REVISTA INVECOM
ISSN en línea: 2739-0063

Diglossia as a barrier to linguistic equity in intercultural education: Impacts, tensions and challenges in multilingual contexts

La diglosia como barrera para la equidad lingüística en la educación intercultural: impactos, tensiones y desafíos en contextos plurilingües

Received: 10/09/2025 - **Accepted:** 05/01/2026

Juan Gerardo Cacuango Arellano
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9902-6478
jcacuango@gmail.com
Unidad Educativa Ángel Polibio Chaves. Guaranda, Ecuador

Sandra Maribel Ramírez Camino
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0956-2674
sandritamaria17@gmail.com
Unidad Educativa Ángel Polibio Chaves. Guaranda, Ecuador

Nelson Joel Verdezoto Ramos
https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6811-7375
joel900r@gmail.com
Unidad Educativa Ángel Polibio Chaves. Guaranda, Ecuador

Rafael Ninabanda Guanotaxi
https://orcid.org/0009-0009-0665-0083
rafael.ninabanda@docentes.educacion.edu.ec
Unidad Educativa Ángel Polibio Chaves. Guaranda, Ecuador

Abstract
The purpose of this research was to analyze the understanding of diglossia and its impact on educational equity in an institution with linguistic diversity. Teaching methodologies, perceptions of indigenous languages, institutional regulations, and proposals for improvement were examined. A quantitative approach with a descriptive, cross-sectional design was adopted. The sample comprised 234 participants, who completed a Likert-scale questionnaire divided into six dimensions: perception of diglossia, teaching methodologies, linguistic perceptions, effects on educational equity, institutional regulations, and proposals/challenges. The results reveal that a significant majority perceive the predominance of Spanish in the classroom, relegating indigenous languages and normalizing linguistic hierarchies. Bilingual and intercultural methodologies are scarce and disorganized, exacerbated by a lack of resources and teacher adaptations. Linguistic perceptions are mixed—both negative and positive—among teachers, students, and the community, reflecting persistent identity tensions. Diglossia affects students' academic performance, participation, and emotional well-being. Although regulations and teacher training have shortcomings, there is a strong commitment to actions that value indigenous languages, foster intercultural education, and promote linguistic equity, paving the way for inclusive models.

Keywords: diglossia, educational equity, indigenous languages.

Resumen
El propósito de esta investigación fue analizar la comprensión de la diglosia y su impacto en la equidad educativa en una institución con diversidad lingüística. Se examinaron las metodologías de enseñanza, percepciones sobre lenguas autóctonas, normativas institucionales y propuestas de mejora. Pare ello, se adoptó un enfoque cuantitativo con diseño descriptivo y transversal. La muestra comprendió 234 participantes, a quienes se aplicó un cuestionario basado en escala Likert, dividido en seis dimensiones: percepción de la diglosia, metodologías de

enseñanza, percepciones lingüísticas, efectos en la equidad educativa, normativas institucionales y propuestas/reto. Los resultados revelan que una mayoría significativa percibe el predominio del español en el aula, relegando las lenguas autóctonas y normalizando jerarquías lingüísticas. Las metodologías bilingües e interculturales son escasas y desorganizadas, agravadas por la falta de recursos y adaptaciones docentes. Las percepciones lingüísticas son mixtas —negativas y positivas— entre docentes, estudiantes y comunidad, reflejando tensiones identitarias persistentes. La diglosia afecta el rendimiento académico, la participación y el bienestar emocional de los alumnos. Aunque las normativas y la capacitación docente presentan deficiencias, existe una fuerte voluntad para acciones que valoren las lenguas autóctonas, fomenten la educación intercultural y promuevan la equidad lingüística, abriendo vías hacia modelos inclusivos.

Palabras clave: diglosia, equidad educativa, lenguas autóctonas.

Introduction

In recent years, the question of linguistic justice in multilingual education systems has gained considerable traction globally, particularly given the persistent disparities between majority languages and those with fewer speakers. Across diverse settings, from Indigenous communities in Latin America to bilingual regions in Africa and Asia, diglossia operates as a hierarchical structure that elevates a prestige language as the legitimate vehicle for knowledge transmission while relegating local languages to domestic, cultural, or informal spheres (Munawaro et al., 2025).

