, several conditions helped contribute to the success of the Japanese language schools, even in the face of strong opposition from institutions and government. In the case of the Japanese, the number of native speakers was increasing along with the population of English speakers. Furthermore, there existed a long tradition of literacy in Japanese, with a large literature, well-defined functions for reading and writing the language and an established curriculum (Reinecke 1969:129-130). Third, although the public schools of Hawaii were alien to both Hawaiians and Japanese, for the latter they were perhaps more alien. The public schools were alien in language as well as teachers, curriculum, procedures and other aspects of the subculture of the school. These conditions most probably generated support for the Japanese schools among the Japanese community. In light of the prejudice against the Japanese from 1885 until after the war (Hawkins 1978:43-44), one might surmise that one psychological motivation for the language schools was the development of a positive self image for children of Japanese immigrants. From the beginning, the Japanese population was overtly excluded from the political process through discriminatory legislation. By the time of the overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy, the rising tide of American nationalism both in Hawaii and on the mainland, accompanied by a strong anti-Asian and anti-non-Christian sentiment, gave the Japanese community every reason to fear for their language, their culture and their children's futures. Furthermore, as a large portion of the labor force in the islands, the Japanese community represented a strong potential for both political and economic influence. Since the majority

of the Japanese in Hawaii were working on the plantations, they were able to organize with respect to common concerns, not just in education but in other spheres as well. All of these conditions contributed to the maintenance of the language schools. The schools in turn provided the kind of language education that was needed to develop a good base for second language literacy.

The main points illustrated by these two case studies are three: First, language education policy reflects the political, economic, and social situation in which the policy exists. Second, those people who control the educational system determine language education policy of that system. Third, the effects of that policy are felt beyond the generation educated under it.

4. Current Language Issues in Hawaii

The two case studies illustrated above provide a historical background for language education policy issues in Hawaii today, especially as it relates to bilingual education for students identified as limited English proficient (SLEP). Although the social, political and economic conditions in Hawaii have changed dramatically since statehood, non-linguistic factors still influence the shape of bilingual education. Furthermore, it can be expected that the policies adopted will have cross-generational consequences. Contemporary language policy issues, however, can only be understood within the context of the demographics of the state and its public school system.

From the turn of the century until the 1960s, the local Japanese community constituted a plurality in Hawaii. Following World War II, this ethnic group made tremendous inroads into the economic, social and political life of the islands. Since 1960, however, large numbers of immigrants from the U.S. mainland and from countries of the Pacific basin, notably from the Philippines, have changed the ethnic composition of the state (see Table 1)³, the former group as a result of statehood and the subsequent growth of the islands' economy,

the latter as a result of the revised immigration laws of 1965.

Despite the proportionate decrease in the local Japanese population over the last twenty-five years, that ethnic group continues to maintain control over the public school system. Comparing ethnicity of school personnel with that of student enrollment, it becomes apparent that the ethnic groups most severely underrepresented are the Filipinos, the Hawaiians and part Hawaiians, the Samoans and the Puerto Ricans (see Table 2)⁴. In addition, many of the decedents of plantation workers are native speakers of Hawaiian Creole English. Three distinct, though not necessarily mutually exclusive groups most immediately affected by language policy issues, therefore, are the immigrant population, the locally-born Hawaiian Creole English speaking population, and the native Hawaiians.

Currently, the largest group of immigrant students who are identified as limited English proficient are the Ilokano from the Philippines, followed by Samoans, Koreans, Cantonese, and Vietnamese. Although Hawaii has the highest percentage of immigrants in the United States, it was one of the last to apply for Federal funds for bilingual education. Reasons cited for the reluctance on the part of the Department of Education to institute programs of bilingual education include, "1) the reaction against the segregated school system based on English ability (i.e., the English Standard schools; see Sato, in press), 2) the 'need' to exhibit and incorporate loyalty and nationalism, particularly {among} the Japanese community, and 3) the newness of statehood and wish to fully participate in the political and economic life of the nation" (Agbayani 1979:4).

