Instituto de Investigaciones Socio Económicas

Documento de Trabajo No. 01/04
Febrero 2004

Interactual and Bilingual Education in Bolivia the Challenge of Ethnic Diversity and National Identify

por
Solange G. Taylor

INTERCULTURAL AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN BOLIVIA: THE CHALLENGE OF ETHNIC DIVERSITY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY

SOLANGE G. TAYLOR
Oxford University

Abstract:

Three important educational reforms took place in Bolivia during the 20th Century. The 1905 reform established a national education system. The 1955 reform broadened education coverage and promoted a homogenous national culture. The 1994 reform, currently in effect, restructures the educational system, encourages popular participation, and promotes intercultural education. The role of language in the three reforms underlines the fundamental questions of how educational provision in Bolivia can address diversity and how diversity can shape the nation. Bilingualism has numerous implications for a wide range of policies, and the successful implementation of bilingual and intercultural education as called for in the most recent reform depends in part upon the degree to which language in education policy correlates with other policies which address national diversity. This paper examines successive Bolivian education reforms and their relationship to changing cultural policies on diversity, roles of language in education, and conceptions of national identity.

Keywords: Bolivia, bilingualism, education reform, diversity
JEL codes: I21, I28

Introduction

Three important educational reforms took place in Bolivia during the 20th Century. The first reform, in 1905, sought to establish a national education system. The second, in 1955, broadened education coverage and promoted a homogenous national culture. The third reform, initiated in 1994 and currently in effect, restructures the educational system, encourages popular participation, and promotes intercultural education (Contreras, 1999). Although Bolivian national education policy has undergone other modifications, Contreras argues that these three reforms mark important social transitions. His analysis, however, does not explore the important role of language in the education reforms or the link between language policy, social change and national identity. The role of language in the three reforms underlines for Bolivia, as for many countries in Central and South America, the fundamental questions of how educational provision can address diversity and how diversity can shape the nation.

López (1994a) distinguishes four phases in the gradual recognition of diversity in general, and linguistic diversity in particular, as a resource for Bolivian education.[1] These phases, however, do not necessarily illustrate an inexorable progression by policy makers toward a particular understanding of the role of diversity in education. Peruvian education policies developed during the 1970s sought to sustain linguistic diversity. They followed a similar, though abbreviated, trajectory to the Bolivian policy development which culminated in the 1994 education reforms, yet they were reversed within a decade by policies brought about by a combination of political and economic change. Language in education policy developments in Bolivia over the past decade, therefore, should not be celebrated as the culmination of a progressive sequence but rather evaluated with cautious optimism as a current, pluralist approach to the never-ending effort to achieve unity in diversity.

Different forms of bilingual education, designed to satisfy different constituencies, have sprung up in isolated experiments across Bolivia since the end of the nineteenth century. The 1994 Education Reform, however, is the first systematized attempt to apply bilingual education, within the Reform's intercultural philosophy, throughout the national education system (López, 1994a). Bilingual education initiatives do not exist in a vacuum. López (1995:100) argues that "*...el bilingüismo no es de manera alguna un asunto únicamente escolar, sino más bien una cuestión social y sobre todo política*".[2] Bilingualism has numerous implications for a wide range of policies, and the successful implementation of bilingual and intercultural education depends in part upon the degree to which language in education policy correlates with other policies which address national diversity. This paper examines successive Bolivian education reforms and their relationship to changing cultural policies on diversity, roles of language in education, and conceptions of national identity.

---

1 These phases include: indigenous presence in the Western school; post-revolutionary attempts at simplifying sociocultural complexity; the rediscovery of a pluricultural reality; and the recognition of diversity as a resource, with arguably a fifth and contemporary stage that begins with the implementation of the 1994 Education Reforms (López, 1994a)

2 "...bilingualism is by no means a uniquely educational matter but rather a social and, above all, a political question" (Present author's translation).

Language in education policy

Spolsky and Shohamy (1999) suggest that there are different components to a particular language policy and that these components, such as the role of language, are influenced by a country's language attitude,[3] the ethnic composition of the society,[4] and the primary activity of language planning.[5] Through his concept of language attitudes, Fishman (1969) examines the link between language and national identity. According to this model there are three clusters of language attitudes based on whether a country has one, several, or no "great tradition" and where, correspondingly, one, several or no language is associated with national identity.[6] The way in which Spolsky and Shohamy (1999) apply this typology suggests that the relationship between language and national identity is both direct and immutable. Accordingly, their own combined typology is static. It does not address how or why a country might change from a monolingual ideology where there is a single language associated *with* national identity to a bilingual or trilingual ideology with several languages associated *within* national identity. Fishman (1969:127), however, stresses that the context of language planning is a "dynamic system in which there are always elements of tension, pressure for change and redefinition on behalf of alternative decisions."

Through his development of the concept of language ideologies, Cobarrubias (1983) offers insight into what might motivate change and redefinition in language planning. The Spolsky and Shohamy (1999) typology classifies language ideologies as either mono-, bi, tri- or multilingual policies.

Cobarrubias (1983), however, makes a clearer distinction between ideology and policy. He identifies four possible language ideologies: linguistic assimilation, linguistic pluralism, vernacularization and internationalization.[7] They are not qualities anchored in a great tradition so much as different visions of the desired relationship between unity and diversity; as such they are the basis for language policy making. Cobarrubias (1983) does not explain how ideologies evolve or how policy makers can change from one language ideology to another. His aim is descriptive rather than pragmatic. Nevertheless, his concept of language ideologies suggests ways in which fluctuations in the relative values accorded to national unity and diversity might result in changes in language policy.

Hamel (1997) links language with cultural diversity and traces three ideological bases for policy approaches to indigenous peoples in Latin America: monoculturalism, multiculturalism, and pluriculturalism. These approaches are neither sequential nor mutually exclusive within a given historical period, unlike Cobarrubias' (1983) language-specific ideologies or López's (1994a) four phases of diversity recognition. Monoculturalism ignores indigenous peoples in favor of equality among all citizens and fashions national culture without attention to linguistic, cultural and ethnic diversity. Multiculturalism, unlike the more common but imprecise use of the word, recognizes diversity but for the purpose of eliminating the perceived problem through assimilation. The decisive juncture, according to

---

3 The authors attribute the concept of great traditions to: Fishman, Joshua (1969). National languages and languages of wider communication in the developing nations. *Anthropological Linguistics* 11, pp.111-135.

4 The authors attribute the concepts homogenous, dyadic and mosaic societies to: Lambert, Richard D (1995). Language policy: an overview. Paper presented at the International Symposium on Language Policy, Bar-Ilan University, Israel.

5 The authors do not cite Cooper (1989); however, they maintain his distinction between status, corpus and acquisition planning.

6 Fishman (1969:113) defines a "great tradition" as a "widely accepted and visible implemented belief-and-behavior system of indigenously validated greatness".

7 A necessary fifth language ideology is *linguistic separatism* (Taylor, 2002).

Hamel (1997:108) is "the transition from multiculturalism to pluriculturalism (and plurilingualism)" which recognizes and values diversity. This transition is currently underway in Bolivia.

The importance accorded to both unity and diversity is often one of the fundamental characteristics of national identity in heterogeneous countries. Concepts of national identity are no more static over time than are the related language ideologies. The ideological change from either mono- or multiculturalism to pluriculturalism and plurilingualism transcends any single policy-making sphere: it involves a comprehensive reinvention of national identity and the manner and degree to which it accommodates national diversity. The relentless efforts to forge a shared sense of national identity directly influenced the three major twentieth century education reforms in Bolivia. The nature of national identity in relation to culture and diversity varied in the reforms of 1905, 1955 and 1994; however, language was always an important element in the equation. The following analysis of these three reforms explores the changing relationship between national identity, language, and education.

