

Native Hawaiian Language Preservation and Maintenance: Community-Based Research



INTRODUCTION

This research project was funded through a \$311,939 American Rescue Plan Act (ARP) Emergency Native Language grant from the Administration for Native Americans, passed through OHA to Native Hawaiian-serving nonprofits to support community-based efforts to preserve and revitalize ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. This study examines the effectiveness and impact of intergenerational transmission of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i programs and seeks to understand how ‘ohana (family) engage with ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i across home, school, and community settings, capturing both participant experiences and the perspectives shared by ‘ohana and program staff.

The purpose of the project was to support intergenerational Hawaiian language programs and study the impact of intergenerational engagement strategies and community-based practices on Hawaiian language perpetuation and normalization. Specifically, the research aimed to identify successes, challenges, and areas of effectiveness and needed improvement among participating programs to inform ongoing and future program implementation and revitalization efforts.

BACKGROUND

The history of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i (Hawaiian language) reflects a trajectory of near loss and remarkable resurgence: following the arrival of Captain James Cook in 1778, the Native Hawaiian population, estimated to be over a million at his arrival, was devastated by the introduction of foreign diseases, yet ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i continued to thrive and continue as the language of the people and their governance. This continued into the 1800s with the support of compulsory education in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i and exceptionally high literacy rates. The mandated English-only instruction in 1896 rapidly eroded the use of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i and by the 1970s, only about 50 children were being raised in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i and roughly 3,500 kūpuna (elders, grandparents) speakers remained. The Hawaiian Renaissance inspired a revitalization movement, leading to the founding of ‘Aha Pūnana Leo in 1983, the repeal of English-only laws, the establishment of the Hawai‘i Department of Education’s Papahana Kaiapuni (Hawaiian language immersion program), Hawaiian Focused Charter Schools, and increased university offerings in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i. Today, there is significant progress—rising numbers of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i speakers, immersion preschools and schools across the islands, and growing university enrollment—though COVID-19 underscored ongoing challenges for new-learner ‘ohana and the need for more fluent speakers, stronger intergenerational learning, and broader normalization of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i as a living language in Hawai‘i.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To collect data on the role of intergenerational engagement in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i perpetuation and normalization through ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, two distinct sets of research questions were addressed, including:

A. Program-Related Research Questions (from staff/kumu perspective):

1. How do ‘ohana engage each other in the learning and transmission of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i?
2. How does the program engage ‘ohana in the learning and transmission of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i?
3. What challenges has the program experienced in supporting families’ Hawaiian language education?
4. What challenges have families experienced in intergenerational transmission of Hawaiian language?
5. What strengths has the program identified in supporting families’ Hawaiian language education?

B. Participant-Related Research Questions (from ‘ohana perspective):

1. What are the characteristics of the ‘ohana participating in the program?
2. What are the demographic characteristics of participants? (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, income, geography, relation to keiki (children), language experience)
3. How is ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i used within the ‘ohana?
4. What is the fluency/comfort level of ‘ohana with ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i?

5. Why do participants value learning and/or transmitting ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i across generations?
6. What impact do participants report as a result of learning or transmitting ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i?

METHODOLOGY

SURVEYS AND DATA COLLECTION

Demographic data and data on the role of intergenerational engagement in Hawaiian language perpetuation and normalization was collected from both participants and program staff via four surveys:

- 30-question pre-program participant survey
- 32-question post-program participant survey
- 22-question pre-program staff survey
- 17-question post-program staff survey

Surveys were made available in both ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i and English, and responses were accepted in either language. Programs were responsible for distributing surveys to participants and program staff and providing responses to pre- and post-program surveys to OHA with progress reports.

DATA ANALYSIS

This report will describe the activities and services provided by the ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i programs from June 01, 2023, to May 31, 2024. The data collected from the surveys of participants who completed both pre-program and post-program surveys and program quarterly and final reports will be used to develop the key findings of this report. Data analysis combined quantitative and qualitative methods to provide a comprehensive understanding of participant experiences and program impact. Quantitative data examined proficiency, comfort, and fluency levels and household engagement. Qualitative responses were coded thematically within respective English and ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i groups to identify common key themes and patterns.

‘ŌLELO HAWAI‘I RESPONSES

Qualitative survey responses provided in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i were translated and analyzed separate of the responses provided in English. This preserved the cultural context of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses and allowed these themes to emerge separate of English response themes. This also ensured that ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i speaking respondents are fully represented in the findings as such and reinforces the value of the language and the intent of the grant.

‘ŌLELO HAWAI‘I PROGRAMS OVERVIEW

Four ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i programs were funded through this study, with each program uniquely tailored to its local population whether service areas ranged from specific ahupua‘a (land divisions) to statewide. Recruitment of participants relied on partner outreach and community-facing strategies such as flyers, radio announcements, and social media. School-based ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i programs used their school enrollment with application and interview processes to confirm eligibility and emphasize commitment to the program. Self-reported ancestry verification was consistently used across programs.

All programs emphasized multi-generational participation through structured opportunities for mākuā (parents), caregivers, and keiki to learn together. Each offered a combination of language instruction, cultural activities, and access to paper and digital learning resources, demonstrating a consistent approach to supporting ‘ohana at different levels of fluency. Programs also incorporated systematic data collection, pre- and post-program surveys, attendance records, and participant feedback.

In total, the programs delivered 141 instructional classes and 35 workshops or gatherings, with 92 total participant classes completed and 149 workshop/gathering completions. Native Hawaiian participants completed 70 classes and 102 workshops. A total of 42 new resources were created, and the programs also engaged 12 partners/collaborators. The following highlights the 'ōlelo Hawai'i programs key project details, including the project purpose, goals, funding received, and service areas:

PAPAHANA KUAOLA – NA LEO MAKAMAE

Project Purpose: to advance Hawaiian language use in the Ko'olaupoko community.

Project Goal: to provide a multi-generational 'ohana-based Hawaiian language instruction program to increase the use of the 'ōlelo Hawai'i and Hawaiian lifestyle traditions and practices within the home.

Award Amount: \$84,757

Service Area: Ko'olaupoko Ahupua'a, O'ahu (southeastern district of the windward coast)

'AHA PUNANA LEO – NOI'I OHA

Project Purpose: to increase the Hawaiian language fluency of 'ohana in homes with children enrolled in Hawaiian Medium Early Childhood Education throughout the state to better support their child's educational development and journey in 'ōlelo Hawai'i.

Project Goal: to collect data to determine if the implementation of 'Aha Pūnana Leo's ('APL) online Hawaiian language videos, virtual coursework and gatherings geared toward supporting 'ohana with keiki in Hawaiian medium early childhood education increases the use and comfort and fluency in Hawaiian language by the 'ohana who participate in the program.

Award Amount: \$79,514

Service Area: Hawai'i Island, Maui, Moloka'i, O'ahu, Kaua'i

KE KULA 'O PI'ILANI – KA PIKO KAIAO

Project Purpose: to create a village of speakers around the students of Ke Kula 'O Pi'ilani elementary school.

Project Goal: to educate parents and caregivers of multiple generations alongside their children and equip entire families and their surrounding community with both the knowledge of the Hawaiian language and the cultural context and practices that bring it to life.

Award Amount: \$77,766

Service Area: Maui

HUI O HANO HANO – PILINĀHĀLEO

Project Purpose: to support the upcoming generation of Native Hawaiians in West Hawai'i in the perpetuation and normalization of the Hawaiian language and culture.

Project Goal: to determine whether the development and implementation of 'ohana community in 'ōlelo Hawai'i and 'ike Hawai'i (Hawaiian knowledge) events, workshops, and weekly gatherings will increase the reported use of 'ōlelo Hawai'i and mo'omeheu Hawai'i (Hawaiian culture) within the home and the greater community by having families engage in learning the Hawaiian language and culture.

Award Amount: \$69,902

Service Area: West Hawai'i, Hawai'i Island

STUDY PARTICIPANTS

The "Native Hawaiian Language Preservation and Maintenance: Community-Based Research" grant served a total of 434 participants, with 341 Native Hawaiian participants. A total of 381 individuals completed the pre-program survey. Following program completion, 234 individuals responded to the post-program survey. Overall, 201 individuals responded to both the pre-program and post-program surveys across the four 'ōlelo Hawai'i

programs, with 73.1% (147) self-identifying as Native Hawaiian. Of the 201 individuals, 161 were identified as primary households, where a single household member was designated as the primary respondent. This approach ensured that household-related questions were represented by only one response per household.

KEY FINDINGS

PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

Adults ages 30–44 made up the majority of respondents (65.3%), representing the age group typically aligned with mākuā. Far fewer respondents were keiki, with only 8.9% ages 5–17, the age range commonly associated with keiki, and 2.6% ages 0–4. Older adults were similarly underrepresented at 9.5% for ages 45–59 and just 1.1% for those 60 and older. This disparity reflects a significant gap in keiki data, particularly within school-based programs where students were not surveyed despite their household members' participation. As a result, keiki perspectives—critical for understanding their experiences and language use—were largely absent. The lack of keiki data limits the ability to fully assess program impact across generations, especially at that level, where firsthand insights are essential for evaluating intergenerational transmission.

More than half (51.3%, 96) of respondents reported completing a post-secondary degree or certificate. This is followed by 20.3% (38) who hold a GED or high school diploma and 16.0% (30) who have completed some college, reflecting a substantial portion with partial or foundational post-secondary experience. A smaller number includes those currently enrolled as students (9.6%, 18) and those with no schooling completed (2.7%, 5). Once again, the low number of respondents identified as students currently enrolled reflects a disparity in data due to surveys not being provided to this group.

Two of the four 'ōlelo Hawai'i programs provided services on individual islands while three provided services on two islands. Of the six main islands, Lāna'i, did not receive services. Only one program provided services on multiple islands (five).

Of the 201 individual respondents, half (50.2%, 101) were from Hawai'i Island, followed by 27.4% (55) on

More than three-quarter of the participants resided on Hawai'i Island and O'ahu

Table 1. The island I live on is...

	Individuals		Households	
Hawai'i	101	50.2%	62	38.5%
O'ahu	55	27.4%	55	34.2%
Maui	31	15.4%	30	18.6%
Kaua'i	8	4.0%	8	5.0%
Moloka'i	6	3.0%	6	3.7%
Total	201	100%	161	100%

Note. Data reflects the response to the survey question "What island are you located on?" Native Hawaiian status data is not provided as ethnicity data would only reflect that of the respondent assigned as the primary member of the household and used in the analysis of household data.

O'ahu, 15.4% (31) on Maui, 4.0% (8) on Kaua'i and 3.0% (6) on Moloka'i. Two islands had more than two-thirds of the 161 primary households: Hawai'i Island with 38.5% (62) and O'ahu with 34.2% (55). Maui had 18.6% (30) responding households, followed by Kaua'i with 5.0% (8) and Moloka'i with 3.7% (6). There is a clear over-representation of participants from Hawai'i Island accounting for half of all individuals and largest share of household. This data also shows that there were only 40 household members who were not identified as the primary household members who responded to both the pre- and post-program survey.

Most of the participating households were included two generations

Table 2. My household is comprised of...

Households		
One Generation	6	3.7%
Two Generations	115	71.4%
Three Generations	36	22.4%
Four Generations	4	2.5%
Total	161	100%

Note. Data reflects the response to the survey question "Which option best describes your household?" with possible responses including "One Generation", "Two Generations (i.e., Parents + Children)", "Three Generations (i.e., Grandparents + Parents + Children)", "Four Generations (i.e., Great-Grandparents + Grandparents + Parents + Children)", "Other (Fill in the Blank)". Native Hawaiian status data is not provided as ethnicity data would only reflect that of the respondent assigned as the primary member of the household and used in the analysis of household data.

Nearly one in four households spanned three or more generations. Almost one in four (71.4%, 115) were categorized as a two-generation household, typically consisting of mākua and keiki, while three generation households, usually including kūpuna, made up 22.4% (36) of the households. Only 2.5% reported four generations and 3.7% of households consisted of a single generation. This distinction underscores that household composition data reflects generational structure rather than cultural or ethnic household definitions.

Based on the available data, this report cannot determine the actual number of household members participating in each program. It appears that many respondents did not include their keiki who are students enrolled in the school when reporting the number of household members participating in that program. Of the 161 primary households, when asked how many members were in their household and how many household members participated in the program, (34.8%) claim to have only one person in their household participating in their respective program, yet 155 (96.3%) report to be a two-generation household (Table 2).