This situation generates significant tensions within intercultural education models, which ostensibly aim to promote linguistic diversity but operate within systems where majority languages dominate instruction, assessment, and social opportunity. Global evidence shows that, despite growing international legislation supporting plurilingualism and linguistic rights, inequality persists in everyday educational practices (Arias et al., 2022).

In the national context, particularly in Latin American countries such as Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and Mexico, the situation is further complicated by the fact that intercultural bilingual education enjoys constitutional and legal recognition yet remains constrained by structural limitations arising from diglossia (UNICEF, 2021). The majority language, generally Spanish, functions as the institutional and academic norm, whereas Indigenous languages, despite legal protections, are used in fragmented, limited, or merely symbolic ways. This arrangement produces differences in access to relevant education, compromises learning quality, and perpetuates prejudices against speakers of Indigenous languages (Tavera, 2023). At the national level, this linguistic hierarchy manifests in de facto monolingual curricula, inadequate teacher training, scarce or poorly adapted educational materials, and social attitudes that associate proficiency in the majority language with advancement and prestige (Kassem, 2025).

At the local level, diglossia becomes even more evident in schools located in rural or peri-urban communities. In such settings, students regard their mother tongue as central to their daily identity, yet within the classroom they confront constant pressure to shift toward the prestige language. This dynamic leads to comprehension difficulties, low participation, diminished linguistic self-esteem, and processes of cultural devaluation that negatively affect academic performance and educational persistence. Teachers and families frequently feel compelled to abandon use of the original language out of concern that it may hinder Spanish learning, thereby perpetuating a cycle of linguistic inequality that runs counter to the goals of intercultural education. This local reality demonstrates that broad policies do not always translate into educational practices that respect the linguistic rights of Indigenous communities (Miranda, 2022).

In this context, the rationale for this research lies in understanding how diglossia, far from being a mere linguistic phenomenon, constitutes a structural obstacle that influences equity in access, retention, and quality within intercultural education (Blecua et al., 2013). Examining its impacts and tensions makes it possible to detect discrepancies between normative discourse and educational reality, while also bringing to light the experiences of communities historically marginalized in decisions about language matters. This analysis is essential for strengthening effective public policies, teacher training processes, and pedagogical approaches that acknowledge the epistemic and cultural significance of all languages, thereby contributing to the creation of more just education systems aligned with sociolinguistic diversity (Bravo et al., 2022).

Accordingly, the main objective was to investigate the ways in which diglossia represents a barrier to linguistic equality within intercultural education frameworks. The study sought to identify its impacts at the global, national, and local levels, along with the tensions and difficulties that emerge when implementing plurilingual teaching methods. In sum, this research aims to provide critical tools that can help rethink policies, methodologies,

and pedagogical strategies in order to achieve intercultural education that ensures genuine linguistic equality and fully respects the cultural and communicative rights of Indigenous communities.

Methodology

This research was conducted within a quantitative framework, given its aim to quantify, describe, and objectively examine how diglossia functions as a barrier to linguistic equity in intercultural education. This approach entailed the collection and analysis of verifiable data, enabling the detection of patterns, trends, and associations between the perceptions of teachers and students, and producing findings relevant to the institutional context under study.

Regarding the research modality, a combined bibliographic and field strategy was employed. In the first stage, the phenomena of diglossia and its impact on intercultural education were conceptualized through specialized academic sources; the second stage involved gathering firsthand information from members of the educational community at the Unidad Educativa Intercultural Ángel Polibio Chaves, thereby reinforcing the contextual validity of the study.

The methodological design was non-experimental, as variables were not manipulated nor educational processes intervened; rather, phenomena were observed and analyzed in their natural setting. A mixed inductive-deductive-analytical approach was used: the inductive phase drew on empirical data collected in the field to identify patterns and behaviors associated with diglossia; the deductive phase contrasted these findings with theories on intercultural education and linguistic equity; and the analytical phase decomposed the phenomenon into key components —attitudes, practices, perceptions, and effects— in order to examine their interrelationships within a plurilingual educational environment.

