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Abstract

Colonialism radically transformed Indigenous societies and cultures by causing great psychological, spiritual, racial, political, social, and economic trauma. Although this ensued through multiple colonial institutions, none were more insidious than education. Despite this, Native teaching and learning, especially Indigenous inquiry, grew over the last two centuries. This study described ten Native graduate students’ and post-graduate scholars’ decolonizing experiences, including my own. These decolonizing experiences detailed our use of Indigenous inquiry, our learning of Indigenous inquiry within the university curriculum, and our application of Indigenous inquiry to benefit our Native communities. The study’s design encompassed Native research features, such as the Hawaiian methodology of ha‘i mo‘olelo (storytelling). I weaved the results of my study into a metaphorical Hawaiian ‘upena (net) that contained powerful mo‘olelo (stories) of how we decolonized our research by exploring our cultural identities; by receiving support in using Native inquiry approaches from mentors, advisors, professors, friends, and others; and by reflecting on the painful research journeys that forced us to seek Indigenous methodologies and methods. Furthermore, our mo‘olelo described how we chose Indigenous inquiry because it was personally relevant and beneficial for our communities; we had distinct cultural lenses; and we received inspiration from our ancestors. When we applied these research processes, we included traditions, protocols, and references to our cultural histories; incorporated stories; and made connections between and among our stories. These mo‘olelo showcased how the next generation of Native scholars embraced culturally inherent research approaches to benefit their Native communities and are now advocates for the decolonization of university curriculum.
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CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Overview of Literature Review

This literature review served multiple purposes. It decolonized the traditional construction of a literature review as well as enhanced my personal decolonization. In addition, it explored the history and scope of the problem through literature authored by primarily Native thinkers, philosophers, researchers, and academics. It also provided the context of theory relating to the problem from an Indigenous perspective. Furthermore, it allowed me to make deep connections to the previous research through Native processes. All of these purposes led to deepening my own understanding of the problem as well as furthering my personal decolonization by strengthening my ‘Ōiwi paradigm.

This literature review was based on Native knowledge and supported a decolonizing agenda. Scholars are actively decolonizing academia and how we conduct Native research within the academy. Bell et. al. (2005) acknowledged this by recognizing how Indigenous scholars see the academy as a site of resistance and continue to question the constitution of knowledge, teachers, pedagogies, research methodologies, and ethics. I saw the literature review within this dissertation as an opportunity to use a critical, post-colonial perspective (Kovach, 2009) that privileged Indigenous processes and knowledge. These research processes raised my consciousness (Wilson, 2008) and illustrated the importance of self in reflection through Indigenous knowledge that moves people forward (Kovach, 2009). I agreed with Sium and Ritskes (2013) who identified decolonization as a complex, multi-layered endeavor that is very personal and political, as well as immediate, relational, and spiritual. This Indigenous literature review was one strategy in my multi-strategic approach to decolonize my research and that of the
academy. In this way, this decolonizing scholarship is akin to ho‘oponopono as I sought to restore, mend, build, and strengthen my relationships with (Chun, 2006) and understandings of Indigenous knowledge and inquiry approaches. This represented an evolving definition of ho‘oponopono from Pukui’s definition in 1957 that focused on mental cleansing (Chun, 2006) to a more specific and personal application within this literature review. The decolonizing aim of this literature review qualified it as a literature review based supportive of Native research design principles.

Another purpose of this literature review was to understand the history and scope of the problem through Native-authored literature. Native academics Wilson (2008) and Battiste (2013) took a historical and chronological approach to the review of literature within their recent publications. I took a similar approach by including within the review of literature a brief history of the transition from an Indigenous educational system to a colonial educational system in Hawai‘i while making connections to other Indigenous authors who wrote about similar colonizing experiences within their communities. I also described the historical growth and current status of Indigenous inquiry and how it countered colonization within academia. Wilson (2008) considered this linear approach a true review of the literature as it is simply sharing the ideas, philosophies, beliefs, and experiences of others. The literature review, modeled after Indigenous authors who used a historical and chronological approach, adequately addressed the history and scope of the problem of colonization for this dissertation.

This literature review also provided the context of theory related to the problem from a Native perspective. I delved deeper into understanding colonization by focusing on its psychological effects through the empirical, conceptual, and theoretical literature written by well-known and contemporary Indigenous thinkers, philosophers, researchers, and academics. I
also examined how colonial education decimated Native psychology and institutionalized Western paradigms of being, thinking, and knowing. I investigated how Native education, particularly Native inquiry, emerged and evolved in the academy. This literature review focused on the context of theory related to colonization. It was unique because it embodied research and thinking from Native Peoples.

A final purpose of this literature review was to make deep connections to the previous research through Indigenous processes. I agreed with Wilson’s (2008) critique of a literature review as an opportunity to criticize others’ work. He believed that this does not fit within an Indigenous axiology congruent with relational accountability. Indigenous research is a sacred ceremony and one needs to build relationships with Native knowledge and bridge sacred spaces between and among them (Wilson, 2008). The selection and review processes within the five-step process used to create this literature review detailed the steps I took to ensure I understood the knowledge referenced and applied it to my research in a pono way. Locating Native knowledge, gaining a deep understanding and making connections with the knowledge through reflective processes, and applying those deep connections between and among the knowledge to this dissertation made this truly an literature review respectful of Indigenous Peoples.

This literature review served a variety of purposes. It primarily served as a tool for decolonization. It also explored the history and scope of the problem of colonization in education. In addition it provided the context of theory relating to the problem of colonization and its impact on education with its continued damaging effects on Indigenous minds today. Moreover it allowed me to build connections to the previous research through a five-step process, inclusive of identifying and selecting literature, that supported the further study of
Indigenous inquiry and its application in academia. All of these purposes were fulfilled in this literature review.

**Literature Selection Processes**

The literature review began with the creation of a five-step process, inclusive of identifying and selecting literature, that enabled me to understand the source of the problem, to investigate the scope of the problem, to provide the context of theory related to the problem, to build personal connections with previous research, and to make connections between and among the literature. The identification process was based on five well-defined review criteria. The selection process encompassed six detailed steps. These processes ensured that the literature contained in this dissertation was relevant.

A five-step process aided me in writing a literature review for this dissertation. The first step began with a search for literature. I looked into online databases, such as the Academic Search Premier (EBSCO Host), for relevant journal articles, books, and handbooks. I also examined Indigenous journals, consisting of electronic and Open Access journals, that I became familiar with throughout my graduate studies. I inspected published books and handbooks written by well-known and respected authors within the field of Indigenous Studies. Lastly, I mined Works Cited, Bibliographies and References at the end of journal articles, books, and handbooks for other sources that were cited or referenced most often. The second step in the process was the application of the review criteria followed by the third step of selecting the relevant literature. If the literature met the review criteria and made it through the selection process, I employed the fourth and fifth steps: summarizing and annotating each piece, noting connections to other specific pieces of literature or particular authors, and incorporating research from these pieces into my literature review and throughout my dissertation. If the literature did
not meet the review criteria or did not make it through the selection process, it was not included. I faithfully and successfully applied the five-step process in order to create and support this study.

One of the steps was the identification of literature using five review criteria. Each piece of literature had to address at least one, preferably more, of these criteria: colonization and/or decolonization; Indigenous and/or colonial education; Western-based research methodologies and methods; Indigenous inquiry inclusive of methodologies and methods particularly as it relates to working with Native communities; and Indigenous inquiry in academia. For literary pieces that addressed Indigenous and/or colonial education, I paid particular attention to those that referenced curriculum and instruction. For journal articles, books, and handbooks that spoke of Western-based or Indigenous research methodologies and methods, I kept an eye out for sources that applied them to research in academia or that mentioned their role within the university curriculum. These review criteria were necessary in order to better align the literature with the focus and purpose of this study.

The following selection process determined whether or not to include a particular literary piece in the dissertation. First, the literature had to link directly to the problem statement and the study focus while supporting or contributing towards the overall framework of this Indigenous inquiry. Secondly, I needed to be able to describe how the journal articles, books, and handbooks were empirically, conceptually, or theoretically based on Native criterion elements from Judy Atkins and Cora Weber-Pillwax as written in Wilson (2008). For empirical studies, I needed to understand if the research was approved by the Native community, included opportunities for reciprocity and responsibility, involved non-obtrusive and deep listening, had fidelity in relations, informed by learning and wisdom, connected to heart and mind, and included the
subjective self (Wilson, 2008). These Indigenous research principles were usually written up as a part of the actual study itself. Conceptual and theoretical literature had to have many of the following elements: foundation in Indigenous research; relationship and interconnection to living things; source as the heart and mind; basis in lived experiences; alignment with Indigenous epistemology and ontology; inclusivity of Native language and culture; and renewal of relationships with ancestors (Wilson, 2008). Third in the selection criteria was privileging literature authored by Hawaiians or others whom contributed towards deepening our understanding of the Hawaiian language or culture. In addition, a fourth selection criteria privileged global, Indigenous authors whom wrote literature addressing key topics of this study. Fifth, historical literature, that I classified as over twenty years old, needed to be those that were frequently referenced or cited as well as easily identifiable as major contributions to the field of Indigenous Studies. Lastly, contemporary literature, that I classified as published within the last six years, needed to illustrate and build upon the most recent developments within the rapidly growing field of Indigenous Studies. Nearly half of the works cited in this dissertation were published within the last six years. The development and subsequent application of the selection criteria was crucial in ensuring that this study had its roots in Indigenous knowledge and praxis.

