INNOVATION IN LANGUAGE LEARNING International Conference

Kichwa Language Teaching Effectiveness and Cultural Relevance in Ecuador's Intercultural Bilingual School System: A Diagnostic

Sophia Cadoux[1], José Pomavilla[2]

[1,2] Yachay Tech University, Ecuador

Abstract

The loss of Indigenous languages in Ecuador continues despite the establishment of the Intercultural Bilingual School System, intended to preserve ancestral languages and strengthen cultural identity. This sociolinguistic mixed-methods study examines the effectiveness of Kichwa language instruction within three intercultural bilingual schools in Imbabura Province. Using observation rubrics informed by constructivist and communicative pedagogies, alongside student surveys (N=55, ages 9–10), teacher surveys (N=6), and classroom observations (N=5), the study assessed both instructional practices and stakeholder perspectives. Results revealed critical gaps in implementation, including insufficient teacher training, limited school-wide use of Kichwa, a lack of culturally relevant materials, and inadequate differentiation for diverse learner levels. Findings underscore the need for enhanced pedagogical support in language pedagogy and culturally relevant pedagogy and the development of multi-level Kichwa curricula to more effectively support Indigenous language revitalization efforts.

Keywords: *Indigenous language revitalization, intercultural bilingual education, communicative language teaching, Kichwa, culturally relevant pedagogy*

1. Introduction

Ecuador's Intercultural Bilingual Education System (Sistema de Educación Intercultural Bilingue, SEIB), formalized in 1988 through Indigenous advocacy, was designed to revitalize ancestral languages and cultural identity. The pedagogical approach, Intercultural Bilingual Education System Model *(*Modelo del Sistema Intercultural Bilingüe, MOSEIB*),* anchored in bilingual instruction and traditional knowledge, was consolidated by the 2008 Constitution and 2011 Organic Law of Intercultural Education, which guarantees Indigenous peoples' right to culturally aligned education. However, despite these legislative advances, classroom practice often falls short: Spanish remains dominant, and the Indigenous language Kichwa continues to face stigmatization, even within intercultural bilingual schools [1].

Multiple studies highlight systemic gaps between policy and practice. Scholars note that symbolic curricula, limited teacher training, and superficial cultural integration undermine SEIB's goals [2]. Although Cotacachi Canton, situated in Imbabura Province, has a notably high Indigenous population, approx. 50% Kichwa nationality [3], the use of Kichwa is rapidly declining. Only 3.8% of youth in Kichwa communities speak primarily in Kichwa in the province, compared to 63.3% of parents and 80.8% of grandparents—underscoring a generational shift [4]. From 2014 to 2024, the use of Kichwa decreased across key domains, including first language acquisition, language spoken at home, and peer interaction.

The classroom emerges as a crucial site for intervention. Students rarely speak Kichwa at school, teachers are often untrained in language teaching pedagogy, and culturally relevant teaching materials are scarce [5]. This study examines Kichwa instruction in three multi-teacher intercultural bilingual schools in Cotacachi Canton. Grounded in constructivist theory, communicative language teaching, comprehensible input hypothesis and critical pedagogy, it analyzes current teaching methods and identifies areas for improvement. By illuminating the disconnect between SEIB's vision and on-the-ground realities, the study contributes to efforts toward meaningful Indigenous language revitalization and culturally sustaining education.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 SEIB vs. SEIBE

Although in 2022 the SEIB was restructured and renamed System of Intercultural Bilingual Education and Ethnoeducation (Sistema de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe y la Etnoeducación, SEIBE), the

article will maintain the term SEIB or Intercultural Bilingual Education (Educación Intercultural Bilingue, EIB) as the study deals exclusively with the MOSEIB and does not address ethnoeducational schools.

