



June 2018

Interpreting and Implementing Interculturality: EIB Educators and In-Service Teacher Training Programs

Frances Kvietok

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

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

Recommended Citation

Kvietok, F. (2018). Interpreting and Implementing Interculturality: EIB Educators and In-Service Teacher Training Programs. *26* (1), Retrieved from <https://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol26/iss1/3>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol26/iss1/3>
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Interpreting and Implementing Interculturality: EIB Educators and In-Service Teacher Training Programs

Abstract

Built on the premise that there is a gap between policy design and policy implementation, this paper seeks to understand how Peruvian teachers make sense of and implement Intercultural Bilingual Education (EIB) policy. EIB policy, introduced in 1991, recognizes the linguistic and cultural rights of marginalized indigenous students in schooling. This paper explores how in-service teacher training workshops influence teachers' interpretation and implementation of interculturality by looking at experiences of the teacher training workshops run by *Fundación HoPe Holanda Perú* (HOPE) and *Asociación Pukllasunchis* in Cusco, Peru. Through this analysis, the paper shows how in-service teacher training workshops can contribute to the ways in which teachers reproduce and/or challenge the historical marginalization of indigenous languages and cultures. It also shows that although in-service teacher training workshops influence the actions of teachers they do not determine them, as individuals' beliefs, attitudes, and past experience, as well as the socio-historical context in which teachers find themselves, also come into play.

Interpreting and Implementing Interculturality: EIB Educators and In-Service Teacher Training Programs

Frances Kvietok

Swarthmore College

Built on the premise that there is a gap between policy design and policy implementation, this paper seeks to understand how Peruvian teachers make sense of and implement Intercultural Bilingual Education (EIB) policy. EIB policy, introduced in 1991, recognizes the linguistic and cultural rights of marginalized indigenous students in schooling. This paper explores how in-service teacher training workshops influence teachers' interpretation and implementation of interculturality by looking at experiences of the teacher training workshops run by *Fundación HoPe Holanda Perú* (HOPE) and *Asociación Pukllasunchis* in Cusco, Peru. Through this analysis, the paper shows how in-service teacher training workshops can contribute to the ways in which teachers reproduce and/or challenge the historical marginalization of indigenous languages and cultures. It also shows that although in-service teacher training workshops influence the actions of teachers they do not determine them, as individuals' beliefs, attitudes, and past experience, as well as the socio-historical context in which teachers find themselves, also come into play.

Introduction

In 1991, the Peruvian government introduced the national policy of Intercultural Bilingual Education [*Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*, or EIB]. The incorporation of the concept of *interculturality*, previously unseen in Peru's policy documents, marked the introduction of cultural policies alongside linguistic policies in the domain of Peruvian education. Given the interrelation between language and culture in relation to the education of minority groups, this paper concerns itself with teachers' implementation of the concept of interculturality with regards to Peru's EIB policy.

Drawing from language policy and planning (LPP) literature, this paper is based on the premise that there is a disconnect between policy design and policy implementation. In the case of EIB policy, Valdiviezo (2009) notes that policy documents offer a very vague treatment of interculturality which hinders its implementation. On the one hand, EIB policy offers a passive definition of the term that overlooks structural causes for inequalities while favoring coexistence amongst diverse groups. On the other hand, policy documents do not offer any guidance as to how the concept of interculturality is to be translated into classroom pedagogy (Valdiviezo, 2009).

The contested nature of policy design provides an agentic space for local implementers to act. However, local implementers do not act in isolation, but are influenced by several forces, ranging from their individual beliefs, attitudes, and past experiences to the socio-historical contexts in which they are situated. In the case of Peruvian EIB teachers, in-service teacher training workshops are also an important source of influence; given the lack of information in circulation about EIB, these workshops are many times the main contexts where teachers learn about EIB policy.

This paper will thus explore how in-service teacher training workshops influence teachers' interpretation and implementation of interculturality by looking at experiences of the teacher training workshops run by *Fundación HoPe Holanda Perú* (HOPE) and *Asociación Pukllasunchis* in Cusco, Peru. Through this analysis, the paper will show how in-service teacher training workshops can contribute to the ways in which teachers reproduce and/or challenge the historical marginalization and inequalities faced by indigenous languages and cultures. It will also show that although in-service teacher training workshops influence the actions of teachers they do not determine them, as individual's beliefs, attitudes, and past experience, as well as the contexts in which teachers find themselves, also come into play.

First, I will provide a review of the theoretical frameworks useful to the EIB case study: critical language policy research and an understanding of individuals as actors. Next, I will provide a brief survey of the socio-historical context of Peruvian linguistic and cultural educational policies and the current context in which EIB is situated. In the analysis section, I will describe the different approaches to interculturality put forward by each teacher training workshop and how they translate into and come into play with teachers' beliefs and practices.

Theoretical Frameworks: Towards a Critical Understanding of Language Policy Implementation

Recognition of the gap between language policy design and implementation was present at the origins of LPP and has evolved alongside the field. Referring to acquisition implementation, Cooper (1989) notes that implementation is about the "organized *efforts* to promote the learning of a language" (p. 157, my italics). Similarly, Haugen (1983) notes that "implementation is that work of *cajoling or enforcing compliance* with decisions made in code selection and codification" (p. 269, my italics). Moreover, the literature also notes that implementation is not value-free, but includes overt and covert goals (Cooper, 1989, p. 159). Contemporary references to implementation continue to explore the gap between policy and implementation by highlighting that language policy is not only about the "explicit embodiment of rules" or about overt and explicit formulations (Schiffman, 1996, p. 13). Shohamy (2006), for example, makes a distinction between declared policies and de facto and real language policies. The former—declared policies—are about "lip service, declarations and intentions" (p. 52), while the latter—de facto and real language policies—represent language practices and ideologies. The ever-present distinction between policy and practice is crucial to the Peruvian case study, as its

recognition makes room to understand the various ways in which EIB teachers manipulate, interpret and implement EIB policy at the classroom level.

A review of the early literature also shows that language policy implementation was thought of as a *process* that included different *actors*:

The entire process of formulating and implementing language policy is best regarded as a spiral process, beginning at the highest level of authority, and ideally, descending in widening circles through the ranks of practitioners who can *support or resist* putting the policy into effect. (Prator, as cited in Cooper, 1989, p. 160)

Although Prator's comments recognize implementation as a process that travels through different levels, its top-down and one-way orientation is limited. In contrast, contemporary work acknowledges the multidirectionality of LPP processes. For example, Ricento and Hornberger (1996) introduce the metaphor of the LPP onion to evoke the multiple layers (and interplay of layers) through which policy moves and develops. Nevertheless, Prator's commentary is also valuable as it notes the role of individuals as actors with the agency to support and resist policies. Given this study's interest in individual teachers' interpretation and implementation of EIB policy, a review of critical language policy research will be helpful to understand the guiding forces behind practitioners' choices, their consequences, and the context in which these choices and practices take place.

Critical Language Policy (CLP) Research

Critical theory is concerned with the study of "the process by which systems of social inequality are created and sustained" and is built on the premise that power is "implicit in all social relationships" (Tollefson, 2006, p. 43). Critical language policy research, in turn, refers to work that is critical of traditional and mainstream approaches to language policy research; it includes research that is aimed at social change, and it refers to research that is influenced by critical theory (Tollefson, 2006). CLP's focus on social inequalities is particularly relevant to the EIB policy case study, as EIB policy is exclusively targeted at Peru's marginalized indigenous population. The field's attention to the dynamic relationship between social structure and individual agency will also be pertinent to this study.

The historical-structural approach

The historical-structural approach to CLP research emphasizes the influence of social, political, economic and historical factors on language policy and use (Tollefson, 2006). The main goals of this approach are to "examine the historical basis of policies and to make explicit the mechanisms by which policy decisions serve or undermine particular political and economic interests" (Tollefson, 1991, p. 32). Although the historical-structural approach moves away from an ahistorical analysis, it is often viewed as a deterministic approach that does not make room for the agency of individuals (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). In relation to the EIB case study, a historical-structural approach will be helpful to understand the historical and structural context out of which EIB policy was born, and the present macro-forces influencing teachers' interpretations and implementations of interculturality.

