ALLEGHENY COLLEGE

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES 610

SPANISH 610

SENIOR PROJECT

Kelly Frantz

Saving Quichua: An Examination of Intercultural Bilingual Education in Ecuador under the Correa Administration

Department *of* International Studies
Department *of* Modern *and* Classical Languages



Saving Quichua: An Examination of Intercultural Bilingual Education in Ecuador under the Correa Administration

Submitted to the Department of International Studies of Allegheny College in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts.

April 15, 2016

I hereby recognize and pledge to fulfill my responsibilities as defined in the Honor Code and to maintain the integrity of both myself and the College community as a whole.

_____
(Signature)

Approved by:

_____ Rehenuma Asmi

_____ Wilfredo Hernández

_____ Shannan Mattiace

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS…….....iv

ABSTRACT…….v

INTRODUCTION……...1

CHAPTER ONE: Intercultural Bilingual Education from Past to Present……..7

CHAPTER TWO: Quichua Language Shift and Possibilities for Revitalization through IBE….20

CHAPTER THREE: IBE's Inconsistent Implementation of Bilingual Education……42

CAPÍTULO CUATRO: *Huasipungo* y los papeles del indio……62

CONCLUSION: There is Hope for Quichua……82

REFERENCES……..87

APPENDIX A: Entrevista con Rafael Pulpiales……93

APPENDIX B: Entrevista con Merian……..98

APPENDIX C: Entrevista con Jenny……...104

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank Rosa, Umberto, Kelleen, and William. You shared with me your culture, your language, and your home, and I will always be grateful for your generosity. You are my inspiration for this project.

Secondly, I would like to thank Professor Asmi. I could not have done this without your unwavering support. Thank you for your thoughtful comments and guidance on this project, and thank you for sparking my interest in bilingual education and language revitalization. You have been an incredible role model for me since the beginning.

I would like to thank Professor Hernández as well. Since my freshman year, you have continued to encourage me to realize my potential as a writer and a researcher. I value your guidance immensely.

I would also like to thank Professor Mattiace. From providing me with numerous resources for my project to answering all of my many questions, you have given me invaluable support over these past two semesters.

And lastly, I would like to thank my family. You taught me to be confident, diligent, and to never settle for less than my best. Your steadfast support helps me through the difficult days and celebrates with me on the good ones. I know that no matter where my International Studies degree takes me, I can always find home where you are.

ABSTRACT

This project examines the possibilities for Quichua language revitalization through Ecuador's Intercultural Bilingual Education (IBE) System. I analyze the current program alongside best practices for language revitalization and bilingual education to determine what linguistic and educational conditions are helping or hindering its ability to promote language revitalization. I conclude that IBE has some strengths, but also significant weaknesses. The biggest strength of IBE under the current administration is its intercultural rhetoric. It is framing linguistic diversity in a positive light, addressing deeply held negative language attitudes. However, due to recent changes in IBE policy and disagreements between the Correa administration and social movements, indigenous groups are losing control over an education system that is meant to serve them. In addition to the loss of indigenous control and support, the program is also failing to adequately allocate the resources that communities and teachers need for successful implementation.

INTRODUCTION

Kelleen and I sit on a thick, wool blanket, warming our toes by the fireplace. Rosa, Kelleen's mother, sits near us, listening to our conversation as her experienced hands work effortlessly on a complicated floral embroidery. Kelleen flips to a page in her Quichua-Spanish dictionary titled "Yupaykuna: Los números." Smiling, she covers half of the page with her hand so that I can only see the numbers in Spanish. She was quizzing me. "Shuk, ishkay, kimsa, chusku, pichka…" I recite the numbers one through ten, pausing occasionally as she corrects my pronunciation. Tonight, Kelleen's father Umberto and her brother William join us. The topic moves from numbers to conversational phrases, and the whole family role plays late into the evening as I maneuver the workings of this new language. As we all finally part for bed, I employ my limited Quichua vocabulary to thank them for sharing their language with me. "Pagi mashi," I say, Thank you friends.

Rosa, Umberto, Kelleen, and William live in the highland community of San Clemente, a rural indigenous community of approximately 700 people in the province of Imbabura, Ecuador. I came to San Clemente as an intern at their local elementary school. I left the community two months later disenchanted by the Ecuadorian education system, but captivated by the local Quichua culture and language. Although I may not recall many Quichua words after a year away from San Clemente, my host family's relationship with their mother tongue continues to resonate with me. While Rosa and Umberto speak Quichua fluently and often, Kelleen and William, the younger generation of Quichua speakers, demonstrate an almost paradoxical relationship with their native language: As enthusiastic as they are to share their language with me, they are much less eager to speak it themselves. These decisions and attitudes about language use are just one of the factors that help explain the uncertain future of the Quichua language. Ecuador's Intercultural Bilingual Education Program is working to address the insecurity that Quichua and other indigenous languages face, however critical barriers to implementation remain. While the program is slowly addressing language attitudes like those held by Kelleen and William, this is not enough to reverse the slow decline of indigenous language speakers. The program currently

lacks critical support from indigenous groups as well as the necessary resources and teachers to make local implementation possible. These strengths and weakness explain why the program is promising but has so far been unable to successfully reverse language shift in Ecuador.

Michael Krauss (1992), a pioneering researcher who drew considerable attention to the problem of language loss, made a shocking prediction. He forecasted that fewer than ten percent of the world's 6000 languages would survive past the year 2100. The decline in linguistic diversity and the decrease in speakers of indigenous languages is an unfortunate, yet undeniable reality. And Quichua is one of these languages. With approximately two million speakers, Quichua is the most commonly spoken of Ecuador's twelve indigenous languages; however, it is threatened. A variety of factors can cause language loss, such as modernization, demographic changes, or the oppression of speech communities. Quichua is endangered due to a combination of these factors. The Quichua indigenous community has experienced centuries of colonial and postcolonial cultural and linguistic oppression; speakers are increasingly migrating to urban areas for education and employment; and younger generations are becoming more connected to mainstream Spanish culture through schooling, jobs, and the media. As a result of these and other factors, the number of Quichua speakers has been steadily decreasing for the past few decades.

The purpose of my project is not to present a bleak diagnosis of Quichua's endangerment, but rather, to examine the possibilities for saving it, specifically through bilingual education in Ecuador's schools. While language revitalization can stem from a variety of language planning efforts, education has the potential to significantly impact the vitality of a language. In Ecuador, education may offer the best chance to save Quichua and other indigenous languages. My project addresses the possibility for Quichua language revitalization through Ecuador's Intercultural

Bilingual Education (IBE) Program. I compare best linguistic and educational practices to Ecuador's current program to address my central question: How well does IBE meet these proven practices to potentially contribute to Quichua language revitalization? I address this question by taking a contemporary, multidisciplinary, and local approach to IBE analysis.

Contemporary analyses of Ecuador's Intercultural Bilingual Education System are limited in number and scope due to recent changes in education policy and leadership. The few researchers that have examined the IBE System since the most recent Intercultural Education Law passed in 2011 admit that substantial conclusions about the state of the program are difficult to make because of how new the policy changes are (Becker, 2013; Gustafson, 2014; Martinez Novo, 2014). National level alterations to the IBE Program may not yet be visible on a local level in individual schools, hence this limits the nature of their conclusions to political analyses and predictions about changes in IBE effectiveness. I will add to this contemporary conversation about IBE by analyzing these recent changes from an educational and linguistic perspective, making my approach multidisciplinary as well as contemporary.

I take a multidisciplinary approach to IBE analysis to reflect the complex nature of language revitalization endeavors. The program, both locally and nationally, needs to reflect best practices for language revitalization and best practices for bilingual education—two separate, but related concepts. Language revitalization refers to any effort aimed at either increasing the number of speakers, the domains, or the functions of a language. It requires certain conditions to happen successfully, two of the most important being positive language attitudes and community participation. Bilingual education is one specific means to revitalize a language. Its success is dependent on meeting not only the suggested conditions for revitalization, but also other

conditions unique to bilingual education. IBE should theoretically attend to language revitalization practices and best practices in bilingual education.

In addition to a contemporary and multidisciplinary approach, my project is unique because I also incorporate a local perspective: San Clemente. During my stay in San Clemente, I conducted interviews with teachers and the founder of the community school. I also collected field notes from my observations and informal discussions with my host family. While the bulk of my investigation comes from a combination of current policy and literature analysis, I employ specific experiences and interviews from San Clemente to show how one community is working through the challenges of implementing bilingual education and revitalizing Quichua. This local perspective also highlights just how much IBE implementation varies from school to school, and thus, how critically it depends on local factors. The specific language dynamics in Rosa and Umberto's household capture the interplay between local and national factors. IBE under Correa has been successful in increasing positive language attitudes, but is struggling to keep the support of indigenous groups and to consistently support schools and teachers with the necessary resources to implement the best program model.

Chapter One traces the history of Intercultural Bilingual Education up to the current system. IBE in Ecuador began as a central demand of the indigenous movement and eventually became an established program under the Ministry of Education in the late 1980s. Its transformation from a far-off goal of indigenous communities and activists to a national institution that functions alongside the traditional system represents undeniable progress towards linguistic and cultural recognition for Ecuador's indigenous communities. However, a contemporary analysis of the recent changes to IBE policy and program leadership under Ecuador's current president, Rafael Correa, suggests that the program is losing a critical

component: the involvement of indigenous groups in decision-making processes. Although policy rhetoric paints a promising picture of an intercultural society and positive educational reform, Correa's sour relationship with indigenous groups points to conflicting visions about the purpose and structure of IBE.

In Chapter Two, I provide background on the Quichua language and explain its current endangered status as highlighted by weak intergenerational transmission and shifting language domains. I outline past Quichua language planning efforts and present Intercultural Bilingual Education as one possibly promising one. While various national and local actors have taken positive steps to promote language revitalization, the current status of Quichua remains insecure. Saving Quichua may lie, I suggest, in the hands of the Intercultural Bilingual Education System—the only official, government-funded program that addresses indigenous language loss. Given the potential promise of IBE, I analyze the current system from a linguistic perspective. Studies of language revitalization point to two critical conditions for program success: community support and positive language attitudes. I determine to what extent IBE meets these suggested best practices.

Chapter Three analyzes IBE from an educational perspective, incorporating literature on best practices for bilingual education to determine the specific conditions that create an effective bilingual program. First, policies need to provide individual schools with the resources and financial support they need to implement and maintain a bilingual program. Indigenous groups need to be involved in national policy decisions, so as to meet the collective interests of the indigenous communities they represent. Also bilingual teacher training programs need to be available to train Quichua language teachers who can carry out the IBE program. Some program details need to reflect specific community characteristics, and therefore should be determined by

the communities themselves. First, the bilingual model needs to reflect the local linguistic environment, and second, the curriculum should incorporate local knowledge and customs.

Chapter Four is a Spanish analysis of the Ecuadorian indigenist novel *Huasipungo*, written by Jorge Icaza. This section acts as a supplement to my other three chapters in a few ways. It portrays the oppression and injustice that indigenous groups in Ecuador faced in the early twentieth century. My analysis specifically focuses on the dual role that Indians played in Ecuadorian society. While the elites exploited their labor for development and modernization projects, they simultaneously viewed the Indian as a barrier—not just a servant—to progress. Today, the remnants of this oppressive past persist in the form of institutionalized racism and the stigmatization of indigenous cultures. This has attributed to indigenous language loss and it presents a significant barrier to language revitalization efforts.

The following chapters attempt to make sense of and respond to a very complicated phenomenon: language shift. While generalized conclusions about the program's effectiveness and its future are attractive, it is difficult to make a certain conclusion about IBE's potential as a tool for language revitalization for two reasons. First, it's still too soon to see the impact of the recent changes to IBE on the classroom level. And second, both language revitalization and bilingual education depend critically on community involvement, and hence, vary by community. As of now, IBE in Ecuador meets a limited number of criteria for successful language revitalization, each of which I will outline in its respective chapter. IBE in Ecuador has the potential to reverse the loss of Quichua and other indigenous languages only if it mirrors proven linguistic and educational practices in a welcoming political atmosphere that encourages participation.

CHAPTER ONE

Intercultural Bilingual Education from Past to Present

Don Rafael's Story

Rafael Pupiales lives with his wife in a small cement home. Behind it lay acres of farmland and in front of it is the singular stone road that cuts through the San Clemente community, winding higher and higher up the side of Imbabura Volcano. I sit with don Rafael in his workshop, a small garage-like room behind his house crammed with half-finished carpentry projects and at least a dozen chickens taking shelter from a heavy thunderstorm. As part of my quest to discover the history of the community school, Merian, the school supervisor, sent me here to meet its founder. As rain pounds against the tin roof, don Rafael begins to tell the story of how the community school became what it is today, taking me back to the early 1960's:

> *I don't remember the exact date [of the founding]. But I'm the founder… I wasn't exactly a teacher, but a literacy teacher. So I started teaching community children not at a school but in my house where I used to live. It was my father's house, and he was an illiterate employed by the plantation. It was there that I created a place for literacy teaching using the radio. So, I founded that place, making me the teacher. But at that time, I hadn't studied anything. I had no more than a fifth grade education. (personal communication, April 16, 2015)*

Don Rafael started teaching Quichua literacy to both children and adults in the community of San Clemente when he was a young man. A common approach to indigenous literacy education during this time was through radio programming (Escuelas Radiofónicas). With international support from a Belgian organization, don Rafael established the Brussels Radio School (Escuela Radiofónica Bruselas) at his family home. He began by only offering adult literacy classes, providing services to about 75 community members. After a few years teaching only adults, he began to offer classes for children as well.

Although don Rafael stresses that he only achieved a fifth grade education himself, he did receive important training under Monsieur Leonidas Proaño, a bishop from Riobamba who famously championed radio schooling programming for indigenous communities and was a fierce advocate for indigenous rights. Don Rafael refers to Proaño as his most influential mentor, the one who encouraged him to eventually pursue a teaching license and to forever live to serve his community. Proaño taught him the power that education holds for poor, marginalized indigenous communities: "I still remember it all [his teachings]. For me, it was that the only weapon for the [indigenous] fight was education. With education, one can defend everything" (personal communications, April 16, 2015). With literacy training and inspiration from the famous "Bishop of the Indians" (Obispo de los Indios), don Rafael continued to provide Quichua literacy education for the largely illiterate community.

In 1973, as part of a larger effort to expand education to rural communities throughout the country, the government intervened, providing the resources to create the first official schoolhouse and assigning the first schoolteacher to the San Clemente community. This marked the beginning of the public school that exists today. It remained a single-room, single-teacher school for five years until an increase in students demanded more space and more teachers. Don

Rafael continued to provide literacy education to adult community members until the mid-1980s, but he transferred the responsibilities for the children's education to the government-mandated teachers in the new schoolhouse. While don Rafael always stressed the importance of bilingual education and of incorporating community knowledge (farming, animal raising, artisanship, etc.) into schooling practices, this new fiscal school operated with mestizo teachers using a Spanish-based curriculum. Despite changes in teachers and national education policies through the decades, this mainstream, monolingual curriculum, which contrasts starkly with the community realities, endures today.

The changes happening in San Clemente that don Rafael describes were not unique to his community, but rather, they were part of a larger countrywide, decades-long shift. The Intercultural Bilingual Education (IBE) Program in Ecuador today has its roots in early efforts to promote literacy within indigenous communities, often with support from religious groups and foreign organizations. These early efforts made way for more significant changes in the 1980s, when the Intercultural Bilingual Education Program was created with the collaboration of powerful indigenous leaders and the national government. Over the next few decades, this program underwent various changes, with significant changes happening under the current administration, leaving the future of the IBE program uncertain.

This Chapter will trace the history of the Intercultural Bilingual Education Program, from its early educational predecessors to the current system. The development of IBE and the current situation from a cursory glance seem to point to a promising future for indigenous language education. However, under a closer look, the recent policy changes meant to improve IBE may actually be in opposition to the collective interest of indigenous groups, resulting in tension between the government and indigenous organizations. This tension may be due in some part to the disconnect between ambiguous top-down political rhetoric and local realities. As Rafael Pulpiales' story underlined, as governmental involvement in the San Clemente school grew, it led to the disinvolvement of community leaders, like don Rafael, in their children's education. So while increasing governmental support has undoubtedly been a positive step towards bringing

literacy education to marginalized communities, it is simultaneously taking education out of community hands and into the hands of politicians far removed from local realities. This chapter offers the necessary framework for deeper analysis by outlining the historical and current policy changes that have shaped the Intercultural Bilingual Education System. The most recent changes to IBE under the presidency of Rafael Correa point to a loss of cooperation between indigenous groups and the current administration, leaving the success of the program in jeopardy.

Early History of Indigenous Education

Before the national Intercultural Bilingual Education Program, any public education provided by the government for indigenous communities had "long served to repress Quechua and Quechua speakers" (Hornberger & Coronel Molina, 2004, p. 28). Like the community school in San Clemente, the goal of the curriculum was assimilation into the mainstream Hispanic language and culture (López, 2009). If the government-run schools provided any Quichua language education, it was part of a transitional bilingual program with the eventual aim of transitioning the students from Quichua to solely Spanish (López, 2009).

Non-governmental support for indigenous education often came from religious organizations. The most well known religious organization that promoted indigenous education all over Andean countries in the mid-1900s was the Summer Institute of Languages, SIL (Velez, 2007; López, 2014; Conejo Arellano, 2008). With its ultimate objective being evangelization, it began operating in Ecuador in 1952, helping to implement education programs in heavily populated indigenous regions. The organization focused on using indigenous languages as the medium to spread religious teachings, and it successfully translated the bible into Quichua. Its impact as an early fighter for indigenous education is unquestionable, but it has attracted its fair

share of critics who see the organization as a "politically conservative Westernizing and assimilationist effort" (Gustafson, 2014, p. 83). SIL implemented programs that utilized indigenous languages, but only as a necessary means to spread religious teachings. The organization did little to promote other aspects of indigenous culture (López, 2014).

Radio programming was also a common way to teach indigenous literacy before conventional schooling was available in rural communities. Leonidas Proaño, the Bishop of Riobamba, created perhaps the most well known Quichua language radio programming, called the Popular Radio Schools of Ecuador (*Escuelas Radiofónicas Populares del Ecuador, ERPE*), in the 1970s (Velez, 2007; Conejo Arellano, 2008). He trained indigenous teachers, like Rafael Pupiales, who then returned to their communities with the clear goal of increasing indigenous language literacy. Another radio school that helped create some of the first indigenous teaching professionals in the 1970s was the Shuar Radio System (*Sistema Radiofónica Shuar*) (Conejo Arellano, 2008). This differed from Monsieur Proaño's radio schools because it not only focused on indigenous language literacy but also Spanish. This made it one of the earliest maintenance bilingual programs for indigenous groups in Ecuador because it simultaneously promoted the development of both languages.

These early efforts to promote indigenous education tended to be limited in scope and resources. If the government did provide resources for community schools, they provided non-indigenous teachers trained to teach from the Spanish curriculum. There was no true national movement towards indigenous bilingual education until the 1980s.

The 1980s: Intercultural Bilingual Education (IBE) is Born

The national government didn't officially recognize the existence of indigenous languages until the 1979 Constitution, declaring that "Spanish is the official language. Quichua and the other aboriginal languages are recognized as integral parts of the national culture" (Constitution of 1979). This change in rhetoric was a response to the growing demands from active indigenous groups. The indigenous movement that began to grow in the 1970s finally achieved political recognition in the 1980s. The Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador (*Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de Ecuador*, CONAIE) formed in 1986 as a merger of smaller indigenous groups, becoming the most powerful indigenous group in the country, and arguably leading one of the most powerful and centralized movements in the entire Andean region (Becker, 2012).

The growing power and visibility of the indigenous movement led to policy changes in favor of the movement's demands, including demands for bilingual education for indigenous communities. Intercultural Bilingual Education (IBE) originated from small-scale efforts of indigenous communities and it was a key proposal of the indigenous movement in the 1970s and 1980s. It was first officially coined in 1981 under Executive Decree No. 000529, which declared IBE as a right for children in predominantly indigenous areas. Article 27 was then adopted into the Constitution in 1983, declaring: "The educational systems in predominantly indigenous zones should use Quichua (or the community's respective language) as the primary language of education and Spanish as the language of intercultural relations" (Article 27, 1983). These initial changes represented a significant shift away from the assimilationist ideology of the traditional education system and towards the intercultural bilingual model. This ideological shift began mainly as a rhetorical pursuit, however, because the government lacked a system to implement

the guarantees that it made. It wasn't until 1988 with the formation of the National Directorate of Intercultural Bilingual Education (DINEIB, *Dirección Nacional de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*) that concrete changes were made to the public education system in favor of Intercultural Bilingual Education.

