

Language Documentation and Description

ISSN 1740-6234

This article appears in: *Language Documentation and Description*, vol 6. Editor: Peter K. Austin

Language management for endangered languages: the case of Navajo

BERNARD SPOLSKY

Cite this article: Bernard Spolsky (2009). Language management for endangered languages: the case of Navajo. In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language Documentation and Description*, vol 6. London: SOAS. pp. 117-131

Link to this article: <http://www.elpublishing.org/PID/073>

This electronic version first published: July 2014



This article is published under a Creative Commons License CC-BY-NC (Attribution-NonCommercial). The licence permits users to use, reproduce, disseminate or display the article provided that the author is attributed as the original creator and that the reuse is restricted to non-commercial purposes i.e. research or educational use. See <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

EL Publishing

For more EL Publishing articles and services:

Website:	http://www.elpublishing.org
Terms of use:	http://www.elpublishing.org/terms
Submissions:	http://www.elpublishing.org/submissions

Language management for endangered languages: the case of Navajo

Bernard Spolsky

1. Introduction

In this paper I outline an approach to building a theory of language management and its application to endangered languages. As I see it, language management is one of the three interconnected components of language policy (see Sallabank, this volume): the other two are language practices and language beliefs. To clarify how this works, I will illustrate the model with the case of Navajo, which is the second largest Native American tribe (after Cherokee) in the United States but whose language is not unreasonably considered to be endangered (Lee and McLaughlin 2001).

2. Navajo historical background

The Navajo Nation covers an area of over 27,000 square miles in the southwestern United States, with portions in the states of Arizona, New Mexico and Utah. In the US Census conducted in 2000, just under 300,000 people claimed full or partial Navajo ancestry, of whom approximately 170,000 live on the Reservation. Some 70% of people on the Reservation over the age of 5 are reported to know a language other than English, and 30,000 say they speak English “less than well.” *Ethnologue* claims that 30% of children now come to school speaking Navajo, compared with 90% in 1968.

While there is evidence that the Navajos, an Athabaskan people, arrived in the Southwestern United States in the 1600s, Navajo elders (McCarty 2002:22), start their historical accounts with the surrender to US troops in 1863 at Fort Defiance Arizona and the Long Walk (some 500 kilometers) across New Mexico to Fort Sumner, in an area called Bosque Redondo (Hwééldi in Navajo). The Navajos had been cultivating fruit trees and other crops in fertile canyons and had been starting to build up sheep herds, but there was constant friction with other tribes and with white settlers moving into the area. Kit Carson’s successful campaign, which involved a scorched earth policy of burning trees and crops, led to their surrender, after which some 8,000-9,000 Navajos were forced to walk to Bosque Redondo. They were kept there for five miserable years in the hope of turning them into villagers. In 1868, the failure of the experiment (the tribal history lists crop failures, Comanche raids, corrupt Indian agents, and a smallpox epidemic)

was recognised and a treaty was signed permitting the Navajo to return to their traditional land, to be supported there. The treaty also included the establishment of schools (with one teacher for thirty pupils) and a ten-year agreement to send children to school. Life resumed on the Reservation, generally harsh high desert land, with regular movement in search of better resources and the establishment of a pattern of summer residence in higher land for pasture for their sheep, returning to the hogan for winter. McCarty (2002:33-35) describes traditional Navajo education, with children taught the activities (herding, rug weaving, cooking) that they were expected to share.

Schooling was a traumatic intervention. The first boarding school was established at Fort Defiance in 1882, and children were rounded up to be taken there. In 1893 there was a violent incident at Round Rock when community members resisted an attempt by the government agent to take their children to school (Aberle 1966:66). The schools were highly disciplined with regular punishment, all teaching was in English, food was poor and inadequate, children were expected to work half a day, and many children ran away (McCarty 2002). A report in 1928 by an independent team finally drew attention to the inadequacies of Indian education, and a new policy was launched under President Franklin Roosevelt and his Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John Collier. Although this involved community or day schools, in fact the schools were little different: the inadequacy of roads and transport meant that they too had dormitories and produced as alien and painful conditions as the boarding schools. As a result, there was firm resistance to schooling, and by 1948 no more than 50% of Navajo children were in school.

