

The Intercultural Bilingual Education Program and its results: Perpetuating discrimination?

El Programa de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe y sus resultados: ¿perpetuando la discriminación?

Cristián Lagos

Departamento de Lingüística, Universidad de Chile
Center for Language, Interaction, and Culture,
University of California, Los Angeles, USA

Abstract

In previous studies carried out about the linguistic and cultural situation of indigenous communities, we have identified the gap in traditional circuits of production and reproduction of indigenous languages as one of the main reasons for the loss of their vitality. Public authorities, indigenous organizations as well as intellectuals have all stated the need for correcting this problem by means of initiatives such as the Intercultural Bilingual Education Program (PEIB). In this article, we undertake a critical assessment of this program, vis-à-vis Chile's multilingual and multicultural character, by analyzing several experiences carried out in rural and urban schools throughout the country. As a result, we found that, at a structural level, there are not enough resources to ensure the initiative's continuity and that it depends on the individual performance of teachers, principals and communities rather than the institutions that should be responsible (National Corporation for Indigenous Development [CONADI], Ministry of Education [MINEDUC]). At an intercultural level, the evidence points out to conflicts among social representations with regard to the pedagogical content about indigenous language and culture, and the role of «traditional educators» as a way to transmit indigenous cultural knowledge. We conclude that public policies such as the PEIB end up propagating the very asymmetric relationships and the social representations they are supposed to overcome in relation to indigenous people, that is, indigenous individuals subordinated to «civilized» people, without a voice or an agenda of their own, living in precarious conditions, with a low social status and whose local systems of production and transmission of knowledge lack of legitimacy.

Keywords: Bilingual Intercultural Education, linguistic anthropology, indigenous languages

Post to:

Cristián Lagos
Departamento de Lingüística Universidad de Chile/Center for Language,
Interaction and Culture, University of California, Los Angeles, USA
Av. Capitán Ignacio Carrera Pinto 1025, 3er piso, Santiago, Chile
Email: crlagos.f@gmail.com

This article integrates the results obtained within the framework of the FONDECYT Initiation project 1110362 and VID SOCU-SOC-11/11. The contributions made to the draft by Dr. Veronica Figueroa Huencho concerning indigenous public policy have also been incorporated.

© 2015 PEL, <http://www.pensamientoeducativo.org> - <http://www.pel.cl>

ISSN: 0719-0409 DDI: 203.262, Santiago, Chile
doi: 10.7764/PEL.52.1.2015.19

Resumen

En estudios anteriores que hemos realizado sobre la realidad lingüística y cultural indígena, hemos identificado la ruptura de los circuitos tradicionales de producción y reproducción de las lenguas indígenas como una de las causas principales de la pérdida de su vitalidad, algo que debería corregirse, según el discurso de autoridades públicas, intelectuales y agrupaciones indígenas, a través de iniciativas como el Programa de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe (PEIB). En este artículo realizamos una evaluación crítica de este programa de relevancia nacional, dada la condición multicultural y multilingüe del país, respecto del carácter intercultural y bilingüe de las experiencias desarrolladas en diversos colegios urbanos y rurales de Chile. Como resultado, descubrimos que en un nivel estructural, no se disponen de los recursos necesarios para dar continuidad en el tiempo a la iniciativa, y esta depende del desempeño individual de las comunidades, de los profesores y de los directores antes que de las instituciones responsables (Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena [CONADI], Ministerio de Educación [MINEDUC]). En su dimensión (inter)cultural se evidencian representaciones sociales en conflicto en torno a los contenidos de lengua y cultura indígena, y la figura del *educador tradicional* como transmisor de los saberes culturales. Se concluye que el PEIB se constituye en una medida política pública que reproduce las relaciones asimétricas y las representaciones sociales sobre el sujeto indígena que propone superar: el indígena subordinado al «civilizado», sin voz ni agenda propia, en condiciones precarias, con bajo estatus y cuyos sistemas locales de producción/transmisión de conocimiento carecen de legitimidad.

