
Language Policy and Education in the Andes

Marleen Haboud and Nicholas Limerick

Abstract

This chapter describes current formal bilingual intercultural educational programs throughout the central Andean region (Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru), focusing on both regional trends and developments of bilingual intercultural programs in each one of the abovementioned nation-states. After a brief historical overview, we discuss a number of recent transformations that are purported to offer inclusive education for Indigenous populations in the region. Some of the ongoing pressures, challenges, and expectations placed on language education are also discussed.

Keywords

Andes • Intercultural bilingual education • Multilingual education • Interculturalism • Indigenous languages

Contents

Introduction	2
Bolivia	3
Early Developments	3
Major Contributions	4
Ecuador	5
Early Developments	6
Major Contributions	7
Peru	8
Early Developments	8

M. Haboud (✉)

Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador, Proyecto Oralidad modernidad, Quito, Ecuador
e-mail: mhaboud@puce.edu.ec; mhaboud@yahoo.com

N. Limerick

Programs in Anthropology, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA
e-mail: nl2539@tc.columbia.edu

Major Contributions	10
Challenges and Future Directions	10
Cross-References	11
Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education	11
References	11

Introduction

This chapter analyzes language and education in Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru. In addition to sharing a common geography, these countries are known for overlapping linguistic and cultural groups, especially in regards to the Indigenous populations of each respective nation-state. Although statistics are controversial, official sources identify 34% of Ecuadorians, 37% of Peruvians, and 62% of Bolivians as Indigenous. There are estimated to be 36 Amerindian languages in Bolivia, 13 in Ecuador, and 68 in Peru (Haboud et al. 2016). Many Native communities still use their own languages. Although each country has preferences regarding the terminology used to name each language, in this chapter, we use Amerindian, Indigenous, originary, and ancestral as synonyms. Indigenous languages have been “officially” recognized in different ways across nation-states, proclaiming the importance of language use across social domains.

Formal education is compulsory in the three countries, and they have compromised to offer intercultural bilingual education (EIB) and to legally support local languages, identities, and cultures. Due to pressures generated with Indigenous movements and the transnational indigenist networks in the Andes that gained steam in the 1970s and 1980s, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru adopted different forms of intercultural bilingual education. These projects have tended to focus on the valorization of Indigenous cultures, respect for and dialogue across cultural diversity, and platforms for linguistic and cultural rights. EIB pedagogy has emphasized the incorporation of the history, values, and technologies of *pueblos Indígenas* (Indigenous peoples). EIB policies have also recognized the teaching of mother tongues with Spanish as the second language and increasingly also the teaching of foreign languages. There are language requirements for teachers who work in the EIB system, such as speaking Spanish and an Amerindian language of the community in which they teach. Despite such progressive policies, Indigenous languages across the Andes face extensive shift and are of limited use in formal education (Crevels 2012; Yataco 2015).

It is worth noting that official figures regarding literacy rates among 15–24-year-olds are as high as 98% for the three countries. As promising as these rates seem, they only refer to Spanish literacy. No similar information is found regarding literacy in Native languages.

Having briefly described language policy and education across the region, the next sections examine recent histories of linguistic and educational policies for each respective nation-state. We show that in spite of favorable conditions surrounding

education, there are profound gaps between policies and practices, oftentimes leading to the continued hispanization of Indigenous peoples.

Bolivia

Bolivia is often cited as one of the most linguistically and culturally diverse nation-states in the Americas. The 2009 Constitution recognizes 36 Indigenous languages, as well as Spanish, as official languages (Art. 5, I). It also institutionalizes Plurilingual Intercultural Intracultural Education (EIIP, formerly EIB) (Art. 30, II.12). Framed in the *Suma Qamaña* principle (Quechua: *to live correctly and well*), EIIP aims to promote intercultural and multilingual relations while reinforcing cultural identities and linguistic diversity. Nevertheless, Spanish is still the main language of instruction nationwide. Council of Assessment, Accreditation and Quality Education (ten listed for Bolivia), English, French, German, Italian, and Mandarin are taught in addition to Spanish.

Early Developments

Though Bolivia has increasingly promoted Indigenous languages and cultures, the use of various languages in education is not new. As early as 1926, President Siles created a so-called national “pro-Indian crusade” and a Pedagogical Rural Institute for Indigenous education. Such initiatives were short-lived, in part due to the resistance of elitist groups.