Since 1975, however, in response to pressure from the U.S. Office of Civil rights, the DOE provides bilingual services to immigrant students during their first two years in the school system or until they perform at the 25th percentile

or above on a standardized achievement test, whichever comes first. These bilingual programs have provided some minimal access to employment within the educational system for ethnic groups traditionally underrepresented within the DOE. Under this "assimilationist" model (Kjolseth 1976), bilingual services consist of two hours of instruction per day provided by a bilingual teacher or aide who teaches primarily in English, but resorts to the native language whenever necessary. No provisions are made for the development of the students' native languages. The model is transitional in its most severe form.

However, those who would like to see the maintenance of the immigrant languages would probably be in for a disappointment, if such were to become an official educational goal. The track record for the maintenance of languages in situations like these beyond the second generation is not very encouraging. There is little institutional support for the use of these languages outside of the schools, and schools in and of themselves cannot sustain the life of a language. Maintenance of a language "depends first and foremost upon its use in other domains" (Kjolseth 1976:122). Moreover, many immigrant parents share the DOE's goal of transition to English as soon as possible.

Recent work on first language literacy for non-English-speaking students suggests, however, that learning to read and write in one's native language before attempting to learn these skills in a second language facilitates second language development (Haddad 1981, Robson 1981). A recent nationwide study of effective bilingual schooling (Tikunoff 1980) suggests that use of the native language as a medium of instruction facilitates learning of subject area content. Therefore, educators in Hawaii might want to explore the possibilities of teaching reading and writing in the primary language of the immigrant students there, even in a transitional program like the one in Hawaii.

A second issue of recent concern is that of Hawaiian Creole English. A recent ruling by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs of the U.S. Department of Education recognizes Hawaiian Creole English as a language qualifying for bilingual education funding under Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). From one point of view, this is a very exciting turn of events. The uniqueness of Hawaiian Creole English as a language distinct from English has been documented by linguists (Bickerton 1977, Day 1972, Perlman 1973, Sato 1978). This ruling affords the Hawaii Department of Education with an opportunity to provide linguistically comprehensible education for Hawaiian Creole English speaking students, for

there can be no justification for assuming that children will pick up the school language on their own, and no justification for not developing some program that will make it possible for children to learn the standard language and for them to continue to be educated all the time that this is going on. (Spolsky 1977:20)

At the same time, it affords the Hawaii Department of Education with an opportunity to provide culturally responsive education (Cazden and Leggett 1981) to their students. Many students in Hawaii public schools who speak Hawaiian Creole English suffer a mismatch between the culture of the home and the culture of the school. (Au and Jordan 1981) The Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP) of the Kamehameha Schools has already done much of the groundwork in addressing this latter issue. Title VII funds would provide resources to begin implementing some of the recommendations coming out of KEEP in the public schools.

On the other hand, there are complex educational and political issues associated with applying for Federal funds for programs of bilingual education for Hawaiian Creole English speakers under Title VII. From an educational point of view, identification and assessment procedures would have to be established for this target group of students. Currently existing instruments designed for immigrant students would not be appropriate. From a political point of view,

if the State of Hawaii elects to exercise its option to apply for Title VII funds for Hawaiian Creole English speakers, those students would surely constitute the largest group of students identified as limited English proficient in the State. While this would mean the availability of new money for educational programs, it could also potentially undermine the inroads into the educational system which bilingual education has heretofore provided for certain minorities in Hawaii, notably Filipinos.

Finally, there is the issue of Hawaiian. Since the reintroduction of Hawaiian in the high schools and the University of Hawaii in the 1920s, the language as a subject of study has spread, through the efforts of the Kamehameha Schools and through State support for Hawaiian materials and programs. However, except for the Island of Niihau, where schooling has probably always been in Hawaiian, the use of the language as a medium of instruction was not reintroduced into the curriculum until 1980. Children from Niihau often migrate to Kauai with their families who work on ranches there for part of the year. Many of these children attend Waimea Canyon School. In 1980, the Hawaii Bilingual/Multicultural Education Project introduced into that school a transitional model of bilingual education for Hawaiian students arriving from Niihau. In addition to providing transitional services to these children, the project trained Hawaiian speaking teachers and produced materials for teaching content area subject matter in grades one through six in Hawaiian. The project was terminated in 1983.

