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ABSTRACT

This study examines the impacts of the United States federal policy Public Law 93-531, the Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act, which was passed by Congress in 1974. P.L. 93-531 forced many Navajo families and their children who had resided on their traditional homeland for generations to relocate elsewhere. Today, Navajo residents who were minors when they relocated with their parent(s) find themselves dispossessed of their cultural heritage. Basically, P.L. 93-531 dispossessed and displaced the Navajo minors (now adults) from their inherent traditional homelands, thus creating a second generation of Navajo relocatees. The relocation plan was not inclusive of second generation Navajo relocatees as stakeholders, leaving them in an indeterminate legal, economic, political, and social state. The primary questions addressed are these, 1) How has the relocation experience, due to Public Law 93-53, impacted the lives of second generation Navajo children, now adults, living in towns or cities off the Navajo Nation? What have been the perspectives and challenges of the participants after relocation? 2) What has the federal and Navajo government’s role been in the lives of Children of Relocation?

The study utilizes a modified theoretical framework, Peoplehood Matrix, which encompasses the components of, language, ceremonial cycle, land, and sacred history, with the addition of livelihood. The components of the modified Peoplehood Matrix are interwoven and dependent upon one another which contribute to a group or individuals identity (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003). Qualitative and quantitative methodologies of collecting artifacts, a Q-method survey, and in-depth interview are used to study the second generation Navajo relocatees as adults living away from the Navajo Nation to document the challenges they experienced as a result of compulsory relocation. Although few studies address Navajo adult relocatees, there are no significant studies addressing second generation Navajos relocatees.
1 Introduction

“The sense of self begins with knowledge of the tribal history which includes the creation story of how the Navajos came to live between the four sacred mountains and why it is necessary for them to continue to live there.” Dr. Jennie R. Joe (Joe 1985)

1.1 Positionality

As the researcher on the topic of second generation Navajo relocatees and as a Navajo Nation citizen, my perspectives come with partialities. My partialities are primarily based upon my personal experience as a Navajo minor relocated at the age of 13 along with my parents from our ancestral home area, Sand Spring, Arizona, due to the Navajo and Hopi Indian Land Settlement Act of 1974 also known as Public Law 93-531 (P.L. 93-531). My longtime perspective is my parents were pressured into applying for home replacement benefits, otherwise known as relocation benefits. My parents were required to include me into their relocation benefits due to my status as a minor. When my parents qualified as legal residents from the lands that were awarded to the Hopi Tribe, their relocation benefits consisted of a home located on a one acre parcel in Flagstaff, Arizona in spring of 1978. The one acre lot with the relocation home on it paled in comparison to the customary land that held our homes that included a hogan, sheep and cattle corral, field for crops, sweat lodge, water well, in-ground storage, livestock grazing area and, livestock permit. When I became an adult, I applied for relocation benefits through my parent’s persistent encouragement. My parents, both of whom spoke almost no English, did not understand the consequences of the legal western construct of including a minor within the framework of compulsory relocation when applying for relocation benefits. Upon
learning I did not meet the narrow federal eligibility criteria, my parents were deeply disappointed. Being raised on my families ancestral homeland from birth until the relocation of my family, my parents felt I and other second generation family members should be able to receive some form of reparation because the loss of our ancestral home area. The ancestral home area should have continued to be home for my siblings and I as well as future generations; a place where future generations will be able to maintain their connection to the land. Many other children of relocation share these similar experiences.

Being a Navajo speaking citizen who was raised on the Navajo Nation and a participant of Navajo culture and traditions, as well as being involved in the Navajo communities on issues and concerns, I could be considered an insider. My past work on the Navajo Nation included extensive community outreach throughout the Navajo Nation allowing me to establish a network of contacts. While sharing community commonalities within the network, a level of trust are established with existing shared experiences and issues. In my research within the relocation community, some of the trust factors exist due to being able to relate to the participants experience of being displaced as a young person and as an adult who has encountered and experienced the frustrations after being relocated. I believed I would be successful in proceeding with my research due to having relocation experience, network of contacts, being familiar with language and culture, and having a certain level of trust established. These foundational characteristics enabled me to have a high probability of completing my research.

1.2 Purpose of Study

The purpose of my study is to examine the impacts of the United States federal policy Public Law 93-531 (P.L. 93-531), also known as the Navajo and Hopi Land Settlement Act, on
the second generation Navajo children of relocation who live off the Navajo Nation. Congress passed P.L. 93-531 on December 1974 which mandated certain members of the Navajo Nation to relocate from their traditional homelands if they reside within a specific area – Navajos residing within the boundaries of the Hopi Partitioned Lands (HPL). Many of these Navajo residents were minors who relocated with their parent(s) and were dispossessed and displaced, thus being deprived of returning to their traditional home area and being ineligible for home replacement benefits when becoming adults. This study will document and examine the experiences of the participants, Navajo children of relocation, as a result of P.L. 93-531.

1.3 Research Questions and Research Design

My research provides an in-depth study of second generation of Navajo relocatees as adults living off the Navajo reservation. The findings document their perspectives and challenges faced by the second generation Navajo children of relocation as a result of compulsory relocation. To provide answers, the following questions are addressed in the research.

1. How has the relocation experience, due to Public Law 93-53, impacted the lives of second generation Navajo children, now adults, living in towns or cities off the Navajo Nation? What have been the perspectives and challenges of the participants after relocation?

2. What have the federal and Navajo government roles been in the lives of second generation Navajo relocatees?
In answering these questions, I utilized Q-methodology and in-depth interviews to investigate the impacts of compulsory relocation. In my methodology, first, I describe the setting and context; next, I present the participants and data collection procedures and analysis.

1.4 Theoretical Framework

A theoretical framework emphasizing a specific U.S. policy having intergenerational effects will be utilized. In this study, the Navajo-Hopi Land Settlement Act policy will be shown to have intergenerational impacts on the second generation of Navajo relocatees; impacts that include five factors, language, sacred history, ceremonial cycle, and place/territory (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003, 13; Carpenter 2008) based on the Peoplehood Matrix framework (Illustration 1), and a modified addition of livelihood (Illustration 2). These factors are typically interwoven and dependent on one another; however, I modified the Peoplehood Matrix (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003) to encase and address additional experiences by children of relocation.

Illustration 1: Peoplehood Matrix (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003)
The modification of the category *place/territory* can be defined as land or homeland for the second generation Navajo relocatees. In a traditional sense, the “relationship with land is organic in nature. It is a living relationship in which humans use the land and consider it part of their heritage (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003, 14).” In many perspectives, the areas that groups migrate or are removed from their territories, a continual connection exist long after a removal or migration (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003). I use the term land and place/territory interchangeable in the study.

The model illustrates that *language* is distinct within a group, set apart or within itself which provides sacred history or a unique interpretation of origins, creations, migration, and other oral traditions, hence, language defines place and vice versa (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003). An example is place-names that describe a relationship with an environment or an area within the context of a group’s sacred history and culture (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003). In
addition, language serves in performing ceremonies that may be meaningful only in a particular language to a place.

_Sacred history_ is intrinsic events at home on the homeland expressing culture, identity and ceremonial cycle in a language encompassing customary traditional life. Sacred history reveals the particulars of kinship structure, the meaning of ceremonies, how groups fit within a particular environment and the explanation of Indigenous peoples’ distinct culture, customs, political economy (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003), including education.

_Ceremonial cycle_ demonstrates how a group's religion is inseparably linked to sacred history, a particular environment or place, and language which normally explain why and how a ceremony is done as well as circumstances under which ceremonies are conducted. Those who have living relationships with particular territories observe and are knowledgeable about the cycles of natural events, such as solstices and equinoxes, the blooming of particular plants, the appearance of certain stars or planets - that occur at a certain time and place. Ceremonies most often coincide with “seasonal, stellar, planetary, solar, floral, or faunal change that occurs above, below, on the surface, or within a group's territorial range” (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003, 14). In a brief manner, the ceremonial cycle is linked by way of language, and sacred history to a particular environment and ecology within a territory, hence directly affecting a group’s worldview.

_Livelihood_ is describes as a means of gaining a living comprising of the capacity, assets, and activities necessary for a means of living (Chambers and Conway 1992; Scoones 2009). Livelihood is also defined as “means of support or subsistence” (Merriam-Webster). In many cases, livelihood is generated through agriculture and livestock as a way to maintain subsistence
to support families (Scoones 2009). An important Navajo subsistence include having sheep; to a many Navajos, sheep if life (Joe 1985, Scudder 1982). Having and maintaining livestock can be an analogous to a bank. When Navajos need supplies, they take their livestock to market where it can be sold for cash or credit. Thus land is connected to maintaining and sustaining a livelihood.

In essence, the concept of Peoplehood reflects Native American knowledge and philosophy based on the understanding of its interrelationship with the natural world where in the final analysis, the factors frame a system that accounts for social, cultural, political, economic and ecological behaviors exhibited by indigenous people in particular territories (Holm, Pearson, & Chavis, 2003). I argue that many second generation Navajo relocatees were deprived of the five factors that make up the modified Peoplehood Matrix, language, sacred history, ceremonial cycle, land/place/territory, and livelihood due to the Navajo-Hopi Indian Settlement Act or P.L. 93-531. The consequences of P.L. 93-531 to the five factors include landlessness, possible loss of language and culture, social disarticulation in inherent events at former traditional homeland, lack or non-engagement in various ceremonies, and diminishment of traditional subsistence to making a livelihood. The five factors are use to frame my analysis of the impacts on the lives of second generation Navajo relocatees.

The dissertation has six chapters. In respect to the Navajo community members who participated in the research, their identity will not be revealed instead a pseudo name will be assigned to each one. Additionally, their experiences will be told in a pseudonym format regarding any specifics which may reveal their identity. Chapter one is the introductory chapter consisting of my positionality, purpose of the study, research question and design, and theoretical framework. Chapter two provides the background that sets the stage toward relocation of
Navajos due to P.L. 93-531. Chapter three consists of a literature review that addresses existing gap pertaining to second generation Navajo children of relocation, past relevant Navajo relocation studies, various theoretical framework utilized that addressed other relocation and resettlement, and overview of select international resettlement efforts. Chapter four addresses the methods utilized to produce the findings consisting of participants, settings, context, and data collection. Chapter five addresses the findings and discussion. Chapter six presents the research questions, conclusion, implications and further research. This study on second generation Navajo relocatees contributes to a specific topic of the larger complex subject matter.
2 BACKGROUND

The Navajo Hopi Land dispute is a complex issue embroiled on the premise in defining who has claims to the 1882 Executive Order (EO) reservation. Throughout the entire process, Congress tended to circumvent its trust responsibility and permitted the courts to settle the land dispute. The courts performed the role of the disciplinarian and guardian while the Navajo Nation and Hopi Tribe resembled two children fighting over property. In other words, the courts became the guardian and the tribes resembled the ward (Williams, 2005).

The purpose of chapter two is to provide information on a complex issue of the land dispute between the two tribes, Navajo Nation and Hopi Tribe, and how these complex issues resulted in compulsory relocation to those affected through dispossession and displacement. The chapter provides a brief background on the historical characterization of both tribes, a glimpse into their co-existing relationships with one another, the Long Walk of the Navajo in 1864, the creations of the 1882 Executive Order, the finding of valuable coal, the creation of District Six, the three influential court cases, Healing v. Jones, as well as additional court cases, and the Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 to bring finality to the land dispute. With a glimpse into the historical components of the land dispute, it is hoped these events will show how it has affected second generation Navajo relocatees.

2.1 Oral Traditions v. Science

Navajo and Hopi oral traditions are firm about their existence in their homelands from time immemorial, for Navajos specifically within the four sacred mountains of their southwestern homeland which today comprises the Navajo Nation (Navajo Nation Human
Rights Commission 2012). Throughout the twentieth century, oral tradition has been rejected by archaeologist reasoning as an “unscientific line of evidence” (Bernardini 2008, 484). Oral traditions of Indigenous Peoples historically have included creation stories not aligned with scientific theories that have been used to determine migrations of Indigenous Peoples into the Western Hemisphere. These western science perspectives have been used to negate the connection between indigenous peoples and their lands. The Hopis have maintained continuity in their ancestral villages since at least the AD 1200s (Bernardini 2008) and the written about as early as 1540 (Healing v. Jones 1962; Loftin 1995). According to anthropological research and in historical journals Navajos were written about for the first time in 1629, (Healing v. Jones 1962; Spicer 1986). From these historical records, the Hopis were characterized as being “timid and inoffensive…peaceable and friendly with outsiders,” and “intelligent and industrious with their working time being interrupted by lengthy religious ceremonies and exhausting tribal dances,” (Healing v. Jones 1962). Contrary to the Hopis, the Navajos were described as being “aggressive in nature, although not warlike as Apaches”, and were “sturdy, virile people, industrious and optimistic…also intelligent and thrifty (Healing v. Jones 1962; Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission 2012). The characterization of the Hopi and Navajo by the courts in the “language of the savage” (Williams 2012) are a continuation of racial stereotyping imagery that began with first contact.

2.2 Navajos and Hopi Relations

Navajo perspectives hold the Navajos and Hopis have coexisted in the area for years through intermarriages, sharing clan identification and ceremonial obligations (Schoepfle 1979). Examples include Hopis taking a risk by assisting Navajo Headman Segundo to conceal his
livestock among Hopi stock from the Spaniards. When Narbona, a Navajo leader and warrior, lived in the vicinity of Oraibi, his three children all married Hopis (Brugge 1994, 17). According from an informant to an ethnographer in 1830’s, the two tribes were friendly and visited each other frequently (Brugge 1994). On the other hand, there were disputes and sometimes military conflict between the two tribes, but nonetheless, both tribes relied on each other as trading partners and formed alliances when threatened by the outside forces (Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission 2012). However, the intrusion of the federal government and the media has perpetuated a negative view of the internal infighting of the two tribes to the American public (Whitson 1985; Kammer 1980). Overall the relationship between the two tribes has been one of respect, accommodation, and sharing lands prior to the intrusion of Euro-Americans.

2.3 Scorch the Earth Campaign and the Long Walk

The Navajo Long Walk, 1864 to 1968, was an event of forced removal and resettlement experiment that was determined a failure and abandoned (Thompson 1982). According to Hollis Whitson, the Navajo-Hopi land dispute “had already begun in 1863 (Whitson 1985, 374)” when Brigadier General James H. Carlton with the assistance of Kit Carson in 1863 began a genocidal “scorch the earth” campaign by indiscriminately exterminating Navajos, slaughtering their animals and destroying their crops to starve the Navajos. In addition, Carlton implemented a cultural assimilation plan that included “civilizing” the Navajos by teaching them to farm, converting them to Christianity and educating their children (Denetdale 2007). After intense military resistance, many Navajos sought relief and surrendered in Fort Defiance; by December 1864, it is estimated that over 8,300 Navajos were imprisoned in Fort Defiance before being force to walk over 350 miles to Fort Sumner in the southeast New Mexico. On June 1, 1868, the
*Naaltsoos Sani* Treaty was signed between the Navajos and the U.S. Government, which also created a reservation now straddling the state of Arizona and New Mexico. The 1868 reservation proved to be too small for a Navajo population of more than 13,000 (Aberle 1993), located west of Dinétah, the place where Changing Woman was born, a traditional Navajo area (Iverson 2002). Prior to expulsion to Fort Sumner, many Navajo lived in the surrounding areas of the Hopis. After the Navajos were released from Fort Sumner, many returned to their home areas within the four sacred mountains of the San Francisco Peaks, Mount Hesperus, Mount Blanca, and Mount Taylor.

Map 1: Important Sites Concerning Navajo People
2.4 1882 Executive Order

In 1848, the Navajo Nation and Hopi Tribes’ aboriginal homeland was transferred through the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo between Mexico and the United States. A portion of the treaty area that was home to the Navajos and Hopis became property of the United States. By the 1850’s, the United States Army began to build forts inside the Navajo land areas (Benedek 1992). As settlers steadily increased into Navajo territory, pressure from Euro-American farmers, cattlemen, and sheepmen, forced the Navajos to move further into the customary areas of Hopi territory generating disputes over land and resources (Aberle 1993; Cheyfitz 2002; Redhouse 1985). Both federal government and white settlers infringed upon Navajo and Hopi territories. According to Redhouse, the “Latter Day Saints had earlier claimed portions of the Navajo and Hopi country as part of their new church state of Deseret” (Redhouse 1985, 3).

In 1876, an Indian agent assigned to the Hopi area recommended the establishment of the Hopi reservation to bring a resolution to the encroachment of the Mormon and Navajo populations (Kammer 1980). In 1882, Indian Agent Fleming was assigned to the disputed area. Fleming was distressed at the Hopi’s negative reaction toward the federal government’s education program. Agent Fleming sought to evict two Anglos assisting Hopis in opposition to sending their children to Bureau of Indian Affairs operated boarding schools. At the time, the Hopi Villages were considered public lands and not an official federal Indian reservation; thus, Indian agent Fleming did not have the proper authority and jurisdiction to remove the Anglos (Benedek 1992, 8; Cheyfitz 2002). In November 1882, Agent Fleming wrote to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs explaining the situation regarding the two Anglos and
recommended the establishment of a reservation for the Hopis. President Chester Arthur on December 16, 1882 signed the 1882 Executive Order (EOA) creating a reservation, “for the use and occupancy of Moqui, and other such Indians as the Secretary of the Interior may see fit to settle thereon,” for the purpose to exercise jurisdictional authority to evict non-Indian trespassers from Hopi territory by an Indian Agent (Aberle 1993; Benedek 1992; Kammer 1980; Cheyfitz 2002). The Indian Agent’s goal in their role as an American statesman was to advance the frontier in an orderly manner by restricting white and Indian contact to maintain order and tranquility (Prucha 2000, 194). During the hasty creation of the 1882 Executive Order reservation, an estimated 600 Navajos living within the newly created 1882 reservation were not accounted for or made aware of this change (Aberle 1993). The created 1882 reservation,

Map 2: 1882 Executive Order Reservation
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a rectangular track of land about 75 miles and 55 miles wide, was withdrawn from public domain confining the two tribes to a specific territory signaling to settlers that lands outside of the 1882 reservation are public domain. Shortly after the Hopi reservation was established through an Executive Order by President Chester Arthur

2.5 Coal Gold

Lying underneath the 1882 reservation lands was an easily “exploitable coal deposit estimated at 2.5 billion tons to perhaps as much as 25 billion tons” (Goodman and Thompson 1975; J. M. Goodman 1976). As early as 1900, there have been attempts to replace the status of Executive Order Indian lands into the category of “Public Domain” for mineral development (Young 1978, 54). These acts could be perceived as special interest attempting to apply capitalistic measures to serve, maintain, and protect privileged society (Delgado and Stefancic 2001). According to Goodman, the high quality coal deposits made the land a matter of economic interest to parties outside of the Navajo Nation and Hopi Tribes (J. M. Goodman 1976). In 1946, John Boyd began pressuring the Department of Interior to clarify the ownership interest of the mineral estate in the 1882 Executive Order; Felix Cohen held that the two tribes had undivided interest (Whitson 1985). The coal mining of Black Mesa, a sacred area within the 1882 reservation, began in 1968 to provide electricity to privileged society in urban centers in the southwest, yet neglecting to provide basic electricity service to Navajos residing right next to where the valuable resource was being extracted

2.6 1934 Reservation
On June 17, 1934, Congress enacted the *Arizona Boundary Bill* to extend and confirm the exterior boundary of the Navajo reservation in Arizona, “…for the benefit of Navajo and other such Indians already settled thereon” (Benedek 1992; Brugge 1994). The boundaries are described as the Navajo Indian Reservation.

Map 3: 1934 Reservation

When the court made a ruling in *Healings v. Jones* (1962), litigation between the two tribes ensued. The Hopis claimed they have undivided one-half interest, and Navajos claimed exclusive interest. The court ruled both tribes have an undivided one-half interest in all lands it "possessed, occupied or used" in 1934, *Sekaquaptewa v. MacDonald*, 626 F.2d 1 13 (9th Cir. 1980) (08-21-80). Appeals were filed and because of continuing litigation, a Navajo family that
became victims included the Tso family, whose home was located on the 1934 reservation was burned down. The Tso family made a request to the Hopi Tribe the opportunity to rebuild their home. Because of the Hopi Tribe’s claim to the 1934 reservation, they enjoined the Tso family from rebuilding on the site and contested the injunction in Hopi Court, Sekaquaptewa v. MacDonald, 591 F.2d 1289 (9th Cir. 1979). A portion of the 1934 reservation became known as the Bennett Freeze, an area where all improvement and development activity came to a standstill.

2.7 District Six

When the Hopi Tribe accepted Indian Reorganization Act in 1934, it also directed the Secretary of the Interior to create and make rules and regulation for the administration of Hopi livestock. When the Secretary created the Hopi Grazing Management District Six in 1936, it was defined as lands to be exclusively utilized by the Hopi Tribe (Brugge 1994; Kammer 1980; Lacerenza 1988). The District Six boundaries were entirely in the 1882 reservation taking in the Hopi villages and lands utilized by both Hopi and Navajo Indians. On April 24, 1943, Land Management District Six was approved by the Office of Indian Affairs, and the Healings v. Jones II (1962) case awarded the Hopis to be exclusive owners of District Six (23 Indian Claims Commission 277 June 29, 1970). District Six consist of approximately 650,000 acres (Kam 1980; Lacerenza 1988). The approval of the land management district, within the boundaries of the 1882 reservation, brought disappointment, “[t]he Hopi Tribe vigorously protested the establishment of District Six” (Senate 2005). According to a Senate report, “Due to increasing tensions between the two tribes, the Congress passed the Navajo and Hopi Rehabilitation Act in 1950 (P.L. 85-740). The Act was intended to promote cooperation between
the tribes by providing federal funding for the construction of infrastructure including roads, hospitals, irrigation, radio, and telephone communications” (Senate 2005)

Map 4: District Six

![Map of District Six]

Source: Report and Plan: Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission 1981

2.8 Act of 1958 and the Three Healing V. Jones cases

In 1957, the hope for a mutual resolution between the two tribes dissolved, the Hopi Tribe sought legislation from Congress to allow the two tribes to sue one another to quiet title to the 1882 reservation (Cheyfitz 2002; Scudder 1982; Senate 2005). Congress passed the Act of July 22, 1958, Pub. L. 85-547; 72 Stat. 403, to “determine the rights and interest of the Navaho Tribe and Hopi Tribe to the 1882 Executive Order…by a three panel judge in district court (Senate 2005).” Congress basically gave permission to both tribes to sue one another in district court to “quiet title” to determine who has rights to these lands. The Act of 1958 became the impetus to the three Healing v. Jones cases, decided in 1959, 1962 and 1963. Both Hopi Tribe
and Navajo Nation presented to the courts to resolve the conflicting claim to the 1882 Executive Order. The plaintiff Hopi Tribe asserted that it had exclusive beneficial interest in all of the 1882 reservation with trust title, and defendant Navajos contended that, subject to the U.S. trust title, it had a four-fifths interest of the 1882 reservation, and that the Hopis had the remainder. To determine which tribe has rights and interest to the 1882 Executive Order area, the court in three cases, *Healings v. Jones*, decided the issue.

In *Healings v. Jones*, 174 F. Supp. 211 (Dist. Arizona, 1959), the U.S. Government motioned to dismiss the suit but the Court denied the motion by reasoning the 1882 reservation is vested equitable interest not executive political discretion. The Court ruled the Indians do not have legally-protected interest to lands unless Congress conveys it; the 1882 Executive Order was a presidential order unconfirmed by Congress. In *Healings v. Jones*, 210 F. Supp. 125, 129 (Dist. Arizona, September 28, 1962), authorized under special statute, Act of July 22, 1958, a three judge panel court ruled, “[t]he Hopi and Navajo Tribes have joint, undivided, and equal interests as to the surface and sub-surface including all resources appertaining thereto, subject to the trust title of the United States” and the Hopis having exclusive interest in District Six within the 1882 reservation, and its remaining area became the Joint Use Area (JUA). In 1963, *Healing v. Jones*, 373 U.S. 758 (June 03, 1963), the U.S. Supreme denied certiorari and reaffirmed the United States District Court for the District of Arizona’s holding. The court upheld that the “[t]he Hopi and Navajo Tribes have joint, undivided, and equal interests as to the surface and sub-surface” as well as the Hopis having exclusive interest to District Six (Healing v. Jones 1963). Despite the Court ruling, Congress would allow the courts to make the final decision on how it would be divided.
The Navajo and Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-531) was passed by Congress on Dec. 22, 1974 to put finality to the land dispute between the two tribes by partitioning the lands.

A significant jurisdictional provision was given to the Arizona District Court to partition the JUA with an allocation of lands “in equal in acreage and quality” (Whitson 1985). The Act also created the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation; an independent agency to relocate tribal members living on land that was awarded to the other tribe and charged with creating a plan. The main provisions of the P.L. 93-531 were,

1. The establishment of Navajo and Hopi negotiating team under the sponsorship of a federal mediator to settle the matter within a six month range period from the date of enactment.
2. The Court ordered partition of the 1882 Reservation based on the mediator’s recommendations if tribal negotiations did not succeed.
3. Relocation of Navajo and Hopi individuals living on partitioned lands they are not a member of.
4. Authority to purchase 250,000 acres of Bureau of Land Management lands by the Navajos for purposes of relocation.
5. A livestock reduction program.
6. Authority to sue one another for damages arising out of the dispute as well as livestock reduction program.
The Navajo and Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 created the Navajo and Hopi Relocation Commission consisting of three commissioners. The three commissioners were given the duty to create and submit a relocation plan that called for completing relocation within five years after the plan was approved by Congress. Congress approved the plan in 1981. The relocation process was not completed by the three member commissioners by July 1986; five years after Congress approved the relocation plan (Office of Inspector General: U.S. Department of Interior 2014). A 1988 amendment allowed the three commissioners to be replaced with a single Commissioner and the establishment of the Office of Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation, an independent agency of

- Navajo Partition Lands
- Hopi Partition Lands.
the Executive Branch. Initially, an estimate of 6,000 Navajos were assumed would be eligible for relocation, however, when tribal negotiations failed, the mediator advised that the adoption of his recommended partition line would relocate an approximately 3,495 Navajos (Senate 2005). Some residents of the former Joint Use Area or current Hopi Partitioned Lands were already being relocated by 1977, “voluntary relocations were commenced in May 1977…on May 15, 1978, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals vacated the line of partition which resulted in a cessation of relocation” (Lewis, Atkinson and Massetto 1981, 2), and recommencing after an interim partition line was established on August 30, 1978.

The Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act sought to eliminate and or reduce adverse impacts of relocation by “providing a thorough and generous relocation program, administered by an independent commission” (Lewis, Atkinson and Massetto 1981). The generous packet of the relocation program included “payment of an incentive bonus, and purchase of the relocatee’s present improvements in the partitioned area and the purchase of a decent, safe and sanitary replacement home” (Lewis, Atkinson and Massetto 1981). The relocation benefits or home replacement benefits were based on “the 9th principle which guided the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in its deliberations on P.L. 93-561 (Lewis, Atkinson and Massetto 1981, 1):

“That any such division of the lands of the Joint Use Area must be undertaken in conjunction with the thorough and generous relocation program to minimized the adverse social, economic and cultural impacts of relocation on affected Tribal members and to avoid any repetition of the unfortunate results of a number if early official Indian relocation efforts (Lewis, Atkinson and Massetto 1981, 1).”
The Home Replacement Benefits, also known as relocation benefits are provided to head of households, who are eligible under the following federal regulations Title 25, CHAPTER IV, §700.147. The primary eligibility criteria’s include,

a) The head of household and/or immediate family must have been residents on December 22, 1974, of an area partitioned to the Tribe of which they were not members.

b) The burden of proving residence and head of household status is on the applicant.

c) Individuals are not permitted to receive separate benefits if they are members of a household which has received benefits.

d) Relocation benefits are limited to those who qualify as heads-of-household as of July 7, 1986.

Due to the narrow eligibility criterions, second generation Navajo relocatees are often denied because they relocated with their parents as children (Appendix 7.1). Often, a second generation Navajo relocatee finds it extremely difficult to qualify under the criterions, particularly when they are part of a household that has received benefits and had relocated. The “eligibility requirements and application process are complex. Only people who attained head of household status while living on Hopi Partition Land (HPL) are eligible at the time of filing for benefits” (Affairs 07-21-2005).

At the beginning of the relocation program in 1974, it was estimated that the cost of the program would be $34 million (Senate Indian Affairs July 21, 2005, 22), but as of fiscal year 2014, the cost is at $564 million (Office of Inspector General: U.S. Department of Interior 2014) and more likely to continue increase. Relocatees were offered a home and incentive bonus if
they voluntarily relocate (Lewis, Atkinson and Massetto 1981) even though the law clearly mandates that they relocate.

To entice Navajos to relocate from the former JUA area, benefits and bonuses were offered to eligible relocatees according to 84 Stat. 1894. The standards of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 or 84 Stat. 1894 was utilized in benefits appropriations which are restricted primarily to moving expenses, replacement housing and advisory services for homeowners, tenants, businessmen and farmers (Scudder 1982). According to a report by the Office of Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation in November 2014, out of 7,161 applications, the Office has certified 3,832 families for relocation benefits and has denied 3,329 other applicants. Of the amount certified, 3,592 are closed cases, 122 are closed cases who are unable to move for various reasons, and currently have 118 certified families to move. There are about 285 appeals pending that will be heard by the Hearing Officer throughout 2015 and 2016 (ONHIR doc).

Table 1: Relocation Status: Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Applicants</th>
<th>Certified Applicants</th>
<th>Denied Applicants</th>
<th>Closed Certified Cases</th>
<th>Closed Case</th>
<th>Current Certified families to move</th>
<th>Cases to be heard in 2015 &amp; 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,161</td>
<td>3,832</td>
<td>3,329</td>
<td>3,592</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation
Table 2: Relocation Status: Specific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Families Relocated from HPL/NPL</th>
<th>On-Reservation Home sites</th>
<th>Off-Reservation</th>
<th>Remaining to be Relocated</th>
<th>Administratively Closed Cased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>3570</td>
<td>2373</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation

2.10 Plethora of Suits

After the *Healing v. Jones* (1962) decision, the ruling of both tribes being co-tenants brought a superfluous of suits for years in litigation entanglement. An exhaustive list of litigated issues related to grazing areas, construction, overgrazing, boundary, value of land, religious freedom, home replacement benefits, and eligibility criteria issues. Both tribes and individuals filed suits. Even individual Navajos who were residents filed suits in the courts to litigate over their rights to home replacement benefits; provisions of P.L. 93-531 eligibility criteria are complex and disregard many residents (Bitsui).

- The Hopis asked to enforce their rights as co-tenants to grazing areas and resources, and the Navajos argued a single judge District Court decision is not final nor has jurisdiction; the Court ruled for the Hopi Tribe and that Arizona District Court has authority, *Hamilton v. Nakai*, 453 F.2d 152 (9th Cir. 1971).
- The United States brought suit on behalf of the Hopi Tribe to evict sixteen Navajos residing in District Six resulting the Court to affirm the Healing v. Jones decision that extinguished
any claim that Navajo Tribe may have had to aboriginal title in District Six, *United States v. Kabinto*, 456 F. 2d 1087 (*9th Cir.* 1972).

- The Hopi Tribe appealed their award to half of JUA lands, and to mandate the Navajos to reduce their livestock and restrict construction on jointly held lands. The Navajos challenged the livestock plan and that the restriction of construction will bring hardship to Navajo citizens. The court ruled “range conservation” is an “exercise by the [Tribes] of their equal interests, and construction is restricted thus imposing a freeze in the Joint Use Area (JUA), *Hamilton v. MacDonald*, 503 F.2d 1138 (*9th Cir.* 1974).

- In a follow up, the court held the Navajos and U.S. Government in contempt of court for not reducing livestock, *Sekaquaptewa v. MacDonald*, 544 F.2d 396 (*9th Cir.* 1976).

- The Navajos appealed the partition boundary decision by asserting the district court abused its discretion under P.L. 93-531. The court affirmed the partition judgment, *Sekaquaptewa v. MacDonald*, 575 F.2d 239 (*9th Cir.* 1978).

- An 80 years old Navajo woman who was born and resided most of her life on JUA partitioned lands was denied benefits despite her name appearing on a list submitted to Congress by the Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation Commission (NHIRC) as a resident of Hopi-partitioned lands. The District court ruled for NHIRC in that eligibility for benefits is decided on a case-by-case, *Walker v. Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation Commission*, 728 F.2d 1276 (*9th Cir.* 1984).

- A Navajo Family applied for relocation rights, the parents deleted their children’s name at the guidance of Office of Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation (ONHIR) because the children could receive benefits in their own rights. When one child became an adult and applied for benefits, they were denied, the family sought review. The court agreed with the denial and
that ONHIR was not arbitrary, capricious, or unsupported by evidence, however, the court reversed the districts court’s grant of summary judgment on the family’s claim for increased housing benefits. *Bedoni v. ONHIR, No. 87-1818 (9th Cir. 1989).*


- The Hopis filed claims concerning damages to HPL range land from overgrazing by Navajo livestock prior to the partition of lands, *Masayesva v. Hale 17032*, 95-15029 etl, and damages for the use of their share of the JUA by Navajos from 1962-1979; the Hopis were awarded damages, *Masayesva v. Hale, No. 76-934 (D. Ariz. 1993).*

- The Hopi Tribe filed a claim for *Owelty* for the difference in the value of the divided JUA lands, but the court denied an Owelty award, *Secakuku v. Hale, No. 58-579 (D. Ariz.1993).*

- The Court was the only forum available to attempt to resolve these conflicts. In one opinion, the judge stated, “Congress decided that the dispute should be brought to an end by litigation…” *Masayesva v. Zah 65 F.3d 1445 (9th Cir. 1995).*

- In the *Noller Pete Herbert* case, decided in February 2008, the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona determined that ONHIR was aware that Noller Pete Herbert to be a member of a family residing on the Hopi Partitioned Lands and that he may qualify for relocation benefits on his own when he turned 18. ONHIR lost an Administrative Procedure Act appeal. The court found that ONHIR had not provided personal notice to Noller Pete Herbert before July 7, 1986, so as to enable him to apply for relocation benefits. As a result, some heads of household who met the eligibility criteria as of 1986 were able to apply for benefits as late as August 31, 2010. In response to this decision and after consultation with the U.S. Department of Justice, ONHIR reopened the application process and accepted

2.11 Nahata Dzil (New Lands)

The 1980 amendment to P.L. 93-531 allowed for the Federal Government to purchase approximately 400,000 acres in Arizona and New Mexico. In 1988, of this land, 350,000 acres was dedicated for a planned community in Sanders, Arizona, called New Lands or Nahata Dziil community for eligible Navajo families facing relocation.