The DINEIB is responsible for the design and implementation of Intercultural Bilingual Education. Gustafson (2014) calls it "a kind of mini-ministry" within the Ecuadorian government that originally offered indigenous groups "a remarkable, almost autonomous space for self-determination" (p. 83). The responsibilities of DINEIB include indigenous teacher training, developing native language curricula and teaching materials, and coordinating and implementing IBE programs in communities all over the country (Conejo Arellano, 2008). The DINEIB was originally decentralized with technical and administrative autonomy, giving indigenous groups the power to determine the characteristics of the IBE system and divide DINEIB jurisdiction into provinces and districts. The IBE system under DINEIB jurisdiction was formalized in 1993 with the issuance of the Model of Intercultural Bilingual Education System (*Modelo del Sistema de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*, MOSEIB).

Although indigenous groups had the authority to elect members to the DINEIB, to design the IBE system's curricula, and to hire teachers, their finances were still under central governmental control. The recognition of indigenous demands and the decentralization of educational control into their hands was part of a larger neoliberal movement in Latin America. International organizations tended to fund—and consequently, control—these types of reforms, encouraging decentralization and simultaneous budget cuts. Therefore, although indigenous groups gained control of this new IBE system, they did not have the financial support they needed from the central government to implement it successfully. Martínez Novo (2013)

criticizes these reforms, calling the IBE system "an example of…recognition without retribution" (p. 126). Marc Becker (2013) presents a similar criticism, calling Ecuador's education reforms "shallow multiculturalism engineered from above" (p. 48). The government recognized and responded to indigenous demands but ultimately didn't provide the new indigenous leaders with enough resources to implement the changes effectively. The spread of Intercultural Bilingual Education has been slow and uneven because of its lack of resources and financial support. Legislative changes in the late twentieth century did not necessarily guarantee lasting education reform in favor of indigenous language education. Instead, the legislation presented ambiguous promises with no plan to support them with the necessary resources.

Another wave of education reform surfaced a few years after the turn of the century as some Latin American governments, such as Ecuador and Bolivia, moved away from neoliberal policies and towards left-leaning, socialist administrations. In Ecuador, Rafael Correa was the face of this new leftist movement, and with his administration came renewed promises of educational reform, including the reinvigoration of IBE. A close analysis of the recent legislative changes and the current political atmosphere suggest that, again, these might be unfulfilled or only partially-fulfilled promises. I will first explain the 2006 election that put Correa in power and how he originally appealed to indigenous groups. I will then analyze the first major change during his presidency, the Constitution of 2008, and its position on Intercultural Bilingual Education. Finally, I will examine what came after the Constitution, primarily the changing relationship between Correa and indigenous groups and the new Intercultural Education Law (*Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural*, LOEI). Correa's administration and his relationship with indigenous organizations has hampered the self-determination of indigenous peoples, including control over their own education.

Rafael Correa's Rise to Power

Correa's electoral platform for the 2006 election rejected the neoliberal policies of the 1990s and proposed "twenty-first century socialism." He argued that he would transform the country in a "Citizen's Revolution" by ruling for the poor and vulnerable, refuting American hegemony and capitalism, and increasing social spending. During his campaign, he won the support of indigenous groups by rejecting the traditional political parties and institutions that continued to fail them. Instead he presented himself as an anti-establishment populist candidate, fighting on behalf of the poor and against social inequalities—a welcome change from the "decade of disappointment" that preceded this election (Conaghan, 2008, p. 49). In 2007, he entered the presidency with a high approval rating (73%) and the momentum to push ahead with his campaign promises (Conaghan, 2008). Some of his first actions as president were to dismantle the Congress and, after 82% approval through referendum, elect a Constituent Assembly to draw up a new constitution that would reflect the tenets of his political party *Alianza Paz* and its Citizen's Revolution.

The Constitution of 2008

The new Constitution, approved in 2008, is different from all past Ecuadorian constitutions (there have been a total of 20) because of its revolutionary rhetoric about the environment, the recognition of collective rights, and the incorporation of indigenous cultural values. The preamble introduces one of the central themes of the Constitution of 2008, *sumak kawsay*:

> We women and men, the sovereign people of Ecuador…Hereby decide to build a new form of public coexistence, in diversity and in harmony with nature, to achieve the good way of living, the sumak kawsay; a society that respects, in all its dimensions, the dignity of individuals and community groups.

Sumak kawsay is a Quichua term describing the indigenous concept of living peacefully with others and with nature. Title VII "The Good Way of Living System" and its two chapters explain this concept in detail, focusing on social inclusion, rights to quality education, cultural valorization, health care, and protection from discrimination. This appealed to socially and economically discriminated groups, specifically indigenous peoples.

Another difference between the newest constitution and its predecessors is the acknowledgement of the rights of nature: "Celebrating nature, the Pacha Mama (Mother Earth), of which we are a part and which is vital to our existence" (Preamble). Not only does the preamble use the Quichua term for Mother Nature, but it previews an entire section of the document devoted to establishing nature as a separate entity that deserves its own rights. This rhetoric is clearly connected to the concept of *sumak kawsay* and harmonic living, and is in obvious opposition to the neoliberal capitalism of the past that encouraged the exploitation of natural resources and environmental destruction. Indigenous communities, generally in rural, resource-rich areas, have historically suffered most brutally at the hands of natural resource extraction, such as oil drilling and mining. This constitutional guarantee, therefore, seemed like a promising step to slow down the destruction of the land that is so central to the indigenous culture and lifestyle.

The most significant change for indigenous education in the Constitution of 2008 was Article 347, guaranteeing "the intercultural bilingual education system, where the main language

for educating shall be the language of the respective nation and Spanish as the language for intercultural relations." Other important education guarantees included "the teaching of at least one ancestral language" for all students, "active participation of students, families and teachers in the education process," and the elimination of discrimination in educational environments.

The Constitution's references to education, the environment, and social services presents promising rhetoric that seems to favor indigenous nationalities; however, although indigenous groups initially supported Correa, he lost much of their support with the passing of the new Constitution and the legislative changes that followed. Many indigenous leaders criticized the Constitution for not being as revolutionary as Correa and the Constituent Assembly had promised and for not going far enough (Becker, 2013). Others accused Correa of stealing indigenous rhetoric, like *sumak kawsay*, to deceive them into supporting him and subdue opposition. Indigenous groups may have been dissatisfied with the Constitution, but it was what came later in Correa's administration, especially dealing with IBE, that solidified indigenous opposition.

Correa and Indigenous Groups Clash over IBE

Although the Constitution of 2008 reiterates that indigenous children have the right to a bilingual education that respects their local languages and cultures, it is a broad declaration without any direct plan for implementation or improvement of the current IBE system. The real changes to IBE came a few years later, starting with Executive Decree 1585 in February 2009. By this time, social groups that originally supported Correa were becoming quickly disenchanted. Correa had expanded executive power and attempted to suppress both conservative and liberal dissenters, criminalizing protests and gaining control of the media. Becker (2011b)

explains: “Correa’s personal charisma and left-populist discourse demobilized the left, leaving popular movements in a worse situation than when he had taken power” (p. 110). Correa did shift resources to the poor and marginalized parts of society, but in the process, he began to “[occupy] political spaces that [social movements] had previously held,” effectively decreasing their autonomy and decision-making power (Becker, 2011a, p. 48). Changes to the Intercultural Bilingual Education Program, starting with Decree 1585, are reflective of this tension between Correa and social movements, specifically indigenous groups.

In February 2009, Correa issued Executive Decree 1585, which placed the DINEIB under Ministry of Education control. Gustafson (2014) explains the purpose of this change: “To reconcentrate power in the executive—and away from CONAIE—the semi-autonomous DINEIB was slated for full absorption into the Ministry of Education” (p. 84). Indigenous organizations, like CONAIE, no longer had the authority to elect individuals to DINEIB positions; this authority now lay completely in Ministry of Education hands. Its effect on the indigenous movement was clear: they lost authority over an important governmental body that was originally under almost complete indigenous control.

The new Intercultural Education Law formalized Decree 1585 and presented other changes to Ecuador’s IBE program. Approved in March 2011, the new law declared that all public education would be intercultural education, requiring the instruction of indigenous cultures even for non-indigenous students. It separated education into two parallel systems: Intercultural Education for non-indigenous regions and Intercultural Bilingual Education for indigenous communities. Gustafson (2014) explains why the law, despite its promising rhetoric of educational equality and interculturality, faced fierce indigenous opposition:

> The law reads much like many modernizing policy reforms, calling for the improvement of quality, efficiency and science and technology in education. Though the law invokes interculturality and guarantees rights to native language schooling, the erasure of bilingualism as a potential characteristic of *all* education is significant. Likewise, the embrace of interculturality appears to follow a folkloric turn. (p. 85)

Martinez Novo (2014) makes similar observations, claiming the new law "appropriated" the term "interculturality" for political purposes, and that it took on a meaning different from what indigenous movements historically fought for (p. 108). As the government has promoted interculturality in education and increased educational spending, it has simultaneously criminalized protests and suppressed the voices of indigenous groups—the people who should have theoretically benefited most from social and educational developments. Instead of participating in the development of educational policies that would affect them directly, like the new Intercultural Education Law, indigenous groups have been silenced.

Indigenous groups are losing control of their own education, which they fought ardently and tirelessly to establish in the form of the IBE Program. Can indigenous education function successfully when it is ultimately controlled by non-indigenous politicians? Indigenous organizations argue that IBE obviously belongs in the hands of indigenous leaders themselves. However, Correa has suggested—or perhaps, accused—that these indigenous leaders are not any more competent at implementing IBE successfully than would be other members of the Ministry of Education. So as the tension between indigenous groups and Correa's administration rises, the true state of the IBE program remains clouded by political power struggles, accusatory rhetoric, and ambiguous policy changes.

This politically charged discourse around IBE is taking attention away from one of the main goals of the program: language revitalization. While researchers who have examined the recent changes to IBE focus on this tension between the current administration and indigenous groups, the effect on language revitalization prospects and local implementation is less clear. Did a change in DINEIB leadership necessarily mean an improvement or worsening of the IBE System and the schools under its jurisdiction? The impact of this change on the IBE Program and the resulting potential for indigenous language revitalization will be examined in the following chapters. A comparison of Ecuador's program to what literature suggests as best practices for language revitalization and bilingual education can highlight the program's strengths and weaknesses, possibly predicting its potential to save the Quichua language.

CHAPTER TWO

Quichua Language Shift and Possibilities for Revitalization through IBE

At the Dinner Table

It's evening in the community of San Clemente. Rosa brings a pot of potato and bean soup to the table and I follow her with a teapot of hot lemongrass tea. Umberto adds a log to the fireplace, rubs his hands together above the warm flames, and calls his children to dinner. William and Kelleen shuffle to the table, eager to pour themselves some warm soup. Chilly mountain air blows through cracks between the concrete walls and tin roof. "Achachay," I say, the Spanish equivalent for "Brrrr." Kelleen and I giggle and start to talk about our days at school. We speak in Spanish and the rest of the family joins in. By this point in my stay, I am accustomed to only understanding half of the dinner conversation—the Spanish part. Communication between the family members is a mix of Spanish and Quichua. Rosa and Umberto, the parents, speak both languages fluently. They communicate with each other in Quichua, with me in Spanish, and with their children using a mix of both. Kelleen and William, in contrast, understand Quichua but communicate and respond to their parents primarily in Spanish.

Rosa and Umberto have talked about this generational difference between the Quichua mastery in parents and children in their community. Even when San Clemente community members from the younger generation are not speaking to an outsider like me, they consistently use Spanish, not Quichua, in everyday conversations. Umberto and Rosa attempt to respond to this language shift in their own children by addressing them in Quichua. Despite their parents' efforts, however, Kelleen and William respond in Spanish, either choosing to do so deliberately or out of inability to speak Quichua fluently (or most likely, from a combination of the two). Umberto and Rosa have struggled to successfully transfer fluency of their mother tongue to their children.

The language dynamics at Rosa and Umberto's dinner table in the highland community of San Clemente are the outcome of a long history of indigenous language shift in Ecuador and the current interactions between the country's languages. Since colonization, Spanish has been (and remains) the dominant language in Ecuadorian society. It is the official language of the government, and the most commonly used in the media and in education. Indigenous communities, like San Clemente, are witnessing the growing presence of Spanish in traditionally Quichua domains, including within the household. The changes happening in Rosa and Umberto's family demonstrate that, although this language shift is happening all throughout the

country, it originates in households and within speech communities. It is the result of individual choices about language use at the household and community level that both stem from and influence larger language shifts.

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. I first explain the uncertain future of the Quichua language and argue for the importance of reversing Quichua language loss through language revitalization efforts. I present the problem–Quichua language shift–that Ecuador's Intercultural Bilingual Education (IBE) System attempts to address. The second purpose of my chapter is to determine whether, according to proven language revitalization practices, IBE does in fact adequately address this problem. In order to fully understand the potential of IBE as a tool for language revitalization, it is important to first consider the history and current status of the language and then the conditions that are proven to promote language revitalization. I begin by presenting the history of the Quichua language in Ecuador. Next, I explain how and why Quichua is a explain the importance of Quichua language revitalization. I outline the historic and contemporary language revitalization efforts in Ecuador and argue that Intercultural Bilingual Education may present the best hope for reversing language shift. Ecuador's IBE Program has the potential to contribute significantly to saving indigenous languages only if it reflects best practices of language revitalization—the most critical being community involvement and the promotion of positive language attitudes.

History of the Quichua Language

Ecuador is an ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse South American country bordering the Pacific Ocean in the West, Colombia in the north, and Peru in the east and south. Its 14 million inhabitants occupy four distinct geographical regions: the Sierra, the Coast, the

Amazon, and the Galapagos Islands. While the ethnic majority is mestizo—of mixed Spanish and Indigenous American descent—, indigenous peoples represent a significant portion of the population. Ecuador's indigenous population is highly debated, with estimates ranging from 45% of the entire population to as low as 5% (King & Haboud, 2002). A lack of precise data collection, census biases, and problems with self-identification may contribute to these discrepancies. Despite the numeric uncertainty, indigenous nationalities have gained both real and symbolic visibility in recent decades as leaders began to fight actively for the recognition and realization of indigenous rights. A demand that has often taken the spotlight in the indigenous movement is the right to the protection and revitalization of native languages.

Of the twelve indigenous languages spoken throughout Ecuador, Quichua is the most common, with about 2 million Ecuadorians belonging to this nationality. Quichua Indians do not all necessarily speak the Quichua language fluently. Again, due to discrepancies with data collection, estimates of the number of Quichua speakers range from 26% to 1% of the Ecuadorian population (King & Haboud, 2002). The number of Quichua speakers continues to decrease significantly—the unfortunate result of centuries of an oppressive social and linguistic hierarchy in which indigenous and afroecuadorian nationalities and languages have occupied the bottom rung. Since the Spanish conquest in the 1500s, Spanish culture and the Spanish language have claimed dominance. The history of the Quechua language, of which Ecuadorian Quichua is a dialect, demonstrates how Spanish dominance over indigenous populations and their languages has hindered mother tongue acquisition and helps to explain the current status of Quichua language vitality in Ecuador.

Shortly before the arrival of the Spaniards, the Inca Empire spread its influence north from modern day Peru into the Andean mountain region of modern day Ecuador and Colombia

and south into present day Bolivia. With the spread of the Empire came the spread of the Incan language: Quechua. As Quechua spread over large geographical distances and mixed with local languages, it morphed into numerous dialectal variations. It is into this linguistic environment that the Spaniards entered in the 1500s. The Spaniards colonized the region that is now Ecuador in 1532, imposing their rules, their culture, and their language. Although Spanish was the de facto official language during this time, Quechua continued to play an important role in indigenous communities and within the greater colonial society.

Kendall A. King and Nancy H. Hornberger (2006) explain that Quechua was the lingua franca during colonial times, as it was an important tool for communication among indigenous peoples and also between indigenous groups and the Spanish colonizers:

> For Spanish elites, Quechua served as a means of maintaining symbolic authority and practical control; for priests and missionaries, Quechua was a tool for educating or proselytizing indigenous populations; whereas for indigenous populations, Quechua served as a means of organizing resistance and rebelling against Spanish rule. (p. 184)

Despite the language's utility, it was situated at the bottom of the colonial language hierarchy. Spanish was seen as the language of the educated and the elite, whereas indigenous languages were viewed as belonging to a barbaric and backward people. The spaniards used the indigenous peoples' own language to control them and the missionaries used their language to convert them.

The South American colonies gained independence from Spain in the nineteenth century, and the Republic of Ecuador was officially formed in 1830. Indigenous groups played a minimal role in the struggle for independence and the decision-making of the newly independent country. They remained, at best, ignored, and at worst, violently oppressed. King and Hornberger (2006)

describe the perspective of the leadership during the postcolonial period: “For the national elites, who held visions of a modern and unified nation-state, the cultures, histories and languages of the Andes were viewed as a significant roadblock on the path towards progress” (p. 185). The new national government promoted assimilation, urging (and often forcing) minoritized groups to learn the Spanish language and adopt the mainstream culture, leaving little space for cultural and linguistic diversity.

Indigenous peoples in Ecuador therefore often felt immense pressure to assimilate in order to participate in mainstream society. Indians, alongside Afroecuadorians, represented the lowest social and economic classes, so they often viewed mastering the Spanish language as a way to achieve higher social standing and more economic opportunities. Education has historically been a powerful assimilator. At the start of the twentieth century, missionaries, and later, the government, started to bring traditional education to indigenous communities. The resulting schools tended to follow a Spanish curriculum and were taught by non-indigenous teachers from surrounding cities. Academic success, therefore, required assimilation to the Spanish language of instruction and to a non-indigenous worldview. This pressure to assimilate, especially in education, continues to play an influential role in the endangerment of indigenous languages, and will be discussed further in Chapter Three.

For most of Ecuador’s history, leaders have stifled the voices of indigenous communities, denouncing diversity and cherishing sameness. Quichua, once a language of great utility for intercultural communication, slowly became just another dying native language threatening the unity of a new nation. The latter half of the twentieth century, however, finally marked a shaky, but positive change for indigenous groups in Ecuador. Indigenous organizations achieved national attention starting in the early 1980s. The Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of

Ecuador (CONAIE, *Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de Ecuador*) became the leading organization fighting for indigenous rights, including the right to local lands, natural resources, local governance, language, and education. As the power of indigenous rights organizations grew, the government responded with policies that finally started to grant indigenous groups their long-awaited demands.

During the late 1980s and early 1990s the government and indigenous organizations worked together to create the first significant policies in favor of indigenous rights, including education, language, and environmental policies. King and Hornberger (2006) explain that these policy changes marked "a shift in societal discourse with respect to indigenous languages and groups, away from the openly racist ideology of the past and toward a more inclusive, intercultural one" (p. 185). Although the fight for indigenous rights is ongoing and far from complete, the national discourse finally began to change in the 1990s, moving away from the assimilationist approach and toward an appreciation of Ecuador as a multicultural, multiethnic nation. Unfortunately, for the native languages of these historically oppressed communities, these gradual changes might have come too late.

Quichua as a Threatened Language

In Ecuadorian communities, where Spanish is overtaking Quichua as the dominant language of communication, Quichua is a threatened (or endangered) language. Joshua Fishman, a pioneering researcher in sociolinguistics, calls changing language dynamics (such as the relationship between Quichua and Spanish) language shift, and explains that "life and death imagery" has been a common way to describe this shift (Fishman, 2001b, p. 5). Scholars describe languages as if they are living species that can be threatened, endangered, revived, or

dead. Various scholars who have analyzed Quichua have come to similar conclusions: the language is at risk of extinction unless effective, multidimensional changes occur at both local and national levels (Hornberger & King, 2001; King & Haboud, 2002; Haboud, 2004; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina, 2004). Beyond the absolute number of speakers, two other factors can help explain the changing vitality of the Quichua language. These are intergenerational language transmission and changes in new and existing language domains.

Intergenerational Language Transmission

Intergenerational transmission occurs when fluency in the mother tongue is passed from the older generation to the younger. UNESCO's (2003) *Language Vitality and Endangerment Report* uses intergenerational transmission to rank language endangerment into six levels, with the highest level (Category 5), called "Safe," and the lowest level called "Extinct." Quichua in San Clemente seems to fall neatly into Category 3: "Definitely endangered." In this situation, children are learning the indigenous language at home and are somewhat fluent, but the youngest native speakers are the parental generation. The category description reflects the situation in Rosa and Umberto's home perfectly, explaining: "At this stage, parents may still speak their language to their children, but their children do not typically respond in that language" (UNESCO, 2003, p. 7-8).

Intergenerational transmission in San Clemente is not necessarily a reflection of Quichua language vitality on a national level, because the situation in each household and each community is undoubtedly different. Beyond its utility in specific community case studies (see King, 2001), this factor alone cannot explain Quichua vitality because "to do so would entail making over-simplified and at least partially inaccurate generalizations" (Hornberger & King, 2001, p. 173). However, Haboud (2004) does confirm that Quichua fluency rates in general are

higher among older generations and decreasing with the younger ones—a strong indicator of language endangerment. Still, to avoid generalizations, linguists tend to examine another factor in addition to intergenerational transmission: language domains.

