University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

GSE Publications

Graduate School of Education

1-1-1996

Language Revitalisation in the Andes: Can the Schools Reverse Language Shift?

Nancy H. Hornberger
University of Pennsylvania, nancyh@gse.upenn.edu

Kendall A. King
University of Pennsylvania, AKK25@georgetown.edu

Reprinted from *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Volume 17, Issue 6, 1996, pages 427-441.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/61
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Language Revitalisation in the Andes: Can the Schools Reverse Language Shift?

Abstract
Quechua, often known as the language of the Incas, remains today a vital language with over 10 million speakers in several Andean republics. Nevertheless, census records and sociolinguistic studies document a continuous cross-generational shift from Quechua monolingualism to Spanish monolingualism in the latter half of the twentieth century, at both individual and community levels. An increasing awareness of the potential threat to the language has led to a variety of new initiatives for Quechua revitalization in the 1990s, initiatives which go beyond earlier experimental bilingual education projects designed primarily to provide mother tongue literacy instruction to indigenous children (in transitional or maintenance programs) to larger or more rooted efforts to extend indigenous language and literacy instruction to new speakers as well. Drawing on documents, interviews, and on-site participant observation, this paper will review and comment on two recent such initiatives: Bolivia's 1994 national educational reform incorporating the provision of bilingual intercultural education on a national scale; and a community-based effort to incorporate Quichua as a second language instruction in a school of the Ecuadorian highlands.

Disciplines
Latin American Languages and Societies

Comments
Reprinted from *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Volume 17, Issue 6, 1996, pages 427-441.

This journal article is available at ScholarlyCommons: http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/61

Language Revitalisation in the Andes: Can the Schools Reverse Language Shift?

Nancy H. Hornberger and Kendall A. King
Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 3700 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6216, USA

Quechua, often known as the language of the Incas, remains today a vital language with over 10 million speakers in several Andean republics. Nevertheless, census records and sociolinguistic studies document a continuous cross-generational shift from Quechua monolingualism to Spanish monolingualism in the latter half of the twentieth century, at both individual and community levels. An increasing awareness of the potential threat to the language has led to a variety of new initiatives for Quechua revitalisation in the 1990s, initiatives which go beyond earlier experimental bilingual education projects designed primarily to provide mother tongue literacy instruction to indigenous children (in transitional or maintenance programs) to larger or more rooted efforts to extend indigenous language and literacy instruction to new speakers as well. Drawing on documents, interviews, and on-site participant observation, this paper will review and comment on two recent such initiatives: Bolivia's 1994 national educational reform incorporating the provision of bilingual intercultural education on a national scale; and a community-based effort to incorporate Quichua as a second language instruction in a school of the Ecuadorian highlands.

Introduction

Quechua, often known as the language of the Incas, remains today a vital language with over 10 million speakers in several Andean republics — indeed it is the largest indigenous language in the Americas. Nevertheless, it has been an oppressed language throughout the five centuries since the Spanish arrived in the New World. Whether enlightened or reactionary in orientation (Mannheim, 1984), assimilationism has been the dominant political ideology in the Andes and patterns of language use have reflected that ideology: census records and sociolinguistic studies document that high rates of Quechua-Spanish bilingualism only mask a continuous cross-generational shift from Quechua monolingualism to Spanish monolingualism, at both individual and community levels.

An increasing awareness among Quechua speakers and Quechua advocates of the potential threat to the long-term existence of the language and of the continuing oppression of Quechua speakers has led to a variety of new initiatives for Quechua revitalisation in the 1990s (cf. von Gleich, 1994). In the educational sphere, such efforts go beyond earlier experimental bilingual education projects that were designed primarily to provide mother tongue instruction to indigenous children (in transitional or maintenance programs) to larger or more rooted efforts to extend indigenous language instruction to new speakers as well.

Drawing on documents, interviews, and on-site participant observation, this paper will review two of the recent initiatives: Bolivia's 1994 national educational reform incorporating the provision of bilingual intercultural education on a

0143-4632/96/06 0427-15 $10.00/0 © 1996 N.H. Hornberger & K.A. King

national scale; and a community-based effort to incorporate Quichua as a second language instruction in a school of the Ecuadorian highlands. Both cases will be analysed with the purpose of illuminating the question of whether (and how) schools can act as agents for reversing language shift. As such, this paper can be seen as an extension of, and complement to, Hornberger's earlier consideration of whether Peru's rural schools could serve as agents of Quechua language maintenance (1989).

