Universidad de Chile

Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades

Departamento de Lingüística

What are you evaluating? : The social representations embedded in the evaluation of English as a Second Language.

Tesis para optar al grado de Magister en Lingüística con Mención en Lengua Inglesa

Yaritza Cuevas

Profesor Guía:

Dr. Cristián Lagos

Santiago, Chile

2020

Acknowledgements

To my mother,

Yaritza Cuevas

To my mother,

Abstract

The present research critically analyzes the evaluation of the performance of English as a Second Language from the view point of Linguistic Anthropology. The goal of this study is to describe and distinguish attitudes, ideologies and social representations different social actors have regarding the evaluations of performance of English of Michelle Bachelet in one of her interviews in this language, in order to understand the political and social backgrounds behind English teaching and assessing in Chile. This implies that the cultural models that serve as base for the evaluations are not based on pure linguistics but rather on the politics of identity and how we identify ourselves regarding others. For this purpose, 6 Chilean citizens with varying degrees of English expertise were interviewed in order to characterize the salient social representations and language ideologies. The results suggest that in the evaluation of performance Nativespeakerism, Linguistic Imperialism and The Standard Language Ideologies are very present in the 'formal aspect' that search for the 'correct' (standard) use of the language, in considering having an accent as an disadvantage and relating a 'good' performance of the language to socio-political features of the speaker.

Keywords: Linguistic Anthropology, Critical Applied Linguistic, Social Representations, Language Ideologies, Second Language Evaluation, Standard Language Ideology, Nativespeakerism, Linguistic Imperialism.

Index

Introduction

The assessment or evaluation of performance in English has been a point of interest in research for many years in the world and also in Chile, because of its direct impact in education policies and English evaluation nationwide. Nonetheless, most studies have focused on the product, results and methodologies of the linguistic assessment not considering a critical perspective. It is relevant to be 'critical' since this perspective defies the imposed 'objectivity' behind certain practices, like the evaluation of English as a Second Language. A perspective is taken and whatever that deviates from the norm is considered an 'error', forcing learners to accommodate to a certain reality that benefits unequal power relationships (Connerton, 1976 , Pennycook, 1989) that are reflected in people's discourse and practices. Thus, this study provides inputs to understand the political and social backgrounds behind English teaching and assessing in Chile, and how through these relationships between people and languages are reproduced.

For this reason, the objective of this study is to characterize the social representations regarding the performance of English of a speaker of English as a Second Language in the discourse of different Chilean citizens. In this case, the subject chosen to be evaluated is the former president Michelle Bachelet, for the reason that to present a well known person allows to stage the different social representations and ideologies. A similar study was conducted by Contreras & Grez (2016) with Alexis Sanchez as the subject to observe and comment on, with the difference that he belongs to different social class and that shapes the evaluation, comments and discourse at some level. The chosen participants have varying degrees of expertise regarding the English language (professors, students and people with no former studies), the aim of this distribution is to analyze political, ideological and cultural factors involved in their assessment and the influence their formation or lack of formation may have in their discourse. This characterization will be done by identifying the **social**

representations and **language ideologies** present **in the discourse of evaluation towards the performance of a speaker of English as an L2 in different social actors**.

It is expected that the social representations identified from the different social actors demonstrate how linguistic attitudes and language ideologies are part of wider social representations that shape the evaluation and assessment regarding the proficiency of a social actor in relation to English as an L2. In turn, this implies that the cultural models that serve as base for the evaluations are not based on pure linguistic parameters but rather on the politics of identity and how we identify ourselves regarding others. This research intends to discuss the 'purely' and 'neutral' quality of these 'linguistic' parameters and the 'linguistic', mainly understood as objective, always hides the situated quality that speaking a language implies.

Taking this into account, the fact that in SLA there are two languages with different cultural prestige and the matter of who has authority on the language or who speaks it in a proper manner answer to a standard vision of the language, that replicates ideologies like nativespeakerism and linguistic imperialism which show its inevitable and undeniable relation with politics because languages are related in significant ways with people's lives, coercing people's choices and shaping opinions. This has an impact in the assessment of students in Chile, the evaluations teachers or social actors have in their variety of English. This perspective can contribute the modification of the evaluation parameters the English students of Chile are set to have.

Chapter 1: Identification of the Study

The following section presents: the research questions, hypothesis, and the general and specific objectives set for the present research study. The research focus sheds light on the salient social representations and ideologies that different social actors have regarding the evaluation of performance of English as Second Language.

1.1 Research Questions

This study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What social representations do Chilean English teachers have on the evaluation of performance of English of Michele Bachelet?

2. What social representations do Chilean English students have on the evaluation of performance of English Michelle Bachelet?

3. What social representations do Chilean citizens, without formal studies of English, have on the evaluation of performance of Michelle Bachelet?

1.2 Hypothesis

The social representations social actors have on the evaluation of Michelle's variety of English and her performance are not based on linguistic foundations but on language attitudes and ideologies concerned with Standard English, Nativespeakerism and Linguistic Imperialism.

1.3 Objectives:

1.3.1 General Objective:

To characterize the social representations regarding Michelle Bachelet's performance of English in different Chilean social actors, with varying degrees of expertise on the language.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives:

1. To characterize the Social Representations of Chilean English Teachers regarding the evaluation of performance of English of Michelle Bachelet

2. To characterize the social representations of Chilean English Students regarding the evaluation of performance of English of Michelle Bachelet

3. To characterize the social representations in Chilean citizens, without formal English studies, regarding the evaluation of performance of Michelle Bachelet

1.4 Methodology

1.4.1 Level of the Study and type of Design

In order to carry out this investigation the design of this study is cross-sectional, belongs to the descriptive level and is a study case. The cross-sectional design allows for "a snapshot-like analysis of the target phenomenon" (Dörnyei, 2005) and enabled the researcher to capture distinct feelings, thoughts and experiences the participants had with respect of the performance of English of a particular L2 speaker in a specific period of time. The descriptive level makes the identification of trends, correlations and categories possible, as well as allowing for the description of characteristics of specific subjects like language, evaluation, etc.. Furthermore, it is a study case because it allows for doing research on a topic and theme that has not been broadly studies, as well as carrying a study with a small amount of participants.

1.4.2 Methodological Approach

This investigation has a qualitative approach because it intends to explore participants' underlying social representations and ideologies regarding the evaluation of performance of a speaker through conversation and deep examination of data.

1.4.3 Participants

The participants consisted of six (6) Chilean citizens that respond to different levels of Expertise in English. Professors of English, Students of English and people without formal studies of English (apart from school). In order to neutralize the gender variable the categories will be represented by two people, a female and a male. The participants belonged to a rather similar socioeconomic background. The participants' age vary from 20 to 45 years old.

Participants	Age	Expertise on English	Gender
Vargas	26	Professor	Female
Varela	27	Professor	Male
Moreno	20	Student	Male
Salinas	25	Student	Female
Estay	45	no formal studies	Female
Acevedo	28	no formal studies	Male

1.4.4 Data Collection

The data was collected by means of semi-structured interviews, in this manner it is possible to assess and guide the course of the conversation, in such way that the participants follow the theme of interest. In principle, the participants were asked the same questions but the development of the interview allowed for different nuances depending on the direction the conversation took.

The same video of Michelle Bachelet was shown to every single participant before the questions started, this video was chosen because Michelle is having an interview in English and she is making use of her second language in a creative and original manner. The video was shown to enable participants to give informed opinions regarding her performance in English..

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=db0eg5ikHOI&list=LL8bjfxVdLBLIgpHbaoQBXyA&index=2&t=30s

Michelle Bachelet is the subject of study because of her impact in Chile as the first female president and latin america, also because she is a known persona among Chilean people. Moreover, Bachelet was the first UNSAUR pro tempure president, the first executive director of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and is now the High Commissioner of Human Right from the same institution.

1.4.4.1 Data Collection Techniques

In the first stage, the interviews were audio -recorder, after this stage the recordings were transcribed in order to be analyzed. The interview was semi-structured, with the purpose of maintaining the core questions motivating the participant to answer the main issue related to social representations but also, in order to maintain a comfortable conversation and let the

participants explain and express their real feeling and opinions open questions will be made in order to get the conversation started and going.

1.4.5 Analysis Models and Instruments

The data was analyzed according to the Social Representations model (Moscovici, 1988). After this identification, relations were made following the Social Representations Model, Language Ideologies (Kroskrity, 2004; Siegel, 2006), and Dominant Ideologies (Bourdieu, 1998).

The questions made in the interview focused on the Evaluation of Michelle Bachelet's performance of English, reasons of those evaluations, opinions regarding what is 'good' and 'bad' English and references of 'good and ''bad' English.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

The goal of this study is to describe and distinguish attitudes, ideologies and social representations different social actors have regarding the evaluations of Michelle Bachelet's performance. Accordingly, the different concepts that are related to the study are defined and explained in a deductive manner.

Firstly, the conceptual and theoretical approaches that guided the study of language will be reviewed. Starting from Linguistic Anthropology as the main approach, followed by the revision of the concepts Language, Education and Politics that situate language and education as political practices and Critical Applied Linguistics as the approach used to expose the unequal power relationships amongst Applied Linguistics.

Secondly, the theoretical concepts that allow for the analysis and description of discourses and practices about languages will be discussed, first, Social Representations and second, Language Ideologies.

Thirdly, salient language ideologies related to English as a Second Language: Linguistic Imperialism, The Standard Language Ideology and Nativespeakerism are discussed and described revealing the mechanisms that allow for their reproduction.

Fourthly, the concept of Evaluation of a Second Language will be defined, discussed with a critical point of view.

This theoretical section will finish with a review of the State of the Art regarding Evaluation of English as a Second Language.

2.1.1 Linguistic Anthropology

This research is framed under the interdisciplinary field of Linguistic Anthropology which is understood as "the study of language within the context of anthropology" (Hymes, 1965:23) and defined as "the study of language as a cultural resource and speaking as a cultural practice" (Duranti, 1997:2). Boas and Malinowski stated how impossible it is to "understand a community without an understanding of the language (s) used by its members" (Duranti, 1997:5) and linguistic anthropology understands language as the product of culture beliefs and one of its practices. In other words, Linguistics Anthropology "it is the understanding of the crucial role played by language in the constitution of society and its cultural representations" (Duranti, 2009:5)

The field of Linguistic Anthropology has had different exponents and understandings of language and its relation with culture across the years. In the beginning, research that regarded this relation was mostly concerned with USA's native communities and the translation of their languages. In this context, Humboldt (1863) foreseed the transference of one's own linguistic pattern in the acquirement or learning process of a foreign country, with this it is possible to understand that in order to acquire a foreign language one must be willing to adapt and modify one's previous viewpoint of language and culture (Duranti ,2009). Whorf would later propose an hypothesis that relates language and thoughts, called the linguistic relativity principle, which explains how each language classification is different and unique because it contemplates a community's world view. For that reason languages must be studied under their own terms (Whorf, 1956).

Later, Hymes would include to the hypothesis:

"the ways in which linguistic structure may influence our experience of the world and the ways in which cultural patterns can influence language use and determine the functions of language in social life" (Duranti, 2007:15)

Highlighting in this way the difference between communities and the meaning such communities give to speech acts. However, at the same time Chomsky's Generative Grammar became popular and language was understood in terms of the grammar system, with an ideal homogeneous community where diversity was omitted, leaving context and the real use of language aside. Classical linguistics , that is related to UG and Saussure, is mostly concerned with a mentalistic perspective of grammar and is mainly interested with the knowledge of language (competence) leaving aside the actual use of language (performance).

In spite of this, Hymes reacted by assuming that "an anthropological program for the study of language must start from the assumption of heterogeneity" (Duranti, 1997: chapter 3) and creating an alternative notion of competence called communicative competence that includes the ability to use knowledge. The appearance of communicative competence motivated researchers to focus on multilingualism and linguistic variation. The new notion of competence also modified the notion of performance, which was defined as " a realm of social action" (Hymes, 1972:283) and this allowed to "broaden the analytical horizon of language use" (Duranti, 2009:21). The issue of language choice began to be addressed by linguistic anthropologist in the 80's. By this time, scholars such as Bakhtin addressed the issue of heteroglossia and Hanks (1986) argued how when two languages have contact, one does not disappear but one community is rather obligated to acquire the traditions of the dominant community (Duranti, 2009).

Thereafter, Silverstein explored and coined the notion of metapragmatic awareness that dealt with the context in which language is used and how aware of this rules a native-

speaker is (Duranti, 2009), with this notion and by doing research on it it was discovered that language use and communication is a complex issue and social, cultural and political matters affect context and consequently the use and the choice of language.

