LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES IN CHILEAN EDUCATION PROGRAMMES: THE CASE OF ENGLISH AND MAPUDUNGUN AS SECOND LANGUAGES.

Felipe Andrés Robertovich Pérez de Arce Ryabova.

Tesis para optar a grado de Licenciado en Lengua y Literatura Inglesas.

Professor: Cristian Lagos.

Marco Espinoza.

Darío Rojas.

INDEX.

DEDICATORIA.

Dedicado a los zorros árticos en peligro de extinción…

AGRADECIMIENTOS.

Luego de cinco años (sí, cinco años, porque perdimos uno debido a las protestas del 2011) he llegado a la conclusión de que hay muchos a quienes agradecer otros tantos a quienes putear, pero para qué amargarnos, ¿no? Mejor hagamos de esto algo divertido, y por ello, mis agradecimientos dicen así:

De partida agradezco a mis profes guías, que son un chiste cada uno en su medida. En primer lugar Don Cristian Lagos, o Chocman como es más conocido por sus alumnos, aunque las nuevas generaciones es probable que ya ni conozcan el comercial de Chocman, pero… las tradiciones quedan, ¿no? Todavía recuerdo esa tarde de julio (¿parece?) cuando me dijo que podía ser su ayudante y en todos estos años me ha enseñado más que la chucha. En segundo lugar, Marco Espinoza, cuyos apodos no diré porque no son de lo mejor, aunque no faltó la compañera que lo encontraba rico (¿cuek?). Aunque he escuchado que lo han tratado de flojo, de vago, de ineficaz y cuanta mierda más, siempre me pareció gracioso escuchar de quien venían esos comentarios. Pero para quienes hemos trabajado con él, sabemos que es uno de los pocos profesores que producen en este departamento y que le interesa mejorar lo que se conoce como la Academia. En tercer lugar, por supuesto que a Darío Rojas, el Wolverine de hispánica, es sex symbol de las chicas de hispánica y de las confesiones uchile. Aunque lo vine a conocer en último año, me enseñó harto de ideologías lingüísticas (que es de lo que se trata esta tesis), además de ser alguien muy simpático con buenos gustos musicales.

Supongo que también tengo que agradecer a la familia, como que se estila eso. Aunque nunca entendieron muy bien qué cresta es lo que estudié (y por ende a lo que me voy a dedicar), al menos estuvieron ahí durante estos años que me han aguantado en casa.

Bueno, hay que agradecer a los compañeros también. A pesar de que gran parte de ellos me odiaban en un comienzo (que bien merecido me lo tenía), creo que al final de este proceso me hicieron reír en más de alguna ocasión. Y por

supuesto a quienes tengo el gusto de llamar amigas, que están todas locas (pero para estudiar lingüística hay que estar medio fallado, ¿no?).

Por último y si no se me olvida nadie (y si se me olvida alguien, lo siento, mala cue'a, para la siguiente tesis será), agradezco a mi polola (Arantxa), que por más complicada que es me ha hecho y me sigue haciendo feliz. Y creo que estos años no hubieran sido lo mismo sin ella.

Y para terminar, ahora vienen las puteadas. Aunque mejor dicho es una puteada general. Aprovecho esta oportunidad para descargarme con la Academia, en todas sus áreas. He llegado a conocer un mundo lleno de vicios, traiciones, competitividad, amiguismos, etc. Es un mundo bien asqueroso que olvidó (si es que alguna vez fue así) su compromiso con la ciencia y la sociedad. Es un mundo que cayó en un ciclo de vicios y peleas sin sentido por tener el mejor curriculum y ser más conocido. Un mundo plagado por muchos viejos rancios que sólo se dedican a comer en cócteles y no son un aporte para nada ni nadie. Un mundo en el que quienes intentan hacer algo, intentan ser un aporte, son atacados y siempre se les intenta echar para abajo. Pero es un mundo al que estoy entrando con la intención de intentar cambiarlo y no dejarme llevar por tanta mierda que tiene. Así que, me deseo suerte a mí mismo para no morir en el intento.

Bueno, y los agradecimientos especiales para no terminar con sabor amargo de boca. Agradezco a mi PS3 y a mi notebook y todos los juegos que jugué durante estos cinco años (y que me quitaron tiempo para muchos trabajos, incluida esta tesis). Agradezco a mis gatos, a los tres, porque bueno, son parte de la familia después de todo. Y por último (y para terminar ahora sí que sí), agradezco a…

ABSTRACT.

As the influence of language ideologies is notedin a number of social fields involving different aspects of language, these have caught the attention of researches. This study intends to look into the language ideologies underlying the official education programmes of English and Mapudungun in Chile, so as to find the motivations behind these programmes. The analysis consisted in the review and categorization of main language ideologies found in Ministry and interviews with the authorities of the education programmes. The main results showed two different language paradigms regarding each language. On the one hand, English is usually conceived under a rationalist model focusing on its functional value, while Mapudungun on the other hand in commonly conceived under a romantic model focusing on its cultural and historic value. These ideologies help to explain the reasons for the language initiatives currently being carried out in Chile in terms of education programmes.

Key words: language ideologies, language planning, education programmes, second languages.

0. INTRODUCTION.

Language ideologies have caught the attention of researchers in the last decades due to their relevance in a number of social fields involving different aspects of language, such as language planning and language teaching. Language planning initiatives and language programmes are not neutral, but they are usually motivated and express certain language ideologies. Thus, the underlying language ideologies behind language planning initiatives and policies and language teaching can reflect the ideologies held by authorities and socio-political elites which are thus transmitted to the larger society.

Although there is increasing interest in these fields, in Chile, the study of language ideologies is still in its infancy. In a country that lacks an overt and clear language policy, the study of the language teaching initiatives becomes more important as it can unveil the ideologies that are being shared through covert initiatives and activities.

The present research aims at identifying those ideologies underlying the language teaching programmes in Chile, specifically, the study focuses on the analysis of English and Mapudungun language programmes. The study thus provides a view of languages ideologies held by the authorities in charge of these education programmes and expressed in official documents, so as to explain the reasons and justifications for specific initiatives and activities that are being carried out nowadays.

The report is structured as follows: Section 1 presents the problem we are addressing and the relevance of the research. Sections 2 and 3 introduce the research question and objectives to be answered. Section presents the literature review used to carry out the analysis. The literature review is divided in 3 main sections: Ideology, Attitudes and Language Planning and Policy. Section 5 presents a brief analysis of the Language Planning and Policy initiatives and activities present in the Chilean context. Section 6 describes the method used to analyse the data. Section 7 presents the analysis of the data, including Ministry

documents and interviews. And finally, section 8 presents a conclusion summing up the analysis and proposing possible further research.

1. PROBLEM.

When we look closely at the Chilean linguistic context, we encounter a multicultural and multilingual country. Spanish is the official language; several minority indigenous languages, such as Aymara, Mapudungun, and Rapa Nui among others are also present in the country; and English gained an important position in Chilean education. However, in the face of this multilingual reality and the several languages that play a role in the Chilean context, there are no noticeable language planning initiatives to address this conflictive reality. In fact, and not taking into account Spanish as the national language, we can just find a set of initiatives of regarding the social promotion of languages, particularly in terms of their role in education programmes. Nevertheless, despite the lack of an overt national language policy, it is possible to claim that these initiatives respond to an implicit policy from their managers, which expresses their ideologies about these languages.

Looking closely at the Chilean reality, the pervasive standard language and the monoglossic culture common in Latin America may actually influence language education programmes. Nonetheless, it would be hasty to assume that the underlying ideologies are only motivated by these general cultural ideologies. Thus, it becomes necessary to elucidate what are the actual beliefs motivating such programmes.

Therefore, this study intends to look into the language ideologies underlying the official education programmes of two languages in Chile: English and Mapudungun. Through this, we are trying to find the motivations behind the covert language policy in Chile.

Both languages to be studied have clear different social roles. On the one hand, English is a colonial international language used mainly for economic purposes. On the other hand, Mapudungun is a native minorized language spoken by the Mapuche people. Mapudungun is promoted by means of a few language courses and the Intercultural Bilingual Education Programme. However, English is taught as part of the national curriculum, it is promoted by means of several

language courses throughout the country, and several grants are given for people to study the language. Summing up, English receives more funds than Mapudungun.

2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS.

This study aims to answer the following questions:

- What are the language ideologies underlying the official language teaching programmes of English and Mapudungun in Chile?

Out of this question, the study raises a series of new questions:

- Which language ideologies can be recognized in the official discourse from the MINEDUC (Chilean Ministry of Education) through the curricular bases and related documents regarding Mapudungun?
- Which language ideologies can be recognized in the official discourse from the MINEDUC through the discourse of the programme managers regarding Mapudungun?
- Which language ideologies can be recognized in the official discourse from the MINEDUC through the curricular bases and related documents regarding English?
- Which language ideologies can be recognized in the official discourse from the MINEDUC through the discourse of the programme managers regarding English?
- How and to what extent are these ideologies representatives of actual Chilean language policy regarding second language acquisition?

3. OBJECTIVES.

GENERAL.

- To characterise the language ideologies underlying the official education programmes in Chile regarding second language acquisition programmes.

SPECIFIC.

- Identify the language ideologies that can be recognized in the official discourse from the MINEDUC through the curricular bases and related documents regarding Mapudungun.
- Identify the language ideologies can be recognized in the official discourse from the MINEDUC through the discourse of the programme managers regarding Mapudungun.
- Identify the language ideologies can be recognized in the official discourse from the MINEDUC through the curricular bases and related documents regarding English.
- Identify the language ideologies can be recognized in the official discourse from the MINEDUC through the discourse of the programme managers regarding English.
- Explain how and to what degree these ideologies are reflected in actual Chilean language policy regarding second language acquisition.

4. LITERATURE REVIEW.

4.1. IDEOLOGY.

4.1.1. THE CONCEPT OF "IDEOLOGY".

The study of ideologies has a long-standing tradition in different disciplines; the concept of ideology has been studied in history, philosophy, anthropology and linguistics, among other fields. Back in the 18th century, French philosophers treated the term "ideology" as a "system of beliefs" closely related to social, political or religious ideas, carrying either a positive or a negative connotation depending on the view point. Marx introduced the concept of ideology as "false consciousness" or "misguided beliefs". In other words, ideologies are sets of beliefs induced by particular social classes –the ruling class- to the general population for their particular interests. This idea endowed a negative connotation to the concept of ideology linking ideas as social conflict, dominance and hegemony to the concept. Durkheim's tradition, on the other hand, related the concept of ideology to the culture of social groups, as shared assumptions and beliefs joining people into communities and societies.