Palabras clave: Educación Intercultural Bilingüe, antropología lingüística, lenguas indígenas

The Intercultural Bilingual Education (EIB): preliminary data

In the 1930s, after the annexation of Araucanía and the resolution of the processes of annexing resources and territories pertaining to the other native ethnic groups in the country, a series of different decrees and laws were enacted to provide indigenous people with legal protection. Since then, public policies on indigenous issues have established positive discrimination initiatives that do not go beyond a welfare, quantifying and assimilationist approach, which has helped reproduce an economic, social, cultural and political asymmetry in the relationship between the national society and the indigenous world, up to the current day. One of the many areas in which this asymmetry can be seen is indigenous cultural heritage and, in particular, languages and linguistic rights (Figuerola, 2004; Wabgou & Roth, 2009). Indeed, indigenous peoples, despite international legal and regulatory changes, have still not been fully recognized by policies as different people with different cultures. This recognition would mean, among other things, incorporating cultural, linguistic, political, economic, value-based, historical and relational variables into a complex political discussion (Wabgou & Roth, 2009). Instead, most governments have promoted assimilationist strategies, prioritizing a set of values and principles that have sought to strengthen a development «Western» vision. This has not generated the conditions for either greater pluralism or a real consideration of the unique historical characteristics of these people (in fact, our PEIB analysis reaffirms this trend).

The linguistic dimension has not been immune to this general model. From the beginning, the use of the Spanish as the language of education was one of the main tools of assimilation in the past (Gallardo, 1984). Over time, in the twentieth century, the processes of migration from homelands to the big cities marked a turning point in the understanding of public policy measures in favor of the revitalization of indigenous languages and cultures, which emerged in the 1980s and remain until today (Gallardo, 1984; Hernández, 1984, 1986; Lagos & Espinoza, 2013). These migrations led to the consolidation of an urban indigenous social subject who uses his or her language in the city, who has been educated in primary schools, secondary schools and universities in urban environments and who claims his or her native language as a central symbolic element to his or her identity construction and resistance (Gissi, 2004; Lagos, 2012). This social base is the starting point for the first expressions of concern about a more systematic regulation of the relationship between languages and cultures in contact, primarily led by an indigenous elite who has been educated in the Chilean university systems. As part of this new context of linguistic and cultural contact, where indigenous subjects are embedded in an urban society and subjected

to socialization processes (through formal education and mass media), in exogenous cultural matrices inspired by enlightenment rationalism, indigenous languages begin to be the object of reflection with new coordinates: (a) they are used in a social environment different from the original one (linked to the land and traditional indigenous life), which requires certain adjustments (loans, neologisms, simplifications and linguistic interference phenomena); and (b), the intellectuals, who are university-trained and specialized in their study, project their own categories of linguistic science (such as the ideals of *standardization*, *intellectualization* and *authority*) on indigenous languages, which explains many of the problems provoked by its teaching in formal education settings (Lagos, Rojas, & Espinoza, 2013).

In the 1990s and thereafter, the state took on a more prominent role in defining a comprehensive public policy oriented towards the indigenous world (Lagos & Espinoza, 2013). One of the basis of this policy is the consideration of education and native languages as essential to the revitalization of indigenous cultures, as part of the new agreement that the state was seeking with these populations. This is because both aspects are understood as fundamental to achieving the recognition, respect and protection of their cultures. Languages are a reflection of cultures and it is recognized that their revitalization requires an educational process in accordance with people's needs. From these needs, the Intercultural Bilingual Education Program (PEIB) was born. It was based on the low performance of indigenous students due to: (a) the decontextualization of the curriculum with respect to the local culture; (b) the development of education practices unsuitable to the interests, needs and learning of these students; and (c) the exclusion of vernacular languages (Donoso, Contreras, Cubillo, & Aravena, 2006; Sir, 2008). In other words, the PEIB was not originally created to revitalize indigenous languages, but rather to establish compensatory education for indigenous people, aimed at improving their performance and the possibility of social mobility. Furthermore, in a broader context, it must be understood as a measure to reduce social tensions within multiethnic states in order to generate a stable social climates that guarantee the arrival of foreign investors, within the rules of the game established by multilateral institutions like the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund (García de León, & García de León, 2012; Lagos, 2011; Quintrileo, Yáñez, & Valenzuela, 2013; Riedmann, 2008; Schmelkes, 2004; Sir, 2008; Viaña, Tapia, & Walsh, 2010; Williamson, 2004).

