



Spring 1986

Should Quechua Be Used in Puno's Rural Schools?

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

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/wpel>

 Part of the [Anthropological Linguistics and Sociolinguistics Commons](#), and the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hornberger, N. H. (1986). Should Quechua Be Used in Puno's Rural Schools?. 2 (1), Retrieved from <https://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol2/iss1/2>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol2/iss1/2>
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Should Quechua Be Used in Puno's Rural Schools?

Abstract

This paper speculates on the possibilities for planning for language maintenance in one particular case. It considers the pros and cons of using Quechua in schools serving Quechua-speaking communities in rural highland Puno, Peru, from the point of view of its bearing on Quechua language maintenance.

The paper is based on a two-year ethnographic sociolinguistic study in two communities of Puno. The study compared uses of Quechua and Spanish in the communities and their schools, one of which participated in a bilingual education project. It also compared attitudes of community members toward the two languages. The paper draws from the findings of the research in discussing two questions:

1. Can language maintenance be planned?; and
2. Can schools be agents for language maintenance?

SHOULD QUECHUA BE USED IN PUNO'S RURAL SCHOOLS?

Nancy Hornberger

University of Pennsylvania

This paper speculates on the possibilities for planning for language maintenance in one particular case. It considers the pros and cons of using Quechua in schools serving Quechua-speaking communities in rural highland Puno, Peru, from the point of view of its bearing on Quechua language maintenance.

The paper is based on a two-year ethnographic sociolinguistic study in two communities of Puno.¹ The study compared uses of Quechua and Spanish in the communities and their schools, one of which participated in a bilingual education project. It also compared attitudes of community members toward the two languages. The paper draws from the findings of the research in discussing two questions:

1. Can language maintenance be planned?; and
2. Can schools be agents for language maintenance?

Planning for Language Maintenance

Elsewhere (Hornberger 1985: 435-489) I discuss a number of extra-linguistic factors involved in language maintenance/retention² as they relate to the case of Quechua in Puno and conclude that the net effect of these factors as they exist now is neither strongly favorable nor strongly unfavorable for the maintenance of the Quechua language. What would be required for the balance to be tipped in favor of Quechua language maintenance?

While in the past conditions have been more favorable for Quechua maintenance, they are becoming less so. Regardless of whose language maintenance/language shift terminology we use, the three principal factors involved in the unfavorable side of the prognosis for Quechua language maintenance in Quechua-speaking communities of Puno, are:

- a) the decreasing isolation of Quechua speakers;
- b) the low status and powerlessness of Quechua speakers; and
- c) the low prestige and restricted use of the Quechua language.

By 'decreasing isolation of Quechua speakers', we refer to an overall phenomenon which embraces a number of characteristics described by students of language maintenance and language shift. Paulston sees language shift as "an indicator of integration into the enviroing society" (1978: 314), and posits isolation as one of three major independent variables which define the nature of the relationship

between subordinate and superordinate ethnic groups and the process of integration (1978). Gaarder (1977: 421-423) names factors of relative social isolation, size and homogeneity of group, existence of marked language monolingual group, access and resource to renewal from a hinterland, and reinforcement by immigration and inmigration all of which are relevant, for the Quechua case, to this same phenomenon of decreasing isolation. Kloss' (1966: 206-252) factors of religio-societal isolation and the existence of language islands apply here. Fishman's references to intactness of the group, rural versus urban residence (1966: 442-445), dislocation of the local economy, decreasing concentration of population, relative isolation from speakers of other languages and from industry (1980), and concentration and separation of the group (1982: 21) are all embraced in this factor of decreasing isolation as well.

The factor of Quechua speakers' low status in the Peruvian nation and in the Department of Puno corresponds to factors discussed in the literature as well. Paulston's two other major independent variables for defining ethnic integration are: the origin of the contact situation and the degree of control over access to scarce resources, both of which contribute in the Quechua case to Quechua speakers' low status and powerlessness. Gaarder's status of bilingual groups refers also to this aspect.

Finally, the low prestige and restricted use of Quechua include Gaarder's factors of the relative usefulness of each language, the function of each language in social advance, the literary-cultural

value of each language, and specialized use by topic, domain, and interlocutors. Kloss' consideration of the former use of the language as the official tongue is a question of language prestige. Fishman also includes the prestige of the language among his factors (1966). Note that this factor may perhaps best be considered as a secondary rather than a primary factor; it may be thought of not so much as an independent factor in language shift as a concomitant by-product of a situation already tending towards language shift.

