

UC San Diego

UC San Diego Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Kumeyaay Language Loss and Revitalization

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5s46s39r>

Author

Rodriguez, Stanley

Publication Date

2019

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS

Kumeyaay Language Loss and Revitalization

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

in

Educational Leadership

by

Stanley Rodriguez

Committee in charge:
University of California San Diego

Professor Carolyn Hofstetter
Professor Alison Wishard-Guerra

California State University, San Marcos

Professor Patricia Stall, Chair
Professor Sinem Siyahhan

2020

Copyright

Stanley Rodriguez, 2020

All rights reserved.

The dissertation of Stanley Rodriguez is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication on microfilm and electronically:

Chair

University of California San Diego
California State University, San Marcos

2020

Dedication

This work is dedicated to the current students of Kumeyaay who offer hope for language regeneration.

Epigraph

When I was growing up, at the age of four, I remember sitting on my grandmother's lap and hearing her speak Kumeyaay to my aunt. I began repeating what I heard. However, before I learned to speak the language, they stopped speaking it. Many years later, I heard my aunt speaking Kumeyaay to another person and I told her, "I want to learn our language. Will you teach me?" She replied, "Why do you want to learn?" She quickly changed the subject. Throughout the years I continued to ask about our language, but most of her responses were dismissive and curt. Finally, I learned Kumeyaay from others. I then used the language with her in conversations because she had no one else to speak to. Before she left this world, she said that she wished more people could speak our language.

Table of Contents

<i>Signature Page</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Dedication</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>Epigraph</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Table of Contents</i>	<i>vi</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>	<i>viii</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Vita</i>	<i>x</i>
<i>Abstract of the Dissertation</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Chapter 1: Introduction</i>	<i>1</i>
Purpose of the Study	2
Preview of the Literature	5
Case Study Methodology	7
Participants	8
Significance of the Study	9
Overview of Dissertation	10
<i>Chapter 2: Review of the Literature</i>	<i>11</i>
Positionality	11
The Historical Context	12
Language Socialization	18
Literacy Socialization	22
Language Loss and Culture	26
Kumeyaay Speakers in Geographical Context	37
UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment Indicators	40
<i>Chapter 3: Methodology</i>	<i>43</i>
Research Design	44
Participants	46
Setting	50
Procedures and Instruments	50
Data Analysis	51

Significance.....	56
<i>Chapter 4: Results</i>	58
Case Study Analysis and Presentation of Data	58
Contextual Narrative of Participant Interviews	58
Reservation I.....	59
Reservation II.....	61
Reservation III	63
Reservation IV	66
Reservation V.....	67
Reservation VI	68
Reservation VII.....	70
Reservation VIII.....	71
Reservation VIII	72
Data Analysis	74
Research Question 1: What are Kumeyaay speakers’ perceptions about the current state of the language?	75
Research Question 2: How do the Nation, communities, and individuals think about using language assets to reverse its moribund status?	114
<i>Chapter 5: Conclusion</i>	135
Revisiting Research Questions	135
Limitations of the Study	142
Conclusion	144
Policy and Programmatic Recommendations	147
Final Thoughts	159
<i>Appendix A</i>	161
<i>Appendix B</i>	166
<i>References</i>	168

List of Tables

Table 1: <i>Summary of UNESCO Framework on Language Vitality and Endangerment</i>	42
Table 2: Interagency Language Roundtable Scale and European Language Proficiency Scales .	49
Table 3: <i>Interagency Language Roundtable Scale Levels</i>	51
Table 4: Summary of the UNESCO Framework on Language Endangerment and Vitality Factors	52
Table 5: UNESCO LVE Factors & Related Interview Codes	54
Table 5: UNESCO LVE Factors & Related Interview Codes (Continued).....	55
Table 5: UNESCO LVE Factors & Related Interview Codes (Continued).....	56
Table 6: Proportion of Kumeyaay speakers on Individual Reservations.....	78
Table 7: <i>UNESCO Intergenerational Language Transmission Scale</i>	91

Acknowledgements

The number of people who have made this work possible is enormous. My teachers, past and present; my family, especially my wife, Martha, my son, Hwaito, Raymond Martinez, and Conor Handly; my students; my colleagues; my friends; my fellow Native activists; and especially, the subjects of this study. I cannot possibly name them all. Without them, I could neither have begun, nor have completed, this labor of love.

Vita

- 1985 Associate of Arts (Social Science), Deganaweda-Quetzalcoatl University, Davis, CA
- 1985-1993 Desert Storm Veteran (9 years honorable service), United States Navy
- 1995 Bachelor of Arts (Behavioral Science), National University, San Diego, CA
- 1995–Present United States Navy Drug and Alcohol Counselor, Surface Warfare Medical Institute
- 1996 Master of Arts (Human Behavior), National University, San Diego, CA
- 2005–Present Professor of Kumeyaay Studies, Kumeyaay Community College; El Cajon, CA
- 2017–Present Lecturer of American Indian Studies, California State University San Marcos
- 2018–Present Director, Kumeyaay Community College; El Cajon, CA
- 2020 Doctor of Education (Educational Leadership), University of California San Diego

PUBLICATIONS

Rodriguez, S., & Gregor, T. L. (2017). Chapter 8: Revitalizing Critically Endangered Languages in California. In J. Proudfit & N. Q. Myers-Lim (Eds.), *On Indian Ground: California. On Indian Ground* (pp 101-120). Charlotte, NC: IAP-Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Abstract of the Dissertation

Kumeyaay Language Loss and Revitalization

by

Stanley Rodriguez

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

University of California San Diego, 2020
California State University, San Marcos, 2020

Professor Patricia Stall, Chair

Indigenous populations around the world face the culturally devastating prospect of language loss. In the United States, Native communities are at risk. This study examines the challenge of language loss for the Kumeyaay Nation, located in southwestern portion of the United States. It explores the language loss experienced by the Kumeyaay people, as well as the impact this loss has had on its people in San Diego, California, and Baja California, Mexico. This is a uniquely Indigenous study: the author is a Kumeyaay tribal member and fluent language speaker, and Kumeyaay elders provide insight for policy recommendations. Interviews with extant Kumeyaay speakers reveal their small number and the difficulties of language

transmission for the individual, family, and community. Perceptions of Kumeyaay elders about language atrophy are mapped onto UNESCO factors of language loss and are placed in the context of language socialization literature. The practices of extermination, containment, and later, of assimilation are shown to have directly and indirectly threatened the Kumeyaay language. Interviews show that elders' perceptions about the state of the language are accurate, and they support the UNESCO supposition that small numbers of speakers and a lack of intergenerational language transmission can produce language atrophy. Prospects for current revitalization of the language depend upon an inventory of Kumeyaay language assets and innovative language transmission programs tailored to Native Kumeyaay communities.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Language loss and learning are crucial concerns for Native identity. For the Kumeyaay, as for all people, language provides the foundational field of experience: it is a vehicle of communication. Kumeyaay culture is embedded in songs, stories, and traditions; which are all expressed through language: language mediates the process of socialization. Instructions for spiritual, social, and physical interactions are conveyed through language. Kumeyaay historical and contemporary stories are encapsulated with language. The cultural envelope of individual awareness is linguistic. Thus, for Native people, the stakes are high when it comes to language preservation. A lost language means the extinction of a unique culture, with the concomitant loss of cultural knowledge. As Hinton, a linguist of California American Indian languages, suggests, the ability of a Native person to think in an Indigenous language is the ability to understand their culture from an ancestral point of view (Hinton, Vera, & Steel, 2002).

There is scant research on the topic of language use among the Kumeyaay, a recognized tribe in both the United States and Mexico. Crawford's (Crawford, 1996) *Seven Hypotheses on Language Loss Causes and Cures* suggests that language loss and recovery are necessarily processes internal to a community. This study acknowledges and affirms that insight. The author is a Kumeyaay tribal member and fluent Kumeyaay speaker, and the Kumeyaay speakers' comments during the interviews shaped the study's policy recommendations to reverse language loss. The voices and perceptions of the Kumeyaay elders form the heart of the project.

To address the issue of language loss and revitalization, it is necessary to consider the history of the Kumeyaay as a First Nation people. In addition, a decision about appropriate methodologies must necessarily reflect Indigenous values. Strictly empirical methodologies, that might be appropriate in other contexts, need to be rejected in favor of qualitative approaches to

this previously neglected field. Although simply measuring language loss is a worthy exercise, the most significant research must necessarily aspire to the development of a strategic plan for the possible revitalization of the language and the subsequent preservation of community identity and culture.

There is a critical lack of speakers in a majority of the Kumeyaay communities. In short, the language has gone dormant. Although there is a population of approximately 4,623 Kumeyaay Native Americans on both sides of the Mexican/American border, there are very few Kumeyaay speakers. A census in 2015 identified 72 Kumeyaay speakers. Today, that number has reduced to 45 (Connolly Miskwish, 2016; LeBrake, personal communication, August 30, 2017). These speakers have varying degrees of fluency, from beginning competency to advanced mastery. Within the group of speakers, there are also dialectical differences. There are no speakers among the youth on either side of the border. Due to this attrition, the Kumeyaay language is in imminent danger of extinction.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the resiliency factors that have allowed the remaining Kumeyaay language speakers to continue using the language and to determine why others in the community have stopped using the language. The present study: (a) documents the experiences of the native language speakers of the Kumeyaay Nation, (b) identifies the factors contributing to the Kumeyaay language loss, and (c) explores potential ways to preserve, revitalize, and stabilize the Kumeyaay language.

The research questions for this study were:

1. What is the current state of the Kumeyaay language?

2. How do the Nation, communities, and individuals think about using language assets to reverse its moribund status?

Subordinate questions explore how: the process of language transmission occurs in Native communities, how dominant – non-Native – cultural impediments to language acquisition can be neutralized, and how successful cases of language learning and preservation can be reenacted as a model for future community-wide fluency.

In today's society, all of the scientific breakthroughs and the continued development of technology have helped to push the use of archaic Native languages into obsolescence (Hinton & Hale, 2013). The dominant cultures in America and Mexico have viewed Indigenous languages through the lens of judgment, using terms such as “savage” and “barbarian” to describe indigenous languages (Adams, 1995). The presumed need for language homogenization suggests that an advanced mass society must focus on a few dominant languages. Currently, these few dominant languages are tied to world economic influence and power. Hence, the languages of smaller, less economically significant population groups are neglected. If political and economic power are the criteria for evaluating the success of a language, then – by those measures – traditional languages and their related cultures are simply quaint curiosities for academic scholarship.

However, the current infatuation with a global order of economic materialism and international interdependence that sustains only a few dominant languages itself paradoxically elicits a counterbalance of interest in cultural authenticity. Different actors assign value to Indigenous language preservation for unique reasons. International non-governmental organizations, and mass cultural tropes alike, focus on the value of recovering threatened cultural knowledge before it is entirely lost. Indigenous culture, perhaps in a romanticized version, is

front and center in this reaction against homogenized world market forces. From the perspective of non-Native people, Indigenous language and culture can perhaps rescue the economically successful, but culturally empty, condition of contemporary life in the fast lane.

However, from the point of view of an Indigenous person, the recovery of threatened language skills is an essential issue of identity. Indigenous communities, as in the case of the Kumeyaay, are fortunately enjoying a period of renewal. Because language is critical to the maintenance of a culture and to the identity of its people, these groups will have to face the language issue. However, for the Kumeyaay – the subject of this study – only a few speakers of the language exist. That loss presages a threat to identity and culture. In fact, of the 12 Kumeyaay reservations in the United States and the six communities in Baja California, only 45 speakers of the Kumeyaay language have been identified (Connolly Miskwish, 2016; LeBrake, personal communication, August 30, 2017). This study addresses the reasons for language loss, identifies the critical variables in the language use and retention of current Kumeyaay speakers, and proposes ways to build on successful language retention to promote language revitalization among the Kumeyaay.

A qualitative case study design, that emphasizes the narrative tradition of the Kumeyaay people, was most appropriate to explore the use of this heritage language in the various communities on both sides of the United States/Mexico border. Face-to-face interviews conducted with 24 individuals, who still speak the language, form the basis for this study. The participants were Kumeyaay language speakers who reside in identified communities in San Diego County, Imperial County, and Baja California, Mexico. I conducted the interviews in English or Spanish, depending on the dominant language of the interviewee. Occasionally, the interviewees and I spoke Kumeyaay during the interview. These interviewed individuals were

identified by their community members as language speakers, and the interviews took place on both sides of the border. It is noteworthy to point out that I am a Kumeyaay speaker, instructor, and tribal member. As Ellis (2004) points out, it is important for a community member to conduct research because they have familiarity with the culture.

Preview of the Literature

The Iipay/Tipay people are the original inhabitants of Southern California and Northern Baja California. The area is one of the most diverse in the world, including the ocean valleys, mountains, deserts, and rivers. The traditional territory of the Kumeyaay was from north of Oceanside, California, to approximately 150 miles south of Ensenada, Baja California, Mexico. It extended from the Pacific Ocean eastward, across the valleys and mountains, through the desert to the Colorado River. The people historically had a traditional migratory cycle that was seasonally driven (Gregor & Rodriguez, 2017).

For the Kumeyaay people, language loss has negatively impacted all aspects of Kumeyaay culture. Language shift, or the switch from the heritage language to the dominant European languages, has profoundly impacted Kumeyaay culture and society (Hinton & Hale, 2013). This shift in language use has been both voluntary and involuntary. The environment of colonization set up the dynamics for language loss. For example, language users became absorbed in the dominant language, and – as a result – fewer opportunities to use the Native language were available (Hinton, 2003). The loss of Indigenous languages is tied to usurpation of Indigenous lands, the destruction of Indigenous habitats, and the involuntary incorporation of Indigenous people into the larger society, generally into its lower-class margins. Language death has become part of a larger human rights struggle (Nettle & Romaine, 2000). Today, global leaders consider language choice to be a right of Indigenous peoples that is part of the

overarching right of self-determination, that was established by the League of Nations in the post-World War II (WWII) period, and reiterated later by the United Nations (Hinton, Vera, & Steel, 2002). Efforts to revitalize languages are part of a global movement towards autonomy and identity for Indigenous communities (Hinton & Hale, 2013).

Given the critical state of affairs, as it relates to the loss of Indigenous languages – as well as the lack of research that explores a pedagogy that could reverse the rate of Indigenous language extinction – the review of literature in chapter two focuses on the following three areas. First, I provide a historical survey of the United States’ American Indian Policy towards Native Americans. Next, I examine the importance of Indigenous languages to the broader community. Finally, I discuss the consequences of language loss for Indigenous tribes.

The theoretical framework guiding this study originates from the academic literature of language socialization. This approach examines how children and other novices are socialized by language, as well as how they are socialized to use language (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). This framework encompasses more than language acquisition and child development. Language socialization examines the manner in which culture influences the universe of human development. This lifelong process, of which language acquisition is only a part (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002), embeds language in the process of acculturation. One significant contribution of the language socialization framework is the focus on the mundane and ordinary activities that make up everyday life. The approach focuses on those recurrent activities that caregivers engage in with the children of the community. The assumption is that cultural knowledge underlies all of our everyday interactions (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002). Using the language socialization framework to elucidate prospects for Kumeyaay language revitalization clearly assumes the essential role of language within the Kumeyaay

community. For example, the Kumeyaay community practices religious ceremonies in their Indigenous language. These enduring ceremonies affect how the Kumeyaay people respond to their world.

In addition, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO) Language Vitality and Endangerment methodology (LVE) served as a theoretical framework for this study. LVE is a tool intended for the design of language maintenance and/or revitalization measures. It provides a method to assess the status of language and linguistic diversity and developing language policies.

Case Study Methodology

A case study approach was used to collect and analyze data. Case study methodology has developed within the social sciences. A case study methodology, which has been developed within the social sciences, is designed to capture the complexity of a case. Yin (1984/1994) defines the case study research method as an empirical inquiry that investigates: (1) a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, (2) its appropriateness when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident, and (3) in which multiple sources of evidence are used (p. 23).

Such methodology is applied – not only in the social sciences, such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, comparative political science, and economics – but also in practice-oriented fields such as environmental studies, social work, education, and business studies. There are different ideas about what a case study is. Case study researchers might agree that it should be something along the following lines: the case study should have a “case” which is the object of study, and the “case” should be a complex functioning unit, investigated in its natural context with a multitude of methods, and contemporary.

The case study for this project was the wide-ranging Kumeyaay community. Kumeyaay language loss and the potential for its recovery are the focus of interviews of specific individuals who have retained their knowledge of the Kumeyaay language. As a Native Kumeyaay speaker and Indigenous language expert, I had unique access to language speakers. Interviews were conducted with identified Kumeyaay speakers in multiple communities in both the U.S. and Baja California, Mexico. The interview protocol consisted of 19 open-ended questions, which are included in Appendix B. All informants read and signed a consent form, and were compensated for their time. These interviews took place in the speakers' respective communities and their community centers. All interviews were audio recorded, translated into English (when needed), transcribed, and coded using the language socialization and UNESCO theoretical framework as a guide for identifying themes. To produce reliable coding, the interviewer formed a team with T.J. Ambo, PhD, and E. Hood, EdD, both of the University of California, San Diego (UCSD). Content analysis of the interview material produced a number of recurring themes, which were compared and synthesized into larger themes.

The coding exercise involved several steps. Round one consisted of forming a code book based on 20% of the answers to the interview questions. Reading the transcripts line by line, I sorted comments into nine categories based upon the nine UNESCO Factors of Language Vitality and Endangerment. Subsequent reviews of the data included cross-checking with two other researchers and analysis using MAXQDA, a qualitative and mixed methods data analysis software package that assists in organizing data in categories.

Participants

The interviewees were all members of the Kumeyaay people, who can be categorized into the following groups: federally recognized and non-federally recognized, reservation and non-

reservation, urban and rural, enrolled, disenrolled, and unenrolled, and gaming and non-gaming. Federally recognized tribes are Native groups who, through treaties with the federal government, are recognized as sovereign nations. These groups are eligible for services under the Bureau of Indian Affairs. These recognized tribes receive the most benefits among Native groups, and their land base is held in trust by the federal government. The trust status ensures that the land cannot be sold in the future. Enrolled members are considered wards of the U.S. government.

Each federally recognized group has its own enrollment ordinance and criteria for membership. This tribal self-regulation becomes a point of contention when tribal members are disenrolled for a variety of reasons. Avenues of recourse are limited by the Indian Self Determination Act, which allows individual tribes to self-govern, including the determination of its own citizens. As a result, language speakers might not be enrolled tribal members.

Significance of the Study

This study explored how existing language speakers have been able to use and preserve the Kumeyaay language while others lost it. The study explored the following question: what factors allow Kumeyaay speakers to continue to use the language while others abandon the use? The results of this study identify: the state of the language on both sides of the border, the factors that contributed to the present state of the language, and the success or lack of success of previous attempts at reversing language shifts. This study has wide ranging implications for language revitalization. Its insights can inform language policy regarding Indigenous cultures and provide directions for teaching the language in an effort to reverse the language shift and to reinvigorate the Kumeyaay language.

Indigenous languages are being lost at an alarming rate (Crawford, 1995). The question is: what kinds of ethnocultural goals would advance the cause of endangered Native American

language preservation, and how can attitudes be molded and tailored to each individual community? Krauss (1992) posited that language shift cannot be reversed by outsiders because they overlook the nuances and interdependency between Natives and their Indigenous language. One cannot, from the outside, inculcate the will to revive or to maintain language; this desire and commitment has to come from within. If language preservation efforts are to succeed, they must be led by Indigenous institutions, organizations, and activists. Schools traditionally have been regarded as outside institutions in Indian communities unless they are under effective local tribal control (Crawford, 1995).

Overview of Dissertation

The following chapters discuss key aspects of this study, offering detailed explanations regarding how this study was designed and analyzed, followed by a discussion of key findings. Chapter two includes a literature review of language socialization theory, the intersections between language culture and identity, how language loss affects culture and identity, and an overview of the UNESCO language vitality and endangerment indicators, which was used as a guideline to measure the findings of the research. Chapter three outlines the research design, qualitative methodology, participants, and overall context of the study. Chapter four discusses the results of the data analysis – organized by research questions and using the UNESCO nine factors of language vitality and endangerment. Chapter five revisits the research questions and the conclusions, the policies and programmatic recommendations and the final thoughts.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The vibrancy of a language is measured not only by how many adults speak the language, but rather, by how many of the youth speak the language (Hinton, 2003). For a language to be self-sustaining, language speakers must include youth. The developmental process for language use starts from birth and continues, as proficiency and complexity expand, as individuals transition through adulthood. The development is honed through interaction with younger people, peers, older siblings, parents, other adults, and elders. The lessons learned through these social interactions establish cultural norms and a code of conduct to guide the individual, as well as lay the foundation for developing a sense of identity, self-esteem, and self-efficacy. The problem today is that there are few speakers of the Kumeyaay language (Gregor & Rodriguez, 2017). This, in part, is due to historical efforts, of both U.S. and Mexican governments, to eradicate Native languages and cultures. The isolation of Indigenous communities is also responsible language attrition. The remaining speakers who communicate in different dialects cannot reliably reinforce a single Kumeyaay language. Additionally, the separation of the Kumeyaay Nation, by the international border between the United States and Mexico, has exacerbated efforts to conduct inter-community cultural exchange.

Positionality

This dissertation has been heavily influenced by my position as an Iipay/Kumeyaay who has been involved in the preservation of my peoples' culture, stories, songs, and religion. My work on the preservation of my people's knowledge has taken me to all of the Kumeyaay reservations on both the United States and in Mexico. For many years, I have been in dialogue with the language speakers, singers and makers of traditional Kumeyaay tools, baskets, pottery and food gathering and preparation. These individuals have been much more than informants.

They have been my teachers, and as a teacher myself, I am grateful for the knowledge that shared with me. The main theme that I have gotten from them is that they did not want our ways to disappear. They wanted others to learn all that they know. There is a saying that knowledge without sharing is not knowledge. Throughout this dissertation I called on my knowledge and experiences to help explain and understand the study findings.

The Historical Context

This review of the literature is focused, in part, on the historical Indigenous experience as it relates to Indigenous language loss (Crawford, 1995). One cannot study the current implications of language loss and revival without considering the history of U.S. policies towards Native American tribes (Reyhner & Eder, 2004). Despite internal changes to U.S. policy, the overall effect has been language loss. Because of the genocidal history of U.S. Indian policy, there are compelling political reasons for language revitalization. The earliest mention of intentional language eradication shows that it was designed and enforced for the purpose of cultural termination (Reyhner & Eder, 2004). The moral stain of past U.S. policy toward Natives today invites an opportunity for partial atonement by supporting language recovery as part of government programs. Hence, it is crucial to recognize how scholars in the field have documented past attempts at language eradication. This literature review will also address the indelible connection between language, culture, and identity, and the consequences of language loss.

In order to understand the causes for Indigenous language loss over the course of more than a century, one must have a historical perspective of the U.S. government's American Indian policy and practice. It is also necessary to note the historical record of Native education policy and analyze its role in language shift (Lindsay, 2012; Madley, 2016; Matthiessen, 1992). From

1492 to 1787, tribal independence existed with an emphasis by most Native nations on peaceful relations with Euro-American settlers. The interests of the diverse European colonial enterprises were compatible with peaceful relations with Indigenous tribes (Madley, 2016). These conditions were short lived, and violence between Indians and settlers increased over time. Disease, introduced by Europeans, decimated Indian populations, and – as a result – the European population increased at a greater rate than Native populations. A pattern of invading Indian territory and taking possession of land and natural resources accompanied European settlement. After the Revolutionary War, the new American nation-state systematized the quest for land through a liberal policy of allowing settlers to squat on land in the west, and later – with a theological justification – through a concept known as Manifest Destiny (Lindsay, 2012; Madley, 2016; Prucha, 1995). Manifest Destiny was a claim, first put forward by the Puritan colonists, that they were the New Israelites, who had been brought out of religious “slavery,” as the Jews had been brought from Egypt. Their “promised land” was the new Israel, the supposedly empty territory of the “New World.” As Moses guided the Israelites by God’s direction, so, too, the hand of God Himself guided the Pilgrims, and by extension, subsequent generations of settlers as they made an entire North American continent their “New Jerusalem.” This settlement was their manifest, or obviously apparent, destiny ordained by God. All of the literature treating this period of history and the writing of people of the time supports this view.

The period of 1828 to 1887 marked the relocation of the Indians, the “Great Removal” of the eastern Indian tribes to the west (Cave, 2003). U.S. President, Andrew Jackson, initiated the policy of removal of Native peoples from the east coast and their relocation to Indian Territory, now known as Oklahoma. During this period, Indian removal became the dominant practice and policy of the federal government for dealing with Indians (Matthiessen, 1992). The United

States government had become stronger and could successfully confront Indian tribes. Additionally, Thomas Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase extended the possibility for a continental claim by the emerging new country. Previously blocked by the French to the west, U.S. momentum grew for the westward expansion of settlements. The Indian Removal Act of 1830 led to treaties that forced most eastern Indian tribes in the United States to be forcibly relocated to the west (Heart, 1998; Madley, 2016; Matthiessen, 1992). The only dim light was the establishment, by the U.S. Supreme Court, of the formal recognition of the nationhood and sovereignty of Indigenous tribes. The discovery of mineral resources along the way, and of gold after the U.S.-Mexican War, led to further American expansion and the perceived need to eliminate Indians. California offered miners the generous bounty of \$5.00 for the scalp of any Native man, woman, or child; whether from a peaceful or hostile tribe. The slaughtering of bison and the destruction of other primary food sources for Indian tribes proved to be an effective policy to weaken tribes. Following the advice of the Peace Commission of 1868, the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) embarked on a conscious attempt of cultural genocide (Crawford, 1995). The goal was to "... blot out the barbarous dialect" and substitute it with English in order "... to civilize the Indians" (Fishman, 1996/2007; Heart, 1998; Lindsay, 2012).

By 1871, coercive assimilation was viewed as a less expensive, and more humane, alternative to Indian military eradication (Madley, 2016; Matthiessen, 1992). BIA boarding schools were set up primarily to destroy Native American languages and cultures (Adams, 1995). The BIA policy was not simply an outgrowth of racism; but grew out of a school of thought known as social evolutionism (Lindsay, 2012; Matthiessen, 1992). The idea was that human cultures evolve through predetermined stages; from savagery, to barbarism, to civilization

(Tylor, 1871). According to the theory, it was natural and desirable for a “lower” culture to die out and be replaced with a “higher” culture (Crawford, 1995). By 1887, 200 boarding schools were established; with 14,000 Native children forcibly removed from their communities and families (Prucha, 1995). At the schools, children were severely punished for speaking their heritage languages. Vestiges of their cultures – long hair and traditional clothing – were forbidden and replaced with Western style clothing and haircuts. Concurrently, laws were established to further this cultural and linguistic genocide: federal courts were authorized to prosecute Indians for practicing traditional Native American religious ceremonies or for leaving the reservation without written permission (Crawford, 1995).

The years of 1887 to 1934 were known as the Allotment and Assimilation periods. Assimilation into Euro-American society became the new federal policy. The 1887 General Allotment Act, known as the Dawes Act, sought to extinguish tribal sovereignty, erase reservation boundaries, and force assimilation. Allotting tracts of land to individual Indians would supposedly transform Natives into property holding farmers; who could easily assimilate into white property-oriented culture. Surplus treaty lands were sold to non-Indians (Matthiessen, 1992). When the non-farming Natives failed on their substandard land, white entrepreneurs purchased their holdings at low rates. Tribal land claims were extinguished. Tribal culture was completely disrupted, communal life destroyed, land taken again, and outsiders allowed to live on Indian reservations (Madley, 2016; Matthiessen, 1992). The United States Congress allowed remaining Native land to be leased to non-Indians, controlled funds that resulted from the leases, and determined when to distribute the funds (Madley, 2016; Matthiessen, 1992; Prucha, 1995).

In California, during the period of Allotment and Assimilation, the Treaty of Santa Ysabel was signed on January 7, 1852 to grant the Kumeyaay people a reservation. It extended

from the Mexican border to Riverside County and from east of El Cajon, California to the Anza-Borrego Desert. This was one of 18 treaties that were made for the Native Americans of California; however, none of the treaties were ratified by the California legislature or by the Federal Government. The state government of California was unanimous in its opposition for ratification (Connolly Miskwish, 2007).

In 1935, the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA), a progressive federal Indian policy, was enacted to protect the remaining Indian land base. The law encouraged Indian tribes to adopt constitutions to engage in self-government that reflected the patterns of the United States government (Madley, 2016; Matthiessen, 1992). This misguided legislation served to strip away traditional cultural values and methods of self-governance that built on cultural models and norms. It further eroded tribal sovereignty in the name of civilization. The IRA has been criticized as paternalistic, ethnocentric, and insufficient (Prucha, 1995). The years of 1953 to 1968 included the termination of previous laws and treaties as a United States policy towards the American Indians. The IRA goals were abandoned and federal policy changed again with the new policy goal of assimilation. Federal benefits and support services for Native populations were eliminated.

The years between 1968 to present day have been known as a period of Tribal Self-Determination. Federal Indian policy changed to one that promotes tribal sovereignty and self-determination (Prucha, 1995). Since 1968, the federal legislative and executive branches have attempted to enact measures to improve the social and economic life of American Indian tribes and their people. However, this policy is not supported in the judicial system. Since the 1970's, Indian parties have lost more than 80% of the cases decided by the Supreme Court (Madley,

2016; Prucha, 1995). Helen Hunt Jackson's *A Century of Dishonor* (1885/2018) quotes

Governor Horatio Seymour:

Every human being born upon our continent or who comes here from any quarter of the world, whether savage or civilized, can go to our courts for protection – except those who belong to the tribes who once owned this country. The cannibal from the islands of the Pacific, the worst criminals from Europe, Asia or Africa, can appeal to the law and courts for their rights all, should be protected from wrong (Jackson, 1885/2018, p. 1)

Both Prucha (1995) and Matthiessen (1992) argue that despite the change in time, U.S. policies toward Native American tribes have not essentially changed since the 1880s. The net result has been extensive language loss. This history of injustices presents a framework for understanding the need for preservation of Indigenous languages.

Richard Dauenhauer, a scholar and linguist specializing in the preservation of the Tlingit language in Alaska – the indigenous language of coastal Southeastern Alaska from Yakutat south to Ketchikan, and also in one branch of the Athabaskan-Eyak-Tlingit language family – observes that language and culture are separable, but that things will inevitably be lost in the separation (Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998). It is with the integration of language and culture that the Kumeyaay people have historically used their Indigenous knowledge and crafted their identity. Kumeyaay leaders are now attempting to create a whole-picture approach to revitalization. Thus, many of the language learning materials developed recently include traditional stories, as well as information about the Kumeyaay material culture and medicinal usages of plants. As a result, not only the language, but also the traditional practices and culture can be carried on into the future through the same effort. Meek (2012) has described indigenous language issues as, “providing people with an opportunity to reclaim their own heritage or to celebrate its persistence” (2012, p. 137). This link between language and culture puts Kumeyaay efforts in line with the rhetoric of more recent official U.S. policy regarding Native American languages,

such as the Native American Languages Act (NALA) of 1990. It states, “The status of the cultures and languages of Native Americans is unique and the United States has the responsibility to act together with Native Americans to ensure the survival of these unique cultures and languages” (US Congress, 1990).

