"Think In Navajo": Reflections from the Field on Reversing Navajo Language Shift in Homes, Schools and Communities

Vincent Werito, University of New Mexico

This chapter examines the role of Navajo (Diné) speakers in perpetuating and sustaining the Navajo language for future generations. Based on past and recent work with Navajo language communities as a Navajo language educator, the author shares personal and professional insights about Diné language revitalization efforts in home, school and community contexts while also drawing from an inquiry project that examined effective practices in Navajo bilingual programs. The discussion highlights the critical role of speakers (whether they are parents, teachers, community tribal or educational leaders) to advocate for their heritage language in the home and community contexts. Finally, some considerations are addressed for future practice and research using Diné centered perspectives for Navajo language revitalization and their implications for the survival of the Navajo language.

In this chapter, I discuss issues related to Navajo language shift and language revitalization by posing questions that I believe require and warrant further critique, dialogue and research from a Diné centered perspective. The questions are:

1) What is language shift and why it is happening?
2) What is language revitalization?
3) Who is responsible for language revitalization?

To address these questions, I share my personal insights and knowledge gained from critical reflections about teaching Navajo and working with Navajo language teachers for over 20 years and more recently from some of the ways in which I continue to work with Navajo language communities to address these questions that highlight critical language advocacy. Finally, I offer my perspectives about the future of Diné language revitalization efforts; specifically addressing the idea that Navajo language speakers (i.e., educators, parents and community leaders) need to think in Navajo as a starting point of moving towards a Diné centered pedagogical approach in language revitalization.

To provide context for the key points of this paper, I pose two critical questions premised on the idea of language advocacy as "organized efforts and actions based on the reality of 'what is' so that visions of 'what should be'… become a reality" (de Jong, 2011, p. 3). Looking beyond the notions of what is and what should be in regards to Navajo language revitalization efforts requires more critical dialogue and reflection about the purpose and significance of the language in contemporary contexts as well as the future. More so, I posit that

Cite as from J. Reyhner, J. Martin, L. Lockard & W. S. Gilbert. (Eds.). (2020). *Honoring Our Students* (pp. 39-51). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Indigenous centered perspectives about community-engagement and language advocacy are needed to sustain our language for future generations. Specifically, these questions are:

1) Are there still reasons for speaking our language?
2) If so, what are those reasons?
3) What is the significance of our transmitting the language to future generations?
4) What are some immediate actions that are needed now?

These questions arise from understanding the myriad of complex issues related to language shift and language revitalization, such as language assimilation, language codification, language ideology, the role of language in schools and the status of languages among many others (McCarty, 2013; Platero, 2001; Bielenberg, 1999; Crawford, 1996). But more so, they should provide deeper inquiry into the critical role of language speakers to advocate for their language if there is any hope of reversing Navajo language shift (Werito, 2018). Finally, these questions are intended to offer some critical reflections about developing strategic ways to engage community members who are speakers of their heritage language to engage in dialogue about what should be happening in our communities, schools and homes if we want a new generation of speakers.

While it may seem apparent that for speakers of the language the purpose of the language is without question, however I argue that this question is more relevant for speakers of the language today than new learners because of dominant language ideologies and policies that continue to impact Indigenous communities like Navajo (House, 2005; Spolsky, 2002). For some language learners, having a purpose or reason to speak the language highlight connections to community, identity and/or a strong desire to learn the language to communicate with elders (McCarty, Romero-Little, Warhol, & Zepeda, 2013; Nicholas, 2009; Lee, 2009, 2007). In contrast, for speakers of the language this question is more pertinent because there seems to be less and less of a reason for speaking the language so that younger learners can hear it in practice. Regardless of different personal reasons for continuing to use the language or not, I underscore the idea that we must ask difficult and critical questions about the role of speakers and their crucial roles in perpetuating the language for future generations. Thus, I maintain that all speakers of Indigenous heritage languages need to reflect upon and reaffirm their role as speakers of the language, especially considering how and why they learned the language in the first place.

Reflections from the Field

Prior to graduate school, I had not heard of Navajo language shift. As I reflect back to my teaching career that started in the late 1990s, I recall how many of elementary and middle school aged students were able to speak in Navajo. When I started my graduate degree program in Albuquerque during the early 2000s, I began to hear about language shift through my graduate degree coursework and my inter-

actions with language advocates like Jenny DeGroat, who were already engaged in reversing language shift. I learned that language shift occurs when one language is gradually replaced by another language. Specifically, when a dominant global language like English is continually imposed upon Indigenous language communities for the supposed benefits of getting an education or employment, the use of the heritage language begins to decline in usage in almost every social and cultural sphere of that community (McCarty 2013; Lee, 2007; Wong-Fillmore, 1991).