Languages are practices that induce "particular ways of being in the world" (Duranti, 1997:5) and for this reason to understand a message it is necessary, to also understand, the interpretation and production context. Currently, this field intends to contribute to "an understanding of the multifarious aspects of language as a set of cultural practices, that is, a system of communication for interpsychological and intrapsychological representations of the social order and helps people use such representations for constitutive social acts" (Duranti, 1997:3) such as the choice of which language to learn, which language to speak, the variation of the language and the situation in which the language will be spoken.

In terms of methodology, linguistic anthropology is concerned with real language use, therefore it relies on observation and other methods such as interviews with the participants, audiovisual recording and annotated transcription (Duranti, 2001). These methods attempt to examine the power of language and to interrelate social categories that were studied independently in former times.

2.1.2 Language, Politics and Education

Despite the fact that theoretical linguists focus mainly on the cognitive function of language (Joseph, 2006), the study of its interpersonal uses reveal how political language practices are, and the inherent political nature language possess. In fact, according to Dunbar (1996) and Desalles (2000) language is the result of the need for mediums to recognize enemies and allies in large distances and bigger groups, this could be accomplished by speaking a certain language "to display their value as members of a coalition." (Desalles, 2000:332). In this manner, Bourdieu's (1977) understanding of language as a an instrument

of power is illustrated since the reason behind speaking is "not only to be understood but also to be believed, obeyed, respected, distinguished." (Bourdieu, 1977:648).

Politics tend to be understood as a matter that is only related to politicians and state affairs when in reality the political can be applied to situations that present unequal distribution of power which may determine, guide or be reflected in the behavior of individuals (Joseph, 2006). In the case of language, Jenkins argues that "linguistic relations are always relations of power" (2005) because the dynamic of the linguistic exchange always provides the speaker with a particular social authority and an audience with a varying range of acceptance regarding the speaker's authority that answer to historical power relations associated with the community or group they belong to. This is clearly mirrored in language choices, language policy, the standard and any situation in which one language, variety, dialect, etc. is chosen in detriment of other.

Bourdieu and Thompson explain the distribution of power in the linguistic exchange by describing "a particular symbolic relation of power between a producer, endowed with a certain linguistic capital, and a consumer (or market), and which is capable of procuring a certain material or symbolic profit" (1991:66) making this exchange economic. Thus, the study of language and politics helps understand the manner in which family, institutions, education and the state shape the way in which individuals and communities perceive and use language as means of presenting themselves to the world, using language as an economic exchange of their value, the value others see in them and the value they see in others.

In the sixteenth century the spread of universal education began the search for a national language and with this process, different dialects started to be stigmatized and neutralized, throughout the years education would become even more universal reaching out most of the population, achieving then the imposition of a 'standard' use of language and the

'correct' use of it. This explains how education plays a major role in the creation and reproduction of language and national identity (Joseph, 2006).

Education is the vehicle to trespass knowledge to the masses, however it is also a manifestation of power and it is determined by it, since the decision behind what it is and what is not knowledge in a particular place and time depends on a group of people that have power themselves (Foucault ,1977). Although education may help oppressed and unprivileged people to scale in the social ladder Freire affirms that "once educated and liberated, the formerly oppressed would become oppressors in their turn (Freire 1970: 27) since the system of education reproduces the social class differences (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977). By doing so the education system helps recreate a vicious circle that will allow privileged and powerful people to maintain the social order and their position in the peak of society.

2.1.3 Critical applied linguistics

The field of Applied Linguistics is an interdisciplinary field that deals with:

> "Practical problems of language and communication that can be identified, analyzed or solved by applying available theories, methods or results of Linguistics or by developing new theoretical and methodological frameworks in linguistics to work on these problems." (Cook and Wei, 2011)

Despite of the fact that Linguistics is understood to be mainly concerned with the system instead of the use, Applied Linguistics focuses on solving and explaining problems that occur in real life situations and it is mainly concerned with the real use of language and

its practice, Second Language Teaching and the use of Mother Tongue. However, throughout the years the areas related to Applied Linguistics have broaden and include: Discourse Analysis, Assessment and Evaluation, Bilingual Education, Translation and Interpretation, Sociolinguistics, Psycholinguistics (Grabe, 2010).

The close relation Applied Linguistics has with teaching a Second Language and the real practice of languages and its problems requires for the analysis of external aspects of language that affect not only the learner, but also the teacher and the setting in which language is being taught. Widdowson considers that the field must consider and be responsible for acknowledging "the criteria for 'an educationally relevant approach to language' and to avoid the uncritical assumption that applied linguistics must necessarily be the application of linguistics" (Widdowson, 1984:20). To be 'critical' on regards to the field implies to question the supposed 'objectivity' behind certain practices and experiences, since a certain perspective regarding reality is taken and anything that differs from it is considered 'deformed', emancipating in this way the ones that have to accommodate to this reality (Connerton, 1976). On the same path, Pennycook (1989) claims that language teaching approaches display "a particular view of the world and [are] articulated in the interests of unequal power relationships" (589–90) therefore it is needed to add the 'critical' approach in order to expose those unequal power relationships, to study the manners in which power relationships are reproduced, how they are resisted and how to resist them.

According to Mahboob & Paltridge, Critical Applied Linguistics studies "ways in which education, regulation, and the study and use of language relate to the realization, maintenance, and reproduction of the distribution of power in society" (2012:1). Under this view, the relationship between context and language is undeniable. The cultural and political implications hidden in language policy, ideologies, choice, etc explain and maintain the

power some languages (like English) have in comparison with other languages. In order to analyze this phenomena foundational political and social analysis proposals by Bourdieu and Foucault, to name a few, must be taken into account and considered in order to foresee the hegemonic social structures that underlie language phenomena.

2.2.1 Social Representations

Social representations are defined as ' universes of opinion' which relate knowledge with behaviors and communication ,with this notion it is possible to understand the origin of people's opinion regarding any subject, including a second language and people's performance.

Durkheim (1898) was one of the first researchers to acknowledge that the collective could not be reduced to the individual establishing the existence of collective representations influenced by social psychology with a marked sociological tendency. Considering this concept, Moscovici (1979) would later coin the term social representation and define it more precisely as ' the common sense knowledge that has as an objective to communicate , to be up to date and feel part of the social environment, and that originates in the interchange of the social group' (Mora, 2002:7). In other words, social representations are pieces of knowledge known and understood as common sense inside a community, pieces of knowledge that are shared and make you part of a social group.

Moscovici also pointed out the dynamic nature of Social Representations in the sense that they are "always in the making, in the context of interrelations and actions that are themselves always in the making." (Moscovici, 1988:219) and they are understood as social because they have been shaped "by an exchange and interaction process" (Codol, 1982:2). Under this scope, Social Representations are not fixated and their development depends upon the quality and speed of communication, as well as the relationship between the individual or

groups that are taking part on the communication process and how this relation determines each other's actions. According to this, "a representation always links a cognitive form with a content widely accepted by the group." (Moscovici, 1988:221) and depending on the relation between participants there are three ways in which a representation can become social: the maintenance of hegemonic and collective representations, the spreading of subgroups interpretation of ideas and knowledge and finally, representations created under the context of social conflict.

Moscovici further argues that in order to analyze social representations three dimensions must be taken into account: the information, the representation field and the attitude. In this research, attitude plays a main role since is the dimension that demonstrates people's favorable or unfavorable orientation towards the object of social representation (Mora, 2002:10). Following this same idea but with more specificity language attitudes focus on individual and groups reactions to language (Razfar and Rumenapp,2012), it seems to be that social actors' underlying language attitudes manifest themselves in social environments or when they discuss the subject of social representation in depth when they have to make an statement or give an opinion regarding the subject.

2.2.2 Language Ideologies

The concept of Language Ideologies is quite recent in comparison with other concepts developed in this research. However, it has suffered modifications following the changes other fields have suffered, such as the change of paradigm Linguistic Anthropology had with the foundation of 'an ethnography of communication' (Hymes, 1964) that joined socio cultural features of speakers with the context in which language took place. Before that revolution, language ideologies were seen as inferences and misleading beliefs (Boas, 1911).

Silverstein (1979) would be the one to define the concept as it is understood today, as: "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use."(193). His definition highlights the importance of metalinguistic awareness and the role it has in allowing speakers to think about and influence language. He does this by focusing on the agency behind language ideologies, in how the rationalization behind people's understanding of language is decisive in the development of the structure of language, such as the case with the former standard 'generic he' and the influence feminist had in changing the use and consequently, the structure. Judith Irvine (1989) would later define the concept from a sociocultural perspective as "the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests" (255). This view, understands language ideologies as constructed by specific economical and political perspectives that will later influence the population's view on language. This phenomenon can be clearly seen in the construction of models for linguistic evaluations and linguistic 'correctness' as a result of beliefs regarding superiority and inferiority of certain languages or variations.

Kroskrity explains the plurality of the concept language ideologies by stating that the study of them:

> "problematizes speakers' consciousness of their language and discourse as well as their positionality (in political economic systems) in shaping beliefs, proclamations, and evaluations of linguistic forms and discursive practices" (2000:192)

With this comment, Kroskrity unveils the internal tensions speakers have regarding language ideologies because when a person is asked to think about language and the uses language may have, and therefore racionalize about it, different discourses play a role in their

rationalization. Different voices come out like their own beliefs, what they have been taught, what they know to be the 'better' practices, mass media information and dominant ideologies.

In order to understand and know what influences the opinions of different speakers metalinguistic awareness (Preston, 1996), which refers to "the degree of consciousness that speakers have about language in general or about some linguistic features in particular" (Rojas Áviles, 2014:68), is key. To comprehend why some linguistic features, ideas and beliefs are more popular and accessible for the speakers Niedzielski and Preston (2003) proposed the existence of two main factors that determine why some features gain more attention than others. One, is that the features feel foreign for the speaker's community and two, that they are perceived as 'incorrect' in an ideal model of language. Rojas and Áviles (2014) explain that, regarding the second factor, there is a close relationship between the idea of what is correct and incorrect in terms of linguistic form and the ideas obtained from family, school and media communication. Briefly put, it could be said that dominant and popular ideologies are part of speakers' consciousness as a result of the influence the previously named media has in them.

As it can be seen, there is a clear correlation between social representations, language attitudes and language ideologies in the sense that language attitudes and language ideologies are opinions and common places of knowledge and preconceived ideas towards language which coincides with the attitude dimension of social representation. That is to say, social representations contain language attitudes and ideologies that are demonstrated when social actors let themselves think about language and processing their opinions towards it, "such rationalizations are typically multiple, context-bound, and necessarily constructed from the socio cultural experience of the speaker" (Kroskrity, 2004: 496). Despite the fact language attitudes and ideologies are very similar, they differ in the level of abstraction.

However, they are interrelated because the more abstract level (ideologies) influences the more concrete level (attitudes) (Maio et al. 2006) , which means that language ideologies influence the opinion (language attitude) a speaker may have towards a certain linguistic object, issue, etc.

Salient language ideologies are frequently used in the discourse schools, media and family have regarding the language form and as a consequence, they influence a major percentage of the population and institutions. They help maintain the social order. Kroskrity explains how some "language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group" (2004:501) more evidently when the matter of interest is leveling a linguistic styles, practices and uses as 'good' or "aesthetically pleasing".

2.2.3 Linguistic Imperialism

In order to understand the motive behind the domination of certain languages across the world Phillipson coined the term Linguistic Imperialism and defined it as:

> "a theoretical construct, devised to account for linguistic hierarchisation, to address why some languages come to be used more and others less, what structures and ideologies facilitate such processes and the role of language professionals" (Phillipson, 1997:238)

The study of Linguistic Imperialism intends to explain the ideologies behind the structures that allow for some languages to be powerful and dominant in comparison with others, in a theoretically informed way. It also analyses the manner in which Linguistic Imperialism works in specific contexts such that discrimination and injustice are identified

and something can be done in order to change the situation. Phillipson (2018) further explains that Linguistic Imperialism is structural considering that most material resources are given to dominant languages, and ideological because attitudes, beliefs and imagery work against the non-dominant languages by stigmatizing them, but at the same time worshiping the dominant language and intends to rationalize the linguistic hierarchy.

To intend to rationalize language is to follow the functionalist perspective of language that considers the spread of a language "to be natural, neutral and beneficial" (Kumaravadivelu, 2006:9) and in general unproblematic. However, Linguistic Imperialism is a subtype of linguicism which is "a term created to draw parallels between hierarchisation on the basis of 'race' or ethnicity, gender and language." (Phillipson, 2009:239). Namely, the privilege the speakers of a dominant language have are based on features that are not linguistic and answer to imperialist and colonialist needs that maintain racist attitudes and values. In the same way that Linguicism benefits dominant language, it also manifests dominant attitudes concerning the purpose a language should have or about values of some pedagogic practices (Phillipson, 2009), like the imposition of a privileged 'standard' variation that is understood as the 'correct' manner of speaking and writing and it is often used in evaluation, education, teaching, etc. These ideologies "only survive if they are reinforced through daily discourses" (Ruecker, 2001:407) such as media, family and institutions naturalizing them in such way that confrontation and challenge are less likely to occur.

