



4-1-2015

Negotiating Ideological and Implementational Spaces for Indigenous Languages in Peru

Frances K. Dueñas
University of Pennsylvania

Negotiating Ideological and Implementational Spaces for Indigenous Languages in Peru

Abstract

This paper draws on the concepts of ideological and implementational spaces (Hornberger, 2002) to understand how different actors, at different historical moments characterized by the emergence and development of multilingual policies, and at different layers of the language planning and policy union (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996), have sought to carve up, fill in and re-imagine spaces for the inclusion of Indigenous languages in Peru. Following a historical-textual analysis, I offer a historical and contemporary analysis of four instances of multilingual policy negotiation, addressing their contributions and shortcomings as well as pointing to areas of future research. Implications are offered for language policy and planning research and practices that seek to promote linguistic and cultural diversity for all.

Negotiating Ideological and Implementational Spaces for Indigenous Languages in Peru

Frances Kvietok Dueñas

University of Pennsylvania

This paper draws on the concepts of ideological and implementational spaces (Hornberger, 2002) to understand how different actors, at different historical moments characterized by the emergence and development of multilingual policies, and at different layers of the language planning and policy onion (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996), have sought to carve up, fill in and re-imagine spaces for the inclusion of Indigenous languages in Peru. Following a historical-textual analysis, I offer a historical and contemporary analysis of four instances of multilingual policy negotiation, addressing their contributions and shortcomings as well as pointing to areas of future research. Implications are offered for language policy and planning research and practices that seek to promote linguistic and cultural diversity for all.

In 1991, Peru introduced the Law of Intercultural Bilingual Education¹ (IBE), which mandates bilingual education for Indigenous students, as well as an intercultural schooling model that validates local ways of being and fosters intercultural relations among ethnic groups in Peru. The introduction of IBE built on prior legislation granting official status to Quechua and other Indigenous languages, and drew from decentralized pilot experiences with bilingual education implemented since the 1970s. IBE policy marked a turning point with regards to the inclusion of Indigenous people, their languages, and their identities in the national education system. IBE policy further marked a shift from assimilationist to pluralist discourses about linguistic and cultural diversity (Hornberger, 2000).

Indigenous bilingual education in Peru and around the globe, however, cannot be separated from the political and ideological context in which it is situated. López (2008) describes the system regulating relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Latin America as similar to that of colonial situations, and highlights the economic, political, and social exclusion of ‘subaltern’ Indigenous populations. The challenge and paradox facing the implementation of IBE policy remains opening spaces for multiple languages and identities within a national society which has long subscribed to a one nation-one language ideology and promoted discourses of linguistic and cultural homogeneity.

With the hopes of contributing to a critical understanding of language planning and policy (LPP) and “simultaneously finding, examining and exploring spaces for educator agency” (Johnson, 2010, p. 63), I seek to respond to Johnson’s call for LPP

¹ Política Nacional de Educación Intercultural y Educación Bilingüe Intercultural (National Intercultural Education and Bilingual Intercultural Education Policy)

research which not only examines the role of language policy and policymaking in perpetuating and creating mechanisms of exclusion, but also sheds light on the role of educator agency in making spaces for cultural and linguistic diversity. With this aim in mind, and focusing on the Peruvian context, I pursue the following research question:

How have different actors negotiated ideological and implementational spaces offered by language policies in support of the maintenance and development of Indigenous languages?

My goal is not to offer a comprehensive review of Peruvian LPP (e.g., Cerrón-Palomino, 1989; Godenzzi, 2008; Mannheim, 1984; Trapnell & Zavala, 2013; Valdiviezo, 2009, 2013); instead I focus my analysis on two time periods that have experienced national-level, top-down multilingual policies. That is, the language policies advanced by the 1970s Velasco government and the ones developed since the 1990s till present day. Within this scope and policy context, I hope to show how different actors have carved up, filled in and re-imagined ideological and implementational spaces (Hornberger, 2002) for the promotion of language diversity in Peru.

This paper is organized in four parts. The first section introduces the conceptual framework while the second one offers the tools that guide my research question analysis. In the third section, I provide a historical and contemporary analysis of four instances of multilingual policy negotiation, addressing their contributions and shortcomings as well as pointing to areas of future research. The last section offers some concluding thoughts that highlight the relevance of LPP research and activities that attempt to craft spaces of linguistic and cultural diversity for all.

Conceptual Framework

LPP Research has been characterized by an attention to the multilayered and complex nature of LPP. In short, LPP research concerns itself with examining different types of planning and policy making activities (status, corpus and acquisition) across different processes (creation, interpretation and appropriation). Ricento and Hornberger (1996) introduced the metaphor of the LPP onion to highlight the multiple layers of LPP—composed by agents, levels and processes—and to describe how they “permeate and interact with each other in a variety of ways and to varying degrees” (p. 402). Within the LPP field, there is also a concern for understanding how both structural forces and individuals’ agency mediate LPP activities and processes (Hult, 2010; Johnson & Ricento, 2013).

Critical Language Policy (CLP) research has particularly spoken back to earlier neo-classical approaches to the field which primarily focused on top-down initiatives and were guided by a belief of the rational and individual nature of LPP choices and activities. Tollefson (1991) introduced the historical-structural approach to orient LPP research and plausibly “discover the historical and structural pressures that lead to particular policies and plans that constrain individual choice” (p. 32). Following this lens, language policies are often understood as “serving the interests of the oppressors” (Tollefson, 2006, p. 46), be them states or institutions controlled by dominant groups. Relatedly, Shohamy (2006) has highlighted how language policy and language policy mechanisms

often result in the violation of democratic principles and personal rights, and can perpetuate social inequalities (p. 148).

Historical-structural analysis can help understand the ways in which language policies, in the interests of dominant groups, can explicitly and inadvertently reproduce societal inequalities affecting language minoritized groups. Critical approaches, however, can risk minimizing the potential of language policies for advancing social-justice oriented goals as well as individuals' agency in negotiating diverse types of policies, which is why combining lenses with a focus on both structure and agency is fruitful in LPP research. Hornberger and Johnson (2007) have thus argued that although formidable foes, language policies can also be allies for multilingual education. Situated within the ecology of language metaphor, Hornberger (2002) posits that "multilingual language policies are essentially about opening up *ideological* and *implementational* space in the environment for as many languages as possible, and in particular endangered languages, to evolve and flourish rather than dwindle and disappear" (p. 30, emphasis mine). While recognizing the power of policy, the concept of ideological and implementational spaces ultimately rests on the ingenuity of individuals, who actively and creatively seize those openings, transforming and expanding them at different levels and within the different processes that constitute the layers of language planning and policymaking. The 1994 Bolivian National Education Reform, for example, opened up ideological spaces for multilingualism and promoted implementational spaces which had to be filled in by local actors with multilingual practices at different levels (Hornberger, 2002). In recognition of the globally contested terrain for language policies favorable of linguistic and cultural diversity, Hornberger (2002) has also suggested that language educators and users need to fill up implementational spaces with multilingual educational practices "as richly and fully as possible, before they close in on us again" (p. 30).