Governmentality

CLP research also draws from Foucault's work on governmentality to understand the indirect acts of governing that shape individual and group language behavior (Tollefson, 2006). According to Pennycook, the notion of governmentality "focuses on how power operates at the micro-level of diverse practices rather than in the macro-regulations of the state" through "discourses, educational practices, and language use" (2006, p. 65). By focusing on how power operates at the micro level one can examine how EIB teachers' approaches to interculturality allow for the operation of power. In this sense, one can ask, how do certain approaches allow teachers to challenge the marginalization of their indigenous students? In the same vein, how do different approaches to interculturality contribute to the reproduction of these inequalities?

Towards an Understanding of Agents

Looking at the role of individual agency, Hornberger and Johnson (2007) recognize the presence of ideological and implementational spaces as sites of action of local practitioners. Local educators, they claim, are not helplessly caught in the ebb and flow of shifting ideologies in language policy, but can develop, maintain and change that flow (ibid). While recognizing that practitioners' choices take place within particular contexts (influenced by historical and structural forces), it is also necessary to recognize that "local interpretation/manipulation of policy is colored by *ideologies, beliefs and attitudes, and past experiences*" (ibid, p. 520). These ideologies, beliefs and past experiences do not only belong to individual practitioners. Drawing from the work of Ricento and Hornberger (1996), it could also be suggested that these shared beliefs, attitudes and past experiences can belong to institutional and national communities, since:

Language policies evolve out of more general social policies, which reflect [...] deep values [that] represent an accretion of national experiences, influenced by certain intellectual traditions, which together create underlying frameworks within which policies evolve and are evaluated. (p. 416)

In relation to our EIB case study, it would be helpful to consider the role of collective ideologies and practices—such as the ones particular to the teaching profession or to Peruvian schools—in influencing individual teachers as they interpret and implement EIB policy, and more specifically its cultural component.

In addition, Spolsky (2007) puts forward a model of language policy that recognizes language practices, beliefs and management. In our case, we will draw on this model to examine the cultural component of EIB. *Language practices* refer to the "observable behaviors and choices—what people actually do," and they represent the real policy as they provide the linguistic context in which language is learned (p. 3). In our case study, a focus on practices will allow us to examine the implementation of interculturality through the observation of EIB classrooms. *Language beliefs* refer to the attitudes about language, some of the most important being "the values assigned to the varieties and features" (p. 4). In our case study, beliefs will allow us to examine the various ideologies—individual, collective, and national—

that guide teachers' interpretation and implementation of interculturality. In this vein, we will also examine the historical and structural forces that underlie these beliefs. Finally, *language management* refers to the "explicit and observable efforts by someone or some group that has or claims to have authority over the participants in the domain to modify their practices or beliefs" (ibid, p. 4), which in our case includes official EIB policy documents and the actions of EIB teachers.

Bringing together all the theoretical frameworks presented, this paper will examine fieldwork data to answer the following questions: How do in-service teacher training workshops color teachers' different interpretations and implementations of interculturality? How do in-service teacher training workshops interact with teachers' ideologies, beliefs, attitudes and past experiences that shape these interpretations and implementations of interculturality? And, what are some of the underlying historical-structural forces behind teachers' choices and practices? Finally, how do teachers' approaches to interculturality reflect, reveal and/or subvert the operation of power by challenging or reproducing marginalization of indigenous students?

Setting the Context: Linguistic and Cultural Educational Policies in Perú

A survey of the structural-historical context out of which EIB was born and in which it is currently situated will be helpful to understand the underlying forces that influence teachers' implementational choices and classroom practices. Moreover, this section will shed light on the general obstacles that the EIB teachers I interviewed encountered when making sense of and implementing interculturality.

A Structural-Historical Approach to Peruvian LPP

Peruvian educational language policies have been influenced by the prevalent language ideologies of the time period, which for the most part have reflected the low status of indigenous languages and their speakers. Although during the early colonial period missionaries used indigenous languages to indoctrinate large numbers of indigenous people (Hornberger & King, 2006), by the eighteenth century, colonial authorities viewed indigenous languages as obstacles to colonial control. Thus, they ordered the eradication of indigenous languages alongside the imposition of Spanish—*castellanización*—as a colonial policy (Valdiviezo, 2009).

Overall, during the twentieth century, paradigms of modernization promoted the idea of a homogenous Spanish-speaking nation state. In this context, indigenusness "emerged as the antithesis of the modern, developed, and unified nation" and instead represented what was backward and underdeveloped (Valdiviezo, 2009, p. 63). The rhetoric of *castellanización* of the Indian, assimilation into a monolingual Spanish nation, continued to prevail throughout this time period. Thus, schooling was regarded "as a project of *castellanización* and the suppression of indigenous languages and cultures" (Valdiviezo, 2009, p. 63). Assimilation was achieved through the curriculum, which was divorced from the realities of Andean rural life, and was delivered through Spanish-only instruction. In 1930, the *Ley Orgánica de Enseñanza* [Organic Law of Instruction] mandated the intensification of Spanish instruction in indigenous areas, allowing teachers to use students' native

language for instruction, but banning the use of books and instructional material in indigenous languages (Chunga, 2009). The Organic Law of Instruction marked the beginning of a transitional model of language education, which guided Peruvian language education policy for most of the twentieth century. Under this approach, indigenous languages were viewed as obstacles that ought to be overcome by transitioning into the dominant language.

In 1968, the Revolutionary Government of the Armed Forces came to power, marking a change in the way in which indigenous cultures and languages were understood at the government level. Juan Francisco Velasco's regime was the first to recognize the multiethnic character of the Peruvian nation (Aikman, 2003). In 1973, the *Reglamento de Educación Bilingüe* [National Policy of Bilingual Education] was introduced, a document which recognized the linguistic rights of speakers of indigenous languages and advocated for the presence of bilingual education in all areas where Spanish was not the dominant language (García, 2004). Quechua soon became obligatory at all grades, as the law specified that Quechua ought to be taught as a second language to Spanish-dominant speakers, which represents a case of enrichment bilingual education (Hornberger, 1987). Moreover, in 1975 Quechua was granted official status, making Peru the first Latin American country to officialize an indigenous language.

Despite the initial enthusiasm, the implementation of Velasco's educational reform was not very successful. The demise of the revolutionary government in 1975 and the change of the constitution led to a systematic dismantling of all policies (Aikman, 2003; García, 2004). Nevertheless, the pilot programs started during the Velasco regime set the foundations for similar programs and policies across Latin America in the years to come (Valdiviezo, 2009). Given the lack of government support, these initiatives originated from non-state actors, such as indigenous organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), religious groups, and universities. Their efforts were in turn financed, for the most part, by foreign assistance (DINEBI, 2007).

In 1991, Perú introduced a national policy of *Educación Intercultural Bilingüe* (EIB), or Intercultural Bilingual Education. EIB uses students' first language to build literacy during the first two grades with the premise that the competencies students develop will be transferred when learning a second language. Between grades three to six, EIB develops literacy in Spanish as a second language, remaining within a transitional model of bilingual education. The focus on interculturality is a bit more complex, and has been interpreted in myriad ways. Ministry of Education (MED) documents show the recurring use of four concepts in the definition of interculturality: horizontal dialogue, harmonious co-existence between cultures, acknowledgment of cultural and linguistic diversity, and community involvement in schooling (Valdiviezo, 2009). The incorporation of the concept of interculturality marks the explicit introduction of cultural policies alongside linguistic policies in the domain of Peruvian education. Moreover, EIB policy continued to develop an official discourse that privileged both cultural and linguistic diversity as national resources, rather than viewing this diversity as "savage" or "backward" (ibid, p. 61).

EIB policy is targeted at Peru's indigenous population, which represents almost half of Peru's population, a country of more than 28 million people (Peru, n. d.). Peru's indigenous population is composed of 65 different ethnic groups and

40 different languages are spoken across the country (MED & UNESCO, 2009), although there is a lack of consensus regarding the actual number of different languages spoken in the country.¹ According to governmental statistics, 16 percent of the Peruvian population has an indigenous language as their first language (INEI, 2009). Quechua is the most widely spoken language, spoken by 13 percent of the population, and has status as an official language in areas where it is heavily spoken (INEI, 2009).² Development-based studies show that indigenous people in Peru face exceptional conditions of poverty and marginalization (Reimers, 2000; World Bank, 2005; Valdiviezo, 2009). Indigenous people have been oppressed and marginalized since the Spanish conquest; during the civil war of the 1980s and 1990s, indigenous non-Spanish speaking people constituted 75 percent of the victims (*Comisión de la Verdad y Reconciliación*, 2003; Valdiviezo, 2009).

