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Identity is at once deeply personal and intensely public. By this I mean that it includes the aspects of our being that are most private and unspoken as well as those that everyone can see and use to pigeonhole us. It is also what people imagine us to be—as incorrect and flawed as those perceptions might be. What you see is almost always far less complex than what you get. Identity is formed and reformed as we grow into new roles and shed the trappings of our past. At the same time, certain aspects of identity are “constants” that give us a sense of belonging and continuity. We make each other and make and remake ourselves through our choices (Greene, 1993) and through the roads taken and untaken. In the language of complexity theory, our identities are emergent, reflexive, and evolving (Mason, 2008). That is, they are unfolding, refer back to earlier states, and are constantly in flux.

The essays, research papers, and poems in this issue explore the tensions within and between personal and professional identities from multiple perspectives and in a variety of contexts. Some of these essays are grounded in personal experiences and perspectives (see Cooper, Park, Rowe and Tolson), and some tap the voices of insiders but take an outsider’s look at identity construction in terms of heritage identity and profession (see Allaire, Lopez) or reveal profound identity shifts due to a traumatic historical event (see Choi). One of the papers offers advice on how to help students explore and unpack aspects of their own identity in ways that encourage a deeper and more respectful understanding of diversity (see Soetoro-Ng). Collectively the essays, research papers, and poems in this issue reveal the complexity, fluidity, and evolving nature of identity and the ways in which it is constructed from the inside out and from the outside in.

Identity is implicated in every dimension of our lives but it is also true that among our social institutions, the educational arena is particularly subject to identity tensions and possibilities. Schools are sites where identities are regularly noted and displayed (McDermott and Varenne, 1995), sometimes contested or debated, occasionally valued, and rarely ignored. Historically, schools are the place where civic values are instilled and immigrants and other non-mainstream children are forged into citizens and pushed toward “normal.” To say that identities are forged suggests that they become solidified and that individuals are hammered into shape by the schools, society, and curriculum like a blacksmith forges and forms metal. Certainly identities are produced and reproduced intentionally and unintentionally through the manifest curriculum as well as the
hidden curriculum. But school identities are also forged in the sense that they are faked. Schools are full of “wannabes” and pretenders, kids trying on new identities and seeking to belong. Schools are places where identities are fastened, unfastened, and refastened according to the spoken and unspoken values and norms of the community (Reed, 2005), and almost everyone feels at some moment in their school lives as if they are not quite “enough”—thin enough, smart enough, popular enough, pretty enough, black enough, white enough—the list is endless. There is no social institution in the U.S. that brings people of such linguistic, cultural, racial, and socio-economic diversity into greater propinquity as public schools. For these reasons a discussion of identity is of particular relevance to educators and worthy of a special issue of Educational Perspectives.

Another powerful shaper of identity is geography. Although most of these papers are not explicitly about Hawai‘i or Hawaiian identity, it is significant that all of the contributors have lived here, studied here, or visited here. The authors have some connection to the place and to the cultures of these islands. This is a powerful reminder of the way in which places and spaces are conducive to certain kinds of conversations. Like classrooms that invite us to reveal our deepest thoughts and reflections, some spaces open us to possibilities for growth and exploration. The ethnic and cultural diversity of Hawai‘i spurs conversations and makes allowances for difference and celebrations of inclusiveness. This issue on identity emerged from the social and cultural context of Hawai‘i where cultural identity is a central theme in art, music, dance, humor, cuisine, and daily life, and cultural fusions are the norm rather than the exception. But this collection does not only focus on ethnicity as a definer of culture, it also looks at other aspects of identity construction and experience as well. Each contribution is previewed below.

**Witnessing**

In her work on the Korean Kwang-ju massacre that took place May 18–27 1980, Sheena Choi reminds us of the ways in which witnesses to tragedies can bear lasting scars that penetrate their being and lead them to make political and personal choices later in life. In her interviews with residents of the provincial capitol city of Kwang-ju who witnessed the tragic massacre, Choi discovered that tragedy prompts a solidifying identity. She reveals how the residents of the city of Kwang-ju were privy to a terrible national secret and developed a community of memory that marked them as separate. This is a paper about the way that seminal events in people’s lives leave an indelible mark on their psyche that forms identity scars and changes the trajectories of their lives.

**Hiding in Plain Sight**

In her essay on coming out of the ethnic closet, Ikumi Park describes the painful negotiation of identity as a third generation Japanese of Korean descent. Weighing the threat of being revealed as a Korean ethnic in Japan where Koreans face discrimination and social marginalization, Park tells the story of a woman who refuses to hide her ethnicity behind a Japanese pass name and the family crisis that ensues with the slip of a tongue. In her provocative discussion of identity, Park leads us to wonder about the relative stress of maintaining a hidden identity versus negotiating the visible markers of minority status every moment of every day.

**Dancing to a different tune**

When Sharon Rowe joined a hula hālau, suddenly all that she knew about teaching and learning was called into question. In her essay “A Hāole in a Hālau: Situating Identity, Practicing Learning,” Rowe explores the pedagogies, protocols, and practices of learning hula but, more than that, she reveals “the extent to which culture drives our expectations of the learning process” (see Rowe). As she describes in detail her struggle to “think Hawaiian” that unfolded over a period of twenty years, she not only helps us to understand the complex world of hula but also explores the challenges that face people who experience pedagogical displacement.

**Navigating Rough Waters**

Franklin Allaire is concerned that there are too few Native Hawaiians entering the field of science, so he goes on a quest to understand how three Native
Hawaiian science teachers reconcile their indigenous heritage with their work as science educators. Al lure uses a “talk story” approach to uncover the tensions and complementarities that arise in the lives of indigenous science educators. He discovers that they have each developed a unique pluralistic identity that melds aspects of their traditional culture, beliefs, perspectives, and practices with scientific knowledge and pedagogies. His paper delves into the complexities of identities and challenges the duality of Western vs. Indigenous in a way that provides insight into its complexity.

**Tools to reflect on Identity**

Joanne Cooper begins on a whimsical note and moves into an insightful discussion of journaling as a pathway to exploring identity and the intersection between the personal and the professional. As she points out, journals are not merely a repository but the act of “journal keeping is a way to read your own thoughts, to mine them for understanding” (see Cooper). In her essay, Cooper provides insights about the process as well as specific journaling techniques. She helps us to understand how journaling can be a valuable tool for unlocking, uncovering, and revealing identity and for reconciling our multiple roles.

**Patriotic Acts**

Other tools for prompting reflection on identity are offered in Maya Soetoro-Ng’s article. She makes the claim that identity is chosen as much as it is ascribed and that the democratic context of the U.S. provides a unique setting in which individuals can exercise the freedom to “choose themselves into the world” (Greene, 1993). She draws upon her own biography to show how aspects of her identity (and that of her brother, President Barack Obama) have been contested and negotiated and subjected to scrutiny and debate. She offers five exercises that teachers can use to help their students take a more systematic as well as a thoughtful and nuanced approach to thinking through the process of identity construction. These exercises are designed to help students to become more sensitive, more appreciative, and more respectful of human differences.

**A Memorial**

The final piece in this issue of *Educational Perspectives* comes from Leslie Lopez who memorializes a beloved faculty member of the College of Education, Dr. Al Carr. In her essay, she reminds us that *Educational Perspectives* has its own history and identity. Lopez’s contribution pays tribute to Dr. Carr by tapping into the collective memory of his family and current and former faculty members. Her contribution grounds this issue in the historical context of the college and reminds us of the ways that our predecessors have shaped our practice and our own sense of who we are.

**Conclusion**

The evolution of this issue of *Educational Perspectives* is worth noting. It began with an idea among several faculty members over a decade ago. Some retired, we all got busy, and it was put on the back burner, so to speak. The idea reemerged about three years ago when a group of us got together to discuss what an issue of *Educational Perspectives* on identity might look like. Along the way others joined, resulting in the diverse perspectives and approaches that are included here.

We suspect that anyone who reads all of the articles in this issue will say, “but you left out so much!” “How can you talk about identity and not discuss gender, social class, religion, age, sexual orientation, or any of a number of identity markers that could, should, and must be addressed in the identity conversation?” Our response would be, “You are absolutely correct. We left out too much!” Nevertheless, we are content that we have contributed to the ongoing conversation about identity construction and negotiation in a way that leads to possibilities for new and different inquiries and conversations. This is just a starting point.

The “Identity Quiz” poem that precedes this essay highlights the common “either/or” approach to identity construction that reflects our usual discomfort with ambivalence and our cultural preoccupation with categories. The poem asks if identity is “the way I look….Or the way I see?” For too long the emphasis has been put on the way we look and not enough
on the way we “see”. The way we see the world is contingent upon a whole host of factors. Among these are our histories, the languages we speak, our experiences, the geographic spaces that we occupy, and our willingness to conform to or resist the identity categories that dominating cultures press on us as we go about “composing a life” (Bateson, 1989). The poem concludes with an affirmation that identity is “all of the above.” Indeed it is! And far more.
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Korea’s road to becoming a modern society... has not been a smooth evolutionary process dictated by the state. Rather, Korea has seen strong resistance to state power and foreign forces, which in turn has crucially shaped its path to modernity. The Kwangju uprising that occurred in May 1980 is another major event in this sequence of contentious politics. Beginning as a student protest in the southwestern city of Kwangju, the uprising escalated into an armed civilian struggle and was met by brutal acts of violence enacted by government troops. While the ten-day struggle ultimately ended in military suppression, its legacy and effect were of lasting significance. It was arguably the single most important event that shaped the political and social landscape of South Korea in the 1980s and 1990s. (Shin, 2003, p. xi).

The above epigraph succinctly describes the Kwangju Democratic Uprising of May 18, 1980. The uprising, variously referred to as the Kwangju democratization movement, the Kwangju democratic uprising, the Kwangju people’s uprising, 5.18, and 5.18 Democratic uprising, is considered a pivotal moment in Korean history. Once framed as a communist disturbance by the ruling military regime, the uprising served a central role in Korea’s transition from dictatorship to democracy. In addition to playing a role in shaping Korea’s modern politics, the uprising also had a critical impact on the identity formation of those who participated as well as bystanders.

At the beginning of Korea’s turn toward democracy, the center of the democratic movement fighting against military dictatorship and for the restoration of democracy was Seoul, South Korea’s capital city. However, a historical twist of fate resulted in the culmination of the movement in Kwangju. The ten days of the uprising (May 18 through May 27), which began as a student protest, escalated into an armed civilian struggle when civilian bystanders who refused to suffer the aggressive, needless brutality of the troops rose up in protest (Underwood, 2003, p. 24). When faced with the horror of state-sanctioned violence, the citizens of Kwangju rose against the system in protest.

For many, the Kwangju uprising affirmed “human dignity” and represents the “prefiguration of a free society” (Katsiaficas, 2006a, p. 1). Yu describes the incongruity between the power and importance of the movement and the human cost it exacted: “... anti-government activists glorified the incident as they tried to come to terms with the tragedy” (Yu, 2006, p. x). Indeed, the citizens of Kwangju paid a high price for their courage: the conclusion of the protests found 4,000 victims dead, missing, injured, or detained. In addition, studies have found evidence that many of the victims have experienced posttraumatic stress disorder resulting in ongoing medical and psychological problems, financial difficulties (including unemployment), and general hardship (Byun, 1996 cited in Lewis and Byun, 2003). Further, the suffering of these victims continues: “[l]ike a pebble dropped in a pond, the death of a child or parent in May 1980 caused ever widening ripples, shattering the lives of family members as well” (Lewis and Byun, 2003, p. 54).

During Chun Doo Hwan’s military regime (1980–1988) and that of his successor Roh Tae Woo (1988–1993), the uprising was portrayed as “communist agitation.” The media manipulation of the Kwangju uprising was conducted through three
consecutive strategies, including the complete cut off of Kwangju from the outside world by the military (Underwood, 2003, p. 33), the tight control of the media during the military regime, and the severe punishment of those who even talked about the incident (Katsiaficas, 2006 a and b). As civil rule was restored and the first democratically elected president (Kim Young Sam, 1993–1998) was inaugurated, the Kwangju uprising found its rightful place in history and was honored as an effort to defend democracy from a potential military siege.

In addition, the uprising is considered to have had positive effects on democratization efforts and citizen movements across the world. As Liyanage observes, “The ‘power of people’ is so strong that it just cannot be destroyed by violent suppressive means. Such power, from the people, spreads a spirit that will last for generations...Kwangju remains as a unique sign that symbolizes a people’s power that cannot be suppressed” (Liyanage, 1996, p. 29 cited in Katsiaficas, 2006a, p. 2). Further, the Kwangju uprising inspired other countries suffering under dictatorship to follow suit and set an example of “ordinary people taking power into their own hands” (Katsiaficas, 2006a, p. 2). Despite the ruthless persecution by the military authorities, the Kwangju uprising is now seen as a historical victory that has inspired generations.

While previous studies of the Kwangju uprising have largely focused on the national and international political dimensions of the uprising, as well as the immediate impact of the uprising on the citizens of Kwangju, this study focuses on the development of the generation of people affected by the uprising. Specifically, by examining the stories of bystanders who witnessed the uprising as children or young adults, this study considers how the uprising has played a role in processes of identity formation at both the regional and individual levels. After providing background into the uprising, I will explain my theoretical frameworks and methodology, and then turn to the interviews with the bystanders. Finally, I will conclude by discussing how the impact of the uprising can be understood in the context of identity formation.

Theoretical Framework

In exploring the impact of the uprising on bystanders’ identity formation, theoretical constructs exploring the role of the individual identity in relation to regional or community identity are particularly valuable. In this section, I will outline how theories of national unity, stereotype threat, and communities of meaning can illuminate the complexity of identity formation and contribute to understanding of how the uprising impacted bystanders.

Etienne Balibar persuasively posits that an “‘imaginary unity’ has to be instituted in real [historical] time against other possible unities” (Balibar and Wallerstein 1991, p. 46, emphasis original). A nation is composed of both the institutional and the imaginary: the political that regulates the judicial and territorial boundaries, and the cultural that defines origins and continuities, affiliations and belonging (Li, 1998, p. 7). Culture disseminates the sense of the nation as an “imagined community” (Anderson, 1983), and the stakeholders engage in “cultural wars” (Graff, 1992) with their activated identities.

In addition to the role that national-level forces play in identity formation, identities are also shaped by forces at the community level. In her illuminating study, Learning from Experience, Moya defined identities as the non-essential and evolving products that emerge from the dialectic between how subjects of consciousness identify themselves and how they are identified by others (Moya, 2002). Identities are “socially significant and context-specific ideological constructs that nevertheless refer in non-arbitrary (if partial) ways to verifiable aspects of the social world” (Moya, 2002, p. 86). Moya further argues that identities, which are “indexed to a historical time, place, and situation” (Moya, 2009, p. 48) are both constructed and real:

Identities are constructed because they are based on interpreted experience and ways of knowing that explain the ever-changing social world. They are also real because they refer outward to causally significant features of the world. Moreover, because identities refer (sometimes in partial and inaccurate ways) to the changing
but relatively stable contexts from which they emerge, they are neither self-evident and immutable nor radically unstable and arbitrary. Identities, in sum, are causally significant ideological constructs and become intelligible within specific historical and material contexts (Moya, 2009, p. 115, emphasis original).

Moya argues that identities are the intersection between ascriptive and subjective identity where “learning from experience” occurs (Moya, 2009, p. 46). Thus, identities are “ways of making sense of our experiences” (Mohanty, 1997, p. 216).

Studies have also documented the existence of “communities of meaning,” a shared element of knowledge-making that congregates individuals into intellectual, identity-based affinity groups and provide sources of identity for community members (Sanchez-Casal and Macdonald, 2009, p. 36). Sanchez-Casal and Macdonald note,

Communities of meaning are formed anytime a group of students generates common perspectives about the world from similar social locations—perspectives that can be either more or less accurate, thus communities of meaning have no intrinsic subversive character. . . . Communities of meaning support students in exposing and critiquing underlying assumptions (theories) about the world that exclude subjugated perspectives, and in opposing hegemonic knowledge; in this way communities of meaning equip students with potentially subversive epistemic tools as they highlight not only the situated character of knowledge-making, but the inherently collective process of determining the truth (Sanchez-Casal & Macdonald, 2009, p. 25–27, emphasis original).

In this sense, communities of meaning represent the activation of collective thinking that empowers the intellectual production by members of minority groups through engaging actively in communal struggles for truth and justice, and opens a space for them to produce collective knowledge about what the world is, and what it should be.

Drawing from studies of the multicultural and multiethnic United States, Sanchez-Casal and Macdonald (2009) praise communities of meaning as democratizing and liberating:

The moral aspect of these intellectual affinity groups supports students of color as they work collectively – based on an awareness of identity-based experiences, knowledge and interests – to establish normative claims about our shared social world; so in addition to creating more reliable and inclusive knowledge about how our world is structured, communities of meaning can simultaneously promote political coalition aimed at constructing a racially democratic future. . . . Thus, communities of meaning function as epistemic, moral, and political affinity groups that empower students of color to think collectively about how to transform our unjust society (Sanchez-Casal & Macdonald, p. 27).