Recently, a paper has been circulating addressing the feasibility of an experimental transitional program on Kauai which would teach reading and writing to Hawaiian children in Hawaiian, while providing an immersion program in Hawaiian for students from Kauai who would volunteer for such a program (Wilson 1983). This proposal has won the support of the District Superintendent (Nakashima 1983) and favorable response from the State Board of Education (Evelyn Klinkmann, Personal communication).

Whether or not the proposal will win support from the State Legislature, and whether or not Hawaiian will be reintroduced as a medium of instruction in other public schools in the State is still to be seen. Even if Hawaiian is reintroduced as a medium of instruction, the likelihood that it would result in the revival of the Hawaiian language over the long haul is unlikely, given the lack of institutional functions for and recognition of that language outside of the school. However, there may be linguistic and educational justifications for the use of Hawaiian as a medium of instruction. Wallace Lambert, in a report following a visit to Hawaii in 1979 to consult with the Program for SLEP staff, recommended a Hawaiian immersion program on the Island of Hawaii on these grounds (Lambert 1981).

These three areas, programs for immigrant students, programs for Hawaiian Creole speaking students, and programs for native Hawaiians, are vital issues concerning the future of Hawaii. From a social perspective, one might ask whether the social structure of Hawaii is stratified, and if so is it stratified along ethnic lines? If an ethnically integrated social structure is a goal for the next generation, the groundwork for that must begin now.

Similarly, one might ask what the political and economic structure is now and what it might be in the next generation. What kinds of jobs are limited English proficient students currently being prepared for? Who are currently getting jobs within the educational system? How can the capacity to achieve a balance be built?

Finally, what are the students learning in the existing programs, in terms of both language proficiency and achievement in content areas? Is this the best that can be hoped for or are there alternatives to explore? A sociolinguistically and historically aware group of people working on bilingual education could address these language policy issues.

5. Conclusion

Since the arrival of Europeans in Hawaii, social, political, and economic forces have worked to influence language education policy in Hawaii. Two case studies illustrate the influence of these forces: the first involving the loss of Hawaiian first as a medium of instruction and later as a native language; the second involving the establishment of an autonomous, community-supported school system, paralleling the official school system to maintain the linguistic and cultural integrity of an immigrant group. Both contribute to an understanding of contemporary language policy issues in Hawaii. Three such issues have been identified and discussed in the hope that an understanding of them in their historical political, social, and economic context will lead to enlightened policy decisions on these issues.

TABLE 1: Ethnic Composition of Hawaii, 1900-70³

Year ^a	Total	Caucasian ^b	Negro	Japanese	Indian	Chinese	Hawaiian	part-Hawaiian	Filipino	Korean	Other
Population											
1900	154,001	28,819	233	61,111	u	25,767	29,799	7,857	u	u	415
1910	191,909	44,048	695	79,675	u	21,674	26,041	12,506	2,361	4,533	376
1920	255,912	54,742	348	109,274	u	23,507	23,723	18,027	21,031	4,950	310
1930	368,336	80,373	563	139,631	u	27,179	22,636	28,224	63,052	6,461	217
1940	423,330	112,087	255	157,905	u	28,774	14,375	49,935	52,569	6,851	579
1950	499,769	124,344	2,651	184,598	u	32,376	12,245	73,845	61,062	7,030	1,618
1960	632,772	202,230	4,943	203,455	472	38,197	11,294	91,109	69,070	u	12,306
1970 ^c	768,559	301,429	7,517	217,669	1,216	52,375	d	71,274	95,354	9,625	12,100
Percentage distribution											
1900	100.0	18.7	0.2	39.7	u	16.7	19.3	5.1	u	u	0.3
1910	100.0	23.0	0.4	41.5	u	11.3	13.6	6.5	1.2	2.4	0.1
1920	100.0	21.4	0.1	42.7	u	9.2	9.3	7.0	8.2	1.0	0.2
1930	100.0	21.8	0.2	37.9	u	7.4	6.1	7.7	17.1	1.8	0.1
1940	100.0	26.5	0.1	37.3	u	6.8	3.4	11.8	12.4	1.6	0.2
1950	100.0	24.9	0.5	36.9	u	6.5	2.5	14.8	12.2	1.4	0.3
1960	100.0	32.0	0.8	32.2	0.1	6.0	1.7	14.4	10.9	u	1.9
1970	100.0	39.2	1.0	28.3	0.2	6.8	d	9.3	12.4	1.3	1.6

u Unavailable.