In the Peruvian case, EIB policy was brought about due to the combination of mobilization for indigenous rights—re-emerging in Latin America during the 1970s—in a wider context of international agendas of universal educational access, education for all, indigenous rights and linguistic rights which defined the social and educational policies during the 1980s and 1990s (Valdiviezo, 2009).

The Current Context

Current EIB policy enjoys ample legislative support. The 1993 Constitution encompassed progressive articles that recognized the cultural and ethnic diversity of the country. Furthermore, in 1994 the Peruvian government ratified the Convention 169 of the International Labor Organization, recognizing indigenous rights. Additionally, the *Ley 27818 – Ley para la Educación Intercultural y Bilingüe* [Law 27818 – Law for Bilingual Intercultural Education] (MED, 2002) concerns itself with the quality of EIB teachers and community involvement. Article 4 states that EIB teachers ought to master Spanish as well as the language of the community where they will work, and that teachers ought to hold an EIB specialization in order to be hired. Article 3 gives indigenous groups the right to participate in the development and management of EIB teacher training programs. In addition, both the *Ley General de Educación* [General Law of Education] (MED, 2003) and the new *Diseño Curricular Nacional* [National Curriculum Design] (MED, 2005) recognize interculturality as one of the key principles underpinning the educational system, and no longer exclusive to indigenous areas.

Despite the supportive legislation, the gap between EIB rhetoric and practice is at the core of ineffective EIB implementation (García, 2004). A survey of the main challenges encountered throughout the Peruvian EIB experience in the Andean region will serve as a backdrop to start understanding the most immediate challenges EIB educators, such as the ones I interviewed, encounter during their careers. Valdiviezo (2009) notes that the contradictions within the principle of interculturality constitute the central problem in EIB. In short, because of the top-down orientation of EIB, the concept of interculturality is “prescriptive and vague” (*ibid*, p. 69). Current definitions have failed to translate policy concepts into pedagogical practice, ignoring the social tensions between different ethnic and social groups in Perú, and thus continue to push forward a policy of *castellanización*.

¹ Thanks to L. Valdiviezo for pointing this out.

² However, these figures are an underestimate, as they exclude those who identify as bilinguals and those who have an indigenous language as their second language.

Additionally, there is a lack of political will from the central and local governments to support EIB. First, the 2007 Ministry of Education Census showed that only 15.6 percent of primary school-aged children with an indigenous language as their first language attended bilingual schools (MED, 2007). Second, despite the increasing production of classroom materials, the main challenges remain distribution and use. In many cases, materials never reach schools, and if they do, they arrive late and in small numbers. Teachers also do not feel prepared to use such materials, given their lack of training. Third, the lack of political will and motivation to support EIB at the administrative level is reflected by the low funding provided to the national office for EIB (currently called the *Departamento de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe* [Department of Intercultural Bilingual Education], or DEIB), as well as by the lack of on-site professional support offered to EIB educators by regional education offices (*Unidades de Gestión Educativa Local* [Local Educational Management Units], or UGEL).

The lack of qualified EIB teachers is another obstacle to the implementation of EIB policy. Although access to training is an initial obstacle, the quality of teacher training programs needs to be reevaluated. García (2004) claims that the main critique by teachers is that teacher-training sessions are not long enough to allow teachers to grasp the new teaching methods, training is detached from local conditions, and teachers are not given resources to put methods into practice. Furthermore, teacher-training workshops have limited language pedagogies and show difficulty in implementing interculturality.

EIB also faces opposition from the community it intends to serve, common in Perú and other Latin American countries (García, 2004; Hornberger, 1987; King, 2004). Parental opposition is rather specific to the language component of EIB. Parents fear that Quechua instruction will impede their children's acquisition of Spanish, and the social and economic opportunities associated with the dominant language. Second, parents reject the poor implementation of EIB programs. Observing their children being taught by poorly trained teachers, parents feel EIB puts their children at a disadvantage and think that teachers waste precious time that could otherwise be spent teaching Spanish (García, 2004). Parental opposition cannot be understood without recognizing the structural and historical inequalities indigenous people face. Unless structural changes that allow for a rethinking of the roles, domains, and attitudes towards indigenous people take place, the future of linguistic and cultural educational policies like EIB will remain unclear.

Methods

During the summer of 2009, I spent nine weeks in the region of Cusco, Perú, conducting field research on the topic of EIB under a Lenfest Student Fellowship. My entry into the field of EIB and the network of rural primary schools of the region was facilitated by my affiliation with *Asociación Pukllasunchis*, my host institution and a leading non-governmental organization in the region within the educational field. To answer my research questions, I used a qualitative methodology composed of interviews, participant and non-participant observation at EIB schools and teacher training workshops. The use of both field methods and a literature review allowed me to triangulate my data (see Appendix I).

An ethnographic approach to fieldwork was particularly relevant to the study of teachers' interpretations and implementations of interculturality, as Hornberger and Johnson (2007) claim that ethnographic work "offers a means for exploring how varying local interpretations, implementations, negotiations, and perhaps resistance can pry open implementational and ideological spaces for multilingual language education" (p. 511).

Participant and Non-participant Observations

EIB school

I visited a total of four EIB rural primary schools (grades K–6), where all students had Quechua as their first language. The length of my visits lasted from one day to two weeks and was determined by the accessibility to the communities and the local school calendar. At each school, I conducted classroom observations throughout the school day in different classrooms and documented classroom organization, teaching tools, classroom activities and textbooks through photographs and videos. In the afternoons, I interacted with teachers,³ students, and my host communities.

Details about these schools and their communities are shown in Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix II. The schools were located in four different communities and two different provinces of the region. The four communities I visited were poor, with agriculture as their main economic activity, although a considerable proportion of the young population migrated to the urban areas of Cusco and other cities such as Lima, Arequipa, and Puno to work in blue-collar jobs. With the exception of Rayanpata, the communities had a significant number of Christian Evangelicals, following the spread of this religious sect in the area since the 1970s and 1980s. The four schools experienced an overall shortage of infrastructure and classroom materials in comparison with their urban counterparts. Three out of four schools had multi-grade classrooms, and teachers taught several grades simultaneously in often-overcrowded classrooms. Given the distance from these communities to the city of Cusco and other urban centers where teachers lived, as well as the high transportation costs, many teachers lived on the school grounds during the school week.

EIB teacher-training workshops

In order to learn more about EIB teacher training programs, I attended three in-service training sessions led by three different NGOs, which took place at different towns and during times when I was not at the schools. At the teacher training workshops, I acted as both a participant and a non-participant observer, conducting observations and recording training materials and activities through photographs and videos. Table 3 in Appendix III provides an overview of the in-service teacher training workshops I attended. In this paper, I will refer to the teacher training workshops of two organizations, *Asociación Pukllasunchis* and *Fundación HoPe Holanda Perú*.

³All names of teachers and program coordinators are pseudonyms, to protect their confidentiality, and all interviews and other Spanish-language texts were translated by the author.

Asociación Pukllasunchis is one of the most distinguished not-for-profit organizations in the region, and has been working in the field of education in Cusco since 1981. Every year, it offers a renowned yearlong in-service teacher-training workshop called the *Programa Diplomado en Educación Intercultural y Desarrollo Sostenible* [Post-graduate Program in Intercultural Education and Sustainable Development], in cooperation with two other institutions—*Proyecto Andino de Tecnologías Campesinas* [Andean Rural Technologies Project] (PRATEC), and *La Universidad Agraria de la Selva* [Agrarian University of the Forest] (UNAS). The program of study describes the teacher-training program in the following way:

The objective is that the professionals graduated from the teacher training program will propose strategies and alternatives that affirm the value of traditional cultures, promote the exercise of rights, promote the biological and cultural diversity of the region in such way that they a development model that recognizes the value of this diversity can be generated. (*Asociación Pukllasunchis*, 2009)

The program of study covers a range of issues, including ecology and *cosmovisión* [worldview], Andean and Amazonian agriculture, cultural diversity, intercultural education, Andean and modern epistemology, and development and globalization in education. Acceptance in the program is contingent on an application process. The monthly cost for attending the program ranges from \$30 for in-service public teachers and \$60 for other participants. The program is structured by monthly weekend sessions, ongoing long-distance training, and three weeklong *internados* [workshops]. I attended one weekend session and part of the July *internado*. Throughout the workshop, participants conduct a research study in collaboration with the community where they work, which is the basis of their final research paper.