However, negative social forces can also play a role in identity formation. Among the many forces acting on identity formation is what Steel has defined as “stereotype threat.” Specifically, Steel describes stereotype threat as a particular kind of identity contingency which results from identities that are socially “stigmatized” in significant ways (Steel, 2004, pp. 38–40; Steel, Spencer, & Aronson 2002, pp. 379–440). Steel and his colleagues argue, “When a negative stereotype about a group that one is part of becomes personally relevant, usually as an interpretation of one’s behavior or an experience one is having, stereotype threat is the resulting sense that one can then be judged or treated in terms of the stereotype or that one might do something that would inadvertently confirm it” (Steel, Spencer, & Aronson 2002, p. 389). Stereotypes thus have the effect of altering the course of an individual’s future by producing anxiety and affecting performance.

Five-eighteen was a moment of tremendous historical significance for Korea and its citizens. During this moment, new identities were forged through collective protest. At the same time, old identities forged in reaction to discrimination and stereotypes were reaffirmed. Ultimately, as will be seen in interviewees’ descriptions of their experiences, these new and old identities combined to alter the lives of bystanders, as well as the political, social, and cultural trajectory of Korea.
Methodology

This research study employs document analysis, both popular and academic, and open-ended interviews. The interviews were conducted in Korean and translated into English at the time of transcription by the author. I conducted ten interviews with persons of varying age ranging from those who were in kindergarten to those who were in college at the time of the Kwangju uprising. Thus, interviewees’ current ages range from the early 30s to the early 50s. The initial selection of interviewees began through recommendations from colleagues at Chonnam National University (CNU), which is located in Kwangju, then the capital of Cholla Namdo (South Cholla Province). Chonnam National University was a logical place to begin, as students from the university played a major role in the uprising. In fact, the university’s main gate was one of the main sites of the clashes between the military and student and citizen protesters. Currently, the university houses a 5.18 Memorial Foundation and museum.

In regards to the researcher’s position, as a Korean-American of Seoul origin, I consider myself an outsider both in terms of hometown affiliation and academic focus. However, I was able to witness the events of 5.18 through media reports while living abroad. The scenes shocked me and caused me to develop an emotional attachment to the topic. Growing up in South Korea in the 1970s, I was familiar with riot police blocking demonstrations and tear gas. Still, soldiers suppressing civilians was unthinkable. The military is supposed to defend the country! Yet, the screen read “trouble in South Korea.” At first, I thought it was North Korea they were reporting on and had made a mistake in the subtitle. However, the reports continued for days without correction.

I thought that a war might have had broken out in Korea. I called my family in Seoul. I do not recall my exact reaction when my sister answered the phone: Did it mean my family had escaped already? When I asked in a panic about war, and Kwangju, my family’s reaction was very calm: “No. Nothing happened here!” When I heard new reports on the news, I called again later. The answer was still, “There is nothing going on in Korea.” Months later, my family informed me of rumors of communist disturbances in Kwangju. It was only after several years that my family told me that they were concerned about my phone calls, not because of what might have been happening in Korea but because of what might have been happening to me. Perhaps the stress of studying abroad had made me emotionally unstable, they thought. For me, with the nagging doubts in my mind, life moved on—until years later when I began to read about the Kwangju Uprising. In this sense, I am not a detached observer in approaching this study.

Stories to Tell

In this section, I will present interviewees’ memories of the uprising and discuss two key emerging themes from the interviews: interviewees’ thoughts on regionalism in Korea and how 5.18 shaped their identities. For many interviewees, there is a clear link between an awareness of their marginalized state in the economic and political arenas, particularly as exemplified by 5.18, and the decision to engage in political protest in the aftermath of 5.18. Specifically, an awareness of marginalization that led many to
participate in *woon’dong’kwon*, a counter public sphere student movement designed to change the world around them. For many, the importance of participating in *woon’dong’kwon* became particularly clear as they realized how sharply their eyewitness accounts of the uprising contrasted with the official discourses during the subsequent military regimes.

**Memories**

The trauma of the Kwangju Uprising is explicated well in the writings of Im Choru, a Kwangju-born novelist:

The [post-Kwangju period] was an era in which ... suffering and cries of tens of thousands were simply ignored and rationalized too easily in the name of groundless rumor. The voices that tried to inform others of the truth were completely violated, and the majority turned their backs and kept silent under the terror and falsehood. It was a time when intellect, conscience, and morality were pushed to the background by violence (as cited in Song 1989, p. 1348).

While my interviewees did not suffer personal injury (and in most cases neither did their families or friends), they all described the trauma of 5.18 as having personal consequences.

One interviewee shared this story:

I was five years old at the time that 5.18 occurred. I recollect vividly because my aunt was clubbed by the military and there was commotion in the family. My aunt was not a demonstrator. While she was running personal errands she got dragged out from a cab in which she was riding, was beaten, and was then hauled off to a truck. When the truck slowed down at a speed bump she and several others jumped off from the truck and escaped.

Seeing his sister so badly injured, my father was angry and was about to go out. He probably wanted to join the demonstrators or do something. My grandma begged him not to go out. My aunt suffered from this injury. My grandma tried all kinds of treatment for my aunt: Chinese medicine, acupuncture, western medicine, physical therapy etc. But she still suffers from the injury (Jin-seo).

Another interviewee relayed her experience:

I was in the second grade when that happened. Our house was near CNU’s main gate, about five minutes walking distance. Every time when there were demonstrations, which mostly occurred at CNU, our house was soaked in tear gas. Schools were closed, of course. I remember being happy about not having to go to school. But other than that I was fearful throughout the time. The airborne unit came to a main street near my house. I heard my mom talking about an *a’jeo’ssi* who was working for my family being caught in our bathroom where he was hiding and arrested. I remember seeing dead bodies covered in white paint. The market was only about two minutes distance from my house. I remember watching my mom returning from the market from my house *ok’sang* (rooftop). That two minutes may be the longest two minutes I ever felt in my entire life. I was so worried about my mom’s safety. We heard rumors: a pregnant women being shot by soldiers. It turned out that she was a bystander and just a casualty of a cross fight.

I had nightmares every night. But I was too young and no one talked to me about what was happening, at least not directly. But I got the idea that soldiers are people I should fear (Eun-young).
Another interviewee told a similar story:
I was in eighth grade at the time of 5.18. I saw some of the things that happened. I rode a bus around to see what was going on, just out of curiosity. At one point, when I rode the bus, two students ran into the bus. It appeared that they were being chased by soldiers. Passengers hid them. Soon two soldiers ran into the bus and demanded to know if two students got in the bus. Everyone, including the bus driver and bus conductor, replied that no one got in. The soldiers said they knew the students got on so hand them over. Everyone insisted that no one got in. The bus conductor snippily said “We told you no one got in.” A soldier hit her head with gun butt knocking her down to ground immediately. Still everyone insisted that no one got on. Caught between the dilemmas of their own safety if they turned themselves in and putting passengers in danger if they didn’t, the students turned themselves in. The sight of it… The students were beaten to a pulp. We were terrified (Soe-sang).

Another interviewee recounted a desperate effort of adults to protect the children:
Several of our neighbors hid in a house. We heard loud shooting outside. Actually we could see flying bullets from the windows. We put up layers of blankets to prevent bullets from penetrating the wall. Adults put us children in the middle to shield us in case bullet penetrated the wall (Joeng-in).

The trauma was so severe that when students returned to school they reported that no one talked about what they had seen and heard. One interviewee related this account:
I saw the entire 5.18 incident myself. I was in the second grade in high school (eleventh grade). A couple of my friends and seniors in my school were arrested for participating in 5.18. So although I didn’t get involved in demonstrations, everyone in my class knew about it. I think school was closed until the end of May. Yet, when we returned no one talked about 5.18. (Maybe it was like shellshock.) We all knew what happened but no one talked about it. Maybe some teachers talked about it but I don’t remember. I remember almost a year Kwangju citizens were dead silent about it (Jin-gu).

Some families tried to keep their children safe by keeping them at home or sending them out of the city:
I was a jaesang.7 I didn’t get involved in the uprising. When my father heard about it he thought it was unsafe for me to stay in the city. So my cousins and I were sent to another cousin’s farm house outside of Kwangju to hide until things calmed down. We took a wooded road at night to avoid getting caught. We walked all night but in the morning we found out that we were still in the city not far from where we started. We city boys were not good at walking in the woods in the dark. While we walked at night no one talked—it was a dead silence. We all were scared to death. I thought if I talk someone would catch us (Min-woo).

My brother was discharged from the military about a week prior to 5.18 so his hair-style was still crew cut. My parents were worried that my brother might be mistaken for a soldier so they forbade him from going out as well (Soe-sang).

Interviewees remembered the silence when they returned to school:
When we finally returned to school, no one talked about it. Everyone acted as if nothing had happened. Teachers didn’t talk about it and friends didn’t talk about it. Yet we knew something happened. Some teachers who talked about it got fired. We thought those who stayed on the job were cowards who compromised their principles. Now I understand them—what it means to get fired and not being able to provide for family… (Young-hee)

When I returned to the campus I never heard anyone talk about it. I only heard a couple people in the English department talking about it in private conversation. We talked about it in family conversations but never in public. In that sense I don’t think anyone healed properly from 5.18. It was a wound in my heart for a long time (Yu-young).

The economic disadvantage to the Honam population led to additional forms of social and
cultural discrimination. Through use of the Cholla dialect in portrayal of the lower class in the media, the mass media also took part in the reproduction and reinforcement of a negative image of Cholla people as backward and uncouth people. My interviewees were keenly aware of these disparities, as one interviewee explained:

In the past (around the 1970s and 1980s) regional disparity was greater [than now]. Cholla-do people were poor. Many people left home to get a job in the factories in Seoul or Kyungsang-do. It was well known at that time that the majority of the factory workers came from Cholla-do. Other low paying service positions such as maids and waitresses were predominantly filled by Cholla-do people (Hyung-ju).

Another interviewee provided this recollection:

It was shortly before the uprising. In my high school, we took a senior field trip to Yongnam/Kyungsang area. That was the first time I had been to the Yangnam area. I was shocked to see the disparity between Honam/Cholla and Yangnam/Kyungsang. In Kyungsang-do, all the roads were paved. In Cholla-do at that time, we didn’t have paved roads, even the road that led to Seoul. It was all sinjangno—dirt road. And the houses in Kyungsang-do were so nice and modern. In Cholla-do at that time, we had thatched-roof houses with no central heating or plumbing. It was an eye-opening experience. We [my classmates and I] were shocked and then became angry. We spat on the highway [in disgust] (Ji-young).

Those who made it to the top also were discriminated against because of their origin. An eminent scientist whose hometown is in the Honam area told me that despite graduating from an elite private university and receiving a scholarship for his entire four years of college, he was still discriminated against because of his Honam origin.

After the 5.18 Uprising, the discrimination against Honam people continued unabated. They were branded as rebellious and often as treacherous. But because of tight media control by the regime, the uprising was unknown outside of Kwangju. Many of my interviewees expressed frustration that people from outside the region still consider the Uprising to have been communist inspired or even a matter of outright fabrication by the Kwangju people.

One interviewee succinctly expressed his frustration regarding regional prejudices:

There was always regional discrimination but 5.18 stamped in our brain that we are different, at least in the eyes of the rest of the country (Jin-gu).

Many of my interviewees were frustrated that people from other regions did not believe participants’ accounts of what they had witnessed. One interviewee’s experience effectively represents the shared experience of Honam people:

As I entered college in Seoul (Korea University) I talked to my friends who came from different regions [i. e., Seoul or Yongnam (Kyung’sang Nam-do and Buk-do)]. No one believed what I said about the Kwangju Uprising. Instead they considered me a communist for talking about it. I felt isolated as a person and as a person from Honam. Honam people were misunderstood by the rest of the country. Now I can understand their perspectives. The government fed citizens misinformation, portraying the uprising as an insurrection by a few unruly communists (Jin-gu).

Indeed, frustration with not being believed by outsiders was a dominant theme of interviewees. One interviewee, for example, shared how she felt betrayed when her own uncle, who lived in Seoul, did not believe what she said.

Misunderstood by outsiders and frustrated by injustice, many turned to books including books about Marxism, for answers. They insist that they did not at the time and do not now believe in communism, but rather sought a society in which people were not oppressed by their government.

One interviewee explained how these ideas spread:

I was just an average student who wanted to enter into an elite university, get a good job. 5.18 changed everything for me. I began to read social science books and began to understand about government: structure, maintenance, exercise of power, etc. These
books helped me to understand the injustice. I spent most of my college years in political activism. 5.18 was an eye-opening experience of the unjust use of power by an illegitimate regime (Hyung-ju).

Another interviewee speculates about the outcome of frustration and isolation:

Maybe because of current and historical discrimination, when smart Cholla people feel they have encountered the glass ceiling they act out (Yong-ju).

My research suggests that these feelings of persecution are not just paranoia on the part of Cholla-do people. Before I began this research, many people wondered aloud why I would leave Seoul and go to Cholla-do Kwangju to study 5.18. After all, they claimed, Kwangju is the heart of communist sympathizers. Some people even cautioned me not to trust Cholla-do people. Perhaps the development of a collective identity based around a protest movement functions, in part, as a defense against outside prejudice.

In college I became very active in the student movement (woon’dong’kwon). When we demonstrated, Kwangju citizens cheered us because we were the only ones who talked about 5.18. Later, I quit those student activities and concentrated on studying because I felt that those who demonstrated seemed to have a different agenda. But when I see injustice and stand quiet about it, I feel guilty for not speaking up. It makes me feel like I am a coward. I know I cannot fight all the injustice, but I still feel guilty when I do not (Yong-hee).

The 5.18 Uprising caused intense trauma for many youths. One interviewee admitted that witnessing the inhumane suppression of 5.18 made him turn into a radical:

I was a just a regular student—study hard, graduate and get a good job. I never participated in demonstrations and had no awareness of injustice and inequality. 5.18 changed everything. I realized the wickedness and abuse of power. Then, I began to read about society. Most of these readings were based on Marxism (Hyung-ju).

For some, grieving was part of their search for direction.

That is why I studied the Kwangju uprising for my doctoral dissertation in the U. S. and later on engaged in 5.18 music research through the Kwangju Human Rights Association (Kwangju min’kwon we’won’hoe). I studied protest music through the songs the protesters sang during 5.18. I found international similarities in protest songs. For example a song by Yang Hee Eun⁹ was rearranged from Bob Dylan’s song, which in its original was a protest about nuclear [weapons]. Through these works I feel that I repaid some of the debts to 5.18 warriors (Yu-young).

Every May, I teach my students songs about 5.18. The new generation is not interested in 5.18. When I took them to the museum, the students thought all those tortured faces were make-ups and photo touch-ups. The new generation has no historical memories and moreover they are not interested in the past. I am so sad about it. But I kept on teaching them because I hope someday they will realize the importance of 5.18 and be proud of their heritage. I teach my children global views, not regional views. I don’t want them to feel victimized (Yong-hee).

Students protested what they saw as collaboration with the forces of injustice:

In high school there were teachers who were conscientious about inequality; most of them were Chon’kyo’jo members (a radical underground teachers organization which was illegal at that time). They joined the woon’dong’kwon. These teachers who joined woon’dong’kwon got fired and the rest of the teachers were afraid of getting fired so they kept silent. We [students] thought undong’kwon teachers were heroes and heroines and those teachers who stayed in the job were cowards. So we protested against the replacement teachers (and to a lesser degree those who remained in the job) by not responding to them. We would not answer their questions, did not make eye contact, etc. We called them “yellow” (eo’young¹⁰, teachers
[professors, and deans]. Come to think of it, the teachers were in a tight spot also. They have families to support too! (Jin-hye).

For many, the Kwangju Uprising became a symbol and some interviewees expressed that they have experienced survivors’ guilt.

For me, 5.18 is not a source of pride for Kwangju but a yoke reminding us that we must continue the democratic struggle. Many people were sacrificed for democratization so it is our obligation to continue. That is why so many students became activists. There was always regional discrimination but 5.18 stamped in our brain that we are different, at least in the eyes of the rest of the country (Jin-gu).

While all the interviewees distinguished the regime from the country, noting it was the usurpation of the sanctity of a nation by an unjust regime, a theme of geographic and emotional isolation of the region emerged. Interviewees uniformly characterized the 5.18 Uprising as an example of how Chun Doo Hwan’s regime abused power and violated the dignity of the country. Expressions of anger, frustration, and disappointment in the misunderstanding and distrust from people in the rest of the country were also recurring themes.

That anger was most commonly directed toward Chun Doo Hwan, the leader of the regime. The anger is so intense that for some bystanders, even religion could not heal the wounds. Interviewees shared these feelings:

I am a Christian but at one point I questioned my religion which teaches that anyone who repents will be forgiven and will go to heaven. I will think it is so unjust if Chun Do Hwan repents five minutes before his death and enters into heaven. It is an absurd injustice even if he became a janitor in heaven because I don’t mind being janitor in heaven. I still haven’t come to terms with that (Young-hee).

I think the Kwangju people are remarkable. The simin kongdong’che (absolute community of citizen) during the 5.18 attests to that. I remember I was getting rice balls from them. At the end of the uprising food was running out. Everything was running out. At that time, people began to share what they had. Supermarket owners opened their shops to the people for free. In that horrific situation there was no looting. In all disturbances, there is looting but not in Kwangju. The only thing people were afraid of was soldiers. (Eun-yung)

**Discussion and Conclusion**

Although Koreaness is characterized by the biological, cultural, historical, and linguistic homogeneity of thousands of years, it also contains regional rivalries and discrimination which are seen throughout history but are especially prevalent in contemporary history. For the Honam interviewees in this study, regionalism and the historical, economic, and political discrimination of Honam people is represented in modern history as 5.18.