Notably, of the 201 survey respondents, 131 (65.2%) are associated with a school-based program where the enrolled participants were mākua, caregivers, or guardians of students. The data appears to be inconsistent in that it is a mismatch between reported household composition and reported program participation affecting data accuracy through possible underreporting.

‘ŌLELO HAWAI’I USE IN HOUSEHOLD AND COMMUNITY

Understanding the patterns emerging from both the English and ‘ōlelo Hawai’i responses provide insight into how ‘ohana of varying proficiencies are engaging with ‘ōlelo Hawai’i following participation in programming. Examining both groups allows for a clearer picture of where language use is most strongly occurring and the differing practices between households at varying stages of fluency and normalization. The combined analysis notes overall trends while also identifying differences between the two groups.

Overall, intergenerational language loss through historical suppression was the most commonly cited use of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in the past

Table 3. In the past, the use of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i by my ‘ohana was...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i	Combined
Historically suppressed	29.3%	50.0%	33.7%
For education	32.3%	33.3%	32.5%
Personal, adult revitalization	29.3%	41.7%	32.0%
To support intergenerational transmission	24.1%	38.9%	27.2%
Minimally or functionally used	27.8%	13.9%	24.9%
Not used	18.0%	2.8%	14.8%
For cultural integration	12.8%	16.7%	13.6%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Describe how ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i has been used in your ‘ohana in the past? If applicable, can you describe what led to the disruption of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i usage in your ‘ohana?” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 169 (84.1%) households provided responses: 133 (78.7%) English responses and 36 (21.3%) ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

Across both the English and ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i response datasets, intergenerational language loss through historical censorship emerged as the most common theme, reflected in more than one-third (33.7%) of responses. The use of Hawaiian-medium education (32.5%), active revitalization (32.0%), and the intentional use of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i across the generations (27.2%) highlights renewed efforts to integrate ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i into daily routines. The minimal or lack of use (39.7%) and the use only in the areas of cultural activities (13.6%) by respondents ‘ohana in the past further emphasize the experienced generational suppression. ‘Ohana consistently described grandparents or great-grandparents as the final fluent speakers in their lineage, noting how education practices, English language dominance, and historical trauma, including punishment for speaking ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i played a significant role in the suppression of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i. Responses highlighting the role of Hawaiian-medium education entities, such as Ke Kula ‘o Nāwahīokalani‘ōpu‘u, ‘Aha Pūnana Leo, Kaiapuni and college programs, was highlighted as important in rebuilding fluency.

When comparing both data sets, overarching themes remain consistent: ‘ohana reconnecting to ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, addressing multi-generational gaps, and relying on both home practices and community structures to support learning. However, the ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i dataset demonstrates a clearer shift toward school-based revitalization, with respondents more frequently crediting immersion programs and post-secondary institutions for strengthening their language use. They also note “first speakers again,” where individuals identified themselves as restarting the use ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i within their ‘ohana after two to three generations without fluency. In contrast, English only responses emphasized cultural continuity—such as values, stories, and partial vocabulary—over formal learning pathways. Taken together, the data show that while the pattern of loss is shared, the strategies and goals of revitalization differ, with more responses noting a structured, program-supported approach to recovering the language across generations.

“The continuation of the language ended in the generation of our great-grandparents because of the influence of American culture/lifestyle”

Mākua overwhelmingly lead the effort to use and learn ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i within the household

Table 4. In our household, the person leading effort to use and learn ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i is the...

	Households	
Mākua(s)	129	80.1%
‘Ohana	18	11.2%
Keiki	6	3.7%
Kūpuna	2	1.2%
Uncle/aunt	2	1.2%
Total	161	

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Who in your ‘ohana leads the effort for learning and using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i?” Of the 161 household respondents, a total of 160 (99.4%) households provided responses.

The data illustrate that leadership in ‘ohana language learning is overwhelmingly centered in the mākua generation. Nearly four out of five responses (80.1%, 129) identified mākua as the primary leaders of learning and using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i within the household. Much smaller proportions pointed to ‘ohana members collectively (11.2%, 18) or keiki (3.7%, 6) as leading these efforts, while kūpuna, uncles or aunts, and individuals without keiki appeared only rarely, each representing around 1% of total responses. These patterns reflect a strong mākua-driven commitment to supporting language growth, with only a small share of ‘ohana reporting alternative leadership structures.

‘Ohana used ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i mostly for communicating with keiki and ‘ohana

Table 5. I use ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in my household and daily life by...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i	Combined
Communicating with keiki, ‘ohana	53.3%	82.9%	59.3%
Using basic words, phrases, commands	48.9%	22.9%	43.6%
Using in household and daily life	29.9%	80.0%	40.1%
Increasing use	38.7%	20.0%	34.9%
Supporting keiki in school, homework	14.6%	20.0%	15.7%
Normalizing use outside home	10.2%	28.6%	14.0%
Mixing use between English and ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i	11.7%	0.0%	9.3%
Muse in mele, hula, oli, games	9.5%	5.7%	8.7%
Not regularly using	8.0%	0.0%	6.4%
Supporting it as the primary language	0.0%	22.9%	4.7%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “How do you use ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in your household and daily life?” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 172 (85.6%) households provided responses: 137 (79.7%) English responses and 35 (20.3%) ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

Participants were also asked how ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i was used in the household and daily life. More than half of all responses (59.3%) described using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i to communicate with keiki and ‘ohana, making this the most frequently referenced theme. References to using basic words, phrases, and commands (43.6%) reflecting the structured ways ‘ohana, especially those who only responded in English, integrate ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i into daily life. This was followed by 40.1% who reported using the language consistently in household routines and everyday activities. Noting an increase in use and intentional practice appeared in 34.9% of responses, while support for keiki in school with homework was noted in 15.7%. About 14.0% mentioned using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i outside the home in the community or social spaces. A smaller number (9.3%) described mixed use of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i and English, and 6.4% noted that their use was still limited or irregular. Finally, 4.7% indicated that ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i is the primary language in the home—an important distinction that appeared only in the ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i dataset.

When comparing the English and ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses, English responses showed a wider range of engagement, from basic commands to early-stage practice, and included all mentions of mixed or irregular use. In contrast, ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses showed significantly higher rates of household immersion (80.0%) and communication within ‘ohana (82.9%), along with all mentions of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i as the primary household language. These households also referred to community normalization and school reinforcement at higher rates.

“In our household and daily life, we use ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i phrases for everyday/routine kuleana from brushing your teeth, folding your laundry and making sure ha‘awina is completed. I also try to further use olelo when shopping in the store and have my son look for the items to purchase.”

English responses noted increased use at more than twice the rate of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses

Table 6. After programming, our ‘ohana used ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i through...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i	Combined
Increased use	51.5%	21.2%	45.6%
Use in the household	27.2%	78.8%	37.3%
Intergenerational participation	36.8%	27.3%	34.9%
Keiki-led learning and reinforcement	41.2%	6.1%	34.3%
Continued structured learning, Practice tools and activities	36.8%	6.1%	30.8%
Use in the community	20.6%	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i 33.3%	Combined 23.1%
Daily use, everyday integration	16.2%	36.4%	20.1%
Limited use	11.0%	0.0%	8.9%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “After programming, how does your ‘ohana use ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i?” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 169 (84.1%) households provided responses: 136 (80.5%) English responses and 33 (19.5%) ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

The most frequently reported theme when asked how ‘ohana used ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i after programming was the increased use of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, reflected in 45.6% of responses. This was followed by 37.3% who noted using ‘ōlelo primarily within the household, and 34.9% who described intergenerational participation in which mākuā, kūpuna, and keiki speak ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i together. Keiki-led learning and reinforcement appeared in 34.3% (58) of responses, most notably in English responses (41.2%), most likely in response to attending immersion schools. About 30.8% reported using tools, activities, or other structured resources to continue learning, while 23.1%

mentioned using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in community or social settings. Daily or everyday integration of the language was reflected in 20.1% of responses, and 8.9% indicated limited or sporadic use.

English responses reflected higher rates of increased use (51.5%), keiki-led reinforcement (41.2%), and reliance on structured tools (36.8%), suggesting that many of these ‘ohana are still building confidence and fluency. In contrast, ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses emphasized consistent, home-centered use at 78.8% and daily integration at 36.4%, with no reports of limited use.

“Flash cards around the house, I feel better equipped to support my children and their learning of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i.”

‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i is most often used in general daily interactions anywhere within the household

Table 7. In our home, we use ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i mostly...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i	Combined
Everywhere, anywhere	37.9%	44.1%	39.2%
In the kitchen, during meals, at the dinner table	28.0%	38.2%	30.1%
During daily routines, chores, commands	21.2%	0.0%	16.9%
In the living room	15.9%	14.7%	15.7%
Through keiki kuleana, scolding, instruction	14.4%	8.8%	13.3%
During morning, bedtime routines	14.4%	0.0%	11.4%
During ‘ohana conversation, reflections	10.6%	5.9%	9.6%
Supporting ha‘awina, teaching, learning	10.6%	0.0%	8.4%
During games, play, stories	5.3%	0.0%	4.2%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Where in your home do you find using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i the most?” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 166 (82.6%) households provided responses: 132 (79.5%) English responses and 34 (20.5%) ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

When asked where in the home ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i was used most, the most frequently referenced theme was the use of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i was everywhere or anywhere, appearing in 39.2% of responses. The next most frequent mention at 30.1% was the use of the language in the kitchen or during meals. Daily routines, chores, and commands were reported in 21.2% of response, while living room use was noted by 15.9% of responses. Other contexts included keiki kuleana (responsibilities), scolding, or instructional use (13.3%), morning or bedtime routines (11.4%), ‘ohana conversations or reflections (9.6%), and teaching or learning activities (8.4%). Overall, English responses showed a wider variety of contexts, while ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses were concentrated in general, kitchen, and living room use.

English responses use of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i during chores, ha‘awina (homework), prayer, and play while ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses in higher proportions of room-based responses and fewer detailed descriptions of activities.

“Everywhere. I ‘ōlelo almost exclusively at home with my son. My son is about to turn two so our conversations are basic.”

Outside of the home, ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i is most often used in community spaces

Table 8. Outside of our home, we use ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i mostly...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i	Combined
In community spaces	24.3%	21.2%	23.7%
Everywhere, anywhere	17.9%	39.4%	22.0%
With ‘ohana, keiki	16.4%	30.3%	19.1%
In school spaces	18.6%	15.2%	17.9%
In the car	15.7%	21.2%	16.8%
Among nature	13.6%	18.2%	14.5%
Around other ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i speakers	9.3%	18.2%	11.0%
Using basic words, phrases, commands	11.4%	0.0%	9.2%
During cultural activities	8.6%	6.1%	8.1%
At work	7.1%	6.1%	6.9%
In private settings	4.3%	0.0%	3.5%
Around non-‘ōlelo Hawai‘i speakers	2.1%	0.0%	1.7%
In church	1.4%	0.0%	1.2%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Where outside of your home do you find using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i the most?” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 173 (86.1%) households provided responses: 140 (80.9%) English responses and 33 (19.1%) ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

When asked where outside the home ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i was most used, nearly one-quarter of responses (23.7%) reported using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in community spaces, followed by 22.0% who use it “everywhere” or “anywhere”. ‘Ohana and keiki interactions accounted for 19.1%, school (17.9%) and in the car (16.8%) were also noted. Additional themes included among nature (14.5%), around other ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i speakers (11.0%), and basic words or commands (9.2%), while cultural activities, work, and use around the home were less frequently mentioned.

Comparing English and ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses shows that both emphasize community, school, car, and ‘ohana use, but ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses placed greater emphasis on “everywhere” and “anywhere” (39.4% vs. 17.9% in English) and ‘ohana/keiki interactions (30.3% vs. 16.4%). English responses, more frequently highlighted community spaces (24.3%) and basic phrases or commands (11.4%), emphasizing situational or functional use.

“Ma nā wahi a pau e ‘ōlelo ai māua i kā māua mau keiki. Inā hui ho‘i me kekahi ‘ohana ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, ‘ōlelo nō mākou i ka ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i.”

“In all the places where we speak to our children. And if we meet up with another Hawaiian-speaking family, we speak Hawaiian as well.”

