

PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD HAWAII CREOLE ENGLISH

JENNIFER H. LIU
University of Hawai'i

This study investigates pre-service public school teachers' attitudes concerning Hawaii Creole English (HCE), a variety of English commonly spoken by many of Hawaii's public school students. The study also explores how attitudes might differ depending on teachers' language background and whether there are differences in ratings of competence and solidarity traits. Thirty-six teachers, including 24 HCE speakers and 12 non-HCE speakers, rated five speech samples representing the following varieties of English: HCE, standard English (SE), and foreign-accented English (a distracter). A 7-point semantic differential scale was used by all raters. Raters were asked to give their first impressions of the students speaking. Multivariate and univariate analyses of variance indicated that teachers rated the SE samples significantly higher than the HCE samples. In addition, univariate analyses of variance revealed that the non-HCE-speaking teachers rated HCE lower than did the HCE-speaking teachers. However, this second finding should be cautiously interpreted since the multivariate analysis did not show statistically significant differences. Finally, a multivariate analysis of variance indicated that teachers rated HCE higher in solidarity than competence, while the opposite was the case for their ratings of SE. It is suggested that an ethnographic study be done to get a more holistic picture of pre-service teachers' attitudes toward HCE.

INTRODUCTION

History of Linguistic Inequality In Hawaii

From a critical perspective, Hawaii Creole English (HCE) can be seen in the context of the linguistic inequality and capitalism in Hawaii and the United States that has taken place over the past few centuries. In Hawaii, HCE can be traced back along a continuum to the pidgin that eventually developed after different immigrants arrived to work on the sugar plantations, since Hawaiians were discouraged from plantation work by the harsh and exploitative working conditions created by New England missionaries (Sato, 1985). To facilitate communication between ethnic groups, Hawaii Pidgin English developed as a contact vernacular at the end of the nineteenth century. Later, HCE became the mother tongue of the children of the early plantation workers, as a creole is "the language spoken by the native-born children of pidgin-speaking parents" (Sato, 1985, p. 256).

According to Sato (1985), as an increasing number of Caucasians settled in Hawaii, they did not want their children attending the same schools as "'pidgin-speaking' non-haole children" (p. 264), and therefore set up separate schools for those who could pass an English language test. The majority of the children who passed the test were Caucasian.

Sato (1985) says that "the major effect of this system was the further stratification of Hawaiian society along ethnic lines by means of linguistic discrimination along linguistic ones" and this type of schooling "legitimized the negative stereotyping of HCE speakers" (p. 264). Even though World War II brought about the abolishment of this system, language discrimination continued. For many, especially the Japanese, Chinese, and Portuguese, Sato (1985) says the shift from the plantation to higher paying jobs in the city also meant making an "effort to suppress their HCE" to compete for jobs (p. 266). Unfortunately, it also meant cycles of "educational failure, socioeconomic stagnation, and political powerlessness" for those who rejected standard English (SE) and affirmed their HCE (p. 266).

Current Language Attitudes in Hawaii

Sato (1991) cites several studies (e.g., Choy & Dodd, 1976 & Day, 1980) of language attitudes in Hawaii that generally find there is a negative attitude toward HCE and a positive attitude toward what many consider Standard American English. She says these attitudes may be partly attributed to the World War II experience of the *nisei* (second generation) Japanese in Hawaii, who were greatly affected by the 'Be American' and 'Speak American' campaigns started in response to anti-Japanese hysteria. According to Sato (1991), language policies in the school system reflect this now middle class and largely politically controlling generation's strong assimilationist perspective. However, Sato (1991) mentions that attitudes may have been sharpened by the 1987 Hawaii Board of Education (BOE) controversy over the use of HCE in the classroom, which was the first time in Hawaii's history that HCE as a "marker of local identity" (p. 657) was publicly discussed. During this heated discussion, many expressed opposition to the BOE's proposal to mandate SE as the only mode of communication to be used in school and school-related settings. In the end, the Board voted against the SE-only policy.

Other changes affecting language attitudes in Hawaii have also come about in the last decade or so. These changes include the increase of teaching multicultural awareness in education classes in teacher training, the resurgence of interest in the maintenance of cultural and linguistic roots (e.g., Hawaiian immersion programs), and the popularization of local and HCE literature by writers such as Darrell Lum, Lois Ann Yamanaka, and Eric Chock. Since these changes and events, especially the BOE debate, there have not been any current studies that examine teachers', students', or the community's attitudes toward language variation in Hawaii. Furthermore, there have not been studies of language

attitudes in working class areas on Oahu or other Hawaiian islands with more native Hawaiians and less Caucasians (Sato, 1991).