Map 6: Nahatah Dzil / New Lands est. 350,000 acres

Moving to Nahata Dziil was an alternative for Navajo families who wanted to dwell close together in a setting that was as close to their original homelands as possible (Senate Indian
According to a U.S. Geological Survey report, the population was expected to increase from a “pre-1983 population of approximately 875 to about 3,000 people as a result of relocation” (Wirt, Van Metre and Favor 1991, 3). By June 1990, 149 families had relocated to Nahata Dziil area (Wirt, Van Metre and Favor 1991). According to the 2010 census data, the population was 1,731 (2010 U.S. Census). On August 16, 1991, the Nahata Dziil Chapter became the 110th chapter on the Navajo Nation to fulfill the requirements of becoming a Local Governance Act certified chapter (Nation 2013).

2.12 Life Estates and Accommodation Agreements

The Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Amendments Act of 1980 or P.L. 96-305, authorized the Navajo Hopi Relocation Commission to grant Life Estates to eligible applicants. Major revision to the 1978 amendments to grant Life Estates were provided under the following conditions, “1) The household head was forty or over (or disabled), 2) the education and skills of the household head were considered a barrier to successful relocation in a border town off the reservation, 3) It is not possible for the household to relocate on the reservation” (Scudder 1982, 121). If relocatees were granted a Life Estate, they were able to maintain adequate “livestock for subsistence purposes and to make improvements during the tenure of the life estate, and until the head of household dies or spouse, whichever that is later” (Scudder 1982, 121).

In 1996, Congress passed the Navajo-Hopi Dispute Settlement Act of 1996 or P. L. 104-301, also known as the Accommodation Agreements, which gave Navajos an option to continue living in Hopi Partition Lands by entering into a 75 year "accommodation lease” with the Hopis. Challenges were ensued by the Hopi Tribe to the Dispute Settlement Act for annual Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) rental determinations for the leases, Hopi Tribe v. Navajo Nation, Nos. 85-

2.13 Bennett Freeze

Robert L. Bennett (Oneida), Commissioner of Indian Affairs, ordered a halt to all basic home improvements and development in the Joint Use Area consisting of 1.5 million acres of land in 1966. Commissioner Bennett, in his negotiating capacity tried to coerce the Navajos to negotiate a land settlement with the Hopi Tribe. The order became known as the Bennett Freeze. The Bennett Freeze was supposed to be a temporary measure until the land dispute could be determined and settle. However, it effectively impeded all infrastructure, commercial, and residential development, along with improvements and repairs to Navajo homes. Families residing in the Bennett Freeze did not face relocation, yet the difference of opinions regarding land between the two tribes directly impacted an estimated 8,000 Navajo families. With an increasing population, the homes of Navajo families living in the Bennett Freeze area became dilapidated and overcrowded (Bitsuie). In September 1992, the Bennett Freeze was lifted, Masayesva v. Zah civ 74-842, permitting Navajos to repair and make additions to existing homes. The court granted the Hopi Tribe partial stay pending an appeal in preventing the Navajo Nation from establishing new home sites in certain JUA areas, Masayesva v. Zah 816 F. Supp. 1387. In 1993, the Hopis appealed in contempt action for illegal construction by Navajo resident in JUA, Masayesva v. Zah, No. 58-579 PCT EHC D. Hopis argue that the district court lacked authority to lift the statutory freeze; the court reinstated the Freeze, Masayesva v. Zah 65 F.3d 1445 (9th Cir. 1995). After more than forty years of Navajo families living in inhumane
conditions, Secretary of Interior Dirk Kempthorne approved an Intergovernmental Compact
between the Hopi Tribe and Navajo Nation to end more than 40 years of litigation and to end the
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Bennett Freeze on November 2006. To bring finality to the freeze, on May 8, 2009, President Barack Obama signed the 111th Congressional act to repeal the Bennett Freeze, section 10(f) of P.L. 93-531 (NavajoTimes).

The Federal Government is liberal in exercising its fiduciary power in the taking or recognizing of property and title in managing Indian affairs in the best interest of the Indians under the trust relationship doctrine, but rather in the best interest of the Federal Government’s imperialistic framework. Western history sources invalidated oral traditional stories in the legal
arena instead applied science and failed to consider how the Navajo and Hopis have lived together for time immemorial. In the language of the savage, either tribe has been described in negative racial stereotypes and imagery to justify oppression and make decisions on their behalf by politicizing and radicalizing their identities. The 1864 and 1974 force removals of Navajos are compatible to U.S. Federal policy plans instill assimilation as well as genocide. The creations of statutory lands by the Federal Government – 1882 Executive Order reservation, 1934 reservation (Arizona Boundary Bill), 1936 District Six, 1963 Joint Use Area (JUA), 1966 Bennett Freeze area, and the 1974 Navajo and Hopi Land Settlement Act- are rooted in imperialism and desire for material gain of land and coal. When Congress allowed the courts to settle the dispute entirely by litigation lasting over 50 years with a slew of lawsuits, where neither tribe came out the winner.

When Congress ratified P.L. 93-531, it created several issues which produced various unique circumstances for Navajos who are impacted by the policy. First, it created Navajo residents of Hopi Partition Lands to relocate either off the reservation or to a community on the Navajo reservation whether they were eligible for home replacement benefits or not (Senate Indain Affairs 07-21-2005). Secondly, in 1988, the Federal Government purchased 345,032 (Administration 2005) acres of land for a planned community in Sanders, Arizona, called New Lands or Nahata Dziil community for eligible Navajo families facing relocation. Moving to Nahata Dziil was an alternative for Navajo families who wanted to dwell close together in a setting that was as close to their original homelands as possible (Senate Indian Affairs 07-21-2005). Thirdly, the many community members of Big Mountain, Arizona, became known for their strong resistant and activism against relocation, and to protect the nearby Black Mesa from being mined for coal as it is considered the liver of Mother Earth. The surrounding area is a
primary sacred area within Navajo and Hopi territory with sites of special shrines, rituals, locations of medicinal herbs collected by healers. Fourth, a number of Navajo families rejected the idea of moving off their traditional home land. As a response, Congress passed the Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute Settlement Act of 1996 by providing an accommodation agreement as a solution by allowing some Navajos to sign a 75 year lease with conditions, including signing an agreement with the Hopi Tribe (Senate Indian Affairs 07-21-2005). Fifth, on the eastern portion of the Hopi reservation, the community of Jeddito, Arizona, was located on Hopi Partition Land but remains under Navajo Nation jurisdiction today due to a large concentrated population of Navajos. This particular population base of Navajos was considered too large to relocate; however, Navajos living outside the boundaries of Jeddito were relocated elsewhere. Today, Jeddito is an island because it is entirely surrounded by the Hopi reservation. Sixth, the western portion of the 1934 reservation became known as “Bennett Freeze” which was instituted in July 8, 1966 on 1.5 million acres on western Navajo Nation (Affairs 07-21-2005). The policy was originally initiated to encourage negotiations to resolve the land dispute between the Navajos and Hopis. Instead it became an oppressive policy for Navajo residents to live in extreme poverty by denying them the basic human right to extend, maintain and mend their homes. Lastly, the Navajo minors who relocated with their parents from their traditional home areas are not likely to be eligible for home replacement benefits when they become adults, thus creating a second generation of Navajo relocatees. In many cases, the second generation of Navajo relocatees has become displaced due to their family’s traditional home area being dispossessed.
3 LITERATURE REVIEW

The relocation of Navajos is considered the largest mandated relocation imposed by the U.S. Government due to the Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 since the internment of Japanese Americans in World War II (Scudder 1982; Tamir 2000). The 1974 Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act relocated over 12,000 Navajos from their customary lands has been a dramatic life changing experience, often traumatizing individuals, families, and communities, as well as disenfranchising future generations.

The Navajo and Hopi land dispute has produced controversy and debates through various sources. The relocation of Navajos has been a theme for a variety of numerous literatures targeting the local, national and international audience. The controversy of the relocation of Navajos has been addressed in newspapers, dissertations, academic journals, books, films, websites, including YouTube films. The subject matter found in the literature ranges broadly from the cosmology and spiritual aspects, conception and history of the issue, legal analysis, case law, Congressional testimonies, mineral interest, health concerns, and reflecting a variety of opinions and views of how it could have been resolved. There are no in-depth studies investigating the situation of the children of relocation living in urban communities as a result of their removal from their ancestral homeland. The very little research that has been found addressing the Navajo children of relocation includes one limited study and two studies regarding the uncertain situation of the children of relocation. The literature review will be organized thematically to provide an understanding of the Navajo relocation issue, specifically regarding the children of relocation.
3.1 Cosmology

The Navajo cosmology is relevant to understanding the relationship that exists between land and being Navajo as part of identity. Maureen Trudelle Schwarz provides insight and information on the complex relationship between Navajos and land. Schwarz illustrates why Navajo people are very reluctant to leave their home which provides a sense of place. The home is the place where the “umbilical cord of a Navajo person is buried connecting them to the earth,” (Schwarz 1997, 44) comparable to a mother and child relationship, establishing a path of Navajo personhood. The Navajo creation story illustrates First Man and First Woman coming through the four worlds and into the fifth world instructing the Navajo people to live within the four sacred mountains (Iverson 2002; Iverson 1981; Underhill, 1956); in addition, “Changing Woman gave warning to the Navajo people that leaving the land of the four sacred mountains is a violation of Navajo stewardship and the reciprocity with the Holy People” (Schwarz 1997, 46).

Former Executive Director of the Navajo Hopi Land Commission Roman Bitsuie in his testimony to the Senate Indian Affairs Committee states the creation story teaches us that we “have a special relationship to the land, including a duty to take care of it” (Senate Indian Affairs, p. 8). His testimony, as an insider, provided insight to the Committee that is interlaced with a range of in-depth knowledge concerning cosmology. According to Schwarz, many impacted Navajo people view relocation as a breach with the Holy People and of personhood, severing the connection of person to place causing a disruption leading to depression, family instability, and health problems (Schwarz 1997, 44). Bitsuie reports that the relocation program has come to be identified as the cause of sickness and death, as well as depression, illness, and family breakups (Senate Indian Affairs, 9). The structure of the complex relationship between the Holy People and Navajos is according to paradigms of Navajo origin stories (Schwarz 1997).
3.2 History

The historical aspects of Navajo and Hopi relocation and its correlation to the conception of the land dispute provides a foundational understanding of how the past influenced outcome as documented in previous literature. Historical account from the 1800’s when New Mexico and Arizona were still a part of the Republic of Mexico and transition through the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo without the knowledge of both Navajo Nation and Hopi Tribes (Aberle 1993; Benedek 1992; Kammer 1980; Brugge 1994). The interactions between Navajos and Hopis as well as neighboring Pueblos were written about with accounts being peaceful and, at times, with conflict (Iverson 1981). The Long Walk of the Navajos and their imprisonment in Fort Sumner from 1864 to 1868 concluded in the signing of the Navajo Treaty of 1868 between Navajo leaders and United States Government. Thereafter, Navajos were allowed to return to their land; the 1868 Treaty reservation had proven to be small for the Navajo population, “a rectangular area that far too small” (Aberle 1993, 157) to accommodate it growing population (Kammer 1980; Wilkinson 1999). By 1882, President Chester A. Arthur set aside a rectangle of land measuring 75 miles by 55 miles for the “use occupancy of the Moquis [Hopis] and such other Indians as the Secretary of the Interior may see fit to settle thereon,” becoming known as the 1882 Executive Order Area (Aberle 1993; Benedek 1992; Goodman and Thompson 1975; Parlow 1986; Tamir 1999; Whitson 1985; Wilkinson 1999). As an extension of the Indian Reorganization Act in 1934, a Hopi livestock district, known as District 6 was created as the first de facto partition, subsequently, the next de facto partition came when the Navajo and Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 is passed by Congress (Aberle 1993; Benedek 1992; Brugge 1994; Cheyfitz 2002; Kammer 1980).
3.3 Legal

The land dispute between the Navajo and Hopi’s is largely based on legal conflicts throughout the years. Hollis A. Whitson analyzed the impacts of Navajo and Hopi relocation through a legal point of view. According to Whitson, there are two versions of the dispute over land in the Joint Use Area. First, the traditional Navajos and Hopis say there is no land dispute between the two tribes but is created and sustained by the federal and tribal government. In the second version, there is claim that Navajos disregard Hopi land rights thus requiring Congressional and judicial meddling to protect Hopi interest (Whitson 1985, 373). In 1958, Congress authorized P.L. 85-547 to allow the Navajo and Hopis to participate in a lawsuit to sue each other to determine who had rights and interest in the 1882 Executive Order area (Aberle 1993; Benedek 1992; Brugge 1994; Kammer 1980; Whitson 1985). In *Healing v. Jones, 174 F. Supp. 211 (D. Ariz. 1959)*, the district court denied the U.S. government’s motion to dismiss based on *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock, 187 U.S. 553 (1903)*, and the plenary power doctrine, “Indians do not have a legally-protected interest to their ancestral lands unless Congress acts affirmatively to convey those rights” (Whitson 1985, 377). In addition, the court said, the “1882 Executive Order was vested equitable interest *not* political discretion” (Whitson 1985, 377). In *Healing v. Jones (1962)*, determined the question of who owns the land in the 1882 Executive Order Act issued by President Chester Arthur in December 16, 1982. The court ruled the Navajo and Hopis have joint, equal an undivided interest in lands and mineral rights outside the boundaries of the land management district as defined in 1934 (District 6) and as determined by the 1882 Executive Order. The Hopis have exclusive right and interest to surface and subsurface, including all resources in District 6 (Healing v. Jones 1962). The Court determined if the tribes
were not able to manage the land fairly, then partition of the reservation would be inevitable. The Supreme Court denied certiorari (Healing v. Jones 1963).

3.4 Mineral Interest

The knowledge that the 1882 Executive Order area is rich in coal is demonstrated by the mining of coal in the Black Mesa area, and possibly enriched with oil. Whitson article suggest the relocation policy is part of a “long term plan to develop the rich mineral resource areas.” (Whitson 1985, 392). It was important to the energy companies to have a legal binding lease to the existing minerals and that the title to the area was quieted; whether the land was jointly owned or divided between the two tribes was not regarded as being important (Aberle 1993).

James Goodman provides a geographic analysis of the partitioned lands supplemented with P.L. 93-531. Goodman writes the Black Mesa mine within the dispute area yields as much as 2.5 billion to 25 billion tons of coal and pristine water (J. M. Goodman 1976, 5). The question posed by Goodman is “should the ground water be retained for future use by the Indian, or can its use as a conveyance for coal be justified while the semi-arid lands remain parched?” Goodman says the problem lies in the allocation of property rights to American Indians by applying an Anglo-Saxon legal solution to a property in dispute outside the traditions of Anglo-Saxon property rights (J. M. Goodman, 5). The Navajo and Hopis joint, undivided, and sharing method of the surface and subsurface was not amicable when Congress partitioned the lands resulting of relocation for both tribal members who were on the wrong side of the fence. His conclusions are the Navajo and Hopi are forced to operate within the “framework of Anglo laws when mixed with the psychological and cultural implications of Navajo relocation” (J. M.
Goodman 1976). To rectify the problems of the dispute impacts is an immense problem to resolve (J. M. Goodman 1976).

3.5 Relevant Empirical Studies

The Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act 1974 prescribed a mandate that Navajo people dwelling within the Hopi Partitioned Lands (HPL) relocate from the area. Thousands of Navajo were involuntarily resettled elsewhere from their customary lands their families resided on. Several empirical studies were conducted to discover how relocation impacted Navajo individuals as well as their families.

Navajo relocation studies examine Navajo relationship to land, socioeconomics, and impacts on women, including relocated Navajo adults suffering from substance abuse, and mental illness, and family breakups as a result of relocation (Joe 1986; Scudder, 1982; Tamir, 1999; Topper, 1979). In an Indian Health Service report submitted by Martin D. Topper, a special concern had been shown for Navajo relocatees who are over the age of 40 because of undue stress related to the land (Topper 1979, 14). However, there is little research about the Navajo children of relocation, and how P.L. 93-531 altered their lives. In 1980, Dr. Thayer Scudder’s research on the impacts of relocation on Navajo families finds, “that little is known…about the effect of relocation on children, in comparison to the elderly, the children may be the forgotten victims” (Scudder 1982, 18-19). Subsequently, there has been very little—if any—examination concerning the 37% of minors who were under the age of fifteen in 1977 (Scudder, 1982, 18).
A 1982 study by Scudder indicates, “Over 5,000 Navajos and up to ninety Hopis” would be affected by Public Law 93-531 (Scudder 1982, 1). A testimony by former Executive Director of the Navajo Land Commission Office, in July 2005, states that “Congress originally estimated 1,000 Navajos and 100 Hopi heads of household would be relocated by the June 1986 deadline” (Senate Indian Affairs July 21, 2005, 9), however, “over 12,000 Navajos and hundreds of Hopis” have been impacted (Senate Indian Affairs, 3).

Studies claim that the effects on the relocatees resulted in the loss of three important elements: land, home and livestock (Scudder, 1982; Joe 1986; Topper 1979; Tamir, 1999). The compulsory relocation causes multidimensional stresses that can be categorized into three types of stress: psychophysiological, economic, and sociocultural (Scudder, 1982). Scudder (1982) interviewed 84 adults, of whom 48 were compulsory relocatees (already relocated) and 36 were potential relocatees (not yet relocated). He found that 80 percent of the 48 compulsory relocatees experienced extreme mental stress during the transition period as a result of combined loss of livestock and land. In contrast, the 36 potential relocatees whom were apprehensive about relocating did not suffer acute mental stress. For many compulsory relocatees, financial instability increased after relocation due to lack of employment and loss of livestock. 76 percent have financial problems due to being unemployed or additional cost associated with being a new urban dweller (Scudder, 1982, p. 67).

In 1986, Dr. Jennie Joe conducted a study on the impacts of relocation on traditional people which included children. First, she examined children living with their parents in the community of Hardrock, Arizona to investigate intergenerational effects of dispossession and displacement associated with forced relocation. Second, she addressed the children who
relocated to the Navajo reservation and those who relocated to bordertowns with their families to determine the sociopsychological effects of relocation (Joe, 1986).

In Joe’s first part of the study on children in the community of Hardrock, she interviewed “one-hundred-seventeen children from a subsample of 90 Hardrock families ascertain the intergeneration affects of dispossession displacement associated with forced relocation” (Joe 1985, 12) the first year of her study in 1986, decreasing to 96 children in the second year. Her conclusions indicate the children from Hardrock were highly traditional who shared many of the same concerns as their parents, such as, facing rejection and racism, and feeling helpless like their parents where few resources were available. The older children were frustrated by the exclusion from the decision making process of relocation, and felt neglected due to being unheard by the federal government. They felt they were being short-changing by the relocation program and will not be able to inherit their ancestral lands (1986).

In the second part of Joe’s study on children, the purpose was to discover the sociopsychological effects of relocation on 17 children whose average age was 14.9 years who relocated with their families. Half of the children relocated with their families to various communities on the Navajo Nation and the others relocated into border town communities. Joe (1985) finds the children enrolled in reservation schools adjusted and performed better than those enrolled in schools in bordertowns. The children who moved on to the Navajo reservation adjusted better to their new communities; however, those who moved to bordertowns, younger children adjusted well in the new communities rather than the older ones. Children who relocated to the reservation were more likely to be traditional rather than those who moved to the bordertowns.
Dr. Orit Tamir’s (1999) ethnographic study from 1987 to 1990 of post-relocation experience in Pinon, Arizona focuses on the relationship between the host community of Pinon and the relocatees. She interviewed one member each of the 47 households relocated to Pinon as well as members of 293 other host households in Pinon. Tamir (1999) found relocation increased mental and physical stress, and depression among relocatees after losing their entire customary land which provided subsistence. The loss contributed to losing their sense of place, loss of independence, initiative and self-respect. The host families’ perceptions were also addressed. In Pinon, the median income was $14,731 per household and after relocation; income had fallen to $11,191. In addition, livestock, as a source of subsistence was loss (Scudder, 1982; Tamir, 1999).

In a 2009 follow up study, 26 years later, Dr. Tamir returned to Pinon, Arizona, to investigate what happened to the original relocation participants in her 1987 to 1990 study. Tamir (2009) found claims of increased multi-dimensional stress, substance abuse and break up of families, parallel to her previous study in 1990. In addition, there was a rise in substance abuse, methamphetamine and youth gangs.

In the community of Pinon, Tamir (2009) finds that the median age was 18.3 years of age. A follow up study by Tamir (2009) found many of the first generation of relocatees and host were deceased. These incidents left the children of relocatees in an indeterminate state due to forced relocation of their parents leaving them no land use rights of their own (Tamir, 2009, p. 39). Because of being in a indeterminate state, some of the children of relocatees have moved into clustered housing areas or “projects,” or they have left Pinon, Arizona, or the reservation altogether (Tamir, 2009). Joe’s study is focused on adults and children from the 90 families as a
subsample. Additionally, Tamir’s study indicates the existence of a gap in the research concerning children of relocation (2009). She shows their situation is of uncertainty particularly in not having a land base and home. There is a sense of a disappearance of these children into the fold of the greater population base and the impacts of the relocation of Navajos are still very much present upon the subsequent generations and communities.

All three studies address adult relocatees comprehensively, and children of relocation on a limited bases or concerns are wholeheartedly expressed. In a study by Scudder (1982), 37 percent were minors under the age of fifteen in 1977, and he notates there was little examination about the effects of relocation on the minors (pg. 18). In addition, Scudder finds that 72 percent of the potential relocatees were worried about the impact of removal of their children, and concern that relocation would sever their children from the land, cutting them off from their Navajo heritage. Joe indicates the most studies concerning forced removal neglect to include children. Joe concludes that “the children appear more resilient than some of their parents whose circumstances have worsened as a result of relocation” (Joe 1985, 98-99). Tamir indicates Navajo children of relocation are left in an uncertain state. Past studies are an indicator that a study on children of Navajo relocation is necessary and inevitable.

3.6 Suggested Alternative Methods to Relocation

Dr. Thayer Scudder and Hollis Whitson provide other alternatives to relocation instead of full scale relocation. Scudder’s and Whitson’s recommendation are very thoughtful and could very well have been applied realistically by policy makers.
Scudder provided three options to the policy makers, first, continue with P.L. 93-531 as currently written; second, amend P.L. 93-531; and third, repeal P.L. 93-2531. (Scudder 1982, 110). The first option, Scudder says would be most disastrous in human and financial cost that consist of extreme multidimensional stress consisting of psychophysiological stress, economic stress, sociocultural stress due to Navajo’s strong bond to land and community, undermining of the Navajo governments efforts to further implement self-determination policy goals, an increase to the estimated excessive yet conservative cost of $200 million, and potential difficulties in completing the relocation plan due to unforeseen problems. The second option is to amend P.L. 93-531. Scudders notes that an amendment was vetoed by the President of the United States in 1978 because of a “modification allowing a one-house veto on any plan submitted by the Relocation Commission, rather than because of modification proposed to ease the stress of relocation for the Navajos (Scudder 1982, 120).” The modifications should consist of providing Life Estates, land acquisition in the same amount of acreages lost of 900,000 acres, expand P.L. 93-531 provisions to include District Six relocatees, implement effective coordination and oversight for involved federal agencies and Navajo government, provide adequate funds towards communities facilities, social services, and planning purposes for various development. The third option, to repeal P.L. 93-531 was considered most beneficial if it is linked to land purchase. Repealing P.L. 93-531 would substantially reduce the human cost for at least “5,000 potential Navajo relocatees, it’s the least expensive option, and it is more consistent with the Self-Determination Act (Scudder 1982, 126).” The repeal, however, falls short of addressing Hopi claim which can be addressed with a principal development plan that includes land acquisition, job training and employment opportunities.
Whitson recommends that federal relocation policy makers, 1) provide major attention to the relocation issue by placing it on Congressional policy-making agenda as it pertains to economic and human cost, 2) commence steps to lessen the influence of tribal attorneys in prolonging litigation between the two tribes, and 3) increase participation and dialogue with relocatees who are most directly affected by the relocation program (Whitson 1985, 396-403). Whitson also recommends to Congressional policy makers the following, 1) provide oversight to obtain reliable information and time to evaluate the relocation policy, 2) lift the moratorium to improve homes and the livelihood of the Bennett Freeze residents, 3) livestock reduction should reflect the consistency of sound range management, 4) assist three groups of distress relocatees whether they relocated and received assistance, have not applied for assistances, have already applied for assistance and are in limbo due to being denied or delayed, 5) compulsory relocation should stop, 6) meaningful compensation should be provided to the Hopis, and 7) Congress should ensure that the current relocation policies will not reoccur (Whitson 1985, 403-412). In conclusion, Whitson says relocation is an example of “contradictory, lawless nature of federal Indian law (Whitson 1985).”

3.7 International Force Displacement

Movement of people from one location to another for various reasons has occurred throughout time, in many cases, involuntarily. Involuntary relocations usually require an adaption to new physical, social, and cultural surroundings. A population base that face displacements are indigenous peoples whose lands for are targeted for development (Downing 2001; Bessel and Haake 2009; Scudder 2005; Oliver-Smith 2009). Involuntary displacement is caused by a number of factors, environmental degradation, natural disasters, conflicts, or
infrastructure projects. The development of infrastructure projects that lead to displacement include water-related infrastructure (dams, reservoirs, irrigation), urban development, transportation (roads, canals), energy (mining, power plants oil exploration and extractions, pipelines), agriculture expansion, parks and forest reserves, and population redistribution plans (IDMC.org). The displacement or relocation of populations is connected with loss of housing, shelter, income, land, livelihoods, assets, access to resources and services, among others. Displacement affects not only those physically displaced but also the resident population (people who are not directly affected and do not move yet feel the impact of losing their neighbors and resources) as well as the host population (those who receive displaced persons whom could be affected by this situation either negatively or adversely). In efforts to resettle displaced persons, the process of resettlement is initiated to replace their homes, assets, livelihoods, land, access to resources and services and to restore their socioeconomic and cultural conditions. The increasingly displaced population has promoted resettlement to become an important issue due to the social cost contributed by large infrastructures and well-organized institutes against involuntary resettlements (Asthana 1996; Bessel and Haake 2009).

Research on modern day relocation, displacement and resettlement surfaced in the late 1950’s from the aftermath of World War II leaving many victims in displacee status (Oliver-Smith 2009, Bessel and Haake 2009). With increase interest of involuntary displacement, existing literature increasingly appeared in journals, books, thematic papers, dissertations, Youtube videos, newspapers, institutional report have increased in addressing the many causes of displacement. Despite the tremendous amount of literature, the review will be narrowed to cases that may be similar to the relocation of Navajos, a “planned” involuntary displacement and
resettlement. The review will focus on existing key frameworks that have been developed and utilized to address involuntary displacement and resettlement cases in various global locations.

3.8 Terminology

When scholars, researchers, and professionals discuss and utilize terms that are used to describe the different types of movement by people, terminology usage presents a complexity in defining the displacement of people whether it is involuntary or voluntary. Stavrolpoulou (1998) observes that various terms, “forced evictions,” “population transfers,” “mass exoduses,” and “internal displacement,” are used to describe this phenomena and applied as though they are separate in meaning and representing a different study. But in fact, they all refer to the same phenomenon, “removal from one’s home and/or land against one’s will” (Stavropoulou 1998, 517).

The term, forced evictions is defined as "the permanent or temporary removal against their will of individuals, families and/or communities from the homes and/or lands which they occupy, without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protection" (Stavropoulou 1998, 517). A distinctive factor of forced evictions from other forms or patterns of displacement is “specific decisions, legislation or policies of State or failures of States to intervene to halt force evictions by third parties” (UNFEHR#25). When persons move against their own will inside their own country in order to avoid situations of generalized violence, effects of armed conflict, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, internal displacement of persons become the result (IDMC; Stavrolpoulou; UNOCHA). In the event of movement involving a substantial forced movement of entire communities to sites at varying distances from their homes, forced relocation has ensued. Similarly, the term, forced removal, is
synonymous with expulsion (Ludtke 2009). Ludtke makes an effort to define forced migration by indicating that the term entails ordinary migration that does not involve force but involves two factors that influence migration - push and pull. Social, economic, and survival difficulties “push” person(s) to migrate, and promising opportunities “pull” person(s) to migrate (Ludtke 2009; Asthana 1996; Bessell & Haake 2009). The terms, involuntary and voluntary resettlement, have similar affect of the “’push’ and ‘pull’ factors (Asthana 1996; Cernea 1988). The World Bank, a major institution addressing displacement, defines involuntary displacement as “occurring when the decision of moving is made and imposed by an external agent and when there is no possibility to stay” (World Bank Operations Evaluation Department 2000, M. M. Cernea 1988). In the case of the relocation of Navajo and Hopis, the Federal Government defines, “Displaced person means a member of the Hopi Tribe residing within the area partitioned to the Navajo Tribe or a member of the Navajo Tribe residing within the area partitioned to the Hopi Tribe who must be relocated pursuant to the Act. This term is synonymous with the term “relocatee” (eCFR Federal Government n.d., §700.59).”

3.9 Theoretical Frameworks

Robert Chambers (1969) identified a general model consisting of three stages in the development of land settlement plans in Africa while working on the Volta River Project (Cernea 1976; Colson 1971; Scudder 2005, 2009). Michael Nelson (1973) substantiated Chambers pattern in a combination of many experiences with new land settlements in the tropical areas of Latin America. The models developed by Chambers and Nelson provided general experiences of voluntary settlers and theorized an institutional dimension of directed land-settlement programs (Cernea, 1996; Scudder 2005, 2009). Two major concepts developed by Thayer Scudder (1984,
1985) and Cernea (1988) have became major theoretical frameworks utilized in understanding relocation cases (Oliver –Smith, 2009; Gutman, 1994). In the early 1980s, building upon previous approaches that dealt primarily with the processes of voluntary resettlement, Scudder and Colson proposed a four-stage model dealing with first and second generations of resettlers, otherwise known as the Scudder or Scudder/Colson Stress Model (Colson 1989; Oliver-Smith 2009; Scudder 2005). In complementing Scudder model, Cernea developed the World Bank policy guidelines for “satisfactory relocation programs based on lessons from various World Bank-financed relocation projects and addressed forced relocation caused primarily by planned development” (Cerna, 1996; Tamir, 2000). Additionally, Cernea made improvement to the World Bank policy model he developed by modifying it with adding Impoverishment, Risk, and Reconstruction into the framework (M. M. Cernea 1996).

3.10 Scudder/Colson: Four-Stage Model

The widely used Scudder–Colson model focuses on the different behavioral proclivity common to each of the stages through which resettlers passed and explains the stages of voluntary settlement; this model was later applied to some cases of involuntary resettlement (Asthana 1996; Oliver-Smith 2009; Scudder 2005). Scudder (1982) and Colson’s (1989) four-stage process model are segmented into phases of planning and recruitment, adjustment and coping, community formation and economic development, and handing over and incorporation (Asthana, 1996; Cernea M. M., 1996; Cernea M. M., 1996; Oliver-Smith, 2010). Scudder and Colson produced a study on the effects of involuntary resettlement of the fifty-five thousand Gwembe Tonga villagers by applying the four-stage model in the late 1950’s (Colson,1971; Colson, 1989; Scudder, 2009). The construction of the Kariba Dam in Zimbabwe and Zambia
was built to produce more electricity for the expanding cities and mines. The dam flooded a large area of the villagers land. Although the officials from the dam project and the overseeing Power Board paid little attention to the resettlement, a number of best practices were pioneered by the local officials for the times; this contributed to the fulfillment of several stages in the Scudder and Colson model.

In the first stage, planning and recruitment, policy-makers and/or developers formulated development and resettlement plans. These plans could be made without informing those who will be displaced by physical removal. In the first stage of the Kariba Dam case, the villagers were included in the plan and came up with concessions for their wellbeing. The villagers wanted a choice of where they could move, maintain their agricultural practices, wanted the government to remove tsetse fly from proposed areas to integrate cattle into their farming system, and to allow the people to reoccupy any lands that were not flooded. In addition to the villager’s concession, a government development program was produced by focusing on small-scale irrigation, agriculture, livestock development, and fishery as an initiate an economy. Unexpectedly, plans were changed and unforeseen mishaps took place. The heightening of the proposed dam would increase the displacees, more lands would be flooded including the proposed areas for resettlement, surveys showed agriculture resources were inadequate, and a proposed area for resettlement, Lusitu, belonged to another tribe resulting in a conflict. Immediately after the conflict, the defeated traumatized villagers were transported to Lusitu (Scudder; Colson).

In the second stage, adjustment and coping is the most stressful of the four stages (Colson, 1989; Scudder, 2009). The people experience the beginning process of physical
removal or have been just removed, sometime overlapping. Depending on the situation, at this stage, the actual removal of people may take a number of years (Scudder, 2010). The focal point at this stage are attempts by household members to re-establish a home, adapt to a new environment and people, and production of food crops for consumption. In the Kariba Dam case of stage two, many villagers visited the dam because of possibly being in denial. The interviewed villager felt that being removed from their homes and forced to live in a hostile environment was an attack on their humanity and vital force (Colson 1971; Scudder 2009). Ritual leaders were not able to rebuild shrines, chiefs and headmen lost influence, as well as those councils who supported resettlement. On the other hand, resettlement provided opportunities for young leaders to emerge as well as young women, both replacing the elders. In addition, the villagers displayed risk adverse behavior by reconciling with kin, building similar homes and structures together.

In the third stage identified as community formation and economic development, the displacees began the process of rebuilding their economy and social networks. Examples are reestablishments of religious rituals, burial grounds, renaming of places to name a few. This stage can mark the beginning of people’s behavior, changing from risk-adverse to a risk-taking stance. Scudders (2010) notes two major changes are associated with this stage, it requires resettlers to change their behavior radically, and development opportunities are required for resettlers to channel their initiatives. However, since few resettlement projects and case studies exist to determine success at this level, the transitions are generalized (Scudder, 2010). In the Kariba case, the villagers were able to clear enough land to grow food to regain self-sufficiency at the household level. Four factor contributed to the success of the stage three in this particular case; first, the control of the tsetse fly carrier of animal sleeping sickness; second, cash
compensation; third, well-executed educational program; fourth, well planned utilization of inshore gill net reservoir restricted to resettlers and host only. Through planning, the villagers were able to raise their standard of living, diets improves, housing improved, develop their farms, fisher, and raise cattle, and education was available. Despite the efforts toward improving their livelihood, stage three was aborted in the mid-1970 due to conflict resulting in a war for Zimbabwe’s independence thus disrupting stage three.

The fourth stage is identified as handing over or incorporation that involves second generation resettlers. At this stage, the local production systems and community leadership is handed over to a second generation of residents that identifies with and feels at home in the community. It supposedly brings the resettlement process to a successful end as the population and project are integrated into the political economy in the area, whether regionally or nationally. Once the fourth stage has been achieved, resettlement is deemed a success. However, in the 1980s and 1990s, the rising evidence of involuntary resettlement method that failed to pass through all four stages suggested that a new model was necessary to explain the consequences of involuntary relocation. In particular, it was recognized that a new theory was necessary to model what was increasingly seen as predictable impoverishment in forced resettlement methods. In the Kariba case, stage four was never reach. Criticism for the Scudder-Colson four-stage model for resettlement, voluntary or involuntary, was provided by other scholars. The model is formulated to explain similarities rather than differences in responses to involuntary relocation (de Wet, 1993), and is an outsider’s model for analyzing group adjustment and incorporation processes (Tamir, 1993).

