Isolation, Integration, and Ethnic Boundaries in Rural Guatemala

Anne R. Pebley
Noreen Goldman
Arodys Robles

CCPR-007-02

October 2002

California Center for Population Research
On-Line Working Paper Series

Isolation, Integration, and Ethnic Boundaries in Rural Guatemala

Anne R. Pebley
Bixby Professor of Population Studies
School of Public Health and Department of Sociology, UCLA

Noreen Goldman
Professor of Demography and Public Affairs
Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University

and

Arodys Robles
Associate Professor
Centro Centroaméricano de Población,
Universidad de Costa Rica

August 2002

Direct correspondence to: Anne R. Pebley, UCLA, Box 951772, Los Angeles, California 90095-1772. **E-mail**: pebley@ucla.edu.

Acknowledgements: The authors gratefully acknowledge support provided for this project from NICHD grant R01 HD27361 to RAND and R01 HD31327 to Princeton University, and from Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grants to Princeton University, RAND, UCLA, and the University of Costa Rica. The data for this project were collected in collaboration with colleagues at the Instituto de Nutrición de Centroamérica y Panamá under the direction of Dr. Hernán Delgado. We also thank Elena Hurtado, Marie Ruel, and many other INCAP colleagues for their important contributions to the survey design and fieldwork. David R. Harris and Donald Treiman provided very helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

Isolation, Integration, and
Ethnic Boundaries in Rural Guatemala

Abstract

The Guatemalan Indigenous population is engaged in a process of ethnic reorganization that closely parallels that of contemporary American Indians. We investigate the consequences of this process on the use of two key ethnic boundary markers for women -- dress and language use – using data from a 1995 social survey. The results show that social isolation and education are key factors in knowledge and use of Indigenous languages. By contrast, use of Indigenous dress does not vary substantially based on individual characteristics. Use of Indigenous dress, but not language, may reflect a pragmatic accommodation to social change.

Key Words: Ethnicity, Guatemala, Language, Indigenous Peoples, Latin America, Central America

INTRODUCTION

Over the past fifty years, social scientists have come to view ethnicity as a social construct which is produced by continual negotiation both within and between social groups (Waters, 1990; Nagel, 1994; Harris and Sim, 2000; Warren, 1997 and 1998). The construction of ethnic identity takes place on many levels. At the individual level, ethnic identity can be situational and fluid, the result of the interplay between an individual's own view of himself and the perceptions of others (Barth, 1969). For example, Harris and Sim (2000) suggest that individuals can have at least three different racial or ethnic identities at the same time: internal (what the individual thinks she is), external (what others think she is), and expressed (what she says she is). Expressed identity is often multi-layered and may change depending on the situation. For example, a child of Guatemalan immigrants in Los Angeles may describe himself as American, Latino, Hispanic, Guatemalan, Indigenous Guatemalan, Guatemalan Indian, Maya, Mayan, K'iche'[1], Momosteco[2], or Native American, depending on social context and to whom he is speaking. In asserting that ethnicity is fluid and situational, social scientists are not ignoring that fact that there are sometimes differences among ethnic groups in average phenotypical characteristics or that individual's ethnic self-identification is based to some degree on what he knows or believes about his ancestry and family history. Rather, as Nagel (1994: 156) suggests, "…ethnic identity is *both* optional and mandatory, as individual choices are circumscribed by the ethnic categories available at a particular time and place."

At a societal level, ethnic boundaries are continually created as "various groups and interests put forth competing visions of the ethnic composition of society and argue over which rewards or sanctions should be attached to which ethnicities" (Nagel, 1994:154). Nation states have a significant stake in ethnic group boundaries and often attempt to create, modify, or eliminate them.

[1] One of the largest Indigenous language groups in Guatemala and, pre-conquest, a major political and cultural power.

States can foster the creation of ethnic groups by treating diverse groups of people as if they represented a single cultural and historical entity (Portes and MacLeod, 1996; Nagel, 1994; Nielsen, 1986; Espiritu, 1992). Portes and MacLeod (1996) suggest that pan-ethnic groups such as "Hispanics" and "Asian Americans" in the United States are examples of this process. Ascriptions such as "American Indian" and "Native American" in the United States and "Indian" or "Indigenous" in Latin America are also examples. On the other hand, states have also frequently tried to eliminate ethnic boundaries and/or ethnic groups through processes such as encouraging or forcing assimilation and "ethnic cleansing" or genocide (Nagel and Snipp, 1993; Oberschall, 2000; Keely, 1996; Diáz Polanco, 1997).

When states take actions that affect ethnic boundaries, ethnic group members, individually and collectively, generally attempt "to resist or modify externally imposed designations" (Portes and MacLeod, 1996: 527). A stark example of external threats to ethnic identity is the effects on the native population of the conquest and settlement of the Western Hemisphere by Europeans between 1500 and 1900. Although English, Spanish, French, and Portuguese colonialists took different approaches toward Indigenous populations, native groups throughout the Americas all experienced catastrophic threats to identity and survival because of epidemic disease and state-sponsored policies of annihilation, assimilation, and amalgamation (Nagel and Snipp, 1993; Thornton, 1997; Lovell, 1992; Díaz Polanco, 1997). Nagel and Snipp (1993) suggest that the experience of native peoples provides an important case study of the strategies that ethnic groups use to survive external threats and to maintain their ethnic identity through social transformation. They argue that "ethnic reorganization" has played a major role in the ethnic survival of indigenous peoples in colonized societies, and that it is also an important ingredient in the organization of ethnicity and current ethnic relations in most contemporary societies. Ethnic reorganization is a

[2] I.e., from Momostenango, a city in the Department of Totonicapán, Guatemala.

process that "occurs when an ethnic minority undergoes a reorganization of its social structure, redefinition of ethnic group boundaries, or some other change in response to pressures or demands imposed by the dominant culture" (Nagel and Snipp, 1993: 203). For example, Native Americans have adopted approaches such as expansion of community boundaries, development of pan-Indian, supratribal identities, tribal political mobilization, and blending of Indian and non-Indian cultural and religious practices.

The experience of the Indigenous[3] population of Guatemala provides both contrasts with, and similarities to, that of American Indians and aboriginal groups in other countries. Indigenous Guatemalan groups have been remarkably tenacious and successful in maintaining a separate social and cultural identity, despite nearly 500 years of subjugation first to the Spanish colonial government and subsequently to a state controlled by the mestizo and European-origin population, known collectively as *Ladinos*.[4] The experience of Indigenous Guatemalans during the twentieth century is different in several important ways from that of native groups in the United States and Mexico. First, while the Native American or Indian population is a relatively small minority group in the U.S. and Mexico[5], the Indigenous currently comprise at least half of the Guatemalan population.[6] As a consequence, while Indigenous Guatemalans have, until recently, had little or no voice in the political system, their status within Guatemalan society has been a central (or some

[3] As in many other societies, the terminology used to identify ethnic groups is often a matter of dispute in Guatemala. In this paper, we have chosen "Indigenous" (from the Spanish "*indígena*") as a relatively neutral term. For a thoughtful discussion, see Warren (1998).

[4] *Ladino* is also a term that has been used in different ways since the time of the conquest. It originally referred to Indigenous individuals who adopted a European or mestizo way of life. See Smith, 1990. By the early 20th century, it had become a term for all non-Indigenous Guatemalans.

[5] Less than 1 percent of the 2000 U.S. population classified themselves as American Indian (U.S.Census Bureau, 2002), although the true percentage is greater (perhaps 2-3%) when people reporting multiple race/ethnicity are included. The 2000 Mexican census asked about Indigenous language use rather than self-classified ethnicity and reported that about 7 percent of the population were Indigenous language speakers (INEGI, 2002). This measure necessarily omits monolingual Spanish speakers who consider themselves Indigenous. Other estimates suggest that the Indigenous population of Mexico may be 12 percent of the national population (Yashar, 1996).