Language Domains

Language domains refer to where the language is used, with whom, and in what contexts. A safe language is present in most or all domains—from official domains to community and household domains. Spanish is the language of official domains, such as in governmental and educational institutions. Quichua is present in these domains in exceptional, but increasing, cases. The government has begun to translate official documents into Quichua and has institutionalized a bilingual education program (King & Haboud, 2002). These remain the exceptions, however. Inevitably, Quichua does not play a significant role in communication among government offices because, compared to Spanish, only a small percentage of the population speaks the indigenous language. The role of Quichua in indigenous community schools—which will be analyzed in depth in the following chapter—varies considerably. Some schools teach Quichua and Spanish, but other schools—including the school in San Clemente—teach only Spanish and entirely ignore possibilities for Quichua language and culture instruction within the classroom.

The Quichua language generally has a stronger presence in traditional social domains within indigenous communities, such as in the household, at community meetings, and in religious ceremonies. However, as the dinner conversation in Umberto and Rosa's home demonstrates, Quichua is losing ground in these traditional domains as well. In San Clemente, older women tend to speak to each other in Quichua, but older men, who likely use Spanish in their jobs in the city, are more likely to speak Spanish or a mix of both languages. Community

meetings and announcements employ Spanish. Beyond casual conversations, Spanish seems to be the official language even inside the community itself. Haboud (2004) affirms this phenomenon, explaining: "Quichua is losing vitality in domains in which it was once present (e.g. the household)" (p. 78). Communities, which were once Quichua-only domains, are shifting towards Quichua-Spanish bilingualism or even further towards Spanish monolingualism (King, 1999; Rindstedt & Aronsson, 2002; King & Haboud, 2010).

It is important to consider the role of migration on language domains. Rural to urban migration over the past few decades has altered ethnic boundaries as originally rural indigenous populations resettle in large cities. King and Haboud (2002) explain: "Thirty percent of the population lived in urban areas in 1950; by 2002 this percentage was 70" (p. 369). Quichua may be the language of social interaction in some indigenous communities, but many people who identify with the Quichua nationality have migrated to metropolitan areas and no longer live within these Quichua communities. Hence it becomes even more important to learn Spanish as a language of communication between ethnic groups. Hornberger and Coronel-Molina (2004) also suggest that permanent migrations create "significant career and lifestyle changes" which make it more difficult to maintain Quichua language and customs.

According to the UNESCO Language Vitality scale, the Quichua language exists in "Dwindling domains" (UNESCO, 2003). Although it never strongly occupied official or media domains, it did have a strong presence in local community domains. This is changing now too, as communities become more connected to outside influences, as families migrate to cities, and as Spanish becomes more important for young adults searching for nontraditional jobs outside of their communities. King (1999) explains: "Spanish has made in-roads into seemingly every speech situation, and presently [in many speech communities], only what might be the traces of

former domains are left" (King, 1999, in King & Haboud, 2002, p. 403). Scholars tend to speak of domains as if they are three-dimensional spaces, and languages are competing with each other for those spaces (Fishman, 2001b; Hornberger & King, 2001). Fishman (2001b) describes the study of language shift as "the analysis of languages in competition in terms of societal functions that are involved, contested, lost or gained" (p. 2). If languages are in fact fighting each other for roles in "societal functions," then Quichua is certainly losing. Spanish, and now English as well, are gaining roles in community domains and are becoming more important for social and economic success.

Given the decrease in intergenerational transmission and its diminishing presence in both official and local domains, the future of the Quichua language appears bleak. But why does the future of this language even matter? If learning Spanish promises more economic success for indigenous youth, and even indigenous community members themselves recognize that Quichua has little use outside of traditional family and religious domains, why should anyone even bother worrying about preventing indigenous language loss? Because, as Nancy Hornberger (2008) aptly puts it, "Indigenous language revitalization is never only about the language" (p. 2).

Language Revitalization: What's the Point?

Language revitalization involves efforts "to add new linguistic forms or social functions to an embattled minority language with the aim of increasing its uses or users" (King, 2001, p. 23). It is a broad term that describes a variety of different methods to recover an endangered language through the increase in number of speakers, functions, or both. Some examples of this include restoring intergenerational transmission, establishing indigenous language literacy programs, and promoting indigenous language use in the workforce, government, or in translated

documents. Researchers promote language revitalization as a way to empower indigenous peoples both culturally and politically.

Language revitalization is a critical component of cultural preservation because languages are a vital part of local traditions and ancestral knowledge. Fishman (2001b) explains:

> Such a huge part of every ethnoculture is linguistically expressed that it is not wrong to say that most ethnocultural behaviors would be impossible without their expression via the particular language with which these behaviors have been traditionally associated. (p. 3)

If marginalized ethnic groups lose the ability to speak in their mother tongue, their values and traditions risk getting lost in translation. Quichua culture has a strong oral tradition of passing down spoken stories and rituals through generations. These rituals, for instance, would lose some of their original meaning if they were performed in Spanish. Some words do not have perfect translations, especially words that are linked to unique worldviews or values. The Quichua word *Pachamama*, for example, is the name of a traditional deity in Quichua culture. The word translates roughly to "goddess of earth and time," "Mother Nature," or just "nature/land," but the word carries a deeper meaning and history than how it is expressed in Spanish. A second Quichua word that is fundamental to the Quichua values is *sumak kawsay*. This translates roughly to "good living," but it refers to an entire lifestyle of coexisting peacefully and in harmony with other people and with nature. *Pachamama* is not "naturaleza" or "nature," and *sumak kawsay* is definitely not just "el buen vivir" or "good living." These words express central values in the Quichua worldview and are part of their ethnic identity, but they lose meaning when they are translated. If language is linked to ethnic identity, then revitalizing a language is about "reversing the process of the loss of identity" (King, 2001, p. 9).

Language revitalization efforts stem from the fear of inaccurate translation of important cultural traditions and also from a growing push to change "the cultural climate" by reaffirming ethnic identity (King, 2001, p. 214). Efforts to revive and revalorize the local language mark a reaffirmation of the importance of the language and the other cultural values that have historically been stigmatized and rejected. Language revitalization efforts have the potential to change attitudes. When a minoritized community is promoting native language use in more domains, such as at town hall meetings or in the classroom, they are reasserting the value of their culture and possibly reducing the stigma surrounding it. When outside organizations or national governments make efforts to revitalize local tongues through programs or policy changes, they are recognizing and confirming the rights of indigenous groups to their native language and culture and "their right to self-regulate the pace and type of change within the community" (King, 2001, p. 230). Together, both community-based and top-down efforts to revitalize local languages can help change the national and local conversation by merely including linguistic and cultural rights as a part of the discussion. Making it a part of the conversation is the first step to changing deeply-rooted prejudices that stem from the country's colonial past.

Indigenous nationalities and their languages have experienced the damaging effects of a discriminatory colonial system that still has not been fully dismantled. Hence, language revitalization—beyond its identity-affirming and attitude-changing potential—can also be an important political tool. Gustafson (2014) explains that language revitalization represents "ongoing political struggles over the decolonization of the state" (p. 85). It is part of a greater political battle to undo centuries of harsh discriminatory policies, reassert the rights of indigenous peoples as full citizens, and reject what Hornberger and Coronel-Molina (2004) call the "homogenizing ideologies of most Latin American governments" (p. 20). It has the potential

to promote both cultural and political empowerment of historically silenced communities by giving them back their language and, thus, their voice.

Ecuador has not yet fulfilled the many promises of language revitalization. Quichua is an endangered language and it continues to carry a negative social stigma. Young people, like the students in San Clemente, are not interested in learning their mother tongue because it appears to lack social and economic utility, so they feel an overwhelming pressure to conform to mainstream society. Over the past few decades, however, international and national organizations, policy-makers, and local players have taken important steps to promote Quichua language revitalization. Although the job is unfinished, language planning projects with the goal of linguistic revival have increased over the past half century. The following section will address some of these policies and practices that have been implemented to promote Quichua language revitalization.

Language Revitalization in Ecuador

Language planning includes efforts to standardize and graphitize a language (corpus planning), change the status of a language in society (status planning), and increase the number of speakers of the language (acquisition planning). Contributions to language planning and revitalization come from international, national, and local levels. International organizations, like UNESCO and UNICEF for example, have historically played a significant role in language planning by increasing the visibility of the rights of indigenous groups through human rights declarations and by offering financial support for specific in-country programs (Hornberger & Coronel-Molina, 2004; UNESCO, 2003). On a national level, governments have the power to

make constitutional and policy changes in favor of language planning. This section focuses on Ecuador's progress so far.

King and Haboud (2002) explain that there is no agency in Ecuador that focuses exclusively on language planning; therefore, any language planning that does occur nationally is the indirect result of "educational and political planning across a wide range of governmental and non-governmental agencies" (King & Haboud, 2002, p. 397). Hornberger and King (1996) suggest that standardizing endangered languages like Quichua is an important first step for language revitalization. In Ecuador, there are a variety of Quichua dialects. The two main varieties are Highland Quichua and Lowland Quichua, and these two varieties consist of several sub-dialects (King & Haboud, 2002). In San Clemente, for example, the dialect is Quichua-Caranqui. The various dialects present challenges for indigenous language education and Quichua literature creation. For example, to develop national Quichua language textbooks, a standardized variety of Quichua is helpful. In 1981, indigenous leaders, university scholars, and governmental offices worked together to develop and agree on a standardized form of Quichua, called Unified Quichua (*Quichua Unificado*). Compared to other countries in the region, Ecuador has been successful in this respect. After Quichua was officially standardized, university departments and governmental organizations have since worked together to create dictionaries and other printed materials in the language (Hornberger & King, 1996). However, standardization does have opponents who argue that it is important to preserve local dialects rather than arbitrarily decide what is the correct or pure language (Haboud, 2004).

In addition to Quichua standardization, national legislative changes can contribute to language revitalization, specifically through status planning, which Hornberger and Coronel-Molina describe as "all planning efforts targeted at establishing or changing the status of a

language in its societal context" (2004, p. 31). Ecuador's changing constitutions are an example of top-down status planning, starting with the Constitution of 1979, which was the first to recognize Quichua and other indigenous languages as "integral parts of the national culture." The newest Constitution of 2008, although still highly contested by many indigenous groups, makes an even stronger argument for the importance of interculturality and respect for diversity.

Government policies can also promote efforts to bring the minoritized language into new domains, such as schools, literature, and media. In 1985, changes to the Constitution recognized the right of indigenous groups to an education with their native language as the medium of instruction. The most recent Constitution of 2008 reinforces this right, as does the new Intercultural Education Law. In addition to schooling, policies can promote indigenous languages in new domains, such as public documents or media. Although Spanish remains the language spoken in Ecuadorian government, various offices are beginning to publish documents in Quichua, such as the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Public Health (Hornberger & Coronel-Molina, 2004). Quichua has experienced minor successes in media domains. Haboud (1998) explains that radio programming in Quichua has been the most successful form of media. Radio, rather than television or Internet, is the most accessible form of media, especially for rural communities. Radio schools (*escuelas radiofónicas*), for example, have been successful forms of literacy instruction and communication for decades. Quichua literature is still uncommon, apart from textbooks and teaching materials for bilingual schools (Haboud, 1998).

These policy changes, although sometimes largely symbolic, have undoubtedly brought more attention to the cultural diversity of Ecuador that has historically been ignored or seen as a threat to national unity. Language planning efforts have helped revitalize the Quichua language by making it a part of the local and national conversation, but the number of Quichua speakers

continues to decrease (King & Haboud, 2002). Researchers who have examined Quichua language shift in Ecuador are realistic but cautiously optimistic about the future of Quichua (King & Haboud, 2002; King 2001; Hornberger & King, 2001; Haboud, 2004). They argue that more needs to be done to reverse Quichua language loss, often pointing to the promise of education.

Education: A Piece of the Solution?

Over the last few decades, and especially during the current administration under President Rafael Correa, indigenous language education has been at the center of the discussion of language revitalization. Ecuador's Intercultural Bilingual Education (IBE) Program and similar programs in surrounding countries are gaining governmental support and the attention of the academic community who see it as a positive step for native language revitalization. Bilingual schooling—considered to be both status and acquisition language planning—can be a potential means to promote Quichua language learning. The new Constitution of 2008, the new Intercultural Education Law, and the overall increase in focus on education reform under the current government, from a cursory glance, suggest that the IBE program may be moving in a positive direction. However, under a closer look, the progress of IBE may not be so promising for language revitalization prospects. According to researchers who have studied language revitalization, there are two critical conditions that any program should meet in order to successfully reverse language shift: engagement of the community and promotion of positive language attitudes. An analysis of IBE as it relates to these two conditions can offer a look into the program's potential to adequately contribute to language revitalization.

Community Involvement: A Critical Condition

The factors that influence language shift—changing domains and intergenerational transmission—often originate at the community level; therefore, efforts to revive languages need to address local factors like these. Although community-based language revitalization may be limited in the number of speakers they affect, they are generally more effective than top-down policy changes because they directly engage the speakers of the language. In her volume *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom-Up*, after including case studies from various indigenous communities ranging from Alaska to Peru, Nancy Hornberger (1996) concludes: "It has been the involvement and initiative of the indigenous communities themselves that have provided the impetus and sustenance for these language planning efforts" (p. 357). Fishman (2001b) makes a similar argument for the engagement of communities in order to reverse language shift because "nothing is as crucial for RLS [reversing language shift] success as intergenerational mother-tongue transmission" (p. 458). Intergenerational language transmission occurs inherently within individual families through interactions and conversations. Language revitalization efforts that don't originate from community initiatives, therefore, can only be effective if they engage the speech communities early and consistently. National language planning efforts need to translate into linguistic changes within individual households. National changes in policies and rhetoric are therefore ineffective without community-based support and implementation. This is evident in the development of Ecuador's Intercultural Bilingual Education System as a means to revitalize indigenous languages.

Intercultural Bilingual Education began as a bottom-up initiative of the Ecuadorian indigenous movement but has now become part of the public education system. If the goal of

IBE is language revitalization, and if community involvement is the key to language revitalization, increased involvement of the government in the IBE program at the expense of indigenous participation may be hurting language revitalization prospects by discouraging the participation of local indigenous actors. The new Intercultural Education Law has shifted DINEIB control from the hands of indigenous leaders into the hands of politicians who may be unaffiliated with the indigenous cause and may have different educational goals.

Therefore, it is possible that—and indigenous groups argue that—educational policies may not reflect and respond to the linguistic and cultural characteristics of indigenous communities. On a local level—where language use originates—communities may see IBE as just another program imposed by the government, rather than something that is truly designed by and for them, thereby discouraging community support. This presents a challenge to language revitalization because national policies alone cannot save a language from extinction. Implementation ultimately depends on the decisions of individuals in the speech communities. Because of the local nature of decisions about language use, researchers also suggest that the attitudes speech communities hold about their language also influences whether they choose to support language revitalization efforts.

Positive Language Attitudes

Researchers attribute the decline of Quichua speakers in large part to the attitudes surrounding the language. Historically, Spanish has been the dominant language while Quichua and other indigenous vernaculars have remained "both stigmatized and stigmatizing" (Hornberger & Coronel-Molina, 2004, p. 14). This perception of indigenous languages as low-status, barbaric, or anti-modern originated from the country's first Spanish conquerors, but the perception remains today in the form of deeply-ingrained societal and institutional racism. The

persistence of these attitudes within Quichua communities themselves is an important factor to consider when analyzing language loss, as well as something that should be addressed through language revitalization efforts.

Kendall King (2001) studied two Saraguro Quichua communities in southern Ecuador and observed that adults in the communities valued Quichua as a critical part of their ethnic identity even though they used the language infrequently. Although they valued the language idealistically, their local realities encouraged more Spanish, rather than Quichua, mastery. King (2001) explains the situation:

> If substantial numbers of community members are socially and economically marginalized and, more importantly, perceive their native tongue to be stigmatizing and contributing to their low status, it is highly unlikely that these individuals will be convinced to use, much less invest in learning, their group's native tongue. (p. 194)

So even when adults recognize the importance of preserving ethnic identity and their native language, they still view Spanish as the language necessary for economic and social success. Hence, despite the symbolic importance of Quichua, economically insecure communities might be more influenced by the desire to assimilate to societal norms outside of their ethnic communities. Rindstedt and Aronsson (2002) also noticed a strong "pro-Quichua ideology" in the community they studied, and they call this inconsistency between ideologies and practices in Quichua communities "the ethnic revitalization paradox" (p. 721).

Parental attitudes towards indigenous languages are often revealed through their "ambiguous support or outright rejection" of bilingual education in indigenous communities for fear that it "would deny students access to social mobility" (Hornberger & Coronel-Molina,

2004, p. 14). While the elderly generation of Quichua speakers tends to favor indigenous language learning more ardently, the parental generation, even when given the choice to teach their children Quichua, may be hesitant because more of their children are now commuting to city high schools, pursuing higher education, and working outside the community. If Quichua still maintains a negative social stigma, it may not seem like the most promising way for a community to use its resources or spend its time. Rosa and Umberto certainly expressed this view. They speak Quichua in the home and encourage their children to use it, but they send both of their children to nearby city schools where they learn Spanish and English but have no opportunities to develop literacy in Quichua.

In addition to parents, some of the local students in San Clemente also displayed negative attitudes towards the Quichua language. Merian, a teacher at the community school in San Clemente, explained that her plan to integrate Quichua language learning into the normal school day met fierce resistance from her students. She explained: "I intended to teach Quichua lessons, and the parents didn't object, but the students did. For example, the oldest students in seventh grade said, 'No, why don't you teach us something better, like English? Quichua doesn't interest us. It's a waste of time'" (personal communication, April 15, 2015). In San Clemente, the children are less worried about maintaining their language and more focused on developing the practical skills that may be more important in education or careers outside of their community.

Cotacachi's (1996) interviews with indigenous teachers, students, and parents in Ecuadorian communities suggests that this particular experience from San Clemente may be commonplace. She concludes that local language attitudes strongly influence whether the communities participate in efforts to save their local tongue . Because of the persistent stigma surrounding native languages and the necessity to learn Spanish to communicate with

mainstream society, many parents did not want their children to learn Quichua in the classroom.The parents felt that learning Spanish would open up more economic and social opportunities for their children. This can present a significant barrier to saving languages because these attitudes may affect whether communities want to support and participate in language revitalization processes. Therefore, one important goal of language planning efforts may be to attempt to change the perception around these non-dominant languages.

In this respect, the IBE program is promising. In light of increased visibility of indigenous organizations and changing political rhetoric, the status of Quichua has improved in recent years and Quichua has gained a form of what Hornberger and Coronel-Molina (2004) call "symbolic acceptance" (p. 33). The new Constitution focuses heavily on the appreciation of interculturality and the importance of ethnic and linguistic diversity. The Intercultural Education Law designates both the Spanish and the bilingual education system as "Intercultural." Not only have these changes brought interculturality and indigenous cultures to the forefront of the political scene, but they have framed linguistic and cultural diversity in a positive light. This rhetoric about interculturality is valuable because it asserts that cultural and linguistic differences can coexist. López (2009) explains interculturality in education:

> The final aim of intercultural education is learning to live together, since systems of knowledge, civilizatory patterns, cultures and languages are seen in complementary distribution rather than from the angle of segregation or opposition. (p. 9)

By regarding languages as entities that can coexist, this challenges traditional ideas about language shift. The traditional view is that there is a limited amount of space in every society for languages. Consequently, languages are competing for different domains, and the most powerful

language (in this instance, Spanish) slowly pushes out weaker languages. To view education and languages interculturally is to question the inevitability of linguistic and cultural loss. What if domains could house two languages simultaneously? And what if indigenous communities didn't feel like they had to choose between the Spanish and indigenous culture? Under an intercultural viewpoint languages and cultures coexist. A community does not have to choose between assimilating into the mainstream Spanish culture and maintaining their indigenous identity. They can simultaneously hold multiple identities and speak multiple languages.

Conclusion

This positive intercultural rhetoric is good for addressing deeply-held negative language attitudes. However, despite the recent rise in intercultural awareness, negative attitudes towards these languages have stubbornly persisted. Local opposition to language revitalization, whether from unfavorable language attitudes or discontent with the centralized national policy, clearly will not result in positive program outcomes. Ecuador's Intercultural Bilingual Education Program meets proven practices for language revitalization to a limited extent. The shift towards intercultural rhetoric is promising, but the shift of directorate control away from indigenous groups is less so. Looking at IBE through this linguistic perspective, however, does not present the full picture. IBE after all is not just any language revitalization program—it is an education system. Just as researchers point to certain characteristics that a language revitalization project should include, an examination of educational research suggests that bilingual programs need to posses certain characteristics as well. Therefore, examining IBE specifically as a bilingual education system can help determine how effectively the current program can promote Quichua language learning at the classroom level.