Multiculturalism and linguistic assimilation

The slow spread of formal schooling to rural Bolivia after independence in 1825 illustrates, among other things, the conflict between the state and the dominant classes, principally land and mine owners, over the value of educating the indigenous population. Once the state no longer relied on the large amount of tribute paid by indigenous people,[8] it sought national unity and a way of incorporating and "civilizing" the rural indigenous population through formal, Spanish-language schooling. The dominant classes, however, were still dependent on cheap labor and feared the liberating effects of literacy (Soria, 1992). While the state gradually began to adopt a multicultural approach based on assimilation, the elite clung to a monocultural vision where, paradoxically, control mattered more than culture but culture determined control.[9]

The Bolivian indigenous population at the beginning of the twentieth century maintained an ambivalent position *vis-à-vis* state educational provisions. In spite of the constitutional provision for free and mandatory primary education in 1880, elite resistance and political instability prolonged the absence of any systematized educational provision for the indigenous population (Sangines, 1968; Alavi, 1994). Prior to the education reform in 1905, clandestine educators began to establish schools in indigenous communities in order to help these communities protect themselves and their lands through a better understanding of written documents and an ability to communicate with legal authorities. The schools adopted mother tongue instruction in the first few years as a communicative crutch to teach Spanish, and they met with fierce resistance from the local elite. The clandestine use of bilingual education was a highly political and highly pragmatic act of defiance in the exclusionary educational system of a country struggling to conceptualize itself as a nation (López, 1994a, 1994b).

---

[8] Until the 1860s nearly half of the national budget came from indigenous tribute. In the state's view, educating indigenous people would result in their becoming *mestizos*, or people of mixed race, at which point they would no longer be obligated to pay tribute (Soria, 1992).

[9] To these elites it did not matter if the rural population were indigenous as much as it mattered that they were a group in a subordinate position which had been a legally exploitable source of labor since the colonial *encomienda*, a system of near-slavery where labor was a right that came with personal property but where laborers were not owned (Anaya, 1996). The rural population was in this subordinate position, however, because it was indigenous and as such had been decimated and dominated throughout the colonial period.

Law of December 11th, 1905

While the state had ignored the rural indigenous population in favor of other post-independence priorities and in acquiescence to pressure from the dominant classes, President Ismael Montes (1904-1909; 1913-1917) saw educational reform as a prime mechanism to promote economic growth and modernization. Towards this end, he passed the Law of December 11th, 1905 which centralized education in Bolivia, promoted teacher training, developed a curriculum for primary and secondary schools, initiated commercial and technical education, promoted girls' education, and sought to strengthen education available to the indigenous population. In an effort to eliminate the *ad hoc* nature of schools in rural (and primarily indigenous) communities, the Montes government developed a system of specially selected itinerant teachers who would divide their time between different areas. This system gained continuity with the arrival of permanent schools, always established with government approval but quite often through the initiative of particular indigenous communities who sought Spanish literacy (Contreras, 1999). The schools implemented a linguistic and cultural policy of *castellanización*[10] which sought to "civilize" the indigenous population.

The gradual systematization by the central government of *castellanización* through education marked the beginning of an important cultural change for rural communities: educational control over culture and language passed from the local community to the State, which did not seek to represent the interests of the indigenous population but rather sought to promote the development of the indigenous population according to the state's own interests (López, 1994a; Sichra, 1997).[11] In education, the state adopted a multicultural approach in which indigenous culture and language were obstacles to national development to be overcome through *castellanización*.

Monoculturalism and linguistic assimilation

The Revolution of 1952, led by Victor Paz Estenssoro, brought about universal suffrage, agricultural reform, industrial nationalization[12] and, in 1955, education reform (de Vries, 1988). Estenssoro argued that a change in the relationship between the social classes required a new kind of education, and that since Bolivia was in the hands of workers, *campesinos*,[13] and the middle class, education had to respond to the needs of these different classes. Estenssoro envisioned technical education for the masses to fulfill national, not

[10] Learning Spanish (*castellano*) was often considered synonymous with literacy learning (*alfabetización*) yielding the term *castellanización* (López, 2002). The term's connotations address cultural as well as linguistic assimilation.

[11] One of the few exceptions to this trend was the Escuela Ayllu founded in Warisata in 1931 by Elizardo Pérez and Avelino Siñani. The school was an important educational as well as political initiative. School and community were bound together in an explicitly socialist philosophy which promoted the traditional Quechua and Aymara *ayllu* (system based on collective agriculture and kinship ties) as a springboard for social struggle (Luyks, 1999). Warisata engaged in an early form of intercultural education in that it promoted community control over educational decisions, communal labor and coeducation; yet despite its integration of indigenous culture and leadership structures, Warisata did not change the role of language or reverse the dominance of Spanish in the classroom (Howard-Malverde & Canessa, 1995; Albó, 2002). The Ministry of Education initially approved the project; however, in the aftermath of the lost war with Paraguay (1932-1935) the government was no longer willing to allow the development of local authority, especially when it conflicted with its policy of cultural assimilation, and closed the school (Contreras, 1999).

[12] Such industries included tin, mining, natural gas, electricity and railroads (Graham, 1998).

[13] Peasant farmer (Present author's translation). This term characterizes the post-revolutionary *mestizante* ideology which subsumed the indigenous communities and thereby deprives them of recognition as culturally and linguistically distinct collectivities in favor of a class-based identity marker.

individual, development needs (República de Bolivia, 1956; Contreras, 1999). The revolution recast diversity in terms of class rather than of ethnicity, culture or language.

Código de la Educación Boliviana, 1955

Unlike the government-drafted 1905 reform, the *Código* was designed by an educational reform commission which, under the auspices of the Ministry of Education, included representation from the Ministry of Rural Affairs, the university sector, the teachers' and other labor unions (Contreras, 1999). In accordance with the interests of these constituencies, the *Código* explicitly promoted a "national, democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal educational system" (Article 1:7). The *Código*'s goals for education included individual character formation (Article 2:3), the incorporation of the whole population into national life (Article 2:4), the building of national solidarity to consolidate national economic independence (Article 2:5), the transformation of rural inhabitants into more efficient producers and consumers with the help of science and technology (Article 2, Section 6), and the invigoration of a single national identity to overcome regionalism and to exalt Bolivian traditional, historic and cultural values (Article 2:8).

The new educational code made mention for the first time of the use of indigenous languages in Bolivian education (Article 115), conceding that instruction in indigenous languages might be necessary in certain regions in order to bring about national linguistic integration through Spanish-language literacy (República de Bolivia, 1956; Apala, 1994; Miranda, 1994). The new approach to language, however, applied only to literacy learning (de Vries, 1989). The 1905 reforms had promoted Spanish language learning as the linchpin of the *castellanización* process, but not until the *Código* did the state formally recognize the need to address the pedagogical relationship between linguistic diversity and Spanish language learning.

The *Código*'s instrumental use of indigenous languages for efficient Spanish language learning, reflects Hamel's (1997) multicultural ideology, where policy recognizes diversity only to overcome it for the sake of national unity. However, this was the only way in which the law addressed diversity; the education reform as a whole focused on social class. In an effort to overcome the country's socio-cultural complexity, the revolution sought to simplify it and to erase ethnic affiliations (López, 1994a, 1994b). As a result, the 1955 education reform was overwhelmingly monocultural in its ideological approach.