The procedures for identifying and selecting relevant literature, housed within a five-step literature review creation process, provided assurance that the literature was relevant to this Indigenous study. The review criteria incorporated the main topics to be explored further during this dissertation all the while connecting with curriculum and instruction as well as research in the academy. The thorough selection process was an effective method for choosing literature aligned with Native ways of knowing and supportive of Indigenous inquiry.
Literature Review Process

The specific literature review procedures were the fourth and fifth steps in the five-step process. I summarized and annotated each relevant source. My reflections were unique because they served a personal decolonizing purpose within the entire dissertation process. In addition, I created a simple matrix that provided a quick, high-level view of the scope and major content of each source. This assisted me in finding initial connections between and among the literature. It was crucial that the literature review procedures incorporated Indigenous processes. In this way, the literature review aligned with this study’s axiology and epistemology by honoring the integrity of its sources while identifying relevant literature for understanding this study’s problem, shaping its focus, and supporting its inquiry framework.

The fourth step in developing this literature review was summarizing and annotating sources for inclusion in this Native study. I not only read each text in depth, but read it interactively, always keeping in mind this study’s identification criteria and selection process. I summarized each relevant source following successful completion of the selection process by determining and writing the key points in a narrative. This helped me in understanding each text while building my knowledge base of the main topics under study. This summarizing process is similar to traditional ways of constructing literature reviews. Reflections followed summaries and included writing my thoughts, connections, and ideas as a result of reading each source. Summarization and reflections of the literature took place throughout the dissertation creation process. This process emphasized the importance of making text-to-text, text-to-self, and text-to-world connections. Both summaries and reflections were considered an important part of my research journal. The research journal also contained reflections on the current progress of my research and my journey towards decolonization, notes and graphics relating to my evolving
Reflections in the research journal were everyday acts of decolonization. Viewed longitudinally, they represented my evolving thinking on Indigenous research and illustrated a growing Native paradigm. This aligned with the first three phases of decolonization as described by Laenui (2000). The first phase is rediscovery and recovery. An Indigenous person recovers his or her own history, language, and identity through a variety of means. For example, Laenui (2000) picked up a book written by Queen Lili‘uokalani and discovered a history she didn’t know. It raised her consciousness of Native history and issues. Similarly, I immersed myself in reading Indigenous research and literature in order to learn more about the culture, philosophies, beliefs, customs, and traditions of Native Peoples. The second phase is mourning. Indigenous Peoples lament their victimization as essential to the healing process and some move towards anger. Some mourning can take place in the first phase also (Laenui, 2000). Some of my reflections contained passages communicating my feelings of guilt for continuing to live and work in colonizing ways, anger and resentment towards an educational system that disavows Native ways of knowing and being, and grief for the seemingly hopeless and dire status of Indigenous teaching and learning within Eurocentric educational institutions. However, Laenui (2000) warned of getting “stuck” (p. 155) and dwelling in this phase of decolonization for too long. My reflections suggest I am currently in the third phase of dreaming, crucial to the decolonization process. This dissertation was representative of my dream, the decolonization of academic research and how it is taught within the university curriculum. In this phase, Indigenous Peoples debate, consult, and build dreams to become the “flooring for the creation of a new social order” (Laenui, 2000, p. 155). I created summaries and reflections representative of
literature from a wide variety of Indigenous thoughts and actions, representing some commonalities yet some differing perspectives. Reflections were crucial testimonies of my decolonizing journey and an important part in constructing this literature review.

A matrix provided a quick, high-level view of the scope and content of each source and assisted me in finding initial connections between and among the texts. I reviewed each piece individually and noted Indigenous affiliation (if mentioned), identified three to five main topics, noted connections to other research or authors, and classified each as theoretical, conceptual, or empirical. The matrix allowed me to easily make initial connections between and among the various journal articles, books, and handbooks for deeper reflection later. It provided enough of an overview to develop a fundamental understanding and gauge the historical and contemporary thinking within the fields of colonization and decolonization; Indigenous and colonial education; Western-based research methodologies and methods; Indigenous inquiry inclusive of methodologies and methods particularly as it relates to working with Native communities; and Indigenous inquiry in academia. I was careful to ensure the matrix did not reduce the rich Indigenous knowledge inherent in the literature into generalized information that would be viewed as extractive and harmful to Native Peoples by using approaches that are respectful to Indigenous knowledge and tribal epistemologies (Kovach, 2009). The matrix was a useful tool in making initial connections with the literature.

I made deeper connections to the literature through employing Indigenous practices. Once I made initial connections identified through the matrix, I re-read summaries and reflections. I called upon spiritual guidance to help me see the connections, understanding that knowledge is spiritual because it draws from our deep connection to our kupuna ‘āina, oceans, language, rituals, and ‘ohana (Meyer, 2008). Young (1995) also wrote of the important role of
spirituality, as well as mana (divine power), in the sources and the pono use of them in research. In addition, I sought the kaona (hidden meaning) within each source, especially those sources authored by Hawaiians. Kaona illustrated the high value placed on expressive and communicative functions within Hawaiian oral traditions (Au & Kaomea, 2009). I relied on all of my senses when recording, storing, and retrieving knowledge (Meyer, 2008) to write this literature review for this dissertation. I organized these deeper connections into distinct sections within this literature review and the entire dissertation in order to communicate the key ideas relating to the problem, study focus, and inquiry framework. It was equally important to keep the knowledge holistic and highly contextual. These actions were consistent with the recommendations of Bell et. al. (2005) who emphasized respectfully presenting Native ways of knowing as well as Kovach (2009) who warned against the creation of generalizations and promoted alignment with Indigenous epistemologies. I was able to make deeper connections between and among the literature because of these Indigenous practices.

The literature review procedures used to reflect on the sources contributing to this dissertation was based on Indigenous practices that strived to present Native knowledge in a way that was holistic, contextual, and relational. While summarizing text allowed for building an understanding of the main topics under study, annotating those same texts provided an opportunity for personal decolonization and led to developing my Native paradigm over time. The matrix was a successful tool to identify initial connections between and among the literature while solidifying those connections came through specific Indigenous processes. The creation of this literature review for this dissertation helped me to develop a disposition for inquiry and reflection (Nakata, Nakata, Keech, & Bolt, 2012).
Literature Quality

This dissertation contained highly relevant literature, met Indigenous criteria determining quality, and encompassed the appropriate scope in order to fully understand the source of the problem, investigate the scope of the problem, provide the context of theory related to the problem, build personal connections with previous research, and make connections between and among the literature. I frequently cited the literature from two Indigenous journals that majorly influenced the creation of this study. Significant Indigenous books and handbooks, that I deemed historical or contemporary, were represented and reflected the progression of curriculum development and Native research within education and academia over the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. This dissertation relied on Hawaiian and other global, Indigenous authors whose writings and research were not only the main sources of inspiration, but were the strong kahua (foundation) on which this dissertation stood.

Literature from two Indigenous journals was most often cited in this dissertation. *AlterNative*, a journal launched in 2005 by the NgāPae o te Māramatanga, New Zealand’s National Institute of Research Excellence in Māori Advancement and Development, enhanced my understanding of Indigenous research. This peer-reviewed, interdisciplinary journal disseminates Indigenous knowledge from Native worldviews inclusive of Indigenous perspectives (NgāPae o te Māramatanga, 2008-2009). It promotes Indigenous dialogue and scholarship that describe historical colonization and recent globalization experiences as well as transformative resistance at the local, regional, and global levels (NgāPae o te Māramatanga, 2008-2009). In addition to *AlterNative*, the undisciplined, peer-reviewed, Open Access journal *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society* was another frequently referenced journal in this dissertation. Begun in 2012, this journal promotes decolonization within education.
Although this is a recently established journal, the journal reflects the emerging, innovative scholarship pushing the outward boundaries of Indigenous Studies. Literature from both of these journals greatly contributed to the development of this dissertation.

Accompanying Indigenous journals were the presence of historical and contemporary books and handbooks regarded as significant contributors to advancing Indigenous Studies. Historical sources hailed from renowned Indigenous authors from all over the globe. They included Africans Frantz Fannon, Albert Memmi, and Ngūgī wa Thiong’o; Māori Linda Tuhiwai Smith; Hawaiian Manulani Meyer; and Brazilian Paulo Freire. Contemporary literature was also global in nature and included two edited handbooks: the *Handbook for Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* and the second edited handbook focusing on decolonization titled *For Indigenous Minds Only: A Decolonization Handbook*. These handbooks joined books authored by Māori Russell Bishop, Plains Cree and Saulteaux Margaret Kovach, and Opaskwayak Cree Shawn Wilson. These historical and contemporary books and handbooks provided the solid research that supported this scholarship.