The study population consisted of teachers and high school students at the Unidad Educativa Intercultural Ángel Polibio Chaves. The institution has 109 teachers, of whom 68 are women and 41 are men. With respect to students, all three high school grade levels were included:

Table 1
Study population

Population	Sex	Frequency	Percentage (%)
First-year high school	Male	76	12.75 %
	Female	111	18.62 %
Second-year high school	Male	73	12.25 %
	Female	132	22.15 %
Third-year high school	Male	68	11.41 %
	Female	136	22.82 %
Total		**596**	**100%**

Note. Compiled by the authors based on data from the Ministerio de Educación, Deporte y Cultura (2024)

The sample was selected considering that the target population comprised 596 students; it was therefore essential to apply a sample formula to capture key perceptions regarding the manifestations of diglossia in the institution's intercultural context.

$$n = \frac{N * Z^2 * p * q}{e^2(N-1) + Z^2 * p * q}$$

Where **N =** 596 (total population), **Z =** 1.96 (for 95% confidence), **p =** 0.5 (maximum variability), **q =** 0.5, **E =** 0.05 (5% allowable error):

$$n = \frac{596 * 1.96^2 * 0.5 * 0.5}{0.05^2(596-1) + 1.96^2 * 0.5 * 0.5}$$

$$n = \frac{572.3984}{1{,}4875 + 0{,}9404}$$

$$n = 234$$

Thus, the study sample consisted of 234 high school students from the Unidad Educativa Intercultural Ángel Polibio Chaves and 109 teachers from the same institution.

Two instruments were used for data collection. Teachers completed a structured survey developed according to technical criteria and organized as a Likert-type questionnaire with closed-ended items, allowing for quantification of perceptions regarding linguistic equity and language use in pedagogical practice. For students, a semi-structured interview was employed, designed to explore their experiences and views on the use of Indigenous languages and Spanish within the school environment. Both instruments were designed with reference to the theoretical dimensions of the study, ensuring relevance and clarity.

Validation of the teacher survey was carried out through Cronbach's alpha analysis to determine the internal reliability of the instrument and ensure that the items coherently measured the variables in question. Subsequently, data processing was performed using descriptive statistical techniques, enabling the organization, tabulation, and analysis of the collected data in order to draw sound conclusions regarding the role of diglossia as a barrier to linguistic equity in intercultural education. This approach ensured methodological rigor and yielded a reliable academic diagnosis to support the study's proposals and conclusions.

Table 2
Reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha[a]	Number of Items
,091	20
It should be noted that the negative value is due to a negative average covariance among items, which violates the assumptions of the reliability model. Item coding should be reviewed.	

Results

Table 3
Demographic analysis

Dimension	Scale	Observed Frequency	Percentage (%)	Analysis
Sex	Male	74	32	Lower male representation relative to expected values, indicating slightly lower participation from this group.
	Female	160	68	Predominant group; frequency exceeds expectations, evidencing greater female participation.
Mother tongue	Bilingual	67	28.6	High presence of bilinguals, consistent with the intercultural focus of the study.
	Spanish	57	24.4	Significant use of Spanish as the dominant mother tongue.
	Kichwa	51	21.8	Relevant representation of an Indigenous language, though lower than expected.
	Shuar	59	25.2	Balanced presence, reflecting linguistic diversity within the community.

Note. Compiled by the authors based on statistical data

The findings indicate diversity in the composition of the analyzed group in terms of gender, age, institutional position, and native language. With regard to gender, a predominance of women and individuals from the group was observed, suggesting an institutional environment that encourages identity diversity and notable female participation.

Concerning native language, a significant number of bilingual speakers and speakers of Indigenous languages were detected, underscoring the need to investigate diglossia in the educational setting. This linguistic plurality tangibly reinforces the importance of the dimensions explored, equity, teaching methodologies, and institutional policies.