Language Socialization

The literature of language socialization research examines cultural influences on human development. This literature offers a central vehicle for exploring Kumeyaay language transmission. If language acquisition is only a portion of human development (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002), then it is essential to frame language learning in a meta-environment beyond strictly linguistic practices and processes.

Language socialization is multidisciplinary in origin, and – because of its wide-ranging sources – it offers a holistic and integrated approach to analysis. The framework centers on asking questions about how children, or other neophytes, interact with elders in the community. It is necessarily inter-generational in nature. Initially, anthropologists noted that values, ideologies, and social organization preferences are inscribed in everyday interactions that give meaning to cultural practices, such as: religious rituals, kinship systems, and patterns of exchange (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002). It is ideally applicable to the study of language acquisition, language loss, and language revitalization. In this study, elements of the framework of language socialization are incorporated into the questions asked of Kumeyaay language speakers. This approach reveals and supports consonance between Kumeyaay language development, Native cultural integrity, and language assets.

Socialization is the process by which people acquire knowledge, practices, and ways of viewing the surroundings that allow them to participate in society effectively. This process is

self-evidently realized through the use of language (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002). It is therefore a requirement of language socialization research to examine how children interact with older and more experienced persons as they acquire the knowledge, practices, and norms in order to function in their communities (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002).

As the literature of language socialization suggests, especially in the work of Garrett and Baquedano-Lopez (2002), socialization occurs through language use in the commission of ordinary daily activities. However, it holds an additional task: it carries and telegraphs both ideology and power relations. The substitution of the English and Spanish languages for Indigenous languages, through forced assimilation and cultural annihilation, affirms the dominance of the hegemonic power. The recovery of Indigenous languages, and of the Kumeyaay language in particular, can be a tool for an Indigenous cultural renaissance in a new political climate of recovery of Native sovereignty.

In the Kumeyaay tradition, bands – which are small communities – pass down knowledge and language through observation and interactions. This is a multi-generational approach, and it is exemplified and supported by the traditional approach of child raising: the entire community both affects, and is necessary for, child development. When language ties with older generations are broken by language atrophy, there is a cascade of fractures in the community. Language recovery can revive not only linguistic skills, but can also cement values and norms.

One characteristic contribution of the language socialization framework, as mentioned above, is its focus on ordinary activities that make up everyday life. The research investigates those recurrent activities that caregivers engage in with the children of the community. The assumption is that cultural knowledge underlies everyday interactions (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002). For example, the Kumeyaay community practices their religious ceremonies in a

performative way using their indigenous languages. Moreover, their religious worldview shapes their daily response to their environments. Hence, the Kumeyaay religion becomes a culturally laden matrix for socialization as elders transmit it to the youth. Language transmission, then, occurs in diverse ways. New technologies have made an impact on data collection and analysis in these culturally rich contexts. For example, sophisticated digital audio-video recording equipment makes it possible for researchers to accomplish microanalysis of both verbal and nonverbal aspects of human interaction at a micro level.

Language socialization researchers also seek to highlight the ideologies and the power relations that underlie socializing interactions (Baquedano-Lopez 1998, 2001; Schieffelin 1996, 2000). These studies have included multi-site ethnographies in an attempt to capture the cultural and linguistic movement across time and space that reflect power relations (Ochs, 1988). Often, the Kumeyaay people have been powerless to maintain residency in their territory where their cultural traditions are richly supported. They have migrated from the reservations into towns or other locations to seek employment, educational opportunities, and access to transportation services. This desperate migration for survival has had a profound impact on socialization processes and language maintenance.

Language socialization research is concerned with “microgenesis,” or the lack of development of communicative competence. This involves the use of all knowledge and practices needed to communicate with others people and to be regarded as a functioning member of a community (Wertsch, 1985). Questions about competency involve how competency is assessed and evaluated, and by whom. The notion of bidirectionality in socialization is the idea that novices are not just passive language recipients, but have the potential to socialize experts (Rogoff 1990, 1993; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978). Examples of this reverse

learning includes the development of phrases that elders have not used while growing up, such as telephone (*tekiilum*), the thing that rings; computer (*sholok hiltekamu*), the electrical brain; and television (*kethlich*), the box that has ghosts. Kumeyaay speakers struggled to develop these new terms. They overcame their own initial resistance to accommodate the younger community members who wanted to use the language in settings that had relevance to them.

The notion of community has a long and problematic history regarding how it should be defined theoretically and be implemented methodologically (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002). Examples of this are dialectical tensions, crosscutting divisions, and possible conflicts in a group or community (Pratt & Fabb, 1987). Assessing the causes of language loss requires an examination of these tensions and disagreements. For example, among the Kumeyaay people in the past, it was a conscious decision of many language speakers to not teach the language to others. They appear to have responded to external pressure by the government to eradicate the Kumeyaay language and culture. Other individuals have attempted to maintain community language skills. A second factor of conflict, that has possibly influenced language loss, is the differences in dialect that occur within the Kumeyaay Nation. The people are classified as the Northern Iipay and the Southern Tipay. Although speakers are able to communicate in either dialect, there appears to be a reluctance to utilize each other's vernacular.

The coexistence of two or more codes in a community is rarely neutral or unproblematic (Irvine & Gal, 2000). Communities where elders speak two or more languages often find the children speaking only one language. The macro sociological changes of modernization directly affect language socialization, and they often lead to language decline. This contributes to what is called "language shift" (Field, 2002; Garrett, 2002, 2002; Meek 2001; Paugh, 2001; Williams & Riley, 2001).

This phenomenon of language shift appears in many Kumeyaay communities on both sides of the border. The Kumeyaay people have endured repeated incursions. Although a number of Kumeyaay language speakers can also speak English and Spanish, most others only speak one language, and it is not Kumeyaay. In order to reverse this language shift, it is important to gather information from speakers in the communities in order to find out what is taking place in those areas so as to develop a plan of action for language revitalization.

Literacy Socialization

Literacy is the culturally organized control over certain forms of language (Barton, 1994; Besnier, 1995; Gee, 1991; Heath, 1983). For the Kumeyaay, the concept of literacy as defined by the above is relatively new. The history, stories, religion, and songs are oral, and are transmitted through social interaction through attending ceremonies, participating in cultural functions, and by becoming an *apock* – an apprentice. The first alphabet was developed by the late Margaret Langdon for the Kumeyaay on the U.S. side of the Mexican-American border. On the Mexican side, the Spanish alphabet was used by the Instituto Nacional de Lenguas Indígenas (INALI).

The narrative has been described as the primordial tool of socialization (Ochs & Capps, 1996; Duranti, 1986). For the Kumeyaay people, the use of the narrative process has been, and is used today, to convey the knowledge that is historical, social, spiritual, and cultural. It is a vehicle that is used to recite the here and now, along with the past. Narrative assists in creating a shared understanding of membership, collectivity, and community among the participants, and they can constitute resistance to the dominant master narratives (Baquedano-Lopez 1998, 2000; Duff, 1993).

Language, Culture, and Identity

Language is the key to identity (Meredith, 2013). Parsons-Yazzie (1995), a Navajo educator, states that the use of a Native tongue is like therapy. Specific Native words express love and caring. Knowing the Native language presents one with a strong self-identity, a culture with which to identify, and a sense of wellness. As such, a vibrant Native language can help reduce drug and alcohol abuse, gang activity, and high dropout rates (Singh & Reyhner, 2013).

The importance of language and culture in official policy can make revitalization efforts less of a struggle. According to Reyhner & Tennant (1995), policy is "...no substitute for grassroots efforts focused on the use of the language in homes" (p. 279). The Kumeyaay have taken this to heart, choosing what Sallabank (2011) refers to as the "phatic route" of encouraging the use of the language in the home and in daily life, particularly among the youngest members of the community, while simultaneously recognizing the importance of training adults as well (p. 205). This emphasis on the family context is expressed in nearly every aspect of the revitalization program. It engages entire families in projects such as Language Revitalization at Home, which utilizes methods such as Communication Based Instruction, and includes language learning media with a focus on using the language in everyday situations including meals, greetings, asking for things, counting, and getting dressed (Popescu, 2015). Littlebear, in his keynote address on effective language education practices and Native language survival, draws attention to the necessity of involving the family in language revitalization efforts (Littlebear, 1990). The Kumeyaay demonstrate this approach through projects such as the Voices in Your Pocket, which emphasizes the participation of the entire family. This aspect of the project has had much success, as demonstrated by the fact that, as the webpage boasts, the youngest "technician" is ten years old (Popescu, 2015). By focusing on making language learning

interesting and engaging for the youth, the Kumeyaay are strengthening the likelihood of successful intergenerational transmission of the language and ensuring that their efforts are “facilitating and enabling” instead of “compulsory and punitive,” which matters in successful minority language restoration (Fishman, 1996/2007). Leap (1981) additionally suggests that it takes the cooperation of the entire community to ensure that learners are able to practice the language in daily interactions in order for revitalization programs to be successful.

In many cultures, novices are taught origin stories and the meaning of sacred ceremonies. These cultural elements are the “theology” of the tribe, and include astronomy, geology, biology, philosophy, art, and music. Their transmission creates better citizens and carriers of the culture for the future generations. Spindler (1963) posits the purpose of education to be the responsible promotion of change in a culture. However, for Natives, the educational system becomes an agent of cultural discontinuity if it does not enforce the traditional values of the Native tribes. Much of the content taught in schools occurs within a rigid schedule of learning activities that is scholastic and Western in nature, and does not consider the value of the tradition and culture of the Native peoples. In the past, Native boarding schools stifled the individual's ability to use Native language. Thus, although people continued to grow chronologically, their use of the language was arrested at the level of a child. Consequently, schools became responsible for the destruction of Native culture.

With the Kumeyaay people, the transmission of culture is conducted by all members of the community for every individual starting from birth and going through rites of passage. Language socialization is a lifelong process. To understand it, we must recognize that as humans continue to develop and evolve they will take on new roles, change in status, and practices (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986, Baquedano-Lopez, 2000; Goodwin, 1990; Sheldon, 1998; Thorne,

1993, Zentella, 1997). Socialization encompasses periods of the adolescent (Rampton, 1995a, 1995b; Rymes 2001), and early middle adulthood (Ochs & Capps, 1995; Dunn, 1999b, Jacoby & Gonzales, 1991), but it is also a lifelong process. For the Kumeyaay people, socialization across the lifespan is represented and visualized by the belt that is used to secure a baby to the cradleboard. The design on the belt has seven diamonds woven into it. Each diamond represents a stage in one's life and the progressive roles, challenges, and expectations that are necessary in order successfully to complete and to move on to the next level in one's personal development. The development of personhood through language is intricately related to moral ways of acting and being in the social world (Field, 2001; Fung, 1999; Rydstrom, 2001). Expectations are identified at each level. This is similar to Erikson's eight stages of human development (Erikson, 1959). Erikson defined his stages as follows: Infancy (0-18 months of age) consists of the virtue of hope and a psychological crisis of trust versus mistrust, Early Childhood (2-4 years of age) consists of the virtue of will and the psychological crisis of autonomy versus shame/doubt, Preschool age (4-5 years of age) consists of the virtue of purpose and the psychological crisis of initiative versus guilt, School age (5-12 years of age) consists of the virtue of competence and the psychological crisis of industry versus inferiority, Adolescence (ages 13-19) consists of the virtue of fidelity and the psychological crisis of identity versus role confusion, Early Adulthood (ages 20-39 years of age) consists of the virtue of love and the psychological crisis of intimacy versus isolation, Adulthood (ages 40-64) consist of the virtue of care and the psychological crisis of generativity versus stagnation, Maturity (ages 65-death) consists of the virtue of wisdom and the psychological crisis of ego integrity versus despair.

If an individual has not been able to complete what is required at a certain stage, this impedes their ability to grow and develop in the other stages (Erikson, 1959). Language is the

key to identity (Meredith, 2013). Knowing the Native language presents one with a strong self-identity, a culture with which to identify, and a sense of wellness. A successful Native language can help reduce drug and alcohol abuse, gang activity, and high dropout rates from school (Singh & Reyhner, 2013). The traditional Kumeyaay stories were used to not only teach the youth about the history of the people, they were also used as a vehicle to instruct the listener on the code of conduct and a way to grow in mind body and spirit, thereby potentially reversing or negating negative behaviors (Field & Blackhorse Jr., 2002).

Language Loss and Culture

Language loss has negatively impacted all aspects of the Kumeyaay culture. The stories, religion, values, and customs are not being taught (Gregor & Rodriguez, 2017). The loss of language impacts the self-esteem of the community in a negative manner, resulting in higher rates of drug use, abuse, neglect, guilt, shame, and poor self-esteem (Hinton & Hale, 2013). In the school system, the loss contributes to the lack of self-efficacy and poor academic performance rates. This lack of success in school then contributes to the difficulty of individuals in obtaining gainful employment. Without employment, it becomes difficult to support oneself, perpetuating the cycle of poverty and low self-esteem. Although the language situation is bleak, actions can be taken in order to stabilize and revitalize the Kumeyaay language. In various Native communities and institutions, efforts have been made to develop programs to address this issue.

Why are Indigenous languages becoming extinct? Some languages have died because every speaker has been wiped off the face of the Earth (Meredith, 2013). Some languages have died due to cultural genocide, perpetuated by the U.S. government and the Roman Catholic Church in the boarding school programs for Native American children (Matthiessen, 1992).

Moreover, languages die due to a language shift. That is, another language such as English or Spanish eclipses the use of the Native languages (Meredith, 2013). Western values place pressure for assimilation into a dominant culture, and policies of repression are directed at Indigenous groups in order to facilitate assimilation (Hinton, 2003).

The loss of Indigenous languages worldwide is taking place at an alarming level (Crawford, 1995). Of the estimated 6,000 languages spoken around the world, approximately half are moribund – spoken only by elders and not learned by children (Hinton & Hale, 2013; Krauss, 1992; Woodbury, 2006). In the United States, there are approximately 165 Native American languages still spoken. Of those, 74 are almost extinct (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2017).

In California, the loss of languages has been catastrophic. Of the approximately 98 Native American languages spoken in California today, 45 have no fluent speakers, 17 have one to five speakers, and the remaining ones have only elderly speakers (Hinton, 2003). Before Spanish, Russian, Mexican, and Northern European/American contact, California had more linguistic variety than all of Europe (Meredith, 2013). California Indian languages are in the ultimate crisis, in a life and death struggle. We might see 90% of these languages, or perhaps all of them, disappear in our lifetimes (Meredith, 2013).

The lack of speakers poses a major concern in many Native communities. In San Diego County, for example, there are few speakers of the Kumeyaay language. If none of the youth are speaking the language, then the language is highly endangered. The primary way to learn a language is through immersion (Hinton, Vera, & Steel, 2002). The use of a language is what propels that language onto the next generation. Fewer speakers means less opportunity to expose others to immersion, and the result is that there will be less language use. This downward spiral

perpetuates itself until there are no more speakers. This process is known as language attrition (Hinton, Vera, & Steel, 2002), in which the decay of one language leads to a community embracing another language. As fewer people use the language, individuals become semi-speakers, and – as this decay persists – individuals become passive speakers. These are individuals who can understand the language; however, they are unable to speak the language. Every year, as the number of speakers decreases, the people and their communities lose more of the language (Hinton, Vera, & Steel, 2002).

What is lost when an Indigenous language is lost? Attitudes toward language loss, and more specifically, language loss as it relates to Native American tribes, depend on perspective (Fishman, 1996/2007). There is a great deal of culture that is expressed through language, and when a language diminishes it also affects the preservation of a culture. Take language away from culture and you take away its greetings, its curses, its praises, its laws, its literature, its songs, its riddles, its proverbs, its cures, its wisdom, and its prayers. The culture cannot be expressed and handed down without the language. What is lost is a way of life, the way of thought, the way of valuing, and the human reality for each individual tribe. A country, nation, or tribe is the sum of all its creative potential (Fishman, 1996/2007). What does a country lose when it loses individuals who are comfortable with themselves, cultures that are authentic to themselves? At stake is the capacity to pursue sensitivity, wisdom, and some kind of recognition that one has a purpose in life.

The death of a language also means the disappearance of cultural creativity, the loss of tradition, which often dates back centuries or millennia. Language and culture are inseparable (Bicher, 2016). Hawaiian singer and language immersion teacher Keali'i Reichel, in the film *Language Matters* (2014), states:

We know that a language is how a particular culture and people interact with the world around them and each other. If you lose a language, then you lose a huge chunk of that culture. We would lose everything. There is no culture without language. There is none. We would be speaking in a language that is not who we are and who we came from” (Grubin, 2014).

Every language represents a repository of the beliefs, stories, songs, and rituals that give life meaning to a particular people. Languages encode and embody the cultures that live deep in the minds of its speakers (Bicher, 2016). This includes how Indigenous peoples perceive space, color, time, family, and friends; all this, and much more, is bound up in the languages.

Linguistic relativity is the subject of much academic debate, but there is general agreement that language influences cognitive processes. The ability to construct and to participate in a shared mental world, to coordinate attention and goals, to practice a cultural identity and traditional knowledge allows participation in an ecology of consciousness (Bicher, 2016). When a language is lost, the culture and all things that are a part of that culture die too (Bicher, 2016). Mary Simmons, a Dogrib language specialist states, “Our language holds our culture, our perspective, our history, and our inheritance, what type of people we are, where we come from, what land we claim... all are based on the language we speak” (McCarty & Nicholas, 2014).

Forms of oral tradition such as narrative and song serve as important cultural resources that retain and reinforce cultural values and group identity (Bauman, 1992; Bright, 1993; Jahner, 1999; Sekaquaptewa & Washburn, 2004). For Indigenous people, the use of language-rich activities to develop and to promote culture through songs, stories, and ceremonies has been the vehicle to transmit the social cultural, social, religious, and socio-political life of the Native people (McCarty & Nicholas, 2014). But just as importantly, these activities have been the basis for many people to learn and to maintain the language. Language loss, therefore, affects all aspects of an individual.

The negative impacts on cultural, spiritual, psychological, and personal or communal self-esteem have been the result of policies dictated by the BIA. One of the impacts of Indian policy is the influence it has had over the educational system and Native American achievement and self-efficacy. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, Native American students have the lowest graduation rates in the country (Liebman, 2015; Snyder & Dillow, 2010). The findings for Native American/Alaska Natives from data collected for the 2011-2012 school year show that Native students had the lowest graduation rates at 67%, with African-Americans at 69%, Latinos at 73%, Whites at 86%, and Asian/Pacific Islanders at 88% (Liebman, 2015). According to the American College Testing (ACT), the scores for Native Americans have been on a decline since 2010 at 19.0 to 18.0 in 2013, while the scores for other groups of students have hovered around the same point (Liebman, 2015). Mean Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT) scores for Native Americans were on average 1427 versus 1576 for White/Anglo students (Liebman, 2015).

Much of U.S. Native American and Native Hawaiian policy from colonial times to the present has involved forced assimilation (Reyhner & Eder, 2004). This assimilation often included forcibly removing children from their parents for years at a time, replacing their Native religion with Christianity, and replacing their Native language with English. While sometimes successful in its aims, forced assimilation often created resistance, destroyed families and left Indian school graduates lost between two cultures. Children found themselves neither a part of their traditional cultural heritage nor were they ever fully accepted in American mainstream society (Reyhner & Eder, 2004). For example, a Native woman recalls how her children were placed in boarding schools:

My children were taken; we were not given a choice, they were taken. We were told that it was for the best, that education was important. And honestly, how

could I disagree? One really does not disagree with the Indian Agents (L.D. Ward, personal communication, January 17, 2008).

The result was that her children were separated in different schools from Oregon to Montana.

Ward described the struggle of raising her grandchildren. How could she blame her daughters?

They never learned how to mother their children because their mother did not raise them – the boarding schools did. They never developed family bonds that would teach them their cultural ways.

As a result of failed Indian policy, we see currently a loss of Indigenous languages and culture that have produced an educational disfranchisement of an entire generation of Native Americans. A disfranchisement that has a direct correlation to lack of academic achievement, unequal access to higher education, and an increase of false rites of passage (Reyhner & Eder, 2004). Rites of passages can be defined as a ritual or ceremony signifying an event in a person's life indicative of a transition from one stage to another (Reyhner & Eder, 2004). False rites of passage are rituals and or ceremonies that are focused on unhealthy behaviors in order to fill the void caused by the erosion of Indigenous language and culture (Reyhner & Eder, 2004). Due to the increase of false rites of passage, such as joining gangs, being sentenced to jail or prison, teenage pregnancy, substance abuse, and the attendant corresponding significant feelings of despair, Native Americans rank the highest in the nation for suicide (Almendrala, 2006).

Historically, the federal government has attempted to assimilate the Native population, yet there is no evidence that the assimilation model improves academic success (Brayboy & Castango, 2009). On the contrary, the results have been an ineffective pedagogy that has failed to meet the needs of individuals and communities; and has done harm emotionally, culturally, and spiritually (Brayboy & Castango, 2009).

Poor performance on standardized testing is also echoed through limited opportunities in the classroom. In 2013, Native American students had less access to high-level high school courses than non-Native students (Liebman, 2015). Findings revealed that along with African-Americans, only 76% of Natives have access to rigorous college preparatory academic classes, which is significantly less than their Latino (91%), White (91%), and Asian (97%) counterparts (Deyhle & Swisher, 1997). Further assessment data revealed that most Native Americans were not proficient in reading or math by eighth grade (Kena, et al., 2014). The lack of achievement throughout Indian Country has been, and is a, concern within every Indigenous community (Pavkov, Travis, Fox, King, & Cross, 2010).

After more than 100 years of institutionalized attempts to eradicate Indigenous languages and culture, the U.S. government detailed the poor quality of Indian education in the 1928 Meriam Report (Reyhner & Eder, 2004). This report found that extensive recommendations for the correction of deficiencies in health, education, and government cooperation for legal and social issues were ignored to the detriment of each tribe of the United States. In 1969, the Kennedy Report, “Indian Education: A National Tragedy – A National Challenge” made recommendations for greater tribal control over education (Reyhner & Eder, 2004). This seminal study led to a shift in government policy towards education, language, and culture. On October 30, 1990, the Native American Languages Act (P.L. 101-477) was passed (US Congress). Although the bill allocated new programs or funds, it acknowledged that the status of Native cultures and languages are unique, and that it is the policy of the United States to preserve, protect, and promote the rights and freedom of Native Americans to use, to practice and to develop Native American languages.

Despite this significant and historic turnaround in Native language policy, its practical application has been limited. Due to the severe impact of the boarding school system, Native languages have already suffered – in some cases – near irreversible damage has occurred, as most communities lack fluent speakers of their Native languages. Native people reacted to the Act with mixed enthusiasm. Most Native American communities endured years of language and cultural eradication policies. The damage done to the cultural fabric has been extensive, with many communities losing all speakers, while in other communities, language speakers are limited to elders. A common complaint has been, “What good is language and cultural protection if there is no language or culture left to protect?”

This recognition of the loss of linguistic diversity brought together a collaboration of different groups to address the issue. In 2008, the collaboration led to the development of California Assembly Bill 544 (Coto, et al., 2008), the “Teaching Credential: American Indian Language.” Followed in 2015 by the California Assembly Bill 163 (Williams, et al., 2015), the “Teaching Credential: American Indian Language-Culture Credential,” whereby tribes can certify their own candidates to teach Indigenous language and culture. These bills represent an enormous achievement.

In order to address the language and cultural loss that was systemic throughout Native American communities as a result of federal and state policies of language and cultural suppression, tertiary institutions were created on the premise of developing a pedagogy that was culturally responsive and focused on decolonization. These Native American and tribally controlled institutions were both on and off Indian reservations. They facilitated a new era of empowerment for Native peoples (Reyhner, Echo-Hawk, & Rosier, 2009).

The Deganawida Quetzalcoatl University (DQU) was created after a group named “Indians of All Tribes” occupied Alcatraz Island in the San Francisco Bay in 1971 (Reyhner, Echo-Hawk, & Rosier, 2009). The occupiers were forced off the island. Activists then focused on an abandoned Army base west of Davis, California. The site was on 645 acres, and California Governor, Ronald Reagan, was prepared to present the site to the University of California, Davis for use as a primate research institute. The land was occupied by Native American and Chicano activists before such transfer was finalized. The land was eventually given to the newly created Deganawida Quetzalcoatl University Board of Trustees for the purpose of creating a tribal college. While the college was operational, the institution created satellite campuses throughout California. During this time the institution became a member of American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC).

The American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) was created in 1973 by the first six tribally controlled colleges in order to provide a support network for all related efforts. The mission of AIHEC is to enhance the quality and credibility of tribal higher education through the accreditation of member institutions. Currently there 37 tribally controlled colleges. DQU was a founding member, and continued for three decades to give support in securing land to tribal colleges (Warner & Gipp, 2009). In 2005, DQU lost its accreditation. The impact of this loss was catastrophic for the tribal colleges and the satellites in California. With the loss of the main campus, the satellite campuses could not continue to offer classes for college credit (Saulk, 2016).

The Kumeyaay Community College was originally conceived as a satellite campus of DQU. The Kumeyaay Community College campus provided educational services to meet the needs of the 12 Kumeyaay reservations in San Diego County and the six Kumeyaay communities

in Baja California, Mexico. DQU was the umbrella institution that handled credentialing courses through the national educational accrediting body known as the Western Association for Schools and Colleges (WASC). This accrediting body was responsible for maintaining the academic standards set forth by the institutions. WASC consisted of six accrediting bodies, and monitored compliance. They were responsible for the accreditation or revocation of these higher institutions.

The former DQU satellite stakeholders decided that in order to continue as an institution, they needed representation. They elected a board of trustees, who were appointed to represent the 12 reservations in San Diego. The board members began a dialog with Cuyamaca Community College in San Diego for the purpose of creating a Memorandum of Understanding. This Memorandum, completed in 2006, created a partnership in which classes for credit could resume at the Kumeyaay Community College. The classes were transferable to the California State University and University of California systems. Since this accreditation, the Kumeyaay Community College has developed and continues to teach multi-level Kumeyaay language classes.

Many other classes are offered there, such as Kumeyaay History 1 and 2, Ethnobotany and Ethnobiology, Traditional Tool Making, Traditional Foods, Basketry, Pottery, and Kumeyaay Humanities. The partnership with Cuyamaca College was strengthened in 2017 with the creation of the first Associate's Degree program in Kumeyaay Studies. It is the first program in California Native Studies that is located in a tribally specific region. Kumeyaay Community College is the only operating tribal college in California today. Although initially a satellite of DQU, Kumeyaay Community College has remained autonomous and independent of AIHEC or any other tribal colleges (LeBrake, personal communication, August 30, 2017). It has

maintained continuous efforts at reversing language loss that now stands to benefit from recent legislation.

California Assembly Bills 544 and 163 were developed to address language and cultural loss (Coto, et al., 2008; Williams, et al., 2015). When a language is lost, important concepts of a culture are also affected and expressed in that language and those too, become lost (Fishman, 1996/2007). Through AB 544 and AB 163, federally recognized tribal governments would have the power to recommend a credential for teaching language, culture – or both.

In 2008, Native American groups worked – in conjunction with lawmakers and tribal leadership – to create and pass into law California AB 544. Assembly Bill 544 established a separate teaching credential for the teaching of Native American languages in California schools (Coto, et al., 2008). Teachers who want to apply for this credential can receive Tribal sponsorship for a separate teaching credential from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. This credential allows federally recognized California tribes to administer tests in Native American languages. Candidates must pass necessary background and other reference checks. To date, 28 teachers have received such Native American language teaching credentials statewide.

In 2015, Governor Jerry Brown signed Assembly Bill 163 into law (Williams, et al., 2015). The purpose of this bill was to implement a separate teaching credential to include Native American culture. The American Indian language-culture credential authorized the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to establish professional standards, assessments, and examinations for entry and advancement in the education profession. It also required the commission, upon recommendation by a tribal government of a federally recognized Indian tribe in California, to issue an American Indian language credential to a candidate who has demonstrated fluency in

that tribal language and meets other requirements. In addition, upon recommendation by a tribal government of a federally recognized Indian tribe in California, this bill also required the commission to issue an American Indian language-culture credential with an American Indian language authorization or an American Indian culture authorization, or both, to a candidate who has met specific requirements. The bill authorizes the holder of an American Indian language-culture credential to teach the American Indian language, or culture, or both, for which the credential was issued in California. The credentialed teacher is then authorized to teach grades preschool through high school, inclusive education, and adult education courses. The credential would make the holder of that credential eligible for a clear teaching credential after five years, upon application and the recommendation of the tribal government. The term “clear” credential signifies that all education and program requirements for the credential have been met. Clear credentials are not held for professional growth requirements. The bill would encourage each federally recognized American Indian tribe to develop a written and oral assessment that should be successfully completed before an applicant is recommended for an American Indian language-culture credential with an American Indian language authorization, American Indian culture authorization, or both, as provided (Coto, et al., 2008).

Kumeyaay Speakers in Geographical Context

There are approximately 4,623 Kumeyaay people combined on both sides of the US/Mexico border, with the total number of fluent, semi-fluent, and passive speakers numbering 45 (Connolly Miskwish, 2016; LeBrake, personal communication, August 30, 2017). Today, the Kumeyaay people in the United States occupy 12 reservations in San Diego County, along with part of the Pala Reservation to the north. This also includes the descendants of the San Diego Mission, which is not federally recognized; the former reservation of Laguna, which took itself

out of the trust status; and the Desert Kumai, who share their land with the Quechan Nation on the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation. These reservations include the following communities in the United States: Barona, Campo, Cosmit-Inyaha, Capitan Grande (jointly allows use of the area for both Barona and Viejas), Cuyapaipe, Fort Yuma, Jamul, La Posta, Manzanita, Mesa Grande, a fragmented population in Pala, San Pascual, Santa Ysabel, Sycuan, and Viejas.

In Baja California, Mexico, the Kumeyaay occupy seven Indigenous communities. The Baja California Kumeyaay communities consist of: La Huerta, La Necua, Neji, Peña Blanca, a fragmented population in Santa Catarina, San José de Tecate, and San José de La Zorra. There are also individuals whose families sold reservation land and lost their tribal connection. For all practical purposes they are banished. There are other groups of people who are Native descendants, but due to their bands' enrollment ordinances, they are ineligible for enrollment. Also, there are the descendants of the people who lived at the Mission San Diego de Alcalá who are not federally recognized and are not eligible for any services.