Asociación Pukllasunchis offered the most progressive workshop I attended. Rather than focusing on EIB classroom pedagogies, they follow an approach of *decolonizar la mente*, or decolonizing the mind (interview, Ignacia, 2009). *Asociación Pukllasunchis* seeks to promote critical thinking in teachers and to encourage a reflection on how best to apply what is learned at the teacher-training workshop at the EIB classroom level in collaboration with local stakeholders in education.

The *Fundación HoPe Holanda Perú* (HOPE) was created in 1991 and provides technical as well as infrastructural support to EIB schools. At the time of my fieldwork, HOPE worked with two EIB primary schools in the province of Calca, building infrastructure, providing classroom materials, and offering teacher training workshops. In order for schools to receive infrastructure and classroom materials, teachers had to attend the teacher training workshops, thus participation was mandatory. The trainings did not present a cost for teachers, as HOPE provided a transportation allowance and meals to all participants attending the workshops.

I attended one of their weekend monthly workshops. In general, these workshops are divided into two sections. During the first section, teachers reflect on issues affecting EIB through small group discussion and then present their reflections to the bigger group. During the second section, teachers receive instruction on language pedagogy. They learn pedagogies to build students' literacy in Quechua as well as to teach Spanish as a Second Language. Additionally, HOPE offers follow-up visits to the teachers' schools. Led by the main teacher training leader—a

specialist on EIB—the visits allow teachers to share concerns in the classroom and provide them with a source of on-site support and counseling. I had the opportunity to visit Tiracanchis School, one of the two EIB primary schools receiving teacher training from HOPE at the time of my research.

Interviews

I developed three sets of guiding questions, and interviewed 13 teachers, two teacher-training leaders, and three NGO staff members. The teachers I interviewed formed a diverse group in terms of gender, overall years of experience as a teacher, years of experience as an EIB teacher, mobility and the types of teacher training workshops they had attended. The diversity of the teaching body was present among and within the four EIB schools visited. All recorded interviews were conducted in Spanish, with durations ranging from 50 minutes to two and a half hours. All interviewed teachers worked in EIB schools and were bilingual in Spanish and Quechua, or at least had oral fluency in the latter. For the most part, the sit-down interviews resembled informal conversations. Additionally, I learned as much from off-the-record conversations as from recorded interviews. Fetching water, waiting for a ride back to the city of Cusco, and recess time were all opportunities to learn about teachers' experiences.

Making Sense of and Implementing Interculturality:

EIB Teachers and EIB In-Service Teacher Training Programs

In this section, I will show the different approaches to interculturality presented by each in-service teacher-training workshop. Then, I will examine how these approaches influence teachers' beliefs about EIB and their implementation of interculturality.

HOPE and Interculturality

The head coordinator of HOPE's teacher training workshops, Edmundo, recognized that in the Peruvian context, talking about interculturality involves recognizing and challenging the inequalities between the dominant groups and the Andean and Amazonian indigenous groups (interview, June 30, 2009). Translated into HOPE's institutional vision, interculturality as an educational project entails encouraging teachers to reflect on the historical role of education and of educators in reproducing social inequalities, and to reflect on new ways of approaching the teaching profession. HOPE is aware of the current state of Peruvian teachers, as expressed by Edmundo, who wanted to shift the role of teachers away from being mere implementers of top-down policies without agency of their own:

There is a type of downplaying the professional quality of the teacher; it is thought that the teacher is someone who only executes things within quotation marks. Yes, exactly, a consumer of curriculum. This is the curriculum and you apply it, if you do it right, cool, you are a good teacher, but your critical and reflective skills, your level of analysis of your reality,

that is not there, out. [...] A teacher who does not have a theoretical framework, a discourse, that can be affirmed culturally will always be a teacher who will be thinking about much more specific, operative things and who will not have enough conceptual clarity and the understanding of everything that implies being an intercultural school.

For HOPE, interculturality also entailed encouraging teachers to bridge the gap between school and community by encouraging the participation of students' parents in school matters and diversifying the curriculum to reflect the local context.

In teacher training workshops, HOPE's approach to interculturality was translated into practice to some extent. In one of the workshops I attended, teachers had been asked to read a critical article titled "*El rol del docente EIB*" ["The role of the EIB teacher"], and had been asked to form three small groups that would discuss the article. The group I sat with discussed the question "How do you define a traditional teacher?" Teachers were very critical of their own role as EIB educators at a theoretical level, and expressed a pressing concern regarding how they were going to translate their vision into teaching practices. This concern is reflected in the ideas that different teachers expressed when answering the question they were given in the following ways:

"One who homogenizes," "Tries to impose," "Doesn't take into account context, their world view," "If we homogenize then we are neo-colonizers, mere linguistic mediators, mere people who repeat the rules and state policy." "There are two types of teachers, those that think of EIB as just a matter of language, now we have to re-think our understanding of interculturality and how to incorporate didactic practices." "This is where we are then. But how, (a participant asks very passionately), how are we going to do that? With what instruments? That is our biggest challenge." (field notes, July 7, 2009)

Other groups discussed the following questions: "How can teachers re-affirm their cultural identity?" and "How can teachers act as mediators between the school and the community?" All groups discussed their questions and offered a short presentation on their conclusions followed by a brief question and answer period. The need for support and concern with translating teachers' beliefs into practices was a shared feeling by many educators attending the workshop. Even though the workshop offered the opportunity to become aware of and discuss these issues, it did not provide concrete pedagogies that could facilitate translating teachers' concerns into their classroom practice.

Translating Interculturality into Practice: The Experience of HOPE Teachers

In this section, I will examine how HOPE's workshops influenced teachers' EIB classroom practices as reflected in teachers' interviews, classroom practices, and workshop experiences. I will focus particularly on how new teachers, with no previous experience in EIB, experienced and incorporated knowledge learned at workshops into their teaching practices. New teachers allow us to examine the effect of teacher training workshops, since for them attending the workshops provided their first formal introduction to EIB.

When asked what EIB meant to them, new teachers' responses tended to focus on the teaching in and of two languages, as well as on making education relevant to the cultural context of their students. Their responses serve to show the predominance of language instruction in the earlier stages of new EIB educators' careers. Profesor Cesar, completing his first year of EIB teaching, commented on the importance of EIB mainly on the affective outcome of teaching in a culturally relevant manner and in a child's first language:

A child learns better in his language. He understands better, expresses himself better, feels better, feels engaged, feels happy, feels within his context, and gets closer to the teacher. In other words he is happier and learns better. It's very important for a child to speak in his language, he feels at ease, complete, and talks about things he knows about. (interview, August 10, 2009)

The lack of a more critical description of interculturality as a holistic approach in Profesor Cesar's explanation is paralleled by teaching practices that reflect a more simplified understanding of interculturality. In the third grade classroom of Profesora Lucía, who is new to EIB as well, interculturality also meant recognizing students' culture inside the classroom. The following paragraph describes the classroom of Profesora Lucía:

The topic of the lesson was diseases and remedies. In an attempt to integrate students' culture and knowledge into the lesson, the teacher asked students to name diseases common in their community. Students raised their hands and gave the teacher many different examples of diseases, always participating in Quechua. The teacher translated the names into Spanish and wrote them down on the blackboard. Next to the name of the disease, she would write down the type of remedy necessary to cure it. At some point, the teacher wrote down headache, and next to it, she wrote aspirin. After completing this exercise, the class went back to reading from the Natural Sciences textbook, which was in Spanish. (field notes, August 10, 2009).

In the Natural Sciences class of Profesora Lucía, interculturality means recognizing students' culture inside the classroom. Overall, however, the lesson was a token exercise of interculturality, where the teacher used students' culture and knowledge as mere resources. The teacher did a simple translation of students' knowledge using a Western understanding of diseases and remedies, without exploring what these terms meant in their own terms. Similarly, Profesora Lucía translated the terms from Quechua into Spanish in an authoritarian way, without taking into account student input. Other token exercises of interculturality include teaching traditional dances and music, or having culturally relevant classroom decorations or materials (yarn, pebbles, seeds). Although the presence of these elements itself is pertinent when making schooling culturally relevant, their presence alone does not entail an intercultural education.