Across all responses, 63.1% indicated that there were no formal rules for using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, while 35.7% reported having rules in place. Intentional or spontaneous use of the language was supported in 21.0% of responses, and specific times, places, or activities for use were noted in 20.4%. Inspiration to start rules or consider possible future guidelines appeared in 17.2% of responses, while barriers to establishing or following rules were mentioned in 6.4%. Use of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i at all times was reported in 5.1% in only ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Overall, the combined data suggests that while most ‘ohana do not have formal rules, many are using

the language intentionally in certain contexts, guided by specific activities or times, and are considering ways to strengthen or expand its use. These patterns indicate a balance between structured guidance and flexible everyday practice, supporting both consistent and spontaneous opportunities for language engagement.

Over two-thirds of responses indicate having set rules for ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i use

Table 9. Rules on ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i use in our ‘ohana include...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i	Combined
No set rules	76.6%	12.1%	63.1%
Having set rules	22.6%	84.8%	35.7%
Being intentional, spontaneous use	21.8%	18.2%	21.0%
During specific times or in specific places, activities	14.5%	42.4%	20.4%
Having the inspiration to start	21.8%	0.0%	17.2%
Experiencing barriers to having rules	6.5%	6.1%	6.4%
To use at all times	0.0%	24.2%	5.1%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Does your ‘ohana have or will have a rule on ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i use? (E.g. ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i wale nō ma ke ka‘a. Speak Hawaiian only in the car.) If so, please share.” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 157 (78.1%) households provided responses: 124 (79.0%) English responses and 33 (21.0%) ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

Data show that ‘ohana are engaging with ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in varying ways, from informal encouragement to structured rules for specific contexts. While English responses reflected more exploratory or early-stage practices—such as inspiration to start rules and flexible language use—‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses demonstrated higher levels of structured, consistent use, including strict rules for times and places and, in some cases, full-immersion practices. Across both datasets, ‘ohana are motivated by cultural and relational connections, integrating ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i use into daily routines and intentionally supporting language learning, whether through formalized rules or flexible encouragement.

“We do not yet have this rule but this will be something I will definitely implement. Hopefully it will help engage everyone in the household.”

FLUENCY AND COMFORT LEVEL

Participants were asked a series of questions to assess their comfort and engagement in using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i across different environments, both before and after program participation. Using a 1–10 scale (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable), respondents rated their comfort levels in applying the ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i learned in the program, as well as their comfort using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in daily life, within their household, and in their community. In addition, participants rated their average household engagement in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, with 1 representing no use and 10 representing full use. These questions provide insight into how the program influenced participants’ confidence, comfort, and frequency of use, highlighting changes in both everyday practice and household engagement. Separating Native Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian participant responses also helps identify program impacts across groups.

Nearly half of all respondents rated their post-program comfort level at the high end of the scale

Table 10. My level of comfort in using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i learned in the program is...

	Native Hawaiian	Non-Hawaiian	Total
1-3	9.6%	25.0%	13.1%
4-7	36.8%	52.5%	40.3%
8-10	53.7%	22.5%	46.6%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is your level of comfort in using ‘ōlelo Hawaii learned in this program:” Of the 201 respondents, a total of 176 (87.6%) participants provided responses: 136 (67.6%) Native Hawaiian participants and 40 (19.9%) non-Hawaiian participants.

When asked to rate their comfort level in using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i learned through the program on a scale from 1 to 10, nearly half of all respondents (46.6%) rated their comfort at the high end of the scale (8–10), while 40.3% fell in the moderate range (4–7), and only 13.1% reported low comfort (1–3).

Native Hawaiian participants consistently reported higher levels of comfort, with more than half (53.7%) selecting ratings of 8–10 and 31.6% indicating the highest comfort level of 10. In contrast, 25.0% of non-Hawaiian respondents reported moderate or lower comfort, 52.5% rated themselves between 4–7 and just 22.5% in the 8–10 range. Only 12.5% of non-Hawaiians reported the maximum rating of 10.

More than half of participants reported an increase in daily life comfort, with non-Hawaiians showing slightly higher gains than Native Hawaiians.

Table 11. My level of comfort in using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in their daily life...

	Native Hawaiian		Non-Hawaiian		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
1-3	24.6%	6.2%	64.5%	25.8%	32.3%	9.9%
4-7	34.6%	41.5%	29.0%	54.8%	33.5%	44.1%
8-10	40.8%	52.3%	6.5%	19.4%	34.2%	46.0%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is the comfort level for using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in your daily life.” Of the 201 pre- and post-survey respondents, a total of 161 (80.1%) participants provided responses: 130 (80.7%) Native Hawaiian participants and 31 (15.4%) non-Hawaiian participants.

Participants were asked to rate their comfort level in using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in their daily life on a scale from 1 to 10 both before and after the program. Among Native Hawaiian participants, those reporting low comfort levels (1–3) dropped dramatically from 24.6% pre-program to 6.2% post-program, while those in the high comfort range (8–10) increased from 40.8% to 52.3%.

Non-Hawaiian participants showed low comfort ratings decrease from 64.5% to 25.8% and high comfort ratings rise from 6.5% to 19.4%. Across all participants, nearly half (46.0%) rated their post-program comfort in the 8–10 range, up from 34.2% pre-program. The proportion of participants who rated their comfort at the highest level of 10 increased across both groups with Native Hawaiians showing the largest shift, rising from 26.2% to 34.6% while non-Hawaiians increased from 3.2% to 9.7%.

Table 12. Change in level of comfort in using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in daily life

	Native Hawaiian	Non-Hawaiian	Total
Decrease	14.6%	16.1%	14.9%
Increase	53.8%	67.7%	56.5%
No Change	31.5%	16.1%	28.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question "Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is the comfort level for using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in your daily life" Of the 201 respondents, a total of 161 (80.1%) participants provided responses: 130 (80.7%) Native Hawaiian participants and 31 (15.4%) non-Hawaiian participants.

Looking at overall change, 56.5% of respondents reported an increase in comfort, with non-Hawaiians showing slightly higher gains (67.7%) compared to Native Hawaiians (53.8%). Only 14.9% of all participants experienced a decrease, and 28.6% reported no change.

Native Hawaiian reported the largest gains in comfort using 'ōlelo Hawai'i within their home.

Table 13. My level of comfort in using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in my household is...

	Native Hawaiian		Non-Hawaiian		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
1-3	17.2%	3.1%	48.9%	21.9%	23.1%	6.9%
4-7	35.9%	30.5%	37.5%	50.0%	36.3%	34.4%
8-10	46.9%	66.4%	15.6%	28.1%	40.6%	58.8%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question "Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is the comfort level for using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in your household." Of the 201 respondents, a total of 160 (79.6%) participants provided responses: 128 (80.0%) Native Hawaiian participants and 32 (15.9%) non-Hawaiian participants.

When asked to rate their comfort level in using 'ōlelo Hawai'i within their household on a scale from 1 to 10 before and after the program, results show a clear increase in comfort levels among all participants. Among Native Hawaiian respondents, those reporting low comfort levels (1–3) decreased sharply from 17.2% pre-program to 3.1% post-program, while those in the high comfort range (8–10) increased from 46.9% to 66.4%. Non-Hawaiian participants also demonstrated gains, with low comfort ratings declining from 48.9% to 21.9% and high comfort ratings rising from 15.6% to 28.1%. Across all respondents, more than half (58.8%) rated their post-program comfort in the 8–10 range, compared with 40.6% pre-program. Remarkably, non-Hawaiian participants rating their comfort level of using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in their household at the highest level of 10 increased 12.5 percentage points from 3.1% to 15.6%, while Native Hawaiians increased only 11.7 percentage points from 29.7% to 41.4%.

Table 14. Change in level of comfort in using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in the household

	Native Hawaiian	Non-Hawaiian	Total
Decrease	14.8%	18.8%	15.6%
Increase	54.7%	65.6%	56.9%
No Change	30.5%	15.6%	27.5%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is the comfort level for using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in your household.” Of the 201 respondents, a total of 160 (79.6%) participants provided responses: 128 (80.0%) Native Hawaiian participants and 32 (15.9%) non-Hawaiian participants.

Looking at overall change, 56.9% of participants reported an increase in comfort, with non-Hawaiians showing the largest gains (65.6%) compared to Native Hawaiians (54.7%). Only 15.6% of respondents experienced a decrease, and 27.5% reported no change.

Non-Hawaiian respondents reported the largest gains of increase in comfort using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in the community

Table 15. My level of comfort in using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in my community is...

	Native Hawaiian		Non-Hawaiian		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
1-3	41.1%	14.7%	71.0%	25.8%	46.9%	16.9%
4-7	31.0%	44.2%	25.8%	61.3%	30.0%	47.5%
8-10	27.9%	41.1%	3.2%	12.9%	23.1%	35.6%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is the comfort level for using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in your community.” Of the 201 respondents, a total of 160 (79.6%) participants provided responses: 129 (80.6%) Native Hawaiian participants and 31 (15.4%) non-Hawaiian participants.

Participants evaluated how comfortable they felt using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in their community on a scale from 1 to 10, both before and after the program. Among Native Hawaiian respondents, those in the low comfort range (1–3) dropped from 41.1% pre-program to 14.7% post-program, while high comfort ratings (8–10) increased from 27.9% to 41.1%. Non-Hawaiian participants showed similar improvements, with low comfort decreasing from 71.0% to 25.8% and high comfort rising from 3.2% to 12.9%. Across all participants, 35.6% reported post-program comfort in the 8–10 range, up from 23.1% pre-program. Native Hawaiian participants reporting the highest comfort level of 10 increased from 18.6% to 26.4%, while non-Hawaiian ratings held steady at 3.2% before and after the program.

Table 16. Change in level of comfort in using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in the community

	Native Hawaiian	Non-Hawaiian	Total
Decrease	11.6%	12.9%	11.9%
Increase	59.7%	74.2%	62.5%
No Change	28.7%	12.9%	25.6%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is the comfort level for using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in your community.” Of the 201 respondents, a total of 160 (79.6%) participants provided responses: 129 (80.6%) Native Hawaiian participants and 31 (15.4%) non-Hawaiian participants.

Overall change shows that 62.5% of respondents reported an increase in comfort, with non-Hawaiians showing the largest gains (74.2%) compared to Native Hawaiians (59.7%). Only 11.9% of participants experienced a decrease, and 25.6% reported no change.

More than half of participants, especially non-Hawaiians, became more confident in their average engagement in using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i within their household

Table 17. My average engagement in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i within my household is...

	Native Hawaiian		Non-Hawaiian		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
1-3	17.2%	3.1%	48.9%	21.9%	23.1%	6.9%
4-7	35.9%	30.5%	37.5%	50.0%	36.3%	34.4%
8-10	46.9%	66.4%	15.6%	28.1%	40.6%	58.8%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is your average engagement in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i within your household.” Of the 201 respondents, a total of 162 (80.6%) participants provided responses: 130 (80.2%) Native Hawaiian participants and 312 (15.9%) non-Hawaiian participants.

Responses to the questions of rating comfort levels in using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i within their household pre- and post-program demonstrated a significant increase in comfort levels across all participants. Among Native Hawaiian respondents, low comfort ratings (1–3) decreased sharply from 17.2% pre-program to 3.1% post-program, while high comfort ratings (8–10) increased from 46.9% to 66.4%. Non-Hawaiian participants also showed significant improvements, with low comfort ratings declining from 48.9% to 21.9% and high comfort ratings rising from 15.6% to 28.1%. Across all participants, post-program ratings show that 58.8% are now in the high comfort range (8–10), up from 40.6% pre-program, suggesting that participants are increasingly confident using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in their homes.

Table 18. Change in average engagement in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i within their household

	Native Hawaiian	Non-Hawaiian	Total
Decrease	14.8%	18.8%	15.6%
Increase	54.7%	65.6%	56.9%
No Change	30.5%	15.6%	27.5%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is your average engagement in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i within your household.” Of the 201 respondents, a total of 162 (80.6%) participants provided responses: 130 (80.2%) Native Hawaiian participants and 312 (15.9%) non-Hawaiian participants.

Of the total respondents, 56.9% reported an increase in household comfort, with non-Hawaiians showing the largest gains (65.6%) compared to Native Hawaiians (54.7%). Only 15.6% of participants experienced a decrease, and 27.5% reported no change.