In the 1930s, Aymara leaders and a *mestiza* teacher developed a community-based school called Warisata. This program later became known throughout the world for providing bilingual education to Aymara students with a pedagogy inspired by community values and local Indigenous organizations (<http://www.katari.org/warisata-escuela-ayllu>). This program, however, which lasted until 1940, was the exception rather than the rule for locally initiated Indigenous schooling. In the 1950s, the National Revolution attempted to use formal education for the assimilation of Indigenous individuals into a national imaginary (Lazar 2010), bringing forth legislation such as the Education Act of 1955. This document proclaimed the importance of literacy campaigns in Indigenous languages “for the immediate learning of Spanish as an indispensable factor in national linguistic unification” (Von Gleich 1994, p. 91). Such policies of assimilation and hispanization continued in the 1960s and 1970s, mainly through the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), which had led education in the Amazonian region since the 1950s.

During these same decades, Latin American indigenists and missionaries began writing in Indigenous languages. The 1954 Interamerican Indigenist Conference adapted earlier work from SIL linguists, yielding a standardized alphabet for writing in Quechua and Aymara that would also travel to Peru (Hornberger 1993). A series of similar meetings in the region, now involving some Indigenous participants,

resulted in the official use of similar alphabets for varieties of Quechua across the nation-states. The Bolivian version of this alphabet was ratified in 1984, although contemporarily many Indigenous groups across the Andes reject a standardized alphabet as difficult and artificial. In the 1980s, cross-Andean influences sent 75 Indigenous individuals from Bolivia to Peru to study bilingual education and linguistics at the Experimental Bilingual Education Project of Puno (PEEB-P) (Jiménez Quishpe 2014). This came about with the introduction of organizations like UNICEF, which promoted education in Quechua, Aymara, and Guarani territories in Bolivia in the late 1980s (Hornberger and López 1998).

Accounts of Indigenous education in Bolivia often highlight the beginning of national-level EIB endeavors in the 1990s, a decade that marked increased mobilization of Indigenous groups. In the same years, the state restructured economic policies with support from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. These processes led to paradoxical outcomes, such as the official recognition of interculturalism and educational reform alongside increases in economic inequality for Indigenous citizens (Gustafson 2009). Despite such tensions, a wide-ranging effort to transform the educational system began, including teaching EIB and Indigenous languages in all of the schools of Bolivia. In 1994, a series of legal reforms such as the Education Reform Act (Law 1565) attempted to institutionalize a number of changes across the system. One such change was the establishment of the Educational Councils of Indigenous Peoples, which afforded a limited degree of responsibility for education to Indigenous communities (Jiménez Quishpe 2014).

Major Contributions

In the 2000s, the economic policies of the 1990s collapsed, and in 2006 Evo Morales became Bolivia's first Aymara president. He arrived to power as Indigenous organizers were designing a number of changes, some of which were influenced by the schools of the 1930s and the reforms of the 1990s. These efforts culminated in 2010 with the Avelino Siñani-Elizardo Pérez Law of Education (No. 070). Named after the founders of the Warisata project, this law reformed EIB to EIIP. Law 070 designates a number of more radical educational labels, such as "anti-imperialist," "de-colonization," and "intracultural," which have been largely ignored elsewhere in the Andes (<http://www.scielo.org.bo/img/revistas/rcc/v17n30/a04.pdf>). It also stipulates the importance of Indigenous languages, Spanish, and foreign languages. Primary education should now include both an Indigenous language and Spanish in monolingual communities, instead of emphasizing on shifting to Spanish. The lack of appropriate materials, infrastructure of rural schools, and teacher training are some challenges faced by EIIP (Machaca 2013).

Such national policy designations brought about a number of other programs, though there is still a tendency to use Spanish (Machaca 2013). Since 2012, parents are officially invited to participate in the *Educación Inicial en Familia Comunitaria* program (Early Education in Family Community program), where they can use their preferred language. In the same year, the government created the *Plurinational*

Institute of Languages, which has published alphabets for 23 ancestral Bolivian languages and has supported Quechua, Aymara, and Guarani universities.

Despite these advances, speakers discuss the difficulties of truly implementing the national policy after centuries of hispanization. Their concern is that Indigenous languages may merely retain symbolic status, since laws and classrooms have not inspired individuals to live their languages with understanding and pride (Saavedra 2011).