According to Edwards (1989), stereotypes that people have of themselves and their language may change over time as society changes, especially if there is a resurgence in interest in "roots" and if minority groups feel the need to accentuate their differences from the mainstream society. On the other hand, Edwards (1989) points out that the attitudes of standard language speakers concerning nonstandard language speakers are slower to change.

Importance of Studying Language Attitudes

Results of current language attitude studies, especially those concerning teachers and students, would be very useful for educators, administrators, and policy makers because of the implications of attitudes. Besides having implications for the possible revision of state policies, language attitudes have implications at an individual level. For example, Rosenthal and Jacobs (1968) found teachers may treat children unfairly based on stereotyped views of their capabilities. Similarly, Ford (1984) found that work in education and psychology reveals there is a relationship between student achievement and teachers' expectations. Likewise, Edwards (1989) says that studies of teachers' expectations of disadvantaged speakers (minority language speakers) usually confirm that teachers communicate lowered expectations toward these children, and in turn children respond by underachieving; thus, a self-fulfilling prophecy takes place and becomes a typical pattern. Obviously, school has a powerful influence over children, which may be psychologically damaging when it comes to non-standard English (NSE) speakers.

To decrease the discontinuity minority language children experience between the home and school, Sato (1989) points out that making discourse modifications or adjustments in teacher talk and classroom participation might help facilitate learning, as was evident in the implementation of a "talk story" approach used in the Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP), a pre-school program on Oahu. Researchers in bilingual education have also found that allowing use of the L1 could help bridge the learning of the L2 (Auerbach, 1993). At the same time, by valuing and allowing use of the L1, teachers may see increased confidence, motivation, and academic success in students (Cummins, 1991). This is because language is closely related to one's social identity (McGroarty, 1996).

It is important to understand why teachers seem to generally hold such negative views of NSE speakers. The answer is doubtfully attributable to aesthetic judgments of language. Edwards (1989) explains that results of several studies show that there is

nothing inherent in certain accents that make them more pleasing than others. Instead, he says that accents are associated with different degrees of social status. Ryan (1973) cites Williams (1970) in describing the process of developing reactions based on accents:

1. Speech types serve as social identifiers.
2. These elicit stereotypes held by ourselves and others.
3. We tend to behave in accord with these stereotypes, and thus
4. translate our attitudes into a social reality. (p. 61)

Others also see attitudes and our "social reality" as it is related to ideologies about language. However, these ideologies may not be known or acknowledged by those who have them (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996) because of hegemony --- the ability of dominant groups to get others to unconsciously accept practices and beliefs as "natural, necessary, or inevitable (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1994, p. 140). Tollefson (1991) describes how this happens:

The policy of requiring everyone to learn a single dominant language is widely seen as a common-sense solution to the communication problems of multilingual societies. The appeal of this assumption is such that monolingualism is seen as a solution to linguistic inequality. If linguistic minorities learn the dominant language, so the argument goes, then they will not suffer economic and social inequality. The assumption is an example of an ideology, which refers to normally unconscious assumptions that come to be seen as common sense...such assumptions justify exclusionary policies and sustain inequality (p.10).

Auerbach (1993) also describes how people come to accept ideologies. If not by coercion, she says it happens by consent when people unconsciously accept and take for granted practices that are permeated in institutions in society.

Review of Language Attitude Studies

In studying language attitudes, many researchers have used the matched-guise technique (MGT), first popularized by Lambert et al. in 1960 (Giles & Coupland, 1991). This technique uses audio-recorded speech samples of different language varieties to elicit judges' attitudes toward the varieties. A balanced bilingual speaker speaks once in each language variety and then the samples are presented to judges who are asked to rate the speakers, usually on a semantic differential scale with polar adjectives or descriptors on each end of the scales.

Some advantages of MGT are: (a) it elicits private attitudes, while extraneous variables are controlled; and (b) it emphasizes the important role of language in forming

impressions (Giles & Coupland, 1991). According to Ryan (1973), adapted forms of MGT have been used to compare reactions to speakers of Canadian-French and European-French, SE and Jewish-accented English, SE and French-Canadian English, and varieties of SE and Black English Vernacular. Other relevant MGT studies can be found in Edwards (1989), such as the comparison of attitudes toward different British accents and Mexican-American versus Anglo-American accents.

When MGT was originally used by Lambert, raters judged speakers on both cognitive and affective factors and results usually showed different ratings for each trait (McGroarty, 1996). When this technique has been applied to speakers of different dialects, results showed that raters evaluate nonstandard varieties differently from standard varieties. Typically, the speaker of the standard variety is perceived as more prestigious and likely to succeed, although the nonstandard speaker is rated high in solidarity traits such as friendliness and honesty (McGroarty, 1996).