With the two primary factors in mind, we can return to the question: what would be required for the balance to be tipped in favor of Quechua language maintenance? We attempt an answer by considering each primary factor separately.

The significance of the isolation factor for Quechua language maintenance is rooted in the difference between maintenance of a language in a monolingual vs. a bilingual context. Albo (1977: 5) has described a rigidly dual-structured society where double monolingualism prevails; that is, where only the dominant minority speaks only language A, and only the oppressed majority speaks only language B. He notes that this extreme situation did exist in the Andes in the past. Such a situation would be, in Fishman's terminology, one of diglossia without bilingualism and is "characteristic of polities that are economically underdeveloped and unmobilized, combining groups that are locked into opposite extremes of the social spectrum" (1967: 34). In contrast, today, with increasing numbers of bilinguals, the situation in the Quechua-speaking communities and the Department of Puno is

becoming one of diglossia with bilingualism. Such a situation is relatively stable if, according to Fishman, the members of the speech community have "available to them both a range of compartmentalized roles as well as ready access to these roles" (1967: 32). These roles are compartmentalized, or kept separate, "by dint of association with quite separate (though complementary) values, domains of activity and everyday situations" (Fishman 1967: 32). In sum, the fact of decreasing isolation for Quechua speakers does not in and of itself mean that the balance for Quechua language maintenance need be unfavorable, as long as a wide range of accessible and separate roles, domains, and situations can be maintained for each language.

Turning to the second of the two primary factors, the low status of Quechua speakers, we find that its significance as a factor in Quechua language maintenance is rooted in whether there is a possibility for Quechua speakers to advance their status within the Peruvian nation without forsaking their language in the process. It is essential for the maintenance of a marked language that the society's primary reward systems be pointed in the direction of maintenance (Fishman 1982: 21).

The Quechua-speaking communities have lived by subsistence but are increasingly unable to survive in that way. All the communities I visited included members who were virtually destitute save for the bare existence they managed to eke from their land (10-26-83).³ The creed of most contemporary Peruvians, both Quechua-speaking and non-Quechua-speaking, is the need to "superarse", which, translated freely, means

to pull oneself up by the bootstraps. Heretofore, as I have described elsewhere (Hornberger 1985: 47-81), the only possibility to do so, to leave behind the poverty and handicap of being a Quechua-speaking community member, has been to leave the community and all it stands for and seek one's fortune in the Spanish-speaking urban environment.

It is the same for these Quechua speakers in Peru as for the Spanish-speaking groups in the US which Ruiz refers to in the following statement: "[the importance of this coincidence lies in] language issues becoming linked with the problems associated with this group--poverty, handicap, low educational achievement, little or no social mobility" (1984: 19). Just as in the United States, the term bilingual is used by many interchangeably with the concept of Spanish-speaking in origin, so in Peru, many say bilingüe when they mean Quechua-speaking in origin. In both cases, the connotations of the term point unmistakably to the putatively inferior social origins and status of the bilingual (compare Haugen 1979: 73).

No wonder then that Quechua speakers, however unsuccessfully, seek to divest themselves of the trait which identifies them with inferior social status. This produces language shift. On the other hand, if social advancement came to rely less on language criteria, the balance could be tipped in favor of Quechua language maintenance.

In sum, Quechua language maintenance would require a situation characterized by at least two conditions, one of them more linguistic and the other more social. The first condition would be stable diglossia with its concomitant wide, compartmentalized and accessible

range of roles, domains, and situations; the second, potential individual social mobility and advancement regardless of dominant language. How likely is it that these two conditions will obtain in Peru, or in the Department of Puno; and what role can planning play in achieving them?

The officialization of Quechua (Decree Law 21156, May 27, 1975; see Comercio 1975, and for discussion, Hornberger 1985: 47-81) was an instance of a policy which broke away from the language-as-problem orientation which has characterized language planning in general (Ruiz 1984: 18) and in Peru in particular, and represented a language-as-resource orientation instead. Such a policy had the potential to go a long way toward the elimination of the automatic association of the Quechua language with inferior social status. Indeed, as I can testify from personal observation at the time of the Quechua officialization, Quechua speakers in urban contexts who had firmly denied they knew any Quechua at all were from one day to the next suddenly heard to speak it.