In sum, "ideology" is not a concept easy to grasp or to define from one single perspective. Eagleton (1991) states that 'ideology' has a whole range of useful meanings, not all of which are compatible with each other (…) The word 'ideology', one might say, is a *text,* woven of a whole tissue of different conceptual strands".

Meanwhile, more recent treatments of the concept of "ideology" are actually based upon historical traditions. Van Dijk (1998, 2000) presented a general notion of "ideology", as this would allow studying both positive and negative ideologies. He states that "a general theory of ideology allows a broader and more flexible application of the notion" (Van Dijk, 2000). Although Van Dijk´s understanding of ideology departs from political connotations, he does not exclude the relations of dominance and conflict that may be carried out through specific ideologies.

Furthermore, Van Dijk (1998, 2000) establishes a main difference between belief and ideology. Beliefs are individual features, while "ideologies consist of socially shared beliefs that are associated with the characteristic properties of a group, such as their identity, their position in society, their interests and aims, their relations to other groups, their reproduction, and their natural environment" (Van Dijk, 2000). Thus, as ideologies are representative of cultural groups and they are not common ground knowledge, they may not –and generally are not- accepted by everyone within a society or community. Moreover, ideologies tend to be a usual cause of conflict and struggle, as they define ideological groups and their members. That is to say, members of the same macro or micro cultural group share fairly similar ideologies. Nonetheless, as ideology is closely related to consciousness, subjective representations, beliefs and ideas (Woolard, 1998), people may experience ideological conflict as their own ideologies may be in contact with others. People may be identified or feel as members of different ideologically conflicting socio-cultural groups simultaneously (Van Dijk, 1998, 2000). What is more, although ideologies represent sets of beliefs and opinions of socio-cultural groups, Woolard (1998) argues that as they are rooted in the experience or interests of particular social positions, they are often presented as universally true.

4.1.2. LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY.

Among all possible social phenomena able to be the subject of ideologies, language has been taken as an area of study by the linguistic anthropological and sociolinguistic traditions. Kroskrity (2004) defines language ideology as "thought about language". Although concise, it seems to summarize years of definition attempts carried out by several scholars from diverse traditions. Language ideologies have been often defined as "shared bodies of common-sense notions about the nature of language in the world" (Rumsey 1990). Irvine (1989) refers to language ideologies as "the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests".

Errington(2001) states that they "refer(s) to the situated, partial, and interested character of conceptions and uses of language." And De los Heros (2008) claims that language ideologies are socially shared sets of beliefs that refer to either the use or value of languages. These ideologies may refer to the origin of a language, the utility of some languages over others, and so on.

Kroskrity (2010) also claims that it is important to consider language ideologies as a cluster concept that is made up of four convergent dimensions. These overlapping layers of significance are required to fully understand the concept of language ideologies as a set of beliefs about language.

First, language ideologies represent the interests of a specific social or cultural group. That is to say, that what members of a community consider as true, false, good, or bad about languages is based on social experience and necessarily tied to cultural, political or economic interests. Thus, language ideologies respond to social ideologies that are tied to specific interests. And through the use of language those ideologies and interests are promoted.

Second, language ideologies are conceived of as multiple phenomena within sociocultural groups. This multiplicity is due to the fact that societies are made up of a variety of different social divisions, such as class, gender, age, elites, ethnicity, etc. Thus, this multiplicity necessarily produces divergent perspectives and ideologies. Then, language ideologies, as language itself, cannot be conceived of as socially uniformly distributed.

Third, awareness of the local language ideologies varies from one group member to the next. Although some members may actually be aware of their ideologies and explicitly articulate them, others are not aware of what they believe about language and therefore their ideologies must be read from actual usage or discourse.

Finally, language user's ideologies mediate between their sociocultural experience and their linguistic resources. That is to say, linguistic and discursive forms are tied to features of the member's sociocultural experience. Thus, through the construction of language ideologies, members of the community show the

influence of their consciousness when they select features of both linguistic and social systems.

Out of the set of definitions above, a series of common features may be identified. Firstly, language ideologies are seen as mental constructions; as context-bound socio-culturally constructed sets of beliefs used by language users to rationalize, explain or justify their language and their environment's language usage (Kroskrity, 2004; Silverstein, 1979).

Moreover, like Van Dijk, Cameron (2004) establishes a difference between belief and attitude and ideologies. The former refer to "mental constructs which essentially "belong" to individuals" (Cameron, 2004). The latter, in turn, refers to "social constructs [which] are ways of understanding the world that emerge from interaction with particular (public) representations of it" (Cameron, 2004).

Among the variety of beliefs that users of language usually have towards language, we can find some of them listed below:

- Beliefs about the superiority and/or inferiority of specific languages,
- Beliefs about the linguistic adequacy of sign languages for Deaf communities
- Beliefs about how languages are and should be acquired,
- Beliefs about language contact and multilingualism,
- Beliefs about the origins of language,
- Beliefs about the proper use of language.

In sum, language ideologies are beliefs about languages as used in their social worlds. (Cameron, 2004; Kroskrity, 2004)

However, considering that on the one hand the Marxist tradition considered ideologies as "false consciousness" or "misguided beliefs", they are commonly associated to false or misleading beliefs imposed by the dominant groups within a particular society. This notion, though, opposes language ideologies from actual linguistic research, it lays the concept of ideology in a field of uncertainty and

mistrust that scholars try to avoid regarding language. While on the other hand, the concept of ideology is often used to signify social belief systems closely associated with particular social groups, such as feminism, racism, etc. This fact does not mean that language ideologies should be considered as truth, but according to Cameron (2004), one reason why scholars prefer to avoid defining language ideology as "beliefs about language" is precisely to avoid this common-sense identification of ideology with false or objectionable beliefs.

Therefore, Van Dijk (1998, 2000) and Cameron (2004) proposed considering language ideologies as social representations of language instead of the commonly used terms of beliefs or attitudes. Then, Cameron (2004) claims that the term is commonly used to refer to sets of representations that give specific socio-cultural meaning to language use within certain communities. Notwithstanding, language ideologies are subject to change as culture is subject to change. In fact, Kroskrity (2004) puts forward the fact that social and linguistic variation play an important role influencing change that affects culture directly, and, therefore, language ideologies. Thus, language ideologies are closely related to the culture of a community. However, as communities are composed by different sociocultural groups, language ideologies may be subject to confrontation and change.

Siegel (2006) proposes a set of common ideologies present in most societies: monolingual ideology, standard language ideology, egalitarian pluralism ideology and equal opportunity ideology. All of these are interrelated and seem to be present across diverse societies. The first two follow nationalistic ideologies from the XVIII and XIX centuries that propose the use of only one language as a symbol of national unity. And, although the other two are supposed to be based upon democratic grounds, they show contradictions that seem to advocate for hierarchy.

Firstly, the monolingual ideology, mostly present in countries in which the official language is spoken worldwide, as English or Spanish, pursues the use of only one language in a particular country or territory, as it considers monolingualism as the normal condition and as the ideal. It considers language

variety or the use of any other language as separatist or divisive hindering the fluent communication within the territory. An example of this ideology is the English-only movement in the USA. This ideology also leads to the use of only one language and the standard variety in the education system.

Besides, this ideology is also motivated by the idea that people can have only one language or one culture, and that they must choose between one and another. As a consequence of this ideology, most speakers are inclined to use a language or language variety (usually the standard) that is unfamiliar to them, and give up their own vernacular language or variety. The monolingual ideology excludes the possibility of constructing identities that involve the use and knowledge of more than one language or language variety.

Secondly, the standard language ideology, closely related to the monolingual ideology, advocates for the use and promotion of the standard variety of the national language, particularly in formal and academic contexts. This ideology, originated after the French Revolution, considers the standard variety, based on the spoken language of the upper middle social and economic classes, as superior than other regional or social varieties, thus it should be the one to give unity to the nation. According to Milroy (2001), it is common that some languages, such as English, French or Spanish, are considered by their speakers as existing in standardized forms. By standardized form or standard variety, he refers to a usually invariable and uniform structure. It is commonly considered as the unmarked form, while other varieties are marked. However, the standard variety, rather than being defined by means of its form, is defined by the social group to which it is associated. Prestige is given to specific language varieties because of the speakers that use such varieties. And the standard variety is commonly considered as the highest prestige variety, because it is used by the social and economic elites.

Siegel (2006) claims that the perpetuation of the standard variety is maintained by the dominant groups or elites to preserve and promote their interests. This perpetuation is carried out through the institutions controlled by the elites, such as the government, the media and of course, the education system.

The media plays an important role by stigmatizing other varieties that are not the standard. Siegel (2006) mentions the common use of terms such as "lazy", "ungrammatical", "faulty", "sloppy", "slothful" and "ugly" when referring to marginalized language varieties. However, as mentioned before, these terms reflect common beliefs also about the groups that use such varieties.

The education system tends to promote the standard language ideology. The standard variety is the only one allowed in classrooms and it is taught as superior in form, importance and use. Other forms are shown as inferior and usually punished or banned from classrooms. Thus, the education system perpetuates and reinforces inequality and social superiority and control of some groups over others by excluding marginalized groups from institutions of power.

Moreover, due to the constant proportion of these beliefs, this ideology is in many cases accepted by the marginalized social groups, which makes the dominated accomplices and sometimes even promoters of their own domination.

Therefore, Milroy (2001) speaks of what he calls the standard language cultures. Members of these cultures believe that there is a correct or canonical form of language that is above the other varieties. And when speakers face two or more variants, only one must be right. A pervasive notion common in these cultures is the idea of "common sense". As what they believe is simply "common sense", no debate is necessary. They believe that their attitudes and beliefs are not ideologically loaded, and everyone who thinks differently is simply wrong and cannot be taken seriously.

Closely related to the monolingual ideology and the standard language ideology, Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman (2002) refer to the concept of monoglossic culture. To understand what a monoglossic culture is, it is necessary firstly to define its opposite, a heteroglossic culture.

By heteroglossic cultures, they refer to cultures where several varied linguistic norms coexist. And the verbal behaviour of the community members encompasses the multiple and varied norms available to them. And although each linguistic norm may be associated with a different culture, this coexistence and the

complex intercultural interactions are seen as natural by the community. In fact, this coexistence may actually constitute the identity of the society.