2.1 Intercultural Bilingual Education Model vs. Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

This study draws on MOSEIB principles, Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP), and its subfield Linguistically Responsive Teaching (LRT) to establish objectives for Indigenous language instruction. While CRP emerged in Western multicultural contexts, it similarly empowers marginalized students by affirming cultural identity and fostering academic and social consciousness [6]. A dialogue between MOSEIB and CRP strengthens both: MOSEIB offers a strong decolonial framework and CRP provides instructional clarity and assessment methods [7]. Although MOSEIB's flexibility is positive in theory as it allows for contextual adaptation, the absence of concrete objectives can hinder implementation.
MOSEIB in combination with Linguistically Responsive Teaching (LRT) [8], as a CRP discipline, provides a practical framework for developing localized, measurable goals for Indigenous language teaching. Throughout this article, "cultural relevance" and "cultural responsiveness" are used interchangeably to reflect shared pedagogical principles across MOSEIB, CRP, and LRT.

2.2 Language Teaching Pedagogy and Intercultural Bilingual Education

Teaching Kichwa requires more than memorization—it demands meaningful engagement rooted in students' cultural realities. Considering critiques on the use of European models to standardize Indigenous languages [9], this study proposes a localized framework for EIB in Imbabura Province, integrating MOSEIB and LRT principles, to be adjusted as needed. This framework was utilized to create a teaching evaluation rubric for the Kichwa language classroom used in the present study.
Constructivism [10] frames learning as an experiential process where learners build understanding by connecting prior knowledge with new input through social engagement. In Kichwa classrooms, constructivist pedagogy fosters environments that encourage problem-solving, group work, and culturally grounded inquiry [11]. This methodology aligns with the pre-, during-, and post-activity framework used in receptive language instruction, which mirrors the four pedagogical phases of MOSEIB: Contextualization (pre-activity), Problematization and Theorization (during activity), and Application (post-activity). Sociocultural Theory of Language [12] and Funds of Knowledge Theory [13], part of the LRT framework, greatly enrich this approach, adding a cultural layer to language learning through connecting students' linguistic knowledge with their cultural knowledge in the classroom, leading to learning that is co-created.
Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) [14,15] prioritizes fluency, interaction, and authentic language use over initial grammatical accuracy, further connecting language to real-world applications. Akin with theories created in multi-cultural second language acquisition contexts, Cummin's Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Learning Proficiency (CALPS) [16], often cited as a theoretical backing for both MOSEIB and LRT, CLT is a pedagogical practice that employs oral tasks and real-life communication scenarios to develop students' communicative competency both in social and academic realms. Unlike BICS and CALPS, CLT does not differentiate between social and academic fluency and as such is more flexible and practical, outlining well-established methodological phases. It is important to note that, although CLT can prepare multi-level students to better follow and participate in oral history, it does not replace Indigenous oral tradition.
Krashen's Input Hypothesis [17], also referenced in LRT, introduces the concept of comprehensible input—language that is understandable yet slightly beyond the learner's current proficiency level. Contextual supports such as images, gestures, and visual materials facilitate natural language acquisition without relying on verbal input only. For Kichwa educators, this theory highlights the importance of culturally relevant visual and auditory input that helps minimize the Spanish use in the classroom and allows lower-level learners to follow the class. As Kichwa levels amongst learners become more diverse, this scaffolding approach will gain importance.
Critical Pedagogy [18] is also of the utmost importance in this context. In a society where Kichwa is often seen as less-than both culturally and linguistically, giving way to Spanish language hegemony, Critical Pedagogy calls for teachers to challenge students' deficit views of their native tongue as well as reflect on power structures that feed into that view. This would necessarily mean actively valuing the culture in the classroom through authentic and contextualized activities.
In the Kichwa language classroom, L1 language acquisition and L2 language acquisition occur. Constructivism, CLT, and comprehensible input provide a robust pedagogical foundation for both,

while Critical Pedagogy ensures reflection on language hierarchies. Together, these frameworks guide the study's analysis of effective, culturally grounded Indigenous language education within the EIB system for all levels of Kichwa language learners.