The program began in Chile with five pilot projects in regions with a significant indigenous population for three to four years (Ministerio de Educación, 2005). In 2000, after the conclusion of these experiences, the PEIB was institutionalized as a targeted program. This enabled its expansion to other institutions with the same conditions as the pilot institutions. The legislation that established this educational program was Law No. 19,253, enacted in 1996. Its articles 28 and 32 stipulate:

1. The use and conservation of indigenous languages along with Spanish in areas with a high indigenous population.
2. The implementation in the national education system of a program unit that enables learners to access knowledge of indigenous cultures and languages and teach them to value them positively. The person responsible for transmitting this knowledge is the so-called *traditional educator*, who is usually a member of the community or indigenous group linked to the educational institution where the EIB is applied. He or she is selected for this task because of his or her level knowledge of the language and traditions of the community (in the case of the Mapuche, this knowledge is called *kimün*, and thus the educator with this knowledge is called *kimche*). This educational actor generally lacks the formal instruction required to be qualified as a teacher (professional with university education), and therefore carries out his or her work in association with the so-called *mentor teacher*, who does have university studies in pedagogy. These two individuals form the so-called *educational duo* that is responsible for the implementation of the PEIB in the classroom.
3. The development of a bilingual intercultural education system to prepare indigenous students to thrive in both their society of origin and society as a whole.

Moreover, according to Decree No. 280 (2009) of the Ministry of Education, the Indigenous Language is a required subject in educational institutions where more than half of the students have indigenous ancestry. In addition to this requirement, it is generated a distinction that is important when evaluating the program's notion of *interculturality*. It implies a differentiated character for the mandatory requirement of the sector, considering that (a) educational institutions with a high indigenous population must offer this subject, which is optional for students and takes on the nature of a recommendation, while (b) for the rest of the country's schools, this subject is offered voluntarily, and is designed to encourage bilingualism and multiculturalism.

Over the last two decades, the development of this educational model in Chile has consolidated an educational approach that, in discourse, is presented as: (a) a reevaluation and rescue of indigenous cultures, within the logic of a pluralistic society that seeks a dialogue between cultures (Lagos, 2011); (b) a new method of intercultural education for the revitalization of indigenous peoples beginning with their language, which is in turn the symbol of their culture par excellence; and (c) an educational proposal that aims to disseminate indigenous customs and cultures in the school environment by teaching their language, thus promoting awareness and respect for diversity (Loncon, 2013; Quilaqueo, 2012; Quintriqueo, Torres, Gutiérrez, & Sáez, 2011). Considering the circumstances and based on our knowledge of different PEIB implementation experiences, mainly in urban and rural schools with Mapuche populations, we aim to assess to what extent this program complies with this statement of purposes, answering questions such as: Is the school the space for the revitalization of indigenous language? And what concept of cultural/linguistic diversity of this program is trying to legitimize in the students? These questions address the linguistic and anthropological bases that supposedly should be the basis of this initiative.

Methodological considerations

Our analysis is based on data collected in different qualitative linguistic anthropology studies, funded by FONDECYT (The National Fund for Scientific and Technological Development) and the Vice-Rectoría for Research and Development (VID) of the Universidad de Chile between 2012 and 2014, conducted in Pehuenche schools and communities in the Alto Bio Bio and in Moluche schools and communities in Mulchén and in communes of Santiago with a high Mapuche population (La Pintana, Pudahuel, Cerro Navia, El Bosque) where the PEIB is implemented.

The data collection was based on semi-structured interviews with different members of the educational communities of the schools studied, including principals, intercultural educators, mentor teachers, students and parents. We also conducted participant observations and activities in the indigenous language subsector, including some related ceremonial activities. Before participating in the research activity, participants were asked to sign consent forms, both for the interviews and for the observation, and were informed that they would be identified only by the initials of their names in any potential publications and research reports. The analysis of the information collected in the interviews was performed following the guidelines of the *language ideologies* model proposed by Irvine and Gal (2000) and Kroskrity (2010).

The ethnographic approach to educational communities in rural and urban environments offered the advantage of learning about the phenomena in their natural context of occurrence and was a valuable methodological strategy in the field of education research. In the next section, we review the main results from the two levels of analysis: the first being structural (dealing with elements of the program's operation) and the second cultural (dealing with the social representations of the subject matters, the social actors of the program and their notion of multiculturalism). These results are discussed in the final section of the article.