Together, these results show that the program has effectively enhanced participants’ confidence and ability to use ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i across multiple contexts. ‘Ohana are actively integrating ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i beyond the program setting - into daily routines, incorporating multigenerational participation, increasingly engaging with ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in social and community spaces and creating environments where language use is normalized and reinforced. This comprehensive increase in comfort suggests lasting impacts on both individual and household-level language practices, supporting the broader goal of revitalizing ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i.

VALUE OF INTERGENERATIONAL TRANSMITTING

Intergenerational teaching and learning have been central to Native Hawaiian culture where knowledge was traditionally passed from kūpuna to mākuā to keiki through daily life, practice, and shared kuleana. Learning and transmitting ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i across generations strengthens cultural identity, fosters intergenerational connections, and ensures the continued vitality of the language. By engaging keiki, mākuā, and kūpuna in shared language practices, ‘ohana not only preserve traditional knowledge but also create meaningful opportunities for everyday communication and cultural participation.

There is an overwhelming consensus that ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i learning is highly valued

Table 19. The importance to learn and/or speak ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i with my ‘ohana is...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i	Combined
Very / extremely / important	84.2%	95.7%	85.8%
To support intergenerational transmission	29.5%	17.4%	27.8%
For cultural connection, identity	19.2%	17.4%	18.9%
To learn as ‘ohana	17.1%	21.7%	17.8%
For perpetuation	9.6%	13.0%	10.1%
For normalization	6.8%	8.7%	7.1%
Foundational	4.1%	4.3%	4.1%
Moderately viewed	2.7%	4.3%	3.0%
Part of being multilingual	2.1%	4.3%	2.4%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “How important is it for you to learn and/or learn to speak ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i with your ‘ohana?” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 169 (84.1%) households provided responses: 146 (86.4%) English responses and 23 (13.6%) ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

When respondents were asked how important it is for them to learn to speak ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i with their ‘ohana, all respondents overwhelmingly emphasized its importance with 85.8% identifying learning ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i with their ‘ohana as “Very” or “Extremely” or just plain “Important”. This was even more pronounced among ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses at 95.7%.

Themes related to cultural grounding and ‘ohana-based learning also appeared consistently across groups. Cultural connection and identity were noted in 18.9% of responses, while 17.8% emphasized the value of learning as an ‘ohana. Intergenerational transmission—highlighting the role of keiki and multigenerational participation—was present in 27.8% of combined responses, underscoring that ‘ohana view language learning not only as a personal priority, but as a shared responsibility across generations. Additional themes such as foundational importance (4.1%), perpetuation (10.1%), normalization (7.1%), and multilingual perspectives (2.4%) further demonstrate the multifaceted motivations behind prioritizing ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i within the home.

‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i responses more frequently emphasized the highest levels of importance and the role of ‘ohana learning, however, English responses, while also highly aligned with these themes, displayed a broader spread across categories such as intergenerational transmission (29.5%) and cultural connection (19.2%). Despite these small differences, both data sets clearly illustrate a shared commitment to language perpetuation and the belief that learning ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i is central to cultural identity and ‘ohana cohesion.

“It is very important for my husband and I. We talked about being able to be supportive of our children prior to deciding to apply them to Pūnana Leo. We currently take papa ‘ōlelo on our own time and will continue knowing our children will very soon surpass us.”

There is an overwhelming consensus that ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i learning is highly valued

Table 19. The importance to learn and/or speak ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i with my ‘ohana...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i	Combined
Supports intergenerational transmission	46.2%	61.9%	48.0%
Connects us to culture, kupuna, ‘ohana	47.5%	42.9%	46.9%
Is our kuleana	24.7%	28.6%	25.1%
Means revitalization, perpetuation	19.6%	33.3%	21.2%
Is ‘ohana learning together	17.1%	28.6%	18.4%
Is pride in self and culture	18.4%	9.5%	17.3%
There is no intergenerational use in our ‘ohana	16.5%	0.0%	14.5%
Is healing historical loss	14.6%	0.0%	12.8

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “What does inter-generational usage of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i mean to you and your ‘ohana? What value does it have to you and your ‘ohana?” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 179 (89.1%) households provided responses: 158 (88.3%) English responses and 21 (11.7%) ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

The survey question “What does inter-generational usage of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i mean to you and your ‘ohana? What value does it have to you and your ‘ohana?” revealed that nearly half (48.0%) of all respondents identified inter-generational transmission as a core theme. Closely aligned with this theme was the value placed on respecting and connecting to culture and kūpuna, noted in 46.9% of all responses. Themes related to kuleana (25.1%) and revitalization or perpetuation of the language (21.2%) further underscore the belief that ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i carries both cultural responsibility and long-term significance for sustaining Hawaiian identity. Additionally, 18.4% described the unique experience of ‘ohana learning together, while 17.3% expressed a deep sense of pride in self and culture. A smaller portion of respondents (14.5%) reported having no intergenerational use within their ‘ohana, and 12.8% reflected on the theme of healing historical loss.

When comparing the two data sets, ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i respondents more frequently emphasized intergenerational transmission (61.9% compared to 46.2%) and revitalization (33.3% compared to 19.6%) than English responses. English responses, however, more often highlighted themes of cultural connection (47.5%) and pride (18.4%) and uniquely included narratives about lacking intergenerational use or navigating historical loss. Despite these variations, both groups strongly affirmed the cultural and familial value of speaking ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, reflecting a shared vision of ‘ohana-based learning grounded in kuleana, connection to kūpuna, and a commitment to strengthening the language across generations.

“He ko‘iko‘i ke a‘o ‘ana aku/mai i ka olelo makuahine ma o na hanauna o ka ‘ohana. Ma laila no e kupa‘a a ho‘oikaikaika ai i ke kahua mauili no na hanauna ‘o keia wa a me na hanauna e hiki ana.”

“It is important to teach and learn the mother language through the generations of the family. It is there that the cultural foundation is strengthened and reinforced for the generations of today and for the generations yet to come.”

Overwhelmingly, participants primarily hoped to strengthen or increase their foundational ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i fluency through their participation in the program

Table 21. What I hoped to gain by participating in this program was...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i	Combined
To strengthen, support, increase foundational language fluency	73.1%	72.1%	72.9%
Personal growth/self-development	29.9%	34.9%	31.1%
Cultural knowledge	28.4%	27.9%	28.2%
‘Ohana growth and support	33.6%	55.8%	39.0%
Community building	19.4%	18.6%	19.2%
Unknown	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “What do you hope to gain by participating in this program?” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 177 (88.1%) households provided responses: 134 (75.7%) English responses and 43 (24.3%) ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

Participants were asked what they hoped to gain by participating in this program and three-quarters of all respondents (72.9%) noted their desire to strengthen or build foundational language fluency and confidence. This priority dominated both data sets at comparable rates—73.1% of English responses and 72.1% of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Additionally, ‘ohana-focused growth and support were mentioned in 39.0% of combined responses, with a markedly higher emphasis among ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses (55.8%) compared to English (33.6%). Themes related to personal growth and self-development (31.1%) and expanding cultural knowledge (28.2%), followed by community building 19.2% also appeared in responses.

Overall, ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses placed a greater focus on ‘ohana growth, suggesting a deeper prioritization of ‘ohana-centered language development, while English responses showed slightly higher representation in personal growth themes. Taken together, the data illustrate that participants view this program as an opportunity not only for skill-building, but for strengthening language, identity, ‘ohana, and community together.

“I hope to gain some proficiency in my language use and better understand Kānaka Maoli values and cultural practices. I would love to be more confident as a speaker and be able to ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i with other mākuā at our kula.”

Participants discovered that ‘ohana-based teaching and learning supports language acquisition, strengthens ‘ohana relationships, and promotes intergenerational learning

Table 22. Discoveries I made about ‘ohana based teaching and learning are that it...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i	Combined
Supports learning	50.4%	40.7%	48.6%
Strengthens ‘ohana relationships	31.1%	51.9%	34.9%
Supports intergenerational teaching and learning	25.2%	33.3%	26.7%
Supports consistency, motivation to continue learning	20.2%	14.8%	19.2%
Is a safe space	10.1%	11.1%	10.3%
Is positive	10.9%	0.0%	8.9%
Not sure, none made	10.1%	0.0%	8.2%
Has a sense of community	5.9%	14.8%	7.5%
Is challenging	4.2%	14.8%	6.2%
Supports cultural, spiritual connection	5.0%	3.7%	4.8%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “What discoveries have you made, if any, about ‘ohana based teaching and learning?” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 146 (72.6%) households provided responses: 119 (81.5%) English responses and 27 (18.5%) ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

The effectiveness of ‘ohana-based learning in supporting language development was the most frequently mentioned theme when asked about discoveries made about ‘ohana based teaching and learning. This premise was mentioned in half (50.4%) of English responses and 40.7% of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Strengthening ‘ohana relationships followed closely, with 31.1% of English responses and more than half (51.9%) of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses identifying this outcome. Intergenerational teaching and learning was present in 25.2% of English responses and 33.3% of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Themes of consistency and motivation also appeared in 20.2% of English responses and 14.8% of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Confidence-building and safe learning spaces were identified by about one in ten participants in both sets (10.1% English; 11.1% ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i), while cultural or spiritual connections were noted by 5.0% of English and 3.7% of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses.

Several differences emerged between the English and ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i response sets. ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i responses more frequently highlighted the relational and communal aspects of ‘ohana-based learning, including higher mentions of strengthened ‘ohana relationships (51.9% compared to 31.1%) and a stronger emphasis on sense of community (14.8% compared to 5.9%). ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i responses also noted challenges at a higher rate (14.8% compared to 4.2%), suggesting a greater openness in discussing difficulties. In contrast, English responses included more general positive statements (10.9%) and a greater proportion of “none” or “not sure” responses (10.1%), which were absent from the ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i set. Findings across both groups show that ‘ohana-based learning is viewed as effective, relational, and intergenerational, with ‘ohana reporting increased learning, stronger bonds, and environments that feel safe and supportive for developing ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i together.

“It feels natural to do it as an ‘ohana rather than always separately. I like that it’s more hands on rather than by a text book. I like that my keiki can hear and see us learning together. My keiki are teaching me too.”

Participants highlighted that multi-generational ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i transmission is reinforced through intergenerational engagement and home-based, parental kuleana

Table 23. Discoveries I have made about multi-generational transmission is that it...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i	Combined
Reinforces inter-generational relationships	30.1%	64.0%	36.2%
Starts at home, parental kuleana	23.0%	20.0%	22.5%
Heals generational loss and supports revival	24.8%	4.0%	21.0%
Keiki are catalysts for revival	22.1%	16.0%	21.0%
Inspires learning	23.9%	4.0%	20.3%
Needs consistent use, practice	15.9%	32.0%	18.8%
I don't know, none	22.1%	0.0%	18.1%
Supports pride in identity and cultural	10.6%	12.0%	10.9%
Enhances kūpuna roles	11.5%	4.0%	10.1%
Is healing	7.1%	12.0%	8.0%
Supports ancestral reconnection	8.0%	4.0%	7.2%
Is positive	8.8%	0.0%	7.2%
Showed changes in the ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i language	7.1%	4.0%	6.5%
Is challenging	1.8%	4.0%	2.2%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question "What discoveries have you made, if any, about multi-generational ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i transmission?" Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 138 (68.7%) households provided responses: 113 (81.9%) English responses and 25 (18.1%) ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

When asked what discoveries were made, if any, about multi-generational ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i transmission, participants noted intergenerational reinforcement as the most frequent discovery, identified in over one-third of all responses (36.2%). Participants highlighted how shared use of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i among mixed generations strengthen learning and normalizing the language within the household. Generational loss and revival (21.0%) and keiki serving as catalysts for language resurgence (21.0%) were also central themes. Additionally, 22.5% of responses emphasized that ‘ohana-based practice begins at home. Nearly one in five responses (18.8%) emphasized the need for regular practice, while 20.3% noted that immersion in ‘ohana contexts inspires learning and is an effective motivator. Themes such as identity and cultural pride (10.9%), healing (8.0%), and ancestral reconnection (7.2%) rounded out the themes.

When comparing English and ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses, ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses overwhelmingly highlighted intergenerational reinforcement (64.0%) and were also more likely to mention the need for consistent practice (32.0%) and healing and cultural pride (each at 12.0%). In contrast, English responses included larger proportions identifying generational loss and revival (24.8%), keiki-led revival (22.1%), and expressions of uncertainty or no discoveries (22.1%)—a theme not seen in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses.