López (1994a) describes the continuing search for Bolivian national identity during the post-1952 revolutionary period as one where the molding of *el nuevo hombre boliviano* rested on a *mestizante*[14] ideology which blanketed the whole population as ethnically mixed and thereby nullified the variables of culture and language. The state's new approach interpreted difference as a reflection of an urban-rural dichotomy. Accordingly, the *Código* (Article 9) established two systems within Bolivian education: the urban system for urban dwellers, and the *campesino* system for rural dwellers (República de Bolivia, 1956). Whether students in either system were indigenous or not was irrelevant to educational planners since both the urban and the *campesino* systems promoted the same national values and national language.

Within days of the 1952 revolution, the government created the Ministry of Campesino Affairs (de Vries, 1988, Albó, 1999). The Ministry was responsible, among other

[14] Participle from the noun *mestizo* meaning person of mixed race or culture (Present author's translation).

things, for administering the *campesino* education system which, though not administered under the Ministry of Education, existed parallel to the urban education system (República de Bolivia, 1994c). Through the *campesino* education system (known as *Educación Fundamental Campesina*), the reformers sought to redress the fundamental marginalization the rural sector had suffered in terms of a lack of educational provision, technological and economic isolation, and deprivation of their political rights (República de Bolivia, 1956: Article 118). The parallel system administered by the Ministry of Education is not identified by any qualifying adjective such as "urban", "regular", or "mainstream", but its provisions for pre-school, elementary and secondary education are outlined in great detail respectively in Chapters 4 , 5 and 6 of the *Código*. The provisions for non-*campesino* education span three chapters; meanwhile the details of *Educación Fundamental Campesina* are outlined in a single chapter (Chapter 11). This reflects the continued neglect of educational provision in the rural sector and, *de facto*, of the indigenous population.

The reforms made elementary school mandatory, but in accordance with the rural/urban divide there were two systems of elementary education (López, 1994b). Non-*campesino* elementary education involved promoting individual development, independent learning, and personal as well as social responsibility (Article 33:1, 2, 4, 5, 7). This contrasts with the more basic, aims of *campesino* education which included promoting hygiene, literacy, vocational goals, more efficient agricultural practices, civic consciousness and national folklore while uprooting superstitions and alcoholism (Article 118: 1-6). The pre-school, elementary and secondary education framework is not mirrored in *campesino* education where instead there are only vague descriptions of elementary school provisions of varying lengths (Article 127). The two systems of Bolivian education created by the *Código* addressed what the reformers perceived to be the different needs of two different sectors. Although the rural and urban sectors differed dramatically in the cultural makeup of their inhabitants, the reformers did not frame the distinction on ethnicity or language. Instead, they distinguished the sectors on the basis of geography, production and consumption habits, and familiarity with what the Revolution considered to be national culture. The number of schools quintupled in the wake of the revolution and education reforms, yet expanded access did not alter the monocultural concept of national identity (Plaza, 1988).

The military governments which took control of Bolivia during the 1960s and early 1970s sought to reverse many changes brought about by the 1952 Revolution, including the distinction within the 1955 *Código* between the urban and rural sectors. Both Generals Barrientos (1964-1966, 1966-1969) and Banzer (1971-1978) sought to fuse the urban and rural education systems into a single system for formal elementary education, with a national curriculum (de Vries, 1988). Apala (1994) blames the debates over whether or not to have a unified curriculum for the lack of further attention to the interrelationship between linguistic and educational policies. Although the *Código* placed greater emphasis on the issue of parallel systems of urban and rural education rather than on the pedagogical role of language in education, for the first time in Bolivian education policy the *Código* recognized the existence of and uses for indigenous languages. The ideological approach, however, was monocultural rather than multicultural because it ignored cultural and linguistic diversity and instead sought national solidarity through a changed foundation for national identity based on a revised relationship between the classes.

The confluence of non-governmental and governmental bilingual and intercultural education initiatives

Efforts to develop bilingual or intercultural education, such as the clandestine indigenous schools at the turn of the century, long preceded any official policies pronounced by educational planners in La Paz. The ideologies behind these initiatives varied with the sponsoring organization but also across time with a shift from multiculturalism to pluriculturalism evident beginning in the 1980s. First with the literacy program SENALEP then with the PEIB cooperative project between the Ministry of Education and UNICEF, government planning began to coincide with initiatives by non-governmental bilingual and intercultural programs as both reflect an increasingly pluricultural ideology.

In the 1940s, the Bolivian government, like other Latin American governments, began to rely on the missionary evangelical Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) to carry out basic education in the remoter parts of the country where it was unable, or unwilling, to undertake teacher training and textbook production (López, 1994a).[15] The SIL supported the 1952 revolution, and in return it received an important role in indigenous education where it continued to apply a linguistic and cultural transitional model (López, 2002). Subsenquent, non-missionary, education programs, such as USAID's PER-1 (1975-1980) and the World Bank's PEIA (1978-1980), adopted a similar transitional model of bilingual education. SIL missionary goals coincided with the government's efforts to incorporate the indigenous peoples into Bolivian national life; whereas the government pursued a monocultural policy that ignored ethnic and cultural diversity, however, the SIL engaged in a multicultural approach for the sake of effective assimilation. Despite this apparent disconnect, the SIL bilingual strategy promoted indigenous language use for effective Spanish language proficiency and in this sense coincided with the policy espoused in the 1955 education reforms.

The Catholic Church's educational arm, the *Comisión Episcopal de Educación* (CEE), began the P.TRB project in 1981 with a different language ideology: mother tongue language maintenance and development through all five years of primary school.[16] The reconceptualization of the role of language in education reflected an alternate view of the value of diversity within the nation. This change of language ideology paralleled a change in political ideology and the 1982 return to democracy.

As part of the Hernán Siles Zuazo (1982-1985) government's 1983 national education plan, the government initiated a literacy program, SENALEP, which began with instruction in indigenous languages and later incorporated lessons in Spanish as a second language. SENALEP marked the first large scale Bolivian literacy initiative; it ushered in a period of

[15] The SIL was a Protestant missionary organization, based at the University of Oklahoma, which sought to evangelize more effectively through the medium of indigenous languages. Towards this end, it taught indigenous students to translate the Bible from Spanish into their own languages so that they might then serve as missionaries within their own communities. The dictionaries and grammars produced by the SIL and its students were important educational outputs of this process, though this linguistic codification has not gone unchallenged (see de Vries, 1988). Despite the transitional model it applied in both the linguistic and cultural spheres, the SIL approach elevated indigenous language use in schools from the realm of informal communication to that of the language of instruction, and developed educational materials in both indigenous languages and Spanish for the first few grades of elementary school (López, 1994a). The SIL's focus on Bolivia's border regions served not only to provide education to the regions receiving the least education provision but also, from the central government's point of view, consolidated the national territory (López, 2002).

[16] Maintenance bilingualism involves both the use and the development of the mother tongue alongside learning another, likely dominant, language as a second language.

national educational planning that no longer sought linguistic homogenization but instead took into account both indigenous languages as mother tongues and the contributions to national culture by different ethnocultural communities (de Vries, 1988; Plaza & Albó, 1989; López, 1994b). While the CEE project spearheaded maintenance bilingualism efforts in Bolivia, SENALEP sensitized the national population, including both the urban and rural sectors, to the benefits of using indigenous languages in education (López, 1994a).

