Language Planning and Policy
in Latin America, Vol. 1

LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY
Series Editors: Dr Richard B. Baldauf Jr., *University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia*
and Professor Robert B. Kaplan, *University of Southern California, USA*

Other Books in the Series
Language Planning and Policy in Africa, Vol. 1: Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa
 Richard B. Baldauf Jr. and Robert B. Kaplan (eds)
Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol. 1: Hungary, Finland and Sweden
 Robert B. Kaplan and Richard B. Baldauf Jr. (eds)
Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol. 2: The Czech Republic, The European Union and Northern Ireland
 Richard B. Baldauf Jr. and Robert B. Kaplan (eds)
Language Planning and Policy in Pacific, Vol. 1: Fiji, The Philippines and Vanuatu
 Richard B. Baldauf Jr. and Robert B. Kaplan (eds)
Language Planning and Policy: Issues in Language Planning and Literacy
 Anthony J. Liddicoat (ed.)

Other Books of Interest
Directions in Applied Linguistics
 Paul Bruthiaux, Dwight Atkinson, William G. Eggington, William Grabe and Vaidehi Ramanathan (eds)
English in Africa: After the Cold War
 Alamin M. Mazrui
Language Decline and Death in Africa: Causes, Consequences and Challenges
 Herman M. Batibo
Language Diversity in the Pacific: Endangerment and Survival
 Denis Cunningham, D.E. Ingram and Kenneth Sumbuk (eds)
Language in Jewish Society: Towards a New Understanding
 John Myhill
Language Planning: From Practice to Theory
 Robert B. Kaplan and Richard B. Baldauf Jr. (eds)
Linguistic Landscapes: A Comparative Study of Urban Multilingualism in Tokyo
 Peter Backhaus
Minority Language Media: Concepts, Critiques and Case Studies
 Mike Cormack and Niamh Hourigan
Multilingualism in European Bilingual Contexts: Language Use and Attitudes
 David Lasagabaster and Ángel Huguet (eds)
Politeness in Europe
 Leo Hickey and Miranda Stewart (eds)
The Defence of French: A Language in Crisis?
 Robin Adamson
Urban Multilingualism in Europe
 Guus Extra and Kutlay Yagmur (eds)
Where East Looks West: Success in English in Goa and on the Konkan Coast
 Dennis Kurzon

Language Planning and Policy in Latin America, Vol. 1
Ecuador, Mexico and Paraguay

Edited by
Richard B. Baldauf Jr. and Robert B. Kaplan

Contents

Series Overview

Since 1998 when the first polity studies on Language Policy and Planning – addressing the language situation in a particular polity – were published in the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25* polity studies (and one issue on Chinese character modernisation) have been published there and between 2000 and 2006 in *Current Issues in Language Planning*. These studies have all addressed, to a greater or lesser extent, 22 common questions or issues (Appendix A), thus giving them some degree of consistency. However, we are keenly aware that these studies have been published in the order in which they were completed. While such an arrangement is reasonable for journal publication, the result does not serve the needs of area specialists nor are the various monographs easily accessible to the wider public. As the number of available polity studies has grown, we have planned to update (where necessary) and republish these studies in coherent areal volumes.

The first such volume was concerned with Africa, both because a significant number of studies has become available and because Africa constitutes an area that is significantly under-represented in the language planning literature and yet is marked by extremely interesting language policy and planning issues. In the first areal volume, we reprinted four polity studies – Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa – as:

> **Language Planning and Policy in Africa, Vol. 1: Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa (2004).**

We hope that the first areal volume has served the needs of specialists more effectively. It is our intent to continue to publish other areal volumes as sufficient studies are completed. We will continue to do so in the hope that such volumes will be of interest to areal scholars and others involved in some way in language policies and language planning in geographically coherent regions. We have already been able to produce three areal volumes in addition to Africa 1 and the four areal volumes presently in print cover 13 polities:

> **Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol. 1: Hungary, Finland and Sweden (2005)** *Robert B. Kaplan and Richard B. Baldauf Jr. (eds)*
> **Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol. 2: The Czech Republic, The European Union and Northern Ireland (2006)** *Richard B. Baldauf Jr. and Robert B. Kaplan (eds)*
> **Language Planning and Policy in the Pacific, Vol. 1: Fiji, the Philippines and Vanuatu (2006)** *Richard B. Baldauf Jr. and Robert B. Kaplan (eds)*

This volume – Latin America 1 – is another such volume:

> **Language Planning and Policy in Latin America, Vol. 1: Ecuador, Mexico and Paraguay**

The areas in which we are planning to produce additional volumes, and some of the polities that may be included are:

Europe, including The Baltic States, Cyprus, Ireland, Italy and Luxembourg;
Asia, including Bangladesh, Hong Kong, Japan, Nepal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, and Taiwan;
Africa, including Algeria, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Nigeria, Tunisia and Zimbabwe.