[6] The 1994 Population Census indicates that 42.8 per cent of the 8.3 million inhabitants of Guatemala were Indigenous, but many observers argue that the proportion is actually much higher (see Lovell and Lutz, 1994). Non-Indigenous Guatemalans are generally known as Ladinos, regardless of physical traits or ethnic origins. There are also other ethnic groups in Guatemala, such as the Garifuna who are African-Caribbean in origin, but they comprise a small proportion of the population (Diaz, 1997).

would argue, *the* central) political, economic, and social policy issue on the national agenda. For example, Smith (1990: 282) goes so far as to attribute "the under-developed state of civil society in Guatemala to the fact that it's 'national question' has never been solved – that a modern Guatemalan nation remains a hope rather than a reality." Since independence in 1821, the state has almost always pursued an explicitly assimilationist policy, discouraging (or in some cases, prohibiting) Indigenous language use and encouraging adoption of Ladino cultural traits, such as European attire (van den Berghe, 1968; Smith 1990 and 1995; Adams 1995; Richards and Richards 1996).

A second difference between Indigenous Guatemalans and native populations in Mexico and North America is their role in the national economy. Because of the proportionate size of the Indigenous population and the centrality of labor-intensive agricultural production, the Guatemalan economy has, since colonial times, depended heavily on Indigenous labor.[7] Despite its assimilationist policy, the state has played the central role in maintaining a social structure, along ethnic lines, which has insured that Indigenous labor is readily available and inexpensive (Grandin, 1997). As described below, the key economic role of the Indigenous population and the ethnically-based social structure has, ironically, contributed to the maintenance of a separate Indigenous identity. However, several observers have argued that recent political, social, and economic transformation in Guatemala poses new and more serious threats to ethnic boundaries (Carlsen, 1997; Grandin, 1997; Smith, 1990).

Third, Guatemalan national ideology has not idealized its Indigenous heritage and *mestizo* culture as has its neighbor Mexico or, more recently, several southwestern states in the United States. Instead, until recent years, the Ladino population was generally reluctant to discuss or even

---

[7] However, it is important to note that Ladino peasants have also provided a major source of agricultural, and more recently, industrial, labor in Guatemala.

to recognize its Indigenous roots as well as the existence and causes of Indigenous marginalization (Adams, 1995).

Despite these differences, the Guatemalan Indigenous population is currently engaged in a process of ethnic reorganization that closely parallels that described by Nagel and Snipp (1993) for contemporary American Indians.[8] For example, Grandin (1997) notes that "…as Indians become organized and represented in nearly all sectors of society, Guatemala is awash in competing definitions of what it means to be Mayan." Like American Indians, Indigenous Guatemalan leaders are attempting both to expand the traditional boundaries of Indigenous ethnicity to include educated, urban, non-community based Indigenous people and to forge a new pan-Indian identity (Smith, 1995). Traditional cultural boundary markers under debate include language use, dress, occupation, place of residence and many other dimensions. For example, in the case of language, Garzon et al. (1998a: 2) argue that:

> Community members now find themselves in the process of redefining themselves as Mayas while at the same time becoming progressively more integrated into the dominant society. The contradictions involved in this transformation are reflected in the choices people make about which languages to learn, use, and pass on to their children.

In this paper, we examine the effects of ethnic reorganization on two key cultural elements – dress and language use – at an important moment in Guatemalan history, immediately prior to signature of the Peace Accords in 1996. Indigenous dress and language have been perceived as key ethnic boundary markers by both the Indigenous and Ladino populations for many years. In fact, censuses and surveys in Guatemala have generally asked interviewers to code the respondents' ethnicity based on observation of language use and dress, rather than asking respondents directly.

However, dress and language use by the Indigenous population has been changing markedly in the past several decades, as described below. The mid-1990s was an important time in this process because it marked the end of the 36-year long civil war and the beginning of a period of greater (albeit still limited) opportunities for the Indigenous participation in the political and social system and the industrializing economy.

The central question in this analysis is: which social groups used Indigenous language and dress in the mid-1990s, after several decades of violent conflict, social disruption, and economic change. We focus specifically on women living in rural communities that have been the center of Indigenous life for many years. Ideally, we would also examine changes over time in language and dress for Indigenous women and in ethnic self-identification. However, sample survey data to support such analyses are not available for Guatemala. Instead, we investigate cross-sectional differences at a single point in time among women in the effects of their background and current social environment on language and dress. These cross-sectional differences provide a window into the process of ethnic reorganization by allowing us to test hypotheses about the effects of social factors, such as educational attainment, religious affiliation and age on women's choices about dress and language use. We also examine the role of social background in determining Indigenous language acquisition in childhood.

This analysis significantly extends earlier studies of ethnicity in Guatemala that have generally focused on a single community or a handful of communities and used qualitative, ethnographic and/or historical approaches. These earlier studies have yielded rich and detailed insights into the process and politics of ethnic transformation, on which our work is based. Yet, because of their study design, they provide little evidence about the frequency of behaviors such as Indigenous language use in the rural Indigenous population as a whole. Our objective in this paper

[8] Although the discussion here is limited to Indigenous Guatemalans, the Maya population across the border in Chiapas,

is complementary to these earlier studies: we seek to provide a quantitative overview of contemporary ethnic self-identification and cultural practices in a broad cross-section of rural communities.

The analysis is based on data from a social survey which collected information on respondents' *self*-reports of ethnicity – the only large scale survey in Guatemala to date to ask respondents about ethnic self-identification[9] – as well as on ethnic identity of relatives, language knowledge and use, and use of traditional dress. The unique design of the survey, which includes approximately 50 respondents in each of 45 rural communities allows us to examine the effects of respondents' social environment on individual behavior.

In the next section, we briefly describe the explanations for past Indigenous resilience in Guatemala, more recent threats to a separate identity, and efforts at ethnic reorganization by Indigenous leaders. Then we outline hypotheses about the effects of ethnic reorganization on cross-sectional patterns of individual behavior and test these hypotheses using sample survey data. We also examine the effects of a woman's childhood social environment on language acquisition. In the final section, we discuss the findings and their implications for understanding the process of ethnic reorganization.

HISTORICAL RESILIENCE AND CONTEMPORARY CHANGE

Indigenous Resilience

Scholars of Guatemalan social, political and economic history generally agree that the reason for Indigenous resilience during the colonial and post-independence periods has been the isolation and relative autonomy of Indigenous communities in Guatemala, particularly in the

---

Mexico has also undertaken a parallel effort of ethnic reorganization.

[9] For example the Guatemalan Encuesta Nacional de Salud Materno Infantil conducted in 1987 and 1995 under the sponsorship of the Demographic and Health Surveys asked interviewers to classify respondents' ethnicity – presumably based on appearance, including dress and language – but did not ask respondents about their own ethnic identity (MSPAS et al., 1989; INE et al., 1996).

western highlands (Smith, 1990; Lovell and Lutz, 1990; Grandin, 1997; Colby and van den Berghe, 1969; Carlsen, 1997). During the colonial period, the Spanish government for the Central American region was located in Guatemala, making it easier for the Crown to protect the Indigenous population from the type of unregulated exploitation common in other parts of Central America. As Smith (1990:74) notes, however, state protection was two-sided:

> On the one hand, no one but the church or Crown had easy access to Indian labor or products in Guatemala. But on the other hand, the church and Crown directly exploited Indians in Guatemala rather than acting as mediators between them and Spanish settlers. This kept most Guatemalan Indians more isolated from non-Indian settlers than Indians in other parts of the New World…These special conditions…saved Guatemalan Indians from the fate of many Indians in the rest of the colony – that is, the wholesale destruction of their communities and separate social identities….

Indigenous communities in the highland periphery were particularly isolated because the region was seen as having little economic value. Not coincidentally, these are the areas where a majority of the Indigenous population lives today. Because the Crown saw tribute as the primary economic gain from this region, the colonial government carried out a policy of *congregación* or *reducción* i.e., forced resettlement of the Indigenous population in towns and villages. Prior to the conquest, the Indigenous population was generally settled in a dispersed pattern. The objective of *congregación* was to speed the process of Indigenous conversion to Christianity and to facilitate the efficient provision of tribute to the Crown (Lovell and Lutz, 1994; Brown, 1998a).

These policies led to a particular form of Indigenous social and political structure: the corporate and relatively autonomous Indigenous community (Wolf, 1959; Smith, 1990). Colonial policy was typically applied to communities as a whole rather than to individuals and Indigenous

communities developed a strong tradition of acting as corporate entities in political and legal struggles with the state. They also generally held agricultural land in common. Relatively autonomous, isolated, corporate communities provided tools (including the development and maintenance of local cultural traditions) to resist a deeper level of state involvement in their daily lives (Smith, 1990).