When I returned back to the communities where I first started teaching, I now observed that many of the students I taught were now primarily speakers of English. In a period of ten to fifteen years, I observed that our language, Navajo, had been replaced by English as the language of the home, school and larger community. Crawford (1996) explains how language loss is "the culmination of language shift, resulting from a complex of internal and external pressures that induce a speech community to adopt and embrace a language spoken by others" (p. 21-21). In a similar vein, Tove Skutnabb-Kangass (1999) postulates that language shift is a result of linguicism and internalized language oppression. Essentially, language shift is an outcome of overt and covert language assimilation policies as well as internalized language ideologies about the value of learning a *minoritized* language like Navajo and instead privileging English (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). In the long term, language shift leads to language and culture loss, especially when a language is almost completely replaced by the dominant language.

What Is Happening to Diné Language?

During the time period when I was in graduate school, I became more familiar with the status of Indigenous languages severely threatened around the world and particularly here in the United States (Krauss, 1996). As I began to understand the status of Indigenous language groups in the U.S., it also became clear that each Indigenous language group must seriously address some critical questions about their languages within their own communities in order to reverse this shift (McCarty, 2013; Hornberger & McCarty, 2012). In *Reversing Language Shift* (1991), Joshua Fishman's intergenerational transmission of languages model describes the eight stages of language shift based on the degree and use of the language from the individual to societal levels. What this model suggests is that a language remains healthy or strong only by how much of it is used and valued in the home, communities and in society. Thus, Fishman (1991) proposes, "societally based RLS (reversing language shift) cannot be accomplished if it is not accomplished at the intimate family and local community levels" (p.4).

In many Indigenous communities, the languages that were used mostly in the home are now shifting towards English because many community members who are speakers are still not informed about the causes of language shift and ways to reverse it. More importantly, language speakers are not challenged to affirm their role as speakers of the language to maintain and sustain it for future generations. Subsequently, I also learned that since the 1990's Navajo children are coming to school more and more not speaking their languages, and many

parents are not teaching it to their children (Lee, 2007; Platero, 2001). Here, I pose additional questions for further consideration and dialogue among Navajo speakers. The questions are:

1) What has happened in the lives of our grandparents and parents that prevented them from speaking the language to their children and making a choice to use mostly English instead?
2) Why are Navajo parents who are speakers of the language not speaking to their children even if they believe that it will not hinder their academic achievement in schools?

Navajo (Diné) language education is a fairly new concept within the history of the people. Prior to the introduction of western schooling, Navajo was acquired by children through interacting with their parents, elders, siblings and other relatives in a natural environment. Navajo families did not 'teach' their language to children, instead children acquired the language by being immersed in different sociocultural community contexts where the language was used everyday for different purposes. Many speakers of language today recall how they acquired Navajo at home in contrast to learning it in a school setting. Today, the experience of many younger generations of Navajos is that they are trying to learn it in school settings like Head Start or through other means like technology despite many of the challenges they face in schools and society (Blanchard, Charlie, DeGroat, Platero & Secatero, 2014). For example, many Navajo children today learn Navajo as a second language in school-based bilingual programs using computer software like Rosetta Stone.

Navajo bilingual programs had their inception beginning in the late 1930s with the federal Indian schools. The Navajo Five Year program in the 1950s was a particular type of bilingual program (i.e., using the Navajo language as part of instruction) designed to catch Navajo students up with their English learner peers (Reyhner & Eder, 2017; Thompson, 1975). In these programs, the language development model was primarily designed to transition Navajo-only speakers to becoming English language learners. Starting in the late 1960s and early 1970s, a primary goal of Navajo bilingual programs, such as at Rough Rock Demonstration School and Rock Point Community School, was to use Navajo students' first language as a medium to transition them to learning and speaking English as their second language. Moreover, these schools also educated Navajo students in their own cultural life ways by incorporating the Navajo language and culture throughout the entire school curriculum (Reyhner & Eder, 2017; McCarty, 2013).