Language maintenance, language revival, language revitalisation, and reversal of language shift involve similar, and to some extent, overlapping processes. However, they also differ in their starting points, goals, and means of attainment. Although we believe many of the factors that are favourable to each are shared, it seems important to define and clarify what the four processes entail. Language maintenance, stated simply, occurs when 'the community collectively decides to continue using the language or languages it has traditionally used' (Fasold, 1984: 189). Different from both language maintenance and language revival, which applies to contexts where the language is no longer spoken (Dorian, 1994), revitalisation involves efforts to impart new vigour in a language already in use through increasing the language's domains, often entailing increased institutional power (Paulston, 1994). Not surprisingly, 'literacy and education become crucial factors in the mechanism for revitalisation' (1994: 99). Similar to revitalisation, the reversal of language shift entails altering trends leading towards individual or community language loss and can be defined as an 'increase in usage of a language by individual speakers, (however) not necessarily through the expansion of domains' (1994: 106). In this paper, we use the terms language revitalisation and reversing language shift nearly interchangeably, since the particular efforts we describe seek to accomplish both.

The two cases considered here differ significantly: while the Bolivian case is a national level policy study, the Ecuadorian one focuses on the community level; and while the data on the Ecuadorian case was gathered through long-term ethnographic fieldwork, information on the Bolivian reform was collected primarily through the researcher's position as an outside consultant. Both initiatives, however, do hold the same language orientation, or 'complex of dispositions {largely unconscious and pre-rational} toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society' (Ruiz, 1984: 16). Both the national policy planners in Bolivia and the community leaders and teachers of Lagunas, Ecuador, hold a language as resource orientation. Rather than viewing language as a problem, or a right, language is understood in these cases as a resource for not only the speakers, but for the society as a whole, and the languages are recognised for 'the fact that they are exhaustible not by use, but by lack of use' (Hornberger, 1994b: 83).

Language Revitalisation and Quichua Instruction in a Community of Saraguro, Ecuador

The findings reported here are derived from King's year long ethnographic study in two indigenous communities of the southern Ecuadorian Andes. That larger study documents programs to teach Quichua (the Ecuadorian variety of Quechua) as a second language in the school, describes home and community

usages of Spanish and Quichua, and analyses the support provided for Quichua revitalisation efforts. Here, we provide an overview and brief analysis of language pedagogies, usages, and attitudes in one of the communities studied.

Background

With a population of 11,226,000 and a land area of 270,670 km^2, Ecuador is one of the smaller Andean republics (Inter-American Development Bank, 1994). Yet with three distinct eco-systems occupied by ten different indigenous nations, Ecuador is also among the most ecologically, culturally and linguistically diverse nations of South America. Indigenous people constitute between 20% and 45% of the Ecuadorian population (von Gleich, 1994; Macas, 1993). Of the ten indigenous nations, the Quichua-speaking nation is by far the largest, with over two million members.

Despite such diversity, Ecuadorian indigenous groups have been unusually successful in effectively organising themselves for the attainment of a range of collective goals. Perhaps most important of these goals has been the advancement of indigenous bilingual education. Developments in this area have been characterised by two features: 'the consolidation of the indigenous movement and the creation of state responses {to indigenous demands} for bilingual education' (Moya, 1991: 7).

As environmentally devastating oil exploration and extraction ravaged parts of the Ecuadorian Amazon in the early seventies, Amazonian indigenous groups began to form ethnically-based organisations to defend their habitats. Following the Amazonian example and motivated by their own needs, indigenous groups from other regions began to organise politically in the seventies and eighties. Their concerns were primarily the protection and control of natural resources, and the recognition of political and cultural rights. Organisational and consciousness-raising efforts culminated in 1986 when the *Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de Ecuador* 'Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador' (*CONAIE*) was established and legally recognised as the representative and advocacy body for all indigenous persons in the country.

As organisation across the indigenous sector increased, so did indigenous peoples' demands for linguistically appropriate and culturally relevant education for their children. In response to political pressure, numerous national policy changes during the eighties allowed for the development of indigenous bilingual education. In 1980 the state accepted proposals from non-governmental organisations for indigenous language education projects (Yáñez Cossío, 1991); in 1981 the state made official bilingual intercultural education in schools which predominantly served indigenous language speakers (von Gleich, 1994); and in 1983, Article 27 was added to the constitution providing for 'the use of native languages as first languages of education and the use of Spanish as a second language or language of intercultural communication' in predominantly indigenous areas (Yáñez Cossío, 1991: 58). As a result of these significant legal reforms, several large-scale experimental programs were implemented, such as the Ministry of Education's 'Macac' Education Model and the German-funded *Proyecto de Educación Bilingüe Intercultural* 'Intercultural Bilingual Education Project'.

Perhaps the most significant change in government policy was the establishment of the *Dirección Nacional de Educación Indígena Intercultural Bilingüe* 'Department for Indigenous Intercultural Bilingual Education' (*DINEIIB*) in 1988. Composed of members of the Ministry of Education and Culture as well as *CONAIE* representatives, *DINEIIB* was created to administer the education system in areas in which the population is more than half indigenous. *DINEIIB* was charged with guaranteeing the unity, quality, and efficiency of indigenous education throughout Ecuador (*DINEIIB*, 1991). This meant that indigenous schools would be directly under indigenous leadership and marked the 'first time in the educational history of Latin America that a Hispanic government allowed and supported the establishment of an independent educational administration for the indigenous populations, transferring the right to develop culturally appropriate curricula and independent teacher-training and selection methods in cooperation with the Indian communities' (von Gleich, 1994: 96). It was within this 'very positive climate' (1994: 96) that the Lagunas revitalisation program developed; indeed, without the significant changes described above, its conception would have been unlikely, and its implementation perhaps impossible.