Although MGT has been criticized for its artificiality, Edwards (1989) maintains that MGT is useful if we consider its limitations and do not over-generalize findings. In addition, he cites Seligman et al. (1972) who found that even when other information was presented (e.g., pictures of speakers or drawings by speakers), speech still remains a cue of importance. To decrease artificiality, Edwards (1989) says some suggest using spontaneous speech rather than the reading of passages. He also refers to Granger et al. (1977) who used speech samples where children describe a picture. This approach takes a middle course between using a reading passage, which favors certain children, and completely spontaneous speech, which could "remove comparability across speakers" (p. 109). Furthermore, Sato (1991) advocates the need for more in-depth interviews, large-scale surveys, and observational data on language socialization to clarify data from elicitation studies.

Several studies have looked particularly at *teachers'* attitudes toward language varieties. Many such studies have been done on the Mainland United States with Spanish-speaking students (e.g., Ramirez et al., 1976 and Ford, 1984) and African American students who speak Black English Vernacular (See Edwards, 1989). Most of these studies find that teachers perceive SE speakers to be more competent than language minority speakers.

Take for instance Ramirez et al. (1976). Ramirez and his colleagues measured student and teacher attitudes toward language variation in a bilingual Spanish-English environment using MGT. Seven guises, spoken by four adult speakers, ranging from SE to Standard Spanish were used (four speakers for each guise). The subjects were 18

teachers and 279 fourth and fifth graders in a low-income district. One group of teachers taught in Title I, a federally-funded reading program for low-income students, and the other did not. The teachers rated the speakers' speech on appropriateness for school, correctness, and likelihood of achievement in school on a scale of one to four. The study also used another treatment variable: some teachers had participated in a two-session workshop on language variation. Conversely, this group did not have significantly different attitudes. In general, the researchers found that students and teachers alike rated SE higher.

In another study, Ford (1984) examined teachers' attitudes toward Spanish-influenced English and SE using paired speech and writing samples (teachers were falsely told both samples came from the same student). She also considered the variables of teachers' ethnicity, native language, and teaching experience. Forty teachers rated third to fourth grade students on a seven-point semantic differential scale with characteristics such as pleasantness and confidence. Ford found that teachers generally had negative attitudes toward the Spanish-influenced speakers, although teachers who spoke Spanish as a native language expected less of a gap in social status between SE and Spanish-influenced English speakers than native English speaking teachers did. On the contrary, Edwards (1989) reports that a study by Williams et al. (1972) found African American and Caucasian teachers to both negatively perceive low-status children in all aspects. He suggests that speech evaluations may generalize across ethnic and class lines because of "the internalization of mainstream social values" (p. 112).

As for Hawaii, there have not been many published studies on teachers' attitudes concerning HCE, although a few have examined *students'* attitudes toward HCE (e.g., Day, 1980 and McCreary, 1986). Day's (1980) study examined elementary students' attitudes and McCreary's (1986) study looked at English as a second language students' attitudes. Another study, Yamamoto (1982), dealt with the attitudes of students, faculty, and staff at the University of Hawaii. Like the other studies, Yamamoto found that SE was rated significantly higher than HCE. Although Yamamoto's findings are important, they do not necessarily say anything about what goes on in public schools.

Choy and Dodd's (1976) study and Yamamoto and Hargrove's (1982) study seem to be the only studies in Hawaii that attempted to determine public school teachers' attitudes toward HCE. Both of these studies found that teachers rated SE higher than HCE. However, not only were these studies both done over 10 years ago, but their designs also have some faults.

Yamamoto and Hargrove (1982) examined teachers' attitudes concerning HCE by presenting 18 Asian-American public school teachers with eight speech samples from students of different ethnic backgrounds, ranging from African American and Caucasian to Samoan. The teachers rated the students' speech on one five-point scale (no traits given) and answered three close-ended and two open-ended questions related to teachers' guesses of students' future occupation and class ranking.

It was not explicitly stated what language variety the students were speaking. Instead, this was implied by the teachers' descriptive comments about the students. Although the students who seemed to speak the most HCE were rated the lowest, there was no statistical test done to see if the differences in ratings were significant. In addition, the researchers did not use balanced bilinguals, so teachers' ratings may have been influenced by idiosyncrasies unique to each speaker. Finally, with the sample size being less than 30 subjects, the results of this test are unlikely to be generalizable.