Moreover, the Quechua officialization occurred in a context of an Educational Reform, an Agrarian Reform, and a Social Property Reform under Velasco's Revolution, all of which were designed to promote participation in Peruvian society by all sectors of the population (Hornberger 1985: 47-81). Certainly these reforms came closer to addressing the low status of Quechua speakers than any other government policy before or since in this century. Unfortunately, none of these reforms was allowed to freely operate long enough to achieve its

desired goals. Other interests in Peruvian society have, by this date, slowed, stopped, and in some cases even reversed, those reforms (see, for example, Hornberger 1985: 47-81, 160). Until reforms such as these can be pursued and deepened in Peru, it seems unlikely that much progress will be made in improving the status of either Quechua speakers or the Quechua language.

Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that the problem here cannot be attributed to the planning efforts in themselves but rather to the overall instability of the government. For any particular policy to survive long enough to be effective, it would have to be able to withstand the frequent shifts of government in Peru. Until such a policy is developed and actually implemented, the effectiveness of planning as an agent of language maintenance cannot be assessed for this case.

What of the condition that a wide range of accessible and separate roles, domains, and situations be maintained for each language? Elsewhere I have documented the existence of an ideal among Quechua speakers which holds to separation of the two languages by domain: the non-ayllu domain for Spanish and the ayllu domain for Quechua⁴ (Hornberger 1985: 215-381). I also describe the increasing overlay between the two domains by a third domain--comunidad, where both languages are used and the choice of one over the other depends on the elements of Hymes' acronym SPEAKING⁵ and individual factors. A pertinent question here would be whether the comunidad domain appears to be making more inroads into the ayllu or the non-ayllu domain. A

pertinent response would be to consider the case of the deportes ("sports") setting in the comunidad domain (see Hornberger 1985: 474-478). The net effect of the comunidad domain for community members appears to be greater exposure to Spanish rather than greater opportunity to use Quechua.

The roles, domains, and situations associated with Quechua are becoming reduced rather than expanded (compare Albo 1977: 6-7). For the balance to be tipped in favor of Quechua language maintenance, efforts will need to be made to counteract this trend. The policy of Quechua officialization addressed this need by calling for the implementation of Quechua in the schools and the courts, and by the Ministries and the Armed Forces. Nevertheless, as noted above, this planning effort was not allowed to operate long enough to achieve its intended effect. An assessment of the effectiveness of planning in achieving language maintenance is stymied for the case of Quechua in Peru by the fact that language planning itself is stymied.

In this context of heretofore failed Quechua language planning, let us consider suggestions given by Quechua-speakers themselves as to what might be actively done to preserve Quechua, i.e., what planning steps might be taken. Out of 37 community members I interviewed on a range of topics related to language, only eight had any suggestions at all for preserving Quechua (see Hornberger 1985: 204-208 for a description of the interview procedure and sample). The few who did have suggestions mentioned speaking Quechua more, speaking it in all situations and roles, and writing it as means to preserving it

(Hornberger 1985: 268-269).

Quechua professionals interviewed had further suggestions. Some of these focused on attitudinal factors, some on expanding Quechua to new channels (or modes), and some on expanding Quechua to new domains. As to attitudes, one suggested that community members should be given an orientation meeting to counteract their current reasoning; and two that they should be told or made not to be ashamed. As to channels, three recommended having news programs in Quechua on the radio, making books, poetry, songs and records in Quechua available, especially for Quechua speakers in the urban context, and in all cases using well-spoken and well-written Quechua; and three emphasized that written Quechua should be standardized. As to domains, four recommended the use of Quechua in the schools to help preserve Quechua.

In sum, the Quechua professionals advised taking steps to rid Quechua speakers of their shame of speaking Quechua, and to expand the use of Quechua to the written and media channels as well as to new domains such as urban and school. Note here that they only recommended steps which were already partly implemented. Language behavior is usually quite conservative. Note too that we confront in Peru the same popular misconception Fishman reports for the United States, namely that "bilingual education fosters maintenance of the marked languages to which it allocates formal educational functions" (1982: 21).

Schools and Language Maintenance

This brings us, then, to our second policy question: can schools be agents for language maintenance? Elsewhere (Hornberger 1985: 490-550) I describe the ambiguous outcome of a bilingual education project (Proyecto Experimental de Educación Bilingüe-Puno; PEEB) in one Puno community, Kinsachata, wherein pupils and teachers benefited from PEEB methods and materials and the increased use of Quechua in the classroom; but the community rejected the program after three years of implementation. From this experience, a two-part conclusion may be drawn: first, that the use of Quechua in the classroom is advantageous for both education and the Quechua language; second, that despite the above, schools cannot be agents for language maintenance if their communities, for whatever reason, do not want them to be. Let us consider each of these conclusions separately.