The Kumeyaay are a border nation, which is a group whose boundaries straddle an international boundary (Connolly Miskwish, 2007). For the Kumeyaay people, this reality has posed its own difficulties when different groups wish to cross the border in order to conduct cultural exchange and for ceremonies such as attending wakes. As a result, concerned Kumeyaay bands in 1998 created the Kumeyaay Border Task Force. This organization addressed the issue of border barriers and particularly what is meant for traditional gatherings. Working with the U.S., Mexican, and Kumeyaay governments on both sides of the border, an arrangement was made to gather census data for the Kumeyaay in Baja. Working with the Mexican and American consuls, they were able to waive requirements for passports such as: having check stubs, rent receipts, and paid utility receipts. The reason for this was the isolation

of the Kumeyaay communities and the lack of services, such as electricity, that would make many Baja Kumeyaay unable to meet the requirements to obtain passports. The border checkpoint of Tecate was designated as the primary entry point for Baja Kumeyaay who wished to enter the United States. The program was implemented in 1999 and Kumeyaays then were able to cross with special laser visas. The Kumeyaay from the United States who are enrolled members of federally recognized bands could use their tribal identification cards, along with a valid California driver's license, to cross. This could be used in lieu of a passport for crossing in both directions through the Tecate checkpoint.

As a result of the ongoing security concerns after the attacks of September 11, 2001, the rules governing pass and repass were tightened, and the U.S. government now requires that U.S. citizens produce passports or other government-issued cards as proof of citizenship. Tribal identification cards are no longer considered to be valid documents for cross-border international travel. This policy change came from a concern that the criminals were forging false identification cards that were being sold to non-Kumeyaay persons to enter the United States illegally.

Other problems are, that after the initial success of the program in obtaining visas for the Baja Kumeyaay, the Kumeyaay Border Task Force disbanded and without follow-up, the visas expired. Without the technical support, the Kumeyaay people found themselves in a dilemma. Currently, various government agencies are considering how this situation can be resolved. With so few speakers on either side, the border-crossing difficulties exacerbate language loss. Language skills are sustained as a Native Kumeyaay community embraces another. As fewer people use the language, individuals become semi-speakers, and as this decay persists, individuals become passive speakers. Every year, as the number of speakers decrease, the

people and the communities are losing more and more of their culture. The remaining speakers are senior and elderly and are losing more every year due to natural attrition through death. With these deaths, the Kumeyaay Nation is continuing to lose knowledge that could be used to address the issues of the nation. As such, the loss of each language speaker is substantial.

Despite the history of U.S. policies that have had devastating consequences for Native American language and culture, there have been efforts to reverse such impacts. AB 544 and AB 163 allow California Natives to utilize their cultural assets to teach language and culture, both within the communities and in the public-school system (Coto, et al., 2008). For Kumeyaay Community College, this offers the institution an opportunity to take a leadership role in developing teachers and assisting in implementing language programs in San Diego.

UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment Indicators

UNESCO adopted the Language Vitality and Endangerment guideline to ensure language maintenance and revitalization (UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group, 2003). The guideline can assist in: developing language methodologies, documenting the status of languages and linguistic diversity, and constructing language policies. With these guidelines, along with scientific collaboration and community engagement, UNESCO aims at ensuring the perpetuation of language diversity. One of the goals of this study was to test the applicability of the UNESCO factors in the Native Kumeyaay language community.

Founded in 1945, UNESCO dedicated its efforts to build peace as collective, and global citizens through the integration of education, science, and culture. Most importantly for this study, UNESCO is addressing the issue of language loss and language diversity confronting Indigenous people from around the world. More than 6,000 languages are progressing from endangerment towards extinction. UNESCO recognizes this loss and is committed to reverse

language atrophy through language revitalization. UNESCO is also working to raise awareness about the importance of maintaining language diversity. For this reason, the UNESCO guidelines are especially relevant for this study of Kumeyaay language loss and revitalization. The categories in the guidelines include: correlating the degree of language endangerment with varying sectors of the speaker populations, assessing the extent of speakers within the reference population, measuring the degree of language endangerment in different social domains and functional applications, considering new domains and media accessibility, and taking stock of the accessibility of written materials in the endangered language. Additionally, the UNESCO guidelines have categories of attitudinal positions of two groups: public officials and speakers themselves.

This study directly addresses many of the categories of the UNESCO guidelines. Measuring the extent and degree of competence of Kumeyaay language speakers and the language speakers' distribution in communities forms the central task of data collection for this study. Although this appears to be a simple goal, identifying, contacting, and interviewing these speakers is a formidable task. Additionally, the UNESCO project offers a guideline to assess both the competence of speakers and the reach of the distribution of the Kumeyaay language. The report sets the standard for measuring the publications in the Native publications and for other aspects of media. The attitudes of Native speakers toward the language become apparent when the language socialization approach is integrated into the interview questions. The UNESCO guidelines for language vitality and endangerment utilize a scale of zero (high degree of endangerment) to five (robust vitality) to measure each of the factors shown in Table 1.

Table 1: *Summary of UNESCO Framework on Language Vitality and Endangerment*

Factor	Category
1	Intergenerational Language Transmission
2	Absolute Number of Speakers
3	Proportion of Speakers w/in Total Population
4	Trends in Existing Language Domains
5	Response to New Domains and Media
6	Materials for Language Education and Literacy
7	Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies
8	Community Members Attitudes towards their own Language
9	Amount and Quality of Documentation

Note. Table adapted from UNESCO (2003).

The specific values associated with each particular category are included in a table in the Appendix A at the end of this study. Considering the important connections between language, identity, and culture, when a language is in danger of becoming extinct, there is a real danger that group identity will also be compromised.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The research questions for this study were:

1. What are Kumeyaay speakers' perceptions about the current state of the language?
2. How do the Nation, communities, and individuals think about using language assets to reverse its moribund status?

The research was firmly grounded in the theory of the language socialization school. This focus highlights an integration of the micro and macro levels – the individual and institutional – in a way that provides for a close analysis of natural interactions and provides empirically grounded access to broader issues of social cultural reproduction and transformation (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002). This appears to be the language socialization paradigm's greatest strength, because it allows researchers to observe continuity and change in language and culture. Using this paradigm has proven to be effective in investigating language shift, cultural revival movements, and social cultural transformations that operate from self, family, community, state, and nation (Crago, Annahatak, & Ningiuruvik, 1993; Fader, 2000; Field, 2001; Garrett, 2000, 2000; Kulick, 1992; Paugh, 2001; Riley, 2001).

The investigation of language shift among the Kumeyaay people is a complex undertaking that is international in scope: it explores language use on the 12 Kumeyaay reservations in San Diego County and the six *Reservas Indigenas* in Baja California, Mexico. Revival movements, which use a multifaceted approach, must account for the fact that culture and language are intertwined, and that socialization is the vehicle by which to transmit information. The focus of this research was the study of everyday life – drawing from mundane activities and interactions in which people participate in a daily basis. This is part of practical consciousness but not discursive consciousness (Giddens, 1979). The language socialization

approach stresses that routine, however mundane, is an accomplishment (Schegloff, 1986). These routines result in co-constructed products of sequentially organized communicative acts, both verbal and nonverbal. Identifying the ways current Kumeyaay speakers engage in language socialization can illuminate pathways for constructing a learning program.

Research Design

This qualitative research study used a case study method of individual interviews to gather information on how particular Kumeyaay speakers were able to use and preserve Native language while others lost it. The interviews assisted in identifying: (1) reasons for language loss and (2) factors of language resiliency. The research design gave primacy to the Indigenous speakers' own perceptions about language atrophy. By shaping the first research question around the accuracy individual Kumeyaay speakers' assessment of language loss, the interview process uncovered elders' narratives of both successful and failed examples of language socialization. The second research question tested the attitudes and opinions of the Nation, communities, and individuals regarding using language assets to reverse its moribund status.

The overarching future question is whether Kumeyaay resiliency can be replicated when teaching the language. It is only by interviews with current speakers that any direct insights for future educational policy can be meaningfully formulated. Questions explored the contextual use of this heritage language, as well as the extensiveness of its use in the multiple Kumeyaay communities on both sides of the border. The participants recruited for the interviews were tribal members who self-identify as Kumeyaay speakers. Collaboration among Kumeyaay bands has been essential to complete this research, and the researcher's personal relations with Kumeyaay communities facilitated this study.

These interviews with Kumeyaay speakers took place on both sides of the international border. One category was speakers in the United States, and the other category included speakers in Baja California, Mexico. The cross-case analysis compared the perceptions from each subject on the following: attitudes about language – including the importance of language, influences – such as who or what encouraged or discouraged them from speaking, and how they evaluate the relevance of language to their cultural identity.

One effective validation strategy is to ensure that the researcher's biases are clearly stated (Creswell, 2013, p. 251). In this study, a bias could emerge as the researcher, is heavily invested in language transmission, evidenced by his teaching the Kumeyaay language for over 15 years. He might view the current speakers negatively because of their failure to teach the language to their own children. This failure to transmit language skills, however, is understandable, and the researcher made every effort to replace negatively judgmental feelings with a measure of empathy for the language-related challenges that elder speakers faced in their lives. Often, they experienced forced language suppression in boarding schools. Many of the speakers wanted to protect their children from discriminatory harm associated with the speaking of a minority language. Some of them simply did not see value in the language. Most chose to focus on teaching English and Spanish instead. Despite the challenges they have faced with language transmission, and although they did not teach their children, they still speak the Kumeyaay language and are potential resources for future language transmission. As a result, their perceptions are essential to develop a pedagogy that will support language revitalization and stabilization. There is also urgency to this research project as the interviewees are largely elderly.

A second method of validation is to ensure continuous engagement with the participants (Creswell, 2013, p. 250). As a Kumeyaay tribal member and speaker, the researcher has a relationship with many of the interviewees based on mutual respect, trust, and personal history. The ability of the interviewer to connect personally on a cultural and linguistic level allowed the researcher to empathize with the interviewees and understand their circumstances on a deep level that would not have been possible to an outsider. The researcher consistently sought to maintain subjectivity and the inside knowledge in a disciplined way. Another benefit of this methodology was that it complements the Native American tradition of narrative sharing. This is appropriate as long as the one sharing is not bragging or being the center of the issue for their personal gain. As the interviewer, the researcher was not the center of attention and had no personal gain.

Participants

The Kumeyaay people can be categorized into the following groups: federally recognized and non-federally recognized, reservation and non-reservation, urban and rural, enrolled, unenrolled, and disenrolled, gaming and non-gaming. Federally recognized tribes are Native groups who, through treaties with the federal government, are recognized as sovereign nations. These groups are eligible for services under the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Federally recognized tribes enjoy the most benefits, and their land base is held in trust by the federal government. The enrolled members are considered wards of the U.S. government. Each federally recognized group has its own enrollment ordinance and criteria for membership. This has been a point of contention in the past when members of a tribe are disenrolled. Their avenues of recourse are limited due to the Indian Self Determination Act, which allows the individual tribes to self-govern, including determination of its own citizens.

Non-federally recognized groups include the descendants of the Mission San Diego de Alcalá who were not granted a land base, and have no protections with the federal government. The state may have recognized the groups and the BIA may have a role for census purposes to recognize them; however, the groups appear fragmented and lack the government infrastructure necessary to function as a tribal entity. Another example are the tribes who were formally recognized and – during forced relocation – opted to take federal money, resulting in disenrollment from the tribe. One example would be the 10% of the Bands of Barona and Viejas, who – after forced relocation of El Capitan Reservoir – opted to take the money and leave. Many of them purchased private homes in San Diego, rather than using the money they received to buy into the new reservations. The result is they have no ties to the reservations. Other groups include individuals who have parents enrolled in federally recognized tribes; however, due to enrollment ordinances they are ineligible for enrollment and would be considered descendants only. Non-federally recognized tribes and their descendants may have limited services offered to them, such as medical and educational benefits. Some descendants are also allowed to reside on reservation lands, but only if they reside on family land. However, their ability to vote or run for office is restricted. Only enrolled members can exercise these rights.

The current Kumeyaay speakers represent all 18 communities and regions of the Kumeyaay Nation. The geographical distribution results in dialect differences and creates its own opportunities and challenges. Each dialect contains part of the language that the individuals of other communities might have forgotten due to language diaspora. Individuals and families that consider their particular region to be their home turf for the family and the community might take a proprietary interest in preserving only the version of dialect specific to their place of

residence. The pitfall is that, when there is a lack of communication between the communities, the regional use of the language becomes isolated and the effect is that speakers across communities have difficulty understanding each other. Moreover, such regional dialect differences create difficulties when bringing speakers together for the purpose of developing curriculum for creating an effective language program. Another concern is the age of the speakers. The median age of Kumeyaay language speakers is greater than 60 years, and hence the pool of speakers is gradually being lost due to senility and death. As this language resource dwindles, the affected communities are losing opportunities to preserve their language and their culture.

According to the last census there are 4,623 Kumeyaay individuals who reside on both sides of the border. Of those, there are approximately 45 individuals who were raised speaking Kumeyaay. Table 2 categorizes these documented Kumeyaay speakers by reservation and gender. The present study includes 24 of these speakers who were willing to be interviewed for the study.

Table 2: Interagency Language Roundtable Scale and European Language Proficiency Scales

Reservations in the United States	Population	# of Male Speakers	# of Female Speakers	Total Speakers
7	600	2	0	2
8	360	1	2	3
9	12	0	0	0
10	10	0	0	0
11	40	1	0	1
12	65	1	0	1
13	1	0	0	0
14	55	0	0	0
16	630	0	0	0
17	187	0	0	0
18	1000	3	3	6
19	350	1	0	1
20	340	1	2	3
15	138	0	0	0
Total	3,788	10	7	17

Reservations in Baja California, Mexico	Population	# of Male Speakers	# of Female Speakers	Total Speakers
2	155	1	4	5
1	250	2	0	2
6	150	0	3	3
3	48	0	1	1
4	2	0	2	2
5	240	6	9	15
Total	845	9	19	28

Note. The speakers from Table 2 were contacted through the identified tribal leader to verify that they were speakers and that they were willing to participate in a language study.

Setting

The setting and context consist of eight Kumeyaay communities, two communities in Baja, California and six communities in San Diego County in Southern California. The communities that were targeted were the ones that have the largest number of speakers. Conducting interviews took place in the various communities, starting with the communities in Baja California, Mexico; which were conducted during a five-day data collection trip. Then, individuals from the reservations in the United States were interviewed.

Procedures and Instruments

Once participants were identified and signed an informed consent, individual interviews were conducted. While the study concerns the Kumeyaay language, the dominant language of the participants was either English or Spanish; therefore, the interviews were conducted primarily in those languages – with brief greetings and occasional comments in Kumeyaay. Interview questions are listed in Appendix B. Due to the lack of a Kumeyaay language proficiency instrument, the interviews began with an informal conversation in Kumeyaay for the researcher to gauge proficiency level. Participants were also asked to assess their own proficiency level using the Interagency Language Roundtable scale (ILR) to measure fluency. This scale is a set of descriptions detailing the different levels of abilities in communicating a language. Table 3 indicates proficiency descriptors and the equivalency with the European Language Proficiency Scale.

Table 3: *Interagency Language Roundtable Scale Levels*

Interagency Language Roundtable Scale
Level 0 No proficiency
Level 1 Elementary proficiency
Level 2 Limited working proficiency
Level 3 Professional working proficiency
Level 4 Full professional proficiency
Level 5 Native or bilingual proficiency

Note. Information adapted from UNESCO (2003).

The interview questions, included in Appendix B, were divided into five categories: (1) Demographics: reservation, gender, age, and the number of language speakers in their community; (2) Language activity: when the language is used, where the language is used, who uses the language, and Native language use; (3) The reasons for language use: culture, pride, feelings, and the importance of language; (4) Language loss: reasons for lack of language use, difficulty speaking, language atrophy, resistance learning, oppression from the government; and (5) Learning the language: teaching language, language learning, and Kumeyaay as a second language.

Data Analysis

Interviews were recorded and transcribed. Coding of the transcripts was guided by the UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment guidelines. As described in Chapter 2, UNESCO is addressing the issue of language loss and language diversity confronting Indigenous people from around the world. For this reason, UNESCO adopted the LVE guidelines, which is included in Appendix A. The interview questions are divided into five categories cross-referenced with UNESCO LVE guidelines. The categories are demographics, language activity, language use, language loss, and learning the language. Table 4 correlates this study's questions with the relevant categories of the UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment factors.

Table 4: Summary of the UNESCO Framework on Language Endangerment and Vitality Factors

Interview Category	UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment Factors
Demographics	Factor 2. Absolute Number of Speakers Factor 3. Proportions of Speakers within the Total Population
Language activity	Factor 4. Trends in Existing Language Domains Factor 8. Community Members' Attitudes toward Their Own Language
Language use	Factor 1. Intergenerational Language Transmission
Language loss	Factor 8. Community Members' Attitudes toward Their Own Language
Learning the language	Factor 1. Intergenerational Language Transmission Factor 7. Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies, Including Official Status and Use

Note. In this table, the present study's interview question categories are matched with UNESCO's LVE factors (UNESCO, 2003).

Questions posed to the interviewees for this study, then, directly addressed the following 5 categories and their corresponding features:

- Demographics of their Community: Number and proportion of speakers.
- Language Activity: When the language is used, where the language is used, who uses the language, and Native language use.
- The Reasons for Language Use: Culture, pride, feelings, and the usefulness of language.
- Language Loss: Reasons for lack of language use, difficulty using the language, language atrophy, resistance learning, oppression from the government.
- Learning the Language: Teaching language, language learning, Kumeyaay as a second language.

Initially, these five categories provided classifications for coding of the transcriptions. Additionally, I isolated trends and themes within the five categories. In Mexico, I conducted interviews in Spanish, and – when in the United States – in English, to ensure clarity of the questions and in-depth responses. After the interviews, I translated the responses into a common language. For this purpose, I used English. I also brought in an additional researcher to review

the translation of the results. If questions arose, I revisited the participants with another interview. In order to minimize coder bias, I formed a coding committee consisting of Professor T.J. Ambo, PhD, of UCSD, and Professor Elena Hood, EdD, also of UCSD, and myself. Together we unpacked the comments in the interviews, placed them on a board, and engaged in the process of categorizing the comments using MAXQDA, a qualitative and mixed methods data analysis software package that assists in organizing data in categories.

The coding exercise occurred in several stages. For round one, I scrutinized the transcripts of the interview responses to create a codebook. I correlated the nine UNESCO factors of Language Vitality and Endangerment, available in Appendix A in this document, with the responses. Briefly, they were (1) Intergenerational Language Transmission, (2) Absolute Number of Speakers, (3) Proportion of Speakers in the Population, (4) Trends in Existing Language Domains, (5) Response to New Domains and Media, (6) Materials for Language Education and Literacy, (7) Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies, (8) Community Members' Attitudes toward their own Language, and (9) Amount and Quality of Documentation. This correlation formed the guidelines for the codes.

I reviewed the codes and then developed secondary codes. For example, using Factor 1, Intergenerational Language Transmission, I was able to develop these sub factors: (a) Language across and between Generations, (b) Immersion, (c) Language Spoken at Home, (d) First Language Speakers, and (e) Kumeyaay as a Second Language. Using the final codebook, I organized the categories that form the basis for the discussion in this study; they are elaborated below. I kept detailed notes of the analysis that emerged from each code and sub-code. This is not an empirical study; the qualitative analysis that emerged from the interviews is significant as

much for the elicitation of Kumeyaay speakers' opinions and perceptions as for its formal findings.

Table 5 depicts by code and sub code the total number of respondents from the United States and Mexico and their responses.

Table 5: UNESCO LVE Factors & Related Interview Codes

UNESCO LVE Factors	Code	Coded Interviews	Coded Segments
Factor 1 Intergenerational Language Transmission		22	29
	Immersion	7	18
	Ability to speak other Native language	3	7
	First language	13	23
	Second language	9	11
	Struggles using language (-)	14	37
	Instructions in household (+)	6	4
	How language is learned (across generations) (+)	8	19
	Between/across generations (-/+)	20	56
	Culture (+)	16	74
	Passive speaker (-)	9	12
Factor 2 Absolute Number of Speakers		12	20
Factor 3 Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population		16	25

Table 5: UNESCO LVE Factors & Related Interview Codes (Continued)

UNESCO LVE Factors	Code	Coded Interviews	Coded Segments
Factor 4			
Trends in Existing Language Domains			
		21	51
	Struggle to use the language	12	35
	Example of when language is used (+)	19	50
	Kumeyaay as a secret Code	2	4
	Passive speakers (-)	9	10
	Fluency	18	32
	Social	17	36
	Situational fluency	5	5
Factor 5			
Response to New Domains and Media			
		14	17
	Technology	4	6
	Interaction with non-Kumeyaay	8	19
	School (-/+)	13	25
Factor 6			
Materials for Language Education and Literacy			
		8	21
Factor 7			
Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies			
		20	12
	Integrating language into schools	14	36
	Boarding schools (-)	7	15
	Tribal policies (+)	18	7
	Classes offered		72

Table5: UNESCO LVE Factors & Related Interview Codes (Continued)

UNESCO LVE Factors	Code	Coded Interviews	Coded Segments
Factor 8			
Community Members' Attitudes Towards Their Own Language			
		21	48
	Activism/sovereignty/self-determination	7	13
	Marriage with/to outsiders (-)	7	10
	Willingness to use (+)	17	48
	Desire for children to learn (-/+)	17	49
	Embarrassment/reluctant to Use (-)	14	39
	Concern over language shift (-/+)	14	45
	Value of language use	14	47
Factor 9			
Amount and Quality of Documentation			
		6	15

The process of coding the responses of interviewees to the questions necessarily was limited to comments the interviewees made that directly addressed the questions. This might seem obvious, but interviewees often spoke beyond the confines of the questions asked. Cultural norms of the Kumeyaay require allowing conversation to flow uninterrupted. Sensitivity to the narrative shared by a Kumeyaay speaker offers a previously unavailable opportunity to privilege the voice of members of the Kumeyaay community in assessing the state of their own language community. Many of their comments fit into the UNESCO categories, while others did not.

Significance

This project affirms perceptions of Kumeyaay speakers about: the decline in language use in their communities, reveals their recommendations to remedy the decline, and supports the relevance of the UNESCO factors of language loss and resiliency in the Kumeyaay language community. This research has yielded information about language resiliency and is of value in

developing a pedagogy to support language revitalization and stabilization. The literature of language socialization illuminates the interdependence of Kumeyaay language and culture. By revitalizing language, individuals and communities could be empowered to develop self-efficacy that could be transferred to other aspects of culture. Most importantly, Kumeyaay language revitalization could also be a vehicle to address and to heal intergenerational trauma; it could play a role in developing healthy communities.

Chapter 4: Results

Case Study Analysis and Presentation of Data

The purpose of this study was to identify the state of the Kumeyaay language and to understand how the Kumeyaay Nation, particular tribal communities, and individuals can reverse language loss and revitalize cultural identity. The following section offers readers a detailed description of each Kumeyaay Reservation and the interviewees participating in this study. Findings are organized thematically in direct response to the following research questions:

1. What are Kumeyaay speakers' perceptions about the current state of the language?
2. How do the Nation, communities, and individuals think about using language assets to reverse its moribund status?

Contextual Narrative of Participant Interviews

This section discusses the data collection, analysis and findings from 24 interviews that I conducted with participants on four Kumeyaay reservations in Baja California, Mexico and five Kumeyaay reservations in the United States. The goal of the interviews was to assess individual Kumeyaay speakers' language use, including its reach in conversation and daily life and to assess their perceptions of the state of the language. All participants were identified as Kumeyaay language speakers by members of their respective communities. To determine their level of proficiency with Kumeyaay, I spoke to them in Kumeyaay and was able to carry on conversations with them. This was an informal measure to determine individual fluency levels. Using the Interagency Language Roundtable scale (ILR) to measure fluency, I rated the participants and also asked them to rate themselves. The individual interviews took place during three weeks in December 2018.

A description of each community and survey participant can offer the reader insight into the scope of the problems with language loss and the difficulty with reversing language shift. Although each community is unique, commonalities exist on both sides of the border; envisioning trans-border solutions is essential to develop a plan to address language loss. Analyzing community and individual narratives is a crucial step to achieve this. Smith (1999/2013) argues that decolonial approaches to social science research reside in storytelling. She states that, “For many Indigenous writers, stories are ways of passing down the beliefs and values of a culture in the hope that the new generations will treasure them and pass the story down further” (Smith, 1999/2013, p. 145). Storytelling transmits not only information, but also shares the history of the knowledge keeper and is in keeping with American Indian traditions. It brings a human element to the research and it honors the individuals who have kept the embers of language and custom alive. Moreover, the narratives offer hints about the network of issues that tie tribal identity to language. The Kumeyaay people interviewed in this study reside in nine reservations and are separated by the international border between the United States and Mexico.

Reservation I

Reservation I is located in Baja California, Mexico. Among the residents there is constant interaction with the non-tribal Mexican community and culture. Almost all of the people have married Mexicans, and there is an ongoing language shift. Also, Korean Christian missionaries have built a large modern church in the community. There is a saying on the reservation that the Catholic missionaries brought the whip and the Evangelists brought the guitar (J. Mesa, personal communication, 2000). Both missionary groups desired the same thing – the “cleansing” of the Indian people. The effect of this colonization has been devastating to Native language and culture.

Participant A was an unassuming elder who agreed to be interviewed in his house. He was surrounded by his family. His daughter and grandchildren moved in and out of the house during my visit. His daughter gave us coffee and invited us to sit down in the kitchen. As we got ready for the interview, he sat down and spoke of a time when the community members spoke the Kumeyaay language across multiple generations – when children were surrounded by family who were language speakers. Participant A was immersed in the language and culture. He talked about social interaction beyond the reservation and the impact of the outside culture. As more and more speakers married with Mexicans, he told me, their offspring were exposed to the outsider's language, which in this case was Spanish.

The proximity to the town was a contributing factor in exposure to outside language. The frequent marriage to Mexicans reinforced the Spanish language usage with the children. Access to media also played a part, with shows, news, and music reinforcing Spanish language communication. The elder emphasized the importance of teaching the Kumeyaay language to the children. He believes that a language program could possibly reverse language loss. He said that it is important that people become immersed in the language and culture.

Participant B was also from Reservation I, and is an elder who speaks with passion and conviction. He was the second interviewee, and we found him walking on the side of the road on the reservation. When asked about being interviewed, he eagerly accepted, and I interviewed him immediately. Participant B is a traditional singer who learned the *ashaa liipit* song cycle. He is well known in his community and in Baja as a cultural carrier. Participant B is a proud man who speaks with passion when he talks about the language and the culture. He learned traditionally, from his grandfather and his mother, how to sing when he was a child. Participant B said that although he has a light complexion and does not look Indian, he is proud and is not

afraid to tell people that he is Native. For him the culture and traditions are too important to lose. On this point, he said that he has no support from the community, and this has been frustrating for him. To him, the language and culture is sacred, and he does not want to see this lost. Although he and Participant A are the only Kumeyaay speakers, he said that he enjoys going to other Kumeyaay communities where there are more speakers, and this is how he can use the language. Participant B helped teach the language in the local school but only a few people would come to the classes to learn. He said that one problem is that people do not want to listen to the elders. He emphasized that only a few individuals keep the cultural knowledge and if no one wants to listen, then these traditional ways will disappear.

Reservation II

Reservation II, located in Baja California, Mexico is the most isolated of the four Kumeyaay Communities in Mexico, including two smaller communities that are about three hours apart. Reservation II has the second most speakers of all of the Kumeyaay reservations in both Mexico and the United States. There, cultural practices such as basket making and soapstone carving are being revived. Although there were a number of Kumeyaay language singers in the past, almost all have died, except for one who is young and does not speak the language fluently. He was learning from one of the elders who started to teach him but the teacher passed away before his training could be completed.

In the second community, the first house that we visited was the home of Participant C. She was born on Reservation II and grew up speaking the Kumeyaay language as a first language. She learned Spanish at the age of 19, and she speaks Spanish with her sisters and brother. In her community there are six language speakers, four women and two men, who still speak the language. She said that she wishes that more people could speak the language. She

said that we are Indians and that this is our Indian language. She said it bothers her that many people understand the language, yet they choose to speak in Spanish. She said that she would talk in Kumeyaay, but they would respond in Spanish. She has taught classes; however, she reported that the people taking the classes appear embarrassed to use the language. She believes that focusing on the children is imperative because the children are not embarrassed to learn. She also reported that getting spouses that were Mexican significantly contributed to language loss.

Participant D was the next person we visited. She is a language speaker, and a sister of Participant C. Participant D's first language was Kumeyaay, which she learned from her parents who both spoke Kumeyaay. She also speaks some Spanish. She is in a wheelchair and has trouble getting around. Her grandchildren helped her into her house. Although she had health issues, she was lucid and eager to assist me with the information gathering. What struck me about the interviews in this community was the hospitality and the genuine concern for the language and the culture. She shared that she used the language only with her sisters and only when they visited. She has tried to talk to her children and grandchildren, but they do not understand it, so she communicates with them in Spanish. She would rather speak in her Kumeyaay language, but there are few people who can still speak it, so she gets very few chances to use it. She said that everyone understands the language; however, they do not want to speak it. She attributes it to their embarrassment to use the language. She would like to see classes again and would like to see the old customs come back.

After interviewing Participant D, we then went to Participant E's house. She was gracious and inviting, and had no problem speaking her mind. She is a person of convictions and she fights for her beliefs. As we sat down to talk, she shared that she was probably the youngest

language speaker in her community. She is perhaps in her late 60s and appeared full of life. She volunteers at the school to translate stories from Spanish to Kumeyaay. She shared that the government does not give any support and that she chooses to volunteer because she does not want the language to die out. She also notices the shift in the diet of the people and shared what was eaten when she was young.

Reservation III

Reservation III is the most isolated of all the Kumeyaay communities on both sides of the border. The people are well known throughout the Kumeyaay Nation as the most traditional people. They continue to make baskets. Some of them trap their own foods, gather acorns and other plant foods, and they have the most speakers. The problem today is that the Mexican government has placed bilingual schools (*escuelas bilingues*) on the reservation. Bilingual here means English and Spanish. These schools are staffed by Mexican teachers who do not speak Kumeyaay, and they have told the children and their parents that if they want the children to be successful, then they shouldn't teach them the Kumeyaay language. The result is the younger generations are not speaking the language.

The first interview on this reservation was with Participant F. She is one of a number of well-known basket makers in this community. She is a Kumeyaay first language speaker, and she readily agreed to be interviewed. She was raised by her grandmother and speaks an older dialect of the Kumeyaay language. She remembers that for a time when she would use the Kumeyaay language with many people in her community, and they would respond in Spanish. In the past few years, she has noticed a reversal of cultural and language shift and she is hearing more people greeting each other in the language. There are young people who want to learn the

songs. While there is no language program in this community, Participant F believes that a language program should be developed, implemented daily, and be focused on the young ones.

Participant G is also a traditional basket weaver who was raised in a traditional environment. A fluent speaker of the language, she prepares her food in a traditional way and cooks outside making a fire. It is her hope to teach her grandchild to be a speaker. She remembers a day when everybody spoke the language all of the time. She said that although her sons understand the language, they have difficulty making the sounds, and the result is that they answer back in Spanish. She also remembers a time when all of the people used plants to heal themselves. Participant G said that she believes the people in the community want to learn the language, but what discourages them is the difficulty that the learners have pronouncing the words. She said that the speakers are getting old and dying, and it is important for the children to learn before they die.