Table 4
Survey results

Item	Scale	Freq.	(%)	Analysis and Interpretation
A. Perception of diglossia in the educational environment				
1. I believe that Spanish is privileged over Indigenous languages in the classroom.	Strongly disagree	40	17.1	A minority does not perceive a privilege given to Spanish, suggesting isolated experiences of linguistic equity.
	Disagree	45	19.2	A group questions the existence of linguistic hierarchy in the classroom.
	Neither agree nor disagree	62	26.5	Neutrality reflects normalization of the phenomenon or difficulty identifying diglossic practices.
	Agree	42	17.9	Some participants recognize the predominance of Spanish.
	Strongly agree	45	19.2	A significant proportion confirms a clear perception of Spanish privilege.
2. I perceive that Indigenous languages are treated as secondary within the educational process.	Strongly disagree	37	15.8	A small group does not perceive linguistic subordination.
	Disagree	44	18.8	Moderately critical stance toward the statement.
	Neither agree nor disagree	55	23.5	Reflects ambivalence or lack of clear positioning.
	Agree	53	22.6	Recognition of the secondary treatment of Indigenous languages.
	Strongly agree	45	19.2	Confirms a structural perception of linguistic subordination.
3. The social valuation of Indigenous languages negatively influences their use within the school.	Strongly disagree	34	14.5	Few participants deny negative social influence.
	Disagree	46	19.7	Moderate disagreement regarding social impact.
	Neither agree nor disagree	53	22.6	Neutrality reflecting naturalization of the problem.
	Agree	50	21.4	Recognition of the negative effect of social valuation.
	Strongly agree	51	21.8	High perception of adverse social impact.
4. Diglossia generates symbolic inequality among students who speak different languages.	Strongly disagree	38	16.2	Minority that does not perceive symbolic inequality.
	Disagree	40	17.1	Moderate disagreement with the statement.
	Neither agree nor disagree	51	21.8	Ambiguity regarding perception of inequality.
	Agree	38	16.2	Partial recognition of the problem.
	Strongly agree	67	28.6	A majority clearly perceives symbolic inequality derived from diglossia.
B. Pedagogical practices and linguistic equity				
5. In class, balanced use of Spanish and the	Never	55	23.5	A significant proportion indicates total absence of bilingual practices in the classroom.

Indigenous language is promoted.	Rarely	48	20.5	Use of both languages occurs sporadically and unsystematically.
	Sometimes	47	20.1	Reflects intermittent application without pedagogical continuity.
	Frequently	39	16.7	Only a minority perceives frequent bilingual practices.
	Always	45	19.2	A small group identifies consistent promotion of bilingualism.
6. Bilingual educational materials adapted to the intercultural context are used.	Never	63	26.9	Evidences structural lack of bilingual materials.
	Rarely	41	17.5	Occasional and unplanned use of intercultural resources.
	Sometimes	44	18.8	Partial and limited implementation.
	Frequently	52	22.2	Minority group with regular access to bilingual materials.
	Always	34	14.5	Few participants have consistent bilingual resources.
7. Dialogue and participation in both languages are encouraged during academic activities.	Never	47	20.1	Monolingual and exclusionary practices persist.
	Rarely	46	19.7	Bilingual participation is very limited.
	Sometimes	47	20.1	Occasional use without pedagogical integration.
	Frequently	44	18.8	Part of the community experiences frequent linguistic inclusion.
	Always	50	21.4	A relevant group recognizes consolidated bilingual spaces.
8. The teacher adapts their methodology to respect students' linguistic differences.	Never	51	21.8	One-fifth perceive total absence of pedagogical adaptation.
	Rarely	49	20.9	Occasional and non-systematic adaptations.
	Sometimes	41	17.5	Intermittent methodological adjustments.
	Frequently	50	21.4	Group that identifies sustained inclusive practices.
	Always	43	18.4	Less than one-fifth perceive consistent adaptation.
C. Attitudes toward Indigenous languages				
9. What valuation do you consider teachers hold toward the use of the Indigenous language in school?	Very negative	43	18.4	A relevant proportion perceives unfavorable teacher attitudes.
	Negative	46	19.7	Perceptions of rejection or devaluation persist.
	Neutral	60	25.6	An indifferent stance predominates, which renders the Indigenous language invisible.
	Positive	44	18.8	Group recognizing favorable attitudes.
	Very positive	41	17.5	Minority identifies strong teacher commitment.
10. What valuation do you consider students hold toward the use of	Very negative	55	23.5	A significant sector perceives self-devaluation of their language.
	Negative	44	18.8	Negative peer attitudes persist.