In the mean time, we will continue to bring out *Current Issues in Language Planning*, adding to the list of polities available for inclusion in areal volumes. At this point, we cannot predict the intervals over which such volumes will appear, since those intervals will be defined by the ability of contributors to complete work on already contracted polity studies.

Assumptions Relating to Polity Studies

We have made a number of assumptions about the nature of language policy and planning that have influenced the nature of the studies presented. First, we do not believe that there is, yet, a broader and more coherent paradigm to address the complex questions of language policy/planning development. On the other hand, we do believe that the collection of a large body of more or less comparable data and the careful analysis of that data will give rise to a more coherent paradigm. Therefore, in soliciting the polity studies, we have asked each of the contributors to address some two-dozen questions (to the extent that such questions were pertinent to each particular polity); the questions were offered as suggestions of topics that might be covered. (See Appendix A.) Some contributors have followed the questions rather closely; others have been more independent in approaching the task. It should be obvious that, in framing those questions, we were moving from a perhaps inchoate notion of an underlying theory. The reality that our notion was inchoate becomes clear in each of the polity studies.

Second, we have sought to find authors who had an intimate involvement with the language planning and policy decisions made in the polity they were writing about; i.e., we were looking for insider knowledge and perspectives about the polities. However, as insiders are part of the process, they may find it difficult to take the part of the 'other' – to be critical of that process. But it is not necessary or even appropriate that they should be – this can be left to others. As Pennycook (1998: 126) argues:

One of the lessons we need to draw from this account of colonial language policy [i.e., Hong Kong] is that, in order to make sense of language policies we need to understand both their location historically and their location contextually. What I mean by this is that we can not assume that the promotion of local languages instead of a dominant language, or the promotion of a dominant language at the expense of a local language, are in themselves good or bad. Too often we view these things through the lenses of liberalism, pluralism or anti-imperialism, without understanding the actual location of such policies.

While some authors do take a critical stance, or one based on a theoretical approach to the data, many of the studies are primarily descriptive, bringing

together and revealing, we hope, the nature of the language development experience in the particular polity. We believe this is a valuable contribution to the theoretical/paradigmatic development of the field. As interesting and challenging as it may be to provide a priori descriptions of the nature of the field (e.g., language management, language rights, linguistic imperialism) based on partial data – nor have we been completely immune from this ourselves (e.g., Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003, Chapter 12) – we believe the development of a sufficient data base is an important prerequisite for paradigm development.

Furthermore, the paradigm on the basis of which language policy and planning has conventionally been undertaken may be inadequate to the task. Much more is involved in developing successful language policy than is commonly recognised or acknowledged. Language policy development is a highly political activity. Given its political nature, traditional linguistic research is necessary, but not in itself sufficient, and the publication of scholarly studies in academic journals is really only the first step in the process. Indeed, scholarly research itself may need to be expanded, to consider not only the language at issue but also the social landscape in which that language exists. A critical step in policy development involves making research evidence understandable to the lay public; research scholars are not generally the ideal messengers in this context (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2007).

An Invitation to Contribute

We welcome additional polity contributions. Our views on a number of the issues can be found in Kaplan and Baldauf (1997); sample polity monographs have appeared in the extant issues of *Current Issues in Language Planning* and in the volumes in this series. Interested authors should contact the editors, present a proposal for a monograph, and provide a sample list of references. It is also useful to provide a brief biographical note, indicating the extent of any personal involvement in language planning activities in the polity proposed for study as well as any relevant research/publication in LPP. All contributions should, of course, be original, unpublished works. We expect to work closely with contributors during the preparation of monographs. All monographs will, of course, be reviewed for quality, completeness, accuracy, and style. Experience suggests that co-authored contributions may be very successful, but we want to stress that we are seeking a unified monograph on the polity, not an edited compilation of various authors' efforts. Questions may be addressed to either of us.

