Lang Policy (2014) 13:1–20
DOI 10.1007/s10993-013-9297-4

ORIGINAL PAPER

An ancestral language to speak with the "Other": closing down ideological spaces of a language policy in the Peruvian Andes

Virginia Zavala

Received: 9 May 2013 / Accepted: 26 September 2013 / Published online: 8 October 2013

Abstract Using a multilayered, ethnographic and critical approach to language policy and planning, this article examines a language policy favoring Quechua in Apurímac in the Southern Peruvian Andes, which is being imagined as an integrated community unified by the local language. This study presents a case in which top-down policies open up ideological spaces, while other layers of the policy process obstruct them due to particular interpretations of official declarations. In fact, although official documents indicate a repertoire of Quechua as "our" language for regional integration, Quechua-speaking civil servants and teachers present another, very extended repertoire that portrays Quechua as an ancestral language, important to use only when interacting with the "Other" or with the "pure" Quechua speaker from high-altitude communities. The data analyzed here not only confirms, once more, that various layers of the language policy process can contradict each other, but also that dilemmas exist within the individuals themselves due to the ambivalent colonial structure of Apurimenian society. Thus, while Quechua is associated with subordinated and disdained peasants, officials and teachers also value it as part of "our culture," and in that sense they identify with it.

Keywords Language policy · Quechua · Ethnographic approach · Perú · Otherness · Colonial discourse · Language rights · Discourse analysis

Introduction

In this article, I use a multilayered, ethnographic and critical approach to language policy and planning (LPP) to address a language policy favoring Quechua in the

V. Zavala (✉)
Departamento de Humanidades, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú,
Avenida Universitaria 1801, San Miguel, Lima 32 Lima, Peru
e-mail: vzavala@pucp.edu.pe

Southern Peruvian Andes. Since 2005, the population of Apurímac[1] has been developing a "Regional Education Project" within the framework of educational decentralization, designing a "unique" and "appropriate" education plan for the region; various social actors from the State (e.g., civil servants and teachers) and civil society (e.g., nongovernmental organizations and universities) participated in the development. After acknowledging that, like more than 70 % of Apurimenians, "we speak Quechua," those who participated in this process proceeded to create a general language plan titled "Expanding Quechua in the Apurimac Region 2008–2021," which was explained as follows:

> During all of the conferences leading to the establishment of the Regional Education Project, we have come to understand that our 'runasimi' (Quechua) is not a dead or ancient language, and we are convinced that it is the cultural element which is fundamental to our identity and regional integration; and it is our duty to transform it into a cornerstone of the social and cultural recognition process for Apurimenians (Gobierno Regional de Apurímac (GRA), unpublished manuscript).

This process of revitalization, which is also called a process of expansion, calls for "widespread use of the language," "massive use of 'runasimi' to transform it into a multifunctional language" and "rural and urban communities empowered by the need for Quechua revitalization in the region" (Dirección Regional de Educación de Apurímac (DREA) 2011). As a result of the decentralization of the central government, a process that began in 2000, the region is being imagined (Anderson 1983) as a community of Apurimenians unified by the local language, which creates an emotional identification with the region. In fact, the official discourse favoring the spread of Quechua that appears in various political documents exhibits a strong "we" in an attempt to construct an *Apurimenian* identity and regional integration. Nevertheless, as evident here, there is a disconnect between legislation that supports Quechua expansion and the way various social actors interpret it as well as how policy is finally implemented.

Based on the language planning positions that Ruiz introduced 30 years ago (Ruiz 1984), I analyze the interpretative repertoires (Edley 2001) about Quechua that underlie Quechua ideological debates and hinder the implementation of these official policies. The data collected from civil servants and teachers who are leading the policy of Quechua revitalization illustrate that the Quechua-related stereotypes at work in Apurímac include mixed views of the language as a problem, as a right and as a resource within the ambivalence of colonial discourse and representational practices of "difference" and otherness (Hall 1997; Bhabha 1994). Even though official documents indicate an interpretative repertoire in which Quechua is seen as

[1] According to the census of 2007 (INEI 2008), the region of Apurímac in the Southern Peruvian Andes (situated between Cusco and Ayacucho) has a population of 438,782 people. Of these, 45.9 % live in urban areas and 54.1 % in rural areas, although the process of migration from rural areas to urban ones is permanent and grows every year. In relation to the languages spoken, 28.1 % of Apurimenians speak Spanish as their first language and 71.5 % speak Quechua as their first language. The only province where more people speak Spanish is Abancay (the capital city), where 48.1 % of the population reports Spanish as their mother tongue.

"our" language for regional integration, the actors interviewed present another very extended repertoire that portrays Quechua as an ancestral language, important to use only when interacting with the "Other" or with the "pure" Quechua speaker from high-altitude communities. However, even though this second repertoire appears to be the dominant one among the actors interviewed, they certainly reproduce the first one in some circumstances and an ideological dilemma (Billig et al. 1988) emerges between two contradictory repertoires.

A multilayered, ethnographic and critical approach to language policy

This study is framed within a new critical-ethnographic approach to language planning and policy, which no longer focuses only on polity-generated official documents, but assumes policy as a multilayered process (Ricento and Hornberger 1996; Johnson and Ricento 2013) with many social actors who interact with it in varied and unpredictable ways (McCarty 2010). This framework questions traditional dichotomies between "creation" and "implementation" of policies and proposes that diverse types of actors in national, institutional and interpersonal contexts (or layers) constitute policy interpreters, appropriators and creators of the policy. Therefore, top-down policy legislation would only be one part of the continual policy process, which allows for divergent and even contradictory interpretations of a policy document (Hornberger and Johnson 2010). Although there is still an interest in revealing how language policies may perpetuate social inequality (Tollefson 1991; Pennycook 2006; Ruiz 1984), the ethnographic perspective tries to unravel the planning process taking into account the social actors' internal point of view.

Recent critical and ethnographic work in language planning and policy has discussed cases of top-down policies that close down ideological spaces, as well as bottom-up initiatives that open them back up (Canagarajah 2005; Menken and García 2010; Freeman 2004). Instead of overemphasizing the hegemonic power of policies, these studies have examined the agentive role of educators (and other types of social actors) as they interpret and implement them. Nevertheless, as Hornberger has argued (2000, 2009), national multilingual language policies can also open ideological and implementation spaces for bilingual education and indigenous language revitalization throughout the world, and local language policies can restrict this type of education and minority language development. This is precisely what happens in the context under study.