The site

Lagunas is one of roughly 60 communities of the southern highlands and south-east lowlands that are occupied by an indigenous group known as the Saraguros. Numbering approximately 20,000, the Saraguros, while part of the Quechua nation, are an ethnically distinct group, nationally and locally identifiable as such by their clothing and silver jewellery (Belote, 1984). The residents of the community of Lagunas were some of the earlier Saraguros to engage in extended contact with the non-indigenous world, due to a large extent to the community's location adjacent to the Pan American highway and just above the town of Saraguro, the largest commercial centre of the region. Lagunas was one of the first communities to send its children to primary and secondary school in large numbers and one of the first to have its members go on to higher education at the nation's larger cities. There are a number of professionals in the community and the residents are viewed by many in the region as relatively well-off and well-educated.

Not coincidentally, the Saraguros of Lagunas were also among the earliest in the region to become bilingual Quichua-Spanish and soon after Spanish-dominant. Presently the residents of Lagunas find themselves in the position of uniformly self-identifying as indigenous, yet using Spanish, the language of the Hispanic sectors, as the principal language of communication. In general, young adults are Spanish-dominant, with limited Quichua-speaking skills and partial aural comprehension. Older adults are bilingual; the very oldest among them are Quichua-dominant. The children of the community are all but monolingual Spanish-speakers, with knowledge of some basic vocabulary and simple commands in Quichua.

The school and instruction

In recent years there has been increasing concern among Lagunas community members over the linguistic situation and a growing desire to reverse the trend

towards Quichua loss. In 1986, a group of local indigenous teachers who were dissatisfied with traditional education formed schools in three communities, the second being the *Inti Raimi* school of Lagunas. One of the schools' primary goals was (and remains) to instruct Quichua and promote its usage, with the larger aim of revitalising Quichua within the community. The initiative, viewed in light of Hornberger's (1994b) integrative framework of language-planning goals, was an instance of acquisition planning with the goal of cultivating reacquisition of the language at the community level.

The *Inti Raimi* school, like the other two alternative schools in the area, is known as an 'active' school; a name derived from the pedagogical practice based on the belief that children learn best through 'hands-on' self-directed manipulation of learning materials. The teachers serve as supporters and observers, rather than directors of student activity. There are no grade levels and no examinations. Students are given both the responsibility to independently complete work in the four content areas of math, language (including Spanish and Quichua), social and natural sciences, and the liberty to decide when to do what activity and to monitor their progress in each area.

Quichua instructional activities consist of four types: basic grammar and vocabulary work with learning materials (generally word or phrase cards which students match and copy into their notebooks), conversation practice with teachers, copying and completing teacher-directed vocabulary and grammar exercises from the black-board, and the learning and practising of Quichua songs and poems. By far the most common of these is the first, with the other three only occasionally occurring.

Regarding Quichua instruction and acquisition, two aspects of the school are of concern. As has been found elsewhere (Hornberger, 1987), a relatively small portion of the school day is devoted to academic activities. Timed observations of students over the course of a typical two week period indicate that 27% of school time was devoted to academic activities in the four content areas; 25% was 'lost' due primarily to teacher or student tardiness and absenteeism; 41% of the school day was spent on extra-academic activities, the most notable of which was free play; and seven per cent of the day was dedicated to other activities such as medical check-ups.

In addition, while a small part of the students' day is devoted to Quichua activities, Spanish remains almost exclusively the language of communication within the school. Students use Spanish for both academic and non-academic talk directed at fellow students and teachers; teachers use Spanish for directives, instructional statements and questions directed at individuals and groups of students, as well as for informal, spontaneous conversations with students. However, teachers do make an effort to speak Quichua amongst themselves when students are on the school grounds. And Quichua holds a symbolic role as the language of formal greetings and good byes by both teacher and students and as the language for simple announcements such as *micunapacha* 'time to eat' and *wasimanpacha* 'time to go home'.

Perhaps the most important aspect of Quichua instruction in the school is that it is continually promoted by the teachers as both a beautiful and useful language that should and could be used among Saraguros. Children generally express

positive attitudes towards the indigenous tongue; many, however, appear for the most part to feel unable or inhibited to speak.

Language and ethnicity in the home

During formal and informal interviews community members and especially young parents express openly and frequently their beliefs in the beauty, importance, and value of Quichua. All members of the community feel that it is important for themselves and their children to remain indigenous and not adopt Hispanic clothing, lifestyles, and values. Adults in the community believe that speaking Quichua is an important, if not essential part of being indigenous and consistently express regret, sadness and embarrassment regarding their families' collective dependence upon Spanish as the principle language of communication. However, despite these sentiments, parents of Lagunas remain either unable or unwilling to speak Quichua regularly with their children.