CHAPTER THREE

IBE's Inconsistent Implementation of Bilingual Education

Where is IBE in San Clemente?

When I studied the Ecuadorian education system before moving to San Clemente, I was impressed by how progressive the program seemed. The 2014-2015 MOSEIB document guarantees "intercultural bilingual education to all ancestral cultures and communities, independent of the number of members, and at all education levels" with the ultimate goal of "the construction of a plurinational and intercultural State" (MOSEIB). The new Intercultural Education Law calls for linguistic revitalization, the incorporation of cultural education in all schools—even non-indigenous schools—, and a zealous effort to combat social and educational inequalities. This is incredibly promising rhetoric, and I was eager to see these policies in action. After my first day teaching at the San Clemente school, however, I was quickly disenchanted with the IBE system and, frankly, discouraged. In a community with an entirely Quichua population, the elementary school in San Clemente serves 70 students using an entirely Spanish curriculum. But isn't this community guaranteed by law bilingual education in Quichua with a curriculum that incorporates local customs and ancestral knowledge?

Puzzled by the apparent disconnect between the national education policies and the local reality in San Clemente, I asked Merian, the school director and second through fourth grade teacher. When I mentioned the LOEI and the new Constitution, she explained that the school hasn't experienced any significant changes as a result of the recent national education policies, apart from better district organization and changes to teacher evaluation and salaries. The school

has never been a bilingual school and she doesn't seem confident that it will become that way any time soon. About Quichua language education, Merian explained:

> Yes, there are Quichua schools, primarily in the Otovalo region, but the problem is that there aren't language professors. They don't know the grammar; they just speak it, nothing more. There aren't linguists that know how to organize a sentence correctly. They simply speak a mix of Spanish and Quichua, So, since there aren't language teachers, they can't give Quichua classes. Because if there were teachers, like we have English teachers, then we would teach the language here. But there aren't, so they [the government] can't demand it, neither can the parents. (Personal communication, April 15, 2015)

Merian refers to an important factor (to be discussed later in this chapter) that influences how successful a bilingual program can be: the availability of teachers. None of the three teachers at the San Clemente school speak Quichua, so they are extremely limited in what they can do to implement the nationally mandated changes.

Jenny, the preschool and first grade teacher, provided a similar response when I asked about some of the workbooks that contained select pages in Quichua: "We skip them [the pages] because we aren't bilingual teachers…The government is trying to make it so they don't forget [their language]. There are bilingual schools for this. But at this time, we can't because of the lack of teachers… They can't leave schools without teachers, so they sent us here" (personal communication, April 14, 2015). Jenny, like Merian, suggests that the main reason why there is no IBE curriculum implemented in San Clemente is the lack of Quichua teachers. In this community, a lack of bilingual teachers does seem like the main factor preventing Quichua language instruction. Although the school in San Clemente is technically under the jurisdiction

of the Intercultural Bilingual Education System—as opposed to the traditional system—there is a blatant disconnect between policy and practice.

Is the problem with Intercultural Bilingual Education in Ecuador simply a lack of teachers? Would IBE be successful countrywide if somehow there were enough teachers to fill all the schools in the indigenous communities? Available teachers are definitely a necessary condition for the success of a bilingual program, but unfortunately, the problem is not so simple. Even schools with bilingual teachers often struggle to teach indigenous languages successfully. Analyses of successful bilingual programs point to certain underlying conditions that promote bilingual education and subsequent language revitalization. On the policy level, the success of a bilingual program relies on the availability of resources, the general participation of indigenous groups in the education policy decision-making, and strong indigenous language teacher training programs. Bilingual programs also require a program model that promotes additive bilingualism and a localized curriculum—two characteristics that should vary by community. This chapter will analyze how Ecuador's current Intercultural Bilingual Education System measures up to the conditions suggested by successful program examples.

IBE as an Effective Educational Policy

For an education program to function successfully, it should not only be supported by a well-designed policy but also have the necessary resources and implementation power. Ecuador's Intercultural Bilingual Education System, above all, needs to be supported by educational policies that allocate the necessary resources and provide the necessary support for the enrolled schools. Decisions about policy design also matter, with a number of researchers stressing the importance of direct participation of the indigenous groups that these decisions

affect. Also, the availability of teacher training programs and higher education for indigenous language teachers is a national-level concern that can potentially help or hinder IBE implementation. Taken together, these three national-level factors have a significant impact on the strength of IBE as a bilingual program.

Resources and Support

The most recent education law, the Law of Intercultural Education (*Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural,* LOEI), outlined in Chapter One, reaffirms IBE as a right of all indigenous children. It formalizes the parallel education systems, Intercultural and Intercultural Bilingual, both of which recognize and promote the country's plurinational character and cultural diversity. A detailed IBE model (MOSEIB), reflecting the new law, addresses the importance of indigenous language education and interculturalism as a national value. It calls for diversified curricula to respond to the realities of the different linguistic and ethnic communities. Although these policies address what the government's official stance is, they may not accurately reflect the local realities of implementation. Changes in policy have not led directly to an increase in resources for the communities under the IBE System. Without changes that specifically funnel financial resources and materials to IBE schools, many communities have no means to improve their bilingual programs or respond to policy changes.

Kendall King (2010) observes that communities that are more economically and socially secure are more likely to pursue language revitalization efforts, including bilingual education. The communities that do not have the resources to devote to language planning and education are disadvantaged. Oviedo and Wildemeersh (2008) also claim that schools under IBE receive fewer economic resources: $138 per indigenous student in basic education versus $144 for every mestizo student. National policies should address this inequality by fairly allocating resources to

schools in order to make bilingual education universally available regardless of how poor or marginalized communities may be. In addition to providing schools with the necessary resources and support, an effective bilingual program policy should also respond to the interests of the community it is affecting—in this case, the indigenous population.

Indigenous Participation

The inclusion of indigenous peoples in the decision-making processes that affect them directly is critical for gaining IBE support and ultimate program success. Indigenous participation is necessary at the local level in individual schools (which will be discussed later in this chapter) and at the national level in policy writing and Directorate leadership. Gustafson (2014) analyzes IBE policies in Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia and concludes that the perspective of State governments and that of indigenous groups on the purpose and function of IBE differ significantly. Gustafson (2014) explains:

> Such different views often lead to collisions between, say, a short-term externally-financed project; a regionally-situated Indigenous struggle that combines education issues with land, resources and regional political power; and a temporal and calculated State regime that makes decisions based on one or another potential impact on regime strength. (p. 92)

The government in these countries tends to consider IBE "merely as a pedagogical proposal" concerned with increasing enrollment and educational quality (Martínez Novo 2014, 106). Indigenous groups, on the other hand, see it as a piece of their larger political battle for decolonization and political power. They want the IBE curricula to reinforce indigenous worldviews and promote ethnic reaffirmation and true interculturalism. Interculturalism in education and society as a whole has been a political project of indigenous groups for decades,

but some scholars fear that the new Constitution and education policies have led to the "appropriation...and watering-down" of the meaning of this term (Martínez Novo, 2014, 108; see also López, 2008, 2014). López (2014) argues, "A better match between educational proposals and practices and ethno-political expectations of Indigenous leaders and intellectuals is needed" (p. 43). Collaboration between the State and indigenous leaders is necessary to guarantee that national policy decisions actually respond to the demands of the people the policies directly affect.

In Ecuador, indigenous groups gained significant power over the IBE system when the DINEIB was originally created and implemented. Martínez Novo (2014) suggests that this indigenous political autonomy over education "has not been achieved to the same degree in other Latin American countries" (p. 119). The new Intercultural Education Law, however, places the responsibility of implementing intercultural reforms in the hands of the Minister of Education, rather than in the hands of the indigenous groups who have historically fought for this issue. This recent change in Directorate autonomy has resulted in less direct indigenous group participation in decision-making processes. Although the effects of this change on local level IBE implementation is still uncertain, some scholars argue this was meant to suppress resistance from the indigenous movement, and they predict this change will negatively affect indigenous education in the long run (Gustafson, 2014; Conaghan, 2008; Becker, 2013; Martínez Novo, 2014; Oviedo and Wildemeersh, 2008). Without the input of indigenous groups in the creation of IBE policies, the education system may be designed to meet solely the goals of the national government rather than the goals of indigenous communities.

The researchers mentioned above highlight the different perspectives of the State and indigenous groups on the purpose of intercultural bilingual education and the challenges that

may arise from the new education policies that decrease indigenous participation. Their arguments, however, are mostly predictions. Very little formal research is available on the actual impact of these changes because they are so recent. Current events, covered by national news, confirm the researchers' predictions of indigenous discontent, but does not specifically confirm a negative or positive impact on IBE in terms of educational quality and language revitalization. Indigenous groups rejected the passing of the Intercultural Education Law in 2011 and continued to speak out and protest against the concentration of executive power (*El Universo* December 9, 2010; March 8, 2012; December 10, 2013). Indigenous leaders argue resolutely against the recent education reforms, drawing a direct connection between lack of indigenous participation and a weak IBE system. Although the connection hasn't been proven by any actual educational data, the mere fact that indigenous groups don't support the policies that address their education system directly is disquieting. Indigenous support for IBE is arguably one of the most important determinants for IBE success. Currently, the situation in Ecuador does not seem to favor indigenous participation nor State-indigenous cooperation. Indigenous groups and the national government in Ecuador have different ideas of what Intercultural Bilingual Education should look like, or at least, of who should be in charge of it.

Teacher Education

In addition to financially-backed education policies and the participation of indigenous groups in the creation of these policies, the availability of teacher education services greatly influences the effectiveness of IBE. The interviews with the teachers in San Clemente suggest that this can be an obvious and a serious barrier to IBE implementation. Analyses of bilingual programs in Ecuador and other countries confirm that indigenous teachers are critical to indigenous language education and revitalization efforts. Training indigenous language teachers,

however, requires powerful recruitment strategies to attract indigenous language speakers to the teaching profession and additional resources to offer quality higher education and specialization opportunities. Because indigenous languages are not commonly found in university curricula, a successful IBE program at the elementary and secondary level would first require the incorporation of indigenous languages in higher education in order to create IBE's future teachers.

Benson (2004) argues that training indigenous teachers is a challenge, not only because of the lack of universities that offer indigenous language education and training, but because indigenous language teachers have immensely more responsibilities than do traditional teachers. First, because most indigenous language teachers have been educated from a traditional hispanic curriculum during their childhood, they have little experience with a bilingual classroom model. They are expected to teach using a model that they are generally unfamiliar with. Benson also argues that indigenous teachers carry the responsibility of combating the stigma surrounding native languages. After years of linguistic and cultural oppression, indigenous language teachers are expected to promote the languages they teach in an attempt to break down longstanding prejudices. Often, they have to convince their own students and the parents of their community to support IBE as well. López (2014) similarly explains that indigenous language teachers play multiple roles in their school and community, which requires teacher training that goes far beyond pedagogical and technical concerns. Training should help new teachers develop political awareness, recover their indigenous identity, and understand colonial oppression. They essentially are not just teachers, but activists in their community and beyond.

For Ecuador to cultivate indigenous teaching professionals, the country needs specialized higher education institutions. In response to the lack of teachers to implement IBE, CONAIE and

the DINEIB have established intensive teacher training programs (King and Benson, 2004). There are currently 5 specialized indigenous teacher training colleges throughout the country but these institutions are still unable to fulfill the demands of the growing number of IBE schools (López, 2008). Despite the substantial policy changes that indigenous education has undergone in the past few decades, there are still not enough training options for indigenous professionals and, to some extent, indigenous languages remain stigmatized and unappealing for indigenous students pursuing college educations. Insufficient indigenous language teachers may stall the growth of Ecuador's IBE program and limit its potential for language revitalization.

Strong indigenous teacher training institutions are necessary to support IBE with human resources and to encourage indigenous youth to pursue the profession. Ecuador has some, but arguably not enough, higher education institutions that offer this specialization. Quichua, specifically, is the most commonly available native language of study. The development of Unified Quichua has also helped promote language education in schools and colleges because there is a formal means to teach the language and grammar. Opportunities to study Quichua and other indigenous languages at the university level have increased over the past few decades, but the current shortage of IBE teachers suggests that this growth remains inadequate. The new Constitution and Intercultural Education Law guarantee native language education to all indigenous students, but this promise cannot possibly be fulfilled without teacher training programs that can rival traditional Spanish language programs in number and vigor. However, even with enough teachers to fill the holes in Ecuador's IBE system, this may not be sufficient. King and Benson (2004) argue that indigenous teachers do not guarantee successful IBE implementation and language revitalization. Much of the success of bilingual education

programs depends on specific decisions made at the community level, which will be discussed in the next section.

Compared to best practices for education policy design and implementation, the state of Ecuador's Intercultural Bilingual Education System is ambiguous. An effective IBE program with the potential to support language revitalization needs a strong cohort of dedicated bilingual teachers, as well as financial support and sufficient educational resources. There are currently insufficient teachers and resources for universal program implementation. Also, policy design and implementation should include input from the indigenous groups that the policies directly affect and should respond to their vision of indigenous language education, rather than solely the goals of the State. While, both indigenous groups and the national government support the IBE system, their visions of IBE differ significantly. Educational policies rhetorically promote IBE growth; however, these policies have simultaneously weakened the political and administrative autonomy of indigenous leaders over DINEIB, decreasing cooperation and cordiality between the State and indigenous groups. An analysis of the design and scope of IBE points to clear obstacles to bilingual program success. These three conditions, however, do not present the full picture of IBE's potential because program specifics tend to vary between communities. From an educational perspective, bilingual programs also depend on the type of bilingual model and curriculum design, both of which are determined more by local actors than national policies.

Local Decisions about IBE

Critical weaknesses remain in terms of national-level resource allocation and policy design; however, much of the success or failure of the IBE programs is also determined by local characteristics. Analyzing IBE implementation on a community level presents obvious

difficulties because of the diversity of communities throughout Ecuador and the risk of making oversimplified generalizations. The school in San Clemente is an obvious failure of the IBE system to even provide teachers that support indigenous language learning. This, however, is just one of the thousands of schools under DINEIB jurisdiction. While some schools face a situation similar to San Clemente, other schools in Ecuador that follow the MOSIEB have indeed been successful at promoting native language learning. Additionally, even some schools with indigenous language teachers have still been unable to teach the native language successfully. So this raises the question: Why are some bilingual schools successful while others fail at promoting native language learning? A consideration of various studies and examples of bilingual schools suggest that there are certain local conditions necessary for IBE success. Effective native language education, first and foremost, depends on community participation. This section will first explain the importance of community participation in bilingual education and will then specifically address the two critical program characteristics that should be determined locally: the school's bilingual model and curriculum design.

Community Participation

Community involvement is critical for the success of the IBE program because schools function within a broader cultural, linguistic, and social environment. As the majority of researchers who have studied indigenous language education programs emphasize, community participation is arguably the most important determinant of program success (Hornberger, 2014; López, 2009, 2014; Dutcher, 2001; Malone, 2003). Like other language planning initiatives, many bilingual programs are mandated through top-down government policies, but their implementation ultimately depends on local community support and decision-making. The

inconsistencies of IBE schools among Ecuadorian communities support the researchers' claims that local factors may affect implementation more than any changes in national policies can.

Given the lack of indigenous language teachers available to public schools, the participation of community members becomes even more important. López (2009), drawing from examples of native language programs in Bolivia, Mexico, Guatemala, and Paraguay, argues that community involvement directly affects school quality because it can "establish adequate links and bridges between what happens in schools and in the indigenous real world" (p. 37). Parents and elders have knowledge of the community culture, traditions, and language, thus making them important teachers, whether at home or in the school setting. Without community support of and participation in IBE efforts, however, the school becomes an isolated entity. An intercultural school needs to function within the larger community to be able to successfully transfer the local language and culture to the new generation of students.

López (2009) and Malone (2003) both argue that community participation should take place not only after the IBE program has been implemented, but also during the planning stages in order to determine how to design a program that responds to the community's specific needs. Each community, and consequently the makeup of their school, is unique, so shouldn't both the program model and the curriculum be unique as well? Different bilingual program models as well as curriculum designs can help communities all reach the same goal: native language and culture revitalization. While MOSEIB offers a broad framework for reaching this goal, program specifics are left in the hands of local teachers and community leaders. Researchers point to the local bilingual program model and the curriculum as two elements that strongly influence IBE success and that should be determined, in large part, by the community in response to local conditions.

The Bilingual Model

Bilingual education can take a variety of forms depending both on the goals of the program and the local linguistic environment. While the benefits of indigenous bilingual education reach far beyond solely linguistic revitalization, I will focus on this as the central goal of IBE. Throughout Ecuador, the local linguistic environment varies greatly between communities. In some communities, the children still learn Quichua, or another indigenous language, as their first language. In other places, children are more comfortable with Spanish, and learning their mother tongue is comparable to learning a second language. In other communities, both indigenous and non-indigenous students make up the classroom, adding another layer of complication to providing indigenous language instruction. Intercultural Bilingual Education in Ecuadorian schools, therefore, should look different depending on the characteristics of each individual school. Researchers assert, however, that regardless of classroom makeup, for language revitalization to occur, the bilingual model needs to support additive (rather than subtractive) bilingualism.

Additive bilingualism is a form of bilingualism in which the speaker learns a second language without losing competence in the first. In a Quichua-Spanish bilingual school, for example, additive bilingualism would mean the students are learning and continuing to improve both Spanish and Quichua. Additive bilingualism in IBE schools can be supported by a maintenance and development bilingual model (López, 2009). A maintenance bilingual model develops both first and second languages by using them both as the mediums of instruction in other academic subjects. In an Ecuadorian IBE school, this could take various forms. Teachers may teach subjects in both Quichua and Spanish, or they may designate certain subjects to each language. López (2009) explains the role of indigenous languages in an additive bilingual

setting: “The indigenous language is seen as a medium of instruction and simultaneously as an end in itself” (p. 10). Teachers use the Quichua language to teach other subjects but also dedicate time to specific language studies (like writing, reading, and speaking).

With subtractive bilingualism, on the other hand, students continue to improve one language while slowly leaving the other language behind. Traditionally, if indigenous schools included any native language learning, it was through a transitional bilingual model that promoted subtractive bilingualism (López, 2009). A transitional bilingual model uses the student’s first language (Quichua, in this case) solely as a means to slowly transition them to Spanish language mastery. In this model, Quichua classes may only be offered during the first few years of elementary school, until the students eventually move to a completely Spanish curriculum. The goal of the transitional bilingual model is assimilation to the mainstream Spanish culture and language, rather than the development of true bilingualism. Only in the past few decades has indigenous education in Ecuador begun to shift away from the transitional towards an intercultural, maintenance and development orientation. Despite this ideological shift and “the undeniable political recognition...that indigenous people now enjoy,” López (2009) explains that transitional models of indigenous schooling still remain the norm in Latin America and that “the mainstream assimilationist political paradigm has not yet been abandoned” (pg 8).

A maintenance bilingual model, as opposed to a subtractive one, seems to be an obvious requirement for a indigenous bilingual education program with the goal of language revitalization. For schools in homogenous indigenous communities, an effective maintenance model can result in the development of both mainstream and native languages. Ecuador’s IBE document (MOSEIB) proposes a maintenance model that transitions from 100% native language as medium of instruction in early primary schooling to a combination of 40% indigenous

language, 40% Spanish, and 20% foreign language by high school years. As previously mentioned, this model clearly has not been implemented universally on a local level. In addition to this obvious weakness in MOSEIB, this model does not consider the diverse reality of the country's indigenous population. What about indigenous communities where students speak Spanish as their first language? Do they still deserve access to indigenous language education? And what about schools in more urban areas that have a mix of indigenous and non-indigenous students? The MOSEIB doesn't consider these differences, but instead seems to refer solely to homogeneous rural indigenous communities and presumes that the first language is invariably the native language. In reality, however, language shift and migration have diversified the linguistic environment both in rural indigenous communities as well as in urban areas. So how can students in a linguistically diverse classroom get access to native language education?

Ruiz's (1984) language theory suggests that the solution to this dilemma lies with language orientations. He explains that languages can be viewed as a problem, a right, or a resource. Ecuador's program arguably takes a "rights orientation" towards indigenous languages, guaranteeing native language education to communities in response to demands of cultural and linguistic equality. Ruiz argues, however, that language planning efforts, such as IBE programs, should go further, framing native languages as resources that can benefit indigenous and nonindigenous students who learn them. King (2004) uses this orientation to offer a possible solution to linguistically diverse classrooms, arguing that enrichment bilingual education can take the maintenance model a step further, making native language education available to students who speak the native tongue as their first language and students—both indigenous and nonindigenous—with Spanish as their first language. Enrichment language education is a form of maintenance bilingualism that teaches the target language as an additional course. It has

traditionally referred to language classes for elite, mainstream students, such as French for English speakers in the US or English for Spanish speakers in Ecuador. The additional language is seen as a resource—a positive addition to a student's education. King suggests that enrichment programs can develop a language-as-a-resource orientation by offering native language courses as additional classes. Not only does this challenge the traditional dichotomy between elite enrichment bilingual programs and transitional indigenous bilingual programs, but it also gives schools with more linguistically diverse populations more freedom to design curricula to promote additive native language education.

