University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

GSE Faculty Research

Graduate School of Education

6-1987

Bilingual Education Success, but Policy Failure

Nancy H. Hornberger

University of Pennsylvania, nancyh@gse.upenn.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs

Part of the [Anthropological Linguistics and Sociolinguistics Commons](#), [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Linguistic Anthropology Commons](#), and the [Social and Cultural Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hornberger, N. H. (1987). Bilingual Education Success, but Policy Failure. *Language in Society*, 16 (2), 205-226. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500012264>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. https://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/263
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Bilingual Education Success, but Policy Failure

Abstract

In 1977, a bilingual education project began in rural areas of Puno, Peru, as a direct result of Peru's 1972 Education Reform. This paper presents results of an ethnographic and sociolinguistic study comparing Quechua language use and maintenance between: 1) a bilingual education school and community, and 2) a nonbilingual education school and community. Classroom observation indicated a significant change in teacher–pupil language use and an improvement in pupil participation in the bilingual education school. Community observation and interviews indicated that community members both valued and used their language. Yet the project has had difficulties expanding or even maintaining its implementation.

Keywords

Quechua, Puno, Peru, Andes, bilingual education, classroom language use, ethnography, sociolinguistics, community development, language planning, language maintenance, educational policy

Disciplines

Anthropological Linguistics and Sociolinguistics | Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education | Linguistic Anthropology | Social and Cultural Anthropology

Bilingual education success, but policy failure

NANCY H. HORNBERGER

*Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania*

ABSTRACT

In 1977, a bilingual education project began in rural areas of Puno, Peru, as a direct result of Peru's 1972 Education Reform. This paper presents results of an ethnographic and sociolinguistic study comparing Quechua language use and maintenance between: 1) a bilingual education school and community, and 2) a nonbilingual education school and community. Classroom observation indicated a significant change in teacher–pupil language use and an improvement in pupil participation in the bilingual education school. Community observation and interviews indicated that community members both valued and used their language. Yet the project has had difficulties expanding or even maintaining its implementation. (Quechua; Puno, Peru; Peru; Andes; bilingual education; classroom language use; ethnography; sociolinguistics; community development; language planning; language maintenance; educational policy)

This paper will discuss the Experimental Bilingual Education Project of Puno, Peru, in terms of the context in which it arose, the success it experienced at the classroom level, and the sense in which it may be considered an example of policy failure, despite that classroom success. First, I will place the Project within the context of the policies surrounding it and the population it was designed to serve. Second, I will describe the success of the Project in the classroom in terms of both its faithfulness to the model of bilingual education it sought to implement, and the improved communication of educational content in the classroom. Finally, I will consider the Project as an example of policy failure in terms of both the problems Project staff encountered in implementing it and the problems inherent in assigning bilingual education the task of assisting in language maintenance.¹

THE POLICY CONTEXT

Four Peruvian policies of the 1970s set the stage for the Project: the Education Reform (*Compendio* . . . 1975), the National Bilingual Education Policy (Ministerio de Educación 1972), the Officialization of Quechua (*Comercio* 1975; Comisión . . . 1975), and the Constitution of 1979 (*Constitución política del*

© 1987 Cambridge University Press 0047-4045/87 \$5.00 + .00

Perú 1980). Each of these policies included dispositions relating to the Quechua language as either a major or minor part of policy. Each policy revealed certain orientations toward language, in particular toward the languages of the minority groups in Peru, specifically, the Quechua language. There are in fact three basic orientations evident both in these policies and in language-planning activities in various parts of the world. As described by Ruiz (1984), a "language-as-problem" orientation sees languages of minority groups within a national society as problems for both the speakers of the languages and the nation as a whole. A "language-as-right" orientation sees minority languages as a right to which their speakers are entitled. A third orientation, "language-as-resource," sees the minority languages as potential resources for the whole nation.

To achieve the full participation of everyone in the "new education," the Education Reform of 1970 saw self-education, life-long education, and nonformal education as mandatory components of the educational system. In addition, the Reform called for profound transformation of pedagogical principles, attitudes, and practice within the school system. This latter transformation was to be implemented by a variety of new practices, among them reorganization of the educational system into three levels (initial, basic, and higher), decentralization through the nationwide application of the nuclear school concept (called *nucleos educativos comunales* 'community educational nuclei'), educational extension, and bilingual education.

The overriding consideration in including bilingual education in the Reform was to draw the indigenous groups into the Peruvian mainstream efficiently and with respect shown to their language and culture. Passing attention was given to the languages as cultural resources for the nation, but the emphasis was on the rights of indigenous peoples to participate. Language was seen as a problem standing in the way of that participation.

The National Bilingual Education Policy (PNEB) of 1972 arose from the Educational Reform. Its three principal objectives may be summarized as: 1) consciousness raising aimed toward participation of the vernacular language communities; 2) the creation of a national culture, including pluralism; and 3) the use of Spanish as the common language in Peru while maintaining respect for linguistic diversity and the revitalization of the various vernacular languages.

The objectives reveal some ambiguities in orientation: for instance, the call for revitalization of the vernacular languages and for their communities to participate in structural change contrasts with the desire to achieve the use of Spanish as the common language, which implies incorporation of vernacular language speakers into the Spanish-speaking mainstream of the society. Similarly, the affirmation of cultural pluralism necessarily contrasts with the call for integration into a national culture.

The ambiguities reveal a spectrum of orientations toward language among the writers of the PNEB. Alfaro (1976), head of the National Education Ministry's Bilingual Education Unit, regarded language as a right; Pozzi-Escot (1978) re-

garded it as a problem; and Escobars (1978) and Escobar (1978) were somewhat ambiguous in orientation.

Implementations specified in the policies also revealed ambiguities in orientation. On the one hand, the by-laws specified that Quechua should be taught as a second language to Spanish speakers – a case of enrichment bilingual education entirely congruent with a language-as-resource orientation. On the other hand, the Basic Model of Bilingual Education developed by the Bilingual Education Unit revealed a language-as-problem orientation. It was a transitional model in which the increasing use of Spanish was accompanied by a decreasing use of the mother tongue for presentation of content in the first four grades of primary school.