Participant H was probably the briefest interview. This woman is a first language Kumeyaay speaker and she remains a fluent speaker. Although brief in her responses, she was adamant that she does not want the language to die out, and she does not know why the younger people did not pick up the language.

Participant I learned the Kumeyaay language from his family through immersion. He reported that when was growing up everyone spoke Kumeyaay. No one spoke Spanish. He said that he is concerned that the younger generation is not learning the language. He stated that they are not hearing the older ones using the language enough. This is how I realized that we Kumeyaay speakers need to use it more with older speakers. Participant I believes the problem is that the young ones have difficulty pronouncing the words and are embarrassed.

Participant J is a fluent speaker of the language and wishes for the language to continue. He believes that having a strong and vibrant language and traditions are necessary for the health of the community. He believes that a school needs to be created to teach the children. He believes that the children have difficulty pronouncing the words and this results in the children becoming embarrassed, so they stop trying to speak the language.

Of all of the elders that I interviewed, Participant K was by far the frailest. She was bedridden and could barely move. I hesitated to conduct the interview; however, after I told her what the interview was about, she insisted on participating. She was weak and her answers were short, but are included in this research to represent the difficulties of fieldwork and to honor her status as an elder who had been through so much in her life. She reported that all of her life had been hard. Her main view was that the language was important, and it was our responsibility to not lose it. She said that it is important for the children to learn it, but when she teaches it they forget it because they do not practice.

Participant L is also a basket maker who learned the language from her family. When we went into her house, she offered us a cup of coffee and she talked about how she learned the language from her family. She is a fluent speaker who learned from her family and she has taught language in the school in the past but the school lost its funding. She said that not everybody was interested in speaking the language, and this makes it hard to teach the children. The children, she opined, are the ones who want to learn the language, culture, songs, dances, and traditions. She said that they learn faster than older people. She said that what is needed are more language programs to teach the children.

Participant M is a *vaquero*, a cowboy, who works on various *ranchos* in the area. I found him by his modest house, mending his lasso and saddle. He is an imposing figure, a tall man

who has worked hard all his life. We asked if he would consent to an interview. He thought for a moment, and then agreed. He is a fluent speaker of the language and shared that he talks only with the older people who still speak Kumeyaay. He said that it is important to continue using the language. "It is our language," he said, adding that it is hard because he feels that there is not much interest to learn it. The knowledge and culture that is tied into the language is part of the people. He believes that the children should learn the language and that it should be taught in school.

Reservation IV

Reservation IV, which is on the Mexico side of the border, is separated into three tracks. The isolation of the tracts and the need to find employment have contributed to a diaspora of the tribal members. Very few people reside on the reservation. There are few speakers left, but I was able to interview two.

I met Participant N at the Native Museum in Tecate. She is the oldest of four sisters, one of whom just passed away. They are all speakers of the language. Although they are fluent, they do not use the language often. While she did not teach the language to her children, she would like to teach her grandchildren. She talks about not sharing the language with others because it was not for outsiders, and she shared that she did not learn Spanish until she was about 14 years old. When she was young, it took about two hours on a horse-driven wagon to reach the school, and they would stay at the school from Monday to Friday. She reported that she only had her sister to talk to, and no one else spoke Kumeyaay. When she got married, her children were sent away to school and they could not learn Kumeyaay. She reported that it is difficult to teach the language to others now because everyone is scattered. She lamented that cultural knowledge and traditions, such as protocols for grieving when someone passes away, are not being transmitted

to the next generations. She does not see any interest from the community to learn. She also shared that the people who have tried to learn have trouble making the sounds and get embarrassed, so they stop trying and end up speaking Spanish. She would like to write down the language, and said that when she travels to San José de la Zorra there are more speakers that she can converse with. She reiterated that there is little interest to learn from the people and that because they are dispersed, it would be important to make a central location to learn.

Participant O is the younger sister of Participant N. Participant O is a friendly, welcoming individual. Participant O has been more active in maintaining her language and culture. She teaches classes at the museums in the area. The classes that she teaches are open to non-Kumeyaay, and most of the people participating are non-Indian. She is a first language speaker and experienced the same hardships that her sister had gone through. She talked about people wanting to write things in the Kumeyaay language down, but she said that she does not know how to write things. She also reported that people who try to learn have trouble with the pronunciations and this makes it difficult to use the language. Also, the dispersal of her community is an issue that stymies any efforts to learn the language. She also said that outside of teaching classes, she has very little opportunity to use the language. Participants N and O were interviewed at the same time. In many cases, it was difficult to determine from the audio recording and transcription who was speaking. The result is that the information and quotes are attributed to Participants N and O.

Reservation V

Reservation V is on the U.S. side of the border. This reservation consists of approximately 600 acres. The people here have lived through many hardships and have to walk to a nearby town to look for gainful employment. In the late 70s the tribal leadership decided to

take a risk and open a bingo hall. This was created for the purpose of developing jobs within the growing community. Today, they are one of the most successful gaming tribes in the country, employing thousands of people from all walks of life. The tribal members have also had a cultural renaissance. Tribal members are learning the song cycle, such as *tokok*, or bird singing, dancing, and the language. This community supports a Kumeyaay Cultural Center and Museum and Community College. Despite this focus on Kumeyaay culture, there is only one speaker left.

I was able to contact Participant P and meet with him at the restaurant in the casino. He is a friendly man who loves to talk. He has accomplished much in his life and is active in culture, language, and singing throughout Kumeyaay territory on both sides of the border. Participant P is a Korean War veteran. He is a fluent speaker of the Kumeyaay language. He grew up speaking the language and today he is his reservation's last speaker. He had a good friend from the Manzanita reservation who was the last speaker there, but he passed away. Now Participant P travels to other reservations and speaks to other known speakers. He used to teach language classes in the 1990s, but does not today. However, he is mentoring an individual who is from his reservation and is teaching him the language. He shares that the reason for the lack of speakers is that people are marrying outside of the Kumeyaay Nation, and the offspring are not learning. According to Participant P, there are no more Indians. He said that the people are more interested in spending money, going to concerts, and partying.

Reservation VI

Reservation VI is on the U.S. side of the border, has a casino operation, and is starting to expand into other business ventures. Perhaps because of its geographical isolation, the people have a stronger cultural base than some of the other communities. They have a number of singers and they are active in intercommunity cultural events. They had four identified speakers

of the Kumeyaay language. During the interview phase of this project, one of the speakers died a week before I was going to interview her. Nevertheless, I was able to interview one tribal member.

I called Participant Q and asked her if I could meet with her to do an interview. At first, she appeared indecisive, but then she agreed to meet me. We decided to meet at the casino. I met her by the restaurant, and she had just gotten off of work. She is part of the maintenance department and she was dressed in work boots, jeans a flannel shirt, and a scarf. She looked tired, no doubt due to the heavy lifting and other physical labor that is in her job description. She is probably over 60, but she reported that she has no problem doing this type of work. She struck me as a “salt of the earth” type of person and she was very humble. She shared that she could not speak Indian, but then confided that, in fact, she could maybe speak just a little. She said that her parents spoke Kumeyaay all of the time, and that is how she learned along with her brothers. She then said that growing up and going to school she experienced racism and discrimination. She said that they called her a dirty Indian and she did not make it past ninth grade at Sherman Indian School. Despite the often-hostile school climate, she said that she enjoyed attending due to the Indian population. She met her husband who was an Indian from up north. He would not allow her to teach Kumeyaay to their children and he only wanted to teach his tribal language. This was an issue due to him not being able to speak his language. She said that it is important to teach the children. As mentioned above, she said that she did not speak the language. I then started to talk to her in Kumeyaay and we began a conversation that lasted for almost an hour in the language. She speaks fluently. I asked her why she said that she does not speak anymore. She said that she speaks to people who speak the language, and because there is no one to talk to, she does not speak anymore.

Reservation VII

Reservation VII began in a different location, but the people were forcibly relocated to their present reservation. This population removal was done to construct a reservoir. During the removal, the people took everything, including their graves, with them to the new community site. Since then the people of Reservation VI have created a successful gaming enterprise. The total population of this reservation is 600 members. Of those members there are two speakers. I had the opportunity to interview both.

Participant R is well known throughout the Kumeyaay Nation. When asked, he will make items for graves. This is a skill that was passed on to him by elders. He is a language speaker, and he resides with his wife. He invited me to his house on a Sunday. I remember his house; there were many dogs and they told me before I got out of the car that they needed to put them away. After they did, they invited me into their home. They gave me coffee and Participant R's wife made me some homemade tortillas with butter and jam in them. They then sat down, and as I prepared the interview equipment, we talked about people we knew who have passed away. As we started the interview I could see the passion that Participant R had for the language and the culture. I could see the irritation on his face as he talked about the tribal members who, flush with cash, have no desire to learn the language or the culture. He said that it was being Indian that brought the community this wealth, and that lack of interest in the culture and language is no right way to honor the people. He spoke with passion. In the end he shared that it was the old timers who preserved the community and were responsible for the current prosperity. He said they should be respected. Participant R shared that he uses the language all of the time when he talks to his wife. However, because she is a Luiseño Indian she does not speak the language. But that does not stop him – he talks to her all of the time in Kumeyaay. He

said that he wants to teach others, but because his wife is very ill, the students would need to come to his house.

The other speaker I was able to interview was Participant S. He is a lifelong member of the Barona Band. Participant S is an accomplished musician. He has done many things, such as being a cowboy herding cattle for his relatives. He served as a minister and was a Kumeyaay language teacher for 14 years. He grew up surrounded by speakers. He remembers that all of the people in his grandparents' generation spoke the language. He said that people in his father's generation did not want to teach the language. He said that they would use the language as a code when they did not want anyone else to know what they were talking about. He wanted to learn, and he spoke despite his father's reservations for his son to learn. He has been teaching classes and although he encounters some people saying greetings in Kumeyaay, his fear is that the language use will not go back to the way he remembers. He attributes the language loss to the intense discrimination towards the Native people during his father's time. The participant shared that he uses the language when he prays and when he talks to his pets.

Reservation VIII

Reservation VIII is also on the U.S. side of the border. This group is arguably the most traditional group when it comes to spirituality and the old religion. This group still practices cremations and there are a number of groups that sing the traditional song cycles. The reservation has two groups: the Kwitsan, or the Yumas, and the Kumia, or the Desert Kumeyaay. The Kwitsan are the numerically dominant group. Of the Kumia, there is one speaker left.

Participant T is an elder who is the last speaker of the Desert Kumia dialect. Participant T is a traditional song leader and sings both *Sholok* Lightning and *Tipai* People song cycles. Participant T is fluent in both Kumia and the Yuma dialects of the Kumeyaay language. He is

also a playwright and is a member of the actors' guild. He is a Marine Corps veteran and has held tribal office twice. He is a proponent of language use and refers to using daily communication when using the language instead of literacy. Participant T said that the song cycles are in the language and if an apprentice does not speak the language then they will not know what they are talking about. When he spoke about the singing he spoke with passion and his convictions come out. He has taught many people and he shared that his time for death is coming. He wants people to learn but he says that people don't seem to care. He was one of my teachers, and I could hear the urgency in his voice. It brought a sense of finality to his work.

Reservation VIII

Reservation VIII, also on the U.S. side of the border, has the largest population of all of the Kumeyaay communities. The approximate number is 998 members. This reservation is partitioned into three sections: Tracts 1, 2, and 3. The reservation has been one of the more isolated Kumeyaay settlements and it has had more language speakers than other communities. However, the number of speakers today is only five, with two who are unable to speak due to strokes. The others are over the age of 60. The language speakers appear to be struggling with language atrophy. Nevertheless, the community is going through a cultural renaissance with many younger men learning the songs. There is also a revival of basket making and pottery along with traditional stories, house construction, and food preparation.

Participant U is a tribal member who is the epitome of a Native woman. She is a language speaker, as well as a basket maker. She teaches others. She learned these skills from her father, an accomplished traditional toolmaker. She is a respected member of the community and has held various tribal offices. She has extensive knowledge of the history of the families, and the community as a whole. She is a warm, strong, and assertive individual. She commands

respect, and is a fair person who cares about others. She is working with another elder who is also a language teacher to focus on teaching her family's dialect. At times she appeared to struggle with language atrophy and would answer back in English. However, when she continues conversing in the language, her language use picks up. She stated that there is hardly anyone to talk to in the language.

I was invited by Participant V to her house. I remember that it was raining hard and she welcomed me in, offering me food and a cup of coffee. We then talked about how the reservation has changed much since she was young. Participant V, like many of the Indians before her, spoke multiple languages. Participant V speaks Iipay/Kumeyaay, English, and Spanish. She is the oldest language speaker on the reservation. She grew up speaking the language, as did her oldest brother. She remembers the impact of the boarding school system on the language and the culture. She and her brother, who passed away, would teach language classes, along with her aunt. Although she said that she forgot much, she has been asked to teach language classes again. She is working with her cousin, Participant U, in a women's group. She talked about how when she left the reservation she did not get many opportunities to use the language. She spoke of a granddaughter who wants to learn the language. She sent her some tapes. Participant V then talked about growing up and how it was important for her to use the language. She said that her parents were prayer leaders and she had to attend to all of the Indians who came to her house. Most of the time they spoke no English, so she had to talk to them in the language. She does not want to see the language die out.

Participant W is the last person that I interviewed on this reservation. I met with Participant W before an event, and I asked her if she would consent to an interview. She agreed. As we sat down and talked, I noticed that her two children were using broken Kumeyaay

language to communicate. Participant W reported that she could only speak about 40% in the language. We then started talking in the language and, although she struggled at first, as we continued she appeared to become more comfortable and proficient. It appeared that she was struggling with language atrophy. I also noticed that although she at times had difficulty with the language, she had taken an active effort to teach her children, and they appear to respond to her insistence that they learn the language. She talked about how when she was young, she would hear the language and she wanted to learn. She is also fluent in Spanish and English. She said that when she took Spanish in school she got a D grade, but when she moved to Mexico with a friend she was immersed in the Spanish language, and that is how she gained proficiency. Her husband is a Hopi Indian, and she wants her children to learn all of these languages. They are supportive of each other's language interests.

Data Analysis

As discussed in Chapter 3, the interviews were recorded, transcribed, translated, reviewed, and coded by committee using MAXQDA for themes related to the UNESCO Framework on Language Vitality and Endangerment in order to answer the research questions. Additionally, empirical data was collected in each reservation to assess the number of community members and the number of Kumeyaay speakers.

I have used the UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment framework and the Language Socialization framework to organize the different aspects of the elders' perceptions of the state of the Kumeyaay language. As described in Chapter 3, there are nine major factors taken from the UNESCO framework and used to evaluate a language's state of endangerment and vitality. These UNESCO formed the field for mapping the responses of interviewees. These factors are displayed in Table 1.

Research Question 1: What are Kumeyaay speakers' perceptions about the current state of the language?

The following section answers the first research question about the Kumeyaay speakers' perceptions of the state of the Kumeyaay language by applying factors, beginning with Factors 2 and 3, to report the absolute number of speakers and the proportion of speakers within the total population. Subsequently, I discuss the themes that emerged from the interviewee's comments about their perceptions, which correlate with Factor 1 (Intergenerational Language Transmission), Factor 4 (Trends in Existing Language Domains), Factor 7 (Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies), and Factor 8 (Community Members' Attitudes toward the Language). In the discussion of participant responses related to Factor 1, intergenerational language transmission, I consider how the language is used between/across generations and the degree of immersion or its lack across the Kumeyaay Nation. I discuss the language spoken at home and how it is tied to immersion, which is how first language speakers learn language. I also consider how the lack of immersion affects the use of language. Lastly, I examine Kumeyaay as a second language and the implications for a person who might speak their own language as a second language when the language is revitalized.

According to the UNESCO guidelines, Factor 4 focuses on the trends in existing language domains, such as: when it is used, with whom it is used, and the range of topics in which its used (UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group, 10 March 2003, p. 9). I discuss the current struggle to use the language, given the lack of speakers, and the difficulty of crossing the international border. I also discuss how the lack of use affects fluency, whether there is language atrophy taking place, and the growing group of people who are passive speakers. These are people who can understand the language; however, they cannot speak.

Participant responses related to Factor 7, government policies and attitudes, provide a historical perspective of the road to language loss. Most importantly, I discuss Factor 8, community members' attitudes toward their own language. Community members exhibit pride in their language coupled with pessimism about its future. Another concern for members of the community are interactions with non-Kumeyaay people: how the outsiders view the use of the language, the influence of marriage to non-Kumeyaay, and the impact on the children due to the lack of language use. I also address the lack of the desire to learn, along with the concern over language use.

Factor 2: Absolute Number of Speakers. According to the UNESCO guidelines a small speech community is always at risk. A small population is more vulnerable to language decimation than a larger population (UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group, 2003). Using the UNESCO framework, I once again demonstrate that Kumeyaay language is critically endangered based on participants' responses to the question about "absolute number of speakers." There is a serious challenge to revitalization of the language because the Kumeyaay people populating both sides of the border number approximately 4,623 individuals. Of these, there are approximately 45 individuals who still speak the Kumeyaay language. Under the UNESCO framework, the absolute number of speakers is the literal number of speakers as determined by participants.

For interviews, individuals in the following communities were participants: two males, one of which is a traditional singer at La Necua; four female speakers at La Huerta; eight speakers (three men and five women) at San José de la Zorra; three female speakers on the Santa Ysabel reservation; two male speakers on the Barona reservation; four speakers (one of whom died before our interview) on the Campo Reservation; one male speaker and singer on the Fort Yuma reservation; and finally, one male speaker on the Sycuan reservation (see Table 2). The

absolute number of speakers gives an estimate of the extent language loss in the community. In the not too distant past, before children were sent to boarding school and kept from speaking their language, all communities maintained their language. The low number of speakers today, who are repositories of the language, and are thus assets for language transmission, indicates the difficulty that the remaining language speakers face for using the language. Without opportunities to use the language regularly, speakers can experience language atrophy, forgetting substantial language knowledge. Participant A stated, “We have a few old people who know the basics. Yes, right now there are the only two that know the language [fluently], but we are losing the people that can speak it. They are running out.”

The comment above by Participant A reflects the unfortunate situation of declining numbers of living language assets on both sides of the border. Participant D estimated, “So, there are only three people that can speak it.” Participant E had a similar response, noting, “I think around eight or nine, or maybe even ten or eleven.” Based on these consistent remarks indicating the small number of speakers, the report of tribal leaders who identified speakers, and my personal observations, we can conclude that there are few speakers, that the elders correctly recognize this fact, and that they additionally see this dwindling number as a cause of language atrophy. The Kumeyaay language is critically endangered.

Factor 3: Proportion of Speakers Within a Total Population. As previously mentioned, according to the UNESCO guidelines, the number of speakers in relation to the total population of a group is a significant indicator of language vitality (UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group, 2003). Does this assertion hold in Kumeyaay communities? To answer this question, I inquired of participants in interviews about the proportion of speakers within the total

community population. The proportion of speakers reflects a general estimate of speakers in the community and conditions the elders' perceptions of the future of the Kumeyaay language.

Table 6: Proportion of Kumeyaay speakers on Individual Reservations

Reservation	Reported Number of Speakers	Size of Population	Proportion
1	2	250	.8%
2	5	155	.033%
3	1	48	2.08%
4	2	2	100%
5	15	240	6.25%
6	3	150	2%
7	2	600	.333%
8	3	360	.83%
9	0	12	0
10	1	10	0
11	1	40	2.5%
12	2	65	3.07%
13	0	1	0
14	0	55	0
15	0	138	0
16	0	630	0
17	0	187	0
18	5	1000	.5%
19	1	350	.28%
20	2	340	.58
Total	45	4,623	0.522%

In all of the communities where I conducted interviews, the proportion of speakers was low. In some communities there were no speakers. The implication is that without the presence of Kumeyaay speakers, community members have less and less of an opportunity to be exposed to and to learn the language. If there are no language speakers at family meals, community events, or regional Native gatherings, the connection of participating Native people to their culture will be diminished. Language loss in the communities can be connected to loss of culture, and subsequently lead to an overall struggle with identity. Participants' comments reflected these elements as reasons for their low prognosis for Kumeyaay language retention.

Factor 1: Intergenerational Language Transmission. Intergenerational Language Transmission is used to determine the vitality of a language by evaluating if the language is passed on through generations. It is considered one of the most important factors according to the UNESCO guidelines. It is the most common and natural way that language is learned and it is a crucial component in language socialization. The intergenerational language transmission factor includes all the literal ways that the language is transmitted and the purposes for that transmission. The data indicates that, among speakers, the Native language is integral to communicating various aspects of culture, including ceremonies, games, and spiritual aspects of the traditions. Language cannot be transmitted if it is not understood; therefore, communication is predicated upon learning the language in natural settings through immersion and language spoken at home. This is the process of language socialization.

In this study, Kumeyaay was the first language spoken for nearly all of the participants. Considering the nuances and complexities associated with knowing and using any language, when the language of a Native person is not their first language, the implications for language preservation are exacerbated. The vibrancy of a language is not only measured by how many adults speak it, but also by how many children speak it. The Language Socialization perspective and UNESCO guidelines support this idea given that both frameworks emphasize intergenerational language learning and use (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002). Successful transmission of the language can be measured by intergenerational comfort and proficiency in communication of a language through generations. The primary use of the language in communication between and throughout generations would be a norm if a language would be preserved.

Intergenerational communication using the language was reported by all participants in developing language proficiency. Everyday language use, such as casual conversations or social interactions with family members, was seen as critical in creating an atmosphere for natural language use and to communicate with family members who were unable to speak the non-Native languages. An example of this is children communicating with the grandparents and vice versa. Another example would be a casual conversation between a parent and their toddler; although the language used is simplistic, it is building a foundation for further language development. The difficulty seems to be that many Kumeyaay elderly speakers do not pass on their language skills. This failure to transmit the language poses a challenge to the future revitalization of the Kumeyaay language.

Intergenerational language transmission is important to the continuity of language, and these findings elucidate the difficulties of doing so, such as the lack of fellow speakers experienced by participants who expressed a willingness to pass on their language skills to younger people. It is also necessary to consider the environment. The lack of immersive environments has taken a toll on intergenerational language transmission.

Based on participants' responses and using the UNESCO framework, I argue that Kumeyaay language is critically endangered. According to the UNESCO framework, "Endangerment can be ranked on a continuum from stability to extinction" (UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group, 2003, p. 7). UNESCO identifies five degrees of language endangerment on a scale from five to zero; with five being safe, four unsafe, three definitely endangered, two severely endangered, one critically endangered, and zero being extinct. For example, "safe," five on the scale, indicates that, "The language is spoken by all generations" (UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group, 2003, p. 7). Extinct, or zero, is, "There is no one who can speak or remember the

language” (UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group, 2003, p. 8). Scoring each community based on participants’ responses, I argue that most of the communities in this study fall under scale one, at critically endangered. Six of the reservations are a zero on the scale, indicating being extinct. The following discussion details specific themes that illustrate how and why the communities participating in this study have been categorized as one or zero. The following themes explain community challenges with intergenerational language transmission that place them at critically endangered or extinct. Both the Kumeyaay participants in this study and UNESCO agree.

Participants describe how language was transmitted in the past. For example, being taught by parents, grandparents, and other close relatives helped the participants in this study to use and maintain their language. For instance, one participant reported, “My mom taught me really well since I was a child... I think that I can speak in Kumeyaay better than Spanish. That is what my mom taught me. When I was young, I only spoke Kumeyaay.”

Some interviewees stated that a reason for learning the language was because it was the only language spoken in the household when they were young. Parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, and siblings all played a role in fostering Native language use. An interviewee detailed being compelled to use the language in order to communicate with family members who didn't speak English or Spanish,

We spent a lot of time with my aunt and uncle and they talked a lot. They spoke fluent Indian. We were always with them, so we had to learn. My aunt, she didn't speak English unless she actually had to. We lived with them, so we had to learn. Native language is still being taught by the elders to the younger generation, albeit with slender results. Of the 24 participants, 13 indicated that the younger generations appear to struggle in learning the Native language. As one participant shared,

Sometimes I speak the language to my grandchildren. But they do not hear much. You explain one thing to them, and after a while you talk to them and then they

do not know it anymore. They forget and are already more used to speaking in Spanish.

This may be due to the lack of exposure and reinforcement of the language.

Reinforcement appears to be important in developing proficiency with language use. However, other participants had opposite experiences in sharing the language with their grandchildren. Seventeen of the participants reported that their experiences teaching the language to a younger generation was yielding positive results. It should be noted that their definition of positive results was learning numbers up to 10, colors, and greetings. An example is when participants were asked whether their grandchildren could understand them when speaking Kumeyaay. Participant F responded, “Yes, the young boy speaks it very well. He was telling me in Kumeyaay that it is hot.” Although she described her grandson’s fluency as speaking “well,” this child is a passive speaker – an individual able to understand the language but not able to formulate sentences despite knowing more than most other children in his age group in his community (Kaufmann, 2018). Passive speakers, also called receptive speakers, could be an asset to language learning if they participate in immersion classes or environments. However, passive language knowledge itself does not translate into actual language transmission, in that it is not necessarily generating new speakers.

Culture. In alignment with Language Socialization research and the UNESCO guidelines, the participants in this study reported that the use of Native language is intertwined with culture. Participant W said, “It’s vital. Language is your culture and it’s true when they say when you lose your language, you lose your culture and obviously that could be overstated but truly those words have meaning that you can’t translate.” An example is the Kumeyaay word for “hello.” *Haawka* means more than simply, “hello.” It goes back to the Kumeyaay creation story, when the creator made the sun. The half circle by the cuticle on a fingernail represents the

energy of the sun coming into the body. The mark indicates the individual receiving the soul given by the Creator. The Kumeyaay word for the soul is *Mat how*, or the fire within the body. When one says “hello,” or *haawka*, to another person what one is saying is, “May the fire in your body continue to glow brightly.” This is a blessing that one conveys to another that is embedded in a greeting. If one does not know the language or the culture, then they will miss critical parts of the transmission.

This sentiment echoes what linguistic anthropologists recognized, which is the relationship between everyday language and social structure and cultural system (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). Participant U also had the same view, “Because that’s our beginnings. That’s attached to our religion, in our language. So, we got to know our language to know how all that works for us.” As a singer, language teacher, and storyteller, I remember my teachers would emphasize that a word has many meanings to it. These words are tied into our creation story, which form the base of Kumeyaay epistemology. Without that understanding one would not be accurate in one’s inference when using the language or practicing the culture.

Integral to Native American cultures, is the spirituality associated with ceremonies and everyday life (Chilisa, 2012). For example, in the Kumeyaay culture, there are 22 different song cycles with hundreds of songs in each cycle. Each song is in the Kumeyaay language and each song tells a story. The songs are repetitive and this gives the singer an opportunity to use the language. During ceremonies, such as wakes, the singers will sing all night long without singing the same song twice. All of the songs put together tell a story. Participant S commented,

The Indian language, the Native American language, is special because that’s the language that, as the old timers say, the Creator gave [to] us, and he wants to hear it. Sometimes that’s why I pray in the language to myself. Because the Kumeyaay culture is an oral culture without a formal written orthography, the importance of language use becomes apparent.

A singer who does not speak the language cannot hold the proper intention while simultaneously singing. It is essential that the singer communicate to the spirit world the proper information about the deceased during a funeral ceremony. When a person dies, the duty of the singers is to successfully guide the deceased to the spirit world. Certain songs inserted during the wake ceremony give the deceased directions to go to the spirit world. If the songs are done incorrectly then it is believed the spirit will not be able to depart this world and this could bring about repercussions to the departed, to the family of the departed, and to the community. For the singers, there are protocols that are traditional processes. It is said that a young man, at the age of 14 becomes married to the *halma*, or gourd rattle. This means that he is given the responsibility to carry the songs and the culture. He then became an *ahpok*, or apprentice. At this point the apprentice learns from a singer. All of this is done in the language. The songs are in the language and the repetition of the songs help the apprentice with recall. There are hundreds of songs in the song cycle and it takes years to master them. Participant P shared that this is done through, “Bird singing, peon games. We have a lot of bird singing now. Young generations are taking it up, which makes me feel good.” There has been a sort of revival for the younger generations in the past several years. All 24 of the participants had a similar stance on the younger generation taking up the cultural aspect. Participant V stated:

Well, I think that the youth are doing the right thing right now. They’re learning through the peon songs. I’m hoping that when they stand up or when they play peon and they’re singing those songs, they know what they’re saying. That’s important. The peon game is also part of the creation story. There was a story of twin brothers who fought over a woman. The coyote came to one of the brothers and said that he would help the brother win the woman. The coyote pulled out his bones and gave the brother instructions on how to hide the bones and he would win the woman. The songs were used to upset the other group. They were in the language and each song tells a story.

The teaching of a future singer, an *ahpok*, is an intense process and takes many years.

The apprentice must learn the songs in the proper order in the cycle. The apprentice must also

learn when they are used and for what ceremony. All of this is done in the Native language. Participant P shared, “Before [there] used to be a lot of people who could sing and speak the language. We need to continue singing and teaching other people who want to learn.”

According to several participants, there is a revival of younger people who wish to learn the bird songs in the United States, while in Mexico there is not as much of an interest. For example, Participant P described younger generations participating in peon games and bird singing. He said, “It’s like old times again. In fact, they [tribal members] all performed yesterday night out here. So, it’s coming back to life, the birds singing.”

There are two teachers of bird singing who speak the language and have a desire to teach others in Baja. However, the Native religion in Baja also appears to be more fragmented and more limited in how it is used compared to the United States. Without bird singers, the culture is dead. Bird singing connects the community in a moral matrix that might not be readily apparent to an outside observer, but it is essential to the moral life of the community. It is clearly an asset for language transmission. Hence, revitalization of Kumeyaay language skills might be supported indirectly by community members’ desires to maintain the tradition of bird singing.

Cultural assets can encourage language learning. The games in the Kumeyaay culture are tied to religion and language. Interviewees, like Participant J, referred to the importance of games to the preservation of the culture, “[We] have [our] language, crafts and customs. Also, the Indigenous games are beautiful.” Instructions are transmitted in the language and the games are also tied into the creation story. Games give the players an opportunity to use the language and to learn stories that are part of the Kumeyaay culture. The games also instruct the players on the proper etiquette and how to conduct oneself with others with patience.

It is evident that the current popularity of game playing can be an important cultural asset in transmission of the Kumeyaay culture and language. At the end of a long day of singing, eating, and socializing at a Kumeyaay gathering, huge bonfires are lit and peon teams gather to compete. The setting is intensely attractive, and the lure of the games to the younger generation is an invitation to speak in their Native language. Hence, the support of cultural and social gatherings can be a tool to bring a new generation of speakers together.

Traditional Arts. Similar to learning the cultural songs and games, traditional arts and skills include basket and pottery making. To transmit the cultural traditions, younger generations receive instructions in gathering the material, learn the time of the year to gather, how the accompanying songs are used, the manufacture of dyes and paints, the designs, and how the items are manufactured. This instruction is in the Native language and is also tied to the creation story. Participant A commented, “They have already learned to make baskets. Now, they need to learn the language as well.”