a April of the given year, except for 1920, when census was taken on 1 January.

b Includes Puerto Ricans, Portuguese, Spaniards, and "other Caucasians".

c Figures for 1970 are not directly comparable with other years because of changed census definitions of race.

d Included with figure for "part Hawaiian".

Sources: Lind (1967, table 2); United States, Bureau of the Census (1961, table 15; 1972 a, table 139); Schmitt (1969:20).

Table 2: Summary of School Personnel and Students by Ethnic Category in the State of Hawaii

STAFF	N %	ETHNICITY											TOTAL
		Black	Chinese	Fil.	Haw.	Japa- nese	Korean	Part Haw.	Puerto Rican	Samoan	Caucasian	Mixed	
Principal	0 0	20 8	12 5	0 0	153 65	7 3	20 8	1 0.5	0 0	20 8	3 1	0 0	236
Assistant Principal	1 0.8	11 8	5 4	0 0	79 60	4 3	13 10	0 0	0 0	16 12	2 1.5	0 0	131
Classroom Teachers	28 0.3	653 8	294 4	27 0.3	4899 60	92 1	539 7	7 0.1	15 0.2	1299 16	301 4	43 0.5	8197
Counselors, Librarians, Registrars	5 0.7	60 9	15 2	2 0.3	386 56	8 1	49 7	0 0	1 0.1	136 20	26 4	4 0.6	692
Total	34 0.4	744 8	326 4	29 3	5517 60	111 1	621 7	8 0.01	16 0.2	1471 16	332 4	47 0.5	9156
STUDENTS	2936 2	5661 4	31044 19	3540 2	27651 17	2958 2	30012 19	9433 6	5365 3	32437 20		10131 6	161,168

Sources:

Hawaii State Department of Education, Office of Personnel Services,
 Personnel Data Form ECBA3R-A, 10-26-82;
 Hawaii State Department of Education, Student Information Services Branch,
 Student Ethnicity Survey, 1-18-83.

NOTES

¹ This is a revised version of a paper presented at the Hawaii Department of Education State Education Agency Institute for Effective Leadership in Bilingual Education held in Honolulu, January 14 - 16, 1984. I am grateful to Virgie Chattergy for affording me the opportunity to participate in that institute, to the other participants for their comments and encouragement, and to Carol Edelsky, Linda Brodkey, and Nessa Wolfson for their suggested revisions of that paper.

² But see Reinecke 1969:30, 140-41.

³ From Gardner and Nordyke 1974:26.