Examination of language-use patterns in the home indicates that Spanish by far predominates in familial communication. Quichua is used amongst adults for specific and limited functions, namely for humour, for 'secret communication' of information that is deemed inappropriate for children, for intentional practice, and as overt expression of ethnicity in ritualistic practices (e.g. drinking 'toasts'). Some parents do on occasion teach Quichua to their children, primarily through concrete vocabulary instruction with elder children and Quichua language games with the younger ones. However, Spanish remains by far the more common and most basic language for communication. Parents do not attempt to naturally interact with their children in Quichua, thus making natural language acquisition impossible and limiting the children's exposure to 'lists' of basic vocabulary.

Additionally, the linguistic situation of Lagunas is considerably more complex than described above. The Quichua of the older members of the community, commonly referred to as 'authentic Quichua', while reflecting the phonological system of the region, contains many Spanish loan words and has lost some elements of its morphological structure. The Quichua which is being learned and on occasion spoken by the younger, better educated, and more politicised of Lagunas is the relatively 'pure' standardised variety, known as Unified Quichua. Agreed upon nationally by representatives of the different spoken varieties of Ecuador in 1980, Unified Quichua is used for the development of Quichua educational texts and literature. Although it has been stressed that spoken Quichua can (and should) continue to vary by region and group, there has been some controversy surrounding Unified Quichua, especially regarding spellings and lexical items in regions such as Saraguro where aspects of the local variety differ significantly from the unified.

While mutually intelligible to most, there are alternatively both clashes and gaps between the older and younger Quichua speakers in the community of Lagunas. Differences between the two varieties are accentuated in Lagunas because the children and young adults studying and learning written Unified Quichua have not mastered the phonological system nor lexical particularities of the local variety; thus, young Saraguros not only learn to *read* but to *speak* Unified Quichua. Some older members have stated that they do not like, understand, nor

wish to speak Unified Quichua, while younger members claim that 'authentic Quichua' is mixed with Spanish, and therefore, impure and lacking 'a good structure'. Hence, Lagunas finds itself in the rather odd linguistic situation of having two dialects of their 'native' language present, but Spanish still predominating, and where the oldest and youngest members may be to some extent bilingual but choose to communicate in Spanish rather than Quichua. While the existence of multiple varieties of a language in a community is a normal and, indeed, desirable phenomenon, the Lagunas situation is potentially problematic because functional distribution of the language varieties is not developing. Rather than cultivating a diglossic situation where Unified Quichua is used for literary or formal purposes while the local variety of Quichua is used for informal, ordinary communication, the introduction of Unified Quichua into the community has created (or perhaps only accentuated) generational and educational differences within the community.

Reflections on the future

The residents of the community of Lagunas hold a unique position. They have achieved a level of social and economic success within the national society which remains uncommon for Saraguros and, indeed, for many indigenous groups of Latin America. These advances allowed for Spanish acquisition, but also concomitantly hastened Quichua loss. At the same time, their success permitted high levels of educational attainment and contact with indigenous intelligentsia at the national level which were crucial in the development of a politicised and educated body of teachers and educational leaders concerned with maintenance of indigenous ethnicity and language. These individuals not only formed alternative schools but have been in part responsible for the spread of such concerns among many adults of the community. Indeed, many members expressed their beliefs in the importance of remaining and transmitting indigenous ethnicity and identity. And previous work in the region indicates that those indigenous community members who are socially and economically secure (such as those in Lagunas) are unlikely to adopt Hispanic dress, lifestyle, and values (Belote and Belote, 1987).

However, while the positive attitudes of members towards Quichua language and ethnicity and the real efforts and innovations on the part of the school staff and some parents are encouraging first steps, alone they are not and will not be sufficient to significantly alter language-use patterns in the community. More intensive efforts are needed for this, involving, for example, Quichua immersion programs in the schools and serious efforts among parents to use Quichua regularly both amongst themselves and with their children. Efforts such as these, requiring individuals to do much more than simply memorise vocabulary words or greet one another in Quichua will demand considerable commitment of time and energy; it remains to be seen whether such an investment will be made.

Implementing National Curricular Reform to Reverse Language Shift in Bolivia

The following discussion draws from Hornberger's participation as consultant to the 1994 national Bolivian Education Reform, specifically from her

involvement as: (1) one of two dozen international specialists convened in June 1995 by the Bolivian government to evaluate and refine the proposed curriculum which had been under development during the preceding year; and (2) provider of a short course in approaches to classroom observation for 300 pedagogical advisors-in-training during October 1995. In addition, we draw on documents and on Hornberger's prior experience in bilingual education in the Andes (cf. Hornberger, 1988).

Goals of the national education reform

The national Bolivian Education Reform of July 1994 envisions far-reaching institutional and curricular change with the twin goals of making Bolivian education fully intercultural and participatory (López, 1995). With more than 30 ethnolinguistic groups, of which the largest are Quechua (2.5 million), Aymara (1.6 million) and Guarani (60,000) (Albó, 1995), indigenous language speakers comprise approximately 63% of Bolivia's population, the highest percentage of any of the Andean nations (López, 1995). The Reform seeks to make Bolivian education more reflective of Bolivian society in both its long-standing linguistic and cultural diversity and its newly promoted popular participation.