Four participants lamented that even though they are speakers of the language, they do not have a deep knowledge of the cultural aspects associated with the traditions. Participant W stated:

It’s the culture, and if you identify as being Native, you can’t really do that if there’s not a cultural base behind it. To have that cultural base, the language is vital because with that you can’t understand our songs or our games or the traditions. Even basket making which is something I want to learn, I’ve been told that there’s like basket songs that the women used to sing. I would love to know those, and the same for just different activities and our prayers. The language is the essence of the culture and when you think about some of the words, you translate them and it’s like, “Oh, okay. That goes to a story, that’s a creation story, or a story about life and learning lessons.” So that’s why it’s so vital to keep the language.

Basic subsistence skills, like traditional food gathering and preparation, are part of the

Kumeyaay culture that can be recovered with language revival. Conversely, from searching for

plants, nuts, berries, and seeds, along with hunting and fishing, taking part in seasonal activities can reinforce language skills. Contemporary learners can be inspired by participating in and by learning about the science of these skills. Traditional survival skills are embedded in the Kumeyaay culture and are passed on with the language. The Kumeyaay tradition also has components dealing with land management, fire science, and cosmology. It teaches the people about what mainstream culture today identifies as environmental stewardship and sustainability. Language is part of these fields of knowledge. Not only is the content of this information transcribed in language, but also additionally, only a Kumeyaay speaker can capture nuances that defy easy translation. These fields of knowledge are attractive to younger members of the communities. The challenge is to engage them in these areas and use their interest to leverage an equal interest in the acquisition of language skills.

Immersion. The primary way to learn a language is through immersion. The Language Socialization framework focuses on immersion in the mundane and ordinary activities that make up everyday life. The research focuses on those recurrent activities that caregivers engage in with the children of the community. The assumption is that cultural knowledge underlies everyday interactions (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002).

The use of language for the Kumeyaay is vital to communicate life lessons to socialize children. In the past, according to interviewees, as one became a more proficient member of society, more complex instructions were transmitted through stories, songs, and experiences. According to Hinton et al. (2002), the lack of speakers poses a major concern in many Native communities because people normally learn a language primarily through immersion, which is what happens in intergenerational transmission (Factor 1 in the UNESCO guide). Almost none of the participants in this study reported learning the Kumeyaay language in a formal setting,

such as school. All of the participants shared that they learned their primary language and secondary languages through immersion. Immersion is a natural form of learning for all cultures, and is used to gain proficiency in language. All of the participants felt that learning young created a foundation that has stayed throughout their lives. The participants shared that their language proficiency was articulated through their experiences. Participant U described immersion in the following way, “We had to understand it because they were talking to us to tell us what to do.” Other participants report similar experiences. Likewise, Participant J reported “Since I was born... My mother spoke Kumeyaay and we talked in Kumeyaay with her, but, we are losing the tradition.” If transmitting the language through immersion is the primary means of learning, then it will be necessary to create new immersive environments. With few speakers, there are few opportunities for learners to hear it and for it to be reinforced in daily life. This makes immersion problematic.

The immersive experience in the past for the Kumeyaay language occurred at home and had utilitarian purposes, such as instructions for various activities and socializing. For most of the participants in this study, the use of two languages was a norm in the house and was an important part of interpersonal communication. Whether it was Spanish and Kumeyaay in Mexico or English and Kumeyaay in the United States, the non-Native languages eroded Kumeyaay language skills. Interviewees indicated that they no longer were able to effectively communicate in the Native language with their grandchildren. When language use is reinforced, language proficiency is increased. Hence, Kumeyaay speakers, assets in the transmission of the language, are not reinforcing the limited language exposure that their younger family members might have. Language socialization research shows how essential it is for the youth to interact with older and more experienced persons as they acquire the knowledge, practices, and norms in

order to function as a member of one's community (Garrett & Baquedano-Lopez, 2002). Crawford's hypotheses about language loss, first published in 1996, laid out the core role of shared values as essential for language transmission. This ability to communicate allows individuals to pass instructions within the family and to others in the community. Participant I said, "It is like a normal, natural form of learning. They used to ask me, 'bring me water,' 'come and eat,' and 'go to sleep.' That is how we learned." Clearly, older speakers had the benefit of a more immersive language environment than do today's youth.

Almost all of the participants in this study reported that they learned Kumeyaay as their first language. They shared that the language was also used as the primary language in their communities in the past and this contributed to their ability to retain the language. Participant J said: "I have always talked in Kumeyaay and I can't forget it once I know it. Since I was born. My mother spoke Kumeyaay and we talked in Kumeyaay with her. But, we are losing the tradition." Another interviewee had a similar upbringing. Participant P explained, "I learned Indian first. That's all we spoke. When we did speak English [at home], they didn't like it, so they'd go, 'Speak Indian.' When we spoke Indian in school they told us to stop it, [to] speak English." The latter part of the comment was made in reference to the time when the participant attended school.

Participant H related, "Kumeyaay was my first language and I learned Spanish when I was older." What emerges from these interviews is the connection between the home and Kumeyaay language learning. It is evident that intergenerational transmission of a first language was the method of language acquisition for the older generation of Kumeyaay speakers. Language socialization was a dense process, with reinforcement occurring in daily life.

In contrast with the Kumeyaay speakers in this study, all of the participants shared that the younger Kumeyaay who are learning the language today are learning the language as a second language. The data show this to be common to the Kumeyaay on both sides of the border. The elder family members, or other figures in the community, are teaching the language. Participant R described how he and his spouse try to communicate in Kumeyaay,

We talk [in Kumeyaay] when we get the chance. I'll say things, and then she'll pick it up, or if she doesn't understand, I'll explain it to her and tell her in English, then I'll tell her back in Indian.

Here, Participant R indicates to two patterns found in the data related to Kumeyaay as a second language. First, he indicated that he speaks Kumeyaay with his wife when given the opportunity. Second, he explained how he relies on English, her first language, to teach her the second language, which he refers to as "Indian." As individuals are new to the language and just learning, their vocabulary is limited. For example, Participant P shared: "Now a few people can speak, well, a lot of them speak it here, but they say '*Haawka Mememyu temewa?*' 'Hello, how are you?' But they can't make a conversation." Here the participant is indicating that learners whose first language is English know a few words, but are unable to hold full conversations.

Factor 4: Trends in existing language domains. According to the UNESCO framework, Factor 4 (Trends in Existing Language Domains) refers to, "Where, with whom, and the range of topics for which a language is used directly affects whether or not [a language] will be transmitted to the next generation" (UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group, 2003, p. 9). If there are no social events or cultural interactions where elder members of the Kumeyaay communities interact with younger relatives and friends, then the UNESCO framework predicts that language loss will occur. Trends in the existing language are rated on a scale of zero to five. A score of five indicates universal use; four, multilingual parity; three, dwindling domains; two, limited or formal domains; one, a highly limited domain; and zero, extinction.

Table 7 provides the UNESCO Intergenerational Language Transmission scale that can be used to measure the degree of endangerment. It focuses attention beyond the more general endangerment and vitality factors to highlight the degrees of intergenerational language use that are associated with levels of language endangerment.

Table 7: *UNESCO Intergenerational Language Transmission Scale*

Degree of Endangerment	Extent of Intergenerational Transmission
Safe	Language is spoken by all generations; transmission is uninterrupted
Vulnerable	Most children speak the language, but it may be restricted to certain domains (e.g. home)
Definitely endangered	Children no longer learn the language as mother tongue at home
Severely endangered	Language is spoken by grandparents and older generations; while the parent generation may understand it, they do not speak it to children or among themselves
Critically endangered	The youngest speakers are grandparents and older, and they speak the language partially and infrequently
Extinct	There are no speakers left

Note. Table adapted from UNESCO (2003).

This study shows the state of the Kumeyaay language in existing intergenerational use to be critically endangered. The scale also indicates what improvements would have to occur for the next level of security to exist. In order to reverse language loss, it might be necessary to attempt to move directly from the critically endangered stage to the vulnerable stage. School instruction and other immersive language learning experiences could realistically achieve that goal with the proper commitment and effort.

The focus of this analysis was on how language is used, as opposed to how it is not used. Within the Kumeyaay communities, because of the lack of speakers, the universal use of language is nonexistent. For six reservations there are no language use opportunities, thus classifying the Kumeyaay language as extinct. The rest of the reservations in this study exhibit highly limited language use. Evidence in this study demonstrates that the language is critically endangered.

In communities that have few speakers, there is a concern among those speakers about the lack of opportunities to use the language. With few other speakers, it becomes a struggle to remember what they do know. This is an example of language atrophy, and it is the condition on many of the Kumeyaay reservations. This language atrophy appears to exacerbate further attempts to use the language. To illustrate this fact, Participant M shared that, “It is hard to be talking in Kumeyaay because there isn’t a lot of people to talk to. Not a lot of people can speak the language.” This is a common concern among the interviewees who speak the language. With a lack of speakers comes a shortage of opportunities to use the language in different domains. The limited domains where language is used negatively impacts language vitality as well. Participant L said the following about the frequency of Kumeyaay language use, “Here there isn’t anybody to talk to in Indian. The people here just say good morning and good afternoon and that is it. There is no one to talk with in the language.”

This quote speaks underlines the fact that there are not any speakers to converse with outside of basic conversational expressions in limited domains. The speakers struggle to find domains in which use the language, and participants have had to develop strategies for using the language and addressing language loss. Participant A explains:

I still know everything. I speak more Spanish because I do not have anyone to talk to in Indian. Sometimes I speak to them [other community members] in

Kumeyaay, but I just say “*Howka, Moyu?*” and no more. I do not speak to them anymore because they do not know, they do not understand. Sometimes they ask me questions and if I know the answer I give them the answer. If I don’t know the answer, I just ignore them.

This quote is an example of language atrophy. Because of the limited number of speakers with whom to converse beyond daily pleasantries, Participant A exemplifies a retreat to the intrusive language of English or Spanish that many speakers report. When Participant A ignores questions, the other individuals in the conversation might be discouraged from further efforts to communicate in the Kumeyaay language.

In some Kumeyaay communities, speakers are siblings in a family that speaks the language. They can use the language during family interactions. For other speakers, it might be with friends. As these speakers pass away, the opportunity to use the language decreases. Learning their Native language from birth or at a young age is easier for speakers than having to learn it in adulthood. Participant I said,

The problem is that when they were children they never got used to speaking the language. If the older people would have taught them since they were young, right now they would understand it and be able to speak it.

Participant I blamed the older generation for their failure to pass on their language skills. This failure of the older generation is understandable as discussed above; however, it has devastated the transmission of language and the state of the language today. This lack of intergenerational training points to the importance of language immersion programs to substitute today for traditional language acquisition.

If learners are not embedded in a fluent environment, the common way of transmitting language and culture, then language and culture loss are inevitable. In the following quote, Participant D describes the results of not using the language daily, “I wish that everyone could speak it, but they don’t. They are losing the traditions. Just a few old people speak it. Young people can’t speak it.” Not using and practicing the language daily has made fluency more

difficult for individuals. When community members stop using the language with others during the formative years of child development the results can be frustrating for the individual – it will inevitably be a struggle to hear and to replicate the unique sounds of the Kumeyaay language.

Participant F voices this concern:

I don't know, maybe it is because they can't pronounce the words correctly. But, it is easier for the young children to pronounce it. The grown-ups want to speak it, but they can't pronounce it correctly because their tongue is hard.

Participant F speaks to the fact that older speakers trying to learn the language presently are unable to pronounce the different sounds in the language. The struggle to master the sounds that are specific to language learning appears to be a major hurdle for people who want to speak the language.

The lack of language use has also impacted tribal identity. Participant T indicated this connection between language and identity, “We have to practice, is what I'm saying. We have to practice the tribal ways so it'll bring you back. We don't practice that anymore. If we do practice, it's easy, too.” The only way to learn and master a language is to practice it on a regular basis, and Participant T suggests that the revival of tribal knowledge is linked to consistent language usage. Language recovery can also involve cultural recovery.

Fluency. An examination of fluency among the study participants is in order to evaluate nuances in the reported number of Kumeyaay speakers. Fluency refers to the ability of the individuals to carry on conversations in the heritage language. Fluency can exist in a small number of language speakers, even as the language might be in a state of atrophy. The individuals who have identified themselves as fluent in the language report that their proficiency results from being raised and immersed in the language. The following quotes corroborate this condition of fluency. Participant A reported, “I think [my fluency is] about 100% because I spoke the language through my childhood.” Similarly, Participant J stated, “One hundred

percent. I can understand it and can write it too, but not very well. Our language needs letters for the different sounds.” Participant J was referring to specific sounds that are made in the Kumeyaay language that cannot be replicated in either Spanish or English. Neither the English, nor the Spanish alphabet, can be used to replicate those sounds. Continuing to use the language has helped some participants in this study to retain fluency. The issue is finding someone with whom to converse. Participant R stated that language fluency is conditional on fluent companionship, “Well I could rate it at 100% if I have somebody to talk to.”

For others, there appears to be a developmental cutoff for their fluency. With the Kumeyaay people, the transmission of culture is conducted by all members of the community for every individual starting from birth and going through rites of passage. This is similar to Erikson’s eight stages of human development, which was described previously. Kumeyaay culture identifies seven stages of development, which are indicated by the woven belt that holds the baby to the cradleboard. On that belt are seven diamond designs. Each diamond represents a stage in life, from infancy to toddler to child to adolescent to adult to senior and elder. This tangible representation of individual growth, with which many Kumeyaay elders are familiar, is important to understanding language development. A fluency cutoff could be predicted in the cultural tradition of language learners because each stage requires certain tasks to be learned before moving on to the subsequent stage. Perhaps this old way of describing development is roughly accurate. Someone who believes the individual stages are sequentially necessary, might think that language acquisition is too difficult a project to tackle for an older person.

Some of the interview participants gave misleading answers to the question about fluency. The following quote gives an example of this confusing situation. Participant Q answered, “Today? Maybe one.” I responded, “Well when you were young, how would you

rate your fluency?” Participant Q replied, “Probably 100%.” It was apparent during the interview that this individual was following the Kumeyaay tradition of not boasting of what she knew; she was being humble. Her entire demeanor during the interview was one of humility. This was an example of an individual who spoke Kumeyaay fluently and then was sent away to a boarding school. The student was gone for 10 or more years and as a result of a lack of language development opportunities in the boarding school she experienced a developmental cutoff in her Kumeyaay language skills. People who today are elders who attended boarding school are missing a substantial part of language and culture. They might speak the language at the level of a five-year old. Participant G further illustrates this situation, “... right now I think I can speak 50%, more or less, I don’t know. I don’t remember or I never learned some of the older words.” Some speakers rate themselves a lower rate than others. Participant W stated, “I don’t know. Maybe 35%.” There are different reasons why fluency could be lost for an individual, but the most common reason would be that they are simply no longer using the language, therefore they forget or lose their knowledge base.

It is important to acknowledge that the self-report of fluency level is subject to participants’ interpretations. Therefore, I emphasize that fluency of speakers is only one indicator of the state of the Kumeyaay language. All other factors combined help us to understand that the language is critically endangered. Calculating fluency levels is tricky, and self-reporting only offers an approximation. Despite that fact, current fluency levels are low even among active speakers. This lack of fluency acts as a deficit in an assessment of the state of the Kumeyaay language. Additional empirical research might refine the assessment of language skill, but with so few speakers with even partial fluency, and with so few speakers in absolute

numbers, future research might best address the most efficacious teaching methods for reversing Kumeyaay language loss.

Situational fluency. When we move from the question of fluency to examining the specific domains, or situations, in which Kumeyaay speakers report their fluent language use, participants reveal pathways for language learning for non-speakers. Situational fluency refers to a specific set of words or phrases that are used in conversation for a particular situation in a language. Many speakers relate retaining language use for certain situations such as singing or basket making. Others would use language for harvesting materials. Today, one can see situational fluency in contexts of conveying greetings, inviting others into the home, and opening events for the communities. Participant S described these social contexts for language use,

I thought it was great. I enjoyed listening to this language. Many times, at wakes and funerals and fiestas and even at birthday parties. Whenever the family got together in those days, the old folks always talked in the language and I enjoyed listening to it.

Many of the speakers use more of the language in social settings or in gatherings with other speakers.

Participant A reported,

When I talk more is when there are parties. That is when people come from other tribes and I can talk to them in the language. I ask them, "What are you doing? Where are you going?" and we just talk about normal things.

Parties and social gatherings seem to be a time where more conversations in Kumeyaay take place. These social situations present a relaxed opportunity for Kumeyaay language speakers from many communities to come together and use the language. Participant B said, "This year we have had two parties where we got to sing and dance. There was one on October 13, [when] we sang for about five to six hours. Everybody seemed to be happy." The type of singing that Participant B refers to is bird singing. As mentioned earlier, this song cycle is in the Kumeyaay language and each song tells a story. When the dancing starts many singers will tell the group what each song is saying. This explanation helps in reinforcing language use with culture.

Attending language classes also offers learners a social environment to practice their language. Participant W shared, “My use of language is sporadic but [I use it] at home and then in cultural settings, and obviously now in the language class.” Participant W also shared:

At gatherings, tribal functions and we do a lot of that or any time I'm with my kids. I teach them body parts and things like that. When I get together with my sister that is when we talk in Kumeyaay. Sometimes I teach my grandchildren. So, when I get together with people that know it, we do talk in Kumeyaay.

This comment illustrates how some speakers utilize opportunities to use the language in various situations. Others describe how they attempt to use the language in order to teach their family members. The following quote by Participant O reveals an intriguing aspect of Kumeyaay language transmission:

They are very jealous about their language and they don't want to teach it to anybody. They don't want to share the language with other people. The tradition used to be that we were not supposed to share it with anybody. But now there is a necessity to teach it because it is disappearing.

Perhaps the demands of cultural survival can trump older beliefs about the secret nature of language. If guarding cultural and religious traditions from outsiders was essential in the past to maintain their integrity, then it is possible that a cult of secrecy developed around language transmission. However, today the very language is in jeopardy, and widespread participation in cultural activities appears to be essential for future generations of Kumeyaay people to sustain a Native identity.

Because grandparents and parents were generally taken to boarding schools away from the reservation, having a local school is a relatively new domain for the Kumeyaay communities and the focus is generally on learning the dominant language, which in this case is English or Spanish. What impact do mainstream educational institutions have on the Native language? The bombardment of the mainstream language on the people of the communities results in the dominant language becoming commonplace at the expense of the Native language. Can the

communities and the language adapt to these challenges? On a language vitality scale of five to zero, five is dynamic, four indicates a robust language use, three receptive, two coping, one minimal, with zero inactive (See Table 3); most of the communities in this study are at a one, minimal vitality, with six communities scoring zero. The various mainstream media has penetrated both sides of the border. The impact of English language media has been devastating for Native language development. The Kumeyaay language is an afterthought as Native youth now study the dominant languages of English in the United States and Spanish in Mexico. Now, language learning in schools involves developing writing and reading comprehension in a non-Native tongue. This is the case of Kumeyaay people in Mexico who, perhaps inevitably, want to learn English as their second language, after Spanish, rather than learn Kumeyaay.

In summary, Factor 4 (Trends in Existing Language Domains) is measured by the participants' responses to questions about language activity. Their answers to the questions posed in this study indicate that Kumeyaay language usage is limited to very few domains. Indeed, social interactions and practicing traditional cultural arts currently appear to offer the only counterbalance to the incursions of mainstream, dominant language use.

Factor 7: Government and institutional language attitudes and policies. UNESCO factor 7 focuses attention on the attitudes and policies about language revival on the part of governments, educational institutions, and other agencies. Their policies can either promote or discourage Indigenous language use. The UNESCO scale for this factor measures the impact of these organizations' policies on Native language and culture. A score of five indicates equal support for the Indigenous language, four specifies differentiated support, three marks policies of passive cultural and language assimilation, two denotes active assimilation, one, signifies forced assimilation, and zero indicates language prohibition. The Kumeyaay communities on both sides

of the border have struggled with colonial institutional efforts to actively assimilate their members into the dominant culture and to prohibit their language use. The impetus for many of these policies was the mainstream belief that differences between Indian society and culture and that of Europe necessarily indicated Native inferiority (Adams, 1995, p. 6). According to the participants in this study, this attitude was most obvious in the U.S. and Mexican Indian boarding school system.

The U.S. and Mexican governments developed the boarding school system as a way to eradicate Native culture and identity and get Native people to assimilate to the dominant culture (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). The foundational model for boarding schools was the replacement model. It advocated for a rapid assimilation of Natives into mainstream life (Adams, 1995, p. 52). This system focused on the replacement of Native languages and culture with that of mainstream society. In California, this goal was accomplished through active repression of the Kumeyaay language and by outlawing Native religion. The social, economic, and political purpose was the assimilation of the people and the termination of the reservations. In Mexico, the government developed bilingual schools (*escuelas bilingues*) in English and Spanish that had a similar philosophy and policy toward the Native population. The teachers at these schools were Mexican and did not speak the Native language. Rather than attempting to learn the culture and language, the teachers told the students that if they wanted to do well in school then they ought not to speak the Kumeyaay language and should speak Spanish only. The Mexican government lacked the resources and the desire to allocate much funding for these schools. The distance from the communities to the schools was also a concern. Participants N and O related similar boarding school experiences,

We stayed [at school] for five days. That is where we ate and slept. We stayed there from Monday through Friday and then we came back home on Friday. It took us about five to six hours walking. This is why I learned Spanish. The *escuela bilingue* in this case separated Native children from their families and culture by keeping the children away from their families during the week, and by allowing contact only on weekends. The message the children and parents received about Native language use was disparaging. It discouraged the use of the Kumeyaay language and replaced it with the use of the Spanish language exclusively.

In the United States, the boarding school system was even more severe, and the impact of this on language and culture was devastating, as discussed in Chapter 2. Native children were forcibly taken away from their families and homes and placed in a school, many times in a different state. In California, the principal boarding schools were Sherman Indian Boarding School – formerly Perris Indian School – in Riverside (Gonzales, 2002; Keller, 2002; Sisquoc, Trafzer, & Gilbert, 2012; Bahr, 2014), and St. Boniface Indian Industrial School in Banning (Stewart, 2018). The goal of these institutions was to shift language use as a precursor to assimilation. Participant S recalled a boarding school memory as told by a parent, “I know my dad went to Riverside and was taken away [from his home]. They were told not to use their language and I think that’s part of the brainwashing they went through.” Unwittingly, this form of cultural and language replacement was often taken by the students to their home and communities, with the message that the Kumeyaay ways are the old ways and the White man’s ways are the ways of the future. The meta-message was that the Indian is inferior, and – if one wished to have any success – it would be necessary to embrace the White man’s way of life.

Analysis of the data reflected the loss of language use due to the punishment that participants and their families received. When the students returned to the reservations there was a reluctance to use the Native languages. Siblings did not want to speak the language to other

siblings for fear that when it was their turn to go to boarding school that they would be punished. As the survivors of the boarding school system had children, there was a reluctance to teach their children for the same fear. Participant W reinforced this argument by stating:

My grandmother didn't really teach my dad and my uncles the language because she was a product of the boarding school. Still, the end of her life she didn't want to say really a lot of bad things about it. She went to Saint Veronica's. She went to Phoenix Indian School. She didn't want to say a lot of bad things, but she did say they wouldn't let them speak the language.

This example demonstrates the impact of the boarding schools on members of the family and community. I would equate this example to throwing a rock into a pond. The impact of the boarding school is like ripples in the pond – long after the rock is gone, it continues to have an impact. Boarding schools, which we now know were spaces riddled with terrible violence and sexual abuse, extend their impact on Indigenous language and culture long after the policy has shifted.

Even after the boarding school era, schools and institutions continued to devalue the Native language. With non-Native encroachment into Kumeyaay land, and the subsequent interactions, there are inevitable points of friction and a clash in value systems. The non-Natives in the United States and in Mexico placed little to no value on the language and culture of the Kumeyaay, as evidenced by the policies of boarding schools, *escuelas bilingues*, and other policies that were used to discourage language use in order to assimilate Native people and terminate tribes. This marginalization of the Native people caused them to retreat into their own communities. Participants in this study shared the belief that it was not safe to use the language; hence, little of the culture was transmitted. Interviewees consistently support this contention. The following quote displays this perception. Participant V shared, “My mom and my grandma told me that they were forced to speak the English language and were severely punished if they talked in [their Native language].” Schools seem to be a main area where Native people feel

more marginalized. For others, the stigma of being Native was overwhelming. Going to school meant enduring a pattern of abuse that ranged from micro aggressions to open hostility and physical violence.

American Indian children were sometimes separated from non-Indian children for purposes of gaining funding. However, the funding didn't always go toward services to help the Indian children. Participant V described of the daily life interactions in school between Kumeyaays and non-Kumeyaays,

I remember one time that they called all our Indian names... all the White people walked out. They were all looking at us. I think that was a time when they were starting to get funding for all the Indian people. [We] kind of looked at each other and... felt more like they're separating us, just Indians in there.

The separation of the Natives in school is never mentioned in the context of *Brown v Board of Education*, the U.S. Supreme Court decision that established the principle that separate schools for African-Americans can never be equal; separation is inherently discriminatory. The experiences of Native students in special classes or schools, where abuse was rampant, left scars on more than just the children's language skills. Participant V reflects this example of being singled out, by race, for being Native American.

The other difference Natives experienced is economic. There was, and is, an obvious discrepancy in the life styles between the Kumeyaay and non-Indians. The overall disdain for Native people led to many hiding their identity in order to protect themselves from these perceived forms of discriminations. Others experienced similar forms of aggression due to their race. The pressure to conform and assimilate was intense, and it was not limited to the Indian boarding school. The public-school system also presented problems for Kumeyaay students. Participant Q described her experiences in the public-school system by enumerating some personal trials,

Yeah, [they called us] a lot of bad names... we've been in a lot of fights and got kicked out... When I was young at school they wanted me to forget Kumeyaay and to speak in English. But, I never forgot it... Indigenous people have always had to face discrimination from outsiders.”

The statement made by Participant Q illustrates the hostile environment that many Natives had to endure in the school system.

The trauma that the youth had to endure in school and in interactions with non-Indians was not only limited to the school setting. Going to town, buying items from the store, visiting a park, a restaurant, or the cinema all presented the potential for further exposure to bigotry. Participant Q recalled the following experience, “They made fun of us. Dirty Indians and niggers, they called us Kunilly (niggers).” This is yet another example of a hostile environment that Participant Q had to endure because she was Kumeyaay. This overt aggression on the part of mainstream society has had a profound impact on individuals. It has contributed to feelings of an unsafe environment. Individuals experiencing this discrimination can be pushed to hide their identity as a form of self-preservation. Speaking the Kumeyaay language was frowned upon by non-Indigenous individuals and thus, suppressing one’s own language may have been a way to avoid further discrimination.

Experiences with discrimination were not isolated to the United States. Mexico also has a history of racist policies. Mexican culture, as a byproduct of Spanish colonization, extolled the superiority and supremacy of European culture and has viewed Indigenous cultures as backwards and people as subhuman. The impact of this belief has created a sense of caution and mistrust for many Kumeyaay toward outsiders. Participant N said,

I learned to speak Spanish when I was about 14 years old. Before this I only spoke Kumeyaay. I was always quiet because I was embarrassed to speak in Spanish. For example, if we went to a party, I would get in trouble if I spoke in Kumeyaay.

They were chastised by Mexican teachers if they spoke their language and the messages transmitted to them were used to compel them to cease using their language and adopt the mainstream language.

Factor 8: Community members' attitudes towards their own language. Attitudes towards the language differ among the members of the community. The use of a language might promote a sense of pride and nationalism. It might be seen as a means of demonstrating sovereignty. Some individuals have strong convictions about using and promoting the language. Others have a negative view about the language, such as being ashamed of it or believing there is no use for it any longer, while some are completely indifferent. Using the UNESCO scale to grade the Kumeyaay community members' attitudes toward their language, this study scores them at a one. Only a few members support language maintenance. Other individuals are indifferent to, or might even support, language loss. Perhaps surprisingly, six communities score a zero which indicates that no one cares if the language is lost; all prefer to use the dominant language.

Embarrassment and reluctance to use language. The absence of a desire to utilize the language is a concern that affects the ability of both language speakers and learners to effectively develop language acquisition and proficiency. Despite the many youth who now have the desire and determination to learn the Kumeyaay language, learning any new language is difficult, and some do not follow through on their intentions for different reasons. Many have difficulty pronouncing the words and when they attempt to use the language the struggle can be insurmountable. During classes, many students will follow the path of least resistance and answer back in the mainstream language. Other prospective students have difficulty finding a person who speaks the language, and they might have to go to another community in order to

learn. For many individuals, rather than looking for a teacher, the path of least resistance might be to stay safe and not do anything. When asked about younger people not wanting to learn the language, Participant A lamented:

I think that they do not try to learn it. They need a person who can talk to them constantly for them to grasp the words. But there are not many people to talk to. Yes, they have to work a little harder. They didn't want to listen to old people and follow their suggestions... they don't follow their guidance. They don't want to talk a lot because they are embarrassed or something like that. People who choose not to learn the language and culture are discounting not only their language, but also Native epistemologies. Instead, they embrace the language and culture of the mainstream society and create a void in their cultural knowledge. Because of their lack of knowledge, they are unwilling or unable to transmit this knowledge to their own children. This hesitation or refusal has led to a substantial part of language and cultural knowledge being lost or becoming dormant. As individuals attempt to learn the language and reverse language shift, many individuals – who would normally be surrounded by resources and support from the community – are now finding a lack of either and they may find the attitude of community members to be one of indifference.

Some people know and speak the language but they make the choice to not use it, or deny their knowledge of it. The choice not to use the language appears to be shame-based; this attitude affects whole communities. This shame differs from the previously mentioned attitude of humility about language proficiency. The modesty of some speakers about their language skills is different from the speakers who directly attribute their lack of use to embarrassment about the language. This embarrassment comes from their reluctance to be identified as an Indian. They fear that being perceived as Native would indicate inferiority to other people in mainstream culture; therefore, they opt not to use the language. The impact of this continues to negatively impact efforts to use the language in many communities. This internalized shame can

also discourage speakers to attempt to use the language, especially if there is no desire to use the language. Participant P noted, “Here in [our community] everybody can understand it, but they don’t speak it. They say that they don’t know [how to speak], but they do. They just don’t want to speak it because they are embarrassed.” There is an embedded reluctance to use the language within many communities. Within communities, individuals or families choose whether or not to use the language. The decision to speak Kumeyaay is ultimately the responsibility of the speakers.

Embarrassment about competence also seems to be a common issue. The following informant speaks to the difficulty that many community members have had when they did not learn the language while growing up. As previously mentioned, later in life when one tries to use the language, the distinctive sounds that one needs to make are missing and they must master those in order to be able to effectively use the language. The following quote by Participant G supports this idea:

When they are young they don’t speak it and when they get old they have a different accent. This is why they don’t like it, I believe. For example, if I was learning English and I can’t pronounce it correctly, I would not say it. Because they are not used to speaking the language and can’t pronounce the words. They do understand it, but they don’t talk that much.