There were also economically motivated changes. Traditional Navajo livelihood in the early 20th century was based on livestock, needing extensive rangeland. The run-off from these lands, as McCarty (2002:57) points out, threatened the newly constructed Hoover Dam, so the Federal government declared the Navajo Reservation overgrazed and began a stock reduction programme aimed at destroying half the sheep and goats on the Reservation. Unable to live off their reduced herds, many Navajo men started to look for work off the Reservation, in mines, on roads, in seasonal agriculture, and in border towns. With the entry of the US into World War Two in 1941, 4,000 Navajos joined the US Armed Forces (including a celebrated group in the Marine Corps special unit of Navajo Code Talkers) and more than 10,000 went to work in the war-related industries in peripheral towns or in other states (Young 1961).

Many schools were closed during the war, but in the 1950s funds were provided to try to increase the proportion of children in school. By 1960, six times as many Navajo children were enrolled as had been in 1939. Most were in boarding schools off the Reservation. Another large group, usually the most highly qualified, was in public schools being built in urban settlements for the

children of Bureau of Indian Affairs employees, traders, and missionaries. There were only a handful of Navajo teachers working in the schools until the 1970s, so that communication between English-speaking teachers and Navajo-speaking pupils was minimal.

These developments had linguistic effects, including the development of written Navajo. Early missionaries and anthropologists developed their own systems of orthography to record texts. The first major activity was that of the Franciscan order who established a Roman Catholic mission at St Michaels, Arizona in 1898, and published a decade later an ethnological dictionary (Franciscan Fathers 1910). A bilingual dictionary followed in 1912, and a grammar was published in 1926 (Haile 1926). In the 1930s, the missionaries adopted the orthography used by Edward Sapir, who instituted the marking of tone (Sapir 1942). Some Protestant missionaries, however, published materials using their own orthography in this period. In 1934, Gladys Reichard developed yet another orthography to train interpreters. In the 1930s, the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the leadership of Willard Beatty, decided to try teaching Navajo children bilingually. Beatty asked for help from the Smithsonian Institution, which assigned him a linguist, John P. Harrington, who had little experience with Athabaskan languages. Harrington started to work with Robert W. Young, a young graduate student at the University of New Mexico who had begun fieldwork with a student of Reichard. In the autumn of 1937, Young (who was now working at Fort Wingate at the Southwestern Range and Sheep Breeding Laboratory) developed the official government orthography together with his Navajo co-worker William P. Morgan, and Harrington, with the help of the anthropologist and novelist Oliver LaFarge. This orthography was used in reading and teaching materials in the spring of 1940, and a number of primers and school readers were produced. In 1943, Young and Morgan published a grammar and dictionary (Young and Morgan 1943) which remained the standard work until it was revised 40 years later (Young and Morgan 1980, 1992). The literacy work served political purposes: grazing regulations were published in Navajo with explanations of the stock reduction programme (Austin-Garrison et al. 1996:354), a book entitled *The War with the Axis* was translated from English, and a monthly Navajo newspaper was launched (Young 1977:466). Of critical importance in the acceptance of the official orthography was the decision by the Protestant organisation Wycliffe Bible Translators to use the government system. The movement to encourage written Navajo lost Bureau support in the 1950s (Young 1977:466), and by the time Wayne Holm arrived as a teacher at Rock Point School in the mid-1950s, the Navajo readers were collecting dust, the dictionary was a collector's item, and the newspaper a curiosity (Holm 1996:392). Thus, any effort to teach Navajo reading initially or even to teach Navajo children to read their own language was essentially dead by the 1960s. Schools on the Navajo Reservation were alien institutions,

physically, culturally and linguistically separated from the community, and children were forced to pick up English if they wished to learn.