This article presents a case in which top-down policies in Apurímac open up ideological spaces in a context where the use of Quechua has long been associated with social and political marginalization, economic poverty and low educational achievement. However, other layers of the policy process obstruct them due to particular interpretations of official declarations. In what follows, I take into account a "meso" layer of language policy and planning, which corresponds to discourses and "talk" of civil servants and teachers, and make connections between this layer and the more "macro" one of official policy documents about the expansion of

Quechua. I add a discourse analytic approach to the ethnographic lens, since this will allow me to capture ambivalences and dilemmas in the social actors' voices.

This work is part of a two-year interdisciplinary investigation that I conducted in Apurimac during 2011 and 2012 focusing on the existing favorable conditions and main obstacles in the development of the policy of Quechua expansion.[2] Here I utilize data gathered from interviews of government employees (mayors, deputy mayors, municipal workers, among others) and teachers from the seven provinces of Apurimac, and audio recordings of debates that took place in many types of meetings and workshops among these social actors participating in the language policy process. Within the framework of a multi-site ethnography (Marcus 1998), I also gathered data from workshops that I attended in Lima, where social actors (some of whom were Apurimenians) discussed the elaboration of a national policy favoring indigenous languages. Finally, I used information from personal observations made during the many activities in which I participated in Apurímac (and in Lima), informal conversations with diverse actors over multiple trips to the area, and analysis of Quechua instructional texts that were created in Apurímac.

In the Southern Peruvian Andes where Quechua is spoken, intercultural bilingual education programs (IBE) have been mostly restricted to rural areas, although both rural and urban areas have numerous Quechua speakers.[3] In fact, the use of Quechua is not limited to rural peasant communities from the highlands, where people are immersed in a more traditional and "indigenous" way of life. In the cities of the Southern Andes, most people who are 50 years old and older speak Quechua (even socioeconomic elites who do not define themselves as indigenous), although new generations born in the cities tend to be raised only in Spanish. In 2001, more than 75 % of the population in Apurímac declared that Quechua was the language regularly used at home (ENAHO 2001).

Migration processes from rural to urban areas is also common as Quechua speakers move to the cities to attend high schools and then universities, and increasingly work in socially prestigious jobs such as public service or elected leadership. Therefore, currently many mayors and municipal employees no longer originate from urban elite classes (as occurred many decades ago), but rather from lower classes and even from rural areas, which are generally the poorest areas of Peru. Indeed, the majority of interviewed employees spoke Quechua, although they had different abilities in the language.

Quechua as an "ancestral" language to speak with the "Other"

Ancestralization and ruralization of Quechua language and Andean culture

Officials and teachers spoke about the Quechua language as a language anchored in the past: "because additionally, we have to maintain Quechua because it belongs to

[2] This research was conducted thanks to a grant awarded by my university.

[3] This is because IBE has been assumed as a compensatory and remedial type of education for poor and rural children.

our ancestors" (civil servant). The Quechua language indexes an ancestral identity linked to signifiers such as "ancient," "archeological remain," "Machu Picchu," "ancestors," and "forefathers," among others. This widespread interpretative repertoire consists of "resources for making evaluations, constructing factual versions and performing particular actions" (Wetherell and Potter 1992) in relation to the vernacular language.

Interpretative repertoires are relatively coherent ways of talking about objects and events in the world and consist of clusters of terms, descriptions and figures of speech that are usually put together around metaphors or vivid images (Wetherell and Potter 1992; Edley 2001). In this case, a characteristic of this interpretative repertoire includes the use of metaphors linked to archeological remains. The testimony of a local mayor displays this: "Quechua is, you could say, it's the Machu Picchu of Peru, because it comes from our forefathers, our predecessors, and what are we going to retain from them? Their language, what they have left behind, Machu Picchu, the archeological remains, etc. It's part of Peru's history, it's important to maintain it." A teacher who works in a regional body of the Ministry of Education also alluded to the same repertoire: "speaking of Quechua or interculturality is, for them [the teachers], a sign of backwardness, but the issue doesn't involve that, it's not a sign of backwardness, if it were, we wouldn't have our culture, the construction of Machu Picchu, or Sacsayhuaman [another archeological remain], so it's a bit ignorant of the teachers. That's the issue."

That said, an important point to consider is that, in the dialogues I collected, the ancestrality of the Inkas, archeological remains, and ancestors is considered embodied in present-day rural dwellers. Thus, the Quechua language indexes not only ancestors, but also an idealized communal rural life. This is what I will call the "ruralization" of Quechua, or the association that is established between the present-day "ancestral" language and the culture of the rural communities. Furthermore, the Quechua language is conceived of as an iconic representation of a rural peasant (Irvine and Gal 2000), as if the language could reflect the inherent nature or essence of a specific social group.[4]

When the professionals who reside in urban areas allude to "our identity" or "our people (*pueblo*)", they are really referring to the identity linked to the "pure" peasant from high-altitude rural areas. As a civil servant declared: "If you penetrated farther inside [in the sense of the most rural and distant zone], there's a living culture deep within it that we preserve. We have seen that as one of our riches, and maybe many populations would like to have it. Well, Peru is rich in every corner, but each village has its own special feature, and we try to put that at the forefront". Although the actors interviewed claim a more urban identity, the "ancestral" identity carries the most weight. This is how a local mayor described it when he shared that sometimes he wears a woven *poncho* and *sombrero* when he works at the municipal office: "Of course, that means that we may come wearing a *poncho* and a *sombrero*, and sometimes others say, 'you look like a clown,' right?

[4] Within this iconic representation it is almost impossible, for example, to imagine a young man dressed in a t-shirt, jeans and dark sunglasses talking with his mobile phone in Quechua in Abancay (the capital city of Apurímac, which is associated with more white and Spanish-speaking people).

But if it happens once per year *we must make it feel like that is our identity*, obviously here our identity is more mestizo" (emphasis mine).