Ecuador

Formal education in Ecuador has undergone wide-ranging reforms since 2009, which are part of President Rafael Correa's *Sumak Kawsay* (Kichwa, Ecuadorian variety of Quechua: "Good living"), the National Plan for Development that draws from the Kichwa notion of prioritizing human needs and harmony (Becker 2013). However, many have noted that Correa's project is closely linked to economic development, including the exploitation and extraction of raw materials railed against by many Indigenous groups.

Supporting the 2008 Constitution (Art. 2), which recognizes Spanish as an official language and Kichwa and Shuar as official languages of intercultural relations, the National Plan includes the 2011 Organic Law of Intercultural Education, which describes a nationwide restructuring of formal education. Article 19 offers an example of its paradoxes, such as how the law draws simultaneously from audit culture in international education and the recognition efforts of Indigenous groups: "the Ecuadorian government must provide quality education considering all the pedagogical, technological, cultural, and linguistic characteristics of the peoples and the right of every person to be taught in their own language, as well as others that relate to the international community."

In Ecuador, the following rubric has structured two parallel public school systems (Law of Education, Art 27):

1. National "intercultural" system (formerly Hispanic Education) with three levels: (a) Early Childhood Education (0–5 years of age), (b) Basic General Education (6–15 years of age), and (c) General Unified Baccalaureate (15–18 years of age). Spanish is the main means of instruction, but English is usually taught as a required subject. Under the Law, thousands of English teachers have been trained in the United States and through programs via e-training, webinars, or Massive Open Online Courses. The Curriculum Reform Aimed at the Development of the Learning of English program, which came into effect in 1992 under an agreement between the British and Ecuadorian governments, has been devoted to improving the teaching of English in all Ecuadorian schools, including in EIB.
2. Intercultural Bilingual Education (EIB) is aimed at students who belong to an Indigenous nation. In Ecuador, EIB has had an unprecedented arrangement of a parallel national-level school system for indigenous students, which we examine below.

Early Developments

Histories of intercultural bilingual education in Ecuador often begin with the Kichwa leader Dolores Cacuango. In the region of Cayambe, Cacuango established a network of three schools in the 1940s with both Kichwa and Spanish as mediums of instruction. Over the following decades, Indigenous communities established various educational projects throughout the country (Conejo 2008). These initiatives were important not only for bringing formal education to Indigenous communities but also for developing local initiatives that would later aid national projects. These initiatives also formed a cadre of Indigenous leaders with experience in founding and administrating educational institutions.

Montaluisa (1980) describes how, in Ecuador, the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) led efforts for writing in Kichwa since their arrival in 1953, where they foregrounded regional Kichwa registers in bible translations. According to Barriga López (1992), the goal of SIL in Ecuador was the “global preparation” of Indigenous communities through bilingual and bicultural education, literacy programs, and Indigenous teacher training. As in Bolivia and Peru, Abram (1992) emphasizes that SIL educational institutions used Kichwa as a language of transition, excluding it from use past the third grade. Pan-Andean ideologies about enlightening and converting Kichwa speakers through alphabetic writing also surfaced in discourses in the 1980s orthography meetings in Ecuador and in Peru, though in Ecuador many Kichwa individuals played central roles.

As Indigenous organizations gained traction in the 1970s and 1980s, they relied not only upon the experiences of local community leaders but also upon a variety of non-Indigenous national and international actors. The same can be said for education initiatives. Two such projects were especially influential for Indigenous education in Ecuador. One was the Center of Research for Indigenous Education (CIEI) at the Pontifical Catholic University of Ecuador in Quito, which created materials for teaching in Ecuadorian languages and trained a number of prominent Kichwa linguists and education activists. A second project was a Bilingual Intercultural Education Project (P.EBI) sponsored by the German Cooperation (GTZ) in conjunction with the Ecuadorian government. P.EBI developed pedagogical materials, trained teachers, and yielded a large-scale network of schools for Indigenous education (Abram 1992).