Results: PEIB's contribution to interculturality

Based on our field experience and from our perspective —linguistic anthropology— the overall assessment of the program is that it is always partial, depending on the varying interest of those in charge, with serious problems in obtaining funding to ensure its quality and continuity. Even worse, it is reduced to the folklore sphere with no great cultural relevance and complexity, regarding what it means to be indigenous people today (in an urban and rural setting). This impression becomes more troubling when focusing on a more detailed two-level analysis presented below.

Structural level

In all the experiences studied, the program's results, quality and level of depth depend directly on the individual efforts of the teachers in charge, and to a lesser extent, on the institution's management team. In the cities, all the initiatives that emerged from urban Mapuche groups in the communes that have gone the municipality to present their demands. The management and the implementation of these initiatives

is not a responsibility of the National Indigenous Development Corporation (CONADI) nor the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC). Rather, and contrary to what the law states, these two institutions have little oversight over the programs and their implementation, their financial contribution is irregular and marginal and they lack of coordination for the development of these initiatives. Furthermore, exists a deficiency of centralized pedagogical material from MINEDUC that is relevant to each community or is distributed in a number of copies to allow them to work properly.

The initiatives are specific to each school and dependent on the ideas of each teacher or educator. This not only has implications for the different strategies and educational approaches, but also for language standardization. Thus, each *traditional educator* uses the writing systems and material that he or she wants (some, for example, use the *Azumcheffe* alphabet to write the Mapuche language and others use the *Raguileo* alphabet, etc.). This also happens with the «intellectualization» of Mapudungun language present in the texts, with different neologisms adapted for using in the current reality. All these phenomena increase the entropy within a language that, in order to be inserted into a formal education system, requires standardization, unification, and intellectualization if somebody wants to place Mapudungun on the same level as Spanish, something that lacks of consensus and is the subject of discussion within the communities (Irvine & Gal 2010; Lagos & Espinoza, 2013). This is a clear sign that an EIB that does not go together with a language planning process can be detrimental to the language that it seeks to promote (Lagos et al., 2013).

Another important element limiting these initiatives is the need for financial resources to ensure the quality and continuity of the work. Most schools designate one or two hours per week for teaching to the indigenous language, because they do not have additional resources for personnel. This leads to a reduction of continuity, since it is not known whether it will continue from one year to another, and a lack of quality, since courses and hours are limited due to money, not to an educational strategy. All this means that the contents receive the label of *workshop* or *extracurricular activity*, which diminishes their legitimacy in the eyes of the student. Labeling the topics of indigenous language and culture in this way reduces its social significance and its relevance for the school community. In other cases, contents relating to the Mapuche language is embedded in one of the units of a History or Language class, and the traditional educator is dependent on the space given to him or her by the teacher.

Additionally, with regard to the quality of teaching a second language, an important difficulty has to do with one of the facilitating factors in learning a second language: motivation. The urban areas where the indigenous population makes the PEIB possible and necessary are precisely the most disadvantaged sectors in socio-cultural terms with the lowest rates of school enrollment and performance. To ask these students to learn another language besides Spanish and English is already an additional complexity. Moreover, to increase their hours of classes or to ask them to study Mapudungun as an extracurricular activity, outside of regular school hours is to ignore the reality. This shows that it is not enough to add elements into the school curriculum to cover the needs of the EIB. Rather, a reorganization of the national curriculum is required to give proper attention to these requests. In other words, a greater structural, not cosmetic, change is required. This means a change that recognizes that intercultural contents (not only concerning indigenous population, but also migrant populations in a globalized world) are as important to forming citizens as other subjects. This clearly requires definitions in educational policy at national level.

Cultural dimension/level

Regarding the cultural dimension of its proposal, the PEIB proves to be an educational model designed for a traditional rural reality (an idealized image of the indigenous world that does not exist even in isolated areas). In rural areas, due to the population density, is not difficult to find schools where the implementation of the PEIB can be required. However, this perspective must be adapted to the new Mapuche reality: the highest proportion of indigenous people lives in cities. This new urban character divides people and disintegrates them as a community, making difficult to either achieve enrollment percentages or demand for their rights if they are a minority. From this perspective, therefore, the unsolved task is to adapt indigenous language policy to the urban reality of the new Mapuche population. Hence, it is not surprising that the dominant approach is a folklorization with respect to the language and culture. As one urban *traditional educator* says: «It consisted in language, like Mapuche customs, so what was being taught to children was about meals and things they were interested in» (EP, traditional educator, urban educational institution).