As mentioned by the workshop facilitators, an intercultural education entails bridging the gap between school and community and working alongside parents to include them in the EIB project. This task was the cause of much distress and frustration for new teachers, who did not know how to approach parents and

found that HOPE's interpretation of parent-school collaboration was very overwhelming. First, teachers did not have a clear idea of how to interact with parents. Profesor Cesar (interview, August 10, 2009) mentioned not knowing how to approach parents:

Researcher: And you go to their houses?

Cesar: No, almost no, because they never invite us anyway. I mean, they are afraid, they are embarrassed, I think, I don't know, they might think that we are going to criticize their poverty that might make them feel a bit shy. But they never tell you, teacher, will you come to my house or let's go.

Second, teachers commented on the high expectations that HOPE places on teachers. Workshop facilitators tell teachers of the need for them to save students and parents' culture and traditions without providing them with the tools or assistance. The following comment from Profesor Cesar shows one of these postures:

Well, that is what HOPE aims for, I mean, to rescue their lifestyles, their Andean epistemology, the traditions of their ancestors, the tribute to the Earth, all of those things, the people from HOPE want us to apply it to teaching. I mean starting from their knowledge to make them express themselves, to capture that in the classroom. Mmm, if we do it, right? Well sometimes we do it. But they [HOPE] insist, right? "You have to continue doing it." I mean, they have a different way of ... introducing the unit, learning, always departing from the local context. We've been working with HOPE for almost six months, but... (interview, August 10, 2009)

Moreover, the emergence of different Evangelical and Christian religions created difficulties in teachers' inclusion of the local culture in schooling. Since the 1970s and 1980s, Christian religions have increased in the Cusco area (interview, Profesor Josefino, July 25, 2009). This situation also applied to three out of four of the schools I visited. In the Paru Paru School, for example, I observed that many of the students had decorated their notebooks with religious stickers, and they wore clothes with religious messages printed on them (e.g. *Jesús me ama* [Jesus loves me]). In one of the first grade classes I observed, one of the students told his peer that he was singing "songs of the devil," referring to a popular song played in the radio at the time. When I asked the teacher about the student's comment, he mentioned that many Evangelical parents prohibit their children listening to the radio (interview, Profesor Josefino, July 24, 2009).

Many times, religious views clashed with the indigenous culture that teachers are supposed to maintain. In this sense, teachers found religion was an impediment to encourage cultural maintenance in their schools. Profesora Lucía faced a similar challenge as Profesor Marco, from Paru Paru School:

The teacher [workshop facilitator] tells us, right? She insists, "They have to maintain their culture, you have to encourage them." But it is hard for us to do that because their religion has changed them. Completely, religion has changed them. (interview, Profesora Lucía, July 22, 2009)

Religion has been entering the area, it's getting lost, homogenizing their culture. They no longer celebrate their rituals, their dances, they

don't drink their *chicha* [corn-based alcoholic drink]. Even the children do not believe you when you tell them about the creation myths. If you tell them they will tell you "God created that," or if you tell them that the *apu* [mountain], the river are alive, they will say "No, it is not alive." [...] The children who were indoctrinated are now parents and they don't believe in that, it is very hard for them to change their minds, they are losing their traditions. (interview, Profesor Marco, July 5, 2009)

The previous quotes point to two major trends. First, HOPE is imposing a specific type of definition of interculturality that means rescuing or preserving the Andean culture of the community where teachers work, or fixing it as changeless. Neither teachers nor the community is participating in defining what interculturality means. There is a top-down approach to defining interculturality, even if it is in favor of incorporating community members and local culture and knowledge. Second, no concrete actions are given to teachers to help them enact this understanding of interculturality. More importantly, HOPE is not tackling the main concern of teachers, which is how to deal with rapid culture change in the context of strong religious activity in their communities.

New teachers' interpretation and implementation of EIB can be explained, to an extent, by the nature of the workshops they attended. Teachers' focus on Spanish instruction paralleled HOPE's focus on language methodologies. Second, the limited understanding of interculturality could be explained given the workshops' approach to interculturality and the limited resources HOPE provided to teachers. Without a more complete understanding of indigenous cultures that goes beyond fixing them as changeless, the teacher-training workshop did not support teachers in interpreting and implementing interculturality. The teachers themselves then had a more simple approach to interculturality, a weaker commitment to EIB and possibly became mere implementers of workshop guidelines. Ironically, the teachers continued to be the implementers described earlier on by the head coordinator. Cesar and Lucía, both new teachers, approached interculturality in a less critical way; they used culture as a tokenized resource rather than exploring indigenous epistemologies and different ways of learning inside the classroom. To some extent, this practice can contribute to reproducing the marginalization of indigenous communities and impede the formation of an indigenous identity in students. Moreover, this approach does not allow for students to critically examine the structural causes of power inequalities between different social groups. This approach does not support the sustainability of EIB, as it is questionable whether or not the concept of interculturality will continue to be implemented without pressure from NGOs.

HOPE's commitment to EIB is not questionable. However, in practice, it favored language methodologies and a simplistic reflection on interculturality with little follow up. External constraints, such as donor vested interests, also influenced HOPE's institutional practices. Although the head coordinator mentioned not being limited by sources of funding, he admitted that all NGOs have agendas and that HOPE cannot implement EIB as they wished to one hundred percent (interview, Edmundo [HOPE coordinator], June 30, 2009). Two examples serve to show the external constraints placed on HOPE. First, in order to receive NGO funding, all schools affiliated with HOPE had to institute a uniform policy (see

Figure 1 below); the uniform was the traditional dress of the community and students were expected to wear it at all times. Although the uniform policy encourages cultural maintenance, it is also a strategic move when requesting funding, as dress is a clear indigenous marker that can attract foreign donors. However, many parents rejected the uniform, as they found it costly. Without addressing community concerns and imposing this uniform, HOPE overlooks the principle of community involvement in intercultural bilingual education.



Figure 1. School uniform at Tiracanchis School

External constraints were not only felt at the school level, but the NGO staff also felt their consequences. Three months after my departure from my site of research, HOPE's main workshop facilitator was fired from her job after proposing a progressive project proposal that entailed "working with the communities" (email, Profesora Rocío, December 1, 2009). Although compatible with the principles of EIB, this project would not have been approved by government agencies, which meant that HOPE would not have qualified for tax exemptions. The contradiction between the institution's support of EIB and its institutional practices shows the complicated context within which many NGOs find themselves.

Asociación Pukllasunchis and Interculturality

The yearlong in-service teacher-training program offered by *Asociación Pukllasunchis* is recognized as one of the most progressive programs in the region by several of the teachers I interviewed. *Pukllasunchis* workshops move away from a focus on classroom pedagogies—in contrast to HOPE—and instead aim to

decolonize the minds of teachers and re-affirm teachers' indigenous identities (*Asociación Pukllasunchis*, 2009). *Pukllasunchis* goes beyond a passive recognition of interculturality as the celebration and recognition of cultural diversity, to explore the historical, political and structural causes of inequality and marginalization. Additionally, *Pukllasunchis* workshops seek to educate participants in Andean and Amazonian culture, language and epistemology. The first workshop I attended took an academic stance on Andean culture and the critical analytical skills of the participants:

I realized the meaning of Andean world vision as something that goes beyond folklore or traditions, it is, indeed, a way of looking at the world. For me, today was a crash course in interculturality, the workshop started to lead me to understanding this Andean world vision which I had never realized its huge magnitude. First, to recognize the differences in power (the West wants to be the only one and be universal, it reminded me of the discussions we had in our social theory seminar last semester). Second, the difficulty of the dialogue between the two cultures, always trying to keep the best of both. I was surprised by the arguments which teachers used to bring down traditional education, literacy campaigns, etc, saying that they were permeated by a Western approach to development. (field notes, June 27, 2009)

For *Pukllasunchis*, interculturality starts with a re-examination of the dominant paradigms of knowledge and seeks to introduce critical thinking to its participants. Edmundo (interview, June 30, 2009), head coordinator of HOPE and participant of *Pukllasunchis* workshops, mentioned:

It is a decolonization of the mind, right? It is terrible to understand that the dominant paradigm of the last 25 centuries has been a positivist paradigm that has placed man as the supreme being in front of nature. Traditional worldviews have thus been invisible in the face of the hegemony of scientific knowledge, but we can see that now this is starting to be revised.