The projected institutional reforms seek to guarantee transparency, democracy and accountability in the educational system through new mechanisms of decentralisation and popular participation. The educational nucleus (composed of approximately six schools each) will be the basic unit of organisation and planning.

The curricular reform pursues bilingual intercultural participatory education via a dynamically-structured curriculum consisting of competencies established at both the national and the local levels, denominated *tronco común* 'common trunk' and *ramas diversificadas* 'diversified branches' (or *ramas complementarias* 'complementary branches') respectively, and via the inclusion of instruction in and through Quechua, Aymara, Guarani (and other Bolivian indigenous languages) for both native speakers and Spanish speakers nationwide. Integral to the implementation of these curricular innovations will be new patterns of classroom organisation and interaction based on the concepts of a *pedagogía de ayuda* 'pedagogy of help' and a *pedagogía diferenciada* 'differentiated pedagogy' and including for the first time in Bolivian education such features as: ability grouping, learning modules, learning centres (including the classroom library), and cooperative learning strategies.

With respect to Hornberger's (1994b) integrative language-planning framework, the bilingual education component of this reform initiative is an instance of language-acquisition planning with the goal of cultivating reacquisition, maintenance, and/or second language acquisition of the indigenous languages, in accordance with the varying sociolinguistic characteristics across the nation and in pursuit of the recuperation and revitalisation of the indigenous languages, as well as of the improved educational achievement of all sectors of the Bolivian population. In the following sections, we will briefly touch on three aspects of the Reform which are relevant to our topic of language revitalisation and reversing language shift: modalities, teacher support network and modules.

Modalities for bilingual education

In terms of the goal of reversing language shift, the inclusion of two modalities of bilingual education is a significant feature of the Bolivian Reform. In the monolingual modality, intended primarily for the dominant Spanish-speaking population, children are taught in their Spanish mother tongue and receive instruction in (but not through) an indigenous language as subject. The monolingual modality explicitly presents the opportunity for Bolivia's bilingual education to be truly intercultural and two-way.

In the bilingual modality, directed primarily at indigenous populations, children receive instruction through the medium of both their indigenous mother tongue and Spanish L2. Underlying this bilingual modality is a basic premise of the Reform — the principle that every child should have the opportunity to learn in his or her own language.

This is not to say that every detail for implementing these principles has been worked out. There are some difficult decisions yet to be made. For example, in centres of urban migration such as El Alto, Cochabamba and Santa Cruz, there are often monolingual Quechua, Aymara and Spanish-speaking students, as well as various sorts of bilinguals, within a given educational nucleus or even school. In addition to such linguistically mixed communities, there are also communities (e.g. in northern Potosí and La Paz) undergoing shift, not just from indigenous languages to Spanish but from one indigenous language to another. The question is: in which language(s) should children in these communities be taught? In other words, although it is clear that the bilingual modality is mandated for such schools and nuclei, the choice of languages within the modality is far from clear and will necessarily be worked out on a case-by-case basis. Similarly, it remains unclear how the curriculum for mother tongue will be implemented in each modality and whether the two modalities will actually cover the diversity of cases.

Teacher support network

Crucial to the successful implementation of the Education Reform will be the participation of willing and informed teachers. The Reform has largely been formulated at top governmental levels, at the initiative of the president and vice-president and in response to popular political pressure, more so than from the teaching profession. Partially as a result, there has been some initial resistance to the Reform from teachers, perhaps exacerbated by their long-standing and pressing concerns for adequate salary and other job-related securities and benefits.

The Reform foresees the important role of teachers in the success of the large-scale curricular change envisioned and proposes an active pedagogical support network to that end. Key players in this support network will be the pedagogical advisors ('*asesores pedagógicos*') mentioned above. This new corps of educational professionals will be comprised of 500 experienced teachers drawn from across the nation who will be given special training and charged with providing support nationwide to Bolivia's in-service teachers in the implementation of the Reform.

Particularly challenging for teacher and advisor alike will be the implementa-

tion of the use of the indigenous languages in the classrooms. Importantly, the first hour of each morning of the pedagogical advisors' seven-month training course was dedicated to classes in the indigenous languages. These classes were geared toward both raising the pedagogical advisors' awareness about the languages and providing them with the necessary technical skills (e.g. grammar, writing) to teach and use them in their work with teachers in the schools. For example, in the Cochabamba course, there were classes in Quechua, Aymara and Guarani for those who already speak the languages to some degree, a beginning Quechua class, a small group of Chiquitano speakers working together on developing materials for Chiquitano instruction, and one Guarayo speaker who had set himself the task of writing a Guarayo dictionary.