Indeed, the figure of the traditional educator, his or her legitimacy and his or her integration into the educational team is one of the great challenges of implementing the program. In general, this point has been vaguely treated as a lack of personnel who are qualified for the job and have the necessary teaching skills for doing it. This seems to be reinforced in the discourse of educators, who state that they operate from a more intuitive dimension (compared with the strategic vision of teachers trained in Western institutions of higher education). This demonstrates the use of a variety of approaches and purposes among them. For example, one educator says: «The classes are divided by the learning of common elements in everyday life, in which the games, crafts and performances are relevant to the children's behavior» (TG, traditional educator, urban educational institution).

Thus, for some, this emphasizes the idea that a lack of university qualification leads these educators to use their intuition and therefore their work should be limited to an activity with a tutor teacher, and at the same time, train him or her in the subject. However, we take a different interpretation, as herein lies one of the main weaknesses of the program, which shows its artificial character that is only halfway committed to interculturality. This is so because the problem is not that there are no qualified personnel; a perception that leads to the traditional educator working in isolation from the rest of the school's teaching team and without a link within the school curriculum. The «educator» finds himself/herself in a limbo. He or she has been removed from his or her natural environment, the community or group, in order to bring him/her to a place where is an artificial, strange person, and both the content and the practice are relegated to a marginal place. Only if the teacher with university education gives the educator a place in his or her class, the educator will be legitimized. Thus, the educators depend on people and situations rather than an institutional framework for succeeding in their activity (some educators mention that they are not free to address issues they consider relevant to their culture, such as the history of the Mapuche population, and must submit to what the university teachers consider important). They are in a clear situation of subordination.

In this sense, the fact that their performance as traditional educators depends on their relationship with the figure of a mentor teacher (university educated, *teacher* and not *educator*, a differentiation that shows how language creates and reproduces power relations), does no more than symbolically reproduce the relations of dependence and asymmetry that have existed and exist between Chilean society and the indigenous world. Moreover, this relationship is the most faithful reproduction of nineteenth-century evolutionary imagery in the context of the twenty-first century, a subordinate relationship that is confirmed in the most precarious wage conditions of these educators. No success in PEIB will be achieved without minimum working conditions and wages for the traditional educators to ensure their continuity and interest in the project. Additionally, these working conditions should also take into account how the traditional educator is considered for the rest of the educational community. The significance of their role is not understood neither by teachers nor by the administrative personnel. There are many cases where, for example, the educators perform labors of doorman or caretakers when a member of the educational community is missing. It is impossible to think that a student would consider prestigious or important the information taught by a member of the school community who is, precisely, not prestigious.

In order to understand these dynamics, we believe necessary to incorporate models from linguistic anthropology and its notion of *language ideology* (Irvine & Gal, 2000; Kroskrity, 2010; Makihara & Schieffelin, 2007; Silverstein, 1979). Indigenous cultures like the Mapuche have language ideologies (beliefs, feelings and conceptions, explained explicitly or manifested in communicative practices, about the structure and use of language. This conception does not conceive the Mapudungun language as a system with objective existence, but as a product delivered by nature. So, the owner of this cultural richness is not a particular individual or entity, but rather a group patrimony that, as such, can be claimed as a right (a linguistic right) as part of the confrontation and resistance process that characterize the relationship between indigenous people and national society in the postcolonial era. Thus, the question is: who should safeguard the language? Who could assume its ownership and indicate what is right or wrong? Or what changes should undergo to be adapted to new uses? In societies with the rational enlightenment tradition like ours, this question is easily solved. No one debates the role of scientific experts in language or its teaching (linguists, teachers, etc.) or the role of schools and academic institutions in language planning. From our early education in school we learn to observe them as authorities and keepers of the right visions of what our languages are. However, in the case of indigenous languages, associated with its specific cultural conception, the answer is not so clear. This is an important issue when trying to turn school into the place for teaching the language (as a second language) and culture of indigenous communities. So, how do we define and legitimize the *specialists*?