Drawbacks can also be found with Choy and Dodd's (1976) study. Their research was two-fold. It assessed the processing efforts of SE and HCE speakers after they listened to stories in SE and HCE and concluded that students processed information better in their first language. It also used a seven-point scale to measure attitudes and found that teachers attributed less desirable traits to HCE speakers. The subjects in this study were fifth grade students in a public school on Oahu. The three raters were Japanese-Americans born and raised in Hawaii and well-aquainted with HCE.

Unlike Lambert's original study, this study did not use balanced bilingual speakers. Instead, the researchers used 14 HCE speakers and 14 SE speakers to provide speech samples for teachers to judge. Interestingly, the speakers came from the three teachers' respective homeroom classes. Obviously, the teachers' familiarity with the students could have influenced their reactions so that they were not judging speech alone. In like manner, the teachers' reactions could have been affected by *what* the students said, not *how* they said it, since the speech samples were taken from students' reactions to stories. Moreover, the study did not account for such variables as teachers' ethnicity or first language, or teachers' multicultural or ESL teaching background. It should also be noted that only three raters were used, which makes it difficult to generalize about teachers' attitudes since this is such a small sample size. Thus, the results of this study are only applicable to these teachers and their classes.

As I have shown, the research available about *teachers'* attitudes toward HCE is outdated, limited, and questionable in validity. Additionally, past HCE studies never considered teachers' language background or differences in ratings of competence versus

solidarity as variables. As mentioned before, some past studies have shown that teachers who have the same language background as the students tend to give them higher ratings than teachers with different language backgrounds do. Also, although raters might downgrade the competence of nonstandard English speakers, they may rate these speakers higher in terms of solidarity.

Lastly, past HCE studies focused on in-service teachers as opposed to pre-service teachers. With many teachers in the DOE recently retiring, there will be a new breed of teachers entering Hawaii's public schools. These teachers' attitudes toward HCE may be an important factor in their students' success in school.

Purpose

The purpose of my study was to find out what pre-service teachers' attitudes are toward students who speak HCE compared to students who speak SE. This study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. Is the mean for the attitudes of public school pre-service teachers in Hawaii toward HCE-speaking students significantly different from the mean for their attitudes toward SE-speaking students?
2. Is the mean for the attitudes of SE-speaking pre-service teachers toward HCE-speaking students significantly lower than the mean for the attitudes of pre-service teachers who consider themselves to be HCE speakers (now and as a child)?
3. Are there significant differences in the mean for the ratings of how pre-service teachers rate students on competence traits versus solidarity traits?

The experiment-wise alpha level was set at .05.

METHOD

Subjects

A total of 36 pre-service teachers participated as raters in this study. These soon-to-be teachers (henceforth to be called teachers although they are still students) were in two different teacher preparation courses in the University of Hawaii's College of Education. Of the 36 teachers, 24 said they could speak HCE and also spoke it as a child. About one third, or 12, said they could not speak HCE. However, eight of these teachers, who also happened to be of Asian ancestry, stated they spoke HCE as a child. I included them in the SE sample since their self-assessed inability to speak HCE shows they do not identify with the language now. All teachers also spoke English as a first language, although the

variety of English probably varied between Hawaii standard English and Mainland standard English. Language ability was determined from a questionnaire (see Appendix A). Of the HCE-speakers, 50% were Asian, 25% were part-Hawaiian, 17% were Filipino, 3% were Samoan, and 3% were mixed (non-Hawaiian). Of the SE speakers, 33% were Caucasian and 67% were Asian. This 67% was the same eight teachers who said they spoke HCE as children but could not speak it "fluently and naturally today".

Besides language background, other information was gathered about the teachers: 58% were female and 42% were male; 78% were between 20-29 years old; 14% were between 30-39; and 8% were between 40-49. The most popular subject specialty areas were social studies (22%), math (19%), English (11%), and science (11%). The rest (37%) of the teachers were in other fields. On average, the teachers had already completed about 12 credits in education classes. The average number of credits in either English as a Second Language or multicultural education was 1.19. This shows that there is the chance that most of the teachers probably had not studied culturally-responsive pedagogy, which is stressed in multicultural education courses.