According to my research in Puno, the principal difference between language use in the non-PEEB and the PEEB schools resided in the fact that in the PEEB school the use of Quechua was expanded absolutely, linguistically and sociolinguistically. In other words, more Quechua was used by both pupils and teachers; a more complete form of Quechua was used; and Quechua was used in domains and channels in which it was not used in the non-PEEB school (Hornberger 1985: 411-434). The principal outcome of these differences was the improved communication of educational content in the PEEB school (Hornberger 1985: 490-532). Such

an improvement is indicative of improved education for Quechua-speaking pupils through the PEEB school.

The record of traditional schools in successfully educating Quechua-speaking pupils is not good. As is well known, drop-out rates are high. The 1981 census reported that in the Department of Puno, 29% of the population over 15 had no education, and 34% of the population over 15 had completed only from one to four years of primary school. When the population between five and 15 years of age was included, the percentages were 27% and 50% respectively (Instituto Nacional de Estadística 1982: 147).

Perhaps more important than this, however, is the fact that even for those pupils who do stay in school, proportionately little education occurs. This is because of what may be called the overall slow-down in education. This slow-down is due in part to the small percentage of time-on-task relative to time in school, which I have described elsewhere (Hornberger 1985: 355-367). Yet over and above that, further slow-down occurs within time-on-task as a direct result of the teacher's failure to communicate and the pupils' failure to understand. Each task takes far too long to complete; pupils spend 40 minutes copying what should take five minutes to copy. Each lesson takes far too long to convey; the teacher must go over the same material for three or four class periods until the pupils can learn by rote what they cannot grasp by reasoning, since reason is dependent on language. Each grade takes too many years to complete. The result is that pupils spend far too much time in school for remarkably little

result.

Table 1 shows repeaters' rates for two non-PEEB schools in the Puno communities of Visallani and Pumiti. These rates reflect only the pupils who were registered in that particular school for both years.

Table 1

PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS REPEATING, BY GRADE

SCHOOL	GRADE			
	First	Second	Fifth	Sixth
Visallani				
1983	23%	27%	19%	25%
Pumiti				
1983	36%	---*	24%	---*
Pumiti				
1982	67%	50%	28%	---*

* - Records unavailable.

In many cases, pupils transfer from one school to another, often repeating grades and finishing in seven, eight, or nine years rather than six. Other students never finish at all if they repeat too many times: they get so big that they are embarrassed to be in school (9-24-83). Even so, ten of the pupils in Pumiti's upper grades were 15-18 years old.

It would require several years of effective functioning of the PEEB before we would be able to quote drop-out rates and repeaters' rates that might indicate precisely how much the use of Quechua in school improves this situation of educational slow-down. However, at this point in time, we can say that the more effective communication of content in the PEEB classroom makes it likely that pupils in those classrooms will not only grasp more educational content than their non-PEEB counterparts, but will do so with a more efficient use of time.

Not only drop-out rates and repeaters' rates but also illiteracy rates indicate the overall failure of the traditional schools to communicate educational content. Illiteracy rates are high in the Department of Puno; the 1981 census records 32% of the population over 15 (and 33% of the population over five) as illiterate (Instituto Nacional de Estadística 1982: 166). Yet these rates do not include in any systematic way the common case of a formerly "literate" person who is now functionally illiterate. Literacy loss in the Quechua-speaking communities is a common and well-known occurrence. An individual who attends school for one, two, or three years and "learns to read", later "forgets" how to read. Since most of the reading that occurs in non-

PEEB schools consists of pronouncing the sounds of Spanish without any understanding, it is not surprising that this skill vanishes with the passage of years.