3.11 Impoverishment, Risk, and Resettlement
In efforts to deal with compulsory resettlement, steadfast measures should be taken to protect lives, welfare, culture and human rights of those displaced people from an institutional stance. In response, Michael M. Cernea (1988) developed five principles to be applicable toward directed relocation as policies for the World Bank (Cernea 1988; Scudder 2005; Ashanti 1996). Cernea’s guidelines are developed from the viewpoint of an institution as potential sponsors of a project that may have to displace and resettle people (Tamir, 1993). The first principle, relocation should be avoided or minimized, “whenever feasible, involuntary resettlement must be avoided or minimized and alternative development must be explored” (Cernea 1988, 4). The second principle, to ensure the availability of resources necessary for relocation, the cost of relocation should be inclusive of the overall project cost, including lost compensation for lost assets and costs (Cernea, 1988). The third principle, relocation as a sociological problem with cultural, economic and psychological consequence should be addressed by planning for changes, including physical infrastructure (Cernea, 1988). Relocation gives rise to special and technical problems more severely than voluntary relocation due to feeling powerlessness, alienation, and weakening of social and community cohesion. In addition, patterned syndrome of settler dependency can be a reaction and should be discouraged. The fourth principle, in avoiding economic and social disruption, all relocation programs must be considered development programs (Cernea, 1988). The fifth principle, the responsibility for the relocation of affected group lies with the government by directly consulting and encouraging their participation in order to find solutions (Cernea, 1988). The five principles as objective are gracious guidelines for project developers to abide by, and may be very difficult to accomplish (Tamir).

Cernea formulated a model advancing the study of resettlement (Scudder, 2010). The Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) framework (Cernea 1990) is emphasized on
eight characteristics associated with resettlement, which can be avoided, by having a well-planned and implemented process, (Cernea 2004, Scudder 2010). IRR model shows how impoverishment can occur as a result of displacement and relocation leaving people worse off as shown by empirical evidence disclosing a set of eight persistent characteristic that needs monitoring (Asthana 1996; Cernea 2004). In avoiding the debilitating characteristics, cooperative interaction is stressed rather than prioritization; the eight risks are landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalization (downward mobility), increase morbidity, food security, loss of access to common property, and social disarticulation (Cernea 2004, Scudder 2010, Asthana 1996).

Landlessness occurs when “land expropriation takes away the foundation upon which social and economic production systems are constructed” (Asthana 1996, Cernea 2004). Due to the loss of both natural and man-made capital, recapitalization and pauperization of displaced people become principal events (Cenea 1997). Unless these are reconstructed elsewhere or replaced by steady income of some sort, landlessness sets in, social and economic productivity cannot be reestablished, and the affected families are impoverished. Examples include Kiambre Hydropower project in Kenya where farmers landholding dropped from 13 hectare to six hectare, livestock were reduced by a 1/3, yields per hectare reduced by 68% for maize and 75% for beans (Cernea 2004; Asthana 1996). In addition to losing land, loss of job is a symptom of the displaced.

Joblessness happens when loss of income and employment take place both in urban and rural displacement. Displaced people lose in three ways, losing access to lands, loss of job opportunities, and loss of assets under a common property system. Often, unemployment and
underemployment lingers among resettlers long after physical relocation has been completed. Examples include the Madagascar Tana Plain project where displaced private small enterprises 1993 are not entitled to any compensation thus losing their trade and customers (Cernea 2004). Paraquay Yacyreta projects found 17% unemployment rate in a resettled community was higher than the rest of the population (Ashana 1996). Churchill-Nelson Hydro project, in Manitoba Canada, economic activities of resettled indigenous peoples are drastically reduced when their subsistence of water activity (i.e. fishing) were impacted resulting in non-productivity within the community (M. M. Cernea 2004).

**Homelessness** is the loss of shelter or housing resulting in a decrease of living standards. A lack of home could be a temporary situation for some displaced families but it can remain if improvements or compensations are not made to replace lost homes. Examples include the Cameroon-Douala urban resettlement project which found that over 2,000 displaced families were delayed in setting up new homes and less than 5 percent of the families received loans to aid in paying for assigned house areas (M. M. Cernea 1988). In Mauritania, the Foum-Gleita irrigation project was found that only 200 out of 881 displaced families reconstructed their housing, and the rest lived in tents or tarpaulins (M. M. Cernea 1988).

**Marginalization** occurs when families cannot fully restore lost economic strength thus putting them on a path toward “downward mobility,” including loss of social status (M. M. Cernea, Impoverish Risks, Risk Management, and Reconstruction: A Model of Population Displacement and Resettlement 2004). Examples are when middle-income farmers become small landholders, shopkeepers, and craftsmen downsize and slip into poverty unable to recapture loss income. Additionally, many are unable to continue using their skills at the new
location; instead they become inactive. The inactivity increases the income differentiation between evacuees and hosts. In an independent study, the Nepal Kulekhani Hydroelectric project, found that the majority of displaced people were worse off socially and economically due to lower productivity of their new area, and with less diversified production of goods (M. M. Cernea 2004).

*Morbidity* ensues when serious declines in health result from displacement-caused social stress, insecurity, psychological trauma, and being exposed to a higher degree of illness (M.M. Cernea 2004). Many displacees become vulnerable due to unsafe water supply and poor sewage system contributing to an increase of epidemics and chronic illnesses. In locations of displacees, the weakest population, infants, children, and the elderly are most affected (M.M. Cernea 2004). Examples include Sri Lanka’s outbreak of gastroenteritis along the Victoria dam reservoir (M.M. Cernea 2004) and in Mahaweli’s resettlement site the incidence of malaria rose from 8.9% to 15.6% (M.M. Cernea 2004).

*Food insecurity* is often experienced when forced uprooting takes place resulting in a sudden decrease of food production and loss of harvest; thus increasing the risk of people falling into undernourishment defined as “calorie-protein intake levels below the minimum necessary for normal growth and work” (M.M. Cernea 2004,19). An example is at the Foum-Gleita irrigation project, Mauritania, multiple cropping and animal husbandry was replaced by paddy-rice harvesting, leading to the deterioration of diets and cash-crop income. Rebuilding food production may take years.

*Loss of access to common property* belonging to the displaced community also represents a loss of income and livelihood, especially for the landless and asset-less. Losses include
gathering wild edible harvest, collecting firewood, access to water for household and livestock, and access to generational burial grounds. An example of loss is illustrated in the semi-arid regions of India where the land provided the majority of firewood, domestic fuel, and grazing need which were supplied by lands held under a common property system (M.M. Cernea 2004).

*Social disarticulation* takes place when forced displacement disintegrates social support networks, communities, kinship groups, a sense of cultural identity, hence inducing powerlessness. In many cases, the dismantled social capital and social organization patterns remain unnoticed and uncompensated by planners (M.M. Cernea 2004). An example is seen in the Rengali dam project in India, a sociological study has found various manifestations of social disarticulation, such as growing alienation, loosening of intimate bonds, weakening of control on interpersonal behavior, and lower cohesion of family bond became present (M. M. Cernea 2004).

The Cornea Impoverishment, Risk, Resettlement framework can be applied to determine which of the characteristic of impoverishment require monitoring (M.M. Cernea, 1996). One research that was carried determined some identified inadequacies when applying the IRR model. In M.M. Horowitz’s research, 12,000 Manantali people in Mali were involuntarily removed to develop the Manatali dam (Horowitz ed 1993; Cernea, 1993). The dam had severe impacts on the regions ecology, agricultural production, fisheries, and public health. While the affected communities were allowed to select the resettlement sites themselves, many families did not receive sufficient agricultural land and grazing grounds. The study found that a number of inadequacies are associated with the implementation of Cernea’s IRR in this particular case (Asthana, 1996; Horowitz 1993). Three principles are found to be lacking; i) the absence of a coherent plan for the region’s future development; ii) the lack of adequate settlers and host
participation in all phases of the projects planning and implementation; iii) A lack of understanding of the existing social systems resulted in receiving an inadequate amount of land for several resettlement villages for sustainable resource use over the long term (Asthana, 1996; Horowitz et al. 1993, 1993; Cernea, 1993). The research concluded that had the implementation begun earlier by educating the communities about the complexity about the economic development features of the project, the outcome might have been more positive (Asthana, 1996; Cernea, 1993; Horowitz, et al. 1993).

3.12 Routine Dissonant Model

The Routine Dissonant Model (RDM) was formulated to address displacement and resettlement studies by complementing the Scudder-Colson Four-Stage model. The Routine Dissonant Model (RDM) serves to fill a gap when gauging routines of culture in events of resettlement. The literature discussing the RDM states that in the past, a lesser amount of attention has been given to noneconomic psycho-socio-cultural (PSC) impoverishment that is imposed by involuntary displacement by disrupting culture. PSC distinctly takes place when “involuntary displacement transforms routine culture into dissonant culture, which then transforms into a different routine culture” (Downing and Garcia-Downing 2009, 226). Downing (227) defines culture as a “set of construct and rules constructing the world, interpreting it, and adapting to it” (Downing and Garcia-Downing 2009, 227). Accordingly, these constructs and rules answer the following primary questions: “Who are we? Where are we? Where are we coming from? Where are we going?” (Downing and Garcia-Downing 2009, 228) as well as a host of other questions that emerges, thus disrupting routine culture. When involuntary displacement unbalances lives, routine culture gives way to dissonant culture, an
impermanent “reordering of space, time, relationships, norms, and psycho-socio-cultural constructs which request resolution” (Downing and Garcia-Downing 2009, 230). The start of a new routine culture may possibly begin and end at various times within a population; basically, “the shift from routine, to dissonance, to new routine (R → D → R) may begin and end at different times,” and is dependent on a scale of disruption (Downing and Garcia-Downing 2009, 235). It is reported that incremental changes are preferred over transformational change (Downing & Garcia-Downing 2009). Downing makes a point that it is not a stage model, but a model of changes in the routine of a displaced person in time and space (Downing and Garcia-Downing 2009, 235). He writes that it is “highly improbable that a pre-displacement routine culture will be recovered, let alone restored,” but there are ways to mitigate PSC impoverishment (Downing and Garcia-Downing 2009, 231). He argues it could be mitigated by “how well the post-displacement routine culture is able to address fundamental questions of the displaced, compared with the pre-displacement culture” (Downing and Garcia-Downing 2009, 228). Downing (226) asks “If resettlement is unavoidable the applied question is - what can be done to facilitate the reestablishment of a new routine culturally to adequately address the primary questions.”

3.13 Examples of Resettlement

Roli Asthana writes the Yacyreta Hydroelectric project involved a dam and reservoir requiring displacement. This unique case is one of the few cases where a development project is leading to urban and not rural resettlement. It will resettle approximately 48,000 displaced people to live in the cities of Posadas in Argentina and Encarnicion in Paraguay (Asthana 1996) (Asthana 1996, Gutman 1994). According to principles similar to IRR, the Resettlement and Social Acton
Program was formulated for the Yacyeta project (Asthana 1996). The resettlement program is based on the following principles for the Yacyreta project: 1) adequate housing or compensation as a preferred option to the affected population should be provided; 2) compulsory relocation imposes harsh strains upon affected population thus generating multidimensional stress on life; 3) an adequate replacement of housing should be substantive enough to provide support to the affected population in adapting and rebuilding their livelihood as well as protect their social and economic system; and 4) social support should not generate dependency on patron-client relationship between Yacyreta and the affected populations (Asthana, 1996; Michael M. Cernea, 1988). Asthana’s conclusion provides an understanding on the social consequences of resettlement, and the importance of sound social policies capable of improving negative impacts and helping make people good use of new opportunities generated by large scale projects which lies in the study of coping and adaptive behavior under these circumstances (Asthana, 1996; Downing & Garcia-Downing, 2009; Scudder, 2009).

Guggenheim’s study of Mexico’s dam project and displacement experience was projected with doubt (Asthana, 1996; Oliver-Smith, 2009). The proposed resettlement site was located several hundred miles away in dense tropical forests. The resettler’s farm had degraded and collapsed due to poor soils and multiple crop diseases in the tropical areas. The mishandling of the resettlement spread unrest throughout Indian Oaxaca where the army was called into the affected communities at least seven times subdue local protest. The hostile and strange environment led many of the resettled Mazatec and Chinantec Indians to abandon the resettlement sites and take their chances squatting around the reservoirs that had inundated their lands. The Mexican government initiated a corrective action by attempting to locate and acquire replacement lands around the reservoir for the impoverish population. Due to local resentment
and lack of adequate funds, staff, and planning, the program accomplished very little. Guggenheim points that foresight and planning improves outcome; the types of planning deficit affecting development–induced resettlement can be summarized as follows: 1) resettlement planning occurs in a policy vacuum. An example is when most of Mexican laws guiding resettlement principle refers to taking land away and lacks legal mechanisms to restore lands (Asthana, 1996; Cernea & Guggenheim, 1993); 2) lack of apparent policy objectives for assisting displaced population to livelihood restoration other than providing compensation for loss assets, (Asthana, 199; Cernea & Guggenheim, 1993); 3) the management of resettlement are controlled by professional such as, engineers, architects and urban planners. The focus has been on new infrastructure such as houses, roads, and sewer rather than indentifying local needs of whether people can make a sustainable living (Asthana, 1996; Cernea & Guggenheim, 1993); 4) resettlement planning has been mismanaged independently from elsewhere providing the notion that resettlement seem to be not a priority (Asthana, 199; Cernea & Guggenheim, 1993); 5) officials in charge of resettlement lacked the authority to resolve issues; 6) there is lack of communication regarding the project for resettlers to articulate their grievance and needs to officials (Asthana, 1996; Cernea & Guggenheim, 1993). Guggenheim partly concludes that the lack of traditional social concerns, non-governmental organization activist have assisted countries like Brazil, Canada, Philippines, and India, and the local communities in Mexico who have lack of experience in political communication.

3.14 Resettlements Considered Successes

In study by Partridge (1993) analyzed by Anthana, he writes about a successful resettlement as a result of Arenal Hydroelectric Project in Costa Rica. According to an
assessment, the Arenal resettlement succeeded in improving the standard of living and returning to the resettlers control over own lives after a period of five years (Asthana, 1996; Scudder, 2005). Partridge feels that the Arenal Hydroelectric Project was well prepared and contains lessons in how to respond to settlement. First, an early study on the community was conducted to learn how the population was likely to respond to settlement; 2) a participatory approach was utilized to a large extent to inform, consult and integrate into the preparation process to combat resentful dependency; 3) an central strategy was to first establish new farms with traditional crops and technology (Asthana 1996). The lessons include, 1) research and preparation with planning documents several years prior to resettlement; 2) focus on self-sufficiency and viable economic systems rather than welfare; 3) viable preparation and plan resulting from participatory action; 4) complete and rigorous technical, economic and financial analysis of a system proposed for displaced families; 5) an analysis of communities threatened with resettlement and the different impacts and responses; 6) anthropological analysis of a new production systems, social organizational requirements with their customs, and their limitation of the resettlement process; 7) analyze impacts of their altered carrying capacity and social utilization patterns of land and water resources in the resettlement areas (Asthana, 1996; Scudder, 2005).

Ulla-Marjatta Mustanoja and Kari J. Mustanoja (1988) study on the resettlement of 4,000,000 Karelians in Finland from the former Soviet Union following the 1939-1940 and the 1941-1944 is considered one the largest resettlements operations in European history. The involuntary relocation of the Karelians is considered relatively successful mostly due to the advanced policies and planning procedures. The Karelian was resettled in Finland from the 25,000 sq. m due to ceding lands to the Soviet Union at the end of WWII. Mustanoja and
Mustanoja say the relative success of the plan is attributed to, not only advanced planning, but having the majority understand, approve and participate in the decision-making process. The plan entailed of, first, compensation system provided for monetary or real property settlement. The monetary settlement was partly made in cash and partly in securities. Second, the settlements provided subsistence as well as a social and physical environment that ensured an acceptable level of living; third, standard design buildings (urban type functional houses) complemented with guidance and materials in construction was utilized; fourth, the responsibility of self-sustenance was given to families or individuals; a representation that displaced Karelians was ensured decision-making; fifth, the displaced were resettled in groups into continuous areas, and municipal and religious institutions were transferred to new areas for a transitional period; and, sixth, the minority interest of Swedish-speaking municipalities were protected from changes due to resettlement (Asthana 1996; Mustanoja and Mustanoja 1988). The inclusion of the Karelian people in the resettlement plan made for rapid adjustments for a government initiated removal (Mustanoja and Mustanoja 1988). The combination of participation and the flexibility of the state led to one of the few successful resettlement experiences in the world. The case of the Arenal Hydroelectric Project and the resettlement of the Karelian are ideal resettlement projects.

In looking to the future, resettlement is a social issue that deserves to be address with consideration to recreate and improve the livelihoods of the victims of involuntary displacement, critical issues the many resettlement projects seem to fail. Solution should be created to avoid displacement and resettlement whenever possible, or minimizing it. Cernea brings a point of addressing the needs and concerns of the affected displaced population as a legitimate part of the any projects goals.
4 METHODS

4.1 Introduction

The chapter represents my research design in investigating the impacts of compulsory relocation on second generation Navajo relocatees. To collect data, the methods I utilized are Q-Method, in-depth interviews, and artifacts such as documents to help answer the research questions. First, I will describe the setting and context of the urban locations where the survey and interviews were conducted. The descriptive narrative will provide sample scenarios of where the surveys and interviews were held. Next, I will present the participants and the data collection procedures. Presenting a more descriptive narrative of this information will provide an atmosphere to the reader of where the data was collected.

The urban centers I chose to conduct my study are in Phoenix, Flagstaff, and Winslow; cities and towns all located in the State of Arizona. The rationale in choosing these urban centers are due to data I obtained from the Office of Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation in Flagstaff, Arizona. The data information provided illustrates the top three cities or towns which are host to certified Navajo relocatees who relocated to the three off-reservation communities since relocation began (see Table 3). These urban centers are closely located near various Indian nations, including Navajo Nation. The city of Flagstaff and Winslow, Arizona are considered bordertowns given that they are located near the Navajo reservation, and consisting of businesses where basic necessities are purchased. In many cases, relocatees are more likely to be familiar with these urban centers prior to relocating.
Table 3: Off-Reservation Relocation Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relocation Site</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff, Arizona</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>2,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winslow, Arizona</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4.2 Context and Settings

The study was conducted in a setting and context preferred by the participants when engaging in a Q-method study or an in-depth interview. The Q-method participants responded to select statements or Q-set from a concourse to help determine conclusions to the study; the Q-method study is comparable to a survey. Participants responded to Q-sets at events where they attended, such as community meetings. Another method of completing a Q-set by the respondent was through a mail-in method; however, face-to-face survey method was more desirable in case there were any issues that needed to be address for clarification (Van Exel and De Graaf 2005). There is a notion that Q-sorting procedure is complex and unfamiliar to the lay public that it requires face-to-face interview setting; however, it is argued it can be conducted by mail due to study’s findings that “Q-sort self-administered is very congruent with those from in-person interviews” (Van Exel and De Graaf 2005, 7).

The in-depth interview settings were conducted at the study participant’s homes, work, community urban center, and public gathering area such as a library. The primary setting for the interviews were mostly in the home of the participants since the home setting offered a personal
and comfortable venue to share and describe their relocation experience. There were possibilities if interviews were held at work or at public gathering areas such as a library, the interviews may become impersonal, uncomfortable and distracting at these locations. Additional options for possible settings were at the urban Indian centers, such as Phoenix and Flagstaff, Arizona. Winslow, Arizona did not have an Indian center facility. An Indian center has the mission of “helping the urban Indian bridge the gap between [their] traditional tribal heritage and the functional urban society” (French 1979, 1). The Phoenix Indian Center (PIC) is a non-profit organization that primarily provides services and resources to the Indian community in the metropolitan Phoenix area. The center, located in the north central corridor of downtown Phoenix, provides social, economic, education, employment and training for American Indians residing in Maricopa County. The Native Americans for Community Action (NACA) located in Flagstaff, Arizona, is another possible location to hold interviews. NACA is a non-profit, community-based agency located in Flagstaff, Arizona that provides services to urban Native Americans and other diverse populations. The PIC and NACA was able to assist with announcements and outreach to second generation relocatees who reside in the Phoenix or Flagstaff area to participate. Winslow, Arizona did not have an urban Indian center facility; thus, other methods for outreach to locate participants were utilized. The Q-method surveys and interviews were held at the participant’s choice of location that provided convenience in a comfortable atmosphere in one of the three cities, Phoenix, Flagstaff and Winslow, Arizona. I provide descriptions of selected samples of individual participant settings in the three locations.

4.2.1 Flagstaff Setting
Flagstaff, Arizona became a host urban center for the highest number of Navajo citizens who had to relocate off Hopi Partition Lands. The city of Flagstaff is located within Coconino County in northern Arizona approximately 45 miles from the Navajo Nation, and is the location of the county seat, the second largest county in the United States. Flagstaff is located at a near elevation of 7,000 feet making it one of the highest elevation cities in the country while located near the southwestern edge of the Colorado plateau surrounded by the largest Ponderosa Pine forest in the United States. The highest mountain range in Arizona, San Francisco Peaks, is located next to Flagstaff. The San Francisco Peaks are sacred cardinal mountains to thirteen southwestern tribes, including the Navajo Nation and Hopi Tribe. In the Navajo language, San Francisco Peaks is called as Doko’o’osliid. As a cardinal mountain of the West, it is the abalone shell mountain that is created for our social unity and life.

The city of Flagstaff and its surrounding communities have an estimated population of 134,421. The racial makeup of the area is White (61.72), Black or African American (1.21), Native American (27.43), Asian (1.37), Pacific Islander (0.2), from other races (10.9), and of the population were Hispanics or Latinos (13.51) of any race (United States Census Bureau 2013). Flagstaff is a city and county center for government, education, transportation, culture and commercial. The unemployment rate is 7.0% with median household income of $49,771, and approximately 41.8% have Bachelor’s degree or higher (City of Flagstaff 2015). The government sector is one of the largest employers, particularly in the tourism area as the City oversees 5,000,000 visitors per year. Northern Arizona University provides a major economic impact annually since the campus is a training site of the Arizona Cardinals, the Phoenix Suns, and Olympic athletes (City of Flagstaff 2015).
The City of Flagstaff’s Native American population is primarily attributed to the city's proximity to several Native American reservations that include Navajo, Hopi, Havasupai, and Yavapai. In relation to the location of Flagstaff to Indian Nations, the border of the Hopi reservation is about 80 miles east, Hualapai is about 110 miles west, Havasupai is about 100 miles west, and Yavapai is located about 50 miles south. A state higher education institution, Northern Arizona University, has 20% American Indian student population. The Native American community in Flagstaff is primarily Navajo with about 5,500 people of Navajo ancestry living in the city (United States Census Bureau 2013).

Both Q-method and interview participants reside within the city limits of Flagstaff as well as the surrounding rural communities outside the city limits of Flagstaff. The rural oriented communities are in unincorporated areas of Coconino County.

4.2.1.1 Flagstaff Participant Sample

1) On an overcast afternoon day, I arrived at the home of a Q-method participant located on the east side of Flagstaff. The participant resided in an apartment home with her mother, sister and brother located in an older diverse neighborhood. The neighborhood homes consisted of apartment homes, single family home, duplexes, and trailer homes, all surrounded with a landscape of ponderosa pine trees, scrubs, as well as grass. The largest contiguous Ponderosa Pine trees in North America grow adjacent to the Flagstaff area. The exterior of the apartment had tan color painted wooden panels with brown borders. The front of the apartment was a small brick patio with a metal security screen door. The interior of the home was furnished with a couch, kitchen table, television as well as walls adorned with pictures of family.
2) On a dark cool evening, I met with a participant who resided with her parents and sister in the unincorporated rural area east of Flagstaff. The homes in the neighborhood sat on one acre plots with each home having its own distinctive look that added character to the neighborhood. The home was spacious and showcased with American Indian artwork, such as painting, baskets and pottery adorning their walls. The participant and her parents were rather intrigued by my research, and indicated they were one of the few relocatees who held on to their relocation home while many of the former residents in the area either sold or lost their homes.

3) Near the city limit boundary of Flagstaff on the east end, I met with a participant and her family on a late afternoon when it was convenient for them. The family resided in a home they rented near Mount Elden. Mount Elden is a mountain consisting mostly of lava with many outdoor trails utilized for recreation. The home was spacious and comfortable allowing the participant to complete the survey without any distractions. After the completion of the Q-method survey, the participant indicated that she moved to Flagstaff to learn more about the Navajo culture and language so she would be able to teach her daughter.

4) At another location on the east side of Flagstaff, a survey participant completed a Q-method survey on a drizzly late afternoon at a popular restaurant. The restaurant is a favorite for local and regional residents who desire a home style cooked meal. The restaurant patrons include American Indians who are possibly residents of one of the surrounding reservations. The restaurant was located in a strip mall shopping center along historic route 66 near where the road that splits into highway 89A going north. The famous route 66 runs east west through the city of Flagstaff. The restaurant had a casual almost grassroots atmosphere with tables and chairs, vinyl covered booths, and decorative items on its walls. On this day, the popular restaurant did not
seem busy; it provided a relaxed atmosphere to carefully complete the survey at a large enough booth table next to a wall adorned with painting and photos.

4.2.2 Metropolitan Phoenix Setting

The metropolitan Phoenix area, where the natural landscapes of the Hohokams have been replaced by manmade landscapes of cement and golf courses, provides diverse areas for participants to engage in completing Q-method surveys and in-depth interviews. The city of Phoenix became the host to the second highest number of Navajo relocatees who had no choice but to move off of their traditional home areas. The greater Phoenix is made up of more than 25 town and cities where many Navajo relocatees are living, working, or going to school. The municipality of Phoenix and its surrounding towns and cities are established on the ancestral territories of the sovereign nations of Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community, Gila River Indian Community, Ak-Chin Indian Community, and Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation. The existence of these communities has resulted in a strong presence of Native people in contemporary Phoenix.

Phoenix, the capital of Arizona, is located on the southwestern borders of the upper edge of the Sonoran Desert region approximately 200 miles from the Navajo Nation. The 13th largest city in the country, Phoenix, is situated in the Salt River Valley on a flat desert terrain enclosed by the Superstition Mountains and Phoenix Mountain Preserve. The climate is consistently warm with low humidity, often referred to as the sunniest city in the nation with an average of 325 sunny days per year. It is considered the fifth most populous city in the United States; in 2013, the population of metropolitan Phoenix including its contiguous fifteen towns and cities is approximately 4.33 million (Sunnucks March); however, the 2013 population for the city of
Phoenix is estimated at 1,513,367 (United States Census 2010). According to the 2010 Census, Phoenix’s race and ethnicity is composed of White (65.9%), Hispanic or Latino of any race (40.8%), Black or African American (6.5%), Asians (3.2%), Native American (2.2%), Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander (0.2%), and other races (1.7%) (United States Census 2010). Phoenix is an industry for agricultural, commercial, and services that mainly consist of professional and management, education, health, social services, retail trade, manufacturing, construction, and other services in the southwest. It is reported that the city of Phoenix has a median income for a household of $47,139, and 26.3% have earned a bachelor’s degree (United States Census 2010). The city is situated in the south-central portion of the state where arterial federal highways, Interstate 17 and 10, intersect. The majority of people commute to work at 71.7 percent compared to those that carpool at 17.4 percent. Otherwise public transportation, walking, or other means are used to get to place of work; however, there is a sector of people that work from home.

4.2.2.1 Metropolitan Phoenix Participant Sample

1) In north Phoenix area, two brothers who were Q-method participants completed the survey at their apartment. The brothers resided between the community of Anthem and Deer Valley, and west of Cave Creek. The brothers indicated they lived in that particular location due to the convenient location to their work and educational institution. Their place of residence was in buildings that mirrored each other and more easily identified by building numbers and letters, in the midst of a sparsely built area near Interstate 17. Interstate 17 is a major freeway link that meets Interstate 40 in Flagstaff, Arizona. Like many of the aesthetic exterior of buildings in the
Phoenix area, the apartment buildings were textured in neutral colored stucco in attempts to coordinate with the desert landscape.

2) Two sisters met me at a popular coffee shop conveniently located in a shopping area near Interstate 17 in north Phoenix. Since the two sisters lived in different areas of Phoenix, they preferred to meet in a location that would accommodate their travel distance as well as time to complete the Q-method survey. The coffee shop housed wooden tables and chair with a few patrons either reading or working on their laptop computers. The location had decorative walls with music playing in the background. I had anticipated that meeting in a coffee shop would be distracting but found that it was not. After they thoughtfully completed the survey, they indicated they lived in Phoenix most of their lives plus their other siblings, however, one sister indicated she had lived in Phoenix her entire life.

3) One location where an interview occurred was at the Burton Barr Central Library in central Phoenix located near the Heard Museum and Phoenix Museum. Since the location of the library was near the interviewee’s place of employment, it was more convenient for her to meet there rather than at her home in Peoria. Peoria is a located between Sun City, a retirement community, and Glendale in the northwest area of the greater Phoenix area. Prior to meeting with her, I reserved a room for the interview where we were able to converse without being distracted and vice versa. The library had multiple floors with a water fountain near the entrance and artwork providing a serene atmosphere designated for studying.

4) In a popular coffee shop in north Scottsdale, on a hot summer late afternoon, a Q-method survey was completed by a participant whose place of work was nearby. The city of Scottsdale is a located between Phoenix and the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC)
with Interstate 101 crossing through these communities. SRPMIC lies on 52,600 acres encompassing a population of over 9,000 enrolled members and surrounded by the cities of Scottsdale, Tempe, Mesa and Fountain Hills. SRPMIC has two distinct backgrounds and cultures comprising of the Pima, "Akimel O'odham" (River People) and the Maricopa, "Xalychidom Piipaash" (People who live toward the water). At least three other patrons were present in the coffee shop which had displayed an abundance of windows streaming with natural light.

5) In the community of Chandler, Arizona, a southeast suburb of Phoenix has 1.5% American Indian in contrast to 73.3% White (City of Chandler 2015). A Navajo couple residing in Chandler completed their survey in a quiet neighborhood one evening. Their neighborhood was conveniently located near a shopping area and an elementary school. On a very warm evening, the Navajo couple had time to do the Q-method survey during a hectic weekday schedule. Their home was closely set next to other homes with a spacious interior with family pictures and Navajo art work on their walls providing a welcoming atmosphere. South of Chandler is the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) which lies adjacent to the south side of Phoenix in Maricopa and Pinal counties on 583.749 acres. The GRIC is a community of both the Akimel O’odham (Pima) and the Pee-Posh (Maricopa) Tribes with a population base of approximately 11,712 members (Center for Business Outreach; Arizona Rural Policy Institute; W.A. Franke School of Business; Northern Arizona University; 2010 Data). Presently, the GRIC has its own golf course, hotel, casino, shopping center, healthcare clinic, and newspaper published every month.
6) In Mesa Arizona, two Navajo brothers completed the survey in the home they share along with their families. Their home was located in an older quiet neighborhood of Mesa, conveniently located near Interstate 202 and Highway 87. Mesa is the central city in the east valley of the greater Phoenix area which lies between Chandler to the south and Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community to the north. Mesa’s American Indian population is 2.4% while Whites are at 77.1% in a population of 440,677 (City of Mesa AZ 2014). An activity that stood out at the Navajo brother’s home was the curiosity of the children who were wondering what their fathers were doing.

7) In the same town of the two Navajo brothers, it was also the home of interviewee Yuma whose place of residence was located further east. East Mesa provides an up close view of Red Mountain; a sacred mountain of the O’odham people. On the east side of Red Mountain, is the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, located on a 40-square mile reservation that is home to its enrolled community members. Fort McDowell, located east of Phoenix and Fountain Hills, operates a pecan farm, golf course, hotel, as well as a casino. The Verde River flows through Fort McDowell and flows into the Salt River. Yuma’s home is located in a quiet residential area consisting of bi-leveled homes that are covered in stucco. Inside the home, the television was filled with the day’s local and international news. On the walls were pictures of family and American Indian artwork, such as rugs and paintings. Outside the home in the yard was a dog that seemed to continuously bark but would stop momentarily and begins again. The home provided a hospitable comfortable atmosphere to convene an interview.

8) An interviewee lives in Gilbert, Arizona where she rents her home. Her neighborhood was polished with green grass and trees in an organized manner with homes with the shades of gray
colors. The town of Gilbert is located southeast of Phoenix, a relatively young affluent community that has seen tremendous growth during the past two decades. The American Indian population is only 0.8% out of the 2013 population estimate of 229,972 (United States Census Bureau 2015 revised). The interviewee preferred to meet at a relative’s home in Tempe, Arizona, a city located south of Phoenix and west of Gilbert. Tempe is conveniently within a portion of the arterial freeway, Interstate 10, a route leading to Tucson, Arizona. Tempe is home to Arizona State University and to 2.9% of Tempe’s estimated population of 168,828 (United States Census Bureau 2015 revised). The home is Tempe was located in a quite neighborhood with a large pine tree and cacti in the front yard with its interior of southwest style furniture and an array of American Indian art works. Tempe is located northwest of the Ak-Chin Indian Community and is located on 22,000 acres in the Santa Cruz Valley of Southern Arizona and lies 58 miles south of Phoenix in the northwestern part of Pinal County. Ak-Chin has an enrollment of over 770 tribal members. The O'odham word, Ak-chin, translates to mean "mouth of the wash" or "place where the wash loses itself in the sand or ground,” referring to a type of farming that relies on seasonal flood plains created by winter snows and summer rains (Ak-Chin Indian Community Arizona 2014). Ak-Chin farms currently utilize over 15,000 acres, making it one of the largest farming communities in the United States.

4.2.3 Winslow Setting

The city of Winslow received the third highest number of Navajo relocatees. Winslow, Arizona is located approximately 15 miles south of the Navajo Nation in Navajo County and 54 miles west of Flagstaff on Interstate 40. The city of Winslow is situated in the high desert plains near the Little Colorado River Basin. The well-known U.S. historic Route 66 road runs through
the town, as well as, Interstate 40 and the Santa Railway. Winslow is a border town community for the Navajo and Hopi people. Winslow’s diverse economy is in transportation, tourism, trade, education, two regional hospitals, education, U.S. Forest Service Air Tanker Base, and retail and service business. Trade and tourism are closely linked and serves as the second largest employer partly due to the Interstate 40 corridor, and state Highway 87 connecting Winslow to Flagstaff, Phoenix, and the Navajo and Hopi reservations. The City is also supported by direct access to national forest, Interstate 40, state Highway 87, the BNSF Railway, and the third-largest airport in Northern Arizona. The estimated population of Winslow is 9,409, with a racial makeup of White (53.4), Black (5.7), Native American and Alaskan Natives (25.7), Asian (1.0), Hispanic or Latino (32.8), Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander (0.1) (United States Census Bureau 2010). In a similar scenario like Flagstaff, the Native American population of 25.7 percent is attributed to the location of Winslow being near the Navajo and Hopi reservations. 11.5% of the community has earned a bachelor’s degree, and has a median household income of $41,756 (United States Census Bureau 2010). The town of Winslow is a location for Winslow Residential Hall, Inc. for Navajo student attending Winslow Jr. High School and Winslow High School.