Today, the situation is reversed where young Navajo English monolingual speakers struggle to learn their heritage language. In contrast to the early Navajo bilingual programs that were primarily transitional programs, Navajo bilingual programs, particularly in New Mexico today, are more commonly dual language, language maintenance, or language enrichment models.[1] These models today differ in terms of design and implementation as well as in student makeup and teacher

training. Most Navajo students' first language in these programs today is English and most teachers have very little background and/or experiences teaching Navajo as Second Language and little understanding about immersion methodologies to reverse language shift. Only recently has there been an Indigenous heritage revitalization model. However, in all of these program models, the present day school environment for learning Navajo is very minimal and often devoid of real life contexts for meaningful, engaging and purposeful learning of a complex, verb based language like Navajo that should require years of immersion, deeply nuanced cultural contexts, a holistic natural approach to learning, situational and interactional learning, and a purpose for learning the language.

Working with Navajo Language Teachers

Upon moving to an urban setting in the early 2000s, I began teaching Navajo language as an elective in a high school bilingual program. One difference I observed from teaching in my home community to the urban context was the number of students who could comprehend Navajo or speak the language. In an article by Benally and Viri (2005) written over a decade ago, the authors explain why they believe Navajo is at a crossroads in many ways but still viable in other respects. However, fast forward to today, there is no longer a question about whether language shift is occurring or how fast it is happening. Instead, the questions are now: what *will be* the status of the language in the near future if conscious efforts are not made today? Will there be any speakers or even teachers of the language in the next generation? Who will teach the language in our schools? Will there still be a purpose for speaking in the home or community? More so, there are even more personal questions about what can be done to RLS in our personal lives; like who is responsible and what is the responsibility of speakers of the language to perpetuate the language. These concerns and questions are being raised by language educators, tribal leaders and Indigenous scholars today because many believe that the purpose of the language relates back to the long term vitality and viability of the language as well as the wellbeing of people and their cultural life ways that has huge implications for the next generations.

From my experiences as a teacher and working with Navajo language teachers, it is more evident to me now that the Navajo Nation is well past the crossroads and quite possible farther down the path to language loss if efforts are not made with urgency to reverse Navajo language shift. In speaking with many parents and grandparents, this reality is becoming clearer every day when they find that they can't communicate with their children and grandchildren any longer. However, in many communities, there are still different understandings of what this means. For some Navajo speakers, the language is still very strong as evident by their own ability to speak fluently. For others, there is the belief that the language will continue to be strong into the future regardless of its current status. For others, there is a growing concern that many of the youth are no longer communicating with older generations and there are some efforts to provide opportunities for Navajo children to (re) learn the language. So how do we talk about language shift?

In many of the language programs that I have become familiar through formal and informal observations, the amount of classroom learning time is often limited to 45 minutes to an hour. What is significant about this is that in contrast to research on successful comprehensive bilingual school models that require ongoing sustained learned over long periods of time (Collier & Thomas, 2009), many Navajo school based programs provide very little time for students to learn their heritage language. More so, many of these students' parents may not be able to provide rich opportunities to learn the language, much less to support them in learning their language at home. In many homes, young Navajo parents themselves are not speakers. If the goals of Indigenous heritage language programs are to create new generations of speakers, then we need to ask ourselves what needs to happen systemically in the home, school and community contexts for young Indigenous language learners to successfully become speakers of their heritage language and carriers of sacred and cultural Indigenous knowledge? What type of a transformative language education model do we need to create to achieve this reverse not only in language but also in paradigm shift?

In this section, I share some significant insights that came about from my involvement in an inquiry (research) project called Academic Language Development for All (ALD4ALL).[2] Its purpose was to examine the impact of customized sustained professional learning on bilingual educators' instructional practices and their connections to student learning outcomes. The inquiry project participants were all bilingual educators of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) and English learner (EL) students within their school's Bilingual, Multicultural Education Program (BMEP) across the state's public schools. The sites were located in a variety of rural/urban and low-SES Latina/o and/or Native American communities with a high CLD and/or EL enrollment. Age among the staff ranged widely from early twenties to mid-fifties. Educators' experiences ranged between one and twenty years. Drawing upon the personal implications from this inquiry project, I share some key insights about teaching Navajo in the home, school and community settings as well as discuss some critical questions and ideas for considerations for future practice and research in Navajo bilingual education and Navajo (Indigenous) language revitalization.