King (2004) describes an example of an enrichment bilingual program in the Quichua community of Saraguro. The majority of the students speak Spanish as their first language, although they are Quichua nationality. Given this linguistic environment and the resources available, the community chose to implement an enrichment model of native language education, where Quichua is taught as a second language in additional classes throughout all grade levels. King notes that this alone may not reverse Quichua language shift, especially in communities where children are no longer learning it in the household. However, the positive image of indigenous languages that a successful enrichment education program promotes can address language attitudes, which is perhaps the most powerful barrier to language revitalization.

Whether it's maintenance, enrichment, or a hybrid model, some form of additive bilingualism that maintains and develops both Spanish and Quichua is necessary for language revitalization to occur. The linguistic and geographic diversity of the Ecuadorian population requires an IBE model that can change shape based on specific community characteristics. National level mandates for IBE, therefore, need to translate into specific diversified models for each individual community. A program that can promote and revitalize native languages needs to

be shaped by local factors. And who knows these factors better than local community members themselves? Even once they decide on the model, however, they need to determine what content to teach and how to teach it, i.e. the curriculum.

Curriculum Design

Apart from designating certain percentages of instruction time to Spanish and the indigenous language, the curriculum of an Intercultural Bilingual Education school should specify the content being instructed. If the goal of IBE is both bilingualism and interculturalism, shouldn't the curriculum design consider both language of instruction as well as this concept of interculturalism? But what exactly does interculturalism look like in a curriculum? López (2014) explains that interculturalism:

> refers to learning that is rooted in an individual's own culture, language, values, worldview and system of knowledge and, at the same time, is open to and appreciative of other knowledges, values, cultures and languages. (p. 28)

Native language education is rooted in the desire to revive not only a language, but a dying culture. Culture and language are inherently connected, and a bilingual curriculum should reflect that, incorporating local knowledge and traditions. Hornberger (2014) explains that native language education has a significant role in the revitalization of both language and cultural identity. Therefore, she argues that IBE programs need to move away from prewritten, decontextualized curricula and towards holistic learning that integrates the students' own knowledge and daily lives.

Modifying the curriculum to incorporate the local culture requires community involvement in the planning stages of IBE. It may also encourage participation and support once

the program is running. Dutcher (2001) describes some of the benefits of localizing the curriculum:

> The community will find the material authentic and useful. Sometimes this process goes further, and oral history is preserved because local stories, legends, songs, poems, and lore become part of the formal curriculum. These materials resonate with the life experiences of children and their parents. (19)

Incorporating content that is relatable and applicable to students' lives is an element of a good curriculum regardless of whether the school follows a bilingual or mainstream model. In an IBE school, this could mean preserving oral history, as Dutcher discusses, or including activities like horticulture and raising livestock. A community curriculum may also include traditional systems of knowledge, such as non-Western math and science concepts.

Chaluiza (2006) describes a successful example of a math curriculum in an Ecuadorian bilingual school that uses Quichua as the language of instruction and incorporates local knowledge. Instead of the mainstream way of teaching math in Spanish and through memorization, the teachers in this community utilize a traditional Quichua counting tool, called the taptana. The taptana is usually a wooden board that has rows of circles representing the ones, tens, and hundreds places (Montaluisa, 2010). Students can use this tool to solve simple and complex algebra problems, giving them a more concrete, rather than solely theoretical, application. Irma Gómez and Julio Agualongo (2006) provide another example of a localized, community-integrated curriculum in an Ecuadorian community school. The pedagogy focuses on community knowledge, fostering a relationship with nature, agriculture, and community service projects (called *mingas*). Recreational activities for the students, such as dance, music, artisans, and storytelling, include parents and other community members. Gómez and Agualongo explain

that this system has been successful because the students and the rest of the community actively participate in decisions about their education. They have created an "education community" (*comunidad educativa*) where the entire community works towards the educational goals of the school, including cultural and linguistic maintenance.

The schools described above are just two examples of indigenous schools in Ecuador that have successfully implemented an IBE program through comprehensive community support and involvement in decision making. Decisions about the bilingual model and the content of the intercultural curriculum in IBE schools require extensive community input because each locality has unique needs, goals, and cultural characteristics. Also, if the community's goal is successful linguistic revitalization, language learning cannot happen solely in the school setting. Students need to be using the language outside the school, in their homes and within community gatherings to promote intergenerational transmission (Fishman, 2001a). Therefore, the community needs to not only help shape what their bilingual education program looks like, but supplement and actively support the students' language learning outside of the school.

Conclusion

Analyzing Ecuador's Intercultural Bilingual Education Program through the lens of proven bilingual education practices indicate that IBE is meeting some, but not all, of the suggested criteria. Financial, resource, and teacher training constraints limit the possibilities of universal implementation. Also, the lack of indigenous participation in policy decisions suggest that the program design may not reflect the interests of indigenous communities. Scholars point to effective resource allocation, strong teacher training institutions, and indigenous participation as characteristics that strengthen a bilingual program. However, they also maintain that

successful implementation of bilingual education is ultimately determined by the local community. Communities need to make decisions about how to design an additive bilingual model and a curriculum that incorporates community knowledge.

As demonstrated above, some schools have been able to successfully implement the IBE model while others have failed. IBE has had uneven progress because it is not adequately supporting schools on a local level with the teachers and financial resources that they need, making local implementation challenging even if communities are involved and support the ultimate goal. If a community is empowered to make decisions about their schools and they choose not to teach their native language, then that is entirely their choice. But they deserve to at least feel empowered to make that decision. And currently, many communities in Ecuador do not have that choice.

CAPÍTULO CUATRO

Huasipungo y los papeles del indio

Introducción

En 1932, Jorge Icaza publicó *Huasipungo*, una novela que se convertiría en una de las obras más importantes e impactantes sobre la vida indígena ecuatoriana. Ganó la popularidad no solamente en Ecuador mismo, sino también internacionalmente. Se ha traducido el libro en más de diez idiomas (Adoun, 1981). Aunque ha recibido tantas críticas como alabanzas, permanece como una obra fundamental del estudio de la vida indígena al principio del siglo veinte y del movimiento indigenista. En su novela, Icaza llama la atención a la injusticia social y presenta un argumento fuerte contra la explotación y marginalización de los indios bajo las pretensiones de progreso. *Huasipungo* presenta una representación brutalmente realista de la vida en la hacienda durante este período del desarrollo, destacando las desigualdades entre las clases sociales (y raciales) diferentes—los blancos, los mestizos y los indios. Estas tres clases desempeñan los papeles diferentes durante los cambios con propósito de desarrollar su pueblo y hacienda. Un análisis de la estructura social y racial en *Huasipungo* sugiere que los Indios en esta sociedad tienen dos papeles distintos. Son trabajadores que usan los blancos para realizar sus planes de desarrollo, como trabajos de construcción. Al mismo tiempo, se consideran a los indios no como ayudantes para el progreso, sino como obstáculos que se tienen que remover. Antes de este análisis, ubicaré la novela como parte del movimiento indigenista, e introduciré la vida y la escritura de Jorge Icaza.

El movimiento indigenista

El movimiento indigenista—en que *Huasipungo* se sitúa como subgénero—surgió durante la mitad del siglo diecinueve. Era un movimiento político, social y literario dirigido generalmente por los intelectuales y políticos blancos de los países latinoamericanos quienes abogaban por el mejoramiento de la situación del indio. Maria Elena García (2005) explica que variaban las perspectivas de los actores del movimiento. Aunque algunos de los participantes del movimiento respetaban y promovían las culturas de las comunidades indígenas y luchaban para sus derechos, otros mantenían una perspectiva asimilacionista y paternalista. Consideran a los indios como un problema que podían resolver con su integración a la cultura hispana y su "civilización." A pesar de estas actitudes condescendientes, del movimiento indigenista vinieron cambios políticos que favorecieron a los indios y las obras literarias que destacaron las injusticias sociales que enfrentaban.

José Carlos Mariátegui se considera el primer filósofo quien definió el indigenismo en la literatura (Vara, 2013). Era fundador del partido comunista en Perú, y en sus obras, adopta el pensamiento socialista para argumentar contra la opresión de los indios en la sociedad peruviana. En su colección de ensayos *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad* analiza el papel de la literatura indigenista: "El indigenismo, en nuestra literatura, como se desprende de mis anteriores proposiciones, tiene fundamentalmente el sentido de una reivindicación de lo autóctono" (Mariátegui, 1928, p. 274). Explica que el crecimiento de la literatura indigenista durante ese período era parte de "una corriente ideológica y social que recluta cada día más adhesiones en la juventud" (p. 270). La literatura indigenista, según él, tiene propósito de atraer atención al grave problema social de los países latinoamericanos: el tratamiento del indio. Explica que es la responsabilidad de los indigenistas para representar y luchar para los intereses de los indios hasta

que puedan luchar para sus mismos. Termina su análisis de la literatura indigenista con esta esperanza para el futuro del indio:

> Y ya la experiencia de los pueblos de Oriente, el Japón, Turquía, la misma China, nos han probado cómo una sociedad autóctono, aun después de un largo colapso, puede encontrar por sus propios pasos, y en muy poco tiempo, la vía de la civilización moderna y traducir, a su propia lengua, las lecciones de los pueblos de Occidente. (p. 284)

Mariátegui demuestra un pensamiento común de muchos escritores indigenistas, que ha atraído muchas críticas contemporáneas. Cree que se puede salvar a la raza indígena solamente por introducirse a las ideas del occidente y asimilarse a la "civilización."

Mariátegui era parte de un movimiento indigenista fuerte en Perú, pero este movimiento no era tan visible en Ecuador. Los dos políticos más conocidos del movimiento indigenista de Ecuador son Pío Jaramillo Alvarado y Víctor Gabriel Garcés (Becker, 2012). En 1943, fundaron el Instituto Indigenista del Ecuador (IIE) con el propósito principal de estudiar al indio para mejorar sus condiciones de vivir. Antes de este momento, la presencia del indigenismo en el mundo político de Ecuador era insignificativa. El IIE consistía completamente en políticos y académicos blancos. A pesar de que muchos de los líderes del Instituto tenían posiciones de poder en la sociedad ecuatoriana, no tenían éxito en establecer un instituto con poder político. Comparado con los movimientos indigenistas en otros países latinoamericanos, Becker (2012) explica que nunca lograron los cambios políticos indigenistas que realizaron los otros. Por último, el movimiento político indigenista era débil, pero es a causa de esta debilidad, sugiere Becker, que se formó un movimiento indígena bien organizado.

La literatura indigenista en Ecuador nunca alcanzaron al nivel de otros países en términos de los números de autores y el alcance de las obras. Jorge Icaza era la excepción. Ganó la popularidad como el escritor ecuatoriano más conocido de este género. Usaba su escritura para pintar las realidades brutales de los indios. Su obra más popular, *Huasipungo*, es la representación más icónica del indigenismo en Ecuador. Fernando Alegría (1959) explica el significado de la aparición de la novela de Icaza en 1934: "marca el fin de la tradición indianista romántica y la culminación de una nueva tendencia indigenista caracterizada por un lenguaje de brutal realismo" (p. 246). Icaza se considera como un pionero del indigenismo ecuatoriano porque apareció su trabajo una década más temprano que el movimiento político. Un examen de su vida y sus obras literarias explica su papel como pionero para la causa indígena.

Jorge Icaza y *Huasipungo*

Jorge Icaza nació en 1906. Su padre murió cuando era muy joven, entonces crecía con su madre y su padrastro, quien le introdujo a las ideas liberales (Vara, 2013). Icaza atribuye mayormente sus pensamientos liberales y sus ideas sobre la justicia para los indios a su tiempo en el campo. Cuando era joven, pasaba tiempo en la hacienda de su tío, y allí se introducía a las comunidades indígenas y la explotación bajo los patrones blancos. Icaza explica: "Allí como era niño todavía, los indios me permitieron entrar en sus chozas y pude vivir sus dolores, su vida y miseria" (citado en Sacoto, 1991, p. 257). Esta experiencia le permitía conocer el sufrimiento del indio en la sociedad ecuatoriana y influiría su carrera de escritor significativamente.

Icaza estudió la medicina en la universidad hasta que abandonó su educación después de la muerte de su madre. En lugar de terminar su educación, empezó una carrera como dramaturgo. Sus obras de teatro empezaron a convertirse en las críticas sociales, que le trajeron mucha

desaprobación de la alta sociedad en que asociaba. Entonces, empezó a escribir las novelas. Su primer cuento, *Barro de la sierra* (1933), trata de la explotación del indio, pero su primera novela, *Huasipungo* (1934), recibió la atención internacional. Después de *Huasipungo*, continuaba escribiendo con el propósito social de mostrar y luchar contra las injusticias perpetradas por la clase alta contra de los indios. Los mensajes de sus novelas era de naturaleza proletaria, entonces ganaron atención especialmente en los grupos socialistas y en la Unión Soviética, tanto que se designa a la posición de embajador de la Unión Soviética. Icaza también recibió el título honorario de Defensor del indio ecuatoriano (Vara, 2013, p. 219). Aunque no tenía intenciones políticos, se convertía en un gran diplomático, visitando muchos países en América Latina, Europa y Asia.

Aunque ganó mucha popularidad internacional, la recepción de *Huasipungo* y las otras novelas de Icaza en su propio país era menos acogedora (Dulsey, 1961). Antonio Sacoto (1991) explica el impacto de la obra de Icaza en la sociedad ecuatoriana: "Se lanza *Huasipungo* como piedra en ventana de convento" (p. 25). Por su trabajo, Icaza criticó a la sociedad alta ecuatoriana y especialmente la Iglesia. No solamente ofendió a muchas personas con sus críticas fuertes, sino también con su realismo brutal. Pintó una imagen de la vida indígena muy aborrecible, y algunos críticos mantienen que es una exageración. No obstante, el impacto de *Huasipungo* es innegable. Icaza utilizó las imágenes chocantes y las críticas fuertes para atraer la atención del público a un tema que siempre han ignorado: la injusticia que sufren los Indios.

Para denunciar las injusticias sociales, Icaza cuenta la explotación que aguanta una comunidad indígena en su novela *Huasipungo.* Tiene lugar primariamente en la hacienda de Cuchitambo y el pueblo vecindario de Tomachi. El escenario es 1910, veinte años más temprano que la fecha de publicación (Sacoto, 1991). Pereira es dueño de la hacienda en que viven muchas

familias indígenas. Los indios trabajan en la hacienda de Pereira a cambio de sus hogares humildes (sus huasipungos) y los sustentos. Pereira decide trabajar con unos gringos de negocios para establecer la industria de madera y petróleo en su tierra. Entonces, Pereira visita su hacienda y comienza las preparaciones. Estas incluyen la construcción de una carretera y la preparación de tierra para construir edificios. La mayoría del libro se enfoca en las vidas lamentables de los indios. Están explotados bajo el control del patrón Pereira y el cura corrupto, y sufren las vidas de hambre, enfermedad y castigo. Finalmente, al fin de la novela, los indios se rebelan contra sus explotadores, pero se reprime la rebelión rápidamente y muchos de los indios se mueren.

Los papeles indígenas: Un análisis

La novela indigenista *Huasipungo* tiene un argumento enfocado en relatar los numerosos horrores que padecen los indios de la hacienda Cuchitambo. En general la historia del libro es estática: No hay ningún clímax específico. En lugar de este, solamente consiste de una serie de eventos para mostrar el sufrimiento del indio hasta culminar en la rebelión al fin de la historia. A pesar de que no refleje las convenciones literarias tradicionales, la novela *Huasipungo* efectivamente retrata la jerarquía social y racial de que proviene la opresión de los indios. El tema del progreso penetra toda la historia. Es un concepto que enfrentan todos los personajes: los blancos, los mestizos del pueblo y los indios. Icaza muestra cómo cada grupo participa en el desarrollo de la hacienda Cuchitambo para mostrar el papel dual de los indios en esta sociedad. Por la yuxtaposición de los dos papeles, Icaza destaca una paradoja central del indio en su obra. Los Indios son necesarios para la labor que requieren los avances "civilizatorios."Al mismo tiempo, las otras clases consideran a los indios como obstáculos para progreso. Hay dos eventos específicos que muestran los dos papeles del indio: la construcción de la carretera y el comienzo

del proyecto de los gringos que incitó la rebelión. Durante el trabajo de la carretera, los indios son la mano de trabajo esenciales para el término del proyecto de desarrollo. Al contrario, cuando los gringos y Pereira deciden adelantar con sus planes de las industrias de petróleo y madera, los indios sólo aparecen como obstáculos fastidiosos. Antes de analizar los dos eventos, es necesario explicar las perspectivas de los tres grupos sobre el concepto de progreso.

El progreso

El progreso puede ser un término ambiguo porque hay perspectivas distintas sobre lo que refiere. Un análisis de los papeles de los indios en el progreso que cuenta *Huasipungo* requiere que primero se defina el concepto. Los tres grupos sociales distintos—los blancos, los mestizos, y los indios—tienen visiones diferentes para el desarrollo y el futuro de la hacienda y el pueblo. Los motivos de los tres grupos para empezar la construcción de la carretera y las esperanzas de los grupos al final de la historia muestran sus perspectivas del progreso.

Antes del comienzo de la construcción de la carretera, Icaza muestra los motivos de los tres grupos sociales, empezando al principio de la novela con los blancos de alta sociedad. Alfonso Pereira discute con su tío Julio el mal estado de su hacienda y sus finanzas. Su tío recomienda a Alfonso que se involucre en la industria de la madera y el petróleo. Julio explica con entusiasmo, “tenemos entre manos un proyecto que nos hará ricos a todos” (Icaza, 1934, p. 9). Explica que los hombres de negocios gringos se interesan en establecer las industrias de madera y petróleo, y la hacienda de Pereira tiene el potencial de proveer los recursos que requieren. Para atraer los negocios (y la plata) de los gringos, es esencial que Pereira construya una carretera para hacer accesibles la hacienda y los terrenos circundantes. Con promesas de riquezas y progreso, Julio convence a Pereira que viaje a su hacienda para iniciar los cambios. En esta escena temprana, se introduce la jerarquía social en la sociedad ecuatoriana. Pereira y su tío

ocupan la clase alta de la sociedad. Son terratenientes blancos que viven en la ciudad de Quito. Para ellos, los gringos americanos representan el progreso. Vienen a Ecuador con las riquezas y las ideas modernas. Traen la oportunidad y las posibilidades del desarrollo económico y comercio internacional. Con la dirección de los gringos, Pereira espera prosperar.

Cuando Pereira y su familia llegan a su hacienda, aparece la otra clase social y racial que caracteriza la sociedad ecuatoriana: los mestizos. La hacienda Cuchitambo está situada cerca del pueblo Tomachi. Mientras los indios, primariamente peones de la hacienda, habitan chozas pobres situadas en las tierras del campo, los mestizos (o los cholos) viven primariamente en el pueblo. Los mestizos, con una mezcla de sangre blanca y india, ocupan el medio de la jerarquía social y hacen trabajos varios. Algunos trabajan como peones y otros proveen servicios en el pueblo. Jacinto Quintana, por ejemplo, es el jefe de la policía. Otros tienen papeles pequeños de liderazgo, como Policarpio, el mayordomo de la hacienda. La diferencia de los hogares y los trabajos de los indios y los mestizos destaca la separación de las dos clases raciales en la hacienda de Pereira, aunque todos tienen vidas humildes. La perspectiva sobre el progreso que tienen los mestizos se introduce cuando Pereira y el cura los persuaden a participar en la construcción de la carretera.

Los blancos, quienes incluyen a Pereira, el cura local y el ingeniero, cultivan un plan para reclutar el trabajo de los aldeanos mestizos. Organizan “una junta patriótica” para iniciar la minga comunitaria (p. 62). En la tienda de Jacinta, asisten a reuniones los hombres del pueblo para discutir el trabajo que viene, pero mayormente, para emborracharse. La mañana del comienzo de la minga, el cura da un sermón inspirador para motivar a la gente del pueblo. Le promete el cura a la gente cautivada, “Por cada barrazo en esta obra magna tendrán cien días de indulgencia, el Divino Hacedor sonreirá a cada metro que avance la carretera y echará sus

bendiciones sobre este pueblo" (p. 62-63). El cura asocia la construcción de la carretera con las riquezas venideras y la aprobación del Dios. Convence a los poblanos que su trabajo traerá un futuro prometedor para ellos y que es lo que quiere Dios. Los mestizos están persuadidos. Respetan a Pereira y al cura como figuras de autoridad, y comparten la misma esperanza para la carretera: que traiga oportunidades y avances económicos y sociales. De buena gana, los poblanos marchan hacia el trabajo para empezar a construir la calle.