The third policy which contributed to the policy context of the Bilingual Education Project was the Officialization of Quechua. Decree Law 21156 of May 27, 1975, recognized Quechua as an official language of Peru, coequal with Spanish. It represented very clearly a language-as-resource orientation in language status and corpus planning. Attention was given to issues of preservation, development, and management of the several Peruvian varieties of the Quechua language, and to bilingual development for the nation. It called for the obligatory teaching of Quechua at all levels of education, beginning in 1976, and the use of Quechua in all court actions involving Quechua speakers, beginning in 1977.

Finally, the Constitution of 1979 also included dispositions relating to Quechua. Article 83 stated that “Spanish is the official language of the Republic. Quechua and Aymara are also in official use in the zones and form which the Law establishes.” Such a statement revealed a retreat in orientation from the language-as-resource orientation of the Officialization to a language-as-right orientation recognizing the right of Quechua speakers to speak and use Quechua, but with no attention to the possibility of extending the use of Quechua to other zones and speakers.

These are the four policies and the three different orientations toward language which make up the policy context for the Quechua language in Peru in the 1970s. Each policy assigned to bilingual education a role in the revitalization and maintenance of the Quechua language or the recognition and incorporation of Quechua speakers.

THE SOCIOHISTORICAL CONTEXT

There are currently, by conservative estimate, between nine and eleven million Quechua speakers in seven republics of South America. There are approximately three and one-half million Quechua speakers in Peru; one-third to one-half of these are monolingual Quechua speakers. Though they have a rich history and cultural tradition, Quechua speakers live a marginalized existence in their national societies, deriving a subsistence existence from their agricultural and livestock production. Agricultural production is primarily potato and the highly

nutritious indigenous Andean grains *kinuwa* (*chenopodium quinoa*) and *qañiwa* (*chenopodium pallidicaule*) (Gade 1975:153–56). Livestock include primarily cattle, sheep, llamas, and alpacas. Quechua speakers live in dispersed homes in dispersed communities on the high plains and intermountain valleys of the Andes – usually at an altitude of 10,000 feet or higher. Increasingly, they migrate to the cities, mines, and coastal industries of Peru on either a permanent, or more often, a cyclical basis.

The research I am reporting here concentrates on the Quechua-speaking population of the Department of Puno, Peru. Puno department is located in southern Peru, contiguous to Bolivia and including portions of Lake Titicaca. There are 325,000 Quechua speakers in the department – half of Puno's population over age five.

Since the introduction of schools in the Quechua-speaking communities of Puno in the early part of this century, the language of instruction has traditionally been Spanish, despite the fact that most children arrive at school speaking only Quechua. Children are sent to school at considerable sacrifice to their parents, who require their children's labor in maintaining their fields and animals; and children show a serious intention to learn at school. Nevertheless, both dropout and illiteracy rates are high – 1981 census figures show that of Puno's population over fifteen, 32 percent are illiterate and 34 percent have only one to four years of schooling. The Education Reform and the Bilingual Education Project we are considering were intended in part to address these problems.

In other words, the Puno Bilingual Education Project arose in a particular sociohistorical context and a particular policy context. The sociohistorical context was one in which Quechua speakers and the Quechua language were kept on the margins of the national educational system. The policy context was that of a National Bilingual Education Policy enmeshed on the one hand in an Educational Reform which recognized the rights of Quechua-speaking communities and on the other hand in policies of Quechua officialization which recognized the Quechua language as a right for its speakers and a resource for the nation.

THE PROJECT

The Experimental Bilingual Education Project of Puno (PEEB) was undertaken in 1977 by the Puno Board of Education and the research arm of the Peruvian Ministry of Education, *Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo de la Educación* (INIDE), with technical advice from the West German Agency for Technical Cooperation (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit* [GTZ]). The Project began work in 100 schools in 1980 and is currently continuing in 40 schools. Though the Project began by “applying the basic model of bilingual education, . . . as proposed by the Bilingual Education Unit,” that is, transitional-type bilingual education, it has increasingly moved into maintenance-type bilingual education.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION SUCCESS, BUT POLICY FAILURE

The Project staff have written that while the choice to teach only in Spanish implies a policy of hispanicization and the choice of transitional bilingual education implies a policy of assimilation, their choice of maintenance bilingual education implies a policy of national integration based on respect for all ethnic groups. They outline a number of long-term effects which they hope the maintenance bilingual education model will contribute to: the development of the vernacular languages, the production of written material in the vernacular languages, cultural integration, the overcoming of social discrimination, reduction of illiteracy, and better use of educational opportunities.

There are many ways in which an educational project's success in the classroom might be evaluated. One approach would be to measure academic success of pupils both in and out of the program, and the Puno Bilingual Education Project has undertaken measurements of that kind. This paper, however, focuses on two other indicators of classroom success: first, the degree to which observed classroom language use was consistent with the Project's stated goals as to that use; and second, observed pedagogical benefits in terms of the interaction between pupil, teacher, and curriculum.²

CLASSROOM LANGUAGE USE

We noted above that Project staff stated that the type of bilingual education they were implementing was a maintenance-type bilingual education. In contrast with the model developed by the national Bilingual Education Unit, the Project bilingual education model called for the use of Quechua as a medium of instruction in all subjects in the classroom, in constant (not decreasing) amounts, and throughout all six years of primary school.

The Project developed texts, guides, and materials for the use of Quechua as a medium of instruction not only in the language arts, but also in mathematics, natural sciences, and social studies. These materials were provided to the teachers and pupils of the Project, and teachers were trained by Project staff in the use of the materials and the application of the methodologies of the Project. During the first year of Project operations, bilingual education was applied in first grade classes only; during the second year, in first and second grades; in the third year, in the first three grades, and so on.

The Project did succeed in introducing the use of Quechua as a medium of instruction. My observations of classroom language use in both traditional and Project classrooms showed that there is more Quechua language use in the bilingual education classroom. This is so for pupil language use, teacher language use, and written language use.

Pupil language use in both traditional and Project schools may be divided into pupil-to-pupil talk and pupil-to-teacher talk and discussed in relation to three domains of language use in the community: *ayllu*, non-*ayllu*, and *comunidad*. *Ayllu* is a Quechua term which is often translated as 'family' and more often as

'community', and it reflects the reality not only of language use in the community but also of social organization in the Andes. 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; 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.