“Our language will only live on if we pass it on to our generations to come, we need to decide for them that learning to ‘ōlelo is the only way our people will never be forgotten.”

IMPACTS REPORTED BY PARTICIPANTS

Meaningful impacts can reinforce continued learning and use by creating positive feedback loops. Increased confidence and successful intergenerational practice encourage more frequent language use, while stronger ‘ohana and community connections provide supportive environments for practice. As participants see the benefits of using ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in daily life, motivation grows, sustaining both individual learning and the broader transmission of the language across generations.

Participants self-reported an increase in their ‘ōlelo Hawaii proficiency from pre- to post-program

Table 24. I believe my proficiency with ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i is...

	Native Hawaiian		Non-Hawaiian		Total	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Novice	43.6%	26.3%	84.4%	68.8%	51.5%	34.5%
Intermediate	16.5%	21.8%	0.0%	12.5%	13.3%	20.0%
Advanced	27.1%	30.1%	12.5%	12.5%	24.2%	26.7%
Distinguished	9.8%	16.5%	3.1%	3.1%	8.5%	13.9%
Superior	3.0%	5.3%	0.0%	3.1%	2.4%	4.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “At this point, how would you rate your proficiency with ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i?” Of the 201 respondents, a total of 165 (80.6%) participants provided responses: 133 (80.6%) Native Hawaiian participants and 32 (15.9%) non-Hawaiian participants.

Participants assessed their ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i proficiency across five categories—Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, Distinguished, and Superior—before and after the program. Overall, the results show a positive movement toward higher proficiency, particularly among Native Hawaiian participants. Pre-program, more than half of all respondents (51.5%) identified as Novice, but this dropped 17 percentage points to 34.5% post-program. Native Hawaiian participants demonstrated the most significant progress, with a 17.3 percentage point decrease in novice ratings (43.6% to 26.3%) and modest increases across the Intermediate (16.5% to 21.8%), Advanced (27.1% to 30.1%), and Distinguished (9.8% to 16.5%) levels. Non-Native Hawaiian participants also improved, though at a slower pace.

Table 25. I believe my proficiency with ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i has...

	Native Hawaiian	Non-Hawaiian	Total
Decreased	9.0%	3.1%	7.9%
Increased	37.6%	18.8%	33.9%
Not Changed	53.4%	78.1%	58.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “At this point, how would you rate your proficiency with ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i?” Of the 201 respondents, a total of 165 (80.6%) participants provided responses: 133 (80.6%) Native Hawaiian participants and 32 (15.9%) non-Hawaiian participants.

When looking at overall change, the majority of respondents either improved or maintained their level of proficiency. More than one-third (33.9%) of all participants reported an increase from pre- to post-program, and Native Hawaiian participants again showed the highest rate of upward movement at 37.6%. Over half (58.2%) reported no change while a small percentage (7.9%) indicated a decrease.

Participants overwhelmingly gained an increase in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i improvement and confidence in use post-program

Table 26. In this ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i program, I gained or experienced...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i	Combined
An improvement in language, confidence in use	77.1%	34.3%	68.1%
Motivation and personal growth	45.8%	37.1%	44.0%
‘Ohana connection	29.0%	31.4%	29.5%
Cultural connection and kuleana	31.3%	20.0%	28.9%
Community building	19.8%	40.0%	24.1%
Pride and identity	11.5%	22.9%	13.9%
Keiki growth	9.2%	25.7%	12.7%
Resources	7.6%	2.9%	6.6%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “What did you gain by participating in this ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i program?” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 166 (82.6%) households provided responses: 131 (78.9%) English responses and 35 (21.1%) ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

Across both data sets, participants overwhelmingly identified language development and increased confidence as the most significant gain from the program, representing 68.1% of all responses. Motivation and personal growth (44.0%), ‘ohana connection (29.5%), and cultural connection and kuleana (28.9%) followed as other major themes. Community building (24.1%), pride and identity (13.9%), and keiki growth (12.7%) were also present but appeared at lower frequencies, with resources (6.6%) least frequently mentioned across the combined data.

When comparing English and ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i response sets, both groups identified language development as the top theme, though this was far more pronounced among English responses (77.1%) than ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i responses (34.3%). ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i responses, however, showed higher proportions in themes such as community building (40.0%), keiki growth (25.7%), pride and identity (22.9%), and ‘ohana connection (31.4%).

Ua nui kā mākou mau mea i loa‘a ai eia na‘e, ‘o ka pilina ‘ohana ka mea nui! ua hana nui nā kumu ma ke kukulu pilina ma waena o ke kula a me nā ‘ohana. Mahalo nui mākou i ka hana keu a ka maika‘i o nā kumu. Ua ‘ike ‘ia nō ko nā kumu aloha i nā keiki, honua kula, ‘ohana a me ka papahana ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i. He mea nui ke kāko‘o aku kāko‘o mai o nā makua a pēlā nō e holo pono ai kā mākou hana. Ua ‘ike ‘ia nō ka nani o ka ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i a nā manu ma ka pūnana.

“We have gained many things, but the most important is family relationships! The teachers have done a great deal in building connections between the school and the families. We are very grateful for the teachers’ dedicated and excellent work. The teachers’ love for the children, the school environment, the families, and the Hawaiian language program is evident. Support from the parents is very important, as it ensures that our work runs smoothly. The beauty of the Hawaiian language is clearly seen in the children at the preschool.”

The programs strengthened participants’ ‘ōlelo Hawai’i abilities by increasing usage, vocabulary, confidence, and motivation

Table 27. The impact of the program on my ‘ōlelo Hawai’i ability was...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai’i	Combined
Strengthened, increased language usage	16.2%	50.0	19.9%
Increased vocabulary, sentence structure	18.2%	27.8%	19.3%
Motivation to learn/continue	18.2%	22.2%	18.7%
Confidence	18.2%	22.2%	18.7%
Cultural connection	5.4%	0.0%	4.8%
Supportive learning space	12.2%	27.8%	13.9%
‘Ohana learning together	20.9%	22.2%	21.1%
Limited/none	7.4%	5.6%	7.2%
Positive	61.5%	44.4%	59.6%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “The impact of the program on my ‘ōlelo Hawai’i ability was...” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 166 (82.6%) households provided responses: 148 (89.2%) English responses and 18 (10.8%) ‘ōlelo Hawai’i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

A majority of participants reported experiencing strong or meaningful improvement (59.6%) in their ‘ōlelo Hawai’i ability. The most frequently mentioned was ‘ohana learning together at 21.1%, followed by strengthened or increased language usage at 19.9% and increased vocabulary and sentence structure at 19.3%. Motivation to continue learning and increased confidence were each reflected in 18.7% of responses. Supportive learning spaces were mentioned in 13.9% of responses and 7.2% noted limited or minimal impact.

When comparing English and ‘ōlelo Hawai’i responses, half (50.0%) of ‘ōlelo Hawai’i responses emphasized strengthened or increased usage, compared to 16.2% of English responses. Supportive learning spaces were also more prominent in ‘ōlelo Hawai’i responses at 27.8%, compared to 12.2% in English responses. In contrast, English responses more frequently mentioned ‘ohana learning together at 20.9% and cultural connection at 5.4%, while cultural connection did not appear in ‘ōlelo Hawai’i responses. Both groups reported similar levels of motivation to continue and increase confidence.

Overall, data indicates that the program fostered increased usage, confidence, and ‘ohana-based language learning beyond the classroom, while also creating a supportive environment that encouraged continued engagement with ‘ōlelo Hawai’i.

“I’m so grateful for having been able to listen to the reasons behind how certain phrases or structures come to exist. That made all the difference in my ability to learn foundational ‘ōlelo Hawai’i. It felt like a switch flipped and opened up my ability to comprehend.”

Almost all participants would participate in the program again

Table 28. If given the choice, would I participate in this program again?

	Native Hawaiian	Non-Hawaiian	Total
Yes	96.8%	95.8%	96.6%
Maybe	2.4%	4.2%	2.7%
No	0.8%	0.0%	0.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “If given the choice, would you participate in this program again?” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 176 (80.1%) households provided responses.

When asked whether they would participate in the program again, responses were overwhelmingly positive for both Native Hawaiians and non-Hawaiian respondents. Nearly all participants indicated they would return, with 96.6% selecting “Yes.” Native Hawaiian participants expressed the highest level of enthusiasm at 96.8%, with non-Hawaiian participants at 95.8%. Very few respondents expressed uncertainty, with only 2.7% selecting “Maybe,” and less than 1% indicating they would not participate again.

Almost all participants would recommend their respective program to others

Table 29. Would you recommend this program to others in your 'ohana and community?

	Native Hawaiian	Non-Hawaiian	Total
Yes	96.0%	87.5%	94.6%
Maybe	4.0%	12.5%	5.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “If given the choice, would you participate in this program again?” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 176 (80.1%) households provided responses.

Participants expressed strong support for the program when asked whether they would recommend it to their 'ohana and community. Overall, 94.6% of respondents indicated they would recommend the program, reflecting notable satisfaction with the learning experience. Native Hawaiian participants showed especially high endorsement, with 96.0% selecting “Yes,” demonstrating deep confidence in the program’s value for their 'ohana and communities. Non-Hawaiian participants also responded positively, with 87.5% stating they would recommend the program, though they expressed slightly more uncertainty, as shown by the higher “Maybe” responses.

Participants not only expressed a widely embraced willingness to re-enroll but also showed overwhelming support in recommending the program to their 'ohana and community. Together, these responses indicate that learners found the experience meaningful, supportive, and effective in strengthening their 'ōlelo Hawai'i skills and confidence. The combined enthusiasm for returning and encouraging others to participate reinforces the program’s cultural relevance and its role in fostering a positive, engaging learning environment that strengthens language use and community connections.

Participants highlighted positive experiences, gratitude, and ‘ohana growth as final mana’o on their experiences in learning ‘ōlelo Hawai’i

Table 30. My final mana'o on my experiences learning ‘ōlelo Hawai’i as an ‘ohana is...

	English	‘Ōlelo Hawai’i	Combined
A positive program experiences and outcomes	57.9%	22.2%	51.6%
A continued commitment, desire to continue program	34.9%	18.5%	32.0%
Gratitude	25.4%	48.1%	29.4%
Growth as an ‘ohana	31.0%	11.1%	27.5%
Perseverance	16.7%	18.5%	17.0%
Pride	9.5%	51.9%	17.0%
Keiki growth	15.9%	11.1%	15.0%
Personal growth	14.3%	3.7%	12.4%
Confidence	6.3%	0.0%	5.2%
Participation challenges	4.0%	0.0%	3.3%

Notes. Data reflects the response to the survey question “Final mana'o on your experiences learning ‘ōlelo Hawai’i as an ‘ohana.” Of the 201 survey respondents, a total of 153 (76.1%) households provided responses: 126 (82.4%) English responses and 27 (17.6%) ‘ōlelo Hawai’i responses. Percentages represent coded responses within each language group. Respondents may appear in multiple themes; therefore, percentages may not equal to 100%.

When asked for their final mana’o (thoughts) on their experience learning ‘ōlelo Hawai’i as an ‘ohana, more than half (51.6%) of all responses indicated positive program experiences and outcomes, making this the most frequently mentioned theme across both language groups. Nearly one-third (32.0%) emphasized a continued commitment to learning ‘ōlelo Hawai’i and a desire to stay engaged in the program, while 29.4% expressed gratitude for the opportunity and support received. Growth as a ‘ohana was noted in 27.5% of responses, and perseverance appeared in 17.0%. Themes such as pride (17.0%), keiki growth (15.0%), and personal growth (12.4%) further highlight the broad emotional and developmental impact of the program, though confidence (5.2%) and participation challenges (3.3%) were less frequently noted.

When comparing English and ‘ōlelo Hawai’i responses, English responses most commonly reflected on positive experiences (57.9%) and ‘ohana growth (31.0%), while ‘ōlelo Hawai’i responses, in contrast, strongly emphasized gratitude (48.1%) and pride (51.9%). While both groups shared themes of perseverance and continued commitment at similar levels, confidence and participation challenges were mentioned only in English responses, and keiki or personal growth appeared more modestly in the ‘ōlelo Hawai’i set. Together, these similarities and differences suggest that while all participants valued their learning journey, ‘ōlelo Hawai’i reflections conveyed a heightened sense of cultural identity and appreciation, complementing the broader program satisfaction expressed in English responses.