4.2.3.1 Winslow Participant Sample

1) Along Interstate 40 within the city limits of Winslow are major national chain stores for locals and regional shopper as well as for tourists. An exit off the interstate onto a local street provides a view of the Indian Health Services buildings, a provider for health care for enrolled members of federally recognized tribes in the local and regional area. Not far from Indian Health Service is a residential neighborhood with well-kept yards of trees, scrubs, flowers and
grass. A Q-method participant resides in a home with wooden fencing surrounding the home. The home was welcoming and comfortable with family members visiting from out of town. The kitchen, dining, and living area were open and spacious providing a place for conversation and interacting. It seemed the walls of the home were heavily adorned with pictures of families and relatives, as well as Navajo cultural items.

2) At a nearby residential area, an interviewee resided in an area south of Interstate 40. The home was next to a variety of styled homes that are either single or bi-leveled homes with a backyard yielding sand and common native shrubs of the high desert of Winslow. On a hot afternoon, the home she shares with family provided a cool air of relief to comfortably engage in an interview. The interior of the home had a homey atmosphere with plushy couches and a large kitchen table, also, the living area was carpeted and the kitchen and dining area had tile flooring. Like many homes, the walls and shelves were pictures of family as well as American Indian artwork. The home provided an important factor of having a quiet space to converse.

3) South of Winslow Indian Health Service on Route 66 is a two-story apartment with wooden stairs leading to the second level. The paint peeling apartment building was located behind a mix of businesses that consists of a restaurant and a laundry mat. Unlike many urban apartments which have paved and lined parking places, this particular one had a dirt parking lot as well as no definitive landscape with the exception of several towering cottonwood trees. The cream colored interior of this particular apartment was rather well-kept with carpeting and linoleum floors; however, there was very little to no furnishing. The Q-method participant at this site thoughtfully and carefully completed the survey without being distracted even though the television set was on.
4) Not far from these two-story apartments in the southwest area of Winslow was the site of another Q-method participant’s home. The single floor U-shape apartments had white exterior paint with blue trimming as well as a dirt parking area. The apartments had shade trees and flowers that bloom in the high desert environment along the exterior walls. As you gaze south pass the apartments, it provides a view of endless scrubs and mountains. Right in-between these apartments are Route 66 and BNSF railway. Route 66, once a busy and major Winslow thorough way has been replaced by Interstate 40. The interior of the apartment was furnished very cozily with all the basic amenities of an apartment.

5) On the far west of Winslow are housing for low-income families with a gap between the Winslow and the housing area. The housing offers no frills, the brown brick homes lacked paint with the exception of red-orange trim on windows and doors. The exterior of the homes have accessible ramps with a paved parking area. The interior home have linoleum floors, lack luster walls and windows, as well as basic amenities. The location offers a view of the city of Winslow to the east as it’s surrounded by sand and shrub. A little further west is a compound of homes with adobe style homes as they are specifically for members of the Hopi Tribe who reside there. Toward the east of both housing compound is a privately operated prison.

6) North of downtown Winslow, a few blocks away from the location that was made famous by a song sung the Eagles, “Standing on the Corner of Winslow, Arizona,” is the home of an interviewee. The participant lives in a duplex with a large shed for storage on a quiet street with green grass and trees in the front yard. The exterior of the home was painted white with green trim on the doors and windows, with simple clean furnishing with white walls provided a pleasant atmosphere to complete the survey. The streets of the neighborhood are lined with trees
giving it a sense of residential novelistic order. Nearby was a small park with a playground for children as well as a basketball court.

7) At one of the dozen of churches that Winslow has, a church that is located behind a chain grocery store in a strip mall has a meeting space for the community. The church location provided a meeting space for the Navajo community members to discuss issues affecting them. The church is an L-shape building with a lawn of green grass and trees as well as a pebbled parking area. A sidewalk leads to the glass doors of the meeting room furnished with elongated tables and chairs. The facility provides a kitchenette with a sink, stove, cabinets, as well as a refrigerator for preparation and storage of food. This location provided an ideal place for Q-method participants to complete the survey since one of the issues addressed is relocation.

8) Near the downtown area of Winslow is the employment location of an interviewee, located near other government and professional offices. The professional offices included real estate, attorneys, and accountants to name a few. Grace’s place of employment was on a tree-lined one-way street that had no parking meters. The location was busy with patrons of available governmental services. The interior of the office location as busy with other employees milling around, however, the break room was the contrary. The employee break room was a small room with tables and chairs, and humming vending machines. Since the room was empty with the exception of vending machines, it provided a convenient location to engage in an interview.

4.3 Participants: Q-Method

The participants or responders in the Q-method study comprised of 72 respondents or P-set who are not randomly selected. The respondents of the Q-method study were located through
word of mouth, network, and community meetings. The respondents encompassed Navajo individuals who have varying degrees of knowledge about P.L. 93-531 policy and its impact on Navajos relocatees either directly or indirectly. The respondents or P-set is not by chance; rather, they are a “structured sample of respondents who are theoretically relevant to the problem under consideration,” and who have “clear and distinct viewpoint regarding the problem” (Van Exel and De Graaf 2005, 6). In retrospect, the P-set must have some knowledge about the relocation of Navajos as a result of P.L. 93-531 to be able to rank-order the statements.

Table 4: Q-Method Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Parents Relocated From</th>
<th>Parents Relocated To</th>
<th>Year Relocated</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Teesto</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sand Springs</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sand Springs</td>
<td>Tuba City</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Coal Mine</td>
<td>Tuba City</td>
<td>1990 or 1991</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Blue Canyon</td>
<td>Tuba City</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Coal Mine</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Reed Springs</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Sand Springs</td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Sand Springs</td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Teesto</td>
<td>Seba Dalkai</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Coal Mine</td>
<td>Kirkland, NM</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Big Mountain</td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Dilkon</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Hardrock</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Teesto</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Teesto</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Teesto</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Seba Dalkai/Teesto</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Seba Dalkai</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Finger Point</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Teesto</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Seba Dalkai</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Low Mountain</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Pinon</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Teesto</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Sand Springs</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1980 or 1981</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Sand Springs</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Dinnebito</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1985 or 1986</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Hardrock</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Dinnebito</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Dinnebito, AZ</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Sand Springs, AZ</td>
<td>Winslow, AZ</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Sand Springs, AZ</td>
<td>Mesa, AZ</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Big Mountain, AZ</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Hard Rock, AZ</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Big Mountain, AZ</td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Coalmine, AZ</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Sand Springs, AZ</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Sand Springs, AZ</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Sand Springs, AZ</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Dinnebito, AZ</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Dinnebito, AZ</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Sand Springs, AZ</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Characteristics of Q-Method Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Survey</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Relocated To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td>19 Unk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>36 Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>15 Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>On-Reservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Other city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Participants: In-Depth Interviews

The in-depth interview participants were located through their participation in the Q-method surveys, and selected accordingly to four main criteria. First, the participant must have been a former resident of the Hopi Partition Lands (HPL) or Former Joint Use Area (FJUA); secondly, the participants will have been a minor at the time they relocated with their parents; thirdly, they may have applied for relocation benefits with the Office of the Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation and were denied to receive benefits; and fourth, they reside off the Navajo Nation.
These essential criteria assisted in remaining focus on individuals who have direct experience as second generation relocatees allowing the study to have valid sources. I interviewed a total of ten participants, 3 males and 7 females, who are thirty years old and beyond. The interviewees were all relocatees from Former Joint Use Area or Hopi Partitioned Lands with their parents and currently living in an urban area.

Table 6: Interview Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male - 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants in both studies were comprised of both men and women who were over the age of twenty and above. They were self-employed or employed in occupations as engineers, office administrators, managers, educators, construction specialist, marketing professionals, artist, and service industry, consisting of a broad range of skill levels. Their education level ranged from high school, some college, trade schools, undergraduates, graduates, and professional education. The participants either rented single family homes or apartments, or paid mortgages on their home with the intent to own the home. Additionally, many of the participants had families of their own living with them while some continue to live their parents in the urban areas. The backgrounds of the participants in both data gathering methods, Q-method and In-depth Interview, varied while having a common bond of being a second generation Navajo relocatee.
4.5 Institutional Review Board and Supporting Resolutions

It is required to receive clearance by the University of Arizona’s institutional review board (UAIRB) prior to performing an empirical study concerning human subjects. Since my study involved interviewing human subjects, it was necessary for me to fill out the required forms by adhering to the proper channels and protocol. Given that my research was inclusive of and about Indigenous Peoples, the clearance was twofold.

First, my research specifically pertained to working with Navajo citizens residing in the urban areas off the Navajo Nation. After completing the institutional review board’s necessary forms, I contacted the Navajo Nation advising them of my research on second generation Navajo relocatees living off the Navajo reservation and whether I needed a research permit. In April 2014, I received notice from the Navajo Nation that since my research was off the Navajo Nation, a research permit was not required. A research permit is required if research is held on the Navajo Nation. In addition, my council delegate of my home chapter in Leupp, Arizona, Honorable Council Delegate Walter Phelps assisted me in obtaining a supporting resolution successfully to move forward with my research on my behalf in March 2014 (Appendix 7.2). In furthering support for my study, I also received a supporting resolution in March 2015 from the greater regional area of the estern Navajo Nation, an area constituting a consortium of fifteen chapters consisting of the Western Navajo Agency (Appendix 7.3). With the approval from the western communities of the Navajo Nation where a large part of the relocation measures have taken place, I moved forward in obtaining approval from the UAIRB. Since my research was considered low risk, the consent form did not require a signature from the participant as it was considered low risk (Appendix 7.4). My UAIRB approval was made in April 2014.


4.6 Data Collection

I utilized three data collection techniques – artifacts, Q- method, and in-depth interviews. There were artifacts gathered, ten participants in the in-depth interviews, and 72 participants in the Q-method study.

4.6.1 Artifacts

The first technique, the gathering and collecting of artifacts may include pictures of relocated families, documents (i.e. formal letters from the Office of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation), field notes, and other documents linked to relocation (Marshall and Rossman 2011, 160). Field notes are a secondary data storage method in qualitative research. Because the human mind tends to forget quickly, hence field notes maintained by the researcher are crucial in qualitative research to retain data gathered (Lofland & Lofland, 1999; Groenewald 2004).

4.6.2 Q Method

The second technique, Q methodology, is a study of human subjectivity where the participant reveals his or her point of view based on their experiences. In this study, the second generation Navajo relocatee’s perspectives were based on their experiences with relocation. The Q-method is described as the ““the best-developed paradigm for the investigation of human subjectivity”” (Brown, Durning and Selden 2007, 722) by “correlate[ing] persons instead of test” (Stephenson 1935, 18). A typical stage of the Q-method consists of developing the concourse, Q-sampling the concourse, constructing the Q-set, and Q-sorting.

4.6.2.1 Development of the Q-set
The concourse consists of existing or gathered opinions or arguments about a topic (Brown, Durning and Selden 2007; Van Exel and De Graaf 2005; McKeown and Dan 1988). It is developed by selecting statement about what is being said about a topic from interviews, observations, media reports, congressional hearings, or previous research. I researched videos made about present urban Indians, perused through congressional hearings about Navajo relocation, read previous studies about first generation Navajo relocatees, examined other studies about removal of indigenous people from their traditional territories. These opinions and arguments became raw material for a Q-set.

Q-sampling the concourse occurred when the concourse had been thoroughly documented and selected representative statements of opinions or arguments in the concourse are extracted. At this juncture, the selected statements are considered to be raw material. The samples selected were not randomly selected, but “selected carefully by the researcher with the goal of capturing the diversity and complexity of the different views contained within the concourse” (Brown, Durning and Selden 2007, 723). The topics I selected pertained to themes related to land, ceremonies, tradition and culture, language, and livelihood. Each topic had to resonate with Navajo relocatees in order for them to rank and order them accordingly.

I was able to successfully find 85 raw materials that were developed from “ready-made” Q-samples which are statements from other sources rather than oral or written communication from respondents (Appendix 7.5). Only after careful examination, forty statements were chosen as Q-set that participants will understand and relate to as a possible final Q-set (See Appendix 7.6). These Q-samples were turned into unambiguous statements or Q-set that was presented to the participants. The Q-set was basically printed as individual statements expressed as a single
idea that represented the opinions of the concourse with consecutive numbers to be ranked by the participants. Brown, Durning and Selden state that a Q-set is a “communication of facts, information, beliefs, opinions, and feelings about a topic which comprises a concourse” (Q Methodology 2007), and are a “flow of communicability surrounding any topic in an ordinary conversation, commentary, and discourse of everyday life” (Van Exel and De Graaf 2005, 4). Alongside the development of the forty statements, a grid containing forty spaces to place each statement was developed (Appendix 7.7).

4.6.2.2 Advisory Committee

In the study, a five member advisory panel of Navajos citizen was formed to assist with any recommendations of edits to the unambiguous statements by taking a Q-method survey. The committee members were chosen based on their knowledge of the impacts of the Navajo Hopi Indian Land Settlement Act 1974 on Navajo relocatees through work on relocation issue or as relocatees themselves. Two of the committee members formerly held positions with the Navajo government as well as with the federal government, and three committee members were relocatees. Each committee member received the sample Q-set and a grid to complete the survey. The committee advised the statements reflected the concerns of the second generation relocatees and could relate to each statement in one manner or another. When the committee did not have any objections to the statements, I made no changes to the statement, thus finalizing them. At this juncture, I refined the procedures and direction of how the Q-method survey would be completed by the participant either face-to-face or by mail. The establishment of a five member advisory committee illustrates and exemplifies the principle of community participation, and will improve the quality of the study.
4.6.2.3 Recruitment - Fliers

To recruit participants for the study, I proposed to the Phoenix Indian Center (PIC) and the Native American for Community Action (NACA) in Flagstaff to advertise my research by posting fliers (Appendix 7.8) to attract potential participants. The exception was Winslow, which did not have an Indian center. I wrote letters of request to PIC and NACA about my proposal. PIC advised they are able to post fliers on the bulletin board in the waiting room of their facility with the other posted fliers. NACA, on the other hand, did not allow flier to be posted on their premises due to their institutional review board policy. However, NACA posted fliers in branch facilities where they felt would lead to potential participants, such as their health care facility. After PIC’s and NACA’s consent, I developed recruitment fliers containing information about the study and contact information for both locations. Additionally, PIC posted the flier on their social media page in hopes of attracting potential participants. I had hoped potential participants would take notice of the flier and contact me about participating in the study, however, that was not the result. After passing the time waiting for participants to respond to my study through the fliers from both PIC and NACA, I proceeded to my next recruitment technique.

The snowball sampling was the next method I utilized for the Q-method surveys since second generation Navajo relocatees were a hard-to-reach target group. Utilizing this method, I found individuals who I believed were possible second generation Navajo relocatees, thereafter, the individuals contacted other potential second generation Navajo relocatees to determine if they were interested in participating in the study. If the contacted participants were interest, I was contacted by telephone or email. When the potential participant and I communicated, I
determined if they were second generation Navajo relocatees by inquiring if they were relocated with their parents when they were minors to a town/city due to the Navajo Hopi Indian Land Settlement Act or if they are residing in a town/city due to relocation. When I determined they were second generation Navajo relocatees, I made an inquiry if they are interested in completing the Q-method survey by mail or face-to-face (Appendix 7.9). If the potential participant was interested in completing the Q-method survey face-to-face, I made an appointment to meet at a location that was convenient for them to meet. If they preferred to complete the survey by mail, I provide the necessary Q-method survey forms in a envelope and mailed it. When conducting the survey face-to-face, I than fully explained the purpose of the project and their role in the study as well as providing participants with consent information.

I began my Q-method field work in June 2014 and completed the surveys by September 2015. To begin the snowball sampling, I approached a Navajo individual in the Phoenix area whom I believed is a second generation Navajo relocatee, who then recruited her husband as well as three other relatives. All of the surveys in the Phoenix area were completed by a chain of referrals as a result of participants who contacted and recruited their families, relatives and/or friends.

In the city of Flagstaff, the same recruitment method was applied. I contacted select Navajo individuals whom I believed to be second generation Navajo relocatees, who also recruited families, relatives and/or friends. Moreover, I found active Navajo community leaders in their own right who were able to connect me with potential participants. These active Navajo community leaders were recognized and trusted within their community in Flagstaff. Despite being a former Flagstaff area resident for many years and former active community member, I
found more it challenging to find second generation Navajo relocatees who were willing to be participants in the Flagstaff area than the Phoenix and Winslow area. Regardless of the challenge, I was able to complete the majority of the survey with the assistance of the participants and community leaders.

In the city of Winslow, attending a community meeting attended by a majority of Navajo residents who were impacted by relocations provided me access to second generation Navajo relocatees. I met participants who were able to complete the surveys at the meeting, as well as set up appointments for those who were interested in taking the surveys at another time and place. In the city of Winslow, an active community leader assisted me in facilitating the snowball method by reaching out to her network of Navajo relocatees which resulted in participants.

The snowball sampling worked effectively for my study in all three targeted urban centers. I believe it was primarily successful due to Navajo individuals who are tied to a community of families, relatives and friends sharing the common experience of relocation. Throughout my study, I found more willing participants when the lead participant in each network and community leaders were supportive of your research.

4.6.2.4 *Q-sorting*

*Q-sorting* is the process of presenting the *Q*-set to the respondents or *P*-set who rank orders the *Q*-set. The *P*-set rank order the *Q*-set according to their individual point of view based on their preference about them, primarily through a quasi-normal distribution providing subjective meaning to their statements (Brown, Durning and Selden 2007; McKeown and Dan
1988; Van Exel and De Graaf 2005) according to what is most important to what is least important because of their awareness of Public Law 93-531.

At the start of each survey, the 72 P-sets were presented with instructions on how to rank order the 40 statements of the Q-set onto a Q-sort diagram or grid. The Q-set were written on separate cards that were numbered; the P-set read, sort and rank the statement card into three categories from applies, neutral, to not applies on a nine-point continuum, beginning with 1 and ending with 9 correlating with the number scale range of -4, -3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, following a quasi-normal distribution (Brown, Durning and Selden 2007). The Q-sorting were conducted at community events, public venues such as a public library, coffee shops or home by non-random P-sets.

4.6.2.5 Face-to-Face and Mail-In

When the Q-sort was to be administered face-to-face, an appointment time and location was agreed upon. Upon meeting with the participant, I explained the process and provided the consent form. When a participant began the ranking process, I observed the sorting of the statement process. After the completion of the Q-sort, I recorded by writing in each numbered statement where they were placed on the Q-grid. I encouraged the participants to provide comments if they had any strong opinions about any statement. The majority of the participants felt all the statements were relevant to their experience. However, as a researcher, I was reluctant to ask questions since this portion of the study was a survey and not an interview.

I received three referrals for potential participants who were interested in participating by mail. The potential participant’s addresses were made available by their family members. I enclosed
the necessary items into an envelope: return stamp envelope, Q-grid, statements, instructions, and consent form. The mail-in participants could leave comments if they desired; the participants returned the surveys without any comment pertaining to the statements.

4.6.2.6 Q-Method Instructions

When meeting with a participant for the Q-method survey or interview, I provided information and documents prior to each activity. The Q-method participants received a packet containing the consent form, instructions on how to proceed with the Q-method survey (Appendix 7.10), Q-set, Q-grid, and an abstract of my study. Potential Q-method participants choosing to participate by mail were sent four items as well as a return stamped envelope. The interview participant received only the consent form and abstract.

4.7 Consent Form

The importance of the consent form was stressed to each participant. The consent form contained the purpose of the research, why the study is being done, and how long the survey or interview will take. The consent form states that participating is wholly voluntary and as well as a confidentiality clause protecting their identity. Each participant received a consent form prior to completing the Q-method survey and prior to an interview (Appendix 7.4). The Q-method interviewees who agreed to partake in the interviews received a consent form as well prior to the actual interview.

4.8 In-Depth Interviews
The third technique was the in-depth interviews which are described as being at “a construction site of knowledge,” and discussing a “theme of mutual interest” (Marshall and Rossman 2011, 142). Specifically, phenomenological interviewing is the type of in-depth interview that was be utilized. Phenomenological interviewing is the study of lived experiences and the ways we understand those experiences to develop a worldview to describe the meaning of a phenomenon that several individuals share (Marshall and Rossman 2011). A primary advantage of this type of interview is it allows for an “explicit focus on the researcher’s personal experiences combined with those of the interview [cohorts]” (Marshall and Rossman 2011, 148). The in-depth interviews could be implemented in a series of two interviews, if necessary, with each interview spaced apart by three to seven days each, and held at locations where the main participants will be most comfortable, such as their residence, “to reconstruct their experience and to explore their meaning” (Seidman 2006, 92). According to Seidman, spacing days apart will allow the participants to ponder over the preceding interviews and to maintain close connection to their experience. These series of interviews reflected on the main participant’s experiences before, during and after relocation. The interviews should be approximately ninety minutes each, allowing enough time for the interviewee to reflect on answers and long enough to be taken seriously (Seidman 2006, 20). The interviews conducted were approximately sixty minutes. The in-depth interviews provided data to my research by answering all three questions because of direct relocation experience by the participants. The first question, how has the relocation experience, due to Public Law 93-531, impacted the lives of second generation Navajo children, now adults, living in towns or cities off the Navajo Nation? The participants have intimate knowledge of their own families or relatives who have personal experience and how relocation has affected their lives as a family unit. The second question, what have been the
perspectives and challenges of the participants after relocation? Only the participants were able to answer this question because of their own personal experiences, before, during, and after relocation. The third question, what have the federal and Navajo government roles been in the lives of second generation Navajo relocatees? The participants have the knowledge of how closely involved the government has been, and the role the government has played in their lives throughout their relocation experience. The in-depth interviews were tape-recorded for reliability of participant’s terms and expression thus enabling me to transcribe accurately (Seidman 2006).

4.8.1 Questionnaires

I developed twelve semi-structured questionnaires for the ten in-depth interview participants which I may or may not have asked. The questions were asked if they were relevant to the participant’s situation. The following semi-structure questions lead to other questions that the participant could further elaborate on regarding land, language, and ceremonies, and home replacement benefits process.

Table 7: Semi-Structured Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Structured Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell me about your relocation experience as a result of P.L. 93-531?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What was your families experience with relocation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tell me about your experience about living on the Navajo Nation before relocation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can you tell me about your experience of living away from the Navajo Nation after relocation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Did you move to an urban area as a result of relocation?

6. What were some of the difficulties about living in an urban setting?

7. Do you participate in any cultural event in the urban area?

8. When you applied for relocation benefits, what were your thoughts or reaction when you were denied?

9. Do you want to possibly return to the Navajo Nation?
   a. If so, where would you like to return to?

10. Do you have children?

11. Do you feel your children have a strong connection to their culture and tradition since the majority of their life has been spent off the Navajo Nation? (If they live off the reservation)

12. What do you propose the solution might be for the children of relocation?

### 4.9 Data Analysis

#### 4.9.1 Q-Method

The Q-method was analyzed and interpreted by, first, calculating the Q-sort by correlating the matrix which represents the degree levels of disagreements and agreements (Brown, Durning and Selden 2007; McKeown and Dan 1988; Van Exel and De Graaf 2005). Next, the correlation matrix was subjected to factor analysis by examining how many Q Sorts are substantiated. The same factors will be shared with similar views. The next step of the analysis is, factor rotation, which used to preserve as much of the variance as possible. The rotations may be either objective, or theoretical, driven by theoretical concerns, some prior knowledge or
preconceived idea that emerged during the study. By rotating, the statements or opinions are examined from various angles to seek confirmation of a theory or idea (Van Exel and De Graaf 2005; Brown, Durning and Selden 2007). In this study, when factors were rotated, it showed a lack of any notable differences in the outcome; the original rotation was utilized. The final step is the calculation of factor scores, the average statement scores (Z-score) of the respondents that define those factor, and difference scores, is the difference between a statement’s score on any two factors that is required for it to be significant. When the statement’s score on two factors that exceeds the difference score, it is known as a distinguishing statement, however, if it is not distinguishing between any of the identified factors, it is known as a consensus statement (Van Exel and De Graaf 2005). Factors that highlight the difference scores point out the salient statements in describing and interpreting factors that rank at opposite ends are called characterizing statements. The distinguishing and consensus statements can be used to highlight the differences and similarities between factors (Van Exel and De Graaf 2005).

4.9.2 In-Depth Interviews

The data collected was initiated by in-depth interviews with the use of a digital tape recorder to provide accuracy. Following the interviews, the recorded interviews were downloaded onto a computer which allowed reviewing of the interviews before transcribing. Each interview file was labeled with a pseudonym name. The interviews were carefully transcribed and created into a transcript format word for word. After transcribing the interviews, it was read numerous times. The reading of the transcribed interviews was followed by editing for clarification when it necessitated prior to evaluation. After the transcribing was complete, I met with the interviewee to receive feedback about the transcribed interviews and their consent
to move forward with their data. Seven interviewees advised the transcribed interviews were acceptable, two made edits after reviewing it, and one made additional comments toward their experiences with relocation. At this point the researcher conducts a validity check by returning to the participant to determine if the essence of the interview has been correctly captured (Hycner 1999).

The data analysis is a process where the focus is on what the data are “saying” to you (Galman 2007, 87). In an attempt to determine what the data might be “saying,” I utilized the technique, open coding (Marshall & Rossman 2011), by comparing and assessing events and behavior, and identifying key words, phrases, and context within the transcripts that could be perceived as answering the research question. After further sorting the data, I apply axial coding (Marshall & Rossman 2011) by grouping codes to categories that reflect commonalities by assigning codes with certain terms and phrases categorically to further organize the data. In addition, I remained mindful and hopeful of being able to answer the research questions by attempting to identify patterns in the data while observing for relationships between and across emerging patterns (Galman, 87) to try to determine answers. In addition, I identified patterns in the data and observed for relationships between and across emerging patterns to answer the research questions (Galman 2007, 87). According Galman (89), the terms and themes used to sort data can come from your conceptual framework and research question (Galman 2007). After sorting the data by assigning by three letter abbreviations with certain terms and phrases, the codes will be assigned categories to further organize the data. In an effort to cross verify data, I integrated the Q-method survey and artifacts with the interview data to reduce misrepresentation, provide clear meaning, and verifying events by utilizing the triangulation process (Stake, 1998). The data was process with a top down analysis approach. According to
Galman, the terms and themes used to sort data can emerge from the conceptual framework and research question (89). The final coding will be assessing what patterns and key words and phrases emerge from the categories of data to identify themes. The emerging themes will be able to provide findings to the research questions. After completion of the coding, themes emerged. The themes were related to ceremony, language, sacred history, land, and livelihood.

4.9.2.1 Interview Profiles

All of the interviewees had two criteria’s in common. First, they relocated with their parents from the Hopi Partition Lands, and second, they reside in the urban setting of Phoenix, Flagstaff, or Winslow. It was originally hoped that all of the interviewees would have applied for home replacement benefits with the Office of the Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation; seven applied for home replacement benefits and were denied, and three did not apply for relocation benefits for various reasons.

Table 8: Interviewees Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Urban Community</th>
<th>Applied HRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Joan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Franklin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Norris</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Yuma</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tess</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shannon</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Paulina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Samantha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Christina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Grace</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Joan is originally from the western area of the Navajo reservation. She relocated to the Flagstaff area with her parents in the mid-1980. Joan is in her 30’s and lives in the city of Flagstaff. Joan indicated she was interested in applying for home replacement benefits on her own; however, her family members advised her that she probably would not be eligible because she was included in with her mother’s home replacement benefits.

2. Tess is originally from the southwestern area of the Navajo reservation. Tess was in her 50’s and currently lives in the area of Winslow, Arizona. She relocated with her mother in late 1970’s. Tess has applied for a home replacement benefit and was denied as well as her siblings.

3. Shannon is originally from the southwestern area of the Navajo reservation. Her parents relocated in the early 1980’s to Winslow, Arizona. She is in her 40’s and currently lives in metropolitan Phoenix with her family. Shannon applied for home replacement benefits and was denied.

4. Yuma is from the western area of the Navajo reservation. Yuma’s parents relocated in the 1980’s with his parents to a major Navajo community nearby. He is in his 40’s and currently resides in metropolitan Phoenix. Yuma applied for home replacement benefits and was denied.

5. Paulina is from the western area of the Navajo reservation. Her parents relocated to an off-reservation community north of the Navajo reservation. Paulina is in her 30’s and lives in metropolitan Phoenix. Paulina applied for home replacement benefits and was denied.

6. Samantha is originally the southwestern area of the Navajo reservation. Her parents relocated to Winslow, Arizona in the 1980’s. Samantha moved to metropolitan Phoenix area where she currently lives with her family. She applied for home replacement benefits and
was denied. She was denied because she was included with her parents home replacements benefits.

7. Norris is originally from the western area of the Navajo reservation. His parents relocated to Flagstaff in the late 1970’s. Norris attempted to apply for home replacement benefits. He went to the Office of Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation to apply for home replacement benefits but he was advised he could not apply and there was nothing they could do.

8. Christina is originally from the southwestern region of the Navajo Nation where she was raised. She is in her 50’s and lives in Winslow, Arizona. Her parents relocated to Winslow, Arizona in the early 1980’s. She applied for home replacement benefits and was denied.

9. Grace is originally from the southwestern region of the Navajo Nation. Her parents relocated to Winslow, Arizona in the mid 1980’s. She has applied for home replacement benefits and was denied due to being included with her parents. Grace has other siblings who were also included with her parent’s home replacement benefits, and they reside in urban communities with their families.

10. Franklin is originally from the western area of the Navajo reservation. His father relocated in the early 1990’s to a community on the Navajo reservation. Franklin is in his 30’s and lives in Flagstaff with relatives. Franklin did not apply for home replacement benefits, and he indicates that he has limited knowledge about the relocation issue.

All of the participants were cooperative as participants, and were appreciative of the study. Some of the participants were on a limited time schedule in providing an interview due to work, family and other commitments. The participants either agreed immediately about doing the interview and others needed time to think about it. Another interviewee who agreed advised that since this topic is regarding sacred lands, they would have to give it some thought about it. One
potential interviewee has previously agreed but decided not to do the interview due to time constraints and wished me luck. Another interviewee informed me that because I was Navajo, she agreed to the interview and that she provided more information than she normally would have.

4.10 FINDINGS

When the results of the Q sorts were analyzed, three separate factors or perspectives emerged from second generation Navajo relocatee residing in urban locations: 1) Livelihood, 2) Urbanism, and 3) Traditionalism. The Q sorts topics were based on a modified Peoplehood Matrix of Land, Language, Sacred History, Ceremony, and Livelihood; the modified topic being livelihood. The Q-method findings will be presented for all three themes that have emerged as prominent factors.

4.10.1 Q-Method Findings

The data that was gathered in conducting the Q-method survey or Q-sort was entered in the PQ Method software program to determine outcome. The Factor Score Arrays attempts to clarify a pattern based on responses by the participants. It is representative of an overall points of view based on how each statements were scored by ranking made by the participants (Brown, Durning and Selden 2007). In the following table, Factor A is correlates to Livelihood, Factor B is representative to Urbanism, and Factor C is shows a relationship to Traditionalism. The factor scores assist in identifying which statements characterize a specify factor.
Table 9: Factor Score Arrays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements and Rankings for each Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A home site lease on the Navajo Nation should be available and secured quickly without difficulty when attempting to return to the Navajo reservation.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Passing down traditional knowledge, teaching lessons on morality, and sharing experiences and events through oral tradition has been disrupted.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is challenging to access medicine people to have a ceremony performed in the town/city.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I speak less Navajo and my children do not speak Navajo.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The home replacement eligibility requirements and application process of the Office of the Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation are unfair.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is challenging when you are not in a Navajo community to maintain ceremonial and cultural ties.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. After relocating, my extended family structure and sense of community disintegrated.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Everything is in English and that has changed everything.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If I was not relocated, I would have been able to provide a stable home environment for my children.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I would have preferred relocating as an extended family to another area on the Navajo reservation rather than as a single family unit to a town/city.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It can be disempowering to be known as a Navajo relocatee.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. There are no adequate opportunities to learn traditional songs and stories as part of a family daily and seasonal event.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Living in a town/city marginalizes speaking the Navajo language.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The high cost of living in the town/city I live in concerns me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The many thousand acres of land Navajo Nation received on behalf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of relocatees should be utilized to assist relocatees.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Living in a town/city among strangers is depressing and lonely.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Relocation has resulted in the inability to practice traditional religion based on a spiritual relationship with my ancestral lands.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My family and I would be more exposed to the Navajo language if relocation did not happen.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The lack of family support makes it difficult to live in a town/city.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I want to obtain a home site lease and move back to the Navajo reservation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I consider the town/city I live in my new community.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. To maintain a form of cultural expression, I attend Native cultural events in the town/city.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The Navajo language is important in understanding our worldview.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I would move back to the reservation if I could live well.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Securing land for a home to pass on to my children is more valuable than any types of wealth.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The best part of my life was at home on our customary lands.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Having access to a Navajo hogan is important for ceremonies.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. It is important to teach my children or grandchildren the Navajo language to communicate with grandparents, relatives, and others.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. It is easier to find housing in a town/city.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Despite being a relocatee and living in a town/city off the reservation, I still consider the Navajo Nation is as home.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am interested in participating in civic and political events at a local Navajo community chapter</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Harvesting medicinal and tobacco plants on a seasonal basis for ceremonies and our wellbeing is important.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. We visit the Navajo reservation to be more exposed to the Navajo language and culture.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. It would be good to have livestock (i.e. sheep, cattle, horse...) and a farm again to survive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. I refer to the place where my umbilical cord is buried as “home.” | 1 | -3 | 1
37. Navajo leaders should help Navajo relocatees for a possible return to the Navajo Nation. | 1 | 0 | -4
38. *Kinaalda*, a coming of age ceremony is important within my family. | 0 | 2 | 4
39. Access to Navajo language classes is essential for my family. | 1 | 2 | 0
40. Living in a town/city provides me access to education and employment opportunities. | 4 | 4 | 0

The following table illustrates the relationship between the three factor scores through the correlations of the factor score arrays. The three distinguishing factors represent 34% of the variance. Table 10 illustrates there are no correlations between the factors since they are near zero.

**Table 10: Correlations Between Factor Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0531</td>
<td>-0.0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0531</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.0041</td>
<td>0.0584</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total 72 participants completed the Q-method surveys. 37 out of 72 participants loaded heaviest in the Livelihood factor, while 12 out of 72 participants chose statements connected with Urbanism factor, and 8 out of 72 participants loaded in the Traditionalism factor. 15 out of 72 participants loaded into other factors.

**Table 11: Number of Defining Participants**

- **72 Q-Method Participants**
  - 51% Livelihood
    - 37/72
  - 17% Urbanism
    - 12/72
  - 11% Traditionalism
    - 8/72
  - 21% Other Variables
    - 15/72
The following table suggests that there exist some factor scores that are similar within each factor. The participant number that loaded considerably on each of the factors and whose sorts were utilized in producing the defining Q-sort are identified with the X mark. The total number of the participants is noted at the bottom of the table as well as the percent of the variance for each factor.