Emphasizing the agency of the bottom-up layers and actors of policymaking, Hornberger (2005) has explored how even in the context of restrictive policies, multilingual implementational spaces can "serve as wedges to pry open ideological ones" (p. 606). The ethnographic work of Hornberger and Johnson (2007) in the Philadelphia School District has illuminated how within the limited ideological space for bilingual education, local actors developed their own ideological and implementational spaces favoring bilingual education through local re-interpretation and appropriation of top-down policy. Menken and García (2010) have also offered a rich portrayal of teachers' negotiation of language policies in schools, situated in contexts of varying degrees of multilingual policies, to highlight how educators can craft multilingual spaces to better support their students.

Research on local negotiation and implementation of language policies highlights its complex and variable nature within and across contexts. Hornberger and Johnson's (2007) ethnographic work also explored how local appropriation did not always result in opening spaces for bilingual education, and how district-level changes meant that the sustainability of the ideological spaces that had been pried open remained under threat. Menken's (2008) research on testing as a *de facto* language policy mechanism convincingly shows how New York City schools, under a similar national policy climate as Johnson's site of study, provided limited spaces for incorporating multiple languages in schooling. Much ethnographic

research on LPP has successfully showed how the concepts of ideological and implementational spaces are inextricably linked and how, as elaborated by Hornberger and Johnson (2007), nurturing one without the other would be of little avail.

An Analytical Frame: Exploring Ideological and Implementational Spaces

In order to explore the negotiation of ideological and implementational spaces in the Peruvian context, my analysis follows a historical-textual approach that combines various LPP heuristics and concepts. Influenced by Tollefson's (1991) historical-structural approach, I seek to contextualize the political context of each era that is examined, historicize the policy developments across time periods and examine the different ideological orientations to linguistic and cultural diversity. To this end, I draw from Ruíz's (1984) orientations to language planning in order to illuminate the multiple ideological orientations reflected by language policies.

Ruíz (1984) refers to orientations as "a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society" (p.16). Orientations provide a framework in which attitudes about language are formed and "determine what is thinkable about language in society" (p. 16). Ruíz proposes three orientations to language and its role in society underlining language planning and policy: language-as-problem, language-as-right and language-as-resource. Language-as-problem orientations view language as a social problem that is to be treated and solved within the goal of development or modernization. Within this orientation, there is a connection between language diversity and social problems, and planning is seen as an activity to rid minority speakers of such a problem and integrate them into society. Transitional language education programs epitomize this orientation, as the target population learns the dominant language at the expense of other languages.

Language-as-right orientations are reflected in the granting of national and international linguistic rights to minority speakers, encompassed by the right to freedom from discrimination on the basis of language and the right to use the language in public domains (Ruíz, 1984). The development and persistence of these rights, Ruíz argues, is influenced by the nature of legal systems as well as transnational advocacy movements for minority speakers. Johnson (2013) connects this language orientation to one-way development bilingual education programs, where minority language speakers can learn the dominant language and maintain their mother tongue. Lastly, language-as-resource orientations understand languages as resources to be "managed, developed, and conserved" (Ruíz, 1984, p. 28) for both their speakers and society as a whole, and include a concern for the mismanagement and repression of these resources. Johnson (2013) links this orientation to two-way immersion or dual language bilingual education programs, given that both native and non-native speakers benefit from these programs.

In addition, my analysis draws from Cooper's (1989) seminal LPP question "*Who plans what for whom and how?*" (p. 31, emphasis mine) to explore the interplay between policy orientations and how policies are negotiated by different actors to different ends. In order to explore my research question, I focus on *who* negotiates *what* for *whom* and *how*. A focus on *who* participates in the negotiation

of Peruvian language policies brings my attention to (a) individuals engaged in local experimental bilingual education programs, which is the case of the Experimental Bilingual Education Project of Puno (PEEB) and the Program for Bilingual and Intercultural Education of the Alto Napo (PEBIAN), as well as to (b) representatives of Peru's General Office of Intercultural Bilingual and Rural Education (DIGEIBIR) and of the Office of Indigenous Languages. The multi-actor and multi-era perspective seeks to elucidate the diversity of actors at different layers of language policymaking, as well as the cumulative nature of LPP activities and processes. A focus on *what* is negotiated by these actors centers my analysis on the different types of language planning they engage with, ranging across status, acquisition, and corpus activities (Cooper, 1989). Particularly, I highlight acquisition planning processes in relation to the types of bilingual education models proposed by different initiatives. Considering *for whom* negotiation of language policies takes place allows me to examine the target audience and recipients of various LPP activities.

Drawing on the *whom, what* and *for whom*, the bulk of my analysis centers on *how* actors negotiate ideological and implementational spaces within various policy contexts in Peru. My research for this project relied on a close reading of various policy documents (laws, regulations, directives), official materials and documents (classroom textbooks, teacher guides, brochures, posters) as well as reports and academic articles focusing on the various time periods and the initiatives that are the focus of this paper. Ethnographic insights from my 2009 and 2013 fieldwork experiences researching IBE in Peru also inform my interpretations.

My textual analysis is guided by Ball's (1993) distinction of policy as text and policy as discourse. Briefly, Ball argues that an understanding of policy as text puts emphasis on how policies are understood and put into action by different policy stakeholders. A policy-as-discourse perspective argues that policies put forth certain discourses that delimit what is thinkable, in this case, languages in society. Together, both views allow me to examine policy orientations, the richness of negotiated ideological and implementational spaces, and spaces left unseized.

By combining a historical-structural perspective, the language orientations framework to language policy and the concept of ideological and implementational spaces, I craft a lens to examine structure and agency in LPP through a historical-textual analysis. This type of lens, I suggest, can allow us to cut through the various layers of the LPP onion with a historical perspective when ethnographic research is not possible, and can additionally offer a rich understanding of policy discourses to inform future ethnographic studies.

A Historical Perspective: Seizing Multilingual Spaces

Mannheim (1984) has identified two positions that define the orientation of language policies and language use in Peru since colonial times: a liberal position and a Hispanist assimilation position. Both positions, promoted by Spanish colonizers, Jesuit missionaries, and leaders of the new independent republic, had as their goal the *castellanización* of Indigenous people in order to accommodate them into the viceroyalty, and later on, the republic. Although the two positions differed in the degree of usage of Indigenous languages to achieve such goal, they both reflected an Indigenous languages and cultures-as-problem orientation.