Returning to pupil language use, Table 1 shows that approximately 89 percent of pupil schooltime is spent in settings in which pupils are primarily interacting with other pupils: 14 percent in settings of the *ayllu* domain, 41 percent in settings of the *comunidad* domain, and 34 percent in settings of the non-*ayllu* domain but where interaction is with other pupils (*ayllu* role relationship). The remaining 11 percent of pupil schooltime is spent in interaction with teachers: 6 percent in class, and 5 percent at line-up times.

In both the traditional and the Project schools, pupil-to-pupil talk was usually in Quechua; but at the Project school, it was even more so. Moreover, at the Project school, instances of insulting and showing off among pupils, which usually involved the use of Spanish, were rarer than at the traditional school.

In both the traditional and the Project schools, pupil-to-teacher talk occurred in all four pupil talk categories; but at the Project school, this talk was in Quechua,

BILINGUAL EDUCATION SUCCESS, BUT POLICY FAILURE

TABLE 1. *Pupil schooltime by language use domain^a*

Domain	Activity	Hours	%
Ayllu ^b	Waiting during adult meetings	3.5	7
	Teachers absent	3.5	7
Non-ayllu ^c	Line-up	2.5	5
	Classtime: Teacher teaching	3	6
Comunidad ^d	Recreo	16.5	32
	Deportes	4.5	9
Non-ayllu Setting and Ayllu Role Relationship	Classtime: Pupils on own	9	18
	Classtime: Housecleaning	4	8
	Classtime: Board work	4	8
Total		50.5	100

^aObservations during seven school days, Aug. 12, 1982 through Aug. 20, 1982. Kinsachata, Puno, Peru.

^bAyllu: situations pertaining to "traditional" community life, where Quechua is the language used.

^cNon-ayllu: situations resulting from the intrusion of the larger, national Peruvian society into the community territory, where Spanish is the language used.

^dComunidad: situations where community members come together for meetings, celebrations, or recreation using program formats originating outside the community. Quechua and Spanish are used in this domain.

while at the traditional school it was in Spanish.³ In Content Responses and Reading Responses, Project pupils used Quechua extensively; in Spontaneous Requests and Comments, they used Quechua to some extent. As with pupil-to-pupil insulting and showing off, Project pupils tended to use fewer Spontaneous Comments in interaction with their teachers than did their traditional counterparts.

Teacher language use in the Project classrooms differed from the traditional classrooms in both quantitative and qualitative use of Quechua. Project teachers used significantly more Quechua than their non-Project counterparts in the classroom: one-third to one-half of the time, as opposed to less than 1 percent of the time.

Project teachers used Quechua more often as a language of primary communication, while non-Project teachers used it as a secondary language of translation. Tables 2, 3, and 4 illustrate that in the classes I observed, the most common type of language switch in the bilingual education classroom was use of Quechua alone, while in the traditional classroom it was Quechua translation.

These Tables also show that Project teachers and pupils used Quechua in the exchange of information content which was also in Quechua, while non-Project teachers and pupils used Quechua as a back-up in exchanging information which was in Spanish, and that only occasionally. The most common type of teacher talk in Quechua in the bilingual education classroom was elicitation, evaluation, and information, while in the traditional classroom it was in direction and meta-statement as well as information.⁴ It seemed that in the traditional classroom,

TABLE 2. *Types of teacher Quechua use in Visallani first-second grade (by utterance)*

Type of talk	Type of switch			Total
	Q alone ^a	Q translation ^b	Codeswitching ^c	
Information ^d	2	6	3	11
Elicitation ^e	1	6	1	8
Direction ^f	2	9	0	11
Metastatement ^g	7	3	0	10
Evaluation ^h	2	0	0	2
Total	14	24	4	42

^a*Q alone*: a complete statement of new content in Quechua. May or may not be followed by translation into Spanish, but Spanish never precedes.

^b*Q translation*: a direct and immediate translation of either a word or entire sentence preceding in Spanish.

^c*Codeswitching*: use of Quechua within a Spanish utterance that is not a direct translation of a preceding Spanish word or phrase.

^d*Information (I)*: provides information: *Q'umir q'aytu kanqa sapankunapaq*.

^e*Elicitation (E)*: requests a linguistic response: *Iskribiyta atirquwaqchu uchuta, manachu?*

^f*Direction (D)*: requests a nonlinguistic response: A: *Hawatan llusiyichis chay mana atindiqkuna*. B: *Ch'inlla, ya, ch'inlla*.

^g*Metastatement (M)*: "its function is to help the pupils to see the structure of the lesson . . . to help them understand the purpose of the subsequent exchange, and see where they are going" (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975:43). Includes summaries and reviews: *Kunan kaymanta qallarisunchis*.

^h*Evaluation (V)*: includes praise, reprimand, and simple acknowledgement: *Mana allinchu chayqa*.

TABLE 3. *Types of teacher Quechua use in Kinsachata PEEB first grade (by utterance)^a*

Type of talk	Type of switch			Total
	Q alone	Q translation	Codeswitching	
Information	10	0	1	11
Elicitation	66	0	0	66
Direction	11	0	2	13
Metastatement	3	0	1	4
Evaluation	79	0	0	79
Total	169	0	4	173

^aTable 3 is not strictly comparable to Table 2 since the former represents Quechua use in one lesson, while Table 2 represents rare instances of Quechua use over a six-month period in multiple lessons.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION SUCCESS, BUT POLICY FAILURE

TABLE 4. *Types of teacher Quechua use in Kinsachata PEEB second grade (by utterance)^a*

Type of talk	Type of switch			Total
	Q alone	Q translation	Codeswitching	
Information	71	0	0	71
Elicitation	34	0	0	34
Direction	43	0	1	44
Metastatement	8	0	0	8
Evaluation	21	1	0	22
Total	177	1	1	179

^aTable 4 is not strictly comparable to Table 2 since the former represents Quechua use in one lesson, while Table 2 represents rare instances of Quechua use over a six-month period in multiple lessons.

teachers resorted to use of Quechua to translate a direction or crucial lesson-shaping statement when the same statement in Spanish had failed to produce the necessary reaction on the part of the pupils.