Table 12: Factor Matrix with an X Indicating a Defining Sort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSORT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3305</td>
<td>-0.2585</td>
<td>0.2475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2552</td>
<td>-0.2809</td>
<td>0.3136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4304</td>
<td>-0.2854</td>
<td>0.6482X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4623X</td>
<td>0.1265</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4703X</td>
<td>0.2623</td>
<td>0.3271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6194X</td>
<td>-0.0198</td>
<td>0.0692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6083X</td>
<td>-0.1907</td>
<td>0.2174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5827X</td>
<td>-0.2795</td>
<td>0.1508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2333</td>
<td>0.1967</td>
<td>0.1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5900X</td>
<td>0.4393</td>
<td>0.3463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1212</td>
<td>0.3288X</td>
<td>0.2131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.3339X</td>
<td>-0.1044</td>
<td>0.2519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5548X</td>
<td>0.3115</td>
<td>0.1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.3504X</td>
<td>-0.3228</td>
<td>-0.1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.3065</td>
<td>0.1875</td>
<td>0.0499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.6138X</td>
<td>-0.3098</td>
<td>0.4185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.5238X</td>
<td>-0.0500</td>
<td>0.1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.2836</td>
<td>-0.3181</td>
<td>0.5523X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.5160X</td>
<td>0.2023</td>
<td>0.0593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.5872X</td>
<td>-0.1825</td>
<td>-0.1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.4855X</td>
<td>-0.1963</td>
<td>0.4278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.5165X</td>
<td>-0.0287</td>
<td>-0.2306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.3812X</td>
<td>-0.1497</td>
<td>0.1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.5474X</td>
<td>0.3986</td>
<td>-0.1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.1897</td>
<td>0.3744X</td>
<td>-0.0821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3701X</td>
<td>-0.0649</td>
<td>-0.1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.4721X</td>
<td>-0.2521</td>
<td>-0.2449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.3099</td>
<td>-0.4979X</td>
<td>-0.3167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.4236</td>
<td>-0.3803</td>
<td>-0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.6331X</td>
<td>0.3053</td>
<td>-0.4034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.2435</td>
<td>0.3417</td>
<td>-0.4572X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.6098X</td>
<td>0.2606</td>
<td>-0.2712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.2896</td>
<td>0.0965</td>
<td>-0.3952X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-0.0456</td>
<td>0.3109X</td>
<td>0.1394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.1624</td>
<td>0.1534</td>
<td>0.2816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.5888X</td>
<td>0.1231</td>
<td>-0.5247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.5927X</td>
<td>0.3715</td>
<td>-0.2884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.4698</td>
<td>-0.0659</td>
<td>-0.5112X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.4827</td>
<td>-0.5331X</td>
<td>0.1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.4478</td>
<td>0.3823</td>
<td>-0.3366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.3126</td>
<td>0.5446X</td>
<td>0.4329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.5539X</td>
<td>-0.2490</td>
<td>0.0711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.3174</td>
<td>-0.4749X</td>
<td>-0.1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.0392</td>
<td>-0.1084</td>
<td>-0.3359X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.4094</td>
<td>-0.3611</td>
<td>-0.2455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.3762X</td>
<td>0.3435</td>
<td>-0.0911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.3471</td>
<td>-0.3546</td>
<td>0.3392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.1229</td>
<td>-0.5995X</td>
<td>-0.3158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.2633</td>
<td>-0.0313</td>
<td>0.2189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.3679</td>
<td>0.2916</td>
<td>-0.3267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.3575</td>
<td>0.0415</td>
<td>-0.3903X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.4631X</td>
<td>-0.0702</td>
<td>0.3487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.3097</td>
<td>0.1085</td>
<td>0.3990X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.1920</td>
<td>0.4611X</td>
<td>0.3779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.0725</td>
<td>0.1149</td>
<td>0.1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.4442X</td>
<td>-0.0493</td>
<td>-0.0133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.4150X</td>
<td>0.1040</td>
<td>-0.0281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.3554</td>
<td>0.6169X</td>
<td>0.0686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.1612</td>
<td>0.6673X</td>
<td>0.2937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.3996X</td>
<td>0.0603</td>
<td>0.2365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.7084X</td>
<td>0.1320</td>
<td>-0.2122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.3260X</td>
<td>0.3031</td>
<td>0.0783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.4946X</td>
<td>-0.0021</td>
<td>0.4019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.2502</td>
<td>-0.2365</td>
<td>0.2098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.3171X</td>
<td>-0.1318</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.3475</td>
<td>-0.2153</td>
<td>0.3195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.1687</td>
<td>0.3230X</td>
<td>0.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.6800X</td>
<td>-0.2405</td>
<td>0.0697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.6412X</td>
<td>-0.1174</td>
<td>-0.2155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.5850X</td>
<td>-0.0162</td>
<td>-0.5684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.6184X</td>
<td>-0.1067</td>
<td>-0.3318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.1452</td>
<td>-0.3001</td>
<td>0.0193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Loaded: 37  
% Variance: 18  

---

# Loaded: 37  
% Variance: 18
The majority of the participants ranked most significantly in Factor One. 37 participants that loaded in Factor One represent most of the discourse of their larger community. Both, Factor Two with 12 participants, and Factor Two with 8 participants, indicate they have fewer participants in their respective factors yet have distinguishable discourse within their community of peers. 15 participants loading are not shown due to lack of representation by either not loading significantly enough or loaded on various other factors resulting in not being chosen as a defined factor. The 15 participants could be represented in a correlation with one of the three factors to a certain degree.

4.10.1.1 FACTOR ONE: LIVELIHOOD

The foundation of what most applies and important to this particular group or themes are land, livelihood, and traditions. The perspective on the importance of land is supported by five statements: Land is an integral part of providing security above all else for the future generation within their families (26); Navajo Nation should assist Navajo relocatees with lands the Nation received in exchange for loss of lands (16); the home site lease process should be secured without difficulty when attempting to return to the Navajo reservation (1); the federal agency, the Office of the Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation, eligibility and application process are unfair because of the exclusion of attaining land and home (5); and, they consider Navajo Nation as home even if they are relocatees living off the Navajo reservation (31).

Table 13: Factor One - Livelihood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14: Livelihood Q-Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly not Applies</th>
<th>Moderately not Applies</th>
<th>Somewhat not Applies</th>
<th>Slightly not Applies</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Applies</th>
<th>Somewhat Applies</th>
<th>Moderately Applies</th>
<th>Strongly Applies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theme of livelihood is indicated by the strongly applicable or important factors of making a living, or a livelihood while being in an urban area. The participant’s view of residing in a town/city provides them access to education and employment opportunities (40) as to support themselves and their families; and, if they could live well on the Navajo reservation (25), they would return.

The last theme for Factor One relates to aspects of traditionalism that are moderately applicable and important in the lives of Navajo relocatees. Two main statements emerged as being moderately applying to the Q-method participants and supported by five other statements that are aligned with traditionalism. The participants believe that relocation had disrupted the conveyance of traditional knowledge, teaching lessons on morality, and sharing of experiences and events through oral traditional (2); in possibly transmitting these knowledge through oral
tradition, the participants believe in the importance of teaching the Navajo language to communicate with family and relatives (29); and it somewhat applied that the Navajo language is important in understanding their worldview (24). Perspective related to aspects of traditionalism that somewhat do not apply to the participants are statements (13, 23, 28).

The perspectives of Factor One show that the Q-method participants have a sense of confidence living in an urban setting. The participants find that living in a town/city is not difficult with the lack of family support (20) and that it is depressing and lonely to live among strangers does not strongly apply to them (17); additionally, feeling trapped living in a town/city without land on the Navajo reservation does not moderately apply to them. And they find that English has not changed everything (9).

In summary, land is highly important in securing a future for their children as well as employment and educational opportunities to sustain a livelihood. They also believe it is important to maintain traditional and cultural aspects of their identity, including language. Despite living in an urban environment, they are confident and secure in who they are as Dine people. They look forward to securing land for their children, and returning in the event they can live well.

4.10.1.2 FACTOR TWO: URBANISM

The primary perspectives of the Q-method participants point to the embracement of urbanism, and the importance of the Navajo language. The notion of accepting an urban setting as a new community is supported by two statements that strongly and moderately apply to them: these statements are further supported by nine statements. The acceptance of a new community
are reflected in the following: while living in a town/city setting, their community provides them access to educational and employment opportunities (40); they consider the town/city they live in as their new community (22); and, they find that it is easier to find housing in the town/city they live it (30).

Table 15: Factor Two - Urbanism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Two</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Living in a town/city provides me access to education and employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I consider the town/city I live in my new community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is easier to find housing in a town/city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Everything is in English and that has changed everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Living in a town/city marginalizes speaking the Navajo language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Access to Navajo language classes is essential for my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I speak less Navajo and my children do not speak Navajo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>We visit the Navajo reservation to be more exposed to the Navajo language and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Navajo language is important in understanding our worldview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kinaalda, a coming of age ceremony is important within my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Harvesting medicinal and tobacco plants on a seasonal basis for ceremonies and our wellbeing is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>I would have preferred relocating as an extended family to another area on the Navajo reservation rather than as a single family unit to a town/city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>If I was not relocated, I would have been able to provide a stable home environment for my children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>I would move back to the reservation if I could live well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>The many thousand acres of land Navajo Nation received on behalf of relocatees should be utilized to assist relocatees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The best part of my life was at home on our customary lands.

I refer to the place where my umbilical cord is buried as “home.”

I want to obtain a home site lease and move back to the Navajo reservation.

It would be good to have livestock (i.e. sheep, cattle, horse...) and a farm again to survive.

I feel trapped living in a town/city without land on the Navajo reservation.

Table 16: Urbanism Q-Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly not Applies</td>
<td>Moderately not Applies</td>
<td>Somewhat not Applies</td>
<td>Slightly not Applies</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Slightly Applies</td>
<td>Somewhat Applies</td>
<td>Moderately Applies</td>
<td>Strongly Applies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In supporting the notion of an adoption of a new urban community, the following statements do not apply to them in a continuum of degrees or interests: having livestock and a farm again to survive on (35); feeling trapped in a town/city without land on the Navajo reservation (6); regarding where their umbilical cord is buried as “home” (36); and, regarding the best part of their life was on their customary lands (27); obtaining a home site lease and moving back to the Navajo reservation (21); idea that the Navajo Nation should assist Navajo relocatees with lands the Nation received in exchange for loss of lands (16), all apply to certain degrees to
these participants. In another rather supporting statement, relocating with their extended family to another area on the Navajo reservation rather than as a single family unit to a town/city (11) somewhat does not apply.

The participants find and recognize changes to their Navajo language as well as aspects related to ceremonial tradition due to being in an urban setting. The language findings are reflected in the following two statements and supported by four statements: they find that being in town/city, everything is in English and that has changed everything (9); and, in the same frame, living in a town/city marginalizes speaking the Navajo language (14). Additionally, having access to Navajo language classes are essential for their families (39); because they find that they speak less Navajo and their children do not speak Navajo (4); they also visit the Navajo reservation to have more exposure to the Navajo language and culture (34); and, they feel that the Navajo language is important in understanding the Navajo worldview (24). As related to Navajo worldview, it somewhat applies that the Navajo coming of age ceremony, *Kinaalda*, is important within their family structure (38). In relation to tradition, the harvesting of medicinal and plants on a seasonal basis for ceremonies and wellbeing as being important (33) somewhat does not apply.

In summary, they find that living in an urban area provides opportunities for a livelihood, such as education, employment, and housing thus easier to regard a town or city as a new community. They are aware that western immersion has marginalized their Navajo language, and believe that access to learning the Navajo language applies to them. The ceremony, *Kinaalda*, is important to their family structure. These participants do not feel trapped living in
an urban setting, nor are they leaning toward returning to live on the Navajo reservation. They are acclimated to the urban setting with the knowledge that tradition and culture are important.

4.10.1.3 FACTOR THREE: TRADITIONALISM

The Factor 3 perspectives revolve on the premise of traditional knowledge and ceremony and the practice and maintenance of it. The perspectives of how traditional knowledge is transmitted, usually in the Navajo language, received the highest ranking; this statement is also supported by two other statements: they believe that relocation has disturbed the dissemination of traditional knowledge, teaching lessons, and sharing of experiences conveyed through oral tradition (2); if it had not been for relocation, their families and themselves would be more exposed to the Navajo language and way of life (19); it is important that their children learn to communicate with their grandparents, relatives and others (29), however, speaking less Navajo and their children not speaking the Navajo language somewhat does not apply to them (4).

Table 17: Factor Three - Traditionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 2  Passing down traditional knowledge, teaching lessons on morality, &amp; sharing experiences &amp; events through oral tradition has been disrupted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 38 Kinaalda, a coming of age ceremony is important within my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3  It is challenging to access medicine people to have a ceremony performed in the town/city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 8  It is challenging when you are not in a Navajo community to maintain ceremonial and cultural ties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 28 Having access to a Navajo hogan is important for ceremonies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 18 Relocation has resulted in the inability to practice traditional religion based on a spiritual relationship with my ancestral lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18: Traditionalism Q-Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-4 Strongly not Applies</th>
<th>-3 Moderately not Applies</th>
<th>-2 Somewhat not Applies</th>
<th>-1 Slightly not Applies</th>
<th>0 Neutral</th>
<th>1 Slightly Applies</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Applies</th>
<th>3 Moderately Applies</th>
<th>4 Strongly Applies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary statement in this section is concerning ceremonies. The primary declaration is strongly supported by four statements which heavily loaded toward the importance of ceremony. The following ceremonial emphasized statements are: the *Kinaalda*, a coming of age ceremony is important within their family (38); it is challenging to access medicine people to have a ceremony performed in the town/city (3); they also find it challenging that they are not in a Navajo community to maintain their ceremonial and cultural ties (8); having access to a Navajo hogan is important for their ceremonies (28); and that relocation has resulted in the inability to practice their religion on their ancestral lands (18).

The themes of securing land did not seem to resonate with the participants in this section. The following statements related to land seem to support one another: they considered the Navajo Nation as home despite being a relocatee living in an urban setting (31); they have the notion that it would be good to have livestock and to farm (35) as it requires land; and the view that the federal agency, the Office of the Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation, eligibility and
application process is unfair (5) did not strongly apply to them; returning to the Navajo Nation with the assistance of Navajo leaders (37) also did not strongly apply to them; and, the that home site lease should be available, secured and without difficulty when returning to the Navajo reservation (1) did not moderately apply to them.

Statements that are important to other factors seem to be either moderately or somewhat not applicable to them: preferring to relocate with extended family to another area on the Navajo reservation rather than to an urban area (11); and, the best part of their lives spent on their customary lands (27) did not moderately apply to them; feeling trapped in a town/city (6); being disempowered as a Navajo relocatee (12); the high cost of living (15); and lack of family support (20) were ranked as somewhat not applicable to them.

In summary, the traditional and cultural teachings are primarily important and foremost, as well as the ability to communicate in the Navajo language. They also would like to maintain and have access to ceremonial events as participants. In the same notion, they believe their way of life has been disrupted by relocation. They seem to not subscribe to returning to the Navajo reservation with the assistance of the government. Relocation to another area with neither extended family, nor attaining a home site lease does not moderately apply to them, as well as their aspects of their customary lands. Additionally, they are secure and confident about living in an urban setting with not much concern about livelihood, such as the cost of living. They are traditionalists who seem to be associated with strong family support that prioritized traditional and cultural teachings, plus ceremonial life on the Navajo reservation.

4.10.2 Interviews
4.10.2.1 Livelihood

The findings of the interviews demonstrate the importance of land to second generation Navajo relocatees and their proceeding generations. In addition to land, they articulate the importance of livelihood as well as opportunities to sustain a livelihood. They also believe that tradition and culture are central to being Navajo.

Land is viewed as a necessity by the interviewed second generation Navajo relocatees. Most of the interviewees were raised on their customary lands prior to relocating elsewhere with their families; thus feeling tied to the land after relocation. The notion of being tied to the land provides the catapult on the importance of securing land for the future generation for a home, and perhaps a livelihood.

Second generation Navajo relocatee interviewees indicate that they have a sense of insecurity about their children not having a place to call home on the Navajo reservation. Interviewee Tess articulates that Navajo customary lands were taken and transferred to their neighboring tribe without a plan to replace it. Tess says, “We had all that land and it was taken, that is really the bottom line; that is you can’t build a home.” Christina says if she had land to call home, she would feel secure knowing that her succeeding generations will always have a place to go to.

“I]f I had a place to say right here is your home, I think, it would make me feel better in that way… It would make them feel like they have a place to go to at anytime…knowing that he has a place that he can always come to; not only him but my grandchildren.”

Joan expresses the notion that she would want to have an area to pass on to family members.

Samantha and Grace both believe it is very important to pass land onto their children. Samantha
explains how land and culture go hand in hand, she says that their culture cannot be taught without the foundation of land, “[W]e can try and teach the culture so much off the reservation. Tell[ing] stories are all it becomes; we need to be there, we need to keep our ways of life…”

Grace says she wishes there was land but questions the lack of available land, “Yes, I wish there was [land] but where?” Shannon makes this clear as she talks about her children and how having land would provide an awareness to their identity,

“No, I am very certain it is important [to pass land to children]. It only makes them aware of where they come from, to keep them connected to our traditions, to family and culture. I want to see my children, grandchildren to understand they have a beautiful place to call home, to call it theirs.”

Norris, who comes from a traditional family, expresses the important connection with land by defining what land means to him and his family, “For us land is…for Navajo people land is kind of who we are as a People, it’s who we are, it’s where are roots are; it’s so important to have land.” Norris adds that having land available for the future generation is important, “It secures a space for descendants…”

One common aspect of acquiring land is through a home site lease method which is conducted through the Navajo Nation. It is a process of selecting and applying for a one acre home site lease on the Navajo Nation. When the topic of a home site lease was approached, the interviewees cited that returning to the reservation can be challenging when initiated through a home site lease process.

Yuma plans on pursuing a home site lease in the future but has not decided when and where. At this time, his focus is on his work and career off the Navajo reservation. Yuma says he has not made any initiatives towards it due to his employment, “…I’m not sure where I am
going to end up… I just don’t want to go up there and get a home site lease and then do nothing.”

Samantha indicates that she has never applied for a home site lease because her focus has been to provide and raise her children. However, Samantha says, “[I]t’s like, more and more, it’s on my mind now, because as you get older, its home.” To possible return someday, Tess provides accounts of what some relocatees may experience due to the lack of land. Tess says,

“…land is still really kind of hard to get…The process to get a home site lease is that you have to have the people that live around you sign your papers…some [people] still have their sheep and their cattle, so if you go to them, they’re going to say I can’t sign it for you because that’s my grazing area…The other people that have more land, and if you go to them, they won’t sign your paper for you because they will say that is my land; you lost your and yours is over there, and we can’t sign it for you.”

Shannon says that she has never applied for a home site lease and would consider it, “It crosses my mind sometimes, but I’m not motivated to challenge the system…it’s hard to start the process.” Shannon says her mother has a one acre home site lease but has a discomfort with the area; she would rather return to her family’s customary lands from where they relocated from. She expresses her reluctance,

“It also feels like I wouldn’t know where to ask for land lease, because I can’t freely access the land I grew up on and because my relatives aren’t too welcoming. I don’t have a place in mind for lease, except the one acre property my mother currently has but it’s close to my relatives who are not so friendly. That’s when you think, I wish I was back to where I was raised – the old rez. I feel out of place.”

In a similar outlook as Yuma, Franklin indicates he will not pursue a home site lease yet, “not right now, no.” The interviewees all agreed that regardless of displacement caused by relocation, they consider the Navajo Nation their homeland.

The interviewees explain how relocation has impacted their Navajo language while residing in urban centers. When interviewees noticed how much they spoke the language within
the home and outside the home. Samantha indicated that after relocation, speaking the language was almost nonexistence, “[I]t almost came to an end in high school…it’s like everybody spoke English, and so that was my first culture shock; like nobody speaks Navajo.” However, when she was at home, she and her family spoke Navajo. Samantha tells about her experience with the Navajo language post-high school when she moved to a larger urban area. She indicates she once spoke the Navajo language with flawless smooth pronunciation as well as not having to second guess her Navajo vocabulary; however, that changed while living in the city. Samantha says,

“[T]hen when you move out here to come to college and to get families going and all that, it’s just fully English and so going back and talking Navajo and being comfortable…you have to say, how was it you say this, you know, it’s an impact.”

Shannon is a Navajo language speaker as well as her spouse. She says that living in an urban community has an impact on her Navajo language, “I think we kept it up but it’s been a struggle too because we also live in the city.” Norris articulates that he tends to speaks English more in the city but will speak Navajo if he does know someone who also speaks Navajo. Yuma says it is rare he speaks Navajo in the city even with his sister,

“Down here in [the city] it’s really…rare, it’s really rare, sometimes me and my sister will sit here, we’ll talk a little bit but it always breaks up, but when we go up north to go see my grandma it’s pretty much back to Navajo there…”

In the same common setting as Yuma, when Shannon visits her mother on the Navajo reservation, she only converses with her mother in Navajo, “She’s the one that makes me speak my language because she doesn’t understand English. I talk to her in Navajo.” Franklin, who does not speak the Navajo language, says that if his family was not relocated, he would hear the language more often and would have picked it up. Paulina says that while growing up, her
father discourage her and her siblings from learning the Navajo language. She does not speak her language even though both of her parents are Navajo speakers.

“My dad chose not to talk to us in Navajo…in his thinking, he was like, you’re not going to need your native language when you go off to school, you know, go do something else…you’re not going to need it.”

Despite not speaking the language, Paulina feels that if she wants to learn it, it is up to her. She says,

“I think it would be good to know, but it really doesn’t bother me, if I really wanted to learn, I would have made it more of an effort than I am. Right now it’s on me, if I wanted to learn.”

Additionally, Paulina says that living and working in the city provides sparse opportunities to speak the language. Joan, who grew up in an urban area says she learned the Navajo language when she spent the summers and weekends with her grandparents. At first, she found the language situation to be disorienting while being with her grandparent, she says, “[It] was kind of like a culture shock because they didn’t speak any English; and so, you had to learn [Navajo] right away…” Joan says she learned a lot of Navajo from her grandparents. Both Shannon and Samantha experience the impact of the Navajo language with their children. Shannon says,

“And I never passed my language to my kids… it’s a big impact. Maybe you don’t speak [Navajo] everyday; sometimes you just say words here and there.”

Samantha says, “My kids when they were little [and] growing up, it was not an issue just because English was the only language. But now, the two older are adults, [and] they want to learn, so I try my best to say things, you know, words to them.” Yuma says that younger relocated family members do not speak the Navajo language but they understand it. He says, “They’ll say certain words for certain things, but nothing in complete thought or expressing themselves.” In a similar
scenario, Joan shares that her younger siblings do not speak Navajo. She also articulates that “If you know your [Navajo] language, it’s a whole different way of thinking,” thus approaching life differently. Samantha believes that if they still lived on their customary land and had not relocated to an urban area, her language and culture would have been easily passed on to her children. Not only would she have passed the language on, she would have continued to fully maintain her Navajo language. In efforts to learn the Navajo language, one of Samantha’s children is studying the Navajo language, “[S]he’s wishing she could speak Navajo but she’s been studying it, she’s been reading and writing it, but she can’t speak it.” Joan says the being in an urban school has allowed her to supplement her Navajo language with classes. Joan describes how she was able to become more proficient with the Navajo language,

“…here in town at the middle school and high school they had Navajo language classes so I got a lot of the reading and the writing part of it from the school system here in town…”

Joan has also experienced losing the language and relearning it, “…I moved away…that is when I lost the language so not until I got back to Flagstaff and going to my dad’s side; that is when I started to pick up the language again.” In linking land with the Navajo language, Tess says, "the Navajo language had a lot to do with the land and being there among our people and among our relatives.”

The interviewees discussed how their families were subsistence before relocation, and how that had changed after relocation. Some of the interviewees recall how their families made their livelihood prior to relocation. Tess says the lands that were lost due to relocation were a sustainable resource for ensuring a livelihood for their Navajo families, “Land means everything to us, being raised using the land, farming, grazing our sheep, our cattle…growing fruit trees,
that’s your livelihood.” Shannon recalls how her father provided for the extended family, and not just her immediate family,

“My father, was the working man, he worked for the railroad. My family depended on him financially and he didn’t mind being a support because I believe he knew how close the family was…”

In the same retrospect as Tess, Norris remembers Navajo relocatees making use of the land, “I remember people had sheep, people had land, people had cattle; people had lives.” Paulina illustrates how her family worked to maintain livestock as well as farming in a very family oriented manner, “It was very family oriented…we had cousins and relatives that were out there.” Pauline says her grandparents lived on their customary lands and the family often helped in caring for the livestock. Paulina says,

“My grandparents were there the majority of the time too. They had their cornfield and they had their sheep in the area. My other grandma had her whole homestead there, and her cornfields there.”

In summoning up the past prior to relocation, Tess recalls the relationship with her Hopi relatives, “My grandfather was half Hopi…” She says they had a working and trading relationship with them, “[We] would plant with them, you know, and they would come to our home, and bring us their peaches, or their piki bread…” she say after relocation, that relation was no longer there. Yuma articulates the difference on how life was before relocation and after when relocatees received their home replacement benefits.

“[T]hey live a whole different way where they got to pay bills, they got to find work to put food on the table. They lost all their livestock. They got a nice new house but you got to maintain that and I think a lot of people are not trained properly or given the right resources, especially the grandparents, if they move to a new place, how are they going to support it? Before they didn’t have to, they didn’t have to worry about electricity; water was done by us or they go down to the windmill, and bring their water for the week.”
As an important part of sustaining a living was having a grazing permit which was required to raise livestock as well as selling them at the market. Navajos who were subjected to relocation and held grazing permits on behalf of their families found their permits voided upon relocating. Yuma says of Navajo relocatees with grazing permits, “They would lose a lot of the permit, *dibe binaaltsoos* (livestock permit), they didn’t want to lose that.” He also provides a Navajo viewpoint on having livestock,

“Traditional way, animals are sacred, if you have that; it’s a good thing to have…you’re not going out there just to have livestock. They are there to help you live and be there in your journey so that’s the thought.”

Shannon points out that her family had cattle and sheep as well as a field where they grew corn, fresh fruits, and vegetable. Traditional skills such as weaving also served as providing a livelihood. Both Shannon and Joan grandmother were weavers. Shannon says, “[M]y grandmother was a weaver.” Joan says that it was her grandmother who taught her life skills such as weaving.

“My [grandma’s] very open to teaching me about the culture, I mean traditional culture…she retains the weaving aspects, like the sheep herding, wool dying, you know, things that are traditional life. Life skills I guess.”

In trying to build a future, including a home for their children, second generation Navajo relocatee interviewees indicate they have taken the initiatives in applying for home replacement benefits at the Office of Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation (ONHIR) with hopes of becoming eligible. Christina explains that her parents included her siblings in their home replacement benefits, “[W]hen my parents moved out, they included the two youngest in our family.” She mentions the inconsistency of the relocation criteria by explaining that her two other sisters received home replacement benefits. Christina further explains that she, another sister, and a
brother who served in the military, were denied home replacement benefits. Norris tried to apply for benefits; he was advised by the ONHIR that there was nothing they could do for him. As he reflects on his relocation experience, he articulates,

“[T]oday, when I think about it, we just gave up our homeland for free, and there is not compensation for us who are the descendents of people who exactly lived and made a living there. Now we’re just kind of living where ever.”

Norris believes the process is unfair leaving thousands of relocated children in a precarious state, “Because of that, a lot of us, how many thousands of us are landless.” Yuma also applied for benefits but was denied due to being included in his parent’s benefits. He says he “felt a little pushed out by whatever criteria they were using. I kind of felt a little upset but at the same time I was kind of expecting that.” His siblings decided not to apply after hearing about Yuma’s denial. Samantha applied for home replacement benefits and was denied due to being included in her parent’s benefits. She began to appeal her denial but felt discouraged by the required process established by the Office of Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation. Samantha says “I wasn’t given a fair chance.” Shannon’s applied and her application for home replacement was denied. She says the denied made her heart heavy. She appealed her denial and was still denied. Shannon says,

“I was crushed even more because I’m the one who lived there and rightfully so…For the relocatees who never got a chance to get benefits, like us…It’s disappointing!”

Shannon says that her siblings were denied also, “They think the process is tedious, only to hear they are once again denied. I can relate to the feeling of rejection.” Tess who was also denied, indicates was the process was unfair. Like other interviewees, some of her siblings did not apply due to not wanting to face receiving denial letters. Tess says of relocation, “[I]t’s an emotional
trauma, and financial drain, spiritual and everything else,” She adds, “[W]e feel like that was unfair for us not to be recognized and acknowledge through this whole process.”

In summary, the second generation Navajo relocatee interviewees explain that they no longer have their customary lands due to relocation. They yearn for land to call home as well as a place to secure for their descendants. With land, it provides a basis for identity, and the opportunity to learn the language by being among other Navajo speakers. Without land, they indicate it is difficult to teach their way of life, including livelihood skills. According to the interviewees, obtaining land through the Navajo Nation home site lease process is challenging due to lack of land and bureaucracy. As second generation Navajo relocatees, many have unsuccessfully applied for home replacement benefits at ONHIR; they believe the home replacement benefits process is unfair.

4.10.2.2 Urban Opportunities

The livelihoods of the interviewees changed after relocation by moving to an urban area due to lack of a permanent place on the Navajo Nation to re-establish roots. While in the urban areas, all the interviewees engaged themselves in education, employment, and opportunities available for their children. The survey participants view these opportunities important to their livelihood. The interviewees to some extent seized these opportunities in providing a livelihood for themselves as well as their families. Supplementary opportunities for their children were identified as well.

Although none of the participants claimed that they had adopted the urban community as their home. The interviewees discussed aspects of opportunities existing in urban communities.
It is likely some of the opportunities provide an incentive for some second generation Navajo relocatees who were not interviewed to consider an urban community their new community.

Interviewee Franklin says a benefit that is available for him is education, “[M]ore educational opportunities.” In the case of Joan, after she graduated from high school, she was able to continue her education; she attended a college in a neighboring state for at least two years. Joan returned to northern Arizona for additional schooling and to work in her profession. Joan says “there’s not a lot of a job on the reservation.” Tess, through the encouragement of her mother and due to the life changes imposed by relocation, she continued her education and received her graduate level degree. Yuma’s father also encouraged him to go to college and received an advanced professional degree. He indicates he is in an urban setting for work and to get work experience; Yuma says he takes his job and career seriously. Paulina’s parents supported her efforts to go to college as well, and received a professional degree. Both Yuma and Paulina are employed in their chosen profession.

The interviewees included opportunities available for their children. Shannon says that living in an urban area offers her children the opportunity to participate in sports and after school activities. Franklin recalls the available opportunities while being raised in the city, “…they have YMCA…summer camp, summer youth programs, church, and just a lot more things.” Grace indicates that although her employment is in town, she thinks it certainly benefits her children more, “[P]robably more of a benefit to them.” One clear benefit is easier access to school, “[S]chool is just right there.”

The interviewees mostly ended up living in the urban area due to relocation. Grace moved to Winslow with her parents as a young adult. An issue for Grace is the urban cost of
living, “living in the city limit is different and expensive.” Joan moved to Flagstaff as result of relocation as a young child. She says that living in an urban community is a “whole another world.” Joan finds that economic conditions in the urban areas make it difficult to visit the Navajo reservation. She says, “You have to pay bills,” thus ending up with a limited amount of travel funds for expenses. Shannon moved to the urban area due to relocation. In the community of Phoenix, Shannon is able to own her home; stressing that “nobody is going to tell her to move away.” Paulina is in metropolitan Phoenix due to her job; she indicates she did not move to an urban area due to relocation but for education and work.

In summary, the interview participants value the opportunities present in the urban areas. They indicate the opportunities include education, employment, and housing. A benefit is access to higher education as well as local schools for their children. The interviewees also discuss the having employment and gaining work experience as providing a livelihood. Additional benefits include access to facilities that offer YMCA, summer camps, sports, youth programs, church, and after school activities. One of the drawbacks of residing in an urban setting is expenses. The primary urban benefits indicated by the interviewees are education and employment. Lastly, the majority of the relocatees reside in a city/town because of relocation.

4.10.2.3 Traditionalism

The theme of traditionalism that surfaced in the findings include traditional knowledge gained about and on the land, traditional skills, supportive family structure, teaching obligations, ceremonial activities, and the impact of relocation on these elements.
As elements of traditionalism, having acquired traditional knowledge as part of being raised on the Navajo reservation was made apparent with Yuma’s knowledge. Yuma indicates being out on the land, you are able to recognize where to go and not go, which plants to eat and not eat, where the springs are, and which bushes to avoid,

“Where to go and not to go, you know where to get the onions, you know where to the berries, if you’re walking out there, we didn’t have these, you know where to get the fresh water, you go to certain areas, there’s always water there and you drank from it. [I] don’t ever remember getting sick from it. And the plants as you’re walking along, you knew which ones to eat and which bushes to avoid because some of them had snakes or whatever, and you hunted the rabbits that were out there”

As mentioned in Factor One, traditional knowledge is also discussed; knowledge that includes components related to weaving. As Joan articulated, weaving was taught to her as a life skill. Traditional knowledge that are life skills also include farming and caring for livestock.

An aspect of traditionalism is how the Navajo family kinship structure provided support. The interviewees indicate that the close family structure brought by traditionalism is one aspect they miss. Shannon says her family and extended relatives were very close and living in very close proximity, “my mom’s and grandma’s residence were a few yards apart, and in the same area we had relatives; my grandfathers, my grandmothers, siblings, cousins….” Shannon says life was peaceful and good on the reservation. Having a close family structure provided support for one another. Paulina says her close structure of family and relatives provided help with livestock. Grace says “it felt like a community,” family and relatives gathered and helped one another especially during ceremonies. Grace also recalls feeling like, “we were all brothers, sisters, aunt, uncle, grandparents…we knew each other.” Samantha says, “…we were all raised that way in the same area so that was really good, everybody knew everybody, everybody knew about families, and families stayed together and it was always family first. Our tradition and
culture was all intact.” The close family structure served as support for each other prior to relocation.

After relocation, some of the interviewees describe how their traditional family structure fell apart thus unraveling lives. Norris articulates, “After relocation, I see families scattered all over…So I see the destruction of relocation now.” Norris says he hears that he has family in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. Shannon says, “We were literally torn from our close knit families and livelihood which totally devastated each and every one of us…” She adds that moving away from family had an enormous impact and is a loss, “It feels like we don’t have a family connection anymore, it’s very hurtful for me to think of that…it seems like I don’t know my family anymore…that is hard.” Grace says “…everybody was relocated to different areas.” She indicates that the split of the families and relatives contributes to the “disconnect [of] our culture, our religion, our family, our relative.” The impacts of relocation provided a partitioning of familial disconnection.