After independence from Spain, different republican governments continued to ignore or repress the multilingual reality of Peru (Cerrón-Palomino, 1989). However, the early 20th century saw an increased interest in the so-called Indian problem, that is, in how to incorporate Indigenous people in the national society. The *indigenista* movement, a “liberal urban-based movement that emphasized the liberation and ‘uplifting’ of the Indian” (García, 2004, p. 352) promoted the use of a transitional model of bilingual education that would help transition peasants into national society by giving them access to Spanish. Given the lack of governmental attention and support for the education of Indigenous people, bilingual education initiatives were carried out in an experimental fashion, which overall remained transitional and encouraged the “linguistic and cultural desertion” of Indigenous peoples (Cerrón-Palomino, 1989, p. 25).

The revolutionary leftist government of Velasco Alvarado (1968–1975) brought with it a shifting political scenario aimed at changing the country’s social structure through agrarian, social and educational reforms (Balarin, 2006). In doing so, it sought to improve the living standard of the marginalized, integrate peasants into national society, and fortify national identity (Escobar, Mar, & Alberti, 1975). A set of reforms—including the 1970 Educational Reform, the 1972 General Law of Education, the 1972 Política Nacional de Educación Bilingüe (National Bilingual Education Policy) (Trapnell & Zavala, 2013) and the 1975 Officialization of Quechua—produced a major shift in the language policy landscape, mandating the use of Indigenous languages in schooling, for both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous population, as well as granting the right to use Quechua in public spaces such as courts (Hornberger, 1988). Of particular interest are the objectives of the 1972 National Bilingual Education Policy (NBEP):

- (1) To advance, in vernacular-speaking communities, the critical interpretation of their socio-economic reality for their spontaneous, creative and conscious participation in the process of structural change oriented towards the elimination of the mechanisms of dependence and domination.
- (2) To contribute to the formation of a new man in a just and worthy society through the reinterpretation of the cultural and linguistic plurality of the country, with an eye towards the creation of the national culture.
- (3) To achieve the use of Spanish as the common language of the Peruvian population while affirming, at the same time, respect for linguistic diversity and the revalorization of the various vernacular languages (in Trapnell and Zavala, 2013, p. 183, my translation).

The three objectives of the NBEP point to (1) the promotion of critical consciousness among speakers of Indigenous languages, (2) acknowledgement of diversity and the creation of a national culture and (3) respect for Indigenous languages alongside the promotion of Spanish as a lingua franca. These goals reflect both language-as-right and language-as-problem orientations. On the one hand, Indigenous languages now enjoyed recognition under the law, speakers had the right to be educated in their mother tongue, and Indigenous languages were to be revalued. Alongside this legal recognition, the overarching purpose of the incorporation of Indigenous languages and cultures in bilingual education was to facilitate the

development of a national culture and the promotion of Spanish as the language of national communication. The transitional bilingual education model that was proposed by government educational officials further exemplifies this language-as-problem orientation (López, 1991). Absent from the NBEP was any mention of Peru's cultural and linguistic diversity as a resource for people who were not speakers of Indigenous languages.

Within this particular historical and political context, I now turn to describe how two pilot projects negotiated the ideological spaces offered by the Velasco reforms, and the NBEP specifically, to support the maintenance and development of Indigenous languages.

PEEB: The Experimental Bilingual Education Project of Puno

PEEB came into existence in 1975, with a signed agreement between the government of Velasco and the German Society for Technical Cooperation, with the goal to develop bilingual programs in Quechua- and Aymara-speaking communities of Puno, located in southern Peru. The program involved a range of state and non-state, national and foreign agents offering technical assistance to practitioners (López, 1991).

After its first year of implementation, taking advantage of the dismantling of the 1972 educational reform and the presence of a new non-interventionist government, PEEB seized the opportunity to transcend the transitional model characteristic of the era and opted for a maintenance model of bilingual education (López, 1991). The model was one in which:

the mother tongue will serve as an instrument of education while at the same time it will itself be developed, with the purpose of reinforcing its use by pupils and, ... the second language will be systematically taught with the purpose of getting pupils to use it in an efficient manner in their interrelationships with members of the majority culture. (PEEB, 1982, p. 13, my translation)

PEEB extended bilingual education from four (as stipulated by government policy) to six years of primary schooling, and advocated for the use of Indigenous languages as both medium ("the mother tongue will serve as an instrument of education") and subject of instruction ("while at the same time it will itself be developed") to be maintained throughout schooling alongside Spanish. To this end, PEEB developed teaching guides, such as the one cited above, outlining language allocation planning, language skills to be developed, grade-specific goals and pedagogical recommendations.

What is more, PEEB members, grounded on the ideological spaces offered by the NBEP, and enjoying autonomy from the central government and funding from foreign organizations, continued to expand and fill implementational spaces for Indigenous languages and identities by re-thinking the nature and content of the curriculum:

maintenance bilingual education transcends a linguistic scope as it pursues the incorporation of content from two cultures in the curriculum. The objective... is the auto-affirmation of the individual

in their own cultural environment, the possibility of exchange and relationships of equal conditions with the majority environment (PEEB, 1982, p. 13, my translation).

For PEEB bilingual education encompassed the incorporation of local knowledge into curricular contents, validating students' cultural milieu, as well as the promotion of a balanced relationship with the majority culture, for which efficient teaching and learning of Spanish was fundamental. To both ends, the second grade Spanish book *Puente* (PEEB, 1983) shows several readings and follow-up activities that portray and examine the socio-cultural and economic activities of students' communities, of other regional and urban areas, and of other Indigenous people of Peru. Together, the readings point to PEEB's bicultural stance, which affirmed students' cultures and provided spaces for them to access other realities.

In addition, PEEB engaged in a long-term goal of developing Indigenous languages for their new roles as written languages and languages of schooling. In this vein, López (1991) recognizes the potential of schools as contexts for corpus planning, as PEEB schools engaged in the "lexical and idiomatic elaboration and intellectualization of the vernaculars" (p. 9, my translation). The elaboration and production of multiple print classroom materials used to implement PEEB's bilingual and bicultural model is a manifestation of corpus planning, and one of the project's biggest accomplishments (Montoya, 1990). By the termination of the program in 1991, PEEB had become the only national-level bilingual education initiative with a curriculum and classroom materials for the five subject areas of all primary grades (López, 1991).

Not only did PEEB expand ideological and implementational spaces for Indigenous languages and cultures in its Puno schools, but in doing so it paved the way for other national and international IBE initiatives. The new Office for Bilingual Education of the Ministry of Education of Peru, as well as other private institutions across the country, sought professional and technical support from PEEB. At the regional level, PEEB's bilingual education model was expanded from 40 to 1350 Puno schools. Finally, the bilingual and intercultural education ripples caused by PEEB produced transnational collaborations with the Ministries of Education of Ecuador and Bolivia, who used, to different degrees, the materials produced by PEEB (López, 1991).