In fact, the identity linked to the Quechua language is that which is located "deep within" the wilderness and must be "conserved." It is that which is associated with the "pure ones that still maintain their tradition" and that, according to many actors, is found in "the rural parts" of the "high-altitude zones" of the Andes. The correlation between the Quechua language and the "pure" peasants from high-altitude communities can also be acknowledged when the people who have migrated to the city return to their communities for holidays and "perform" this identity. As a civil servant established: "Yes, I think that as a Quechua speaker it's important to speak about our land's roots, our customs, our cultures, what a great thing when, for example, people return to their village, enjoy their childhood in the way they grew up, how they sang in Quechua, and this is it, *suddenly at this moment you start singing in Quechua*, the harp and violin are already going, that's how it is, don't you think?" (emphasis mine). A similar situation occurs in the context of Carnival celebrations, in which people who travel from the city to the countryside adopt the "Andean identity" for the duration of the event. A mayor put it this way: "Everyone's dressed in that clothing, and that makes them follow *and everyone speaks in Quechua*, they arrive in Ticapama, *they have kind of forgotten Spanish for a bit* and I like that, because in other areas there is no more Quechua, it's diminishing" (emphasis mine). In both cases we can observe that Quechua only emerges during the performance of the "pure" peasant. When this "ancestral" and "rural" identity is left behind, the speaker returns to Spanish.

A revealing anecdote exemplifies this link between Quechua, ancestral rural practices, and an "Andean" identity. At a workshop in Lima organized by the Ministry of Education, working groups met to produce, in a participatory way, a national policy regarding native languages. One of these groups convened Apurimenians of various social statuses, including teacher trainers from urban regions and one classroom teacher from a rural background, who was attending the meeting in traditional clothing (*sombrero* and woven *poncho*). When the time for group work ended, each group had to decide which of the members would share the results with the entire audience. At that time, the group suggested that the leader should be the teacher in the indigenous outfit. One of the trainers of urban origin told him, "You do it, you are authentic, you speak 'pure' Quechua." This phrase naturalizes the association between "pure" (or "true") Quechua, "authentic" cultural practices (or those that prevail in the most traditional rural communities), and a specific identity (the "Andean" identity), and it creates a division between the residents of rural areas, bearers of this "authentic" culture, and those from urban areas, whose Andean culture (and their Quechua) would be—by contrast—fake or illegitimate.

This shows the construction of identity relations within processes of authentication and denaturalization (Bucholtz 2003), which establishes a distinction between a genuine and credible identity and an inauthentic, artificial and noncredible one. In addition, the Quechua language is affiliated with an ideology of authenticity, since it acquires its value when associated with a concrete community and as an expression of its spirit (Woolard 2007). The "authentic"

Quechua voice is constructed as deeply rooted in a determined geographical space and in specific rural and traditional cultural practices. It is important to point out, however, that authenticity—and the authentic subject—is constructed by the social practices of authentication and that authenticity as such does not exist as an essence.

The discourse of "inclusion": Quechua as a duty

This conception of the Quechua language as ancestral, as if it were tied to an "ancient" culture but also to a contemporary "pure" peasant culture has influenced the belief—specifically held by officials—that Quechua is important for "assisting" the rural population that only speaks Quechua and cannot communicate in Spanish. This idea has developed within the framework of a new discourse of "inclusion," in a situation in which local and regional authorities are managing many more economic resources than before and it has become more feasible to provide public service even in places previously considered isolated. New aid programs, better resources, and the greater possibility of civil work have resulted in increased connection with rural populations and greater prominence of its Quechua speakers, whose votes and overall civic engagement have become considerably more significant.

In the last 5 years, some regional Peruvian governments have ruled various ordinances about the official use of local languages, which establish that public officials must know these languages in order to interact with the Quechua-speaking peasant population. In that context, current authorities are beginning to understand that Quechua use is a key requirement of their position, and they now accept as natural the importance of interacting with the population in the local language: "One who doesn't understand Quechua, in addition to not speaking it—how is he going to interact with the population?" (Deputy mayor). Therefore, government workers are beginning to assume a new identity now that they perceive a duty to address the peasant population in Quechua: "The idea is that when the people come [from rural areas to the city], right?, they speak in Quechua, *you have the obligation of* responding, understanding, and attending to them in Quechua so that the person who comes to the institution is not poorly served or disadvantaged, or not understood in this case" (mayor); "In all sectors *they [workers] are obligated* to be able to answer questions, offer services, as the mayor said, in the language they best handle" (civil servant); "the public workers *have to* know Quechua as a priority in order to be able to communicate with the user" (deputy mayor, emphasis mine). This construction of a repertoire in which speaking Quechua is assumed to be an obligation of the public worker positions the speaker—in this case the same public worker—in a new identity. Nowadays, being a good public servant implies offering special assistance to the rural population with the goal of "strengthening communication between the people and local authorities" (civil servant). The mandate to use Quechua to offer "good service" to the population and be able to better serve it is reinforced with, and reflected by, deontic modal verbs: now the public worker "has to" speak in Quechua with the Quechua-speaking population, because if he or she behaved in any other way, he or she would not be seen as a good worker. Furthermore, almost all of the mayors interviewed declared that they had utilized Quechua in their political campaigns and specified that they often base their

counter-campaigns on the argument that the other candidate does not know Quechua. They pointed out that in order to gain support, "It's necessary to show that you speak both languages" (mayor). One of the mayors put it more bluntly: "For me, Quechua is an opportunity. Thanks to Quechua I was Mayor, I was Governor, I was Sub-Prefector, Judge; I've occupied almost all public offices in the village."

Quechua as a "problematic" right

This use of Quechua as a "duty" on the part of public workers coincides with a slightly ambivalent view of Quechua as a right of its speakers. Even though the actors affirm that the population has a "right" to speak its language, this conception of "right" is predicated upon the notion of "necessity." For this reason, we can hypothesize that an abstract right to speak Quechua does not exist. Rather, speakers have the right to speak the local language only if they do not possess another form of communication. Once someone overcomes his or her "limitations," or his or her "problem" in Ruiz's terms (in other words, learns Spanish), then his or her subsequent speaking of the local language seems to lack purpose. Currently, the most progressive authorities have strong views about the rights of peasants, such as a right to land, to health or to justice. Nonetheless, Quechua itself is not conceived of as a right, but rather only as an instrument that allows Quechua speakers to satisfy their other rights if they do not speak the dominant language.