Los indios, al contrario, no necesitan las persuasiones de los blancos porque no tienen ninguna opción excepto trabajar bajo las órdenes del patrón Pereira. Desde la perspectiva de los blancos, los indios son su propiedad. Siguen las órdenes del patrón porque él provee sus sustentos y sus huasipungos a cambio de sus trabajos. A través de la novela, pero especialmente con la construcción de la carretera, Icaza retrata la relación entre los blancos y los indios como una de esclavitud. Los Indios viven en endeudamiento perpetuo y no tienen ninguna oportunidad de escapar el control del patrón. Mientras Icaza retrata las actitudes de los mestizos hacia el proyecto de la calle como entusiastas y optimistas, no ofrece la perspectiva indígena hacia el trabajo. Solo llegan con los mestizos siguiendo las órdenes de arriba; sin embargo, no se sabe sus opiniones sobre el trabajo. No es claro si esperan el progreso que promete la carretera también, o si solamente participan por temor del castigo del patrón.

Al final del libro, sin embargo, las acciones de los indios demuestran un cambio cuando finalmente se guían por sus creencias. Cuando Pereira decide empezar a despejar la ladera para crear espacio para las construcciones que planifican los gringos, manda la eliminación de los huasipungos situados allí. Uno de los huasipungueros afectados es Andrés Chiliquinga. Enfrentado con la destrucción de su huasipungo y el desplazamiento consiguiente, incita a sus

vecinos a rebelarse. Entonces, esta escena muestra cómo ven el progreso los indios: una amenaza a su sustento.

Esta última escena refuerza las perspectivas ya establecidas de los mestizos y los blancos. Es claro que los dos grupos comparten una visión similar de progreso, y están dispuestos a seguir cualquier orden de los gringos para realizarlo. Para ellos, el progreso se caracteriza por la modernización, el desarrollo de las industrias y el mejoramiento económico. Los indios no necesariamente expresan una oposición a esta visión de progreso, excepto cuando amenace su seguridad de vida. He decidido enfocarme en los dos eventos de la historia de *Huasipungo* que satisfacen la perspectiva de los blancos—y por consiguiente, los mestizos—sobre progreso, porque al fin y al cabo, los blancos del libro son los que tienen el poder de seguir y realizar su visión ideal. Los dos eventos—la construcción de la carretera y el comienzo de las preparaciones para las industrias de los gringos—representan el entendimiento del desarrollo que mantienen Pereira y sus compañeros blancos tanto como los gringos. El primer evento—la construcción de la calle—demuestra el papel de los indios como trabajadores necesarios para la realización de la visión de Pereira.

La carretera: el indio como trabajador

Cuando Alfonso Pereira y Julio discuten las detalles del trabajo de la hacienda, asumen que la labor necesaria para la construcción de la calle vendrá de los indios. Según sus perspectivas, los indios son parte del terreno, parte de la propiedad de Pereira. Para obtener más ayuda, Julio tiene una solución: comprar más tierra. Explica: “Con los bosques se comprará a los indios, con los indios el brazo que abrirá el surco en esas montañas” (p. 12). Los hombres consideran a los indios solamente como otra parte de su hacienda que pueden utilizar para su beneficio. Para recoger más manos de obra, solamente tienen que comprar más tierra con los

habitantes indígenas incluidos. El plan de la construcción de la carretera incluye la suposición que se puede explotar a los indios para lograr este plan ambicioso.

Cuando comienza la minga, incluye la participación de los mestizos del pueblo y los indios. La diferencia entre el tipo de trabajo de los mestizos y él de los Indios destaca el papel particular del indio. Al principio, los dos grupos trabajan juntos. Es una labor dificil que dura muchas semanas. Mientras algunos mestizos pueden regresar a sus hogares para descansar durante la noche y los otros tienen abrigos buenos, los indios tienen que aguantar los elementos naturales como las lluvias fuertes que causan las enfermedades terribles. Después de algunas semanas de la construcción, llegan a un pantano. Tienen que drenar el pantano para continuar construyendo la carretera, pero este trabajo es muy peligroso. Es aquí que se ve la diferencia entre las dos clases sociales. Los mestizos empiezan a abandonar el proyecto por temor de arriesgar sus vidas, pero los indios tienen que continuar. El drenaje del pantano es muy arriesgado, y por eso, mueren muchos indios. Si los indios tratan de huir, sin embargo, se castigan brutalmente.

Según la perspectiva de Pereira, estas víctimas son sacrificios necesarios para realizar su última meta. Pereira explica al ingeniero: “Pero el trabajo debemos seguirlo así, de lo contrario, iríamos al fracaso, no cumpliríamos nuestra misión de cultura, de hacer a este pueblo a imagen y semejanza de nuestra civilización” (p. 84-85). Sólo con la continuación del trabajo de los Indios, puede conseguir el desarrollo y la “civilización.” Refiriéndose a los Indios, Pereira continua: “Que se pierdan veinte, que se pierdan treinta, no se ha perdido gran cosa” (p. 85). De su perspectiva, el trabajo y las víctimas de los indios son una parte necesaria e inevitable del proyecto. Los indios se consideran como su propiedad, entonces la muerte de ellos se considera un sacrificio de Pereira mismo, como una pérdida de su capital.

Después de ocho semanas fatales de trabajo en el pantano, hay un desplazamiento de tierra que mata a más indios, pero resulta en la conclusión del trabajo de la carretera. El reconocimiento nacional que sigue muestra que a pesar del trabajo crucial de los indios en la realización de esta hazaña, no reciben ningun crédito. Las noticias nacionales reconocen a Pereira como héroe, alabando su perseverancia y espíritu empresarial. Un columna dice que el logro del pueblo de Tomachi bajo el liderazgo de Pereira "ha dado un paso definitivo en el Progreso" (p. 92). Cuando refiere al progreso el artículo, refiere al involucramiento creciente de los negocios extranjeros en las selvas de Ecuador. En todos los artículos que elogian a Pereira, ninguno menciona el papel de los indios de su hacienda. El narrador explica: "Era imposible distinguirles por ningún rincón—ni en las fotos ni en los artículos...se podía encontrar un indio" (p. 91-92). El propósito de Icaza aquí es claro: mostrar que el papel del indio como trabajador para el desarrollo no se reconoce. Desde el punto de vista de la sociedad alta, los indios funcionan solamente como herramientas de los blancos. No merecen ningún reconocimiento porque no se consideran como humanos completos.

La construcción de la carretera y el reconocimiento nacional que sigue ilustran el primero de los dos papeles que desempeñan los indios en esta sociedad. Los indios son las manos ocultos detrás de la modernización. Sin la labor de los indios, no sería posible la construcción de la carretera, y sin la construcción de la carretera, no pudiera atraer los negocios de los gringos. La carretera abre oportunidades para más desarrollo económico, como el establecimiento de las industrias estadounidenses de petróleo y madera. A través del tema de la carretera, Icaza muestra el sufrimiento escondido detrás del progreso y la modernización. Las elites crean los planes impresionantes, pero son los indios quienes sufren implementándolos. Aunque los indios tienen un papel crítico en el camino al progreso, no reciben ningún reconocimiento, ni cosechan los

beneficios resultantes. El contraste entre el verdadero involucramiento de los indios en la modernización y la falta de reconocimiento muestra su posición en la sociedad ecuatoriana. Los blancos e incluso los mestizos no consideran a los indios como contribuyentes al progreso, sino como obstáculos al progreso.

El último plan: el indio como obstáculo

Icaza utiliza la última sección de *Huasipungo* para mostrar cómo ve el resto de la sociedad a los indios: no como trabajadores necesarios para la modernización, sino como una barrera que impide el progreso. Esta indica el segundo—y más reconocido—papel del Indio en la sociedad ecuatoriana. En esta última escena, los gringos viajan a la hacienda de Pereira para felicitarle por el éxito con la carretera y discutir los planes para avanzar. Quieren establecer una industria para la extracción y el comercio del petróleo y la madera. Para empezar, necesitan espacio para construir las casas para los gringos, unos edificios de oficina y un aserradero. Específicamente, quieren construirlos en la ladera, donde actualmente viven muchas familias indígenas. Entonces, ordenan a Pereira que despeje la ladera de los huasipungos, y él ordena a algunos mestizos a cumplir con los deseos de los gringos. Los temores que expresa Pereira antes de este evento y la rebelión reactiva de los indios muestra que, diferente al rol de trabajador para progreso, la idea que los indios son obstáculos al progreso es más común en la sociedad.

Al principio de la novela, el oír la necesidad de desplazar a los Indios, Pereira caracteriza inmediatamente a los indios quienes ocupan la tierra de su hacienda como un obstáculo en realizar este objetivo. Pereira teme que estarán muy descontentos con su desplazamiento. Recordando los levantamientos que pasaron en la tierra de su padre, Pereira advierte de la fijación de los indios con sus huasipungos: “A ese pedazo de tierra que se les presta por el trabajo que dan a la hacienda, lo toman con gran cariño, y levantan su choza, cultivan su

sementera, cuidan de sus cerdos, sus gallinas y cuyes" (p. 11). Parece que esta preocupación de los indios con sus huasipungos está retando los grandes planes de Pereira. Sin embargo, Pereira parece no entender porque están tan ligados a sus pedazos de tierra. Para él, los indios no son humanos civilizados sino barreras que él tiene que superar.

A pesar de sus temores sobre las reacciones de los indios, Pereira ordena a algunos mestizos del pueblo despejar la ladera. En esta sección, los mestizos otra vez siguen las órdenes de los blancos, pero esta vez, las siguen a costa de los indios. Aunque los mestizos son medio indio, se identifican con y emulan a los blancos. Para ellos los indios representan el pasado no civilizado, mientras los blancos representan la civilización y la modernización. Dulsey (1961) explica que en esta novela se puede ver que, cuando tienen la oportunidad, los mestizos tratan de "forget the Indian side of their heritage" (p. 100). La idea que los indios tiene un papel negativo y anti-moderno es evidente aquí con las acciones de los mestizos. Para ganar la aprobación de Pereira y para ayudar en el desarrollo de su comunidad, los mestizos tienen que eliminar el obstáculo de los huasipungos de los indios.

La respuesta de los indios a su desplazamiento forzado refuerza la perspectiva de los blancos y los mestizos que son barreras que se tienen que eliminar para seguir progresando. Un examen de las reacciones de los Indios afectados hacia este acto de "desarrollo" muestra la perspectiva del indio y sugiere que hay un punto de inflexión cuando rechaza el concepto blanco del progreso. El narrador describe una escena horrible cuando los mestizos expulsan a una familia indígena de su huasipungo y lo destruyen totalmente. El narrador expresa la lamentación del padre de la casa:

> Cómo decirles que no abran a los cuatro vientos el vientre de su casa; cómo convencerles que ese es el único hueco donde se pueden dormir todos los

> cansancios. El grito de protesta de perdería en el valle, acrecentando el griterío de las lágrimas de los guaguas y de la mujer, de suyo ya insoportable. (Icaza, 1934, p. 160)

Es este momento cuando enfrentan a la pérdida de sus huasipungos que no pueden aguantarlo más. Toda la novela describe los numerosos horrores e injusticias que enfrentan los undios. Incluye los acontecimientos realmente aborrecibles, como los linchamientos, la inanición de los niños y las enfermedades mortales. Sin embargo, increíblemente, los indios soportan todo, hasta que se amenazan sus huasipungos.

La reacción del indio cambia del lamento hacia la indignación, mostrando que finalmente ellos no van a soportar la explotación. El narrador explica la escena en que hay una agitación creciente: "Los hombres se arremangan los ponchos alistándose a recibir la chispa que haga explotar esa fuerza angustiosa que está a punto de desbordarse por los ojos, por las manos, por los dientes" (p. 161). Cuando aprenden de la destrucción venidera de sus huasipungos, los indios no pueden permitirlo sin una lucha. Mientras se reúnen las familias de la ladera por indignación, Andrés Chilquinga está especialmente enojado y desesperado a hacer algo. Con los indios de la ladera acumulados afuera de su huasipungo, Andrés "inventó la palabra que les sirva de bandera" (p. 163). Gritó, "¡Ñucanchic huasipungo!" que significa "Nuestra huasipungo" (p. 163). Con este grito de guerra, incita la rebelión. Este último evento marca el punto de cambio cuando los indios paran de seguir las órdenes del patrón. Finalmente tratan de impedir el progreso porque amenaza la única cosa que parece casi como su propiedad misma: sus huasipungos. La destrucción del huasipungo es significativa porque esta es la coyuntura decisiva. Es el punto cuando el papel del indio cambia de trabajador para el progreso hacia barrera de él. Es el punto cuando el indio se convierte en el papel más reconocido.

La rebelión no dura mucho tiempo. Los indios matan a algunos de los mestizos que trabajan para Pereira, incluyendo al jefe de la policía. Sin embargo, Pereira escapa de la hacienda con éxito. Lo importante de esta escena es la reacción del resto de la sociedad. Cuando difunden las noticias de la rebelión, muchas personas están furiosas. El narrador explica: "En los círculos gubernamentales la noticia cayó, como han caído siempre estas noticias, como un acto de barbarie contra la civilización" (p. 166). Se hace una comparación distinta del "acto barbarie" de los indios y los blancos civilizados. Una voz dice, "Hay que defender a la gloria nacional: Alfonso Pereira, hombre que se hizo solo un carretero" (p. 167). Aquí la perspectiva de los blancos es clara: los indios son un obstáculo al progreso. Las noticias de la carretera no mencionan el rol de los indios en su creación; sin embargo, ahora que están previniendo el progreso, los indios atraen mucha publicidad. Al nombre de la civilización y el progreso, el ejército llega a la hacienda Cuchitambo y suprime la rebelión. Mata a casi todos los insurgentes incluyendo a Andrés y su niño.

La supresión de la rebelión, en la superficie, representa un fracaso para los indios de la hacienda Cuchitambo. Sin embargo, el significado de las últimas palabras de la novela sugiere algo diferente. La historia termina así:

> Entre los despojos de la dominación, entre las chozas deshechas, entre el montón de carne tibia aún, surgió la gran sementera de brazos flacos, como espigas de cebada, que al dejarse mecer por los vientos helados de los páramos de América, murmura, poniendo a la burguesía los pelos de punto, con voz ululante de taladro: ¡Ñucanchic huasipungo! ¡Ñucanchic huasipungo!

La voz de la rebelión continúa sonando. La historia termina con la voz de los indios, no la de los blancos ni los mestizos. Termina con la perspectiva indígena. Los indios desempeñan dos

papeles según la perspectiva de los blancos y los mestizos: trabajadores explotados y obstáculos no civilizados. Sin embargo, con este final, Icaza parece sugerir que ahora los indios han escogido un papel nuevo promoviendo su causa. Ahora tienen su propia causa—su propia idea de progreso para que pueden luchar. El progreso para ellos es la justicia. Entonces, el papel nuevo de los indios es luchador para la justicia.

Conclusión

La novela *Huasipungo* atrajo la atención de la sociedad ecuatoriana y del público internacional a la injusticia fuerte entre las clases sociales y las razas diferentes. Zum Felde (1964) explica el impacto chocante del libro durante el tiempo de publicación y hoy en día: "Pero en ninguna, como en *Huasipungo*, se halla un trasunto documental tan crudamente patético de esa realidad y, por ello, de una fuerza impresionante y convincente más directa" (p. 225). Icaza retrata la vida indígena con imágenes terribles con propósito de hablar en contra la explotación de las clases bajas en el nombre de progreso. Los acontecimientos en la hacienda de Cuchitambo y el pueblo Tomachi demuestran cómo los blancos deciden una imagen del desarrollo y la siguen sin pensamiento en cómo afecta a los indios. Para los de la alta sociedad, los indios no merecen la atención excepto para ordenar o castigar.

El indio en la novela varía entre dos papeles: trabajador bajo las órdenes del patrón y obstáculo para la realización de la visión blanca de progreso. Entonces, mientras los blancos consideran a los indios como barreras para el progreso económico, simultáneamente los necesitan para suplir la labor esencial para los cambios que quieren. Icaza presenta este contraste como una paradoja, subrayando el puesto del indio en la sociedad. Cuando trabajan para realizar las metas de los blancos sin protestar, son útiles. Sin embargo, cuando empiezan a demonstrar su

habilidad de pensar y tomar decisiones, se asustan los blancos. Cuando se forman sus propias ideas, los indios se convierten en una amenaza grave para los intereses de la elite.

Al fin del libro, sin embargo, Icaza sugiere que tal vez haya otro papel potencial del indio: luchador en la batalla contra la injusticia social. Los indios cambian de la sumisión a la acción cuando amenazan sus huasipungos. Icaza aparece sugerir que para empezar a luchar contra la clase explotadora, se necesita algún punto de ruptura cuando los indios finalmente se unen para desafiar la dominación y explotación que han soportado para siglos. Aunque la rebelión por último es un fracaso, las últimas palabras de resistencia (Ñucanchic huasipungo) proveen la esperanza. Con este fin de la novela, el autor indica que no es completamente un fracaso, sino el primer paso en una lucha larga para la igualdad. Encuentran su voz.

Según José Carlos Mariátegui, la responsabilidad del escritor indigenista es ser la voz del indio hasta que pueda encontrar su propio voz. Mariátegui (1928) explica la diferencia importante de la literatura indigenista y indígena:

> La literatura indigenista no puede darnos una versión rigurosamente verista del indio. Tiene que idealizarlo y estilizarlo. Tampoco puede darnos su propio ánima. Es todavía una literatura de mestizos. Por eso se llama indigenista y no indígena. Una literatura indígena, si debe venir, vendrá a su tiempo. Cuando los propios indios estén en grado de producirla. (p. 275)

Mariátegui insiste que los indigenistas tienen que representar al indio primero para que eventualmente pueda representar su mismo culturalmente y políticamente. Icaza alude a esta creencia al fin de *Huasipungo*. Su trabajo, como autor, es representar el sufrimiento del indio. Al fin del libro, la última grita de los indios sugiere que, de alguna manera, Icaza alcanza su meta. Los indios encuentran su voz para tomar control sobre su propio movimiento.

Huasipungo como obra indigenista intenta cambiar las perspectivas de los blancos y los mestizos hacia el indio. Icaza no solamente quiere chocar a los lectores con una representación terrible de la vida del indio, sino también intenta mostrar que el Indio en la sociedad no necesita desempeñar su papel de trabajador explotado ni obstáculo fastidioso. Al contrario, Icaza sugiere que en el camino de progreso se puede incluir al indio justamente. Para el progreso verdadero, todas las clases en la sociedad ecuatoriana necesitan contribuir al diseño de la visión y participar en su implementación.

La novela *Huasipungo* y su retrato de la sociedad ecuatoriana al principio del siglo veinte tiene importancia para mi trabajo porque muestra la opresión y la injusticia grave que tenían que enfrentar los indios para eventualmente lograr los derechos fundamentales. Al fin de la novela, los indios encuentran su voz. Finalmente empiezan a luchar contra los papeles opresivos de la jerarquía social desigual y se convierten en protagonista de su propia vida. El desarrollo de la Educación Intercultural Bilingüe refleja esta misma historia. Al principio, la educación para los indios era impuesta por los blancos para asimilarlos. La idea de una educación indígena propia empezó como solamente un sueño de algunos hasta los años setenta y ochenta cuando finalmente ganó espacio social y político el movimiento indígena. Hoy en día, aunque la administración actual tiene una relación mala con el movimiento indígena, no se puede negar su progreso. Han logrado los indios la representación política y el reconocimiento de sus lenguajes, sus culturas y el derecho de su propia educación en la nueva constitución.

Aunque la situación ha mejorado significativamente para los indios desde el periodo de *Huasipungo*, permanecen los recuerdos de un pasado de opresión. Los indios todavía enfrentan la discriminación y se queda un estigma sobre sus culturas y lenguajes. La pérdida de sus idiomas se puede atribuir a esta historia de opresión. Permanecen las actitudes negativas cerca

del uso de los idiomas indígenas aun en las comunidades indígenas mismas. Por eso, la revitalización de las lenguas indígenas representa una lucha contemporánea contra la injusticia del pasado. La recuperación de las culturas y los lenguajes de los grupos históricamente marginalizados es un paso importante para lograr la verdadera igualdad en la sociedad ecuatoriana. Representa un paso para reclamar su lenguaje, y con esto, su voz.

CONCLUSION

There is Hope for Quichua

Originally motivated by the inconsistencies between policy and practice I witnessed in the San Clemente school, I began this project with a specific question in mind: How well is the Intercultural Bilingual Education Program meeting proven linguistic and educational practices, and what conditions are helping or hindering its ability to promote language revitalization? A comparison of the program with best practices for language revitalization and bilingual education indicates that IBE has some strengths, but also significant weaknesses. The biggest strength of IBE under the current administration is its intercultural rhetoric. It is framing linguistic diversity in a positive light, addressing deeply-held negative language attitudes. However, it is unable to maintain indigenous support and is failing to adequately allocate the resources that communities and teachers need to implement the program locally.