One of the insights I gained from working with teachers over a sustained period of professional learning relates to how Navajo bilingual teachers are not fully informed about the type of language program they are teaching in and/or the specific goals of these programs. One of the questions I asked Navajo language teachers in the ALD4ALL project was specifically about their program model and their understandings about the goals of the program. Some teachers responded that they were aware that their school language program model was Indigenous heritage language revitalization. Ironically, when asked about the goals of their language programs, Navajo language teachers that I spoke with stated that bilingualism is their program goal and others did not know. One teacher explained that she wanted her child to learn both languages because it will benefit her in the future and in her education. While this is a reasonable response, it is also interesting to consider if she, along with many others, is not fully aware

that creating new speakers of a threatened language is not the same as creating bilingual speakers, especially when there are adverse structural, institutional and language inequities. In particular, creating a new speaker of an Indigenous language is very different from creating a bilingual speaker in that there needs to be an acknowledgment and understanding of the sociocultural and historical contexts of the language as well. Moreover, it is important for schools and teachers to know what cultural and professional resources are needed to meet the different program model design and implementation outcomes. In addition, there must be community engagement and increased parental support of the programs that are in place such that parents are engaged in what their children are learning and students are not only hearing the language in one hour classes.

Beyond the technical issues and questions about reversing Navajo language shift in school contexts, I believe that there also has to be a critical awareness of language equity, language advocacy and community engagement beyond the school setting to the home and community context (Werito, 2018; de Jong, 2011). In particular, while there has been great success for bilingual programs utilizing a comprehensive approach over a long period of time as evident in the research on Spanish bilingual dual language program models (Collier and Thomas, 2009), what does this mean for threatened languages that face many challenges within the school setting? While there is some promising literature about the role of schools in Indigenous language revitalization efforts by asserting educational and linguistic sovereignty (McCarty & Lee, 2015), there is still a great need for more practical research-based evidence to inform future questions about what types of Indigenous centered community engagement are needed and who to bring into the dialogue about language program model design and implementation for creating effective Indigenous language revitalization school programs. In particular, while there have been successes in developing schools and programs over the past twenty years (McCarty & Lee, 2014; McCarty, 2013), a critical question remains: Are these schools creating new speakers of the language?

In the case of one teacher who I observed and later interviewed, her classroom practice and perspectives about Navajo language revitalization were very different from many other teachers that I have encountered over the years. When I entered her elementary classroom from the beginning of the school day until I exited her classroom I only heard her talking in Navajo to her children. Moreover, her classroom space was very conducive to learning Navajo in terms of Navajo print materials displayed on the walls, Navajo music played in the background and Navajo cultural *realia* laid out all over the classroom. She addressed all of her students in a culturally appropriate way by calling them, *shiyázhí* or my child. For her instruction, she used Navajo songs, dancing and storytelling, while staying in Navajo throughout the entire time. One of my colleagues who is not Navajo but very familiar with bilingual education was equally impressed with this teacher's disposition, pedagogy and practice. In particular, we were very much moved by how the students in her classroom were very engaged with her and how they appeared to be very comfortable in her classroom almost as if they were at home with a grandparent. Before moving to the next class period, the

students eagerly lined up and practiced a Navajo dance. From the look on their faces, we were sure that these students were quite possibly internalizing what it means to be Navajo, not only in language but thought.

Later during my interview with this teacher, I asked her a question of how she was able to stay in the language, relate to her students, engage them through instruction and, most importantly, make them feel like they were at home. In response, she shared with us how she tries to think about what these children's parents and grandparents would want for them. In this instance, I was reminded of how schools often want parents to become involved, but instead they do not seriously acknowledge their role as parents or consider how to include their input and perspectives into school curriculum. Also, she talked at length about how she works to make the language engaging, meaningful, fun and relevant to the daily lives. After all of this discussion, I asked her again, "So how do you do it?" She looked at me and asked, "What do you mean, how do I do it?" I rephrased my question and said, "So how are you able to stay in Navajo and make your teaching fun, engaging and relevant?" Her reply was, "You have to think in Navajo." She continued, "Everything I do when I prepare for class, when I teach, and even later when I am thinking about what I did, I think in Navajo." In essence, she described her approach to her teaching as a speaker of the language from a Diné centered perspective. More so, her response is an example of language advocacy to reverse Navajo language shift from a Diné centered paradigm.