The teachers for these classes were drawn from the ranks of the pedagogical advisors themselves, amongst whom exists a growing expertise on indigenous languages. The two teachers of the more advanced Quechua class were graduates of the applied linguistics program at the Universidad Nacional del Altiplano in Puno, Peru, a graduate program founded in 1985 and to date providing dozens of native speakers of Quechua, Aymara, Guarani, and other indigenous languages with training in (among other areas of specialised knowledge) the grammar and writing of their own languages.

In one class session of the beginner Quechua group, the teacher presented present, past, and future tense verb conjugations in both oral and written form and had the students practice them together in groups of four; in a class session of the more advanced group, the two teachers helped students arrive inductively at the forms for possessive nominal inflection and present tense verb conjugation. Of particular interest in this latter class were the teachers' use of Quechua more than Spanish as medium of instruction (as well as subject), including the use of Quechua terms to designate grammatical categories; and the many spontaneous questions and contributions from the students, which revealed a reflective and wide-ranging process of inquiry into their own language.

The indigenous language classes provide grounds for optimism with regard to reversing language shift in at least two respects. First, the enthusiastic participation of the pedagogical advisors suggests a genuine eagerness to deepen their knowledge of the language and thereby a likelihood that their use of the language, in both oral and written forms, will only continue to expand. Second, the very existence of such classes, and the availability of personnel to teach them, is evidence of the progress already made in the last decade in expanding the knowledge and use of these languages in new, written domains.

Yet, there was also evidence of ongoing challenges. In the advanced Quechua class, there were occasional disagreements between teacher and student as to points of grammar or spelling, disagreements reflecting for the most part unresolved aspects in the process of Quechua standardisation. Further, once the pedagogical advisors are versed in these indigenous language skills, there still remains the task of ensuring that classroom teachers are equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to teach and use the indigenous languages.

Modules

A third set of challenges surrounding the implementation of the indigenous

languages as medium and subject of instruction in Bolivia's schools is the development of the learning modules for the indigenous languages. The learning modules constitute the new unit of learning and teaching for all areas of the curriculum and are one of the key pieces of Bolivia's curricular Reform. Modules for the teaching of Quechua, Aymara, Guarani, and Spanish L2 are currently under development (8 modules for each language for the first cycle — i.e. the first three years of primary education).

The modules for the indigenous languages are being developed by native-speakers of the languages. As such, they have the potential to contribute doubly to reversing language shift — by providing a vehicle for native authorship as well as for children's learning. Yet, some have also expressed concern that the specialists developing the language modules have limited or no training in pedagogy or linguistics, thus perhaps limiting the quality and ultimate effectiveness of the modules in teaching the languages.

Challenges and potential for the future

Here we have touched on three aspects of Bolivia's Education Reform — modalities, teacher support and modules, each representing a concrete means for fully incorporating Bolivia's indigenous languages into Bolivian education and each also presenting challenges yet to be resolved. In addition, there are the many challenges of the larger Reform itself — to be launched in all its complexity in February 1996 in approximately a third of Bolivia's schools. The embedding of the revitalisation of indigenous languages in such a large and complex undertaking as is the Education Reform raises the possibility that attention to the language-specific objectives will be lost in the larger effort. And of course there is the ever-present possibility that, under the weight of trying to accomplish too much too fast, the larger effort itself will collapse, taking the embedded language revitalisation effort down along with it.

Yet, there are at the same time considerable grounds for optimism with regard to the potential for Bolivia's Education Reform to make headway in revitalising Bolivia's indigenous languages. Not least among these is the very same embedding of language objectives in the larger Reform that is cause for concern; as an integral part of the goal of reforming Bolivia's education, the goal of revitalising Bolivia's indigenous languages gains a wider audience and arena than it might otherwise have had. In addition, with respect to the larger Reform effort, the allocation of substantial national and international resources, the absolute commitment at the highest levels of government, and the remarkable progress made thus far offer hope even in the face of the many challenges.

Conclusion

Returning to our primary concern, it is now appropriate to ask what insight these two cases can provide regarding whether and how the schools might serve as agents for reversing language shift. Despite differences in the magnitude and scope of the two initiatives, they hold in common critical features which inform our question; it is to them that we now turn. In our discussion, we take into account various factors identified in the literature as favourable or unfavourable to language maintenance and reversing language shift.

Several aspects of the Bolivian and Ecuadorian initiatives suggest an affirmative response to the question at hand. First, in both cases, the instruction and use of indigenous tongues in the schools alters the functional allocation of the languages, bringing the indigenous tongues into a new, official, and previously all Spanish domain. (Kloss, 1966 includes official and school affiliation as favourable to language maintenance.) Furthermore, both initiatives explicitly extend the use of the indigenous languages in the schools beyond the mother tongue speakers of the languages, seeking to cultivate reacquisition and second language acquisition in addition to maintenance of the languages.