PEBIAN: The Program for Bilingual and Intercultural Education of the Alto Napo

At the same time period, across the country in the northwestern Amazon, PEBIAN was born in response to demands of the Napuruna people for control of their own education. The Napuruna, through the Organización Kichwaruna Wankurina del Alto Napo (Kichwaruna Wankurina Federation of the Alto Napo), demanded their community's right to bilingual education taking advantage of the favorable Velasco policy context, a connection explicitly elaborated in the writings of program members (Ashanga, Vera, San Román & Tushupe, 1990; Fernández, 1983). The heightened ethnic consciousness of the Napuruna was facilitated by the presence of SINAMOS (National System for the Support of Social Mobilization) brigades in the area, which promoted participatory and autonomous organizations

systems among peasants, in addition to the leadership of Catholic missionary Juan Carlos Mercier (Freeland, 1996).

For PEBIAN, the purpose of education was centered around the production of critical Napuruna individuals who could value their culture and dialogue with others (similar to PEEB's goals), but above all could examine and transform the conditions that lead to the marginalization of their people (Ashanga et al., 1990). PEBIAN developed a maintenance bilingual education model, although it offered little elaboration on the planning and use of languages in schooling. However, the educational model was grounded in the Napuruna way of life and followed Freirean ideals of education for liberation, as described by one of the program coordinators:

With this liberatory education of the student, he/she discovers their own qualities and capacities, the value of the knowledges and customs of their people and can overcome the inferiority complex engendered by destructive accumulation (Fernández, 1983, p. 131, my translation).

The above quote points to how PEBIAN creatively seized and made its own NBEP's goals of education for critical consciousness and for integration into the national culture. Education would not merely use Napuruna's language and culture as bridges to approximate national culture, but a bilingual and critical education would also question and transform national culture. With this purpose in mind, diversifying and transforming the curriculum, and not merely translating it into the community language, was one of the main activities of PEBIAN. For example, the first grade Kichwa textbook *Ayllu Kanchi* included the following discussion questions for a unit titled 'We are owners of our land':

Who is the owner of our house? And of our *chacra*? Who is the owner?

Is it good for a *patrón* (master), a *señor*, to come from the outside to become the master of our lands? (cited in Fernández, 1983, p. 132, my translation)

The upper grades textbook *We the Napuruna* (Mercier, 1979) includes several bilingual texts about Napuruna myths, traditions and history, including Napuruna experiences of oppression and struggle against the Spanish, rubber barons and river merchants. A text describing changes in Napuruna clothing and lifestyle during times of conflict with neighboring Indigenous groups and rubber barons includes the following reflection questions:

Do you think some young people who are annoyed at their customs do well by wanting to copy all the things from outside?

Why do some only take the bad from the Whites? The vices?

Think: is it ok that others value what is ours and that you are not proud of your good native customs? Give your opinion.

In order to take the good things from other cultures, do we have to throw away what we have? Think nicely (p. 256, translation mine).

Both textbook examples serve to show how PEBIAN's curriculum opened spaces for the inclusion of many identities, voices and histories, in ways not envisioned by the Velasco policies. Unlike PEEB, which favored more balanced and harmonious representations of cultural diversity, PEBIAN curriculum tackled conflict and inequalities head on, starting in the early grades. Moreover, PEBIAN started elaborating more nuanced understandings of intercultural relations beyond official policies' concern for respect and harmonious relationships. The questions from *We the Napuruna* implicitly critique uncritical copying from the outside, without consideration of the shortcomings of White Peruvian and mestizo culture (or what the text calls the "Whites") and with disregard and shame for Napuruna traditions. Furthermore, the textbook questions could be interpreted as leading to a discussion that recognizes both positive aspects of Napuruna and national culture and which positions students as actors who engage in critical intercultural exchanges where they negotiate what elements of different traditions they will reject and embrace, with a primary focus on maintaining and strengthening Napuruna traditions. Worth mentioning is the fact that the curriculum diversification experiences of PEBIAN paved the way for more critical approaches to intercultural education in the Amazonian region of Peru, some of which are reflected in contemporary IBE documents.

In addition, PEBIAN prioritized the inclusion of community members and teachers in carving ideological and implementational spaces for Napuruna education. For example, it was parents who requested that *mestizo* (non-Indigenous) teachers be replaced by Napuruna teachers, who they believed would better serve their communities (Ashanga et al., 1990). From then on, the ORKIWAN federation played a key role in the selection process of future teachers, a move that has been incorporated by other Indigenous-run teacher education institutions like FORMABIAP (Teacher Training Programme for Intercultural Bilingual Education in the Peruvian Amazon). Napuruna teachers, rather than actors outside the school, were responsible for and active in developing curriculum resources needed to support implementational practices that served their model of education (Fernández, 1983). Teachers also contributed with 20% of their salaries to PEBIAN in order to support the program's financial autonomy, which to a considerable extent explained its freedom in developing an educational model distant from governmental intervention (Freeland, 1996).

Negotiating Ideological and Implementational Spaces in the 1970s and 1980s

An exploration of the origin, activities and orientations of both PEEB and PEBIAN provides examples of how local networks of actors can fill in and expand spaces offered by language policies. One of PEEB's major accomplishments was to transcend the reigning transitional model of education and craft implementational spaces for a maintenance model of bilingual education. PEBIAN, in turn, built on the critical ideological spaces of the NBEP—overlooked by a more powerful discourse regarding the respectful yet transitional model of national integration—and promoted a culturally relevant and social justice oriented model of education for intercultural relations and transformation. Together, both initiatives appropriated and re-imagined the role of Indigenous languages and cultures in education.

While acknowledging the gains of PEEB and PEBIAN, it is worth noting that both limited *for whom* bilingual education was targeted, that is primary-school aged Indigenous children in rural areas. During this era, bilingual education in multilingual urban areas remained ignored (Cerrón-Palomino, 1989). Developing ideological spaces and implementational practices that reflected an Indigenous-languages-as-resources for all orientation continued to be an area for future growth.

The Velasco reforms played a catalyst role in the activities of both programs, showing the potential of policy to provide ideological spaces to be mobilized by advocates of Indigenous languages. PEEB was born out of a governmental-international agency partnership, and the political organizing of the Napuruna, leading to their claim for bilingual education, benefited from Velasco's social reforms. This latter context serves to show that rather than language policies alone, it is language policies in conjunction with other social policies (in this case Velasco's Law of Native Communities (Freeland, 1996), and the presence of the SINAMOS brigades) which can provide a fertile context to seize spaces for including multiple languages and cultures. After all, complementary social policies entailed re-imagining the role of speakers, their languages and identities within wider socio-economic and political structures.