Both teachers and pupils in the bilingual education classrooms tended to use a more linguistically complete form of Quechua than did their non-Project counterparts and a more linguistically reduced form of Spanish. For example, Project teachers used a Quechua which was not only made up of complete sentences as opposed to fragments or words, but also incorporated the full range of Quechua syntax in their Quechua use. Quechua is a language particularly rich in markers which tie discourse to previous utterances. These discourse-tying markers tended to be left out of non-Project teacher Quechua use. Examples of discourse-tying markers are underlined in the following sentences taken from Project teachers' speech.

Kunan nuqa churasaq ahinata, qankunapis churallankichistaq.

Now I will put one like this, and you too should put yours like this.

Uk rumitawan churaychis.

Now add another stone.

Huksitutallawan yapaykusunman.

And now we'll add just one more again.

Kaypiñataq, kay sapankunapi, hayk'an kashan?

And now, here, in these ones, how many are there?

On the other hand, as observed in one lesson each of bilingual education grades one and two, between 70 and 80 percent of Spanish utterances by Project teachers were limited to short, standard cues, such as: *a ver*, *muy bien*, *ya* 'Let's see', 'very good', 'now or o.k.'

Approximately half of all written language in the bilingual education classrooms was in Quechua, while in other classrooms there was no written language in Quechua. This included all categories of writing: wall decorations, board writing, notebook writing, and textbooks.

PEDAGOGICAL BENEFITS

The Project succeeded in achieving the use of Quechua as medium of instruction allotted equal time with Spanish. The direct result of this use of Quechua was the improved transmission of educational content as evidenced in a number of differences in the interactions among pupil, teacher, and curriculum.

Pupil participation in the bilingual education classroom was significantly more than in the traditional classroom. This was true for oral participation, reading, and writing. Oral pupil participation in traditional classrooms is limited to *sí*, *no*, *yo* 'yes', 'no', 'me', and names of numbers. I observed classes where children were unable to generate modifying adjectives (1st & 2nd grades), sentences using abbreviations (for *Señorita*, *compañia*, *jirón*, *departamento*, *sin número*, *sociedad anónima*, *avenida*; 3rd & 4th grades), or any sort of sentence beyond a three- to five-word sentence closely following the teacher's model sentence (*Juan juega con sus amigos*, *Luis juega con su amigo*, *María corre mucho*, *Luisa corre en el campo*, *Pedro juega con su perro*; 5th & 6th grades). The problem in these cases was not in writing the word or sentence but in thinking of it in the first place.

Yet when teachers encouraged oral participation in Quechua, the difference was remarkable. The same pupils who, in class, could barely invent a five-word sentence in Spanish, could in Quechua invent complex and varied sentences:

Qullanapi vulita pukllaspanchis wayra hap' iwan.

While we were playing volleyball in Qullana, the wind got me.

Papay chakrata trabahan tutamantaña.

My father works in the fields from the early morning on.

Huk paluma urqu puntata halarin.

A dove flew over the top of the hill.

Huk niñasñataq klasinpi liyisharqan.

A girl was already in her class reading.

Mamay ñachá sinayta wayk' ushanña.

My mother is probably already cooking my dinner.

In the bilingual education first grade classroom, where pupils were accustomed to their teacher using Quechua all the time, lively discussion between teacher and pupils occurred regularly.

It is often said that Quechua children – and indigenous children in many parts of the world, for that matter – are naturally shy and reticent, and that that is why they rarely speak in school. We should therefore not interfere with their cultural

patterns by encouraging them to speak out more. In light of my observations, however, I think we should ask ourselves whether at least some of that reticence is due to the fact that the school language in many of these cases is a language entirely foreign to the child. Of course, more may be involved than language. In some parts of the world, children are shy in school even though the home language and the school language are the same. Philips (1983) has shown that, for the case of the Native American children at Warm Springs, at least, it is the cultural patterns themselves which are precisely the key to the children's participation. Given participation structures which are more congruent with their own cultural patterns, Warm Springs children do participate more in school. Participation structures may also be a factor in the case of Quechua children. Nevertheless, an even more fundamental issue seems to be language. Who, after all, can speak out in a language which they do not know?

Another indicator of effective communication of content in the bilingual education classrooms came when children read aloud. In a traditional school, "reading" in the lower grades often consisted of repeating aloud what the teacher read from the board or text. In most cases, pupils were not even looking at the words they were "reading." In one second grade, for example, there were only eight books for thirty pupils, so that most were repeating the words of the "reading" lesson without even seeing them once.

By the time they reach the upper grades, the most successful pupils manage to learn to decipher written Spanish from the printed page or board. In other words, they pronounce the sounds represented there. The Spanish language assists in this by being a phonemically written language: Its letters always represent the same sound. Nevertheless, it became apparent over and over again that pupils were pronouncing the words in Spanish with little or no inkling of what they were reading about. Long pauses occurred regularly while pupils sounded each word out anew each time; they were obviously getting no contextual clues, nor could they "recognize" a word which meant nothing to them. The pupils' reading did not respect punctuation marks or even word boundaries. Sentences and words were split down the middle and rejoined to other words or sentences. Pronunciation was problematic due to the conflict between Quechua and Spanish phonological rules. Non-Project teachers rarely even asked summary or review questions when a pupil finished reading. If they did, they were usually met with a blank or perplexed expression on the pupil's face.

Yet, when children had the opportunity to read in Quechua, the difference was remarkable. In the course of my pupil interviewing in the non-Project school, a few of the pupils became acquainted with the Project texts as part of the interview. Subsequently, pupils in all grades began to ask to borrow the two books. Then they would sit clustered around the books for as long as possible, even up to an hour, taking turns reading aloud. They read fluently, though most of them had never read in Quechua before. When they did make a mistake, it usually consisted of substituting a related and sensible word for the one in the text, rather

than a nonsensical look-alike substitution, as often occurred when they read Spanish. They read with understanding, laughing at appropriate moments, commenting on and summarizing to their classmates what they had read. These were the same children who could barely decipher a sentence from their Spanish reader and who usually had no idea what they were reading about.

In contrast to the teachers in the traditional classrooms, the Project teachers often asked the children summary and review questions about what they were reading, and got appropriate responses.

In the traditional classroom, when pupils were asked to copy exercises from the board or write as the teacher dictated, there was evidence in nearly all the children's notebooks that they had no idea what they were writing. The examples in Table 5 show that pupils were getting practice at forming the shapes of the letters, but with no understanding of any meaning in the shapes; a perfect example of form without content.