The autonomy and isolation of rural Indigenous communities continued in the post-independence period. Since colonial times, affiliation with a rural community rather than "Indigenous-ness" *per se* has been the central focus of Indigenous identity (Bourque and Warren, 1997; Watanabe, 1995; Smith, 1990; Garzon, 1998a; Carlsen, 1997). Each Indigenous community has a different dialect of one of the twenty-two Mayan languages as well as other distinctive customs which set it apart from other communities. Indigenous individuals often identity themselves by the rural community that they or their family are from (e.g., Marqueños, i.e., from San Marcos) rather than as Indigenous, Maya, or Indian. The dispersed and diverse nature of Indigenous ethnic communities in Guatemala has facilitated maintenance of a separate (non-Ladino) identity and made forced assimilation policies less successful (Smith, 1990).

Contemporary Changes

Many observers argue that Indigenous communities are now facing new and greater challenges to local autonomy and separate identity than at any time since the conquest and its aftermath (Carlsen, 1997; Warren, 1998; Grandin, 1997; Smith, 1990), as a consequence of three interacting forces: (1) economic change, (2) massive government military intervention, and (3) the spread of Protestantism. Carlsen (1997) argues that contemporary economic changes began with the conversion of the Guatemalan economy to coffee production in the late 1800s and have continued since then. The integration of Guatemala into the international economic system in recent years has substantially accelerated economic change. Economic changes have had at least

two different effects on the Indigenous population. While they have increasingly undermined the traditional structure of the corporate community and transformed long held definitions of ethnic identity, they have also greatly expanded opportunities for improving living standards and upward social mobility for the Indigenous population. Nonetheless, the Indigenous population has benefited less from the recent economic changes than Ladinos because of lower educational attainment and continuing discrimination (Patrinos, 1997).

A second force that substantially undermined Indigenous communities' autonomy was massive and violent military intervention in the highlands. Between 1978 and 1984, Guatemalan military forces attempted to exterminate a guerrilla movement in the western highlands. Tens of thousands of Indigenous people in rural communities were killed by both the army and by guerillas and many more were left homeless or fled in fear for their lives. The violence led to increased Indigenous political involvement and to dramatic growth in the Mayan identity movement that began in the 1970s. In addition, international condemnation of the violence led eventually to pressure for political reform. The result has been a peace accord between the government and the guerilla forces and halting democratization of the political and economic system. These changes have opened opportunities for Indigenous political action, but have also fostered an extensive reexamination of what it means to be Indigenous.

The rapid spread of Protestantism has also changed social relations in Indigenous communities (Steigenga, 1994; Carlsen, 1997). Evangelical Protestant missions have been very successful in Guatemala and by the end of the 1990s, approximately one third of Guatemalans classified themselves as Protestants. The effects of the evangelical movement on Indigenous identity are controversial and most likely vary considerably among communities. However, in many communities, evangelical religious groups appear to view Indigenous traditions negatively. For example, Carlsen (1997: 165) reports that evangelical churches and missions have generally

portrayed traditional Indigenous practices and those who follow them as the root cause of Indigenous poverty and position in Guatemalan society.

Indigenous Responses

Social, economic, and military changes in the past several decades have created substantial challenges for Indigenous communities and their leaders (Warren, 1998; Fischer and Brown, 1996). In response, Indigenous leaders have developed different approaches than those used in the past. Specifically, they have created a unified political, economic, and cultural agenda and are attempting to forge a pan-Maya identity (Smith, 1990; Garzon., 1998b). This agenda, one version of which is summarized by Demetrio Cojtí Cuxil (1996), closely mirrors Nagel and Snipp's (1993) typology of types of ethnic reorganization: it explicitly calls for social, economic, political, and cultural reorganization and a realignment of Indigenous-Ladino relations. Cojtí Cuxil's agenda includes both Indigenous autonomy (e.g., self-governance) as well as Indigenous representation on the national level (e.g., proportional representation in the Congress) in each of these areas of activity. A central item in this agenda is the development and use of Mayan languages in education, government offices, and the mass media, reflecting Indigenous concerns about the potential loss of Indigenous languages and the important role that they play in Indigenous identity.

CONTEMPORARY LANGUAGE USE, DRESS, AND IDENTITY

As described above, rural Indigenous communities have been and remain the center of Indigenous identity in Guatemala. Consequently, residents of these communities are deeply enmeshed in the debate about what it means to be Indigenous in 21st century Guatemala. In this section, we examine the use of two key cultural elements traditionally associated with Indigenous identity, language and dress among women, in contemporary Indigenous communities. Our objective is to describe the effects of individual and community-level social characteristics on

choices about language and dress. In other words, in the midst of a period of rapid change described above, which Indigenous individuals use indigenous language and dress and which do not?

We focus on women's behavior because it is a particularly sensitive barometer of cultural change in many societies. For example, Smith (1995: 723) argues that women generally "bear the burden of displaying the identifying symbols of their ethnic identity to the outside world" in part because they have primary responsibility for socialization of younger generations (also see Otzoy, 1996). Brown (1998a:110) argues that change in the use of Indigenous dress is "one of the most visible indicators of cultural change among the Highland Maya communities…" For example, fifty years ago in the Quinizilapa Valley, Brown reports, all Indigenous men and women wore traditional dress.[10] Gradually, men adopted western dress and only elderly men now wear Indigenous attire. The great majority women continue to wear distinctly Indigenous dress on a daily basis, including a *huipil* (hand-made embroidered blouse) and *corte* (woven wrapped skirt) with designs which are specific to their community. However, Brown (1998a: 110) reports that "The general trend in the valley is away from *huipil* use" although women not wearing hand-made *huipiles* often wear *cortes* and blouses that are distinctively Indigenous.

A similar change has occurred in language use in Indigenous communities since the 1960s and 1970s. Because their greater involvement with Ladino society, men were the first to learn and use Spanish, while most women remained monolingual Indigenous language speakers.[11] However, evidence from ethnographic studies in Indigenous communities suggests that women's language use

[10] We use the term "traditional" to refer to clothing that was commonly used by the Indigenous population during the past hundred years. Like other aspects of culture, dress has evolved substantially over time. While contemporary Indigenous dress contains pre-conquest elements, it also includes both European and completely novel elements as well (Otzoy, 1996).

[11] While this pattern is common in the literature on language shift in minority populations, Garzon (1998) points out that it is not universal among Native American populations. For example, Medicine (1987) argues that it was often Sioux (Lakota) women who acted as go-betweens with European newcomers and therefore most likely learned European languages first.

is now changing rapidly as well. For example, Garzon (1998b) reports, that in San Juan Comalapa, younger women are much more likely to be bilingual or monolingual Spanish speakers than older women. On the other hand, the Indigenous identity movement has brought renewed interest and pride in using Indigenous languages, as well as efforts at systematizing writing systems, publishing in Indigenous languages, and bilingual education (Brown, 1998b; Brown, 1996; Warren, 1998). Thus, we might expect that women who are more involved in the political and social life of their communities may be more likely to use an indigenous language or to learn one, if they are monolingual Spanish speakers.

Based on the process of change described above, we investigate three alternative hypotheses about the use of Indigenous dress and language by *self-identified* Indigenous women in rural communities: (1) use of Indigenous language and dress is associated with social class and opportunities for upward mobility, i.e., more educated and well off Indigenous women and women living in more industrial and commercial communities are *less* likely to use Indigenous dress and language; (2) use of language and dress is associated greater community social isolation, i.e., a high proportion of residents is Indigenous and the community is physically more isolated from mainstream Ladino culture; and (3) use of Indigenous dress and language is increasingly common among *more* educated and politically involved rural women because of greater identification with the Indigenous identity movement.

Data

We use data from a survey of women living in rural Guatemalan communities. The 1995 Encuesta Guatemalteca de Salud Familiar (EGSF) is a survey of women ages 18 to 35 carried out in rural areas of four departments[12] of Guatemala (Chimaltenango, Totonicapán, Suchitepequez and Jalapa). The sample was restricted to these departments because a national sample would have

necessitated interviewing in more than 22 Indigenous languages spoken in Guatemala. The four departments were selected on the basis of social, economic, and environmental diversity, and ethnic composition. In this paper, we use data from three of the departments (Chimaltenango, Totonicapán, and Suchitepequez) which are predominantly Indigenous.[13] Rural communities in the first two departments are almost exclusively Indigenous while in Suchitequez, they are generally mixed Ladino and Indigenous. The two predominant Indigenous languages spoken in these departments, K'iche and Kaqchikel, are two of the three most common Indigenous languages in Guatemala , spoken by approximately 1.5 million people (Warren, 1998: 16).