One answer to this need could be to turn to an institutional framework in our rational Enlightenment tradition: the academy, the university. However, this vertical vision of language ownership seems to conflict with the local way of understanding the language, with the language ideology that makes each speaker a valid representative for making decisions about his or her own language. This point supports the questioning of language specialists, which is crucial when understanding the problems the PEIB faces in the classroom. It involves defining who should have the language custody, who is the authority on it and, ultimately, who owns it. Since the language belongs to everyone, the criteria and requirements to be considered a specialist would not come from scientific support or a foreign criteria to the indigenous culture, which immediately discredits academic experts. However, the Chilean government and the academic world are not and have never been willing to yield this autonomy to the communities. It is clear, therefore, that this conflict among language ideologies is ultimately a political struggle. At the local level, where the PEIB is applied in communities and communes with indigenous populations, the traditional educator has a completely inferior status to the (university educated) teacher and must always perform under the supervision of the *mentor* teacher. This situation hinders, for example, using the knowledge and skills of other less qualified personnel at the school (such as cleaners, drivers and cooks) as an educational resource, even though they are often who better know the indigenous language, more than any teacher (university educated, who does not master the language and culture) or even the traditional educators.

At a more general level, beyond the reality of the communities, we found many cases where academic and government institutions demonstrate the replication of their own cultural rationale in the way they have tried to «contribute» to the revitalization of indigenous languages, ignoring the language ownership and authority models. This is clearly exemplified by the problems surrounding the university qualification of the traditional educator. However, this does not mean that these communities do not recognize the existence of language specialists, who in the case of the Mapuche are classified as *kimches* ('wise' in their language and culture). For example, individuals traditionally validated in the culture as experts. However, this validation has nothing to do with formal education or scientific validation. The validation of their expertise and wisdom opinion lies on a different path, as a Pehuenche traditional educator expresses:

...he is called wise because he knows the language, knows the culture [...]. It depends autonomously on each of them, it depends on each *kimche*, on the wise person, on the material and the teaching and the way he will teach... the *kimche* has the final decision (IR, traditional educator, Pehuenche rural educational institution).

Thus, the question is: Is this wise person an ignorant for not knowing about linguistics or pedagogy? As an authority figure extracted from his or her natural context of legitimacy (the community) who is transferred to an artificial scenario of education (the school), the traditional educator loses all his or her natural attributes and is reduced to a secondary character. The educators do not have the elements to be considered an authority: they do not have formal education in pedagogy and linguistics and they do not speak standard Spanish, but rather one with many Chedungún's interference. This provokes laughing situations from students, as mentioned by SM, the principal of a rural Pehuenche educational institution. Then, the vicious cycle of reproduction of the negative and stigmatized valuation relating to indigenous knowledge is closed, reinforcing the message among students, where it becomes apparent that the lack of visibility of these and other ideologies must be overcome.

Discussion and conclusions

The PEIB implementation initiatives in schools across the country, beyond the added value involved in undertaking something with limited resources and, in many cases, self-management, should make it clear that the product generated does not comply with the theoretical purpose of this paper. The programs require a rethinking and reformulation in light of the new indigenous contexts, rural and urban settings. From the findings we have already examined, we conclude that:

1. The PEIB is not a tool for the revitalization of indigenous languages, since its conceptual and methodological shortcomings are obvious. If it is considered as a tool for language planning, it ought to be understood in the context of many other measures of corpus and status planning (Deumert, 2000).
2. The PEIB does not accomplish its promise of being bilingual, because in the city all children and young people, Mapuche and non-Mapuche alike, come to school as monolingual Spanish speakers (Gundermann, Canihuán, Clavería, & Faúndez, 2009; Lagos 2012), except for students who know individual phrases and repeated speeches in Mapudungun). Bilingualism is another illusion because Chile is not a bilingual country (or, at least, the country does not understand that bilingualism entails languages other than English). No student will graduate from school as bilingual (a) with an hour a week of scattered phrases in Mapudungun, (b) if when arriving home, he or she is spoken only in Spanish, (c) if nowhere else than school (in the few hours dedicated to the topic and in the few occasions when the language is concerned) their native language is spoken, (d) if the second language lacks of an associated social (and economic) value and (e) if this language in society lacks of functionality, no procedure is performed in it (even those that relate to the indigenous area), and no public worker is fluent in it. Additionally, this will also not be achieved with intercultural educators who lack of methodological training to teach indigenous languages as a second language or additional language. Especially in the case of languages whose traditional learning approaches do not correspond to Western linguistic ideology. The aim of this point of view is not to discredit the traditional educator. Rather, it is to draw attention to the need to clarify the path that should be followed, as the figure of the educator cannot be only a symbol of multiculturalism.
3. The PEIB is not intercultural, since there is not a symmetrical dialogue between the two cultures in contact. The indigenous population are forced to learn Spanish and the entire symbolic structure of Chilean society, contents that are not optional. However, indigenous and non-indigenous students can choose to learn about their own cultural contents (indigenous), and only as an extension of the topics that «do matter» in the curriculum, which belong to the dominant, non-indigenous society. This is not multiculturalism. In this vein, an interesting analysis for understanding the real implication of an intercultural education has begun. Considering little importance that the place of the subjects of indigenous language and culture have, any change to this situation would imply that the curricular structure given by MINEDUC acknowledge them as more than an elective subject and, therefore, not necessary only for students of indigenous ancestry, but for all Chilean students.