The critique of dominant forms of knowledge extends beyond the field of education, as participants encounter issues that extend from politics to economics. It is through this consciousness-building effort that the roles of EIB and EIB educators are explored. First of all, participants become critical of the traditional role of education in relation to indigenous culture and knowledge. Edmundo reflected further:

What does the curriculum mean? At the end, the curriculum is a cultural selection, and the problem is who selects, why they select it, what part of social culture selects it so that it enters into schools as content, right? [...] This curriculum has rendered them [local knowledges] invisible, it has paved them over, they call it subjugated knowledge. One is a learned culture, the other is vulgar, myth, tradition, popular knowledge, popular culture, the other is, well, legitimate, highbrow...that dichotomy, right?

Participants critique traditional and hegemonic ways of knowing and thinking, uncovering hidden curriculums, and more importantly, begin to understand

the local epistemologies and ways of knowing in their own terms. Rocío, teacher trainer of HOPE and former participant of *Pukllasunchis'* workshops, mentioned:

Living it right? I think that it is also about that, because if you study it and you don't live it, you don't feel it, you will not understand.... There are things that they tell you, solstice, equinox, but if you don't see it, how will you understand that? (interview, July 30, 2009)

In this way, participants have a conception of EIB that moves beyond the bilingual component and the recognition of indigenous culture, recognizing the need to introduce the interplay between dominant and indigenous cultures. Profesor Abraham, an experienced educator and participant of *Pukllasunchis'* workshops, commented, "They believe that EIB is only about language and it's not like that. It is about recuperating our culture and also about learning about the other culture, knowing how to navigate both cultures" (interview, July 24, 2009).

Pukllasunchis' also recognizes the need to encourage the participation of local stakeholders as a crucial component of interculturality. In *Pukllasunchis'* conception of interculturality, parents are not only educational allies but are at the core of the EIB educational project. It is only through parents and community members that teachers can begin to understand indigenous ways of knowing and being in their own terms. Profesor Abraham recognized that the cultivation of an Andean epistemology and sensibility could only be built in collaboration with the community where teachers serve:

What we are missing is working with the worldview, the Andean worldview, and work it in with the teachers. First of all, we teachers need to become embedded with the worldview, we have to start to live together with the community, the parents, the children. I think that only then will we start to develop an intercultural education maybe approximated to reality, right? (interview, July 24, 2009)

In this sense, the workshops require participants to conduct research in the community where they work—in the case of rural EIB teachers—or in another indigenous community of their choice. It is through the fieldwork that teachers are to start connecting with parents and community, as Edmundo explained:

Like I told you, EIB expands out of the borders of the school itself. I think we should start working mainly with the community, recognizing the theme of their local knowledge. We are elaborating a research project on local knowledge. When you start investigating, you become aware of the richness and the educational potential within the communities. (interview, June 30, 2009)

The research project serves the purpose of connecting teachers to parents and community members from whom they learn about local knowledge and culture, and additionally, to encourage teachers to use this new knowledge in pedagogical practice. Participants are required to give a presentation and submit a final monograph about how they would integrate local culture into the curriculum (interview, Ignacia [*Asociación Pukllasunchis'* coordinator], June 25, 2009). This exercise provides participants with a concrete experience in collaborating with parents, a

skill that was missing in the HOPE workshops, which was a concern shared by many teachers.

Finally, the readings, discussions and workshop activities all had a strong impact on teachers' individual and personal lives. Through the workshop, teachers not only re-examined their role as teachers, but also their own personal lives. One of the teachers, Dora, described the deep impact on her sense of self:

I have learned a lot from the workshops. First, I learned more about myself, who I am, how to affirm myself, culturally, and only then I have been able to start understanding my job. [...] I also thought about migrating to the city, [the city] was the best, and to some extent it was a concern, "When am I going to buy a piece of land in Cusco?" And now, with all the work that I am doing I have no interest in going to the city. I go into the fields happy, I feel at home with the people from rural areas. I am not a person who imposes, but I listen to them and learn a lot. Now, in my town, I go to talk to my grandparents, I want to learn more, know more, also with my mother. How many things does she tell us? I make my own family reflect, I tell them "Why can't things be like that anymore?" (interview, July 22, 2009)

The workshop allowed Dora to reconsider her previous attitudes and beliefs about her own identity and indigenous culture. The affective component of the workshop serves to reinforce teachers' personal convictions and commitments to EIB and ensure the sustainability of the project. Furthermore, having been transformed at a personal and professional level, and having decolonized their minds, some teachers felt an individual commitment to embark on an EIB project, rather than pressure to do so.

Translating Interculturality into Practice: The Experience of *Pukllasunchis* Participants

In this section, I will examine *Pukllasunchis* workshops' influence on teachers' EIB classroom practices. Teacher interviews and classroom practices, triangulated against the workshop observations described above, will allow us to understand this influence.

Teachers who participated in *Pukllasunchis* workshops shared a view of EIB that moved away from a simple focus on bilingual education and recognized the importance of teaching from the community's and students' worldviews, knowledge, and indigenous identities. Translated into practice, this conception applied to classroom pedagogies as well as to the content that was taught. In terms of pedagogies, Profesor Abraham (interview, July 24, 2009) noted the difference between schooling from an Andean and Western perspective. As he elaborated, the compartmentalized organization of schools (in terms of distinct subjects and classrooms) runs against a more holistic Andean conception of knowledge and learning:

When it is our turn to work Andean culture, or community culture, it is not necessary to work with schedules. No, there is no rigid schedule, nor fragmentation of disciplines, nor topics, because it is experiential knowledge, you have to live it, feel it. And in the other culture, then it is different. The knowledge of modern culture. There, you can work inside the classroom,

like in a laboratory, but not in the other culture, it is all lived, experienced, it is feeling. For example, if you want to work with mother nature, you have to feel it, touch it, and share it, for example, with the parents.

Second, in terms of content, an EIB education was understood as one that recognized two epistemologies and brought them into conversation. Profesor Abraham shared an example of how he taught a Natural Sciences lesson that was focused on seeds. First of all, he noted that there is a difference between the Andean and Western conception of a seed. In the Andean culture, he explained:

The seed is a mother, and when the seed will sprout it becomes a daughter. We must take care of it, we must care for it because when it gives fruits, it will take care of us, then it starts to circle, it is a cycle.

Moreover, the community respects seeds, as Abraham explained: "*La queremos, la apreciamos, la respetamos* [We care for it, we appreciate it, we respect it]". Students should also know the modern conception of seeds; how modern science and technology use seeds as a resource, understood as "*conceptos fríos y abstractos* [cold and abstract concepts]". However, in Profesor Abraham's opinion, teachers ought to be careful to balance a conception that introduces both epistemologies to students without placing one as better than the other:

[We must work] in a comparative manner, but not a comparison like only saying, "Look here it is this way, but there are other cultures" [...] Then, the child will form his ideas and consciousness, right? And at some moment, he will assume a role, right? Which one he considers better. Because we can't say or work in a chauvinistic manner, "This is good, that is bad, and we have to reject the other." No. Instead, we have to give that opportunity and amplitude to both cultures. (interview, July 24, 2009)

Teaching an EIB curriculum also meant uncovering sources of inequalities and historical oppression of indigenous groups. Referring to a history class, Profesora Ernestina (interview, July 22, 2009) gave the following example of what interculturality meant in the classroom:

For example, one topic, I believe, is rather the way in which the Spaniards, landowners and hacienda owners have killed all that culture, which is teaching history, right? What really happened in the town? What happened with those indigenous leaders, right? And if we enter into these issues, it is also revaluing the heroic courage of the peasants, men, and women, in the struggle and, now, what are we doing?