Materials

Teachers were presented with the stimulus of speech samples representing three different tape-recorded guises, each of about 20 seconds: HCE, SE, and foreign-accented (FA) speech. Two balanced bilinguals (one male, one female) were used for the HCE and SE samples (four samples total) and one FA speaker was used as a distracter (one sample). Both a male and female were used for each of these samples to avoid evaluations based on the speaker's sex. Speech samples in each category (HCE, SE, and FA) were also interspersed to avoid the HCE and SE being identified as produced by the same speaker. With identical speakers, differences in voice quality and personality are invariant and attitudes toward language rather than personality or other factors are elicited. Speakers were chosen on ability to present authentic samples so that raters would not perceive the guises as to coming from the same person or as non-authentic. To elicit speech samples, speakers were asked to describe a picture instead of read a passage to avoid raters making judgments on reading ability. All speakers described the same picture. Before teachers rated the samples, the samples were checked for authenticity and naturalness by four students in the graduate program in English as a Second Language at the University of Hawaii. Each of these students grew up in Hawaii, can speak both HCE and SE, and has studied language acquisition and use. Although these graduate students confirmed that the HCE samples sounded natural and authentic, it should be noted that

one student said the HCE samples sounded like the HCE spoken on Oahu and not the neighbor islands, where a more mesolect variety (closer to Hawaii Pidgin along the creole continuum) is spoken. Another student pointed out that the samples sounded like acrolect varieties (closer to Hawaii standard English) of HCE. I decided to use these speech samples anyway because from my experience growing up in Hawaii, attending public schools, and teaching in public schools. I felt these samples reflect the variety of HCE spoken in Oahu schools. Since the majority of teachers end up teaching in Oahu schools, I thought they should be presented with HCE samples that are typical of what they are most likely to encounter.

To rate each speech sample, teachers used a seven-point semantic differential scale, based on Osgood's semantic differential technique (see Snider & Osgood, 1960). Osgood (1960) has found the semantic differential technique to be objective, reliable, valid, and sensitive in measuring attitudes. He says it is objective because it yields quantitative data that is verifiable since other researchers could apply the same set of scales to equivalent subjects and get essentially the same results. It also usually has a high Pearson product-moment coefficient and displays convincing face-validity. In addition, it is sensitive because it can evoke responses on a scale that can be hard to intentionally verbalize. Also, ways in which meaning can vary may be represented by a single dimension.

In most matched-guise technique (MGT) studies of teachers' attitudes toward students, the characteristics on the rating scales are elicited from the raters, who are asked what they think are ideal traits of students. For my rating scales, I selected traits used on scales in past studies, assuming most of the teachers in these studies had a similar idea of what positive student traits are. The traits I used fell into the categories of competence (intelligence, ambition, effectiveness as a communicator, confidence, and likelihood of success) and solidarity (sincerity, physical attractiveness, interpersonal relationships, likability, and generosity). The traits were randomly switched in a positive to negative direction using polar adjectives such as from likable to not likable (see Appendix B).

Procedures

The study was done with two different education classes and took place during two separate sessions, both in quiet, cool classrooms. One of the classes is required for all secondary education majors while the other is required for all secondary and elementary majors. The study was conducted at the beginning of each class to avoid teachers rushing or being restless to leave class as might be expected if the study took place toward the end of the period. First, the teachers were given directions and asked to voluntarily participate

in the study. The teachers were told that I was trying to find out their first impression of certain students. Then the teachers listened to the speech samples. After each sample, which was played only once to elicit an immediate impression, the teachers rated the speakers on the semantic differential scale. They were not told the true nature of the study until after they made their ratings. After rating the speech samples, the teachers filled out the background information questionnaire. They were also asked not to speak about the study with other teachers during the session or afterwards.

Data Analysis

To find out the general attitudes of teachers concerning HCE- and SE-speaking students, overall ratings (competence, solidarity, and combination of competence and solidarity) served as the dependent variables. The independent variable was the language being evaluated (HCE or SE). To determine how ratings differed depending on teachers' language background, the dependent variables were ratings of: HCE total, HCE competence, HCE solidarity, SE total, SE competence, and SE solidarity. Teachers' language background served as the independent variable. To see how ratings of competence and solidarity traits differed, the dependent variables were the ratings for competence and solidarity and the independent variable was the language being evaluated.

Descriptive statistics were calculated. Teachers' ratings were scored by assigning point values to each point on each scale, with one being the most negative evaluation and seven being the most positive evaluation. For each teacher, a mean score was figured for overall rating of HCE and SE and for ratings of competence traits and solidarity traits for the HCE and SE samples. Multivariate analyses of variance were also computed (including Wilks' Lambda, Roy's Greatest Root, Hotelling-Lawley Trace, and Pillai Trace). A separate analysis had to be done to answer each of the three research questions. Because three MANOVA designs were used in this study, the overall alpha level of .05 was divided by 3 for individual comparisons in order to adjust approximately for the probability of a spuriously significant difference.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

The means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum for the teachers' ratings of the HCE and SE speech samples are shown in Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 shows the results of all the teachers' who participated in the study. Since there were more teachers

who could speak HCE than those who could not, 12 HCE speakers were randomly eliminated to make for an even number of both speakers to find the analyses of variance results shown in Table 4. Thus, Table 2 only shows the results of the teachers used in these analyses of variance.