There was a great diversity of Indigenous authorship among the literature included in this review and throughout the dissertation. I was influenced and/or referenced authors from the Pacific Islands, Americas, and Africa. Native Hawaiians or those who wrote about Hawai‘i included progenitors within the field of Hawaiian Studies Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwoʻole, Manulani Aluli Meyer, and George Terry Kanalu Young; respected Hawaiian cultural historians George S. Kanahele and Malcolm Nāea Chun; and influential academics Julie Kaomea and kuʻualoha hoʻomanawanui. Māori Russell Bishop and Linda Tuhiwai Smith as well as Fijian Unaisi Nabobo-Baba added to the Pacific scholarship. I included African knowledge and wisdom from Ghanaian George Sefa Dei, Maseko Ngoni Devi Dee Mucina, and Kenyan Njoki Wane.
Other Indigenous authors from the American continents included Tewa Gregory Cajete, Peruvian Sandy Grande, Fisher River Cree Michel Anthony Hart, Bear Clan Mohawk Taiaiake Alfred, Xicano Miguel Zavala, and Michael Yellow Bird from the Sahnish and Hidatsa Nations. Their research added to the many others referred to in this dissertation and illustrated the generations of Indigenous wisdom given by the cosmos and passed down by the ancestors to these scholars and emerging scholars like myself for application in contemporary ways that benefitted Native communities.

The literature cited was highly relevant and of superior quality as identified, selected, and reviewed through the five-step literature review process. The relevancy of the literature allowed me to see greater connections between and among the research as well as increased my capability to go further in my personal decolonization. The quality of the literature was superior as determined by Native criterion elements within the selection process in addition to Indigenous reflective practices within the review process. Nearly all of the literature came from Hawaiian and other Indigenous authors in an effort to comprehend the international impact of the problem, understand the global nature of the study focus, and show diverse support for an Indigenous inquiry framework. The majority of the literature selected for inclusion was theoretical or conceptual with a smaller amount I classified as empirical. This met the expectations of a literature review for Native inquiries because empirical knowledge is not stronger than cultural knowledge (Wilson, 2008). On the contrary, cultural knowledge is extra intellectual (Wilson, 2008). Young (1995) also commented on the sources for Native research countering that objectivism, the hallmark of many empirical studies, opposes Native intellectual contributions and relies on consensual, universal truth. He cited Sahlins’s contention of the importance of metaphors to historical studies and Hanlon who encouraged the application of oral traditions,
frowning upon the use of imposing outside standards to define credibility of local sources (Young, 1995). The relevancy and quality of all the theoretical, conceptual, and empirical literature in this review were credible as deemed by Indigenous criterion and reflective practices.

The dissertation contained high quality literature that was relevant and appropriately scoped for the proposed study. Relevancy was evident through the citation of emerging research from two of the most innovative Indigenous journals and significant historical and contemporary books and handbooks; the diversity of referenced Indigenous authors; and the inclusion of the knowledge from theoretical, conceptual, and empirical texts. The identification, selection, and review processes not only determined the scope of this literature review but also aided in determining the overall direction and organization of the dissertation.

**Major Works and Substantial Findings on Colonization**

In order to understand the history and scope of colonization within education, one must have intimate knowledge of not only the differences between Indigenous and colonial educational systems, but also the violent societal upheaval that led to the disintegration of Native teaching and learning and the rise and current dominance of Euro-centric, formal schooling that continues the colonial indoctrination of Indigenous Peoples today.

**From Indigenous to colonial education.**

*Indigenous education.*

Traditional, Hawaiian education not only transmitted knowledge and skills orally from one generation to another, but also developed and nurtured mutually beneficial and long lasting relationships between kumu (teacher) and haumāna (students) that were grounded in the culture and the language of the people (Chun, 2011). This bonded relationship furthered socialization into Hawaiian society, beginning with the ‘ohana (family). A child’s introduction to societal norms and behaviors began with education conducted within the ‘ohana, with children simply
observing and working alongside kūpuna (elders) (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Teaching and learning in these informal, familial settings as well as within more formal settings used the context of ‘āina-based (land based) and place-based teaching and learning in order to meet the diverse yet practical needs of the society (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). Thus education aimed to develop a strong cultural identity and to root haumāna in the ‘āina (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). Haumāna deeply respected the ‘āina as they learned valuable cultural knowledge and skills to mastery, eventually becoming kumu in relationship to others, hence repeating the cyclical, educational process (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005).

Although there are currently few historical accounts of the exact teaching and learning processes involved in traditional, Hawaiian education, of the accounts that are known Chun (2011) identified five common, sequential elements: nānā (observing) incorporated the skill of deduction; hoʻolohe (listening) required patience and attentiveness to the words of the kumu and the sounds of the environs; paʻa ka waha (reflecting) created opportunities to link observation and listening; hana ka lima (doing) allowed haumāna to actually do the task while providing for opportunities to learn from mistakes and celebrate success; and nīnau (questioning) permitted haumāna to ask the kumu questions following the learning experience. All throughout the process, kumu used tools from the ‘āina when instructing haumāna, such as the papa ʻiliʻili (table of pebbles) to graphically illustrate the human body and the ‘umeke (calabash) in astronomy. This type of education strengthened the relationship between the kumu and the haumāna and fostered the self-teaching capabilities of the haumāna (Chun, 2011).

For those haumāna who exhibited special talents, more formal training took place that often lasted many, many years (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Kahuna (experts) conducted this formal training in specific fields of study that dictated strict adherence to rules and regulations and often
encompassed memorization (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). The professional training of kahuna and young chiefly leadership are our best examples of this process in action (Chun, 2011). For haumāna learning the medical arts, na akua (gods) grounded the teaching and learning in spirituality and was the basis of a curriculum composed of a significant amount of memorization and chants that consisted of the knowledge of diseases, the art of saving lives, and the art of killing others (Chun, 2011). Chiefly education also had a strong foundation in spirituality as well as military and politics. Young leaders went to live with wise kahuna, often in poverty, to learn from tales of good and bad ali‘i (chiefs) governance and perform tasks of bravery (Chun, 2011). After tutelage, haumāna proved their mastery in a myriad of ways, sometimes before the kahuna or an audience, such as a physical demonstration like the ‘ūniki of a hula dancer, or perhaps through oral examination, such as the rigorous questioning endured by Hawaiian historian ‘Ī‘ī by his uncle before the ali‘i (Chun, 2011).

Traditional, Hawaiian education reflected many qualities of national and international, Indigenous, educational practices. According to Pewewardy (2005) of Comanche and Kiowa, before colonization Indigenous Peoples had largely informal, culturally responsive educational systems. Immediate as well as extended family members, tribal elders, and religious and social groups within the community held responsibility for educating the next generation. The Native tongue was the language of instruction and transmitted the cultural and social values, norms, and behaviors to the next generation. African scholar Ngugi (1986) recalls his own educational experience as a young boy when Gĩkũyũ was the language of both the home and his schooling. Gĩkũyũ instilled the values of cooperation and community. Storytelling was an instructional strategy that communicated these cultural values and mirrored real-world experiences (Ngugi, 1986). These traditional, Indigenous, educational practices would all but disappear as
colonization transformed the psychological, spiritual, racial, political, social, and economic lives of Indigenous Peoples.

**Societal upheaval.**

Prior to colonialism, Hawai‘i had a complex social structure with distinct classes, each having its own mana based on each individual’s mo‘okū‘auhau (genealogy) (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). The kapu system, the religious codes and rules that defined relationships between the classes and between individuals, the careful stewardship of the ‘āina, and the value of communal land ownership supported this structure (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005; Osorio, 2002). Colonialism destroyed these traditional spiritual, political, economic, and social structures as struggles over land and self-determination resulted in Hawaiians becoming minorities in their own homeland (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005; Osorio, 2002).

Traditional, Hawaiian society transformed during the nineteenth century. The diversity of leadership and the vibrancy of Hawaiian society began to wane with the suppression of the ali‘i nui (high chiefs) by the powerful warrior Kamehameha and a diminishing Native population (Osorio, 2002). The ‘ainoa (free or profane eating) broke many of the spiritual, social, and cultural customs and traditions that defined Hawaiian society (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994; Osorio, 2002). It disrupted the traditional relationship that linked members of the society together, especially the maka‘āinana (commoner) to ali‘i, and the ali‘i to na akua, with the ali‘i losing their divinity (Osorio, 2002). This corresponded with the arrival of the American Missionaries. Armed with their American elitism and influenced by the New Divinity Movement of the seventeenth century, early Calvinist missionaries arrived in Hawai‘i aboard the Thaddeus with their heavenly mandate to sow the seeds of Christianity within the Native population (Meyer, 2004). The timing
of their arrival could not have been more favorable for their conversion of the ali‘i and thousands of Hawaiians to the Christian faith filled the deep, spiritual void left from the abandonment of the traditional, spiritual kapu (Dotts and Sikkema, 1994; Meyer, 2004; Osorio, 2002). This ushered in new kapu and drastic changes to spiritual, cultural, and social life and relationships that further drove a wedge between the maka‘āinana and ali‘i, with the ali‘i losing authority in many aspects of Hawaiian society (Osorio, 2002).