The survey is based on a sample of households living in communities with between 200 and 10,000 inhabitants. A probability sample of 45 rural communities in the three departments were included in the survey, 15 in each of the selected departments. The sample was designed to be self-weighting within (but not across) departments and to have sufficiently large cluster sizes (i.e., an average of about 50 women per community) so as to facilitate the estimation of community-level effects (see Peterson, Goldman, and Pebley 1997).

In the three departments, individual interviews were administered to 2,119 women ages 18 to 35. Among these women, 1,801 identified themselves as Indigenous, as described below. The EGSF fieldwork was carried out between May and October 1995. The individual interview collected information on a wide range of subjects, including the respondents' background, maternal and child health, and family income and economic status. Spanish, K'iche, and Kaqchikel versions of the individual questionnaire were used, and the field teams consisted of bilingual interviewers (either K'iche/Spanish or Kaqchikel/Spanish).[14] Interviews were conducted in the language that the

[12] Departments are a major geopolitical subdivision in Guatemala. There are a total of 22 departments in Guatemala. Departments are further subvidived into *municipios.*

[13] Jalapa residents are almost all identify themselves as Ladino and virtually none report speaking an Indigenous language or wearing Indigenous attire.

[14] Interviewers were recruited from the areas in which the survey was conducted and were from the same ethnic/language group as the respondents. All interviewers were female. Interviewers were trained to interview in the language (Spanish, K'iche' or Kaqchikel)

respondent preferred. A community questionnaire was administered in Spanish to three key informants in each of the 45 communities and provided information on economic activities, wages, infrastructure, services, transportation, migration and other aspects of community life.

The EGSF is asked respondents to report their own *self-classification* of ethnic identity. Information collected on ethnicity includes: (1) self-identification, i.e., whether the respondent considers herself to be "natural or Maya" (Indigenous) or Ladina, (2) whether her siblings identify themselves as Indigenous or Ladino, (3) if married or in a consensual union, ethnic self-identification of partner or husband, (4) language usually spoken at home, (5) other languages the respondent can speak, and (6) literacy in Spanish, Indigenous languages and other languages. Interviewers were also asked to observe and record whether or not each respondent was wearing Indigenous dress (defined as *huipil* and *corte*).

Results

As shown in Table 1, the distribution of women's ethnic identity differs among the three departments included in the analysis. Almost 90 per cent of respondents in Chimaltenango and almost 99 per cent of respondents in Totonicapán identify themselves as Indigenous. Very few in either department describe themselves as being of mixed ethnicity,[15] and fewer than 1 per cent either do not know or refuse to report their ethnicity.

(Table 1 about here)

In Suchitepequez, plantation agriculture has for many years drawn migrants primarily from the western highlands, but also from other areas of the country. The result is an ethnically heterogeneous population and much more social interaction between the Indigenous and Ladinos. Two-thirds of respondents in Suchitepequez identify themselves as Indigenous, a quarter as Ladino,

in which the respondent was most comfortable. Most Indigenous interviewers wore Indigenous dress both in their daily lives and during fieldwork.

[15] Those in the "mixed" category report their ethnic identity as "a little of each" (i.e., Indigenous and ladino).

and almost 5 per cent as mixed. Furthermore, a slightly larger proportion of respondents in Suchitepequez (almost 2 per cent) do not know or do not want to report ethnicity.

How common is Indigenous language use and dress among Indigenous women in these rural communities? In Table 2, we show the frequency of Indigenous language use and dress for the sample of women who identify themselves as Indigenous. The first panel shows the percent of Indigenous respondents who were wearing Indigenous clothing at interview (as determined by interviewer observation). Women were classified as wearing full indigenous dress (*huipil* and *corte*) or partial indigenous dress (*huipil* or *corte* or manufactured clothing – e.g., a blouse or skirt -- that was distinctively indigenous in style). The second panel shows the distribution of *current* language use, i.e., the language or languages that respondents reported speaking at home. Of course, current language use depends on respondents' *knowledge of* an Indigenous language and/or of Spanish. Therefore, in the third panel of Table 2, we also examine the distribution of languages respondents know.[16]

There is considerable variation in language use, but much less variation in clothing. More than half of Indigenous respondents are bilingual while 24 per cent are monolingual Spanish-speakers and 19 per cent monolingual Indigenous language speakers. Although roughly three-quarters of Indigenous respondents are *able* to speak an Indigenous language, only about half speak an Indigenous language at home. By contrast, the vast majority (81 per cent) wore full Indigenous dress when they were interviewed, suggesting that changes in language use have affected a larger portion of the population than changes in dress. Nonetheless, almost 15 per cent of women in these rural communities who identified themselves as Indigenous wore western attire, suggesting that this cultural element is also changing.

[16] The questions on language were: "What language do you normally speak at home?" and "Do you speak any other language? What other language?"

While our central focus is Indigenous women, we also examined language use, language knowledge, and dress among respondents who identified themselves as Ladinos and the very small number of women of mixed ethnicity (results not shown).[17] Not surprisingly, given the structure of Guatemalan society, less than 1% of women of Ladino and mixed ethnicity use or are able to speak an Indigenous language or wear Indigenous clothing. Among the very small group who would not report ethnicity, most are also monolingual Spanish speakers and wear western dress. Because use of Indigenous language and dress is essentially limited to the self-identified Indigenous sample, Ladinos are omitted from the analysis presented below.

(Table 2 about here)

Determinants of Indigenous Dress and Language Use

Next, we examine the evidence concerning the three hypotheses, described above, about the use of language and dress among Indigenous women, using multivariate statistical methods. The analysis is divided into two sections. First, for the entire Indigenous sample, we examine the effects of respondent and community characteristics on whether they wear Indigenous clothing. Second, we investigate the effects of these characteristics on language use. Variation in language use at a single point in time is more complex than dress because it depends on the proportion of the population who know how to speak a given language. In rural Guatemala, Indigenous language acquisition usually occurs early in life (Asociación de Investigación y Estudios Sociales, 1995), because until recently, Indigenous languages have generally not been taught in school. Therefore, in this section of the analysis, we look separately at: (a) the effects of childhood characteristics on ability to speak Spanish and/or Indigenous languages for the entire Indigenous sample and (b) the effects of contemporary characteristics on whether the subsample of respondents who are bilingual report using an Indigenous language at home at the time of the survey.

[17] Ladino respondents were asked about their parents' ethnic identity. It is worth noting that, at least in these

(Table 3 about here)

The distributions of the independent variables used in this analysis are shown in Table 3 both for the entire Indigenous sample and for the bilingual subsample. [18] These variables are grouped into characteristics pertaining to: (a) the respondent, (b) the community in which the respondent lived at interview, and (c) the community in which the respondent lived in childhood. Our first hypothesis is that lower social class and poorer opportunities for upward mobility increase the odds that women use Indigenous clothing and language. As measures of social class and economic status, the analysis includes educational attainment and an index of household consumption or expenditures. The household consumption measure is the *per capita* value (in quetzales[19]) of all purchased and home-produced goods consumed by household members during the past month. In a poor, rural, and primarily agrarian setting, household consumption provides a better measure of economic well-being than earned income, crop sales, or other measures (see Peterson et al., 1997).

To measure opportunities for social mobility in respondents' communities, we constructed a variable from responses to the community survey about the most important way that families in the community earn their living. Communities were coded 1 if the most important means for earning a living was commercial farming, producing products for sale, factory work, or plantation work, and 0 for more traditional means such as subsistence agricultural or running small shops (which primarily cater to local residents). The variable is intended to distinguish between communities involved in larger national markets with greater opportunities for entrepreneurial activities and those that rely primarily on more traditional economic activities.

---

communities, virtually no Ladino respondents reported that their parents were Indigenous or mixed.

[18] As Table 2 indicates, there are 1,801 EGSF respondents who report themselves to be Indigenous. A total of 56 respondents were excluded from subsequent tables because of missing data on one or more variables, primarily on the consumption index and/or women's group membership. Thus, the multivariate analysis includes a total of 1,745 Indigenous respondents. The analysis of language use in the household is limited to the subset of 1,003 of these respondents who are bilingual.