For many of these interviewees, 5.18 disrupted the smooth development of an “imaginary unity” between Honam people and the rest of the country and reinforced feelings of separateness and isolation. While the historical experience of discrimination is part of Honam identity, it is critical to understand how the 5.18 Uprising provided a crucial point in the formation of collective Honam identity by reinforcing a “protesting identity.” The regime’s brutal suppression of peaceful demonstrators transferred moral authority to protestors and bystanders and pushed Honam students into engaging in opposing hegemonic knowledge. Among the current manifestations of this protesting identity are the continuation of block voting and a desire among many protestors to teach the next generation about 5.18.

For many interviewees, participation in woon’dong’kwon can be understood as an effort to create “communities of meaning.” For woon’dong’kwon participants, 5.18 represented a critical form of knowledge-making through shared experience, resulting in a sense of having developed a community of meaning. In addition, at the intersection between national identity and regional identity, 5.18 provided people of Cholla-do with a specific historical moment of “learning from experience.” This collective learning from experience coupled with the reinforcement of a sense of community, has been crucial to the identity construction of Kwangju uprising bystanders.
It is remarkable that in 1998 Korea elected a president from Honam who had been persecuted during the successive military regimes of Park Chung Hee and Chun Doo Hwan. With that symbolic act, a great degree of the psychological wounds of 5.18 were healed. For people of Honam, the election of Kim Dae-jung redressed the identity that is based on being “indexed to a historical time, place, and situation” (Moya, 2009, p. 48). Furthermore, the national recognition of the role that people from Homan played in charting the ultimate national democratic transition has become an important symbol of respect for the region. Nevertheless, in order for Korean “imaginary unity” (Balibar and Wallerstein 1991) to be solidified and in order to forge a national body of “imagined community” (Anderson 1983) that is inclusive to all and prevents the eruption of a disruptive “cultural war” (Graff 1992) that reinforces differences between people of varying identities, this research suggests that Koreans must move beyond monetary reparations for the victims. Instead, Korea must begin to engage in a critical examination of Korean society and redress the psychological and personal burdens that have resulted from the 5.18 Uprising.
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ENDNOTES

1 Romanization of the Korean alphabet provides for different ways of spelling. Thus, Gwangju and Kwangju are used interchangeably as different authors prefer different Romanization of the city name.

2 This study was conducted during my tenure as 2008–09 Fulbright Senior Research Fellow in South Korea. I would like to acknowledge the support and guidance of Dr. Min Hyung-bae and Professor Na Gan-chae who provided valuable insight about the Kwangju Uprising and supported me throughout the project. Particular appreciation belongs to those who generously shared their stories.

3 Under the military regime, talking about the Kwangju Uprising was prohibited. In an effort to diminish the significance, when necessary, it was referred as Kwangju incident or Kwangju disturbance.

4 While both Cholla Namdo (South Cholla Province) and Cholla Bukdo (North Cholla province) are considered to be the Honam region, Cholla Namdo is regarded as the true Honam. Kwangju stands as the heart of the Honam region.

5 While underground circulation of information about the Kwangju Uprising was available in Korea during the 1980s, possession and circulation of such materials were strictly prohibited by the government. Only during the 1990s with the inauguration of a democratically elected government was public and academic discussion of the Kwangju Uprising possible.

6 A general way to address a middle age man.

7 Term for “repeater” used to distinguish those who failed to enter their preferred university after preparing for the college entrance exam after graduation.

8 Since the military regime of Park Chung Hee, the majority of the modern day ruling elite have come from the Youngnam region and particularly Daegue, the third largest city in Korea and capital of Kyungsang Bukdo. As the ruling elite concentrated development in their base area, regional disparities in development intensified.

9 Yang Hee Eun has been a popular singer in South Korea since the 1970s. Some of her songs were banned by the military authority during the ’70s and ’80 as they allegedly contained themes of protest.

10 Literally translated as “government employed teachers,” eo’young connotes government puppet or collaborator.
Coming out of the Ethnic Closet: Perspectives on Identity

Ikumi Park

In the context of identity politics, identity has been perceived as something substantial, inborn and essential—an unchangeable quality of self that waits to be explored and expressed. Its dynamic aspect could be nurtured through enlightenment and experience as one grows up. Although multiplicity of identity has always been an issue, especially when those who are in the margin of the society were discussed, it was perceived as plausible and existential; something already there, and if you are honest, courageous, and articulate enough, you can take it out and share it with the rest of the world.

However, as identity changes over time and space, so does its definition and meaning. After the Linguistic Turn (see Rorty, 1992), which emphasizes the power of language that shapes and produces our thought, language is no longer seen as a tool to express the thoughts already in our mind but rather perceived as a system to shape and produce them. Ueno (2001) argues that the paradigm shift after the Linguistic Turn brought an epistemological questioning of the “objective fact,” instigating “simultaneous, multiple plate shift in knowledge” across the fields of social science (p. 277). This important change was also brought to the field of narrative analysis.

Narratives, including identity narratives, can no longer be taken as an output of a substantial self but rather as a constructive and negotiating process between a speaker and an audience. The focus was shifted from what was said to what can be said in a given discourse community. For example, developing Foucault’s (1978) argument that human beings become subjects by being subject to the discourse, Fairclough’s (2001) critical narrative analysis emphasizes the interdependency between an individual’s narrative and the discourse that surrounds it. He questions the notion of “spontaneous talk” that is independent from the shared knowledge and expectations, and emphasizes the interdependent nature between discourse and narrative construction.

From this point of view, I will perceive identity narratives not so much as a confession of the past or “true self,” but rather as a future-oriented decision and a commitment; how one wants or choose to present self in his/her discourse community. Identity narrative describes not only who you were and who you are, but also who you will be in a particular discourse community that you belong to. Attention should also be paid to the act of identity narrative itself; why does this person decide to talk about identity out loud? What is the purpose and desire?

As the argument revolving around the “don’t ask, don’t tell policy” suggests, there is a huge gap between silently sharing one’s secret with others and articulating it out loud. For example, there are many ethnic Koreans in Japan who use Japanese pass names on a daily basis, hiding their ethnicity. However, the reality is that often people around them already know or assume their ethnic background; it is just a shared secret on both sides. As long as ethnic Koreans use Japanese pass names, both sides can pretend not to notice and play the game nonchalantly. The custom of using Japanese pass names contributes not so much to concealing their ethnic background, but to maintaining this shared secret policy: even if everyone knows, everyone can pretend not to notice.

On the other hand, adoption of a Korean name, which does not allow such a pretension, surely will bring discord to such “harmony.” In that sense, Korean names should not be recognized simply as revealing one’s ethnic background, but more as the presentation of one’s positioning and commitment to the world. For those who decide to speak out, identity narratives mean the beginning of a new relationship with others and the world.

However, they soon notice that presentation of identity is not exclusively the property of self; once outside, such open statements go beyond one’s
intention. If you are a Jew, so is your family. Your confession may reveal what your kin do not want to share with the rest of the world. Because of the blood relationship, your commitment demands your family members, who are in a default setting basking in a shared secret policy, to face and deal with the issues despite their will or wish.

In this essay, I want to explore the dilemma that identity as a commitment holds by introducing a story I heard from my close friend who decided to adopt a Korean name after she entered college. I want to tell the story of the conflict between one’s choice and the way family members choose to live. Here is her story:

About a year ago, my brother’s former colleague opened a new clinic in my neighborhood. I went there last month to get a medical check-up to submit to the company. While seeing a doctor, I was wondering whether I should mention my brother to him or not. Why? It is because of my Korean name that presents my ethnic background. I started to use Korean name after I entered a college, a big commitment to live as a visible minority. It is difficult for the people in Japan to tell my Korean ethnicity from appearance alone, but my Korean name always made me a visible “Other.” As I submitted my health insurance card with my Korean name on it, I was wondering whether I should tell the doctor my relationship with my brother or not. Since all my family use Japanese pass names, including my brother, I was quite sure the doctor did not know my brother’s ethnic background. But if I say we are siblings, he would easily assume my brother is an ethnic Korean, too. My brother is not one of those who makes every effort to hide Korean ethnicity. Yet I thought he might feel uncomfortable if his ethnic background were suddenly revealed. This is a familiar conflict I face when I meet the common acquaintances of my family, and I thought it would be safer to remain silent as usual.

However, when the doctor asked me, “how did you find out about my clinic?” I told him about my brother and our relationship. The doctor showed unexpected happy surprise and asked me to say kind regards to my brother. I was relieved by the doctor’s reaction and thought that it was not a big deal after all and I shouldn’t be too nervous telling who I am to my family’s acquaintances.

Then about a week later, there was a family gathering celebrating my father’s birthday. My brother’s and sisters’ families got together. When the topic came to the clinic near our house, I told my brother that I went there just a week ago to get a medical check-up. Then my brother said, “Oh, really? And did you tell him that you were my sister?” I felt the tension that filled the atmosphere. It was a question that everyone there wanted to hear the answer to. Everyone wanted to know whether I revealed my brother’s ethnic background by telling the doctor that I was his sister. As soon as I answered “yes,” my mother got upset. “How could you? Why did you say such an unnecessary thing!” My brother quickly calmed her down by saying “It’s O.K. I don’t care (about my ethnic background being revealed).” But my sisters were also critical of me, and that night when I was alone with my parents they told me that I should have known better; that I should be more careful and thoughtful about my brother and his family.

I was upset and angry with my parents. I thought they should respect my feelings too as much as they worry about my brother’s. I hated their hypocrisy; encouraging me and actually being proud of my using my Korean name when they were with other ethnic Koreans but hating it when I use my Korean name in front of their Japanese acquaintances. It seems so ridiculous for us ethnic Koreans to live between two names like a swinging pendulum.

But then, I gave it a second thought and felt that it was unfair of me to expose my brother’s secret in that manner. What if I were in his position? I mean it would be quite contrary but what if my friends who know me only by my Korean name suddenly notice that I used to use a Japanese pass name? I would surely be embarrassed. I discarded the Japanese pass name as I entered college because I wanted to get away from my guilty feeling that I was deceiving myself and others. I was not so much ashamed of being Korean but was very much bothered by the idea that I was cowardly hiding something. I wanted to be myself in front of other people; a consistent
person with one name. My desire to maintain a consistent self-image always made me afraid that my friend might find out my Korean name while I was using a Japanese pass name. By the same token, after I started using my Korean name, I was afraid my ex-Japanese name might be revealed to my college friends; a serious threat to my consistent self-image.

People with one name usually see no distinction between Koreans who grew up in Korea with only a Korean name and ethnic Koreans like me who chose to use a Korean name in Japan. But I think there is a huge difference between us; I feel my identity fits neither with my Korean name, nor my Japanese name. It is not so much like I belong to both names positively, but rather I belong to neither of them. It is as if I am the “negative” of the two; that is to say, I exist as “not Japanese” yet simultaneously “not Korean.”

Sometimes people commend me for my using Korean name, saying I am courageous and strong. But I do not think that is true. I have to admit that I share and understand the contradictory feelings my parents have toward our ethnicity with complicated and dynamic emotions. That is why I got hurt and angry with my parents: I saw myself in them, the same dilemma and hypocrisy, the need to be consistent.

This story of my close friend remained in my heart so vividly for a long time. It was so poignant to me as I shared the very similar emotional conflict since I started to use my Korean name. It could be a story of my own as well as other zainichi who chose to live as a marked “Other” in a Japanese society. The shared dilemma is that “one’s confession” necessitates the unexpected involvement of his/her family. Whether we like it or not, families stand on an extended line of our identity. Although it is their affection and caring that nurture and embrace us, it is also their excessive affection and attachment that hurt and distract our commitment to our identity.

As much as they support and protect us from society, they get in our way and interfere with our challenge against it in the name of love and caring. It would be easy to criticize the attitudes of the parents of my friend. However, what we should ponder here is the fact that their comments only reflect the value system and “reality” we see in our society. We should not forget that my friend, who appears to be against such values, also belongs to the same discourse community and shares the “reality.” Even if she knows that what makes her suffer is just something imagined, she still cannot get away from it.

As Žižek puts it, ideology is no longer something we do without realizing it, but rather something we do even though we know it. We know the price of the brand item is not so much to do with the substantial value, but with the illusion the brand sign produces in our “value system.” However, the problem is that, though we understand the mechanism of the market, the brand item does appear to have the substantial value even if we rationally know it does not. It might sound strange but our illusion is real in that sense, and whether we conform to it or try go against it, it always stays with us as a referential point. I do not have any answer to the conflict between my friend’s logical commitment and the powerful illusion that distracts it. However, to try to accept such a contradiction might be the first step to get along with oneself. Maybe identity commitment is not hope for an impeccable honest self, but a way of getting along with endless irrational and contradictory feelings within; a commitment to live the complication. Why? Because identity preconditions such contradiction and if we try to “solve” the problem of contradiction, we might lose the narrative of identity itself.
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In this paper I look at a set of teaching techniques and practices that I experienced as a student of traditional hula over the past twenty years. I explain the practices of hō’ike (testing by showing what one knows), ‘aiha’a (getting grounded), pa’a ka waha/ ho’olohe (hold the mouth/ listen), and learning without palapala (paper) as I have experienced them in hālau hula (hula school). I discuss how these practices have challenged my assumptions about teaching and impacted my understanding of the learning process and my identity as a learner. I then isolate key values that I find interwoven throughout these practices, but which I find largely absent in our contemporary, Western educational institutions. I conclude with a discussion of what I call a pedagogy of respect. This concept, which I have drawn from my experience as a haumana hula (hula student), has helped me to clarify my identity both as an educator and a learner, and has increasingly informed my own teaching practice.

Imagine hula. What comes to mind? A dark skinned Polynesian woman with long black hair? The sensuality of swaying hips, moonlit nights on Waikīkī’s white sand beaches, perhaps a Mai Tai? The image of hula is painted in scenes of entertainment and allurement. It’s mostly about sex. This is how we identify hula. It is how hula is sold and often why it is bought. It is romance at best, exotic titillation at its most base. Given this stereotypic image of hula—what would draw a white (haole) intellectual, a philosopher and classically trained dancer to the practice of hula? Why would she stay for twenty years, and more importantly, what would she learn there?

Hula Lessons

“Think Hawaiian,” I remember my kumu (teacher) demanding. Initially, I heard this as an impossible imperative. How could I “think” a cultural identity that was not my own? In the back of my mind, I heard my dismissive Western academic self, asking: How is “thinking Hawaiian” even necessary for learning to dance hula? Yet, I had come to this teacher because I wanted to learn traditional hula. I was not interested in Waikīkī hula. I did not want to dance for parties. I wanted to know something of Hawaiian culture and its values, and I believed I could learn it through its traditional dance. I wanted to learn something authentic, and yet somehow a lifetime in Western educational institutions had led me to expect that I could achieve this without considering the cultural context from which the very knowledge I wanted to access had evolved and been transmitted.

In this paper I want to explore a different kind of learning experience through a set of specific practices in our hālau hula (hula school), and discuss how they have impacted not just my learning of hula, but my understanding of the effort and practice of learning. I then want to draw some general conclusions about what I have found essential to my hālau practice but lacking in my experience as a student and educator in Western educational institutions.

But first a disclaimer: I was, and still am, a hula haumana, a student of hula. I studied for nearly twenty years with two kumu who taught from the same tradition. I intend only to represent my experiences and observations from my perspective as a hula student and a professional educator. I do not speak for any hula tradition or practice. I have chosen specific practices that I have learned about in and out of hālau, practices that have helped me to become a better
student and a better teacher. They have given me a keener understanding of the learning process, encouraged me to experiment with my teaching practice, and broadened my attitudes and thus my facility and confidence in the classroom. Given this perspective, I will discuss four practices: hō’ike (showing knowledge), ‘aiha’a (bending one’s knees), pa’a ka waha / ho’olohe (keeping quiet and listening), and learning without palapala (paper). I will then offer some general observations about how my hālau experience has impacted my view of contemporary education.

Hō’ike

Most simply, hō’ike is a matter of showing what one knows. In Classical Hawaiian Education: Generations of Hawaiian Culture, John Charlot states that in traditional Hawaiian pedagogical practice, knowledge was constantly tested (12). This was true of my hālau experience. Testing in hālau was always a matter of hō’ike. At any time we could be asked to demonstrate what we knew, or, more likely, did not know. More formal hō’ike were performed before an audience. They were akin to recitals, public performances that culminate a course of study. These performances required extended preparation and involved substantial rehearsal and review of the material we were expected to have learned. In addition to the performance of dances, they often entailed research and written work and the production of costumes and adornments. Within the audience were kumu who were specifically asked to observe and offer their judgments of our progress in learning.

As a learner, however, the more significant hō’ike were informal, those times when we were required to demonstrate on command what we had been taught. At the whim of kumu, in the presence of invited guests or just among ourselves, informal tests could come in the form of a simple, innocuous question that we were expected to answer readily, a request to explain something to another hālau member, or an observance and correction to something within our personal practice. Or, we could be called to perform a dance or chant a mele solo, or in pairs or small groups. Sometimes we would be given advance notice; often we were not.