2. Language practices

Until the Second World War, the Navajo Reservation was isolated and largely monolingual, with perhaps some contacts with other Native Americans like the Hopi (Hopi bilingual villagers in Hano probably picked up some Navajo). Years of contact with Spanish speakers had had a minimal effect on the language; indeed, Sapir even suggested that the language was psychologically unable to borrow. But by 1968, English had encroached in serious ways. First, it was the principal language of schools – studies I carried out showed evidence that the closer a family lived to a school, the more likely their children were to be exposed to English. Secondly, it was the language of the towns around the edge of the Reservation, so that Navajos working or shopping there were also increasingly likely to be bilingual. Demographically, living off the Reservation, or close to an off-Reservation town, meant a probability of bilingualism, as did the amount of schooling. But Navajo remained the usual spoken language on the Reservation: it was used in homes and at the trading posts (Werner showed that the traders developed a kind of pidgin) and in all public activities except education. Thus, the Navajo Tribal Council insisted on pure Navajo (criticising borrowing and code switching) even though an interpreter provided a running English translation for Bureau of Indian Affairs staff. Similarly, Navajo Tribal Courts conducted their business in Navajo. The growing number of FM radio stations which played mainly country and western music had announcers who used Navajo all the time. Navajo traditional religious ceremonies were also in Navajo, with no place for English. Many of the Christian churches were also using Navajo, and even more did so when a translation of the Bible was completed. But school was completely in English (there were only a handful of Native American teachers, and few of them were Navajo). All written functions, such as the minutes and laws of the Tribal Council, the records of Tribal Court decisions, and the Tribal newspaper, were in English. In 1969 we carried out a survey of the language knowledge of children starting school (Spolsky 1970) which showed this situation clearly: children in off-Reservation towns like Gallup and Flagstaff were likely to know English (and some were monolingual in it). Six-year old children in Public Schools on the Reservation were also likely to be bilingual, with Navajo stronger. But 90% of the children from the Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding schools (who were required to attend because they lived more than a mile and a half from the nearest road along which a school bus could make its daily one hour journey) were meeting English for the first time when they came to school. However we must also note that the Navajo they spoke already contained many loan words

from English, showing that their parents were already in contact with the language (Spolsky, Holm, and Holm 1973).

Thirty years later, the situation was very different. More and better roads had been built, telephones and electricity introduced, convenience stores were supplementing or replacing the trading posts, English-language television was widespread, and intermarriage had become common (Lee and McLaughlin 2001). English was heard in the neighbourhoods and the basketball scores on the radio were reported in English. Members of the Tribal Council freely switched languages in the middle of their speeches. And the result showed up in the language of six-year olds: Platero 1992 reported that the number of children coming to school monolingual in Navajo had dropped, and half of the Head Start children he studied were monolingual in English; Holm (1996:404) reported that less than a sixth were considered by their teachers to be fluent speakers of five-year old Navajo. Lee and McLaughlin (2001) believed that Navajo remained the main language spoken by adults in family situations, but English and Navajo were spoken to young people and outside the home. Tribal governance is increasing in English, but local community meetings are still in Navajo. Critically, Navajo parents (especially younger parents in the urbanised communities) now speak to their children in English.

3. Language beliefs

Parsons-Yazzie (1995) suggested six reasons why parents do not speak Navajo to their children. Some are practical – the parents themselves use English much of the time, or the children are away at school. Others however represent beliefs: many parents accept the force of US monolingual policy and believe that their children will do better if they know English and that speaking it at home will make school easier. Clearly, they value English with its higher status (as the standard language associated with government, economic success, literacy) than Navajo (a heritage language, no doubt, but associated with poverty and powerlessness). When questioned about language, the most common references that Navajo adults in the 1970s gave were to their own or other people's school experiences, the way they suffered or were punished for not knowing English, and a desire to spare their own children this discomfort. They recognised the growing status of English: in school, English was the language of the principal and teachers; only the cleaning staff and the cooks and bus drivers could speak Navajo. English was the language of the rapidly intruding outside modern world, of the nearby towns where they went to shop or seek work, of literacy, and increasingly of television and computers. What purpose could be served in assisting the spread of Navajo or even attempting to maintain Navajo alongside English? In the 1970s, major teacher training programmes conducted by universities in the

southwest produced a large number of Navajo teachers, but most of them believed that English was the appropriate language for schooling.