It is relevant to mention that Linguistic Imperialism entails a close relationship with a structure of imperialism since "language has always been the consort of empire, and forever shall remain its mate" (Illich, 1981:34–5). Throughout history language has always been the means to impose unity and a "nation" like sensation between the inhabitants of an empire,

nation, country, etc. Dominant languages have become dominant because of the monetary and military power the speakers of that language have and the power they have to impose their culture and practices such as monolingual ideologies.

Within this concept and focusing on English , Phillipson coined English Linguistic Imperialism and defined it as :

> "when the dominances of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages" (1992:47)

In the context of English as a Second Language "mainstream English associated with white native speakers and race have been imbricated through colonial legacy (Ruecker, 2011:403) and so has the concept of the 'superior native teacher', constructed in the ´60s as " a saleable product to support American and British aid trajectories" (Holliday, 2006:12) which demonstrates how colonial time policies and impositions continue to exist, are maintained and commonly accepted by being disguise under the argument of "free choice". Bourdieu would argue that this 'free choice' is guided by social factors that answer to 'symbolic violence', concept that refers to non-physical violence manifested in the differences of power between two individuals (Bourdieu, 1991) or in this case, two languages. A non-native of English feels intimidated by the language since it is presented as the only option and in most cases people are forced to acquire and learn the "global" language that English is sold to be. To speak this specific language entails social, economic, cultural and political advances and privileges that a non-speaker wishes to have and become. In Phillipson's words "English has served to consolidate the interests of the powerful globally and locally and to maintain an exploitative world order" (2018:4).

2.2.4 Standard Language Ideology

The alleged search for uniformity and communicative efficiency motivated the standardization of language in different countries. The process of standardization 'went hand in hand with the rise of capitalism and expansion of large scale commercial activity" (Milroy,2002:133) which means that in order to be able to communicate efficiently and rapidly in a fast moving- capitalist world a variation of the language had to be chosen to later spread that variation as the norm. The notion of standardization goes relates with the expansion of literacy, that was mainly implicated with the written language (Bonfiglio, 2010), it is evident that to norm a language in terms of writing is far more plausible than to norm and control the everyday use of a language, clearly this process has some obstacles when it comes to the practice. Milroy explains that "the most important structural property of a standard variety of language is uniformity and invariance" (2002:133). Namely to standardize a language is to dismiss the dynamic nature of language and impose certain grammar structures, pronunciations and vocabulary, excluding the other varieties that do not follow those structures. Bourdieu (1991) argues that to maintain the social class differences language is fundamental since it reproduces the discourses education pretends to impose, like the 'correct' use of language with the standard variation.

Lippi-Green's (1997) study on contemporary educational policies and practices revealed the class-interested foundation behind the standard language ideology that is widely promoted by numerous institutions that are in charge of educating and policing language practices. The standard language ideology is defined by her as:

> ''a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogenous spoken language which
> is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its

model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the speech of the upper, middle class" (Lippi-Green, 1997:64)

Lippi-Green's study also demonstrated the lack of linguistic evidence that accounts for the better efficiency behind the chosen variety of English that corresponds to the standard, since the mid-western dialect does not have a superior structure in comparison with any other English dialect. This language ideology advocates for the process of language subordination that only benefits wealthy social classes by maintaining the social stratification via their - political-economic influence. Thus, Standard English is universally used as a metric for scholarships, immigration programs, second language evaluation, etc. which forces speakers to modify their speech and to normalize the standard-based prescriptivism that supports the hierarchisation of a language. Cook states how actually "the measure of success in L2 learning is often held to be the extent to which people's pronunciation conforms to native standards" (1999:195). Therefore, the standard variation is associated with political economic issues such as being chosen for a job, a school, university, going up or down the social ladder and in general, fitting in a capitalist economy.

2.2.5 Nativespeakerism

The notion of 'standard' and 'correct' dialect or speech are related to political economic issues as it was previously mentioned, granting privileges and authority regarding language to a particular group that speaks in an specific manner. From a macro perspective, this phenomenon can be transferred to an entire language like English, in which case "concepts of standardization must also be present in the attribution of authority to the native speaker" (Bonfiglio, 2010:8). This phenomenon is translated in ideological terms as Nativespeakerism described as:

"an ideology that upholds the idea that so-called 'native speakers' are the best models and teachers of English because they represent a 'Western culture' from which spring the ideals both of English and of the methodology for teaching it (Holliday 2005: 6)

For Holliday (2005) this dominant professional discourse is an everyday practice that contributes the prejudice against English professors that are not native speakers of English and on the contrary assumes that English native speakers are better professionals and have more knowledge regarding the English language. This ideology does not facilitate the role English professors have when they were not born and raised in an English speaking country and the persistence of this ideology in the professional circle only promotes neo racist dynamics.

It has been proven that there is no first language speaker or writer that has the entire knowledge of the uses and rules of a specific language (Mugglestone, 1997). Nevertheless, SLA research usually uses the comparative fallacy (Bley-Vroman, 1983) as a resource to measure the success of an L2 learner. The comparative fallacy relates the L2 learner to the native speaker in equal terms, as if their processes were the same or equiparable. Cook (1999) illustrates how the brain of a L2 learner works differently from an L1 learner since they already have a system in their minds and comprehend the world in those terms, they are able to switch languages and in general learn in a completely different manner than monolinguals which means that to compare them is futile and unnecessary. L2 learners should not be "expected to conform to the norm of a group to which they do not belong" (Cook, 1999:194) native speakers are an arbitrary group and it should be understood that L2 learners speak in a different manner not 'incorrectly'.

In spite of this fact, "many SLA research methods, such as grammatically judgments, obligatory occurrences and error analysis involve comparison with the native speaker (Cook, 1997, Firth and Wagner 1997). L2 speaker are obligated to follow the example of native speakers and they aim to acquire their accent, structure, style, etc. since they are evaluated under the comparative fallacy premise in standardized tests. Society has normalized monolingual privilege, punishing and correcting behaviors that are expected and common amongst bilinguals by imposing the goal of achieving native-like performance and competence, disregarding more accurate linguistic notions like multicompetence. As a consequence L2 users aim to be native speakers and accept their role as "deficient" native speakers, when in fact they are bilinguals in a world that sees monolingualism as the norm.

Holliday (2005) argues that native-speakerism undermines the ELT profession and the popular perceptions of English and its culture because it spreads a cultural disbelief in 'non-natives' by labeling them so, assuming that they are not able to contribute culture or perform 'active' oral skills as teachers, or as non-native bilinguals. Natives and native-teachers represent the Western culture that is seen as the example and the norm to be followed, idealized in the methodology, evaluation and understanding of the English language, this is the vested interest behind native-speakerism (Holliday, 2005). The assumption that English native speakers are 'proper' cultural containers and that non-natives are not capable to add cultural value to the field of ELT 'rationalizes the subordination of people of colour on the basis of culture' (Spears,1999:11–12) .Nonetheless, this racism is hidden under supposedly 'neutral' practices and 'innocent' cultural differences, such as evaluating, teaching and learning a second language are believed to be since they are linguistic and follow the ideal native-speaker structure. Since this phenomena is not out in the open for everyone to acknowledge it is classified as neo-racism (Holliday, 2005).

Kumaravadivelu (2003) comments on how nativespeakerism embodies a discursive dialectic that accounts for colonial representation by producing an 'Other' with the purpose of correcting the 'othered' behavior and culture through contact. Accomplishing then the "production and justification of an 'unproblematic' colonial and contemporary self" (Kumaravadivelu. 2003:16). This type of strategy has contributed to the denial of nativespeakerism in ELT professionals, assuming their job and practices as 'neutral' (Holliday, 2005). However, the implications native-speakerism has in the world are undeniable and clear, such is the case of employment practices, immigration policies and evaluation standards that instigate neo-racist ideologies in order to segregate non-native of English.

2.3 Second Language Evaluation

Second Language Acquisition assessment or evaluation (for the purpose of this thesis these two concepts are interchangeable) has been widely studied, nonetheless language assessment has been frequently understood and carried out 'within a framework which takes the formal properties of language into account '(Pienemann & Johnston, 1987:91) such as grammar, lexicon, semantics and phonology. This view of language and its assessment is expected to be understood as something homogeneous as well as transversal in every speaker. Other views on evaluation, such as Conductivism, have defined it as "make inquiries in certain direction to collect relevant data about something with such data, and, from there, make some decisions" (Bordón, 2006:18). However, this definition fails to be specific and does not offer an explanation on what is behind the evaluation, what the point of it is, or if there is a difference between the speakers. It seems like the participant, object, or methodology being evaluated is something that is suspended in the air with no context and without any variable that might have an impact in its assessment.

The previously named definition is aligned with Chomsky's (1965) definition of competence, which is the linguistic knowledge every speaker has of their language. Nonetheless, Chomsky differentiates between competence and performance, the production of actual utterances. However, this definition of competence seeks' an ideal speaker-listener with perfect linguistic knowledge, which is supposed to be unaffected by cognitive and situational factors during actual linguistic performance'(Rickheit & Strohner, 2008:17) and so leaving the notion of performance forgotten even though is related with the practical and real use of language because is actual speech. Many scholars used this definition to develop their methodologies, studies and evaluations. Nonetheless 'issues of linguistic correctness go far deeper than the particular grammatical or lexical quible at hand. They are interpreted as reflecting the speakers' intelligence, industry, social worthiness' (Joseph, 2006:4) and this view of competence does not acknowledge those issues.

However, as criticism Hymes (1963) coined the term communicative competence which is the 'general concept for the communicative capacity of a speaker, capacity that covers the knowledge of a language and their ability to use it.' which includes the notion of performance and allows for new conceptions of competence that do mind about the context and conceive it as the speaker's capacity of adapting to a certain speech community including rules related to linguistic descriptions and sociohistorical and cultural contexts. (Hernandez et.al 2008), communicative competence has been adapted and used in many institution and new characterizations of evaluation have taken place, notwithstanding

> "evaluation, has been, and is, conditioned by obsolete language conceptions and methodologies; it is not uncommon to find ourselves in classrooms where the development of communicative competence prevails and yet, when evaluating, totally opposite and improper patterns of this methodology are followed."(Doval, 2015:47)

McNamara (2008) is able to criticize this aspect with his definition of evaluation, which attempts to reach an agreement concerning the knowledge and performance of a person. At the same time, it sheds light in the fact that to be able to reach a conclusion regarding someone's knowledge comparison with a standard or a level has to be made, to finally conclude if that person corresponds below or above certain level. Under this definition it is understood that evaluating someone always implies the comparison of that person with a certain standard and 'as the standard emerges, the myth arises that is the one, true, original form of the language - the language proper." (Joseph, 2006:29).

Doval (2016) highlights that assessment has the tendency to focus on the results of the evaluations and the resources used to obtain those results with different methodologies rather than focusing on why is the evaluation being made and what is the goal behind the assessment. In this thesis it is intended to explore assessment understood as ' an instrument of control or an exercise of authority' (Doval, 2016:48) which is imbedded in social actors' social representations, language attitudes and ideologies which are constituted by political views as Joseph (2006) explains ' the politics have to do with the issues of language and identity: each of the variants onto which hierarchy of correctness is imposed belongs to some speakers and not other" (31) and notions such as " standard English" may affect the appreciation that speaker have regarding what is 'good' and what is 'bad' in discourse aimed at understanding how our apparent 'choices' are guided by social forces .

2.4 State of the Art

In the last few years, an interest for a critical view regarding assessment has arisen and many researchers have been interested in not only improving their quantitative methods but also in identifying the mistakes made in the process of evaluation taking into account the global aspect of the English language (Llurda, 2004 ; McNamara, 2012 ; Kuwornu, 2017 ;

Rose &Syrbe, 2018). Although there is little research of performance evaluation with qualitative methods, there are some international studies that are related to assessment of performance and proficiency with a qualitative method. To be more specific Europe and the US have developed research in linguistic attitudes along the lines of English as an L2 from the perspective of learners (Henderson, 2015 ; Menegatti, Crocetti, Rubini, 2017; Lehnert et al, 2018), teachers (Henderson, 2017) and linguists (MacSwan, 2017).

In Latin America, the study of social representations related with English as a second language is focused on the evaluation process of students with the perspectives of different participants such as pre-school students (Cadavid et al, 2014), indigenous students that are bilingual (Arismendi., Ramirez & Arias, 2016), in the case of the teacher's perspective, accents and variations have been discussed (Chacón, 2010) and linguistic discrimination (Vanegas et al, 2016). In Chile, the focus of social representation studies regarding language has been given to indigenous languages along the lines of language ideologies about mapudungun(Wittig, 2009; Lagos 2011;2012; Rojas, Lagos & Espinoza, 2015) and the social representations behind linguistic planification of mapudungun (Lagos & Espinoza, 2013). In the case of English in Chile, most studies have been focused on the language as an L2 and in the evaluation process of students and teachers (Orrego et al, 2017), also in the beliefs behind the teacher's assessment (Torres, 2017). Nonetheless, not much attention has been paid to the evaluation embedded in different social actors' opinion regarding a certain user of the English language as an L2.