2.3 Research Gap

While there are numerous historical and policy analyses of Ecuador's EIB System, few studies focus on classroom realities of Kichwa language teaching methodologies. Research reveals symbolic state support for Kichwa but limited practical implementation [19,20,21]. Quichimbo Saquichagua et al. [22] examine MOSEIB's methodological processes, noting inconsistent application due to weak teacher preparation and limited contextual strategies. Laso Bonilla [23] identifies misalignments between MOSEIB principles and educational realities in Cotacachi, calling for curriculum reform that better reflects Indigenous needs. Drawing on data from 413 respondents, Apolo et al. [24] view EIB as a form of cultural resistance but also report persistent challenges: lack of institutional support, resources, and coherent MOSEIB implementation. In the only studies focused on language pedagogy in the SEIB, Pauta Tenesaca and Zhau Morocho [25] underscore gaps in language teaching methods for Indigenous languages, and Guatatuca Yumbo, Guaygua Mejía, Toapanta Rodríguez y Lescano Toapanta [26] found that gamification greatly increased students' Kichwa vocabulary acquisition and their linguistic self-esteem.

Given the scarcity of hands-on first and second language acquisition research in the EIB system in Ecuador, this study seeks to measure perceptions on cultural integration and language pedagogy in the Kichwa language classroom through student surveys, teacher surveys, and classroom observations. The research questions are as follows:

RQ1: Is Kichwa language being taught using MOSEIB and LRT teaching pedagogy in intercultural bilingual schools?

RQ2: Do students and teachers think that the school system effectively promotes Kichwa language and culture?

4. Methodology

This study employed a mixed-methods approach, integrating quantitative and qualitative techniques to examine pedagogical practices used in Kichwa language instruction across three Intercultural Bilingual Community Education Centers (Centros Educativos Comunitarios Interculturales Bilingües, CECIBs) in Cotacachi Canton. Guided by a framework drawing from constructivism, the communicative approach, comprehensible input theory and critical pedagogy, a classroom observation rubric was designed to assess student participation, language teaching methodology and the incorporation of Indigenous knowledge. Additionally, semi-structured questionnaires including Likert-scale items were created for teachers and students to explore their perspectives on the presence of Kichwa language in the classroom, its cultural value, and the methodologies used.

With approval from the District Education Office, consent was sought in person from guardians of students aged 9–10 in three multi-teacher CECIBs: Nazacota Puento, San Jacinto and Pichincha. Kichwa language classroom observations were conducted, and observation rubrics were completed by the researchers. Surveys were administered to both educators and students to capture insights into their experiences and attitudes regarding Kichwa's role in the educational process.

Survey responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics to identify patterns and trends. Open-ended responses were coded and categorized to highlight recurring themes and points of divergence. Finally, all data—classroom observations, surveys, and insights from the literature—were triangulated to develop a well-supported diagnosis of Kichwa instruction and its cultural significance in Cotacachi's CECIBs. Survey items and responses were translated from Spanish to English.

5. Findings and Discussion

5.1 Student Surveys

An anonymous survey was administered to 55 students aged 9–10 across three intercultural bilingual schools, exploring their perceptions of Kichwa language instruction and its cultural relevance. The first 15 items were quantitative, using a Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Mean scores and standard deviations were calculated to identify strengths and areas for

improvement. These items were followed by four qualitative questions aimed at understanding student attitudes in greater depth.
Value coding was applied to Questions 1, 3, and 4 to classify responses as positive, neutral, or negative regarding Kichwa language, culture, and/or Kichwa class experience. Thematic analysis was then used to identify emerging patterns within each category. Question 2 was analyzed using descriptive coding to catalogue popular classroom activities.

5.1.1 Quantitative Results

Quantitative results support findings that EIB appears to be identity-affirming for students [24]. Higher scores tend to have lower standard deviations, indicating that opinions were relatively uniform on these items. Therefore, the importance of Kichwa teachers, the only positions that truly require Kichwa language sufficiency in the SEIB, cannot be highlighted enough, both as cultural and linguistic role models. Although it is important to acknowledge these positive student perceptions, discussion focuses on the lowest-rated areas to highlight room for improvement.