The perennial literacy classes offered in each community, under the auspices of the national ALFIN (Alfabetizacion Integral Nacional--National Integrated Literacy Program), at best only repeat the same mistake of teaching form without content. All texts and board writing observed in literacy classes were in Spanish (e.g., 11-6-82, 10-22-83). Some had culturally appropriate subject matter (10-22-83), and some did not (11-6-82, 8-18-83). At worst, these classes do not even make any real attempt to teach reading but only serve as political footballs for would-be community leaders (8-20-83, 9-21-83, 9-24-83, 10-15-83, 10-22-83, 10-29-83). In either case, little literacy is acquired. The few women attending the literacy classes in both Visallani and Kinsachata did not appear to be engaged in the process of learning, but, like their children in school, were trying to learn the appropriate forms by rote. This contrasted with the example of two women at the Visallani literacy class who asked to see the Quechua texts, and, after seeing them, requested enthusiastically to have them for their literacy classes (10-29-83).

The use of Quechua in school is advantageous for improved communication of educational content in Quechua-speaking communities. It is also advantageous for the maintenance of the Quechua language, since it extends the use of Quechua into a new domain. We mentioned above that one of two conditions for the maintenance of the Quechua

language is that a wide range of accessible and separate roles, domains, and situations be maintained for each language. We also mentioned that inroads into the Quechua ayllu domain are occurring through the growth of the comunidad domain where Spanish as well as Quechua is used. In this context of a diminishing range of domains for Quechua, the use of more Quechua in the non-ayllu domain, i.e., the school in the community, may contribute to the maintenance of a wider range of roles and situations for the Quechua language.

It must be recognized, however, that such a use of Quechua involves a dramatic change in language use patterns in the communities. Even with the increasing encroachment on the ayllu domain by the comunidad domain, the ideal pattern of language use which most Quechua speakers still hold to is Quechua for the ayllu domain and Spanish for the non-ayllu domain. The use of Quechua in the non-ayllu domain flies in the face of this ideal.

Moreover, such a use of Quechua requires a change in community expectations about education. Community members regard the purpose of the school in their midst, and in fact tolerate its existence there, as a means for their children to acquire Spanish, and especially, literacy skills in Spanish (Hornberger 1985: 462-465, 472). The use of Quechua in the school, especially written Quechua, flies in the face of this ideal as well.

In view of that, our second policy question must be preceded by the question: will community members allow schools to be agents for language maintenance? In other words, will they allow the use of

Quechua in their schools? What Fishman writes for the case of the United States is also true for the Peruvian case:

The basic problem of whether the dialect(s) should be used/taught in school is probably not one that teachers should solve by themselves, but, rather, one which would benefit from full and frank community consideration. Languages live in communities, and if they "belong" to anyone they belong to their speech communities. A community deserves to be consulted in connection with how the school makes use of "its" language, particularly if the school undertakes to use it as a medium (1982: 18).

Elsewhere (Hornberger 1985: 533-550), I discuss the case of one community's rejection of the PEEB and conclude that in that case at least, the rejection did not imply that community members rejected their language altogether, but did imply a rejection of an experimental program imposed from outside which was perceived to potentially jeopardize their children. In addition, the rejection of the PEEB in that case may imply a rejection of the use of Quechua in school. Given the opportunity to do so, Quechua-speaking communities may or may not choose to permit the use of Quechua in their schools. Part of the reason for this has to do with the difference between community expectations as to the role of schooling (i.e. that it is a means to learn Spanish) and the implicit assumptions that the PEEB and educators in general make about the role of schooling (i.e. that it is a means of teaching certain basic skills such as reading, writing, and arithmetic, and of developing the intellectual potential of each child).

There is in Peru a widespread belief that the acquisition of the Spanish language constitutes the major content of formal education.

Furthermore, the identification of Quechua with the community and the traditionally strong distinction maintained between school and community may combine to cause community members to see the use of Quechua in school as a threat to their community, and as a consequence, their individual, identity. This reinforces the identification of Spanish with education.

Ogbu's discussion of cultural discontinuity is appropriate here. He argues that when we assume that cultural differences cause educability problems, we overlook the fact that "some discontinuities are inherent in formal schooling and universally experienced by children and that some other discontinuities may be transitional" (1982: 292). He goes on to distinguish between primary discontinuities which result from cultural developments before a particular population comes in contact with "Western-type" schools; and secondary discontinuities which develop after members of two populations have been in contact, "as a response to a contact situation, especially a contact situation involving stratified domination" (1982: 298). The two types of discontinuities may coexist in any given situation. In the case of primary discontinuities, "non-Western people are willing to learn to overcome these discontinuities in order to succeed in school" (1982: 298); whereas in the case of secondary discontinuities,

there is a tendency for subordinate-group members to reinterpret their primary cultural features in opposition to those of the dominant group... and (they) do not necessarily... give up their way of behaving in preference for the way of their superiors as long as the structural discontinuities between the two groups remain (1982: 300).