This ambivalent conceptualization of Quechua as a right of the speakers is connected to the unequal relationships within the Apurimenian society, relationships that are part of a colonial-like structure. When speakers refer to peasants' right to speak in Quechua when they enter government offices, they transmit a conceptualization of the local language as a "problem" of this "Other," who is also seen as lacking and helpless due to a need to be spoken to in the language that he or she best understands, rather than the dominant language. Otherwise, the peasant will not be able to reach his full potential in the city: "in order to be able to *help* the citizen who arrives to the Municipal office, even more so the Quechua speaker, and *guide him* to the area he or she needs to go, what procedure he or she has to complete" (municipal worker); "the Municipal office is a center where users come from *rural places with minimal services*; when they consult a professional who does not comprehend Quechua, he is not going to be able to resolve their problem" (mayor, emphasis mine). This ambivalent conceptualization of Quechua as a right of the speakers invokes the discourse surrounding "the Indian problem" that was active in Peru until the middle of the twentieth century and was characterized by discourses of "modernization" and "development." In fact, this discourse can still be found in the common sense and the habitus of many Peruvians (Degregori and Huber 2007).

The following excerpts express this conceptualization of Quechua as a problem that must be overcome:

> When you go to the rural areas, the men are generally already literate but the majority of women, almost 90 %, are illiterate. We have an illiteracy rate and the highest percentage of this population is women, generally they are women. Therefore, given their need, they say, they express: "Please, could you speak

> in Quechua?" They say that, if we speak with them, right? In fact, when we are in the village community, we don't need them to ask (Deputy mayor).
>
> We utilize Quechua if we see that the people are going to understand better in Quechua, we do it in Quechua, in the schools the same, in the way they are taught today, the children in preschool, almost 99 % now speak Spanish, thus those are advantages that we already have from the beginning. Here as a Municipal office, for example, if we see that there are peasants who don't understand Spanish we do it in Quechua, we are fluent in Quechua. There's only the problem that we can't write, I can speak Quechua for two hours but I can't write (Mayor).

Various discussion points emerge from these two excerpts. First of all, one can notice that the citizen who supposedly has the right to speak his or her language is represented as lacking and needy. As he or she comes from a rural area where there are "minimal services" and is generally illiterate, the public worker is obligated to "help him" and "guide him." Furthermore, this necessity that the peasants supposedly have is made clear in the first excerpt. The informant utilizes direct reported speech, or constructed dialogue (Tannen 1995), to put words in the mouth of an illiterate peasant woman ("Please, could you speak in Quechua?"), where through "please" and the modal verb ("could"), the identity of the "Other" is constructed as someone who pleads to receive service in her native language.

Second, we note the construction of an ideal monolingual Spanish speaker, both as a level that one must achieve and as a solution to a "problem" associated with Quechua. In the second excerpt the mayor considers an "advantage" the fact that, of the city's preschool-aged children, "almost 99 % now speak Spanish," listing this as a reason why they will no longer need bilingual education. Quechua serves only as a palliative measure when there is a "problem" to solve, in other words, while there are still "peasants who do not understand Spanish." The fact that peasants (or even people who live in the city) could feel more comfortable speaking in Quechua regardless of an ability to communicate in Spanish is not included as part of the right.

The use of language as a social practice is always situated within a "game" of subject positions that do not only temporarily place people in determined identity categories, but also establish certain social relationships between them (Fairclough 1992). Throughout this research, some Quechua-speaking local friends of mine attempted to speak the language to people in diverse urban contexts, but usually those people responded in Spanish. The basis for this phenomenon can be found in the relationship that is constructed in these types of situations and in the discussion about duties and rights that I have presented. If Quechua is only spoken to peasants when it is known that they do not speak Spanish and thus a tutelary[5] (Nugent 2001;

[5] Tutelage is a very common form of authority in Perú that emphasizes difference understood as hierarchy and that has created something very natural: "to consider that there are people who cannot take care of their own interests and who must be guided by those who by nature are the leaders" (Nugent 2001). Tutelage is also associated with the figure (that is still in use today) of the master; although nowadays it often does not designate a concrete state, it works as a field of meanings that refers to aspects of people's identities and relationships (Ruiz Bravo and Neira 2001).

Ruiz Bravo and Neira 2001) relationship is established, then speaking in Quechua to a city-dweller—e.g., a taxi driver, a restaurant server or a store clerk—also constructs this type of relationship, positioning the interlocutor as someone who does not understand Spanish and, consequently, as inferior, lacking, problematic, etc. It is as if responding in Quechua constituted a confession of inferiority.

In this conceptualization of Quechua as existing only to speak with the "Other," public workers feel that it is absurd to address a colleague in Quechua, although both speak the language. Therefore, the public workers adopt the predicament of the language as a duty for interacting with the "Others," but not as a right for themselves to converse with those around them. It is due to this that, in many cases, Quechua speakers themselves who promote a Quechua-spreading policy feel embarrassed when others assume that they speak Quechua outside the traditional context, in other words, with those who do speak Spanish. It is interesting, for example, to observe the responses that many public workers gave when I attempted to challenge the dominant interpretative repertoire or when I asked them if they had Council meetings in Quechua in the municipal office.

1. Interviewer: The Council sessions for example
   Deputy mayor: At this point we haven't had the need to have Council sessions in Quechua
   Interviewer: For what reason?
   Deputy mayor: The people who are present have not demanded it, they also speak Spanish and there hasn't been the need, but we do constantly have meetings in villages to talk about their projects, about their requirements. The visits to the communities, the villages, there Quechua is spoken purely. If a decentralized session were held, possibly that would be done in Quechua, but to date there hasn't been the request. There are leaders who come to participate in the sessions, but as they speak Spanish, there also hasn't been the need, but if in that case there were citizens who asked for it, who do not understand Spanish and they would like Quechua, there wouldn't be a problem. Especially the mayor, the mayor knows Quechua very well, as I was telling you, wasn't I? In fact, his speeches are even more inspiring in Quechua than in Spanish.

2. Interviewer: You've never thought about that topic, correct?[6]
   Deputy mayor: No, truthfully we haven't thought about that, but if the mayor—during our outings, as I was saying, there are meetings, when a councilor goes and doesn't speak Quechua and says "I don't know what you are going to do but figure it out, now you have to speak in Quechua and the meeting is going to be in such-and-such village and in Quechua."