Table 1. Likert Scores for Student Survey Questions in Descending Order

Question	Mean (descending)	Standard Deviation
1. Kichwa language and culture are valued at my school	4,3	0,75
13. My Kichwa teacher explains everything well—everything is very clear	4,26	0,77
4. I learn important things in Kichwa class	4,1	1,01
7. I feel motivated to improve and learn Kichwa	4,1	0,99
3. I learn a lot in Kichwa classes	4,1	0,92
9. My Kichwa teacher speaks the Kichwa language very well	4	1,11
12. My Kichwa teacher likes the Kichwa language and culture	4	1,06
8. My Kichwa teacher uses different types of activities in class (oral, written, and reading activities)	4	1,02
10. My Kichwa teacher knows a lot about Kichwa culture	4	0,94
5. I learn how to read, listen, write, and speak in Kichwa	4	1,04
14. My Kichwa teacher uses images to help us learn better	3,94	1,01
6. I have many opportunities to participate in Kichwa during class	3,9	1,06
2. I like my Kichwa classes	3,9	1,08
11. My Kichwa teacher includes cultural activities in the classroom	3,57	1,26
15. My Kichwa teacher has us work in different ways: individually, in pairs, and in groups	3,15	1,38
Total Average	**3,95**	**1,03**

Statement 15, “My Kichwa teacher has us work in different ways…”, received the lowest mean score, indicating a perceived lack of collaborative or varied engagement. When viewed through the lens of constructivism and communicative language teaching pedagogy, as well as culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy, this is an area for reflection. Ideally, students would be continually engaged, placed in pair or group work, to be considered main actors in the classroom and not solely passive recipients of knowledge. Due to the communal, collaborative nature of Kichwa culture, not only is it pedagogically-sound to include group work in the classroom, but it is also culturally relevant [27]. “My teacher includes cultural activities…” (3.57) and “I have many opportunities to participate in Kichwa…” (3.90) also highlight the same concerns. According to Funds of Knowledge, Sociocultural Theory of Language and Critical Pedagogy, students should be given opportunities to share their cultural knowledge in non-traditional classroom configurations. A lack of pair work and groupwork, whole-class participation opportunities, and culturally grounded activities, is not viable according to language acquisition frameworks and MOSEIB principles. Qualitative data and classroom observations further confirmed these trends.

5.1.2 Qualitative Results

In reply to Q1, “How do you feel in Kichwa class? Why?”, 76% of students (42/55) reported feeling good in class. Of these, 18 students cited interest in the language or enjoyment in learning new words. Of the remaining 24, some referenced general enjoyment of school or appreciation for their teacher, though many did not elaborate on why they felt positively. Seven students (13%) gave neutral responses, and six (11%) expressed discomfort. Reasons for strain included difficulty memorizing vocabulary or not being fluent in Kichwa, which made participation challenging.
In reply to Q2, “What do you like about Kichwa class?”, students named a wide range of enjoyable activities. Notably, "working in teams" emerged as a favorite, contrasting with its low rating in the quantitative section and suggesting it occurs less frequently than desired.
In reply to Q3, “What part of Kichwa class do you not like or think could be improved?”, five students (9%) felt the teacher's explanations lacked clarity. Eight students (14.5%) identified dictation or writing tasks as difficult. Four students (7.2%) expressed general dislike for the class or the language itself.
In reply to Q4, “Do you think being a Kichwa person is good or bad? Why?”, an overwhelming majority (49/55, or 89%) responded positively, affirming that being Kichwa is good. Among these, 12 emphasized cultural pride and communication, 7 valued bilingualism, 4 cited societal or workplace relevance, and 2 referred to agricultural knowledge. Two students (3.6%) held negative views. Six students were neutral or left the question blank.
These results, although overall positive, highlight a need for a curricular option for lower-level Kichwa students so as not to alienate them from their own language. If Kichwa language loss continues on trend, having L2 Kichwa learners will soon become the norm, and as such, the SEIB should consider separating students into Kichwa language classes based on level and training teachers in language teaching strategies for multi-level classrooms. More varied participation formations and activities are also required in order to engage all students and create a student-centered class environment.