However, most Western societies have been constructed as monoglossic cultures. Del Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman (2002) state that these cultures consist of two principles: focalization and convergence. The former expresses the notion that grammar is always used when we speak; a grammar which is necessarily understood as a well-defined and almost invariable system. Variability is therefore stigmatized. The latter should be considered as the diachronic part of the first one, and it assumes that the verbal behaviour of community members tends to become more homogenous with time. Thus, multilingualism is assumed to slowly disappear as the dominant language and standard variation is acquired by the community members. This idea is the basis for the modern cultural nationalisms. Western national communities are often conceived of as homogenous societies, both culturally and linguistically.

Thirdly, the egalitarian pluralism ideology considers all languages and language varieties as valid language systems as they fulfil their communicative purpose. However, this ideology also advocates for learning and acquiring the standard variety as it is considered a useful resource for gaining social advantages, although it does not mention why or how the standard variety got to be more prestigious.

Finally, the equal opportunity ideology is not strictly a language ideology, but it also has a major influence over the treatment of languages within a national territory. This ideology considers that people, whether due to ethnicity, mother tongue or dialect, social class or gender are not born with the same social opportunities. Thus, such disparities entail difficulties in life. Therefore, speakers should be encouraged to learn the standard variety or official language in order to overcome such difficulties.

All these ideologies are commonly promoted in the media, political discourse and through education in schools. Thus, the study of language programmes becomes vital for understanding which ideologies are being promoted within a country.

For the purposes of this research, we will define "language ideology" as situated sets of socio-culturally shared representations associated with the use and value of language that may carry moral or political load. By socio-cultural, we refer both to macro and micro socio-cultural groups in constant contact, conflict and flux. Finally, we prefer to use of the concept "representation" instead of "belief" so as to avoid possible misleading interpretations.

Besides the problematic definition of language ideology, there is the problem of studying and analysing language ideologies. Disregarding fully ideological discourses as manifests and ideologically loaded political speeches, most forms of discourse express little or no direct and explicit ideologies. Then it is necessary to address language ideologies from a different perspective.

Cameron (2004) argues that the study of ideologies has to be carried by analysing texts and practices in which language is represented, both written and spoken, and written and spoken about. However, as already stated, some issues are presented by trying to elucidate actual language ideologies. Van Dijk (1998, 2000) states that there is "a wide gap between the abstract, general ideologies on the one hand, and how people produce and understand discourse or engage in other social practices on the other hand". Therefore, he introduces the concept of language attitudes and claims that attitudes may work as intermediary representations between ideology and discourse, because attitudes, although mainly individual may stand for ideological propositions. Then, attitudes also represent forms of socially shared cognition. Thus, the study of language attitudes becomes fundamental for the study of language ideologies.

4.1.3. LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES ABOUT ENGLISH.

Since the 1980s, the picture of English as a global language has gained strength among both non-specialists and specialists in language studies (Crystal, 1997). This notion is highly motivated by different reasons. First, English language nowadays is spoken by about 1.5 million people around the globe. Second, English

has linguistically dominated most of the world in terms of large scale commerce, industry, technology, banking, the sciences and professions (Pan and Block, 2011). And third, the English language is used as a communication vehicle among people of a wide range of diverse cultures and nationalities.

However, although English holds this recognition as a global language, sometimes even as "the global language", this belief still needs some further discussion considering different contexts of use and ideologies.

First, we will refer to the ideas presented by De Swaan (2001) in relation to his world linguistic system theory. Following his theory, a single global language system now operates around the world. And all known languages are connected in a hierarchical pattern. At the centre of this system we find the hypercentral English, linked to a group of supercentral languages that work as link points to different sets of peripheral languages. According to De Swaan, speakers tend to learn a second language that is perceived to provide them with some kind of greater communication advantage, usually preferring the central languages, which stand higher in the system of language hierarchy. Thus, there is a constant attraction by the speakers of peripheral languages towards the centre, meaning English.

Second, we will analyse the role of English according to its instrumental value. English is commonly associated to the acquisition of social and economic prestige for individuals (Pan and Block, 2011; Hamel, 2008). This idea of English as necessary for economic progress, both for individuals and for entire societies, however needs to be closely analysed.

We need to refer to Kachru (1990), Kachru and Smith (1985, 1988) and Kachru and Nelson's (2006) pluricentric idea of the English Circles. English, according to the authors, cannot be understood as a unitary language system, but as a set of different systems that are distributed in three different circles: the Inner Circle consisting of native English varieties; the Outer Circle consisting of varieties of English as second language; and the Expanding Circle consisting of contexts where English is learnt as a foreign language. Following this notion, we could consider that speakers see English as a tool for economic progress. The large sums of money spent on English language learning are also a sign of this notion. In

Seargeant's (2009) word, the general perception among speakers is that the English language gives access to the wealth of the world that is otherwise linguistically hindered. Thus, English is regarded as a tool for linguistic mobility.

Considering these different beliefs, it is not strange that bilingual speakers who have English as one of their native languages or as an L2 have a more favourable attitude towards English. And that, in general, non-native speakers of English also have a positive attitude towards English (McKenzie, 2010). Although it is worth mentioning that non-native speakers mostly see English as a unitary system rather that a wide set of different varieties.

4.1.4. LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES ABOUT INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES.

One of the common criticisms against the wide spread of the English language, and thus one of the reasons for negative attitudes towards English language learning is its negative effect over local indigenous languages. (McKenzie, 2010). Following De Swaan's world linguistic system theory, indigenous languages would stand in the peripheral areas,holding low prestige and thus being considered less desirable for learning by speakers of supercentral or other peripheral languages. In fact, the indigenous population would prefer to learn supercentral or the hypercentral English instead of their own native languages even at the expense of their language's extinction.

Furthermore, in the case of Latin America, as a result of the pervasive influence of the monoglossic culture (Valle and Gabriel-Stheeman, 2002) and the standard language culture (Milroy, 2001), in most countries, Spanish is seen as the most prestigious language covering most contexts of language use and in the position of official language in institutions and the education system. Besides, the geo-political distribution of Latin America has placed Spanish as the only language. As all neighbouring countries speak Spanish, there is no actual need to learn an L2 as the use of Spanish seems to be applicable to all contexts. This belief tends to raise negative attitudes towards language variation and multilingualism.

Lagos, et al. (2013) argue that although we cannot take for granted that members of South American indigenous peoples are permeated by the same or similar language ideologies as those of the members of dominant cultures of European origins, we cannot ignore that the standard language ideology has had some influence on the views and beliefs that members of non-Western cultures, either minority or minorized, have about their own languages. This influence is constantly promoted through official political discourse, the media, and the education system.

In that same line, the authors highlight that this influenceis particularly true in the case of members of indigenous intellectual elites involved in language revitalisation programmes or education programmes due to their education in universities of Western tradition.

They identified five common attitudes underlying the discussions of Mapuche intellectuals about their own language:

- Those who believe that the revitalisation of the language implies increasing the language 'supply', i.e. diversify spaces in which the language can be taught and learnt.
- Those who believe that revitalisation involves the promotion of what we call a 'demand' for the language, that is to say, the promotion of the conditions so that Mapudungun is used in a greater variety of social domains.
- Those who assume that the solution implies giving social status to indigenous languages like Mapudungun.
- Those who think that the solution is a legal issue, through giving constitutional recognition to the language and to the Mapuche people as political subjects.
- Finally, those who think that revitalisation involves developing indigenous languages from the point of view of the 'corpus'.

From these attitudes, it is possible to note the influence of the Western tradition on language planning and the influence of the standard language ideology. It is

important to keep in mind that these attitudes gain special relevance considering that indigenous intellectual elites, in many cases, take part in the development of language revitalization and education programmes.

4.2.   ATTITUDES.

4.2.1. THE CONCEPT OF "ATTITUDE".

Attitudes, unlike ideologies, have been primarily studied under the scope of social psychology. Broadly speaking, psychologists define attitudes as personal evaluations people hold towards all sorts of elements of the surrounding reality. In other words, attitudes are what people like or dislike, that is to say, whether they react favourably or unfavourably towards different aspects of their reality (Bizer, 2004; Edwards, 2006).

Attitudes have a great influence on people's choices and decisions regarding their actions. For instance, a consumer's attitude towards different products may influence which one he or she will buy; a family's attitude towards animals may influence which pet they will have; the attitudes of university students may impact on the courses they will attend or their performance on the ones they are already attending; and someone's attitudes towards languages may influence what language they will learn as an L2 or even their behaviour towards certain language speakers.

Within the scope of social psychology, the study of attitudes has commonly followed McGuire's tripartite model (McGuire, 1969). The tripartite model suggests that attitudes, as psychological dispositions towards elements of reality are composed by three components. The first one is the affective component, referring to the personal feelings tied to the object of the attitude. The second one is the cognitive component, referring to the thoughts the subject carries regarding the attitudinal object. Finally, there is the behavioural component, which refers to the tendency of action towards the target object. Therefore, we believe, know and act towards and object of interest.

4.2.2. LANGUAGE ATTITUDE.

Edwards (2006) highlights the importance of avoiding confusion between the concepts of attitude and belief, opinion, value or ideology. This confusion is more typical in studies of language attitudes as responses regarding importance or liking of particular languages are commonly misinterpreted as favourable or unfavourable attitudes towards those languages. Still most people believe and actually qualify different languages and linguistic varieties as better or worse based on alleged intrinsic qualities.

McKenzie (2010) puts forward that language attitudes thus refer to a wide range of empirical studies concerning a specific number of attitudes speakers may hold towards a large set of linguistic phenomena.

Baker (1992) identified the following possible areas of study under the scope of language attitudes:

- attitudes towards language variation, dialect and speech style,
- attitudes towards learning a new language,
- attitudes towards a specific minority language,
- attitudes towards language groups, communities and minorities,
- attitudes towards language lessons,
- attitudes of parents towards language lessons,
- attitudes towards the uses of a specific language, and
- attitudes towards language preference.

The study of language attitudes gains importance as, for example, learners' attitudes towards a target language may influence their proficiency and success in the acquisition of an L2 (Dornyei and Skehan, 2003). Thus, McKenzie (2010) establishes that there is a close correlation between the attitudes towards an L2 and the level of motivation and success of achieving proficiency in the L2 by a potential speaker.

Furthermore, attitudes may motivate or be motivated by language policies and therefore affect directly over what languages are going to be taught or not in a particular country or region and how those languages are going to be taught. Language policies may cause an effect on what speakers think and believe about their own languages or languages in contact. And these attitudes would impact on prestige and motivation for learning particular languages. Thus language policies should be studied considering the factor of the attitudes of the speakers involved.