Chapter 3: Results and Analysis

The following section presents the main findings of this study, as well as the analysis of their evaluation and discourse towards the performance of a speaker of English as a Second Language. In the first place, the results and analysis of the Social Representations Chilean English professors had towards the use of Michelle Bachelet's English are presented in order to answer the first objective of this project, followed by the conclusion in relation to this level of expertise.

Secondly, similarly to the previous section the results and analysis that answer the second objective of the research, which is focused in the Social Representations Chilean English Students have towards the evaluation of performance of Michelle Bachelet, is presented followed by the conclusions.

Thirdly, the results and analysis of the third group, Chilean people with no formal studies of English, is presented and summarized in the conclusion.

3.1 Social Representations of Chilean English Teachers regarding the performance of English of Michelle Bachelet

English professors social representations on the English of Michelle Bachelet vary from formal aspects of language -such as pronunciation and grammar- to privilege, prestige and tensions regarding evaluation, their role as authorities, and the native speaker.

Professors evaluate and assess students on their daily basis, therefore it is expected for them to evaluate the performance of Michelle Bachelet with special attention in the formal aspects of language, what is interesting is with what approach they evaluate those aspects, as it can be seen in the following quote:

"first of all the pronunciation because it is not the typical English pronunciation that we are used to. Like, I work with kids and people that are learning English, obviously here are words and pronunciations that are more difficult and she accomplishes that very well and the vocabulary too. The vocabulary also calls my attention because she is talking about a very specific topic." (Varela, Interview)

"In fact, I tried to identify some grammatical error maybe and I couldn't identify any, she does not have problems with the inflection of the "s" you know? none of those things." (Vargas, Interview)

As predicted, the participants refer to formal aspects in the evaluation, such as pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar. In the first place, pronunciation is well evaluated because Michelle accomplishes difficult sounds that are not acquired or not properly pronounced by high school students; therefore, this particular evaluation consists in the comparison between Michelle and the average high school student in Chile. However, the conditions Michelle Bachelet has in order to learn, acquire and practice the language are completely different from the conditions the students of public and semi-public schools have. Taking this into account it is not fair to compare both pronunciations and performances and as Labov suggests one group should not be measured considering the norm of another.

Regarding her vocabulary, one of the participants highlights the specificity and complexity of the words Michelle uses, this is related to the concept lexical richness which is defined as "the degree of difficulty of the words used by the informant" (Vermeer, 2000), however to understand a word as complex is to judge an entire culture and worldview, which makes this evaluation more political than linguistic.

When it comes to grammar, errors are a very important aspect of the evaluation as the professors are in active search for errors in Michelle's performance. Errors are seen as deviations of the correct order grammar would suggest, which is exactly what one of the participants alludes to when she mentions how Michelle did not have any problem with the inflection of the sound "s" which is a very common "error" in EFL students and English learners in general. Nevertheless, there is no need to focus in systematic errors as such "if the vast majority of the world English speakers produce and understand it" (Jenkins, 2007:141). Furthermore, to understand the language as perfect and with no errors, is to follow Chomsky's concept of the idealized native speaker that knows it's language perfectly, this concept implies that an L2 learner could never truly achieve the level of proficiency and mastery of a language that a native speaker naturally has. On top of this, methods like error analysis and grammaticality judgments suggest a comparison with the native speaker (Cook 1997, Firth & Wagner, 1997), considering this, to compare a native speaker and an L2 learner/speaker is to fall into the comparative fallacy (Bley-Vroman, 1983) that relates both speakers as if they were the same and sees the L2 speaker as a failed native speaker instead of being treated as an independent speaker with different features

Torres-Rocha's (1992) mentioned that amongst EFL professors the trend is to teach communicative language methods, this trend is taught in their formation as English professors in university, and passed on in their seminars and among colleagues. The focus in communication and achieving the understanding of the messages two interlocutors have is present in the discourse of both participants; in their definition of "Good English" and in what speaking "good" English is, one participant has special attention in effective communication "I mean in reality, I think that communicating having effective communication is what defines speaking well" (Vargas, Interview) and the other in achieving understanding "I mean I think that the most important thing I think is to know how to have a

real use and knowing how to communicate with the language. To make yourself understood." (Varela, Interview).

Both participants pay special attention to getting the message across, with effective communication or a real use of the language. Effective communication is understood by the participants as "beyond knowing how to create a sentence and for it to be grammatically correct, to know in which moment and context you can use it" (Vargas, Interview) which is very close to the concept of communicative competence coined by Hymes (1963) which is the 'general' concept for the communicative capacity of a speaker that covers the knowledge of a language and their ability to use it, this concept keeps in mind the context and capacity to adapt to a certain community. It is important to highlight how context and familiarity with the context of the L2 culture play an important part of effective communication and communicative competence. These features are more than linguistic and go beyond that, as knowledge of cultures, interactions, etc. are needed. Features such as sentence building and correct grammar that are themselves linguistic have to be closely related to knowledge of the culture and immersion in order to attain the ultimate goal of communicating.

Real use of the language is understood as "she is exposed to the language for many hours and she is forced to speak English in order to be understood and communicate" (Vargas, Interview). However, there is tension in the participants discourse. As it was previously mentioned, both understand "good English" as good communication, but they also contemplate the native speaker as the parameter of perfection and the level of English desired instead of focusing solely in the communicative aspect of her performance.

"clearly, she has a real use of the English language. maybe you can tell she is not a native speaker, but she does it very well" (Vargas, Interview)

"maybe you could tell she is not a native, but she achieved a very effective communication with the native speaker of English" (Vargas, Interview)

"All those sounds that she may not perform as a native, she gets close to it but you can tell she is not native, you know?" (Varela, Interview)

In all the different quotes above one message is understood; the English Michelle Bachelet speaks is good and she has a very good performance despite not sounding native. With this, the participants imply that being noticed as a non-native puts Michelle Bachelet in disadvantage because speaking the standard adds cultural prestige to the person who is speaking it (Joseph,2006) and although she is well evaluated by the participants, her performance could be better if she could perform, pronounce and talk like a native speaker. This is relevant because the indicated evaluation shows that to speak like a non-native is not an indicator of lack of vocabulary, syntax, instruction or knowledge of the language at all, this is something that has to do solely with the prestige the standard variation of the language gives to the speaker and how the native speaker is seen and perceived as someone with a prestige the non-native lacks.

The native speaker is understood "as the unquestionable linguistic goal to whom the learners of the language should always aspire to and as the legitimate standard to evaluate with"(Espinoza, 2015:801) because besides claiming that effective communication is what speaking well means, the comments about how non-native Michelle sounds are recurrent, other than her achieving communication, her accent is perceived as a weakness. This understanding of the native speaker as the model, as perfection and as the higher goal every student should acquire and aspire to is known as Nativespeakerism (Holliday, 2005) and as part of this ideology professors "often take for granted that the only appropriate models of

language use come from native speakers" (Cook, 1999:182) which has consequences in their expectations regarding the performance of their students, and also illustrates how the communicative approach and methods are taught and are a trend between professors, but the evaluation methods and standards continue to encourage the idealization of the native speaker and dismisses new concepts such as multicompetence coined by Cook (1999) that conceive "L2 users be viewed as multicompetent language users rather than as deficient native speakers and suggests how language teaching can recognize students as L2 users both in and out of the classroom (185)".

To have effective communication or a real use of the language seems like an illusion, just a theory when in the real evaluation the native-speaker is always present and the lack of native-like accent is highlighted, commented as a weakness and a disadvantage in so many occasions.

"I'm not saying she speaks bad but you can tell she is not a native. I mean that she comes from another language and that she has other sounds and if you hear her talk among natives, you're gonna say this person is not a native." (Varela, Interview)

In the quote above the attitude the participant has towards the native speaker explains the emphasis in sounding native. It has a close relationship with identity because to speak like a non-native is to be recognizable as someone who does not belong, as someone different, as an outcast. To be recognized as an equal is important as Bonfiglio (2010) explains the main difference and opposition between the speaker of an L1 and an L2 is power and this power can be maintained in time and discourse if the identity and confidence of the non-native allows for this to continue happening. In this case, the participants not only allow for this difference to exist but highlight the lack of nativity in Michelle's sounds and accent because "A given accent is said to be native because it is unconsciously perceived as the repository of

the linguistic capital that is desired and worshiped" (Bonfiglio, 2010:16) ; this demonstrates that for Michelle to have a better English and a better evaluation she has to blend with the natives, to appear as one of them, to be one of them as much as possible. Both participants do not consider the possibility of the natives accommodating to Michelle's reality and mother tongue, on the contrary she is the one that has to adapt to her surroundings. These attitudes that accommodate and position the English native in a higher level are part of a far bigger ideology that is deeply embedded in the teaching of an L2: Linguistic Imperialism (Phillipson, 1992).

This ideology explains how the choice between one language and another is purely motivated by power and economic interests. In the case of English, these interests serve the United States of America and it is put in practice by Americanization which aims to spread their cultural and economic models as the norm; by creating standards, evaluations, certifications and laws in order to achieve loyalty, adherence to their model and worldview, or ultimately universal resignation (Phillipson, 2004) that has been ingrained through a colonial legacy. This ideology is also present in the participants discourse as English is the only option Michelle has when it comes to communicating in the UN, when the institution actually has five different formal languages including Spanish. To dismiss their own mother-tongue is a clear sign that to speak English gives the speaker a certain power, solemnity and prestige that Spanish does not; as one of the participant mentions "how can you be an ONU ambassador if you do not speak the universal language, and in this case that is English." (Varela, Interview).

The colonial legacy and mindset continues to exist and it can be seen in the way 'minority' or 'foreign' cultures are perceived as cultures that lack civilization or studies, this leads to illustrate the non-native as a generalized Other (Holliday, 1994) that needs to be

corrected and taught the proper ways, models and in this case, pronunciation. The non-native needs to adjust to the reality, context and models of the native but to understand the communication as unilateral and as the effort of one instead of all the participants is far from linguistic, but rather social and political.

> "obviously we studied this hence we are very aware of, like the pronunciations and that stuff, so watching her interview I noticed that she has, you can tell she is not a native." (Vargas, Interview)

To speak like a native is generally understood as having the standard accent that "is generally considered as the accent spoken by the majority of the population and/or is associated with high socioeconomic status, power, and use in the media in any given country (Giles & Billings, 2004) to speak the standard variation of a language is to adjust your speech to the high class manners and this is why "one's rise through the rank is obviously conditioned by one's ability to speak the language in a way that is not perceived as non-standard" (Joseph, 2006:33).

This need to rise through the ranks and the understanding of English as an International Language correlate with the fact that English "has become the language of power and prestige in many countries (Kumaravadivelu, 2003:13)" including Chile and it is seen as a social and economic gatekeeper, as well as an identifiable feature in people that belong to the higher classes, giving them prestige and the means to obtain better jobs and positions. This role has become recognizable amongst Chilean people and the world, which is why English is seen as a Global Language (Crystal, 2000) and why " the phenomenon of 'sounding native' is a subset of the larger category of proper pronunciation which is itself constructed by the social anxieties of the bourgeoisie" (Crystal, 2000:14). In other words, the

evaluation of Michelle's performance is based on social class, prestige and power, not only in her linguistic capabilities.

"I mean more than a privileged person, because I'm sure that her daughters speak very well too, you know? because kids from schools also like where people pay more, more money, more expensive also most probably will speak like that because they recieve another type of instruction" (Vargas, Interview)

"Because Michelle Bachelet is public education's daughter, so she studied in Liceo 1, from a school that, I imagine when she studied there there wasn't any English, or the English was very basic. But, umm I'm surprised because ultimately I feel that it could've been way worse"(Varela, Interview)

As it can be seen, the evaluation of competence, performance and the sociocultural features of the speaker are blended in the participants' discourse, which means that evaluation per se cannot be and it is not independent from the sociocultural aspect of the speaker. The expectations and the argument behind the positive evaluation the participants give to Michelle Bachelet suggest that her upbringing conditions both evaluations, the school she went to, her social status and the instruction that is expected from her education. In Chile, private schools have a different instruction and development of the English language in their classes. Students from these types of schools have more input of the language, most of these schools are bilingual and the majority of their classes are taught in that language. On the other hand, public schools only have one subject in which English is taught and English becomes mandatory only from 5th grade, this information alone clarifies that students from public schools do not have the same input regarding the English language than their higher class peers and for this reasons it is expected from them to have a higher level of competence

because their conditions suggest a better quality of English instructions and a closer relationship with the language itself.