Tables 1 and 2 first show the ratings from the HCE-speaking teachers and SE-speaking teachers combined. Then the ratings from the two groups are shown separately. As these tables show, teachers on average rated the SE speakers higher than the HCE speakers in both competence and solidarity traits and all traits combined. Also, the combined groups of teachers rated HCE higher in solidarity than competence traits. In Table 1

Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Pre-Service Teachers' Ratings (on 7-point scale)

	HCE tot.	HCE com.	HCE sol.	SE tot.	SE com.	SE sol.
HCE and SE Teachers' Combined Ratings (N=36):						
Mean	4.22	4.02	4.45	5.34	5.75	5.01
Standard Deviation	.84	1.10	.80	.64	.64	.69
Minimum	3.10	2.20	2.90	4.25	4.20	4.20
Maximum	6.60	6.70	6.50	6.65	7.00	6.70
HCE-Speaking Teachers' Ratings (N=24):						
Mean	4.30	4.13	4.53	5.44	5.89	5.07
Standard Deviation	.89	1.09	.92	.66	.63	.76
Minimum	3.10	2.40	2.90	4.35	4.90	3.50
Maximum	6.60	6.70	6.50	6.65	7.00	6.70
SE-Speaking Teachers' Ratings (N=12):						
Mean	4.05	3.82	4.29	5.15	5.48	4.88
Standard Deviation	.73	1.13	.47	.58	.73	.54
Minimum	3.10	2.20	3.60	4.25	4.20	4.10
Maximum	5.90	6.40	5.40	6.00	6.70	6.00

tot. = total com. = competence sol. = solidarity

Table 2

*Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Pre-Service Teachers' Ratings (on 7-point scale)
Used in Univariate Analyses in Table 4*

	HCE tot.	HCE com.	HCE sol.	SE tot.	SE com.	SE sol.
HCE and SE Teachers' Combined Ratings (N=24):						
Mean	4.13	3.95	4.28	5.34	5.79	4.97
Standard Deviation	.81	1.14	.67	.64	.73	.59
Minimum	3.10	2.20	2.90	4.25	4.20	4.10
Maximum	6.15	6.40	6.40	6.50	7.00	6.40
HCE-Speaking Teachers' Ratings (N=12):						
Mean	4.82	4.80	4.92	5.40	5.89	4.92
Standard Deviation	.86	.98	.94	.74	.63	.79
Minimum	3.40	3.30	3.50	4.50	4.90	3.50
Maximum	6.60	6.70	6.50	6.50	7.00	6.40
SE-Speaking Teachers' Ratings (N=12):						
Mean	4.05	3.82	4.29	5.15	5.48	4.88
Standard Deviation	.73	1.13	.47	.58	.73	.54
Minimum	3.10	2.20	3.60	4.25	4.20	4.10
Maximum	5.90	6.40	5.40	6.00	6.70	6.00

tot. = total com. = competence sol. = solidarity

contrast, they rated SE higher in competence compared to solidarity traits. You can also see that the ratings made by HCE-speaking teachers of the HCE samples are higher than the same ratings made by the SE-speaking teachers.

Statistical Differences as Determined by Analyses of Variance

As shown in Table 3, the differences in general ratings of HCE versus SE were found to be significant ($p < .017$) in both multivariate and univariate analyses of variance.

Table 3

Results for Univariate Analyses of Variance for Pre-Service Teachers' Combined Ratings

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Ratings By All Teachers					
total (HCE vs. SE)	22.66	1	22.66	40.95	.0001*
competence (HCE vs. SE)	53.91	1	53.91	64.34	.0001*
solidarity (HCE vs. SE)	5.61	1	5.61	9.99	.0023*

* $p < .017$

Table 4

Results for Univariate Analysis of Variance for Pre-Service HCE-Speaking Teachers' vs. SE-Speaking Teachers' Ratings

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Ratings Of HCE Teachers Vs. SE Teachers					
HCE total	3.57	1	3.57	5.56	.0277*
SE total	0.36	1	.36	.82	.3730
HCE competence	5.80	1	5.80	5.18	.0329*
SE competence	1.00	1	1.00	2.15	.1569
HCE solidarity	2.41	1	2.41	4.35	.0488*
SE solidarity	0.00	1	0.00	0.02	.9048

* $p < .017$

When the ratings were examined in relation to teachers' language background, the multivariate analysis did not display a significant probability value ($p = .1637$) in how SE-speaking teachers rated the language samples compared to how HCE-speaking teachers' made their ratings (Table 4). However, the univariate analyses of variance shows that there were significant differences ($p < .017$) between the two groups of teachers' ratings of the HCE samples. Lastly, according to a multivariate analysis computed, combined teachers' ratings of competence traits were found to be significantly different ($p < .017$) from their ratings of solidarity characteristics for both SE and HCE. But, as Table 5 shows, the univariate analyses only showed a significant difference between ratings of the

two characteristics for SE ($p < .017$), while the difference in ratings of competence versus solidarity traits was not significant for HCE ($p = .0652$).