Richard B. Baldauf, Jr.   Robert B. Kaplan
rbaldauf4@bigpond.com   rkaplan@olypen.com

Note

*Polities in print include: 1. Algeria, 2. Botswana, 3. Cote d'Ivoire, 4. Czech Republic, 5. Ecuador, 6. European Union, 7. Fiji, 8. Finland, 9. Hungary, 10. Ireland, 11. Italy, 12. Malawi, 13. Mexico, 14. Mozambique, 15. Nepal, 16. Nigeria, 17. North Ireland, 18. Paraguay, 19. The Philippines, 20. South Africa, 21. Sweden, 22. Taiwan, 23. Tunisia, 24. Vanuatu, and 25. Zimbabwe. A 26th monograph on Chinese Character Modernisation is also available.

References

Kaplan, R. B. and Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2007) Language policy spread: Learning from health and social policy models. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 31 (2), in press.

Kaplan, R. B. and Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2003) *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kaplan, R. B. and Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (1997) *Language Planning From Practice to Theory.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pennycook, A. (1998) *English and the Discourses of Colonialism.* London and New York: Routledge.

APPENDIX A

Part I: The Language Profile of . . .

1. Name and briefly describe the national/official language(s) (*de jure* or *de facto*).
2. Name and describe the major minority language(s).
3. *Name and describe the lesser minority language(s) (include 'dialects', pidgins, creoles and other important aspects of language variation)*; the definition of minority language/dialect/pidgin will need to be discussed in terms of the sociolinguistic context.
4. *Name and describe the major religious language(s)*; In some polities religious languages and/or missionary policies have had a major impact on the language situation and provide *de facto* language planning. In some contexts religion has been a vehicle for introducing exogenous languages while in other cases it has served to promote indigenous languages.
5. Name and describe the major language(s) of literacy, assuming that it is/they are not one of those described above.
6. Provide a table indicating the number of speakers of each of the above languages, what percentage of the population they constitute and whether those speakers are largely urban or rural.
7. Where appropriate, provide a map(s) showing the distribution of speakers, key cities and other features referenced in the text.

Part II: Language Spread

8. Specify which languages are taught through the educational system, to whom they are taught, when they are taught and for how long they are taught.
9. Discuss the objectives of language education and the methods of assessment to determine that the objectives are met.
10. To the extent possible, trace the historical development of the policies/practices identified in items 8 and 9 (may be integrated with 8/9).
11. Name and discuss the major media language(s) and the distribution of media by socio-economic class, ethnic group, urban/rural distinction (including the historical context where possible). For minority language, note the extent that any literature is (has been) available in the language.
12. How has immigration effected language distribution and what measures are in place to cater for learning the national language(s) and/or to support the use of immigrant languages.

Part III: Language Policy and Planning

13. Describe any language planning legislation, policy or implementation that is currently in place.
14. Describe any literacy planning legislation, policy or implementation that is currently in place.
15. To the extent possible, trace the historical development of the policies/ practices identified in items 13 and 14 (may be integrated with these items).
16. Describe and discuss any language planning agencies/organisations operating in the polity (both formal and informal).
17. Describe and discuss any regional/international influences affecting language planning and policy in the polity (include any external language promotion efforts).
18. To the extent possible, trace the historical development of the policies/ practices identified in items 16 and 17 (may be integrated with these items).

Part IV: Language Maintenance and Prospects

19. Describe and discuss intergenerational transmission of the major language(s); (is this changing over time?).
20. Describe and discuss the probabilities of language death among any of the languages/language varieties in the polity, any language revival efforts as well as any emerging pidgins or creoles.
21. Add anything you wish to clarify about the language situation and its probable direction of change over the next generation or two.
22. Add pertinent references/bibliography and any necessary appendices (e.g., a general plan of the educational system to clarify the answers to questions 8, 9 and 14).

Language Policy and Planning in Ecuador, Mexico and Paraguay: Some Common Issues

Richard B. Baldauf Jr.
Associate Professor of TESOL, School of Education, University of Queensland, QLD 4072 Australia <rbaldauf4@bigpond.com>

Robert B. Kaplan
Professor Emeritus, Applied Linguistics, University of Southern California Mailing Address: PO Box 577, Port Angeles, WA 98362 USA <rkaplan@olypen.com>

Introduction

This volume brings together three language policy and planning studies related to Latin America[1]. (See the 'Series Overview' for a more general discussion of the nature of the series, Appendix A for the 22 questions each study set out to address, and Kaplan *et al.* (2000) for a discussion of the underlying concepts for the studies themselves.) In this paper, rather than trying to provide a thorough introductory summary of the material covered in these studies, we will want to draw out and discuss some of the more general issues raised by these studies; we will provide enough summary to position those general issues.