3. Interviewer: Have you ever had a Municipal Council session in Quechua?

[6] That the councilors' meeting be held in Quechua.

Mayor: We haven't tried it, but good proposal, good idea, in that case it would have to be much more open and over radio so that they could know how we speak.

4. Interviewer: Have you ever had a proposal to hold a council meeting in Quechua here?

Mayor: No, look, eh, when, shall we say, our sessions are open, public, it's not closed, then a village comes, right? They can't speak in Spanish necessarily, in Quechua, and our general municipal secretary who leads the council sessions knows Quechua, he speaks, therefore there isn't any difficulty in that sense, therefore, and I also speak and understand Quechua very well, therefore a request comes, he speaks in Quechua, right? Because the people openly come to the municipal office to make a request and they say it in Quechua and we understand and it's feasible, there is no problem.

These excerpts show that the repertoire of Quechua as restricted to speaking with the peasant who does not know Spanish is deeply entrenched in this population. In the first excerpt above, the mayor reiterates several times that "there is no need" to use Quechua in the Council meetings because the participants "also speak Spanish." In the other three excerpts, the interviewer asks about Quechua at the Council meetings and the interviewees always orient their answers toward the trips they make to village communities, toward radio communications directed at people in the communities, or toward the open and public sessions that these Quechua-speaking populations attend. In excerpt #2 the contrast between assuming a "must" in the use of Quechua with peasants and not having thought about using it in urban contexts with urban interlocutors clearly stands out. The categorical tone in the direct reported speech attributed to a mayor's utterance ("I don't know what you are going to do but figure it out, now you have to speak in Quechua and the meeting is going to be in such-and-such village and in Quechua") reveals a firm belief about the use of Quechua with rural peasants as a duty of civil servants.

In excerpt #4, the speaker produces a series of hedges ("No, look, eh, when, shall we say") when providing a non-preferred answer, showing disalignment toward the project undertaken in the question asked (Pomerantz 1984). Features such as hesitations or delays in the second part of an adjacency pair (as question–answer) anticipate the imminent production of a dispreferred response, such as the one given by the mayor. Even more, this dominant repertoire is so ingrained that even the interviewees misinterpret the questions from this common perspective, and they do not think to consider the Council meetings attended only by government workers. In Excerpt #3, for example, the interviewee believes that he has been asked something else and his answers depend on the dominant repertoire that we are discussing. By responding with the utterance "good proposal, good idea" the mayor in excerpt #3 believes that the interviewer asked about a Council meeting with the peasants as participants.

Who is responsible for revitalizing Quechua?

Considering that the Quechua language indexes an ancestral culture as well as a contemporary one consisting of "pure" peasants from high-altitude communities, these peasants are charged with the responsibility to guarantee that this language does not disappear. More city-dwelling public workers, even those of rural origin, do not assume this to be their responsibility. After all, if the majority of people think that "true" or "authentic" Quechua is spoken in the "punas" (communities in very high altitudes), then the people from these contexts are supposedly the ones responsible for its continuous use. When we asked if Quechua could disappear, many of those interviewed argued that this would be absurd:

> Because we have people, we have communities that even though it is true (…) then it is a form of revaluing, of searching for their identity, then precisely what you were saying, that tendency to hispanicize Perú can occur, to me it seems impossible, why? because people have their idiosyncrasies, they have their way of living, it's like if 15 years from now we'll no longer have people who cook with wood stoves, on their stones. Logically changes will start occurring, it's that type of change, otherwise the Quechua language would have disappeared a long time ago because Quechua is ancestral. Thus, it's not so much that it'll be lost but it's necessary to give Quechua its due importance by developing good strategies for its use. More or less that is talking about Quechua, it's complex. We've worked on intercultural bilingual education, the communities don't adopt it correctly, I mean, they have a wrong understanding, they ask why they are going to teach us Quechua if we already know Quechua (Mayor).

> For example, that is what I like best: *compadres, comadres,*[7] they say that in those times it was nice to do things here, in those areas they practiced the *comadre*, before carnival season, and those things, when you are telling them, they are already remembering, and that means it's always necessary to be doing [practicing cultural traditions]. For example, if there were stories from years ago, it's necessary to keep sharing the stories from generation to generation so that they don't forget, so that they continue telling them to their grandchildren, to their great-grandchildren. If in your family there were stories from years ago you have to keep sharing so that they don't forget, only in this way our culture won't die (Teacher).

The conservation or survival of Quechua is attributed to these "Others" who will keep speaking the language because they are the ones who also supposedly maintain the "true" Quechua culture. The causal relationship that is established is clear: Quechua will not disappear "because people have their idiosyncrasies, they have their way of living, it's like if 15 years from now we'll no longer have people who

[7] "Compadre" (masculine) and "comadre" (feminine) are kinship terms used in the Andes to refer to a relationship between two persons, in which one of them is godfather or godmother of the other person's daughter or son. In more traditional rural areas, this kinship relationship implies much closeness and specific duties and rights between the people involved.

cook with wood stoves, on their stones." The reasoning is that one will keep speaking the ancestral language only if one maintains the ancestral culture. As I have mentioned previously, speakers consider the association between Quechua and specific Andean cultural practices as natural. Therefore, when a mayor affirms that Quechua is indeed spoken, he always does so in relation to these cultural practices associated with peasant communities: "Yes, they are working, because here it isn't strange to speak Quechua or exhibit it. It's like during Carnival season, we sing in Quechua, there are songs in Quechua" (mayor). It's important to point out that government workers utilize Quechua to speak with "them" but also when they act like "them."

We should also address the identity "game" enacted in the previous excerpts and the ideological dilemma that is produced between the two interpretative repertoires discussed in this paper: the dominant one of Quechua as an "ancestral" language to speak with the "Other" (and hence as "their" language) and Quechua as "our" language for regional integration (as declared in the official documentation). On the one hand, the informants construct a considerable distance between themselves and the Quechua speaker who supposedly has the responsibility of preserving Quechua. To this end, they utilize a series of linguistic devices: the third person subject pronoun "they" ("they are already remembering," "so that they keep telling the stories to their grandchildren"), "people" ("people have their idiosyncrasies, their ways of living"), the third person possessive "his/her/their" ("it's a way of reestablishing the search for their identity"), the verb "to have" for expressing possession of this "Other" in a tutelary way ("we have people"). On the other hand—and simultaneously alongside this constructed distance between "us" and "them"—they also use discursive strategies to position themselves as partially responsible: "it's always necessary to be acting," "it's necessary to keep telling the stories," "it's necessary to give Quechua its due importance by developing good strategies for its use." Even more, the alternation between both forms in a single phrase is conclusive: "you (impersonal) *have to* keep telling so that *they* don't forget." It's important to note, however, that the use of this deontic modal ("you have to…") has an impersonal form and does not suggest much involvement of the subject in the represented actions.