New political and economic systems and institutions brought remarkable change to Hawai‘i. A constitutional government built on the rule of law and a new capitalist economy, beginning with the preeminence of the whaling industry and later sugar production, were markedly different from the traditional governance and subsistence economy that were hallmarks of traditional, Hawaiian society (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994; Osorio, 2002). Rights and laws changed the authority of the mō‘ī (king) and the ali‘i, replacing the traditional responsibility of land governance through ancient lineages to that of authority of law (Osorio, 2002). With this change in authority came a change of governance between the maka‘āinana and ali‘i, and between those ali‘i of high and low births (Osorio, 2002). For example, the konohiki traditionally oversaw the ‘āina of the ruling ali‘i and ensured the maka‘āinana who lived there were productive (Osorio, 2002). However the role of the konohiki changed as young, Western, Christianized Hawaiians, other than the conventional konohiki, became counsel to the mō‘ī (Osorio, 2002). This strange, new Hawaiian elite illustrated the powerful transformation in Hawaiian ways of thinking and being following Western and Missionary contact (Osorio, 2002).

The Hawaiian government consisting of these new Hawaiian elite attempted to remedy Western encroachment, but was unsuccessful in preventing the rising tide of colonialism. Many Hawaiians viewed their own government’s actions as furthering colonization, such as the
Decolonization through indigenous inquiry: A moʻolelo enactment of the 1848 Mahele and the Kuleana Act of 1850, an act designed to protect the interest of Hawaiians but ultimately benefited foreigners (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). These land privatization efforts caused immense social, economic, political, and cultural turmoil in the lives of Hawaiians by severing their strong, communal relationship to the ʻāina, and ultimately causing them to question their sense of identity (Osorio, 2002). The result was the disinheritance of a vast number of makaʻāinana from the ʻāina, with the mōʻī, a few aliʻi, the Hawaiian government, and foreigners owning the most ʻāina in Hawaiʻi (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994; Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005; Osorio, 2002). Concurrently, the Native population was declining, thus weakening the traditional land tenure system that was heavily dependent on a labor-subsistence economy (Osorio, 2002). Due to these events, foreigners filled the void left behind by these crumbling relationships among the Hawaiian people and gradually took over governance that culminated in the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian government in 1893; finances that transformed Hawaiʻi into a capitalist-based, large-scale agricultural and later tourist and military-based economy; religion that replaced traditional spirituality with Christianity; and an educational system that effectively subjugated minds in order to perpetuate colonialism well into the present day.

Colonial education.

Western contact dramatically altered traditional, Hawaiian, educational practices (Au & Kaomea, 2009). American missionaries introduced their schooling and foreign ideas of literacy (Au & Kaomea, 2009; Meyer, 2004) while disparaging Hawaiian values, language, culture, and spirituality (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). According to the Missionaries, the purpose of school was converting the “heathen” (p. 27) and “savage” (p. 27) Hawaiians into civilized Christians (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005) who would live to serve the Christian God (Dotts &
Sikkema, 1994). They started over one thousand Hawaiian-medium schools (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005) focusing first on adult education and later educating young children (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). Laws supported this type of universal schooling with the first ones enacted in 1824 (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Village schools popped up across Hawai‘i with adults encouraged to attend. By the 1830s, adult enrollment waned and schools began to admit children. In 1840, Kamehameha III enacted general school laws that established common schools with a curriculum that stood in stark contrast to former, traditional, Hawaiian education (Au & Kaomea, 2009).

The common schools’ curriculum shifted the focus from the ‘ohana and Hawaiian societal needs to a classroom-based approach with a systematic focus on Western literacy and acculturation (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). The curriculum set a rigorous routine that was very different from the Hawaiian way of life (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). This created great distance between children and parents, as well as children from their Indigenous culture (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). Many felt conflicted between Christian and Western-based concepts and Hawaiian cultural ways of knowing and being (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). This was further exacerbated with the introduction of literacy.

Literacy played both an empowering and disempowering role in the lives of Hawaiians (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Europeans introduced formal processes of reading and writing that not only standardized the alphabet, but also led to an explosion of literacy among the populace following the proclamation by Kamehameha III instituting a government of learning (Chun, 2011). Although Europeans were instrumental in transforming the oral Hawaiian language into a written language, translation stripped much of the Hawaiian poetic and spiritual underpinnings (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). Nevertheless, thousands learned to read, write, and spell within six
months of Kamehameha III’s announcement under the authority of the ali‘i, who engaged in teaching and learning within their own households and subsequently sent out learned teachers to instruct others within their realm (Chun, 2011). Yearly hō‘ike (show) denoted major events for haumāna, young and old, to demonstrate their skills (Chun, 2011). Due to the high rate of literacy, newspapers, both disempowering Missionary-controlled newspapers and empowering Hawaiian-controlled newspapers, flourished. The Missionaries used newspapers to proselytize, civilize, and support the colonial, capitalist system, whereas Hawaiian-sponsored newspapers wrote of nationalist, anti-colonial resistance against the racism that underpinned the changing society (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Hawaiian-sponsored newspapers advocated for pride in culture and traditions, combatted the Western domestication of Native women, and challenged laws against traditional and spiritual practices (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Some Hawaiian historians, American eyewitnesses, and Europeans marveled at the high literacy rates and the proliferation of newspapers written for consumption by the people, but others expressed grave misgivings regarding the transformation of Indigenous education and the larger effects on the minds of Hawaiians.

Hawaiian historians, such as Samuel Mānaiaikalani Kamakau and Davida Malo, captured this momentous change through their astute observations and writings. Kamakau and Malo witnessed this revolution with skepticism of Western culture and traditions (Osorio, 2002). Kamakau believed the new society created was inferior to the old, and noticed how the people struggled to cope and change and that the “young people are beginning to follow foreign teaching” (Osorio, 2002, p. 4). The young were educated in Western-based literacy and knowledge at schools, such as Lāhaināluna whose admission was based on Christian conversion (Osorio, 2002). At Lāhaināluna, haumāna re-interpreted their own people’s history and often
spoke of the “era of darkness” (p. 21) before the arrival of the Missionaries to Hawaiian shores (Osorio, 2002). They became the conveyors of Western knowledge and Christian theology to the makaʻāinana they subsequently instructed (Osorio, 2002). Although they helped to create a literate Hawaiian society, they also colonized future generations of Hawaiians.

All throughout the 1800s, traditional, Hawaiian educational practices faded away, replaced by colonial, educational institutions. This was not a smooth transition as several educational leaders of the time spoke out against this travesty (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994; Osorio, 2002), while others ushered in formal, Western-based education into the public school system (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). As the first education superintendent, Malo believed Hawaiians were in danger of losing their nation (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994; Osorio, 2002). On the other hand, William Richards, a superintendent who followed Malo’s tenure, held radically different educational views and goals: a Calvinist, moral education; standardized teacher training; English language instruction; adequate financing for schools; and the phase-out of common schools (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). He promoted agricultural and industrial training for work in commercial industries and the Western domestication of Hawaiian girls (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). High Chief Kekūanä‘a succeeded Armstrong and similar to Malo believed Hawaiians were losing pride in their culture (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). He resented Western values and the changing political, economic, and social systems (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). Yet Malo and Kekūanä‘a’s criticisms and warnings remained unheeded as formalist education firmly took hold in Hawai‘i.

The rich oral traditions found in legends, proverbs, poetical sayings and chants that placed a high value on expressive and communicative functions found in traditional, Hawaiian education (Au & Kaomea, 2009) disappeared over time, supplanted by a colonial, education
influenced by Missionaries and American businessmen whose influence ended Hawaiian medium schooling (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005; Meyer, 2004). The elimination of these common schools dealt a deathblow to traditional, Hawaiian education, and shortly thereafter an 1897 law banned the use of the Hawaiian language from government activities and schools altogether. Many who spoke the language in school received physical punishments and felt ashamed for still speaking their Native language (Au & Kaomea, 2009). The law banning Hawaiian-medium education was only lifted in 1986 (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005).

Schooling became progressively formalized and segregated into English-standard and other public schools (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). The public schooling system became a two-tiered, classist system with Hawaiians marginalized in education (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). Unfortunately, the strong literacy rates among Hawaiians seen in the early nineteenth century declined over time due to a variety of reasons, including the lack of employment for graduating students who could not utilize their newly ascertained knowledge and skills and the waning authority of the ali‘i over the people (Chun, 2011). Chun (2011) attributed the success of these early literacy efforts to overwhelming government support, encouragement and authority of the ali‘i, culturally-based instruction, and early growth of Hawaiian-rich learning resources. All of this diminished by the colonizing force of Western education (Chun, 2011). The loss of a truly remarkable, traditional, Hawaiian education system was part of the larger colonial effort to disintegrate the social structure, the kapu system, the spiritual connection to the ‘āina, and the cultural traditions of the past (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005).