However, the study of attitudes requires further analysis to determine the sometimes hidden or even unknown attitudes towards languages or language practices, and therefore policies, as attitudes are not clearly observable but they have to be inferred from behaviour.

4.3. LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY.

4.3.1. ORIGIN OF THE TERM.

According to Haugen (1966), it was Weinreich the first to use the term language planning during a seminar at the University of Columbia in 1957. But Haugen (1959) himself was the first to define the term as "the activity of preparing a normative orthography, grammar, and dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a nonhomogeneous speech community". This first approach however, later known as corpus planning, is solely a branch of what today is understood as language planning and policy (LPP). Nonetheless, Haugen's definition established the conscious and deliberate practices of carrying out activities that have an intentional effect on language practices under the scope of social sciences and as a sub-discipline of the study of linguistics.

However, although the systematic study of language planning has only seen light in recent decades, Ricento (2006) states that the study and interest in issues nowadays studied under the scope of LPP have been the concern of scholars of diverse disciplines throughout the history of mankind.

Although it is a sub-discipline of linguistics, Amorós (2008) highlights that it has an important interdisciplinary component, as it encompasses elements from sociolinguistics, sociology, politics and economics. Following Baldauf Jr. (1994), language planning brings together theory from a wide range of disciplines to put it into practice to solve social language problems. And thus he sheds light on the importance of keeping in mind that all language planning answers to social planning and one cannot be considered without the other. Moreover, the field itself has changed its scope over the years from a discipline concerned mainly with formal language issues in developing societies to a critical wide discipline concerning all language issues in all societies (Baldauf Jr., 1994).

4.3.2. LANGUAGE PLANNING AND LANGUAGE POLICY.

LPP has received diverse names as different authors have approached the subject: language engineering (Miller 1950), language management, glottopolitics (Hall 1951), language development (Noss 1967), or language regulation (Gorman 1973). But language planning and language policy have become the common definitions for activities concerning the decisions over the language practices over a specific territory, as a means for solving language problems in society. However, according to Cooper (1989), as language planning aims to a wide variety of different purposes, there is no single definition of language planning accepted by all authors. Instead, definitions vary according to the specific purposes and contexts involved.

Besides, language planning and language policy still stand in an unclear position and they have been cause for great confusion, as different authors use both terms indistinctly. Although they are both closely connected, that same connection is the reason for misunderstanding and the common overlapping of definitions. In fact, RotaetxeAmusategi (1990) says that all language policy leads necessarily to language planning. For practical purposes and in order to draw a clear line between language planning and language policy, we will refer to Baldauf Jr.'s (1994) definitions:

Language policy represents the decision-making process, formally stated or implicit, used to decide which languages will be taught to (or learned by) whom for what purposes (cf. Cooper 1989, LaPonce 1987). In Haugen's model, policy planning is related to 'selection and "codification" procedures.

Language planning can be defined as the implementation of language policy, to the extent practicable, across all the possible domains of language use referred to in the policy. In Haugen's model, language planning is most closely related to language cultivation that includes the subcategories of "implementation" and "elaboration."

Sichra (2003) and Baldauf Jr. (2004) highlight the same distinction identifying language policy as statements of intent and language planning as the actual implementation of the policy. Furthermore, Baldauf Jr. (2004) states that LPP is meant to influence, change or lead language practices and natural language changes within a society. Bangbose (1987) states that language planning often takes place when remedial actions are need facing language inadequacies due to social inadequacies.

4.3.3. CONDITIONS FOR LANGUAGE PLANNING.

Besides, Sichra (2003) and Cooper (1989) put forward that it is important to mention that all kinds of language planning and policy emerge in contexts of social or linguistic conflict and therefore they cannot be understood without referring to their social environment. It occurs generally in contexts where two or more languages are competing for power relations or where language becomes a means for the expansion or establishment in positions of influence or power. Thus, language is not the purpose of language planning and policy, but merely a means for other socio-political purposes. Furthermore, discourse and language in society, and therefore language planning as well, cannot be regarded as neutral

phenomena, as they are usually motivated and express certain language ideologies that are in constant flux and change according to the particular socio-historical and socio-political contexts (Blommaert, 1999; Sallabank, 2012). What is more, LPP carries assumptions about what societies consider good or bad for their people by choosing one language over another, determining official languages or language varieties, establishing the languages to be taught, etc. Thus, LPP is determined by political conditions and ideologies.

Activities, whether overtly stated or not, in the field of language planning usually respond to a public problem or socio-political purposes. Among possible public problems or purposes we can encounter national integration, political control, economic development, scientific knowledge access, new elite language rise, assimilation of indigenous or minority groups, bilingual education, massive immigration movements and work related conflicts among others.

Therefore, as the range of possible causes for language planning initiatives is so varied and heterogeneous, also the process of language planning adopts a varied and heterogeneous pattern. Thus, we cannot simply talk about one type of language planning.

4.3.4. TYPES OF LANGUAGE PLANNING.

Scholars distinguish different approaches or areas within LPP. Kloss (1969) divided LPP into corpus and status planning.

In the first place, status planning, according to Sichra (2003), Amorós (2008), Lo Bianco (2004) and Baldauf Jr. (2004) refers to defining and establishing the social position a language or a set of languages should have within a particular territory. For instance, status planning should take care of factors such as what languages should be known, learnt and taught; which variety of the languages involved, in which circumstances languages will be used, etc. Furthermore, Baldauf Jr. (2004) argues than in the case of second languages, four aspects must be addressed by status planning: "1) their status for their own communicative purposes, 2) their role as second languages – as a lingua franca or as a language

of instruction, 3) their role as immigrant or ethnic minority languages and 4) the degree to which promotion of second language impacts on linguistic or language rights".

Second, corpus planning, according to Sichra (2003), Amorós (2008), Lo Bianco (2004) and Baldauf Jr. (2004) is defined as the actions carried out at an intralinguistic level. However, corpus planning depends on and is shaped by status planning. Among the activities carried out within the scope of corpus planning we can list the establishment of graphemes, a grammar, a dictionary, and lexical development and stylistic development. Thus, corpus planning can be considered as the formal planning of languages.

Third, language-in-education planning, (Baldauf Jr., 2004) or acquisition planning (Sichra, 2003; Amorós, 2008; Lo Bianco, 2004) is defined as the actions taken to promote language learning, and thus increase the number of speakers (if so required). This area of LPP gains significance in contexts where minority languages or languages in danger are present. Moreover, although language-in-education planning occurs mostly within schools, it is not restricted to formal education, but it also can be present in the community.

Fourth, usage planning, as defined by Lo Bianco (2004), refers to efforts to extend the communicative domains of a given language. That is to say, to increase the possible contexts of language use. This level or approach of LPP is mainly considered for territories with more than one language in conflict. It is also considered for efforts on behalf of dying languages.

Fifth, prestige or image planning, as brought up by Baldauf Jr. (2004) and Lo Bianco (2004), refers to all actions taken in order to increase the prestige of the languages involved in the LPP process. Image or prestige, as well as acquisition, gains relevance in contexts of minority languages, as prestige is one of the main motivating factors in the acquisition of a language.

And finally, discourse planning is introduced by Lo Bianco (2004) as an addition to the study of language planning. By discourse planning, he means the influence and effect on people's ideologies through institutional discourse. That is

to say, discourse planning refers to the efforts of institutions to influence by means of official discourse the ideologies of population regarding particular languages.

Although the six areas may seem to be unrelated and sometimes are addressed separately, they are all interconnected and dependent upon each other. For instance, status planning is required for corpus planning and corpus planning is generally required for language-in-education planning, and it may contribute or benefit from prestige planning. Therefore, we should consider LPP from a holistic approach always keeping in mind its close relation to socio-political planning within a particular society.

Thus, all different types of language planning address different purposes within the scope language issues in a particular society.

Type of Language Planning	Purpose
Status Planning	To define and establish the social position a language or a set of languages
Corpus Planning	To change, establish or affect in any way the form (grammar, vocabulary, phonology, etc) of a language.
Acquisition Planning	To promote language learning and increase the number of speakers.
Usage Planning	To increase the possible contexts of language use.
Prestige Planning	To increase the prestige or public image of the languages.
Discourse Planning	To influence people's language ideologies through institutional discourse.

4.3.5. DIFFERENT LEVELS OF LANGUAGE PLANNING.

LPP is often carried out on a large scale –national- by governments or governmental organizations, and thus authors commonly refer to LPP as activities generally undertaken at a national official level. However, this view restricts LPP only to governments, government-authorized agencies, or other authoritative bodies, leaving aside a great number of other activities and initiatives led by minor groups or individuals, that nonetheless can be labelled as LPP. Furthermore, Cooper (1989) states that to narrow language planning to the work of official authoritative institutions is too partial and restrictive. It is important to keep in mind that language planning activities are motivated by power relations, as usually decisions related to language have an impact on the whole society.

LPP may also happen at regional or local levels, and not necessarily carried out by governmental organizations or institutions. Initiatives coming from minority language communities are common in order to revitalize their languages. The case of Euskera and Catalan in Spain during and after Franco's dictatorship and the many cases of indigenous languages in Latin America are examples of LPP outside the Governments. In this respect, planners range across different fields: community members, linguists, academies, universities, governments, non-governmental organizations, etc.

Thus, we can distinguish between marco and micro-level language planning (Cooper, 1989; Baldauf Jr., 1994). Macro-level LPP refers to the initiatives and activities undertaken on a large scale, usually by governments or governmental organizations. Baldauf Jr. and Liddicoat (2008) argue that deliberate language planning at the marco-level usually implies a direct relationship between decisions and the actual results, and leaves aside the acceptance by those who are beneficiaries of such plans. Micro-level LPP, on the other hand, refers to those initiatives carried out on a small scale, either by individual, minority groups or smaller organizations. However, these initiatives are usually not considered or classified under the scope of LPP (Baldauf Jr., 1994). Thus, Bangbose (1987) ventures that the canonical model of LPP should be modified in order to include all

language planning practices over the world, as in most developing countries, the processes related to LPP take different steps than those in developed countries.

As LPP has been defined as deliberate actions to influence language practices, either carried out on a macro or micro-level, the idea of a planned process is always present. However, covert, unplanned, or non-language planning, according to Baldauf Jr. (2004) is also a possibility and needs particular consideration by scholars and planners. He highlights the fact that the lack of a national explicit policy has a major effect on what it is being planned. Therefore, its effects are unpredictable and need to be watched carefully. Besides, planned and unplanned features often coexist and have an impact on each other. Thus, language planners always need to consider the possible effects of these.