[19] At the time of the EGSF, a quetzal was approximately equivalent to between 18 and 20 cents US.

The second hypothesis is that use of Indigenous clothing and language is more common in communities that remain more isolated from mainstream, urban and Ladino culture, i.e., those that are predominantly Indigenous and less accessible to the outside world. The ethnic composition of each community at the time of the survey is measured by the ethnic distribution of households interviewed in that community in the EGSF (approximately 50 households per community). The geographic isolation of communities is measured in two ways. First, the measure of accessibility is coded 1 for more accessible communities -- i.e., those in which the main road is open all year round and which have had regular bus service for at least five years --and 0 otherwise. Second, we use a measure of distance between the *municipio* in which the community is located and the national capital, Guatemala City. Guatemala City is the principal urban center and the main source of urban, modern Ladino culture. We also include a measure of the degree to which women themselves have lived relatively isolated lives: whether or not they currently live in their village of birth.

The third hypothesis is that *more* rather than less educated women and women who are politically active will more frequently use Indigenous language and dress, because they identify more closely with the Indigenous identity movement. As a measure of political involvement, we use whether or not the respondent belongs to a woman's group. We also examined a second measure, the level of involvement by the respondent and family members in community leadership roles. Of course, involvement in community leadership roles varies considerably and does not necessarily indicate a particular viewpoint on the Indigenous identity movement or cultural reconstruction. Preliminary analysis showed that this variable was unrelated to use of Indigenous dress and language, perhaps because it included all types of leadership roles, and it is therefore not included in the analysis presented here.

The analysis also includes several other variables. The first is the respondent's age. As noted earlier, ethnographic studies suggest that the process of cultural change in Indigenous communities

has produced a marked cohort effect, i.e., younger women are less likely to use Indigenous language or dress compared with their older sisters and cousins. Second, we also include a variable describing whether or not the respondent's husband is Ladino. Although Indigenous women with Ladino husbands are a small group (about 3 per cent), they may be the least likely to use Indigenous dress and language. Third, we include the percent of the population, which was Indigenous (in 1973) in the *municipio* in which each respondent was born. We hypothesize that women raised in predominantly Indigenous communities are more likely to retain a strong Indigenous identity than those who grew up in more mixed communities. Furthermore, children growing up in an exclusively or primarily Indigenous language community are much more likely to become highly fluent in the language and to use it later in life (Brown, 1998a). Fourth, we include a dummy variable indicating whether a respondent is evangelical Protestant. As described above, there is some evidence that Protestant churches discourage indigenous members from traditional practices which may include Indigenous language and dress. Each analysis also includes dummy variables for department of residence to compensate for the sampling design of the EGSF (i.e., the sample was stratified by department) and also to capture variation across departments that is not measured by other variables in the model.

While the analysis of use of Indigenous dress and language spoken in the household is based primarily on current characteristics of respondents and their communities, we argued above that an individual's *knowledge* of Spanish and/or an Indigenous language is primarily acquired in childhood. While we do not have any information on which community each woman grew up in, we do know which *municipio* she was born in. Therefore, in the analysis of language ability we include characteristics of the *municipio* of birth, as a proxy for the type of place respondents spent their childhood. Specifically, as shown in Table 3, we include the percent of the population which

was literate[20] and the percent Indigenous for her *municipio* of birth. These characteristics come from the 1973 Guatemalan census, which was conducted 22 years before the EGSF. Since the average age of the EGSF sample is 26 years, these data approximate conditions in these *municipios* when respondents were young children. We also include distance from the birth *municipio* to Guatemala City as a measure of geographic isolation of the community in which respondents spent their childhood.

A comparison of the full Indigenous sample and the bilingual subsample in Table 3 indicates that the two groups are very similar. Bilingual respondents are slightly more likely to have gone to school, to belong to women's groups, and to live in Chimaltenango.

To test our hypotheses, we estimate binomial and multinomial logit models of Indigenous dress and language use with a procedure that corrects standard errors for clustering. The results are shown in Tables 4 through 6. The EGSF was designed to be highly clustered (an average of 50 households in each of 45 communities). Techniques for estimating standard errors are generally based on the assumption of a simple random sample and therefore ignore the effects of clustering. As a result, they produce standard errors that are typically too small and, consequently, Z-statistics that are too large. The standard errors presented in Tables 4 through 6 have been estimated in STATA (StataCorp 1999) based on a robust variance estimator that corrects for the clustering of observations at the community level. Although compared to ethnographic studies, the sample sizes for this analysis are large, the high degree of sample clustering reduces the effective sample size substantially. As a result, while some coefficients estimated in this analysis are large, they may not be statistically significant.

(Table 4 about here)

[20] We also considered including the percent urban in the *municipio*, but did not because this variable is highly correlated with the percent literate.

Use of Indigenous Dress

Table 4 shows the results of a binomial logit analysis in which the dependent variable is whether or not the respondent wears Indigenous dress.[21] The estimated coefficients are shown as odds ratios.[22] Two of the respondent's characteristics are significantly related to use of Indigenous dress: husband's ethnicity and the percent Indigenous in the respondent's *municipio* of birth. As expected, Indigenous dress is substantially less common among the small number of women with Ladino husbands. These women either may find it less acceptable to wear Indigenous dress or may feel less need to do so since their husbands are Ladino. Women who were born in predominantly Indigenous *municipios* are markedly more likely to wear Indigenous dress. The results also show, contrary to expectation, that evangelicals are significantly *more*, rather than less, likely to wear Indigenous dress (although the coefficient is of borderline significance). Socioeconomic status, educational attainment, and political involvement are not significantly related to dress.

The percent Indigenous in the respondent's current community is also statistically significantly related to use of Indigenous dress. As in the case of the ethnic composition of place of birth, a higher percent Indigenous in a woman's current community substantially increases the odds that she will wear Indigenous dress. As expected, greater social mobility opportunities and accessibility substantially decrease the likelihood that women wear Indigenous dress, but the coefficients are not statistically significant.

These results suggest that the ethnic composition of the community in which a woman was born and her current community exert a substantial effect on her use of indigenous dress. We return to

[21] The small number of respondents (2.3 per cent of the sample) reported to be wearing "partly" Indigenous clothing were classified as not wearing Indigenous clothing.

[22] All estimates are presented in terms of exponentiated coefficients. In the case of the binomial logit models shown in Table 4 and 6 these are referred to as odds ratios. The odds ratio of 1.64 in Table 4 indicates that the odds of wearing Indigenous clothing for respondents with no schooling are 1.64 as large as the corresponding odds for respondents with more than a primary school education (the omitted category). For the multinomial model presented in Table 5, the exponentiated coefficients are relative risk ratios and are interpreted relative to a case category (in this case, the category of bilingual speakers).

this result below. Other community characteristics, i.e., mobility opportunities and accessibility are also related, but not significantly. By contrast, variations in individual characteristics among women in the same community have no significant effects.

(Table 5 about here)

Monolingualism vs. Bilingualism

In Table 5, we examine the factors affecting whether Indigenous women are: (a) monolingual in an Indigenous language (K'iche or Kaqchikel), (b) bilingual in Spanish and an Indigenous language, or (c) monolingual in Spanish. This analysis is based on a multinomial logit model and on the same sample as in Table 4. "Bilingual" is the base or comparison category for the dependent variable. As described above, the independent variables include educational attainment, whether the respondent still lives in her place of birth, age at interview (as a measure of cohort), and characteristics of the *municipio* of birth. In this model, we include education as a dichotomous variable indicating whether or not the respondent completed any education, because the sample size is too small to distinguish between women with a primary and those with more than a primary education.

The coefficients suggest a continuum between monolingual Spanish on one hand and monolingual Indigenous language on the other, with bilinguals in the middle. For example, completing at least some education is clearly related to language acquisition: in comparison with bilingual women, those with no education are significantly *less* likely to be monolingual Spanish speakers and significantly *more* likely to be monolingual Indigenous language speakers. The cohort effect observed in earlier ethnographic research is also readily apparent: older women are less likely to be monolingual Spanish speakers and more likely to be monolingual Indigenous language speakers (although the latter coefficient is of borderline significance).