My experience of these hō’ike went through three stages. At first I was oblivious to the fact that these simple moments were tests. Because I did not recognize them for what they were, I experienced them neither as stressful nor as opportunities. In the second stage, I experienced them as unfair and an annoyance. My expectations of a test included at least a fair warning and a chance to prepare, so that I could show my knowledge in the most positive light. But once their purpose was clear to me, these moments became not only simple and orienting learning experiences, they clarified what it meant to know, and in this context they took on epistemological significance. Knowing meant precisely being able to produce on request. It was direct and empirical. If I could not produce it, I did not know it. There was no ambiguity. These informal hō’ike clearly demonstrated, both to kumu and myself, whether or not I had embodied what I had been taught. Often no explicit critique was given, nor was it necessary. My inability to show was all the critique that was needed. The expectation was clear: As a hālau, we were expected to know our hula pa’a pono (firmly, solidly) and recall them on request—even after several years.

Only after I was able to move from experiencing these events as unfair, because they were unannounced or implicit, was I able to take responsibility for my learning. I also came to see that these hō’ike were as much for the kumu as they were for the dancers. They allowed our kumu to temper the pace of our lessons, to go back to basics or to move the lessons further, as our responses indicated. For myself, I learned that I needed to be prepared for each class session. This entailed not only being focused enough to have the knowledge at hand, but to have the confidence and concentration to perform it. I learned that we were always being tested in this way, and that with each successful demonstration more would be expected. The bar was always being raised. Accepting this responsibility gave way to a deeper understanding of ‘aiha’a.

‘Aiha’a: Getting Grounded

The basic stance in hula is ‘aiha’a. It is a bent kneed posture with feet, knees, hips, and torso placed
squarely forward. Standing in ‘aiha’a brings us closer to the earth. It requires us to relax our feet, stretch our calves, and strengthen our thighs. It frees our hips to move side to side (kao) and in a circular path for the essential movements of ‘ami and ‘ōniu. In hula, in this position, one becomes connected to what is most essential.

‘Aiha’a can be compared to the fundamental stance in Western classical dance technique—the plié. Like ‘aiha’a, plié involves bending the knees, keeping the pelvis and torso aligned, and balancing over one’s feet. In both traditions, the more comfortable a dancer can become in a bent-kneed stance, the more balanced and centered she becomes, and the more easily she can execute the step vocabulary of each respective dance form. Yet the function of the plié differs almost metaphorically from ‘aiha’a, and I find this concept of bending at the knee distinguishes two culturally different ways of viewing and relating to the world. As the preparation and ending for almost any movement within the repertoire of ballet’s step vocabulary, the mastery of the plié supports safe practice and gives quality and assurance to one’s dancing. But it is most powerfully used as a means to thrust dancers off the ground and to catch their weight safely as they descend. The goal is to get off the earth and into the air. One can never get too high. In ballet the plié is a way to use the ground more effectively. It is a means to an end. In hula ‘aiha’a it is an end in itself—a way of becoming connected and stable. This is what the two dance forms have in common. But for hula, ‘aiha’a allows the dancer to receive the rhythms of the earth, to be affected by the earth and to affect it in turn.

This connection to the earth links ‘aiha’a to a proper way of being, and relates it to the virtue, ha’aha’a (humility). In the language of Aristotle or Dewey, ha’aha’a is a disposition. As with a plié, getting to the physical ‘aiha’a involves practice and effort. One must repeatedly push the body while asking the muscles to release in order to bend deeper. With training, dancers acquire discipline and consistency in movement. By pushing the body they overcome limitations and find new possibilities for movement. The physical stance is the beginning point. It is from the base of ‘aiha’a that the learning of hula proceeds. As a disposition, ha’aha’a is a starting point for learning as well, comparable to a Socratic recognition of a lack of knowledge. All future learning is predicated on this premise.

I am learning ha’aha’a slowly and with difficulty. Perhaps it will take a lifetime of learning. I came to hula as a trained dancer, believing I was a quick study and a ready performer, able to learn material easily. But, for my first formal hō‘ike my kumu paired me with a woman in whom I saw no ability. She moved awkwardly and haltingly and had difficulty remembering the simple hula noho (sitting hula) we were to perform. While I did not understand it initially, I came to believe this pairing was deliberate. It was kumu’s way of teaching me ha’aha’a. It forced me to focus my own effort and to open up my perspective so that I could adapt and dance with my partner. I learned that being in ‘aiha’a/ha’aha’a meant acknowledging limitations—my own and those of others. It required shedding ego and relying on others for success. This in turn opened me to learning from others. Without such openness, the possibilities for further learning were limited by the perceptions I had of my own abilities, as well as the abilities of others, perceptions that if wrong, became barriers to the learning I sought.

**Pa’a ka waha**

‘Aiha’a/ ha’aha’a closely relates to another facet of my hālau education which is summarized in the ‘ōlelo no’eau (proverb), Nānā ka maka; hoʻoloho ka pepeiaoa; paʻa ka waha. This translates as, Observe with the eyes; listen with the ears; shut the mouth” (Pukui, 248). In any dance form, imitation is the primary mode of instruction, and imitation requires watching closely. Any good dancer is trained in watching and imitating. In hālau, listening (hoʻoloho) was equally important, not only for hearing corrections and directions, for keeping time and hearing the words of mele (story/songs) that were being danced, but for hearing the contextual subtleties that gave meaning to a particular interpretation of the dance. These subtleties could be communicated at any time and if one were not attentive, opportunities were missed to synchronize the dancing and the words.

Perhaps the most effective technique my kumu would use to teach us better how to use our ears,
was speaking so softly as to be almost inaudible. When I first experienced this, I was not quite sure what was happening. When I realized it was deliberate, I thought it was incompatible with any sound pedagogy. I perceived it as both an insult and bad teaching technique. But I continued to come back to hālau. I leaned in closer. I focused my attention and watched facial expressions, lips, and body language more attentively. I learned to use my ears differently, to block out distractions and tune in selectively in order to learn. The technique was teaching me to focus on what was important at the same time that it was literally drawing me in.

This emphasis on listening was reinforced by the directive, pa’a ka waha. Closely related to this instruction is a prohibition on asking questions (nīnau) until one is given permission. Hawaiian scholar Mary Pukui connects this proscription to traditional pedagogy. She writes:

The elders well knew that, “I ka nānā no a ike, by observing, one learns. I ka ho‘oalohe no a ho‘omaopopono, by listening, one commits to memory. I ka hana no a ‘ike, by practice one masters the skill. To this, a final directive was added: Never interrupt. Wait until the lesson is over and the elder gives you permission. Then—and not until then—nīnau. Ask questions.” (quoted in Chun, 3).

Charlot elaborates on the prohibition on asking questions:

“Questioning seems to be considered a distraction from observation, which requires more effort, engages more of the senses, imprints the information more firmly in the memory, and exercises the individual’s own thinking capacity. . . . Observing and listening are therefore basic and lifelong learning skills and the means of acquiring the first knowledge necessary for all human activity (178).

Asking questions during a lesson was strongly frowned upon in hālau, and perhaps no other aspect of my hālau education was as foreign for me as was this attitude toward inquiry. In virtually all my other educational experiences, asking questions had been encouraged. As a student, I was accustomed to being praised for asking questions. It was a sign of interest and indicative of my desire to learn more. I understood it as sincerity to grasp, clearly and correctly, what was being taught. As a teacher I encourage students to question, not just to clarify their understanding, but to challenge the material and my knowledge as well. The point here is that knowledge grows and clarifies with thinking through and correcting inevitable error. As a hallmark of Western pedagogy, questioning implies an acknowledgement of the limited authority of individual knowledge. In hālau, however, it was perceived as rudeness, if not arrogance. Far from signaling eagerness, attentiveness, and worthiness to be taught more, the quick question was interpreted as impatience and a further instruction.

The time for questions was always at the discretion of the kumu, usually at the end of a class and with explicit permission. Hawaiian educator Malcolm Chun offers his insight on the value of this approach. “Questioning, or nīnau, . . . is thought of as something a person would consider almost as the last expression of learning. Having experienced seeing, listening, reflection, and doing, a student may have answered many of the trivial questions, leaving only the most important to be asked of one’s teacher or mentor” (Chun, 5).

From a student’s perspective I came to learn that eager desire did not necessarily signal readiness to learn. Rather listening and staying quiet signaled both readiness and respect for the kumu. It was through the many informal hō‘ike that we demonstrated whether we had listened and what we had actually learned. Having listened and having shown that we knew what had been taught us, was sufficient demonstration of our readiness to learn more. Our personal desire was never as relevant as was kumu’s perception (sometimes solidified through consultation with others who were knowledgeable) that the time was right to further instruction.
Learning without palapala

Learning without palapala (paper) was a practice that both our kumu struggled to continue, in spite of what appeared to me to be their desire to do so. While recognizing a need to accommodate students who had neither grown up with hula nor had a working knowledge of Hawaiian language, they seemed to value this traditional approach. My experience was that I embodied the dances taught in this way more firmly than I did those for which we were given paper that contained the words and choreography.

Typically, we learned a new hula by being shown choreography, beginning with the footwork and then adding on the arms. Often we would be given the words of the mele, and sometimes the choreography on paper. If not we would be given time in class to write notes. We would practice these dances over a period of weeks, and then they were considered part of our repertory. Often, we did not return to the dance for several months or even years, yet it was expected that we would practice on our own, so as not to lose touch with the dances. Learning without paper, however, always began with the words of the mele. We would sit together and repeat short phrases until kumu felt we were able to move on. After we had learned the mele to the kumu’s satisfaction, we were given the pa’i or rhythmic accompaniment, which clued us to the foot movement. Layered onto this would be the choreography. Learning choreography always began with the step vocabulary, and the dance was completed with arm gestures and facial expression. The learning process was layered from the inside out and from the ground up. Knowledge of the dance began with what the dance spoke to, the story it was intended to convey, which is expressed in the chanting of the mele. The knowledge of the rhythm reinforced the knowledge of the footwork and the gestures reinforced and spoke the story. Everything was set in context. Nothing was disconnected.

From a pedagogical perspective, several things were operating in this process. What we now call scaffolding is clearly at work. In our hālau, learning a hula begins with footwork and the basic vocabulary of arm gestures. These basics are the kinesthetic foundation of all future dances. After some time it was expected that we had acquired a minimal understanding of Hawaiian language to allow us to understand the basic story we were dancing. Rote memorization—much maligned in contemporary Western pedagogy—was a necessary component, yet never encouraged without a fundamental grasp of what was to be memorized. Because words ground movement, knowing what is meant gives context to the storytelling that is the heart of hula. Aural learning was used in the recitation of the mele, kinetic and visual learning in the learning of movement. The entire process was multisensorial. Imitating kumu in the phrasing of mele and the rhythm of the pa’i gradually brought us to independent performance. Being asked to show what we have learned brings concentration and confidence. The need to focus my mental faculties to hear, repeat, and remember required active attention and individual engagement. In teaching without paper, I found that even after years, the dances came back more readily. The body memory was stronger and the context that built from the mele provided more latching points for recall.

This mode of learning also made me aware of the value of a kind of collective knowledge. And here, perhaps, is a parallel to the idea in Western pedagogy that questioning can correct inevitable error. Both traditions have a means for self-correcting. In hālau, what one individual may have forgotten, others remember. While no one individual remembered the dance flawlessly, the entire group could collaboratively recover the complete dance. The knowledge of the hālau’s repertoire was held intact among its members, not by individuals. This notion of group knowing is not widely recognized or promoted in Western educational models where individual knowledge is more highly regarded; but I have come to appreciate the idea of the extended mind of the hālau and to respect the advantages of not having all knowledge reside in one dancer. It encourages respect for other knowers, cooperation among learners, and an appreciation that one individual cannot be responsible for knowing everything. This links to a fundamental ‘ōlelo no’eau that every hula dancers learns: ‘A’ohe pau ka ‘ike i ka hālau ho’okāhi (Not all knowledge resides in a single school) (Pukui, 24). Everyone is
responsible and our mutual reliance is a strength within and among hālau that encourages individual responsibility and engenders community.

**Applying Hālau Lessons**

As I try to generalize from the lessons I learned in hālau, I recognize a pedagogy of respect, a respect that begins and ends with respect for the knowledge. Not only is the knowledge of the hālau worth knowing, its value is such that it is better to lose it than to pass it over to those who will not exercise care and trust of it. This attitude was reflected in the strong sense of kuleana (responsibility) that our kumu felt. Kumu are respected as keepers of knowledge. Respect for them is, in part, respect for the lineage of their knowledge. Our kumu earned this respect, having demonstrated their knowledge over time, through extensive study, practice, and personal commitment to hula. They have been directed toward teaching by their kumu, credited with the perspective to guide the learning of others. Acknowledging their role as keepers of knowledge, the process of passing that knowledge on is left to their discernment. The kumu decides who will learn what, and when and how they will learn it. This allows the learning to be tailored to the individual student. While everyone learns the basics, anything beyond this reflects the judgment of the kumu.

Clear protocols establish boundaries that separate students and kumu. Within the frame of the class, the knowledge and the judgment of kumu are not questioned. Students are given the knowledge the kumu believes they can be responsible for, and students reflect back the quality of the kumu’s judgment through hō‘ike. The process is respectful of students by not entrusting them with more responsibility than the kumu believes they can handle. Asking students to show what they have learned, what they have been taught, and, therefore, what they should know, respects students as learners and as individuals. It communicates the kumu’s expectation that students acquire the ability to use what they have been given. It offers as well an opportunity for the student as to display that her commitment to the learning is sufficient to make that knowledge her own. William James’s observation that “[t]o give up pretensions is as blessed a relief as to get them gratified,” and his characterization of self-esteem as “a ratio of successes divided by pretensions” (54) seem to sum up my kumu’s understanding. Students are respected enough to be allowed to fail because failure is so often the occasion for further learning, and because it is the learning, and not an appearance of learning, that is important. Knowledge had priority over the learner because the primary purpose of our hālau was to preserve knowledge. Therefore, it was shared only with those perceived to have the ability and the sense of responsibility to mālama (take care of) it.

Respect is reflected in key values, beginning with ha‘aha‘a. No student was allowed to believe her knowledge is too great. The bar was always being raised, and at each new level, one sensed directly the familiar feeling of not knowing. Ha‘aha‘a asks us to acknowledge personal limitations and the need for continued learning. But the values of kuleana and mālama are also important. Kuleana suggests our responsibility as students to learn and remember what we have been taught. Kuleana extends to the kumu as well, who tell us the quality of their teaching is reflected in our performance and our deportment. Mālama is caring for. Whether or not we mālama what we have been taught is clearly shown through hō‘ike. If we have taken care of what we have been taught, we will remember it and continue to improve. This respect extended even to our instruments, our attire, and the adornments we wore. These items were considered an extension of our being; they carried not only our personal mana, but that of the tradition we carried forward.

I find these, or any other corresponding values, to be largely absent in our contemporary educational institutions. In general, the students coming into my classes have no sense that they have a responsibility to take care of the knowledge they are presented with. They take for granted their right to access knowledge, which they understand as information, and they have little humility in the face of any lack of knowledge. This is certainly not their fault. Education has been rationalized to them as an endless chain of means to ends—a means to graduation, a job, or a credential
that serves some purpose beyond knowledge. Nor has the Western educational tradition promoted any notion that knowledge is something to be responsible for and cared for in any sense conveyed by the term mālama. As far back as the ancient Greek “schools,” challenging prevailing knowledge has been the means by which knowledge in the West has developed. Individual perspective, creativity, and interpretation have been encouraged, while inculcating dispositions of humility, responsibility, and respect as essential to the learning process is rarely fathomed. Generating new knowledge has been more important than preserving what has been accumulated in the past.

I believe our current cultural lack of regard for knowledge has telegraphed into disrespect for teachers. That teachers in our society are not highly valued is amply evidenced by the lack of pay and social status we accord the profession. Epistemological views that argue all knowledge is inherently limited—at best provisional, along with a tradition of questioning, have encouraged us to push the edges of what is and can be known, but they have also undermined the credibility of knowledge and learning itself. The idea of knowledge as information denigrates knowledge and the idea of educators as facilitators takes responsibility from them, displacing teachers from a position of authority that commands respect and students as active participants in their own learning. The commodification of education devalues students’ relationship in the process of learning, encouraging them to think in terms of exchange value, where “knowledge” is available at a price and without any intrinsic worth.

Generation or Preservation

Teaching and learning have different purposes. The purpose of teaching and learning in our hālau was to preserve a tradition of practice and knowledge, not to generate new knowledge. This simple distinction—something I don’t think I would have ever thought about were it not for my hālau experience—has helped me recognize the extent to which culture drives our expectations of the learning process. My impulse to question and readily offer unsolicited opinions, my assumptions that I could select what of the hālau curriculum I would learn or that I might learn it without considering the full context of its meaning and importance, reflect a cultural way of thinking and have their place in a context that seeks to encourage specialization, independent learning, and the expansion of knowledge. But in hālau this context and its assumptions—not only about knowledge, but about my identity as a learner—were inhibiting. Hālau clarified that my choice was to learn differently or not learn at all. It did not cause me to dismiss the value of Western ways of knowing and a pedagogy that I deeply admire for encouraging independent reasoning, curiosity, and questioning, and for the way these qualities have opened our vision of the cosmos, extended technological achievements, stimulated creativity, and expanded our vision of humanity. But through my hālau experiences, I came to recognize value in another approach, one that has expanded my understanding of how learning happens, how knowledge is kept deep in our being, and how teacher and student exist in a dynamic of mutual determination.