The broader goals of the CEE project narrowed to textbook production in 1988 when UNICEF and the Bolivian Ministry of Education began a joint effort to develop a program (PEIB, 1988-1995) that served as a pilot project for bilingual and intercultural education implemented at the national level.[17] The Bolivian PEIB project relied in part upon an bilingual and intercultural education project (PEEB-P) underway in Puno, Peru which ran from 1979 until 1990 and was funded by the German aid agency GTZ. The program had five aims: research, curriculum and materials development, teacher training, classroom evaluation, and EIB implementation in Quechua and Aymara communities, which overlap the Peruvian-Bolivian border. The Peruvian PEEB-P trained numerous Bolivian linguists and anthropologists and developed the textbooks and methodological guides to which Bolivia gained access in a 1990 accord with the Ministry of Education of Peru on cooperation in EIB planning (López, 1994b).

The Bolivian PEIB project produced Aymara and Quechua language textbooks for the five grades of elementary school in maternal language, mathematics, life science, Spanish-as-a-second language, and teacher guides. It produced textbooks in Guaraní for those same subjects but only for the first three grades of elementary school. It also produced storybooks: two in Quechua, ten in Aymara, and one in Guaraní (López, 1994a). The project was designed for monolingual speakers of indigenous languages or indigenous language speakers with only basic bilingual skills; as a result, there was little to no focus on the acquisition of Spanish as a second language (López, 1995). Although the transition into a systematic alternation between the mother tongue and Spanish after the fifth year of elementary school was never fully achieved, this does not alter the significance of a program whereby for the first time indigenous languages were the main languages of instruction during five consecutive years of schooling (López, 1994b). Implemented in a total of one hundred and forty rural Quechua, Aymara and Guaraní schools, Bolivia's PEIB project trained teams of supervisors, directors and teachers at the national, district and local levels (ETARE, 1993). The PEIB project is evidence of a shift, from a disjointed monocultural and multicultural ideology to a pluricultural ideology, in both non-governmental and governmental planning for the role of language in education.

Pluriculturalism and linguistic pluralism

The officialization of EIB went hand in hand with efforts towards the third major education reform of the 20th Century. In 1991 the Ministry of Planning and Coordination in the government of Jaime Paz Zamora (1989-1993) organized the *Equipo Técnico de Apoyo a la Reforma Educativa* (ETARE), the team in charge of developing the education reforms (República de Bolivia, 1994c). The team was not part of the Ministry of Education because, according to Contreras (1999), after several failed attempts in the late 1980s to initiate the

[17] In Bolivia, and in the remainder of this paper, bilingual and intercultural education is known as EIB (*educación bilingüe intercultural*).

process of reform, there were doubts that the Ministry had the vision and capacity to carry out a reform with the necessary scope for the complete restructuring of the educational sector. ETARE was funded by international aid and thereby gained an additional measure of independence from the government (República de Bolivia, 1994c).

In January 1992, while the PEIB program had yet to reach full implementation and ETARE was still in the early stages of the reform scheduled for 1994, the government officialized EIB with *Decreto Supremo 23036* (Miranda, 1994; Martines, 1996). There were arguments against this decree from those who disagreed on a pedagogical or logistical basis and who pointed to the absence of any EIB validated curriculum to implement (Miranda, 1994). Other criticisms focused on the rush to institutionalization that undercut the possibility of grassroots participation in policy formation (Cárdenas, 1993; Miranda, 1994; Pimentel, 1993). The haste in officializing EIB may have also resulted from the desire to impose the policy while simultaneously giving the impression of unanimity in order to facilitate international financing (Alavi, 1994). The government faced of growing pressure to address the claims of indigenous peoples, especially the claims of the Guaraní promoted by the APG[18]; pressure stemmed from the demands and the increasing mobilization of indigenous communities[19] as well from the obligations incurred as a signatory of the International Labor Organization's Convention 169.[20] The government made no attempt to disguise that the officialization of EIB was intended to address the pressure of indigenous claims on the government's own terms (D'Emilio, 1991).

La Reforma Educativa, 1994

Due partly to its international funding and extra-ministerial status, ETARE's reform planning continued apace through the Paz Zamora government and into the government of President Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada (1993-1997). The education reform became law (*Ley 1565*) in June of 1994. The reform repeals the provisions of the *Código* which divided the education system into two parallel systems, one urban and one rural, and not only institutionalized the modality of EIB but also established interculturality as an *eje transversal* or *vertebrador*[21] of the entire education system (Moya, 1998; Anaya, 2002a).

The goals of the reform include: to improve the quality and efficiency of education and to make it more relevant to community needs, to broaden its coverage, to promote the permanence of educators in the system, and to guarantee equality between the rights of men and women (República de Bolivia, 1994b, Article 3:3). Towards this end, it incorporates bilingual intercultural education; it restructures the education system, the teacher training system and the system of educational administration; and it prioritizes primary education (Contreras, 1999). The reform calls for transforming two dimensions of the Bolivian

[18] The APG is the *Asamblea del Pueblos Guaraní*, the alliance of Guaraní communities formalized as the APG in 1987. The government signed D.S. 23036 in Ivo during the centennial commemoration of the battle of Kurujuky where the Guaraní lost their autonomy to the Bolivian army, never having been vanquished by the Spanish (D'Emilio, 1991; ETARE, 1993).

[19] Mobilizations such as the 450 mile March for Territory and Dignity in 1990 by the indigenous populations of eastern Bolivia also created a sense of international pressure as they were compounded by similar marches in Ecuador and Guatemala (Ströbele-Gregor, Hoffman & Holmes, 1994).

[20] In 1991, Bolivia was one of the first countries to ratify ILO Convention 169 (International Labour Organization, 1989) which calls for bilingual education and alternate measures where not practicable; adequate provisions to assure national language proficiency; and efforts to preserve and promote the use and development of indigenous languages (Article 28:1-3).

[21] A pivotal element (Present author's translation). The other pivotal element is popular participation (Anaya, 2002b).

education system simultaneously: the curricular-pedagogical approach and the institutional-administrative approach. In this way it differs significantly from other Latin American education reforms which focus on elements of the existing curriculum and pedagogy (Anaya, 2002b). This integrated reform promotes the necessary ideological as well as pedagogical change without which bilingual education would remain transition-oriented rather than maintenance-oriented, and assimilationist rather than pluralist.

Under the reform, Bolivian education takes into account the country's sociocultural heterogeneity and is, therefore, both intercultural and bilingual (Article 1:5). Unlike the *Código*, the 1994 reform addresses the importance of developing both personal and collective identity (Article 2:3).[22] This goal somewhat counterbalances repeated references to *la colectividad*, or the community, as does the recognition of Bolivia as both multicultural and multiregional (Article 1:4 and Article 2:4). In its recognition of the importance of regions combined with the efforts at decentralization, the reform reverses both the centralism and the rural-urban divide promulgated in the *Código*. Respect for sociocultural heterogeneity, however, remains in a delicate balance with the long-time goal of forging a common sense of national consciousness.

The 1994 education reform directly addresses language (Article 9: 2), yet bilingual education is not the focus of the document's provisions. Instead the reforms hinge on two concepts: interculturality and popular participation. Popular participation, which allows for local representation in government and community involvement in policy making, was a central theme of the series of reforms under President Sánchez de Lozada (1993-1997). The Popular Participation Law (*Ley 1551*, 1994) does not detail its relationship to educational planning; however, the education reform law and subsequent regulations for popular participation in education (*Decreto Supremo No. 23949*, 1995) specify mechanisms through which communities can influence educational planning, where representation in the board of education (*Juntas Escolares*) is the most local form of participation.