Teaching in students' own terms was not free of challenges. The biggest difficulty experienced by teachers was teaching from an indigenous epistemology that is commonly portrayed as irrational, in opposition to a more "rational" Western epistemology. As Edmundo explained:

When we are in the workshops, you see that there is no irrationality that corresponds to the West. From the Andean world, we say "It's that way, there is no rational explanation." You can't rationalize it. You just say

"That's the way it is, don't ask." That's the uncertainty, the complexity [of Andean culture]. (interview, June 30, 2009)

This difficulty was particularly heightened when teaching Natural Sciences lessons. Edmundo also described this challenge at the classroom level:

When I used to teach, I used to tell my students, that in the Andean worldview everything is alive. The mountains, the water, everything. [...] Once, a student asked me, "But teacher, if everything is alive, what happens to water when you boil it?" And I remained like, frozen, I didn't know what to say to him.

In response to this challenge, Profesor Abraham noted that students should not ask questions of "why" in the Andean worldview because, "*Así pervierte la cultura y la humanidad, se desvía de su esencia el hombre, eso al menos es la concepción andina* [That is how culture and humanity becomes perverted, man deviates from his essence, at least that is the Andean worldview]" (interview, July 24, 2009). This response is an example of how this approach to interculturality can limit the domains of Andean culture and marginalize it to the realm of superstition. Moreover, it can take away from students' interest in learning about Andean culture, when the teachers' approach does not provide answers to their concerns. Thus, the critical nature of the workshops, as well as the difficulty in reaching a balance when negotiating both dominant and indigenous knowledge, could encourage some participants to continue to marginalize indigenous students and culture.

Additionally, some teachers shared a task, similar to that of HOPE teachers, of attempting to preserve indigenous culture intact, in a static and unchanged form. In their case, however, it was a more entrenched duty that they felt had to be fulfilled. Profesora Susana, for example, felt the need to recuperate and maintain traditional agricultural practices amongst parents:

Some parents, they are contaminating the earth. They are already using chemical fertilizers for their harvests [...] I always tell them, "Don't spoil your land, it won't produce anymore." And I always talk with the parents, I go in the afternoons, I take some coca leaves and tell them, "Don't do that anymore, do it with this. You shouldn't do it [use chemical fertilizers], you should grow crops the way you used to do it." (interview, July 22, 2009)

This attitude, although not ill-intentioned, means that teachers construct an idea of indigenous culture as incompatible with change and modernity, marginalizing different ways of being indigenous and different indigenous practices. For example, Profesora Ernestina criticizes parents' commercialization of their indigenous knowledge and resources:

[Parents] want to take advantage of it, but not for recuperating that ancestral way of living for their advantage or for their communities. They have already grown interested; "Yes let's do it, in that way we learn to cultivate and to export, do this and that." Everything is being lost, they are looking at EIB as a way of commercialization. It is the same with homestead tourism. If I want to continue living the way I live not because

I want to, I value it, but because how am I going to make a living, what do I have to do. (interview, July 22, 2009)

In both cases, teachers' views seem to be mutually exclusive with practices through which parents could increase their income and improve their lifestyles. Additionally, under this approach to interculturality, teachers are left to decide what counts as authentic culture, without incorporating parents into this process, which marginalizes indigenous people from the efforts of cultural maintenance.

The nature of the *Pukllasunchis* workshop and some of the comments of participants suggest a reading of interculturality that tends to idealize, to some extent, indigenous culture. Profesora Rocío noticed that the different ways of thinking and living can be considered fundamentalist by others:

It's not only about reasoning, but Andean culture, you feel it, right? Sometimes they call us fundamentalist, I don't know what else, but it is another way of living. It's simple. (interview, August 17, 2009)

Pukllasunchis workshops have been able to introduce the consciousness-raising that was absent in the first generation of EIB training. In contrast with the immediate practicality of HOPE workshops for teachers new to EIB, however, *Pukllasunchis* does not offer concrete language methodologies similar to the ones HOPE does. In this sense, *Pukllasunchis* seems to cater for a group of EIB educators who already have some experience in the field, or whose interest is not as strong in language methodologies as it is in other areas.

Conclusion

In-service teacher training workshops run by HOPE and *Asociación Pukllasunchis* provide opportunities for teachers to learn about EIB policy and interculturality and can influence the way teachers implement it. However, workshops do not determine these interpretations and implementations. Teachers' individual choices and practices are also influenced by their beliefs, convictions and past experiences, as well as by broader structural forces. There is no direct causality between training and practice; rather, teacher-training workshops are one of the many forces influencing EIB teachers. For example, in the case of more experienced teachers it is hard to determine to what extent their actions are colored by training workshops and to what extent their beliefs and actions are compatible with the type of training they choose to receive. Similarly, in the case of new teachers, it is difficult to pinpoint the effect of teacher training workshops if these were to be discontinued.

These observations serve to reinforce the multidirectionality present in the process of policy interpretation and implementation. It is difficult to assign direct causality to teachers' interpretation and implementation of the concept of interculturality. Thus, future research could concern itself with studying the various other factors that influence this complex process. For example, what is the role played by the professional communities of practice to which teachers belong? Similarly, what is the role played by the indigenous communities to which students belong, as well as the community of students' parents, in teachers' sense-making and

enactment of interculturality? Moreover, what are the complex relationships between this multiplicity of factors?

This paper has also shown that regardless of the approach to interculturality put forth by each training program, in-service teacher training workshops do not escape the possibility of reproducing the marginalization of indigenous culture and indigenous students. In this sense, it seems necessary for teacher training programs and EIB teachers to distinguish between intent and effect, as many teachers can indirectly cause adverse consequences for their students through their implementation of interculturality. Recognition of the shortcomings of the training programs and teaching practices is necessary, as well as a conscious and critical re-evaluation of how workshops and teaching practices could be improved to better serve students.

At the same time, in-service teacher training workshops can provide teachers with the tools to challenge the marginalization of indigenous culture and their students. Overall, workshops that encourage participants to challenge the marginalization of their students—such as *Pukllasunchis* workshops—will engage with participants' beliefs, attitudes and prior experiences that come into play when making sense of interculturality, as well as providing them with various practical tools to implement it. Failing to engage with both these elements might result in having participants endorse a holistic approach to interculturality in theory without putting into practice. Similarly, a lack of commitment to interculturality, in terms of teachers' beliefs and attitudes, might put in danger its implementation once workshops are over. Developing programs that explain the pedagogical relevance of EIB—engaging with teachers' attitudes and beliefs—while simultaneously providing teachers the know-how skills with follow up and support will be crucial to develop effective teacher training programs for EIB educators.

When re-thinking how teacher training programs can better serve teachers, and thus their students, it is also necessary to keep in mind that ultimately, educators are active agents who can choose how to better make use of the in-service training workshops. Teacher training workshops have the potential to be useful to EIB teachers and individuals also choose or choose not to make use of them, depending on their needs and capabilities, past experiences and personal convictions. Future research as well as action in the field of intercultural bilingual education should concern itself with learning about and sharing the experiences of EIB educators, who on a daily basis interpret and implement interculturality in multiple contexts. Facilitating the development of learning communities among teachers and across the different groups of professionals passionate about EIB is a pressing need.

Acknowledgements

This paper would not have been possible without the support of the many dear friends I met in Cusco, Peru during the summer of 2009—teachers, students, NGO staff and activists. *Gracias por acogerme y hacerme sentir una más de ustedes.* I would like to thank Lisa Smulyan and Nancy Hornberger for their warm support and thoughtful comments during the many stages that led to the writing of this paper. I would also like to thank Laura Valdiviezo for her very insightful comments on an earlier draft of this paper and Joanna L. Siegel for her thoughtful observations.

I would like to invite those of you interested in this issue to contact me (franceswat@gmail.com). I would be more than happy to hear your thoughts and exchange experiences and ideas.

Frances Kviotok is a recent graduate of Swarthmore College, Class of 2010, where she pursued a Special Major in Educational Studies and Anthropology. Her interests lie in the field of intercultural and multilingual education in indigenous communities, as well as in-service teacher education.