Pupils in the traditional classes learned to be very attentive to form, since they were unable to make sense out of the assignments in any other way. When an assignment was given, the pupils' great concern was usually to know whether it should be written in blue or red ink, or both; on every line or every other line; filling one or two sides of the page; and so on.

Yet when pupils were given the opportunity to write in Quechua, they did so relatively easily. In this case, their knowledge of the language, their first language, was sufficient to supply meaning even in the context-reduced classroom situation. In one Project classroom, the teacher dictated sentences in Quechua, which one pupil at a time wrote on the board while the others wrote it simultaneously in their notebooks. All were able to do this.

Writing in Quechua comes so naturally to a Quechua-speaking child that I observed children write even their Spanish assignments in Quechua. For example, one labeled his drawings *wasi* 'house' and *sach'a* 'tree' instead of *casa* and

TABLE 5. *Examples of writing errors from pupils' notebooks*

Model:	<i>la-casa-tiene-techo-rojo</i>
Pupil notebook:	<i>la-casa-tien-et-echo-rojo.</i>
Model:	<i>El sustantivo singular nombra a una sola persona animal o cosa.</i>
Pupil notebook:	<i>El sustantivos in nombra a una sola persona animal o casa.</i>
Model:	<i>El sustantivo plural indica</i>
Pupil notebook:	<i>El sustantivo plural indica</i>
Model:	<i>Papá dame mi pelota.</i>
Pupil notebook:	<i>papa-me-mi-pe</i>

árbol, as the teacher had it on the board. Another labeled her drawing *sara* 'corn' rather than *maíz*, as the teacher had labeled it.

In one of the traditional first grade classes I observed, there were two pupils who had fairly serious behavior problems in class, but who appeared quite normal and in fact lively and self-confident outside class. There was no way for me to confirm or disconfirm my impression that much of their misbehavior stemmed from the stress of being in an environment which they did not understand, the more so because so much happened in a language not entirely familiar to them. It appeared to me that they were used to being in control of a situation and felt very much left out of control in the classroom. One, in particular, seemed particularly anxious to speak Spanish at every opportunity, which I took as a sign that he meant to conquer the "enemy," that is, the foreign element in his world.

As I noted above, the kind of put-down and show-off behavior I observed in the traditional classrooms did not seem to occur in the bilingual education classrooms. This, too, could be an indication that many discipline and behavior problems may in fact stem from the language gap in the traditional classroom.

On the whole, as these instances of increased oral participation, improved and comprehending reading, greater ease of writing, and easier classroom relations exemplify, pupils adapted immediately and wholeheartedly to the expanded use of Quechua in the classroom. Differences in teacher techniques in the bilingual education classroom also gave evidence of improved transmission of educational content.

In the bilingual education classrooms, teachers assigned copying tasks to pupils as a reinforcement of lesson content rather than as a substitute for the lesson or worse yet, a time-filler, as often happened in the traditional classrooms. In the bilingual education classrooms, teachers stressed concepts and logic in arithmetic lessons rather than mere step-following or memorization as in the traditional classrooms. In the bilingual education classrooms, Spanish phonology was treated as a separate subject in Spanish as a Second Language lessons. Because of that, and because other subjects were taught in Quechua, lessons in pronunciation did not intrude into language, arithmetic, and social studies lessons as so often occurred in traditional classrooms. Finally, teachers in the bilingual education classrooms did not use corporal punishment (pulling of the ear, spanking with a belt, rapping of the knuckles) as much as their traditional classroom counterparts. I attribute this largely to the fact that the pupils in the bilingual education classrooms understood what was required of them more often than those in the traditional classrooms. The exception to this were those traditional classrooms where routines were well established and pupils knew from custom and without need of verbal instruction what would be required of them.

I believe that the techniques mentioned above as characteristic of the traditional classrooms have arisen over time because teachers have been conscious of a gap between the language of the school (Spanish) and the language of the

pupils (Quechua) and have attempted to deal with it. By means of emphasis on routine; copying; following steps; memorizing; and the teaching of the sounds, if not the meanings, of Spanish words, teachers have attempted to create a learning atmosphere against great odds produced by the language gap. These techniques have managed to allow teachers to convey at least some formal skills to most pupils and considerable skills to the very able pupils, but nevertheless have in the end worked against communicating the essential content of education to the majority of the pupils. In contrast, the improved pupil participation and content-oriented teacher techniques which come as a consequence of using Quechua indicate a more effective transmission of educational content in the bilingual education classrooms.

LOCAL OBSTACLES AND COMMUNITY RESISTANCE

Despite the success of the Project in implementing the use of Quechua in the classroom and thereby improving the pedagogical relations and transmission of content there, the Project is nevertheless an example of policy failure. This failure is at essentially two levels: one, because the Project itself ran into serious obstacles in its implementation, and two, because the goals and implementations specified by the policies surrounding the Project were themselves incongruent.

Over the years, the Project has withdrawn from approximately eighty schools. The withdrawals occurred for a variety of reasons, but they can be summarized as inappropriate selection and introduction at the outset, the teacher factor, and community resistance.

Many of the schools originally selected for the Project turned out to be in areas that were too urban and whose populations were too bilingual for the Project's model, which had been designed to meet the needs of monolingual children. Other schools mistakenly identified the Project with furniture assistance and lost interest once the furniture was given or denied.

The teacher factor includes several problems. Teacher transfers in and out of Project schools created difficulties. Untrained teachers were often transferred into Project schools or trained teachers transferred out. Because of bureaucratic inefficiencies, these transfers usually occurred in the middle of the school year. Because of transportation and communication problems in the rural areas of the Department of Puno, teacher transfers took so long that classes were left teacherless for weeks or a month. There were also trained teachers who did not apply the Project techniques for several reasons: They didn't want to because of the extra work involved, they were unable to because of insufficient training or other logistical problems, or they succumbed to real or imagined community pressure.

Much community resistance stemmed from factors unrelated to bilingual education per se. Sometimes one party in a leadership struggle within the community used bilingual education as an issue to polarize the community and promote him- or herself. Migratory cycles in many communities brought back into the commu-

nity numbers of young urban-exposed men with strong prejudices against the use of the vernacular language. In some cases, economic factors such as the illegal cocaine traffic or contested land or water rights made it undesirable from the community's point of view to have frequent visits from Puno-based officials.