CIEI and P.EBI were essential for one of the most radical proposals of Indigenous education seen in Latin America. As Ecuador was transitioning from dictatorship to multicultural democratic citizenship, Indigenous activists proposed an intercultural bilingual school system, relying on the will of a new President and the prevailing discourses of democracy. In 1988, with the efforts of the National Indigenous Confederation CONAIE, an executive order established the National Directorate of Intercultural Bilingual Education (DINEIB) to run the nationwide Indigenous school system (King and Haboud 2007). Over the years, many of the individuals trained at CIEI or P.EBI would direct the bilingual system, and schools developed by P.EBI would later become EIB institutions. This system, sometimes criticized for

focusing largely on the Kichwa language, would design and carry out a curriculum for and with Indigenous peoples.

Major Contributions

In recent years, the system has seen criticism, from outside and within, for not teaching Indigenous languages in schools or for being run by a small group of directors without the input of others (Martínez Novo 2009). After his election in 2007, President Correa seized upon such criticisms to systematically alter the system. His Executive Decree 98 created a government office, the Subsecretariat of Education for Intercultural Dialogue (later termed Subsecretariat of EIB) that would now oversee EIB. On the one hand, this office would be in charge of “interculturalizing” Ecuador’s entire educational system, a process which has still largely yet to unfold. On the other, the Decree proclaimed that the Ministry of Education would choose the new office’s director. These changes have been controversial, and many indigenous communities decry the loss of the system’s autonomy. Indeed, such transformation is indicative of larger-scale divides around Correa’s policies. Under his administration, Indigenous languages have gained unprecedented visibility throughout government events and offices. Yet, Indigenous organizations such as CONAIE have also accused Correa of manipulating such symbols as he shifts authority from Indigenous communities to state institutions (Becker 2013).

One of the more recent controversies of reform in EIB is the arrival of Millennium Schools. With new buildings, technologies, and/or teachers, Correa’s administration has attempted to provide a nationwide “education of quality,” planning for up to 88 Millennium Schools by 2015. In the process, the state has shuttered hundreds of schools, including EIB community-based educational institutions. This project has divided communities, with some appreciating the disappearance of schools with a sole teacher for all grade levels and others lamenting the erosion of community values and jobs (Sacha Rosero, Kichwa leader, in personal communication, 06/15). Most recently, the Ministry of Education has announced plans for 14 Millennium Schools called “Guardians of the language,” devoted in name to preserving and revitalizing ancestral languages.

Regarding higher education, the Secretariat of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation; the Council of Higher Education; and the Council of Assessment, Accreditation, and Quality Education are evaluating and restructuring universities according to new standards, which has caused problems for institutions created by EIB that train Indigenous teachers for the system. While this reform has increased awareness about the importance of educational processes, it has also boosted bureaucratic and administrative requirements, delaying pedagogical activities across universities.

Indeed, education has been emphasized during Correa’s administration, as evidenced in the creation of four public universities, two of them with Indigenous names: *Yachay* (Kichwa: “knowledge”) and *Ikiam* (Shuar: “forest”). Criticisms have arisen in regard to content and the fact that Amerindian languages play no role in

instruction (Villavicencio, 2014). On a more general level, while Indigenous languages and cultures have gained presence in the public sphere, programs have tended to lack serious engagement with teaching and encouraging speakers and nonspeakers of the languages. They have also divided speakers of Indigenous languages around Correa's political project.

Peru

Like Bolivia and Ecuador, Peru has introduced a number of national laws and policies for various domains of education. According to the 2003 Law of Education (28044), Peru's educational system requires equal rights, quality education, and respect for each individual and human group in regards to their linguistic and cultural particularities. This legislation centers on the most-spoken Indigenous languages, Quechua and Aymara. The current Constitution has proclaimed Quechua and Aymara as official languages, alongside Spanish, since 1993. Peru also recognizes 68 Indigenous languages, stipulating the need to apply them in educational settings (General Law of Education 19326 and National Policy of Bilingual Education), though the processes through which this would play out are unknown. Instruction can be in Spanish, a foreign language, or an Indigenous language, depending on the region. Outside of Indigenous education, international schools offer dual immersion in Spanish and English, French, or German.

Legal recognition of Quechua, and the standardization of policies for originary languages, has a relatively long history in Peru. At least on paper, Peru is progressive in assuring the participation of Indigenous peoples in the creation and implementation of educational programs. In general practice, however, Indigenous languages have largely been caught up in ideologies of repression that shift to ideologies of making modern citizens, the latter of which has sometimes involved recognizing regional linguistic diversity (Freeland 1996; Mannheim 1991).