To arrive at this conclusion, I first examine the development of the Intercultural Bilingual Education System. It began as a proposal of the indigenous movement in the 1980s and eventually became an established part of the public education system. This represents significant progress for a historically marginalized community. Constitutional and policy changes now guarantee bilingual education to all indigenous students regardless of geographic, ethnic, or economic characteristics. Despite these promising changes, however, recent political analyses of IBE suggest that it is failing to meet the expectations of indigenous groups. The current administration under Rafael Correa has not been receptive to input from indigenous groups on educational policy. The new Intercultural Education Law hampers the autonomy of indigenous groups in the DINEIB, weakening their control over an education system originally designed by

and for them. As Directorate control of the IBE Program shift from indigenous hands into the hands of politicians unfamiliar with the indigenous goals for bilingual education, researchers suggest that it may be hindering the self-determination of indigenous groups on the national level. If indigenous groups are not involved at the political level, educational policies may not reflect and respond to the linguistic and cultural characteristics of indigenous communities. The implications for indigenous participation given the current political environment are clear. Less clear are the implications for language revitalization. What do these changes in IBE policy mean for its potential to reverse Quichua language shift? I take a linguistic perspective in Chapter Two to attempt to answer this question.

Intercultural Bilingual Education up to now has been a semi-effective form of language planning. If IBE better reflected the nature of language revitalization, however, it may have a much stronger impact because of its potential to reach thousands of schools. Intergenerational transmission is arguably the most crucial determinant of language loss or revitalization, and this happens within the household. Therefore, for IBE to reverse Quichua language shift, it needs to encourage community participation and support. Language attitudes are also a critical determinant of decisions about language use. Thus, policies to reverse language shift may do well to promote positive language attitudes. In Ecuador, the new Constitution and LOEI have sparked a growing discussion about interculturalism and equality. For a country that for years has promoted an assimilationist education system and the repression of indigenous cultures, an explicit declaration of interculturalism and multilingualism in education is a significant step forward. In recent years, Quichua and other indigenous languages have become "a public symbol of empowerment" and pride in some communities (King and Haboud, 2002, p. 409). Attitudes may be shifting—albeit slowly—in a positive direction for linguistic diversity.

The conditions that are favorable for language revitalization—community participation and positive language attitudes—are related, but not identical, to the conditions that favor a bilingual education program in schools. Because IBE is not just any language revitalization project, but a bilingual education system that is implemented in thousands of communities throughout the country, it should also meet proven best educational practices. Intercultural Bilingual Education on the national level requires sufficient resources and teachers to support and staff local schools. A lack of bilingual resources, financial support, and trained teachers can block IBE implementation entirely. The school in San Clemente is an example of this. Even with sufficient top-down support, however, the success of IBE is not a guarantee. Successful bilingual education relies on specific local conditions. While variations between communities make it difficult to determine how well these local conditions are being met in Ecuador, successful examples point to two critical community-based factors: an additive bilingual model and a curricula that reflects local realities. Especially given the inconsistent resources and support provided by IBE from above, community participation becomes critical to make up for scarce resources and to encourage language learning both in and outside of the school environment. Bilingual education needs to be shaped to meet the local linguistic and cultural environment, which requires the community to be involved in determining the best bilingual model to promote language learning and a curriculum that incorporates their culture and ways of knowing.

Intercultural Bilingual Education in Ecuador is currently experiencing political changes that make it difficult to draw exact conclusions about the program's potential. An important strength of the IBE program is its incorporation into part of the national public education system under the promise—albeit unfulfilled—of bilingual education for all indigenous students. Another critical strength of the program is its intercultural rhetoric that is slowly helping to

minimize the stigma surrounding indigenous languages. The weakness of IBE, however, are abundant, beginning with serious problems with implementation. There is a serious lack of resources, financial support, and available bilingual teachers. Also, indigenous participation in national policy decisions may be decreasing under the current administration, threatening the power of indigenous groups over their own education. Possibly the most important determinants of program effectiveness, however, are almost impossible to judge because they vary by community. Both literature on language revitalization and on bilingual education emphasize the importance of community decisions about language use and program design.

I am ultimately able to answer my original question with a qualified "There's hope." IBE is meeting some, but definitely not all, of the conditions that promote language revitalization through bilingual education. Progress is slow, however. And changing language patterns is even slower. Intercultural Bilingual Education in Ecuador has experienced undeniable progress, and as the analysis of *Huasipungo* illustrates, so have indigenous groups as determinants in their own education. Progress is far from complete, as the many weaknesses in IBE demonstrate. The tension between the current administration and indigenous groups may be a minor setback, but I would argue that the shifting rhetoric in the new Constitution and the growing prominence of indigenous languages in society is part of an even bigger step forward. The future of indigenous languages like Quichua may at times appear bleak, but after enduring centuries of explicit oppression and discrimination, indigenous nationalities in Ecuador have proven to be resilient in their fight to maintain and promote their cultures and languages. However, the responsibility of language revitalization should not rest solely in the hands of indigenous communities. After all, they are not to blame for the years of political, cultural, and linguistic oppression that has ultimately caused their languages to become endangered. This is why Intercultural Bilingual

Education is promising. It represents the entire country—both national and local actors—recognizing the value of, and taking responsibility for, indigenous language revitalization.

REFERENCES

Adoun, J. E. (1981). Huasipungo: el indio, persona o personaje. *Casa de las Américas*, 22(127), 22-29.

Alegría, F. (1959). *Breve historia de la novela hispanoamericana*. México: Ediciones de Andrea.

Araujo, M. D. & Bramwell, D. (2015). Cambios en la política educativa en Ecuador desde el año 2000. Paper commissioned for the *Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2015, Education for All 2000-2015: achievements and challenges*. UNESCO.

Becker, M. (2011a). Correa, Indigenous Movements, and the Writing of a New Constitution in Ecuador. *Latin American Perspectives*, 38(1), 47-62.

Becker, M. (2011b) *¡Pachakuchik! Indigenous Movements and Electoral Politics in Ecuador*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Becker, M. (2012). The Limits of "Indigenismo" in Ecuador. *Latin American Perspectives*, 39(5), 45-62.

Becker, M. (2013). The Stormy Relations between Rafael Correa and Social Movements in Ecuador. *Latin American Perspectives*, 40(3), 43-62.

Benson, C. J. (2002). Real and Potential Benefits of Bilingual Programmes in Developing Countries. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 5(6), 303-317.

Benson, C. (2004). Do We Expect Too Much of Bilingual Teachers? Bilingual Teaching in Developing Countries. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 7(2-3), 204-221.

Chaluiza, O. (2006). Guía para la enseñanza de conceptos matemáticos en el Primer Ciclo de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe. In *Historias Desde el Aula. Educación Intercultural Bilingüe y Etnoeducación en Ecuador.* (71-78). Quito: Abya-Yala.

Conaghan, C. M. (2008). Ecuador: Correa's Plebiscitary Presidency. *Journal of Democracy*, 19(2), 46-60.

Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador. (2012). *Proyecto Político para la Construcción del Estado Plurinacional. Propuesta desde la Visión de la CONAIE.*

Constitución de la República del Ecuador. (1979)

Constitución de la República del Ecuador. (2008)

Cortina, R. (2014). Partnerships to Promote the Education of Indigenous Citizens. In R. Cortina (Ed.), *The Education of Indigenous Citizens in Latin America* (pp. 50-73). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cotacachi, M. (1996). Attitudes of teachers, students and parents toward bilingual intercultural education. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom up* (pp. 285-298). Contributions to the Sociology of Language. Berlin: Mounton de Gruyter.

Dosh, P. & Kilgerman, N. (2009). Correa vs. Social Movements: Showdown in Ecuador. *NACLA Report on the Americas,* 42(5), 21-24.

Dulsey, B. (1961). Jorge Icaza and His Ecuador. *Hispania*, 44(1), 99-102.

Dutcher, N. (2001). Expanding Educational Opportunity in Linguistically Diverse Societies. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, ERIC.

Fishman, Joshua A. (2001a). From Theory to Practice (and Vice Versa): Review, Reconsideration, and Reiteration. In C*an Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective*, edited by Joshua A. Fishman, 451-483. Clevendon:Multilingual Matters, 2001.

Fishman, Joshua A. (2001b). Why is it so Hard to Save Threatened Languages? (A Perspective on the Cases that Follow). In *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective*, edited by Joshua A. Fishman, 1-21. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters, 2001.

García, M. E. (2005). *Making Indigenous Citizens: Identity, Development, and Multicultural Activism in Peru*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Gómez, I. & Agualongo, J. (2006). La oralidad en la Unidad Educativa Intercultural Bilingüe 'Tránsito Amaguaña.' In *Historias Desde el Aula. Educación Intercultural Bilingüe y Etnoeducación en Ecuador.* (37-50). Quito: Abya-Yala.

Gustafson, B. (2014). Intercultural Bilingual Education in the Andes: Political Change, New Challenges, and Future Directions. In R. Cortina (Ed.), *The Education of Indigenous Citizens in Latin America* (74-97). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Haboud, M. (2004). Quichua language vitality: an Ecuadorian perspective. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 167, 69-81.

Hale, C. R. (2004). Rethinking Indigenous Politics in the Era of 'Indio Permitido'. *Report on Race, Part 1. NACLA Report on the Americas*.

Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Language planning from the bottom up. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom up* (357-366). Contributions to the Sociology of Language. Berlin: Mounton de Gruyter.

Hornberger, N. H. (2000). Bilingual Education Policy and Practice in the Andes: Ideological Paradox and Intercultural Possibility. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 31(2), 173-201.

Hornberger, N. H. (2008). Introduction: Can Schools Save Indigenous Languages? Policy and Practice on Four Continents. In N. H. Hornberger (ed.), *Can Schools Save Indigenous Languages? Policy and Practice on Four Continents* (1-12). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hornberger, N. H. (2014). La educación multilingüe, política y práctica: Diez certezas. In Lepe, L. M. & Rebolledo, N. (Eds.), *Educación bilingüe y políticas de revitalización de Lenguas Indígenas* (235-261). Quito, Ecuador: Editorial Abya-Yala.

Hornberger, N. H. & King, K. A. (1996). Bringing the language forward: school-based initiatives for Quechua language revitalization in Ecuador and Bolivia. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom up* (299-319). Contributions to the Sociology of Language. Berlin: Mounton de Gruyter.

Hornberger, N. H. & King, K. A. (2001). Reversing Quechua Language Shift in South America. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective* (166-194). Clevendon: Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N. H. & Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2004). Quechua language shift, maintenance, and revitalization in the Andes: the case for language planning. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 167, 9-67.

Icaza, J. (1934). *Huasipungo*. Quito, Ecuador: Eduardo Viteri Guzman.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censo (INEC). (2010). *Resultados del Censo 2010*. Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censo. http://www.ecuadorencifras.gob.ec/resultados/

Isch López, E. (2011). Las actuales propuestas y desafíos en educación: El caso ecuatoriano. *Educaçao & Sociedade* 32(115), 373-391.

King, K. A. (2001). *Language Revitalization Processes and Prospects: Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 24. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

King, K. (2004). Language Policy and Local Planning in South America: New Directions for Enrichment Bilingual Education in the Andes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 7(5), 334-347.

King, K. A. & Benson, C. (2004). Indigenous Language Education in Bolivia and Ecuador: Contexts, Changes, and Challenges. In Tollefson, J. W. & Tsul, A. B. M. (Eds.), *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* (241-261). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

King, K. A. & Haboud, M. (2002). Language Planning and Policy in Ecuador. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 3(4), 359-424.

King, K. A. & Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Quechua as a Lingua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26, 177-194.

Krauss, M. (1992). The world's languages in crisis. *Language* 68, 4-10.

Ley Orgánica de Educación Intercultural. (2011). Ministerio de Educación.

Lopez, L. E. (2008). Top-down and Bottom-up: Counterpoised Visions of Bilingual Intercultural Education in Latin America. In Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.), *Can Schools Save Indigenous Languages? Policy and Practice on Four Continents* (42-65). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

López, L. E. (2009). Reaching the unreached: indigenous intercultural bilingual education in Latin America. Paper commissioned for the *Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2010: Reaching the marginalized.* UNESCO.

López, L. E. (2014). Indigenous Intercultural Bilingual Education in Latin America: Widening Gaps between Policy and Practice. In Cortina, R. (Ed.), The *Education of Indigenous Citizens in Latin America* (19-49). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lucero, J. A. (2008). *Struggles of Voice: The Politics of Indigenous Representation in the Andes.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Malone, D. L. (2003). Developing Curriculum Materials for Endangered Language Education: Lessons from the Field. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 6(5), 332-348.

Mariátegui, J. C. (1928). *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana*. Lima: Biblioteca Amauta.

Martínez Novo, C. (2013). The Backlash against Indigenous Rights in Ecuador's Citizen's Revolution. In Eisenstadt, T. A., Danielson, M. S., Bailón Corres, M. J., & Sorroza Polo, C. (Eds.), *Latin America's Multicultural Movements: The Struggle Between Communitarianism, Autonomy, and Human Rights* (111-131). New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

Martínez Novo, C. (2014). "Managing Diversity in Postneoliberal Ecuador." *The Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 19(1), 103-125.

Mijeski, K. J. & Beck, S. H. (2008). "The Electoral Fortunes of Ecuador's Pachakutik Party: The Fracaso of the 2006 Presidential Elections." *The Latin Americanist* 52(2), 41-59.

Ministerio Coordinador de Patrimonio. (date) *Nacionalidades y Pueblos Indígenas, y políticas interculturales en Ecuador: Una mirada desde la educación*. (41-56).

Ministerio de Educación. (2013). *MOSEIB: Modelo del Sistema de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*. Quito, Ecuador: Ministerio de Educación del Ecuador.

Montaluisa, L. (2010). *Taptana Montaluisa*. Quito.

Oviedo, A. & Wildemeersch, D. (2008). "Intercultural education and curricular diversification: the case of the Ecuadorian Intercultural Bilingual Education Model (MOSEIB)." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 38(4), 455-470. doi: 10.1080/03057920701860137

Ponce Jarrín, J. (2010). *Políticas educativas y desempeño: una evaluación de impacto de programas educativos focalizados en Ecuador*. Quito, Ecuador: FLASCO, Sede Ecuador.

Rindstedt, C. & Aronsson, K. (2002) Growing up Monolingual in a Bilingual Community: The Quichua Revitalization Paradox. *Language in Society* 31(5), 721-742.

Rebolledo Recendiz, N. (2014). Enseñanza de lenguas Indígenas y revitalización lingüística.

Una aproximación interdisciplinaria. In Lepe, L. M. & Rebolledo, N. (Eds.), *Educación bilingüe y políticas de revitalización de Lenguas Indígenas* (19-47). Quito, Ecuador: Editorial Abya-Yala.

Rodríguez, E. C. (2014). Qué tan interculturales han sido las políticas de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe (EIB)? Una reflexión sobre los casos de Bolivia y Ecuador. *Magistro* 8(15), 59-87.

Romaine, S. (2006). Planning for the survival of linguistic diversity. *Language Policy* 5, 441-473.

Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in Language Planning. *Journal of National Association of Bilingual Education* 8(2), 15-34.

Sacoto, A. (1991). Jorge Icaza: El indigenismo ecuatoriano. *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana*, 17(33), 253-259.

UNESCO. (2010). *Datos Mundiales de Educación*. 7th edition. 2010/2011.

UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages. (2003). *Language Vitality and Endangerment.* UNESCO Document.

Van Cott, D. L. (2005). *From Movements to Parties in Latin America: The Evolution of Ethnic Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Vara, A. M. (2013). *Sangre que se nos va: Naturaleza, literatura y protesta social en América Latina*. Sevilla: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Vélez, C. (2007). Trayectoria de la educación intercultural en Ecuador. Paper presented at the *VIII Congreso Iberoamericano de Historia de la Educación Latinoamericana "Contactos, cruces y luchas en la historia de la educación latinoamericana,"* Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Zum Felde, A. (1964). *La narrativa en hispanoamerica*. Madrid: Aguilar.

APPENDIX A
Entrevista con Rafael Pulpiales
16 de abril 2015

Cuando fue fundado la escuela, y por quien?

Rafael Pulpiales: No me acuerdo la fecha o el año, también exactamente. Pero yo soy el fundador. Antes de yo soy profesor…como un alfabetizador no más por las escuelas radiofónicas aquí en el Ecuador. Entonces comencé yo no fundando en la escuela sino que haciendo funcionar una clase con los niños de la comunidad en una casa que yo vivía abajo. Esta casa es comprado, es recientemente no puedo decir. Pero la casa donde yo tenía era de mi papa y como mi papa era empleado de la hacienda, analfabeta. Sí pero trabajaba[…]Entonces allí fue que yo hice un local para alfabetizar por el radio. Entonces, en ese local fue que fundé yo, haciéndome como profesor. Pero en este tiempo no era estudiado de nada, era una persona de quinto grado nada más. Entonces comencé con veintiuno alumnos. Después de algunos meses de funcionar conmigo ya apareció una profesora que solicitamos a la dirección provincial. Entonces llegó una profesora que llamaba Inés Obando. Esa fue la primero profesional que ya comenzó como profesora. Pero yo como profesor auxiliar fue yo que comencé con los niños de la comunidad a dar las clases. Pero exactamente no recuerdo en que año fue, pero más o menos es en el año 1972.

A mi me gustaba a trabajar. Entonces viendo lo que trabajan. Entonces las instituciones veían y me decían 'que es lo que necesitan?' En ese momento estaba funcionando en mi casa.

Todavía existe un […] que dice Escuelas Radiofónicas Bruselas. Lleva ese nombre Bruselas porque nos apoyaron los de Bélgica. Por eso pusimos ese nombre. Es la escuela radiofónica esa casa. Allí nació la escuela fiscal. Comenzamos.

Después, no me acuerdo cuantos años funcionaba allí. Pero viendo que la comunidad avanzaba mucho con esa necesidad. En seguir, nos llevó las estructuras para hacer la casa acá donde es la escuela. La primera casita que es la primera escuela que hicimos. Es la primer escuela.

Había muchas ayudas no? Por el caso de que un dirigente esta trabajando por la comunidad. El apoyo era de todo lado. Rapadísimo la bodega. Teníamos también la casa comunal. Pero en eses años era un apuro, un trabajo para la comunidad, no? Muchos trabajos. Pero hoy como gente joven, claro que les va por sus intereses no mas. Pero gentes mayores, más mayores que mí, ahorita se acabaron. Me ven ustedes mi edad. Yo era recién de veinte años que comencé a trabajar. Entonces ahora que ya tengo setenta y cinco años, han pasado muchos años. La gente mayor ya se acabaron. Entonces ahora existe gente joven pero conmigo no quieren comprender nada. Un poco […] así pero no digo todos sino que muy pocos que son así. Para mí, muy bastante la vez anterior les contaba que las escuelas radiofónicas aquí en el país eran fundados por Monsieur Proaño. Entonces yo era alfabetizador pero veinte años que trabajaba con él, me maduró la conciencia muy madura mismo. Y hasta ahora conservo esto. Entonces, para mí era que la única arma para la lucha era la educación. Con la educación ya se puede defender todo. A eso voy yo. Porque ya viejo yo también puse a estudiar, ya con mi señora, agradezco a mi señora, que mi señora me apoyó como una madre para yo poder estudiar. Me casé sin haber estudiado

nada. Pero comencé a estudiar, fundé la escuela aquí, fundé el colegio […] también aquí en la comunidad. Y también era yo el fundador de […] en Ibarra como yo primer alumno así. Pero todas las cosas que se comienzan eran hasta terminar.

Entonces hasta en el año 2002, estuve graduando de la licenciado. Mi profesor que me gustó mucho de la historia de Monsieur Proaño, las experiencias que el tenía con la educación. Ese era una arma. No arma en las manos sino que arma en la mente, en el corazón.

Después, ya aparecieron por la escuela unos profesores, unos, otros. Yo también como estudiante, gradué de profesor. Comencé a trabajar. Cambió un poco el sistema educativo aquí. Si hubiera seguido solo yo no más, si hubiera nombrado a mi un profesor aquí en la comunidad San Clemente, ya sería una maravilla como en la propia comunidad. Pero no se pudo hacer porque yo también era encargado de otra comunidad como profesor. Yo comencé en el año 1995. Me dieron ya para trabajar con las escuelas.

Para mi era muy, muy, muy importante la educación bilingüe. La educación bilingüe he hecho bastante cosas que usted le conversé. Las clases mismas no eran teóricos sino prácticos con todas las realidades de la comunidad.