“I am so honored to be learning Hawaiian alongside my daughter and my husband. We will forever be haumana. It is so important to me to see that my children become rooted and who they are as Hawaiians. To remember who we are to remember where we come from and to remember that we are strong people. Learning Olelo Hawaii has reminded me that we need to Kupaa and to be a good representative of who we are as Hawaiians.”

“Mahalo ‘ia nā molia nui a me nā hana iki a nā kūpuna, nā kumu ho‘ohālike a me nā alaka‘i pa‘a mau o kēia aukahi no ka ho‘okāhua a kahukahu mau ana i ke ola loa o ka ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i i ko kākou ‘ōlelo. Ne ‘ole lākou, pau paha ka ‘ōlelo, ka ‘ike, ka mauli ola a kākou nā

“Deep thanks to the great and small efforts of our kūpuna, mentors, and steadfast leaders of this era who continually lay the foundation for the life of the Hawaiian language. Without them, we might have lost the language, the knowledge, and the essential life force of us as Native people.”

PROGRAM STAFF INSIGHTS

Due to limited responses from program staff, the following overviews are a combination of qualitative responses and information from quarterly and final report outs.

‘Ohana engagement with one another

When asked how ‘ohana members engage each other in learning and transmission of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, program staff note that ‘ohana engage in multiple ways. ‘Ohana practice short phrases and basic sentence structures at home and wherever they are, using everyday questions—such as asking names, ages, or where someone lives—to normalize ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in daily conversation. Many ‘ohana speak a mix of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i and English at home, at work, and in the community, gradually increasing their comfort and fluency. ‘Ohana also reinforce learning through text or email, by playing games that prompt ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i word usage, and by striving to use the language enough that it becomes second nature.

Programs provide safe, immersive spaces where mākuā and extended ‘ohana can practice together, push each other to converse, and make ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i the expected language on campus. Successful engagement is often driven by mākuā or other adults who already speak or are confident learners; these adults help facilitate conversations, support homework, and model consistent use, though ‘ohana have shared the challenges when they are beginners themselves.

Collectively, these practices highlight the importance of a supportive village—mākuā, keiki, aunties, uncles, and kumu—working together to strengthen language transmission across generations.

Program engagement of ‘ohana in community

Program staff were asked how their respective programs engage with ‘ohana in your community. They state that their program actively engages ‘ohana in the community by providing multiple opportunities to learn and use ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, as well as access to cultural knowledge, traditions, and ancestral wisdom.

Classes, workshops, and ‘ohana-oriented events encourage participation across generations, allowing keiki, mākuā, and extended ‘ohana to practice together. Programs incorporate hands-on activities, games, and resources that ‘ohana can take home and use in their daily lives, making the language both accessible and relevant.

Engagement extends beyond the classroom through community events, virtual platforms, and partnerships with schools and hālau, fostering connections among ‘ohana and reinforcing the ongoing use and transmission of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i throughout the wider community.

Program engagement of ‘ohana in learning and transmission of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i

The program engages ‘ohana in the learning and transmission of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i by creating intentional opportunities for ‘ohana to use the language together in class and beyond. Lessons introduce common phrases and vocabulary that mākuā can practice daily with their keiki, helping to normalize ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in the home. A variety of teaching methods—including manipulatives, books, flashcards, games, and repetitive

dialogue—support learning for both children and adults, while activities such as reading, acting out stories, and hands-on projects reinforce understanding through social and experiential learning.

Programs and other 'ohana-focused workshops provide structured practice, encourage consistent use of the language on campus and in community events, and give 'ohana access to resources to continue learning at home. By participating together, 'ohana become more confident and familiar with 'ōlelo Hawai'i, fostering intergenerational transmission and supporting the long-term goal of making 'ōlelo Hawai'i a living language in the home and community.

Challenges the program experienced in supporting 'ohana 'ōlelo Hawai'i language education

The program faced multiple challenges in supporting 'ohana and their 'ōlelo Hawai'i language education. Attendance and consistent participation were the most significant obstacles, with many 'ohana attending irregularly due to work, school pick-ups, keiki activities, or other personal kuleana. Some 'ohana would attend only part of a class or participate early in the year before tapering off, particularly kūpuna, who were rarely present by the program's end.

Variations in age and skill levels within 'ohana also made engagement difficult, especially with a larger number of keiki relative to mākuā and kūpuna. Workshops and weekend sessions often had low turnout, and new 'ohana who joined late sometimes dropped out. While the program provided skilled teaching staff, abundant materials, and resources for at-home practice, many mākuā lacked the time, confidence, or language skills to fully support their children's learning throughout the duration of the program.

Additionally, some 'ohana found the ha'awina or examples less relevant to daily life, suggesting that more practical phrases and everyday usage could strengthen learning. Overall, success was more likely when whole 'ohana units attended consistently, highlighting the importance of sustained 'ohana engagement for intergenerational transmission of 'ōlelo Hawai'i.

Challenges 'ohana experienced in intergenerational transmission of 'ōlelo Hawai'i language

'Ohana faced a range of challenges in the intergenerational transmission of 'ōlelo Hawai'i. Many reported feelings of self-consciousness or fear of making mistakes, which made them hesitant to speak. Differences in learning pace between keiki and mākuā, as well as keiki's limited attention spans or reluctance after a full school day, sometimes created tension in lessons. The strong presence of English in daily life, coupled with its ease for emotional expression, further complicated efforts to use 'ōlelo Hawai'i.

Regular attendance by multiple 'ohana members was critical, as inconsistent participation made it harder to retain language skills and maintain practice at home. External factors such as work schedules, after-school activities, transportation, and other life responsibilities often limited opportunities for consistent learning.

Additionally, 'ohana noted that materials and lessons that were not relatable made comprehension more difficult, and lack of home support could cause language use to feel like a chore rather than a natural part of daily life. Early exposure, particularly for keiki under age two, was cited as helpful, highlighting the importance of starting language learning young and fostering a supportive, confident environment across generations.

Strengths the program identified in supporting 'ohana 'ōlelo Hawai'i education

The programs demonstrated several strengths in supporting 'ohana and their 'ōlelo Hawai'i education, particularly in fostering perseverance, engagement, and cultural connection. 'Ohana showed resilience and a willingness to navigate the differences between English and 'ōlelo Hawai'i, while staff observed that hands-on activities, games, and interactive approaches helped normalize the use of 'ōlelo Hawai'i in everyday life.

Participants noted that the program provided valuable opportunities for learning and cultural enrichment for learners of all backgrounds, helping to strengthen ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i and culture.

Feedback also highlighted areas for growth, including the need for longer program duration to make a more significant impact, increased ‘ohana-centered activities, clearer teaching strategies, and curriculum mapping to guide learning progression. Several respondents emphasized giving mākuā and kūpuna a more active role in teaching, focusing on foundational content, and fostering accountability both in class and at home.

Despite some logistical challenges, such as attendance and reporting burdens, the program was seen as a strong starting point with potential to grow, especially if lessons are made relatable, applicable to daily life, and supported by consistent ‘ohana involvement.

DISCUSSION

Findings from the ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i Community-Based Research Project show that ‘ohana-centered programming supports meaningful growth in language use, confidence, and intergenerational engagement. Across the four ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i programs, participants reported increased use of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i in their households, with mākuā most often leading language learning, and keiki serving as important catalysts for ‘ohana engagement. Intergenerational participation, where mākuā, grandparents, and keiki practice together, was frequently observed, reflecting the programs’ success in creating ‘ohana-centered language environments.

Participants also reported greater comfort using ‘ōlelo in daily life. Use extended beyond structured lessons into household routines, community spaces, and social settings. ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i speakers generally reported higher levels of consistent use, but both Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian participants demonstrated growth, showing that inclusive, accessible programming can accommodate varying levels of prior experience.

Despite these gains, structural challenges limited full measurement of program impact. Survey non-response—particularly among keiki and households with inconsistent attendance—reduced dataset completeness, and the absence of student perspectives remains a notable gap. External factors such as scheduling constraints, transportation barriers, and post-wildfire impacts also affected participation and data collection.

Even with these limitations, the evidence indicates that ‘ohana-based programming strengthens language fluency, cultural identity, and ‘ohana connections. Participants described improved ‘ohana relationships, increased cultural pride, and deeper engagement with ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i practices. These outcomes underscore the importance of continued investment in culturally grounded curricula, flexible program designs, and improved data systems that capture multigenerational experiences.

Overall, the project demonstrates that community-driven, ‘ohana-centered approaches are critical to the revitalization of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i. By supporting ‘ohana-level language practices and encouraging use in everyday life, these programs contribute to the long-term vitality of the language and the well-being of Native Hawaiian communities.

CHALLENGES

This section presents challenges noted in quarterly reports submitted during the program implementation across all four ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i programs. Some challenges were experienced across more than one program while some challenges were specific to individual programs.

Challenges shared by multiple programs included:

The August 2023 Lahaina fires created significant challenges for ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i program implementation, particularly for two programs directly impacted by displacement and community disruption. One program lost its Lahaina campus, affecting 24 ‘ohana, who were offered the option to transfer to another campus or continue part-time elsewhere, though participation in the project was not required. Another program delayed implementation to support the community, while participants and ‘ohana faced housing and employment loss, transportation limitations, emotional trauma, and shifting recovery priorities. These disruptions resulted in decreased enrollment, reduced survey completion, irregular attendance, and modification or cancellation of planned program activities, collectively limiting program engagement and participation.

Ongoing challenges with attendance were compounded by the open, voluntary nature of some programs, competing work schedules, and household obligations. Programs with voluntary attendance saw inconsistent pre- and post-survey completion, limiting the ability to track individual progress and assess overall impact. Even programs requiring enrollment and commitment experienced participation drops of up to 30%. Staff turnover and multi-location scheduling further reduced program continuity, engagement, and reporting quality. These combined factors—including displacement, attendance variability, staffing changes, and logistical challenges—constrained the reliability of data and limited the ability to evaluate program-specific effectiveness or attribute outcomes directly to participation.

LIMITATIONS

The evaluation faced several limitations in survey design and administration that affected the completeness, accuracy, and representativeness of the data. Challenges included a lack of age-appropriate questions for keiki, underrepresentation of younger participants, and inconsistent survey practices across programs. These issues were compounded by households where one adult completed surveys on behalf of others, survey fatigue due to repetitive or lengthy questions, and variations in how grantees distributed and formatted the survey tools. Together, these factors created inconsistencies that limit the ability to reliably compare or aggregate results across sites.

Additional biases further complicated interpretation of the findings. Participants may have altered responses due to social desirability, especially when they knew program staff could view their surveys. Pre/post self-assessment data was also affected by response shift bias, where participants’ understanding of their own proficiency changed as they learned, potentially lowering post-ratings despite actual growth. These limitations underscore the need for more consistent survey administration, improved question design—particularly for keiki—and careful interpretation of self-reported outcomes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Several areas for strengthening future programming emerged from survey trends and participant feedback.

- Expanding ‘ohana-centered activities, where mākuā, kūpuna, and keiki learn together, may support continued growth, particularly for beginning-level participants.
- Programs that incorporated take-home tools, practice activities, or routine-based prompts saw higher reported use and may benefit from additional structured materials.
- Attendance barriers such as work schedules, transportation, or community disruptions highlight the need for flexible scheduling, hybrid options, or wellness supports.

- Continued integration of cultural practices, mele, mo'olelo, and place-based learning remains important for strengthening cultural identity and deepening connections across generations.
- Increasing survey completion rates, especially among keiki, would provide a more complete picture of intergenerational learning and program impact.
- Longitudinal study to monitor continued participant engagement and learning progression to assess long-term impacts and program effectiveness.

Overall, findings show that 'ohana are motivated to learn and use 'ōlelo Hawai'i and would benefit from expanded supports that reinforce daily use in home, school, and community settings.

CONCLUSION

Overall, findings show that 'ohana are not only engaging in 'ōlelo Hawai'i learning during class time but are carrying those practices into their daily lives, community spaces, and multi-generational interactions. While proficiency levels showed little change over the course of the program, 'ohana reported noticeable gains in confidence, with participants expressing greater comfort speaking, practicing, and introducing new vocabulary across a range of daily activities. These increases in confidence appear closely tied to consistent use, suggesting that the more 'ohana incorporate 'ōlelo Hawai'i into regular routines, such as during meals, bedtime, and chores, the more the language use becomes normalized and natural.