Resistance in these cases arose largely from factors outside the domain of the Project and demonstrate the odds against which such a program must work. In addition, there were other sources of resistance more directly related to the Bilingual Education Project itself: community resistance to use of the vernacular in school and to the implementation of projects in the community.

The resistance to the use of the vernacular in school arose from the fact that, from the point of view of community members, the school has historically been, is universally perceived, and should continue as a non-Quechua island within the community. The school/community distinction was hard-won and is carefully maintained. Community members keep a critical eye on the school and implicitly expect the school to remain separate from the community in certain ways.

One indigenous Catholic priest of the area recalled that the introduction of schools in the rural Aymara and Quechua-speaking communities of Puno beginning circa the 1920s was a process fraught with tension and resistance. Communities that had survived through centuries of exploitation and dominance by developing strategies of internal cohesion and exclusion of the larger society were not inclined to easily permit within their midst an institution representing that larger society. It was only when the communities perceived that Spanish literacy might be to their advantage in maintaining themselves against the abuses of the larger society that they began to seek to have schools.

It seems likely that, from that time when the communities did seek to have schools, they did so only with the implicit condition that the school maintain itself as a separate entity within the community. Community members were to be able to take advantage of what the school had to offer, namely the Spanish language, but the school was not to be part of the community in any way. In other words, it is quite probable that not only did the school and the school-teachers promote and use only Spanish, but also that the community insisted that that be so.

Other examples of the school/community distinction are the careful separation between the school treasurer and the community treasurer. Different community building projects are undertaken by the school or by the community and are kept separate. Parents frequently make critical comments about the school or its personnel. Regardless of how much time and energy community members may have put into the building of the school or hours passed in study there, for them, it is still not a part of their community.

Furthermore, both schoolteacher behavior and school language tend to and are expected to reinforce this separation. Teachers do, on rare occasions, visit in community homes to show some concern and interest in their pupils. It is much more often the case, however, that teachers maintain a certain aloofness from the

community in which they teach. I once commented to a teacher that it was a shame that he, an Aymara speaker, was not assigned to an Aymara-speaking community as teacher. His response was that it was much better for him to work in a Quechua-speaking community. In his own community, he said, he would not be well received. He quoted that "a prophet is respected everywhere except in his home town and by his own family" (Matthew 13:57). On another occasion, this same teacher commented that the new director at the school was related to some 80 percent of the community. When I ventured to say that that might be good for community relations, he responded that it wasn't good for the school, because if the community always supports the director, it leaves the other teachers out on a limb.

The separation of languages is a further contributing factor to the school/community distinction. Spanish is the language taught and spoken in the schools. Historically, there have been a few teachers using some Quechua as well as Spanish, but the majority have taught using only Spanish, in many cases prohibiting the use of Quechua in the classroom.

As might be expected, the overall effect of this situation of schoolteachers speaking Spanish in a school located within a Quechua-speaking community is that the pattern of language acquisition for community members is to learn Quechua at home and Spanish at school. In addition to separation of the languages in terms of patterns of acquisition, there is a strict division of domains for the two languages, as noted in Table 1.

Community members both expect and desire Spanish to be the language taught and spoken in the schools. One community member told me: "I don't want any Quechua, I want to learn English, French, Aymara, those are good; but our children are brought up with Quechua from the cradle, so to speak; when they get to school, they are just starting to open their mouths with Spanish. Why revert to Quechua?"

This last opinion suggests another idea which I heard expressed fairly often: the teaching of Quechua in school confuses the child. One parent explained to me that he had removed his daughter from the community school because she already spoke Spanish when she went to school and the Quechua she was being taught confused her. A young teenager who spoke Quechua easily and freely with me and whose family uses Quechua nearly exclusively at home nevertheless commented that the use of two languages in school might not be so good because *umata muyuchin* 'it makes the head dizzy or mixed-up'.

The interesting thing about this argument was that it was not raised in the reciprocal case. In other words, when the child who speaks only Quechua for several years is suddenly put into a pure-Spanish environment (the school), there is no concern that *that* case of the use of two languages might confuse the child and mix up his or her head. The issue here seems to be one of the strict division of domains, functions, and channels for Quechua and Spanish. Quechua is perceived as the language of the home and of informal, intimate, and oral use,

while Spanish is perceived as the language of the school and of formal, official, and written use. The school, though physically located within the community, is not a part of the community.

The final factor involved in community resistance to the Bilingual Education Project was rooted in community members' resistance to any project imposed from outside. Community members are wary of outside and, particularly, experimental, programs; and with good reason. The Department of Puno, as an area with one of the lowest per capita incomes and the highest illiteracy and infant mortality rates in Peru, is the recipient of numerous agricultural, health, and educational development programs from outside sources.

Particularly in the twentieth century, the record of development programs in these communities has not been good. Projects are begun with, most likely, the best of intentions, but those responsible usually have very little knowledge or understanding of the area and people they are meant to serve. The program operates for two or three years, just long enough to begin to learn enough about the community through the efforts of several community members who dedicate themselves, usually without pay, to interpreting, training, and collaborating with them. Then, the program is withdrawn, either because it was only budgeted for three years in the first place or because the sponsoring agency has not seen the results it wanted to see in the allotted time span.

The fruitlessness of these repeated abortive attempts is not lost on the community members. One member commented that the community wants help from the outside, but doesn't want the outsiders to *trampohear* 'set traps'. He offered the example of government development representatives, or politicians, who come to the community and make promises; the community puts in its quota of time or money in response; the outsiders leave and are never seen again.

In view of experiences like these, the community members, even though they have in a sense become dependent on the programs to supplement their subsistence agricultural livelihood, regard them with suspicion. When the effects of a policy change at the national level begin to be felt in the community, it is automatically suspected, with good reason, that that change is to the disadvantage of the community. Comments by community members as to the Bilingual Education Project's being a backward step for the community and only being implemented in the community and not nationwide arose from these well-founded suspicions.

The particular circumstances of the Bilingual Education Project's implementation in a community might contribute to the opportunities for suspicion. For example, in one community, the Project had been introduced under the former school director. It was known by community members that the director's uncle was the regional director of the Project, and therefore they assumed that their director had brought the Project to the community. Since the community, according to the teachers, had not liked their director, they did not like anything that he was thought to have introduced.