Lee (2007) has looked at more recent adolescent attitudes. She found expressions of regret at not being able to communicate with their grandparents: one said “I wish I knew Navajo so I could talk to older people. I feel bad when I can’t talk to an older person. It’s not my fault. I wish someone had taught me” (ibid. p.9). But they reported “many negative experiences in trying to speak Navajo, such as scolding from adults and teasing from peers.” An adolescent who used Navajo was called a “John”, a “rez kid”, and considered poor, uneducated and uncool. They had learned from peers, and especially from school, that Navajo was marginalised. As a result, they tended to hide their knowledge. McCarty et al. (2006) reported that adults they interviewed thought that fewer than half of the children in their school could speak Navajo, while the children themselves thought it was closer to 80%.

Essentially then we see a previously monolingual Navajo ideology moving through a bilingual intermediate stage with English accepted as appropriate for new channels (writing especially) and institutions (schools and churches), finally moving towards acceptance of the external monolingual English US ideology. Navajo, however, is still required for some public official roles (chapter houses) and politics, and is appropriate for older people and is recognised even by non-speakers as a treasured or regretted heritage language.

4. Language management – simple and complex

The third component of language policy is what I prefer to call *language management* – the older term *language planning* is probably better retained for the optimistic days after the Second World war when everybody thought that language, like economics, could be planned (Nekvapil 2006). In the model proposed by Nekvapil and others in the Prague School tradition (Jernudd and Neustupný 1987, Neustupný and Nekvapil 2003) there are two kinds of language management, *simple* and *complex*. Simple language management refers to the actions of an individual speaker correcting an error of speech or trying a simpler synonym or word or phrase in another language; it is more or less what is referred to as speech accommodation (Cooper and Greenbaum 1987, Giles, Taylor, and Bourhis 1973). Complex management refers rather to more long-term activities undertaken to correct difficulties of communication, such as arranging to teach a language, or providing interpreters, or determining through persuasion or authority the variety to be used in a specific situation.

Whereas *language planning* was generally assumed to be a problem for national governments (Fishman, Ferguson, and Das Gupta 1968), it is now

increasingly recognised that *language management* takes place within different levels of a speech community, ranging from the family to the national or supra-national level. To understand the Navajo case, it is useful of course to look at the different levels involved.

Clearly, language shift and change on the Navajo Reservation has reflected decisions of the national government on language matters. The most important of these have concerned schooling and school policy. As noted in section 1 above, the policy of requiring Navajo children to attend school had already started in the 19th century and represented a national goal of integrating the various Native American tribes into an English-speaking homogenous group amenable to US control (McCarty 1998:31). Schooling was the principal weapon of linguistic colonialism in the US government's policy to control and subjugate the Navajo. The boarding schools interrupted traditional aspects of indigenous Navajo education: the children missed hearing the stories of their grandfathers which are told only in winter when they were at school, and the girls missed the correct timing for puberty ceremonies. At the same time they missed the linguistic enrichment of these and other occasions.

Traumatic as the boarding schools were for those forced to attend, and while they changed attitudes, they did not lead immediately to a language shift. Inadequate financing and implementation of educational policies greatly weakened the effects. The absence of universal schooling, the inappropriate curriculum, and the teachers who were linguistically blocked from communicating with their students all slowed the process of Navajo language attrition. Government economic policies had stronger effects, especially the government programme of forced livestock reduction which began to destroy the already weak economic base of life on the Navajo Reservation, increasing the effect of the national economic depression and building lasting enmity within the communities over the implementation of the policy, as well as making Navajos more willing to seek work off the Reservation, with consequent exposure to English.

In the 1970s, taking advantage of a national policy tolerating or even encouraging bilingual education, a good number of schools on the Reservation developed bilingual programmes, some showing considerable success (Rosier and Holm 1980). Had they continued, these programmes might well have slowed down or reversed the shift to English. However, at the same time that federal policy was moving away from and finally abandoned bilingual education (Crawford 2008), state government policies requiring standardised testing in an English curriculum persuaded school principals and parents that it was counter-productive to continue teaching in Navajo. I heard this belief expressed even in the 1970s when I asked some Navajo members of a school board about their priorities: the top of their list was state accreditation,

achieved by standardised English test results and enabling their school to compete in state basketball competition.