Second, and closely related to the new functional allocations of the indigenous languages, is the accompanying, increased status associated with these domains. As they are brought into government-sponsored and official realms, the languages take on the higher status associated with being official. Quichua's symbolic roles and the positive attitudes associated with Quichua are indicators of this increased status in the Lagunas case, as is the wholesale commitment to use and instruction of indigenous languages in education on a national scale in the Bolivian case. The use of the indigenous languages in school contradicts the all too common and persistent notions that indigenous languages are incomplete, ungrammatical, or not appropriate for abstract or academic expression. One potential impact of usage in a new domain is that the stigmatisation of the native tongues will decrease, ultimately a powerful motivation in reversing language shift towards Spanish. (Fishman, 1966 cites prestige as a factor contributing to language maintenance.)

Third, the impact the initiatives have in promoting standardisation and unification of the varieties must be seen as a positive factor in language revitalisation. The Unified Quichua of Ecuador and the nationally standardised varieties of the indigenous languages in Bolivia, while agreed upon officially by corpus planners, are still in the process of being disseminated and negotiated among the speakers. The acceptance and use of a unified variety for inter-regional and inter-group communication is favourable for language maintenance as well as reversing language shift. (Ferguson, 1968 and Haugen, 1972 posit and describe the role of standardisation in language development.)

And finally, we believe that the expansion and enrichment of native language literacies also bodes well for language revitalisation. Several of the factors Bendor-Samuel (1990) identifies as favourable for the sustainability of indigenous literacy initiatives appear to be present in the Ecuadorian and Bolivian cases described here, in particular: a relatively straightforward phonological system, a script that is easy to read, large numbers and relative cohesion of speakers, adequate language studies and publications, government approval of and support for the program, mother tongue speakers sharing responsibility for the program, and, to some degree at least, a well-rounded and well-implemented program. While neither the sustainability of indigenous literacies nor the direct correlation of indigenous literacy development to language maintenance or revitalisation can necessarily be taken for granted, in this case as in other cases of native literacies, much confidence is placed and energy invested in literacy as a means of preserving and extending the language (cf. Hornberger, 1994a; 1996).

In sum, then, the instruction and use of unified native languages and

standardised native language literacies, the introduction of the tongues into a new linguistic domain and to new speakers, and the associated increased status of the language all suggest that the initiatives may very well serve to revitalise the threatened languages. Yet, while the above all augur well for the possibility of the school's serving as an instrument of reversing language shift, it would be foolish not to recognise that there are also indications which temper enthusiasm and are cause for scepticism.

Foremost amongst the negatives, we must acknowledge that there is a limit to the amount of linguistic impact that the school can have. Hornberger's earlier consideration of whether Peru's rural schools could serve as agents of Quechua language maintenance clearly pointed to the importance of factors beyond the school, including the allocation of resources

> to counter the decreasing isolation of Quechua speakers by promoting an increasing range of roles and domains for Quechua and Spanish in all sectors of the society; and to improve Quechua speakers' status by promoting opportunities for social mobility and advancement regardless of language spoken. If community members could be convinced … that the Quechua language was being promoted through policy and through the primary reward systems, they might accept bilingual education in their schools … Under those conditions, the schools would be able to act effectively as agents for Quechua language maintenance.' (1989: 157)

We take these same conditions — increased roles and domains for Quechua language use, improved social mobility for Quechua speakers, and acceptance of the use of Quechua in the schools by Quechua speakers, to be prerequisites for Ecuadorian and Bolivian (and Peruvian) schools to serve as agents for reversing Quechua language shift. In all three respects, and in all three countries, there is some distance still to go in achieving these conditions.

Yet there is also more involved, particularly when it comes to moving beyond maintaining a language to reversing language shift. Fishman (1991) stresses that the criterion for evaluating any effort to reverse language shift must be to what extent it serves to reinforce/reinstate the threatened language as the tongue of inter-generational transmission. 'He logically locates the key to minority-language preservation in the intergenerational transmission of the language in the home by families, not in government policies and laws', (Reyhner and Tennant, 1995: 283), nor, we might add, in the larger societal and institutional domains.

Any school based initiative, therefore, must be evaluated in the light of the criterion of intergenerational transmission. Experience has taught us that the duty and responsibility of reversing the language must not be left solely upon the shoulders of the school. In the Lagunas case, more is needed than giving an occasional pep-talk to parents at school meetings about the importance of using Quichua with their children. In Bolivia, the extent to which the national attention given to the indigenous languages can serve to reinforce indigenous language use in the home and other domains beyond the school will be crucial.

Also worthy of consideration in evaluating the potential of school-based initiatives in reversing language shift are the inevitable changes in the traditional language corpus that ensue when the language is used in new domains and for

new functions. In both the Ecuadorian and Bolivian cases compromises were and are being made regarding the corpus of the languages. As mentioned in discussion of the Lagunas case, this has resulted in some conflict within the community regarding the variety appropriate for inter-personal communication; in Bolivia, too, we saw that, as in the example of the pedagogical advisors' advanced Quechua class, the process of standardisation of the indigenous languages is ongoing and has the potential to leave some speakers in its wake.

Finally, it cannot be emphasised enough that these initiatives entail using traditional languages in non-traditional ways. Moving native language instruction and acquisition out of the home and family domain necessarily alters the discourse patterns in which the languages were traditionally embedded and demands that they be used and knowledge of them be displayed in new and non-traditional ways.