Although Ecuador, Mexico and Paraguay do not represent a neat geographic cluster, they do have several things in common:

- they are all in Latin America;
- they all have Spanish as their official national language;
- they all have significant numbers of long ignored indigenous languages;
- they all have made recent attempts to correct the situation regarding indigenous languages;
- they all have experienced internal and external migration;
- they all demonstrate significant urbanisation;
- they all have experienced substantial emigration;
- they all have experienced difficulty in gathering accurate demographic data;
- they all suffer from the dearth of qualified teachers of indigenous languages;
- they all suffer from administrative complications and resource shortages;
- they all suffer from conflicting ideologies concerning the suitability of indigenous languages for school contexts;
- they all suffer from disparate definitions and interpretations of interculturalism and bilingualism;
- they all experienced religious conversion into Christianity – particularly into Catholicism. Missionary work had a huge effect on the socio-genesis

of languages. This is not to say that, prior to colonialism and Christianity, there were no indigenous languages, but rather to suggest that some contemporary ways of thinking and imagining indigenous languages have their origins in Christianity and literacy;

- they all have recently experienced greater recognition and respect for the languages, cultures and linguistic rights of indigenous groups, but
- they all have experienced a significant gap between policy and rhetoric on the one hand and reality on the other.

As Sánchez and Dueñas (2002) point out, the arrival of Spanish and its subsequent teaching in Latin America was not a policy of the King of Spain and his legislators, i.e., there was no early language spread policy, but rather as there were a large number of small languages that were spread over small territories, except for Quechua, Spanish became the administrative lingua franca and was increasingly used as a powerful tool for the expansion of the Christian religion. It has been estimated that by the end of the 17th century, about 200 years after the arrival of the colonisers, much of the indigenous population could understand Castilian. This linguistic homogeneity also served the *Libertadores* well in the 18th century when they united to break away from Spain, forming independent states, but these new Spanish-speaking elites then reinforced its use, rather than adopting an indigenous identity. Except perhaps in Paraguay, it is only more recently that indigenous languages, education and language rights have become issues. This emphasis is reflected in the studies listed in the 'further references' section of this paper. The three following sketches illustrate the importance of these common issues in the language situations of the several polities examined in this volume.

Ecuador

The Republic of Ecuador sits on the equator on the northwest coast of South America, limited by Colombia on the north and by Peru on the south and east. It is one of the smallest countries in Latin America, occupying some 272,045 sq. km., and supporting a population of slightly more than twelve million (12,616,102). It is divided into three major geographic regions: *la Costa* (the Coast), *la Sierra* (the Highlands) and the *Oriente* (the Amazon Basin), each marked by indigenous groups that together characterise Ecuador as a multilingual, multiethnic and multicultural country. In addition to Spanish, roughly a dozen indigenous languages are spoken.

Shortly before the arrival of the Spaniards, the Incas had conquered the Highlands and a portion of the Coast imposing their language, Quichua, on the other groups in those regions. Ecuador's history as a Spanish colony began in 1532. Spanish became the de facto official language of Ecuador, and the existing socio-political and socio-economic systems were restructured and modeled after Spain. At independence (1830) the new national government aimed to assimilate the indigenous population into mainstream society, to the detriment of indigenous identity and culture; indeed, the government proposed to eradicate all trace of Indianness and to Christianise the Indians so that they might learn how to develop political reasoning in order to permit them to participate in building the nation. Despite the strenuous efforts of the government, even after

more than four hundred years of contact with Spanish under hugely unfavorable circumstances, many of the Indian languages have survived.

The largest part of the population is currently made up of *mestizos* (individuals of mixed indigenous and Spanish heritage) and indigenous people. The so-called *whites*, most of whom are descendants from Spanish settlers, constitute around 10 per cent of the total population; however, they have exercised – since the 1532 conquest of the country by the Spaniards – and they continue to exercise – political and economic power, defining national Ecuadorian culture in terms of the country's Hispanic heritage. The middle class consists largely of *mestizos* and less well-off whites – individuals occupying positions in administration, in the military, or in the professions and smaller businesses. Anxious to distance themselves from the lower class, the members of the middle class have traditionally identified with upper-class values and traditions. The Indians, as well as the Afro-Ecuadorians (whose ancestors were brought to the country as slaves during the Spanish period) occupy the bottom of the social hierarchy. Thus, although Ecuador can be defined by its geographic, cultural and linguistic diversity, historically the dominant tone was set through the Hispanic heritage and the Spanish language, but the linguistic and cultural differences among the indigenous groups has persisted.