In a similar vein, both experiences benefited from the inclusion of multiple actors (foreign organizations, foreign funders, government, missionaries, Indigenous federations, teacher groups) in determining *what* ideological and implementational spaces were negotiated and *how* bilingual education was to be accomplished. The case of PEBIAN serves to show the value of incorporating community members and Indigenous organizations in this process, which remained a shortcoming of PEEB (Hornberger, 1987). What is more, different configurations of actors (public, private) involved different affordances. The autonomy PEBIAN gained through economic independence allowed its members to imagine more critical implementational practices, although limited funding certainly constrained its work and scope. In the case of PEEB, however, the public eye that fell upon it, given the participation of governmental and international players, opened opportunities for the model to be picked up and implemented in other areas. In this way, PEEB encouraged other actors to pry open their own spaces for the inclusion of Indigenous languages in education. Although the success of such effects is hard to measure, it is worth noting the role of various practitioners and scholars, such as Luis Enrique López, Nancy Hornberger and Lucy Trapnell, who participated in different ways in the program's creation and development, and who have since been tireless advocates for the maintenance and development of Indigenous languages across different contexts. It is also worth mentioning the continued support of Napuruna community members and teachers for intercultural and bilingual education, which I encountered during my 2013 fieldwork in the Alto Napo, almost 40 years after the beginning of PEBIAN.

A Contemporary Perspective: Filling in Multilingual Spaces

Multilingual educational policies in Peru arose within a wider context of mobilization for Indigenous rights—re-emerging in Latin America during the 1970s—as well as international agendas of education for all and linguistic rights, which defined the social and educational policies during the 1980s and 1990s

(Valdiviezo, 2009). The promotion of IBE for the purpose of national integration was recognized in the 1993 Constitution and further elaborated in the Ley General de Educación (2003) (General Law of Education), which recognized the cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity of Peru as a basis of national identity (Article 9) and interculturality as one of the guiding principles of education for all (Article 8). The General Law of Education also provided more guidelines as to the meaning of IBE. Article 20 specifies IBE as an education which (a) respects and incorporates cultural diversity in education, (b) guarantees mother tongue education and learning Spanish as a second language, (c) has teachers that are proficient in both their students' indigenous language and Spanish, (d) guarantees Indigenous communities will participate as educational stakeholders and (e) preserves and promotes Indigenous languages. Despite the framing of interculturality as a guiding principle for all (Article 8), linked to a diversity-as-resource orientation, the General Law of Education limits IBE to Indigenous students, reflecting a diversity-as-right orientation.

Multilingual policies enjoy ample legislative support. However, tensions and ideological paradoxes remain. The bilingual education models arising from these policies have been described as transitional and one-way, in that they only target Indigenous language speakers, and are limited to the primary years of schooling (Hornberger, 2000). Within the targeted Indigenous population, bilingual education has failed to meet the wide range of needs of Indigenous multilingualism, as it has remained focused on serving rural dwelling students with an Indigenous language as their home language (López & Kuper, 1999). Interculturality, even if targeted for all students, does not acknowledge the systems of oppression and inequalities that underlie relations between different ethnic groups, and has remained an elusive concept with no guidelines for its implementation (Valdiviezo, 2009). Despite regulations including the rights of Indigenous communities to participate in the design and implementation of IBE, ethnographic work continues to shed light on the ideological gap between policymakers, implementers and those living with the everyday consequences of IBE (García, 2004). In addition, policy has not always been met with top-level support to build on those gains. Since the Office for Bilingual Intercultural Education was reinstated in 1996, the changing political climate has meant that the existence and funding status of this office continues to be under threat (García, 2004).

The DIGEIBIR Renaissance: Negotiating Spaces in Education and Curriculum Policy

Since 2011, the Office of Intercultural Bilingual and Rural Education (DIGEIBIR) has engaged in language-in-education policy development and implementation surpassing any activities in the last two decades (Servindi, 2013). Across a range of activities including developing a national system to quantify provision of and demand for IBE schools and teachers, producing an ethnolinguistic map of Peru, elaborating a national IBE curricular proposal, providing previously unavailable in-service professional development to schools, revitalizing IBE teacher education, and engaging in the ongoing standardization of multiple languages and the production of educational materials in such languages (Burga, 2013; DIGEIBIR, 2013a), DIGEIBIR's activities force us to consider how IBE is currently being re-

thought. Building on DIGEIBIR's current priorities (curriculum, personnel and materials development) and for the sake of this paper, I limit my analysis to changes at the educational policy and curriculum policy areas.

The Reglamento de la Ley General de Educación (2012) (Regulations of the General Law of Education) offer an example of how ideological spaces offered by previous multilingual policies (e.g., 1993 Constitution, 2003 General Law of Education) can further be expanded into implementational spaces by accompanying legislation. The 2012 Regulations elaborate how the General Law of Education is to be interpreted and implemented by expanding the different types of schools to serve Indigenous students and incorporating, for the first time, the teaching of a second language in preschool (Article 30). Correspondingly, the 2013 Directives identify intercultural bilingual schools (IBE) as those which serve students who "have as a mother tongue the indigenous language spoken in the community, district, province or region", or who have different degrees of proficiency but for whom "the indigenous languages is the language that predominates among students and the community" (Ministerio de Educación, 2013, p. 2). The Directives also identify intercultural schools (IE) as those that serve communities where students have Spanish as their mother tongue and who desire their students to "regain or learn the indigenous language of their people as a second language" (p. 2). The creation of IE schools marks a key moment in IBE history, since the DIGEIBIR opened implementational spaces for schools to become places to counteract language shift.

The ideological spaces offered by the Regulations and Directives are further developed into implementational practices by the DIGEIBIR as reflected in the document *Towards an intercultural bilingual education of quality: Pedagogical Proposal* (DIGEIBIR, 2013b). The Pedagogical Proposal (PP) offers much awaited and needed conceptual, curricular, and pedagogical guidelines on IBE. The PP introduces language allocation models for educators to implement the maintenance models of bilingual education in IBE and IE schools, and the teaching of a second language, either an Indigenous language or Spanish, in the last year of preschool. Moving away from a one-bilingual-education-model-fits-all approach, the PP introduces a taxonomy of four different sociolinguistic contexts and language allocation models for each context. The sociolinguistic contexts range from contexts where students are monolingual in an Indigenous language and have limited Spanish use/contact, to contexts where students have Spanish as the home language and the Indigenous language has very limited or non-existent domains of use. For all cases except the last, bilingual education models maintain the use of the first and second language as subjects and medium of instruction, and aim to achieve a 50/50 language allocation by the last year of primary school.

In the last context, in which IE schools support language revitalization efforts, the suggested language allocation is more flexible and depends on the community context and demands. Additionally, the PP endorses maintenance and enrichment models of bilingual education, which consider "the possibility of learning an Indigenous language by all the population, whether Indigenous or not" (DIGEIBIR, 2013b, p. 29, my translation). Although there are still no resources for the teaching of Indigenous languages to the non-Indigenous population, the document starts carving ideological spaces for such an implementational practice guided by a language-as-resource orientation.