5.2 Teacher Surveys

Six Kichwa language teachers of nine and ten-year-old students (two teachers from each of the three intercultural bilingual schools included in the study) completed a written survey either before or after their classroom observations. Using a Likert scale, teachers rated a series of statements from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), and mean scores were calculated for each item. One open-ended item was also included; responses were analyzed using value coding to categorize perspectives on SEIB as positive, neutral, or negative. Within each category, thematic coding was employed to identify specific concerns and suggestions. Lower scoring items will be discussed as areas for improvement.
Criterion 9, “At the school where I work, all the other teachers speak Kichwa,” received the lowest average score (3.16 out of 5). Teacher comments revealed that most colleagues are “Hispanic,” and while Kichwa-speaking educators use the language in instructional contexts, their mestizo counterparts generally do not. We can understand this to mean that the predominant language in meetings or school-wide events, for example, is Spanish.
Criterion 7, “I feel the support of parents in teaching Kichwa”, had a mean score of 3.5. Responses varied widely across schools and individual teachers. Those who rated the item 2 noted a lack of parental engagement, while some stated that families “do not value their mother tongue” and that students often prefer Spanish because “their parents speak Spanish.” In contrast, respondents who gave the item a 5 described highly supportive families, students already speaking Kichwa at home and parents “requesting grammatical instruction.”
Criterion 6, “My professional training has enabled me to carry out my work successfully”, had a mean score of 4.16. One respondent rated it 2, explaining that their specialization was in an unrelated field, making instruction challenging. Two teachers gave it a 4, one indicating a need for additional practical training. The remaining three teachers rated the item 5, with one emphasizing the value of “establishing clear and achievable goals to connect with students.”
The final survey prompt—“In what aspect(s) could intercultural bilingual education be improved in terms of the Kichwa language and culture?”—was qualitative. One respondent left it blank, and another expressed uncertainty about the question. Among the four remaining responses, all emphasized the importance of preserving and revitalizing Kichwa. Two highlighted the role of parents as “key figures in improving education and sustaining the language and culture,” while the other two called for ongoing professional development focused on bilingual teaching methodologies, Kichwa grammar, and culturally responsive classroom strategies.

In the teacher surveys, a clear need for professional development is outlined, especially in methodologies that would make them more successful Kichwa language teachers. A lack of Kichwa spoken in EIB and within student homes is also a clear take-away from these responses, both environments reinforcing each other in terms of Kichwa language loss. This is especially concerning as, according to the MOSEIB, the Indigenous language is the principal language of instruction and Spanish is only to be used in intercultural contexts.

5.3 Kichwa Class Observations

The final phase of data collection involved five classroom observations focused on evaluating Kichwa language teaching methodologies. Observers used a rubric organized into three categories: Participation (5 criteria), Methodology (11), and Culture & Language (3). Average scores across all observations were 6.6 (Participation), 7.5 (Methodology), and 9.2 (Culture & Language) out of 10.
Within Participation, two criteria stood out as areas for improvement: “Students actively participate in whole-class, pair, and group activities,” and “Student participation is predominant to that of teaching staff.” No instructor scored higher than 2 out of 4 for either item, with averages of 3.7 and 4.3 out of 10 respectively (Table 2). Lessons were predominantly teacher-centered, with students seated and focused on individual tasks like writing or drawing. Oral participation and collaborative activities were largely absent.

Table 2. Average Scores in Descending Order for Participation Criteria

Participation Criteria	Mean (descending)
1. The teacher speaks in Kichwa, only using Spanish when necessary	9,3
5. The planned activities are inclusive	8,1
2. The students speak in Kichwa, only using Spanish when necessary	7,5
3. Student participation is predominant to that of teaching staff	4,3
4. Students actively participate in whole class activities, pair and group activities	3,7
Total Average	**6,6**

In the Methodology category, three criteria each scored an average of 6.8: “Use of images to enhance learning,” “Effective use of vocabulary/grammar examples,” and “Clear sequencing of class activities with pre- and post-phases” (Table 3). Visual aids were missing in four classes and of poor quality in one. According to Comprehensible Input Theory —and studies in English teaching contexts [28]— visuals significantly boost grammar and vocabulary acquisition and student motivation. Their limited use likely reflects a scarcity of Kichwa teaching materials (no teachers used materials from the SEIB), and/or inadequate training in language teaching.