Bhabha (1994) has posited that the structure of colonial discourse is always ambivalent, as the "Other" is simultaneously a subordinated subject of disdain and a seducing subject of desire. In this sense, the discourse produces a vague boundary between colonizer and colonized. In the analyzed case, even though the government workers distance themselves from the peasant sector while attributing to it the responsibility for conserving the Quechua language, they also identify with this language and feel attracted to a culture that is an "Other" but also "Ours." Although in the second excerpt the informant uses an impersonal deontic modal, at the end he points out that "only in this way our culture isn't going to die" and in this way constructs an inclusive "we" after distancing himself with the previously-mentioned devices. Hence, we can take up Ruiz's classification again and appreciate that the vernacular language is conceived as a problem but also as a right (at least, of "others") and as a resource drawn upon by officials both for speaking with the "Other" and for positioning themselves within an identity that is also assumed as theirs.

Ancestrality and Quechua teaching

The repertoire about Quechua as an ancestral language that is important to use to speak with the "Other" from high-altitude communities has also affected the development of proposals for teaching Quechua to adults who work in diverse government sectors in the region, since the goal is for the student to learn the language in order to speak with this peasant "Other." One of the manuals used for the courses, for example, suggests the following: "The language, at the basic level, is oriented toward the development of oral communicative abilities, fundamentally, for everyday use, and with this you can improve your performance with Quechua-speaking inhabitants"; "Friends, we hope this manual serves as a help to you, and that it allows you to improve your communicative abilities with Quechua speakers and in your daily activities" (Asociación Educativa Saywa 2010). It is significant that, in these excerpts, the "Quechua speakers" refer to those peasants who live in rural communities and require service in Quechua because they do not speak Spanish, even though there are many Quechua speakers who live in urban areas in the region. Therefore, in this way, speakers not only associate "Andean culture" with the practices of the high-altitude rural communities, but they also do the same with the signifiers of "Quechua" and "Quechua speaker."

Furthermore, this division between "us" and "them" is constructed upon the base of a dichotomy between the "urban" and the "rural." For example, this same manual proposes to develop "processes of cultural reaffirmation and the revitalization of the Quechua language, and in this way diminish the gap of inequality between the Quechua-speaking Andean population and the Spanish-speaking urban population." Here once again we can perceive this distance between a presumably Spanish-speaking "us" (even though a large percentage of the region's urban population is bilingual) and a "them" that would be the "true" Quechua speakers and bearers of "Andean culture."

Additionally, Quechua is taught within the framework of traditional rural practices, as if the relationship between a language and a culture were something natural and intrinsic. In that regard, a teacher verified that "each language has its world view" and that learning Quechua means doing so from "the praxis in Quechua": "In these times of climate crisis, we are using Quechua because it is a language with a profound philosophy and profound ethics about relationships with nature; 'saramama', mother corn; 'Pachamama', earth mother." In this way, the Quechua courses for adults in urban areas develop the following abilities: "Listen and narrate your experiences of interaction with the beings of the 'ayllu' (traditional Quechua family and village community structure)," "Read texts about Andean worldview, sharing your knowledge and experiences (ayni)," "Write and interpret sowing songs," "Write narrative texts about the aging of water," "Listen attentively and dialogue about the 'uywanakuy'," "Write narrative texts about Andean upbringing" (DREA, unpublished manuscript). More than Quechua courses, these courses seem to be about knowledge of peasant culture.

In addition to this association between Quechua and traditional cultural practices comes the idea that Quechua is "distorted" if one utilizes it for cultural practices that are not "essentially" Quechua (such as "to sell Donofrio brand ice cream or

Kolynos toothpaste,[8]" according to a teacher). The argument behind this position seems to be the following: if the Spaniards' descendants used what is ours (i.e., Quechua or Andean culture) in order to oppress us, deceive us, and betray us ("they have Christianized us with our Quechua," indicated a teacher), what guarantee exists to believe that the same thing will not keep happening? Thus, this has to do with a withdrawal or a defensive reaction in the face of the risk that, when in contact with more Western cultural practices, Quechua will always end up losing in the context of an unequal power relationship. While alternative proposals for Quechua teaching do exist (above all from NGOs that are external to the Apurimenian context), Quechua leaders who strongly believe in the association between the language and the "Andean worldview" do not welcome these initiatives.

That said, this interpretive repertoire about Quechua teaching for adults is also directly related to the dominant repertoire that is circulating about intercultural bilingual education (IBE) and its purposes. We can see, then, that the discussion so far allows us to better understand the dilemmas of IBE and its multiple paradoxes (Hornberger 2000; Aikman 2003; García 2005; Howard 2007; Valdiviezo 2009). The following excerpt also seems to reveal ideas about the subject:

Interviewer: And what information do you have about that program? What have they shared with you? What have they told you? What are its objectives?[9]

Teacher: Well, in our area here in Cotabambas, first of all it relates to bilingual education, well, to cultural identity, almost all of us identify with that, don't we? It relates to the experiences from our area, all that. Even though the IBE training courses don't infiltrate so strongly around here, however it is the work of each teacher in an educational institution. Well, each one of us does our part because throughout this area we have children, as much as pure Quechua-speaking parents as well, we have, here Quechua alone is still spoken, so it's due to customs more than anything, Cotabambas is rich in traditions. Around there one gets caught up in the enthusiasm to keep cultivating our language, so as not to lose our mother tongue. And, well, IBE, "Quechua for all", works with all schools. I think that they themselves update us at least once per year, they tell us, "you should work on this, you should do that."

Interviewer: And what are the criteria for that selection?