Pewewardy (2005) and Ngugi (1986) described similar historical atrocities in the transformation of Indigenous Peoples’ education in the continental United States and in Africa.
respectively. Post-contact Europeans created an educational system in the continental United States that indoctrinated Indigenous Peoples to forget their cultural identity and their historical significance in the world (Pewewardy, 2005). The colonial curriculum’s focus on vocational and agricultural followed by mechanical and industrial education de-cultured and disconnected Indigenous Peoples from their tribal perspectives and worldviews (Pewewardy, 2005). Boarding schools separated children from their families and ancestral homelands, educating them in the practices and philosophies that supported the dominant power structure based on Euro-centrism, individualism, and materialism (Pewewardy, 2005). White policy makers, such as General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, Richard Henry Pratt, and Estelle Reel promoted the de-culturing of Indigenous children while promoting white hegemony (Pewewardy, 2005). This promotion took place in the colonial schools of Africa too, where the language of the home conflicted with the European languages in formal education (Ngugi, 1986). Ngugi (1986) recounted the humiliation and punishment of children who used their home language in schools, how schools and universities preferred and promoted students with English achievements, and literature published in the foreigner’s language replaced traditional, African oratory and storytelling. The colonial language communicated Western values and beliefs and colonized children’s view of their culture and their relationships to each other as well as to their Indigenous society (Ngugi, 1986). Thus, the African school and university system produced Native elites who could conspire with Europeans in maintaining colonialism well after post-colonial independence and liberation with the devastating, residual effects still felt today.

**Psychology of colonization and decolonization.**

Colonialism not only radically transformed the political, social, spiritual, economic, cultural, and educational landscape of Indigenous Peoples, but also profoundly altered Native psychology, the very essence of being and patterns and ways of thinking that contribute towards
a strong and healthy Indigenous identity. One is colonized through the experiences and circumstances of one’s birth (Memmi, 1965). Ultimately, colonialism denies a person of his or her humanity (Fanon, 1963). The colonizer and the colonized psychology include patterns of domination and submission (Alfred, 2004). It is important to more deeply explore the psychological effects of colonization on Indigenous minds and then explore these further within the context of our present colonial education system because this study addressed the decolonization of Indigenous minds within the context of university and academia.

**Psychological effects.**

In order to comprehend the psychological effects of colonialism on the colonized mind, one must thoroughly understand that colonialism creates, defines, and maintains the dehumanizing relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. Colonization created a colonial apparatus that bankrupts the souls of the colonizer and the colonized (Memmi, 1965). This system is unsustainable because it is based on a destructive and oppressive relationship (Memmi, 1965). The unconstructive, negative thinking colonialism fosters further exacerbates the psychological effects of colonialism on the minds of both the colonizer and the colonized (Yellow Bird, 2012). This system privileges the colonizer and does not empower the colonized to think about colonization and strategies to decolonize this detrimental relationship (Memmi, 1965).

Colonialism ascribed certain negative attributes to the colonized that have seriously infected the collective psyche of our global society. These attributes are so pervasive that they have significantly altered the minds of the colonizers and the colonized and how the colonized see themselves and their roles and responsibilities in the world. Laziness is just one of the many false characteristics attributed to the colonized (Memmi, 1965). Another is the belief that the
colonized are inherently criminally negligent (Fannon, 1963). However, more insidious is the development of an inferiority complex within the colonized mind. The colonizer denies the colonized the liberty of being who they fundamentally are and thus the colonized move towards becoming objects in the world (Memmi, 1965). As objects, the colonized mentality embodies self-deprecation and thus the colonized feel they know nothing (Freire, 1970) and their culture is less than that of Western, Euro-centric culture (Cajete, 2012; Fannon, 1963). They believe their past is a “wasteland of non-achievement” (Ngugi, 1986, p. 3). The colonized lose confidence in their ancestral ways and Native institutions and thus place power in foreign ideas and beliefs (Osorio, 2002). This shameful belief in inferiority led many to think they are unworthy of Native knowledge because they do not know their own language or are too ashamed to ask because they are not good enough (Bell et. al., 2005). This inferiority complex caused confusion in the Native mind and was taught by the colonizer and many colonized to generations of Indigenous Peoples (Bell et. al., 2005). Thus, Indigenous youth feel alienated from their community because the value systems and ways of being are so very different (Bell et. al., 2005). This alienation makes them less likely to contribute to their Native communities. Unfortunately this is representative of “all kinds of dysfunction, twisted-up thinking that has become part of our identity (Bell et. al., 2005, p. 81).”

Colonialism is the root cause of Indigenous trauma. Indigenous communities, especially Hawaiian communities, and their youth have suffered moral outrage and great sadness originating from kaumaha (cultural loss) of their lands, knowledge systems, ecologies, economies, people and places due to colonialism. This created great social, health, and economic disparities for Hawaiians and their youth within our larger society (Trinidad, 2012). These disparities are dehumanizing (Trinidad, 2012) and are not only physically displayed in many
Indigenous communities, but caused psychological trauma (Fannon, 1963) that the colonized continue to endure. Psychological trauma manifested itself in a myriad of mental disorders, such as those experienced by Algerians during the colonial wars as documented by Fannon (1963). Others described this trauma as not only affecting Indigenous minds, but also hearts. This may explain the current spiritual crisis among Native Peoples (Alfred, 2004). The combination of trauma to minds and hearts, much of which was caused by the loss of language, worldview, oral traditions, values, relationships, ceremonial life, and land, led to Native Peoples walking around as simply hollow shells (Wilson, 2004). In particular, the loss of language and the prevalence of European languages as the prominent language of everyday discourse and academia is the colonizer’s vehicle to hold the soul and the spirit hostage (Ngugi, 1986). Indigenous scholars and activists throughout the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries clearly documented and identified Indigenous trauma to minds and hearts as a result of colonialism.

Colonialism caused Indigenous Peoples to adapt to unnatural ways of living and being (Alfred, 2004). According to Fanon (1963), governmental and economic structures legitimized racial-cultural discrimination that caused the colonized to feel silenced. They were treated as “less than human” (Fannon, 1963, p. xxv). This resulted in depersonalization and bodily memories of disenfranchisement (Fannon, 1963). Thus, the colonized had to adapt through managing their outward images and protecting their bodies and spirits through unnatural means in order to survive in a colonized world. He often asked, “Who am I really (Fannon, 1963, p. 1)?” Indigenous Peoples drew less and less from their Native past and ultimately lost their cultural memories (Memmi, 1965). The colonized were told to avoid their own pasts, taught history that was not his or her own, and informed the world did not belong to them (Memmi, 1965). They become objects in history and forget their previous freedoms (Memmi, 1965). Thus
it separated people from their past, the past from their present, and newcomers from those who originally populated the land (Alfred, 2004). This unnatural adaptation had a profound impact on Indigenous identity and explained why modern man’s identity has been disconnected from the natural world causing alienation, loss of community, and incompleteness (Cajete, 2012).

Colonization deteriorated the Native identity so profoundly that violence became a viable solution to fight systematic dehumanization. Colonialism bred a culture of fear, violence, and hatred between groups of people (Alfred, 2004). The colonizer viewed the colonized as a “wicked backward person” (Memmi, 1965, p. 7). Many colonized accepted this identity that was so far removed from their true selves that they fell into despair and despondency, begging for a death wish (Ngugi, 1986). Others turned to violence as the solution to reconstruct their Native identity and to further ground themselves in the national soil beneath their feet (Fannon, 1963). They engaged in horizontal violence against others who were oppressed (Freire, 1970). These perspectives, emotions, and actions expressed by the colonizer and the colonized originated from the broken relationships between people that was caused by colonization.

One of the unfortunate results of colonization is the colonized emulate the colonizer. Eurocentric mimicry caused untold emotional, psychological, mental, and material costs to individuals and the larger collective (Dei, 2012). The colonized can be attracted to the oppressors’ way of life, especially the middle class (Freire, 1970). They imitated the colonizer’s dress, language, and manners (Memmi, 1965). These oppressed became sub-oppressors by emulating the individualism and materialism of the oppressor because they had no models of liberation or humanity (Freire, 1970). When colonization is threatened, many times they were the first to speak up and defend it (Memmi, 1965). Those colonized who defended colonization do so because they escaped their conditions and ultimately took on the ideology and interest of the
Colonizers (Memmi, 1965). They internalized the racism and ideologies of the dominant culture (Wilson, 2004). Renowned scholar Albert Memmi (1965) witnessed this as a non-Muslim, Jewish colonized man living in a European-colonized society in the mid-twentieth century. He saw his fellow Jews ascribe to be like the French colonizers, but with none of the colonizer’s privileges. He also questioned his own colonial identity through his reflective writings.