It must be recognised that it is paradoxical in some way for educational and language/literacy planners to attempt to instruct and promote in an official institution what is inherently home-and-family based. We believe this is not so problematic as to suggest that the schools are not appropriate sites for native language use and instruction; however, it should be acknowledged that such school-based initiatives crucially rely on surrounding and supporting community initiatives, and therefore on integral participatory and decision-making roles for the speakers of the languages involved. Further, when we consider that reversing language shift entails altering not only the traditional language corpus but also how it is traditionally used, both at the micro level in terms of inter-personal discourse patterns, and at the macro level of societal distribution, the crucial importance of the involvement of speakers of the language becomes even more apparent. In a very real sense, revitalisation initiatives such as these are not so much about bringing a language back; but rather, bringing it forward;[1] who better or more qualified to guide that process than the speakers of the language, who must and will be the ones taking it into the future?

Note

1. This paper is a revised version of our paper presented at the session entitled 'Bringing the Language Forward: Language and Cultural Revitalisation Efforts', at the Annual Meetings of the American Anthropological Association in Washington DC, November 1995. We borrow the phrase, 'bringing the language forward' from that session title, with many thanks to session organisers Gisela Ernst and Rosemary Henze for the phrase and for the session.

References

Albó, X. (1995) Educar para una Bolivia plurilingüe. *Cuarto Intermedio* 35, 3–37.

Belote, J. (1984) Changing adaptive strategies among the Saraguros of southern Ecuador. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Belote, L. and Belote, J. (1987) Drain from the bottom: Individual ethnic identity change in southern Ecuador. *Social Forces* 63 (1), 25–50.

Bendor-Samuel, D. (1990) Factors affecting the successful development of spoken languages into written ones. In M.A.K. Halliday, J. Gibbons, and H. Nicholas (eds) *Learning, Keeping and Using Language* (Vol.2) (pp. 115–29). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Dirección Nacional de Educación Intercultural Indígena Bilingüe (DINEIIB) (1991) La educación intercultural bilingüe en el Ecuador. *Pueblos Indígenas y Educación* 17, 31–67.

Dorian, N. (1994) Purism vs. compromise in language revitalisation and language revival. *Language in Society* 23 (4), 479–494.
Fasold, R. (1984) *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Ferguson, C.A. (1968) Language development. In J. Fishman, C.A. Ferguson, and J. Das Gupta (eds) *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (pp. 27–35). New York: Wiley & Sons.
Fishman, J. (1966) *Language Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother-Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups*. The Hague: Mouton.
— (1991) *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Haugen E. (1972) Dialect, language and nation. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds) *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 97–111). New York: Penguin.
Hornberger, N.H. (1987) Schooltime, classtime, and academic learning time in rural highland Puno, Peru. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 16 (2), 205–26.
— (1988) *Bilingual Education and Language Maintenance: A Southern Peruvian Quechua Case*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
— (1989) Can Peru's rural schools be agents for Quechua language maintenance? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 10 (2), 145–59.
— (1994a) Continua of biliteracy: Quechua literacy and empowerment in Peru. In L. Verhoeven (ed.) *Functional Literacy: Theoretical Issues and Educational Implications* (pp. 237–56). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
— (1994b) Literacy and language planning. *Language and Education* 8 (1&2), 75–86.
— (ed.) (1996) *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom Up*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Inter-American Development Bank (1994) *Executive Summary: Basic Socio-Economic Data*. World Wide Web page (iadb6000.iadb.org.).
Kloss, H. (1966) German-American language maintenance efforts. In J. Fishman (ed.) *Language Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother-Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups*. The Hague: Mouton.
López, L. E. (1995) *La Educación en Areas Indígenas de América Latina: Apreciaciones Comparativas desde la Educación Bilingüe Intercultural*. Guatemala: Centro de Estudios de la Cultura Maya.
Macas, L. (1993) Tenemos alma desde 1637. In D. Cornejo Menecho (ed.) *Los Indios y el Estado-Pais* (pp. 111–34). Quito: Abya-Yala.
Mannheim, B. (1984) Una nación acorralada: Southern Peruvian Quechua language planning and politics in historical perspective. *Language in Society* 13(3), 291–309.
Moya, R. (1991) Un decenio de educación bilingüe y participación indígena: Ecuador. *Pueblos Indígenas y Educación* 17, 7–29.
Paulston, C.B. (1994) *Linguistic Minorities in Multilingual Settings: Implications for Language Policies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Reyhner, J. and Tennant, E. (1995) Maintaining and renewing native languages. *Bilingual Research Journal* 19 (2), 279–304.
Ruiz, R. (1984) Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal* 8 (2), 15–34.
von Gleich, U. (1994) Language spread policy: The case of Quechua in the Andean republics of Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 107, 77–113.
Yáñez Cossío, C. (1991) The implementation of language policy: The case of Ecuador. *International Review of Education* 37 (1), 53–66.