One management force for Navajo maintenance might well have been literacy. The development of standardised literacy could be a major force, especially in connection with the status of sacred texts in religion. Literacy certainly played a major part in the maintenance of Hebrew after the language was no longer spoken, and in the spread of Islam, and in the development of Latin-centered Western education. In the case of Polynesian languages like Māori, Samoan and Tongan, the willingness of missionaries to develop literacy in these languages and to translate the Bible into them was of great importance in the 19th century in the raising their status (see Spolsky 2009b). By the end of 19th century, there was more written material being published in Māori than in English in New Zealand; in Tonga, the King's authority and policy kept the strength of the language throughout the 20th century (Spolsky, Engelbrecht, and Ortiz 1983). As noted in section 1 above, Navajo literacy was developed by missionaries and anthropologists, but only in the late 1930s was there a government-supported effort to develop a standard orthography, which was then adopted for three functions: schools, government propaganda (including a Navajo newspaper), and the Protestant bible translation by the Wycliffe Bible Translators (Austin-Garrison et al. 1996). It was not used for other official functions, because official power rested with non-Navajo-speaking Anglo-Americans or English-literate Navajos. Literacy remained essentially an alien skill to be used for alien purposes (Spolsky and Holm 1973). There were exceptions: there was one community where literacy spread outside the church and school (McLaughlin 1987), and some teachers who found indigenous uses for literacy (McCarty 2002), but generally it was a force for shift to English.

Religion did help to maintain Navajo, but not as much as in other cases mentioned above. There are four significant religious groupings. Traditional Navajo religion, with prescribed rituals conducted by highly trained singers (medicine men) remains an important force in support of the language, but nowadays there are some reports of English prayers being admitted even in traditional religious ceremonies. A negative effect is that some Christian Navajos object to the teaching of Navajo in schools because of its association with traditional religion. Among the various Christian groups, Navajo literacy was encouraged by the Bible translation completed in the 1940s, but for many missionaries this was seen as a first step to full conversion and to English. There has also been considerable activity by Mormon missionaries, but this included a plan to have Mormons adopt Navajo children to make conversion more certain. The fourth religious group was the Native American Church, which originally involved all-night peyote ceremonies with songs in languages other than Navajo. It grew, according to Aberle (1991), partly because participation did not demand Navajo language skill.

Commonly, language maintenance and revival efforts are associated with or parallel to political movements for independence. The classic cases of Hebrew and Irish or the more recent regional autonomy of Quebec, Catalonia, and Wales are primary examples. This has not been the case with Navajo, as Young (1978:7) helps to explain: “Navajo culture does not have a heritage of coercive religious, political or patriarchal family figures, and in the Navajo scheme of things one does not usually impose his will on another animate being...” As a result, he notes, “coercive laws are distasteful from the Navajo point of view, and Tribal leadership has long preferred persuasion to force, even in applying ‘compulsory’ education laws on the reservation.” Political governance was, then, externally imposed. While there was some consultation with ad hoc councils of headmen, all power remained with government agents until well into the 20th century. Language became a source of power, and knowledge of English made it possible to communicate with the government. Chee Dodge, who was recognised as Head Chief in 1884, became the first chairman of the Tribal Council when it was set up in 1923 (mainly to approve mineral and land sales). He gained his position because of his bilingual skills. In its early years, the Council could only meet at the call of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in the presence of federal officials for whom the Navajo debate had to be translated into English. For many years, the Council insisted on the languages being kept separate, but by the 1980s, code-switching was regular (Neudorf 1987:163). Political power then was bilingual, with the importance of English steadily growing.

An important economic force contributing to the loss of Navajo was the stock-reduction plan of the mid-20th century, noted in section 1 above. In the earlier part of the century, the Reservation could be described as a limited industry community, as sheep and livestock herding provided the main income. Bureau of Indian Affairs experts decided the Navajo were overgrazing, and decreed that they must reduce their flocks. Once children were no longer needed for shepherding, they could be sent to school, and once a family no longer needed to live near their range, they could move to a semi-urban development or off the Reservation to find employment. Both were moves towards English.