While law and regulations outline the concept of popular participation, there is no legal document on which the educational reforms can rely for an accepted and detailed definition of interculturality. Amalia Anaya (2002a)[23] explains that in the 1994 reforms interculturality was understood as a relationship of respect and appreciation for different Bolivian cultures that transcends regional and national borders. If this is the intent, then one problematic aspect of the 1994 education reform is the provision for continued Catholic religious instruction in public schools and in private Catholic schools (Article 57). The provision allows for substitution of an ethics class where religious instruction is not acceptable, but in a law that only addresses general areas of study, not specific subjects, and focuses more on organizational changes in the educational framework, the detailed provisions for religious instruction seem to run counter to the self-professed focus on interculturality. While education reform implementation has yet fully to operationalize interculturality, language as it relates to this *eje transversal* is clearly addressed in both the education reform and D.S. 23950 (*Reglamento sobre Organización Curricular*), which outlines the curricular changes to stem from the reforms.

---

[22] The document, however, does not explicitly address the issues arising from multiple collective identities, such as simultaneous membership in an indigenous community and in the larger body of the nation.

[23] Amalia Anaya was a member of the ETARE commission that planned the education reforms, Vice Minister of Education (1997-2001), and Minister of Education (2001-2002).

Language in the 1994 education reform

The education reform addresses the specifics of bilingual education in Article 9 where it outlines the linguistic component of formal and alternative education. Education may be monolingual in Spanish with the additional study of an indigenous language or it may be bilingual with an indigenous language as the first language (or mother tongue) and Spanish as the second language (Article 9:2). The *Reglamento sobre Organización Curricular* (República de Bolivia, 1995) details more precisely the new role assigned to language in Bolivian education.

Bolivian education, both public and private, now has two parts. The *tronco común*, or common core, is a national curriculum which the *Reglamento* characterizes as both intercultural (Article 9) and bilingual (Article 11). The common core is differentiated from the *ramas complementarias diversificadas*, or complementary diversified branches, which are the elements of the curriculum determined by local educational authorities in keeping with the specific needs and values of the community and region (Article 8). Bilingual education should begin in elementary school and then gradually increase its coverage across the entire educational system to preschool and secondary school. The *Reglamento* specifies that the curriculum is bilingual primarily in areas where students speak indigenous languages and need educational provision in a language other than Spanish.[24] It also defines bilingual education as one which promotes the maintenance and development of mother tongue proficiency as well as the universalization of Spanish proficiency.

The *Reglamento* outlines a model of maintenance and development bilingualism where initial reading and writing instruction takes place in the indigenous, mother tongue language at the same time as oral Spanish instruction begins through a second language teaching strategy. Reading and writing in Spanish starts once students have mastered these skills in their mother tongue. Once students have mastered reading and writing in both their mother tongue and in Spanish, both languages are used equally in classroom instruction (Article 11:1-3).

In what is heralded as a move towards *educación bilingüe de doble vía*, or two-way bilingual education, the *Reglamento* (Article 12) requires that the curriculum for monolingual Spanish-speaking students include learning an indigenous language (López, 1995). The document, however, does not specify that Spanish-speaking students must learn an indigenous language, only that their curriculum should include such a subject. The vagueness of this intention is heightened by the long list of Ministries and Vice Ministries which it is hoped will coordinate different strategies for promoting indigenous language learning by Spanish-speaking monolinguals with the additional guidance and funding of private and international organizations (Article 12). The document does not detail the strategies they are to coordinate or the means by which they are to coordinate them, thereby indicating that coordinating indigenous language learning by Spanish-speaking monolinguals is less of a priority than bilingual education for indigenous language speakers and calling into question the extent to which the reforms will promote two-way bilingualism.

The *Reglamento* identifies Spanish as the language of intercultural and interethnic dialogue (Article 30:4), yet this may not be sufficient to overcome parental resistance to bilingual education based on their fears that their indigenous language-speaking children will

[24] The document offers no pedagogical justification for such a need, treating the matter as either understood or as an issue beyond the document's scope.

never gain adequate mastery of Spanish (Contreras, 1999).[25] Parents reassured by the detailed provisions for Spanish language learning may nonetheless wonder whether bilingual education will put their children at a disadvantage after elementary school. Article 11 outlines how the bilingual curriculum begins in elementary school and will gradually extend to the entire education system. In Article 34:1 the *Reglamento* specifies that indigenous language-speaking students will learn in their mother tongue and in Spanish, where the latter is treated as a second language. The corresponding section for secondary education (Article 40), however, makes no mention of students who are native speakers of an indigenous language and for whom Spanish is a second language. The lack of continuity in bilingual education provision, therefore, raises doubts as to the extent to which maintenance and development of mother tongue proficiency can occur if only promoted during elementary education.

A weak foundation for two-way bilingualism and a lack of continuity between elementary and secondary education, however, do not decrease the significance of the role of language in the education reforms. For the first time Bolivian education policy addresses language with a pluricultural ideology which sees not only pedagogical but sociocultural value in the use of indigenous languages in the classroom. As Moya (1998) explains, there is now a policy basis for both horizontal (between different regions of the country, both rural and urban) and vertical (between educational levels) development of EIB in the Bolivian education system.

The Law of Popular Participation, 1994

Popular participation was an important element in the government's cross-sector reform package.[26] The three-part plan, known as the *Plan de Todos*, or Plan for All, included privatization, popular participation, and education reform. All three components sought to increase the number of stakeholders in the nation while making the nation more responsive to local control (Graham, 1998).

Popular participation, approved three months before the education reform in the 1994 *Ley de Participación Popular* (LPP), seeks both to strengthen national legitimacy and fight corruption through municipal decentralization (República de Bolivia, 1994a). Whereas the overwhelming number of local communities had been without adequate regional, departmental or national representation, the LPP seeks to create a greater connection between these communities and the state at all levels as well as to promote electoral and financial accountability and a better distribution of public resources. The LPP addresses the historical marginalization of rural Bolivia by increasing its voice at all levels of government through

[25] These fears may be simultaneously heightened and allayed by the fact that the most avid defenders of the indigenous communities have a high level of Spanish language mastery. They may or may not have maintained their mother tongue proficiency, but they showcase the continued importance of solid Spanish language skills (López, 1994b).

[26] President Sánchez de Lozada (1993-1997) served as the head of the economic planning team for the third Estenssoro government (1985-1989) and was the lead promoter of the *Nueva Política Económica* (NPE), the new economic plan designed, during a severe economic crisis and escalating social conflict which resulted in the president declaring a state of siege in 1985, to shock the economy out of spiraling deflation and to create a market economy. In addition to economic stabilization the NPE sought to re-establish state authority by, contrary to Bolivian precedent, shrinking the central government's purview. The economic plan, including the reduction of the role of centralized planning, constituted a reverse of the policy instituted by the 1952 revolution led by the same president and the same party. Although the plan ended hyperinflation, Sánchez de Lozada lost his 1989 presidential bid to a popular backlash against the high social costs of the NPE (Grindle, 2000). While victor Jaime Paz Zamora (1989-1993) maintained the economic reforms and the state of siege already underway, Sánchez de Lozada developed the *Plan de Todos*, which he implemented once elected in 1993.

the creation of three hundred and eleven new municipalities and general redistricting so that eighty-six percent of all municipalities have a rural majority even though the rural population represents forty-two percent of the national population (Graham, 1998; Grindle, 2000). Greater representation and funding for rural municipalities benefits indigenous people, who represent over seventy percent of the rural population,[27] as does the law's recognition of indigenous and community organizations and urban neighborhood councils as territorially-based organizations known as OTB (*Organizaciones Territoriales de Base*, Article 4). Legal recognition grants these organizations jurisdiction over certain areas and representation at the municipal level (Grindle, 2000).