These insights help to explain why Quechua-speaking community members may choose to continue the use of Spanish only in their schools. Primary and secondary discontinuities coexist in the case of the Quechuas. On one hand, the primary discontinuities resulting from the initial contact between the Quechua-speaking communities and the Western-type schools introduced by the Peruvian government are ones which Quechua speakers are willing to learn to overcome in order to succeed in school, especially since success in school is perceived as the way of improving one's overall status in society. On the other hand, the secondary discontinuities which have resulted over the years of contact between Quechua speakers and the national Peruvian society and its schools, have led to the reinterpretation of primary cultural features. For example, the Quechua language, in opposition to features of the dominant, Spanish-speaking group. This results in a reluctance to give up Quechua, since it is the language of the ayllu domain, and is therefore separate and distinct from Spanish, the language of the non-ayllu domain.

Under this choice, the answer to the second policy question is obvious. If community members oppose the use of Quechua in their schools, the schools cannot be agents for Quechua language maintenance. Even if community members are not directly consulted as to policy formulation in this matter, the experience of the PEEB has shown that community members can effectively impede the implementation of Quechua in their school if they decide to.

The choice to exclude Quechua from the school may enhance other

influences for Quechua language maintenance. It may well be that by keeping the non-ayllu domain and ayllu domains well separated, the chances for survival of the ayllu domain, where Quechua is used exclusively, will be increased. In addition, such a choice does not imply that Quechua speakers do not value their language. Quechua speakers may turn their attention to increasing the use of Quechua in other domains, such as in voluntary religious and cultural organizations in urban and rural areas, or in arenas of non-school education such as the media, literacy campaigns, and so on. Particularly as more Quechua speakers get through the school system successfully, they, like the Quechua professionals I interviewed, may come to recognize the value of their own language, and redouble their efforts to preserve that language.

Finally, the choice to exclude Quechua from the schools may be the only realistic one for Quechua-speaking communities given that the primary reward systems of the larger society do not now promote and do not appear to be moving toward promoting the use of Quechua in the larger society. In these circumstances, it behooves Quechua speakers to guard their interests by keeping the school as a Spanish proponent in the community.

On the other hand, Quechua-speaking community members may decide in favor of the use of Quechua in the schools. Just as the introduction of schools themselves into the communities was fraught with tension but ultimately accepted by community members when it was perceived to be of some advantage to them (Hornberger 1985: 462-463);

so the introduction of the use of Quechua in the schools, though currently fraught with tension, may ultimately be accepted by community members. It seems, though, that one or more of several conditions which held for the schools would have to be met for that to occur. First, the introduction of Quechua in the school would have to be at community members' request rather than imposed arbitrarily from outside; second, it would have to be not experimental, but universal; and third, the primary reward systems of the society would have to reinforce it in order for community members to seek it.

The first condition is one that the PEEB has increasingly sought to encourage. As of 1984, it is no longer the Project staff that designates which schools will implement the PEEB; now, the PEEB responds to requests from communities. Before beginning work in the community, the PEEB investigates the request by holding a meeting with the community at which community members decide whether they want the PEEB or not. If they do want it, they must prepare a solicitud (formal application) requesting it. Many communities request the PEEB on the basis of having observed its successful application in a neighboring community.

Currently, however, the PEEB staff finds that the most successful argument for convincing communities to have the PEEB in their school is to demonstrate to the members that their children learn to read Spanish better through bilingual education than through traditional Spanish-only education. To this end, at community meetings, PEEB staff ask PEEB pupils to read aloud before their parents in both Spanish and

Quechua. To this end also, PEEB research has focused on Spanish reading as a measure of the success of the bilingual program.

In view of the above, our second policy question once again gets sidetracked to a prior question: does the use of Quechua in school foster Quechua language maintenance or not? If community members accept the use of Quechua in their schools only because it achieves a more effective teaching of Spanish, then those charged with the implementation of the program are likely to focus attention increasingly on the effective teaching of Spanish, and the type of bilingual education applied is likely to be increasingly transitional.⁶ Under these circumstances, Quechua language shift rather than maintenance is likely to occur. Fishman has this to say about transitional bilingual education:

If it is fortunate enough to be accompanied by booming economic opportunity (or unfortunate enough to be accompanied by oppressive political repression), it succeeds in transethnifying its charges and is therefore no longer needed. If it fails to accomplish this goal under these circumstances it will be discontinued as ineffectual. Transitional bilingual education is thus damned if it does and damned if it doesn't and is clearly programmed to self-destruct (1982: 26).