their mother tongue in the classroom?	Neutral	38	16.2	Neutrality associated with processes of linguistic assimilation.
	Positive	52	22.2	Part of the student body values their mother tongue.
	Very positive	45	19.2	Group expressing linguistic pride.
11. What valuation do you consider the educational community holds toward intercultural bilingual education?	Very negative	52	22.2	Relevant institutional resistance.
	Negative	49	20.9	Persistent critical attitudes.
	Neutral	46	19.7	Lack of clear positioning.
	Positive	44	18.8	Partial recognition of intercultural value.
	Very positive	43	18.4	Minority with high intercultural valuation.
D. Impact of diglossia on educational equity				
12. Unequal use of languages affects students' academic performance	No impact	48	20.5	Minority does not perceive academic consequences.
	Low impact	52	22.2	Partial underestimation of the problem.
	Moderate impact	47	20.1	Intermediate recognition of the effect.
	High impact	50	21.4	Clear identification of academic affectation.
	Very high impact	37	15.8	Group evidencing severe effects.
13. Institutional preference for one language limits equitable participation in class.	No impact	50	21.4	Minority denies participatory limitation.
	Low impact	43	18.4	Weak recognition of the problem.
	Moderate impact	47	20.1	Partial identification.
	High impact	44	18.8	Significant recognition.
	Very high impact	50	21.4	High perception of participatory exclusion.
14. Lack of proficiency in the dominant language generates insecurity and exclusion among students.	No impact	53	22.6	Minority does not perceive exclusion.
	Low impact	43	18.4	Minimization of the phenomenon.
	Moderate impact	43	18.4	Partial recognition.
	High impact	35	15.0	Relevant impact.
	Very high impact	60	25.6	Relative majority identifies strong exclusion.
E. Institutional policies and teacher training				
15. The institution has clear policies promoting linguistic equity.	Totally insufficient	51	21.8	Widespread critical perception.
	Insufficient	44	18.8	Structural shortcomings.
	Regular	53	22.6	Incipient policies.
	Sufficient	48	20.5	Partial progress.
	Very sufficient	38	16.2	Minority satisfied.
16. Teacher training in intercultural bilingual education is sufficient.	Totally insufficient	50	21.4	High training deficit.
	Insufficient	53	22.6	Persistent deficiency.
	Regular	45	19.2	Limited training.
	Sufficient	43	18.4	Reduced group with training.
	Very sufficient	43	18.4	Minority with solid training.
17. The institutional curriculum integrates content that promotes respect for linguistic diversity	Totally insufficient	53	22.6	Weak curricular integration.
	Insufficient	37	15.8	Evident insufficiency.
	Regular	45	19.2	Partial progress.
	Sufficient	48	20.5	Moderate implementation.

CC BY

	Very sufficient	51	21.8	Group perceiving real inclusion.
F. Proposals and challenges				
18. Promote institutional campaigns to revalue Indigenous languages	No priority	51	21.8	Minority not prioritizing action.
	Low priority	43	18.4	Limited recognition.
	Medium priority	43	18.4	Moderate interest.
	High priority	53	22.6	High demand for intervention.
	Very high priority	44	18.8	Growing consensus on urgency.
19. Design teacher training programs in intercultural management and bilingualism	No priority	42	17.9	Little resistance to training.
	Low priority	47	20.1	Initial interest.
	Medium priority	56	23.9	Clear training demand.
	High priority	34	14.5	High perceived urgency.
	Very high priority	55	23.5	Consensus on critical need.
20. Incorporate educational materials that equitably represent both languages.	No priority	45	19.2	Minority without interest.
	Low priority	57	24.4	Limited recognition.
	Medium priority	46	19.7	Moderate interest.
	High priority	46	19.7	Relevant demand.
	Very high priority	40	17.1	Recognition of urgency.