However, it is important to discuss the concept of "unplanned" language planning. As Baldauf Jr. (1994) puts forward, in the case of LPP, the absence of a particular activity often provides information about the phenomenon itself. In cases of multilingualism, usually planning only affects some languages and others are left aside. And Truscott and Malcolm (2010) define covert or invisible (as they call it) language planning) as the effects, intended or otherwise, direct or indirect, of government policies on language use. These decisions, far from being actually "unplanned", answer to social and political variables and aims.

Moreover, "unplanned" language planning often occurs at the level of acquisition or language-in-education planning. It is common that education programmes work independently from other governmental institutions a follow no overt language policy. However, the actual implementation of such programmes – either the funding, the class hours, etc.- reflects language ideologies and answer to language planning processes, covert or unplanned as they may be.

4.3.6. LPP IN ENGLISH.

One issue that has gained great relevance in the last decades is the language planning applied to second and foreign languages. As English has become a global language spoken by more than 1500 million speakers -375 mill.as L1, 375 mill. as L2, and 750 mill. as FL approximately- across the world (Crystal, 1995; 1997), it is commonly associated to economic, political and social power. This enormous spread of the English language has also led to the emergence of new local and even non-native varieties of English, what has been called World Englishes (see Kashru (1990) and Kashru and Smith (1985, 1988). Truscott and Malcolm (2010)notices that English has gained relevance in symbolic and political terms, particularly in education and immigration contexts.García (2011)argues that the reason for English spread is in fact its global identity and its association with economic and technological progress.

The value of a language is not something easy to be measured, but the ones who use a particular language, the contexts of use and the purpose of use are indicators of the value people usually attach to languages. In fact, following Blommaert (1999), it is common that policy-makers make decisions according to factors such as the status of a language or a language variety, the use of one language over another, the symbolic quality of a language, the cultural authenticity, modernity, equality and others. This can explain the amount of research on English over other languages.

As a matter of fact, Truscott and Malcolm (2010)claim that in the Australian context, it has been the invisible or covert language policies that have put Standard Australian English literacy above all other language objectives, including the maintenance and promotion of indigenous languages, while overt language policies have unsuccessfully been carried out in relation to those minority languages. Baldauf Jr. (1994) highlights that the impact of ELF and ESL programmes on the teaching of national, minority and indigenous languages is an issue to be regarded by LPP.

4.3.7. LPP IN MINORITY LANGUAGES.

Another area that has also gained relevance is the application of language planning programmes to minority and indigenous languages(Truscott and Malcolm, 2010;Liddicoat, 2008; Ricento, 2006). Ricento (2006) highlights the influence that "bottom-up "social movements since the 1960s have had over legislators and educators to look into previously disregarded matters such as minority groups rights and languages. However, the main interest of LPP remained to be the establishment of national languages, but failed to question the historical processes that led to the socio-political division of majority and minority languages. Still today policies undermine indigenous languages and efforts aimed at their revival. Moreover, as Truscott and Malcolm (2010)put forward, assimilatory policies towards indigenous people still are present as part of language planning activities Furthermore, majority languages were and still are viewed as languages of "wider communication" while minority languages are considered as holders of "tradition" and historical identity" (May, 2006). These ideologies have been of great influence in determining the interest of LPP planners, either specialists or not.

Nonetheless, in recent years, the new approaches to LPP have taken into consideration the processes that have undermined minority groups and their languages. And as LPP has turned into a more interdisciplinary perspective, the scope has also considered processes outside the linguistic field, as language revitalisation and maintenance need to be considered necessarily as part of a wider context, meaning the demands for recognition of the rights and identity of Indigenous peoples (Truscott and Malcolm, 2010)**.** Moreover, Liddicoat (2008) argues that indigenous groups have been subject to a process of political control by dominating groups. Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) has noted a shift from overt, and usually physically punitive policies to a covert, and usually psychologically punitive policies that pursue language control and oppression.

In the case of Latin America, indigenous groups have mainly been oppressed by European groups and languages during colonial times and national identity groups since the independence movements. This conflictive relationship

has led minority groups to a position of lower economic, political, demographic and social power in contrast to the dominating groups. However, the concept of indigenous minority languages is still a subject of controversy. As already stated, it is commonly associated to situations where a dominant language, usually European, is in a position of social, economic and political power over a subordinated indigenous language. Nonetheless, superordinate/subordinate relations also happen in contexts of only European languages -Catalan and Euskera in Spain, or Sami in Scandinavia-, or they can also happen within indigenous (not European) languages where on language stands over the others.

Another issue that has sometimes not been considered is the indigenous group's viewpoint. Most LPP programmes are carried out by institutions from a superordinate/subordinate perspective, meaning by governmental agencies rather than by the communities (BrattPaulston and Heidemann, 2006; Liddicoat, 2008). This approach has led to the creation of programmes that are not well accepted by the indigenous population as they disregard the group's particular cultural practices and ideologies, and these policies that develop outside communities tend to be problematic. Liddicoat (2008) argues that local initiatives are a more legitimate than those undertaken by the government.

Current approaches from a language planning perspective to indigenous languages have focused mainly on acquisition planning. Liddicoat (2008) highlights that most work has been done as redressive action so as to remediate long periods of government neglect or active opposition that has taken indigenous languages to endangered or near extinct situations.

Liddicoat (2008) lists the three main treatments that nations carry out in relation to minority indigenous languages:

- the offering of the indigenous language as a school subject,
- the provision of vernacular literacy programmes, and
- the integration of an indigenous minority language in education as an official language of the nation state.

In relation to the first treatment, the teaching of indigenous languages as a school subject is a clear example of the acquisition planning initiatives taken by national governments. Although this programmes are intended to give recognition and higher prestige to the language in education contexts, the actual implementation of the programmes in many cases tend to be quite limited and unsuccessful (Liddicoat, 2008). Moreover, Amery (2001) puts forward that IBE programmes also have been taken as "language revival" initiatives, as an effort to reintroduce the language to younger generations of speakers. And, although language planning has taken into consideration the issue of language revival, Amery (2001) claims that the discipline, as currently understood deals mainly with issues that all languages face -choice of orthography, corpus elaboration and modernisation, etc., no matter how large or small they are. But they lack the tools and theory to deal with the problems that language revival involves.

In fact, some education and revitalization programmes that have been successful in European contexts have failed to meet their goals in Central and South America. Baldauf Jr (2004), Amorós (2008) and Romaine (2002) note the fact that LPP is unpredictable because of the lack of straightforward causal connections between theory and practice because of sociocultural differences. Thus, the same policy may lead to different results depending on the social, political, economic and cultural context.

Although LPP has shown an increased interest over minority and indigenous languages and language rights (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000), still around 4 per cent of all world languages have official status (Romaine 2002), which shows that political power still has a major impact over LPP processes as most languages still remain not officially recognised and restricted to familiar and private contexts of usage. In fact, Amery (2001) argues that language planning has been most interested in preserving and creating large languages, in many cases at the expense of smaller or minority indigenous languages.

5. LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY IN CHILE.

Chile has one national language: Spanish, and six native languages: Mapuche, Aymara, Rapa-nui, Quechua, Kaweskar and Yagán. Out of these six indigenous languages, it is important to keep in mind that Quechua has no community where the language is learned as L1, and Kaweskar and Yagán are dying languages with 12 speakers the former and 1 speaker the latter. The Mapuche language has enjoyed a privileged position among researchers as it has about 85% of the entire indigenous population in the country according to the last census.

Although Spanish is the national language, there are no official languages *de jure*, that is to say, no language is stated as official in the Chilean constitution. However, Spanish is considered as the official language *de facto*, that means it is the language in which the constitution is written, it is used by official institutions and it is the language of education. In short, Spanish is the only language required to live and communicate in Chile.

Actually, only two laws of the constitution mention language issues: Law N° 19.253, also known as Ley Indígena and Law N° 20.370, known as Ley General de Educaión (LGE). The former, in its article N° 32 states that in areas of high indigenous population density, an intercultural bilingual education programme must be developed so indigenous students can function appropriately in their original society as well as in the global society. The latter, in its article N° 3 states that the Chilean educational system is built upon the constitution and international treaties ratified by Chile. It also mentions that the system is inspired by the principles of interculturality, and the recognition and value of cultural specificity, considering language, world view and history. In its article 28, it establishes the minimum requirements for the IBE in its pre-school, primary and secondary school levels. It states that students from schools with a high density of indigenous students besides the regular educational programme should develop the knowledge to understand and express simple messages in their indigenous language in the pre-school and primary school levels; and students should be able to understand

diverse written and oral texts as well as expressing themselves orally in their indigenous languages in high-school level.

However, we need to look at the programme's background. It was implemented in 1996, and carried out by the CorporaciónNacional de DesarrolloIndígena (CONADI), and later taken over by Ministry of Education (MINEDUC). In 2010, the subject of indigenous language was made mandatory in schools where the programme is applied. Currently, by law, the Ministry of Education has determined that schools with at least 20% of indigenous students must implement the programme. The language is taught two pedagogical hours per week by intercultural educators. An intercultural educator is a non-professional native-speaker recognized and accepted by the community or organization as a sage of the culture and language. Besides, educators have the assistance of a tutor teacher, who is selected by the school and assists the educator with methodology and administration. Since 2010, the programme has gradually been applied in schools from 1st year of primary school adding one school year each year. Currently the programme is applied up to 4th year of primary school. All materials and programs are supplied by the Ministry of Education.

Besides the IBE programme, other institutional initiatives can be counted in relation to Mapudungun. CONADI, each year, funds hundreds of indigenous language courses in urban contexts at a national level (Talleres de aprendizaje de laslenguasoriginarias).

In relation to English, the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC) decided English language is the official second language taught in Chilean schools. Unlike Mapudungun, English is taught in an EFL context at a national level in all state schools starting from 5th year of primary school up to 4th year (last year) of secondary school. Furthermore, English is also mandatory in schools where the IBE programme is taking place. The language is taught 3 pedagogical hours per week from 5th to 8th grade of primary school and 4 hours from 1st to 4th year of secondary school. And in contrast to the IBE programme, the language is taught by professional teachers.

Since 2012, the demand from schools that were teaching English from 1st grade of primary school, the Ministry of Education released optional English programmes from 1st to 4th grade as an aid for those schools, and in order to keep a common programme throughout the country.