Two characteristics of place of birth appear to be important. Being born in a more literate *municipio* significantly decreases knowledge of an Indigenous language and has a positive (but not significant) effect on the likelihood of being a monolingual Spanish speaker. Women born in a predominantly Indigenous community are less likely than those born in a more heterogeneous community to be monolingual in Spanish. Distance to Guatemala City is not significantly related to language acquisition, suggesting that physical distance from this center of urban, Ladino culture during childhood is not a key factor.

(Table 6 about here)

Home Language Use for Bilingual Women

In the final part of the analysis, we examine the effects of individual and community factors on the use of an Indigenous language at home, in Table 6. This analysis is limited to bilingual women (approximately 57 per cent of the sample) since only they have the possibility of using either Spanish or an Indigenous language at home. Bear in mind that bilingual respondents are not a random sample of Indigenous language speakers. The results in Table 5 indicate that they are more likely to be educated and to have grown up in more highly literate communities. The same independent variables as in Table 4 are included in this analysis.

The results in Table 6 show that bilingual women who are less educated and those who continue to live in the place where they were born are more likely to speak an Indigenous language at home. Women in the poorest households are also significantly more likely to speak an Indigenous language at home. Surprisingly, older women are *less* likely to speak an Indigenous language at home than are younger women. We speculate that the reason is related to selection. As shown in Table 5, older Indigenous women are more likely to be monolingual in an Indigenous language than younger women. We conjecture that because it was less common in the past to be bilingual, older

Indigenous language speakers who did in fact learn Spanish may have done so because they had to use it. By contrast, younger women may have had greater opportunity to learn both languages.

Another potential explanation is that older bilingual women (who are, in this sample, in their late 20s and early 30s) may also be more likely to have older children who are in school and learning Spanish. Brown (1998a) and Garzon (1998a)'s results suggest that parents of older children who are in school may be more likely to speak Spanish at home either to help their children become fluent or because their children want them to.

Not surprisingly, women married to Ladino men are less likely to speak an Indigenous language at home, although the coefficient is not significant. More importantly, bilingual evangelical protestants are significantly more likely to use Spanish at home. These results are consistent with Carlsen's (1997) reports that evangelical group members discourage use of traditional practices among members. However, as shown earlier, if evangelicals do discourage traditional practices, it is not apparent in differences in the use of traditional dress. So there may be other reasons that bilingual evangelicals are more likely to use Spanish at home.

While growing up in a heavily Indigenous community does have a substantial effect on language acquisition, as shown earlier, it is not significantly related to home language use among bilinguals. Again, this effect differs considerably from that observed for use of traditional dress, as shown earlier.

What does affect current language use is the ethnic composition of the community that a woman lived in at the time of interview. Women who live in predominantly Indigenous communities are significantly more likely to use an Indigenous language at home. This result reinforces the idea that community ethnic homogeneity greatly increases the use of Indigenous dress and language use. Although neither social mobility opportunities nor community accessibility are significantly related

to language use, women in communities further from Guatemala City are significantly more likely to speak an Indigenous language at home.

DISCUSSION

In this paper, we have presented a cross-sectional picture of contemporary use of language and dress in rural Indigenous communities in Guatemala. In the aftermath of the violence in the 1980s and the subsequent Peace Accords, the Indigenous population now appears to be facing even greater threats to maintenance of a separate identity because of greater integration into mainstream Guatemala society. While this may seem ironic at first glance, it is entirely consistent with the history of Indigenous resilience in Guatemala and of many other ethnic groups (e.g., Jews in the United States) who have suffered extensive external threats in the past. During the centuries since the conquest, the physical and social isolation and the relative autonomy of Indigenous communities provided the means to maintain a separate ethnic identity. In the 19th and 20th century, the effects of this isolation were reinforced by severe discrimination faced by Indigenous people outside of their communities. Contemporary economic and social integration, on the other hand, presents a significant new challenge.

Comparison of the results presented here with earlier studies in the Western Highlands of Guatemala suggest that there has been considerable change in use of language and dress by Indigenous women. While previous studies suggest that Indigenous dress and language were universally used in the past by women in these highland areas, our results show that a significant minority did not wear traditional dress or speak an Indigenous language at the time of the survey.[23] The differences appear to be greater in language use than in dress: almost one quarter of

[23] Given the limitation of the sample to three departments, these results cannot be generalized to all Indigenous rural communities in the western highlands. In particular, Kaqchikel areas are much closer to Guatemala City and other more urban areas and, therefore, Kaqchikeles have been less isolated that other Indigenous language groups. By contrast, Mam, Q'eqchi' and Q'anjob'al communities are generally much more isolated. Therefore, we would expect women in these communities to be more likely to Use Indigenous language and attire.

respondents is monolingual in Spanish and almost half use Spanish at home. By contrast, approximately 80 percent wear full Indigenous dress.

Our results show that socioeconomic status, religious affiliation, involvement in community groups, community mobility opportunities, and community accessibility are not significant correlates of dress. Nor is a woman's age. However, because of the limited age range of the EGSF sample (18 to 35), these data may not capture variations between women in their 40s, 50s, and 60s, and younger women. Thus, in the case of dress, neither our first hypothesis (i.e., social position and mobility opportunities affect dress) nor our third (i.e., community involvement increases the probability of Indigenous dress) receive support. The key factor affecting women's choices about dress appears to be living in a predominantly Indigenous community, both in childhood and at the time of the survey. This is an important finding, particularly in contract to the results for language use, because it suggest that rural Indigenous women in all social groups and all types of communities continued to be very likely to wear Indigenous dress in the mid-1990s.

The results for language use are quite different. Language use is more complex, because it requires either learning a language at home or acquiring it in school or later in life. Language acquisition among Indigenous women in these rural communities is significantly tied to whether or not they attended school, the type of community they grew up in, and their age. Younger women and those who attended school are more likely to be monolingual in Spanish. Women who attended school are also more likely to be bilingual (Spanish and an Indigenous language), reflecting the key role that Guatemalan primary schools have played in the past in determining Spanish language acquisition by the Indigenous children (Wuqu' Ajpub', 1998; Garzon, 1998b). Women who grew up in predominantly Indigenous communities and in communities with lower literacy levels are more likely to be monolingual in an Indigenous language or to be bilingual.

Among bilinguals, higher incomes, school attendance, being Protestant, and the type of community in which a woman currently lives are significantly related to the use of Spanish at home at the time of the survey. The results for income and school attendance are consistent with our first hypothesis: despite the efforts at Indigenous language revival among the Mayan elite, in the rural communities where most Indigenous live, Indigenous language use is more common among poor and uneducated women. On the other hand, the results suggest that evangelical Protestantism is significantly related to Spanish language use among bilingual Indigenous women. Roughly a third of the EGSF Indigenous sample is evangelical. Our results show that bilingual evangelicals are significantly *less* likely to speak an Indigenous language at home. This finding, which may be related to the selection of Indigenous women into evangelicalism and/or to the cultural practices or beliefs of evangelical churches, deserves further study.

Not surprisingly, home use of an Indigenous language is more common among bilingual women living in predominantly Indigenous communities, presumably in part because the proportion of Indigenous language speakers in the community is larger. More interesting is the finding that bilingual women in communities further away from Guatemala City are more likely to speak an Indigenous language at home. This result is consistent with our argument that communities which are more isolated from the influences of urban, Ladino society that dominates Guatemala City can more easily maintain traditional practices.

Taken as a whole, these results show that predominantly Indigenous communities, and communities which are more isolated from Ladino influences, continued to play an important role in the maintenance of Indigenous language use and dress for women in the mid-1990s. The fact that more educated, higher income, less isolated, and evangelical women are *less* likely to know and use an Indigenous language does not bode well for language maintenance in a rapidly changing society. As has been true for many other minority languages groups, these results suggest that

increased educational attainment and social integration may come at the price of loss of Indigenous languages. For this reason, Indigenous language revitalization and Mayan language schools are central concerns of Mayan leaders and international linguistic scholars (Brown, 1996; England, 1996; Cojtí Cuxil, 1996). Instruction in Indigenous languages in schools is a relatively recent phenomenon. It is yet to be seen whether these efforts will succeed in producing future cohorts of educated, Indigenous-speaking adults.