Discussion

I share these ideas and insights from the field because I believe that language revitalization efforts are in essence about decolonization and transformation. In 2006, this notion of thinking about language revitalization as decolonization was discussed by Dr. Larry Emerson at a Diné Studies conference presentation titled "*Taking Back Our Learning: Dine Community Views on Dine Education*" at the University of New Mexico.[3] Using this critical perspective, I continue to maintain that speakers of Indigenous languages must engage in critical language revitalization (CLR) efforts from a Diné centered paradigm that acknowledge the ongoing legacies and remnants of colonization (oppression) while also recognizing our capabilities, looking ahead to the possibilities of perpetuating who we are, and truly believing in what we want for our children based on who we are as our ancestors did for us. Moreover, critical language revitalization efforts from a Diné-centered perspective requires us to "think in Navajo" about all of these critical issues and relevant questions about the future of our generations who will be born tomorrow. This is a decolonizing, transformative educational agenda for moving towards a Diné-centered pedagogy to restore our humanity, our way of life, our language and identity. Diné centered pedagogy is premised on achieving critical Diné centered consciousness guided by a Diné centered perspective (Werito, 2014) and knowing that in this search for knowledge for life's sake (Aronilth, 1999) lies the answers, the dreams, goals, aspirations, hopes and possibilities for transformation that we seek to attain and sustain through our Diné philosophy of education.

Critical language revitalization efforts from a Diné centered paradigm are key to long term Native nation building and decolonization efforts that are essentially critically informed, clearly articulated and well-organized conscious efforts (i.e., critical language advocacy) to curb English as the only language spoken now in home, schools or in the larger community today. Otherwise there are increased risks of really losing the language completely. For these reasons, it is vital that speakers of Indigenous languages, such as Navajo, demonstrate the purpose and model the significance of speaking/using the language for the younger generations to see and affirm to all aspects of their lives.

To give an example of CLR using a Diné centered pedagogical lens, I recall a time when I was working with Navajo language teachers in Albuquerque. As part of my work as a resource specialist, I developed and co-developed lesson plans and curriculum units with Navajo teachers across the school district. One of the teacher during this time in particular asked me about my thoughts of teaching the Navajo version of the United States (American) Pledge of Allegiance to her students so that they could say the pledge for the school every morning. In many schools even today, there is the practice of having students reciting the U.S. Pledge of Allegiance in different languages like English, Spanish and Navajo over the school intercom system for all students and staff to hear and follow. After some thought, I posed a question to her about what the Pledge means for her and what it represents. From this question, we engaged in a dialogue about what the Pledge means for Indigenous people as colonized people and if the English version translated well into Navajo. Later I shared with her that our own Navajo Nation has a flag and a Navajo Pledge and shared the Navajo Pledge with her.

Using Navajo Nation Pledge for her and her students reaffirmed many of the inherent core values that are embedded in our language with respect to the land, water and natural environment as well as our worldview and cultural knowledge as a distinct sovereign nation. In particular, the Navajo Pledge is more culturally relevant to knowing, learning and deeply understanding what it means to be Navajo. For example, when the Navajo pledge is read it comes across like a spiritual prayer about the sacredness and sanctity of our lands, our way of life and our humility as human beings that are only a small part of the natural world. In contrast, the Navajo version of the American Pledge is only a loose translation about white American values, God and country deeply rooted in settler colonialism as well as patriotism (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006).

Based on all of my reflections from teaching and working with other Navajo language teachers, it has become even more evident to me that parents and community members like tribal leaders, educators and parents who are speakers of the language must be the ones to lead the efforts to reverse language shift. However, this is not to suggest that school-based programs should not be part of this work and take on this responsibility, as a few have for some time now. Instead, everyone in a language community must take responsibility to reconnect, rejuvenate and regenerate their Indigenous identity that is their language as well as rekindling their deep affinity to the language for the sake of future generations by finding innovative ways (i.e., renewed purposes and reasons) to

speak the language every day and transmit the language to children, whether in the home, school or in the larger community contexts. Parents, teachers, school leaders and tribal leaders today need not only become aware of language shift and considerations for reversing it. In addition, they must also be conscious in their efforts to name language shift for what it is, to reflect and respond to it from a culturally grounded perspective and to plan strategic ways to organize efforts that place the responsibility back on the speakers of the language.