Besides the common syllabus, we can also find the English Opens Doors Programme (InglésAbrePuertas). The EODP has no influence over the syllabus, but it is in charge of offering optional training and further English courses for teachers. In addition of their work with teachers, the EODP also offers opportunities for native speakers of English to work as teacher assistants in Chile in order to increase the motivation and the opportunities for students to use the language. Also, the programme offers a range of scholarships for Chilean students to study abroad in order to increase their English competence.

Therefore, although Chile has no overt language policy, we can see a set of language planning initiatives at the level of acquisition or language-in-education planning. These initiatives are carried out as the national education programmes mentioned earlier. However, though at the level of acquisition, these initiatives embrace different levels of language planning. All types of language planning will be reviewed regarding official second language initiatives in Chile.

At the level of status planning, Chile has no official languages de jure (not even Spanish). However, taking into consideration the Ministry of Education's programmes, we can distinguish three types of languages in Chilean education. First, Spanish is considered as the official language of instruction de facto. That is to say, it is language used as means of education if all Chilean schools. Second, the official foreign language taught in all public schools is English. Third and finally, indigenous languages (mostly Mapudungun) are taught along with English as a second language in only some schools (requirements indicated previously). Nonetheless, both programmes hold completely opposite purposes. On the one hand, the IBE programme, which only works as indigenous language classes, according to its curricular bases, has the following purpose:

"[…] to prepare indigenous learners to navigate properly both in their original societies and in the global society".

In short words the purpose of indigenous language classes, is for indigenous learners to become intercultural, though most of them already are. It is expected that through the command of indigenous languages, indigenous people should be able to interact with both other indigenous and non-indigenous people.

On the other hand, the national English programme has a purpose that aims on an opposite direction:

"for students to learn and use the language as a tool to navigate in varied simple communicative situations, and mainly, to access new knowledge and answer to the global communicative demands through media and current technologies".

Thus, English is seen as a tool for global interaction and as means to access knowledge.

Then, although Mapudungun is a language actually spoken in Chile (by a reduced number of speakers), thus an L2, and English has no native speakers and no real contexts of use in Chile, thus a foreign language, both share a similar status and treatment as foreign languages. That is to say, bot Mapudungun and English are simply taught as subject at school. However, English still holds higher status by being taught at a national level in all schools while Mapudungun (and other indigenous languages) are only taught in schools with high indigenous student percentage.

At the level of corpus planning, there is also a wide gap between English and Mapudungun. On the one hand, English bears no issues. Although the English languages has many varieties either as different dialects or accents, both native and non-native, still it has a long standing written tradition. Thus, the Chilean curriculum prefers the use of Standard English.

On the other hand, the case of Mapudungun presents several of the norm-related issues common to most indigenous languages. For example, the language has not any definite official grapheme system. Discussions over grapheme systems have been taking place for several years already within the Mapuche community, but they have not yet come to a satisfactory end. Nowadays, there are at least four main different grapheme systems: Raguileo, Azümchefe (proposed by CONADI), Unified and one proposed by the Mapuche Language Commission (MLC). However, as the MINEDUC works along with CONADI, all their materials are written in the Azümchefe alphabet.

Another important issue still not settled is the standardization of the language. Mapudungun, as any natural language has different accents and dialects, and taking into consideration the issues already mentioned, it is not unexpected that still no standard variety has been chosen. However, this issue is not even mentioned in the curricular bases or Ministry programmes. But materials are commonly written following the variety spoken in the Araucania region, where the largest Mapuche communities can be found.

Therefore, although corpus planning is still a conflictive matter regarding Mapudungun, the Ministry of Education has settled the majority of these matters in relation to their programmes mostly by taking unilateral decisions.

No doubt that acquisition or language-in-learning planning is the most treated in Chile, and the most relevant in terms of MINEDUC programmes. However, in terms of education Mapudungun and English are treated differently as already mentioned.

On the one hand, English is taught in all Chilean schools, three hours per week in primary education and four hours in secondary education. And although the programme starts in 5th grade, there are intentions to move it back to 1st grade as soon as there are enough English teachers. Besides schools, the Ministry, through the English Opens Doors programme offers further training for teachers, assessment and volunteering programmes for native speakers to help teachers and give students opportunities to use the language. Furthermore, State Universities offer English pedagogy programmes in order to prepare new teachers.

And different scholarships are given each year for students to go study English abroad. On the other hand, Mapudungun is only taught in schools with at least 50% indigenous students. It is taught just 2 hours per week by non-professional educators. Besides the IBE programme, CONADI funds different indigenous language courses across the country. Thus, as we can notice, more funding is given to English education rather than Mapudungun. This issue is noted as the major problem presented by those in charge of the English programme is the lack of qualified teachers, while the major problem presented by those in charge of Mapudungun programme is the lack of resources.

On the level of usage planning, no real policies have been implemented in order to extend the contexts of use of either English or Mapudungun. However, we can only see intentions of what use is meant for both languages in the curricular bases. In the case of English, as a foreign language is meant to be used merely as a tool for global communication and access to information. Mapudungun however, is meant only to be used at a community level in familiar and informal contexts, and only by indigenous people.

In terms of prestige planning, there is no much the Ministry of Education has done. However, we can infer intentions of prestige planning due to the usage contexts meant for both languages. On the one hand, English holds a higher prestige due to its varied use in global contexts, while Mapudungun holds lower prestige because it can be only used in local informal indigenous contexts. Other differences in term of prestige between English and indigenous languages have been already discussed.

Finally, in terms of discourse planning, it is necessary to analyze in detail the different language ideologies that motivate and therefore are expressed through both English and Mapudungun programmes and through the discourse of those in charge of such programmes.

6. METHOD.

This descriptive applies a qualitative method in gathering and analysing data. The method consists in the analysis of official documents from the Ministry of education in relation to the Mapudungun and the English programmes, and analysis of interviews with the authorities of such programmes. In detail, the series of activities carried out are the ones indicated below:

- Analysis of:

  - o Bases Curriculares Inglés 1° a 6° Básico 2012.
  - o Bases Curriculares Inglés 7ºB a 4°M 2009.
  - o Mapas de Progreso del Aprendizaje 2009. Sector Idioma Extranjero: Inglés. Mapa de Progreso de Comprensión Lectora.
  - o Marco Curricular Lengua Indígena 1° a 8° Básico 2009.
  - o Respuesta del ministerio de educación a las recomendaciones formuladas por el consejo nacional de educación en el oficio n°556/2011 y oficio n°559/2011 sobre la propuesta de programas de estudio tercer año básico para lengua indígena 2012.

The analysis of the documents consisted in a review and selection of the most common ideas, notions and concepts associated to the purpose for teaching either Mapudungun or English, the language itself, and the functions of the language. These different sets of ideas were categorized and analyzed as completed categories according to metaphors, concepts and association in relation to the Chilean context and common language paradigms and ideologies.

- Interviews with:

  - o Marisol Besa y Carolina Laage (in charge of English programmes, MINEDUC).

- o Javier Quidel (in charge of the IBE programme).
- o Mauricio Huircán (in charge of revitalization programmes).

Three interviews were carried out. Mr. Javier Quidel, in charge of the IBE programme, and Mr. Mauricio Huricán, in charge of language and cultural revitalization, were interviewed during October and Mrs. Marisol Besa and Carolina Laage, both in charge of the English programme were interviewed in November. All interviews were recorded and later transcribed focusing in content rather than form. The analysis of the interviews followed a similar treatment that the analysis of the documents previously described.

7. ANALYSIS.

Upon close examination ofthe curricular bases and interviews with those in charge of the English and Mapudungun languageprogrammes we can identify a set of different motivating language ideologies that are to some degree representative of different social ideologies and paradigms of particular socio-cultural groups within the Chilean society. Moreover, these language ideologies underlie current language planning initiatives in Chile and how much money is invested in those initiatives. It is important to highlight that these ideologies are not only embodied in the programmes and curricular bases, but they are also shared through them. That is to say, the ideologies emanating from programmes are actually transmitted to those human groups the programmes are aimed at, which may end up reproducing such ideologies.

A fact that is sometimes overlooked is the reality of these different languages in Chile. On the one hand, English is a foreign language, and it is described as such in the curricular bases. That is to say, it is a language that is not spoken in any contexts in the country, but that is only spoken in other countries. On the other hand, Mapudungun is regarded as one of the languages that is spoken in Chile, which according to the curricular bases, is a multicultural and multilingual country in which different language systems converge. Thus, Mapudungun is initially pictured as one of the languages actually spoken in Chile, and that it belongs to a particular cultural group.

First of all, we need to identify the reasons that have been put forward to justify the need to teach a foreign language in Chile. On the one hand, English is portrayed as a social need. Thus the English programme is seen as a means to answer to the needs of the current globalized society. This notion is constantly repeated across the curricular bases:

> "The purpose of the subject English as a Foreign Language is to answer the different demands of global communication" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 222).

"The different changes experienced by the country as a consequence of its increasing integration into the globalized world require that all the students graduate with the essential command of a foreign language" (Mineduc, 2009a, p. 85).

"The need to respond to the requirements of Chilean society today demands that students improve their English proficiency in order to meet the new challenges of the global world"(Mineduc, 2009a, p. 86).

This same idea is put forward in the "Mapas de Progreso del Aprendizaje 2009. Sector Idioma Extranjero: Inglés. Mapa de Progreso de Comprensión Lectora":

"Command of the English language is essential in order to meet successfully the demands of XXI century society" (Mineduc, 2009b, p. 3).

Therefore, competence in the English language is repeatedly presented as a need and a requirement of the global society. Globalization is seen as a self-explanatory reason for teaching English in Chilean schools. Then, English is clearly useful and worth learning. Furthermore, in the curricular bases, it is bluntly stated that English is relevant to all purposes:

"The importance of learning English as a foreign language is recognized in all the different fields" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 222).

This is a pervasive notion that reflects common ideologies regarding English as a global language, and sometimes even as the global language of the XXI century society. Thus, learning English becomes essential and that is why English programmes seem necessary and mandatory.

On the other hand, the reality of Mapudungun is addressed in a completely different manner. Mapudungun is by no means regarded as a useful language that

is necessary or required. However, a recurrent notion related to Mapudungun (and other indigenous languages) is the idea of respect. By respect I mean that teaching of Mapudungun is explained through the notion that indigenous languages should be respected, protected, recognized, rescued and developed. This set of ideas is constantly repeated across the Ministry documents:

"[the State must] ensure children of different cultures and languages, the access to learning opportunities of indigenous languages" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 121).