Using English as an example, this quote by Participant G illustrates how speakers struggle to pronounce words when they do not learn the language at a young age. Her experiences highlight the difficulty that individuals have when learning a language. When someone is attempting to accomplish a task, such as learning and gaining proficiency in language use, many factors come into play. One factor is self-esteem. Learning a language amounts to risk-taking. One opens oneself to ridicule when making faulty sounds, and this fear appears to compel individuals to stay safe. If one is not supported, then one might simply disengage from the learning process.

Although many elders see a lack of interest in language from adults and the younger generation, many of them also believe that if the language is going to survive, efforts must be focused on the youth. Participant L addressed these concerns and the language speakers' observations on adult language learning efforts, "The young adults don't really care about the language and don't participate [in classes] as much. But the [little] children are more willing to learn and learn faster." Participant L is referring to a government-funded program where the language is taught for one hour, one day a week. Her observation is that the younger the learner, the keener the learner is to participate in language activities. As the students grow older there appears to be more reluctance to participate.

The introduction of casinos has also created a culture shift, and it appears that many of the youth who are from gaming tribes are focused on immediate gratification instead of cultural preservation. The gaming industry was developed in order to address the dire poverty and marginalization that was and still is impacting many Kumeyaay communities. Although the revenues have increased the standard of living for many individuals, the impact on the culture and language has been a point of concern for many people who have grown up in the time prior to Indian gaming. Participant R expressed this concern, "No, the parents won't teach them. They don't care, either. Since the [casino] money came into this place, it just ruined everything." This quote illustrates Participant R's, and others' views, that many community members have become accustomed to the culture of casino revenues and are immersed in the lifestyle that it entails. This sets a false impression of Indian culture because if it wasn't for the Kumeyaay language and culture, then there would be no acknowledgement by the federal government of the tribe's sovereignty. Essentially, there is a paradox in that language and culture lead to

acknowledgement, but the byproduct of Indian gaming as a result of this recognition has led to members being apathetic to learning about their culture.

Interaction with non-Kumeyaay: Marriages to outsiders. For language to be learned it must be transmitted. Typically, language is transmitted through the family. This is a natural way of language learning that traditionally takes place at home through interactions with family members. However, if only one of the spouses speaks the language, then this creates its own challenges and opportunities. If a non-Kumeyaay spouse is willing to learn the language, then the Kumeyaay language has the reinforcement that is needed to have learning take place. This is true if there are few to no other opportunities to use the language. However, if the spouse has no desire to learn or use the language, then the opportunities for its use become scarce. In regards to language loss, participants noted that the marriage of Kumeyaay with non-Kumeyaay has impacted the use of language. If the partner does not reinforce the language in the home, then this appears to be an obstacle in language retention. Participant T expressed his frustration with his failure to teach his own children:

No. That was funny about my children. I have two kids, my son and my daughter. Of course, their mother, she was a *mat hakai* (person of mixed tribal groups). I tried to teach them but their mother just didn't really cooperate, you know? Then I tried to teach my kids, but my kids, they didn't want to learn.

They just wanted to answer to whatever I said. They didn't want to try.

This quote echoes experiences by other speakers who reported that people in mixed marriages decide whether or not they will use the language. The spouse of Participant T was a mixed Paiute /Quitsan who grew up in the foster care system and only spoke Spanish. Participant T reported that although he attempted to teach the language to his children, he did not receive support from his spouse. It appeared that the parents held conflicting views on the value of Kumeyaay language use and this impacted the children's exposure to the language and contributed to their lack of desire to learn it.

At times, the lack of Kumeyaay people marrying other Kumeyaays has been due to the lack of available Kumeyaays. The Kumeyaay custom is to not marry a blood relative no matter how distant. This leads to having relationships with non-Kumeyaays – who may not understand the language and the culture. As this continues to take place, the impact on the culture can be profound. Participant P expressed the impact of marrying non-Kumeyaays, with the comment, “All the real Indians are gone. There’s a lot of Indians married non-Indians.” This quote by Participant P illustrates the difficulty in finding a spouse who is a Kumeyaay. Fewer opportunities to find suitable partners means fewer opportunities to use the language and for others to hear and learn the language.

Others reported similar beliefs about marrying outside. Participant A, for example, shared:

Here the people are marrying the boys and girls from outside, Mexicans. Not from here because we are all relatives. That is the main reason why this is happening. The ladies speak Spanish to their children at home. Although one speaks the language to them, but their mother speaks to them in Spanish. The moms talk more to their children than their dads. Since the father works all day, he only speaks to them in the evening or in the morning, speaking in Spanish rather than in Indian.

The quote by Participant A reflects his experiences with marriage. He married a Mexican woman and had to support his family by working most of the day. His wife did not speak Kumeyaay and was not inclined to learn due to the fact that everyone in the community spoke Spanish. Therefore, she used Spanish exclusively with the children. Since she was with them most of the time, they learned Spanish as a first language. Other informants shared similar beliefs on the reason for language loss. Participant B stated, “It is our fault. The problem is that our people marry people from outside, Mexicans. If your husband/wife can’t understand Kumeyaay then you have to speak in Spanish to them.”

Lack of desire to learn. The concern from many speakers was the ambivalence of non-speakers to use the language. The causes appear to derive from a number of reasons, from embarrassment to a lack of value for the language. The following informants are from a community that has no resources on the land base. The tribal members were compelled to move into the outlying communities in order to find employment. This diaspora has impacted the cohesion of the community and has also negatively impacted efforts to have language classes.

Participants N and O explained that their community has had to migrate to the outlying communities in order to find employment, due to the lack of resources. The impact on the tribal community is a breakdown of tribal cohesion and the desire to learn the language is replaced by the dominant language and culture due to the immediate monetary, educational, and practical values they represent. Why this community breakdown is happening and its impact on learning is a concern. The community cohesion issues have implications for language retention. The learning of a language is dependent on not just the speaker's knowledge, but also the desire of the student to learn. When language shift has taken place, the community replaces the Native language for the mainstream language. The use of a language reflects its perceived utility. If people see that it has no value, then it will be replaced. Participants N and O offer us some context for understanding this phenomenon:

I don't really see any interest. At our meeting they only speak in Spanish. They never solve any problems, they always end up with disagreements or an argument. When they get together they start to fight and nothing gets solved. The problem is that our community doesn't want to learn the Kumeyaay language. They don't show any interest in learning the language.

Participants N and O articulated that when their community replaced the Kumeyaay language and culture with that of the dominant culture, the impact on the community was the breakdown of tribal cohesion. Without tribal cohesion, the traditional cultural practices that the Kumeyaay language supports, such as respect for elders and allowing one person at a time to speak, are not

being taught. Traditional rules for discussion in the community are being replaced by a mimicking of features of a non-Native government, which in this case is the local *ejido* (Mexican community land holding) government system.

Another reason for lack of interest in learning the language is related to the distractions that are ongoing within and outside the community. Non-cultural activities have an influence on the youth and contribute to their lack of desire to learn the language. One example is, again, of the gaming tribes. Gaming revenues have led to members receiving per capita income. This gives individuals opportunities to enjoy a standard of living that many people would envy. However, this new wealth has impacted a number of tribal members who have no desire to learn the language and the very tribal culture that has made their wealth possible. Participant R shared this concern:

The state of the language... Shit, I'd rate it zero. Nobody knows how to talk. I wouldn't know how to describe it! The community doesn't care! I don't know how to explain that... oh hell, they don't care. They just don't. They'd rather go do their thing, and that's it. It makes you wonder what's going to happen in the future. Because like I said, they get money, they run around, they don't have time for us [older people]. They're out there either smoking dope or doing this or doing that.

The quote by Participant R elucidates the challenges that are faced by members of the community who are attempting to teach the language and the culture. He not only has to deal with a lack of speakers, but the language and culture must compete with the draws of the mainstream society and the influence that it has on the community members. The change in value systems, along with the temptation to use illicit drugs, continues to play a part in the lack of desire to use the language. As language speakers pass through natural attrition and die, language and cultural knowledge also disappear.

Some individuals know the language, but for some reason choose not to use it. The desire to use the language is a personal choice. As stated earlier, for one to use the language, one

must see that there is value in it. Encroachment from two dominant cultures have stressed the superiority of English and Spanish language and culture, sending the message that Native language and culture are inferior. The result is that there are fewer and fewer people who want to use the language.

Participant I shared his view, “They should speak it, but they don’t because they don’t hear it. There are a few that can understand it, but they can’t speak it. They don’t want to use it.” The quote by Participant I illustrates the frustration many speakers have towards tribal members who chose – of their own volition – not to use the language and, in effect, contribute to language extinction. As stated earlier, an individuals’ decisions about language use reflect conscious or unconscious decisions to allow language shift to replace the Kumeyaay language in favor of mainstream languages.

Speakers on both sides of the border have expressed the concern of ongoing language shift. Elders fear for the future of their language since there are many passive speakers and even more non-speakers. Participant A lamented, “... we are already old, and soon we are going to die. If the one who knows dies, then everything is gone and the Indigenous city dies.” Participant A has seen a shift in language use from when he was a child; when everyone in the community spoke to now when only two individuals in his community still use the language. He reported that although he is hopeful, there is also a lack of a program to teach the language in his community and it appears that there are limited resources to address this concern.

The concern over the dwindling number of speakers was shared by almost all of the individuals who were interviewed. All of the speakers learned through immersion and the loss of speakers equates to a loss of opportunities to learn the language. In order to reverse language shift, the target group, which are the children, must learn through some type of immersion;

however, the dwindling number of speakers limits opportunities for this to be achieved. Participant G offered his opinion on this matter:

I would like to keep talking and to keep teaching to the kids or anybody. I would talk to them and explain it to them so that they don't stop talking in Kumeyaay. When all the older people die, then there is not going to be more Kumeyaay. I don't want our traditions to disappear. The young generation needs to learn it, but they can't speak it because they don't hear the older people talking in Kumeyaay. If they were always listening, then they would learn.

Participant G's reflection on this concern illustrates the cultural and language damage that took place, the gap that took place with one or two generations who cannot speak the language, the hope that the children can help revive the language and cultural traditions, and with that, bring back tribal cohesion. At the present time, the attitude of many tribal members is focused more on developing skills of the mainstream culture in order to navigate through this society rather than revitalizing tribal knowledge.

Research Question 2: How do the Nation, communities, and individuals think about using language assets to reverse its moribund status?

Language loss is a process with many variables. It is a gradual process that is influenced by both internal and external factors. Language revitalization is also a process. It requires first identifying the reasons for language loss then, by utilizing cultural and material assets, developing a strategic plan to reverse language shift. The focus of question one was on the Kumeyaay speakers' perception of the current state of the language, which they – and I – found to be critically endangered. This section answers question two – if a lack of intergenerational transmission and low number of speakers correctly predicts the atrophy of the Kumeyaay language. The answer to question two is, yes. Both parts of the study aim to identify the potential practices that could be used in developing effective language programs. First, by inventory of current elder speakers' perceptions and suggestions for language transmission, and

secondly, by considering new resources for language transmission. This study reflects, extends, and affirms the findings of Crawford's research on language shift in the Navajo, Hualapai, Pasqua Yaqui, and Mississippi Choctaw Indigenous communities.

Factor 4: Trends in existing language domains. UNESCO Factor 4 focuses on the trends in existing language domains, such as when it is used, with whom it is used, and the range of topics in which it is used. Since there are several reservations spread between two countries, it is not unusual that dialectical differences have emerged. Sometimes, those dialectical differences are so pronounced that speakers from different regions are unable to communicate within the existing domains, greatly limiting when and with whom the language is used. Perpetuation of an endangered language is dependent upon the ability to teach it and learn it. Typically, teaching and learning the language is dependent upon written and spoken resources that are standardized. In the absence of standardization, there has to be an understanding and acceptance of differences. Differences in Kumeyaay dialects pose serious challenges to language revitalization.

The Kumeyaay language is broken down to northern, central, southern, eastern, and desert dialects. In the past, there was no U.S.-Mexican border to separate Native speakers. The Kumeyaay people were able to travel freely to neighboring communities to visit and engage in trade and other activities. In addition to border restrictions, the governmental creation of reservations contained and isolated individual population groups. The result of confinement of Kumeyaay speakers to their communities has led to the lack of opportunities to experience Kumeyaay language diversity. Speakers today have difficulty understanding different dialect speakers from other communities, as noted by Participant U:

We do understand there's differences in the language from our reservation and some of the other reservations that speak very similar to us... I did experience one

class I didn't understand. What they were doing was more formal and I kind of just ducked out of it because I didn't [understand]. Although Participant U is a proponent for language revitalization, she appeared to struggle with the language speakers of a different Kumeyaay dialect. Rather than attempting to connect with the commonalities, she appeared to focus on the differences. The formal classroom setting appears to have also played a part in her reluctance stay and participate in the session. Participant U learned the language through immersion. Although she has rejected a classroom setting, her language knowledge would be valuable in developing pedagogy to address Kumeyaay revitalization.

Differences in dialect between the different reservations have caused confusion and difficulty for some individuals who are attempting to learn the language. Many individuals, who would previously have learned from their family members, now have to learn from speakers from different communities. This can cause confusion for the learner, as not speaking the families' dialect can be a source of concern, and even hostility. More positively, some individuals have had to replace voids in their language vocabulary with phrases from different dialects. This blending of dialects has been a way to increase one's language proficiency. Participant W discussed the use of other Kumeyaay dialects in order to strengthen language use, "We can't put each other down because there's like sub-dialects and different families said things different ways. At some point, you just have to say, look, yeah maybe it's a mixture, but wouldn't you rather speak that than nothing?" Participant W's quote illustrates the dilemma that many speakers have in maintaining fidelity to their own family dialect and simultaneously recognizing the necessity of adapting what has been lost in one's own dialect with phrases from another dialect.

These dialect differences can discourage some of the youth from wanting to learn the language. There is a natural tendency to want to speak one's own dialect, and if the state of the Kumeyaay language were vibrant, then that would not be an issue. However, when the language is critically endangered, this mindset has the potential to hinder any efforts to revitalize the language. However, there are people who have taken risks and are utilizing other language speakers as a resource. Participant W suggested that when practicing and trying to learn the language, speakers may need to be more accepting of the different dialects, "... whether it's the elders or the young kids, who say, 'Oh, that's not the way we say it.' I think getting over that his huge."

This statement by the participant articulated what would amount to attitudes regarding language use and the need for a paradigm shift among speakers and learners in order to redefine the Kumeyaay language, utilize language assets, and develop capacity for the purpose of reversing language shift. A strong argument for the inclusion of words and phrases from the various Kumeyaay dialects could be built on the very pattern and the distribution of the people on Kumeyaay land. The Kumeyaay are people of the ocean, valleys, mountains, and the desert. The communities residing in close proximity to the ocean have cultural and language knowledge for this particular area. The same could be said for the communities in the valleys, mountains, and desert. Due to isolation, many speakers have lost the language for the other areas. The bringing together of the various speakers not only brings in language not used by other communities, but it also brings in pieces of knowledge that have been forgotten by other communities; thus, this benefits the nation as a whole.

There are language resources, such as language workbooks and dictionaries, that have been published, but those too have different dialects and different pronunciations. The need for

teaching one's own dialect is a source of pride, and this has been a motivating factor in developing grassroots language programs. Some individuals have seen some of the language publications and have opted to teach from their own memory. Participant U offered the following example, "We know that there's different words in there that are different than what we say... There's words that we know, that aren't even in that book... We're sticking to that." This comment from Participant U illustrates her desire to teach what she learned from her family, and highlights the desire to not lose the knowledge that was transmitted to her by her community. At the time of this study, she was working with her cousin, another elder, to provide classes in her community.

Successful language environments. Learning how the remaining speakers of Kumeyaay use the language, and in what context, gives one a clearer insight on how to utilize these patterns to develop an intervention that would promote immersion. The home was and is a place where language is first heard and learned. The process of cultural socialization, mediated by language, first occurs there. This ongoing theme of the interviewees of creating a safe place for the speakers that replicates the home to keep the language alive is noteworthy.

The majority of current speakers reported that they use it on a daily basis. For example, Participant G, shared, "Yes, every day, if they understand me or not, I speak it." Participant G divulged her commitment to use the language. For the participant, the language has been a part of her and her culture. She makes traditional baskets and cooks, and utilizes the language in these contexts. The connection between language and culture is an important part of language use and transmission. Language not only communicates facts and feelings, but also preserves the meaning of traditional songs and stories. How does a language speaker and a cultural knowledge keeper manage to use the language in an environment without much support? Meeting this

challenge requires creative adaptability. As noted, one speaker uses the language whether or not people understand. Another participant, Participant B, reported similar use, “I practice every day, I talk and sing in Kumeyaay. Yes, even though I’m by myself, I pretend that there is other 10 or 15 people around me. I sing and dance.” Kumeyaay song cycles have hundreds of songs, and when one is singing, then one is using the language. These songs not only reinforce the language for the singer, but also tell stories and teach the songs for the listeners. Speakers can also use Kumeyaay in social settings, such as giving opening words at the start of weddings, wakes, births, inaugurations, film series, or historical commemorations.

Some speakers are lucky enough to have living siblings who are fellow speakers. Participant F provided an example for this, “I speak with [my sister] daily, she can speak it, but she has trouble hearing. The only time that I speak it is when [my sister] comes. We speak only in Kumeyaay. Sometimes every two days, it is often.” Participant F shared examples of the continued use of the language among family members. This persistent use of the language demonstrates the resilience of many language speakers in their daily routines.

Other individuals use the language for spiritual connection. There is a saying that goes like this, “How can the Creator understand us if we don’t use the language that the Creator gave us?” Participant S described using the language in a variety of situations, “Sitting here, talking to the dogs, going through my mind... [sometimes] I pray in the language.” The quote by Participant S, who is also a retired minister, reflects the reverence that he has for the language. On a number of occasions, I have heard Participant S give invocations or benedictions in the language.

I remember an elder telling me that our language is different from English or Spanish. In our language, we speak from the heart. The following quote comes from a participant who went

to visit another elder in the hospital. She described her visit as one of great happiness because they both spoke in Kumeyaay, “When I went to the hospital to see her, over there, I didn’t talk to them in English, I only talked Indian and she was real happy.” The quote illustrates the value of using the language. Her use of it with a terminally ill individual brought joy to this person and also gave her a sense of cultural connectivity as she prepared herself for closure of this life, and she prepared to begin her next journey into the spirit world.

Some speakers take every opportunity to share Kumeyaay. Many participants volunteer their time at the community schools and are eager to share their knowledge to others. Some actively look for other speakers for the opportunity to use the language. Participant E said, “I speak all the time with the people that can understand me. If someone can understand me, I talk to them. I’m a volunteer at the school. I translate the stories from Spanish to Kumeyaay for the students.” The participant’s comments illustrate her determination to teach what she knows to the younger generations. She volunteers her time in her community, and is a strong advocate for language use and revitalization efforts. This activity puts into practice the desire that many language speakers indicate they have to revitalize the Kumeyaay language.

Passive speakers. Although there are few speakers, and many non-speakers, there is a group in between who understands the language but cannot speak. This presents opportunities for developing language speakers by utilizing these passive speakers and developing them as language users. Participant G shared her opinion on this issue, “Yes, they can understand it, but they can’t speak in Kumeyaay like I can. All of my sons understand it, but they answer in Spanish.” People who can understand the language but do not speak the language are known as passive speakers. This group has struggled using the language in particular with the sounding of certain sounds that are particular to the Kumeyaay language.

This group appears to be the children of the language speakers. For some reason they did not complete their language development. One possibility could be a language block due to language use being discouraged, which may have stemmed from the language speakers themselves. For whatever the reason for the difficulty, it is apparently widespread. Participants N and O said, “Even if they don’t answer in Kumeyaay, I speak to them and they understand it and answer back in Spanish... Sometimes they say a few words in Kumeyaay, but they can’t have a full conversation.”

Factor 7: Institutional language attitudes and policies.

Tribal Policies. How each community addresses language shift has been a concern in many Kumeyaay communities. Tribal governments are not consistent in their language training programs, and there is little coordination among individual Kumeyaay bands (triblets). Some tribes have taken an active role in developing and supporting language programs, while others give the issue of addressing of language loss a low priority. Some communities simply do not pay any attention to the issue. Participant T’s direct assessment was frank:

You’re committing suicide when you don’t learn. You don’t want to do it, and the tribal leaders don’t say, “Hey, we’ve got to learn.” They’re not saying it either, because they don’t give a damn about learning. They just want to get up there and make the money.

Participant T reflects the frustration of the lack of tribal governmental support. He speaks about the low priority that is given to developing language programs. The community that the participant is a member of has two operational casinos, and – although the resources for language development are available – there is no language support from the tribal government. A desire for a language program or school was a common request among those who were interviewed.

The challenge of language development is not only getting support from the community, but also obtaining additional funding from federal sources. Developing the infrastructure to

create a viable training facility can be difficult at many levels. Many communities lack access to these types of resources. However, the long-term benefits for these investments can be substantial when it comes to language revitalization. Participant A recalled, “They have tried to teach the kids, but they still do not know it.” Participant A went on to explain the belief that language learning programs offered today are ineffective and, in order to reverse language shift, the program must focus on the children, be offered almost daily, and must be sustained if it is to develop actual proficiency with language use. This type of language program costs money.

Having resources available to community members is important for efforts to revive the language, even if initially there seems to be little interest. There is a Kumeyaay saying that trying to revive a language is like trying to light a wet log. It can be frustrating, but if one is persistent the log eventually will light. Participant U expressed this concern, “Offer it to people who want to learn. Like classes, you know? I don’t know what else would make it easier right now, in this day and age. Just have it so you could offer it to people.” The interviewee alludes to the issue of a limited interest. Although there might be few people taking the opportunity to learn the language, having a few people willing to utilize language-learning resources could help to create a critical mass of speakers for continued language transmission in the future.

Integrating language into schools. School systems might offer the single most promising institutional asset for Kumeyaay language recovery. Although in the past they were instruments of Native language repression, now they could hold the key to heritage language revitalization. In order to address language loss and revitalization, many of the participants in this study shared the desire to develop pedagogy to address and reverse language shift. Many participants look to developing a language program and implementing it in the school system. The following quote reflects this belief. Participants N and O suggested, “To have

classes and to teach them the vocabulary, they would learn a lot in one or two years. It is hard, it is not easy.”

The assessment made by the participants describes the belief that, in order to address language loss, it is imperative to expose the students to the language. The participants acknowledge that it is not an easy task and it will take time, perhaps years, to develop proficiency; however, they believe that there will be progress in these endeavors. Participant B related his experience in teaching that language, “I have been a teacher to young and old people, and the state paid me for it. [Now] the government doesn’t give us any support. I’m a volunteer at school.” Even with modest funding, the desire to use what is available demonstrates the strong desire to teach the language and develop speakers. One of the difficulties in reversing language shift is the time allotted in order to develop language proficiency. Although Participant B related that the limited classroom time is a concern, the language teacher is doing what he can. Something is better than nothing. If these language classes could be extended, then this could give the students a better opportunity to develop proficiency.

In the absence of sufficient funding, some other participants shared the importance of collaboration and pooling of resources in order to address the issue of language loss and take steps towards language revitalization. Participant W suggested, “The way our tribes out here at least are situated, there’s enough proximity where people can come together not too far away, and just to work collaboratively to bring those programs [so] that every kid has the opportunity.”

Many of the language speakers have hope that language revitalization efforts can be made by the use of the existing resources available such as on-site tribal supported schools. Others believe that it is necessary to develop a pedagogy that focuses on language revitalization. Many communities have attempted to develop programs with limited success. The programs

have focused on third party communication such as teaching colors, numbers up to 10 and greetings. The problem with this is that the language instruction plateaus and it usually cycles and begins again. The goal of this model is not fluency, which is essential to language revitalization. Another common suggestion from participants is the importance of collaboration and pooling of resources in order to address the issue of language loss and take steps towards language revitalization.

A number of informants shared that the children enjoy learning the language and that they offer an opportunity for future language transmission if there were resources to teach the language. Many participants express a belief that a culturally responsive pedagogy implemented into the existing school system the youth attend would have positive results. More childhood exposure to the language would start the reversal of language shift. The following quote by Participant F supports this belief, “The kids do like the language. At school, if they are going to use the bathroom or they are going to eat, they say it in Kumeyaay.” Participant F observes that given a supportive environment and the resources, the target group will use the language. Schools, with their teaching mission, provide the ideal environment for language learning. The youth spend most of their days in school. If Kumeyaay language classes were to be incorporated in schools, then the children would have more opportunities to use the language. Some language speakers have the support of the community and the school system. Teachers, like Participant C, have seen the benefits in having a cultural component integrated into their teaching method. Participant C said, “Yes, I do teach them. Their teacher at school wants us to teach the language to our children. We teach them the name of the animals or about herbs and their uses.” This quote illustrates how traditional community members have adapted the use of an established institution, in this case a school. By partnering with the teachers, they are not only teaching the

Kumeyaay language, they are also transmitting plant knowledge to the students who otherwise might not get the opportunity to learn this traditional knowledge. Here is an opportunity for hope about intergenerational cultural transmission in the future.

Though rare, a promising practice and motivation for learning the Kumeyaay language in school is the requirement to learn a foreign language in school. Participant L said:

An opportunity is this [Kumeyaay] class where both of my kids have been approved to get not just elective credit but language credit... As somebody that has a passion for education, we always tell the kids you don't have to choose between culture and school. You can do both, but you have to do it in a smart way... this is exactly the smart way to do it... to ensure that we have equal footing. I mean our language is Native to this land and there's no reason it shouldn't be accepted.

This quote by the participant shows the opportunities that are possible when schools work with tribal tertiary institutions. Such is the case with Kumeyaay Community College. This institution teaches language classes and offers these classes for high school students who elect to attend a Kumeyaay language class rather than another foreign language class. The student receives credit and satisfies the requirements for a foreign language. This also bridges a gap for many institutions that lack resources to teach Native language and cultural classes.

Factor 8: Community members' attitudes.

Activism/sovereignty and self-determination. According to the UNESCO guidelines, self-determination and sovereignty are critical issues in the preservation of Indigenous languages. For the Kumeyaay Nation, the protection of land, water, cultural sites, along with religion and language is a priority. All of these – and more – are aspects of culture that the Kumeyaay Nation language speakers believe must be protected. Formal protection must extend to preservation efforts. These issues are a concern for the Kumeyaay people on both sides of the border. Because of the separation of the Nation by the border, the issue becomes more complex. However, strategies to address these concerns are available. There are three types of strategies:

Language Revival, such as in the case of Hebrew; Language Fortification, which is to increase the presence of the non-dominant language; and Language Maintenance, which is to support the stable use of the language – in this case, in both the United States and Mexico. This study shows that there are community members who support the importance in revitalizing the language and its place in the greater picture of tribal sovereignty and self-determination.

Language use could be used to unify communities on both sides of the border. This development of a trans-border community of Kumeyaay speakers could have a positive impact on Native Kumeyaay identity and tribal sovereignty. It is possible to bring language speakers from both sides of the border together to share their particular customs and traditions. The logistical issues are minor compared to the need to overcome reluctance among individual residents of reservations on the U.S. side of the border to acknowledge their common identity.

Participant M explained, “Since this is an Indigenous community that speaks Kumeyaay, there is going to be a stronger autonomy. I could keep helping the children so that they don’t lose their tradition and everything that has to do with Indigenous people.” Participant M went on to explain that they feel connected when they speak the language with others. The interviewee stated that although many people could not speak the language, there is still pride in one’s Indigenousness. However, when one can speak the language, it then becomes a uniting factor that can lend energy to connect communities on both sides of the border.

Losing the language completely also means that the culture and traditions will be lost. Many Native people view active use of the language and culture as going beyond a renaissance. Using the language is seen as paramount to asserting one’s own tribal identity and sovereignty and it is a counter balance to the threat brought by the dominant language and the pressure to assimilate. If the dominant culture sends a meta-message that the Kumeyaay people have been

conquered, the use of the language amounts to defiance – the Kumeyaay people are a sovereign people who continue to resist any attempts towards assimilation. One participant said, “... we will wipe ourselves out of existence if we don’t learn the language and culture.” He went on to explain his belief that the language and culture are essential in order to decolonize oneself and one’s community. He identified self-esteem as a concern, and he commented on the need to embrace the language and culture to develop a sense of pride – not just for oneself, but also for the health of the community. The participant emphasized that without practicing the language and culture, the result would be equated to suicide for the community. In his own life, he sets an example by using language and culture to send the message that he is not conquered. His belief that language use is a form of resistance is crucial to communicate to younger Kumeyaay language learners. He believes when it comes to developing resistance strategies, language usage gives strength to tribal members to overcome the micro and macro aggressions that they are exposed to daily by the dominant society.

How motivated Kumeyaay speakers are to use the language is an ongoing concern that impacts the efforts to revitalize the language. According to many language speakers surveyed in this study, the motivation to use the language goes deeper than simply wanting to speak. With some interviewees, it is part of the foundation of the self, the family, the community, and the Nation. In other words, it is a definition of oneself. Participant J described how deeply the language is entwined in culture and identity, “We have to speak Kumeyaay because it is in our blood. I can’t say that I don’t understand it, because I can understand it. Because I have it in my blood.”

All of the participants in this study were older and had grown up with the language. To bring back the language is an important part of their cultural aspirations that many of them hold.

They also identified other parts of the culture, such as singing, pottery, and basket making that they would like to see revived during their lifetimes. Participant P displayed this wider cultural application of language use and how the use supports self-determination, “I would like to see it come back with the young generation. ‘Cause all the old-timers are gone. It won't be long till I'm gone too.” Sadly, he is the last speaker of the Kumeyaay language on his reservation. He has been invited recently to say opening prayers for various events and he wishes that he could talk to more people.

With language being so clearly tied to identity, most of the participants in this study are concerned by the lack of motivation and support to learn the language. Some speakers, although discouraged by the lack of desire to learn the language from the community, have turned to their own families in order to teach the language and the culture. One participant said, “We need to keep teaching them so that the language doesn't disappear. If the community doesn't want to learn, then we are just starting with our own family.” This quote by the participant also shows efforts to revitalize the language by working with family members. Participants N and O disclosed that although they are disappointed by the lack of interest in the community, they are working to keep the Kumeyaay language alive with their own family through immersion.

While the future of the language might seem bleak, there are some hopeful indications that all is not lost. Non-Natives have also shown interest in learning Kumeyaay. Some of the speakers enjoy the interest that non-speakers have with the language. This new interest reflects a fundamental paradigm shift from the time in the past when there was an active effort to repress Native language use and a devaluing of Native culture. Today, with a more inclusive and tolerant social atmosphere, individuals and organizations are asking Kumeyaay people to speak about the language and culture at conferences and other functions.

During this critical time of language endangerment, the speakers appear guardedly optimistic that the efforts to reverse language shift will be successful. However, the lack of speakers in the various communities means that there are few people who are transmitting the language. Many people who are Kumeyaay have never even heard their own language spoken. However, there appears to be an interest in the language by the youth. Perhaps young Kumeyaay people can foster feelings of curiosity in their unique language and heritage. A few dedicated instructors could nurture this curiosity and bring them a sense of pride. Participant S reported,

There are kids on the reservation today that have never heard people talk the language... and I noticed that when they hear somebody speaking the language, they kinda smile and they eavesdrop. They check in to the conversation because they like hearing it I think. It's special.