Project staff attempted to resolve many of the problems noted above in creative ways. For example, as soon as they became aware that the furniture donations were interfering with community members' perceptions of the real goals of the Project, they stopped the furniture donations, despite considerable pressure from both community and educational officials not to do so.

To counteract the effects of the teacher factor, Project staff sought support from the Ministry's personnel division in not transferring Project teachers out of Project schools. When that support was not forthcoming, the staff sought to train teachers in bilingual education before they were even placed in schools by offering a certificate in bilingual education at the Normal School. They also sought ways to give teachers professional incentive to learn and apply bilingual education techniques by setting up programs of advanced education credit for course work in bilingual education.

In attempting to deal with community resistance, the Project staff initiated a policy of applying the Project only in communities whose members requested their presence, and of working in several communities concentrated in one geographical cluster rather than in individual, isolated communities where community members tended to feel they were being singled out as a "guinea pig" from among the surrounding communities. Project staff also had pupils read aloud in both Quechua and Spanish in community meetings in an effort to convince community members that their children would actually learn Spanish better through bilingual education.

POLICY SHIFT AND INADEQUACY

Nevertheless, there were other problems related not so much to the regional and bureaucratic contexts in which the Project was implemented as to the political and policy contexts in which the Project came about. If the significant successes which the Project has managed to achieve despite numerous obstacles are to be strengthened and extended, these issues will need to be addressed.

In the first place, the Project was out of synchronization with national policy. As the Project moved more firmly away from the transitional model and into the maintenance model of bilingual education, official language policy in Peru moved in the opposite direction. The Project moved from a language-as-problem orientation to a language-as-right orientation, while national policy moved away from an understanding of language-as-resource toward a view of language-as-right and even of language-as-problem. While the two trajectories of shifting orientations met in common ground at the language-as-right orientation for a period of time, each shift has continued along its path, taking Project and policy further apart from each other.

These conflicting orientation shifts are reflected in Project documents. For example, the early Operational Plans made no mention at all of official laws or decrees authorizing bilingual education (such as the Education Reform Law or

the National Bilingual Education Policy [PNEB]). The justification for the Project was given in terms of improving education in rural areas by improving attendance and retention rates. The justifications for education attending to indigenous languages in particular were taken for granted in the context of existing official policy.

In the Operational Plans for 1982 and 1983, however, specific mention was made of official policy under which the Project was operating. In the context of changing national policy and an implicit loss of status for the indigenous languages, the Project found it necessary to make explicit that there was still support for their stance in official policy.

Second and more important, however, goals as to the Quechua language may in fact have little to do with the implementations specified either by policy or the Project. The goal of language revitalization enunciated in the PNEB and of Quechua language maintenance espoused in the officialization of Quechua may have little to do with bilingual education, even of the maintenance type. The policies I discussed at the beginning of this article saw schools as important means for achieving Quechua language maintenance and improved education for Quechua speakers. Nevertheless, schooling is only one of many factors involved. There are important societal factors working against Quechua language maintenance in Peru in this century. Three primary ones are: 1) the decreasing isolation of Quechua speakers; 2) the low status and powerlessness of Quechua speakers; and 3) the low prestige and restricted use of the Quechua language.⁵

Prospects for Quechua language maintenance and for the role of schools in that maintenance would improve if these three factors were counterbalanced by, for example, increasing the range of roles and domains for both Quechua and Spanish, offering opportunities for social mobility and advancement regardless of language spoken, and promoting the Quechua language through policy and the primary reward systems, respectively. Schools could then contribute to the promotion of Quechua, and community members might choose bilingual education as a means to the more effective education of their children.

During the period of the reforms and policies discussed at the beginning of this article, that is, the 1970s in Peru, it appeared that such counterbalancing factors were being set in motion. Nevertheless, just as Quechua officialization arose in a context of widespread reform in all sectors of Peruvian society, the subsequent reversal of language policy evidenced in the Constitution of 1979 was symptomatic of a reversal in other policy areas.

POLICY FAILURE AND LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE

The lessons from this case of policy failure are lessons for both Quechua speakers and national policy makers in Peru. Given the present circumstances, community members' rejection of the use of Quechua in the schools is a logical choice. They recognize that Spanish is necessary for their interaction in Peruvian

national society. They not only wish to acquire Spanish because of its prestige and usefulness in the national society, but they also eschew the use of Quechua in the school because of the strong identity of individual–language–community that is part of the Quechua speaker's world view.

However, the point is that Quechua-speakers' rejection of Quechua in school is not a rejection of Quechua. Note that none of the community resistance factors discussed above, not even the factor revolving around the use of Quechua in the school, had anything to do with the goal of Quechua language maintenance. Quechua speakers are attached to their language and are not opposed to its maintenance.

On the other hand, Quechua speakers are not concerned about the future of Quechua. Most Quechua speakers are confident that the Quechua language will endure because the community will endure. My own analysis of influences for and against as well as mixed influences on Quechua language maintenance in the community (common land, work, families, *fiestas* vs. commuting, assistance, commodities, accessibility; and radio, district *fiesta*, and school [Hornberger 1985]) also underline the connection between maintenance of the language and maintenance of the community.

Nevertheless, there are many indications that the communities may not endure. In the Department of Puno, there are communities exhibiting various stages along the continuum of both degree of connection and contact with the larger society and degree of Quechua usage. Quechua speakers need to consider that, given their attachment to Quechua and the current situation of societal pressures working against the maintenance of Quechua, they may need to take steps to preserve their language.

Policy makers interested in the maintenance of Quechua, if indeed there still are any, need to consider that in light of the societal factors working against the maintenance of Quechua, policies which rely only on the schools and not on the sustaining power of the primary reward systems of the society are not likely to lead to the desired goals.

These lessons are just as appropriate for minority language speakers and national policy makers in the United States as they are for the case of Quechua in Peru. The situation in Puno, though it has its own peculiar cultural context, is not very different from other world contexts. In every case, what is needed for successful language maintenance planning and effective use of schools as agents for language maintenance is: autonomy of the speech community in deciding about 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.