Table 3. Average Scores in Descending Order for Methodology Criteria

Methodology Criteria	Mean (descending)
7. There is an efficient and effective use of didactic material	9,3
15. The teacher corrects students in an effective and kind way	8,1
6. The objectives of the classes are clear/obvious and achievable	7,5
8. The teacher teaches and explains grammar and/or vocabulary clearly	7,5
11. The teacher gives clear instructions regarding the activities	7,5
12. The students can practice the grammar and/or vocabulary in different activities	7,5
13. Students have the ability to practice the following skills: auditive comprehension, oral expression, reading comprehension, writing	7,5
16. The pacing of the lesson is pertinent	7,5

9. The use of vocabulary and/or grammar examples is effective	6,8
10. The teacher uses images to enhance student learning	6,8
14. Class activities follow a clear sequence that include pre- and post-activities	6,8
Total Average	**7,5**

Lessons also showed inconsistency in example clarity. In one session focused on numbers, students consistently confused *chunka ishkay* (12) with *ishkay chunka* (20). In another, an overwhelming vocabulary list hindered effective explanation. In two cases, mixed grammatical structures caused confusion; for instance, “Ñukanchik allku tantata mikunchik” was correctly interpreted by a student as “We eat dog bread”, highlighting a need for clearer modeling. A lower score for statement 14, “Class activities follow a clear sequence that include pre- and post- activities”, also reflects inconsistent implementation of foundational pedagogical pre-activity, during activity and post-activity phases.
In the Culture & Language category, scoring revealed discrepancies between rubric results and observational comments. Non-Kichwa observers hesitated to rate teachers critically due to lack of a “not applicable” option. While the criterion “Activities include authentic aspects of Kichwa culture” was often rated 3 or 4 out of 4 due to the presence of a Kichwa teacher with Kichwa students, notes clarified that cultural themes were not explicitly present in any of the classes.
Data and observations support the finding that Kichwa language teachers generally taught using traditional, teacher-centered methods, which deem the teacher as the source of knowledge and the students as recipients of knowledge. According to MOSEIB and LRT, Kichwa culture should be a guiding principle in Kichwa language instruction, and as such, student configurations in class should reflect how knowledge is constructed in the culture: through community-based practices, reciprocity and collective rituals [29]. Kichwa culture should be not only present in the classroom but be the foundation from which classes are planned. This means that MOSEIB is either intentionally not being implemented, or the school administration and/or teachers have received insufficient training to transform this model into a reality.

5.4 Limitations

Several limitations may have influenced the study’s findings. During student survey administration, some Kichwa teachers remained in the room, and students were observed discussing responses or encouraging each other to answer in certain ways. Additionally, many students required individual clarification of the instructions, suggesting possible misunderstandings of survey items.
For teacher surveys, the lack of anonymity and presence of the researcher may have affected the authenticity of responses. One teacher openly requested help completing the form, asking for suggestions on how to respond, thus raising concerns about response bias.
Classroom observations also presented challenges. Researchers, who were not Kichwa, expressed discomfort in evaluating Kichwa teachers working with Kichwa students in the Culture and Language category. This underscores the need for Kichwa evaluators to provide culturally informed assessments. Finally, all survey responses and observation notes were translated from Spanish to English by the researchers, introducing potential bias in interpretation.

6. Conclusions

This study reveals that, although CECIBs are culturally affirming and have great potential as incubators for language revitalization, there are persistent gaps in the implementation of culturally sustaining bilingual education across Cotacachi’s intercultural bilingual schools. A silent finding in this study was a decline in Kichwa language class hours. At the time of the study, the largest intercultural bilingual school in Cotacachi Canton UEIB Sumak Yachana Wasi, did not offer Kichwa classes, and only 2 out of 28 teachers spoke Kichwa, leading to the school being omitted from the study. However, students in the researched CECIBs did not receive sufficient Kichwa language instruction either, ranging from 45–90 minutes per week. The decline in the use of Indigenous language in EIB is apparent in the lack of Kichwa language skills amongst homeroom teachers, further isolating Kichwa language into one minor subject [30]. Therefore, true curricular integration is essential [19,31]. Without it, Kichwa risks being treated as a peripheral skill rather than a living language embedded in culture and identity. Despite critiques of rote learning and standardized assessments that disregard Indigenous realities [32], there remains a lack of focused research and pedagogical innovation in

language revitalization efforts under MOSEIB, leading to serious concerns about the validity of the system.