This curiosity of kids could be the lynchpin for the language to continue. The youth who are Kumeyaay appear to be excited to hear their own Native language, and this curiosity can generate interest in language learning.

The broad consensus is that language and culture play a key part in having a clear identity. It is important that the members of the Kumeyaay community have knowledge of their Native language to reinforce sovereignty and the principle of self-determination. When Indigenous communities lose their language and culture, this places them in a precarious situation. If they can lose their language, then they can also lose their land base. The views of participants in this study are not isolated to just one reservation. Other language speakers express similar concerns and are taking steps to intervene in the hope of creating more language speakers to reverse language shift. These individuals see the importance of tribal sovereignty – with language use the integrity of the tribe is reinforced. The distinctive character of Native communities forms the basis for the legal and moral obligation of Mexico and the United States toward Native tribes. The stakes for Kumeyaay language revitalization are high.

The Kumeyaay language is more than a language. It is a chronicle of the people who have been in this area for thousands upon thousands of years. The knowledge, history, and way of expressing oneself and one's self-identity cannot be replaced once it is gone. The loss is staggering and may be irreplaceable. Participant J stated, "We don't want to lose our traditions. We want to have a strong community." This interviewee spoke of the memories that he had when the people in his community all spoke the language. The language was vibrant, the culture and traditions were a living, everyday part of the people's lives, and the community was cohesive. The desire to revitalize the language equates to healing of one's community. The disappearance of a language is equated to a library being burned to the ground. This knowledge cannot be replaced once it is gone. The knowledge of the language and its use contributes to not just a part of one's own sovereignty but also a part of one's own spirituality. The land that the Kumeyaay live on is considered to be our holy land. Every mountain, valley, plant, the ocean, desert – each of the land's natural features – has a place in the creation story. The following quote by Participant U alludes to this belief, "... that's our beginnings. That's attached to our religion, in our language. So, we got to know our language to know how all that works for us." Kumeyaay language has the potential to assist in developing pride and a social awakening.

The value in knowing an Indigenous language is not only to promote community vitality, it is also beneficial to a person's core and sense of well-being. Even with past attempts to eradicate the language and culture, the use of the language can be connected to a sense of pride in oneself and to the development of a sense of self-efficacy. To use one's language has a value that cannot be easily measured. Participant R explains that, "[language] has more value than money, really." The value goes beyond anything that can be purchased. It is within the individual, and is something that can contribute to one's self worth.

Factor 9: Amount and quality of documents. According to the UNESCO guidelines, language documentation is essential for revitalization. UNESCO defines documentation as written text, transcribed audio recordings, adequate grammars and dictionaries, and video recordings. On a scale of zero to five, with a rating of five being superlative documentation and zero indicating non-documentation, the Kumeyaay language currently is at a one, which is inadequate. Although there have been a number of linguists and other scholars who have done work on Kumeyaay ethnography and anthropology, little has been written from the viewpoint of the Kumeyaay people. At this time there is very little documentation on Kumeyaay language revitalization. However, there are some resources that are being used to try to preserve the language and teach it to a new generation. One of the first scholars to study with the Kumeyaay people was Margaret Langdon, a linguist from Belgium. She was a professor from UCSD who worked with the Kumeyaay from Barona and, later, the Mesa Grande reservation. Langdon developed one of the alphabet systems that some people use today. Participant S is the nephew of one of the main sources of Margaret's work. Fortunately, his commitment and love of the language lead to the preservation of this work. Participant S reported:

I guess it was just desire within me. I wanted to do it, but my grandparents talked to me. Margaret Langdon, who was the linguist working on our language, the first linguist to really get deep into it. When she retired, she gave me all her tapes – I listened to those tapes going to work in those days in the morning and coming home at night. I wore a lot of them out and I loved hearing the stories and the people talk and all the recordings she made. When our museum opened up, I donated all those tapes and they digitized them. Now they're preserved in the museum. The Ted Couro Mesa Grande Dictionary and the Barona Dictionary, the little brown one, was her work.

This quote describes his experiences with a linguist who was working with his grandparents.

Prior to this linguist, there was very little work done to record the language. The tapes that the participant received from this retired linguist have been recorded and are now being used by the language program on one of the reservations. These tapes are teaching aids for language

learners, as they allow students to hear past speakers using the language that they might not otherwise have the opportunity to hear.

A number of stories have been translated along with some recordings of songs and conversations. When assistance from the outside the Kumeyaay community is offered, it might be initially welcomed. However, without a follow-up, the resources might not be effectively utilized. Participant A described one such instance from previous outside researchers who came to document the Kumeyaay language:

A long time ago, people came and asked us questions just like you and we answered in Indian. Someone would ask us a question and they would write what we answered in the language. Everything was very organized. Even though they only stayed here for eight days, by the time they left, they were already speaking the language. They were really nice and smart people. The one who puts interest in the language can learn it, but they do not put interest in anything.

The quote describes the visit to his community by INALI, the Mexican National Institute of Indigenous Languages. This organization sent representatives to his community to record Native speakers for the purpose of documenting the Kumeyaay language and developing teaching materials. After that meeting, INALI created language books that could be used to teach the language. However, the materials were lost in a fire and, due to budget constraints, no new books have been made to replace the lost materials. It is not clear if any copies exist.

Recording songs have been useful in preserving the language. The song cycles tell stories of journeys and relate to our spiritual beliefs. Another category of song that has been almost forgotten is the lullabies. These songs exemplify the socialization process through the stories they contain, which are passed onto children when sung. For example, one song shares a story about a young boy who is walking down a path. The boy comes upon a coyote. This coyote wants to bite the boy. The boy is scared and he makes a bow and arrows and uses them to defend himself. He kills the coyote. The moral of the story is that throughout one's journey in

life one will be challenged with obstacles and danger. By preparing oneself, one can overcome these challenges. It is then important to learn what one's teachers are passing on. They are to help teach life lessons. Participant V expressed the importance of the stories and the efforts being made to translate and record these stories for future generations. She has been working with her younger brother, Rudy, and her granddaughter who just completed graduate school in New York. Her granddaughter wishes to help and is working on documenting the stories and creating a storybook that can be used in order to pass on this information to the next generation.

In the past some individuals who have studied the language managed to put together dictionaries. This has taken place on both sides of the border. The following communities have developed dictionaries: Barona, Campo, and Mesa Grande. Barona helped to develop an inter-dialect dictionary. Paula Meyers developed a dictionary using Juan Mesa as her informant, and in Mexico the INALI has developed a dictionary using the Spanish alphabet. Today the INALI is working with the various groups in Baja to revise their work. On the U.S. side of the border, the Barona Museum has been working on developing a dictionary that is inclusive of all of the dialects. The following quote refers to these efforts. Participant S commented, in an almost off-handed way, "Oh yeah, we did. I forgot about the dictionary. We have that dictionary that's been done and that took years to put together. It's a comparative dictionary so it's got southern and northern languages in it." It is somewhat revealing that such a crucial resource might be almost forgotten by one of the interviewees. Current speakers are not book learners. This comment describes the work that was done to develop a standard dictionary that was inclusive and used sources from reservations throughout San Diego County. The dictionary is comprehensive compared to the others. However, if there were a new revision, I believe that it should include the input from speakers from Mexico and Imperial County. This would assist the

Nation in developing a standardized alphabet and bridging the knowledge gaps produced by the isolation that many Kumeyaay communities have experienced because of the reservation system and the international border.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Revisiting Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the issue of Kumeyaay language loss in the territory on both sides of the U.S.-Mexican border, to identify the ways in which language preservation maintains its tenuous foothold, and to link current preservation and revitalization practices and efforts to possible educational policy recommendations. One of the insights of Crawford, in his *Seven Hypotheses on Language Loss*, was that language shift cannot be reversed by outsiders (Crawford, 1996). This study is consistent with that recognition. It was conducted by a Kumeyaay tribal member and language speaker who investigated tribal elders' perceptions of Kumeyaay language atrophy. It is a piece of research internal to the Kumeyaay community. The perceptions of the Kumeyaay speakers shape the policy recommendations that come from this study.

One of the most intriguing and positive findings was that some individuals have successfully preserved the language, while most others in the communities have lost the ability to use it. Additionally, a key unintended subtext was the assessment of the desire of Kumeyaay people, whether enrolled or unenrolled tribal members, to revitalize the language. The factors that allow for the sparse but strong use of the language could be replicated in developing a program to reverse language shift. If such a program could be developed, then it is possible that it could be used as a template to address language shift and language loss in other Native communities beyond the Kumeyaay.

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are Kumeyaay speakers' perceptions about the current state of the language?

2. How do the Nation, communities, and individuals think about using language assets to reverse its moribund status?

These questions were answered with the interview protocols, the narratives of the speakers, and by the empirical evidence of speaking ability of the individuals in the identified Kumeyaay communities in both the United States and Mexico.

What is the state of the Kumeyaay language? Using the UNESCO framework for language vitality and loss and using the interview protocols, I conducted interviews with 24 Kumeyaay language speakers who reside in the United States and in Northern Baja California, Mexico. I then transcribed the interviews, translated when necessary, and analyzed the information with a small group of academic coders. The perceptions of the informants were strikingly consistent. There is a clear and shared judgment on the part of the interviewees that the Kumeyaay language is critically endangered. This view appears to be endemic throughout the Kumeyaay Nation on both sides of the border. Empirical evidence about the number of speakers supports this perception. Six reservations have no speakers left, thus leaving these language communities rated as extinct. The interviews have revealed an alarming drop in the number of speakers. This drop has exacerbated efforts to transmit the language intergenerationally. The influences that have contributed to this language loss appear to be complex, and have affected the ability of language transmission in various ways. The perceptions of Kumeyaay speakers, as revealed in the interview process, about the state of their Native language center on identifying intergenerational language loss and the low number of speakers as responsible for the dismal state of fluency. Additionally, UNESCO factors of language endangerment are shown to be applicable to the Kumeyaay case. The findings show

the UNESCO factors of language loss regarding intergenerational language transmission and a low number of speakers to correctly predict language loss in Kumeyaay communities.

Containment of tribal members on the reservations played a role in isolating multiple communities and contributed to the lack of cultural interaction among the groups. When the international border was drawn, it effectively fractured the Kumeyaay Nation. As international relations became an issue, and during times of friction between the U.S. and Mexico, there was a profound impact on the Kumeyaay Nation. The division of Kumeyaay land has hindered attempts to use the language. The separation of the communities and their placement in areas that lacked sufficient resources has led to an exodus for many families who relocated to urban areas in search of gainful employment. This diaspora has negatively impacted the cohesiveness of the communities. As a result of this population dispersal, individual members of the communities are left with fewer opportunities to listen to or to use the language. The saturation of media and culture of mainstream society have also contributed to language loss. Additionally, the lack of speakers of the Kumeyaay language has contributed to language shift. The incorporation of the mainstream languages – of English in the north and Spanish in the south – has replaced the Kumeyaay language for use in daily affairs.

The Language Socialization model has guided this study. Its emphasis on intergenerational language transmission brings the comments of Kumeyaay language speaker participants in interviews into focus. Language learning among the current speakers occurred intergenerationally, and it is the common avenue of language learning across cultures. The inability of current speakers to continue this transmission by teaching younger family members to speak hampers the process of language socialization and cultural transmission. One finding of this study was that language use between and across generations has dramatically declined. The

failure of language transmission was accompanied by a simultaneous replacement of the heritage language by the mainstream languages of English and Spanish.

This replacement of the Native language has had an impact on Native epistemology, which is the understanding of the nature of Native knowledge. Our understanding of traditional Native ways of knowing depends on the language. The structure of language *affects* our understanding of the validity of different ways of knowing. This is why the loss of Native language is more than the loss of a means of communication. English or Spanish can serve communication needs, but only the Native language of the Kumeyaay people can preserve an entire and unique worldview. This study showed the tentative hold that the Kumeyaay communities have on their language, and hence on their characteristic ways of being in the world and knowing that world.

The Language Socialization model also identifies immersion as the primary means of learning a language. The results of the study indicated that immersion is not taking place. Immersion relates to intergenerational language transmission, because the home is the most immersive environment for language acquisition. Elderly language speakers learned the language through participating in daily routines using Kumeyaay, but they were unable to effectively develop fluency in the Kumeyaay language in the next generation. It appears that the next generation became passive speakers. These are people who can understand the language; however, they do not speak it. Kumeyaay language use in the household declined. As the next generations interacted, there were fewer and fewer opportunities for immersion to occur. Accompanying the loss of a language rich environment, was a decline in language proficiency and the number of individuals who use Kumeyaay as a first language dropped drastically. Older first language speakers of Kumeyaay were transmitters of Native culture. This group of speakers

grew up immersed in the culture and language. They were the informal caretakers of, not only the details of the language – including vocabulary, usage, and nuance, but they even more significantly were guardians of the deeper meaning of the language and its tie to the Kumeyaay religion. With the lack of new speakers, the result is that – for the foreseeable future – people who speak the Kumeyaay language will be secondary language speakers. These individuals will come from the population of grandchildren of the language speakers.

According to the information gathered in this study, there is an alarmingly low proportion of speakers to the total population. There is a critical lack of language speakers in relationship to the general population of the community. Because the Kumeyaay people on both sides of the border number approximately 4,623 people, the Kumeyaay are considered a small population and a small language community. This makes the language vulnerable and at risk for loss from internal and external pressure. The numbers support the UNESCO observation that few speakers in relation to the population size threaten language transmission. I add that the lack of opportunities to learn and to use the language also diminish with the size of the pool of speakers.

The research also focused on fluency of those interviewed. Although the majority of those questioned reported that their fluency was 100%, this assessment appeared to be subjective. Their fluency was based on familiar, consistent situations. There appeared to be a challenge to use the language when new situations arise. Also, because of the lack of speakers the informants appeared to be struggling with language atrophy. It is difficult to keep up language skills if there is little opportunity to speak.

Until recently, the Kumeyaay language was suppressed. However, in this study the pedagogy that has been developed to reverse the loss of the Kumeyaay language appeared to be limited in scope. Teaching goals focused on the memorization of a few basic words – for

example, colors, numbers, usually up to 10, animals, and greetings – rather than the development of fluency in conversation. Courses plateaued and cycled over. Also, the instruction was usually one hour a week, an inadequate amount of time to develop language proficiency. Bilingual education must be revisited. For the Kumeyaay people, the struggle for developing continuity in teaching and the acquisition of materials has been exacerbated by the mainstream language difference; English spoken in the United States and Spanish spoken in Mexico. It is difficult to have communities on different sides of the border with different primary languages.

One crucial issue that this study identified was that of orthography, the alphabetical representation of Kumeyaay sounds. Because of the border and language divisions among Kumeyaay communities, attempts to write down the oral language lacked continuity and coordination. The differences in the English and Spanish alphabets exacerbated the challenge. These community divisions and language differences complicated efforts to utilize and share language resources across the border. The level of accessibility to written materials to facilitate language study was highly limited. The development of a written form of the language may be necessary for large-scale transmission; however, a written version of the language will necessarily be the product of a European, non-Native model.

The problematic interactions between cultures surfaced in this study, and rest on an entirely antagonistic historical foundation. The participants in this study underscored the use of mainstream languages as a point of contention and friction for Kumeyaay individuals who often find it easier or more practical to use the mainstream language in order to communicate. The need to communicate with non-Kumeyaay people reinforced mainstream language use, and discouraged communication in Kumeyaay.

Perhaps one of the most significant elements of cultural interaction, with an impact on Native language use, was intermarriage of Kumeyaay individuals with non-Kumeyaay people. This study showed that intermarriage, resulted in the loss of Kumeyaay language use in the household. Immersion for children was impossible when parents were not using the language, and few non-Kumeyaay partners have any Kumeyaay language skills. Informants in this study reported that because of the negligible number of eligible Kumeyaays, many have resorted to marrying non-Kumeyaay. This situation will not change in the future.

Within the Kumeyaay territory, apparently small differences have also hampered language transmission. The communities that have language speakers used their own clan dialects. Today the use of language is a struggle for some speakers because of their difficulty understanding the different dialects. Other people felt that their particular dialect was the only accurate one. Despite these difficulties, there was a positive aspect, as different communities appeared to have components of the language that other areas have forgotten. The potential for integrating the various dialects into a culturally responsive pedagogy is tremendous.

The results of the interviews in this study indicated that cultural practices complement and reinforce language use. The interviews thus supported the presuppositions of language socialization literature. In the Kumeyaay case, these practices included traditional singing, basket, and pottery making, and food gathering. Any successful language teaching will have to incorporate these kinds of cultural elements in the curriculum. Additionally, cultural activities as discussed throughout this study, can provide the foundation for immersive learning experiences: situational fluency supports language preservation.

The reason for language use is that individuals see its value. This simple fact is a partial explanation for the shift from the Native language to that of the wider social mainstream.

Although there were 45 Kumeyaay speakers at the beginning of this study who still use the language, there was a larger number who were passive speakers. They understood the Kumeyaay language but used the mainstream language when replying to Kumeyaay. This group has the potential of increasing the pool of speakers if they are able to work through their hesitations. The interviewees of this study all acknowledged the value of their language. They shared a desire to speak and to hear it spoken.

During this study, it became apparent that although the UNESCO categories are applicable to the Kumeyaay case, they also omitted a critical issue. One of the most interesting things to emerge from elderly speaker's narratives is the cluster of reasons for the neglect of Native language training between and among generations. The UNESCO framework could be enhanced by augmenting the current factors to ask why people do not teach their children and grandchildren their languages.

Limitations of the Study

The major limitation of this study was the small number of Kumeyaay speakers. In the Kumeyaay Nation, there are approximately 4,623 Kumeyaay on both sides of the border and of that number, there are 45 speakers (Connolly Miskwish, 2016; LeBrake, personal communication, August 30, 2017). These speakers represented the various communities and the northern, central, southern, eastern, and desert dialects. The isolation of many of these speakers made interaction problematic, due to the distance from one community to another. This isolation had led to language use becoming idiomatic and idiosyncratic, and thus language speakers have had difficulties understanding speakers of different dialects. Another limitation was the speaking ability and the degree of fluency of the language speakers.

It is not known what impact boarding schools or bilingual schools (*escuelas bilingues* in Mexico that have been established by the Mexican government in various communities) have had on the participants. It is likely that many individuals have had school experiences that stifled their Kumeyaay language development. Although many interviewees were elders, they might have the language use of a five-year old due to being discouraged from using the Native language in the school setting.

Another concern was related to the difficulties crossing the border for speakers. This territorial boundary compounds the isolation of communities and their struggle to engage in cultural sharing. The result was language limitation and cultural stagnation. For the researcher, given the border situation – with English spoken north of the border and Spanish spoken in Mexico – it was essential to utilize two interview instruments, one in English and one in Spanish. While the instruments were essentially the same, language nuances in translations can alter and affect meaning.

This study was also limited to one group of language speakers. The observations and interviews were necessarily constrained by the way individuals utilize the language. They were not universal. This study was limited to the subjects who voluntarily agreed to participate, and the validity of this study was dependent upon the reliability of those respondents. Additionally, this study was not longitudinal. A future round of interviews could correct this initial limitation. Unfortunately, most of the participants were elderly, which makes longitudinal data difficult to collect. Ideally, there would be a greater number of Kumeyaay speakers to replicate the study. Sadly, that is not an option.

Among the additional limitations for this study was the geographic distance between Kumeyaay communities and separation because of the international border. In addition, the

scale used to measure language fluency might not be relevant when gauging the fluency of the Kumeyaay people, as Kumeyaay is an oral language without a standard written alphabet. Also, there were a number of individuals who would be considered to be passive speakers, who entirely understand the language but who are unable to speak it. However, the scale, based on a generally acceptable gauge for fluency, helps to put Kumeyaay language fluency into perspective. The final limitation was the issue of researcher positionality and potential bias; the information gathered in the study was subject to the interpretation of the researcher.

Conclusion

The first question of this study about the perceptions of Kumeyaay speakers regarding the state of their language was the most engaging of the research findings; not because they held accurate views of the level of language atrophy, but because in sharing their perceptions the interviewees revealed an array of explanations for language loss in their communities. The explanations clustered around the UNESCO factors of intergenerational language transmission and number of speakers. Their responses displayed a profound and poignant self-awareness of their failure to pass their language skills to subsequent generations and to create a sufficient population of speakers to sustain conversational exchange.

Fieldwork showed that the Kumeyaay language is, at this time, critically endangered. The preservation and revivification of Kumeyaay culture is critical. The threat of cultural loss directly tied to Native language loss is endemic throughout the Kumeyaay Nation on both sides of the border. On six of the Kumeyaay reservations in the United States there are no speakers: their language communities are extinct.

Using the UNESCO Factors of language endangerment and vitality, the interviews demonstrated that very few members in the various Kumeyaay communities in the United States

speak the language. These are the last speakers in the United States. Most of them were elderly; several were ill. They represent the remnants of a once vibrant language community. All of the speakers shared that they learned the Kumeyaay language through immersion and they gained proficiency at home and within their community. Many of the speakers were also active within the community culturally, for example, as traditional singers. These individuals started out as apprentices and, over time, became lead singers and are now teaching others. For this group, the transition of language takes place every time they sing. They serve an important role in the community when a member passes away. It is the singers who, through the songs, assist the soul of the departed to the next world. Some people also use their knowledge to assist with burial rituals in Kumeyaay. Others have learned traditional basket and pottery making. There is a bedrock of information required for these skills: knowing the time of the year to gather materials, understanding the preparation processes, and finally manufacturing the various items. The Kumeyaay language transmits this technical knowledge. These examples suggest that language and culture support each other.

The dismal lack of speakers continues in the present to handicap any efforts for individuals to learn the language. What speakers experienced as a natural learning process with community members using the language, is now absent and the opportunities to use and learn the language are becoming rare. A critical mass of fluent Kumeyaay speakers is necessary to develop sustainable language programs in the future. Perhaps the one opportunity for learning in an immersion context would be if the learner were to live with the speaker.

Although the number of first language speakers has dwindled, there is hope that the next generation will learn the language. The next group of speakers will probably be second language

speakers – Kumeyaay will not be the mother tongue. This situation will pose a number of obstacles in developing a new generation of Native people who speak fluently easily.

When we consider assets or factors that might enable the revival of the Kumeyaay language, it appears that there is a possibility of language renewal. Although the Kumeyaay population is fragmented by the dispersal created by the international border and the situational isolation that is the legacy of the border system, the Kumeyaay people have the capacity to become language speakers and reverse language shift. There is a desire among many tribal individuals to address language shift and develop programs that are geared towards language revitalization. Past efforts have been community-based in scope and confined to the individual communities. There is a growing movement to develop collaboration among these different groups, not just across communities, but also across borders. These findings lead to implications for research, practice, and policy.

Although the informants shared that they want the youth to learn the language, the ways that it would be taught were not clear. Kumeyaay was available in classes on a number of reservations. The teaching system appeared to be focused on colors, numbers, animals, and greetings. The students quickly plateaued and at best learned third party communication.

Factor 8, the community members' own attitudes toward their language, was one of the most crucial issues to address. Heritage language speakers' attitudes can range from experiencing great pride in their language to having a great deal of shame. The psychological elements in these varying attitudes are beyond the scope of this study; however, the impact of the attitudes on intergenerational transmission holds massive implications. Speakers' pride in their language use can compensate for even a non-supportive environment. It can be the energizing element for community building and cultural recovery and maintenance. Likewise, a sense of

shame about the language or a feeling of embarrassment about low competency levels can be a tremendous detriment.

In this study, the informants reported that the community members shared an embarrassment and reluctance to use the language. This feeling appears to be common among passive speakers who were embarrassed to speak because they were unable to pronounce words correctly. Additionally, some participants described Native language use as marking speakers as being outside mainstream culture. Because this study surveyed only language speakers, and not non-speakers, it was difficult to judge the level of shame non-speakers might have about their traditional tribal language. The association of heritage language use with past racial discrimination will have to be overcome. For this reason, language recovery will depend upon an ability to re-calibrate past associations of inferiority and replace those associations with pride and self-esteem. Using cultural components in language teaching can offer learners new insights about the richness of their traditions, and hence of their language.

Policy and Programmatic Recommendations

This study invites additional research in several areas. Most evident is a need to provide a comprehensive guide to resources on the Kumeyaay language. These materials ought to be digitized and stored in the cloud, in addition to being made available as hard copies across the different communities. Documentation of Kumeyaay culture needs to accompany these language materials. Funding should be secured to develop and create new media for language and cultural transmission. Additional research on differences in language use across Kumeyaay reservations could be helpful to generate programs to sustain and enhance Kumeyaay language socialization within the communities.

Analysis of the interview material showed an inability to sustain immersion by language speakers and by those identified as passive speakers. Several questions arise: What prohibited individuals from learning the language? Did specific events occur that discouraged them from gaining language proficiency? Could interviews with non-speaking community members reveal pathways to remedying language atrophy? Answering these questions could help to identify and to develop strategies that could address and mitigate language loss.

Additionally, more research is needed to understand why people fall into the category of being passive speakers. If these passive speakers could somehow transition to fluency, the overarching problem of developing a critical mass of Kumeyaay speakers could, at least partially, become a realistic goal. Also, understanding the learning trajectory that leaves some individuals as passive speakers could prevent this failure of fluency in the future.

Because the number of Kumeyaay speakers is at a critically low number of 45, it is essential to reach the target group of speakers' children. The children of the language speakers who are passive speakers are candidates for further study. This category of people can understand the language but cannot speak it. What were the factors that inhibited them from evolving from understanding the language and becoming speakers themselves? Can a program be envisioned and constructed to develop them into speakers? What can be done when creating an education program that focuses on immersion to ensure maximum opportunities for speaking? Another area for investigation would be to see what motivates a target group to learn a language. If we could learn the negative triggers that discourage continued language acquisition, then we could also learn how to avoid them.

Bringing willing learners together in a setting for a total immersion in language learning appears to be the best option to overcome community wide language loss. A sketch of such a

program would minimally involve assembling fluent speakers as teachers. The best way to do this might be to draw on the culturally specific practice of a Native Kumeyaay gathering. By transferring the experience of a gathering to the context of language learning, it might be possible to extend the familiar and deeply embedded positive connotations of traditional social interaction to an arena for learning.

An initial immersion experience, perhaps hosted by local gaming tribes at their capacious facilities, would require sustained follow up. Perhaps a “Share the Elders” weekly social event at the home of families with fluent speakers where participants would only speak Kumeyaay could become a new tradition and a way to reinforce new language skills. Minimal costs for food and entertainment could yield enormous results.

The keystone of language revitalization in Kumeyaay communities should involve an intergenerational approach. This research project has documented for the first time the extent of Kumeyaay language loss, and the central role in language shift played by intergenerational language transmission and/or its absence. Only by tapping into the rich resource of remaining language speakers will language learning be reinforced in Kumeyaay communities. Cultural and social programs on reservations currently emphasize the traditional respect the Kumeyaay have for their elders in the population. It ought to be possible to transfer this respect for the elders to a respect for their language knowledge base. Leaders on the various reservations will have to assert and transmit this respect for language skills to tribal members.

Additionally, programs ought to be established to allow learners across generations to continue to gain proficiency at home. Learning could thus be reinforced in the context of the household. Outside the home, having elderly speakers simply joining with younger students occasionally at classroom facilities could serve as inspiration for continued learning.

As speakers develop language proficiency, the goal ought to be to encourage them to themselves become language teachers in the community. One way to prepare them to become teachers could be to use a model within language classes of small group activities guided by a designated student leader. They could gain confidence in speaking skills in this learning format of peer learning, and additionally could begin to see themselves in the role of team leaders, and eventually, as teachers. Also, if the class enrollment regulations would allow it, current class participants could tutor newcomers. Training teachers can be a formal, as well as informal process. The key is to foster an enthusiasm in learners that can be transmitted by them to new students.

Another recommendation of this study is to begin, as soon as possible, to secure funding for an immersion school for the Kumeyaay language. The school could work at two levels. The first audience would be young people and adults who could be trained in Kumeyaay as a second language. The second target audience would be preschoolers who could learn Kumeyaay simultaneously with one of the mainstream languages, either English or Spanish, depending upon the location of the school. Educational institutions could transmit Native languages to students. These institutions could be on or off the reservations. They could be boarding schools or parochial schools. Teachers biases play a part with the transmission of knowledge. Of course, teachers' attitudes play a part in the transmission of knowledge. The biases of the teachers and/or the institution can impact the individuals who attend these schools. Although in the past these schools have been the vehicle to repress Native language, today, the school system gives speakers an opportunity to develop programs in order to teach the language.

Some participants voiced the importance of collaboration and pooling of resources in order to address the issue of language loss and take steps towards language revitalization. One

participant noted, “I think that there’s tribes that have the resources and tribes that don’t, but I think there’s a lot of possibilities out there to bring it to everyone.” The concept of synergy put into practice by the communities working to address a concern is much more effective than each community attempting to make changes separately.

In many Kumeyaay communities the use of instructional language aids holds promise for learning. Technological support, like audio and visual recording equipment, the development of language application devices such as computer games, and math programs in Kumeyaay could be helpful. Unfortunately, many learning tools and equipment enhancements are costly, especially for non-gaming tribes. In some reservations that have gaming revenues the ability to acquire state of the art resources is much more available than some of the more isolated communities that lack even the basics, such as water and electricity. The distance among reservations, along with the issue of the international border, serves to exacerbate efforts to successfully utilize the language speakers as assets effectively. With the advent of Skype and Zoom, we have the ability to reach out to the more isolated communities. The potential for collaboration and giving mutual assistance and support to develop language programs through technology is enormous.

It will be necessary to use the technological tools that have been partially responsible for the dearth of speakers and the destruction of traditional ways of life to counteract their own effects. By utilizing technology, teaching efforts can enhance the impact of classes. Language speakers could provide the content for the development of new language media. A particularly intriguing possibility for exploration is the development of electronic language games. The target youth group appears to be immersed in video game activity. Could the introduction of

Kumeyaay language video games be used to support a formal language immersion program to enhance interactive language use?

The popularity of video games among Native youth holds promise for language learning. The development of these games using the Kumeyaay language could have an enormous impact. Because the games employ repetition, users would internalize the Kumeyaay language in order to successfully navigate the games. The goal of these games would be to give the target group an exposure to situational fluency. Peer power could have a multiplier effect and the popularity of the games could skyrocket. Many of the participants have shared that the children appear more open to language learning and the use of these applications would be used as an aid to complement a language program. Considering the distances to the various reservations and also the issue of the Kumeyaay communities in Baja California, the use of applications such as Zoom could give the language speakers an opportunity to interact. This interaction could benefit not only the speakers, but the language learners as well.

Language speakers could provide the content for the development of new language media. One simple solution, currently being experimented with by two of the tribes, is to have one of the gaming tribes sponsor a Native language radio station. The Navajo Nation effectively utilizes this asset in their language transmission. Although the territory of the Kumeyaay people is small compared to that of the Navajo, the equipment for radio transmission is relatively inexpensive, and the programming could be limited to a few hours a day. During the rest of the time programming in one of the mainstream languages could consist of telling traditional stories and describing cultural events. The advantage of utilizing radio as a medium for language teaching is that it would familiarize listeners with the sounds of the Kumeyaay language. Interview participants in this study identified difficulties pronouncing the sounds of the language

as one of the greatest barriers to learning. Perhaps the station could be broadcasted on the Internet.