By contrast, the great majority of Indigenous women in these communities continue to wear Indigenous dress regardless of income, educational attainment, age, religious affiliation, or community characteristics. The differences in the use of dress and language are important and may represent a change in the relative salience of these two ethnic boundary markers for the Indigenous population. Although language is often an important component of ethnic identity, the ethnic reorganization perspective suggests that ethnic groups are frequently faced with choices about which cultural elements to retain and to abandon when social, economic, and cultural circumstances change. Use of Indigenous dress but not language may reflect a pragmatic accommodation by some Indigenous women and their families to social change and to the national (and international) dominance of Spanish language. However, this adaptation for many Indigenous Spanish-speakers is combined with the maintenance of the highly visible ethnic boundary marker of Indigenous dress.

Like many other native peoples, Indigenous Guatemalans are faced with the formidable task of finding a place in a commercial, industrializing, and urbanizing society in order to take advantage of educational opportunities, to improve living standards, and to gain a new type of autonomy and control which is not dependent on isolation, while at the same time retaining a separate ethnic identity. This process will hopefully involve political, economic, and cultural changes in Guatemalan society as a whole as well as those in Indigenous communities. The ethnic

reorganization perspective suggests that this process is not unique to Guatemala or this time period, but rather part of the long history of on-going negotiation within all multiethnic societies about ethnic identity and boundaries.

References

Adams, R. N. 1995. *Etnias en Evolución Social, Estudios de Guatemala y Centroamérica*, México: Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana.

Asociación de Investigación y Estudios Sociales .1995. *Educación Rural en Guatemala: Situación actual y perspectivas*, Guatemala: Asociación de Investigación y Estudios Sociales.

Barth, Frederik .1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, Boston: Little Brown and Company.

Bourque, S.C. and Warren, K.B .1997. "Denial and reaffirmation of ethnic identities: a comparative examination of Guatemalan and Peruvian communities," Manuscript, Univ. of Massachusetts.

Brown, R. M. 1996. "The Mayan Language Loyalty Movement in Guatemala." in Fischer, E. and Brown, R. McKenna (eds) *Maya Cultural Activism in Guatemala*. Austin: University of Texas.

Brown, R.M .1998a. "Case Study Two: San Antonio Aguas Calientes and the Quinizilapa Valley" in Susan Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. B. Richards, and Wuqu' Ajpub' (Arnulfo Simón) (eds.) *The Life of Our Language*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Brown, R. M .1998b. "Mayan Language Revitalization in Guatemala" in S. Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. B. Richards, and Wuqu' Ajpub' (A. Simón) (eds.) *The Life of Our Language*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Carlsen, R.S. 1997. *The War for the Heart and Soul of a Highland Maya Town*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Colby, B.N. and P. van den Berghe .1969. *Ixil Country: A Plural Society in Highland Guatemala*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Díaz, E. 1997 'La población indígena guatemalteca según los censos de 1981 y 1994', in L. Rosero Bixby, A.R. Pebley, and A. Bermudez (eds), *De los Mayas a la planificación familiar: demografía del istmo*. San José, Costa Rica: Editorial de la Universidad de Costa Rica, pp.133-44

Díaz Polanco, H. 1997. *Indigenous Peoples in Latin America: The Quest for Self-Determination*, Boulder: Westview Press.

England, N.C. .1996. "The Role of Language Standardization in Revitalization" in Fischer, E. and Brown, R. McKenna (eds) *Maya Cultural Activism in Guatemala*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.

Espiritu, Y.L. 1992. *Asian American Pan Ethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fischer, E. and Brown, R. M. (eds) 1996 *Maya Cultural Activism in Guatemala*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Garzon, S. .1998. "Indigenous Groups and Their Language Contact Relations" in S. Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. B. Richards, and Wuqu' Ajpub' (A. Simón) (eds.) *The Life of Our Language*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Garzon, S..1998c. "Conclusions" in S. Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. B. Richards, and Wuqu' Ajpub' (A. Simón) (eds.) *The Life of Our Language*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Grandin, G. .1997. "To end with all these evils: Ethnic transformation and community mobilization in Guatemala's western highlands, 1954-1980" *Latin American Perspectives*, 24(2): 7-34.

Harris, D.R. and J.J. Sim .2000. "An Empirical Look at the Social Construction of Race: The Case of Mixed-Race Adolescents." University of Michigan, Population Studies Center Report No. 00-452.

INE et al. (Instituto Nacional do Estadìstica, Ministerio de Salud Púublica y Asistencia Social, Agencia para el Desarrollo Internacional, Fondo de las Naciones Unidas para la Infancia and Demographic Health Surveys) .1996. *Encuesta Nacional de Salud Materno Infantil 1995.* Guatemala: INE and MSPAS.

INEGI (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informatica) Estados Unidos de México .2002. *XII Censo General de Población y Vivienda, 2000* at www.inegi.gob.mx.

Keely, C.B. .1996. "How Nation-States Create and Respond to Refugee Flows" *International Migration Review*, 30(4): 1045-1066.

Lovell, W. G. 1992 *Conquest and Survival in Colonial Guatemala*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press

Lovell, W.G. and C.H. Lutz .1994. "Conquest and Population: Maya Demography in Historical Perspective" *Latin American Research Review*, 29(2): 133-140.

Medicine, B..1987. "The Role of American Indian Women in Cultural Continuity and Transition" in J. Penfield (ed.) *Women and Language in Transition*. Albany: SUNY Press, pp. 159-166, cited in Garzon, S .1998) "Indigenous Groups and Their Language Contact Relations" in S. Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. B. Richards, and Wuqu' Ajpub' (A. Simón) (eds.) *The Life of Our Language*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

MSPAS, INCAP, and DHS (Ministerio de Salud Pública y Asistencia Social, Instituto de Nutrición de Centro América y Panamá and Demographic Health Surveys) .1989. *Encuesta Nacional de Salud Materno Infantil 1987*. Guatemala: MSPAS and INCAP.

Nagel, J. .1994. "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture" *Social Problems*, 41(1): 152- 176.

Nagel, J. and C.M.Snipp .1993. "Ethnic reorganization: American Indian social, economic, political and cultural strategies for survival" *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 16(2): 203-235.

Nielsen, F. .1986. "Structural conduciveness and ethnic mobilization: The Flemish movement in Belgium" in S. Olzak and J. Nagel (eds.) *Competitive Ethnic Relations*, Academic Press, pp. 173-198.

Oberschall, A. .2000. "The Manipulation of Ethnicity: From Ethnic Cooperation to Violence and War In Yugoslavia" *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23(6): 982-1001.

Otzoy, I..1996. "Maya Clothing and Identity" in E.F. Fischer and R. M. Brown (eds.) *Maya Cultural Activism in Guatemala*. Austin: University of Texas.

Patrinos, H. A. . 1997. "Differences in Education and Earnings Across Ethnic Groups in Guatemala" in A.R. Pebley and L. Rosero Bixby (eds.) *Demographic Diversity and Change in the Central American Isthmus*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Books.

Portes, A. and D. MacLeod .1996. "What shall I call myself? Hispanic identity formation in the second generation" *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 19(3): 523-547.

Peterson, C., Goldman, N., and Pebley, A. R. .1997. *The 1995 Guatemalan Survey of Family Health (EGSF): Overview and Codebook*. Santa Monica, California: RAND.

Richards Becker, J. And Richards, M. 1996. 'Maya education: a historical and contemporary analysis of Mayan language education policy' in E. Fisher and R. McKenna (eds), *Maya Cultural Activism in Guatemala*. Austin: University of Texas.

Smith, C. A..1984. "Local History in a Global Context: Social and Economic Transitions in Western Guatemala" *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 26: 193-228.

Smith, C. A..1990. 'Class position and class consciousness in an Indian community: Totonicapan in the 1970s' in C.A. Smith (ed.), *Guatemalan Indians and the State: 1540-1988.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Smith, C.A. .1995. 'Race-Class-Gender ideology in Guatemala: modern and anti-modern forms', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 37(4): 723-49.

STATA CORP. 1999 Stata statistical software: release 6.0. College Station, TX: Stata Corporation.

Steigenga, T. 1994 'Protestantism, the state, and society in Guatemala', in D. Miller (ed.), *Coming of Age: Protestantism in Contemporary Latin America*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.

Thornton, R. .1997. "Aboriginal North American population and rates of decline, ca. A.D. 1500-1900." *Current Anthropology*, 38(2): 310 –315.