As a consequence, and as we stated above, indigenous contents do not seem significant either in the manifest or in the hidden curriculum (the relationship between the educator and the rest of the school community). Thus, we faced with the paradox of an education that seeks to be inclusive and recognize the cultural differences of indigenous groups but that becomes a tool of discrimination, a situation that seems no different, in any case, from other Latin American experiences, which use this strategy of compensatory education for indigenous people (García de León & García de León, 2012).

Since Chile is not an intercultural society, its curriculum is not either. While non-indigenous students studying of higher income institutions (which, therefore, students of indigenous origin do not attend), spend class time exclusively on training and gaining knowledge that will be evaluated at higher levels of education (as the university admission system), marginalized students with a high percentage of indigenous population, are forced to spend time and effort on contents that the curriculum and society do not take into account. Also, while primary and secondary schools without multicultural enrollment can devote all their efforts to achieving good scores on the SIMCE test (System of Measurement of Education Quality), with all the economic and academic benefits that this implies, the institutions from indigenous and poor areas are forced to spend their time on content that the SIMCE does not assess. The result — as many teachers and principals expressed in our on-site conversations— is the stigmatization of the contents of indigenous language and culture among administrators, teachers, parents and guardians. They see them

as a problem and the realization of a self-fulfilling prophecy (as stated by many parents in the schools we visited, both in the city and in rural areas), that indigenous languages are a barrier to learning Spanish and subjects that society considers important.

Thus, we observe the paradox of an initiative that seems to contribute to a more symmetrical relationship within our society. But actually, by not explaining its true ideological foundations, perpetuates the linguistic and social relationships that it supposedly aims to change.

Finally, it is reduced to a careful discourse and statement of intent that falls within the scope of political correctness and does not withstand a depth analysis that incorporates linguistic and anthropological variables, which are essential for the incorporation of indigenous languages in the field of language planning and policy. The necessary incorporation of these dimensions clearly confirms that the language recovery should not start in the school (without excluding the fact that the school can be a place of social value and functionality), but rather in the community and, ultimately, in the overall society.

The original article was received on July 18th, 2014
The revised article was received on August 25th, 2014
The article was accepted on December 30th, 2014