Pero después ya comenzaron aquí la gente preparándose para el colegio, universidades, así. Pero aislamos un poco mi escuela en el otro lado. Acá la comunidad siguieron otro…fue un poco desvío por las personas que sintieron que son estudiados. Pero no eran estudiados por los demás sino que para uno. Ese fue el problema. Hasta ahora no sé como, porque yo exigía este, que la educación bilingüe yo le hace […]. Entonces, pero la gente aquí un poco que ya sabían. No comprendieron.

Eso fue la historia de lo que era la escuela aquí en San Clemente. Y antes claro que no había nada. No teníamos este centro que hoy es la escuela. Este lugarcito no era. Era de la hacienda. Entonces solamente como era […] de la hacienda. Nuestra casa también no era de nosotros. Era de la hacienda como nosotros éramos peones de la hacienda. Por eso fue que yo hice una casita para las escuelas radiofónicas abajo donde vivía más antes. Entonces, allí le hice un cuarto, por eso que me ayudaron los de Bélgica a construir la casita. Por eso llevaba ese nombre de las escuelas radiofónicas Bruselas. De allí nació. el nombre por ejemplo que es Patricio Espinoza Bermeo no es el nombre que nosotros pusimos. Era un supervisor de la dirección provincial se llamaba Edgar Gervais. Entonces él, volándonos, entregaban cosas para la construcción de la escuela, con talleres, todo así. Pero el gusto de lo que él podía entregar no más. No porque necesitábamos. Y el nombre lo mismo el puso. No sé quien es Patricio Espinosa Bermeo. Hasta ahora no sabemos. Ni saben nadie quien fue porque no los han visitado un patrón de este nombre nadie.

El supervisor Edgar Gervais, primeramente nos indicaron a todos los dirigentes de las comunidades, nos llevaron, formaron una nuclearización. Entonces toda la zona era nuclear de Rumibamba. Donde necesitaban la escuela, pero volando, es que no teníamos la escuela. Yo haciendo las clases en mi casa. Volando, rapidísimo. Y la gente como era, la gente mayor, pero bien comprendidos. No les importaba el trabajo de la casa sino el trabajo de la comunidad. Las estructuras extrajimos desde Chiruazi, cargado estaba. Como no teníamos camino nada. Pero

cuando comencé a trabajar entonces abrió. Por ejemplo este camino por aquí a Imbabura. Esta tierra era de la hacienda. Entonces yo me puse al frente compramos estas tierras que son 107 […]. Compramos con la comunidad. Entonces el camino viendo que nosotros trabajábamos bien unidos la comunidad. Entonces el ministerio de agricultura ya nos dieron maquinarias para sacar el camino y todo, la escuela, la luz. Pero volando en esos años cuando yo fue dirigente. El agua lo mismo de Imbabura.

Así le digo ahora en las reuniones. Le digo que ahora ya no tiene nada que hacer. Tenemos aqua, tenemos camino, tenemos luz, tenemos transporte, todo eso. Entonces no tiene nada que hacer. Sea por eso que hacen trabajos individuales.

Tengo todavía en la mente lo que yo hice, y como colaboraron las autoridades. En estos tiempos no era que yo pasaba a oficios solicitando, no. Es como conocían a mí entonces. Pero sabían que estamos haciendo, venían a preguntar. Decían, que necesitan. En ese momento decíamos esto. Para traer el agua de arriba lo mismo. Yo era el principal que yo iba al monte arriba a buscar el agua. Donde está. Donde esta vistiendo un poquito hacer una coche a coger a […]. Sin solicitarles. Y así fue la escuela.

Cuando era director y cuando cambió a otro director?

Pulpiales: De la escuela, no era director. No era todavía legal. Yo reunía los niños de la comunidad para seguir dando clases no mas. No eran profesores nada. Por eso ya viendo esto este señor Edgar Gervais era quien ya vio la necesidad de la escuela, por eso el apoyo de la estructura, todo eso. Por eso digo tal vez que funciona un año abajo en mi escuela, en mi casa.

Y cuando ya contruyeron así, quien fue primer director?

Pulpiales: No era director. Era una escuela unitaria. Era la Señorita profesora Ines Obando.

Y ella, de donde era?

Pulpiales: De Ibarra.

En que año más o menos será?

Pulpiales: 1973.

Y cuanto tiempo fue unidocente?

Pulpiales: Cinco años. Después ya viendo la necesidad, con más alumnos, vinieron otros profesores. Ya hasta cuatro cinco profesores que avanzaron. Después, de disminuyó. Nuevamente bajo a tres.
…
La comprensión de los padres de familia era una buena cosa, una maravilla. Viendo que los niños, ellos mismos no iban a otra escuela, pero aquí ya comenzamos las clases. Pero [] la colaboración. Es como estaba diciendo las escuelas radiofónicas abajo en mi casa. Pero hicimos

volando. Para alfabetizar a los adultos. Eran en mi casa. No era siquiera mi casa sino casa de mi papa. [……] cuarto grande. Como tenía setenta y cinco alumnos. Eran de Chiriwazi, San Clemente, Naranjita, y algunos de la Esperanza también subieron.

Aunque había escuelas allí, venían a la radiofónica.

Pulpiales: Claro, alfabetización. Sí, gente mayor. Después de unos seis años de alfabetización por la radio, allí comencé a hacer clases con los chiquitos.

Hasta que año dio la alfabetización?

Pulpiales: Yo estuve dentro de ese sistema hasta 1982. Yo comencé en los años 1964. No, desde 1963, 3 de noviembre. Yo desde agosto, no de julio a noviembre fue […] a Colombia. Regresé y ya comencé a trabajar con la alfabetización con la radio.

Con la alfabetización, todos eran mayores?

Pulpiales: Sí, mayors. Era mezclado, como ya jóvenes de ocho o diez mas años hasta 40, 50 años de edad veníamos. 75 alumnos. Claro que yo como alfabetizador siempre nos capacitaban en Riobamba. Pero eso me sirvió para como que ya tengo capacidad para seguir con los niños ya había la escuela.

Esas capacitaciones en Riobamba eran de Monsieur Proaño?

Pulpiales: Claro. Desde 1963 hasta 1982, estuve con Monsieur Proaño. Eso fue la buena acogida de las experiencias de Monsieur Proaño Y eso me queda en la mente, en mi corazón, en todo, servidor[¿] para la gente. No he sido capaz de hacerme un individual, egoísmo, no. Siempre he sido al servicio.

La escuela siempre era una escuela pública?

Pulpiales: Inmediatamente cuando nos diera profesora, entonces ya estaba ya legalmente escuela del estado. El estado dio la profesora. También venían los alumnos de Naranjito porque ya no había escuela.. Venían se unificaron acá. Con eso también fue más incremente de profesores. Cuando ya construyeron la escuela […]. Venían de Chiriwazi.
Claro eso digo yo, porque a la comunidad mismo lo querían. Porque con mi dirigencia, era que funcionaba, todos los aspectos, programas recreativos, todos le gustaban aquí en San Clemente. Por eso es que venían de otras comunidades acá a San Clemente.

Por ejemplo para el Inti Raymi—ojala usted vea lo que es el Inti Raymi—y también los años viejos. La única comunidad era aquí que hace programas. Pero en todo programa viene comunidades de toda la zona. Pero pasábamos con los programas con cosas de presentación.

APPENDIX B
Entrevista con Merian
15 de abril 2015

Yo sé que todavía no sabes mucho de la historia, pero hay algunas cosas que sabe?

Merian: Lo que hemos investigado es que…en el 1976, allí sacamos el papel de la creación de la escuela. El 26 de octubre de 1976 es creada la escuela. Pero anteriormente, no había donde hacer la escuelita. Era todo esto una sola hacienda. Entonces después les fueron repartiendo pedacitos a cada uno los guacipungos que decían. Desde allí empezaron aquí. Habían más o menos visto que es algo central a toda la comunidad y organizaron una casita para que allí estudien. Pero al principio iniciaron con clases radiofónicas, mediante radio. El creador de eso, creo que fue papa de quien es ahora de la junta parroquial. Don Rafael Pulpiales. Él había empezado con eso. Entonces después fueron ya avanzando un poco más y ya fueron creando la escuela haciéndolo mediante las organizaciones, la ayuda gubernamental fueron haciendo la escuela. Poco a poco, mediante mingas, ayuda de los papas, de toda la comunidad. Fue creándose la escuelita y siempre fue pocos niños hasta ahora. Ahora menos asi que dicen que se va acabar la escuela, entonces apoyaron a llevar al centro sus hijos y por eso se esta acabando la educación aquí. Pero no porque el gobierno ha dicho que va a cerar la escuela. Por la distancia que tiene de escuela a escuela no hay […]. Se perdujicaria a los niños porque vienen de muy lejos y trasladarse mas lejos es imposible. Entonces es aquí sigue quedándose la escuela. Mas bien lo que seria, mientras mas niños que hay, mas maestros ponen. Pero si hay menos niños, quitan a los maestros y asi esta que se cierran la escuela. Pero en ese caso ya no seria culpa ni del gobierno ni de maestros sino de los mismos de la comunidad

Siempre había tres profesores?

Merian: No, en el pasado, hasta cinco maestros. Casi completaba la escuela. Pero como siempre han ido, les ponen en el centro porque dicen que es una mejor educación, por muchas cosas que antes de verdad se veía cosas que no estaban bien de las maestras. Entonces ellos mandaban sacando las maestros…maestros vagos…tenían razón los papitos.

Como es la relación entre la escuela y el gobierno? El distrito provee materiales?

Merian: A pesar de que la escuelita no tiene la escritura de la escuela es como que no existiera. pero como ven que hay niños y maestros aquí. Entonces si nos colaboran. Siempre nos han colaborado. Siempre nos dan una pequeña parte aunque sea, pero siempre nos han dado. Eso viene un fondo rotativo que les dan al centro de las escuelitas. Hay un circuito. Este circuito se encarga de ver que necesidades tiene cada escuelita y repartir este fondo de acuerda a las necesidades que tengan. Puede ser aguanto económico, puede ser, por ejemplo vidrios. Lo que hago es tomar fotografía y mediante una solicitud, y decir que tengo tantos vidrios rotos…Nos envían. Igual nos han dotado material de oficina, material de aseo, como cloro, desinfectantes, papeles, cobas, copiadores. Todo eso siempre nos han dado. Siempre nos da el Estado mediante el distrito.

Había cambios después de la constitución nueva y la ley orgánica?

Merian: Casi sigue igual. Claro que es estructurado en una mejora. es mas organizado. Siempre el gobierno estaba pendiente de que mejore la educación. Ha mejorado mediante las pruebas de los maestros, mediante la promulgación de sueldos, todo lo demás. Aunque la paga es poco para los maestros. La peor de todas las profesiones.

Hay algunos desafíos o problemas que la escuela esta enfrentando ahora?

Merian: Desafíos, no. El problema si es la desconfianza de los papitos para venir a dejar sus hijos aquí. Seria el único porque les llevaron a muchos otros lugares
Todo es por internet. No puede estudiar en lugar lejos de la residencia. Por los pasajes, por la seguridad de los jóvenes mismos.

Hay un currículo nacional que siguen para todas las clases?

Merian: Si, es una sola. Eso es lo bueno. Tanto en el campo como en la ciudad utilizamos los mismos textos, la misma planificación, el mismo currículo. Todo lo que es educación. Todo es igual. Ya depende del maestros de cómo imparta sus clases. Pero todo tenemos la guía de maestro, todos igual. Como el gobierno se encarga de darnos a todos igual los libros, por ejemplo. Entonces todos seguimos el mismo proceso. Sino que aquí un poquito mas lentito por lo que tenemos tres grados. por eso es un poco mas lento. De allí es igual. Entonces al cambiar el niño de aquí a la ciudad es igual. No va tener problemas.

Hay exámenes anuales para todos los grados?

Merian: Claro. Cada parcial, cada bloque. Porque el libro tiene seis bloques de trabajo. Cada bloque, tenemos un determinado tiempo para dar el bloque. Cada bloque tiene su evaluación, su prueba. Al quimestre, se toma los tres primeros bloques.

Después del séptimo año aquí, todos van a las escuelas en Ibarra?

Merian: Claro, tienen que trasladarse a buscar un lugar donde a octavo, noveno, decimo, las demás, para seguir la educación. Aquí en la comunidad nadie se queda sin estudiar. Todos son estudiados. Siguen, continúan la educación. Entonces desde aquí tienen que ir a buscar

La escuela es pública, entonces gratuita?

Merian: Sí.

Hay problemas con la ausencia de los estudiantes?

Merian: Sí. El problema es que algunos faltan demasiado, incluso se hablo con los papitos, de que no les hagan faltar, pero es imposible.
Los niños que viven en San Cristóbal, ellos vienen dos días de la semana. A vez faltan un mes entero. Siempre hay un retraso, vacíos.

A causa de la distancia?

Merian: Si, puede ser la distancia. Cuando llueve

El gobierno manda a algo porque las clases son mandatarias?

Merian: Nos dicen que nivelan en las tardes. Pero si no vienen como se nivelan en las tardes? O si vienen un día en la semana. Es imposible. No hacen deberes, no traen cuadernos, es un desastre. No se puede. Pero el gobierno simplemente nos culpan a nosotros. El maestro tiene que ver, como enseñar. Pero es imposible. No se quedan en las tardes porque vienen el bus. El gobierno también no permite que les dejen de año por faltas.

Sabe algo sobre la escuela del Milenio en Rumibamba?

Merian: Lo que pasa es que para hacer la escuela del Milenio toca dinero del gobierno. Y ahorita no hay dinero. Entonces es imposible que se ponga crear una escuela del milenio. Entonces hasta que hagan esta escuela supuestamente para cuando será. La intención del gobierno es esa: Crear las escuelas del Milenio para que todos los estudiantes estén en un solo lugar. Pero esto es difícil hacer. Y sería muy lejos para muchos estudiantes. Entonces para hacer una escuela del Milenio, también tiene que dar transporte a todas las comunidades. Eso era el proyecto del circuito. Ir a recibir clases en la mañana en la escuela y tarde el colegio. La institución es grande. Sí, están hechas ya dos. En Guayaquil y Quito. En cambio, aquí no. Son bien distanciados los lugares.

Cuantos estudiantes hay?

Merian: 70 estudiantes.

Hay algunas cosas o eventos que tiene la escuela que promueven la cultura local?

Merian: Hace unos dos años, hicimos el concurso de cuentos en Quichua. Era para promover el idioma para que no se pierda. Que ya la mayoría ya no hablan. Quedamos campeones, ganamos el concurso.
Eso hicimos en cuanto la cultura y la comunidad.
De allí en cuanto sus costumbres, sus cosas, casi no. Lo que promovemos es su vestimenta, de que no cambien. Y sus costumbres, de esos se encargan la comunidad mismo de mantener eso. Los maestros, no. Lo que esta dentro de lo académico, sí. De que deben hacer deberes, de que deben seguir cultivando, de que deben saber el idioma, y de que en la casa traten de seguir con el idioma.

La escuela hace alguna actividad para inti raymi?

Merian: No. Antes, era centro de lo que entregaron en rama….No había dinero. Las familias. Ellos son los que organizan el programa, pero la escuela no. No participa en esto.

Como es la comunicación entre ustedes y la comunidad, los padres?

Merian: Si existe la relación no cuanto con los padres de familia desde familia. En cuanto con la comunidad, no, porque nosotros no asistimos las reuniones de ellos. Una por el horario que ellos se ponen, es un las noches, que es alejado de donde nosotros vivimos. Y otra porque no habido esa ocasión, no hemos participado en reuniones con ellos. Pero siempre que no han pedido la colaboración en cualquier cosa, si hemos colaborado la escuela con la comunidad. Pero de allí a nosotros integrarnos a la comunidad, no.

La comida preparada martes y jueves es donado por las familias o pagado por el gobierno?

Merian: Es de parte de los papitos, se ponen una cuota. Como es pequeña la cuota, no alcanza para todos los días. Entonces ellos optaron por hacer todos días de comida y los otros días la colada.
Es financiado por los padres mismos. Miércoles y viernes es del Estado—la colada y las galletas.

Para ustedes quienes tienen tres grados en la aula, tienen algunas estrategias que usan?

Merian: Nos toca planificar para trabajo autónomo. Trabajo con un grado y los otros dos trabajo autónomo, trabajo en aula. De allí, terminan ese, quedan evaluación. Paso al siguiente año, igual trabaja allí con el trabajo que empezó ya al inicio de la clase y de igual manera quedan con trabajo.

Todos los materiales son del gobierno?

Merian: Todo es del gobierno. Ahora es prohibido pedirles un libro. Todo tiene que ser usado lo que el gobierno nos da. Si necesita algo mas, un refuerzo, ya toca el maestro, hojas de trabajo. Solo los libros de textos.

Como es la participación de las familias?

Merian: Falta de participación. Ellos vienen trayendo pero es solamente como pago de la comida que quedaron una cuota. En vez de dar el dinero, vienen trayendo alguna parte de comida. Pero eso es como paga de la cuota. No es a parte de buena voluntad. Es como parte de pago. No hay colaboración. Especialmente de la comunidad a la escuela, no. Solo los papitos que se encargan de los hijos.

Como se determina el salario de los maestros?

Merian: Tenemos una escalafón de acuerdo a los años de servicio, de acuerdo a los títulos, de los años de estudio. De acuerdo a eso lo ubican en una tala de categorías. Desde la "J" hasta la "A"

Además del concurso de Quichua que mencionó, hacen algo mas con la lengua?

Merian: El idioma que antes había aquí. Pero con las generaciones, viendo que no utilizan el idioma en ningún lado, entonces dicen, ¿para que aprender eso? Entonces no quieren, los niños

[…..]. En cambio, los papitos dicen, no, hay que mantener el idioma. Esta es una cultura madre, hay que mantenerla. Pero, no. Ahora la mayoría de los niños ya no saben. Yo intenté a dar horas de Quichua en cual los papas no me prohibieron, pero si los niños. Por ejemplo, los mas grandecitos que estaban en séptimo dijeron, No, porque no nos dar mejor otra cosa, como Ingles, porque Quichua no nos interesa. Es una perdida de tiempo. Entonces, no.

Y el gobierno no manda nada?

Merian: Si hay escuelas Quichuas, mas que todo en el sector Otovalo, pero el problema es que no son profesores lingüistas. No saben como es la gramática de la escritura. Simplemente hablan Quichua. Nada mas. Pero no hay un origen, no hay un lingüista que sepa de cómo organizar bien una oración. Ellos simplemente hablan una mezcla. Usted haber visto que se mezclan el español con Quichua. Entonces como no hay profesoras lingüistas, no se da quichua. Porque si hubiera, así como los profesores de Ingles, así que se diera el idioma aquí.
No hay, entonces no nos pueden exigir, ni los papitos tampoco.

APPENDIX C
Entrevista con Jenny
14 de abril 2016

Hay algunos estudiantes aquí que, cuando vienen a las clases la primera vez en inicial, ellos saben español o solo Quichua?

Jenny: Los mas pequeñitos ya vienen de madres jóvenes, ya aprenden el español. Ellos saben mas español que quichua. Según lo que yo puedo observar aquí es que están perdiendo el idioma dentro de aquí. Pero los papas usan cualquier palabra les van indicando a los niños.

Entonces, no hay problemas cuando vienen los estudiantes.

Jenny: Los niños todos saben español.

Algunos de los libros tienen paginas de quichua. Ustedes las usan?

Jenny: hay algunas paginas de quichua que nosotros nos saltamos porque nosotros no somos docentes bilingües. Somos docentes solo de español. Por que antes se tomaba mucho en cuenta el idioma, hasta hoy se toma el gobierno…Pero justo en estas escuelas no tenían docentes. ¿Qué es lo que hizo el gobierno? El gobierno mandó a los docentes que estábamos disponibles, mandó aquí. Pero realmente están haciendo un currículo de quichua para que las escuelitas bilingües puedan actualizar y también participar en eso. Pero nosotros no somos bilingües.

Entonces es algo para el futuro? Van a tener profesores de quichua?

Jenny: Sí. Me imagino que sí nos van a [….]. La comunidad aquí…las personas mayores hablan en quichua. Por lo general se relacionan en español. Pero lo que trata el gobierno es de que no olviden toda su lengua nativa. Trata el gobierno de que no olviden, de que sigan manteniéndose. Por eso es que son escuelas bilingües. Pero en este momento no podemos porque había escasez de docentes. Nos hicieron pruebas, y para que no queden estas escuelas sin profesores, tuvimos que venir acá. Pero prácticamente nosotros no somos especializados en la otra idioma.

Para usted, cuales son algunas de los problemas, dificultades trabajando con los estudiantes.

Jenny: El primer problema que he visto es el descuido de aseo. Es un problema y es grave en toda la comunidad. Entonces nosotros hemos tratado de ayudarles. No es responsabilidad nuestra como docentes. La educación viene de la casa y allí tiene que aprender el deseo, tiene que aprender los buenos costumbres, tiene que aprender muchas cosas que se aprende dentro de la familia. Nosotros no estamos para indicarlos. Complementamos. Pero nosotros mas damos conocimientos.