Table 5

Results for Univariate Analyses of Variance for Pre-Service Teachers' Combined Ratings of Competence Vs. Solidarity

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Ratings by All Teachers					
HCE Rating (com. vs. sol.)	3.25	1	3.25	3.51	.0652
SE Rating (com. vs. sol.)	10.05	1	10.05	21.25	.0001*

* $p < .05$

DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to determine if pre-service teachers rate SE higher than HCE (question #1). The results indicate that teachers rated SE significantly higher. Another aim of this study was to find out if teachers who identify with HCE as one of their languages have a different opinion of HCE than those teachers who do not speak HCE (question #2). The results show that the language background of teachers does not necessarily affect their evaluations (Although the F value for the MANOVA was over 1.0, the p value was more than .017 at .1637.). It should be pointed out, though, that according to univariate analyses of variance, there was a significant difference in how HCE-speaking teachers evaluated HCE compared to how the non-HCE-speaking teachers did. However, these results should be interpreted cautiously because the MANOVA did not yield significant results. A larger sample size than 24 may provide different results. This study also tried to determine if teachers evaluate students differently on competence and solidarity traits (question #3). By calculating a MANOVA, it was found that teachers rated HCE speakers higher in solidarity. In addition, the opposite held true for teachers' feelings about SE speakers. It is not clear if more multicultural education or sociolinguistics courses would have affected their evaluations. Remember, the subjects' average number of credits in multicultural education or ESL was less than 2.0.

CONCLUSION

Implications

One of the most important results of this study is that it finds teachers to have a more positive evaluation of SE than HCE. This finding is consistent with the results of other studies done on attitudes concerning language variation (see literature review). Most studies find that nonstandard language varieties are evaluated negatively compared to standard varieties. This has been the case with HCE, Spanish-accented English, and Black English Vernacular.

With the present study, only speculation can be made about the difference in evaluations made by SE-speaking teachers compared to HCE-speaking teachers. It appears it might be possible that teachers who speak HCE have a bit higher evaluation of HCE speakers than those teachers who do not identify with HCE. Further research should be done in this area.

Finally, it might be inferred from the results in the differences between ratings based on competence and solidarity traits that although teachers do not see HCE speakers being as capable or likely to succeed as SE speakers, they favor HCE students more highly on an interpersonal level.

As stated in my introduction, teachers' judgments can have major effects on how students perceive themselves and on their chances for success in society. My study implies that HCE speakers may face a disadvantage since teachers perceive them as less capable than SE speakers. Since I used more acrolect varieties of HCE, students who speak a more mesolect variety, as is common in rural areas, may be at even more of a disadvantage. To solve this problem, more awareness about cultural and language differences is needed among pre-service teachers. In Hawaii, with such a high population of HCE speakers, this is especially important. Teachers also need to learn about discourse modifications that could facilitate learning.

Limitations of Study

There are several limitations to this study. For one thing, the use of MGT as a valid measure is questionable. McGroarty (1996) says that because the rating scales use polar adjectives that are not defined, raters interpret the descriptors based on their own ideas. Besides being skeptical of such vague semantic differentials, McGroarty (1996) also questions the use of decontextualized speech samples. Another limitation of the study might apply to any research that uses quantitative methods to measure constructs such as

attitudes or motivation. Ricento and Hornberger (1996) feel that a positivist, or neo-classical approach does not consider broader historical and economic forces involved in shaping attitudes. To accomplish this, McGroarty (1996) suggests the use of ethnographic observation and interviews. She says that observation could infer attitudes from behaviors. According to McGroarty,

such efforts are an essential complement to experimentally manipulated studies of language attitude because they add an essential component of ecological validity to quantitative experimental work and reveal how attitudes unconsciously shape repeated interactions in critical instructional settings, and thus create conditions that promote success for some students but inadvertently discourage others from mastering aspects of literacy. (1996, p. 18)

Suggestions for Further Research

This study is only one step in determining the role of HCE in Hawaii. It would also be interesting to see how in-service teachers evaluate HCE speakers and if there are differences among pre-service and in-service teachers' attitudes, teachers working in rural or outer-island schools and those in urban areas, and teachers who have studied multicultural education and those who have not. (Although I collected information on whether the pre-service teachers took multicultural education classes, it is difficult to tell if this made a difference in their ratings. I would need to a statistical analysis to see if there was a significant difference. Also, since so few of the pre-service teachers had taken multicultural courses, it would be impossible to have two equal sized and large enough groups to do the analysis. With the average number of multicultural courses being 1.19, it is doubtful that this even made a difference in ratings.)