Note. Compiled by the authors based on statistical data

The findings indicate that over 40% of respondents clearly recognize the existence of diglossic practices, while a considerable portion adopt neutral positions, suggesting that this phenomenon is becoming normalized. Diglossia is perceived not only as a linguistic choice but also as a factor contributing to symbolic and social inequality within the educational sector.

Likewise, the results suggest that pedagogical strategies oriented toward linguistic equity are not yet fully integrated into the system; 55% of participants report that balanced language use, bilingual resources, and methodological modifications occur never, rarely, or only occasionally. This implies that intercultural bilingual education depends largely on individual teacher initiatives rather than benefiting from robust policy support. Nevertheless, the presence of intermediate percentages on the "frequently" and "always" ends of the scales suggests that isolated positive experiences exist and could be strengthened and replicated.

Furthermore, the results in this area show ambivalent and contradictory sentiments toward Indigenous languages in the educational sphere. Although teachers, students, and the educational community express positive valuations, these do not coalesce into a dominant or hegemonic stance. The notable number of neutral and negative perceptions indicates that, in many cases, Indigenous languages continue to be regarded as secondary elements in the educational process, more closely associated with culture than with academics.

This dimension reveals that diglossia is not merely a language issue but also a structural element affecting educational equity. The majority of participants believe that unequal language use impacts, in various ways, academic performance, classroom interaction, and students' emotional confidence. This shared perception indicates that the predominance of Spanish creates both symbolic and practical obstacles for those who lack full command of that language.

The impact on academic performance becomes clear when students must assimilate complex concepts in a language other than their mother tongue, restricting their comprehension, expression, and critical thinking abilities. Likewise, institutional preference for a dominant language limits equitable participation, as students who use Indigenous languages frequently face self-exclusion, fear of making mistakes, and devaluation of their knowledge.

Exploration of this dimension reveals a notable discrepancy between what is stipulated in regulations and the practical reality of institutions regarding linguistic equity. Although official policies and declarations advocate for intercultural bilingual education, the results suggest that many consider them insufficient or merely acceptable, evidencing incomplete and fragmented implementation.

Findings in this dimension show broad agreement on the urgent need for intervention to mitigate diglossia and promote linguistic equity. The majority of participants assign medium, high, or very high importance to the

proposals presented, reflecting social readiness for change and growing awareness of the need to value Indigenous languages within education.

Discussion

The results reveal that school diglossia is a complex and structural phenomenon, experienced differently by the various actors involved, yet converging on a clear consensus: certain languages are excluded. In dimension A (perception of diglossia), although a percentage does not identify a dominant language, over half of respondents agree or strongly agree that Spanish predominates in the classroom, relegating Indigenous languages (Urgiles et al., 2025). The tendency toward neutral positions across the four statements suggests that participants have either grown accustomed to diglossia or lack sufficient critical awareness to challenge linguistic hierarchies, an observation consistent with qualitative findings in which diglossia is assumed as a covert and naturalized process. However, the fact that nearly 30% of respondents recognize that diglossia generates symbolic inequality among students points to a significant problem that directly affects power relations and recognition within the school (Lorenzo et al., 2020).

Similarly, dimension B, concerning pedagogical strategies and linguistic justice, indicates that these are not merely scarce but practically absent or so minimally employed as to be negligible. The bulk of responses underscores that, in terms of equitable language use, availability of bilingual educational materials, and promotion of dialogue in both languages, inclusive and cosmopolitan practices are not the norm but the exception, they represent more of an individual initiative than an established policy. The group that perceives notable efforts or sustained practices over time does not imply that this behavior is widespread, leading to the conclusion that most teachers do not incorporate linguistic equity into their daily routines, nor do institutional curricula consider it (Ortiz, 2022).