This is not to say that my hālau experience played out only in the form of positive insights and valuable pedagogical lessons. Frustrations constantly emerged, and ultimately what ended my hālau experience was the core of my haole identity. I was always a cultural other — as one inclined to questioning, solid in my sense of autonomy and overtly self-assertive, as one given to critical reflection with the complement of self-doubt that often accompanies inward focusing. Biting my tongue to avoid asking a clarifying question, wanting to protest perceived inconsistencies, I could feel my face and posture pull into tense attention and distance me. It made me stand out as haughty, arrogant, and overly serious. Even without speaking, my judging self was apparent and perceived as disrespectful, although this was never intended. Clearly, I made others uncomfortable, when all I wanted was to test my own understanding. I could never swim easily in the ambiguity and frequent contradiction that moved us along. Nor could I ever comfortably subsume my identity to the collective identity of the hālau. While my experiences helped to expand and clarify my sense of self, I was never able to abandon my sense of self.
Hālau made me a better learner by opening up new ways of learning for me. It has helped me consider how others might be learning. As an educator, it taught me that if you cannot show it, then you do not really know it. This is the meaning of the ‘ōlelo no’eau, “Hō a’e ka ‘ike he’enalu i ka hokua o ka ‘ale (Show [your] knowledge of surfing on the back of the wave)” (Pukui, 108). Experience, trial and error, failure, and mistakes are one side of this learning coin. The other side is tenacity and self-discipline, patience, responsibility, and care. From a classically Aristotelian perspective, these virtues can become settled dispositions only through persistent practice. Their currency is evidenced in individual confidence and capability—truer measures of self-esteem. These values have diminished in credibility, if not vanished completely, from our current landscape of learning, effaced by our satisfaction with word counts and multiple-choice tests, with assessments, learning outcomes, and rubrics or simply with making it to the end of a semester and accepting a veneer of knowledge that rarely presses students to demonstrate what they can do with the knowledge they have been given. Somehow knowing enough to pass tomorrow’s test is thought to be more substantive than anything that would pass as knowing in hālau—as if swaying hips told the whole story.

I will never “think Hawaiian.” My identity is too strongly embedded in the ways of knowing of my root culture. My default mode is to think like a haole. But what I learned in hālau changed me. It added immensely to the range of what I draw upon as a student, an educator, and a human being. I have a clearer sense of what it means to learn, and I recognize a broader range of dispositions that support learning—dispositions that have strengthened my identity as an educator and helped me to understand better the contexts and purposes of what it is I teach. This in turn has helped me to focus the skills and knowledge I try to convey to my students, and recognize those they bring with them into the classroom.

We live in a culture where information and the ability to access information are easily passed off as knowledge. In hālau, I learned that only when knowledge is understood as something worth caring for, does it becomes a foundation for identity, and only when it becomes a foundation for identity, can it vitalize a culture. What I have learned has vitalized my understanding of cultural differences, expanding it further than anything I imagined when I took my first hula lesson. As I continue learning, I draw hālau lessons into my teaching practice almost daily, looking for places where its values and techniques can guide the learning process for my students, and for me. If I were asked to summarize what my hālau experience taught me, I would say this: It has taught me that knowledge is a gift, which, while it can be given widely, is only learned by those ready to receive it, those who care for it and bring it deeply into their being, with a respect that nurtures it at its roots.
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“I got hooked on science...through the ability of teachers to engage me in science through cultural stuff. Doing natural products research and looking at Native Hawaiian herbs, herbal medicine and exploring microbiology through cultural eyes...it excited me because it validated who I was as a Hawaiian.” (Kalaimeaola, personal narrative)

“Learning to sail a double-hulled canoe as well as learning the art of celestial non-instrument navigation motivated me to learn science. It taught me to observe and to look at a natural system and how it’s related...how they’re connected...how they may be disconnected. Culture has helped ground me in applying contemporary scientific methodology.” (Ku’ulei, personal narrative)

The question of how schools can better meet the educational needs of a diverse population of students has been hotly debated for many years. Since the unveiling of Project 2061 (American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1989), science for all is a concept that has become the cornerstone of curriculum reform efforts. While these efforts are to be commended, there is still much that science educators do not know about “science for all,” especially the science education of populations traditionally underrepresented in the sciences, and chief among these, indigenous peoples.

Over the past several years a body of research focusing on closing the gap between school science and indigenous knowledge has emerged and has provided insights into the attitudes, instructional practices, and curriculum developments that have proven to be successful at inspiring and supporting indigenous students in the sciences (Boyne, 2003; Chinn, 2007; Sing, Hunter, & Meyer, 1999).

As part of my master’s degree in the Department of Educational Foundations in the College of Education, I conducted a pilot project that explored Native Hawaiian science teachers’ influences in pursuit of a science-related career. This project involved three science educators of Native Hawaiian ancestry and sought to understand the supports and barriers they encountered (and continue to encounter), the role of cultural identity and heritage in science and science teaching, and connections they have made between Hawaiian cultural practices and science.

Statistics regarding Native Hawaiian student achievement are staggering. Native Hawaiians made up approximately 23 percent of Hawai’i’s general population and 27.6 percent of all public school students in the state of Hawai’i during the 2007–2008 school year. Seventy-nine percent of public schools that are predominantly Hawaiian (≥ 50 percent of school population) are in some form of corrective action. Despite improvements, standardized test scores of Hawaiian students are the lowest among all major ethnic groups. Their test scores consistently lag behind total Hawai’i Department of Education (HIDOE) averages by at least nine percentiles, and they achieve Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) at a lower rate than schools with fewer than 50 percent Native Hawaiian students. Additionally, these same schools have the highest percentage of teachers with emergency or provisional credentials (25.9 percent in 2005–2006 compared to an overall average 14 percent). Hawaiian students are overrepresented in the special education system, with 14.8 percent of
Hawaiian students classified as requiring special education compared to 8.9 percent of non-Hawaiians. The graduation rate of Hawaiian students has increased since 2002 at the same rate as for the state population overall, but is still among the lowest in the HIDOE, 71.2 percent in 2006 compared to the state average of 78 percent. Hawaiian adolescents have the highest rates of juvenile arrest (40.5 percent of the 1,250 juvenile arrests in 2001), are more likely than their non-Hawaiian counterparts to use drugs (12.6 percent of Hawaiians had used some type of drug by the 6th grade, compared to 8.3 percent statewide), and engage in early sexual activity with 11 percent reporting having sexual intercourse before age thirteen (Kana’iaupuni & Ishibashi, 2003). Needless to say, these are truly rough waters through which our Native Hawaiian students must navigate to be successful.

Research with Native Hawaiian science teachers is contributing to a better understanding of issues relating to equity in science education, and towards improving science curriculum to support Native Hawaiian students as well as support systems for Native Hawaiian students interested in pursuing higher education and science-based careers. Additionally, this research supports the voices of individuals like the participants. In this way, the shared inspirations, influences, and challenges they encountered can inform both the Native Hawaiian and scientific communities.

There were two research questions central to the project:

1. In what way(s) has being Native Hawaiian enabled or diminished your capacity to be a science teacher?

2. In what way(s) has being a science teacher enabled or diminished your capacity to be Native Hawaiian?

It is the belief of some scholars, past and present, that so-called “Western science” and Native Hawaiian culture are separate islands in a tumultuous ocean that few have dared to bridge. This belief raises the following questions: Is the disconnection between these two identities so wide and irreconcilable that Hawaiians interested in becoming science teachers must identify themselves singularly as a Hawaiian or a science teacher? How do Hawaiian science teachers navigate this apparent science teacher/Hawaiian divide? Before exploring the experiences of current Native Hawaiian science teachers, I would like to briefly survey some of the current literature as it pertains to science and Indigenous culture, knowledge, and language. The literature explored here provides an academic framework from which we can think about and analyze differing viewpoints of identity. While this literature is thought-provoking, it lacks the experiential quality that personal narratives from teachers navigating these points-of-view can provide.

**Literature Review**

**Include Indigenous Knowledge in Science Curriculum?**

Until recently, science education materials and programs designed specifically for use with Indigenous peoples were geared specifically towards assimilation into the dominant culture and acceptance of western scientific methods over native cultural beliefs. Recently there has been a paradigmatic shift by some in the scientific, educational, and philosophical community to find a way to bring balance to this curriculum by focusing on the educational strengths of Native Hawaiians and other Indigenous peoples. Articles by and on the subject of Hawaiians and education (Chinn, 2007; Kana’iaupuni, 2005; Meyer, 1998; Sing et al., 1999) concern themselves with Native Hawaiian epistemology and curriculum reorganization. These scholars challenge misconceptions “based on foreign perceptions of reality” (Kana’iaupuni, 2005, p. 32) that non-Hawaiians have of Hawaiians, especially in the sciences. This challenge, and the research that stems from it, is an effort to improve student performance through cultural experiences (Kaholokula, 2003; Meyer, 1998; Michie, 2002) during and after school, the creation of a native teaching force (Au, 1998), the use of strengths-based approaches to education (Kana’iaupuni & Ishibashi, 2003; Simonelli, 1994a), and the creation of Hawaiian
culture-centered schools (Kaholokula, 2003; Meyer, 1998; Simonelli, 1994c).

**Singular Identity**

Various authors have approached the issue of identity from an array of vantage points. The literature on which I will elaborate relates to the construction and basis of arguments presented by researchers who have aligned themselves with the singular identity framework.

Multiculturalists (Brickhouse & Kittleson, 2006; Kawagley & Barnhard, 1998; O’Loughlin, 1992; Siegel, 2002; Simonelli, 1994a; Stanley, & Brickhouse, 2000; Stanley, 1994) have examined science curriculum and apparent disconnections between Western science with other ways of knowing by calling for more of a “world view” within the science textbooks and the curricula they espouse. Stanley and Brickhouse (2000) pose three important questions that multiculturalists seek to answer: “Whose culture are we teaching? Whose knowledge is of most worth? Who benefits and who is harmed by current approaches to curricula?”

Infusionists (Aikenhead, 1997; Boyne, 2003; Corsiglia & Snively, 2000; Michie, 2002; Simonelli, 1994b) have sought to reconcile science education and indigenous knowledge by advocating for the infusion and incorporation of indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing into the current science curriculum. The basis of this argument is, as Kawagely, Norris-Tull & Norris-Tull (1995) note, to challenge methods in the “teaching of science in the United States [that are] dominated with examples of the contributions of European and American scientists (p. 42)” while ignoring the contributions of Indigenous Peoples. Aikenhead (1997) goes on to examine the curricular focus on “think[ing] like a scientist” while acculturating students into the “mechanistic, reductionist, empirical, mathematically idealized, exploitive, impersonal, and elitist” (p. 220) ways of science.

Both Native and Non-Hawaiian Universalists, on the other hand, believe that casting such a wide net over the term ‘science’ can be detrimental to both the so-called “Western” conception of science as well as various forms of Indigenous knowledge. With any challenge to the status quo come questions of appropriateness and feasibility. Debate among Universalists centers around the addition of the word ‘science’ when discussing ways of knowing (i.e. Native Science and Indigenous Science). Both types of science, so-called Western and Indigenous, “consist of a set of explanations which seek to make sense of the natural world” (Baker, 1996, p. 18) and involve prediction, theory formation, experimentation, and explanation. However, Native/Indigenous Universalists view science in its role in the history of subjugation and colonization. Accordingly, there is no such thing as Native science because the word ‘science’ itself is a Western word and a philosophical construct that has no Native meaning.

The Western Universalist viewpoint is characterized by the belief that Indigenous science and Western science are the same as long as the knowledge and methods used to obtain it meet certain ‘scientific’ criteria. Proponents of this view insist there is only one kind of science and that scientific methods can include, but are not reliant upon, processes such as spirit, emotion, and imagination.

**Teachers’ Life Histories**

The subject and core idea of this research project was to learn how Hawaiian science teachers have navigated and reconciled the seemingly incompatible identities of being both a Hawaiian and a science educator. The purpose of talking story with Hawaiian science teachers was not, as Seidman (2006) notes, “to get answers to questions, nor to test hypotheses, and not to ‘evaluate’ as the term is normally used,” but to understand the, “lived experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (p. 9). This is especially true of those people representative of indigenous cultures due to the fact that many indigenous cultures, including ancient Hawaiian culture, passed their knowledge along from generation to generation through an oral tradition. While modern Hawaiians also utilize written language as a method of sharing ideas and knowledge, “oracy…structured silences and other conventions which shape oral traditions remain a most important way of developing trust, sharing information, strategies, advice, contacts, and ideas” (Smith, 2004, pp. 14–15).
Although a wealth of information could have been gained through literature, surveys and quantitative data analysis, none of these methods would have given the rich insights that can be realized through encounters with people who have experienced being a Native Hawaiian science teacher. Merriam (2001) explains that this (qualitative) methodology emphasizes “the way humans experience the world” and “the stories that they tell” (p. 157). Additionally, this framework co-mingles indigenous methodologies as a way to stay true to the nature of the participants and the culture they represent. As clarified by Smith (2004) “the mix reflects the training of indigenous researchers which continues to be within the academy, and the parameters and common sense understandings of research which govern how indigenous communities and researchers define their activities” (p. 143).

Method

Participants

The participants were three individuals of Native Hawaiian ancestry who, at the time of this project, were employed as science educators in the state of Hawai‘i. Two of the teachers teach at the secondary school level; one on O‘ahu and one on Hawai‘i Island. The third is employed by a non-profit organization that focuses on environmental restoration and education efforts on O‘ahu. The participants, Kalaimeaola, Ku‘ulei and Lopaka, represented a spectrum of scientific disciplines and professional experience that ranged from seven to over fifteen years.

- Kalaimeaola is a veteran high school biology teacher at a school on Hawai‘i Island. He grew up in Hawai‘i and attended university in the continental United States. He is pursuing a master’s degree and is involved in a variety of activities including a fellowship in New Zealand, school and district science fairs, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Department of Hawaiian Homelands, and various charter schools on Hawai‘i Island.

- Ku‘ulei considers herself to be more of a native practitioner than a science educator, although she has taught biology through a project-based format for almost ten years. She attended university in Hawai‘i, where she earned her bachelor’s degree and teacher’s certification. She currently works for an environmental education organization that partners elementary and secondary students with researchers from colleges and universities.

- Lopaka teaches biology and physics at a secondary school on O‘ahu. He attended private schools on O‘ahu, graduated from a university in the continental United States and returned to earn his graduate degree at a university in Hawai‘i. He spent time in the Peace Corps, is a member of a local science teacher’s organization, and helps run a summer program for high school students, which focuses on the ahupua‘a system of land management and conservation. Lopaka is also very light-skinned, a factor that affects how other Native Hawaiians perceive his Hawaiian-ness.

Qualitative Methodology

The subject and core idea of this research project was to learn how Hawaiian science teachers have navigated and reconciled the identities of being both Hawaiian and a science teacher. To facilitate this, life histories and personal narratives were collected through interviews as well as follow-up phone calls and e-mails. Each narrative was collected during three one-hour semi-structured interviews. The first interview focused on life context and history and included questions about parents, community, neighbors, home life, cultural upbringing, (e.g., food and language), childhood, schooling, movement, and early employment. The second interview, focused primarily on areas of expertise and schools and organizations they are presently involved with, addressed the question “how and why did you decide to...” as it relates to their professional lives, and explored details of their experiences in professional life. The third interview allowed us to reflect and make meaning together from personal and professional experiences.

Research Plan

The research plan for this project focused data collection around the following themes:
Identity: Cultural identities; specifically ethnic and professional identity. This included their views of their own cultural identities, familial and educational influences on identities, as well as influences on the development of their professional identity as a scientist/science teacher; the significance of cultural and professional identities and their relevance both in and out of the classroom; and changes in teachers’ views of cultural and professional identity were also explored.

Supports/Barriers: The role of family as both a support and a barrier in terms of their cultural identity and emergent professional identity. This discussion included family educational history as well as experiences with bias based on socio-economic status, ethnicity, skin color, and gender. The role of self-esteem was also dealt with as participants shared experiences related to their pursuit of higher education in science, college experiences, positive and negative occurrences related to being Hawaiian and a science teacher, and how their professional identity has developed and evolved.

Connections: Information was collected on how each teacher has reconciled their personal and professional identities. This included programs that they each support, experiences with their families and colleagues, and the incorporation of Hawaiian culture into the science classroom and/or making the science curriculum a cultural experience. Changes in teachers’ attitudes regarding Hawaiian culture and science were discussed including concerns regarding scientism, Hawaiian sovereignty, Hawaiian identity, and constructivist approaches to both science and “Hawaiiana” curricula.