⁴ From University of Hawaii College of Education 1983:4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agbayani, Amefil. 1979. Bilingual Education and Public Policy in Hawaii: Historical and Current Issues. Paper presented at the National Association of Asian American and Pacific Education Conference.
- Agnew, John A. 1981. Language shift and the politics of language: The case of the Celtic languages of the British Isles. Language Problems and Language Planning. 5:1, 1-10.
- Au, Kathryn He-Pei and Cathie Jordan. 1977. Teaching reading to Hawaiian children: Finding a culturally appropriate solution. In Trueba, Guthrie and Au (eds.) Culture and the Bilingual Classroom: Studies in Classroom Ethnography. Rowley, Ma : Newbury House.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1981. Roots of Language. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers Inc.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1977. Change and Variation in Hawaiian English II: Creole Syntax. Final Report on NSF Grant no. GS-39748.
- Bickerton, Derek and Talmy Givón. 1976. Pidginization and syntactic change: From SXV and VSX to SVX. Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Bickerton, Derek and Carol Odo. 1976. Change and Variation in Hawaiian English I: General Phonology and Pidgin Syntax. Final Report on NSF Grant No. GS-39748.
- Cazden, Courtney and Ellen L. Leggett. 1981. Culturally responsive education: Recommendations for achieving Lau remedies II. In Trueba, Guthrie and Au (eds.) Culture and the Bilingual Classroom Studies in Classroom Ethnography. Rowley, Ma : Newbury House.
- Curriculum and Development Group. 1979. Molokai Hawaiian Language Feasibility Study Final Report. University of Hawaii.
- Day, Richard R. 1972. Patterns of Variation in Copula and Tense in the Hawaiian Post-Creole Continuum. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- Day, Richard R. In press. The ultimate inequality: linguistic genocide. In Joan Manes and Nessa Wolfson (eds.) Language of Inequality, The Hague: Mouton.
- Dole, Stanford B. 1895. Evolution of Hawaiian land tenure. Overland Monthly. pp. 565-579.
- Gardner, Robert W. and Eleanor C. Nordyke. 1974. The Demographic Situation in Hawaii. Honolulu: East-West Center.
- Glauberman, Stu. 1984. Envoy sees end to Japanese-Isle ethnic bond. Honolulu Star-Bulletin, January 10.

- Haddad, Francis Trix. 1981. First language illiteracy-second language reading: A case study. In Hudelson, Sara (ed.) Linguistics and Literacy Series I: Learning to Read in Different Languages. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Hawkins, John N. 1978. Politics, education, and language policy: The case of Japanese schools in Hawaii. Amerasia Journal. 5:1, 39-56.
- Kjolseth, Rolf. 1976. Bilingual education programs in the United States: For assimilation of pluralism? In Francesco Cordasco (ed.) Bilingual Schooling in the United States: A Sourcebook for Educational Personnel. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kloss, Heinz. 1977. The American Bilingual Tradition. Rowley, Ma : Newbury House.
- Kuykendall, Ralph S. 1938. The Hawaiian Kingdom, 1778-1854: Foundation and Transformation. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- _____. 1953. The Hawaiian Kingdom, 1854-1874: Twenty Critical Years. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- _____. 1963. The Hawaiian Kingdom, 1854-1893: The Kalakaua Dynasty. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- _____. and A. Grove Day. 1948. Hawaii: A History from Polynesian Kingdom to American Commonwealth. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Lambert, Wallace E. 1981. An Evaluation of SLEP Programs in the Hawaii and Leeward Districts: Observations and Suggestions. Unpublished report to the Hawaii State Department of Education.
- Nakashima, Mitsugi. 1983. Memo to Dr. Donniss Thompson. Superintendent, Hawaii State Department of Education. re: Progress report on efforts to improve education for Niihau children.
- Pearlman, Alan. 1973. Grammatical Structure and Style Shift in Hawaiian Pidgin and Creole. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Reinecke, John. 1969. Language and Dialect in Hawaii. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Robson, Barbara. 1981. Alternatives in ESL and Literacy: Ban Vinai. Asia Foundation Final Report. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Sato, Charlene J. In press. Linguistic inequality in Hawaii: The post-creole dilemma. In Joan Manes and Nessa Wolfson (eds.) Language and Inequality. The Hague: Mouton.
- Sato, Charlene. 1978. Variation in Hawaiian Pidgin and Creole English: Go and Verb Constructions. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Hawaii.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 1977. The establishment of language education policy in multilingual societies. In Spolsky, Bernard and Robert L. Cooper (eds.) Frontiers of Bilingual Education. Rowley, Ma : Newbury House.

- Tikunoff, William J. 1980. Overview of the significant bilingual instructional features study. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.
- University of Hawaii College of Education. 1983. Hawaii Bilingual/Multicultural Teacher Training Project. ESEA Title VIII Teacher Training Grant proposal.
- Wilson, Williams. 1983. Hawaiian language and education for Ni'ihau people. M.S.
- Wist, Benjamin Othello. 1940. A Century of Public Education in Hawaii, 1840- 1940. Honolulu: Hawaii Educational Review.