Early Developments

In the twentieth century, discourses of assimilation drove SIL's largely autonomous efforts, with approval from the state, to establish schools for 24 Native groups in the Amazon. By 1956 there were 37 bilingual schools, including 12 in remote areas. Writing in Indigenous languages also began in the 1940s and 1950s when SIL initiatives combined with indigenists' efforts in creating alphabets for Amerindian languages.

As early as 1963, the Roundtable on Quechua and Aymara monolingualism brought anthropologists, educators, and linguists together to elaborate linguistic and educational policies. Though these meetings largely continued assimilationist ideologies, Velasco Alvarado's leftist dictatorship in the 1970s brought national proclamations that emphasized language and education through labor reform and class inequality. In 1975, as part of such discourses of equality, Decree Law 21156

made Peru the first country in the Andes to declare Quechua an official language, meaning that Quechua was supposed to be taught in the educational system; however, many of the more radical sectors of the government changed as Velasco began to relinquish power later in the decade (Freeland 1996). As the leadership transitioned, the 1979 Constitution named Spanish as the only official language, erasing the previous gains (Hornberger 1993).

These early efforts at standardizing and officializing languages were also invoked in movements for educational reform, including legislation that emphasized bilingual education (Hornberger 1988b). But as the policies of the 1970s faded, they gave way to internationally sponsored, regionally focused projects in bilingual education like the Upper Napo Bilingual Intercultural Education Project and the Training Program for Bilingual Teachers of the Peruvian Amazon. One of the most prominent of such programs occurred in 1977 as GTZ financially sponsored and provided expertise for the PEEB-P program (Cortina 2014), which attempted to conduct primary education in Quechua and Aymara throughout the region. Initially, the goal was still assimilationist, transitioning the students into Spanish after the first 4 years of education (López 1991). The programs sometimes proved to be controversial, as they were often institutionalized in ways that Quechua communities viewed unfavorably (Hornberger 1988a). In later years, the program focused on creating a more equitable, community-based project, and its work on bilingual education in Indigenous languages became a model for bilingual education around the world.

Freeland (1996) notes that the national government continued the bilateral agreement with GTZ, building 40 schools in the region by 1988. The state sought an even larger-scale version of the program, but such efforts failed for a number of reasons, including the lack of grassroots support and expertise. The government established the National Bilingual Directorate in 1987, which was heavily influenced by international institutions like the World Bank and UNESCO. This founding was a part of, and brought about, a larger-scale discourse of interculturalism that would figure prominently into national policy initiatives, which Hornberger (2000) describes as still promoting assimilation. An important difference to highlight is that many of Peru's leaders who planned Indigenous education and language policy have been urban elites, as opposed to indigenous community leaders as in the rest of the Andes (Gustafson 2014).

While Indigenous movements advanced in Ecuador during the 1980s, the Shining Path became a primary factor keeping bilingual education in the margins. As García (2005) notes, the election of Alberto Fujimori brought aggressive military campaigns and neoliberal multiculturalism that promoted official recognition of linguistic and cultural diversity. Recognition of Quechua and Aymara in the 1993 Constitution was part of Fujimori's strategic attempt to offer an image of a unified nation-state. He also opened Peru to the economic policies of global institutions like the World Bank, exacerbating economic inequality. Though he had previously ended the National Bilingual Directorate, Fujimori reopened what became the National Directorate of Bilingual Intercultural Education because of local protests (García 2005). These undertakings have had significant effects on changing discourses of

language rights and human rights in Peruvian education – discourses that are prominent contemporarily.

Major Contributions

It is within this historical trajectory of ideologies about recognition and assimilation that we can better understand contemporary Peru, where national projects are still somewhat lacking in practice. Trapnell (2011) and Valdiviezo (2009) note that the Law of Education (Art. 20), and the supporting documents that make up EIB's platform, has offered important advances like intercultural education for the entire school system, even if such documents are riddled with contradictions. As we have seen throughout the Andes, many of the conflicts center on what constitutes interculturalism. Such contradictions frequently play out as teachers invoke and rework legal designations.

Similar to presidential politics in the rest of the Andes, the election of Ollanta Humala in 2011 has seen the emergence of new policies, such as the Prior Consultation Law with Indigenous communities. These efforts have focused on the social inclusion of marginalized groups, especially through notions of interculturalism. Since 2011, the Law of Languages (29735), which has been translated into five Indigenous languages, regulates the use, preservation, development, recovery, promotion, and diffusion of the originary languages of Peru. With the goal of facilitating intercultural dialogue, the Ministry of Culture and the Directorate of Indigenous Languages have sponsored the training of interpreters of 35 different indigenous languages (Law 29785, Art. 16).