Further research is needed to better understand the political and social forces that led to the renaissance of the DIGEIBIR. Nevertheless it is worth noting the role of key players within DIGEIBIR responsible for its activities. Many representatives, including the General Director of DIGEIBIR as well as heads of departments, staff and consultants, have been IBE researchers and practitioners with experiences in Andean and Amazonian initiatives, such as PEEB and the longstanding FORMABIAP teacher education program. The PP includes many of these players in the table of contents, and references the work of local researchers, academics and prior IBE projects that it draws insights from. The presence and roles of such individuals in the top-level policymaking layers serves to show the value of prior bottom-up IBE experiences which, through their own negotiation of spaces for Indigenous languages in education, nurtured individuals who would then go on to advocate for similar spaces at the top-down layers of the policymaking process. Multi-era and multi-layered analysis like the one presented here can thus contribute to our understandings of the historical transcendence of ideological and implementational spaces.

With regards to *who* is engaging in the negotiation of multilingual spaces, current DIGEIBIR activities have sought to incorporate broader sectors of society in re-imagining intercultural bilingual education. The PP, for example, was elaborated in consensus and participation with community leaders, representatives of Indigenous organizations and IBE students. The creation of a National Commission of IBE (CONIBE), a Technical Roundtable for IBE, and the *Tinkuy* national symposium for boys and girls from diverse ethnic groups, are all examples of implementational spaces opening avenues for the participation of multiple sectors of society that call for future research (DIGEIBIR, 2013a).

The Office of Indigenous Languages: Seizing Spaces Beyond Schools

The introduction of the Law of Languages² (2011) sheltered in the Office of Indigenous Languages within the Ministry of Culture, marked a shift in language policy in Peru, which expanded beyond the scope of language-in-education policies. Couched on a language-as-right orientation, the law provided an elaboration of Peruvian linguistic rights (Article 4), expanded the domains of official use of Indigenous languages (Articles 15 and 20), and further reinforced support for maintenance models of IBE, including those for languages in the process of revitalization (Article 22). Article 22 has been mobilized in language-in-education policy documents, providing a legal backbone for DIGEIBIR's education and curriculum policy developments described in the last section, which serves to show how multiple policies can support each other in opening up ideological spaces to pursue the goals of maintaining and developing Indigenous languages.

The expansion of the domains, where Indigenous languages have official status brought about by the law, constitutes a case of status planning. According to the law, speakers have the right to receive services in their mother tongue in governmental institutions:

² Ley que regula el uso, preservación, desarrollo, recuperación, fomento y [Law that regulates the use, preservation, development, revitalization, promotion and dissemination of the Indigenous languages of Peru]; hereon referred to as Law of Languages.

Public and private entities which provide public services implement, in a planned and progressive manner, training or hiring policies and programs so that in the areas of the country where an indigenous language predominates its civil servants and public sector workers, as well as the members of the Armed Forces and the National Police of Peru can sufficiently communicate in that language. (Ley que regula el uso, preservación, desarrollo, recuperación, fomento y difusión de las lenguas originarias del Perú, 2011, Article 4, Sec. 15.2, my translation)

Although the law still waits for an approval of the regulation that will further clarify its guidelines and responsibilities, actors within the Office of Indigenous Languages have begun to develop implementational spaces that translate the language-as-right orientation of the law into implementation practices through the continued development of a Training Program for interpreters and translators of Indigenous languages.

The Training Program was established in 2012 with the goal of training a body of interpreters of Indigenous languages who could support the processes of prior consultation underway (N. Bariola, personal communication, 2015). Since its creation in 2013, the Office of Indigenous Languages has housed the Training Program and managed the implementation of translation and interpretation workshops and accreditation. In this way, seizing the ideological spaces offered by the Law of Languages, the continued activities of the Training Program aim to support the new roles of Indigenous languages in governmental institutions. Now in its sixth session, the program has trained 172 interpreters and translators representing 28 languages (Ministerio de Cultura, 2014a). Interpreters and translators applying for training must be speakers of an Indigenous language and preferably have the backing up of their Indigenous organization. The workshops, led by academics from various institutions, include topics pertaining to interpretation and translation services, international and national Indigenous rights, and the creation of new terminology, opening spaces for corpus planning activities.

The Training Program is still in its initial stages, however, one of the ongoing challenges has been creating a market and a demand for the interpreters across national and regional governmental spaces (N. Bariola, personal communication, 2014), a task which is not achieved by the decree of a law alone. In this sense, it is worth exploring how the Office has begun to brand the use of Indigenous languages in governmental institutions. The poster *Let's talk about linguistic rights* elaborated by the Office and targeted at civil servants reads:

By respecting linguistic rights, we will achieve better results:

As a civil servant, you are under the obligation to know and obey these rights. Remember that by using an Indigenous language, you will generate trust, improve your performance and secure results (Ministerio de Cultura, 2014b, my translation).

The above excerpt reflects a language-as-right orientation in addition to a language-as-resource orientation, although of a heavily instrumentalist orientation. The use of Indigenous languages by civil servants is linked to discourses of efficiency in the work place. The co-existence of both orientations suggests that the opening of

ideological spaces for Indigenous languages is being approached using different orientations with different intended audiences.

Negotiating Ideological and Implementational Spaces in the 2010s

Policy developments within DIGEIBIR and the Office of Indigenous Language point to new ways in which ideological and implementational spaces for Indigenous languages are being negotiated in present day Peru, raising some questions and depicting some ongoing tensions. Overall, there is an increase in implementation activities at the legislative level, through the elaboration of new laws, directives and regulations that build on and expand on prior multilingual policies. Despite their intricacy and somewhat arcane nature outside these policymaking circles, analysis of these documents helps illuminate the complexity of what ‘top-down’ language policies means and what top-down negotiating encompasses. In addition, increased policymaking within and across different top-down institutional domains can fortify the legal backing for each other and open ideological spaces for other initiatives to strategically seize and fill in. For example, carving new spaces for Indigenous languages in public and governmental institutions provides more incentives for bilingual education, as Indigenous languages are seen to have different roles and functions in society, which opponents of IBE often cite as lacking. Similarly, the use of Indigenous languages in these public and governmental spaces creates a demand for bilingual speakers, which can be achieved through bilingual education. Finally, the creation of IE schools can help extend the domain of IBE beyond rural schools and contribute to initiatives that are advocating for the use of Indigenous languages in spaces that traditionally have not been privileged.