"In this way, you value their existence because they are an essential part of the Chilean roots and because they must be recognized due to their integrity and development according their costumes, values and world view" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 121)

"the importance of respect and promotion of indigenous cultures" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 121).

"the promotion and value of indigenous languages" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 122).

"the contents of indigenous language programmes support cultural diversity" (Mineduc, 2012b, p. 6).

"In order to meet the challenges of the process of globalization, the culture and the language of indigenous people are supporting the construction of local identities" (Mineduc, 2012b, p. 6).

"We can appreciate the high value of the coexistence of cultural and social diversity as a possible influence not only on the formation of a national

identity, but also as a contribution to the prosperity of humanity" (Mineduc, 2012b, p. 6).

Moreover, the idea that indigenous languages should be respected, protected and even rescued is also present in the discourse of those in charge in the indigenous language programmes. As Javier Quidel, manager of the Chilean IBE programme, explains:

"Every language, due to linguistic rights is a language and has the right to develop".

"indigenous languages have the right to develop, to project themselves and to be implemented, and those that are endangered should be revitalized and rescued".

"when a language is lost, we lose a lot, not only for the people, but also for humanity. Because we lose an incredible wealth of knowledge, of understanding of the world, of everything".

Mauricio Huircán, in charge of indigenous language revitalization also mentions this idea:

"In the field of revitalization in particular, first of all, maintenance is a key element, it keeps the culture and attempts to retrieve the key elements of the language, because they have been violated languages and it is a right of all these people. A right that has been promulgated by the constitution that affirms the 149 convention, which reaffirms the indigenous law, therefore, it is a must as a country that those elements of the cultures and languages of indigenous people are not lost and remain extinguished".

In sum, indigenous languages are not being taught because they are useful or required for everyday life in today's society, but simply because it is their right to be recognized, respected and rescued if they are endangered. Actually, the interest in teaching Mapudungun, and therefore the IBE programme is not the result of the government's interest towards the teaching of indigenous languages. These initiatives are not proactive but a result of the indigenous people's demands for a culturally pertinent education. They are not a response to global needs, but a response to the demands of particular groups. Javier Quidel clearly states that:

> "In Chile, the issue of IBE is a demand of indigenous people […] it is a response to the specific demands of indigenous people".

Closely related to the notion of language and culture is the idea of an intercultural society. This concept is rarely present in the Ministry documents; however it is recurrent in the discourse of the authorities. Javier Quidel mentions the relation between the Mapuche society and the Chilean society and the value of intercultural education:

> "Intercultural [societies] involve the recognition, respect and negotiation".

> "[it is important] to recognize and validate different contexts".

> "They are people with their own systems, and in that direction we should go. And it shouldn't be understood only to indigenous people, interculturality must go in both directions".

> "Dialogue, understanding and recognition [must exist]".

> "We need to aim […] at diversity, but also from the point of view of an intercultural society. The idea is not to incorporate indigenous people in

order to be like us. The idea is to respect each other and to construct a different society".

"We need to recognize that the person who is next to us is different, with all their distinctive features and wealth".

An intercultural society is therefore understood as a society that respects and recognizes the particularities of the different cultural groups living in the territory. This idea becomes highly relevant in order to understand why Mapudungun is being taught at schools nowadays.

Therefore, we have two completely different visions of English and Mapudungun. While English is seen as a requirement for the modern society, although it is not spoken or used in any contexts in Chile, Mapudungun, though seemingly spoken in Chile, is pictured as a language that should be respected and recognized, but by no means a language that people need to be competent in. Thus, while the curricular bases of English focus on the utilitarian value of the language, curricular bases on Mapudungun focus on the cultural value of the language.

This contrast between both languages is even clearer when we analyze the way both languages are actually depicted, beyond the reasons that lie behind the implementation of the programmes.

There are two key concepts usually associated to English: the first refers to English as a tool, and the second considers the language as a key. These two concepts are closely intertwined and sometimes depend on each other. The idea of English as a tool is a pervasive notion present both in Ministry documents and in the discourse of the programme managers. Besa and Laage say that learners must:

"[use] English as a tool".

In the curricular bases we find that English:

"It is a tool of global communication" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 222).

"It is a tool to navigate in communicative situations" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 222).

"It is a tool […] to resolve communicative situations" (Mineduc, 2009a, p. 85).

"[It is a tool] that encourages active participation in higher education or in the work field" (Mineduc, 2009a, p. 85).

As it can be noticed, English is mainly considered as a communicative tool. It is seen as a tool that allows people to communicate with other people, a tool that allows and enables people to navigate in different contexts, as education and work. However, it is not merely a communicative tool, but it is also a tool that allows access to information, knowledge, work opportunities, etc.

"[English is] a tool that allowsaccess to information" (Mineduc, 2009a, p. 85).

"[English] has instrumental uses for academic, work and other purposes" (Mineduc, 2009a, p. 85).

"[English is] a tool to access information and technology and as a vehicle of communication to other realities and cultures" (Mineduc, 2009b, p. 3).

"[It permits] an active participation of our country in several areas of international scope, such as the different changes produced by the phenomenon of globalization" (Mineduc, 2009b, p. 3).

This same notion goes beyond the ministry documents and it is also present in the discourse of the authorities. In the words of Besa and Laage:

> "The [English] language [is mainly seen] as a tool for communication, but it is also [a means] to access information".

English seems to be completely deprived of any cultural value, but it is regarded merely as means to an end. English is portrayed as a tool for global communication and as tool for accessing information. This later notion leads to the conceptualization of English as a key. The idea of the English language as a key is also pervasive and recurrent in the official discourse.

The name itself of the Ministry department in charge of English related activities, InglésAbrePuertas (English Opens Doors) reflects the idea of English as a key to opportunities. This same idea is constantly repeated throughout Ministry documents:

> "[English is a] means to access further knowledge" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 222).

> "[English allows] access to new knowledge and learning processes throughout different media and technologies" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 222).

> "[English is] a means to get new information" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 223).

> "The English language is used as a means to increase the knowledge of different realities and lifestyles, and also to acknowledge and appreciate different features of our own reality" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 230).

> "[English] has wide use at the international level, in the field of communications in general and in particular in commercial, technological and scientific fields" (Mineduc, 2009a, p. 85).

"[English] extends the opportunities to access information in other areas of knowledge" (Mineduc, 2009b, p. 3).

It is possible to notice how English is a key not only to knowledge and information, but it is also a key to awide range of different opportunities. Through English, you have access to the media, to other realities and ways of life, technologies, etc. According to Besa and Laage, English allows:

"Access to information of interest to the learners".

"Access to information that they see on the web, which is what they are mostly exposed to".

"Access to every culture".

"Learning from a lot of different cultures".

Moreover, Marisol Besa and Carolina Laage claim that English is "almost as a lingua franca". It is, therefore, a language of global communication and interaction. It is a utilitarian language to connect different cultures, a vehicle of international communication. It is also a language to share and access knowledge and information worldwide. Thus, the English language is conceived as a tool for a wide range of different purposes.

On the contrary, the conceptualization of Mapudungun is completely different. Mapudungun is by no means seen as a tool, neither for communication nor for access to information. Rather, Mapudungun is commonly conceived of as a type of knowledge, rather than a language. Moreover, it is not a knowledge isolated from context, but it is a knowledge closely related to the culture of a people. In fact, language and culture are usually conceived as an inseparable unit in the case of Mapudungun. This common notion is present all across the Ministry documents:

"Language is an essential knowledge in the comprehension and appreciation of a particular culture" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 121).

"Throughout language [we can come closer]to a particular culture" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 121).

"[Through language] we can learn fundamental features of a culture, such as the circularity of time, the relationship between we as human beings and nature, the position and definition of a particular person in relation to his environment, and balance and correlation between each other" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 121).

"The construction of a language is directly related to the cultural meanings of the people who use it" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 121).

"[We need to introduce] cultural elements" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 121).

"By being bilingual, they have access to two sets of codes or forms of representation of reality" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 122).

This notion is closely related to the idea that Chile is a multicultural and multilingual country. By considering that Mapudungun is in an intercultural relation with Spanish, the language is usually associated with the Mapuche culture as indivisible elements. In fact, this is a common idea that is also present in the discourse of the programme managers.According to Quidel:

"[We need to have] language and cultural competences".

"the different knowledge that has been created there".

"cultural contents need to be incorporated in their own plans and programmes".

"cultural contents in natural spaces".

"[we need] to work on the cultural contents in the Mapuche language particularly".

"It is essential to work with the language; and throughout the language we can work with the culture. We cannot understand the notion of language without the cultural knowledge".

Furthermore, at the moment, the programme is being reformed and the new name intended for the programme is "lengua y cultura de los pueblos originarios" (language and culture of the native peoples). The new name brings even closer both ideas, as currently the focus is, or at least it is supposed to be, on the language. Nonetheless, it is possible to see how language and culture go hand in hand when it comes to indigenous languages, Mapudungun in this case. Besides, language is also conceived of as an essential element of the "identity-building process" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 122). That is to say, that Mapudungun is regarded as a key element to the Mapuche identity.

Another element typically present in Mapudungun and indigenous languages, that other European languages as English or Spanish among others lack, is the idea of ownership of the language. In the case of Mapudungun, Mauricio Huricán says that people commonly "turn to sages (kimches)" as they call them. Sages or wise men are what the Mapuche refer to as people who have a vast knowledge of the language and culture. Again, the idea of language and culture as a unit is present. Those who actually know about the language are the people who know about the culture, one idea cannot be independent of the other.

Actually, unlike English and other European languages, indigenous languages are treated differently. According to the curricular bases, "[indigenous]

language particularities must be taken into consideration". This notion follows the idea that indigenous languages are actually different from other languages and they should be addressed and taught differently.

Nonetheless, although the common idea of Mapudungun as a cultural knowledge, the language is still to some extent, seen as functional. Javier Quidel refers to the language as functional, meaning that it is used as a means of communication.

However, the idea of a language as a means of communication is totally pervasive in the case of English. It is not odd to expect such idea considering that English is already seen as a tool for communication. But the emphasis on communication as the aim of teaching the English language is a recurrent matter across the curricular bases.

"A means of communication with other realities" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 222).

"Communicative approach" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 222).

"[to develop] a communicative competence" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 223).

"[To put] emphasis on the process of communication" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 222).