*Colonial education decimated Native psychology.*

Colonial education perpetuated colonialism’s psychological effects on Indigenous minds. For many Indigenous Peoples, colonial rule by the sword and bullets was followed by colonial rule through the chalk and blackboard (Ngugi, 1986). Although there are few European- or American-governed colonies in the twenty-first century, the former colonial education apparatuses enacted in previous centuries still strongly remain in many former colonies and continue to inflict extreme psychological damage on Native Peoples, creating “individuals without anchorage, without borders, colorless, stateless, rootless, a body of angels” (Fannon, 1963, p. 155). As Indigenous scholar Mucina (2011) observed, Whiteness endeavored to turn black minds against themselves and some had to forget their Blackness to survive. Indigenous Peoples from all over the globe understand this astute observation because they experienced this first hand, especially within colonial schools and particularly in colonial boarding schools. The following paragraphs describe in detail the psychological effects of colonial education on young Indigenous minds.

Colonial education created Native intellectuals and an Indigenous elite indoctrinated in Western ways of knowing and being. Osorio (2002) described how nineteenth-century, colonially educated Hawaiians became an integral part of haole (foreign) education and Christian missionary proselytization to the makaʻāinana. Indigenous scholars such as Malo saw the
confusing choices faced by the maka‘āinana and although these students helped to create a literate Hawaiian society, they educated the masses in Western literacies, especially governmental and law practices, that set them apart from the culture of the older ali‘i (chiefs) (Osorio, 2002). Their growing numbers and increasing influence radically transformed the Hawaiian nation, replacing decisions made that were grounded in Hawaiian ways of thinking and doing with ones based on Western approaches learned through colonial education practices.

Indigenous scholar Frantz Fannon (1963) described the rise of African Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite. Europeans colonized Africa and created a class of GrecoRoman blacks who wanted to be European. This Euro-centric mimicry caused “epistemological imperialism” (Dei, 2012, p. 105) amongst these privileged classes. Psychological colonization through education started from adolescence and “branded the principles of Western culture on their foreheads with red-hot iron, gagged their mouths with sounds, pompous awkward words that twisted their tongues” (p. xliii). These actions ensured that the colonized were inhibited in their thinking and actions and under the submission of the colonizers (Fannon, 1963). Thus, colonialism took away their dignity, especially among the intellectuals and the elite, so they became true products of colonization (Fannon, 1963).

The psychological damage continues to be inflicted from one Native intellectual generation to another as colonized educators develop curriculum from a Western paradigm. Ngugi (1986) pointed out the study of English literature reflected European values and experiences, especially a European bourgeoisie culture. Even English literary pieces about Africa characterized the continent in certain ways, whether portraying Africans as immature or promoting the African who helps the colonizer subdue his own people (Ngugi, 1986). This was only reinforced in other subject areas, such as geography, history, science, and technology. With
this type of education, colonizers inflicted psychological damage upon the next generation by continuing the practice of creating new Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite who conspired with the colonizer (Ngugi, 1986).

This is a dangerous cycle to break as many Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite benefitted from the colonial system. Some put on public displays of non-threatening indignation, but just enough to keep the contracts coming and prevent their own firing (Cruz, 2012). An older socialist and lawyer told Indigenous scholar Cruz, “don’t get me wrong, I’ve done well, very well, in the colony. I work towards decolonization helping poor people. But I have done real well in this system just as it is” (Cruz, 2012, p. 151). Many Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite realized they were products of colonization, products of Western culture, but stop short. They needed to progress further on their journey towards decolonization by reclaiming themselves totally from colonialism and genuinely renewing their contact with the people (Fannon, 1963). It was only through reclaiming their people’s past that change in their psycho affective equilibrium will occur (Fannon, 1963).

Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite want to be whole again. It is important to understand that the colonial education system built upon Western culture and ways shaped them. It takes time for them to see that they are indeed colonized and it is only at that moment of clarity that true decolonization can begin (Fannon, 1963). The days of the Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite as token prizewinners are over (Fannon, 1963).

The colonial education system also developed a colonized mentality that manifested itself in an intellectual dependence on the oppressor for the creation and perpetuation of knowledge. For example, the colonized relied heavily on a Western-based educational model that educates Native children through Western-trained professors and teachers, not even realizing that they
themselves were the source of their own knowledge (Freire, 1970). Growing up in Kenya, African scholar Wane (2013) recounted how it was common knowledge that community members felt nothing good came out of Embu, Kenya, and that was why children were sent away for a Western-style education. This forced young and impressionable Indigenous minds to be disconnected from the lands and cultures of their ancestors and led to confusion over what to do, read, learn, look, and feel (Alfred, 2004). Wane (2013) then had to unlearn and then relearn African Indigenous ways of knowing. It is difficult to shed one’s Eurocentric perspective because the educational system ingrained such thinking and believing into its learners (Dei, 2012) but it must be the oppressed themselves that must unveil the realities of the world, know it critically, and then transform it through knowledge in order to be permanently liberated (Freire, 1970).

The loss of Indigenous languages as the medium of instruction in education not only severed relationships between the home and the school, it also caused Native youth to slowly lose their ability to speak and ultimately think in their own languages and this drastically altered the development of their cultural identities. In Hawai‘i beginning in the nineteenth-century, literacy in the Hawaiian language was no longer taught in the schools, and those who did speak received physical punishment and shaming (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Hawaiian scholar ho‘omanawanui (2010) lamented that the nineteenth-century banishment of the language led to the trauma that is still with us today. Children associated their language with low status, punishment, and humiliation with negative images of their own people affecting their cultural and political choices as Indigenous persons (Ngugi, 1986). Ngugi (1986), a Native language advocate and renowned African writer and researcher, struggled to write in his Native language and realized that the written language created by the missionaries was often difficult to use. This
form of cultural imperialism caused children to become alienated from their traditional social and linguistic environments with the devastating results seen today as many Native Peoples have lost their ability to speak in their Native languages, know very little of their cultural traditions and customs, and identify more with the culture and language of the colonizer (Ngugi, 1986). Europeans purposefully created educational systems that indoctrinated Indigenous Peoples to forget their cultural identity and significance in the world (Pewewardy, 2005). The curriculum, often taught in the colonizer’s language, de-cultured and disconnected Indigenous Peoples from their perspective and worldview (Pewewardy, 2005). The loss of one’s ability to speak and also learn in his or her Native language caused great psychological damage in forming a strong Indigenous, cultural identity.

Colonial education shaped young Indigenous minds so they easily assimilated into the dominant culture, a Western culture that is then viewed as superior to Native cultures. Assertiveness, competition, and individualism are prized attributes in Western society instilled in Indigenous youth taught in colonial educational institutions (Wane, 2013). Having these characteristics support the dominant power structure that is Euro-centric, individualistic, and materialistic (Wilson & Yellow Bird, 2005). This fits nicely into the well-known concept of the “American Dream” (Cajete, 2012, p. 145). Native American scholar Cajete (2012) wrote that the current goal of American Indian education is to create consumers of this dream who are enticed to pursue careers in Western thought and conditioning and to survive in the post-industrial American society. The dangerous effects from this indoctrination were prejudice, contradictions, narcissism, frustration, alienation, and unethical behavior (Cajete, 2012). Hawaiian scholar Kaomea (Au & Kaomea, 2009) wrote how the curriculum within schools prepared Native youth to fulfill the dominant society’s aspirations. Historical, curricular texts were used for Hawaiian
and immigrant socialization of children to work on plantations (Au & Kaomea, 2009). Current texts are really no different because they align closely with the tourist industry as they emphasize the values of aloha and hospitality, further perpetuating the role of Hawaiians as exotic and ever-ready to care for the needs of tourists (Au & Kaomea, 2009). The unfortunate result of years of curriculum for assimilation was that many children are so far removed from their Indigenous past that they do not know their own people’s Indigenous knowledge (Wane, 2013). Education for Indigenous youth is “objective” (p. 151) in that it is detached from their communities (Cajete, 2012). Even progressive education within democracy is still assimilationist pedagogy (Grande, 2008). Education is a site of struggle (Cajete, 2012) and contestations because it caters to reproducing colonial ways of knowing (Dei, 2012). Curriculum and pedagogies are so saturated in the dominant knowledge systems through Eurocentric paradigms and colonial specificities that they are assimilating Indigenous students into the dominant culture with the ill effects of negating students’ own historical and cultural memories as well as denying their embodied knowledge (Dei, 2012) causing them to believe Western culture superior to their own Indigenous cultures.