Use of 'ōlelo Hawai'i also expanded into the community and social settings, at school events, within the workplace and during cultural activities. Keiki continued to play a central role in reinforcing learning, modeling new language patterns and vocabulary, and encouraging mākuā and grandparents to practice what they learned outside of the classroom setting. This keiki-led learning strengthened intergenerational participation and reinforced the 'ohana as the primary environment for normalizing 'ōlelo Hawai'i.

Despite participation and data limitations, responses demonstrate clear movement toward more consistent household use, more frequent integration of vocabulary and phrases, and stronger cultural connection. The results point to a community of learners who are committed to sustaining and growing their use of 'ōlelo Hawai'i and who benefit from programs that support 'ohana-based, culturally grounded, and routine-integrated learning.

APPENDIX

SET 1: OHA INTERGENERATIONAL 'ŌLELO HAWAI'I PROGRAM QUESTION SET

1A - Pre-Programming Questions	Response Formatting																										
1. Date of Survey	Date Format mm/dd/yyyy																										
2. What is your full name?	Open-Ended																										
3. What is the name of your program site?	Open-Ended																										
4. What is your project role?	Open-Ended																										
5. How many years have you worked at the program?	Whole Number 1 - 40																										
6. What is your gender identity?	Male Female Transgender Non-Binary/Non-Conforming Another Gender Prefer to Not Answer																										
7. What was your age on your last birthday?	Whole Number 1 - 100																										
8. Are you Native Hawaiian?	Yes No																										
9. What is your race? Select all that apply.	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Native Hawaiian</td> <td>Chuukese</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chamorro/Chamoru</td> <td>Other Pacific Islander (please specify)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fijian</td> <td>Chinese</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I-Kiribati</td> <td>Filipino</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kosraean</td> <td>Japanese</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marshallese</td> <td>Korean</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Palauan/Belauan</td> <td>Okinawan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pohnpeian</td> <td>Vietnamese</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Samoan</td> <td>Other Asian (please specify)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tahitian</td> <td>Alaskan Native</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tokelauan</td> <td>American Indian</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tongan</td> <td>Black or African American</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yapese</td> <td>White Other (please specify)</td> </tr> </table>	Native Hawaiian	Chuukese	Chamorro/Chamoru	Other Pacific Islander (please specify)	Fijian	Chinese	I-Kiribati	Filipino	Kosraean	Japanese	Marshallese	Korean	Palauan/Belauan	Okinawan	Pohnpeian	Vietnamese	Samoan	Other Asian (please specify)	Tahitian	Alaskan Native	Tokelauan	American Indian	Tongan	Black or African American	Yapese	White Other (please specify)
Native Hawaiian	Chuukese																										
Chamorro/Chamoru	Other Pacific Islander (please specify)																										
Fijian	Chinese																										
I-Kiribati	Filipino																										
Kosraean	Japanese																										
Marshallese	Korean																										
Palauan/Belauan	Okinawan																										
Pohnpeian	Vietnamese																										
Samoan	Other Asian (please specify)																										
Tahitian	Alaskan Native																										
Tokelauan	American Indian																										
Tongan	Black or African American																										
Yapese	White Other (please specify)																										
10. What is the highest level of schooling you've completed?	Currently a student No schooling completed Regular high school diploma GED or alternative credential Some college credit, but less than 1 year of college Some college, but no degree Associates degree (for example: AA, AS) Bachelor's degree (for example: BA, BS) Master's degree (for example: MA, MS, MEng, MEd, MSW, MBA) Professional degree beyond bachelor's degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD) Doctorate degree (for example, PhD, EdD) Other – Fill in blank																										

<p>11. What is your proficiency with 'ōlelo Hawai'i?</p>	<p>Novice – Communicates with words and short phrases regarding familiar topics, e.g. colors, food, family.</p> <p>i. lllLow – This person can communicate with usual phrases and remember the names of objects around him, e.g. chair, door, book.</p> <p>ii. lllMid – This person can use short and familiar phrases that have been memorized. She responds with to three words and phrases that have been memorized, e.g. The usual, thanks. And you?</p> <p>iii. lllHigh – This person can respond to personal questions and ask for information. His conversation is limited to what has been memorized.</p> <p>Intermediate – The person at this level can produce and use language to converse on familiar topics that was taught, health, weather, store.</p> <p>i. lllLow – The person at this level can generate language for social situations like talking about self, the family, work and needs that arise like ordering food at a restaurant.</p> <p>ii. lllMid – The person at this level can answer usual questions and inquiries concerning the family, work, favorite things. Trips. Her production of language is greater and comes more easily.</p> <p>iii. lllHigh – The person at this level can converse with ease on routines an in various social situations. Her production of speech is about a paragraph in length.</p> <p>Advanced – The person at the Advanced level can converse on various topics and speak in formal and informal settings.</p> <p>i. lllLow – He can narrate a story in present, future, and past tenses. His production of speech is about a paragraph in length but not quite proficient and flowing and contains many self-corrections.</p> <p>ii. lllMid – She can narrate a story in present, future, and past tenses and manage her speech well Speaking at the Advanced Mid-level is more fluent</p>
<p>12. How many years have you been speaking/using 'ōlelo Hawai'i?</p>	<p>Whole Number 1 - 100</p>
<p>13. How many years have you been teaching 'ōlelo Hawai'i?</p>	<p>Whole Number 1 - 100</p>
<p>14. Why did you decide to work with 'ōlelo Hawai'i programming?</p>	<p>Open Ended</p>
<p>15. Where did you first learn 'ōlelo Hawai'i?</p>	<p>Home School – Pre-School School – Kaiapuni School – College Work Other (Fill in Blank)</p>
<p>16. How would you describe your 'ōlelo Hawai'i learning experience?</p>	<p>Open Ended</p>

17. How was the transition from learning 'ōlelo Hawai'i to teaching/working with 'ōlelo Hawai'i programming? What types of things helped that transition?	Open Ended
18. What did you learn?	Open Ended
19. How is 'ōlelo Hawai'i used in your 'ohana or household?	Open Ended
20. How does your role/program support 'ōlelo Hawai'i teaching/learning?	Open Ended
21. How does your program engage with 'ohana in your community?	Open Ended
22. What strategies drive attendance, participation, or interest in 'ōlelo Hawai'i?	Open Ended
23. Final mana'o regarding 'ōlelo Hawai'i teaching/learning strategies in teaching and/or engaging 'ohana in 'ōlelo Hawai'i activities?	Open Ended

SET 1: OHA INTERGENERATIONAL 'ŌLELO HAWAI'I PROGRAM QUESTION SET

1B - Post-Programming Questions	Response Formatting
1. Date of Survey	Date Format mm/dd/yyyy
2. What is your full name?	Open-Ended
3. How would you describe your participation in the 'ōlelo Hawai'i program?	Open-Ended
4. Through your involvement in the program, what discoveries have you made, if any, about 'ohana based teaching and learning?	Open-Ended
5. Through your involvement in the program, what discoveries have you made, if any, about inter-generation 'ōlelo Hawai'i transmission?	Open-Ended
6. Through your involvement in the program, what discoveries have you made, if any, about 'ōlelo Hawai'i normalization?	Open-Ended
7. How do 'ohana members engage each other in learning and transmission of 'ōlelo Hawai'i?	Open-Ended
8. How does the program engage 'ohana in the learning and transmission of 'ōlelo Hawai'i?	Open-Ended
9. What are the challenges the program experienced in supporting families' Hawaiian language education through your programming?	Open-Ended
10. What are the challenges the families experienced in the intergenerational transmission of Hawaiian language?	Open-Ended
11. What are the strengths the program experienced in supporting families' Hawaiian language education?	Open-Ended
12. What resources were offered to the participants by the program (readers, dictionaries, flashcards, etc, CDs, apps.)?	Open-Ended

13. Estimate how many hours were spent (in total) by you during the tenure of the Program for: Preparation and Development	Open-Ended
14. Estimate how many hours were spent (in total) by you during the tenure of the Program for: Staff Training	Open-Ended
15. Estimate how many hours were spent (in total) by you during the tenure of the Program for: Implementation	Open-Ended
16. Estimate how many hours were spent (in total) by you during the tenure of the Program for: Evaluation	Open-Ended
17. Final mana'o regarding 'ōlelo Hawai'i teaching/learning strategies in teaching and/or engaging 'ohana in 'ōlelo Hawai'i activities?	Open-Ended

SET 2: OHA INTERGENERATIONAL 'ŌLELO HAWAI'I PROGRAM QUESTION SET

2A - Pre-Programming Questions	Response Formatting
1. Date of Survey	Date Format mm/dd/yyyy
2. What is your full name?	Open-Ended
3. What island are you located on?	Hawai'i Maui Lāna'i Moloka'i O'ahu Kaua'i Ni'ihau
4. What is the name of your moku (district), community, or neighborhood?	Open-Ended
5. How many members are in your household?	Whole Number 1 - 100
6. How many of your household members are participating in this program?	Whole Number 1 - 100
7. In what range is your annual household income?	Under \$50,000 \$50,001 - \$70,000 \$70,001 - \$90,000 \$90,001 - \$120,000 \$120,001 - \$150,000 \$150,001 - \$180,000 \$180,001 - \$200,000 \$200,000+ \$0 Income I don't know
8. Which option best describes your household?	One Generation Two Generations (i.e., Parents + Children) Three Generations (i.e., Grandparents + Parents + Children) Four Generations (i.e., Great-Grandparents + Grandparents + Parents + Children) Other (Fill in the Blank)

9. How would you best describe your role in the household?	Child/Keiki Parent/Makua Grandparent/Kupuna Great-Grandparent/Kupuna Cousin/Hoahanau Hanai Aunty/Uncle Non-Family Household Member Other (Fill in the Blank)
10. What is your gender identity?	Male Female Transgender Non-Binary/Non-Conforming Another Gender Prefer to Not Answer
11. What was your age on your last birthday?	Whole Number 1 -100
12. If applicable, where do you attend school?	Open-Ended
13. If applicable, what is your current grade level?	Pre-K K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
14. What is the highest level of schooling you've completed?	Currently a student No schooling completed Regular high school diploma GED or alternative credential Some college credit, but less than 1 year of college Some college, but no degree Associates degree (for example: AA, AS) Bachelor's degree (for example: BA, BS) Master's degree (for example: MA, MS, MEng, MEd, MSW, MBA) Professional degree beyond bachelor's degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD) Doctorate degree (for example, PhD, EdD) Other – Fill in blank
15. Are you Native Hawaiian?	Yes No