In the early 1970s, there were school-based efforts at reversing language shift, approved by the Tribal Government and supported in large part by Federal Bilingual Education funds. A number of schools were active, but the movement did not take hold (Holm and Holm 1995), and by the end of the millennium, Navajo programmes even at the small number of contract schools (Lee and McLaughlin 2001) were teaching little if any Navajo. No more than 10% of Navajo children receive any Navajo courses.

In the classic view of what used to be called language planning, there are two major components, *corpus planning* and *status planning* (Kloss 1966).

The former involved efforts to manage the language. For Navajo, in the absence of an academy or an activist language movement, this came down to a long-term ideological preference for pure Navajo, slowly weakened under the pressures of modernisation (Spolsky and Boomer 1983). Because of the ease of word formation in Navajo, it is fairly straightforward to avoid borrowing, and this was, for a while, enforced by members of the Tribal Council during their debates. But direct borrowing from English is now more common.

There is also a technical problem with the official Navajo orthography: the need for characters not normally found on American typewriters – the French acute accent for high tone, the Czech cedilla for nasalisation, and the Polish barred ‘l’ for the voiceless lateral phoneme. The printing press at the Phoenix Indian School which printed most of the material developed in the late 1930s and early 1940s could handle this, and Robert Young had a typewriter built with the special keys. In the 1970s a Navajo version of the IBM ‘golf ball’ electric typewriter was developed, but it wasn’t until the arrival of personal computers that this typography became widely available to writers. There was one attempt to challenge some aspects of the official orthography: Holm (1972) showed the possibility of simplifying the system by dropping the marking of tone, length or nasalisation, but the proposal was shouted down by teachers who had already become used to the thirty-year old system. One final project in corpus planning must be mentioned: the development of specialised vocabulary for military purposes by the Navajo code-talkers who served in the US Armed Services (U.S. Navy 1945).

Status planning (in Kloss’ 1966 definition) dealt with government decisions on appropriate and permitted functional choices of varieties, although I prefer (following Nekvapil (2006) and others) to consider other social levels (Mac Giolla Chríost 2006, Nahir 1998). In the model proposed in Spolsky (2009a), I start with the family and move up. While a good number of traditional Navajo families evidently continue to raise their children speaking the language, the larger proportion now appear to use or at least accept English. Religious institutions vary: traditional religion still maintains Navajo as the ceremonial language, but there is some acceptance of English responses from patients undergoing treatment. The Native American Church appears not to set language policy, but uses many languages. Christian churches made a great contribution when they started to use the Navajo Bible, and raised its status in that way: Navajos (apart from school teachers) who are literate are likely to have developed that literacy in a church environment. Some churches still conduct services in Navajo, while others use English. At the trading posts traders were prepared to learn Navajo, but one suspects that supermarkets (even if occasionally they have a sign in Navajo) are likely to be mainly English domains. Tribal government at the local level (called the ‘chapter’) probably still mainly uses oral Navajo, but minutes are written in English. The Navajo Nation conducts its oral business largely in Navajo, but with regular

code-switching and interpreting for monolingual English-speaking officials (and recently even Tribal members), but all written material is in English. The Navajo Nation has passed resolutions supporting bilingualism, and provides funds for Navajo pre-school programmes; it also requires all Navajo university students receiving stipends to take some courses in the language. As described earlier, the fading of the Bilingual Education Act and the emphasis on standardised testing act as a de facto Federal policy working against Navajo language maintenance. While their language was exploited during the Second World War, Navajos in the Armed Services are expected to learn English. Similarly, workplaces outside the Reservation require or encourage English.