Framed as regional educational projects and decentralization policies, there are important local initiatives in bilingual education and Quechua revival in regions like Ayacucho and Cuzco, although with less success in using the languages in public spaces (Zavala et al. 2014). Additionally, there is a shortage of intercultural education materials and the rejection of EIB on the part of several bilingual teachers; as such, carrying out the policies continuous to be a permanent challenge.

Challenges and Future Directions

Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru are complex multilingual and multicultural territories where Spanish has long been the main language of instruction. As such, the use of ancestral languages in education implies challenges that demand new creative responses. Although the three countries have modified their legal charters to assert multilingual identities, there are numerous political and practical controversies that have problematized the fostering of interculturalism and multilingualism as stipulated by law and demanded by powerful Indigenous voices.

While much work needs to be done regarding curricula, instructors, and methodologies, we note that intercultural education must not be limited to the rural and Indigenous, but systematically adopted across each nation-state, including urban

populations. Otherwise, discourses around interculturalism will continue merely as synonyms of assimilatory multiculturalism. Intercultural education must be a tool for systematic social change that transcends the conundrums of recognition that have divided Indigenous populations. We strongly believe that such efforts must rediscover individual and collective particularities beyond standardization. Though laws promote inclusion and respect, they oftentimes lead to new social hierarchies and the exclusion of other voices. In the Andes, this frequently involves the masking of numerous marginalized communities, including smaller Indigenous and non-Indigenous others such as deaf communities and their languages (Haboud and Ortega 2015). Merely going beyond official recognition will help us reconceptualize, recreate, and redesign linguistic and educational planning and practices toward creating egalitarian education in which students of multiple cultures and languages equally value and promote all ways of knowing, creating, and learning.

Acknowledgment We thank Daniel Bryan for his valuable comments and suggestions on this chapter.

Cross-References

- ▶ [Bilingual Education in Andean Latin America in a Neoliberal Economy](#)
- ▶ [Decolonization and Bilingual/Intercultural Education](#)
- ▶ [Indigenous Language Policy and Education in Mexico](#)
- ▶ [Language Education and Multilingualism](#)
- ▶ [Language Education Planning and Policies by and for Indigenous Peoples](#)
- ▶ [Language Education Policy: Practices, Ideology, and Management](#)

Related Articles in the Encyclopedia of Language and Education

Enrique Hamel: [Bilingual Education for Indigenous Peoples in Mexico](#). In Volume: [Bilingual and Multilingual Education](#)

References

- Abram, M. (1992). *El proyecto EBI 1985–1990: Lengua, cultura e identidad*. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- Barriga López, F. (1992). *Las culturas indígenas ecuatorianas y el Instituto Lingüístico de Verano*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Amauta.
- Becker, M. (2013). The stormy relations between Rafael Correa and social movements in Ecuador. *Latin American Perspectives*, 40(3), 43–62.
- Conejo, A. (2008). Educación intercultural bilingüe en el Ecuador. *Comunicación y Sociedad, Alteridad*, 66, 64–82.
- 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/Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