Likewise, dimension C, related to attitudes toward Indigenous languages, does not show a clear predominance, as discordant, neutral, and positive voices coexist. For example, a significant percentage of the educational community indicates that teachers hold very negative or negative opinions about the use of Indigenous languages in school activities, while within the community silence prevails, interpretable more as an attempt at invisibilization than as recognition of their use (Molina et al., 2024). Such practices generate in students a process of linguistic discrediting, but also pride and positive valuation of their identity, demonstrating that rigidity in the use of the dominant language has both advantages and disadvantages. Similarly, they support the thesis that intercultural bilingual education becomes a site for discussion and institutional conflict, given that an opposing current of opinion within the center makes it difficult to reach consensus for a truly inclusive line of work (Moreno, 2022).

Dimension D demonstrates that diglossia directly affects educational justice, particularly in terms of academic performance, classroom participation, and students' emotional well-being. Although some minimize the impact of diglossia, a significant portion of the population rates it as high or very high, generating insecurity and exclusion derived from not using the legitimized and dominant language. Consequently, diglossia hinders equitable access to learning and promotes symbolic and emotional inequalities in a legitimized manner (López, 2023).

Finally, dimension E reveals a critical view of institutional policies and teacher training in intercultural bilingual education. First, the majority of respondents consider the implementation of linguistic equality policies to be insufficient or barely sufficient, as well as teacher training, which suffers from serious deficiencies. Second, the incorporation of curricular content aimed at promoting respect for linguistic diversity is, according to most respondents, insufficient, once again demonstrating the gap between school spaces and the application of these strategies (Vernimmen, 2019).

Conclusions

The research findings allow us to affirm that diglossia in education constitutes a long-standing structural problem that affects not only classroom coexistence and the perception of languages, but also educational equity. On the one hand, it is striking that 40% of students consider that Spanish functions as the dominant language in classes and that Indigenous languages occupy a secondary place, confirming the existence of deeply rooted linguistic hierarchies in the educational system. On the other hand, the significant number of neutral responses suggests that diglossia operates at an implicit level and is therefore not perceived critically nor consciously reproduced in daily life.

It is evident that actions to mitigate linguistic inequality are very few, irregular, and unsystematic. The equitable distribution of prominence between both languages, the availability of bilingual teaching materials, or the

CC BY

promotion of intercultural dialogue are realities with many interactions that manifest the distances between the principles of Intercultural Bilingual Education and educational practice.

Finally, it is worth pausing to consider the potential contributions of Indigenous languages. According to the findings, there are no guarantees, either positive or negative, as they receive very unequal treatment. In the environment, crossed and divided identities coexist; but above all, a misrepresented and scarcely credible representation of their own language persists among young speakers. Attitudes toward Indigenous languages, far from breaking the symbolic inequalities that traverse them, contribute to reproducing them, both in their social stigma and in the weakness they evidence in the school setting.

The study leads to the conclusion that, although institutional policies, teacher training, and the inclusion of linguistic equity in the curriculum are considered inadequate, there is a favorable disposition toward transformation within the educational environment. The great importance attributed to projects such as the promotion of Indigenous languages, the strengthening of intercultural training for educators, and the incorporation of bilingual educational resources demonstrates a growing awareness of the urgency to change the current educational system.

References

Arias, O. K., Alarcón, R. S., Barriga, O. J., & Solís, G. M. (2022). Tensiones en las prácticas de coenseñanza durante la implementación de la educación intercultural bilingüe. *Revista Educación, 46*(2), 1-33. https://doi.org/10.15517/revedu.v46i2.49804

Blecua Falgueras, B., Crous, B., Sierra, F., & Borrell, S. (2013). *Plurilingüismo y enseñanza de ELE en contextos multiculturales*. Asociación para la Enseñanza del Español como Lengua Extranjera. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/libro?codigo=562312