Cooper (1989) added a third component to Kloss's model, which he called *language acquisition planning*. Its goal is to add new speakers of the variety, either by encouraging parents to speak the language to their children, or by teaching it in some formal (or semi-formal) settings. In the case of Navajo, as of other minority or marginalised languages, this was the essential task of the school system which, from the beginning, required English not just as medium of instruction but also for many years as the only language permitted to be used by pupils. Schools have worked to shift their pupils from Navajo to English, except for a short period in the 1940s when a few school readers were produced in Navajo and Navajo-speaking aides were provided to help English-speaking teachers in some off-reservation programmes, and the period under the influence of the Bilingual Education Act in the 1970s. In the early 1970s, formal teaching of English as a second language was added to rather unsophisticated English immersion (or better, submersion), accompanied by the addition of a pre-first grade year to schooling in the vain hope that this would produce proficient English speakers. In fact, this simply guaranteed educational failure. Navajo was introduced as an elective subject in some schools in the 1960s and 1970s, and is taught as a 'foreign language' in many Navajo-majority secondary schools in Arizona. A few community-controlled and some public schools continue to use Navajo as a medium of instruction. For a long time, Rock Point Community School had a two-language programme. In 1990, noting the declining Navajo proficiency of entering students, an immersion programme was started at Fort Defiance Elementary School. For some years, Navajo continued to be used beyond the first two years, but this was later stopped (Holm and Holm 1995). Navajo has been taught as a subject at the Navajo Community College and at universities neighbouring the Navajo Nation. Some of these classes can be considered 'language diffusion' intended for non-Navajos, but others are for Navajo students.

5. Conclusions

The dominant impression left by our analysis of the Navajo situation is that the shift from Navajo to English is mainly supported by such language management as exists on the Reservation and elsewhere. Compared with government activities in Quebec, Catalonia and the Basque Country, or the grass-roots and government-supported programmes for Māori language regeneration in New Zealand (see Spolsky 2009b), one cannot disagree with the pessimism of Fishman's judgement that there have been "generations of passive dependence on such quickly disappearing factors as isolation or distance from Anglo influence as the prime protectors of the Navajo way of life", and that any efforts to restore the language will be "too little and too late" (Fishman 1991:190). We also understand the "fatalism" of two Navajo educators writing a decade later and reporting that the shift from Navajo to English is "taking place with extraordinary speed" (Lee and McLaughlin 2001:24). Only a major change of policy, with concerted grassroots and government support for active language management, is likely to reverse this situation.

References

- Aberle, David F. 1966. *The Peyote religion among the Navaho*. New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research Inc.
- Aberle, David F. 1991. *The Peyote religion among the Navaho* (Second edition ed.). Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Austin-Garrison, Martha, Bernice Casaus, Daniel McLaughlin and Clay Slate. 1996. Diné Bizaad Yissohígíí: the past, present and future of Navajo literacy. In Eloise Jelinek, Sally Midgette, Keren Rice and Leslie Saxon (eds.), *Athabaskan Language Studies: Essays in honor of Robert W. Young*, 349-390. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Cooper, Robert L. 1989. *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cooper, Robert L. and Charles W. Greenbaum. 1987. Accommodation as a framework for the study of simplified registers.
- Crawford, James. 2008. The Bilingual Education Act: 1968-2002: An obituary. In James Crawford (ed.), *Advocating for English learners: Selected essays*, 124-127. Clevedon UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1991. *Reversing language shift: theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Fishman, Joshua A., Charles A. Ferguson and Jyotirinda Das Gupta. 1968. *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley.
- Franciscan Fathers. 1910. *Ethnologic dictionary of the Navaho language*. St. Michaels, Arizona.

- Giles, Howard, Donald M. Taylor and Richard Bourhis. 1973. Towards a theory of interpersonal accommodation through language: some Canadian data. *Language in Society*, 2(2), 177-192.
- Haile, Berard. 1926. *A manual of Navaho grammar*. St Michaels AZ.
- Holm, Agnes and Wayne Holm. 1995. Navajo language education: retrospect and prospects. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 19(1), 141-167.
- Holm, Wayne. 1972. *Some aspects of Navajo orthography*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM.
- Holm, Wayne. 1996. On the role of "Young and Morgan" in the development of Navajo literacy. In Eloise Jelinek, Sally Midgette, Keren Rice and Leslie Saxon (eds.) *Athabaskan Language Studies: Essays in honor of Robert W. Young*, 391-406. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Jernudd, Björn and Jiří V. Neustupný. 1987. Language planning: for whom? In L. LaForge (ed.), *Proceedings of the international colloquium on Language planning*, 69-84. Québec, Canada: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Kloss, Heinz. 1966. German-American language maintenance efforts. In Joshua Fishman (Ed.), *Language loyalty in the United States* (pp. 206-252). The Hague: Mouton.
- Lee, Tiffany 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.
- Lee, Tiffany and Daniel McLaughlin. 2001. Reversing Navajo language shift, revisited. In Joshua A. Fishman (Ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved?* (pp. 23-43). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- MacGiolla Chríost, Diarmait. 2006. Micro-level language planning in Ireland. *Current Issues in Language planning*, 7(2 and 3), 230-250.
- McCarty, Teresa L. 1998. Schooling, resistance and American Indian Languages. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 132, 27-41.
- McCarty, Teresa L. 2002. *A place to be Navajo: Rough Rock and the struggle for self-determination in indigenous schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McCarty, Teresa L. Mary Eunice Romero Little, and Ofelia Zepeda. 2006. Reclaiming the gift: Indigenous youth counter-narratives on Native language loss and revitalization. *American Indian Quarterly*, 30(2), 28-48.
- McLaughlin, Daniel Jay. 1987. *When literacy empowers: an ethnography of English and Navajo literacy*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- Nahir, Moshe. 1998. Micro language planning and the revival of Hebrew. *Language in Society*, 27, 335-357.
- Nekvapil, Jiří. 2006. From language planning to language management. *Sociolinguistica*, 20, 92-104.