NOTES

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 Educación Bilingüe – Puno (Convenio Peru-República

BILINGUAL EDUCATION SUCCESS, BUT POLICY FAILURE

Federal de Alemania) in Puno, Peru, the Dirección Departamental de Educación in Puno, Peru, and the Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo de la Educación (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. I would also like to thank Andrew Cohen, Shirley Heath, and Nessa Wolfson for their comments on earlier versions of this paper. A version of this paper was presented at the Joint SIEDE/CIES Conference on Comparative Education and International Development, Stanford, California, April, 1985.

2. The data on classroom language use and interaction cited in the following paragraphs are drawn primarily from extensive classroom observation and interviews with students and teachers carried out in two community schools over a period of six months spent in each community. Additional insights were gained through brief one- or two-day visits to approximately twenty Project and non-Project schools over the two-year period of my research in Puno department.

3. The categories of pupil talk are derived from participant observation in the classrooms:

Content Response: A pupil responds to a question the teacher asks about the lesson at hand. It is usually a one-word response.

Reading Response: A pupil reads aloud from the board or a book in response to a teacher request.

Spontaneous Request: A pupil requests teacher assistance or advice, either directly by speaking aloud to the teacher or indirectly by commenting aloud on his or her own work. This is always done verbally, and not, for instance, by raising the hand.

Spontaneous Comment: A pupil comments aloud to the teacher and the class in general on another pupil's behavior.

4. The five categories of teacher talk are adapted from Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) twenty-two acts. Of those twenty-two acts, four (bid, acknowledge, reply, and react) refer to pupil acts, two (aside and silent stress) are not included here since they are irrelevant to my present purpose, two (marker and cue) are not included since they are usually realized in Spanish by the teachers, and nine are incorporated into the five categories: elicitation/direction incorporate starter, prompt, clue, check, nomination, and loop. Evaluation incorporates accept, and metastatement incorporates comment and conclusion.

I take the liberty of reducing the catalog of acts in this way since my purposes in analyzing teacher talk are different from Sinclair and Coulthard's. I am interested only in broadly outlining the types of teacher talk which occur in Quechua within actual lesson time while Sinclair and Coulthard were interested in analyzing the flow of discourse in the classroom and in understanding how the various acts form moves which in turn constitute the boundaries and teaching exchanges that make up a lesson.

5. For discussion of similar factors in other language cases, see Fishman (1982), Gaarder (1977), Kloss (1966), and Paulston (1978).

REFERENCES

- Alfaro Lagoria, C., & Zegarra Ballón, L. (1976). Peru: Institutionalizing Quechua. *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Education* 6(3):424-29.
- Castro Pozo, H. (1963). Social and economic-political evolution of the communities of Central Peru. In J. H. Steward (ed.), *Handbook of South American Indians*. New York: Cooper Square. 483-500.
- Comercio (1975). El Gobierno Revolucionario oficializó la lengua Quechua. Lima, Peru. May 28, p. 1.
- Comisión Implementadora del Decreto Ley 21156 (1975). Significación y alcance cultural de la oficialización del Quechua como lengua de la República. Lima, Peru.
- Compendio de Decretos Leyes y Resoluciones de Educación*. (1975). Lima, Peru.
- Constitución política del Perú* (1980). Sancionada y promulgada por la Asamblea Constituyente el 12 de julio de 1979 en plena vigencia a partir del 28 de julio de 1980. Lima, Peru.
- Escobar, A. (1978). "Alfabetizar" y "castellanizar" en el Perú. *Primer Seminario de Educación Bilingüe: algunos estudios y ponencias*. Lima, Peru: Ministerio de Educación. 35-41.
- Escribens, A. (1978). Monolingüismo y bilingüismo: lengua vernácula y castellano con especial referencia al área andina. *Primer Seminario de Educación Bilingüe: algunos estudios y ponencias*. Lima, Peru: Ministerio de Educación. 23-33.

- Fishman, J. A. (1982). Sociolinguistic foundations of bilingual education. *The Bilingual Review/La revista bilingüe* 9(1):1-35.
- Gaarder, B. A. (1977). Language maintenance or language shift. In W. F. Mackey & T. Andersson (eds.), *Bilingualism in early childhood*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House. 409-34.
- Gade, D. W. (1975). *Plants, man and land in the Vilcanota Valley of Peru*. The Hague: Dr. W. Junk B.V.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1985). Bilingual education and Quechua language maintenance in Highland Puno, Peru. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Kloss, H. (1966). German-American language maintenance efforts. In J. A. Fishman (ed.), *Language loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton. 206-52.
- Ministerio de Educación (1970). *Reforma de la educación peruana: informe general*. Lima, Peru: Editorial Universo.
- (1972). *Política Nacional de educación bilingüe*. Lima, Peru (reprint: Cusco, Peru).
- (1978). *Primer Seminario de Educación Bilingüe: algunos estudios y ponencias*. Lima, Peru.
- Mishkin, B. (1963). The contemporary Quechua. In J. H. Steward (ed.), *Handbook of South American Indians*. New York: Cooper Square. 411-70.
- Murra, J. V. (1975). *Formaciones económicas y políticas del mundo andino*. Lima, Peru: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Paulston, C. B. (1978). Education in a bi/multilingual setting. *International Review of Education* 24(3): 309-28.
- Philips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation*. New York: Longman.
- Pozzi-Escot, I. (1978). El uso de la lengua vernácula en la educación. *Primer Seminario de Educación Bilingüe: algunos estudios y ponencias*. Lima, Peru: Ministerio de Educación. 43-54.
- Proyecto Experimental de Educación Bilingüe (1980). *Plan Operativo 1980: bases y elementos de planificación del PEEB - Puno*. (1980). Lima, Peru: Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo de la Educación (INIDE).
- (1981). *Plan de Operaciones*. Elaboración, experimentación y validación de un modelo de educación bilingüe - Puno. Lima, Peru: INIDE.
- (1982a). *Modelo de educación bilingüe - Puno* (documento de trabajo). Puno, Peru. December.
- (1982b). *Plan de Operaciones*. Lima, Peru: INIDE.
- (1983). *Plan de Operaciones*. Lima, Peru: INIDE.
- 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. 183-330.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal: Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education* 8(2):15-34.
- Sinclair, J. M. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Tschopik, H. (1963). The Aymara. In J. H. Steward (ed.), *Handbook of South American Indians*. New York: Cooper Square. 501-74.