This is not the type of bilingual education that the PEEB is seeking to implement in Puno. Rather, it seeks to implement strong maintenance-type bilingual education (Hornberger 1985: 98-160). Even this, however, is not enough to affect Quechua language maintenance. If transitional bilingual education programs are programmed to self-destruct, maintenance bilingual education programs are "constantly involved in delicate if not explosive intergroup problematics" (Fishman 1982: 26).

If a bilingual education program is to make any contribution to language maintenance, it must be an enrichment bilingual education program. Enrichment bilingual education is, according to Fishman, "the best that bilingual education has to offer" (1982:26).

I concluded the first section of this paper by noting that only in the context of a strong language maintenance stance in the whole society can any particular planning for language maintenance have an effect. In the second section, we suggested that though schools alone cannot assure language maintenance, they can contribute to it if other more powerful societal processes are pointed in that direction. Here we conclude that if schools are to make that kind of contribution, enrichment bilingual education is the most likely means for them to do so.

We are now in a position to return to our second policy question: can schools be agents for language maintenance? In the present national circumstances, community members might accept bilingual education in their schools if they were convinced that bilingual education more successfully taught their children Spanish, but in that case, the schools would not be agents for language maintenance.

On the other hand, let us consider the hypothetical case in which language maintenance planning efforts would be undertaken that would create the best possible situation for the Quechua language, i.e., a situation where the decreasing isolation of Quechua speakers would be counterbalanced by an increasing range of roles and domains for Quechua and Spanish, and where Quechua speakers' low status would be

counterbalanced by opportunities for social mobility and advancement regardless of language spoken. If community members could be convinced, by real and visible signs in their national society, that the Quechua language was being promoted through policy and through the primary reward systems, they might accept bilingual education in their schools as a means to the more effective education of their children. Under those conditions, the PEEB would be in a position to move into enrichment type bilingual education, and the schools would be able to act effectively as agents for Quechua language maintenance.

The situation in Puno, though it has its own peculiar cultural context, is not then so very different from other world contexts. In every case, what is needed for successful language maintenance planning and the effective use of schools as agents for language maintenance is: autonomy of the speech community in deciding about the use of languages in their schools and a societal context in which primary incentives exist for the use of one, two, or multiple languages in that and every other domain.

1. The research on which this paper is based was carried out in 1982 and 1983 with the permission and support of the Proyecto Experimental de Educacion Bilingue-Puno (Convenio Peru-Republica Federal de Alemania) in Puno, Peru, the Direccion Departamental de Educacion in Puno, Peru, and the Instituto Nacional de Investigacion y Desarrollo de la Educacion (INIDE) in Lima, Peru. Financial support came from the Inter-American Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education

(Fulbright-Hays). Their assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

2. Heath has recently (Heath and Harmon, 1985) emphasized a distinction between language maintenance and language retention. Under this distinction, language maintenance would refer to "policy formulation and implementation directed from the federal or state polity toward a language minority group to help the group keep its own language". Language retention would refer to "the language minority group's own behaviors, conditions, and values which support the indigenous language". In this paper, the general term language maintenance is used throughout, but the discussion of language maintenance in the community corresponds to Heath's term language retention.

3. A date within parentheses refers to an observation or quote in my field journal on that date.

4. Note that my choice of the term ayllu to designate language domains is a choice which reflects the reality not only of language use in the community but also of social organization in the Andes. Ayllu is a Quechua term which is often translated as "family" and more often as "community". Its connotations include both genealogical and territorial relatedness among the members of a particular ayllu. The term and the concepts it represents have been well studied in the anthropological literature. See, for example: Castro Pozo 1963: 483, Mishkin 1963: 441, Murra 1975: 25, Rowe 1963: 253, and Tschopik 1963: 539.

The ayllu domain, then, as defined on the basis of ethnographic

observation, includes all those social situations pertaining to "traditional" community life; that is, those aspects of community life which have maintained a continuous tradition since at least the coming of the Spanish to the New World. Conversely, the non-ayllu domain includes all those social situations resulting from the intrusion of the larger, national Peruvian society into the community territory. Social situation is used here to mean the juncture of setting (time and place) and role-relationship.