Limited collaboration between schools and communities, insufficient teacher preparation in language pedagogy, minimal differentiated instruction, and a lack of culturally grounded materials all hinder effective language teaching. While MOSEIB offers a transformative framework, its framework is too flexible and subjective, leading to inconsistent application, and unaligned teaching methodology [22,23]. This allows for traditional teaching methods and Spanish language to be consistently used in CECIBs, which is not pedagogically-sound nor is it culturally responsive.

Ultimately, revitalizing Kichwa requires more than policy; it calls for meaningful instructional change, the base of which includes a renewed commitment to Indigenous languages. It also includes clear language teaching pedagogies and training on those pedagogies, teacher development, curricular integration and scaffolding for students who are not Kichwa speakers (yet), and authentic collaboration with students' communities. A theoretical framework by which the contemporary SEIBE seeks to revitalize Indigenous languages, along with suggestions for pedagogically aligned activities and assessments, must be articulated. By analyzing current teaching practices, this study calls for the training of teachers in the application of accepted language teaching pedagogy and linguistically relevant pedagogy in Kichwa language classrooms, giving them the tools to succeed while also offering the flexibility to adjust and transform materials based on their localized reality.

REFERENCES

[1] Pinos Montenegro J. E., "La educación intercultural bilingüe en Ecuador. ¿Continuidades coloniales?", Revista Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales, Madrid, Eumed.net, 2020, enero.

[2] Rizzo-Zambrano B., Mendoza-Sierra M. I., & Moreno-Sánchez E., "El devenir de la educación intercultural en Ecuador. Aproximación socio histórica de su institucionalización", MODULEMA. Revista Científica sobre Diversidad Cultural, Granada, Universidad de Granada, 2023, pp. 26–45.

[3] Decentralized Autonomous Municipal Government of Santa Ana de Cotacachi, "Demografía", Cotacachi.gob.ec, Cotacachi, GAD Municipal, n.d.

[4] Ortega F., Haboud M., & Viteri F., "Análisis comparativo del sondeo sociolingüístico de Imbabura 2024 y el sondeo Geolingüística Ecuador 2014", Asociación Kichwakamak Sisariy & Programa Oralidad Modernidad, Ibarra, 2024.

[5] Ipiales Arellano S. Y., "Pérdida del uso de la lengua kichwa en el entorno escolar: Reflexiones para una educación intercultural en el cantón Otavalo", Universidad de Otavalo, Otavalo, 2023, Trabajo de titulación, pp. 1–80.

[6] Ladson-Billings G., "Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy", American Educational Research Journal, Washington D.C., AERA, 1995, pp. 465–491.

[7] Valdez-Castro P. A., "Culturally responsive teaching and intercultural bilingual education: The United States and Latin America's proposals to cultural and linguistic diversity", Revista Caribeña de Investigación Educativa, Santo Domingo, Instituto Dominicano de Investigación Educativa, 2021, pp. 133–147.

[8] Lucas T., Villegas A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez M., "Linguistically Responsive Teacher Education: Preparing Classroom Teachers to Teach English Language Learners", Journal of Teacher Education, Washington D.C., Sage Publications, 2008, pp. 361–373.

[9] López L. E., "Hacia la recuperación del sentido de la educación intercultural bilingüe", Revista Ciencia y Cultura, La Paz, Universidad Católica Boliviana, 2021, pp. 41–66.

[10] Piaget J., "The psychology of intelligence", Littlefield, Adams & Co., New York, 1966.

[11] Santos I., "Fundamentos para el aprendizaje significativo de la biodiversidad basados en el constructivismo y las metodologías activas", Revista de Innovación y Buenas Prácticas, Córdoba, Universidad de Córdoba, 2019, pp. 90–101.

[12] Vygotsky L. S., "Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes", Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1978.