Teaching situational fluency can produce rapid language acquisition. Making language relevant by developing context specific scenarios makes teaching less intimidating, especially for a non-professional community speaker. By limiting the teaching goals to learning to maneuver linguistically in practical situations both the learner and the instructor become proficient. The practice of “scaffolding,” building on prior situations and knowledge to develop new language skills, can additionally enhance the rate of learning.

Another area for additional research is to ask fundamental questions about the effectiveness of the pedagogy that has been used in the past to instruct Native language. The instructional techniques used in the past have not generated language speakers. These techniques have focused on third party language use. Some of the more promising language programs include Advocates for Indigenous California Languages’ (AICLS) Master/Apprentice Program (MAP). This program was developed to address the concern of language shift by pairing up a language speaker with an apprentice for the purpose of immersion. The program is three years long and the mode of language transmitting is through immersion. As noted, immersion is how the current language speakers successfully learned the language.

If the goal is to develop new speakers, then proven methods like the MAP must be employed, at least in the initial stages of overcoming critical language loss. The inherent limitation of this kind of program is its one-on-one design. Can that focused teaching energy transfer to a group rather than an individual? One possibility could be the model of the Defense Language Institute. This program is utilized by the Department of Defense to train military personal in developing language proficiency. It is a yearlong, full-day program from Monday to

Friday. The program focuses on immersion and the results are promising. The essential issue is the transfer of such a program to a culturally specific Kumeyaay environment. As long as one is mindful of cultural competency and the pedagogy is culturally responsive in scope, there should be a strong prognosis for success.

The net cannot be cast too widely for promising practices for language acquisition. It is worth investigating the programs currently used in New Zealand among the Maori people who are working to retain their Indigenous language. Here in the United States, the Korean community has a successful program for intergenerational language transmission.

During this study, interviewees referred to the way in which Kumeyaay language speakers experienced their use of their endangered language as speaking in code, and as having secret knowledge. These references appear to be accompanied by a sense of pride in their language competence. Additional research should be conducted to probe this aspect of their understanding of their speech acts. It might be possible to analyze their perception of language as code and incorporate some of this attitudinal element in the teaching environment.

Many participants in this study indicated difficulties in teaching the language due to the lack of a standardized alphabet. They attempt to compensate for that absence by breaking down the language into categories, like colors, body parts, numbers, etc., to make it easier to retain the words. Memorization becomes essential for learning. Some speakers use everyday activities as a context to teach others the language. Participant Q offered an example, “Like, ‘Go over there and get that.’ Or, you name the thing and then as they, as we grew, other things were added like outside, the trees, and the dirt, and rocks, and lizards and all that.” This is Participant O’s approach of attempting to develop situational fluency to help Kumeyaay learners to develop language proficiency. Despite this noble effort, it is readily apparent given the dismal state of

Kumeyaay language development that more sophisticated techniques and teacher-training programs are necessary.

Recently, language conferences have been held to assist in teaching Indigenous languages in Native communities. The conferences promote best practices in teaching methods and offer documentation and support as a resource for language teachers. One example is the Yuman Family Language Summit, which is held annually. This summit focuses on speakers of the Yuman language family, of which Kumeyaay is a part. The summit has representatives from California, Nevada, Arizona, Baja California, and Sonora, Mexico. The purpose of the summit is to bring together language speakers, instructors, students, and supporters to meet, to share various language program methods, and to collaborate. Minimally, conferences like this one can inspire and energize the language instructors. At their best, they can disseminate effective language teaching methods.

Some communities have received short term funding from various sources to support their efforts at language transmission and revitalization. The funding supports the establishment their own language programs. For example, Indian Health has funded language programs for women in the past. This is usually a type of a grassroots effort to utilize limited resources in order to address language loss. This participant is describing how she assists a language activist in her community to record the local Kumeyaay dialect and its variations.

Many community members have realized the importance of writing down the language to preserve it. As noted earlier, there is not a standardized system to write the language. The separation of the Kumeyaay people by the international border also exacerbates the development of a formal, universal form of writing. Although this has been a problem in the past, different groups have recently come together to address this issue. In Baja California, Mexico, a number

of Indigenous groups have been working with the INALI the National Institute of Indigenous Languages, which is an arm of the Mexican government and whose mission is to work with Indigenous groups to record and preserve Native languages. One participant reminisced about getting together with a couple of other speakers to write a little book in the Kumeyaay language about the Kumeyaay people. However, those books have long since been lost.

In some of the more impoverished Kumeyaay communities, instructional materials that are taken for granted in mainstream communities, such as pencils and writing material, are almost non-existent. The following informant is a traditional basket weaver who supports her family financially by making and selling traditional Kumeyaay baskets. Her grandson is in primary school and she volunteered to teach language once a week for an hour. He did not have any writing materials so she sold a basket to buy school supplies for him. She reported, “[He] really wants to learn, [and] when we have the classes he brings a notebook to write notes. He always asks questions.” This participant is an example of a member of a community that was given modest funding by the INALI for language classes. When the funding ran out, she volunteered her time in order to teach the language. Her exemplification of the drive to transmit the traditional Kumeyaay language despite an appalling lack of resources is poignant.

The UNESCO framework states that material for language education and literacy is fundamental for the vitality of a language. In some communities there is a strong oral tradition; in others, literacy is a source of pride. Languages that are not used decline. Latin and classical Greek, old English, and many others are of limited use today, and they have a largely academic audience. Kumeyaay will, and has, inevitably changed. However, the Kumeyaay Nation has a strong oral tradition. Unfortunately, current cultural standards tend to discount non-written languages. Those languages are typically Indigenous ones. To correct this supposed deficiency

and to better support language teaching, linguists have made efforts to develop dictionaries and a writing system for the Kumeyaay people to use. These efforts have been problematic at times because of the lack of cultural competency on the part of the linguists. Subtle nuances in the language and regional variations in usage often blur the accuracy of the dictionaries. To this date, six dictionaries have been developed – four in the United States and two in Mexico. The dictionaries in Mexico were developed by INALI. These used the Spanish alphabet, which differs in a few instances from that of English. In the United States a Belgian linguist developed a dictionary. The lexicon that she created used different letter combinations to represent specific sounds. The difficulty is that language speakers attempting to use the dictionary had to rely upon the English alphabet, which can't accurately transcribe Kumeyaay sounds; therefore, the words did not make sense. Training was required in order to use these materials. Currently, a practical orthography is being developed in the Kumeyaay the community. Much more support is required in a sustained, consistent program to produce the materials necessary for Kumeyaay language revival. The challenge to go beyond the original scope of this study and to develop concrete recommendations for specific teaching materials is enticing. This discussion indicates some of the paths that those suggestions might pursue.

This study invites conversation about policy directions at many levels of government. At the tribal level, the most essential level to forge a commitment to regain Kumeyaay language usage, individuals in leadership positions must create a culture of respect surrounding the language. This could occur by ensuring that children in after-school programs on individual reservations learn basic language skills in the context of play. Preschool programs could familiarize very young children with the language. Elders who maintain their language skills could be singled out for recognition on every appropriate occasion. Tribal administrators and

council members need to support grant writing to fund language immersion programs. Wealthy tribes will necessarily have to take a leadership role to fund teacher training and immersion experiences. Examples currently exist, such as stipends that can offer initial incentives to study the language with an elder. Space allocation for language programs requires specific attention. Tribal leadership buy-in is essential if the Kumeyaay language is to regain its lost status.

At the state level, California educational policy should include making the teaching of heritage languages part of the school curriculum. Bilingual education could accommodate the addition of a Kumeyaay/English program throughout the relevant counties. Course offerings at the high school, community college, and university level will require the development of language teachers. Clearly, because of the lengthy time required to gain language proficiency, this must necessarily be a long-range goal. However, there is a moral imperative to correct past policies of language suppression and prohibition. Allies will have to be identified within the State of California political apparatus to lobby for these policy changes.

Addressing language loss and revitalization ideally would involve multinational action. Starting within the local level, individual bands of the Kumeyaay Nation could commit human resources. One recommendation of this study is that the Kumeyaay Community College makes inquiries with the Department of Homeland Security in order to clarify the status of Kumeyaay border crossing permits and to develop parameters to facilitate the process of securing crossing rights. The connection with the Baja California, Mexico communities will bridge the ties with the Kumeyaay Nations' Mexican counterparts, and develop language capacity within the Kumeyaay Nation as a whole. The issue of the Kumeyaay Tribe in Mexico will need to be addressed in order to effectively utilize this knowledge resource. Additionally, grassroots

community resolutions could assert the need for developing border pass and repass for the Kumeyaay people in Baja California. There is a history of policy forged between the Kumeyaay Nation, the United States, and Mexico to address this concern. The organization was called the Kumeyaay Border Task Force and it addressed the issue of pass and repass. The Kumeyaay in Baja California are tremendous resource for language transmission, and despite the politicization of border issues, it is essential to reinforce a rightful claim for Native transit.

Final Thoughts

The revitalization of the Kumeyaay language is not only a challenging linguistic experiment; it is an active process of righting a wrong done to the Kumeyaay people. The Kumeyaay people have had to endure three waves of encroachment: Spanish, Mexican, and U.S. Each wave was focused on disrupting the culture, obtaining our land, and using the people to create a servant class. At times, policy goals included the genocide of the people. The land of the Kumeyaay has been cut in half by the international border separating the United States and Mexico. The difficulties of crossing have posed other obstacles for the people to come together and share language and cultural knowledge. Throughout all of the challenging history of the Kumeyaay, the people continue to survive. We still inhabit our traditional lands and, although our language is critically endangered and at risk of becoming extinct, we still have speakers. For myself, I believe that the revitalizing of the language is imperative for the efficacy of our people. It is a belief that echoes throughout our territory among our elders on both sides of the border. The message is that we are not victims. We, as a Native people, have a unique knowledge base that can contribute to the reservoir of global knowledge. As Natives, we have a rich history that can inspire us to thrive as a people. Although we have had to endure extreme hardships and

efforts to exterminate us, our very ability to endure is a measure of our will to survive as a culture. Language revitalization holds the key to our future.

Appendix A

Theoretical Framework: The UNESCO Language Vitality and Endangerment Guide

Degree of Endangerment	Grade	Speaker Population
Safe	5	The language is used by all ages, from children up
Unsafe	4	The language is used by some children in all domains; it is used by all children in limited domains
Definitively endangered	3	The language is used mostly by the parental generation and up
Severely endangered	2	The language is used mostly by the grandparental generation and up
Critically endangered	1	The language is used mostly by very few speakers, of great-grand parental generation
Extinct	0	There exists no speaker

Degree of Endangerment	Grade	Proportion of Speakers Within the Total Reference Population
Safe	5	All speak the language.
Unsafe	4	Nearly all speak the language.
Definitely endangered	3	A majority speak the language.
Severely endangered	2	A minority speak the language.
Critically endangered	1	Very few speak the language.
Extinct	0	None speak the language.

Degree of Endangerment	Grade	Domains and Functions
Universal use	5	The language is used in all domains and for all functions.
Multilingual Parity	4	Two or more languages may be used in most social domains and for most functions.
Dwindling domains	3	The language is in home domains and for many functions, but the dominant language begins to penetrate even home domains.
Limited or formal domains	2	The language is used in limited social domains and for several functions.
Highly limited domains	1	The language is used only in very restricted domains and for a very few functions.
Extinct	0	The language is not used in any domain and for any function.

Endangerment	Grade	New Domains and Media Accepted by the Endangered Language
Dynamic	5	The language is used in all new domains.
Degree of Robust/Active	4	The language is used in most new domains.
Receptive	3	The language is used in many domains.
Coping	2	The language is used in some new domains.
Minimal	1	The language is used only in a few new domains.
Inactive	0	The language is not used in any new domains.

Degree of Support	Grade	Official Attitudes toward Language
Equal support	5	All languages are protected.
Differentiated support	4	Minority languages are protected primarily as the language of the private domains. The use of the language is prestigious.
Passive assimilation	3	No explicit policy exists for minority languages; the dominant language prevails in the public domain.
Active assimilation	2	Government encourage assimilation to the dominant language. There is no protection for minority languages.
Forced assimilation	1	The dominant language is the sole official languages are neither recognized nor protected.
Prohibition	0	Minority languages are prohibited.

Nature of Documentation	Grade	Language Documentation
Superlative	5	There are comprehensive grammars and dictionaries, extensive texts; constant flow of language materials. Abundant annotated high-quality audio and video recordings exist.
Good	4	There are one good grammar and a number of adequate grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature, and occasionally, updated everyday media; adequate annotated high-quality audio and video recordings.
Fair	3	There may be an adequate grammar or sufficient amount of grammars, dictionaries, and texts, but no everyday media; audio and video recordings may exist in varying quality or degree of annotation.
Fragmentary	2	There are some grammatical sketches, word-lists, and texts useful for limited linguistic research but with inadequate coverage. Audio and video recordings may exist in varying quality, with or without any annotation.
Inadequate	1	Only a few grammatical sketches, short word-lists, and fragmentary texts. Audio and video recordings do not exist, are of unusable quality, or are completely un-annotated.
Undocumented	0	No material exists.

Grade	Community Members' Attitudes toward Language
5	<i>All</i> members value their language and wish to see it promoted.
4	<i>Most</i> members support language maintenance.
3	<i>Many</i> members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss.
2	<i>Some</i> members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss.
1	Only a <i>few</i> members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss.
0	<i>No one</i> cares if the language is lost; all prefer to use a dominant language.

Note. Each of these tables was adapted from UNESCO (2003).

Appendix B

Participant Interview Protocol

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my research project *Kumeyaay Language Loss and Revitalization*. This project is designed to help me understand resiliency factors that allow individuals to develop and maintain language fluency. My findings will help to develop a pedagogy supporting language immersion and language revitalization.

1. How do language revitalization efforts (influence/contribute to) support tribal sovereignty and community cohesion?
2. What would you say about the state of the language?
3. What are your interests in the language?
4. What are your beliefs regarding Indigenous language?
5. What are your experiences with language use?
6. What is it like to hear people using the language?
7. Describe your language use.
8. When do you speak/use the language?
9. How often do you use the language?
10. Who do you use the language with and in what context?
11. Tell me a story of when you first became conscious of Kumeyaay as a Native language.
12. Describe what compels you to use the language.
13. How would you describe community interests in regard to language use?
14. What are your thoughts on language programs? Have you participated in any?
15. What would you like to see done to address language loss?
16. What are circumstances that you believe helped you to learn or maintain the language?

17. What makes it difficult for younger people to learn the language?
18. What would make it easier for others to learn the Kumeyaay language?
19. What else would you want to add?

References

- Almendrala, A. (2016, December 20). *Native American Youth Suicide Rates Are At Crisis Levels*. HuffPost. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/native-american-youth-suicide-rates-are-at-crisis-levels_n_560c3084e4b0768127005591?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xILmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAHLV33uphTPaAmYf7FoVzd1x2ZiFE2aBA8oyBK4yXTYCDkMd4RXJ7HN7XQrIAtWOIIPC7IPjB8T9fF-hMVrnPb7h_6C1aM4HzK6SZhDMbhbiTApP0ubvSAoRsczJTmi-i--9GR_WfgjBNIBUv8nd2ic5Etx8rgjQvOT2bOfHceb_ (Original work published October 2, 2015)
- Adams, D. W. (1995). *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Bahr, D. M. (2014). *The Students of Sherman Indian School: Education and Native Identity Since 1892*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Baquedano-Lopez P. (1998). *Language Socialization of Mexican Children in a Los Angeles Catholic Parish*. (ProQuest ID: 199862674) [Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Baquedano-Lopez P. (2000). Narrating Community in *Doctrina* Classes. *Narrative Inquiry* 10(2), 1–24.
- Barton, D. (1994). *Literacy: An Introduction to the Ecology of Written Language*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Bauman, R. (Ed.). (1992). *Folklore, Cultural Performances, and Popular Entertainments: A Communications-Centered Handbook*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Besnier, N. (1995). *Literacy, Emotion, and Authority: Reading and Writing on a Polynesian Atoll*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bicher, K. (2016, March 29). *Profile – Poet Bob Holman by Kristina Bicher*. Columbia Journal. <http://columbiajournal.org/profile-poet-bob-holman-by-kristina-bicher/>
- Brayboy, B. M. J., & Castagno, A. E. (2009). Self-determination through Self-education: Culturally Responsive Schooling for Indigenous Students in the USA. *Teaching Education*, 20(1), 31-53.
- Bright, W. (1993). *A Coyote Reader*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Cave, A. A. (2003). Abuse of Power: Andrew Jackson and the Indian Removal Act of 1830. *The Historian*, 65(6), 1330–1353.
- Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

- Connolly Miskwish, M. (2007). *Kumeyaay: A History Textbook*. Sycuan Reservation, California: Sycuan Press.
- Connolly Miskwish, M. (2016). *Campo Band of Kumeyaay Indians*. Sycuan Reservation, California: Sycuan Press.
- Coto, J., Ammiano, T., Brownley, J., Buchanan, J., Carter, W., Eng, M., Miller, J., Nestande, B., Portantino, A., & Solorio J. (2008). Assembly Bill No. 544. (Teaching Credential: American Indian Languages). In Sacramento, CA: California State Assembly.
- Crago, M. B., Annahatak, B., & Ningiuruvik, L. (1993). Changing Patterns of Language Socialization in Inuit Homes. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 24(3), 205-223.
- Crawford, J. (1995). Endangered Native American Languages: What is to Be Done, and Why?. *Bilingual Research Journal* 19(1), 17-38.
- Crawford, J. (1996). Seven Hypotheses on Language Loss Causes and Cures. In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing Indigenous Languages* (pp. 45-60). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (Third Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dauenhauer, N. M., & Dauenhauer, R. (1998). Technical, Emotional, and Ideological Issues in Reversing Language Shift: Examples from Southeast Alaska. *Endangered Languages: Current Issues and Future Prospects*, 57-98.
- Deyhle, D., & Swisher, K. (1997). Research in American Indian and Alaska Native Education: From Assimilation to Self-determination. *Review of Research in Education*, 22(1), 113-194.
- Duff, P. A. (1993). *Language Socialization in Hungarian-English Schools* (ProQuest ID: 304084353) [Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Dunn, C. D. (1999)b. Coming of Age in Japan: Language Ideology and the Acquisition of Formal Speech Registers. In J. Verschueren (Ed.), *Language and Ideology: Selected Papers from the Sixth International Pragmatics Conference, Volume 1* (pp. 89-97). Antwerp: Int. Pragmatics Association.
- Dunn, C. D. (1999). Toward the Study of Communicative Development as a Life-Span Process. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 30(4), 451-454
- Duranti, A. (1986). The Audience as Co-author: An Introduction. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse (Special Issue)*, 6(3), 239-248.

- Ellis, C. (2004). *The Ethnographic I: A Methodological Novel About Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Erikson, E. (1959). *Identity and the Life Cycle: Selected Papers*. New York, NY: International Universities Press.
- Fader, A. (2001). Literacy, Bilingualism and Gender in a Hasidic Community. *Linguistics and Education*, 12(3), 261–283.
- Field, M. (2001). Triadic Directives in Navajo Language Socialization. *Language in Society*, 30(2), 249-263.
- Field, M., & Blackhorse Jr, T. (2002). The Dual Role of Metonymy in Navajo Prayer. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 44(3), 217-230.
- Fishman, J. (2007). What Do You Lose When You Lose Your Language?. In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing Indigenous Languages* (pp. 80-90). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University. (Original work published 1996)
- Fung, H. (1999). Becoming a Moral Child: The Socialization of Shame Among Young Chinese Children. *Ethnos*, 27(2), 180–209.
- Garrett, P. B. (2000). *Language Socialization, Convergence, and Shift in St. Lucia, West Indies*. [Doctoral Dissertation, New York University]. Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Garrett, P. B. (2000). “High” Kwéyòl: The Emergence of a Formal Creole Register in St. Lucia. In J. McWhorter (Ed.), *Language Change and Language Contact in Pidgins and Creoles* (pp. 63–101) Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Garrett, P. B., & Baquedano-López, P. (2002). Language Socialization: Reproduction and Continuity, Transformation and Change. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31(1), 339-361.
- Gee, J. (1991). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses* (Third Edition). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure, and Contradiction in Social Analysis, Volume 241*. Berkeley, CA: University California Press.
- Gillham, B. (2000). *Case Study Research Methods*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Gonzales, N. (2002). Riverside, Tourism, and the Indian: Frank A. Miller and the Creation of Sherman Institute. *Southern California Quarterly*, 84(3/4), 193-222.

- Goodwin, M. (1990). Retellings, Pretellings and Hypothetical Stories. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 24(1-4): 263–276.
- Gregor, T. L., & Rodriguez, S. (2017). Chapter 8: Revitalizing Critically Endangered Languages in California. In J. Proudfit & N. Q. Myers-Lim (Eds.), *On Indian Ground: California. On Indian Ground* (pp 101-120). Charlotte, NC: IAP-Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Grubin, D. (2014). *Why Language Matters*. Language Matters Film.
<http://www.languagemattersfilm.com/educational-resources/why-language-matters/>
- Heart, B. (1998). *The Wind is My Mother: The Life and Teachings of a Native American Shaman*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinton, L. (2003). Language Revitalization. In M. McGroarty *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, Volume 23* (pp. 44-57). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinton, L., & Hale, K. (Eds.). (2013). *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*. Boston, MA: Prentice Hall.
- Hinton, L., Vera, M., & Steele, N. (2002). *How to Keep Your Language Alive: A Commonsense Approach to One-on-One Language Learning*. Berkeley, CA: Heyday.
- Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S., (2000). Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. In P. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities* (pp. 35-83). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Jackson, H. H. (2018). *A Century of Dishonor*. Frankfurt, DE: BoD-Books on Demand. (Original work published 1885).
- Jacoby, S., & Gonzales, P. (1991). The Constitution of Expert-Novice in Scientific Discourse. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 149-181.
- Jahner, E. A. (1999). Traditional Narrative: Contemporary Uses, Historical Perspectives. *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 11(2), 1-28.
- Keller, J. A. (2002). *Empty Beds: Indian Student Health at Sherman Institute, 1902-1922*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Kena, G., Aud, S., Johnson, F., Wang, X., Zhang, J., Rathbun, A., ... & Kristapovich, P. (2014). *The Condition of Education 2014*. NCES 2014-083. National Center for Education Statistics.
- Krauss, M. (1992). The World's Languages in Crisis. *Language*, 68(1), 4-10.

- Kaufmann, S. (2018, December 13). *Passive and Active Vocabulary*. The Linguist. <https://blog.thelinguist.com/passive-and-active-vocabulary>
- Kulick, D. (1992). *Language Shift and Cultural Reproduction: Socialization, Self, and Syncretism in a Papua New Guinean Village*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Leap, W. L. (1981). American Indian Language Maintenance. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 10(1), 209-236.
- Liebman, B. (2015). New York State and the National Assessment of Educational Progress Tests. Available at SSRN 2651713.
- Lindsay, B. C. (2012). *Murder State: California's Native American Genocide, 1846-1873*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Littlebear, D. (1990). Effective Language Education Practices and Native Language Survival. *Effective Language Education Practices and Native Language Survival*, 1-8.
- Lomawaima, K. T., & McCarty, T. L. (2006). *"To Remain an Indian": Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Madley, B. (2016). *American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (2017, January 22). Indigenous Language Program: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Indigenous Language Initiative. Massachusetts Institute of Technology Linguistics. <http://linguistics.mit.edu/mitili/>
- Matthiessen, P. (2012). *In the Spirit of Crazy Horse*. New York, NY: Random House.
- McCarty, T. L., & Nicholas, S. E. (2014). Reclaiming Indigenous Languages: A Reconsideration of the Roles and Responsibilities of Schools. *Review of Research in Education*, 38(1), 106-136.
- Meek, B. A. (2001). Kaska Language Socialization, Acquisition and Shift. (ProQuest ID: 3023484) [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Arizona]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Meek, B.A. (2012). *We Are Our Language: An Ethnography of Language Revitalization in a Northern Athabaskan Community*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Meredith, A. (2013). *Racing Against Extinction: Saving Native Languages*. Noksi Press. <http://www.ahalenia.com/noksi/tsalagi.html>

- Meriam, L., & Work, H. (1928). *The Problem of Indian Administration: Report of a Survey Made at the Request of Honorable Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, and Submitted to him, February 21, 1928* (No. 17). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nettle, D., & Romaine, S. (2000). *Vanishing Voices: The Extinction of the World's Languages*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and Language Development: Language Acquisition and Language Socialization in a Samoan Village*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. & Capps, L. (1996). Narrating the Self. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 25(1), 19-43.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1995). *The Impact of Language Socialization on Grammatical Development*. In P. Fletcher & B. MacWhinney (Eds.), *The Handbook of Child Language* (pp. 73-94). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Ochse, R., & Plug, C. (1986). Cross-cultural Investigation of the Validity of Erikson's Theory of Personality Development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(6), 1240.
- Parsons-Yazzie, E. (1995). Navajo-Speaking Parents' Perceptions of Reasons for Navajo Language Attrition. *Journal of Navajo Education*, 13(1), 29-38.
- Paugh, A. L. (2001). *"Creole Day is Every Day": Language Socialization, Shift, and Ideologies in Dominica, West Indies* [Doctoral dissertation, New York University]. Dissertation and Theses Global.
- Pavkov, T. W., Travis, L., Fox, K. A., King, C. B., & Cross, T. L. (2010). Tribal Youth: Victimization and Delinquency: Analysis of Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey Data. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(2), 123.
- Popescu, R. (2015, May 10). *Tribes try to preserve Kumeyaay dialect*. The San Diego Union-Tribune. <https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/lifestyle/people/sdut-preserving-kumeyaay-language-2015may10-story.html>
- Pratt, M. L., & Fabb, N. (1987). *Linguistic Utopias*.
- Prucha, F. P. (1995). *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Rampton, B. (1995a). Language Crossing and the Problematisation of Ethnicity and Socialisation. *Pragmatics*, 5(4), 485–513.

- Rampton, B. (1995b). *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity Among Adolescents*. London, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Reyhner, J. A., Echo-Hawk, W. R., & Rosier, P. (2009). *Education and Language Restoration*. Philadelphia, PA: Infobase Publishing.
- Reyhner, J., & Eder, J., (2004). *American Indian Education: A History*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Reyhner, J. & Tennant, E. (1995). Maintaining and Renewing Native Languages. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 19(2): 279-304.
- Riley, K. C. (2001). *The Emergence of Dialogic Identities: Transforming Heteroglossia in the Marquesas, F.P.* [Doctoral Dissertation, City University of New York].
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in Thinking: Cognitive Development in Social Context*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B., Mistry, J., Göncü, A., Mosier, C., Chavajay, P., & Heath, S. B. (1993). Guided Participation in Cultural Activity by Toddlers and Caregivers. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 58(8), i-179.
- Rydstrom H. (2001). Like a White Piece of Paper: Embodiment and the Moral Upbringing of Vietnamese Children. *Ethnos* 66(3), 394– 413.
- Rymes B. (2001). *Conversational Borderlands: Language and Identity in an Urban Alternative High School*. New York, NY (Rymes, 2001): Teachers College Press.
- Sallabank, J. (2011). Attitudes to Endangered Languages: Identities and Policies. In P. Austin & J. Sallabank (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Endangered Languages*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Saulk, J. (2016). “Interview with DQU Chairman of the Board of Trustees”.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1986). The Routine as Achievement. *Human Studies*, 9 (2-3), 111-151.
- Schieffelin, B. (2000). Introducing Kaluli Literacy: A Chronology of Influences. In P. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of Language* (pp. 293-327). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.
- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1986). Language Socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15(1), 163-191.
- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (1996). The Microgenesis of Competence: Methodology in Language Socialization. In D. I. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A. Kyratzis, & G. Jianseng (Eds.), *Social Interaction. Social Context and Language: Essays in Honor of Sue Ervin-Tripp* (pp. 251-286). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Sekaquaptewa, E., & Washburn, D. (2004). They Go Along Singing: Reconstructing the Hopi Past from Ritual Metaphors in Song and Image. *American Antiquity*, 69(3), 457-486.
- Sheldon, A. (1998). Talking Power: Girls, Gender Enculturation and Discourse. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Gender and Discourse* (pp. 225-244). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Singh, N. K., & Reyhner, J. (2013). Indigenous Knowledge and Pedagogy for Indigenous Children. In J. Reyhner, J. Martin, L. Lockard, & W. S. Gilbert (Eds.), *Honoring Our Children: Culturally Appropriate Approaches for Teaching Indigenous Students* (pp. 37-52). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Sisquoc, L., Trafzer, C. E., & Gilbert, M. S. (Eds.). (2012). *The Indian School on Magnolia Avenue: Voices and Images from Sherman Institute*. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press.
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London, UK: Zed Books Ltd. (Original work published 1999)
- Spindler, G. (1963). *Education and Culture: Anthropological Approaches*. New York, NY: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stewart, K. L. (2018). *(Re)writing and (Re)righting California Indian Histories: Legacies of Saint Boniface Indian Industrial School, 1890 to 1935* (ProQuest ID: 10936776) [Master's thesis, University of California, Los Angeles]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Tylor, E. B. (1874). *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Customs*. New York, NY: Holt.
- UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group. (2003, March 10). Language Vitality and Endangerment. In International Expert Meeting on UNESCO Programme Safeguarding of Endangered Languages.
http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/Language_vitality_and_endangerment_EN.pdf
- Snyder, T. D., & Dillow, S. A. (2010). *Digest of Education Statistics 2009* (NCES 2010-013). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.

- US Congress. (1990, October). United States Public Law 101-477. 101st Congress (Native American Languages Act of 1990). In *Washington, DC: United States Congress. On WWW at <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/stabilize/ii-policy/nala1990.htm>*.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction Between Learning and Development. *Readings on the Development of Children*, 23(3), 34-41.
- Warner, L. S., & (Williams, et al., 2015)Gipp G. E. (Eds.). (2009). *Tradition and Culture in the Millennium: Tribal Colleges and Universities*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the Social Formation of Mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Williams, D., Alejo, L. A., Bigelow, F. E., Garcia, E., Hernandez, R., Linder, E., & Wilk, S. (2015, October). Assembly Bill No. 163. (Teaching Credential: American Indian Language-Culture Credential). In Sacramento, CA: California State Assembly.
- Williams, R. S., & Riley, K. C. (2001). Acquiring a Slice of Anglo-American Pie: A Portrait of Language Shift in a Franco-American Family. In R. D. Gonzalez & I. Melis (Eds.), *Language Ideologies: Critical Perspectives on the Official English Movement* (pp. 63-90). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Woodbury, A. C. (2006). *What is an Endangered Language?*. Linguistic Society of America. <https://www.linguisticsociety.org/content/what-endangered-language>
- Yin, R. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. (Original work published 1984)
- Zentella, A. (1997). *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.