The impact of colonial education on the mind can be so appalling that some Indigenous Peoples, including Native intellectuals and Indigenous elite, support the maintenance of the status quo and actively resist decolonization efforts. Colonialism is rooted in power and promotes an artificial culture that maintains complacency (Alfred, 2004). This complacency allows the colonized to work alongside the colonizers in maintaining the status quo because they have so deeply internalized the racism and ideology of the dominant culture (Wilson, 2004) ingrained in them through colonial education (Fannon, 1963). There are some Native intellectuals who play an important role in perpetuating colonialism and who are unprepared to
address this within educational settings, such as university, or who insulate themselves in the academy (Alfred, 2004). These untruths are so deeply embedded in the mind that they must be eliminated so that every facet and essence of being can be liberated (Fannon, 1963). The systemic oppressions felt by our Indigenous learners within our colonial educational system have led to a lack of mental, bodily and spiritual nourishment (Dei, 2012) that must be challenged through decolonization efforts.

**Decolonization reclaims Native identity.**

Decolonization begins first and foremost with critically reflecting on one’s own psychological, mental, and spiritual colonization. Decolonization calls on Indigenous Peoples to assess deep rooted colonial claims through facilitated critical thinking that can occur within Indigenous communities (Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012). Yellow Bird (2012) created an analytical model that defines decolonization as both a process and an event. Decolonization as an event is when one reaches a level of critical consciousness and actively acknowledges one’s own colonization (Waziyatawin & Yellow Bird, 2012). Decolonization as a process is the implementation of multiple and varied strategies towards liberation that includes restoring one’s cultural practices, thinking, and beliefs to creating new ideas, thinking, lifestyles, and technologies used to empower and enhance one’s Indigeneity. For Native scholars, decolonizing activities include engaging in praxis useful for Indigenous peoples, encouraging critical thinking skills, and developing culturally specific decolonization strategies relevant to Indigenous communities (Wilson & Yellow Bird, 2005). There are a variety of activities, such as decolonizing indigenous thinking, establishing tribal critical thinking centers, decolonizing through storytelling, and Indigenous education (Wilson & Yellow Bird, 2005). Our communities
are in trouble, violence happens and health is threatened. Using these decolonization strategies paves the way to liberation (Wilson & Yellow Bird, 2005)

**Major Works and Substantial Findings on Indigenous Inquiry in Academia**

Despite the overwhelming dominance of colonial education within Western-based schools and universities and the numerous challenges Indigenous Peoples face learning and working in educational institutions, Indigenous teaching and learning have grown, especially in the Pacific, over the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Indigenous knowledge originating from Native inquiry, especially methodologies, are now found within the university through the pioneering work of Indigenous scholars, such as Kovach (2009), Wilson (2008) and Smith (2000), whose research promoted the inclusion of traditional knowledge and the acceptance of methodologies built on knowledge from Indigenous People’s own knowledge systems (Ray, 2012). These are now taught within Indigenous university programs of study. However, there is still much work needed in defining the field of Indigenous inquiry within academia and university programs of study.

**Indigenous inquiry grows within the academy.**

Indigenous inquiry grew over the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, especially in the Pacific. Wilson (2008) drew on the work of Martin (2003) to describe the rise of Indigenous inquiry in Australia in four distinct phases: Assimilationist, early Aboriginal research, recent Aboriginal research, and Indigenist research. The Assimilationist Phase (1940-1970) continued the exploitation of lands and resources but included research that examined the Aboriginal social structure, kinship structure, and mythologies as well as informed solutions to Aboriginal problems (Wilson, 2008). Aboriginal voices were silenced, with non-Aboriginals feeling qualified to pass on Aboriginal learning through their research (Wilson, 2008). The Early
Aboriginal Research Phase (1970-1990) continued this legacy of research on Aboriginal People. The Recent Aboriginal Research Phase (1990-2000) began to challenge governments for redress due to centuries of colonization (Wilson, 2008). Indigenous voices are now entering the Indigenist Phase (Wilson, 2008).

These phases, classifying the rise of Indigenous inquiry within Australia, mirrored other efforts in the Pacific. The call to decolonize research projects in the wider Pacific originated during the 1970s. Indigenous Peoples established their scholarly authority and called upon research to include more cultural framings and methodologies grounded in the Pacific to ensure greater validity (Nabobo-Baba, 2008). This corresponded with others engaged in counter hegemonic struggles (Nabobo-Baba, 2008). In the 1980s, the Māori challenged the reform agenda by making space within education for Māori knowledge, culture, and language with the launch of Te Kōhanga Reo (language immersion schools), Kura Kaupapa Māori, and Wānanga (tribal degree granting institutions). This revolutionized education, freed Māori minds from the colonizer, and allowed the Māori to exercise individual and collective agency (Smith, 2006).

However, the struggle continued with the advent of knowledge viewed as a commodity in the 1980s and 1990s (Smith, 2006). The narrowing definition of knowledge within the academy reflected a Eurocentric worldview that allowed one to treat knowledge as nothing more than a revenue generator (Greenwood & Levin, 2008; Meek, 2006). This commoditization of knowledge greatly affected universities, notably research universities, as they strived to develop a continuous means of cash flow to support operations (Greenwood, 2008), especially during these austere, economic times. This resulted in the creation of academic capitalism, where market-style approaches rewarded researchers who could both show profits from their research as well as add to the intellectual capital within their unique disciplines (Meek, 2006). Thus, the
sciences embraced entrepreneurialism by focusing more on generating applied research to validate further public and private investments while supplanting basic research (Greenwood & Levin, 2008). In addition, researchers in the social sciences, with the exception of high profile psychologists, economists, and sociologists, also became more positivistic in their research methodologies and methods in order to compete for limited resources. This influenced the way researchers work with graduate and post-graduate researchers (Greenwood & Levin, 2008), by endorsing more positivistic and often colonizing methodologies that are directly aligned with Western capitalist interests. Thus colonization continues its shameless perpetuation through the research of the next generation of scholars.

The progenitors of Indigenous inquiry Graham and Linda Smith as well as numerous others continued to conduct research well into the twenty-first century against the dominance of the capitalist academy that views knowledge as a commodity by focusing on Indigenous cultural aspirations, understandings, and practices. The Smiths’ research designs did not address truth and authority as traditionally defined, instead epistemological validity was used that located power and control in Māori customs and traditions (Bishop, 2011). Smith (2006) described how ethical research on the margins using Indigenous cultural knowledge and values are very different from institutionalized research ethics based on Western moral philosophies that really only began in the mid-twentieth century. The remarkable growth of this research is now taught within Indigenous programs of study at universities.

**Indigenous university programs are created.**

Indigenous inquiry within academia is taught within Indigenous Studies in universities. In Canada, the 1996 Royal Commission Report on Aboriginal Peoples (RCSP) recommended Indigenous knowledge be integrated into post-secondary education. Indigenous knowledge is
important within the Western academy because it carries a history of struggle; it connects to culture, Indigenous rights, and higher education; and it brings Indigenous bodies of knowledge and actual Indigenous bodies to the academy (Kovach, 2009). So programs, such as the Bimaadiziwin/Atonhetseri:io option of the Trent University Native Studies Department PhD program, is part of a larger international movement to situate Indigenous knowledge, protocols, frameworks, relationships, and methodologies in research. It is part of an emerging scholarship occurring around the world that questions knowledge creation and the paradigm inherent in the Western academy (Bell et. al., 2005). In addition, Australian Indigenous Studies has had a political agenda of self-determination for well over forty years. However, there is tension regarding how to teach Indigenous Studies in higher education, particularly in the area of Indigenous contestation of Western knowledge systems, the role unique disciplines play in subjugating Indigenous knowledges, and the politics of knowledge production itself (Nakata, Nakata, Keech & Bolt, 2012). My dissertation explored and described this recent tension within Indigenous inquiry from the perspective of graduate and postgraduate Indigenous scholars whom these programs educate to become the next generation of Native thinkers.

**Defining the field of Indigenous inquiry.**

The field of Indigenous inquiry expanded over the course of decades within academia. Researchers are now able to rely very little on Western research techniques, including qualitative methods, within studies about and for Indigenous Peoples. However, the academy is currently wrestling with the crumbling of its previously homogenous environment and it is causing fierce discourse and great challenges. Some in the academy are actively resisting the change, others are not aware, and some wonder how to include Indigenous frameworks in their work (Kovach,
This requires advancing the current scholarly and active work of decolonization addressed in my research.

In addition, a critical mass of professionals are getting their hands dirty and rewriting their own history (Cruz, 2012). Bell et al. (2005) challenged the notion of aboriginal epistemology as fixed or mono-epistemic because aboriginality by nature challenges the cognitive, epistemic, and relational violence of colonialism. They advocated for metaphors in curriculum design in higher education as pedagogy to address imbalances and historical trauma. Some academics felt frustrated because they cannot question traditional, community, or cultural forms as well as sources of counter narratives (Nakata, Nakata, Keech & Bolt, 2012). Some Indigenist theorists found themselves challenged and caught in a battle between coloniality and simplistic Indigenous analysis (Nakata, Nakata, Keech & Bolt, 2012). Indigenous inquiry is a field experiencing rapid growth and change because Indigenous scholars continuously explore its boundaries and are pushing beyond them.