[13] Moll L. C., Amanti C., Neff D., & González N., "Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms", Theory Into Practice, Columbus, College of Education, Ohio State University, 1992, pp. 132–141.

[14] Hymes D., "On communicative competence", Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings, London, Penguin Books, 1972, pp. 269–293.

[15] Canale M., & Swain M., "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing", Applied Linguistics, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1980, pp. 1–47.

[16] Cummins J., “BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction”, Encyclopedia of Language and Education: Volume 2 – Literacy, New York, Springer, 2008, pp. 71–83.
[17] Krashen S. D., “The input hypothesis: Issues and implications”, Longman, New York, 1985.
[18] Freire P., “Pedagogy of the oppressed”, Seabury Press, New York, 1970.
[19] Limerick N., “¿Pueden utilizarse las instituciones estatales para reivindicar los idiomas indígenas? Políticas de educación intercultural bilingüe en Ecuador”, Runa, Lima, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, 2022, pp. 37–55.
[20] Limerick A., “Language policy and practice in Ecuador’s bilingual intercultural schools: A case study of Kichwa revitalization”, Applied Linguistics, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2024, pp. 215–238.
[21] Rodríguez Cruz M., “Unidades educativas del Milenio, educación intercultural bilingüe y (des)igualdad en el acceso a la educación en Ecuador”, Runa, Lima, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, 2017, pp. 41–55.
[22] Quichimbo Saquichagua J., Cachimuel A., & Morales J., “El proceso metodológico del MOSEIB: una mirada desde la práctica docente”, Revista Científica Modulema, Granada, Universidad de Granada, 2023, pp. 45–62.
[23] Laso Bonilla C. A., “Situación y perspectivas de la educación intercultural bilingüe en el cantón Cotacachi”, Revista Ecos de la Academia, Ibarra, Universidad Técnica del Norte, 2021, pp. 63–72.
[24] Apolo D., Flores G., Pauta P., & Mansuttir A., “Educación Intercultural Bilingüe: prácticas de resistencia para la transformación social en Ecuador”, Revista Izquierdas, Santiago, Universidad de Santiago de Chile, 2022, pp. 1–25.
[25] Pauta Tenesaca C. B., & Zhau Morocho M. E., “Guía didáctica para desarrollar las competencias comunicativas del idioma Kichwa en estudiantes de tercer año de la Unidad Educativa Comunitaria Intercultural Bilingüe ‘Tupak Yupanki’”, Universidad Nacional de Educación, Azogues, 2020.
[26] Guatatuca Y., Guaygua L., Toapanta G., Lescano M., “Gamificación como Herramienta Didáctica para la Enseñanza del Idioma Kichwa”, *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar*, Nueva Loja, Ciencia Latina, 2025, pp. 7817–7835
[27] Grzech K., Grefa D., & Uribe Taborda S., “Endangered oral traditions of Kichwa-speaking Ecuador: Collaborative documentation of Upper Napo Kichwa”, Endangered Languages Archive, London, SOAS University of London, 2022.
[28] Ly L., “The effect of visual aids on vocabulary learning”, Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances, Tabriz, Shahid Madani University, 2017.
[29] Lutuala Toaquiza M. S., “Texto de cosmovisión de la nacionalidad Kichwa”, Universidad Politécnica Salesiana, Quito, 2024.
[30] Paronyan H., & Cuenca Díaz M., “Educación intercultural bilingüe en Ecuador: retos principales para su perfeccionamiento y sostenibilidad”, Transformación, La Habana, Universidad de Ciencias Pedagógicas, 2018, pp. 310–326.
[31] Villagómez Rodríguez M. S., “‘Otras Pedagogías’: La experiencia de la Carrera de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe UPS”, Alteridad. Revista de Educación, Quito, Universidad Politécnica Salesiana, 2018, pp. 30–41.
[32] Pazmiño Aguilar C., Umaña Serrato J. P., & Granizo Jaramillo D. X., “Retroceso lingüístico del kichwa en el Ecuador: una propuesta para la revitalización y la enseñanza de la lengua”, Confluenze. Rivista Di Studi Iberoamericani, Bologna, Università di Bologna, 2022, pp. 775–820.