First, the 1994 education reform law (Article 5) then the 1995 regulations on popular participation in education (*Decreto Supremo No. 23949*) address popular participation as it applies to education where boards of education (*Juntas Escolares*) organized by the OTBs are the most local form of representation (República de Bolivia, 1995b). As the administrative level rises to the national level, local participation is diluted by that of teachers' union, national union, student, university, sub-district and district representation; nevertheless, indigenous representation in education is ensured through indigenous education councils (*Consejos Educativos de Pueblos Originarios*, known as CEPOs). The LPP does not directly address language or interculturality, but it has significant implications for indigenous community recognition and participation in all areas of policy making, including education.

The 1995 Constitution

Reforms in education and popular participation coincided with constitutional changes. The 1967 Constitution was amended in 1994, and the 1995 Constitution approved into law (*Ley 1615*) the same month as the *Reglamento*. The Constitution does not explicitly address language policy or language in education, yet it reflects a broad, if not deep, change in linguistic ideology. For the first time, the Constitution (Article 1) recognizes the country as multiethnic and pluricultural (República de Bolivia, 1995c). Constitutional provisions, however, do not examine the implications of Bolivia's multiethnic and pluricultural reality. There is no mention of ethnicity in any of the subsequent 230 articles. Culture is addressed only in relation to "national culture" which includes colonial art and archeological objects as well as "popular art" (Articles 191 and 192). The Constitution mentions religion, language, values and customs, but does not address how they impact Bolivia's multiethnic and pluricultural reality.

Article 1 does not mention multilingualism, yet language is addressed more directly in the body of the constitution than either culture or ethnicity which, conversely, are mentioned in Article 1. The Constitution (Article 6) guarantees freedom from discrimination on the basis of language.[28] However, the freedom to use, maintain or learn a language, Spanish or indigenous, is not included in the fundamental individual rights guaranteed in Article 7. Both articles remain unchanged from the 1967 Constitution and, therefore, do not substantiate the new multiethnic and pluricultural claims made in Article 1.

The next mention of language in the 1995 Constitution occurs under the heading of Agrarian and *Campesino* Matters (Articles 165-176). The Constitution respects and protects

[27] Based the 2001 census (República de Bolivia, 2001).

[28] The same article also provides for freedom from discrimination on the basis of (but not limited to) race, sex, political opinions, origin and social and economic condition.

indigenous collective social, economic and cultural rights, especially as they relate to communal land, and guarantees the use and sustainable development of natural resources, their identity, values, languages, customs and institutions (Article 171:1).[29] This clause is important to an analysis of Bolivian language-in-education policy for several reasons. First, it is one of only two clauses in the constitution that implicitly recognizes a multilingual reality. Second, it links language to the concept of social, economic and cultural rights. Third, the clause calls not only for the use but also for the sustainable development of languages. In the linguistic arena this would entail promoting maintenance bilingualism (acquisition planning) as well as graphization, standardization, modernization and renovation (corpus planning). The combined link between language, rights, collective recognition, use and sustainable development is a significant boon for the present and future status of indigenous languages (status planning).[30]

In the following clause (Article 171:2), the constitution legally recognizes indigenous communities, *campesino* communities, and *campesino* associations and unions. This provision is problematic because, when viewed in the sequence of Article 171, it is unclear whether the constitution sets a precedent that recognizes indigenous peoples as collective entities. If the terminology in Article 171:1 were preferred then Bolivia, in keeping with Article 1 of the United Nations Charter, is admitting the right of these collective entities to a certain degree of self-determination. In contrast, Article 171:2 affords legal recognition to indigenous communities, where the term "communities" implies a spatial grouping unrelated to ethnicity as with the *campesino* communities, associations and unions recognized in the same clause. The ambivalence of these provisions, however, is not unusual. The debate over whether individual rights provide sufficient protection for all groups, including indigenous peoples, resulted in the United Nations Charter (1945) affirming the principle of self-determination while the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) avoids any mention of ethnic groups and only addresses rights in terms of the individuals that hold them (Kymlicka, 2001).

The term *campesino* denotes a *mestizante* ideology characteristic of the 1952 revolution and subsequent educational reforms. Article 1 of the constitution recognizes Bolivia as multiethnic and pluricultural, and like the 1994 educational reforms reveals a shift away from *mestizante* rhetoric. Nevertheless, there is no separate constitutional section which addresses issues related to indigenous peoples. Despite the distinction between ethnically-based and *campesino* communities, the only indigenous-related provisions (Article 171:1-3) fall under the heading of "Agrarian and *Campesino* Matters" (Part 3, Chapter 5, Section 3). The extent to which the 1995 Constitution has reframed national diversity to include ethnicity and culture rather than class is, therefore, unclear.[31]

Despite the potentially far-reaching implications of Article 171:1, the constitution includes no other mention of issues related to collective indigenous social, economic and

---

[29] The same article recognizes indigenous communities, *campesino* communities, associations and unions as legal entities (Article 171:2) as well as the legality of indigenous and *campesino* community leaders exercising their own administration and applying their own norms as long as these do not conflict with the provisions of the constitution (Article 171:3) (Present author's translation).

[30] Cooper (1989) identifies three language planning foci: status, corpus and acquisition planning. Status planning involves efforts to regulate the demand for verbal resources, while acquisition planning involves the efforts to regulate the distribution of verbal resources. Corpus planning entails the creation, modification and selection of linguistic forms.

[31] The same is true of the Law of Popular Participation which addresses urban, *campesino* and indigenous communities thereby blurring ethnicity with class and geography and ignoring the fact that over half of the urban population is indigenous (República de Bolivia, 2001.) The phrasing in the LPP reveals the perpetuation of a narrow conceptualization of the relationship between culture, ethnicity and class.

cultural rights, language rights, or language maintenance and development. The section on Cultural Matters (Part 3, Chapter 5, Section 4) addresses education in a general and monocultural way (Articles 177-190), and touches briefly on national culture (see discussion above of Articles 191 and 192). The combined provisions for education and culture, however, do not mention any particular rights of, connections to, or provisions for indigenous peoples as collective entities or for indigenous people as individuals.

In the section on Cultural Matters, the only other article implicitly related to language (Article 179) proclaims the importance of literacy for all Bolivians. It does not address, however, the different languages in which Bolivians could become literate, nor does it take into account how even achieving Spanish language literacy to the exclusion of other literacies might require a multilingual approach. After recognizing, in Article 171:1, the reality of Bolivian multilingualism and the right to maintain and develop indigenous languages, in Article 179 the constitution blatantly ignores the educational, not to mention the cultural, implications of such recognition. The incongruity of these clauses despite their proximity belies the constitution's ambivalence towards the change in linguistic ideology that could stem from country's newly recognized multiethnicity and pluriculturalism.

Language officialization

In September 2000, President Banzer signed into law (*Decreto Supremo 25894*) the officialization of thirty-five Bolivian languages (República de Bolivia, 2000).[32] According to the law's preamble, the officialization of these languages (Article 1), the founding of an Eastern, Chaqueña and Amazon Language Academy (Article 2), and the application of the recommendations of the sociolinguistic research currently underway to the education curriculum (Article 3) are based on three laws already in effect. These three laws are the national constitution with special reference to Articles 1 and 171, the ratification of ILO Convention 169,[33] and the 1994 education reform with special reference to Article 9.