Overview of Research Findings

Plural Identity

The primary theme that arose through this project concerned the pluralistic identity that the participants formed as a result of their experiences. As discussed previously, many researchers utilize a singular identity model for the construction of their arguments for infusion, integration, and multiculturalism. Proponents of these models assume that individuals identify themselves by a single characteristic, their culture. Scientism, on the other hand, makes the same assumption albeit from a different epistemological base. Scientism and its supporters see science as being acultural. To be a scientist (or a science teacher in our case) a person must ignore their cultural identity in favor of their science teacher identity. All three participants contradict both the culturalistic and the scientistic models and see both their Hawaiian and scientist identities as crucial to who they are. All of them, therefore, exist within a plural identity model.

All three subjects in this study readily identified themselves as being Hawaiian, see “being Hawaiian” as an important part of who they are, and value their culture as a guide to beliefs and actions. However, they do not see “being Hawaiian” as the sole facet of their being or as the singular defining identity of their lives. In the same vein, two of the three participants identify themselves as science teachers, but they do not view this as the sole defining characteristic of their being. Instead, the participants see the salience of their science teacher and Hawaiian identities as being malleable and adjustable depending upon their situation. The navigation of these identities could be imagined segments of a multi-segmented/colored/cultural mirror. Whereas looking into a standard mirror gives a single reflection (identity), looking into a multi-segmented/colored/cultural mirror or mosaic generates many different colors, angles, and reflections (identities). The separated-yet-interconnected nature of this mosaic is representative of their overall identity and is made up of and supported by a variety of personal, professional, and cultural identities.

Naturally, the degree of importance and salience that participants place on their Hawaiian identity varies and has developed over the course of their lives and individual experiences. For example, Lopaka’s Hawaiian identity may be a smaller segment of his total identity compared with the other participants, Kalamaeola and Ku’ulei. Lopaka identifies, empathizes, and works to encourage Native
Hawaiian students to go into science. However, his Hawaiian experience varied greatly from that of the other participants. He has had to navigate several discouraging challenges from the Hawaiian community based on his very light skin color, his level of education, and his decision to pursue a science-related career. On the other hand, I would argue that Kuʻulei and Kalaimenoa do not have a Hawaiian mirror segment. Instead, they are looking into a Hawaiian mirror, where “being Hawaiian” is one of their most salient identities, with different segments reflecting various Hawaiian identities. As individuals who see “being Hawaiian” as a foundation of their lives, we must recognize that they see, act, and live within a Hawaiian mindset and are “Hawaiians doing things.”

Although the mirror analogy provides a visual representation of different identities, it is not completely accurate. The Hawaiian and science teacher identities are very important to each of the participants. However each stressed the changeable nature of these two identities and the need to navigate through, between, and around them at separate times in each of their lives based on their backgrounds, associations, and social activities. What each of the participants has had to decide as they have navigated through their lives is whether a particular identity is, or is not, important to them, by how much, and when.

In all cases, the participants have placed value on both the identities of being Hawaiian and a science teacher. However, the relative salience of a particular identity depends upon the context. This is not to say that in particular situations participants stop being science teachers or stop being Hawaiian, instead they project which identity they wish to emphasize in a particular situation. This process, as understood by the participants, is both conscious and unconscious and is reflective of the individual situations in which they find themselves as well as their cumulative life experiences.

Are these identities different? All of the participants agreed that they are. Do these identities conflict with each other? Kalaimenoa and Kuʻulei would say yes in respect to the way that knowledge is passed to students. Kalaimenoa and Lopaka would agree that they also conflict in terms of time management. Since there are only twenty-four hours in a day, they expressed frustration that they sometimes have to choose which organizations (Hawaiian or science) to support with their time and effort. Even more interesting is that all of the participants see each of these two identities enhancing and supporting each other. For Kalaimenoa, Kuʻulei, and Lopaka, their Hawaiian identity is an important one. However, all of the participants recognize that navigating the turbulent ocean of life using one lens does not diminish or negate the value of the lenses of their other identities. In fact, all of the participants felt that their Hawaiian identity enhances their other identities and their ability to make decisions relating to social, political, personal, and professional matters.

Facilitations and Impediments

A second theme connecting the three participants relates to the encouragement they received, and in some cases continue to receive, and impediments they have encountered in their journey to become science teachers. Kalaimenoa was fortunate to have been encouraged to pursue his interests in science, but has encountered some discouragement from colleagues when it comes to his integration of Hawaiian culture into his science curriculum. Kuʻulei and Lopaka’s challenges, on the other hand, went to the very heart of who they are and their interests. Kuʻulei’s was discouraged from pursuing her interests by her academic advisors in both high school and college because she is Hawaiian and a woman. This is especially disturbing because academic advisors are people who should be encouraging students to pursue careers based on their strengths and interests. Lopaka, on the other hand, was challenged as a youth, not because of his interest in science but because of his light skin color and the pre-existing belief of what Hawaiians are supposed to look like. This challenge has remained an issue for both Lopaka and his wife ever since their return to Hawaiʻi when they reestablished old friendships and as Lopaka continues to encourage more Native Hawaiians to go into science and technology fields.

In contrast to these impediments are the positive impacts and the support that all the participants
have received. Kalaimeaola has sought to incorporate Hawaiian culture into the science curriculum at his school. As a result, his students not only gain an academic understanding of science and the universe around them, they also leave with a better understanding of themselves. Ku’ulei has worked tirelessly with friends, colleagues, and family members to form an educational group that manages and protects an ancient Hawaiian fishpond. Work on the pond not only helps to preserve Ku’ulei’s culture, it also enables her to practice ancient and modern environmental and scientific techniques with students of all ages. Lopaka remarked how he has turned his negative experiences into a positive one for future generations. He now works during the summers with a program that teaches Native Hawaiian students various scientific techniques to preserve the environment. His participation comes from a desire to support Hawaiian students of all backgrounds and colors.

Connecting Hawaiian and Science Teacher Identities

None of the participants see themselves as either solely Hawaiian or solely as science teachers; instead they see themselves as Hawaiians who are also science teachers (or science teachers who are also Hawaiian). In the framework of these two identities, all of the participants cited the need to identify the importance of Native Hawaiian culture as it relates to scientific methods, theories, and practices. They discussed the challenges they have faced personally as well as the challenges that have faced and continue to face as Native Hawaiians looking for legitimacy within the scientific community.

Lopaka, for example, uses his status as a Native Hawaiian to educate members of the scientific community on issues that are important to him. He also views his Hawaiian identity as a form of leverage giving him additional credibility with students, other scientists, and politicians. Additionally, Ku’ulei leverages Hawaiian culture and identity and encourages her students to take an active role in the restoration and maintenance of ancient Hawaiian fishponds. She helps students relate Hawaiian language, traditions, beliefs, and practices to scientific applications such as salinity, pH, alkalinity, and dissolved oxygen/nitrogen. Kalaimeaola also utilizes traditions of both the past and present to connect students’ cultural identity to the scientific world to see that the two go hand-in-hand. These have included lessons dealing with astronomy and chemistry as well as anatomy and physiology.

While all three participants connect their Hawaiian identity to a variety of scientific disciplines in different ways, they are all in agreement on one issue. Hawaiians were excellent scientists before Western contact, as shown by their abilities and practices that are only now being (re)discovered by others around the world. This scientific ability, according to the participants, is evidenced by their use of observation, theory development, and hypothesis testing in agriculture, and also in their construction of fishponds, crop rotation, and the establishment of the ahupua’a system. These techniques enabled ancient Hawaiians to survive and thrive in an isolated place for centuries.

Educational Contributions of Research

In the past, efforts to improve the quality of education for the majority of Native Hawaiian youth has been hampered by identity disregard—“ignoring, or neglecting altogether, the influence of any sense of identity with others, on what we value and how we behave” (Sen, 2006, p. 20). Additionally, multiculturalist and infusionist scholars, while their intentions have been good, have gotten caught up in a singular affiliation framework, “which takes the form of assuming that any person preeminently belongs, for all practical purposes, to one collectivity only” (ibid).

Researchers, scientists, and members of the Native Hawaiian community see being Native Hawaiian and a science teacher as contrasting identities, while the participants do not. The participants in this project see being a Hawaiian as a means to support and enhance their science teaching, allowing them to form better connections with their students in and out of the classroom. The non-contrasting identity attitude that the participants have regarding their culture and profession counters the assumption that scholars have
made that a person can be defined strictly by a single identity, and that this identity is static regardless of the situation. In recent years, the concepts of both singular affiliation and identity disregard have become prominent for various reasons on the local and national educational stages. Locally, singular affiliation has aided in the establishment of Hawaiian language immersion schools throughout Hawai’i. Much of the impetus for the creation of these types of schools came about from the renaissance of ancient Hawaiian traditions, the growth and determination to increase the number of Hawaiian language speakers, and desire for self-determination from the Hawaiian community.

However, the standards-based movement, as noted by Forbes (2000), threatens to re-marginalize groups of people through its complete disregard for cultural identities “in spite of strong pressures in the direction of multiculturalism, globalism, and interethnic understanding and reconciliation” (p. 1). Ever since 49 of the 50 states adopted “standards” to gauge levels of learning, teacher and students have been rewarded or punished based on standardized test scores. Such tests are created, distributed, and ranked nationally. Therefore these tests “have to be the same in Mississippi as in Hawai’i or Alaska, states with vastly different cultural traditions and social values” (p. 3). This “top-down” approach to education taken by the standards movement as well as the multiculturalists and infusionists ignores the needs, efforts, and experiences of the native (Hawaiian) science teacher and student.

In order to “hook” more students into science and science education, science teachers need to re-examine the current science curriculum with an eye for developing those aspects of the curriculum that can act as catalysts for Hawaiian students to become interested in science. Using key aspects of Hawaiian culture in the classroom can enhance learning for both native and non-native students and show value in the knowledge generated and passed along for thousands of years. The Native Hawaiian community also needs to look inward and discuss what it has done and what it will do to encourage students to pursue careers in science. While the scientific community needs to develop and appreciate the value in Hawaiian knowledge, the Hawaiian community must also find value in scientific knowledge including the acknowledgement that ancient Hawaiians did science, even though they may not have had a word that corresponds to “science.” The Hawaiian community must also take an active role in the field of education. Specifically, Hawaiian students should be encouraged to become teachers (both formal and informal) in all subject areas. Listening to the voices of Native Hawaiians pursuing undergraduate and graduate science degrees as well as those who have made careers in science-related fields will be an important step in this process.

The educational community needs to actively encourage Native Hawaiians to think and see themselves as scientists and science teachers within the local, state, national, and international communities. This can be accomplished formally through various means. First, interested persons can be trained through programs within college/university colleges of education as well as the HIDOE. Second, college outreach programs can target middle and high school students to create and encourage interest in teaching. Third, students majoring in Hawaiian language/cultural studies should be encouraged to pursue teaching degrees as well. On a less formal level, classroom teachers can invite and welcome kupuna from the Hawaiian community to help teach students in and out of the classroom. The formal inclusion of Hawaiian culture as well as informal inclusion of the community in the classroom can help students connect information that is learned in the classroom to their own realities outside of the classroom. In this way, members of the Hawaiian, educational, and scientific communities can all help today’s students and tomorrow’s scientists to navigate the rough waters that surround the multiple dimensions of their identity.
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ENDNOTES

1 This pilot project was later expanded in to a dissertation project within the same department ten individuals of Native Hawaiian ancestry employed or involved in various STEM-related careers.

2 The term “Native Hawaiian science teachers” refers to science teachers who are of Native Hawaiian ancestry as opposed to teachers of Native Hawaiian science.

3 In an effort to maintain anonymity, each participant chose a pseudonym for this project.
Keeping a Journal: A Path to Uncovering Identity (and keeping your sanity)

Joanne E. Cooper

When I was a graduate student, I kept a journal in which I wrote about my desire to be more organized (from Cooper, J. (1991) Telling Our Own Stories, p.96):

Five bananas rot on top of the cookie jar. I realize I have two choices—make banana bread or write…my body is shot, my children feel neglected, the food in my kitchen is rotting and my partner has moved on to God and a new wife…right now I wish my God (or my wife) knew how to make banana bread. No such luck.

Understanding who we are is crucial to the development of the self. Parker Palmer (2004) claims that one of our most important tasks is connecting who we are with what we do. Writing in the journal can help us understand both who we are and what we are doing with our lives. This task is even more complex because, as we write, things change. This is a compelling reason to write regularly…in order to keep up with changing events. As Barbara, a former university president put it, “When I want to know what I really think, I write in my journal…It is an evolving me; it is an organic process; it is discovery work. Writing in my journal changes me. I am growing and evolving as I write” (Stevens & Cooper, 2009, p. 37). Thus, journal keeping not only helps you to get in touch with who you are, but helps you to track your evolving identity.

Journal Keeping and Identity

The central question for most journal keepers is, “Who am I?” We write to discover who we are or at the very least, what we think. Most writers report a sense of discovery and surprise when they write. “Oh! That’s what I think! I didn’t realize that.” Journal keeping is a way to read your own thoughts, to mine them for understanding. Peter Elbow (1998) says people wouldn’t keep writing if it weren’t for the surprises. Writing in a journal keeps us going and adds to our understanding of who we are.

Understanding who we are is crucial to the development of the self. Parker Palmer (2004) claims that one of our most important tasks is connecting who we are with what we do. Writing in the journal can help us understand both who we are and what we are doing with our lives. This task is even more complex because, as we write, things change. This is a compelling reason to write regularly…in order to keep up with changing events. As Barbara, a former university president put it, “When I want to know what I really think, I write in my journal…It is an evolving me; it is an organic process; it is discovery work. Writing in my journal changes me. I am growing and evolving as I write” (Stevens & Cooper, 2009, p. 37). Thus, journal keeping not only helps you to get in touch with who you are, but helps you to track your evolving identity.

The understanding of your evolving identity helps you to make more informed decisions about your life. Journal writing cannot make your problems magically disappear, but it does heighten your awareness of those problems and helps you to find a way to grapple with them. Writing about your problems gives you perspective on those problems and helps you to reframe them in more positive ways. Jeffrey Berman asserts, “…by changing our stories of ourselves, we change our lives” (1994, p. 40).
Benefits and Uses

Getting Organized

While I have kept a personal journal for over thirty years (Okay, I’m an addicted journal keeper, I admit it.), I have found that a professional journal is quite different and keeps me much more organized. My professional journal goes with me to all the meetings I have attended as a faculty member, as well as the year I served as Associate Dean of the College. It holds the notes to all the meetings I attend, states the dates of those meetings, who is in attendance and what is decided. It also holds lists of all the phone calls I receive and check marks after I have returned the calls. It contains musings on the contents of the meetings and on the business of our department. It is a place to hold new ideas that pop into my head while I am in those meetings, whether the ideas are related to that particular meeting or not. It holds plane schedules, class schedules, notes from my meetings with advisees and what was decided. In other words, it holds my sanity in a crazy world that often feels like it is spinning out of control.

Before I kept a professional journal, I used to spend frantic minutes right before a meeting looking for the folder that held that particular committee’s notes. Now I just blissfully pick up my ever handy journal and waltz out the door, confident in my ability to answer any questions about what the heck we did last time the committee met. I’ve got it all in my trusty notebook...probably more than the committee members want to know.

Finding Your Identity and Sense of Belonging

Another advantage of writing in a professional journal is that it provides an emerging portrait of who you are as an educator. Richard, a doctoral student, stated it clearly in our book on journal keeping (see Stevens and Cooper, 2009) when he described how he wrote every day at noon during his lunch and then, when funding opportunities came up, he was ready with a beautiful collection of ideas gleaned from his journal musings. An image of his emerging professional self was right there on the pages. Richard wrote that he first started the journal because he didn’t feel as if he belonged in a doctoral program. Everyone seemed smarter and cleverer. But regularly writing his thoughts in his journal helped him to see, over time, how his confidence and sense of belonging grew.

Stephen Brookfield (1995) has described the sense of inadequacy as the imposter syndrome, stating that everyone has it—doctoral students, faculty, and even famous academics like Brookfield. We all feel a little like we don’t belong, and he believes that this is normal. The journal can be a way to write yourself into greater clarity about such anxieties.

Writing journals has been described as a way of reading your own mind. It is a way to make concrete the ideas that often float in your head without ever being written down. Journals are especially useful for students who are studying a particular profession and feel the need to connect with that discipline and their future professional community.

For example, outdoor educators Dyment and O’Connell (2003) have described seven types of entries they want to see in their students’ journals. They include personal reflections and self-discovery, group dynamics, professional development, sense of place/connection to place, transfer of academic theory to field course, transfer of field course to academic theory, and factual information. In truth, almost all of these types of entries will contribute to a growing sense of identity and of belonging to a particular academic community or discipline. These seven will help you to get started as a novice journal keeper who wants to use the journal to clarify who they are and just what they are doing in their chosen profession—questions, I think, we all grapple with.

Techniques

Some basic techniques will help you get started on your journey. One of the most powerful is freewriting. The only rule in freewriting is that the pen hits the page, produces words, and does not stop for a set period of, say, five to ten minutes for beginners (Stevens & Cooper, 2009). You need not worry about punctuation or spelling, your central task is to see what emerges. You do not even have to stick to the same topic—this is the place to see where your writing takes you. That is part of the discovery process I mentioned earlier. This process is most effective
if it is private (few want to share their raw words off the page); but freewriting can help you discover what’s on your mind and what your concerns are, and it often enables solutions to emerge as you write. Some people think this is just “writing garbage,” but the process is like cultivating fertile soil that can yield positive results if you keep it up. As William Stafford, the poet laureate of Oregon, states, “A writer is not so much someone who has something to say as he is someone who has found a process that will bring about new things he would not have thought of if he had not started to say them” (Stafford, 1964, pp. 14–15).