Speakers of Indigenous languages need to affirm for themselves ways to promote a mindset of continuous engagement to use the language to maintain and sustain it for future generations. In order for the next generations of Navajo to be able "to think Navajo," Navajo language educators and speakers today must seriously contemplate their actions, their ideas about the purpose of the language, and how to engage with each other for the sake of the language. More so, there must be serious discussion about what could happen if the language is lost. Would this loss inevitably lead to loss of cultural beliefs, identity, life way practices and values in the home and community? Personally, I believe that the cultural aspects of a community are the first things to go followed by the language. That is, as Indigenous people begin to forget their cultural practices, they also begin to lose the language. A good example is the use of K'é or kinship in Navajo communities. When kinship terms like shimá or shizhe'é are no longer used or when the practices associated with kinship are no longer valued, what happens to the language?

Conclusion

In this paper, I share my personal reflections about past efforts to revitalize the Navajo language by drawing upon 20 years of work that includes teaching the Navajo language in school settings, providing professional curricular and instructional support to Navajo language teachers and Navajo language programs, and working with Navajo families in community contexts. I also draw upon my work from a three-year inquiry project to identify effective practices in Navajo bilingual programs. From this wealth of experience, I share my critical perspectives and reflections about significant issues pertaining to revitalizing Navajo that include many of the challenges to the perpetuation of the Navajo language by addressing some critical questions about the future and promise of Navajo (Diné) language revitalization efforts. Some of the implications that I share highlight the idea of moving towards a Diné centered pedagogy that is essentially teaching and learning for life's sake from a critical Diné centered perspective that underscores our role as speakers to seriously consider the purpose and role of Navajo language into the next century.

Within each Indigenous language community that is threatened, language revitalization efforts must develop out of a critical Indigenous perspective of how the language became threatened in the first place (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). Consequently, as each community engages with these efforts collectively to empower themselves they begin to engage in language status planning efforts that focus on identifying community assets, needs and strengths by promoting

community engagement in the home, school and larger community contexts (Werito, 2018; Hornberger & McCarty, 2012). Over time, these efforts to reverse language shift by Indigenous communities must be made clear and a priority in homes, schools and the communities. For example, in some Indigenous language communities, school and community wide programs like master-apprentice teams and language nests are helping to reverse language shift and revitalize heritage languages by targeting specific strengths, assets, needs and outcomes (McCarty, 2013; Hinton, 1994). In *Bringing Our Language Home*, Leanne Hinton (2013) also describes how families can bring their languages home to give the gift of language to their children. Furthermore, she offers ideas that include family language planning and increasing the presence of the language as sacred in the home setting. These are some very viable and strategic ways to address language shift and loss by giving the responsibility back to parents, community members,and the speakers of the language (Werito, 2018).

Using Diné centered pedagogy, teachers and educational leaders can consider sharing their newly gained knowledge about language immersion methodologies with parents and community members at large. In particular, everyone in the community needs to become more aware and reflective about their role in these efforts to RLS while also engaging in critical dialogue and praxis (Freire, 2000) for moving from theory to action about ways to advocate for the place of the language in the home, school, and community. In some of the community engaged research work I have been involved with more recently, I have heard community people like parents, grandparents, and elders say, "we must give our language back to the youth," Nihaa'áłchíní nihizaad baa nidiilyeeł. Others say, "we must put our language back into their mouths," Nihaa'áłhíní nihizaad bizanidiilyeeł. Still others say that, "we must help our children to internalize the language into their spirit/essence," Nihaa'ʼáłchíní nihizaad bini'bíihnidiilyeeł. In considering these statements, I wonder what these statements will mean to future speakers of our language? More so, I wonder about how our grandchildren will talk about what their ancestors sacrificed to gift them the language. Will they ask, what did our ancestors do for us? Most importantly, how do we in the words of renowned Navajo bilingual educator Dr. Anita Pfieffer, *just do it*?

Notes

[1]New Mexico Public Education Department website; Bilingual Multicultural Education programs (BMEPs): https://webnew.ped.state.nm.us/bureaus/languageandculture/bilingual-multicultural-education-programs-bmeps/

[2]Academic Language Development for All (ALD4ALL) Project website: https://ald4all.org/stakeholder-report-2015-2016/

[3]University of New Mexico Digital Repository, 2006 Diné Studies Conference agenda information: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1002&context=inlp_nsc2006

References

Aronilth Jr., W. (1999). *An introduction to Navajo philosophy* (4th ed.). Tsaile: Diné College.