The ayllu domain consists of all member-to-member role-relationships in the following settings: (A) household and field; (B) faena (community work project); (C) fiesta (in both the community itself and the district seat); and (D) free encounter within the community confines, including the school grounds when school is not in session. Within the ayllu domain, Quechua is always spoken.

The non-ayllu domain consists of all member-to-outsider role-relationships in the following settings: (E) the district seat; (F) the school grounds when school is in session; and (G) free encounter within the community confines. Within the non-ayllu domain, Spanish is always spoken.

The comunidad domain is that domain in which the community members function together as a "community" in the sense in which the larger Peruvian society defines that concept. This domain is most visible in those situations where community members come together for meetings, celebrations, or recreation in program formats which originated outside the "traditional" community ambience but which have now become

incorporated into the community life to a greater or lesser degree. In this domain, both Spanish and Quechua are spoken.

5. I refer to the mnemonic device proposed by Hymes (1974: 53-62) where:

- S stands for setting/scene
- P stands for participants
- E stands for ends (both expected outcomes and latent goals)
- A stands for act (both message form and message content)
- K stands for key (tone and manner)
- I stands for instrumentalities (channels and forms--language, dialect, variety, code, style)
- N stands for norms (interaction and interpretation)
- G stands for genres (such as poem, myth, talk, commercial, lecture, editorial, prayer)

6. I refer here to the bilingual education typology offered by Fishman (1977: 27-31): transitional/compensatory, maintenance, and enrichment; and corresponding, as Ruiz (1984) points out, to the three language planning orientations: language-as-problem, language-as-right, language-as-resource.

REFERENCES

- Albo, X. (1977). El futuro de los idiomas oprimidos en los Andes. Lima, Peru: Centro de Investigación de Lingüística Aplicada (UNMSM).
- Castro Pozo, H. (1963). Social and economico-political evolution of the communities of Central Peru. In J.H.Steward (ed.), Handbook of South American Indians. New York: Cooper Square Publishers. 483-500.
- Comercio. (1975). El Gobierno Revolucionario oficializó la lengua Quechua. Lima, Perú. May 28. 1.
- Fishman, J. (1966). Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.
- (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. Journal of Social Issues 23(2): 29-38.
- (1977). The social science perspective. In Bilingual education: current perspectives (Vol. 2: Social science). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics. 1-40.
- (1980). The sociology of bilingual education. Lectures at the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM. Summer.
- (1982). Sociolinguistic foundations of bilingual education. The Bilingual Review/La revista bilingue 9(1): 1-35.
- Gardner, B. (1977). Language maintenance or language shift. In W.F. Mackey & T. Andersson (eds.), Bilingualism in early childhood. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. 409-434.
- Haugen, E. (1979). The stigmata of bilingualism. In J.B. Pride (ed.), Sociolinguistic aspects of language learning and teaching. London: Oxford University Press. 72-85.
- Heath, S.B. & L. Harmon. (1985). Workshop goals and overview paper. Prepared for Joint SIDEC/CIES Conference on Comparative Education and International Development. Stanford University, April 16-20.
- Hornberger, N.H. (1985). Bilingual education and Quechua language maintenance in Highland Puno, Peru. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Hymes, D.H. (1974). Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística. (1982). Perú: censos nacionales: resultados de prioridad. Volumes 1,2. Lima, Peru. December.

- Kloss, H. (1966). German-American language maintenance efforts. In J.A. Fishman (ed.), Language loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton. 206-252.
- Mishkin, B. (1963). The contemporary Quechua. In J.H. Steward (ed.), Handbook of South American Indians. New York: Cooper Square Publishers. 411-470.
- Murra, J.V. (1975). Formaciones económicas y políticas del mundo andino. Lima, Perú: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Ogbu, J.V. (1982). Cultural discontinuities and schooling. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 13(4): 290-307.
- Paulston, C.B. (1978). Education in a bi/multilingual setting. International Review of Education 24(3): 309-328.
- Rowe, J.H. (1963). Inca culture at the time of the Spanish Conquest. In J.H. Steward (ed.), Handbook of South American Indians. New York: Cooper Square Publishers. 183-330.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. NABE Journal: Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education 8(2): 15-34.
- Tschopik, H. (1963). The Aymara. In J.H. Steward (ed.), Handbook of South American Indians. New York: Cooper Square Publishers. 501-574.