The interviewees convey the connection between having a close family and teaching of values. Norris believes that relocation contributed to the lack of teaching Navajo values, “I think if the parents do not teach strong values, there place of belong in this world will become murky, and where they will wind up, we don’t know.” Norris adds “I believe it’s caused a lot of confusion and disarray with our communities with those who have been relocated and has disrupted harmony among Navajo people.” Tess observes, “I think one important thing they lost is the teaching of the elders, the moral teachings as oppose to the western way of thinking, that’s kind of hard for them now at this point, because it seems like they are confused.” Yuma talks
about the loss of language and heritage. Although, families may have received homes, Yuma believes much was lost within the families,

“…I think they lost a lot more, their kids not learning the language, not knowing how things were…they lost that part of history, they lost that part of their heritage I think that is the biggest loss there, the families breaking up…the whole family support system got attack, I think that is the biggest loss, because families are a hundred miles apart. That’s not easy for most people now days to just go, where as before, my grandma would walk half a mile to the next house, everything would be okay; they found support in that. I don’t see that now.”

One of the issues brought forth was the necessity of a family hogan for purposes of conducting ceremonies. The interviewees describe how the lack of a hogan interferes with the ability to have a proper ceremony. Norris emphasized the importance of land and hogan when partaking in Navajo ceremonies. He says that although, “[W]e have a sense of identity. We know who we are through our language, our religion, [and] our traditional religion.” Norris articulates that without land, it is difficult to practice the Navajo religion,

“…to practice that religion on a piece of land we called home is difficult now. We have to borrow people’s hogan, we have to move around with our ceremonies in order to practice with our religion in Navajo way, in order to practice our faith it comes with land because of mother earth, all these connection to the land and it’s not there.”

Interviewee Paulina says her father had a Beauty Way ceremony conducted but had to find a hogan, “…we had to have it at my cousin’s hogan.” Grace says it is not proper to have a ceremony conducted at another person’s home, “It feels like we have to borrow.” Samantha also says that in relation to having ceremonies conducted in a hogan, “the main thing right now, what really affects my family is we don’t have a place to put a hogan.” An important ceremony for families for some of the interviewees family is the Kinaalda or coming of age ceremony for young girls. Samantha indicates she could not have a Kinaalda conducted for lack of a hogan.
Grace says her daughter was able to have a *Kinaalda* at her in-laws home; however, interviewee Grace never had a *Kinaalda* conducted due to the loss of customary land. The loss of their customary land due to relocation caused her family to move around from place to place during the time Grace’s *Kinaalda* should have been conducted.

An impact of forced relocation has limited the ability of some interviewees to practice and participate in ceremonial life, such as curing and blessing ceremonies. Those who participated in ceremonial activity; seven were participants and three were mostly non-participants. The interviewees that did participate only do so when it is possible.

Interviewee Norris says, “[O]ur ceremonial life went from 100% all the way down to [near] zero,” as he shares how the lack of land and home infringes on ceremonial life. Norris says,

“In the Navajo way, our thought process, wherever our umbilical cords are, wherever our ancestors are, our grandparents umbilical cords are, wherever our sheep roamed, wherever our religious objects are housed, wherever our songs were sung, curing ceremonies, blessing ceremonies, wherever those things were held as events, that makes it a home, not just a physical home but spiritual home, it makes it….the whole environment is home.”

A conspicuous aspect that some second generation Navajo relocatees notice as participants in ceremonies is the effect of bringing families together. Norris indicates that it is “what brought everybody together…and kept everyone together.” Grace also says, “we all got together during ceremonies.” According to impacted interviewees, additional factors that imposed on the participation of ceremonial life include traveling distance, expenses, and access to medicine people. The interviews revealed that not all of the participants subscribed to the practice of Navajo religion. Christina and Tess have the practice of the Christian faith in common.
Christina, who grandfather was more of a medicine man, indicates she is a cultural participant rather than the Navajo religion, “[O]nly culturally that I can think of is just helping my granddaughter with her Kinaalda.” Tess says, “I’m not necessarily involved in Navajo religion. But I do get involved in culture side of it.” An example of a cultural involvement she provides is attending pow-wows. Franklin indicates he is not involved as much as other family might be.

In summary, aspects of traditionalism subscribes to having a relationship or connection with the land as an essential toward gaining inherent traditional knowledge, providing a cohesive family structure, and a place of families and relatives sharing resources toward important functions. Traditional knowledge gained on the land include being familiar with local plants, or locations of springs. A cohesive family structure provided obligatory teaching of values to family and relatives. The structure also provided a foundation of sharing resources toward family functions, such as farming, livestock and ceremonies. These family functions brought families and relatives together. Before relocation, families were close, however, after relocation; families dispersed thus leading to a breakdown of the cohesive family structure. These important traditional connective elements with the land, family and relatives all changed due to relocation.
5 DISCUSSION

5.1 FACTOR ONE: Livelihood

The components of Factor One include land, livelihood, traditional knowledge and culture, and how participants may have adjusted. The components provide a sentiment that this sector of second generation Navajo relocatees are looking toward the future for their succeeding generations with practical concerns.

5.1.1 Land

Several statements support the perspectives of securing land where one of two primary statements received the highest ranking of importance. The statement, “securing land for a home to pass on to my children is more valuable than other types of wealth” (26) was considered strongly applicable to the participants. Land is critical to the continued existence of the Navajo People (Austin 2009) as it serves as a base in conducting daily Navajo life. The “loss of land through relocation deprives the Navajos of their birthright, their livelihood, their proper social relationships and their familiar and beloved surroundings” (Scudder 1982, 33).

When interviewees shared the common perspective on the significance of securing land to be designated as a home for their children, they also desire a place where intangible aspects of identity can be continued and passed on. Many indigenous people, including the Navajo People, have a “historic, cultural, and linguistic connections to their land” (Anonymous 2007). These intrinsic relationships provide an inherent connection to the land for conversing, teaching, as well as practice, “[t]hey have an intimate connection to the land; the rationale for talking about
who they are tied to the land. They have clear symbols in their language that connect them to places on their land” (Anonymous 2007, 2-3). Interviewee Samantha agrees, “I believe so, it is very important [to pass land to children],” land provides a foundation to continue practicing their way of life. Samantha emphasized that culture and tradition cannot be taught to children without a land base, “…we can try and teach the culture so much off the reservation. Tell[ing] stories is all it becomes; we need to be there, we need to keep our way of life…” To have the greatest impact in learning the culture, participating and experiencing the culture on a traditional land base is essential. “Observation and experiences and guiding principles can be taught and acquired over generations, and spread through stories, ceremonies and discourse from community to another” (Berkes 2012, 220). Stories facilitate the understanding of cultural experiences. “[O]ral tradition stories are told over and over again as a means of cultural transmission and as a tool for teaching” (Howard 1995, 47). In the same premise, interviewee Shannon strongly supports the idea of a land legacy for her children by stating, “Yes, I am very certain it is important.” Shannon would like to see her children have a place to call home, “I want my children, grandchildren to understand they have a beautiful [place]to call home, to call it theirs,” Interviewee Norris agrees that having land to return to provides a place for the future, “It secures a space for descendants.” The perspectives of the participants agree about their desire to leave land for their children. “The Navajo people want to pass something on to their children” (Lueck 1991, 32). In the same breath, Shannon continues to say, “It makes aware of where they come from, to keep them connected to our traditions, to family and culture.” Interviewee Norris reaffirms the importance of land, “…for Navajo people land is who we are as a people, it’s who we are, its where are roots are…so important to have land.” Norris explains when you have a place where you belong; you develop an identity to that place, “You have an intimate
relationship, a spiritual relationship with your land. So it is important, it is very important.” The participants believe it is of utmost importance to leave the succeeding generations land as they view it as being valuable because it provides a livelihood and retains cultural heritage. Land is the foundation of sustaining a lived culture on a daily basis.

The following statement received high ranking of what moderately applies and has importance in the perspectives of the Q-method participants, “the thousands of acres of land the Navajo Nation received on behalf of relocatees should be utilized to assist relocatees” (16). This perspective provides a validation for the critical need of lands since the lack of land for relocatees continue to be an issue. The Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act 1974 includes terms agreed upon in purchasing loss acreages of lands between the Navajo Nation and the Federal Government. “When the 1882 land was partitioned, the Navajo Nation lost 911,000 acres of land upon which Navajo families resided, and only received as compensation 250,000 acres, plus the right to purchase up to 150,000 acres. Land is extremely important in Navajo culture” (Affairs 07-21-2005). “In return for lost acreage, the Navajo Nation was permitted to select federal lands for conveyance into trust for the Navajo Nation” (King 2014). The Navajo and Hopi Relocation Amendment Act of 1980 (P.L. 93-305) gave authority to the Navajo Hopi Land Commission (NHLC) to select and recommend land transfers to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). The lands that may be transferred into Navajo Nation trust lands include state and private lands as well as lands under the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) (Ala 2010). The current selection of lands include Nahata Dzil in Arizona, Paragon Ranch in New Mexico, Turquoise Ranch and select parcels in Winslow, Arizona, and Twin Arrows east of Flagstaff, Arizona, where a casino facility is located; more lands are being considered to fulfill the 400,000 acre quota. Currently, the majority of the selected lands are prioritized and utilized for economic development with the
exception of Nahata Dzil. “According to the act, the Navajo Nation cannot transfer more than 250,000 acres of BLM lands and it cannot exceed 150,000 acres in private lands into trust. These lands also need to be located 18 miles within the present Navajo boundaries in order to be transferred into Navajo Nation trust land” (Ala 2010). The perspective of why they desire land is resonated with Christina, “I have no place to go. I have no place to call home really.” The ultimate goal of second generation Navajo relocatees in Factor One is to acquire lands for a home to return to.

As a form of assurance that land is a primary factor in the Q-method survey, the next three selected perspectives serve as supporting the evidence toward the importance of land as shown in statement (16). The first supportive statement, a home site lease on the Navajo Nation should be available and secured quickly without difficulty when attempting to return to the Navajo reservation (1). According to a report addressing why off-reservation moves are essential, “Most of these off-reservation moves are necessary because of the limited number of on-reservation home site lease available” (Eschwege 1981, 6) which require Navajo Nation approval. Some interviewees have expressed some thoughts to applying for a home site lease on the Navajo Nation. Interviewee Yuma indicates he has given some thought to applying for a home site lease, “I have [thought about it] but I haven’t actually done it…because I’m not sure where I am going to end up.” Samantha indicates that it is more often on her mind now that her children are near grown up, “I have never applied, and I’ve just been busy trying to raise [my] small children” and “So it’s like, more and more, it’s on my mind now.” Shannon says she strongly considers applying for a home site lease, “Yes I would consider…it crosses my mind sometime but because I’m not motivated to challenge the system and the process; it’s hard to start the process.” In a study concerning housing development on the Navajo Nation indicates
that “[i]t is complicated to obtain a home site lease in the Navajo Nation” (Navajo Nation Housing Development n.d., 379). Currently, the Navajo Nation Land Department allows Navajo citizens to apply for a homesite lease consisting of at least a one acre plot to construct a home only. Part of the application process includes getting permission from directly affected community member(s) such as customary land users or grazing permit holders as well as their respective chapter. The process of obtaining a home site lease can be a daunting task with bureaucratic procedures. Tess reveals how a home site lease process can be stressful and complicated for second generation Navajo relocatees due to the lack of land.

“…The process to get a home site lease is that you have to have the people that live around you sign your papers…some [people] still have their sheep and their cattle, so if you go to them, they’re going to say I can’t sign it for you because that’s my grazing area…”

Navajo citizens that hold interest to parcel of lands and the grazing permittees can have power over land use thus challenging potential homeowners (Navajo Nation Housing Development n.d.). Tess points out instances where others will not provide permission to sign your home site lease application, “[T]hey won’t sign your paper for you because they will say that is my land, you know, you lost your and yours is over there, and we can’t sign it for you….” Shannon remembers the difficulty of her parents trying to obtain a home site lease when she was younger, “It also feels like I wouldn’t know where to ask for a land lease, because I can’t freely access the land I grew up on and because my father’s relatives aren’t too welcoming, I don’t have a place in mind for a lease.” In retrospect, Shannon feels most comfortable at her traditional home area where she grew up. “I wish I was back to where I was raised – the old rez. I feel out of place.” The experiences of Shannon’s parents in securing a home site lease left her with an incongruous
effect in pursuing a lease. Instead, it left Shannon yearning to return to the comfort zone of her traditional home area.

In the interviews, the notion of returning to their old traditional area was expressed lending its support to the importance of land. Yuma stated that, “I definitely would [return], yea, because that’s what I’m familiar with it as a kid. Growing up, you know, I know all the trails, all the places that we went, all the ceremonies that happened, I remember those and that’s what really established me.” Shannon indicates that if an opportunity presented itself to return to her traditional home area, she would take that opportunity, “Yes because I still have family living nearby, if I could have that family connection again I would do anything for it.” Norris expresses that he would be open to returning with some concerns, “[I]t would take a lot of adapting back to learning how to live in that environment again, the dirt road, the undeveloped land there, we just have to re-learn how to live there, but I would like to go back.” Interviewee Grace says it would be nice to return,” If we had a choice, it would be great, but I don’t think we can.” Yet, Grace is aware of the reality of relocation, “we can’t go back there…it’s a restricted area.”

The next statement serves in support of the declaration on the importance of land to second generation Navajo relocatees. The supporting statement, “despite being a relocatee and living in a town/city off the reservation, I still consider the Navajo Nation as home” (31), illustrates a unified perspective among the interviewees. Interviewee Franklin indicates the he does consider the Navajo Nation as home, “Yes, oh yes [it is my homeland]. All of the interviewees are in the agreement with Franklin. Grace states the Navajo Nation will always be
home, “Yes, very…I would rather move back there.” Norris articulates his beliefs on why he will always regard the Navajo Nation as home as well as his family’s traditional home area,

“Yes, it will always be home no matter who says they own it now, who took it away from us, despite how much power the US government has. It will always be ours, no matter how much they say it not ours, it is ours, our umbilical cords are there, our language, our spirits, our ancestors are there, they can…if the creator gives you something, no one else can take it, they can try, but they can never take it out of your spirit.”

Yuma says, “Yes, definitely, definitely. I still consider home up there, just generally home. I really don’t feel like I belong down here (metropolitan Phoenix) for the most part. Just to get my work and experience, make a career.” The perspectives show a strong inherent connection to the lands from where they were relocated from.

The following statement also shows support for land and home, the home replacement eligibility requirements and application process of the ONHIR are unfair (5), are in the realm of the desire to have a home which requires land. Both survey participants of Factor One and Two and most of the interview participants felt that the eligibility criteria’s are unfair. When a second generation Navajo relocatee applied for and denied a home replacement benefit, it deepen the reality of loss traditional home area, thus supporting the view that it is highly important to secure land for a home. Interviewee Shannon strongly believes the eligibility process needs to be revised, “[Yes, its unfair], it needs to be revised to include us second generation relocatees. We grew up there, our roots are there, and we were literally torn and stripped from everything.” In Shannon’s experience in applying for home replacement benefits, she indicates the emotional anguish it brings,

“The process of applying was not bad but when you hear you are denied is sickening, it made my heart heavy…while awaiting a decision I was hopeful, to hear something positive but again I received another denial letter. I was crushed even more because I’m
the one who lived there, and rightfully so. For the relocatees who never got a chance to get benefits, like us…It’s disappointing!”

In summary, the Navajo Hopi Indian Land Settlement Act mandates Navajo individuals residing on the wrong side of the partition line be compensated by the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation (ONHIR) for the loss of their homes located on their former traditional areas, as well as moving costs (Navajo Nation 2015). The compensation is basically a new home located on or off the Navajo reservation, “Current benefits include a home valued at $123,000 for a family of three or less; or a home valued at $129,000 for a family of four or more” (Navajo Nation 2015). The selected interviewees were denied benefits despite being a directly affected and immediate member of the family that relocated. Yuma applied and was denied,

“I really thought the application was tailored for a certain specific group. I remember…there were 2 or 3 questions in there that were meant to qualify you, and I fill it out because I thought I qualified…And when I got denied, it was like why? It wasn’t a fair process I think.”

Paulina also applied and was denied, “I don’t think it is fair that we, my siblings…we grew up on that area, and now, it’s like we still do not have a permanent home on the reservation so all three of us…” Bitsuie states the “eligibility requirements and application process are complex. Only people who attained head of household status while living on Hopi Partition Land (HPL) are eligible at the time of filing for benefits” (Affairs 07-21-2005). Prior to relocation, the children had customary use areas available to them within the mother’s clans (Affairs 07-21-2005). The denial of home replacement benefits to second generation Navajo relocatees leaves them outside the realm of being wholly participants of being Navajo with no land or home to return to.
The supporting statement in the same premise, *I would move back to the Navajo reservation if I could live well* (25), supports the idea of having an availability of good jobs that pay well on the Navajo reservation. In support of statement (25), Franklin articulated that if he would return if there were jobs, “Yes, if there were jobs, yes, but other than that no.” If there were available jobs that paid well on the Navajo reservation, moving back would be considered. Statement (25) not only supports statement (40), but also statement (26) concerning land. The partial statement of (25) “…if I could live well,” refers to not only education and employment opportunities but also the availability of land and the ability to secure land for a home and maintain a livelihood. Securing land as a place with a home is seen as a necessary space to have to be able to return, as well as have a good paying job is desired to live well.

5.1.2 Livelihood

The perspective of having access to opportunities for making a livelihood is deemed important, and demonstrated by the following statement, “*living in a town/city provides me access to education and employment opportunities*” (40). This perspective lends to preparing and securing a livelihood for the future by pursuing an education and employment to earn and sustain a livelihood while living in an urban setting.

When Navajos were forcibly relocated, some parents encouraged their children to seek an education since their way of life was changing towards an unknown future. The encouragement by their parents is presented in the format of the Navajo concept,” *t’a’a hw’o’aj’it’eego* (do for yourself)” (Manuelito 2005, 79), as a motivating factor toward a livelihood inclusive of an education or job. Obtaining a livelihood would mitigate the “undesirable effects of relocation [that] might be more bearable to younger, more educated Navajo with a chance to get a good job
than to older Navajo with no such access or skills” (Schoepfle, Burton and Begishe 1984, 889). Interviewee Yuma was encouraged by his father to get an education. Yuma indicated that his father looked ahead for the future of his children, “my dad was very progressive…he kind of made us embrace education, and to keep what you’re learning from your grandparents, he stressed that and to take that wherever you go and do.” Yuma earned a degree from a major Arizona university and is employed in the Phoenix metropolitan area. The second generation Navajo relocatees interviewed found themselves in urban areas and having to survive through their own personal self-determination as a result of their parents being relocated. This is contrary to the apparent opportunities in urban labor markets that provided a probability to escape reservation poverty by means of incentives offered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs Voluntary Relocation Program of 1952 (Snipps 1992) to many American Indian across the country. Despite the hardships experienced, interviewee Shannon indicates urban opportunities allowed her to get an education and work experience acquiring a profession that supports her family, as well as providing opportunities for her children. Shannon explains, “My profession, my job, plus more opportunity for my kids…schools, education, sports, just anything, there’s so much opportunity over here.” Interviewee Samantha also finds similar opportunities to support her family in the urban atmosphere, “Education mainly, work, jobs, more availability of it, housing, yes.” In a previous study in 1982 concerning Navajo relocatees, “the beneficial aspects as better and closer schooling for children, easier access to work, and improved housing” was found (Scudder 1982). These aspects of school and work seem to follow second generation Navajo relocatee’s experiences for themselves, their children, as well as easier access to housing. Interviewee Tess’s mother also encouraged her and her siblings to go to school after they relocated, “my mother just kind of told us to go to school.” She indicates the majority of her
siblings having college degrees. Due to the complete change in Tess’s family’s way of life, Tess followed her mother’s advice about pursuing higher education; she received an advanced degree. Obtaining a higher education became a step towards a way to survive without land.

Life prior to relocation is a constant reminder of family and relatives supporting one another based around activities on their customary lands. Tess conveys her memories of the utilization of the lands that provided a livelihood for her family prior to relocation and the perspective of what land means, “Land means everything to us; being raised using the land [by] farming, grazing our sheep, our cattle, growing fruit trees, that’s your livelihood.” Land and livelihood go hand in hand, there was practice of subsistence farming and livestock provided food, cash income, provisions for ceremonies and family gatherings, as well as gifts for relatives (Schoepfle, Burton and Begishe 1984, Scudder 1982). “In providing a traditional Navajo perspective regarding Navajo lands, “they are valuable and tangible assets which produce wealth. They provide food, income and the support of the Navajo People” (Austin 2009, 195). Traditionally, land, livestock, and farming, are indicators of wealth and livelihood, however, a shift in how this is expressed with relocatees is possible. Instead of having land, livestock, and farm, having an education and employment seem to mostly replace traditional methods of attaining a livelihood for most second generation Navajo relocatees. The loss of traditional lands discontinued the livelihood that sustained their ancestors on the lands they inhabited that provided survival and spiritual education through their homes, subsistence farming and livestock raising.

5.1.3 Traditional Knowledge and Language
An important factor that strongly applied and received high rankings is an emphasis on traditional knowledge, and the importance of having knowledge about your Navajo identity as being imperative. The idea of *passing down traditional knowledge, teaching lessons on morality, and sharing experiences and events through oral tradition has been disrupted* (2) are issues that this group grapples with, especially when the participants have been separated from families and relatives that would help serve in the capacity of passing on traditional knowledge.

The separation from land has not only dispersed the relocated Navajo people; it has disturbed their way of life pertaining to tradition, culture, ceremonies, as well as language. Norris indicates that, “I see families scattered all over, my family is somewhere in Sanders area, some are in Tuba City, some are in Phoenix, I just hear of them all over, some are in Utah. So I see the destruction of relocation now.” “The most valuable tangible asset of the Navajo Nation is its land, without which the Navajo People would be caused to disperse” (Austin 2009, 195). In regards to the disturbance in the daily cultural life of relocated Navajo People, Schwarz writes, “Disruption of the vital associations people have with their matrilineal homes---sometimes their places of birth, often the locations where their umbilical cords are buried---can have grave effects…” (Schwarz 1997, 46). Samantha laments about the disruption, “[The] loss of connection of families, of a home, a place to call home.” “Knowledge of place is therefore closely linked to knowledge of self, to grasping one’s position in the larger scheme of things, including one’s own community and to securing a confident sense of who one is as a person” (Basso, Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apaches 1996, 34). The loss of family connections extends to the disruption of the relationship system. ”The Navajo Kinship system guides, teaches, and orients” (Lewton and Bydone 2000, 479). This relations system embodies the obligations of proper cultural roles and place of families and relatives
particularly concerning the succeeding generations of relocatees. Through the experiences of not
being a wholly participant in a place of Navajo tradition and culture, interviewee Norris states,
“We can only maintain it only to a certain degree because we don’t live permanently there. I
mean like a nine-day ceremony, we can only participate in the two major nights of the ceremony
and then back to Phoenix or back to wherever we live.” In relationship to affordability, time and
distance, Norris further says, “we have to go back because we can’t afford to stay there the
whole nine days because we’re hundreds of miles away.”

Statement (2) goes hand-in-hand with the idea that “it is important to teach my children
or grandchildren the Navajo language to communicate with grandparents, relatives, and others”
(29). “Our forefathers believed and taught the youth that our language and culture was one of a
pair, like a man and a woman. Why? Because culture is a way of thinking, and living a life”
(Aronilth 1985, 100). The participants that spoke the Navajo language believed if it had not been
for relocation, they would have likely passed the language onto their children. Interviewee
Samantha says that “if we still lived the way we did, [and] not relocating, [our] language and
culture would have been easily passed on. It would have been second nature, unfortunately, that
did not happen.” Interviewee Shannon says scarcely speaking the Navajo language is the
principal impact, “It’s a big impact because I hardly speak my language in my household here in
[Phoenix area]. Parents not speaking English themselves (Spolsky 2002) is an impact. Since
Shannon is around other Navajo speakers, she is able to maintain her language to a certain
extent, “Because I’m married to a Navajo speaking spouse and because my mother only speaks
Navajo, I keep up with the language; however, at times, it’s a struggle to speak with clarity.”
Shannon, like Samantha did not pass the language to her children, “And I never passed my
language onto my kids, which too is a big impact.” Living primarily in an urban environment
impacts language where children spend a large portion of their time in school speaking English, and parents speaking English to their kids, (Spolsky 2002). Interviewee Paulina was discouraged from learning the Navajo language, “My dad chose not to talk to us in Navajo…in his thinking, he was like, you’re not going to need your native language when you go off to school, you know, go do something else…you’re not going to need it.” Another primary reason for not learning the Navajo language is when children are being told that Navajo is not important and English guarantees success (Spolsky 2002). Statement 2 and 29 are further supported by “the Navajo language is important in understanding our worldview” (24). Not only is it important to communicate in the Navajo language with Navajo speakers, but it provides depth and breadth to the understanding and meaning of Navajo traditional knowledge and worldview.

5.1.4 Adjustment

The perspectives of Factor One also indicate a sense of adjustment to life after relocation. The notion that living in a town/city among strangers is depressing and lonely (17), and having the lack of family support makes it difficult to live in a town/city (20) are views the participant do not cling to. They do not find it discouraging to live in an urban setting; rather, it is encouraging, as supported by the perspective of being focused on the opportunities available in town/city.

In the area of culture and tradition, they do not quite adhere to the belief that it is challenging to access medicine people to have a ceremony performed in the town/city (3), or that there is a lack of adequate opportunities to learn traditional songs and stories as part of a family daily and season event (13), or that maintaining a form of cultural expression is not dependent on attending events in the urban setting (23). The perspectives indicate that they are not concerned with these issues possibly due to the hopes of returning one day when land is secured.
to participate in their culture and tradition. Lastly, although the urban centers are overwhelmingly in English, they do not hold the view when *everything is in English and that has changed everything* (9). They are very much aware of western society and its impacts. Because of the awareness of the imposed changes of English, they embrace the positive aspects while holding traditional knowledge and Navajo language with high importance.

**Summary**

Factor One survey and interview participants indicate practical perspectives to livelihood aspects that are impacted by compulsory relocation. These practical perspectives include securing land to return to the Navajo reservation in the future, emphasizing the opportunities that exist in the urban areas that provides a livelihood, and being aware of important values of tradition and culture as well as the Navajo language. The participants have shown they have adjusted to some degree and have embraced urban opportunities yet continued to contend with challenges brought upon them by relocation with the notion of being able to return to the Navajo reservation one day.

**5.2 FACTOR TWO: Urbanism**

The primary perspectives of Factor Two point to views that focus on livelihood, new community, and cultural negotiations while living in the urban areas, and having modest concerns to life on the Navajo reservation. The perspectives given indicate that this sector of the participants have adjusted to urbanism well.

**5.2.1 Livelihood**
The perspective that strongly applies and important is being able to have the opportunities to sustain a livelihood in the urban settings where, “living in a town/city provides access to education and employment opportunities” (40). Similarly to Factor One, the perspective of having the liberty to pursue and attain an education and employment for a livelihood is considered strongly applicable. Since relocation of families concludes to loss of lands, educational and employment opportunities are narrowed prospects in maintaining a livelihood. Interviewee Yuma describes his situation of his parents advising him to embrace education; the same advice was giving to Tess by her mother. In both cases, the parents recognized the changes imposed by compulsory relocation to their children’s way of life. The Navajo concept of personal self-determination, “t’á’a hw’o’ajít’eego (do for yourself)” (Manuelito 2005), is a maxim that children are usually taught early on by parents and relatives. Both factors serve as catalysts in encouraging second generation Navajo relocatees to seek opportunities that provide livelihoods in the future to mitigate way of life changes.

5.2.2 New Community

The perspective that received a high ranking that strongly applies to second generation Navajo relocatees is “I consider the town/city I live in my new community” (22). The statement could lend to the experience of being embedded within the relocation process while living in an urban community. Interviewee Joan states that “[W]e were young and so we kind of grew up in it.” Joan further says that “as second generation growing up in it, it was just everyday life; you really don’t think about it.” With no land to return to and growing up as relocatees may provide an intrinsic recalibration to regard the town/city their families relocated to as their new community. In a similar narrate, Samantha recalls how being a minor during transitional phase
of relocating that, “being that we were kids helped it, because we didn’t know, we just had to accept it; it’s easier to accept things.” The recognition of residing in the urban communities lends to the importance of attaining an education and employment thus making it easier to wholly accept the town/city as their new home community. An attribute of accepting a wholly new home community as second generation Navajo relocatees is possibly due to the appealing fact when “it is easier to find housing in a town/city” (30). Some interviewees stated that finding housing is a benefit to living in an urban area. Interviewee Shannon who resides in metropolitan Phoenix states about her place of residence that, “I am able to have a home where nobody is going to tell me to move away...I’m able to have my own home.” Additionally, Shannon has expressed the notion of returning to the Navajo Nation one day. Today, the Navajo Nation is experiencing a housing crisis where many Navajo citizens are trying to find a home to live in. Due to the lack of homes, a housing needs assessment was completed in 2011 by the Navajo Housing Authority shows that the Navajo Nation requires more than 34,000 new housing units with an additional 34,000 existing homes in need of rehabilitation (Consulting 2011). In consideration of a new community in the urban areas, several aspects are potentially deliberated which may not exist in other locations: the right to adequate housing, which includes several core elements: legal security of tenure, including protection against forced evictions; availability of services, including safe drinking water, adequate sanitation, energy for cooking, heating, lighting, food storage and refuse disposal; affordability, in that housing costs should not compromise occupants’ enjoyment of other human rights; accessibility, taking into account the needs of disadvantaged and marginalized groups; habitability, providing physical safety, adequate space, protection from the elements; location, in relation to employment opportunities, health care, schools, childcare centers; and cultural adequacy (Office of the United Nations High
Commissioner for Human Rights 2014, 3-6). These aspects of consideration are elements that present a sense of security.

5.2.3 Cultural Negotiations

The premise in this section is associated with the correlation between language and culture with its relationship to the urban setting. The Q-method perspectives show that the participants are aware that being in an urban setting will provide a definitive change to their cultural life. This awareness is noted when the statement “everything is in English and that has changed everything” (9) received a ranking that it strongly applies to the participants. As an example, Samantha recollects when she moved to Winslow with her parents and attended school there, “it’s like everybody spoke English, and so that was my first culture shock, like nobody speaks Navajo.” In the same premise of language, “living in a town/city marginalizes speaking the Navajo language” (14), interviewee Yuma, who is fluent in the Navajo language as well as in the English language states, “Down here in [Phoenix area], it’s really…rare, it’s really rare [to speak Navajo], sometimes me and my sister will sit here, we’ll talk a little bit but it always breaks up.” Basically, when Yuma and his sister converse in Navajo, they revert to English. These two perspectives (9 and 14) point toward the reality that second generation Navajo relocatees who are in the urban areas are in the enclave of the English language. Being in an English language enclave has the effect of overwhelming the Navajo language speakers to instead engage to converse in English. “Living in the city decreased the retention of the language…” (Fixico 2000, 49). Another example of the Navajo language being marginalized in the urban area is illustrated by Norris who is limited to speaking Navajo to other Navajo speakers only, Norris states, “My interaction here in town is with English speakers so I tend to speak
English more, when…I know someone who speaks Navajo, I will naturally go into Navajo with them.” Franklin indicates that if he were on the Navajo reservation, he would likely hear it more often allowing him to pick up some words, “I would hear it more often,” and says he would have picked up the language.

The following language related statements were ranked as somewhat applicable by the Q-method participants; supporting the perspectives that being around the English language engulfs the Navajo language speaker or potential speaker. The Q-method participants experience are acknowledged by the statement that, “I speak less Navajo and my children do not speak Navajo” (4). While living in the Phoenix area, Shannon says, “I never passed my language onto my kids, which too is a big impact. I try [to pass the language].” Shannon sometimes wonder what might have also attributed to not passing the language onto her children besides relocation, Shannon says it could partly relate to being discipline for speaking the Navajo language at school, “I believe…it relates to my upbringing in a boarding school environment…I was disciplined for speaking my native language.” Yuma adds that his nephew and niece do not speak the Navajo language, Yuma indicates, “no, they don’t [speak Navajo],” however, “they understand it…they’ll say certain words for certain things but nothing in complete thought in expressing themselves.” Many Navajo’s are latent language users who basically understand the Navajo language but do not speak it (Benally and Viri 2005). Supplementary supports the Navajo language and worldview, “the Navajo language is important in understanding our worldview” (24), further supports the previous statements. Understanding the worldview is related to having knowledge of the Navajo language which puts an emphasis on the Navajo thought process, Joan articulated that, “If you know your language, it’s a whole different way of thinking…if you know Navajo; it’s just a totally different way of thinking. If you don’t know the language, than
you don’t have that way of thinking, I see that with my sisters, and just the way they think and the way they approach life.” In efforts to improve their Navajo language and to further understand the language, the participants deem that “having access to Navajo language classes are essential for their families” (39) also supports the previous statements. Joan indicates that since she grew up in Flagstaff, Arizona most of her life and because her mother’s relocation home was located there, Joan says that “the middle school and high school had Navajo language classes so I got a lot of the reading and the writing part of it from the school system in town.” In addition, the classes helped to supplement her Navajo language while visiting both her maternal and paternal grandmother who both did not speak English. “Many of these children growing up in urban areas have little understanding of their language or their families’ traditions. Some have difficulty communicating with elderly family members whose first or only language is the tribal language (Clark 2009).” Navajos living in an urban environment is a place “where Navajo is rarely heard (Schodolski 1998).

Additional supportive statements reveal efforts to learn more about the Navajo language and culture, the perspectives supported by the statement, “we visit the Navajo reservation to be more exposed to the Navajo language and culture” (34). An example is illustrated with Joan, who indicates that while growing up in Flagstaff her Navajo language was mostly nonexistent, “my Navajo language…there was not any until during the summers when we went to go spend the summer with my grandparents, which was kind of like a culture shock because they didn’t speak any English.” Joan says while visiting, she was able to learn words, “I picked up a lot of Navajo from my [maternal] grandma on those weekends that we use to visit her. Then…I moved away to Albuquerque, that is when I lost the language. So not until I got back to Flagstaff and going to my dad’s side that is when I started to pick up the language again.” In another
perspective of being exposed to the Navajo culture, Shannon says of her children, “they understand we go ‘home’ to visit grandma and, at times, to attend ceremonies, and because we don’t partake in Navajo lifestyle and culture daily, they don’t understand the meaning; they appreciate the culture.” Returning and visiting the Navajo reservation for many reasons provides the exposure to language and culture for second generation Navajo relocatees. Lastly, a supplementary statement, *Kinaalda, a coming of age ceremony is important within my family* (38) illustrates maintaining an important ceremony that somewhat applies to their family. Despite living in urban areas, the *Kinaalda* ceremony continues to apply in their family.