Email: franceswat@gmail.com

References

- Aikman, S. (2003). *La educación indígena en Sudamérica. Interculturalidad y bilingüismo en Madre de Dios, Perú*. Lima, Perú: IEP.
- Asociación Pukllasunchis. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.pukllasunchis.org>
- Chunga, J.A. (2009). *Historia de la educación en el Perú*. Retrieved from <http://www.monografias.com/trabajos32/historia-educacion-peru/historia-educacion-peru.shtml>
- Comisión de la Verdad y Reconciliación. (2003). *Informe Final*. Retrieved from <http://www.cverdad.org.pe/ingles/ifinal/index.php>
- Cooper, R.L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- DINEBI [La Dirección de Educación Nacional de Educación Bilingüe Intercultural]. (2007). *La participación de los pueblos indígenas y comunidades rurales en el Proyecto de Educación en Áreas Rurales – PEAR. 2005-2007. Documento de trabajo*. Retrieved from <http://www.oei.es/noticias/spip.php?article2995>
- García, M. E. (2004). Rethinking bilingual education in Perú: Intercultural rights, state policy and indigenous rights. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(5), 348-367.
- García, M. E. (2005). *Making indigenous citizens: Identity, development, and multicultural activism in Peru*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1983). The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In J. Cobarrubias and J. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in language planning: International perspectives* (pp. 269-290). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1987). Bilingual education success, but policy failure. *Language in Society*, 16(2), 205-226.
- Hornberger, N. H. and Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(3), 509-532.
- Hornberger, N. H., and King, K. A. (2006). Quechua as Lingua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 177-194.
- INEI [Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática]. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.inei.gob.pe/>
- King, K. (2004). Language policy and local policy in South America: New directions for enrichment bilingual education in the Andes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(5), 334-347.
- MED [Ministerio de Educación de Perú]. (2002). Ley para la Educación Bilingüe Intercultural, Ley Nro. 27818.
- MED [Ministerio de Educación de Perú]. (2003). Ley General de Educación, Ley Nro. 28044.
- MED [Ministerio de Educación de Perú]. (2005). Diseño Curricular Nacional de Educación Básica Regular. Retrieved from <http://www.minedu.gob.pe/normatividad/reglamentos/DisenoCurricularNacional.pdf>
- MED [Ministerio de Educación de Perú] & UNESCO. (2009). *Promoción y uso del*

- multilingüismo y el acceso universal al ciberespacio*. Retrieved from <http://www.comiunesco.org.pe/i09.html>
- Pennycook, A. (2006) Postmodernism in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 60-76). New York, NY: Blackwell Publishing.
- Peru (n.d.). *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com/>
- Reimers, F. (2000). *Unequal schools, unequal chances: The challenge of equal opportunity in the Americas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press and Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies.
- Ricento, T. K. and Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3), 401-427.
- Schiffman, H. (1996) *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London, England: Routledge.
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London, England: Routledge.
- Spolsky, B. (2007). Towards a theory of language policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 22(1), 1-14.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2001). *Language policies in education: Critical issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2006). Critical theory in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 42-59). New York, NY: Blackwell Publishing.
- 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.
- Wolf, D. (1996). Situating feminist dilemmas in fieldwork. In D. L. Wolf (Ed.), *Feminist dilemmas in fieldwork* (pp. 1-55). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Woods, P. (1986). *Inside schools: Ethnography in educational research*. London, England: Routledge.
- World Bank. (2005). *Indigenous peoples, poverty and human development in Latin America, 1994-2004* (Executive Summary). Retrieved from <http://go.worldbank.org/IY5XAU9800>

Appendix I

Reflections on Fieldwork

In relation to critical theory, Tollefson (2006) notes that “a critical examination of epistemology and research methodology is inseparable from ethical standards and political commitments to social justice” (p. 44), and the need to include self-reflexivity of relationship with others. Going into the field with a wide range of positionalities, most favoring a privileged position (bilingual in Spanish–English, raised in the capital of Peru, student at a Western institution) I was aware of the power dilemmas that would be present as I interacted with subjects who enjoyed a less privileged position. Although one cannot escape one’s positionalities, I made a conscious choice to reflect on them and to redress them. I remained very open with participants about my research and research process. I made sure to give them, when possible, the choice of time and place of the interview. I assured their confidentiality and anonymity by signing forms stating that if their words were to be quoted I would use pseudonyms. I also made sure to explain my research in a non-technical yet unpatronizing way. I remained very open to them asking questions about my research and allowed their interests and concerns to guide the interviews to leave room for subjects to co-construct them.

Although I did not offer financial remuneration to subjects who participated in my research, I did engage in acts of reciprocity. Upon my arrival to schools I made symbolic gifts to the schools (classroom materials, soccer balls) and made sure to cover all my living expenses. I provided symbolic acts of reciprocity, such as translating and interpreting. Similarly, my high mobility allowed me to act as a messenger when they needed to send documents to the city of Cusco. Moreover, the experience of being interviewed was a way for teachers to share and express their opinions about EIB policy, often unheard, and my presence often provided them with company in the solitude of the evenings in desolate areas. As Woods (1986) explains, there is a “potentially therapeutic element in this kind of encounter” (p. 69). One of the teachers, Profesora Diana mentioned that “*Me va a dar penita cuando se vaya, otra vez me voy a quedar solita* [I’m going to be sad when you leave, once again I am going to be alone]” (interview, July 7, 2009). Finally, I offered to share my written research with teachers to thank them for their collaboration and, hopefully, to inform their practice.

My observations did not happen without challenges, including a combination of limited language abilities, logistical troubles, and the overall hardship of fieldwork. Given my lack of Quechua, I could not understand classes or training workshops conducted in Quechua, and missed the opportunity to communicate with Quechua-speaking parents. Logistics was always a cause of concern. From the time of my arrival to Cusco, there were a series of circumstances that prevented me from having access to schools – celebration of regional festivities, national holidays, riots, and road blockages and closing of schools because of Swine flue prior to mid-year vacations. The closing of schools meant that I could not spend as much time as desired in some schools or could not visit the schools of all the EIB teachers I interviewed.

In an attempt to overcome positivist approaches to fieldwork and research, I have included this reflection section. However, I am aware that self-reflexivity does not subvert the power hierarchies, but only acknowledges them. As a researcher, I maintained full authorship of transcriptions and translations, as well as of writing, interpreting, and representing my subjects and the topic of research. As Wolf (1996) notes, the story is no longer their story but has become my story. However,

it is worth noting that subjects have agency of their own and can choose how to represent themselves during interviews and observations. Wolf also claims that research informants are not only objects but are active subjects who have the power to shape and control the ethnographic encounter. This observation is particularly pertinent to this study, where teachers not only negotiated the research process, but are agents in interpreting and implementing EIB policy on a daily basis.

Appendix II

General information about research sites

Table 1

The school

	Paru Paru	Tiracancha	Molle Molle	Rayanpata
# of teachers	4	6	3	1
# of students	104	170	80	20
# of grades	1–6 Multigrade (grades 3–4 and 5–6)	1–6	1–6 Multigrade (grades 1–2, 3– 4 and 5–6)	1–4 Multigrade (all grades)
NGO affiliation	–	HOPE	<i>Asociación Pukllasunchis</i>	–
Teacher- training	CRAN 2 (2 out of 4 teachers)	HOPE	<i>Asociación Pukllasunchis</i>	CRAN 2; <i>Asociación Pukllasunchis</i>

Table 2

The village

	Paru Paru	Tiracancha	Molle Molle	Rayanpata
Location	Province of Calca, Cusco	Province of Calca, Cusco	Province of Paruro, Cusco	Province of Calca, Cusco
Altitude (m.a.s.l.)	3,800	4,100	2,000	2,900
Language	Quechua	Quechua	Quechua	Quechua and Spanish
Main productive activities	Agriculture (cereals and sheep)	Agriculture (Potatoes, llamas, and alpacas)	Agriculture (grains, sheep)	Agriculture (cereals)
Time from Cusco (hrs)	1:45	2:30	2:00	1:15
Transport costs (\$)	12	12	7	5

Appendix III

General information about teacher-training workshops attended

Table 3

	<i>Asociación Pukllasunchis</i>	TAREA	HOPE
Funding	Foreign (Switzerland and Holland)	Foreign (Europe and North America)	Foreign (Holland)
Type of training	Decolonization of the mind; Final research paper	Language education pedagogy	Language education pedagogy; Introduction to interculturality; Follow-up visits to schools
Length	Yearlong: monthly meetings (weekends); Three <i>internados</i>	Yearlong: monthly meetings (weekends); Annual 1-week training sessions	Yearlong: monthly meetings (weekends)
Participation	Voluntary (fee)	Mandatory	Mandatory
# of participating teachers	50	19	15