Prior to officialization, Spanish was the only official language by default since there was no statute necessary to confer the status the language already possessed. The change under the Banzer administration towards pluriculturalism in official linguistic policy is superficially in keeping with the reforms, under presidents Paz Zamora and Sánchez de Losada, underway both within and beyond the education sector. Fishman (2002), however, cautions that whenever a country officializes a large number of languages it is likely that "someone is getting hoodwinked." While a change in status is a necessary parallel to reform implementation, reforms in language and in educational policies can be so symbolic that they easily run the risk of tokenism. It is essential, therefore, to examine language officialization in the context of other reform-related policies.

The significance of official recognition is further called into question by the absence of any reference to Spanish. The most common distinction in the legal status of different languages is between *official* and *national* languages, where the former have functional and the latter ethnic connotations (Fishman, 2002).[34] Peru, for example, recognizes Quechua and

[32] Languages officialized by this decree include: Aimara, Aranoa, Ayoreo, Baure, Besiro, Canichana, Cavineño, Cayubaba, Chácobo, Chimán, Ese ejja, Guaraní, Guarasu'we (Pauserna), Guarayu, Itonama, Leco, Machineri, Mojeño, trinitario, Mojeño-ignaciano, More, Mosetén, Movima, Pacawara, Quechua, Reyesano, Sirionó, Tacana, Tapieté, Toromona, Uru-chipaya, Weenhayek, Yaminawa, Yuki, and Yucaré (República de Bolivia, 2000, Article 1).

[33] Bolivia ratified ILO Convention 169 in 1991 with *Ley 1257*.

[34] For Fishman (2002), an ethnic connotation is one associated with a particular national ethnic group within the nation-state.

Aymara as national languages that are co-official in certain areas but identifies Spanish as the only official language (García, 2001). In Bolivia, the distinctions remain fluid, thereby further obscuring the implications of officialization but leaving little doubt that indigenous languages have yet to reach any form of parity with Spanish.

Despite the broad scope of the precedents cited, the officialization law addresses primarily the educational sphere. The law promotes an academy of languages but does not otherwise strengthen the status of the thirty-five languages through provisions such as requiring that all official languages be treated and valued equally, or that municipal government use at least two official languages. The 1995 constitution addresses the role of language in the judicial system,[35] and the1994 education reform and the 1995 *Reglamento* provide for the role of language in education. The officialization law neither adds to these provisions nor identifies other spheres where the role of language requires specification.

Perhaps the most concrete and significant characteristic of the language officialization law is its reemphasis of the constitutional provision (Article 171) that recognizes the economic, social and cultural rights of indigenous peoples and guarantees them the use of their languages. As discussed above, Article 171 of the current constitution is far from clear. The officialization law, however, underscores constitutional recognition not only of specific rights but also of the collective rights of indigenous peoples without any confusion arising from references to communities, indigenous or otherwise. In spite of the limited scope of the language provisions and the potentially token nature of officialization, the law offers a precedent for increasingly pluralist reforms beyond the educational sphere.

Conclusion

The significance of bilingual education within the 1994 reform, according to Anaya (2002a), exists at five different levels. At the political level, bilingual education has put into practice the first article of the 1995 Constitution which recognizes the country's sociocultural and linguistic diversity. On the institutional level, it has created the condition whereby indigenous communities are better able to participate in democratic governance and take part in the openings created by the Law of Popular Participation. This is true as well at the micro level where parents and the community are better able to contribute to educational planning for the local schools. On the psycholinguistic level, students already show increased confidence and self-esteem, and on a cultural level students and the entire community benefit from the pluricultural context and the ability to reaffirm their cultural identity (Anaya, 2002a).

If Bolivia is successful in implementing bilingual education across the country, in the context of reforms which promote both interculturality and popular participation, then it would be the first country in South America to revolutionalize its language-in-education planning. Other countries, such as Peru in the 1970s, have flirted with such fundamental changes, but their efforts have never progressed from the pilot stage into the educational system at large (Albó, 1994).

There are numerous challenges remaining in the attempt to implement fully the education reform and its *Reglamento*, including the need to integrate the concept of interculturality more effectively into school practice, to promote the benefits of more and

[35] The only specific reference to language in the 1995 constitution (Article 161:10) is the requirement that the judicial system provide free translators in cases where an individual's mother tongue is not Spanish.

better education, to publicize the role of Spanish in the classroom, and to improve teacher training and the human resources necessary to implement EIB effectively (Alavi, 1994; Anaya, 2002a; Contreras, 1999; López, 1994b). The enormity of these challenges, however, must not detract from the significance of the 1994 education reforms. Contreras (1999) argues that while the 1905 reform sought to "civilize" the indigenous population and the *Código* sought to convert indigenous people into *campesinos* and then assimilate them into dominant culture, the 1994 reform and the *Reglamento* aim to develop citizenship by valuing diversity and promoting participation in education planning.

The reform has been in place for four governments who have overseen its gradual implementation. The fifth post-reform government, headed by Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada, took office in August 2002 only to be replaced in October 2003 after a violent public uprising in opposition to government social and economic policies. As the new Minister and Vice Minister of Education appointed by President Carlos Mesa establish themselves in their posts, it remains to be seen whether EIB will continue to develop and expand in the same way it has since its officialization in 1992 and its incorporation into the 1994 education reforms. Until bilingual and intercultural education becomes a state policy irrespective of changes in government, its effective implementation and ultimate success remains in question (Contreras, 1999; Anaya 2002c; López, 2002).

Furthermore, a pluricultural ideology based on bilingualism and interculturality cannot fully develop if only rooted in educational policy, especially when limited to elementary education (Albó, 2002). The Law of Popular Participation and the 1995 Constitution are critical elements of contemporary Bolivian reform efforts, yet they do not adequately address the kind of linguistic and cultural ideological change envisioned in the education reform. The long-term development of EIB policy depends on a transition from mono- and multi- to pluriculturalism in a critical mass of national policy arenas. López (1994a) argues that Bolivian policy makers have not only rediscovered the country's pluricultural reality but now actively recognize diversity as a resource. If this is the case, then a radically different concept of Bolivian national identity will further impact cultural and linguistic ideology, and the current changes to the role of language in education will reach across the spectrum of national policy.

Bibliography

Alavi Mamani, Z. (1994) La formación de educadores y la problemática de la educación intercultural bilingüe, in *La Propuesta de la escuela intercultural bilingüe en el contexto de la Reforma Educativa*. La Paz: UMSA.

Albó, X. (1994) Apuntes Sociolingüísticos del ultimo censo (1992), in *La Propuesta de la escuela intercultural bilingüe en el contexto de la Reforma Educativa*. La Paz: UMSA.

Albó, X. (2002) *Iguales aunque Diferentes* (4th Edn) *Cuadernos de Investigación*, 52. La Paz: CIPCA.

Anaya, A. (2002a). *Interculturalidad y Literatura en la Reforma Educativa*, Mesa Redonda, Jalla Estudiantil (UMSA) 2002, 16 de septiembre de 2002. [unpublished, personal correspondence October 8, 2002.]

Anaya, A. (2002b) *La Reforma Educativa Boliviana*, Primer Forum Internacional educativo "Bolivia Educa 2002", Las reformas Educativas en América Latina y sus resultados de cara al Siglo XXI, 7 de octubre de 2002. [unpublished, personal correspondence October 8, 2002.]

Anaya, A. (2002c). Personal Interview, September 24, 2002.

Anaya, S. J. (1996) *Indigenous People in International Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Apala Flores, P. (1994) Educación Intercultural Bilingüe: Tareas Complementarias, in *La Propuesta de la escuela intercultural bilingüe en el contexto de la Reforma Educativa*. La Paz: UMSA.