U.S. Census Bureau .2002. *Census 2000 Summary File 1*, Matrices P3, P4, PCT4, PCT5, PCT8, and available at http://factfinder.census.gov.

Van Den Berghe, P. .1968. 'Ethnic membership and cultural change in Guatemala', *Social Forces*, vol. 46, pp. 514-22.

Warren, K.B. .1989. *The Symbolism of Subordination: Indigenous Identity in a Guatemalan Town*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Warren, K.B. .1997. "Identidad indígena en Guatemala: una crítica de modelos norteamericanos" *Mesoamérica*, vol. 33, pp. 73-91.

Warren, K.B. .1998. *Indigenous Movements and Their Critics: Pan-Maya Activities in Guatemala*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Watanabe, J. .1995. 'Unimagining the Maya: anthropologists, others, and the inescapable hubris of authorship' *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 25-45.

Waters, M.C. .1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Wolf, E. .1959. *Sons of the Shaking Earth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wuqu' Ajpub' .1998. "Language Contact Experiences of a Mayan Speaker" in Susan Garzon, R. M. Brown, J. B. Richards, and Wuqu' Ajpub' (Arnulfo Simón) (eds.) *The Life of Our Language*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Yashar, D. 1996. "Indigenous Protest and Democracy in Latin America" in J. Domínguez and A. Lowenthal (eds.) *Constructing Democratic Governance: Latin America and the Caribbean in the 1990s*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Table 1. *Percent distribution of ethnic self-identification by department*

Self-Identification	Chimaltenango	Totonicapán	Suchitepequez	Total Sample[24]
Indigenous	89.7	98.8	67.8	85.0
Ladino	8.3	0.5	25.8	11.9
Mixed	1.1	0.5	4.5	2.1
Unknown	0.8	0.3	1.9	1.0
Number of women	731	659	729	2119

Source: EGSF, 1995

[24] The total sample is unweighted and thus does not reflect population size difference among the four departments.

Table 2. *Percent distribution of Indigenous dress and language use by Indigenous Women*

	Percent of Indigenous Women
Wearing Indigenous Clothing?	
Yes	80.6
No	14.8
Partly	2.3
Unknown	2.2
Household Language	
Spanish only	42.5
Spanish/Indigenous	5.0
Indigenous only	52.5
Language Ability	
Spanish only	23.6
Spanish/Indigenous	57.3
Indigenous only	19.2
Number of women	1801

Source: EGSF, 1995

Table 3. Means or percent distributions of variables used in multivariate analyses

Variables	Total Indigenous Sample	Bilingual Indigenous Sample
Respondent's Characteristics		
No school	36.3%	29.1%
Primary School	58.7%	65.1%
More than Primary	5.0%	5.8%
HH consumption (quetzales)	22.0	21.2
Lives in place of birth	65.1%	67.8%
Lives elsewhere	34.9%	32.2%
Age at interview	25.7	25.7
Member of women's group	15.4%	19.2%
Not a member	86.6%	80.8%
Evangelical Protestant	34.7%	37.8%
Catholic or other	65.3%	62.2%
Husband is Ladino	4.9%	2.0%
Husband is not Ladino	74.6%	75.6%
Does not have a husband	20.5%	22.4%
Community /Municipio Characteristics		
Greater social mobility opportunities	74.2%	76.9%
Poorer social mobility opportunities	25.8%	23.1%
Community more accessible[25]	34.6%	39.2%
Community less accessible	65.4%	60.8%
Distance from Guatemala City (km)	82.7	77.8
Percent Indigenous (in current community)	90.9%	94.0%
Totonicapán	35.6%	35.1%
Chimaltenango	36.2%	44.7%
Suchitepequez	28.2%	20.2%
Childhood Community Characteristics		
Percent Indigenous in place of birth (1973)	81.0%	84.8%
Percent literate in place of birth (1973)	33.7%	34.2%
Distance between place of birth and Guatemala City (in km.)	88.1	77.8
Number of women	1745	1003

Source: EGSF, 1995

[25] More accessible communities are defined as those in which the main road is passable 12 months a year and which have had bus service for at least five years.

Table 4. *Estimated odds ratios derived from a logit model of the probability of wearing Indigenous dress*

Variables	Odds Ratio	Z-test
Respondent's Characteristics		
No school	1.64	1.16
Primary School	1.36	1.04
(More than Primary)		
Lowest quartile of HH consumption (quetzales)	1.49	1.72
Second quartile	1.34	1.04
Third quartile	1.22	0.85
(Highest quartile)		
Lives in place of birth	1.06	0.18
(Lives elsewhere)		
Age at interview	1.02	0.98
Member of women's group	0.89	-0.72
(Not a member)		
Evangelical protestant	1.62	1.90
(Catholic or other)		
Husband is Ladino	0.31	-3.59 **
Does not have a husband	1.35	1.01
(Husband is not Ladino)		
Percent Indigenous in place of birth (1973)	1.04	3.41 **
Community /Municipio Characteristics		
Greater social mobility opportunities	0.36	-1.41
(Poorer social mobility opportunities)		
Community more accessible[26]	0.43	-1.42
(Community less accessible)		
Distance from Guatemala City (km)	1.04	1.36
Percent Indigenous (in current community)	1.06	3.79 **
Totonicapán	3.84	1.81
Chimaltenango	27.74	1.77
(Suchitepequez)		
Number of women	1745	
Pseudo-R^2	0.4754	

Source: EGSF, 1995

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Omitted categories are shown in parentheses.

[26] More accessible communities are defined as those in which the main road is passable 12 months a year and which have had bus service for at least five years.

Table 5. *Estimated relative risk ratios (RRR)*[27] *derived from a multinomial model of the probability of speaking Spanish, an Indigenous language, or both*

Variables	Monolingual Spanish		Monolingual in Indigenous Language	
	RRR	Z-test	RRR	Z-test
Respondent's Characteristics				
No school	0.61	-2.56**	4.82	6.15**
(Some school)				
Lives in place of birth	0.74	-1.25	0.91	-0.46
(Lives elsewhere)				
Age at interview	0.95	-2.23*	1.03	1.95
Totonicapán	0.08	-3.74**	4.61	1.56
Chimaltenango	0.19	-1.60	7.17	1.97*
(Suchitepequez)				
Characteristics of Childhood Municipio of Residence				
Percent literate	1.03	1.06	0.91	-3.72**
Percent Indigenous	0.96	-2.01*	1.07	1.09
Distance to Guatemala City	1.00	-0.22	1.01	0.77
Number of women	1745			
Pseudo- R^2	0.3503			

Source: EGSF, 1995

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Omitted categories are shown in parentheses.

[27] RRRs are calculated relative to the base category of bilingual speakers.

Table 6. Estimated odds ratios derived from a logit model of the probability of speaking an Indigenous language at home, based on bilingual Indigenous respondents

Variables	Odds Ratio	Z-test
Respondent's Characteristics		
No school	3.87	3.24**
Primary School	2.70	2.77**
(More than Primary)		
Lowest quartile of HH consumption (quetzales)	1.52	2.16*
Second quartile	0.94	-0.31
Third quartile	1.15	0.66
(Highest quartile)		
Lives in place of birth	1.70	2.38*
(Lives elsewhere)		
Age at interview	0.96	-2.04*
Member of women's group	1.27	1.20
(Not a member)		
Evangelical Protestant	0.55	-3.40**
(Catholic or other)		
Husband is Ladino	0.41	-1.88
Does not have a husband	1.44	1.25
(Husband is not Ladino)		
Percent Indigenous in place of birth (1973)	1.02	1.63
Community /Municipio Characteristics		
Greater social mobility opportunities	0.60	-1.08
(Poorer social mobility opportunities)		
Community more accessible[28]	0.93	-0.21
(Community less accessible)		
Distance from Guatemala City (km)	1.05	1.97*
Percent Indigenous (in current community)	1.04	2.26*
Totonicapán	0.70	-0.55
Chimaltenango	19.99	2.25*
(Suchitepequez)		
Number of women	1003	
Pseudo-R^2	0.1339	

Source: EGSF, 1995

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Omitted categories are shown in parentheses.

[28] More accessible communities are defined as those in which the main road is passable 12 months a year and which have had bus service for at least five years.