Teacher: Ummmm well, single-teacher schools, well, they look on the one hand by educational institution, single-teacher by schools, those are the criteria more than anything in rural areas, for example here in the urban area, there aren't trainings.

[8] Donofrio and Kolynos are brands that are current in Peru.

[9] The interviewer is asking about the program (or the policy) of "Quechua expansion". It is interesting to note that the teacher responds in relation to bilingual education for rural areas ("it relates to bilingual education"). In fact, many people restrict the policy to the school domain in rural areas and cannot conceive of the expansion of Quechua in urban schools and in other public spaces beyond the education sector.

Interviewer: They don't train here?
Teacher: No, there aren't trainings.
Interviewer: And, why not?
Teacher: Because there aren't single-teacher schools, they aren't rural schools.

This dialogue clearly shows that the teacher conceives of IBE as remedial and compensatory education to be implemented only in single-teacher schools in rural areas where supposedly "pure Quechua-speaking" children and parents can still be found. The causal relationship established here is explicit: "each one of us does our part [or 'we try to implement IBE'] because throughout this area we have children, as much as pure Quechua-speaking parents as well, we have, here Quechua alone is still spoken, so it's due to customs more than anything." Even though the informant alludes elsewhere to the right that the children have to be educated in their language, this right is not considered something that would correspond to all Apurimenians but rather only to those people from distant peasant communities who have difficulty speaking Spanish.

A final point that I would like to emphasize is the association that speakers make between IBE and only certain traditional cultural practices, such as occurred with the representations that they constructed about Quechua.

> No, no, almost superficially just like something like shame we'd have about Quechua, it's something like that, it's not like that like over there, right? Because the food is cooked in clay pots, because of the clothing, because of child-rearing, just like how they raise them all, so many things are in IBE, aren't there? The diet that is given to our children with our own goods, it's something that makes you feel, right, that it's your people, your land, this is how the training courses that they gave us were (Teacher).

Beyond the simultaneous use of "they" and "we" ("how *they* raise them all" vs "given to *our* children with our *own* goods"), this example shows the association between IBE and certain traditional forms of cooking, dressing, and raising children, as if "Andean" were a culture frozen in time and space, and as if IBE implied addressing only the most rural practices. We know that today Peru is chiefly urban and also that migration has played a decisive role in redefining ethnic (and Andean) identities, which has not necessarily implied acculturation.

Discussion and conclusions

In this study, we have seen that official documents about the spread of the Quechua language in Apurimac open up ideological spaces and suggest that this policy implies expanding its uses and functions and concerns all Apurimenians. However, the analysis of the interpretation of the macro policy at a meso layer shows that the desire for integration and for the construction of a community of Apurimenians (as stated in the official documentation) is difficult to achieve. This project of building an Apurimenian "nation" meets with persistent unequal power relationships between social and cultural groups and a colonial heritage that continues to structure our

present. The discussions about Quechua are inscribed within rigid borders constructed between social classes and cultural groups, tutelar and paternalistic relationships among social actors and a "coloniality of power" (Quijano 2000), which hinder a project of equality and remind us that we live in postcolonial societies.

The dominating repertoire of Quechua as an ancestral language to be used only for speaking with the "pure" peasant individuals from high-altitude Andean regions closes down the possibility for these official documents about the spread of Quechua to open up. This study confirms, once again, that there could be divergent and even contradictory interpretations of a policy document. However, it also shows that these divergences and contradictions do not only exist among the different layers of the policy process but also within individuals themselves, who—on the one hand—express a distance from this "Other" but—on the other—also identify with the rural Andean culture, yearn for it and assume it as their own. An ethnographic perspective—together with a discourse analysis approach—can give insights into how the construction of group boundaries and racist relationships end up boycotting language revitalization projects.

This withdrawal into the Andean culture of rural regions and a mistrust toward more Westernized cultural practices arise from a history of discrimination as much at a regional level as at the level of the specific individuals who follow this repertoire. Even if many of the people interviewed have "successfully" adapted in cities, generally they were "expelled" from a rural region because, in one form or another (due to political violence or because they had to attend primary or secondary school outside their community), they left it involuntarily. The painful experiences through which they ended up migrating to cities have generated an aversion to an urban identity associated with more Western cultural practices. Apart from another group that simply denies its origins, blames its culture for its menial condition and easily assumes new, more Western practices, there is a group that struggles to reconcile with the one who has oppressed him and discriminated against him. For this reason, many admire and yearn for a rural identity but feel guilty about the cultural contact and mixing. In this way, they imagine a supposedly harmonious peasant world, yearn for an essentialized rural identity and believe that Andean culture and the Quechua language "distort themselves" when they interact with more Western cultural practices. Similarly, some NGOs' proposals for the development of an "Andean modernity" tend not to receive much support from the local people who encourage language policies favoring Quechua.

Many discourses about linguistic revitalization in other contexts have also been framed from the perspective of romanticizing languages and cultures, producing an essentialization stemming from an intrinsic relationship between language, culture and territory (Patrick 2007). The phenomenon of the essentialization of identities and cultures has been widely debated in the human and the social sciences (Bucholtz 2003) and it can also constitute a deliberate movement intended to forge a political alliance based on the creation of a common identity. Spivak (1988) called these uses of essentialism "strategic" essentialism, which function like a weapon for reorienting power relationships when a stigmatized group forms an oppositional identity with the goal of confronting negative ideologies. This is precisely what is happening in the Andean region under study.

Nevertheless, although the essentialization of languages and cultures makes sense based on the logic above, it can also have a negative effect on them. When local languages are situated within a utopian past, and this occurs at the expense of more contemporary representations, certain speakers remain "confined" to fixed identities and spaces, while other speakers who have moved to various places throughout their lives and have experienced contexts of cultural contact are ignored and disqualified (Patrick 2007: 127). In this study, a representation of what is "Andean" and "Quechua" has been constructed, delegitimizing whomever does not fit into this representation and at the same time "erasing" Andean practices and Quechua use in urban areas from people's imaginaries (Irvine and Gal 2000). Therefore, essentialism can disempower many people whom it excludes a priori from certain groups, where they could function as members of those groups based on other criteria.