<p>16. What is your race? Select all that apply.</p>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Native Hawaiian</td> <td>Chuukese</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chamorro/Chamoru</td> <td>Other Pacific Islander (please specify)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fijian</td> <td>Chinese</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I-Kiribati</td> <td>Filipino</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kosraean</td> <td>Japanese</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marshallese</td> <td>Korean</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Palauan/Belauan</td> <td>Okinawan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pohnpeian</td> <td>Vietnamese</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Samoan</td> <td>Other Asian (please specify)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tahitian</td> <td>Alaskan Native</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tokelauan</td> <td>American Indian</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tongan</td> <td>Black or African American</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yapese</td> <td>White Other (please specify)</td> </tr> </table>	Native Hawaiian	Chuukese	Chamorro/Chamoru	Other Pacific Islander (please specify)	Fijian	Chinese	I-Kiribati	Filipino	Kosraean	Japanese	Marshallese	Korean	Palauan/Belauan	Okinawan	Pohnpeian	Vietnamese	Samoan	Other Asian (please specify)	Tahitian	Alaskan Native	Tokelauan	American Indian	Tongan	Black or African American	Yapese	White Other (please specify)
Native Hawaiian	Chuukese																										
Chamorro/Chamoru	Other Pacific Islander (please specify)																										
Fijian	Chinese																										
I-Kiribati	Filipino																										
Kosraean	Japanese																										
Marshallese	Korean																										
Palauan/Belauan	Okinawan																										
Pohnpeian	Vietnamese																										
Samoan	Other Asian (please specify)																										
Tahitian	Alaskan Native																										
Tokelauan	American Indian																										
Tongan	Black or African American																										
Yapese	White Other (please specify)																										
<p>17. What are your reasons for learning 'ōlelo Hawai'i?</p>	<p>Open-Ended</p>																										
<p>18. How do you use 'ōlelo Hawai'i in your household and daily life?</p>	<p>Open-Ended</p>																										
<p>19. How important is it for you to learn and/or learn to speak 'ōlelo Hawai'i with your 'ohana?</p>	<p>Open-Ended</p>																										
<p>20. Who in your 'ohana leads the effort for learning and using 'ōlelo Hawai'i?</p>	<p>Open-Ended</p>																										
<p>21. What does inter-generational usage of 'ōlelo Hawai'i mean to you and your 'ohana? What value does it have to you and your 'ohana?</p>	<p>Open-Ended</p>																										
<p>22. What do you hope to gain by participating in this program?</p>	<p>Open-Ended</p>																										
<p>23. Do you have any specific worries or fears about your participation in the program?</p>	<p>Open-Ended</p>																										
<p>24. Describe how 'ōlelo Hawai'i has been used in your 'ohana in the past? If applicable, can you describe what led to the disruption of 'ōlelo Hawai'i usage in your 'ohana?</p>	<p>Open-Ended</p>																										
<p>25. What is your proficiency with 'ōlelo Hawai'i? regarding familiar topics, e.g. colors, food, family.</p>	<p>Novice – Communicates with words and short phrases</p> <p>i. Low – This person can communicate with usual phrases and remember the names of objects around him, e.g. chair, door, book.</p> <p>ii. Mid – This person can use short and familiar phrases that have been memorized. She responds with to three words and phrases that have been memorized, e.g. The usual, thanks. And you?</p> <p>Intermediate – The person at this level can produce and use language to converse on familiar topics that was taught, health, weather, store.</p> <p>i. Low – The person at this level can generate language for social situations like talking about self, the family, work and needs that arise like ordering food at a restaurant.</p> <p>ii. Mid – The person at this level can answer usual questions and inquiries concerning the family, work, favorite things. Trips. Her production of language is greater and comes more easily.</p> <p>iii. High – The person at this level can converse with ease on routines an in various social situations. Her production of speech is about a paragraph in length.</p> <p>Advanced – The person at the Advanced level can converse on various topics and speak in formal and informal settings.</p>																										

	<p>i. LLLLow – He can narrate a story in present, future, and past tenses. His production of speech is about a paragraph in length but not quite proficient and flowing and contains many self-corrections.</p> <p>ii. LLMMid – She can narrate a story in present, future, and past tenses and manage her speech well. Speaking at the Advanced Mid-level is more fluent.</p>
26. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is your comfort level for using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in your household:	Scale 1-10
27. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is your comfort level for using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in your daily life:	Scale 1-10
28. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is your comfort level for using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in your community:	Scale 1-10
29. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = 0%, none; 10 = 100% 'ōlelo Hawai'i usage) what is your average engagement in 'ōlelo Hawai'i within your household?	Scale 1-10
30. Final mana'o regarding 'ōlelo Hawai'i teaching/learning strategies used in your 'ohana?	Open-Ended

SET 2: OHA INTERGENERATIONAL 'ŌLELO HAWAI'I PROGRAM QUESTION SET

2B - Post-Programming Questions	Response Formatting
1. Date of Survey	Date Format mm/dd/yyyy
2. What is your full name?	Open-Ended
3. How would you describe your participation in the 'ōlelo Hawai'i program?	Open-Ended
4. What did you gain by participating in this 'ōlelo Hawai'i program?	Open-Ended
5. What were the strengths of this 'ōlelo Hawai'i program?	Open-Ended
6. What were the weaknesses or areas of improvement of this 'ōlelo Hawai'i program?	Open-Ended
7. Were there any challenges that made your participation as an 'ohana difficult? What do you think would help in the future or for next time.	Open-Ended
8. What program resources (readers, dictionaries, flashcards, etc, CDs, apps.) helped you the most?	Open-Ended
9. What program resources (readers, dictionaries, flashcards, etc, CDs, apps.) helped your 'ohana the most?	Open-Ended
10. Were there any specific activities, huaka'i, or program assignments that you particularly enjoyed?	Open-Ended
11. Were there any challenges that made your participation as an 'ohana difficult?	Open-Ended
12. Were there any painful moments that made your 'ohana discontinue or want to discontinue the program?	Open-Ended

13. How did you learn about this program? Why did you choose to participate in this program?	Open-Ended
14. Would you recommend this program to others in your 'ohana and community?	Yes No Maybe
15. If given the choice, would you participate in this program again?	Yes No Maybe
16. The impact of the program on my 'ōlelo Hawai'i ability was:	Open-Ended
17. After programming, how does your 'ohana use 'ōlelo Hawai'i?	Open-Ended
18. At this point, how would you rate your proficiency with 'ōlelo Hawai'i?	<p>Novice – Communicates with words and short phrases regarding familiar topics, e.g. colors, food, family.</p> <p>i. Low – This person can communicate with usual phrases and remember the names of objects around him, e.g. chair, door, book.</p> <p>ii. Mid – This person can use short and familiar phrases that have been memorized. She responds with to three words and phrases that have been memorized, e.g. The usual, thanks. And you?</p> <p>iii. High – This person can respond to personal questions and ask for information. His conversation is limited to what has been memorized.</p> <p>Intermediate – The person at this level can produce and use language to converse on familiar topics that was taught, health, weather, store.</p> <p>i. Low – The person at this level can generate language for social situations like talking about self, the family, work and needs that arise like ordering food at a restaurant.</p> <p>ii. Mid – The person at this level can answer usual questions and inquiries concerning the family, work, favorite things. Trips. Her production of language is greater and comes more easily. iii. High – The person at this level can converse with ease on routines and in various social situations. Her production of speech is about a paragraph in length.</p> <p>Advanced – The person at the Advanced level can converse on various topics and speak in formal and informal settings.</p> <p>i. Low – He can narrate a story in present, future, and past tenses. His production of speech is about a paragraph in length but not quite proficient and flowing and contains many self-corrections.</p> <p>ii. Mid – She can narrate a story in present, future, and past tenses and manage her speech well. Speaking at the Advanced Mid-level is more fluent.</p>
19. What discoveries have you made, if any, about 'ohana based teaching and learning?	Open-Ended
20. What discoveries have you made, if any, about multi-generational 'ōlelo Hawai'i transmission?	Open-Ended
21. Where in your home do you find using 'ōlelo Hawai'i the most?	Open-Ended
22. Where outside of your home do you find using 'ōlelo Hawai'i the most?	Open-Ended

22. Does your 'ohana have or will have a rule on 'ōlelo Hawai'i use? (E.g. 'Ōlelo Hawai'i wale nō ma ke ka'a. Speak Hawaiian only in the car.) If so, please share.	Open-Ended
23. How do other 'ohana and community members feel about you and your 'ohana learning 'ōlelo Hawai'i ?	Open-Ended
24. In your opinion, what ways can we work to normalize 'ōlelo Hawai'i usage?	Open-Ended
25. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is the comfort level for using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in your household:	Scale 1-10
26. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is the comfort level for using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in your daily life:	1-10
27. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is the comfort level for using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in your community:	Scale 1-10
28. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is your level of comfort in using 'ōlelo Hawai'i learned in this program:	Scale 1-10
29. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = 0%, none; 10 = 100% 'ōlelo Hawai'i usage) what is your average engagement in 'ōlelo Hawai'i within your household?	Scale 1-10
30. Final mana'o on your experiences learning 'ōlelo Hawai'i as an 'ohana.	Open-Ended
31. Final mana'o on the 'ōlelo Hawai'i program you participated in	Open-Ended

SET 2: OHA INTERGENERATIONAL 'ŌLELO HAWAI'I PROGRAM QUESTION SET

2B - Post-Programming Questions	Response Formatting
1. Date of Survey	Date Format mm/dd/yyyy
2. What is your full name?	Open-Ended
3. How would you describe your participation in the 'ōlelo Hawai'i program?	Open-Ended
4. What did you gain by participating in this 'ōlelo Hawai'i program?	Open-Ended
5. What were the strengths of this 'ōlelo Hawai'i program?	Open-Ended
6. What were the weaknesses or areas of improvement of this 'ōlelo Hawai'i program?	Open-Ended
7. Were there any challenges that made your participation as an 'ohana difficult? What do you think would help in the future or for next time.	Open-Ended
8. What program resources (readers, dictionaries, flashcards, etc, CDs, apps.) helped you the most?	Open-Ended
9. What program resources (readers, dictionaries, flashcards, etc, CDs, apps.) helped your 'ohana the most?	Open-Ended

10. Were there any specific activities, huaka'i, or program assignments that you particularly enjoyed?	Open-Ended
11. Were there any challenges that made your participation as an 'ohana difficult?	Open-Ended
12. Were there any painful moments that made your 'ohana discontinue or want to discontinue the program?	Open-Ended
13. How did you learn about this program? Why did you choose to participate in this program?	Open-Ended
14. Would you recommend this program to others in your 'ohana and community?	Yes No Maybe
15. If given the choice, would you participate in this program again?	Yes No Maybe
16. The impact of the program on my 'ōlelo Hawai'i ability was:	Open-Ended
17. After programming, how does your 'ohana use 'ōlelo Hawai'i?	Open-Ended
18. At this point, how would you rate your proficiency with 'ōlelo Hawai'i?	<p>Novice – Communicates with words and short phrases regarding familiar topics, e.g. colors, food, family.</p> <p>i. lllLow – This person can communicate with usual phrases and remember the names of objects around him, e.g. chair, door, book.</p> <p>ii. lllMid – This person can use short and familiar phrases that have been memorized. She responds with three words and phrases that have been memorized, e.g. The usual, thanks. And you?</p> <p>iii. lllHigh – This person can respond to personal questions and ask for information. His conversation is limited to what has been memorized.</p> <p>Intermediate – The person at this level can produce and use language to converse on familiar topics that was taught, health, weather, store.</p> <p>i. lllLow – The person at this level can generate language for social situations like talking about self, the family, work and needs that arise like ordering food at a restaurant.</p> <p>ii. lllMid – The person at this level can answer usual questions and inquiries concerning the family, work, favorite things. Trips. Her production of language is greater and comes more easily. iii. lllHigh – The person at this level can converse with ease on routines and in various social situations. Her production of speech is about a paragraph in length.</p> <p>Advanced – The person at the Advanced level can converse on various topics and speak in formal and informal settings.</p> <p>i. lllLow – He can narrate a story in present, future, and past tenses. His production of speech is about a paragraph in length but not quite proficient and flowing and contains many self-corrections.</p> <p>ii. lllMid – She can narrate a story in present, future, and past tenses and manage her speech well. Speaking at the Advanced Mid-level is more fluent.</p>
19. What discoveries have you made, if any, about 'ohana based teaching and learning?	Open-Ended

20. What discoveries have you made, if any, about multi-generational 'ōlelo Hawai'i transmission?	Open-Ended
21. Where in your home do you find using 'ōlelo Hawai'i the most?	Open-Ended
22. Where outside of your home do you find using 'ōlelo Hawai'i the most?	Open-Ended
23. Does your 'ohana have or will have a rule on 'ōlelo Hawai'i use? (E.g. 'Ōlelo Hawai'i wale nō ma ke ka'a. Speak Hawaiian only in the car.) If so, please share.	Open-Ended
24. How do other 'ohana and community members feel about you and your 'ohana learning 'ōlelo Hawai'i ?	Open-Ended
25. In your opinion, what ways can we work to normalize 'ōlelo Hawai'i usage?	Open-Ended
26. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is the comfort level for using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in your household:	Scale 1-10
27. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is the comfort level for using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in your daily life:	Scale 1-10
28. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is the comfort level for using 'ōlelo Hawai'i in your community:	Scale 1-10
29. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = not comfortable at all; 10 = very comfortable) what is your level of comfort in using 'ōlelo Hawai'i learned in this program:	Scale 1-10
30. Using a scale from 1-10 (1 = 0%, none; 10 = 100% 'ōlelo Hawai'i usage) what is your average engagement in 'ōlelo Hawai'i within your household?	Scale 1-10
31. Final mana'o on your experiences learning 'ōlelo Hawai'i as an 'ohana.	Open-Ended
32. Final mana'o on the 'ōlelo Hawai'i program you participated in	Open-Ended