Another powerful technique is dialogue. Dialogue is a “conversation” between people, parts, ideas or things (Rainer, 1978, p. 103). You can write a dialogue with yourself, with your boss, with your colleagues, your family, etc. These dialogues are private. There is no requirement to share them with anyone unless you want to. They are a way for you to distance yourself from others and write out an imaginary conversation with them. They help provide fresh perspectives on situations or people and allow you to mine your innate wisdom about issues. Dialogues allow you to speak, but also to listen to one another, to see another’s point of view simply by writing out their part in the dialogue. You can also write dialogues with inanimate objects, such as a dialogue with your thesis or dissertation or with a particular project you are working on. Your project may yield valuable advice for you, which can be uncovered through dialogue.

Another important journal technique is metaphor. Metaphor describes one thing by comparing it to something else (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Metaphors tap our holistic sense of a person or situation and help us to see issues, people, or work from a fresh perspective. They draw on your intuitive knowledge of what is going on. Metaphors can be created over time to get a sense of how things are changing. As we say in our book on journal keeping, “Metaphor is the back door into deeper understanding...and a way to understand the self through the extension of ideas in new directions (Stevens & Cooper, 2009, p. 97).

**Drawbacks**

The biggest drawback to journal writing may be time. Many people say, “Yeah, it sounds great but I don’t have the time.” But there are some tricks to squeezing time out of your busy days. You could write, as Richard does, during your lunch hour. You could write during meetings, during lulls in the conversation, or only when someone makes an important point. Having your journal handy often helps you to find those moments when you have time to write.

You can also make a ritual out of it. I get up early in the morning before everyone else and write in the quiet of dawn. It is soothing and centers me for the day. Or you can write just before you go to bed, reflecting on the day you’ve just had. Journal keeping takes time, but it also saves time. You are more efficient when you know what happened in the last meeting, who was assigned to which tasks, etc. You can also create to-do lists during the meeting as issues emerge. Then you are ready for the work ahead.

Another possible drawback is the issue of privacy. Each person needs to work out their own system for feeling safe. I know one woman who kept all her old journals in a safe deposit box in the bank. Others find a secluded spot to keep their current journal where people are unlikely to find it. If you carry your journal with you all day, you are less likely to worry about this.

Closely related to this is the need for solitude. Hal Bennett (1995, p. 41) states, “However we define it, however we get it, we need solitude.” If you are to turn your mind inward, you need to eliminate distractions that might pull you back to the outer world. You need room to reflect, to dream, to find the surprises in what you have to say. Solitude can nurture us. Finding it can be tricky, however. Some people discover, to their dismay, that they have no solitude in their lives. Try to think back to a time when you had even a fleeting moment of solitude, such as the time when you were running alone on a dirt road. If you have no such recollections, you can dream about a place of solitude you might want in the future — a room of one’s own, as Virginia Woolf put it. It doesn’t have to be a cabin in the woods or a café in Paris, think
about your own life and where you find the most solitude. It might be in the bathtub or in the garden. These moments nourish your soul and help you to be clearer about who you are and where you are going.

**Conclusion**

In whatever way you decide to keep a journal, the process will help you to carve out what Lewis Thomas, a famous biologist and essayist, describes as “. . . your indisputably, singular, unique self.” (1995, p. 130). This self is precious and needs to be cherished. Journal keeping can help you both to understand and to nourish your unique self. Your task is to shape and discover ideas about your relationship to your work, your world, yourself, and your loved ones. Journal keeping provides a rich tool box of ideas for you to ponder. As one journal keeper stated, “My brain is like a treasure chest filled with gold and silver and the way to get it is by unlocking the lock. The key to opening the chest is the journal” (Stevens & Cooper, 2009, p.33).
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Patriotic Acts: Five Activities for Identity Building

Maya Soetoro-Ng

Abstract: Building a personal identity is a lifelong, thoughtful process that takes into account not only one’s race and ethnicity, but also life experiences, relationships, and communities. The process of exploring and evolving one’s identity deserves a place in the classroom. Educators can play a key role in supporting their students’ in this process by teaching lessons that enhance the skills that are crucial to this process, such as critical thinking, perspective shifting, and reflection.

In these pages, I will suggest a few strategies that I have used with my students to encourage the process of identity building and teach the importance of valuing one’s own, unique identity. Many (though not all) of these strategies consider layered, multifaceted identity as something that can be instructive for all children, regardless of whether students are mixed or multicultural. This is because multiracial, multiethnic, or multinational experiences can offer an interesting entry point to understanding and can help us to challenge the notion that identity, in general, is unbendable or unmovable.

When expressing the reasons I love my country, the United States, I often cite my belief that we have so many choices here. I consider our choice to become anything and build something from near-nothing to be the essential underpinning of the “American Dream.” I believe that part of what we choose is our identity and that we name ourselves and revise this chosen identity many times over the course of a lifetime. This process of choosing identity involves both peril and delight. It is something that is educative and that requires critical thinking, reflection, expression, and feeling. I believe that all students should feel the freedom to name themselves, regardless of their ethnic or racial identities; but identity building is not something that teachers often teach. I would like to see more teachers, especially in the Humanities, use activities that explore complex identity formation. In these few pages, I will suggest a few strategies that I have used with my students.

The Back Story

In New York City in the 1990s I spoke Spanish often and danced to salsa, merengue, and bachata. I looked Latina and most people assumed I was Boriqua or Chicana. I thought about my mother, who lived in Indonesia and elsewhere in Asia and loved the people and cultures so passionately. I thought about her urging me to make use of my mixedness, to be a bridge between worlds. She envied me for being able to so fully straddle the two worlds in ways she could not. When I moved back to Hawai‘i from New York in the year 2000, I found myself claiming my Asian-ness anew. I was geographically nearer to Asia and had been hungry for it because I hadn’t journeyed there since my mother’s passing in 1995. Upon my return, I claimed my Indonesian heritage because I needed to do so in order to feel recentered and whole. This felt like a natural transition and wasn’t jarring to me, but I saw that much of the world around me viewed identity as something unmovable, unchanging, and bounded. The perception was (and is) that we don’t ‘decide’ who we are; we are given our identities.

I became a champion for mixed or hybrid views of identity, feeling that complex constructions of identity would help people to understand that we should have the freedom to choose between ascribed worlds. Some people misinterpreted this as a privileging of mixed blood individuals, but that’s not how I felt or feel.
believe that regardless of individuals’ blood and inheritance, everyone ought to have the power to name themselves based on multiple identifiers—career, race, philosophy, ethnicity, politics, aesthetic preference, faith, sexual orientation, and so on. Instead I still find people who are threatened by the idea of being able to approach the buffet of what we are given and choose different dishes depending upon our immediate needs, circumstances, or surroundings. Choosing identities looks like code-switching, like when we switch from vernacular to academic language when we change environments, but just as often means a more stable view of oneself that might endure for years. Regardless, arguing the presence of choice has too often meant that one risks being viewed as insincere or confused: “He doesn’t know who he is!” the accuser might say, or the argument might be made that the choice is not real or possible, and that the pretense of it emerges merely from fear of prejudice or a desire to manipulate in situations of affirmative action.

The New York Times (Saulny & Steinberg 2011) describes the perception that many multiracial students who are filling in college applications are participating in a kind of gamesmanship, where an applicant’s racial identification can increase chances of admission. At her magnet school in Maryland, Natasha Scott, a student who posted about applying as Asian or black on the website College Confidential, typically identified as both races. On her applications, however, she ultimately chose to mark only one box: black. “I think that when you’re a stressed out high school senior, you’ll do anything that’s legal to get into college,” said Ms. Scott, 16, who will be attending the University of Virginia. “I must admit that I felt a little guilty only putting black because I was purposely denying a part of myself in order to look like a more appealing college candidate.” She continued, “In any case, I think it’s up to the individual” (Saulny & Steinberg, 2011).

To be sure, racial or ethnic self-identification might sometimes involve matters of expedience, but the circumstances when this would be so are few. More often a choice is made because of a profound need to belong—to have a community or discover one’s voice. The perception that race, or ethnicity, are things we adopt or discard lightly even when we are mixed is erroneous and simplistic. And yet this perception prevails and is one of the reasons people are so reluctant to give others, especially those who are not multiracial, the right to choose or name their own identities.

When my brother Barack Obama ran for president, internet and blog comments argued that he was acting too black (when he was speaking from the pulpit of a historically black church, say); others like Cornell West (Hedges, 2011) and even people on the opposite side of the political spectrum, like Herman Cain, implied that he wasn’t black enough (Mataconis, 2011).

I watched as my brother was occasionally lambasted for choosing to identify as a black man, a signal to many that he was denying or hiding his European heritage for political gain. Americans debated his Blackness and in some instances wanted him to call himself multiracial or biracial. Few defended his right to name himself as their principle argument, though there were some who identified with his choice.

In an article in Huffington Post (Washington, 2008) US Representative G. K. Butterfield stated that for the president to choose anything else would have been ridiculous. “Let’s just say he decided to be white... people would have laughed at him” (Washington, 2008). Still others suggested that his whiteness was the only thing that made him politically viable, implying that his ability to accommodate white mainstream expectations and standards are what make his candidacy legitimate (Coates, 2007).

Some of the banter and controversy was merely entertaining, but occasionally, the vitriol on both sides left no doubt in me that our national love of ‘freedom’ did not extend to the freedom to name oneself. The need to box and label identities also applied to my brother’s localness here in Hawai’i. I find this view unfortunate and narrow. Why shouldn’t we want our children to weave comfortably in and out of worlds? Will we ever as a nation fully embrace the unique American beauty having so many more identity choices than others with less complex immigration histories? If we do embrace this idea, then our public schools should be places where students can safely tell the story of their identity as it has evolved.
up to the present, thus paving the way for future explorations of self.

A classroom that pays attention to identity will therefore make room for critical dialogue between different points of view. It will be organized on the assumption that a ‘good’ education is one that might liberate the student from being bound to a single world view or an unexamined world view. It will also assume that a good education will lead to the creation of a more inclusive international understanding and more rigorous multiculturalism. It would invite students of all kinds to find self-empowerment through constructing meaning in their lives and becoming participants in their own identity formation. It must make room for reform, argument, revision, undulations, moderations, and compromises in identity and culture.

The following activities have been designed for use with late elementary students as well as secondary history and English classes. They allow us to critically evaluate, while retaining pride in, our traditions. They use dialogue, reflection, and creative expression to help students grapple with issues of identity. They view history and current events from multiple perspectives so as not to draw circles too-tightly around identity, and rigidly separating ‘us’ from ‘them.’ The activities encourage flexible thinking and meaning making and can be adapted for many different classrooms and subjects.

I: The Focused Autobiography

One activity that allows students to look safely at identity is the language autobiography. Language autobiographies invite students to look at their individual and familial histories through language, broadly defined as any system of communication that has a separate set of rules known only to speakers or insiders. Students can explore Tagalog or Hawaiian, but they can also consider Pidgin, the language of formal education, the language of intimacy, or the language of hip hop. Students create exhibit pieces that are displayed in the classroom “language museum.” In terms of thematic categories, I ask students to explore their early experiences with language, linguistic diversity and code-switching, students’ success with language, students’ views on dialect, colloquial language, creoles, and pidgins and, finally, the student’s perspective on the adequacy of language for meaningful communication. Students may choose to explore these themes in any way they wish (through poem, journal entry, painting, letter, collage, short story, skit, or mnemonic).

The language autobiography and similar activities assume that the naming of the self is a fundamental democratic right that can help students to understand that language and other manifestations/expressions of culture aren’t static and that identity is dynamic, ever changing, and fluid. My students spend some time thinking about other kinds of autobiographies and explore themselves as learners, community members, and more. Students see changes in their own identities and in their relationships and, as a consequence, are prepared to craft statements of culture. They define their personal culture and reflect on what they find to be valuable about tradition and cultural preservation as well as cultural change or evolution. They reflect on cultural and linguistic survival. They debate the question of whether culture is ascribed or acquired (through our interactions, decisions, and geography). Students think about whether individual autonomy is important in defining one’s culture. As a result of these autobiographical activities, students deeply question why identity matters and become better equipped to make identity a useful and fortifying concept.

II. The Modified Debate

Students are often asked to debate, but traditional classroom debates often don’t allow for shifting or multifaceted perspectives. Even small adjustments in preparation and process make a traditional debate much more meaningful and productive as a means for empathetic reflection and multifaceted perspective building. A teacher can ask students to fully prepare for both sides of the topic; the student is told on which side they will argue and who their partner is on the day of the debates, only fifteen minutes before debating. This leads to greater ownership of a wide variety of ideas and students are prepped for more empathy and less narrowness. The next stage involves
having students, after the first round of debates, assume the position of the opponent with as much vigor and passion as when arguing their original positions. Finally, students could write position and opinion papers that require that they address both or many sides of the controversy in developing their own opinions. Thus, students not only deepen their understandings of the issues but also articulate their identities and position vis-à-vis these subjects. They have to mine their own interiors and take the intellectual risk of moving flexibly from one side to another. In doing so, they are building a more complex identity.

The modified debate is much like Structured Academic Controversy, a nationally known method of teaching controversial perspectives and topics that leads to an increase in discussions and inquiry. The process is not structured in terms of simply pro or con, but assumes in addition that the class, or indeed any group, will be able to negotiate a consensus by first understanding each position more thoroughly. Any period of history is viewed from many vantage points in an effort to synchronize and mediate between opposing sides and faraway unknowns. The intended outcome of this process is that students begin to understand and enjoy greater complexity of cultural understanding.

A related way to increase intellectual flexibility is through what Peter Elbow, in his book Writing Without Teachers (1973) calls the “believing” and “doubting” games. These are methods of approaching texts and ideas that require that the student first doubt or approach a text “critically,” to look for errors and contradictions and to deconstruct and challenge ideas with hard-headed, scientific skepticism. Elbow believes that the truer it seems, the harder you have to doubt it and work to deconstruct it. By playing the “doubting game,” students can come to appreciate their own opinions, assumptions, and inherited positions by reacting against those of another. Then comes the “believing game” wherein the student projects herself into a writer’s point of view in order to intentionally and vigorously believe, defend, and uphold everything. The game does not involve accepting or adopting the position taken but rather understanding why an individual comes to the beliefs she or he is expounding and exactly what those beliefs are. It involves reflecting too on the what and the why of a student’s own beliefs to make room for a collaborative and tentative formulation of new ideas and approaches. Students repeatedly shift their understandings of self and other. Finally, students can do what I call the ‘sharing game’ where they endeavor to climb and combine multiple vantage points in an effort to develop a more panoramic vision and complete understanding of any truth.

III. Media Matters

In high school I used to have to memorize current events stories every week and fill in the blanks on a weekly quiz conducted in the auditorium. No controversy or alternate opinion would be presented. There was never more than one right answer.

I believe that teachers should never shy away from controversial current events, and there is no reason in this day that we should teach and learn current events from a single source. Instead, we can look at English language newspapers from all over the world and learn so much from simply observing the differences in story placement from place to place, or reflecting on the reasons for changes in tone and emotional timbre. Students can examine what is emphasized or deemphasized and learn not only journalistic standards and language but also re-conceive and complicate the truth.

Students can take a local or national news story and change the narrative voice to imagine and honor the perspectives of people from other countries and cultures. They can research other people’s views and change the beginnings and endings of a story, writing in the voice of someone from a country or place we don’t understand very well. Even domestically, we have media that report very different points of view. We are called on as citizens to evaluate our own and other media in a way that accommodates multiple visions and merges narratives. In this way, students are given opportunities to move away from simplistic understandings of world events and to relocate and rename themselves in a more complex socio-political world.
IV. Banyan Tree Oral Histories

I use the phrase “Banyan Tree Oral History” to describe any oral history and identity research activities that push students to examine multiple entanglements. Students learn how to create case studies and community-based research in order to engage with their families, one another, the past, and home. Banyans are great for climbing, and the roots of the banyan are complicated. It’s hard to tell the difference between endings and beginnings. Student oral history projects bring in history from many places and follow it in many directions. Identity formation is ongoing. These projects contain interviews, pictures, art, analysis, and reflection. Students can examine websites like Tell Me Your Stories and Eye Witness History and teacher resources from the Library of Congress website in order to get a sense of what is possible in their own communities as well as what is available in terms of stories, documents, and other first person sources that can help us to make history come alive.

In “Banyan Tree Oral History,” students create case studies, learning what makes a subject too broad or narrow, interesting or dull. Students learn to ask questions that are open-ended and layered, and they present partial results for future development. They learn to recognize gaps in their own understandings and discuss possible avenues for future exploration. Oral histories include equal parts information and evaluation, so students think about their identities as situated in the case studies or oral histories. By identifying why a subject matters and why and how a subject can be viewed as representative of larger patterns and concerns, students learn to connect with the subject matter and feel empowered to research and write about individual, community, and identity.