Benally, A. & Viri, D. (2005). Diné Bizaad [Navajo language] at a crossroads: Extinction or renewal? *Bilingual Research Journal, 29*(1), 85 – 108.

Bielenberg, B. (1999). Indigenous language codification: Cultural effects. In J. Reyhner, G. Cantoni, R. St. Clair & E. Parsons-Yazzie (Eds.), *Revitalizing Indigenous languages* (pp. 100-111). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Blanchard, R., Charlie, P. DeGroat, J., Platero, P. & Secatero, S. (2014). Borderlands of identity: Revitalising language and cultural knowledge in a Navajo community living apart. In L. Huss, A. Grima & K. King (Eds.), *Transcending monolingualism: Linguistic revitalisation in education* (pp. 193 – 224). New York, NY: Routledge.

Collier, V. & Thomas, W. (2009). *Educating English learners for a transformed world.* Albuquerque, NM: Dual Language Education in New Mexico, Fuente Press.

Crawford, J. (1996). Seven hypotheses on language loss: Causes and cures. In G. Cantoni (Ed), *Stabilizing Indigenous languages* (pp. 51- 68). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

de Jong, E. (2011). *Foundations of multilingualism in education: From principles to practice.* Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.

Fishman, J. (1996). What do you lose when you lose your language? In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing Indigenous languages* (pp. 80 - 91). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (2nd ed.). New York: Continuum.

Hinton, L. (2013). Bringing your language into your own home. In L. Hinton (Ed.), *Bringing our languages home: Language revitalization for families* (pp. 225-255). Berkeley, CA: Heyday.

Hornberger, N. & McCarty, T. (2012). Globalization from the bottom up: Indigenous language planning and policy across time, space, and place. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 6*(1), 1-7.

House, D. (2005). *Language shift among the Navajo*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona.

Krauss, M. (1996). Status of Native American language endangerment. In G. Cantoni (Ed), *Stabilizing Indigenous languages* (pp. 16-21). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Lee, T. (2007). "If they want Navajo to be learned, then they should require it in all schools": Navajo teenagers' experiences, choices, and demands regarding Navajo language. *Wicazo Sa Review, 22*(1), 7-33.

Lomawaima K. T. & McCarty T. (2006). *To remain an Indian: Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education*. New York: Teachers College.

McCarty, T. (2013). *Language planning and policy in Native America: History, theory and praxis.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

McCarty, T. & Lee, T. (2015). "The role of schools in Native American language and culture revitalization." In W. Jacob, S. Cheng & M. Porter (Eds.). *Indigenous education: Language, culture & identity* (pp. 341-360). New York: Springer.

McCarty, T. & Lee, T. (2014). Critical culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy and Indigenous education sovereignty. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 101-124.

McCarty, T., Romero-Little, E. & Zepeda, O. (2006). Reclaiming the gift: Indigenous youth counter-narratives on Native language loss and revitalization. *American Indian Quarterly, 30*(1/2), 28-48.

Nicholas, S. (2009). "I live Hopi, I just don't speak it" – The critical intersection of language, culture, and identity in the lives of contemporary Hopi youth. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 8*, 321- 334.

Platero, P. (2001). Navajo language study. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.), *The Green book of language revitalization in practice* (pp. 86-97). Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.

Reyhner, J. & Eder, J. (2017). *American Indian education: A history* (2nd ed.) Norman: University of Oklahoma.

Skutnabb-Kangass, T. (1999). Education of minorities. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity* (pp.69-98). New York: Oxford.

Spolsky, B. (2002). Prospects for the survival of the Navajo language: A reconsideration. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 33*(2), 139-162.

Thompson, H. (1975). Navajos long walk for education: A history of Navajo education. Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press.

Werito, V. (2018, Winter). Rearticulating the significance of our language: Reflections on the place of Diné language in contemporary contexts. *Soleado, Promising Practices from the Field,* 10-11 & 18-19. (Dual Language Education of New Mexico newsletter). Retrieved from https://www.dlenm.org/uploads/FileLinks/e8cad80410274955bdd342af00495387/Soleado_Winter_2018.pdf

Werito, V. (2014). "Understanding hózhó: A contemporary Diné interpretation of living according to the philosophy of Sá'ah Naghái Bik'eh Hózhóón". In L. Lee (Ed.), *Diné perspectives: Revitalizing and reclaiming Navajo thought*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6*, 323-346.