In the case of Michelle Bachelet, she is not only expected to be competent in the English language as a result of her upbringing, she is also expected to be competent and to have a 'good' performance because she has had very important and prestigious jobs "obviously she is the president" (Varela, Interview) and "I insist, obviously she has to do it because she is a public figure, she was the president of Chile and she represents an international organization" (Varela, Interview).

These appreciations confirm the blending of competence evaluation and sociocultural factors. Michelle is known as a powerful and prestigious person because of her previous jobs and upbringing, the possibilities these jobs gave her to socialize with people from other countries and the many opportunities she's had to have a real use of the English language. As Foucault mentioned' knowledge is not something existing apart from us but itself determined by power'(1980:27) and both professors evaluate and explain the performance of Michelle Bachelet rooted in their own perceptions of her as someone with privilege and power.

The connection between knowledge and power plays an important role in the evaluation of someone's performance and in the general process of learning and teaching. Otero (2015) conceives two different views of evaluation; as a control instrument, authority exercise or as an educational tool and from what the participants have shared in the interviews, evaluation could be understood as a mixture between an authority exercise and an education tool and they, as professors, are the ones who play and master with the adjustments of those features in their own evaluations. There is also a tension between the authority they have with the language when they are confronted with a native speaker.

"for example, native speaker and actually I could not say if they speak good or bad, because in fact they use the language all the time. Is like, if I said that any person here speaks bad Spanish, you know? like with what authority, you know?" (Vargas, Interview)

"I mean we are, I mean I understood very well because I studied English and all that, maybe someone with a lower level of proficiency is not going to understand but any native speaker would have understood what she was saying I think" (Vargas, Interview)

"obviously, we know English, you know? There are things like, I don't know, details that you notice like ok, this is wrong or this is ok" (Varela, Interview)

Professors may understand and know the tensions that exist in the discourse, the methods the community and the economic powers, follow contemporary trends regarding L2 users and learners, know the differences between a native speaker and a speaker of a second language in terms of culture, context, cognition, etc. to draw upon communicative methods but at the end of the day English language teaching "is now a field of work wherein membership is based on entry requirements and standards" (Richards, 2008) that answer to neoliberal, imperialist and native-speakerism needs. English professors are evaluated and are asked to evaluate under standardize requirements that are obsolete. However, "social forces make it possible for certain people rather than others to determine what knowledge will consist of in a particular place and time" (Foucault, 1980:27) and as non-native professors, they carry an authority regarding the language since "those institutionally warranted as possessing (knowledge) have a certain kind of power – the power to grant or withhold the same institutional warrant from others" (Joseph, 2006:34) and do not have any problem evaluating the performance or competence of L2 speakers as well as highlighting the fact they have the power and authority to do so because they do speak the language and are

competent themselves, nevertheless this authority loses power when the native is present because "the native speaker model remains firmly entrenched in language teaching" (Cook, 1999:188).

3.1.2 Conclusion

Regarding the vision provided by the teachers Nativespeakerism and the Standard Language Ideologies were very present in the participants discourse and evaluation respecting the performance of English of Michelle Bachelet. Formal aspects were the primary focus in the evaluation of Michelle's performance and these were identified in the search for 'errors' or deviations in the speakers' speech. This corresponds to the idealized native-speaker, which puts the L2 learner in a difficult position from the beginning since it is expected to behave, acquire and perform like an ideal native speaker that knows, understands and speaks perfectly, with no room for errors. However, reality is very different and mistakes are part of language in general, as well as language acquisition. Participants share the seek for a 'correct' and proper use of the English language, like the 'standard' variation. Professors asses second language evaluation under the comparative fallacy premise, assuming the role of the L2 speaker as a failed native speaker, thus acquiring the nativespeakerism ideology by contemplating the native speaker as the parameter of perfection and only correct model of English, ignoring the research that confirms that L2 speakers should be evaluated as multicompetent and different from monolinguals. Achieving then, the alienation of the native speaker under the notion of 'standard language', which is an abstraction of the habits of a social, geopolitic, ethnic and cultural elite.

This ideology is also present in the disadvantage that the accent with which Michelle Bachelet speaks English entails for the participants, her accent is perceived as a weakness on the grounds that it is very easy to identify her as a foreigner among native speakers. This 'fear' of being 'Othered' is part of the Nativespeakerism ideology and the rationalization

behind racism and racist remarks that may occur when people are identified as foreigners. In this way, the participants depart from linguistic issues and evaluate Michelle's ability to blend in by acquiring a native accent, not problematizing the fact that speaking with an accent is a disadvantage under monolingual views and accepting being 'Othered' by suggesting a change in Michelle, not in the native speakers of English.

However, when defining and characterizing "Good English" the participants paid more attention to the communicative approach, focusing on effective communication and the real use of language claiming that to speak 'good English' is to make yourself understood, allowing errors but also considering context. Hence, a tension exists within the training and discourse of professors of English as a Second Language considering that classes follow a communicative approach and 'Good English' is understood as achieving communication, by any means. On the contrary, the evaluation process is in the constant search of perfection punishing errors (standard ideology), falling into the comparative fallacy and assuming the native speaker as the parameter of perfection. As a consequence, nativespeakerism creates unrealistic and unachievable expectations in the performance of an L2 learner/speaker.

This previous tension is also illustrated in the authority professors have over the language and the authority the native speakers have over it, because despite the fact that the participants know, mention and comment on their knowledge and expertise regarding the English language, they identify the native speaker as the upper authority when it comes to English. This is also motivated by the Nativespeakerism ideology that presents the native speaker as the biggest authority when it comes to their mother tongue. These attitudes demonstrates a deeply embedded ideology in English Second Language teaching: English Linguistic Imperialism, on account of maintaining the establishment of the language by assuming the native speaker as the model and the authority, achieving then the perpetuation

of English as an International language and giving their speakers the power the language represents.

Lastly, as it could be appreciated the evaluation of the English of Michelle Bachelet is based not only in her linguistic capabilities but also in her status, social class and career since she is expected to have a 'good' performance for the previously named reasons, which demonstrates that what is considered 'linguistic' and 'internal' as the basis for evaluation is highly debatable. Her upbringing and current job in the UN are perceived by the participants as markers of her class and privilege, thus the status the English language has is trespassed to her letting the participants assume and demand her to be knowledgeable regarding the language. The evaluation of performance and the socio cultural features of the speaker are blended in the evaluation, discourse and comments the participants made. Both professors evaluate and explain Michelle's performance rooted in their own perceptions of her as a powerful and privileged woman matching her position to the high privileged and powerful position English also has. In sum, the social representations and language ideologies the participants identified as English professors have are in constant tension because their training itself has tension in its discourse, regarding evaluation linguistic features are not the only focus participants mentioned in their discourse.

3.2 Social Representations of Chilean English Students regarding the performance of English of Michelle Bachelet

Social Representations regarding the English use of Michelle Bachelet from English students vary from formal aspects, such as vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation, to fluency, the standard American accent and her international environment as a former president and high commissioner of Human Rights in the UN.

Distinctly from professors, students are constantly being evaluated and their focus is in judging their own performance instead of evaluating others. This does not mean they are not capable of evaluating a speaker, but their focus, point of view and understanding of the different criteria used to evaluate may vary from their educators or it could be influenced by them. As an example of this, this group of participants is not as fixated on errors as the previous one but they do use formal aspects to evaluate the performance of Michelle as it can be seen in the following quotes:

> "I find her to be very clear to say every word. Maybe in some moments she is little bit fast and that makes the words to tangle a little bit, but if you pay attention, you know she can repeat it and you can understand her. Considering everything, her vocabulary is very broad to refer to the topic, grammatically too" (Salinas, Interview)

> "the sounds are very accurate and… well what I said before honestly about the grammar stuff like concordance, like emm...like you could tell that no, that she had some grammatical weaknesses" (Moreno, Interiew)

Both participants mention good pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar as the criteria they used to evaluate the English of Michelle as "good" or satisfactory. The question is, with what are they comparing her sounds, grammar and clarity; in other words, what are the

groundings behind their positive or negative feedback in the case of her "grammatical weaknesses", her speech speed or clarity. As it was exposed in the previous section correct grammar, pronunciation and special attention in the form are concepts inherited from Chomsky's (cited in Cook, 1985) notion of innate language ability, which correspond to an ideal native-speaker that knows and comprehends everything regarding their native language. The main concern with this view is that it considers language to be monoglossic and homogeneous which puts any bilingual or learner of a second language in disadvantage, because it is expected from them to perform as a native and to acquire a native-like competence in the second language. This undermines the fact that learners of a second language already are competent in one language, that their development of the language will differ from the one of a native-speaker, and the fact that they are multicompetent and their entire acquisition is not equiparable to the one of a native-speaker because they are dealing with two systems coexisting in their minds (Cook, 1999).

The criteria behind the evaluation is explicitly mentioned by one of the participants when he clarifies that he will evaluate Michelle's performance "like in general terms, like prescriptively speaking" (Moreno, Interview). This explanation sheds light in the classic view the linguistic community has had, with the grammarians, that studied different languages in detail in order to, later, prescribe the 'correct' use of it just as the participants comment "like you could tell that no, that she had some grammatical weaknesses" (Moreno, Interview) . Since there is a concept of 'correct' use of the language, prescriptivism benefits one variety of the language, which is normally the standard 'written' language, and motivates the ideology that linguistic standards should be maintained and taught (Crystal, 2000). In this manner the monoglossic ideology is preserved with the idea that "bad grammar" should be understood as "bad manners" and consequently, the user of the language as an L2 should avoid making any mistakes or have any "grammatical weaknesses" while communicating

(Leech et al., 2006) and they should act as the "ideal" native speaker that talks and understand their language perfectly.

However, the standard is not inherently better or more 'grammatical' than non-standard English, since all varieties are grammatical in that they follow their own rules, but it has prestige for social rather than linguistic reasons (Leech et al., 2006). The political reasons come from the beginning of the process standardization which was created by the elite in order to maintain their power, identity and status by canonizing certain linguistic features as standard or prestigious. In principle, this variety was secret and exclusionary in order to preserve their prestigious and unattainable status, but "throughout modern times, societies have operated with a very real economic based on language change" (Joseph, 2006:33) and as time passed the standard has become a sort of toll in order to obtain a better job, scholarship, education and opportunities in general.

Stated briefly, the participant refers to the fact that in order to evaluate the performance of Michelle he is going to compare her performance to the standard English. The fact that he was able to made an ideological clarification (Kroskrity, 2004) demonstrates a level of criticism to the evaluation criteria because he explicitly states that he will follow a prescriptive view, not a multilingual or descriptive one. With this, it can be stated that "evaluation has been, and is, conditioned by obsolete language conceptions and methodologies" (Torres, 2013:47) such as prescriptivism and the ambition to acquire the standard variation of the language at hand, which is how he and most of the students of EFL are evaluated.

Despite the fact that the formal criteria to evaluate the performance of Michelle is influenced by prescriptive and monoglossic views, both participants comment their focus is

mostly directed to effective communication and the desire to withdraw from very strict standards of formal aspects of evaluation as it can be seen in the following quotes:

"For me speaking good English is that you are understood, that the tenses are correct and that the other person is able to understand despite sounding different." (Salinas, Interview)

"so what is more relevant to me is like that there is effective and fluid communication, like beyond the formal aspects like grammatical or phonetic"(Moreno, Interview)

The communicative criteria as the name suggests focuses mostly in achieving communication by means of knowing the language, culture and context in which communication is made (Hymes, 1963), thus being able to adequate to different escenarios and speakers and ultimately make yourself understood. In the case of Michelle, as the participants mentioned "She makes herself understood very well" (Salinas, Interview) and " there is some grammatical stuff, but that does not get to disrupt effective communication"(Moreno, Interview). These reasons are why the participants consider her English to be good, however, the attention to the 'correct' form is inevitably always present. This perspective the participants mention gives the impression that the communicative criteria is very well situated in their speech. Furthermore, one of the participants mentions fluidity as a key concept in order to achieve effective communication and explains that this occurs when:

"foreigners come to Chile like in massive immigrations and they do not have formal studies. So, they learn Spanish because they need it...so you're not gonna have a lot of accuracy in formal terms like grammar, phonetics but you you will see that they will begin to generate a very fluid communication.. and that is like the most

important thing, because the ultimate goal in these contexts is to be able to communicate with the other" (Moreno, Interview)

This explanation of fluency is related to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) which defines the concept as "effectiveness of language use within the constraints of limited linguistic knowledge" (Chambers, 1997:536) an approach that highlights the capability of a certain speaker in spite of the lack of formal education or knowledge in the sentence "communication was super fluid" (Moreno, Interview). This approach attempts to detach the monoglossic criteria from the evaluation of the speaker, and from the comparison to a standard that is perfect, understanding language as an imperfect process that is far more than to acquire and perform the 'good form' in order to achieve communication. However, the concept of fluency does not have a clear cut definition or form of evaluation which makes the evaluation of an L2 speaker quite subjective and unclear (Contreras & Gerez, 2016).