As Sato (1991) and McGroarty (1996) recommend, more ethnographic data is needed to get a more holistic picture of teachers' attitudes. A more macro study could include not only further examining teachers' attitudes, but also those of students and community members. It would be interesting to find out what meaning HCE has for those who speak the language and how others' (parents, teachers, administrators, etc.) attitudes influence students' attitudes. In addition, more studies, like the KEEP research mentioned earlier, could provide useful information on culturally-responsive ways of teaching and the best ways to address learners who speak HCE.

In the meantime, teachers and administrators need to be made more aware of multicultural issues (e.g., education about the dangers of a subtractive approach or

monolingualism in schools) and they need to take significant steps toward achieving equal education for minority language speakers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my Scholarly Paper advisor, Gabrielle Kasper, and my second reader, JD Brown, for their assistance with this paper. They both took the time to read several drafts and provide me with valuable feedback based on their expertise. I would also like to thank my family and my boyfriend, Bob Ilonummi, for their support.

REFERENCES

- Auerbach, E. (1995). The politics of the ESL classroom: Issues of power in pedagogical choices. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Choy, S. J., & Dodd, D. H. (1976). Standard English-speaking and non-standard Hawaiian-English speaking children: Comprehension of both dialects and teachers' evaluations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68, 184-193.
- Day, R. (1980). The development of linguistic attitudes and preferences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14, 27-37.
- Edwards, J. (1989). *Language and disadvantage*. Compton Terrace, London: Whurr Publishers, Ltd.
- Ford, C. E. (1984). The influence of speech variety on teachers' evaluations of students with comparable academic ability. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 25-40.
- Giles, H., & Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and consequences*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- McCreary, J. (1986). *Attitudes of nonnative speakers of English to language variation in Hawaii*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii.
- McGroarty, M. (1996). Language attitudes, motivation, and standards. In S. McKay & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 3-45). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramirez, A. (1976). *Language attitudes and the achievement of bilingual Pupils*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 127 829)
- Ricento, T. & Hornberger, N. (1996) Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL*, 30, 401-427.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobs, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Ryan, E. (1973). Subjective reactions toward accented speech. In R. Shuy & R. Fasold (Eds.), *Language attitudes: Current trends and prospects* (pp. 60-72). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Sato, C. (1985). Linguistic inequality in Hawaii: The post-creole dilemma. In N. Wolfson & J. Manes (Eds.), *Language of inequality* (pp. 255-272). Berlin: Mouton.

- Sato, C. (1989). A Nonstandard approach to standard English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 259-279.
- Sato, C. (1991). Sociolinguistic variation and language attitudes in Hawaii. In J. Areshire (Ed.), *English around the world*. Cambridge: AIP.
- Snider, J., & Osgood, C. (1969) *Semantic differential technique*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Tollefson, J. (1991). *Planning language, planning equality: Language policy in the community*. London: Longman.
- Yamamoto, J. (1982). The perception of stereotyping of speech variables in Hawaii. *Working Papers in Linguistics, University of Hawaii*, 2, 75-88.
- Yamamoto, J., & Hargrove, E. (1982). Teachers' attitudes toward recorded speech samples of elementary school children in Hawaii. *Working Papers in Linguistics, University of Hawaii*, 2, 109-34

Appendix A

Name: _____

Speaker 1

Directions: Each scale has two opposite descriptive pairs placed on opposing sides of the scale. After listening to the speaker, please rate the speaker on the following traits by placing an X on each of the given scales. Put an X on the point on the scale where you think the speaker would fall along the continuum.

For example:

good ____:____: X:____:____:____:____ bad

What do you think of this person?

intelligent ____:____:____:____:____:____ not intelligent

good-looking ____:____:____:____:____:____ ugly

not ambitious ____:____:____:____:____:____ ambitious

insecure ____:____:____:____:____:____ confident

not likable ____:____:____:____:____:____ likable

communicates well ____:____:____:____:____:____ communicates poorly

generous ____:____:____:____:____:____ not generous

easy to get along with ____:____:____:____:____:____ difficult to get along with

not likely to succeed ____:____:____:____:____:____ likely to succeed

sincere ____:____:____:____:____:____ not sincere

Jennifer H. Liu

Department of English as a Second Language

1890 East-West Road

Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822

email: liujenni@hawaii.edu