There appear to be five themes marking the contemporary language situation:

1. the dynamic and shifting relationships between languages and their speakers;
2. the continued loss of indigenous languages and the on-going transition towards Spanish monolingualism;
3. the continually, and at times rapidly, shifting politics and practices concerning language and education;
4. the long-standing gaps between official policy and rhetoric concerning indigenous populations and languages on the one hand, and implementation of programs to meet those goals on the other, and
5. the dramatic expansion of indigenous power in recent decades, coupled with unexpected sociopolitical changes which make the linguistic situation unpredictable.

In order to explore these themes, the numbers and location of speakers, and the current status of Ecuador's indigenous languages must be examined. The role of internal and external migration and the difficulty of gathering accurate demographic data constitute critical problems. The issue of language spread, focusing on language and education, constitutes an improbable solution; i.e., the significant steps taken toward intercultural bilingual education in recent years and the challenges faced in implementing these programs. A focus on language policy and planning highlights the informal nature of planning and policy in Ecuador – e.g., the multiple indirect channels of planning, including adult education programs, publishing, mass media, and religion. The prospects of language maintenance (i.e., the lesser-known grassroots efforts to revitalise Quichua and other indigenous languages) as well as the most recent unprecedented shifts that have placed a sector of the indigenous population in positions of relative power have had an impact on language maintenance.

Since terminology invariably requires local interpretation, all languages in

Ecuador (other than Spanish) are ambiguously defined as 'minority languages,' a term that may potentially refer either to a numerical minority or to a less powerful population that may in fact constitute a numerical majority. Furthermore, the languages spoken in the Andean and Amazonian regions may be referred to as 'native', 'autochthonous', 'vernacular', 'indigenous', 'unofficial', 'oppressed' and 'substandard,' but to confuse the matter further, the term *minoritised* (instead of *minority*) has been introduced in order to underline the unbalanced sociolinguistic contact situation (and outcomes) in which dominant and subordinate relations are more important than numbers.

It is, in addition, important to clarify the terms Indian (*indio*), black (*negro*), and nationality (*nacionalidad*); in recent years, Indian and Afro-Ecuadorian organisations have chosen to use such formally stigmatised terms as *indio* and *negro* as symbols of self-recognition, empowerment, and pride. Indian people and organisations see themselves as 'nationalities' to convey their common history and their quest for self-determination. Nationalities are recognised to extend beyond state boundaries; i.e., Quichua speakers recognise their nationality with fellow speakers from such other Andean countries as Peru and Bolivia. This practice generated official concern regarding the meaning differences between 'nation' and 'nationality,' i.e., Article 83 of the 1998 Constitution states that the term *nationality* has been chosen by the Indian people, and that acceptance of the term does not imply detachment from the rest of the country, the Ecuadorian state being defined as '*one and indivisible.*'

Adding to the somewhat confused and confusing state of affairs, the *Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador* claims that at least 40 to 45 per cent of the total population of the country is indigenous, while other studies maintain that 25 to 30 per cent is indigenous, and even more conservative estimates drop the estimate to 15 per cent or even 5.3 per cent. In short, there is no general consensus concerning the number of speakers of different languages, the number of indigenous groups, or even the location of some of the groups, and official demographic estimates differ widely depending on the source.

Quichua

Although a number of indigenous languages are spoken in Ecuador, Quichua is recognised both implicitly and explicitly as the predominant Indian language. The reformed Constitution of 1979 (Art. 1) recognised both Quichua and the other indigenous languages as part of the country's cultural heritage, thus giving them the status of national languages.

Despite the fact that Quichua is the most widely spoken indigenous language in South America, the total number of Quichua speakers is unknown; it is estimated at eight million for all of South America (Argentina 120,000; Bolivia 1,594,000; Brazil 700; Colombia 4,402; Ecuador 2,233,000; Peru 4,402,023); however, estimates of the Ecuadorian Quichua population display great variation, depending on the criteria of Indianness and the methodological procedures used by the researchers. The result is a wildly fluctuating estimate, ranging from 340,000 to 2,000,000.

Ecuador, like most Latin American countries, has high rates of rural-urban internal migration; urban areas are home to 62.7 per cent of the country's popula-