Bravo, R., Granda, S., & Narváez, A. M. (2022). *Prácticas educativas, pedagogía e interculturalidad: V Congreso internacional de etnografía y educación*. Editorial Abya-Yala. https://doi.org/10.7476/9789978108253

Kassem, A. (2025). Bilingualism and diglossia. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/395941388_Bilingualism_and_Diglossia

López, M. D. (2023). *El bilingüismo en el ámbito escolar de Castilla y León. Análisis descriptivo del proyecto bilingüe en educación primaria* [Tesis de grado, Universidad de Valladolid]. https://uvadoc.uva.es/bitstream/handle/10324/63120/TFG-L3624.pdf?sequence=1

Lorenzo, F., Granados, A., & Rico, N. (2020). Equity in bilingual education: Socioeconomic status and content and language integrated learning in monolingual southern Europe. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 42*(3), 393-413. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amaa037

Ministerio de Educación, Deporte y Cultura. (2024, 17 de octubre de 2025). *Información de unidades educativas*. https://www.escuelasecuador.com/unidad-educativa-angel-polibio-chaves-bolivar-guaranda-02h00015

Miranda, M. I. (2022). Perspectivas sobre el bilingüismo y la educación bilingüe: Una perspectiva sociolingüística. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura, 17*(3), 263-272. https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.10527

Molina, G. T., Quintero, A. G., Álvarez, D. S., & Vásquez, E. A. (2024). Preservación de la diversidad cultural en la educación ecuatoriana. *Ciencia Latina: Revista Multidisciplinar, 5*(2), 1-17. https://conrado.ucf.edu.cu/index.php/conrado/article/view/4139/4214

Moreno de Diezmas, E. N. (2022). La educación bilingüe a examen: ¿Qué nos dice la investigación acerca de la eficacia del bilingüismo para el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras, competencias y contenidos? En Moreno de Diezmas (ed.), *Mitos en torno al aprendizaje de idiomas: generando una opinión crítica a través de la divulgación de investigaciones recientes* (pp. 25-34). Ministerio de Educación y Formación Profesional. España. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358201137_La_educacion_bilingue_a_examen_Que_nos_dice_la_investigacion_acerca_de_la_eficacia_del_bilinguismo_para_el_aprendizaje_de_lenguas_extranjeras_competencias_y_contenidos

Munawaro, S., Nurfatimah, D., Azhar, M. S., & Riski, M. J. (2025). The role of diglossia in education: Challenges and opportunities. *Al-Irsyad: Journal of Education Science*, *4*(2), 504–516. https://doi.org/10.58917/aijes.v4i2.197

Ortiz Sandoval, L. (2012). Bilingüismo y educación: la diferenciación social de la lengua escolar. *América Latina Hoy*, *60*, 139–150. https://doi.org/10.14201/alh.8977

Tavera, C. X. (2023, 25 de abril). *La lengua es de los hablantes: Cultura, identidad y la importancia de conocer y reconocer nuestro idioma*. Diseño de la Comunicación Gráfica de la UNLA. https://www.unla.mx/blogunla/la-lengua-es-de-los-hablantes-cultura-identidad-y-la-importancia-de-conocer-y-reconocer-nuestro-idioma

UNICEF. (2021). *Educación intercultural bilingüe en América Latina: Avances y retrocesos en el marco de la pandemia de la COVID-19*. https://www.unicef.org/lac/media/22251/file/EIB-AMERICA-LATINA-SPA.pdf

Urgiles Uyaguari, T. del R., Armijos Romero, P. E., Mora Franco, L. B., Espinoza Blacio, C. E., Galarza Cobos, G. N., & Quingaluisa Sasintuña, J. A. (2025). Desafíos del aprendizaje inclusivo en la educación intercultural bilingüe en Ecuador. *Revista Multidisciplinar de Estudios Generales*, *4*(2), 999–1020. https://doi.org/10.70577/reg.v4i2.132

Vernimmen Aguirre, G. M. (2019). Educación intercultural bilingüe en Ecuador: Una revisión conceptual. *Alteridad. Revista de Educación, 14*(2), 166-178. https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v14n2.2019.01