"I don't take pronunciation much into account, because I feel that that varies a lot from how you learned English. If you lived in an English speaking country, that influences a lot. I think that she is ok maybe some words, some omitted letters but she achieves very good communication" (Salinas, Interview)

The participants are actively trying to detach from past and obsolete ideologies of evaluation and understanding of English as a Foreign or Second language, but that discourse is very well integrated in their understanding of pronunciation, despite what they may have said there is a tension present in their discourse, just as there was in the group of professors. In spite of stating that she did not care about pronunciation, one of the participants immediately and almost exclusively refers to pronunciation and its closeness to the native accent when characterizing a speaker of 'good English' : "The accent cannot be heard not

even a little bit, it is very natural. I think that it is important to not have an accent" (Salinas, Interview).

This can be explained with the concept of double standard that Jenkins (2005) mentions is present in TESOL teachers "even though speakers are aware and comfortable with their own accents, they still champion the teaching of standard varieties", but instead of teachers, here an English language student prefers the acquisition and performance of a native-like accent when characterizing a good speaker instead of focusing her attention and intentions in the communication, as she had previously mentioned. This tension that was also present in the group of professors, is closely related to the ideology of nativespeakerism (Holliday, 2006) which is a compilation of beliefs, attitudes and assumptions that led to believe that the native speaker is the only appropriate model of correct pronunciation and grammar, it also has the added value of being prestigious, ideal and correct form of speaking a language (Bonfiglio, 2010, Holliday, 2007, 2007).

This ideology however has no scientific or linguistics proof since it just operates under power dynamics, this means that the power of English, in this case, determines how the language and the "natives are an empowered group whose speech becomes envied as metonym of their power" (Bonfiglio, 2010:13) not their linguistics superiority. The power the English language has, as it was previously mentioned, is a metonym of the power the U.S currently has in the world. As a very rich, influential and imperialistic country the U.S has the dominance of its language and encourages its use "by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages" (Phillipson, 1992:47) like Spanish. This power dynamic represented by English Linguistic Imperialism also operates under mass-media and cultural aspects such as characterizing the

American accent as 'cool' by one of the participants: "It is very natural, like very American and I find that very cool".(Salinas, Interview)

The participant has been shown through different media and propaganda that English is associated to white native speakers with good education, jobs and respect of the majority of people, whereas other races have been looked down upon since colonialism (Ruecker, 2011). As Said stated, colonized people tend to be treated "as an indistinguishable mass about whom one could amass knowledge" (1978: 716) and the participant does not wish to be seen as a different race with less privilege and less power, this can be seen in the following quote:

"I find that to be very cool because well they are not gonna know you are latina and that could put you in like, could be good, I don't know, it could be more subtle. Because it goes without noticing, to say it in a way, the fact that you are not native" (Salinas, Interview).

She desires to blend into the natives for political reasons hiding her cultural heritage through a native accent that would allow her to be accepted, by correcting her behavior and culture in order to not be pointed out as an 'other'. This situation is mentioned as the 'liberation trap' by Holliday (45678) and accounts for the power dynamic that allows for nativespeakerism. Bashir-Ali (2006) explains this behavior stating that "Many ESL newcomers feel pressured to assimilate into the dominant social culture of their schools, causing them to deny their own language and cultural identities" (628) in order to be seen as powerful as their English native-speaker counterparts.

Linguistic Imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) is also present in the evaluation and explanations participants gave in order to explain the level of English Michelle Bachelet performed as well as they taught: "beginning with the fact that she has lived abroad and I mean… we all know that English is the foundation to be able to live abroad. Whichever

country" (Salinas, Interview) . She conceives English as the language everyone in the world speaks, this utterance reveals that the theoretical construct of English linguistic imperialism (Philipson, 1992) is part of her social representation of the language because English here is clearly conceived as the language any person needs to speak regardless of the country, even if the country does not have English as a first or second language and dismisses the possibility of any other language being as relevant. This appreciation also has to do with the fact that Michelle Bachelet is a woman with power and privilege which allow her to have opportunities like living abroad, having conversations with people from other countries in English, and actually working in an international organization, and the participants are aware of those facts as it can be seen in the following quotes:

"And since she is very international and all, I imagine that she has many opportunities to like practice her English. So those situations are necessarily improving her way of communicating" (Moreno, Interview)

"I think that the very experience of traveling a lot, of being related to politics and universal stuff, she is forced to be surrounded by the language and she has to learn it necessarily" (Salinas, Interview)

As a known, international and political person, Michelle Bachelet is considered proficient and good in English in relation to her position and development as an international worker and professional, her job demands her to be knowledgeable on regards of the English language since that is one of the international languages used in the UN. In Chile, there is a strong social distribution of English (Cortés, et.al, 2017) and because of "the fact that she was the president" (Moreno, Interview), Michelle is expected to be good at it for socio-political reasons rather than intellectual or linguistic as the participants expressed in the following quotes:

"I feel that the minimum you could do is to have a second language. At least to be able to, I don't know, to make yourself understood in conferences or with other presidents, or with people in general" (Salinas, Interview)

"well, surely she had a formal context of education, so she had the opportunity of first, having the formal tools like syntactic, grammatical, etc." (Moreno, Interview)

Michelle's level of English is "interpreted as reflecting the speaker's intelligence, industry, social worthiness, level of exposure to the elders of the tribe" (Joseph 2006:4) by both participants which means that their understanding of Michelle Bachelet's identity as a former president reflects what she should be -an English speaker-, the intellectual capacity she should have -to be competent in that language- and her social worthiness -she is part of the élite which means she should speak the language other élites from the UN speak-.

3.2.2 Conclusion

To sum, the social representations and language ideologies that arose from English language students are very similar from English language professors. Students mentioned formal aspects of language and focused in Michelle's "correct" use of the English language, illustrating again that the 'linguistic' features work under the ideology of 'Standard Language' some, a specific group. Nevertheless, one participant mentioned that in order to evaluate the former president performance he must take a prescriptive view and shed light in the classic view the linguistic community has had, prescribing the 'correct' use of the language benefiting a variety of language with the standard ideology that is also related to Nativespeakerism. His ideological clarification establishes a critical perspective to the evaluation criteria, by stating that in order to evaluate Michelle he is obligated to take a

prescriptive view, which suggests that critical approaches are more present in younger generations and that the lack of new and updated criteria to evaluate under other views.

The participants focused on effective communication, similarly to the professors, and commented on their desire to disengage from strict evaluation criteria, being more accepting of 'errors' and using concepts that are related to the communicative approach. Notwithstanding, the attention to the 'correct' form is inevitably always present when referring to pronunciation which shows a similar tension to the group of professors. Students prefer the acquisition and performance of a native-like accent when characterizing a good speaker finding it 'cool' instead of focusing their attention and intentions in the communication. This occurs because they are evaluated under those terms and are constantly asked to perform with a native-like accent, which would also put them in a better position in job interviews. Nativespeakerism is present in their discourse similarly to the professors group because blending in with the natives is a major concern and advantage. This occurs because English Linguistic Imperialism is present in mass media, TV shows, the news, government policies and English teaching, directing people to the English language understanding and matching the power English speaking countries have with speaker of that language, even more in native-speakers.

For this same reason, students expect and explain the level of English Michelle performed, because she has enough power and privilege to have access to English. Chile's social distribution of English is reflected in the participants' evaluation and again the evaluation is a mix between socio-political reasons and linguistic features that are based on the Standard Language English entails, bringing out the lack of 'linguistic' in the linguistic features and the adoption of native-like proficiency and performance .

In conclusion, English students share social representations with English professors because of their training and their constant exposure to evaluation criteria that forces them to

continue the tradition of evaluating under the ideology of Nativespeakerism and the Standard.However, they are more critical and flexible in regards of linguistic features which suggest a change in future generations.

3.3 Social Representations of Chilean citizens, without formal English studies, regarding the evaluation of performance of English of Michelle Bachelet

Social Representations and Language Ideologies present in Chilean participants without English studies have some common places with English teachers and students but also different perspectives. For them formal aspects of language do not seem to be as important when evaluating the performance of Michelle Bachelet, or when describing what good or bad English means to them. However, in their discourse English as an instrument is well and broadly commented.

As it was previously mentioned formal aspects such as grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation or fluency are not broadly mentioned or explained in this case. However, effective communication and communication in general is constantly mentioned alike other groups of participants that took interest in this aspect of language acquisition and performance, this can be seen in the following quotes:

"I suppose people that speak English understood her. She may be able to communicate, no?, to make herself be understood, that is what is important I think." (Acevedo, Interview)

"To make yourself understood, to have character when speaking it, to feel sure when speaking it. I believe that understanding and being able to communicate is enough." (Estay, Interview)

To deliver the message intended and understand the other's message is the main concern for both participants. To be able to communicate their intentions, however, it is not a simple matter of a given message, with the participation of a message and a receiver. For achieving effective communication there "must be a basis for relying on accepted values, beliefs and unities which guarantee broad areas of meaning and predictability" (Reilly, 1990:129). There is a need for the interlocutors to have an understanding of the world, of the underlying meanings that surround the context of communication, and the persons involved in it. In this sense, what the participants reveal is that, different from the formal perspectives of language, such as the functionalist perspective, that are influenced by monoglossic and prescriptive views that conceive communication and language as a neutral and transparent practice (Pennycook, 2017), communication is not only a language practice but also a cultural, political and social practice. In this same sense, miscommunication would be to not understand the context or any underlying complex or different meaning between the participants of the communication and by this lack of knowledge insult without meaning to. This is what one of the participants indicates: "Not having inconvenients when speaking with the other person, that they don't understand, that they feel offended when you are saying something " (Estay, Interview).

Even though formal aspects of language are not the focus of the participants evaluation it is difficult to refer to evaluation without those aspects. Pronunciation and grammar are somehow inevitable because everyone, regardless of the level, is evaluated in those terms. From the focus of communication minimal pairs are crucial because the pronunciation of one sound instead of another in some contexts may change the meaning of the phrase radically as one the participants comments:

"I don't know if excellent pronunciation is a priority, but it is that they speak and it is understood. That grammatically they know how to create sentences, that their message is understood. To be able to speak with a gringo comfortably without having to speak Spanglish in the middle of it."(Acevedo, Interview)

Notwithstanding, effective communication seems to be understood under the terms of the native speaker of English because as it was exposed in the previous quote the cooperative principle (Grice, 1975) is only expected from one speaker. The non-native of English should be the one making the effort to be clear and understood and there is no possibility of the gringo speaking Spanish although both Spanish and English exist in the world and are equally valid as means of communication. Multilingualism and heteroglossia are not considered, the participant takes a monolingual view and accommodates his reality to the English speaking-native. Beyond communication and its cooperation, the power is given to the English speaker because of Linguistic Imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) and as a repercussion natives of the language are seen as the goal and figure of power, as it appears in the discourse of one of the interviewees, for whom "As a non-native speaker I believe that you have to think that the other person has to understand you. To achieve communication" (Acevedo, Interview)

The ideology of nativespeakerism (Holliday, 2005) gives the entire agency of effective communication to the non-native and leaves the native to be a sort of judge on the performance of the other and not an equal part that tries to achieve communication just as much. The goal is to make the other understand you, not to create a common ground in which the communication can be achieved by a shared effort. However, the participants that do not have formal formation of English do not conceive the native as the goal when it comes to the performance, because their concern lies in communication, not in being perceived as a competent speaker or native. Anyhow, the concept of the native is very present in their discourse "Bachelet that is speaking now, maybe she does not have a native accent but she is

understood and you hear her well." (Estay, Interview) this can also can be seen in the quote below:

> "that what I say is understandable. To be able to speak calmly with someone and that they understand what I'm saying. If I have a native accent or not is not in my priorities. Is not, for me is not relevant" (Acevedo, Interview)

The participants are able to identify the difference between a native or non-native accent but do not judge the success of the communicative process on those regards. Whereas the participants do not have any formal formation on the English language and its acquisition, one of them is aware of some linguistic knowledge and explains how she does not believe that is possible to acquire a native-like proficiency as she discusses in the following quote "But to become a native no, I think that people that have been in the country since they were little acquire that" (Estay, Interview).This ideological clarification (Kroskity, 2009) is understood by her just by watching examples on television or her own life, and because she is not constantly evaluated and expected to achieve a native-like proficiency like students and professors are.