5.2.4 Modest Concerns

A strong perspective that second generation Navajo relocatees who reside in urban areas is that they do not feel enclosed despite the lack of land or being on the Navajo reservation, “*I feel trapped living in a town/city without land on the Navajo reservation*” (6). They seem very secure about living in an urban setting. Statement (6) is contrary to statement (22) suggesting a sense of an adoption of the urban community they live in. This sentiment is supported by their response that, “*it would be good to have livestock (i.e. sheep, cattle, horse...) and a farm again to survive*” (35), suggesting they are not interested in the traditional livelihood method of having livestock or farm which requires land on the Navajo Nation.

The perspective on the theme of land with this group indicates a lack of interest in returning to the Navajo reservation. The statement, “*I want to obtain a home site lease and move back to the Navajo reservation*”(21), does not moderately apply to them which may indicate their lack of interest in vying for and securing a home site lease to return to the Navajo reservation. The viewpoint of the Q-method participants being on their families customary lands
received a ranking that also does not moderately apply to them, “The best part of my life was at
home on our customary lands” (27). The participants may not recall what life was like during
pre-relocation to consider what the best part of life on their traditional home area may be. A
factor in the response may be related to already having been removed from the area to establish
memories of any significant activities related to reservation life. An interesting position of
Factor Three’s view and ranking of place and umbilical cord is an issue that does not moderately
apply to them, “I refer to the place where my umbilical cord is buried as ‘home,’” (36). In
essence, they seem not to regard the place from where their families relocated from as “home.”
It could be attributed to not growing up on their customary lands but rather in an urban area the
majority of their lives. Typically, when a Navajo child is born, their umbilical cord is buried at
the home site so the child will always think of home and return. “Burial of the cord in the earth
anchors the child to the “belly button” of Mother Earth and establishes a lifelong connection
between a person and a place, just as the cord anchors a child to its mother while in the womb
and establishes a lifelong connection between mother and child (Schwarz 1997, 48)” The child’s
umbilical cord maybe buried at the corral of livestock including sheep or at the site where
weaving takes place or other pertinent places so the child will always be connected to that way of
life. “The Navajo system governing the cultural construction of personhood dictates that the
umbilical cord be placed in a location considered by the parents and grandparents to be most
beneficial to the child's future” (Schwarz 1997, 48).

The statements that somewhat does not apply to the Q-method participants are themes
related to family and land. Regardless of relocation, a stable home environment is not is issue,
“If I was not relocated, I would have been able to provide a stable home environment for my
children” (10). The subsequent statement, where group move as a family and relatives during
relocation is not quite an issue also, “I would have preferred relocating as an extended family to another area on the Navajo reservation rather than as a single family unit to a town/city” (11). Interestingly, the issue of land is contrary to the notion of trying to secure land, “The many thousand acres of land Navajo Nation received on behalf of relocatees should be utilized to assist relocatees” (16). Wanting to return to the Navajo reservation is not important even if there are employment and home somewhat does not apply to them, “I would move back to the reservation if I could live well” (25). The last statement of regarding medicinal plants is an activity that somewhat does not apply to them, “Harvesting medicinal and tobacco plants on a seasonal basis for ceremonies and our wellbeing is important (33). The harvesting of plants may somewhat not apply because the participants are not taught or are not held with that responsibility.

Summary

Factor Two primary premise points to the participants as embracing urbanism with the awareness that living in a urban western environment will have an effect to their language and culture. The participants value urban opportunities, namely education and employment to attain a livelihood in their new community. In considering a city/town as their new community, the participants may have been influenced by being mostly raised in an urban environment, and/or found that it is difficult to return to the Navajo reservation. Other opportunities of influence may include easier access to housing, schools, education, and employment. With the strong notion of embracing urbanism, the participant’s perspectives relatively goes against the notion of being tied to the land and having a livelihood that could include livestock. At this time, they are not
concerned about returning to the Navajo reservation in the near future, and are comfortable being in an urban setting at the moment.

5.3 FACTOR THREE: Traditionalism

The Factor Three perspectives interestingly revolve on the premise of the importance of ceremonies, as well as tradition and culture. The participants in Factor Three did not view education, employment, or securing land as being primarily applicable in their lives; instead their priority are more concerned with practice and maintenance of traditional aspects of their lives.

5.3.1 Traditional Knowledge

The perspectives of Factor Three believe Navajo culture and traditions have been interrupted as part of Navajo way of life. This is made evident by the Q-method participants to the following statement, “Passing down traditional knowledge, teaching lessons on morality, and sharing experiences and events through oral tradition has been disrupted” (2). This effectual disturbance is recognized as well as experienced by second generation Navajo relocatees. In the same realm, the following statement highly supports and reflects the disruption of passing down inherent traditional knowledge, “Relocation has resulted in the inability to practice traditional religion based on a spiritual relationship with my ancestral lands” (18). Although statement (18) received a ranking that it somewhat applies to the participants, it no doubt supports the disruption caused by relocation in their lives. Interviewee Norris notes in his experience that the lack of land is a disruptor in continuing the practice of traditional knowledge on a consistent basis, Norris says, “In order to practice our faith, it comes with land because of
mother earth and all these connection to the land and it’s not there.” According to Norris, there is definitely a sense of identity but to practice your religion is difficult,

“[W]e have a sense of identity. We know who we are through our language, our religion, our traditional religion; however, to practice that religion on a piece of land we call home is difficult now; we have to borrow people’s hogans; we have to move around with our ceremonies in order to practice with our religion in Navajo way.”

Thus land being a main conduit, the practice of traditionalism has been disrupted. “Their identity with the land began at birth when their placenta and umbilical cords were returned to land (mother earth) with rituals and prayer” (Joe 1985, 120). As part of cultural teachings and traditions, Norris also explains how a place is connected to a Navajo’s personhood as a wholly Being that makes it a home within the four sacred mountains,

“In the Navajo way, our thought process, wherever our umbilical cords are, wherever our ancestors are, our grandparents umbilical cords are, wherever our sheep roamed, wherever our religious objects are housed, wherever our songs were sung, curing ceremonies, blessing ceremonies, stories told, wherever those things were held as events, that makes it a home, not just a physical home but spiritual home, it makes it….the whole environment is home.”

An aspect of teaching and passing down knowledge includes fundamental moral teachings. The basic moral teachings are often transmitted through oral traditions and concepts where the messages of behavior are embedded. The practice of telling as a conduit could pass on “cultural morals from one generation to the next” (Cheshire 2001, 1531). Interviewee Tess expressed her concerns about the lack of Navajo moral teachings, Tess states, ” I think one important thing they lost is the teaching of the elders, the moral teachings as oppose to the western way of thinking, that’s kind of hard for them now at this point, because it seems like they are confused.” Cheshire finds in her study, “Often, stories are told so lessons are learned by the children, vicariously, so children do not experience the ramifications firsthand” (Cheshire
Interviewee Joan states a relocation affect is the “knowledge of being just Navajo,” in which she connects with language. “[B]eing relocated affected us with our knowledge of being just Navajo, the language…as oppose to someone who is there, who grew up there, they would know more.” Through conversations, observation, Navajo oral narratives and teachings were told in a manner that transcended into moral codes (Vecsey 2015). These teachings are often transmitted by being among family and relatives. Oral traditions include creation stories, White Shell women, or about coyote, to make one aware of proper behavior with oneself and others. Norris expresses his opinion on his concerns about the lack of teaching values, “I think if the parents do not teach strong values, their place of belonging in this world will become murky, and where they will wind up, we don’t know.” The lack of land, being in an urban area as well as the separation of families provides the catalyst in why the transmission of tradition and culture strongly applies as a perspective in this group. Yuma states that “[Family] gatherings…really helped in keeping us focused; I would be thinking about what my grandpa use to sing, it made everything else second.” According to Norris, the result on the lack of transmission is articulated as, “And I believe it’s caused a lot of confusion and disarray with our communities who have been relocated and they disrupted harmony among Navajo people.”

Another strongly applied feature for Factor Three is of importance of a puberty ceremony for young Navajo girls as shown in the following statement, “Kinaalda, a coming of age ceremony is important within my family” (38). A Kinaalda ceremony is a coming of age or puberty ceremony for young Navajo girls provides an important juncture for building a distinctively Navajo identity. The Kinaalda indicate that the girl is affected spiritually, emotionally, intellectually, and physically to be formed into the image of Changing Woman (Markstrom 2003). Shannon, a second generation Navajo relocatee helped to organize a
ceremony for her daughter, “My daughter had her Kinaalda ceremony.” A traditional Kinaalda Navajo ceremony marks a girl’s first period as it is one of the most important events in her life (Kissling 1996). Grace made sure her daughter had a Kinaalda ceremony since she unable to have one, “with my kids, I try to keep the ceremonial going through my in-laws; we just did a Kinaalda for my daughter. I never had that done because of all the moving around, we didn’t know what is going to happen, so it was really nice to have one for my daughter.” Grace and perhaps other may not have had an important ceremony performed due to the disruption by relocation.

A perspective of having access to medicine people to perform a ceremony are important to Factor Three as reflected in statement, “It is challenging to access medicine people to have a ceremony performed in the town/city” (3). The challenge is not only finding a medicine man but also traveling, distance and cost become barriers for second generation Navajo relocatees. “The cost of visiting a Native healer was one of the main barriers to use (Kim and Kwok 1998, 2248)” a healer. Interviewee Bethany states that, “The ceremonies we need to have, we have to travel for to find somebody at this time. We are really short of medicine man and who to find around here because everyone is scattered.” Lack of availability of local healers also acted as a barrier. No exact tally exists of the number and location on the Navajo reservation” (Kim and Kwok 1998, 2249). Additionally, Grace adds, “We don’t know who is doing what now, or who has learned what. It’s just hard getting someone right now because everybody is all scattered; we don’t know who to ask sometimes.”
Another perspective on the concerns of ceremonial activities is the challenge it presents when you live in an urban area, “It is challenging when you are not in a Navajo community to maintain ceremonial and cultural ties” (8). As Norris explains,

“The experience first moving to Phoenix was difficult. We couldn’t do the things we could do back home. There you couldn’t have animals, you couldn’t have sheep, horses…our ceremonial life went from 100% all the way down to a [near] zero, but only what we could practice on our own, like prayers, but there was no ceremony.”

In addition, Norris also believes, “I think it’s more difficult for us to practice our traditional beliefs.” Another statement that also support the challenge of not being in a Navajo community is “My family and I would be more exposed to the Navajo language and culture if relocation did not happen” 2(19).

An important statement that is moderately important to the participants is, “Having access to a Navajo hogan is important for ceremonies” (28). As illustrated in Factor One, Samantha’s lack of a place to call home is linked directly her family’s ceremonial life, “The main thing right now, what really affects my family is we don’t have a place to put hogan. We don’t have ceremonies.” One of the main locations of where a ceremony is performed is in a hogan, “Traditional Navajo ceremonies are ideally performed in a hogan, the traditional Navajo dwelling, and attended by as many of the patient’s family members as possible” (Lewton and Bydone 2000, 482-483). Interviewee Paulina’s family has also experienced the problems of having no family hogan, “[W]e just had a Beauty Way ceremony for my dad this past weekend… but the thing with that is we had to find a [hogan]; we had to have it at my cousin’s hogan…” The connection of the loss of traditional home area, a hogan, and land where passing of traditional knowledge takes place are deeply associated, “The concept of a [hogan] is inextricably intertwined with family in Navajo society and forms the core of the Navajo Nation’s
internal relations and thus is fundamental to a Navajo’s identity, as both a Dine member and as individual” (Austin 2009, 76). The presence of a family hogan preferably at their matrilineal homes is important to the Factor Three assembly of second generation Navajo relocatees. Regardless of their stage in life, Navajo in need of ceremonies return to their matrilineal homes to have rites performed under the sponsorship of concerned relatives (Schwarz 1997, 47).

The factors that support the statement that received rankings of strongly and moderately applicable to the lives of second generation Navajo relocatees include, “It is important to teach my children or grandchildren the Navajo language to communicate with grandparents, relatives, and others” (29). This statement is supportive toward the teaching and preservation of traditional knowledge where meanings of Navajo concepts are not diluted through an English translation. The statement, “Despite being a relocatee and living in a town/city off the reservation, I still consider the Navajo Nation as home” (31), supports the importance of identity as a Navajo and that relocation does not prevail in disengaging them from considering Navajo reservation as home base, more profoundly, the four cardinal mountains is where home is as instructed by the deities. In reminiscing the life on the participants traditional home area, “It would be good to have livestock (i.e. sheep, cattle, horses...) and a farm again to survive” (35) somewhat applies as it is a part of traditional life they behind.

5.3.1 Not Traditional Issue

The following perspectives in this section pertain to the federal government’s home replacement benefit program, and relocating as a whole family unit. The statement, “The home replacement eligibility requirements and application eligibility requirements and application process of the Office of the Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation (ONHIR) are unfair” (5) does not
strongly apply to this sector of the participants. Not only is the home replacement benefit not a strongly applied factor, but do not seem they need to relocate as a group to another area on the Navajo reservation, “I would have preferred relocating as an extended family to another area on the Navajo reservation rather than as a single family unit to a Town/City” (11). Whether they believe relocation it is unfair or not may not be an issue. It seems that Factor Three participants may have a strong family and kinship network.

Interestingly, the following two viewpoints indicate that they are less concern about returning to the Navajo reservation even though they are traditionalists who have implied belief that land is important. The statement that does not strongly apply is, “Navajo leaders should help Navajo relocatees for a possible return to the Navajo Nation” (37). The next statement supports the lack of concern in returning to the Navajo reservation, “A home site lease on the Navajo Nation should be available and secured quickly without difficulty when attempting to return to the Navajo reservation” (1), which does not moderately apply to them. This segment of Factor Three believe that, “The best part of my life was at home on our customary lands” (27), moderately does not apply to them. They seem to be very secure about living in an urban setting despite being traditional, “I feel trapped living in a town/city without land on the Navajo reservation” (6). Also, the expense of being in an urban area moderately does not apply to them, “The high cost of living in the town/city I live in concerns me” (15). As a more traditional leaning group, they seem to have family support, “The lack of family support makes it difficult to live in a town/city concerns me” (20). The issue of speaking the Navajo language somewhat does not apply to them, “I speak less Navajo and my children do not speak Navajo” (4), it could be that they already speak the Navajo language and consider it a non-issue. The perspectives of
this group are not intimidated by being Navajo relocatees, “It can be disempowering to be known as a Navajo relocatee” (12), it moderately does not apply to them.

Summary

Factor Three perspective lean heavily toward traditionalism by emphasizing the importance of cultural and ceremonial aspects that strongly applies to them as second generation Navajo relocatees. They understand that passing down the teachings and practice of their traditions, culture, and ceremonies have been disrupted by relocation. A Kinaalda ceremony is of utmost importance within their families which they indicate strongly applies to them. Having access to a hogan, and to maintain their tradition, culture and ceremonies moderately applies to them since the participants find it challenging to do so. As corroboration that practice and passing of culture, tradition, and ceremonies are applicable and important to the lives of second generation Navajo relocatees, they believe it important their children learn the Navajo language to communicate with elders and other relatives. The perspective of considering tradition and culture including ceremony above all other views, this sector of participants are more likely have family support who are strongly involved in the many facets of the Navajo way of life.

5.4 Modified Peoplehood Matrix

The Land/Place/Territory component of the Peoplehood Matrix is key and central as it is connected to ceremony, sacred history, language and livelihood. In this section, I summarize how the findings of the Q-method survey and the interviews correlate to each component by determining if they are a loss or a gain when impacted by compulsory relocation.

5.4.1 Land, Place, Territory
The Peoplehood Matrix’s land component shows that land is a loss in the lives of second
generation Navajo relocatees. This is reflected in the perspectives of the Q-method survey as
well as the interviewee’s statements. Factor One participants of the Q-method survey ranked
securing land for the future generation as strongly applying to them and is further supported by
the view that lands that have been purchased due to relocation should be utilized, and securing a
home site lease should be done without difficulty. The interviewees believe it is important to
secure and pass land onto succeeding generations thus having a place and space for descendents
as an element of their heritage. Factor Two participants find that it is easier to access housing in
the city. The Q-method survey illustrate that they are not compelled to return to the Navajo
reservation anytime soon. A major reason is compulsory relocation. It is possible they
attempted to return without success or they plan to but not at this time. The interviewees do
provide testimony on the challenges relocatees face when attempting to return, and despite the
challenges, they would like to return one day. Factor Three shows they are concerned about the
lack of place and space to practice and maintain their traditions as well as the inability to have a
spiritual relationship with the land. These concerns illustrate the need to secure land for the
future generation as well as to practice traditions and way of life by second generation Navajo
relocatees.

5.4.2 Livelihood

As a modifying element of the Peoplehood Matrix, livelihood is meant as the ability to be
able to make a living for their families and community of other relations by either methods
practiced for generations and/or through education and employment. Prior to relocation, land
was utilized as part of sustaining and maintaining a livelihood, not only for families but for
relatives. As second generation Navajo relocatees, they were not able to continue and sustain this traditional way of life or supplement it in their lives due to the lack of land and the disbursements of families and relatives to other location. This method of a traditional way of life in sustaining a livelihood is a loss within the Peoplehood Matrix paradigm for second generation Navajo relocatees. On the other hand, when education and employment opportunity paradigm are applied, Factor One and Two participants indicate that living in an urban area provides them education and employment opportunities. Opportunities of education and employment are also announced by the interviewees as well as opportunities for their children. Factor Three survey participants indicated that having a method of traditional livelihood slightly applies to them. When presented as an urban opportunity rather than sustaining a traditional way of life, the livelihood component can be seen as a gain among second generation Navajo relocatees.

5.4.3 Language

Language as a component of the Peoplehood Matrix seems to be a loss in the lives of second generation Navajo relocatees. When stories are told and traditional knowledge is explained, they are more thoroughly understood when told in the Navajo language. Factor One indicate that relocation has disrupted sharing events and experiences of the past through oral tradition, as well as transmittal of traditional knowledge. They also believe that it is important for their children to be taught the Navajo language as a way to communicate with their families and relatives and to understand the Navajo worldview. The interviewees point out that if it had not been for relocation, there is a higher likelihood that the Navajo language would have been passed on and spoken more often. Factor Two participants acknowledge that living in an urban area where everything is in English induced changes as well as marginalizing the Navajo
language thus impacting their families. They also view that the Navajo language is imperative in understanding their worldview, and that Navajo language classes are essential. The interview participants provide examples indicating that the English language is spoken by everybody in the urban areas and that it is rare to speak the Navajo language. Factor Three Q-method survey participants believe that the importance of passing down traditional knowledge, events and experiences through oral traditions has been disrupted. They also indicate that they would be more exposed to the Navajo language if relocation did not occur, and believe that the Navajo language is important in communicating with others. In summary of the interviews and surveys, the language component is a loss.

5.4.4 Ceremonial Cycle

The component of the Peoplehood Matrix, ceremonial cycle, is describes how Navajo religion, traditions, and culture are “linked to language, sacred history and particular environment (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003).” The ceremony component indicates a loss to second generation Navajo relocatees. Factor One points to how relocation has disrupted passing down traditional knowledge, teaching moral lessons, sharing of events and experiences through oral tradition, and learning and maintain the Navajo language, which are all essential in learning Navajo religion, traditions, and culture. The interviewees strongly implied that with families and relative scattered in various location due loss of land, important traditions cannot be properly taught. Factor Two survey participants slightly weighed on how imperative ceremonial aspects related to them. The survey participants indicated that visiting the Navajo Nation provided contact to culture and language. To the same participants, Kinaalda ceremony is important within their families as being slightly applicable. The interviewees indicated that being in an
urban setting, exposure to the language was at a minimum thus affecting how one understands other speakers and indicated that Kinaalda ceremonies were vital in their families. Factor Three weighed rather heavily that relocation is a disruptor of passing on traditional knowledge, teaching moral lessons, sharing of events and experiences through oral tradition as well as the strong importance of the Kinaalda ceremony. The interviewees deemed these traditional and ceremonial aspects as being important but are interrupted by the lack of land. The survey participants indicated that access to medicine people was a challenge in the city, and a challenge in maintaining ceremonial and cultural ties when not on the Navajo reservation; both moderately applies to the participants. Another issue moderately applicable is having access to a hogan for ceremonies which is important and yet challenging according to the interviewees. The interviewees also specify that can be difficult to have ceremonies conducted in urban centers as well as maintaining ties to their culture and traditions. In support of Factor Three, relocation provides the inability to practice the Navajo religion fully and provides lack of exposure to learning and maintaining the Navajo language, and culture.

5.4.5 Sacred History

A component of the Peoplehood Matrix, sacred history, encompasses a group or person’s customary ways of life and their ability to practice it. In the views of both Q-method survey and interview participants, they both convey the concerns that their way of life has been disrupted by relocation with a possible exception of education and employment. Regardless of the disruptions, second generation Navajo relocatees do understand where they come from in relation to their customary home areas and homeland within the four cardinal mountains, however, they are not afforded an exclusive place and space as they had before relocation in
maintaining traditional practices as a way of life. As articulated by interviewees, a place and space is essential in being able to maintain traditional practices. Another major disruption is the transmission of traditional knowledge through a strong traditional family structure giving a sense of a close community. By way of a close kinship based relationships, teaching lessons on morality, and events such as creation stories as well as experiences are also disturb. The disruption includes language; both survey and interviewees indicate that living in an urban area makes it more challenging to pass the language to their children, and for speakers to maintain it. They believe if it had not been for relocation, they would have a higher probability in maintaining and/or learning the language. Another challenge they confront is participating in ceremonies without a proper place such as a hogan thus disrupting the event. Part of the second generation Navajo relocatees sacred history includes relocating with their parents as children, and when becoming an adult, applying for or attempting to apply for home replacement benefits only to be denied. This process has been described by second generation Navajo relocatees as being painful, frustrating, and unfair, which becomes part of their sacred history. Despite the challenges, the participants indicate that education and employment are opportunities that are highly regarded while living in the urban centers. In summary, the sacred history in the lives of second generation Navajo relocatees has been a loss; however, it could be considered a gain when it comes to education and employment.

Summary

The finding of the study when applied to the theoretical framework of the Modified Peoplehood Matrix of how compulsory relocation impacts second generation Navajo relocatees residing in an urban area is concluded to be a mostly a loss. The relationship with land as a
foundational base is almost non-existent since being relocated. In the modified paradigm of the Peoplehood Matrix, land is central to the practice of and maintaining Navajo way of life. Without land, it is interpreted that the Navajo language is either not being fully learned by non-speakers or maintained by Navajo language speakers. The practices of ceremonies are disrupted as well as cultural and traditional life skills. Sacred History have become mere memories of past life on their former customary lands, and facing challenges to practice Navajo way of life in the urban areas. However, urban opportunities of employment and education could be considered a gain thus replacing traditional livelihood.
6 RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of the study was to examine the impacts of the United States federal policy, the Navajo and Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 or P.L. 93-531, on the second generation Navajo children of relocation who, today, reside in city/towns off the Navajo reservation. P.L. 93-531 resulted in compulsory relocation of Navajo citizens, including minors, to relocate from their traditional homelands if they reside within the boundaries of the Hopi Partitioned Lands. The study examines the perspectives and experiences of the second generation Navajo relocatees who were minors when they relocated with their parents. Today, they continue to be displaced and dispossessed.

My research is presented through findings that entailed spending time in the field documenting perspectives and challenges faced by the second generation Navajo children of relocation as a result of compulsory relocation. To provide answers, the following questions are addressed in the research.

1. How has the relocation experience, due to Public Law 93-53, impacted the lives of second generation Navajo children, now adults, living in towns or cities off the Navajo Nation? What have been the perspectives and challenges of the participants after relocation?

2. What have the federal and Navajo government roles been in the lives of second generation Navajo relocatees?

In providing answers to these questions, I utilized Q-methodology and in-depth interviews to examine compulsory relocation impacts. My methodology consists of describing the setting and context of urban location of Flagstaff, Phoenix, and Winslow, where the surveys and interviews were conducted. The three urban locations are host to where the highest number of Navajo
relocatees relocated to as indicated by data provided by the Office of Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation. These urban locations are located near other Indian nations as well as Navajo Nation. The surveys and interviews were conducted in place of business, public areas, and in the home of the participants. I traveled between the three urban centers meeting with participants throughout the summer and fall of 2014.

The theoretical framework utilized was, the Peoplehood Matrix, a framework that shows the connection and interdependency between land, language, sacred history, and ceremonial cycle (Holm, Pearson and Chavis 2003). The Peoplehood Matrix was flexible to modified it by adding livelihood as an important connection to sustaining themselves. I found this theoretical framework worked with my study to show how the experiences and perspectives of second generation Navajo relocatees were reflected in the five factors, land/place/territory, language, sacred history, ceremonial cycle and livelihood.

Relocation policies consist of both the courts and policy makers in a creation of an entanglement of policies that concludes into a quagmire of indulgence in the lives of Navajo relocatees including succeeding generations. Western historical sources nullified oral traditional stories, and failed to consider the social and economic relationships that had developed while being neighbors for time immemorial in a legal setting. During court proceedings, both Navajos and Hopis were presented in racial stereotypes while determining who has interest to the 1882 reservation. Through the exercise of its powers, the Federal Government had created statutory lands consisting of the 1882 Executive Order reservation, 1934 reservation (Arizona Boundary Bill), 1942 District Six, 1963 Joint Use Area (JUA), 1966 Bennett Freeze area, and the 1974 Navajo and Hopi Land Settlement Act leaving a legacy of the displacement of second generation
Navajo relocatees. Moreover, Congress permitted the courts to settle the dispute almost entirely by litigation lasting over 50 years with an abundance of lawsuits, as well as the continuing relocation of both Navajos since 1974 through the Office of Navajo Hopi Relocation Office.

The ratification of Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 by Congress created communities of unique circumstances, relocation of Navajos and Hopis to urban and reservation communities, planned community called Nahata Dziil, a strong relocation resistant community of Big Mountain, allowing Navajo families to remain by signing a lease agreement with the Hopis known as the Accommodation Agreement, created an Navajo island community in Jeddito, Arizona, the portions of the 1934 reservation became Joint Use Area and Bennett Freeze, and the creation of impact succeeding generations of Navajo relocatees who are mostly like landless and possibly homeless. Second generation Navajo relocates have tried to engage with both governments to resolve their issues stemming from being displaced and dispossessed due to force relocation. The engagement include applying for home replacement benefits only to be rejected or advised there is nothing they can do. As well as finding it difficult to return to the Navajo reservation by way of a home site lease, a bureaucratic process filled with obstacles.

Parallel to empirical data gathering by Q-method surveys and in-depth interviews, support of this study include journal articles, newspapers, videos, websites, books, legal analysis, court cases, Congressional testimonies, other opinions and views and archived materials were utilized. These materials were used to support the foundation that this study was essential to add to the growing body of scholarship on the impacts of relocation to Navajo relocatees. Existing models were included to show the various types of resettlement models utilized toward other resettlement in the various parts of the world.
6.1 Research Questions 1

How has the relocation experience, due to Public Law 93-531, impacted the lives of second generation Navajo children, now adults, living in towns or cities off the Navajo Nation? What have been the perspectives and challenges of the participants after relocation?

Second generation Navajo relocatees moved with their parents and family members from Hopi Partition Lands to communities either on the reservation or off-reservation. As second generation Navajo relocatees, they indicate and articulate their challenges and experiences they confronted while living in a town/city. The desires they have and would like to see come to fruition today as relocatees living in urban centers were likely shaped by the challenges and experiences of relocation. The source of their perspectives toward what has become central in their lives after being relocated from their customary lands is the result of how they experienced the challenges of relocation as supported by their articulations in the interviews.

6.1.1 Factor One: Livelihood

The Factor One group indicates the following as issues of prominence after experiencing relocation: land for home and succeeding generations, livelihood opportunities, and retaining tradition and culture including language. An experience that contributes to their high regard of land is the loss of their family’s customary land due to the P.L. 93-531. Land is primary and foremost as shown in the survey results (26). They are interested in securing land as a place and space to call home that they can return to. In securing land, they are also interested in passing land onto their succeeding generations so they have a place to return to at anytime.
The loss of lands continues to be a challenge which results for many second generation Navajo relocatees with no place to return to on the Navajo reservation. Their former customary home area functioned as support systems in many aspects for their families. They consider land to be an integral part as a future endeavor to attain. The perspective on the importance of land is supported by four other statements. To overcome the challenge of returning to a place to, they believe the Navajo Nation should assist them with land, particularly with the lands that were purchased in the various locations in exchange for loss of lands (16), and a home site lease should be secured without difficulty (1). Another challenge that is present to second generation Navajo relocatees is the unfair process of how the federal agency, Office of the Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation, determines eligibility based on criterion; the participants view this as being excluded from attaining land and home (5).

The next item they deem important is livelihood. Second generation Navajo relocatees of Factor One share the view of living in a town/city provides access to educational and employment opportunities (40) as they have experience firsthand. Prior to relocation, a traditional livelihood, livestock, farming, trading, weaving, and other methods of receiving monetary sources, more likely sustained a living for most families. However, after relocation, this way of life was transformed by ultimately residing in a city or town as a result of relocation. While being in an urban area, they utilized the available opportunities. These opportunities include education and employment leading to essentially providing a livelihood. Some second generation Navajo relocatees more likely found that their education and employment has replaced the traditional methods of making a livelihood.
Factor One leaning second generation Navajo relocatees believe in the importance of retaining traditional and culture knowledge in their lives as well as the ability to speak the Navajo language. The challenge that second generation Navajo relocatees face is the difficulty of practicing and participating in traditional events due to living in the city/town, distance and expense of returning to the Navajo reservation, as well as scattering of family and relatives who held key roles in a traditional setting. The result of this view is illustrated in the participants acknowledging that relocation had disrupted the transference of traditional knowledge, teaching lessons on morality, and sharing of experiences and events through oral traditional (2). A challenge that second generation Navajo relocatees face is maintaining and/or learning the Navajo language. Provided that they live in a city or town, they find themselves not speaking the language on a regular basis to maintain it or not knowing how to speak it. In either cases, the contributing factors include the lack of Navajo speakers, being surrounded by an overwhelming amount of English, and being in an environment not conducive to learning the Navajo language. To overcome the challenge of being a non-speak of the Navajo language is have access to Navajo language classes. These challenges provide a chasm when attempting to communicate with family and relatives (29), and understanding the Navajo worldview (24).

6.1.2 Factor Two: Urbanism

The perspectives of Factor Two participants believe that having access to educational and employment (40) as well as housing (30) opportunities are essential and important. Moreover, they appear to embrace living in a city or town they reside in, and tend to consider it as their new community (22) as they indicated. They are aware of the significance of the Navajo language as
being part of their heritage which has most likely become marginalized while living in an urban setting (9) (14).

The participants value the important opportunities that exist in the urban centers similarly to Factor One. These opportunities are education, employment, housing as well as opportunities for their children (30). The opportunities for their children include summer programs, camp, churches, schools, sports, afterschool activities. Perhaps due to an uncertain future created by relocation, the parents of second generation Navajo relocatees likely encouraged their children to continue their education beyond high school.

As young second generation Navajo relocatees, they are in a city/town due to the impacts of relocation. It is likely that this group of participants grew up or spent a significant amount of time after relocation in an urban setting. While experiencing urban transition, they likely acclimated to the urban environment, thus making it easier to consider the urban setting they live in as their new community (22).

A challenge that is experienced by both relocatees and non-relocatees is the lack of housing on the Navajo reservation. This group felt that housing is an important aspect in their livelihood. They iterate that it is easier to find housing in the city/town, thus making it easier to perhaps set down roots in a new community. These opportunities essentially provide a livelihood for their families.

Factor Two recognizes that the Navajo language is marginalized by (14) being in an immersed in English (14) by living in an urban environment. In a similar situation as Factor One, the challenges they experience is not being able to speak Navajo to maintain it or learn the
language. The participants articulate they are unable to speak to another individual on a consistent basis to maintain it at a level prior to coming to an urban area or to learn it due to lack of access and resources. In supporting their challenges with the Navajo language, access to the Navajo language is essential (39), they speak less Navajo and their children do not speak Navajo (4), they visit the Navajo reservation to have more exposure to the Navajo language and culture (34), and they feel that the Navajo language is important in understanding the Navajo worldview (24).

6.1.3 Factor Three: Traditionalism

How relocation has impacted Factor Three group convey that, first and foremost, being relocated from their traditional home area has hindered and disrupted the transmission of traditional knowledge, teaching lessons on morality as well as utilizing oral tradition for sharing events, experiences, and stories (2). They indicate that it is difficult to practice and maintain their traditional and cultural way of life including having a hogan for ceremonies when residing in the urban areas (3) (8) (28). A priority in their ceremonial life is, Kinaalda, or coming of age ceremony (38) within their families. The participants in this group are connected to their traditional and cultural practices

The transmission of traditional knowledge in the form of teaching through oral tradition, usually in the Navajo language, is seen as being disrupted. The contributing elements of disruption are lack of land and the scattering of families and relatives. Through their experiences, they indicate when there were customary lands, family and relatives lived near one another and were able to fulfill their obligations of transmitting teachings as they served in these capacities. Livings in a city or town, second generation Navajo relocatees are likely removed
from an environment of teaching tradition and culture, thus producing a real challenge to properly conduct these important teachings.

Similarly, the disruption on the practice of traditional and cultural aspects is due to the lack of land. The participants indicate that the practice of Navajo ceremonies come with land particularly within the four cardinal mountains. This lack of land is a hindrance for a proper conduct of ceremonies. Other important resources become disruptors, such as traveling long distances, time from work or lack of time, and related financial expenses can become burdensome.

The lack of a customary infrastructure, a hogan, is an additional challenge experienced by second generation Navajo relocatees (28). Having access to a hogan is important when ceremonies are to be conducted. The Kinaalda Ceremony, as indicated is important and highly applicable to the families of the participants (38). Because of the lack of a hogan, an important ceremony that is necessary to the family of second generation family relocatees may find it difficult to be conducted; moreover, utilizing someone else’s hogan is not considered acceptable.

In supporting the views of the importance of traditional and cultural practices as described, Factor Three group believe that relocation is the cause of their inability to practice their traditional religion based on a spiritual relationship with land (18) as well as not having more exposure to the Navajo language and culture (19).

6.2 Research Question 2

What have the federal and Navajo government roles been in the lives of second generation Navajo relocatees?
The major role and involvement of the Federal Government has been to displace and dispossess second generation Navajo relocatees from their traditional home areas as minors when they relocated along with their parents. The Navajo governments seems to be weighted down with bureaucracy when second generation Navajo relocatees are seeking assistance. P.L. 93-531, continues to have an impact on their lives resulting in, as one participant puts, “no place to go home to.”

When second generation Navajo relocatees visit the Office of Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation, they are often seeking assistance by applying for home replacement benefits due to being displaced. The results of their applications after being evaluated mostly conclude to being ineligible for home replacement benefits and are denied. Some second generation Navajo relocatees were discouraged to apply by the Office of the Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation. In some cases, second generation Navajo relocatees are familiar with the federal agency that is responsible for relocating their families and relatives because they likely accompanied their parents as children. Aside from displacing second generation Navajo relocatees, the federal government’s role is lacking in finding solutions that will to resolve displacement for more than one generation. The participants indicated that on the whole, the relocation process is unfair to their situation.