The activities of DIGEIBIR and the Office of Indigenous Languages point to a more inclusive consideration of *what* is negotiated—increased domains of Indigenous language use and increased bilingual education models—and *for whom* this is negotiated—increased recipients of bilingual education and governmental services in Indigenous languages. Although further ethnographic research will serve to show how these ideological and implementational spaces are taken up, it is worth considering if the privileging of a maintenance model of bilingual education can truly encompass the myriad new contexts of Indigenous bilingualism and Indigenous language education to non-Indigenous students. Further implementational spaces with regards to bilingual education models need to be crafted in order for DIGEIBIR to move beyond lip-service interpretations of a language-as-resource orientation to all and indeed create contexts for Indigenous language revitalization and for the learning of Indigenous languages by non-Indigenous students. Although a challenging task, which remained untackled by the bilingual education initiatives of the 70s and 80s, multiple ideological spaces are available to be creatively seized by DIGEIBIR and other educational activists at the present moment.

Negotiating more openings for language and cultural diversity in Peruvian society ultimately necessitates an examination of the overarching purpose of incorporating Indigenous languages in new domains and for new audiences. The experiences of PEEB and PEBIAN, for example, have showed possible goals of bilingual education, from favoring harmonious inter-group relations in society to more critical examinations of it. Current policy changes rely on both language-as-right and language as-resource orientations, but what remains to be seen is

how language-as-resource orientations are taken up. The danger of often-found instrumentalist resource orientations attached to the teaching and learning of heritage languages (Ricento, 2005) is important to consider. Relatedly, the initiatives of the Office of Indigenous Languages necessitates to consider the extent to which a rights-orientation alone can nurture long-lasting and deeper societal views that embrace linguistic and cultural diversities as resources for all of society, not just seeing diversity as an obligation from some (e.g. government workers) to others (e.g. speakers of Indigenous languages). Overall, the initiatives of both the Office of Indigenous Languages and DIGEIBIR are not impossible to achieve nor idealistic, but they do imply a great level of commitment at the political and pedagogical levels, which is not always easy to sustain.

Concluding Remarks

Drawing from and extending Hornberger's (2002) idea that actors ought to fill in as richly and as fully as possible implementational and ideological spaces, I propose that in the Peruvian context and beyond, as many actors as possible in as many layers as possible, and in as many processes as possible constituting the LPP onion should be engaged in opening up spaces for multiples languages and identities if we are to be successful in this endeavor. Despite the various particularities of bottom-up and top-down activities, what remains crucial about the role of actors is the locus of enunciation from which they engage in the negotiation of ideological and implementational spaces. Reflecting on the trajectory of IBE, López (2008) posits how this locus should be guided by an attitude of working for and with Indigenous people. In a similar spirit, I suggest our LPP activities and research be guided by a concern of working from and for cultural and linguistic diversity for all.

Engagement in LPP activities with a concern for diversity for all is particularly heightened in the current Peruvian policymaking landscape. The cultivation of such a stance, however, is not a simple task and is currently influenced by wider neoliberal reforms and decolonization movements that are struggling to re-define the purpose of IBE in Peru and Latin America (Gustafson, 2014; Trapnell & Zavala, 2013). In addition to the danger and limitation of solely instrumentalist orientations to diversity, a critical stance to LPP makes me wonder to what extent the role of Indigenous languages in the public sector remains as a crutch to help speakers of Indigenous languages access services and be incorporated into national culture, without an examination of what 'national culture' means and its exclusionary potential. Similarly, a critical stance leads me to worry about the teaching of Indigenous languages to a more expanded population through models of bilingual education that ignore the role of language in society, particularly its potential for discrimination and exclusion. The concern regards both the education of Indigenous students within bilingual programs that do not engage with wider notions of language, citizenship, and Indigenous struggles, as well as the education of non-Indigenous students within programs that favor views of diversity as an obligation or as an apolitical celebration.

At the same time, recent LPP developments in Peru bring to mind the potential spaces for diversity that could be expanded. Bringing in speakers of Indigenous languages into courts, police offices, banks, medical centers and

various other public domains invites us to consider the new avenues in which Indigenous people can exercise their citizenship rights. What is more, the inclusion and engagement with Indigenous ways of knowing and knowledges that are fundamental to many speakers of Indigenous languages can open opportunities to expand notions of justice, medicine, commerce and other domains which are the setting of LPP activities and can even start to re-imagine what a national culture means. The expansion of the recipients of Indigenous language education also encourages us to consider the development and promotion of curriculum and pedagogy that prioritizes talk about languages in society for all students. More specifically, this potential opening calls for educational practices which include critical and ongoing reflections about how language has shaped and been shaped by different ideologies (or orientations) through time, and how such ideologies have a direct impact in students' everyday communicative activities. In this sense, bilingual education can craft spaces for students to be included in the negotiation of ideological spaces that support Indigenous languages in their societies in ways that transcend an obligatory or instrumentalist orientation.

The highlighted cautions and promises of the current LPP landscape in Peru will certainly be actively negotiated by various actors, with outcomes that remain to be seen. As LPP researchers, we have a rich tradition to draw from in order to support LPP developments in Peru and around the globe, offering critical takes on structures of exclusion and inequalities as well as highlighting spaces of agency and creativity. After all, as LPP researchers we too are actors in the LPP onion with the responsibility to contribute to both theory and practice that crafts ideological and implementational spaces for cultural and linguistic diversity in our multilingual world.

Acknowledgements

I thank Dr. Nancy Hornberger and the participants of the spring 2014 LPP seminar for providing an exciting space where I explored ideas relevant to this paper. I am grateful to Dr. David Cassels Johnson for providing insightful feedback on an earlier draft of this paper and to Aldo Anzures Tapia for his valuable support during the editing process.

Frances Kvietok Dueñas is a Ph.D. student in Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania. Her research interests include Indigenous bilingualism, bilingual education and language policies in Perú and Latin America. She is happy to receive questions and comments at fkvietok@gse.upenn.edu.

References

- Ashanga, G., Vera, R., San Román, G., & Tushupe, L. (1990). Catorce años de educación bilingüe en la Amazonía: análisis y prospectiva. Programa de Educación Bilingüe e Intercultural del Alto Napo [Fourteen years of bilingual education in the Amazon: analysis and prospects]. *Amazonía Peruana*, 10(18), 53–66.
- Balarin, M. (2006). *Radical discontinuity: A study of the role of education in the Peruvian state and of the institutions and cultures of policy making in education*. Unpublished PhD Thesis: University of Bath.