Despite the fact that the pressure English language exercises into these participants is not the same that people with English studies feel, they do feel pressured and inferior for not having it. The power the English language has allows for people that speak it to feel a type of authority for doing so, for speaking the international language the elite uses and on the other hand, people that do not speak feel inferior in the dynamic of powers English possess. It is extremely relevant that the characterization of Michelle's English in this group of participants does not come from a place of authority or complete understanding of the language because none of the participants studied the language outside of school. As a consequence, participants related intimidation and self-doubt to the English language and to their own

evaluation or opinions "My English is not so… is not so good, so I cannot tell you if she speaks exceptionally good or not" (Acevedo, Interview).

"What happened to me when I was very young, I got scared a lot. The course scared me. They assigned you this course and the course was English and I didn't have, I hadn't had the contact, I hadn't interacted with that, so I felt scared. In fact I didn't like it, I didn't like it and I didn't pay attention to it" (Estay, Interview]

The two quotes cited above present the fear and lack of authority participants have towards English and how English is not something they feel comfortable enough to assume as part of their own identity and as a consequence, the first participant does not feel capable of evaluating any other person's performance. On the other hand, since they do not feel confident enough with the language their evaluation centers in the former's president confidence "mm I don't know as I was watching the video, I felt her confident, I didn't feel her hesitate" (Estay, Interview) which is something they lack from their own performance so it becomes a feature worth evaluating and having "sure, she was sure of what she was saying" (Estay, Interview)

The quote related to the participants experience in school also highlights the privilege behind the access to knowledge and the tension that is created between a nation or a government that understands English as a Global Language (Crystal, 2012) (which means, they decide to incorporate it as the priority in the national curricula) and the population that does not have direct contact with the language (mainly, people that do not live in the big capitals or do not have the monetary power to have access to internet or even television) They see it as something foreign and external to their lives, something unknown that has been forced on them by the teacher and by doing this "education created the necessary conditions for intimidation in those speakers who were inclined to feel" intimidated. (Joseph, 2006:48)

This occurs because as Bourdieu (1991) pointed out education plays an essential role when it comes to reproducing social class differences, and in Chile a clear social class difference is the opportunity to have direct contact with the English language because people that are part of the privileged class have access to English speaking countries, bilingual schools, foreign school programs and the overall opportunity and possibility to practice the language.

For these participants not being part of the educated and privileged group that has an expertise regarding the language, or have frequent contact with it creates a sensation of intimidation that Bourdieu describes as a 'symbolic violence' that does not imply any 'act of intimidation' on the part of the former teachers of English the participants had or Michelle Bachelet as a speaker of English but "this timidity lies between the social conditions of production" (Bourdieu 1991: 51) of each of the participants in the equation of the educational system in which the professor, expert or speaker of English has a power the student does not have. This intimidation is blended in the evaluation they make towards Michelle, because Michelle Bachelet is considered a privileged woman, beyond her natural, linguistic or intellectual abilities her performance is expected to be good for the only reason that she is part of the social class that has the opportunity to directly relate to the language.

"She must have gone to a good school and she must have had opportunities to learn English, she surely went abroad and obviously there she must have communicated in English. Because of her upbringing. Her privilege, yeah. Because in the end speaking English in Chile is a privilege. Nobody speaks it."(Acevedo, Interview)

"I think that because of being the president of Chile she must have had a good education in the best universities. I think that because of that you can tell she speaks a very confident English" (Estay, Interview)

For the participants, is only natural that her knowledge of the language is sufficient because as it was previously mentioned she had the access to the knowledge.

As clear as the participants commented English is seen as the social and economic power of the elites, this responds to the construct of English Linguistic Imperialism coined by Phillipson (1992) that is defined as the dominance of English by structurally and culturally maintaining inequalities between English and any other language. It is assumed that English is an added value for anyone who has it and as one participant mentioned "Super necessary" (Estay, Interview)

However, for this same reason "English functions as a gatekeeper to positions of prestige in society" (Cooke, 1988:14) and the participants identify the language as a tool that will allow them or anyone to escalate in the social ladder.

"I think that the benefits, many doors will open, any profession that you chose...the person that knows English many doors will open to them, more safety for your career. You have to speak English." (Estay, Interview)

"I don't know if it is so necessary in Chile, but for some people, for a limited market. For example, people that study business needs English. People that study science, needs it. Maybe people that will enter the academy, whichever it is, they'll need because papers are in English." (Acevedo, Interview)

The ideology of English as a Global Language (Crystal,2012) and Linguistic Imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) are intimately related since English is the favored foreign language for the participants because it will allow them or anyone to have a better commercial contact with a future employee or job, as mentioned by one of the interviewees "

it would be great that everyone knew, I don't know. It is a plus" (Acevedo, Interview). Linguistic Imperialism forces people to make decisions based on imperialist and economic reasons leaving the linguistic part and also the actual facts aside. Nonetheless, it is also mentioned that this advantage and need English imposes only attains certain markets because people that are not working in niches that have direct contact with foreign companies or people are not needed to learn it and will not obtain advantages from the acquisition of English as an L2 "I think that to begin with….because there is no need. There is no immediate need to learn. If you are in Chile. Why do you need English? We don't speak English "(Acevedo, Interview)

In Chile, the language everyone speaks is Spanish and on a daily basis English is a language that people do not encounter. As previously mentioned, most Chileans that use English do it in their jobs or in formal contexts rather than colloquially which puts into perspective the real need for the language to be taught and learned beyond the utilitarian aspect of it. However, the fact that the power the US and consequently the English Language has forces people from less powerful and privileged countries and cultures to make decisions that seem to be free will but this is only a sense of , what Lukács called," false consciousness". This concept also accounts for the universality of English and the assumption that English will be the communicative tool of choice in every single country you decide to go to regardless of the mother tongue of the country and their inhabitants. How, in case of an emergency, people will be able to understand if you speak the universal language of English and not Spanish or Chinese which are the languages with the most amount of native-speakers in the world, it is mentioned:

"there are many people that today are traveling and they travel with children, so sometimes their destinies are countries where English is the language, the main language, is fundamental at least to know the minimum to communicate, because many things can happen, English is fundamental if you are traveling" (Estay, Interview)

The symbolic and tacit power English has in the world is embedded in people's opinion of English all over the world, even in people that do not studied the language. However, these participants conceived the native speaker differently from participants with former studies on the language.

3.3.2 Conclusion

Lastly, social representation and ideologies from Chilean people that have not studied English are similar from the other groups but are presented differently.

To begin with, these participants address effective communication as the ultimate goal, their focus is to get the message across. The manner in which this happens is not as important as it was for the other groups. Similarly, miscommunication is a common concern for these participants, hence to be adequate and able to understand contexts is very important to them, 'correct' grammar and pronunciation are only mentioned when it comes to achieving understanding and avoiding insulting the other. This can be explained because none of them have undergone many English evaluations and to be 'proper' in stylistic terms is not imposed to them as it is for English language professionals. However, effective communication seems to be understood under the terms of the native speaker of English considering that they only mention the effort a non-native must make in order to be understood, this suggest that it is not necessary to study English in order to have a monoglossic view of language and since the entire agency of communication is given to the non-native, the native is a sort of judge on the

performance of the other and not an equal part that tries to achieve communication just as much. By doing so the native is seen as more powerful and as an authority, despite the fact that the participants that do not have formal formation of English do not conceive the native as the goal.

The ideology of Linguistic Imperialism is part of these participants' discourse in a very different way that it is in the groups with English training, people that do not speak English feel inferior in the dynamic of power English possess. Participants related intimidation and self-doubt to the English language and to their own evaluation or opinions, not being part of the English speakers' group creates a sensation of intimidation that Bourdieu describes as a 'symbolic violence' which alienates them and allows for maintaining their social status. This is reflected in their evaluation, making them appreciate confidence in Michelle's performance.

English is seen as the social and economic power of the elites, and because they are not part of the privileged groups that speak the language this groups considers English to be necessary, a plus, because it will allow them to be better positioned and privileged. This ideology forces people to make decisions based on imperialist and economic reasons, it also contributes to the idea that English is an international language that is spoken everywhere, and will allow you to communicate in any country you go to. Nonetheless, one participant showcases a critical view regarding the need to learn the English language in a Spanish speaking country, commenting that it will help you scale the social ladder but that is not needed in order to survive.

Finally, this group also blended evaluation with the socio-political aspects Michelle Bachelet has assuming that she would be competent in the language because of her position and class. Despite not having the same influence people with formal studies of English have regarding the figure of the native speaker as their goal, the participants with no expertise on

the English language also conceive the native as a judge, the authority and a static figure when it comes to communication. The power English gives to its speakers is very present and English Linguistic Imperialism is the ideology that marks most of this group's social representations.

Chapter 4: Discussion

Throughout this study and the development of the interviews' analysis, different ideologies and social representations related to English were discussed. It is undeniable that English as a global, international and privileged language has enough power to indoctrinate countries, people, markets, etc. for the benefit of the countries that have English as a mother tongue (U.S , UK, Australia, etc) and shape their views regarding the language as natural, as common sense and neutral.

Language is a situated phenomenon at heart, thus it is both political and cultural. Those aspects cannot be detached from processes related to the acquisition, like teaching and evaluation of a language because the decision or decisions behind the language one chooses to speak, teach or learn; the accent, the evaluation criteria, etc. are determined by power dynamics and ultimately by entities of power that project interests and habits of the elite. These notions of language are part of the everyday discourse of people, they are seen as common sense when in reality most of those discourses are imposed by governments and institutions. However, despite the fact that imposed ideologies are internalized in the discourse of people, tensions in their discourse demonstrate how critical views question the imposed.

In the case of the evaluation of the performance of an English learner , social representations and language ideologies in the discourse of the participants demonstrate that the evaluation of the English language is closely and almost exclusively related socio political aspects hidden in linguistic categories which are understood as "formal aspects" and which are supposed to guide such evaluations. Aspects such as pronunciation and grammar are heavily influenced by traditional and outdated views of language, views that conceive

'good' pronunciation and grammar comparable to the standard or 'correct' use of the language. In most cases, the figure of the ideal native speaker was repeatedly mentioned and compared with the performance of Michelle, because the goal is to have a native accent and to blend with the natives. Monoglossic views of language prevail in the evaluation criteria despite the fact that the evaluated person is bilingual and a multilingual and heteroglossic approach should be taken. The results reflected that this occurs with most participants ,but with more clarity in professors and students of English because they have been taught in those criteria terms. This comparison was mainly made by professors and students, nonetheless the figure of the native speaker was also mentioned by people that do not have English studies. The participants were reproducing the discourse they were taught for years and the criteria with which they were evaluated and are ultimately forced to acquire and reproduce in order to be taken seriously, achieve better grades, scholarships, jobs, etc.

Despite of this, there is awareness in the fact that evaluation criteria tends to be prescriptive, which suggests that the new generations of English students are mindful with this topic .That tension showcases the nature of evaluation and language teaching as a mechanism of social control that cannot be modified, because the ones with the power to do so are comfortable with its development and execution, which allows for English to keep being a marker of class, privilege and ultimately a profitable market. On the other side, people with no formal English studies added the 'confidence' criteria because as people without the privilege of having English as a second language they feel intimidated by it, which again coincides with the ideology of English linguistic imperialism that works on the grounds of differentiating people that do speak English and people that do not in order to maintain the privileged status of the language. This group also, in contrast to the other groups, does not consider the native accent to be the goal because they do not have the pressure to answer to a certain curricula and standard.

Besides formal aspects, the evaluation of Michelle's performance also presented a strong focus in her socio cultural features, in all the participants. Her position, job, upbringing and her being a strong political figure serve as explanation for her level of competence and good performance. This demonstrates that evaluation goes far beyond linguistics, cultural and political features of the speaker are representative of its performance. In Chile, English is associated with the higher social class because that group has major access to amenities that allow direct and constant contact with the language.

All across the different groups and participants, effective communication and the communication approach in general is what is understood as 'good English'. To understand and to be understood is the main concern for all the participants. However, this approach lacks definitions and clear cut terms like fluency and vocabulary , which means that even though the intention to focus on communication only is there, most of the times participants had to rely in 'formal aspects' like 'correct grammar' in order to define what good English is. Another reflected social representation is the fact that effective communication is understood under the terms of the English native speaker, this means that the non-native is the one that has to adjust to the English speaker and not the other way around. The participants wanted the English speaker to understand them, but the agency of the communication was never related to the native, the one making the effort to be understood has to be made by the non-native. This can be explained because communication, as well as language, is a situated phenomenon that is constantly influenced by the social, cultural and political context in which occurs. Since English and its speakers possess the authority over the language, the agency is given to the non-native of English.

In spite of the fact that most of the participants conceive the English language as a lingua franca and as the language that most people will understand, the analysis of the discourse establishes how there is no linguistic basis in terms of the risen linguistic theory, in

other words, the 'linguistic' does not exist without a context and a certain perspective, it is not neutral or objective by any means. The same can be seen in the terms of the evaluation, despite having theories and research that confirm that the comparison to a standard or a native accent is futile and rather political, certain ideologies that support English are the ones that create and reproduce those discourses in order to maintain control and the power upon language.