According to interviewees, the role of the Navajo government in assisting second generation Navajo relocatees has been modest. Despite the interest of securing land and returning to the Navajo reservation, there continues to be a lack of available land as well as the challenges of securing a home site lease. Due to the challenges of a home site lease, one participant indicated they were not ready to take on the challenges of applying and attaining a home site lease. Despite the lands purchased by the Navajo Nation government in exchange for
loss of land, most are devoted to economic development with the exception of New Lands or Nahata Dzil.

6.3 Conclusion

6.3.1 Summary of Findings

The long historical and unfortunate events of the so-called Navajo and Hopi land dispute has led to the displacement and dispossession of second generation Navajo relocatees, as well as succeeding generation. Second generation Navajo relocatees were children whom at the time were relocated with their parents to urban areas or to on-reservation communities. Due to relocation, many found themselves with no place to go on the Navajo reservation instead have to live in the urban areas.

Originally, I argued that many second generation Navajo relocatees were deprived of the five factors that provide a structure to a modified Peoplehood Matrix consisting of language, sacred history, ceremonial cycle, land/territory, and livelihood due to the Navajo-Hopi Indian Settlement Act or P.L. 93-531. The consequences of the five factors include landlessness, a potential loss of language, and lack of participant in tradition and culture, and social disarticulation of inherent events at former traditional homeland, and lack or non-engagement in various annual ceremonies. However, there is education and employment that helps to provide a livelihood.

The findings that emerged for the study are perspectives from three groups which are labeled, livelihood, urbanism, and traditionalism. The three groups reveal perspectives surrounding livelihood, land, language, traditions and culture. Factor One, land is highly
important in securing a future for their children as well as employment and educational opportunities to sustain a livelihood. They also believe it is important to maintain traditional and cultural aspects of their identity, including language. Despite living in a urban environment, they are confident and secure in who they are as Dine people. They look forward to securing land for their children, and returning in the event they can live well.

Factor Two find that living in an urban area provides opportunities for a livelihood, including housing. They are aware that western immersion has marginalized their Navajo language, and believe that access to learning the Navajo language applies to them. The ceremony, Kinaalda, is important to their family structure. These participants do not feel trapped living in an urban setting, nor are they leaning toward returning to live on the Navajo reservation. They are acclimated to the urban setting with the knowledge that tradition and culture are important.

Factor Three perspectives are that traditional and cultural teachings are highly important and foremost, as well as the ability to communicate in the Navajo language. They also would like to maintain and access to ceremonial events as participants. In the same notion, they believe their way of life has been disrupted by relocation. They seem to not subscribe to returning to the Navajo reservation with the assistance of government. The event that took place prior to their relocation does not moderately apply to them. Additionally, they are secure and confident about living in an urban setting with modest concerns about livelihood. They lean toward being traditionalist with possible strong family support on the Navajo reservation.

6.3.2 Second Generation Navajo Relocatees Resiliency
Second generation Navajo relocatees in the urban centers have shown resiliency by making the best out of their situations. The lost of their customary lands and being relocated with their parent(s) continues to be a struggle. Through their experiences of losing their inherent lands, some would like to acquire land for their children as well as succeeding generations so they may have a place they call home and can return to. This foresight illustrates that second generation Navajo relocatees are willing to recapture what was lost in order to create a sustaining future for their succeeding generations. Many have listened to their family members to continue their education as to create a livelihood. These encouragements have resulted in a number of second generation Navajo relocatees to attain specialized training in their trade or graduate degrees, and be employed in their professional field. Some have become homeowners on their own initiatives or have been able to find other types of housing without the bureaucratic process that exist on the Navajo reservation. The study has revealed the importance of the Navajo language as well as being participants of Navajo tradition and culture, as well as ceremonials practices.

6.3.4 Contributions

The dissertation provides additional new information to the issue of Navajo relocation, specifically second generation of Navajo relocatees. The study adds new knowledge to American Indian studies, law and policy, culture and society, human rights studies, and to the area of displacement and resettlement nationally and internationally, which will complement or lead to new studies. It contributes to the growing literature about forced relocation of Navajos as well as the global literature toward indigenous relocation occurring in various parts of the world. The study also serves to educate impacted Navajo relocatees, general public, Federal and Navajo
policy makers, as well as other stakeholders about the perspectives and challenges of second generation Navajo relocatees. The study provides much needed data to the Navajo Nation government to assist in resolving the problems that have existed over 40 years.

6.3.3 Implications

This study presents insight and findings to a narrow section, second generation Navajo relocatees, of the much larger complex issue concerning compulsory relocation of Navajos. Other questions arose while completing this study which could be addressed in future studies. With any research, there is always room for further research to advance the understanding of how forced relocation impact Navajos, as well as other indigenous peoples.

Limitations of this study were the lack of input from the parents of the second generation Navajo relocatees who may reveal perspectives to complement this study. A critical voice and perspectives are the Hopi second generation relocatees that are not heard. Another voice that could be missing is the third generation Navajo relocatees. Future directions in the development of this topic could include the third generation’s voices and experiences.

In conducting this study about relocation experiences and perspectives of Navajo children of relocation, I hope policy makers will be more mindful of the hardships, struggles, and losses that have and are occurring in the lives of second generation Navajo relocatees and succeeding generations. It is also hoped that a more salient discussion among and about second generation relocatees evolve to correct the social injustices of compulsory Navajo relocation. The outcome of the research will help educate and empower other individuals and communities facing relocation.
7 APPENDIX

7.1 Sample ONHIR Denial Letter .................................................................199
7.2 Resolution of the Leupp Chapter ..............................................................200
7.3 Resolution of the Western Navajo Agency Council .....................................202
7.4 The University of Arizona Consent To Participate in Research ....................203
7.5 Raw Statements for Discourse Development ............................................207
7.6 Final Q-Set or Concourse .....................................................................214
7.7 Q-sort Grid .........................................................................................215
7.8 Q-Method Recruitment Flier ....................................................................216
7.9 Q-method Recruitment Scrip ..................................................................217
7.10 Q-Sort Instructions .............................................................................218
7.11 In-Depth Interview Recruitment Script ..................................................219
APPENDIX 7.1

Sample of ONHIR Denial Letter

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

Christopher J. Bavasi
Executive Director

Application for Relocation Benefits:
Denial & Right to Appeal

The Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation ("ONHIR") received your Application for Relocation Benefits ("Application") on July 30, 2009. **Your Application is denied** for the reasons described below.

To receive Relocation Benefits, an Applicant must meet certain eligibility requirements. One eligibility requirement is that the Applicant must be a "Head of Household" when he or she left the Hopi Partitioned Lands (HPL) or by July 7, 1986, whichever date is earlier. To be a Head of Household a person must meet one of the following criteria: be married, be a parent, or be self-supporting (including earning $1,300.00 or more per year).

In response to question 9 on page 5 of your Application, you stated that you moved off the HPL in 1983 and you moved to XXX. As of 1983, you were not a Head of Household. Specifically, you were not married (you married through a traditional ceremony in 1989, but you do not have a marriage certificate and you did not submit proof that the traditional marriage has been validated), you were not a parent (your first child was born on March 3, 1991), and you were not self-supporting (according to your Social Security Earnings statement you first earned $1,300.00 or more per year in 1988).

Given the foregoing, you do not meet the Head of Household requirement and therefore you are not eligible for Relocation Benefits.

If you believe this denial is incorrect, you have the right to appeal this denial by filing an Appeal with ONHIR. If you choose to file an appeal, the appeal must be in writing and must state the reasons why you believe this denial is incorrect. **Your appeal must be received by ONHIR's Flagstaff Office within sixty (60) calendar days after you receive this letter.** A copy of ONHIR's Appeal Procedures (Management Manual Section 1310) is enclosed.

You are not required to have a lawyer to appeal this denial, but you may be represented by a lawyer. If the lawyer is admitted to practice in any state or in the Navajo Nation the lawyer you select can represent you in an Appeal. You will be responsible for selecting and paying any such lawyer.

P.O. Box KK • 201 E. Birch • Flagstaff, Arizona 86002 • (928) 779-2721 • Fax (928) 774-1977
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RESOLUTION OF THE LEUPP CHAPTER

NO. ____________________

SUPPORTING AND APPROVING REQUEST FOR NAVAJO NATION INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD RESEARCH FOR ARRESTA LARUSSO ON THE TOPIC OF:
“SECOND GENERATION OF NAVAJO RELOCATEES: INHERITING INTERGENERATION LOSSES DUE TO P.L. 93-531”

Resolution No.: __________________

WHEREAS:

1. Pursuant to 2 N.N.C. and 26 N.N.C., the Leupp Chapter is authorized and delegated with governmental authority to address all matters of local interest and concern; and

2. The Leupp Chapter is committed to providing and assisting with opportunities for the betterment and improvement of standard of living for its’ constituents; and

3. Ms. Arresta LaRusso, a constituent of Leupp Chapter and a full time student of University of Arizona is working to complete a research study on the impacts of the Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 aka Public Law 93-531 as it pertains to the children and descendents of families relocated as a result of the Act; and

4. The research will examine the impacts of the United States federal policy Public Law 93-531 (P.L. 93-531), the Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act, which was passed by Congress in 1974 forced many Navajo families and their children who had resided on their traditional homeland for generations to relocate elsewhere; and

5. When the 93rd Congress passed P.L. 93-531, it liberally exercised its plenary power by not addressing the best interests of Navajo children relocatees as stakeholders; and

6. Arresta LaRusso, a PHD Candidate will focus on the primary question proposed, ‘How has relocation, due to Public Law 93-531, impact the lives of second generation Navajo children?’; and

7. Arresta LaRusso research will include qualitative and quantitative methodologies of collecting artifacts, Q-method, and in-depth interview will be used to study the second generation Navajo relocatees as adults living away from the Navajo Nation and document the challenges they face as a result of compulsory relocation; and

8. Whereas prior studies address Navajo adult relocatees, but there are no significant study addressing second generation Navajos relocatees; and

9. The final product will be a published dissertation report.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Leupp Chapter hereby supports and recommends to the Navajo Nation Institutional Review Board a research study request for Arresta LaRusso, University of Arizona on impacts of the Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 aka Public Law 93-531 on the children of families who were forced to relocate.
CERTIFICATION

We, hereby, certify that the foregoing resolution was duly considered at a duly called meeting of the Leupp Chapter, Leupp (Arizona) at which a quorum was present and that the same was passed by a vote of ___ in favor, ___ opposed, and ___ abstained, this 15th day of March 2014.

Motion by: _____________________  Second by: _____________________

__________________________  __________________________
Roberta Gorman, President   Genevieve Riggs, Secretary-Treasurer

__________________________  __________________________
Kevin Todacheenie, Vice-President   Walter Phelps, Council Delegate

__________________________
Allen Jones, Grazing Official

THE LEUPP CHAPTER, AS PART OF THE NAVAJO NATION
SPONSOR: HONORABLE COUNCIL DELEGATE WALTER PHELPS

WHEREAS, Aresta LaRusso, a citizen of the Navajo Nation, a member Leupp Chapter, and a Phd. Candidate at the University of Arizona will conduct the study

WHEREAS,

THEREFORE, examining the impacts of compulsory relocation on the second generation of Navajos relocatees will assist with possible improved policies, the effects of relocation on will be further understood, and the outcome of my research will also help educate and empower other individual and communities facing relocation, document the issues that affect the wellbeing of Navajo relocatees, and provide much needed data for an issue that have existed over 40 years.

THE RESOLUTION WAS PASSED ON _______________ FOR____________ AGAINST_______
RESOLUTION OF THE
WESTERN NAVAJO AGENCY
SUPPORTING AND APPROVING REQUEST FOR NAVAJO NATION INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD RESEARCH FOR ARRESTA LARUSSO ON THE TOPIC OF:
"SECOND GENERATION OF NAVAJO RELOCATEES: INHERITING INTERGENERATION LOSSES DUE TO PL. 93-531"

WNA Resolution No.: 81-284-#5

WHEREAS:

1. The Western Navajo Agency Council is a political subdivision of the Navajo Nation that advocates for eighteen (18) chapters of the Western Navajo Agency and makes appropriate recommendations on behalf of such chapters to the Navajo Nation Government, Federal, State, and local entities;

2. The Western Navajo Agency Council is comprised of elected officials from eighteen (18) Navajo Nation Chapters in the Western Navajo Agency and has the responsibility and authority to address matters and projects that will benefit the 18 chapters of the Western Navajo Agency of the Navajo Nation;

3. Ms. Arresta LaRusso, a constituent of the Western Navajo Agency Council and a full time student of University of Arizona is working to complete a research study on the impacts of the Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act of 1974 aka Public Law 93-531 as it pertains to the children and descendants of families relocated as a result of the Act; and

4. The research will examine the impacts of the United States federal policy Public Law 93-531 (P.L. 93-531), the Navajo Hopi Land Settlement Act, which was passed by Congress in 1974 forced many Navajo families and their children who had resided on their traditional homeland for generations to relocate elsewhere; and

5. When the 93rd Congress passed PL. 93-531, it liberally exercised its plenary power by not addressing the best interests of Navajo children relocates as stakeholders; and

6. Arresta LaRusso, a PHD Candidate will focus on the primary question proposed, 'How has relocation, due to Public Law 93-531, impact the lives of second generation Navajo children?'; and

7. Arresta LaRusso research will include qualitative and quantitative methodologies of collecting artifacts, qualitative methodology, and in-depth interview will be used to study the second generation Navajo relocates as adults living away from the Navajo Nation and document the challenges they face as a result of compulsory relocation;

8. Whereas prior studies address Navajo adult relocates, but there are no significant study addressing second generation Navajos relocates; and

9. The final product will be a published dissertation report.
The University of Arizona Consent to Participate in Research

**Study Title:** Second Generation Navajo Relocatees: Inheriting Intergenerational Losses Due P.L. 93-531

**Principal Investigator:** Aresta La Russo

**Sponsor:** American Indian Studies

**This is a consent form for research participation.** It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate. Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to discuss the study with your friends and family and to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate.

1. **Why is this study being done?**

   The purpose of the study is to document perspectives, experiences, and challenges of second generation Navajo relocatees as adults living off the Navajo Nation due to forced relocation. Currently, there is no significant data about this population base of Navajo relocatees. The data will add to people’s understanding of the relocation issue, inform public officials, educate the public, and could lead to improved policies.

2. **How many people will take part in this study?**

   Q-Method study - 80 In-Depth interviews - 10

3. **What will happen if I take part in this study?**

   Upon providing consent to participate in the study, the following initial procedures will proceed

   **Q-Method Study - In-person:**
   
   a. An appointment time will be determined for the survey.
   b. You will be given a seven question survey form to fill out.
   c. You will be given a deck of 40 numbered cards from 1-40, a grid sheet with a scale ranging from 1 (strongly not applies) to 9 (strongly agree), a grid recording sheet.
   d. You will read all the statements and divide them into three groups or deck from not applies, applies, and neutral.
   e. According to your opinions or perspectives on relocation issues, you will arrange the cards on the scale from 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 on the grid sheet.
Upon completion, the arranged cards will be recorded on the grid sheet.

**Q-Method - On-line**

a. You will be provided with a link to the Q-Flash survey site.
b. Follow the instructions online to complete a seven question survey, and to complete rank ordering 40 numbered cards from 1-40.
c. If necessary, the researcher will provide further instructions.

**In-Depth Interview**

a. An appointment time will be determined for the interview.
b. The interview will take from 60 minutes to 90 minutes, with a possible follow up interview.
c. You will be asked to answer 12 unstructured questions.
d. If follow up questions is necessary, a follow up interview will be scheduled.

4. How long will I be in the study?
   a. Q-Method Study (In-person and On-Line - 30 minutes to 60 minutes)
   b. In-depth interview - 1st interview 60-90 minutes; 2nd interview 30-60 minutes
      (follow up is a consideration but it may not be necessary)

5. Can I stop being in the study?
   Yes. You, the participant, may withdraw from the study at any time.

   Your participation is voluntary.
   You may refuse to participate in this study. If you decide to take part in the study, you may leave the study at any time. No matter what decision you make, there will be no penalty to you and you will not lose any of your usual benefits. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The University of Arizona. If you are a student or employee at the University of Arizona, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.

6. What risks, side effects or discomforts can I expect from being in the study?
   There may be emotional discomfort due to discussing the loss of traditional homeland.

7. What benefits can I expect from being in the study?
   The benefits of the study includes: educating the public, documenting perspectives, experiences, challenges, and outcomes of the study, and possible improved policies related to second generation Navajo relocatees

8. What other choices do I have if I do not take part in the study?
   You may choose not to participate without penalty.
9. Will my study-related information be kept confidential?

Your information will be kept confidential and safe in a secured location at the University of Arizona American Indian Studies data repository area. If you are a Q-Study participant, your name will not be used; instead, a number will be issued. If you do an In-Depth interview, your name will not be used; instead, the study will use a pseudo-name in any references to your interview.

10. What are the costs of taking part in this study?

The only cost to the participant is valuable time spent to assist with the research.

11. Will I be paid for taking part in this study?

No.

12. What happens if I am injured because I took part in this study?

If you suffer an injury from participating in this study, you should seek treatment. The University of Arizona has no funds set aside for the payment of treatment expenses for this study.

13. What are my rights if I take part in this study?

If you choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By signing this form, you do not give up any personal legal rights you may have as a participant in this study.

You will be provided with any new information that develops during the course of the research that may affect your decision whether or not to continue participation in the study.

You may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The University of Arizona reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

14. Who can answer my questions about the study?

For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study you may contact Dr. Trosper at 520-621-7108.

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact the Human Subjects Protection Program at 520-626-6721 or online at
If you are injured as a result of participating in this study or for questions about a study-related injury, you may contact 520-626-6721.

Disclosure Form

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form, and I am aware that I am being asked to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I am not giving up any legal rights and I will be given a copy of this form.

"By participating in this survey/interview I consent to have my data used for research purposes."
Raw Statement for Concourse Development

- How has relocation experience, due to Public Law 93-53, impacted the lives of the second generation Navajo children of relocation?
- What were the experiences of the participants before, during and after relocation?
- What has the federal and Navajo government’s role been in the lives of Children of Relocation?

## LIVELIHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Raw Material or Statements</th>
<th>“Unambiguous” or Revised Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>The Office of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation home replacement eligibility requirements and application process are complex and hard to understand. (Bitsuie, Affairs 07-21-2005, pg. 11)</td>
<td>The Office of the Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation home replacement eligibility requirements and application process are complex and hard to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>The Office of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation home replacement eligibility requirements and application process are not fair. (Bitsuie, Affairs 07-21-2005, pg. 11)</td>
<td>The Office of the Navajo-Hopi Indian Relocation home replacement eligibility requirements and application process are unfair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>“Strong families ties exist among Indians, and those going to the city would be leaving their families and a major source of comfort and aid.”</td>
<td>The lack of family support makes it difficult to live in a town/city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We hope the Navajo Tribe does not give up on us. We want to be part of the Tribe and not be treated like we are no longer Navajos. Scudder pg. 140</td>
<td>Navajo leaders should be aware of Navajo relocatee’s living off-reservation and treat them like Navajo citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>“It seems like this the end for us here. Our future plan for our children is disrupted. Our children were not considered.” Scudder pg. 146</td>
<td>Not being a part of the relocation plan left me landless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>“It seems like this the end for us here. Our future plan for our children is disrupted. Our children were not considered.” Scudder pg. 146</td>
<td>Not being a part of the relocation plan left me homeless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>“Land has more value than other types of wealth. We need land for our own children and their children’s children. Home is land.” Scudders pg. 157 - 57</td>
<td>Securing land for a home to past to our children is more valuable than other types of wealth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>“…It may be good for some of the younger generation to be resettled in town where they can get a job…” Scudders pg. 154 - 46</td>
<td>Living in a town/city provides employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Having livestock is like having money in the bank. We will have no livestock left to pass down to children/grandchildren for daily survival need [food], ceremonies---we will lose all grazing rights and all other lands use rights. Scudder pg. 151-152 - 40</td>
<td>It would be good to have livestock and a farm again to survive on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>“Some considered that relocation was all right if employment was assured, and better urban living conditions were recognized…”</td>
<td>Gainful employment should be guaranteed if relocation is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>My children lives would be different if I had not been denied relocation benefits, and better able to provide a stable home environment. (NNHRC pg. 28)</td>
<td>If I was not denied relocation benefits, I would have been able to provide a stable home environment for my children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Urban economic life proved to be considerably different and [difficult] from rural reservation life.</td>
<td>Economic life in the city/town is difficult.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“…[relocated Navajos] would prefer to move back to the reservation if adequate socioeconomic conditions and opportunities existed.”

I would move back to the reservation if I could live well.

“Urban Indians include very accomplished professionals, many of who would like to contribute to their community and some of who would like to return to live in the community permanently.”

I would like to use my professional skills if I can return to Navajo.

“…undesirable effects of relocation might be more bearable to younger, more educated Navajos with a chance to get a good job than to Navajo with no such access or skills.”
Schoepfle, Burton, Begishe Pg. 888

I have more opportunities and access to education and employment.

“A willingness to invest in education seems common in societies that reach this stage, although its roots may lie in the previous one.”

Education is important for relocatees even though their roots are on the reservation.

Relocation policy should include a scholarship program for children of relocatees.

Relocation policy should include educational benefits for the children of relocatees.

I am concerned with the high cost of living in an urban area.

The high cost of living in the town/city I live in concerns me.

Why can't the children of people who got a relocation homes be eligible. The homes that were build for our parents are all ruin down by now. Even though they have maintain the home very well. So we the children need homes. Yes, we are born after 1974. I believe it's not fair. I have a family of my own and we are in desperate need of a home.

The children of relocatees with families need homes separate from their parents.

Why can't the children of people who got a relocation homes be eligible. The homes that were build for our parents are all ruin down by now. Even though they have maintain the home very well. So we the children need homes. Yes, we are born after 1974. I believe it's not fair. I have a family of my own and we are in desperate need of a home.

The relocation eligibility process is not fair.

As a child in 1974, I was relocated with my parents. In 2009, my older siblings & I, now with grandchildren, still have no home, literally. We have no water for human consumption, electricity, paved roads, emergency services, or any development, & many homeless families. I ask who benefited. Not us.

Even though I relocated with my parents as a child, I did not benefit from relocation.
[Those who moved to urban areas], and returned home again, their experiences and their tales of their experiences did not encourage others to follow.”

Living in town/city is a challenging experience.

Urban Indian Educational Objectives: “To encourage other Native Americans, both adults and high school students, to go on to college.”

Education is important, especially if you live in a town/city.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Raw Statements</th>
<th>Revised Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Seeking and receiving a homesite lease on the Navajo reservation is difficult for relocatees who live off-reservation. (Bitsuie, Affairs 07-21-2005, pg. 11)</td>
<td>It is difficult to get a home site lease when attempting to return to the Navajo Nation at the chapter level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Yes, I regret moving out--I should have not ever moved. We were told we would be moved further away from the reservation if we remained there--…” Scudder pg. 140</td>
<td>Agreeing to relocate is regretful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I want to go back to Navajo Country. Scudders pg. 144</td>
<td>I want to move back to the Navajo Nation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>“The bad thing (about relocation) is that we have to leave where we were born. There’s no good thing about relocation.” Scudders pg. 158 - 61</td>
<td>There is no positive outcome about relocation when families are forced to leave their homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>…prior to relocation, [relocatees] had their own land. Joe, 1985 , pg.</td>
<td>Before relocation, we had our own customary lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>“Indians who leave tribal areas to live in the cities or in other parts of the country, can go home easily…The reservation is still the center of their lives.”</td>
<td>Despite being a relocatee and living in a town/city off the reservation, the Navajo Nation is still home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The raw statement states the no matter where Indians move to, the reservation is still home. The concourse is revised to indicate that no matter where relocatees had to move to, the Navajo reservation is still home; Navajo land is home. This is a rather positive statement.

Obtaining a homesite lease on the Navajo reservation is desirable because it is a location to move back to. The revised statement indicates that a relocatees desire may be to obtain a home site lease which provides an opportunity to move back to the reservation. This is a rather positive statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Raw Statements</th>
<th>Revised Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>We’d like to obtain a home site lease and move back. Scudders pg. 142 - 11</td>
<td>I want to obtain a home site lease and move back to the Navajo reservation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obtaining a homesite lease on the Navajo reservation is desirable because it is a location to move back to. The revised statement indicates that a relocatees desire may be to obtain a home site lease which provides an opportunity to move back to the reservation. This is a rather positive statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Raw Statements</th>
<th>Revised Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>“The 250,000 acres of land that the Navajos were promised should be made available before relocating people. In fact, more acres should be added—the same amount of acres that have been taken…. Scudders pg. 157 - 56</td>
<td>The many thousand acres of land Navajo Nation received on behalf of relocatees should be utilized to assist relocatees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The raw statement suggests that certain Navajo citizen’s loss their lands, yet, lands were selected by the Navajo Nation to compensate lands loss due to relocation. Thus, these lands should be made available to Navajo citizens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Raw Statements</th>
<th>Revised Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>“But [Navajos] should be moved in groups, rather than singles or single families…” (Mills 1969, 149)</td>
<td>I would have preferred relocating as a family group to another area on the Navajo reservation rather than to a city/town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The raw statement indicates that when Natives are to be relocated, they should be relocated in groups to maintain kinship and support system. The revised statements indicate that some Navajos would have preferred to be relocated as a family group instead of as a single family if given the opportunity. A rather positive statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Raw Statements</th>
<th>Revised Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Being able to get a home site lease without prejudice at an enrolled or adopted chapter through an expedited pace is important and desirable.</td>
<td>Having a home site lease on the Navajo Nation should be available and secured quickly without discrimination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The raw statement suggests it can be difficult to get a home site lease when it should not be. The revised statement suggests that a home site lease should be acquired without any difficulty. A rather negative statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Raw Statements</th>
<th>Revised Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I feel trapped living in town/city with nowhere to go to on the</td>
<td>I feel trapped living in town/city without</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The raw statement indicates that when you are forcibly relocated, it’s difficult to return to the Navajo reservation when you don’t have a place to return to. The revised statement indicates that it is difficult to return to reservation when you have no home or land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Raw Material or Statements</th>
<th>Revised Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Navajo men and women, who have relocated are still fighting relocation off HPL, frequently refer to the places where their umbilical cords are buried as “home.” Trudelle Schwarz. Unraveling the Anchoring Cord. Page 43.</td>
<td>I refer to the place where my umbilical cord is buried as “home.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>“Land has more value than other types of wealth. We need land for our own children and their children’s children. Home is land.” Scudders pg. 157 - 57</td>
<td>Securing land for a home to pass to our children is more valuable than other types of wealth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Navajo culture, where the umbilical cord is buried is home. The revised statement reflects the raw statement.</td>
<td>The raw statement indicate that land is valuable than other types of wealth; land to Navajo is considered their mother. The revised statement indicates that land of more valuable than other types of wealth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CEREMONIAL CYCLE – TRADITIONS / CULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Raw Material or Statements</th>
<th>Revised Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>When I want a ceremony done, I have no hogan to have one. UNK</td>
<td>Having a family hogan or access to a hogan is important for ceremonies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“[Education/employment] has been interrupted…for ceremonial purposes, or consultation with the medicine man.”</td>
<td>It is difficult to access medicine people to have a ceremony performed in town/city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Powwow bears some resemblance to other suburban social clubs, but it is the expression of a genuine feeling of a duty to perpetuate certain customs, and serves as an outlet for creative abilities, and make clear both to outsiders and to the Indian organizations the Indian descent of its members.”</td>
<td>To maintain cultural expression, I attend pow-wows in the city/town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is important to remain in the four sacred mountains.</td>
<td>I want to return and remain within the four sacred mountains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>“It is widely said that Navajos, especially the young people, are no longer being taught their culture or being given adequate opportunities to learn its teachings, values, and stories. In the past – certainly in their grandparents’ generation – such knowledge was routinely transmitted as part of a family’s daily and seasonal round.” House, Deborah. Pg. xix</td>
<td>There are no adequate opportunities to learn teachings, values, and stories as part of a family daily and seasonal event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There were songs, prayers, and other lessons that accompanied sheepherding and gardening, weaving and basket making, bearing and tending children, greeting and interacting with others.</td>
<td>Songs and prayers accompanied with livestock and farming is not being taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kinaalda is an important coming-of-age ritual for young women.</td>
<td>Kinaalda, a coming of age ceremony is important within my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We need a hogan to have signing ceremonies in—near this compound so we can have a traditional ceremony. I was already told by the medicine man he can’t perform in a square house. Scudders. Pg. 158</td>
<td>A Hogan is important to have singing ceremonies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Forced relocation of the people from Black Mesa has resulted in the inability to practice traditional religion, which is based on a spiritual relationship with ancestral lands;</td>
<td>Relocation has resulted in the inability to practice traditional religion based on a spiritual relationship with my ancestral lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>We sustained ourselves by harvesting our crops every year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Our life before relocation was like a ceremony by taking care of our livestock, such as sheep, horses and cattle on a daily basis to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Every year, we would make special trips to collect medicinal plants for our livestock.

We no longer visit sacred sites located on our customary lands.

The Navajo, particularly the women, are “sheep-minded”...lambing season requires a night vigil when one must make sure the newly born lambs get to suckle properly and do not freeze.

On a seasonal basis, we harvested medicinal and tobacco plants for ceremonies and wellbeing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Material or Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SACRED HISTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Material or Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 7.7

#### Q-Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly not Applies</td>
<td>Moderately not Applies</td>
<td>Somewhat not Applies</td>
<td>Slightly not Applies</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Slightly Applies</td>
<td>Somewhat Applies</td>
<td>Moderately Applies</td>
<td>Strongly Applies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... (Table continues)
2nd Generation Navajo Relocatees

Did you relocate with your parents when you were 18 years or younger to a town/city off the Navajo Nation due to the Navajo Hopi Indian Land Settlement Act 1974?

I am seeking to document the perspectives and challenges that you experienced as a result of compulsory relocation from Hopi Partitioned Lands.

All information will be kept strictly confidential.

To participate in this University of Arizona research project, please contact:

Aresta La Russo (Navajo)  
602-616-9678 / alarusso@email.arizona.edu

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The University of Arizona reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.
APPENDIX 7.9

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The University of Arizona reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

Q-Study Recruitment Script for Email and Telephone

Resulting from Announcements or Snowball Method

Dear participants name (email) OR Hello. Thank you for calling (telephone)

Hello. Thank you for your interest in being a participant in the study.

My name is Aresta La Russo, and I am a citizen of the Navajo Nation. I am conducting a study on second generation Navajo relocatees living in metropolitan Phoenix, Flagstaff or Winslow.

The purpose of my study is to document perspectives, experiences, and challenges of second generation Navajo relocatees as adults living off the Navajo Nation due to forced relocation. Currently, there is no significant data about this population base of Navajo relocatees. The data will add to the research, inform public officials, educate the public, and could lead to improved policies.

You have the option to participate in-person or online, you can call or email me to further explain the Q-method study.

Before we proceed, I have to ask you a question to make sure you are able to participate for result purposes.

Screening questions for Q-method:

1. Did you relocate with your parents as a minor to a town / city due to the Navajo Hopi Indian Relocation Act?
   a. No (they do not participate)
   b. Yes (they proceed)

To proceed, the potential participant will advise me their preference of an in-person meeting or on-line Q-Flash survey.

- At an in-person meeting: I will provide instructions on how to take the Q-Study survey. I will proceed to read the consent form and instruct the participant to sign the consent form to complete the Q-Study survey.
- If the participant is interested in doing online Q-Flash survey, I will provide them the link. I will advise them to follow the instructions online and to click on the appropriate icon to provide consent to proceed with the Q-Study survey.

My contact information is 602-616-9678 or alarusso@email.arizona.edu. I look forward to speaking with you.
Q-Sort Instructions

You will have the following materials:
1. A deck of 40 numbered cards from 1-40.
2. A grid sheet with a scale ranging from 1 (strongly not applies) to 9 (strongly applies).
3. A recording sheet.

To arrange the set of statements, follow the three steps

STEP ONE: Each of the 40 cards has a statement written on it which describes various opinions or perspectives of relocation issues. The cards are presented to you in random order. Please read all the statements and divide them into three groups or deck.

1. First deck – statements which apply to you.
2. Second deck – statements which do not apply to you.
3. Third deck – statements which you are neutral or unsure about.

STEP TWO: The scale ranges from -4 to +4. Arrange the cards on the scale as indicated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Does Not Applies to Does Not Applies</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Applies to Strongly Applies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 cards</td>
<td>1 5 cards</td>
<td>1 6 cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 3 cards</td>
<td>3 6 cards</td>
<td>2 7 cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 5 cards</td>
<td>4 8 cards</td>
<td>3 9 cards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DECK of Does Not Applies Statements is put in these boxes. DECK of Neutral Statements is put in these boxes.

STEP THREE: To complete the card arrangement you will use all 40 cards.

1. 1st deck – Applies to Strongly Applies:
   a. Once again read through the 16 cards in the 1st deck and sort out according to the scale on the grid from 1 to 4:
      - 6 (6 cards), 7 (5 cards), 8 (3 cards), 9 (2 cards).

2. 2nd deck - Strongly disagree to disagree:
   a. Once again read through the 16 cards in the 2nd deck and sort out according to the scale on the grid from 6 to 9:
      - 1 (2 cards), 3 (3 cards), 3 (5 cards), 4 (6 cards).

3. 3rd deck - Neutral or no opinion:
   a. Once again read through the 8 cards in the 3rd deck and sort out in the neutral or 5 column.

Please follow the procedure until all cards have been placed on the grid. When you have placed all the cards on the grid sheet and are satisfied with the arrangement, record your arrangement of the cards by recording the number of the statement card on the recording grid sheet.

You may change or rearrange the card; however, the number of cards required on the grid sheet must be retained. If you decide to removes a statement card, another statement card must replace it. On the back of every statement card is a number for recording purposes.
APPENDIX 7.11

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The University of Arizona reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

In-Depth Interview Recruitment Script

ME (to Q-Study participant): Would you like to continue your participation by participating in an in-depth interview? The in-depth interview will correlate with the Q-sort results.

POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS: Yes (indicating they are interested)

ME: I will have to ask you three questions.

1. Did you relocate with your parents to a town / city with your parents?
2. Did you apply for home replacement benefits?
3. Were you denied home replacement benefits?

If they answered yes to all three questions, they can participate.

The participant and I will set a date, time and location to do the interview.

The interview will take from 60 minutes to 90 minutes. A follow up interview may be required. I will have the participant sign the consent form at the time of the interview.

Interview questions:

Semi-Structured Questionnaires

1. Tell me about your relocation experience as a result of P.L. 93-531?

2. What was your families experience with relocation?

3. Tell me about your experience about living on the Navajo Nation before relocation?

4. Can you tell me about your experience of living away from the Navajo Nation after relocation?

5. Did you move to an urban area as a result of relocation?

6. What were some of the difficulties about living in an urban setting?

7. Do you participate in any cultural event in the urban area?

8. When you applied for relocation benefits, what were your thoughts or reaction when you were denied?

9. Do you want to possibly return to the Navajo Nation?
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