Even though the ideology of authenticity is associated with minority languages and in many cases has contributed to the survival of stigmatized varieties and subordinated languages because they have been converted as symbols of identity (Woolard 2007), in Apurímac the Quechua language remains situated in a utopian past, and Quechua speakers from cities who refer to its importance based on an ancestralized ideology do not use it in their daily lives. In addition, the particularist value that emphasizes the ancestral identity can be a limiting factor when the goal is the acquisition and use of the language by a more widespread population, as the official language revitalization project establishes. Fortunately, we know that these existing associations between language, identity and territory are not natural or intrinsic, but rather they constitute historical constructions that individuals can deconstruct with time (Heller 2007). After all, "Andean" and "Quechua" are not limited to the rural and peasant way of life, but are also present in what is urban, local and global, young generations and cultural contact and fluxes.

References

Aikman, S. (2003). *La educación indígena en sudamérica. Interculturalidad y bilingüismo en Madre de Dios, Perú*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities. Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. New York: Verso.

Asociación Educativa Saywa. (2010). *Cultura andina y lengua quechua*. Andahuaylas: DREA, SAYWA & LED.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. R. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas*. London: Sage.

Bucholtz, M. (2003). Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7*(3), 398–416.

Canagarajah, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Degregori, C. I., & Huber, L. (2007). *Cultura, poder y desarrollo rural*. Lima: SEPIA.

Dirección Regional de Educación de Apurímac. (2011). *Apurimaq suyupi pusaq chanin yuyaymanay qichwa simi aswan mastarinapaq*. Ocho muy buenas razones para generalizar el quechua en Apurímac. Abancay: DREA.

Dirección Regional de Educación de Apurímac. *Cultura andina y lengua quechua. Módulos de capacitación (nivel básico e intermedio).* Unpublished manuscript. Abancay, Apurímac.

Edley, N. (2001). Analyzing masculinity: Interpertative repertoires, ideological dilemmas and subject positions. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data. A guide for analysis* (pp. 189–228). London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Freeman, R. (2004). *Building on community bilingualism*. Philadelphia: Caslon.

García, M. E. (2005). *Making indigenous citizens. Identity development, and multicultural activism in Perú*. California: Stanford University Press.

Gobierno Regional de Apurímac. Generalización del quechua en la región Apurímac 2008–2021. Abancay: Unpublished Manuscript.

Hall, S. (1997). The spectacle of the 'Other'. In Stuart Hall (Ed.), *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices* (pp. 13–74). London: Sage.

Heller, M. (2007). Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: a social approach* (pp. 1–22). New York: Palgrave.

Hornberger, N. (2000). Bilingual education policy and practice in the andes: Ideological paradox and intercultural possibility. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 31*(2), 173–201.

Hornberger, N. (2009). Multilingual education policy and practice: Ten certainties (grounded in indigenous experience). *Language Teaching, 42*(2), 197–211.

Hornberger, N., & Johnson, D. C. (2010). The ethnography of language policy. In T. McCarty (Ed.), *Ethnography and language policy* (pp. 273–289). New York: Routledge.

Howard, R. (2007). *Por los linderos de la lengua Ideologías lingüísticas en los Andes*. Lima: IFEA, Fondo Editorial de la PUCP & IEP.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística del Perú. (2001). *Encuesta Nacional de Hogares* (ENAHO). Lima: INEI.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Perú. (2008). *Censos Nacionales 2007. XI de Población y VI de Vivienda. Resultados definitivos. Departamento de Apurímac*. Lima: INEI

Irvine, J., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language, ideologies, polities and identities* (pp. 35–84). New Mexico: School of American Research Press.

Johnson, D. C., & Ricento, T. (2013). Conceptual and theoretical perspectives in language planning and policy: situating the ethnography of language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 219*, 7–21.

Marcus, G. (1998). Ethnography in/of the world system: The emergence of multi-sited ethnography. In *Ethnography through thick and thin*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 79–104.

McCarty, T. (Ed.). (2010). *Ethnography and language policy*. New York: Routledge.

Menken, K., & García, O. (Eds.). (2010). *Negotiating language policy in schools: educators as policymakers*. London: Routledge.

Nugent, G. (2001). ¿Cómo pensar en público? Un debate pragmatista con el tutelaje castrense y clerical. In S. López Maguiña, G. Portocarrero, R. Silva Santistevan y, & V. Vich (Eds.), *Estudios Culturales Discursos, poderes, pulsiones* (pp. 121–143). Lima: Red para el Desarrollo de las Ciencias Sociales en el Perú.

Patrick, D. (2007). Language endangerment, language rights and indigeneity. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 111–134). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pennycook, A. (2006). Postmodernism in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 60–76). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Quijano, A. (2000). Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina. In E. Lander (Ed.), *La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas latinoamericanas*. CLACSO: Buenos Aires.

Ricento, T., & Hornberger, N. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(3), 401–427.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal, 8*(2), 15–34.

Ruiz Bravo, P., & Neira, E. (2001). Enfrentados al patrón: una aproximación al estudio de las masculinidades en el medio rural peruano. In S. López Maguiña, G. Portocarrero, R. Silva Santistevan y, & V. Vich (Eds.), *Estudios culturales. Discursos, poderes, pulsiones* (pp. 211–231). Lima: Red para el Desarrollo de las Ciencias Sociales en el Perú.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Subaltern studies: Deconstructing historiography. In R. Guha & G. C. Spivak (Eds.), *Selected subaltern studies* (pp. 3–32). London: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1995). Waiting for the mouse: Constructed dialogue in conversation. In D. Tedlock & B. Mannheim (Eds.), *The dialogic emergence of culture* (pp. 198–217). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Tollefson, J. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. London: Longman.

Valdiviezo, L. (2009). Bilingual Intercultural Education in Indigenous schools: An ethnography of teacher interpretations of government policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(1), 61–79.

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism. Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. New York: Colombia University Press.

Woolard, K. (2007). La autoridad lingüística del español y las ideologías de la autenticidad y el anonimato. In J. Del Valle (Ed.), *La lengua, ¿patria común?* (pp. 129–142). Madrid/Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.

Author Biography

Virginia Zavala Virginia Zavala obtained her Ph.D in sociolinguistics at Georgetown University. She is currently Professor in the Linguistics section of the Department of Humanities at the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú and coordinator of the Masters' Program in Linguistics at the same university. She has published about intercultural bilingual education, language policies, racism, gender and literacy as a social practice from an ethnographic and discourse analytic perspective.