- Neundorf, Alice. 1987. *Bilingualism: a bridge to power for interpreters and leaders in the Navajo Tribal Council*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- Neustupný, Jiří V. and Jiří Nekvapil. 2003. Language management in the Czech republic. *Current Issues in Language planning*, 4(3and4), 181-366.
- Parsons-Yazzie, Evangeline. 1995. *A study for Navajo language attrition as perceived by Navajo-speaking parents*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff AZ.
- Platero, Paul. 1992. *Navajo Head Start Language Study*. Unpublished manuscript, Window Rock AZ.
- Rosier, Paul and Wayne Holm. 1980. *The Rock Point experience: a longitudinal study of a Navajo school program*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Sapir, Edward. 1942. *Navaho texts*. Iowa City, Iowa: Linguistic Society of America.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 1970. Navajo language maintenance: six-year-olds in 1969. *Language Sciences* (13), 19-24.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2009a. *Language management*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2009b. Rescuing Maori: the last 40 years. This volume.
- Spolsky, Bernard and Lorraine Boomer. 1983. The modernization of Navajo. In Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in language planning: international perspectives* (pp. 235-252). The Hague: Mouton.
- Spolsky, Bernard, Guillermina Engelbrecht, and Leroy Ortiz. 1983. Religious, political, and educational factors in the development of biliteracy in the Kingdom of Tonga. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 4(6), 459-470.
- Spolsky, Bernard, Agnes Holm and Wayne Holm. 1973. English loan words in the speech of young Navajo children. In Paul R. Turner (Ed.), *Bilingualism in the Southwest* (pp. 227-239). Tucson, AZ.: The University of Arizona Press.
- Spolsky, Bernard and Wayne Holm. 1973. Literacy in the vernacular: the case of Navajo. In Ralph W. Jr. Ewton and Jacob Ornstein (Eds.), *Studies in language and linguistics, 1972-3* (pp. 239-251). El Paso: University of Texas at El Paso Press.
- U.S. Navy. 1945. *Navajo Code Talkers' Dictionary*. Washington, DC: Department of Defense.
- U.S. Navy. *Navajo Code Talkers' Bibliography*, 30 November 2000, from <http://www.history.navy.mil/faqs/faq12-1.htm>
- Young, Robert W. 1961. *The Navaho Yearbook*. Window Rock AZ: Navaho Agency.

- Young, Robert W. 1977. Written Navajo: A brief history. In Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Advances in the creation and revision of writing systems*, 459-470. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
- Young, Robert W. 1978. *A political history of the Navajo Tribe*. Tsaile, Navajo Nation: Navajo Community College Press.
- Young, Robert W. and William Morgan. 1980. *The Navajo language : a grammar and colloquial dictionary*. Albuquerque, NM: The University of New Mexico Press.
- Young, Robert W. and Morgan, William. 1992. *Analytical lexicon of Navajo*. Albuquerque NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Young, Robert W. and William Morgan. (eds.). 1943. *The Navaho language*. Phoenix AZ: U.S. Indian Service.