Chapter 4: Limitations & Further Research

Since this is a case study one important limitation is that it is not realistic or possible to make generalizations in respect of the findings and conclusions as the number of participant was so reduced. It is also possible that the results vary if this study were replicated in a different socio-cultural context, or with older or younger participants.

Further Research

In terms of future research, the lack of investigations regarding evaluation of a Second Language with an Anthropological approach and a critical view opens up the doors for any person interested in studying this field with the previously named characteristics. It is very important to continue this path or even replicate this study in order to understand and acknowledge the socio-political basis on regards of evaluation that allow for the reproduction of the social order, in this manner English students , professors or anyone can be able to resist imposed ideologies and redefine what speaking 'Good English' means.

References

Arismendi F., Ramirez D. & Arias S. (2016). Representaciones sobre las lenguas de un grupo de estudiantes indígenas en un programa de formación de docentes de idiomas. *Colomb.Appl.Linguist.J.* 18(1), 84-97

Bashir-Ali, K. (2006). Language learning and the definition of one's social, cultural, and racial identity. *Tesol Quarterly*, *40*(3), 628-639.

Bley-Vroman, R. (1983). The Comparative Fallacy in interlanguage studies: the case of sistemacity 1. *Language learning*, *33*(1), 1-17.

Boas, F. (1911). Introduction. In F. Boas (ed.) *Handbook of North American Indian Languages*: 1–83. Bulletin of the Bureau of American Ethnology, vol. 40.

Bonfiglio, T. P. (2010). *Mother tongues and nations: The invention of the native speaker* (Vol. 226). Walter de Gruyter.

Bourdieu, P. (1991), *Language and Symbolic Power: The Economy of Linguistic Exchanges,*ed. by John B. Thompson, transl. by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, Cambridge:Polity, in association with Basil Blackwell.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. (1977), *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture, transl.* by Richard Nice, London and Beverly Hills: Sage.

Bordón, T., (2006) *La evaluación de la lengua en el marco de E/L2: Bases y procedimientos.* Madrid, ArcoLibros.

Cadavid, C., Vásquez, J., Mejía, J. (2014). El uso de juegos dramáticos y dibujos para explorar las representaciones sociales de los niños y las niñas acerca del aprendizaje y la enseñanza del inglés. Íkala, *Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 19 (3), 287-304.

Chacón, C. (2010). Acento e identidad profesional en la formación del docente de inglés: Una perspectiva crítica. *Paradígma*, *31*(2), 25-36.

Chambers, F. (1997). What do we mean by fluency?. *System*, *25*(4), 535-544.

Crystal, D. (2012). *English as a global language*. Cambridge university press.

Crystal, D. (2000). *Language death*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Chomsky, N., (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, Mass, MIT Press.

Cortés, N., Gálvez, M., Guzmán, M., Quintana, A., Rodríguez, D., Urra, F. y Zamorano, D. (2017).*The learning of a second language as a political and cultural practice: a contrastive study concerning the motivations of Chilean learners to enroll on English and Mapudungun independent courses in Santiago de Chile.* Disponible en http://repositorio.uchile.cl/handle/2250/170430

Contreras, W. y Grez, F. (2016).*Is your English good or bad? : Social representations towards Alexis Sánchez's use of English in his first interview in that language: theoretical and methodological implications on teaching English as a foreign language*. Disponible en http://repositorio.uchile.cl/handle/2250/143385

Codol, J., & Leyens, P. (1982). Cognitive approaches to social behavior. *Nijhoff, Haga*.

Cook, V. (1985). Chomsky's universal grammar and second language learning. *Applied linguistics*, *6*(1), 2-18.

Cook, V. (1997). Monolingual bias in second language acquisition research. Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses, 34, 35-50.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, *33*(2), 185-209.

Dessalles, J. (2000), Aux origines du langage: Une histoire naturelle de la parole, Paris: Hermès.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, (65-118)

Doval, H. (2016). *La certificación de la competencia comunicativa del español. Del mcer al (gri) dele* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidade de Vigo)

Dunbar, R. (1996), Grooming. Gossip and the Evolution of Language, London and Boston,MA: Faber and Faber.

Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Duranti, A. (2001) *Linguistic Anthropology.* In International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences. Ed. N. J. Smelser and P. B. Baltes. Amsterdam: Elsevier

Duranti, A. (2009). *Linguistic anthropology : a reader* . Disponible en http://bibliografias.uchile.cl/3493

Durkheim, É. (1898). Représentations individuelles et représentations collectives. *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, *6*(3), 273-302.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. Modern Language Journal, 81, 285-300.

Freire, P. (1970), Pedagogy of the Oppressed, transl. by Myra Bergman Ramos, Harmondsworth:Penguin; New York: Herder and Herder

Foucault, M. (1977), Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, transl. by Alan Sheridan, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Vintage.

Giles, H., & Billings, A. (2004). Assessing language attitudes: Speaker evaluation studies. *The handbook of applied linguistics*, *187*.

Grice, H.P. (1975). 'Logic and conversation' In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics*, Volume 3. New York: Academic Press. pp. 41-58.

Hanks, W. F. (1986). Authenticity and A

Henderson, A. (2015). Smoothie or Fruit Salad? Learners' Descriptions of Accents as Windows to Concept Formation. *Research in Language*, *13*(1), 1-20mbivalence in the Text: A Colonial Maya Case. American Ethnologist,13(4):721-44

Hernández-Pozo, M. D. R., Coronado, O., Contreras, V., & Cerezo Reséndiz, S. (2008). Desempeño académico de universitarios en relación con ansiedad escolar y auto-evaluación. *Acta Colombiana de Psicología, Vol. 11, no. 1 (ene.-jun. 2008); p. 13-23*.

Henderson, K. I. (2017). Teacher language ideologies mediating classroom-level language policy in the implementation of dual language bilingual education. *Linguistics and Education*, *42*, 21-33.

Hymes, D. H. (1963). Notes toward a history of linguistic anthropology. *Anthropological linguistics*, 59-103.

Hymes, D. (1964). Introduction: Toward Ethnographies of Communication 1. *American anthropologist*, 66(6_PART2), 1-34.

Hymes, D. (1965). On Hammel on componential analysis. *American Anthropologist*, *67*(5), 1283-1283.

Holliday, A. R. (2005). The struggle to teach English as an international language. Oxford: Oxford University

Illich, I. (1981). Shadow work. Boston, MA: Marion Boyars.

Irvine, J. T. (1989). When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy. *American Ethnologist* 16: 248–267.

Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of teacher attitudes and identity. *TESOL quarterly*, *39*(3), 535-543.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.

Joseph, J. E. (2006). *Language and politics*. Edinburgh University Press.

Kroskrity, P. V. (Ed.). (2000). *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities*. James Currey Publishers.

Kroskrity, P. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* 496-517. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). Problematizing cultural stereotypes in TESOL. *Tesol Quarterly*, *37*(4), 709-719.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *Tesol Quarterly*, *40*(1), 59-81.

Kuwornu, A. A. (2017). Review of Issues of Language Assessments for Non-native Speakers of English. *Sino-US English Teaching*, *14*(3), 157-168.

Lagos, C. (2012). El mapudungun en Santiago de Chile: vitalidad y representaciones sociales en los mapuches urbanos. *RLA. Revista de lingüística teórica y aplicada*, *50*(1), 161-184.

Lagos, C. (2015). El Programa de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe y sus resultados:¿ perpetuando la discriminación? The Intercultural Bilingual Education Program and its results: Perpetuating discrimination?.*Pensamiento Educativo. Revista de Investigación Educacional Latinoamericana*, *52*(1), 84-94.

Lagos, C., & Espinoza, M. (2013). La planificación lingüística de la lengua mapuche en Chile a través de la historia. *Lenguas Modernas*, (42), pág-47.

Leech, G., Deuchar, M., & Hoogenraad, R. (2007). English grammar for today. Macmillan.

Lehnert, T. E., Krolak-Schwerdt, S., &Hörstermann, T. (2018). Language and nationality attitudes as distinct factors that influence speaker evaluations: Explicit versus implicit attitudes in Luxembourg. *Language & Communication*, *61*, 58-70.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States*. Routledge.

Llurda, E. (2004). Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an International Language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *14*(3), 314-323.

Lukács, G. (2005). Class consciousness. *History and Class Consciousness*, *77*

Maio, G. R., Olson, J. M., Bernard, M. M., & Luke, M. A. (2006). Ideologies, values, attitudes, and behavior. In *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 283-308). Springer, Boston, MA.

MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal*, *54*(1), 167-201.

Mahboob, A., & Paltridge, B. (2012). *Critical Discourse Analysis and Critical Applied Linguistics. The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*

McNamara, C. (2008). *Basic guide to program evaluation.* Free Management Library.

McNamara, D. S. (Ed.). (2012). *Reading comprehension strategies: Theories, interventions, and technologies*. Psychology Press.

Menegatti, M., Crocetti, E., & Rubini, M. (2017). Do gender and ethnicity make the difference? Linguistic evaluation bias in primary school. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology,* 36(4), 415-437.

Milroy, L. (2002). Standard English and language ideology in Britain and the United States. In *Standard English* (pp. 185-218). Routledge.

Mora, M. (2002). La teoría de las representaciones sociales de Serge Moscovici. Athenea Digital, 2. Disponible enhttp://blues.uab.es/athenea/num2/Mora.pdf

Moscovici, S. (1979). *El psicoanálisis, su imagen y su público*, Buenos Aires, Huemul.

Moscovici, S. (1988). *Notes Towards a Description of Social Representations*, European Journal of Social Psychology 18: 211-250

Niedzielski, N. & Preston, D. (2000). *Folk linguistics*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Orrego, R., Singer, N., Úbeda, R., & Yáñez, S. (2017). Learners' and teachers' beliefs regarding the learning difficulty of complex grammar structures in students of an english language teaching undergraduate programme. *Literatura y lingüística*, (35), 419-438.

Pienemann, M., Johnston, M., & Nunan, D. (1987). Applying second language acquisition research.

Phillipson, R. (1992). Linguistic imperialism. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (1997). Realities and myths of linguistic imperialism. *Journal of multilingual and multicultural development*, *18*(3), 238-248.

Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. Routledge.

Preston, D. (2006). "Folk Linguistics". In K. Brown (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (pp. 521-533). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Razfar, A., & Rumenapp, J. C. (2012). Language ideologies in English learner classrooms: Critical reflections and the role of explicit awareness. *Language Awareness*, *21*(4), 347-368.

Rocha, J. C. T. (2014). Teachers' experiences, beliefs and conceptions concerning intercultural communicative competence. *Interacción*, *13*, 69-81.

Rojas, D., & Avilés, T. (2014). Ideologías lingüísticas en la fraseología del español de Chile: dos momentos, una concepción del lenguaje. *Onomázein*, (29), 64-77.

Rojas, D., Lagos, C., & Espinoza, M. (2016). Ideologías lingüísticas acerca del mapudungun en la urbe chilena: el saber tradicional y su aplicación a la revitalización lingüística. *Chungará (Arica)*, *48*(1), 115-125.

Rickheit, G., &Strohner, H. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of communication competence* (Vol. 1). Walter de Gruyter.

Ruecker, T. (2011). Challenging the native and nonnative English speaker hierarchy in ELT: New directions from race theory. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *8*(4), 400-422.

Silverstein, M. (1979). Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. *The Elements: A Parasession On Linguistic Units And Levels*, 193-247.

Stevens, H. (1863). The Humboldt Library. *A catalogue of the Library of Alexander von Humboldt. London*.

Torres, Ana María. (2013). Representaciones sociales sobre el proceso evaluación desde la mirada de docentes de 1° Año Básico en establecimientos municipalizados urbanos de la comuna de Quilpué. *Estudios pedagógicos (Valdivia)*, *39*(1), 285-304

Vanegas Rojas, M., Fernández Restrepo, J. J., Zapata, G., Andrea, Y., Jaramillo Rodríguez, G., Muñoz Cardona, L. F., & Ríos Muñoz, C. M. (2016). Linguistic Discrimination in an English Language Teaching Program: Voices of the Invisible Others. *Íkala, revista de lenguaje y cultura*, *21*(2), 133-151.

Vermeer, A. (2000). Coming to grips with lexical richness in spontaneous speech data. *Language testing*, *17*(1), 65-83.

Wittig, F. (2009). Desplazamiento y vigencia del mapudungún en Chile: un análisis desde el discurso reflexivo de los hablantes urbanos. *RLA. Revista de lingüistícateoríca y aplicada*, *47*(2), 135-155.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). Language, thought, and reality: selected writings of….(Edited by John B. Carroll.).