V. Layered Voices

I often use one particular section of the Facing History and Ourselves (Strom, 1994) textbook. This section includes an excerpt from author Julius Lester, who writes about discovering his voice in Haiku while browsing in a Tennessee bookstore in the fifties. He was a teen, moved by the honesty and strength of the poetry and in need of inspiration, but he questioned his right to claim a voice and style coming from seventeenth-century Japan. He almost returned the book to its shelf but then regarded doing so as an act of ‘self-betrayal,’ so he bought the book and began writing haiku and that opened up multiple pathways for him.

I use this passage to remind students that, while it is important to know from whence we came and where we currently reside, we must make room for the layers and passions that cross our paths in unexpected junctures and around unpredicted turns. We shouldn’t be too quick to decide who we will become, even though we name who we are at any given moment.

In the activity I am calling “Layered Voices,” students have to select an existing piece of published poetry or prose that most closely fits what they consider to be their voice. They write a reflection that asks what kind of voice it is? What is the connection between one’s voice and one’s identity? What part does one’s voice play in shaping an identity?

I pair this discussion of voice with a book by James W. Davis called Hybrid Culture: Mix-Art (2007) that looks at contemporary hybrid forms of art like Hip Fu (Hip Hop Kung Fu) and Jawaiian (Jamaican style Reggae fused with Hawaiian music) as well as hybrid cultures from an earlier era like Afro-Cuban or French-Arabic music or Mughal dance. This is a great way to explore the history of migration, colonization, and globalization. Students have to trace the roots of the poem that they choose to represent them before carefully changing the last stanza of the poem to reflect their life’s current direction. Thus their selected piece becomes shared between the poet and the student—an artifact not only of history but also of current currents of identity.

This is one example of ekphrastic writing—writing that comments on another art form. Students can move beyond writing too; they can entwine their visions and voices with the poetry, painting, prose, photography, and sculpture of others. Such art lives as a mindful communication between the students and innumerable others. Through art, students learn to watch their inner experiences in communication with others. As an exercise in empathy, this layering of voices prevents intellectual rigidity and allows students to layer their
own identities with voices and influences from all over the world, provided they are moved to do so.

**A Look at Mixedness**

In all of the five activities, there are opportunities to explore complex identity by focusing on mixed race literatures and experiences. The exercise of considering multiculturalism within a single family can be instructive for all children regardless of whether students are ethnically or racially mixed. This is because investigation of personal multicultural experience can offer an interesting entry point to understanding choice, something more often claimed and discussed by mixed people. The process of identity building for mixed people is less automatic and inevitable and therefore an examination of this process can help us to challenge the notion that identity in general is unbendable or unmovable.

A few years ago, *The New York Times* entered the national discussion on mixed race by publishing a series of articles called “Race Remixed” (2008) that explored the growing number of mixed-race Americans. The series addressed issues such as the growing number of interracial marriages and the many different ways one can define one’s own ethnic and racial identity.

In the series, biracial author James McBride, when asked which part of him was dominant, responded, “It’s like grabbing Jell-O….But what difference does it make? When you’re mixed, you see how absurd this business of race is.” Well, it’s not quite like grabbing at Jell-O for me as it feels more empowering than that, but his comment reveals a truth about the shifting terrain of identity. It also affectionately conjures memories of my Kansas grandparents’ holiday Jell-O mold (with canned fruit, cool whip, and marshmallows). Many young adults of mixed backgrounds have rejected the bounded identities that have traditionally defined Americans in favor of a much more fluid sense of identity. Michelle López-Mullins, a twenty-year-old junior and the president of the Multiracial and Biracial Student Association says, “It depends on the day, and it depends on the options” (Saulny, 2011). If young people feel the need to embrace more than one identity there is literature out there that now encourages multi-identity acceptance even in early childhood.

Children’s Book Press has published a number of books addressing the experience of mixed-race and biracial children. *Two Mrs. Gibsons* (Igus, 1996) depicts a little girl embracing and enjoying the cultural differences between her Japanese mother and African-American grandmother. In *Cooper’s Lesson* (Shin, 2004), a boy overcomes his initial struggles with being biracial, learning to weave both Korean and American culture into his life.

For older children, the Smithsonian Institution had an exhibit on race that featured the work of Kip Fulbeck and others who take in-depth looks at mixed race. A plethora of resources are available from groups such as Mixed Race America, the Mavin Foundation and the Association of Multiethnic Americans (AMWEA).

I believe that a meaningful understanding of identity must involve students thinking of themselves simultaneously as a product of their family inheritance and as a construction of relationships between self and communities that are both local and global. Such an approach would serve to make students more flexible, more tolerant of ambiguity, and more expansive in their vision. They would be able to identify more readily with others beyond family and neighborhood, and they would think of their experiences and intellectual explorations as a means for growing wider not just intellectually, but also emotionally. In today’s “information age” students are already aware of international social and political upheaval. They are sophisticated conduits between cultures because of their agility with technology. They are sensitive to the dramatic impact of the international economy and cultural forces. All of this means that they must construct an identity that is malleable enough to withstand the impact of global commingling and changes that come from life experiences.

It is important that students have access to powerful local motifs and to their ethnic and familial heritage. It is important that educators offer students opportunities to excavate their own backyards and protect identities and traditions that are useful and esteem-building. Students need to be connected to
place and the community around them. The naming of one’s self and culture is a fundamental democratic right and a student’s understanding of his or her own given identity matters. But we also have to communicate that identity isn’t necessarily a static phenomenon; it can be dynamic and ever changing. Students can be encouraged to draw from the best of their ascribed identities, but both formal and informal education can also involve the acquisition of new layers, with students naming themselves in profound new ways as they stretch and grow, make new connections, and prepare to move through adulthood’s challenging terrain.
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Dr. Albert Carr—Science Educator
1930–2000

Leslie Lopez

Albert Carr was a science teacher from Scarsdale, New York who was a professor of science education in the College of Education at the University of Hawai‘i from 1958 to 1992. His mother had been a teacher in New York City, where “Al” as he was familiarly known, attended Catholic school. An avid reader, Al quickly moved through the secondary grades and, at the age of fifteen, he was accepted to Iona College in New Rochelle, New York. After Iona College, Al studied science education at Teachers College at Columbia University and, at the age of twenty-one, graduated with a master of education degree in science education.

After receiving his degree, Al began teaching science in the New York City Public School System, where he met his wife Norma Gomez. They were both teaching at the same junior high in the East Bronx. A Puerto Rican immigrant herself, Norma taught English to recent Puerto Rican arrivals. Al taught in a classroom in the floor above. Norma recalls that she first met Al as they were both signing in to the morning roll registry located in the front office. Not long afterwards, students started delivering her small tea roses. At first she was unsure who her mystery admirer was, but then she recognized the messenger as a student from Al’s classroom, and she figured out it was he who was sending them. They were married on December 26th, 1954.

Because Al had been continuously enrolled in school, he had been exempted from military service. However, upon graduating he enlisted with the selective service and was drafted into the Army in 1954. Al and Norma were stationed at Henry Barracks in Cayey, Puerto Rico from 1954 to 1956 and it was here that their first daughter Lorrie was born. During this period, Al taught English and played the saxophone. He had learned to play the instrument as a teenager, and he quickly became proficient enough to play in jazz clubs in New York City. For a time, he was a member of Claude Thornhill’s practice band, and this experience helped him develop his mastery of the instrument. He continued to practice playing in Puerto Rico and regularly performed saxophone in the officer’s club band with jazz pianist Eddie Higgins, who had played in Chicago’s most prestigious jazz clubs with jazz musicians such as Dizzy Gillespie and Stan Getz. During the rest of his free time in Puerto Rico, Al enjoyed spending weekends visiting Norma’s family.

In 1956, Al returned to New York to complete his graduate studies, and he soon graduated with a PhD in science education from Columbia University. In 1958 the couple arrived in Hawai‘i with their two daughters Lorrie and Linda, and Al started his long and dedicated service as a professor of science education in the College of Education.

In those days, faculty housing was located at an old Army barracks on Rock Road. Rock Road ran roughly behind Webster and Spaulding Halls (Kobayashi, 1983) and was named after botanist Dr. Joseph Franz Karl Rock who came to Hawaii in 1907. In 1947, sixty-two wooden barracks had been brought to campus to accommodate the post-World War II increase in student enrollment (Papacostas, 2010), and these buildings eventually served as faculty housing. Norma immediately set to work to improve the living conditions for her family as well as neighboring faculty and their families. She recalled how welcoming and supportive the College of Education was to the Carr family. Norma found it to be a warm and mutually supportive environment, with professors collaborating with each other on their work and socializing with colleagues and their families.
A Golden Age

The years between 1958 and 1966 were important years of change in the College of Education. Richard S. Alm (1962) refers to the period as a “Golden Age” for the University of Hawai‘i, which saw considerable expansion in teacher education and in educational research. The basic departmental structure that is familiar to students and faculty today was established in this period. Also, the Curriculum Research & Development Group was created, along lines recommended by the Stiles Report (Williams, 2000).

The very first issue of *Educational Perspectives* was published in October of 1962. Dr. Albert Carr wrote one of the inaugural essays on the topic of current developments in science education (Carr, 1962). The article provided a brief discussion of the relations between scientists and teachers of science. Dr. Carr advocated a cooperative approach arguing that educators had “a great deal to contribute to...efforts to improve the quality of science education” (1962). In support of these views, he cited a number of projects involving cooperative ventures between scientist and science educators in Hawai‘i. Later, in 1971, Dr. Carr contributed further to *Educational Perspectives* with an article that discussed aspects of his specialization in elementary science education. It was titled “Science in the Elementary School: A Humanistic Approach” (Carr, 1971). Dr. Carr took a progressive stance on the nature of science education and argued that it should be viewed as a skilled activity rather than a content area—as a verb, and not as a noun (4).

To view Dr. Carr’s work in context, it’s important to locate it within the progressive ancestry and political identity of the college. Two important figures were influential in shaping the progressive philosophy of the college at this time: Robert Walter Clopton and Hubert Victor Everly. Clopton was a respected man of ideas whose published work focused on the work of the American philosopher, John Dewey. Everly was a skilled administrator with a deep understanding of the nature of the politics of Hawai‘i. His mentor was his father-in-law, Benjamin Othello Wist who was also one of Everly’s predecessors as dean of the College of Education (1931–51). Together, father-in-law and son-in law steered the college for a total of forty-three years. Although Clopton and Everly were very different in temperament and in the roles they played in the college, they were both regarded as “ardent progressives, committed to public education and to education as a preparation for democracy (Potter and Williams, 2000, 12).

Everly, like Wist before him, was known for his commitment to recruiting local teachers and for being a proponent of the role of public education as a socio-economic equalizer. Everly saw Hawai‘i’s “Big Five” corporations as being overly influential on Hawai‘i’s educational organizations and political climate. In his view, the Hawai‘i Teachers College served a purpose in transforming the “social structure and the feudalistic economic system we had in the islands” (University of Hawai‘i Center for Oral History: Public Education, 2010). Everly’s lengthy tenure provided the political grounding and stability that supported faculty growth and development. In order to effectively navigate within this political climate, Everly formed relationships with the teachers unions and the Hawai‘i Department of Education—even walking the line with public school teachers in the 1971 teacher’s strike (Tully, 2006).

For over 40 years, the leadership at the College of Education influenced and supported its progressive identity by actively developing teacher preparation programs that focused on recruiting local teachers and providing “distance education” programs with outer islands and American Samoa. Al Carr flourished as an educator within this progressive and humanistic milieu. And along with other professors like Tony Picard and Frank Brown, Al was among the first faculty to bring UH teacher “distance education” preparation programs to American Samoa, well before the age of the Internet.

During his tenure at the College of Education, Al directed over twenty National Science Foundation grants in Hawai‘i, three Teacher Institutes in Mānoa and Micronesia, and four Pacific Area Science Dissemination Conferences. He created an incredible amount of teaching materials, published articles and monographs, and wrote several children’s books. He collaborated with both science teachers and
other institutions on textbooks, science curriculum guidebooks, science kits, and elementary science curriculum for teachers. His daughter Lorrie fondly remembers his numerous appearances as a guest science speaker in Hawai‘i’s public schools, including, on more than one occasion, his own grandchildren’s classrooms. Elementary science teachers who were his students remember his outreach work to this day and his lessons on such topics as mealworms and marine biology.

Al consulted in science education in Japan, Micronesia, and American Samoa. In 1964–65, he served as a visiting Associate Professor at the University of California, Berkeley. He was the senior author-in-residence for the Encyclopedia Britannica in Chicago in 1968. While on sabbatical, he also spent a year in residence at IBM Educational Systems.

Among the many science programs that he developed for students, the popular Student Science Seminar enabled O‘ahu’s public school students to meet weekly with top scientists. He also served as the coordinator of the Science Curriculum Improvement Study at the University Laboratory School. His children’s books included Black Is a Word (a book about racial diversity), Islands of the Deep Sea (Hawai‘i-themed earth science curriculum); I Wonder Why Readers: Soft As a Bunny, Look and See; and The Black Box (a fable about scientific inquiry).

Al developed a special collaborative relationship with American Samoa, making more than fifty working trips there between 1970 and 1992. In the 1970s, his family accompanied him on working trips to places like Palau, Guam, Kwajelein and Majuro, Truk and Yap, Ponape, and Saipan. During one extended teaching trip to American Samoa, his son David attended high school there. Al worked and collaborated on multiple curriculum resources designed specifically for Samoa—resources that emphasized the development of language skills, classification skills, and observation skills for children.
Al made an effort to develop meaningful relationships with colleagues and students. He continues to be remembered fondly by those who knew him. One former student, Clifford Sanchez credits Al with being instrumental in helping him graduate. Clifford recalls: “Dr. Carr was always open to me, and all of his students. I would often visit him and talk to him about the history of Hawai‘i and the university. A scholar and a gentleman, he was a positive role model who genuinely cared for me throughout my tenure as a student.” Colleagues describe him as gentle and kind, with a great sense of humor who navigated the years of his tenure in the college with grace.

Several of his colleagues have recalled how he provided a calm presence and brought stability to the college through the relationships he nurtured. One professor, Joe Zilliox, stated that it was his “lifelong goal to be like Al Carr” in his work and manners. Zilliox relates a story that illustrates Al’s easy-going, modest approach to his work. It appears that when he spent his year with IBM he continued to carry his papers, as was his habit, in a Long’s Drugs plastic bag. Colleagues and family suggested that a briefcase might be more in keeping with corporate life—a suggestion to which he reluctantly assented. But he soon reverted to his customary practices when he was back home.

Al was regarded by all who knew him as a humble and sociable person. His work and the relationships that he developed with his colleagues mattered very dearly to him. Al helped to create a sense of community at the College of Education in many ways. The Carr family hosted many social events at their home, often with Al presiding as chef. Then there were the annual Aina Haina Academy Awards Banquets where people gathered to root for their favorite movies and actors. There were also weekly social gatherings of COE colleagues and their families at Queen’s Surf, with larger celebrations at the beach over the holidays. Family was at the heart of everything Al did. Al’s son Kevin Carr writes,

As educators and parents our mom and dad are tops. They made the education of their children fun. Our dad tried to take our choices and show us ways we could optimize those decisions. He tried to know our interests and build on them, rather than dictate what we needed to know. He included his family in his journeys (we all got to experience parts of his Micronesian voyages, for example), and always made an effort to seek out and provide enriching experiences.

Al’s wife, Dr. Norma Carr, has received multiple awards and accolades for her work on the history and migration of Puerto Ricans to Hawai‘i, and she is deeply respected for it. She is a regular member of the Women’s Campus Club and, along with her colleagues, founded the Hawai‘i Chapter of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. She has served as a board member on the United Puerto Rican Association of Hawai‘i (UPRAH), and she initiated the observance of the Three Kings celebration at the Puerto Rican Hall on School Street.

Al’s sons Kevin and David were both born in Hawai‘i. They are also talented musicians who are known for their contributions to the Hawai‘i music scene in the ‘70s and ‘80s. Both completed licensure programs in secondary education at the College of Education. David and Kevin, as well as Kevin’s wife, Betty Burdick, are all teachers in Hawai‘i. Al’s daughter, Dr. Linda Carr is a practicing clinical psychologist on O‘ahu, and his daughter Lorrie Carr Ohashi works in real estate. His grandchildren Kai and Sara are recent graduates of the University of Hawai‘i.

We remember Dr. Albert Carr for his scholarship and collegiality, and for the many contributions he made to the College of Education community, and to education in Hawai‘i, American Samoa, and the Pacific.
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The author would like to sincerely thank the Carr family for their time and contribution to this tribute to his years of service to education in Hawai`i.
Barefoot-n-Ruby Reds

Bonnie Lynn Tolson © 2007

The answer is in the question
Who am I
It’s dark between the gap
tears, snot, rage, despair
long and hard
unessential
the answer is in the question
click your heals three times
let it vibrate from crown
to the ground
crack, smash, switch
reverse the order of the words
and strike the last
the answer is in the question
click, click, your Ruby Reds
in the dark
it starts behind your eyes
and ends at sunrise
look, the burning bush
barefoot on ego’s back
dance life’s cycle
fire and drum
circumambulate
the black box
knees bent towards
the sun
stomp the ground
shake the sky
rain
soak
dare to sweat
beneath the moon
hot rocks await
the morning light
click, click your heals
three times
the answer is
in the question
Who am I