Indigenous inquiry grew over the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, especially in the Pacific, despite the overwhelming view of knowledge as a commodity within the colonized academy. The research conducted by Wilson (2008) described the remarkable growth of Indigenous inquiry in Australia, which dovetailed with the rise of Indigenous inquiry in other Pacific scholarship. Indigenous inquiry is an emerging field of study now taught within academia. However with emerging scholarship came fierce discourse and great challenges. Indigenous scholars are broaching new frontiers, challenging the very nature of Indigenous inquiry itself, making it an opportune time for my decolonization scholarship to add to this exciting discourse.
Dissertation based on Indigenous inquiry.

My dissertation was based on the tenets of Indigenous inquiry. Although a relatively new phenomenon within the academy, Native scholars developed criterion elements and design features that further clarify Indigenous inquiry and set it apart from those found within qualitative studies. The primary difference is the focus on decolonization, countering hegemonic research that silenced Native voices in the past by creating a safe space to amplify those Native voices now and into the future. Relationships are also an important part of any Indigenous inquiry and must be maintained and strengthened during the entire study. These relationships also take into account one’s personal relationship with the research as well as the wider cosmos. These Indigenous research principles were applied throughout the design, implementation, and evaluation of my study.

Through interviews with other Indigenous scholars, Wilson (2008) defined criterion for Indigenous research. Indigenous research is related to and connected with all living things. It continually renews our relationships with ancestors while maintaining fidelity with our present relations (Wilson, 2008). The Native community approves the research and in turn the researcher respects the community by adhering to protocols, such as non-obtrusive observation, deep listening, reflection, and non-judgmental thinking (Wilson 2008). Reciprocity and responsibility are guiding values when conducting research in Native communities (Wilson 2008). Indigenous research also includes culture and language and is based on Native ontology and epistemology (Wilson 2008). Its source can be found within the hearts and minds of both those creating new knowledge as well as those touched by the research results (Wilson 2008). Indigenous research is deeply rooted in learning and wisdom yet is based on lived experiences (Wilson 2008). The lived
experiences of the researcher are crucial and included in Indigenous inquiry. These criteria formed the basis of my research and are incorporated into the research design.

Indigenous research design within the academy continues to broaden current notions of inquiry. We have come a long way in research design as Ray (2012) referred to Smith’s (1998) observations that research was previously thought of as objective with paradigms grounded in the Western academy. Scholarship today increasingly reflects inclusion of traditional knowledge and acceptance of methodologies built on knowledge from people’s own knowledge systems (Ray, 2012). Ray (2012) contended that if we continued to use Western knowledge systems to inform our theories and methods under the guise of traditional knowledge systems, we were perpetuating colonial research frameworks. Kovach (2009) greatly added to our understanding of Indigenous research design concepts through her advocacy of Indigenous methodologies embedded in Indigenous research frameworks within academia. Even though she was raised outside of her culture, she used an Indigenous methodology based on her Plains Cree knowledge system. This research was crucial as it is a significant contributor to Indigenous communities as well as members of the academy, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous, particularly for young, Indigenous researchers like myself (Kovach, 2009). I too utilized an Indigenous methodology, which was ha‘i mo‘olelo based on Hawaiian epistemology, within my research design.

Indigenous research design must also benefit the Native community. A locally controlled research agenda best serves the community and its needs (Zavala, 2013). Smith (2006) encouraged Māori and other researchers on the margins to pursue their research using culturally appropriate processes and procedures that benefit their community. This will ultimately transform the way in which we conduct research, work within the academy, and assist marginalized communities in embracing their power, values, and culture (Smith, 2006). Sium
and Ritskes (2013) referenced Wilson’s (2008) contention that research is ceremony, and ceremony holds an important place in Indigenous communities. The next generation of Native researchers is clearly defining the field through the lens of Indigenous scholarship and with the community’s support and engagement (Ray, 2012). These Indigenous research design principles guided the creation of my study and were apparent within my inquiry framework.

Indigenous research, inclusive of its criteria and design, are markedly different from qualitative inquiry. Bishop (2011) claimed that qualitative research did not solve the problems for positivist and neo-positivist research. It too had a history of colonizing the discourse of the Other in addition to asking Indigenous researchers to stand aside from their identity which would be the ultimate victory of colonization (Bishop, 2011). Furthermore, qualitative inquiry can only travel so far, as it is not guided by Indigenous knowledge, but based on Western approaches (Kovach, 2009). Kovach (2009) asserted that it was better to view Indigenous and qualitative inquiry as having an Insider-Outsider relationship. Both share relational and evidence of process and content within an inquiry framework, however, the Indigenous paradigm is based on an animistic philosophy and relation to all forms of life (Kovach, 2009). Zavala (2013) strongly recommended a totally, Indigenous way of conducting research and I wholly support this recommendation. This doctoral dissertation strived to be Indigenous research as opposed to another example of qualitative research with Indigenous overtones.

Another major difference between Indigenous and qualitative research is the focus on decolonization. Indigenous research is decolonizing research that involves Indigenous motives, concerns, and knowledge (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). It allows for the close examination of economic, political, and social factors that affect communities (Wilson, 2008). It is performative and activist within communities (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). It recognizes the role of
colonization in research, resists this colonization, and finds ways to end the current oppression of silenced, excluded, and marginalized voices who lack agency in normative research (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). These voices are provided spaces for recovery, healing, and development through research strategies, such as the Māori whānau and comunidades de base in Latin America (Zavala, 2013). When these voices are heard, they are culturally framed in genres of research and methodologies that reflect the authentic experiences of Indigenous Peoples (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). The research is not static, but fluid because it embraces non-Western forms that promote epistemologies and Native languages and customs within the research process (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). My doctoral inquiry was not only a personal decolonizing journey, but had larger aspirations to promote decolonizing research within the academy.

Indigenous research must strengthen relationships, both academic and personal, as my dissertation did. Wilson (2008) embarked on his research journey to promote strong relationships between humans and the cosmos so we all can increase our level of consciousness and insight into the world. He described Indigenous research as a sacred ceremony that allowed space for Indigenous peoples to be “grounded” (p. 88) in their identity while creating an Indigenous perspective from the land. The molecular memory and intuition about culture and its foundations must be respected within research (Wilson, 2008). Similarly, Kovach (2009) explained how research must communicate a strong connection to self, community, memory, and reciprocity. Focusing on good relationships is an important component as well as experiential knowing, collective relevance, and a decolonizing purpose (Kovach, 2009). Both Wilson (2008) and Kovach (2009) designed frameworks that not only created new knowledge within the academy, but also honored and enhanced relationships with our world. Through my research, I
endeavored to strengthen relationships with my Hawaiian culture and language through personal decolonization as well as added to the growing body of Indigenous knowledge within academia. This addressed the plea for more Indigenous values within research.

The role of the researcher within Indigenous research is unique. Similar to Wilson (2008), I saw myself not as a researcher or an author but as a storyteller. As a storyteller, I had a relational accountability to the ideas generated from the research and a responsibility to connect with the reader. The reader should have seen the relationships unfolding and strengthening over the duration of the research (Wilson, 2008). Kovach (2009) also emphasized the importance of situating one’s self, one’s culture, and one’s purpose firmly within Indigenous research. My personal mo‘olelo played a critical role within my research and my personal decolonizing journey illustrated the growing relationship I have with my culture and language. I agreed with Wilson’s (2008) sentiment that “if research doesn’t change a person, then you haven’t done it right” (p. 135).

My dissertation was based on these tenets of Indigenous research. I incorporated Native design elements and features into my study that set my Native inquiry apart from other qualitative studies. This study was about decolonization that countered the contemporary oppression and colonization of Indigenous voices within the research process. Much of my dissertation highlighted a personal decolonization journey as well as the decolonizing experiences of other promising Indigenous scholars within academia. Maintaining good relationships with others within the community, academia, and the cosmos was a crucial component of my Indigenous inquiry framework. As a storyteller, I strengthened these relationships and ensured that all aspects of my inquiry framework, from my paradigm to my theoretical perspective, were in keeping with the wishes and aspirations of the Lāhui (Nation).
Summary of Literature Review

This literature review achieved its main purposes of decolonizing traditional literature review processes, exploring the history and scope of the problem of colonization, establishing the context of theory relating to the problem of colonization, and deepening my personal connections to previous research while furthering my personal decolonization. The five-step literature review process successfully identified and selected relevant literature that was included in this dissertation. The literature, from influential Indigenous journals as well as historical and contemporary books and handbooks primarily authored by Natives, provided the inspiration for and support of this dissertation’s inquiry framework. The literature reviewed the historical rise and maintenance of colonial education by colonizing minds at the expense of Indigenous educational systems in the nineteenth century. It also described the current state and growth of Indigenous inquiry in the academy. This dissertation added to this emerging scholarship and its burgeoning research literature. Although this concluded the formal literature review for this dissertation, it did not end the incorporation of research literature into all aspects of the dissertation. I followed Wane (2013) in interweaving the research literature with research examples all throughout this personal decolonizing journey, especially within the inquiry framework. This strengthened my ‘upena.
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