Cárdenas, V. H. (1993) Panel sobre lecciones aprendidas de las experiencias de otros países, in *Seminario Taller: Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*. La Paz: Equipo Técnico de Apoyo a la Reforma Educativa (ETARE).

Cobarrubias, J. (1983) Ethical issues in status planning, in J. Cobarrubias & J. Fishman (Eds) *Progress in Language Planning*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Cooper, R. (1989) *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Contreras, M. (1999) Reformas y Desafíos de la Educación, in F. Campero Pudencio *et al.* (Eds) *Bolivia en el Siglo XX: La Formación de la Bolivia Contemporánea*. La Paz: Harvard Club de Bolivia.

D'Emilio, L. (1991) Bolivia: la Conquista de la Escuela. El Proyecto Educativo de los Guaraní-Chiriguanos, in *Etnias, Educación y Cultura*. La Paz: ILDIS.

ETARE (1993). Introduction to *Seminario Taller: Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*. La Paz: Equipo Técnico de Apoyo a la Reforma Educativa (ETARE).

Fishman, J. (1969) National languages and languages of wider communication in the developing world, *Anthropological Linguistics*, 11 (4), pp. 111-135.

Fishman, J. (2002) Comments delivered on January 10, 2002 during a lecture in the course entitled *Language Planning and Language Policy: National and International Perspectives*. Stanford University.

García, O. (2001) Latin America, in J. Fishman (Ed) *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Graham, C. (1998) *Private Markets for Public Goods*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Grindle, M. (2000) *Audacious Reforms*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hamel (1997) Introduction: linguistic human rights in a sociolinguistic perspective, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 127, pp. 1-24.

Howard-Maleverde, R. & Canessa, A. (1995) The School in the Quechua and Aymara Communities of Highland Bolivia, *International Journal of Eudcational Development*, 15 (3), pp. 231-243.

International Labour Organization (1989). *C169 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989* [Available on line] http://ildlex.ilo.ch:1567/english/convdisp1.htm. Accessed January 30, 2003.

Kymlicka, W. (2001) *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

López Huarto, L. E. (1994a) *Balance y perspectivas de la Educación Intercultural Bilingüe en Bolivia.* La Paz: Ministerio de Desarrollo Humano, Unidad de Apoyo y Seguimiento a la Reforma Educativa (ETARE), 1994.

López Huarto, L. E. (1994b) La educación intercultural bilingüe en Bolivia: ámbito para el ejercicio de los derechos lingüísticos y culturas indígenas, in *Data* 5. Sucre: Universidad Andina Simon Bolivar, pp. 97-124.

López Huarto, L. E. (1995) Sigue el debate sobre educación bilingüe, *Cuarto Intermedio*, 36, pp. 79-100.

López Huarto, L. E. (2002) Personal interview, September 13, 2002.

Luyks, A. (1999) *The Citizen Factory*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Martines Portocarrero, J. L. (1996) *Contribuciones sobre Educación Intercultural Bilingüe en Bolivia: Estado del Arte* (2nd Edn). La Paz: Centro Boliviano de Investigación y Acción Educativas (CEBIAE).

Miranda Casas, F. (1994) Consideraciones Curriculares para un Currículo de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe, in *La Propuesta de la escuela intercultural bilingüe en el contexto de la Reforma Educativa*. La Paz: UMSA.

Moya, R. (1998) Reformas educativas e interculturalidad en América Latina, *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 17 [Available on line] http://www.campus-oei.org/oeivirt/rie17a5.htm. Accessed July 2, 2001.

Pimentel, J. C. (1993) Comentario de la Confederación de Trabajadores de Educación Urbana de Bolivia, in *Seminario Taller: Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*. La Paz: Equipo Técnico de Apoyo a la Reforma Educativa (ETARE).

Plaza Martínez, P. (1988) Hacia una caracterización de la política educativo-cultural boliviana, in L. E. López (ed) *Pesquisas en Lingüística Andina*. Puno: Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología Universidad Nacional del Altiplano & GTZ.

Plaza Martínez, P. & Albó, X. (1989) Educación Bilingüe y Planificación Lingüística en Bolivia, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 77, pp. 69-91.

República de Bolivia, Ministerio de Educación y Bellas Artes (1956) *Código de la Educación Boliviana*. La Paz: Departamento de Publicaciones y Difusión Cultural.

República de Bolivia (1994a) *Ley 1551, Participación Popular*, in Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deportes (2000) *Compendio de Legislación de la Reforma Educativa y Leyes Conexas.* La Paz: Centro de Información para el Desarrollo.

República de Bolivia (1994b) *Ley 1565, Reforma Educativa*, in Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deportes (2000) *Compendio de Legislación de la Reforma Educativa y Leyes Conexas*. La Paz: Centro de Información para el Desarrollo.

República de Bolivia, Ministerio de Desarrollo Humano. Secretaría Nacional de Educación (1994c) *En la Hora de la Reforma Educativa*. La Paz: Unidad de Comunicación de la Secretaría Nacional de Educación, Fascículo V, Abril 1994.

República de Bolivia (1995) *Decreto Supremo N^{o} 23950, Reglamento sobre Organización Curricular*, in Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deportes (2000) *Compendio de Legislación de la Reforma Educativa y Leyes Conexas*. La Paz: Centro de Información para el Desarrollo.

República de Bolivia (1995b) *Decreto Supremo N^{o} 23949 Reglamento sobre Órganos de participación popular*, in Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deportes (2000) *Compendio de Legislación de la Reforma Educativa y Leyes Conexas*. La Paz: Centro de Información para el Desarrollo.

República de Bolivia (1995c) *Constitución Política del Estado, Ley 1615* [Available on line] http://www.georgetown.edu/pdba/Constitutions/Bolivia/consboliv1615.html. Accessed February 8, 2003.

República de Bolivia (2000) *Decreto Supremo N^{o} 25894* [Available on line] http://www.congreso.gov.bo/archivo/fondo.asp?fondo=0&serie=32&formato=A&a=2000&id=047. Accessed May 16, 2003.

República de Bolivia, Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE) (2001) Censo Nacional de Población y Vivienda: autoidentificación con Pueblos Originarios o Indígenas de la Población de 15 años o más de edad [Available on line]. http://www.ine.gov.bo/beyond. Accessed May 26, 2003.

Sangines Uriarte, M. (1968) *Educación Rural y Desarrollo en Bolivia*. La Paz: Don Bosco.

Sichra, I. (1997) La interculturalidad...¿Un Problema? in *II Seminario Latinoamericano de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe en Pueblos Indígenas y Estados Nacionales*, 14-17 enero, 1997.

Soria Choque, V. (1992) Los caciques-apoderados y la lucha por la escuela (1900-1952), in *Educación Indígena: ¿Ciudadanía o Colonización?* La Paz: Arywiyiri.

Spolsky, B. & Shohamy, E. (1999) Language in Israeli society and education, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 137, pp. 93-114.

Ströbele-Gregor, J., Hoffman, B. & Holmes, A. (1994) From Indio to Mestizo...to Indio: new Indianist movements in Bolivia, *Latin American Perspectives*, 21 (2), pp.106-123.

Taylor, S. (2002) Multilingual societies and planned linguistic change: new language-in-education programs in Estonia and South Africa, *Comparative Education Review*, 46 (3), pp. 313-338.

de Vries, L. (1988) *Política Lingüística en Ecuador, Perú y Bolivia*. Quito: Abya Yala.

de Vries, L. (1989) Política lingüística y educación bilingüe en los países Andinos relativas a los quechua-hablantes, in *Pueblos Indígenas y Educación*. 46 Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, 4-8 Julio, 1988, pp. 27-43.