References

- Deumert, A. (2000). Language planning and policy. In R. Mesthrie, J. Swann, A. Deumert, & W. L. Leap (Eds.), *Introducing sociolinguistics* (pp. 384-418). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Donoso, A., Contreras, R., Cubillos, L., & Aravena, L. (2006). Interculturalidad y políticas públicas en educación. Reflexiones desde Santiago de Chile. *Estudios Pedagógicos*, 32(1), 21-31. doi: 10.4067/S0718-07052006000100002
- Figuerola, V. (2004). *Capital social y desarrollo indígena urbano: una propuesta para una convivencia multicultural. Los mapuches de Santiago de Chile* (Doctoral thesis). Ciencia política, Universitat Ramon Llull, Barcelona, España.
- Gallardo, A. (1984). La situación mapuche, problema de planificación lingüística. *Cultura, Hombre y Sociedad*, 1, 151-188.
- García de León, J., & García de León, D. (2012). Políticas lingüísticas en Colombia: tensiones entre políticas para lenguas mayoritarias y lenguas minoritarias. *Boletín de Filología*, 27(2), 47-70. doi: S0718-93032012000200002
- Gissi, N. (2004). *Segregación espacial mapuche en la ciudad: ¿negación o revitalización identitaria?* Retrieved from <http://revistaurbanismo.uchile.cl>
- Gundermann, H., Canihuán, J., Clavería, A., & Faúndez, C. (2009). Permanencia y desplazamiento, hipótesis acerca de la vitalidad del mapuzugun. *RLA*, 47(1), 37-60. doi: 10.4067/S0718-48832009000100003
- Hernández, A. (1984). ¡Papel tuaiñ mapudungún meo! Un primer ensayo de ortografía práctica en mapudungún. *Cultura, Hombre, Sociedad*, 1, 189-203.
- Hernández, A. (1986). Encuentro para la unificación del alfabeto mapuche. *Cultura, Hombre, Sociedad*, 3, 195-210.
- Irvine, J., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 35-84). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Kroskrity, P. (2010). Language ideologies-evolving perspectives. In J. Jaspers (Ed.), *Language use and society* (pp. 192-211). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lagos, C. (2011). Educación intercultural bilingüe: posibilidades, limitantes y pertinencia para la lengua y cultura mapuche hoy en Chile. In V. Osorio (Ed.), *Interculturalidad desde el sur: demandas y proyecciones en el bicentenario* (pp. 145-158). Valdivia: Ediciones Universidad Austral de Chile.
- Lagos, C. (2012). Mapudungún en Santiago de Chile: representaciones sociales en los mapuches urbanos. *RLA*, 50(1), 161-190. doi: 10.4067/S0718-48832012000100008
- Lagos, C., Rojas, D., & Espinoza, M. (2013). Mapudungun according to its speakers: Mapuche intellectuals and the influence of standard language ideology. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14(3), 1-16. doi: 10.1080/14664208.2013.828879
- Lagos, C., & Espinoza, M. (2013). La planificación lingüística de la lengua mapuche en Chile a través de la historia. *Lenguas Modernas*, 42, 47-66.
- Loncon, E. (2013). La importancia del enfoque intercultural y de la enseñanza de las lenguas indígenas en la educación chilena. *Docencia*, 51, 44-55.
- Makihara, M., & Schieffelin, B. (Eds.). (2007). *Consequences of contact: Language ideologies and sociocultural transformations in pacific societies*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Ministerio de Educación, Gobierno de Chile (2005). *Orientaciones Programa de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*. Retrieved from http://www.mineduc.cl/Archivos/ConvivenciaEscolar/doc/archivo_177.pdf
- Quilaqueo, D. (2012). Saberes educativos mapuches: racionalidad apoyada en la memoria de los kimches. *ATÉNEA*, 505, 79-103. doi: 10.4067/S0718-04622012000100004
- Quintrileo, C., Yáñez, C., & Valenzuela, C. (2013). Una aproximación crítica a la propuesta en consulta del programa de educación intercultural bilingüe (PEIB) en Chile. *LOGOS*, 23(1), 45-61.
- Quintriqueo, S., Torres, H., Gutiérrez, M., & Sáez, D. (2011). Articulación entre el conocimiento cultural mapuche y el conocimiento escolar en ciencia. *Educ.*, 14(3), 475-492.
- Riedmann, A. (2008). La educación intercultural bilingüe en Chile: ¿ampliación de oportunidades para alumnos indígenas? *Indiana*, 25, 169-193.
- Schmelkes, S. (2004). La educación intercultural: un campo en proceso de consolidación. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa*, 9(20), 9-13.

- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. Clyne, W. Hanks, & C. Hofbauer (Eds.), *The elements: A parasection on units and levels* (pp. 193-247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Sir, J. (2008). *La educación intercultural bilingüe: el caso chileno*. Buenos Aires: FLAPE.
- Viaña, J., Tapia, L., & Walsh, C. (2010). *Construyendo interculturalidad crítica*. La Paz: Instituto Internacional de Integración del Convenio Andrés Bello.
- Wabgou, M., & Roth, A. (2009). *Las políticas públicas de las diversidades: identidades y emancipación*. Bogotá: UNIJUS.
- Williamson, G. (2004). ¿Educación multicultural, educación intercultural bilingüe, educación indígena o educación intercultural? *Cuadernos Interculturales*, 2(3), 23-34.