- Ball, S. J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse*, 13(2), 10–17.
- Burga, E. (2013, August 9). *¿Qué hemos avanzado en la implementación de la educación intercultural bilingüe?* [What have we advanced in the implementation of intercultural bilingual education?]. Retrieved from www.digeibir.gov.pe/articulos
- Cerrón-Palomino, R. (1989). Language policy in Peru: A historical overview. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 77, 11–33.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Constitución Política del Peru (1993). Retrieved from <http://www.pcm.gob.pe/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Constitucion-Pol%C3%ADtica-del-Peru-1993.pdf>
- DIGEIBIR (2013a). *Avances en la implementación de la política de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe (IBE) 2011–2013. Ayuda memoria* [Advances in the implementation of the Intercultural Bilingual Education policy (IBE) 2011–2013. Memoire]. Lima, Peru: Ministerio de Educación.
- DIGEIBIR (2013b). *Hacia una educación intercultural bilingüe de calidad: Propuesta pedagógica* [Towards a quality intercultural bilingual education: Pedagogical proposal]. Lima, Peru: Ministerio de Educación.
- Escobar, A., Mar, J. M., & Alberti, G. (1975). *Perú: ¿país bilingüe?* [Peru: bilingual country?]. Lima, Peru: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Fernández, M. (1983). Educación intercultural y bilingüe en el Alto Napo (relato de una experiencia) [Intercultural and bilingual education in the Alto Napo (tale of an experience)]. In A. Corbera (Ed.), *Educación y lingüística en la amazonía peruana* (pp. 111–148). Lima, Peru: Centro Amazónico de Antropología y Aplicación Práctica.
- Freeland, J. (1996). The global, the national and the local: Forces in the development of education for Indigenous peoples: The case of Peru. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 26(2), 167–195.
- García, M. E. (2004). Rethinking bilingual education in Peru: Intercultural politics, state policy and Indigenous rights. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(5), 348–367.
- Godenzzi, J. C. (2008). Language policy and education in the Andes. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 315–329). New York, NY: Springer.
- Gustafson, B. (2014). Intercultural bilingual education in the Andes: Political change, new challenges and future directions. In R. Cortina (Ed.), *The education of indigenous citizens in Latin America* (pp. 74–97). Cambridge, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1987). Bilingual education success, but policy failure. *Language in Society*, 16(02), 205–226.
- Hornberger, N.H. (1988). *Bilingual education and language maintenance: A southern Peruvian Quechua case*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2000). Bilingual Education Policy and Practice in the Andes: Ideological Paradox and Intercultural Possibility. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 31(2), 173–201.

- Hornberger, N. H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, 1(1), 27–51.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2005). Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 605–609.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(3), 509–532.
- Hult, F. (2010). Analysis of language policy discourses across the scales of space and time. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 202, 7–24.
- Johnson, D. C. (2010). Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education language policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(1), 61–79.
- Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language policy*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnson, D. C., & Ricento, T. (2013). Conceptual and theoretical perspectives in language planning and policy: Situating the ethnography of language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 219, 7–21.
- Ley General de Educación [General Law of Education] (2003). Retrieved from <http://www.minedu.gob.pe/normatividad/leyes.php>
- Ley que regula el uso, preservación, desarrollo, recuperación, fomento y difusión de las lenguas originarias del Perú [Law that regulates the use, preservation, development, revitalization, promotion and dissemination of the Indigenous languages of Peru] (2011).
- López, L. E. (1991). Educación bilingüe en Puno-Perú: Hacia un ajuste de cuentas [Bilingual education in Puno-Peru: Towards settling the score]. In M. Zuñiga, I. Pozzi-Scott, & L. E. López (Eds.), *Educación bilingüe intercultural. Reflexiones y desafíos*. (pp. 173–217). Lima, Peru: FOMCIENCIAS.
- López, L. E., & Kuper, W. (1999). La educación intercultural bilingüe en América Latina: balance y perspectivas [Intercultural bilingual education in Latin America: a review and perspectives]. *Revista Iberoamericana de educación*, 20, 17–85.
- López, L. E. (2008). Top-down and bottom-up: counterpoised visions of bilingual intercultural education in Latin America. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Can schools save Indigenous languages? Policy and practice on four continents* (pp. 42–65). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mannheim, B. (1984). “Una nación acorralada”: Southern Peruvian Quechua language planning and politics in historical perspective. *Language in Society*, 13(3), 291–309.
- Menken, K. (2008). *English learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy*. Cambridge, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Menken, K., & García, O. (Eds.) (2010). *Negotiating language policies in schools: educators as policymakers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mercier, J. M. (1979). *Nosotros los Napu-Runas: Napu Runapa Rimay. Mitos e historia* [We the Napu-Runas: Napu Runapa Rimay. Myths and history]. Iquitos, Peru: Publicaciones Ceta.
- Ministerio de Cultura (2014a). *Intérpretes y traductores* [Interpreters and translators]. Retrieved from <http://cultura.gob.pe/es/interculturalidad/interpretes-y-traductores>

- Ministerio de Cultura (2014b). *Hablemos de los derechos lingüísticos* [Let's talk about linguistic rights] [Poster]. Lima, Peru. Retrieved from <http://www.cultura.gob.pe/es/interculturalidad/derechos-linguisticos>
- Ministerio de Educación (2013). *Resolución Ministerial No. 0630* [Ministry Resolution No. 0630]. Lima, Peru: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.minedu.gob.pe/normatividad/resoluciones.php>
- Montoya, R. (1990). *Por una educación bilingüe en el Perú: Reflexiones sobre cultura y socialismo* [For a bilingual education in Peru: Reflections about culture and socialism]. Lima, Peru: CEPES.
- PEEB (1982). *Enseñanza de lengua materna en un programa de educación bilingüe: Guía metodológica de segundo grado* [Mother tongue teaching in a bilingual education program: Second grade methodological guide]. Lima-Puno, Peru: Ministerio de Educación.
- PEEB (1983). *Puente: tercer libro de castellano como segunda lengua* [Bridge: third book of Spanish as a second language]. Lima-Puno, Perú: Ministerio de Educación.
- Ricento, T., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 401–428.
- Reglamento de la Ley General de Educación [Regulations of the General Law of Education] (2012). Retrieved from http://www.minedu.gob.pe/files/1723_201201301008.pdf
- Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the 'language-as-resource' discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the U.S.A. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9(3), 348–368.
- Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15–34.
- Servindi (2013, December 8). *Encuentro multitudinario demanda al Estado fortalecer la educación intercultural bilingüe* [Multitudinal gathering demands State to fortify intercultural bilingual education]. Retrieved from <http://servindi.org/actualidad/97493>
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. London, England: Longman.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2006). Critical theory in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: theory and method* (pp. 42–59). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Trapnell, L. & Zavala, V. (2013). *Volumen XIV: Dilemas educativos ante la diversidad, siglos XX–XXI* [XIV Volume: Educational dilemmas in the face of diversity, XX–XXI centuries]. Lima, Peru: Fondo Editorial de la Derrama Magisterial.
- Valdiviezo, L. (2009). Bilingual intercultural education in Indigenous schools: an ethnography of teacher interpretations of government policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(1), 61–79.
- Valdiviezo, L. (2013). Vertical and horizontal approaches to ethnography of language policy in Peru. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 219, 23–46.