- Crevels, M. (2012). Language endangerment in South America: The clock is ticking. In L. Campbell & V. Grondona (Eds.), *The indigenous languages of South America: A comprehensive guide* (pp. 167–233). Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Freeland, J. (1996). The global, the national and the local: Forces in the development of education for indigenous peoples – The case of Peru. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 26(2), 167–195.
- García, M. E. (2005). *Making indigenous citizens: Identities, education, and multicultural development in Peru*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gustafson, B. (2009). *New languages of the state: Indigenous resurgence and the politics of knowledge in Bolivia*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.
- Gustafson, B. (2014). Intercultural bilingual education in the Andes. In R. Cortina (Ed.), *The education of Indigenous citizens in Latin America* (pp. 74–97). Bristol/Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Haboud, M., & Ortega, M. (2015). *Voces e imágenes que unen*. Quito: PUCE.
- Haboud, M., et al. (2016). Linguistic human rights and language revitalization in Latin America and the Caribbean. In S. Coronel-Molina & T. L. McCarty (Eds.), *Indigenous language revitalization in the Americas* (pp. 201–223). New York: Routledge.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1988a). *Bilingual education and language maintenance: A southern Peruvian case*. Providence: Foris.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1988b). Language planning orientations and bilingual education in Peru. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 12(1), 14–29.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1993). The first workshop on Quechua and Aymara writing. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *The earliest stage of language planning: "The first congress" phenomenon* (pp. 233–256). New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hornberger, N. H., & López, L. E. (1998). Policy, possibility and paradox: Indigenous multilingualism and education in Peru and Bolivia. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- 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.
- Jiménez Quishpe, L. (2014). Indigenous leaders and the challenges of decolonization in Bolivia. In R. Cortina (Ed.), *The education of indigenous citizens in Latin America* (pp. 169–186). Bristol/Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- King, K., & Haboud, M. (2007). Language planning and policy in Ecuador. In R.B. Baldauf & R.B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Language planning and policy, Latin America, vol. 1: Ecuador, Mexico, and Paraguay* (pp. 39–104). Tonawanda: Multilingual Matters.
- Lazar, S. (2010). Schooling and critical citizenship: Pedagogies of political agency in El Alto, Bolivia. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 41(2), 181–205.
- López, L. E. (1991). La educación bilingüe en Puno: Hacia un ajuste de cuentas. In M. Zuñiga Castillo, I. Pozzi Escot, & L.E. López (Eds.), *Educación bilingüe intercultural: Reflexiones y desafíos*. Lima: Fomciencias.
- Machaca, G. (2013). *La participación social en la educación en Bolivia en el contexto de la implementación de la EIB (2007)*. Cochabamba: FUNPROEIB Andes.
- Mannheim, B. (1991). *The language of the Inka since the European invasion*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Martínez Novo, C. (2009, November). *Is the cultural project of the Indigenous movement in crisis? Some ethnographic remarks on the ambiguities of intercultural bilingual education in Ecuador*. Presented at the 2009 Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, Rio de Janeiro.
- Montaluisa, L. (1980). Historia de la escritura del quichua. *Revista de La Universidad Católica*, 28, 121–146.
- Saavedra, M. (2011). *Políticas lingüísticas en los Gobiernos Departamental y Municipal de Cochabamba*. Tesis presentada a la Universidad Mayor de San Simón, en cumplimiento parcial de los requisitos para la obtención del título de Magister en Educación Intercultural Bilingüe, Cochabamba.

- Trapnell, L. (2011, October). *Perspectivas y retos de la EIB en el Perú*. Presented at the Simposio Internacional Paradigmas de la Diversidad Cultural. Puce, Quito.
- Valdiviezo, L. (2009). Bilingual intercultural education in indigenous schools: An ethnography of teacher interpretations of government policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(1), 61–79.
- von Gleich, U. (1994). Language spread policy: The case of Quechua in the Andean republics of Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 107(1), 77–113.
- Yataco, M. (2015). Políticas de estado y la exclusión de las lenguas indígenas en el Perú. *Droit et cultures*, 63, 2012–1. Retrieved from <http://droitcultures.revues.org/2946>
- Zavala, V., et al. (2014). *Qichwasimirayku. Batallas por el quechua*. Lima: PUCE.

Web Pages [Retrieved: 07/2016]

- http://educacion.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2013/10/Indicadores_Educativos_10-2013_DNAIE.pdf
- <http://educacion.gob.ec/proyecto-emergente-de-unidades-educativas-del-milenio-y-establecimientos-replica/>
- <http://educacionbolivia.yaia.com/historia2.html>
- <http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Constitutions/Ecuador/english08.html>
- <http://unibolguarani.edu.bo/>
- <http://www.andes.info.ec/es/sociedad/9139.html>
- <http://www.camiri.net/?p=16207>
- <http://www.cultura.gob.pe/es/interculturalidad/ley-ndeg-29735>
- <http://www.katari.org/warisata-escuela-ayllu>
- <http://www.minedu.gob.bo/phocadownload/Avanzamos/2012/avanzamos%203.pdf>
- <http://www.unibolquechua.edu.bo/>
- <http://www.scielo.org.bo/img/revistas/rcc/v17n30/a04.pdf>; <http://data.uis.unesco.org>
- <http://www.yachay.gob.ec/yachay-university/?lang=en>; <http://universidadikiam.com.ec/>