"It is a means to communicate different meanings and as a tool of interaction" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 222).

"To develop the ability to communicate" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 223).

"[To be able] to communicate effectively and meaningfully" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 222).

"To move easily in contextualized communicative situations, closer to the reality" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 222).

"[To put] emphasis on comprehension and meaningful communication" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 223).

"The importance of the interactive nature of the language" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 223).

"It is a means to communicate meanings and get information" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 223).

As it can be noticed, the main purpose for teaching English is for students to be able to use it as a communicative tool. Common concepts are the communicative approach, communicative competence, meaningful communication, etc. Again, the notion of English as a means to an end is present. English is conceived of as a useful resource and, moreover, it is seen as a language that can actually be used in real contexts of communication. It is depicted as a language with real use opportunities, a language the main purpose of which is to be used as a means of interaction and communication.

Thus, English is given an instrumental value. As it is a language that can be used in real contexts of communication, as it is a tool for accessing information and knowledge and a requirement to participate in the globalized society, English is consequently associated to the acquisition of social and economic prestige and progress.

Actually, in the curricular bases, high importance is given to the "actual use of the language" in real contexts of communication. Moreover, English is considered as relevant, as it as language that is closer to the learner's reality and needs. By using English, learners can refer to common familiar topics that are meaningful to their daily lives. Learners can deal with "topics closer to their reality, environment, and age" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 227).

The English programme in general aims at a clear objective: to develop communicative competence. Thus, English again is seen as having mainly one purpose: to communicate. In the curricular bases referring to the purpose of reading, the main aim of teaching reading is to "give [students] the opportunity to access information" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 224).

Thus, through the reading competence, learners can use English as a key to access to different kinds of information, particularly due to modern media as the Internet. However, we can also see that English, as a global language has another purpose: "Bring the student closer to different cultures" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 224). This idea will be discussed later.

Along with reading, another important aspect is the writing competence, which just as the previous one has the purpose to work towards developing communicative competence. Writing allows students to use meaningfully the new technologies available to them. Writing is meant to be used for communicating in real contexts. This idea is recurrent in the curricular bases:

"A more frequent use of diverse type of technologies into communication" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 224).

"To express meaningful messages in the target language in a communicative and contextualized setting" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 224).

"The possibility to use the language in order to communicate in real and spontaneous situations" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 224).

Once more, the purpose of English is to be used in real contexts of communication. Both writing and reading are secondary to the main purpose and they work in the same direction. And along with both writing and reading we find a third element that also has the same purpose: grammar. In the curricular bases we can see that the purpose of grammar is also utilitarian:

"To help to achieve different communicative purposes" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 225).

"A support to the process of communication and a real use of the language" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 225).

Grammar is clearly also working in the direction of communicative purposes. English is therefore, in all its manifestations seen as a communicative tool and a key to knowledge and information.

On the contrary, the aims of Mapudungun are completely different. An important idea common in the curricular bases is the target audience of the language:

"Mainly in schools with indigenous students" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 121).

"In those educational units with a majority presence of girls and boys of indigenous descent" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 122).

"The use and conservation of the indigenous language, alongside Spanish in high density indigenous areas" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 121).

"It is strongly recommended its application to children of indigenous origin who do not speak the language" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 122).

Thus, the teaching of Mapudungun, unlike English, is solely aimed at the Mapuche population. That is because Mapudungun is expected to be used only in Mapuche communities. Thus, the Mapuche language is reduced to informal and local contexts of use as it is deprived of prestige and official recognition.

Nonetheless, it is important to highlight that according to the managers of the IBE programme, the Mapuche language is by no means endangered and it is actually used in Mapuche communities. As Javier Quidel puts forward:

"Essentially in schools with higher concentration of indigenous population, where language and cultural vitality is found".

"To develop the language in places where there is language and cultural vitality".

"In contexts where the language is actually being used".

That leads to the real purpose of the IBE programme, which according to the curricular bases is: "to prepare indigenous learners to navigate properly both in their original society as well as in the global society" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 121). However, following the ideas already presented, it is possible to infer that Mapudungun is not the focus of the IBE programme. And when the curricular bases refer to the global society, they actually refer to the Chilean society. Thus, it is expected that through the IBE, the Mapuche learners become able to interact properly with the Chilean society (in Spanish) and with their indigenous peers (in their own language).

Followingthis same idea, the IBE programme is understoodin a completely different way from the English programme. As it has been conceived nowadays as a language maintenance programme by the authorities, and they also consider that the culture is a key element of the programme. Javier Quidel says that in the programme it is necessary to:

"Integrate both family life and school in a complementary manner"

That is to say, school and community are supposed to be understood as units in the same way as language and culture are understood as a unit.

Also, another important point concerns the different elements to be considered in the teaching of Mapudungun. According to the curricular bases, the programme is divided in two different approaches: oral and written language.

On the one hand, the oral aspect is given great importance as a fundamental part of the teaching of indigenous languages. Although indirectly, the oral aspect also takes great significance in the case of English through the focus on communication, the oral aspect is addressed differently in the case of Mapudungun. Mapudungun (as other indigenous languages) is an oral language with no written form or fairly recent written form. Thus, the oral tradition is given ancestral value over the written expression. Therefore, the language becomes a means to pass down ancestral cultural knowledge across generations:

"A means of transmitting original knowledge" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 122).

"Language practices associated to the culture, which belong to the historical heritage of each people" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 122).

"To listen and understand traditional tales of local and territorial memory" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 122).

Mapudungun takes the role of a means to communicate culture and tradition. Thus, once again the language cannot be seen apart from culture. However, Mapudungun is also considered as a means of communication, but it is a restricted communication:

"everyday interactions, discursive practices and knowledge, and a command of the language" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 122).

"everyday relations among community members, greeting formulas, social harmony, principles of relevance facing elders and peers" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 123).

Unlike English, Mapudungun is meant to be used only at a community level among indigenous people. The possible contexts of use are reduced to informal local

contexts, in which Spanish is also a possible option. Thus, Mapudungun still remains as mainly a language to be recognized and respected, but not a language to be used.

Additionally, the written language is not meant to be used as a means of communication. Rather, it is deemed necessary because Mapuche children already have contact with Spanish, thus having command of a written form of Mapudungun is relevant and is "useful in literate communities". (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 124)

Nonetheless, there is one more issue regarding English that needs to be taken into consideration; English, as a lingua franca is a great way to get to know and develop respect for other cultures. English is not associated to any culture in particular, but it is conceived as a vehicle of communication between cultures. According to the curricular bases, the attitudes that the teaching of the English language promote are:

"To show curiosity and interest towards both their own [students'] reality and other realities, cultures, cherishing what is theirs, and extending their world knowledge" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 230).

"To show respect in front of other people, realities and cultures, recognizing their contribution and cherishing the different ways of life" (Mineduc, 2012a, p. 230).

And this idea is also present in the discourse of the authorities. According to Besa and Laage, through the English programme, a set of different attitudes should be encouraged:

"To promote students to know and value other cultures and realities different from their own".

"Due to globalization, [it is necessary] to know no only English speaking countries cultures, but any culture".

"Interest towards knowing other realities and cultures and enlarge their world view".

Therefore, English as a tool of communication also works to get to know, share, recognize and respect other cultures. It is a vehicle of intercultural communication, interaction, and knowledge sharing.

Mapudungun, on the other hand, is seen as a language restricted to the Mapuche people and a means of communication only among the indigenous population. However, another for teaching Mapudungun concerns the value of bilingualism. In the case of English, this idea is rarely mentioned, as the functionality of the language makes it unnecessary to refer to other reasons for the programme. But in the case of Mapudungun, we can find this idea in the curricular bases:

"A tool to both understand the world creatively and to adapt easily to changes" (Mineduc, 2009c, p. 122).

And this idea is also present in the discourse of the authorities when they refer to the reason for teaching Mapudungun at school. In the words of Javier Quidel:

"If I understand more cultural systems, I understand and learn other languages, that means that I have more competences that others do not have".

"[children] would have more competences to solve different problematic situations, therefore it would not be an obstacle, because interculturality allows me to develop better competences in different contexts".

Thus, the teaching of Mapudungun is justified not only by the value of the indigenous languages in the modern society, but also by the value of bilingualism at a cognitive level.

To sum up, the main ideas underlying each language programme are displayed in the chart below.

English	Mapudungun
An answer to global demands	An answer to indigenous demands
A need of globalization	Wealth of humanity
A communicative tool	Cultural knowledge
A key to knowledge and information	Identity marker
Communication	Oral tradition
Access to any culture	Restricted to Mapuche people

From the analysis of curricular bases, ministry documents and the discourse of the authorities behind the programmes, we can see that Chile is a classic example of a monoglossic and standard language culture. As Spanish is seen as the language of prestige, all other indigenous languages share a similar low prestige and have lost most contexts of use, having only some local informal contexts available that are shared with Spanish. The influence of the monoglossic culture has caused negative attitudes towards multilingualism. Thus, learning a second language is only justified if that language is useful.

In that sense, English has a high prestige, as the hypercentral language in De Swaan's linguistic system model explains And following Geeraerts (2006 [2003]) theory of language paradigm, English is usually conceived under the rationalist model. In short, English is seen as a tool for global communication and a key to access knowledge. However, these ideas would still be meaningless, but they are closely associated to social and economic progress. Thus, learning English commonly needs no reason or justification, as English is regarded as the necessary language for the XXI century and the globalized society. Furthermore, English holds high prestige because it is associated to groups of people that hold

social, economic and political power. English is considered as a lingua franca that it is not linked to any culture in particular, but it is a link between cultures.

On the contrary, Mapudungun holds little prestige as it is associated to the indigenous populations, which in Chile in general have little social, economic and political power. Thus, teaching Mapudungun is justified by the value of the indigenous languages and the notion of language rights, considering that indigenous language should be recognized, respected, protected and revitalized if needed. Nonetheless, Mapudungun seems to have no functionality whatsoever and it is conceived of mainly as a type of cultural knowledge rather than a language. And it is usually conceived linked to the culture. In De Swaan's theory, indigenous languages as Mapudungun are placed in peripheral positions holding the lowest prestige. Thus, as Mapudungun is seen as having no functionality, it is common to resort to Geeraerts' romantic model, in which Mapudungun is placed in an oppressed position both by Spanish and English, and that is why other reasons such as language rights or the cognitive value of bilingualism are used to justify the IBE programme.

Language planning initiatives regarding second languages in Chile, therefore display totally embedded different ideologies. From the perspective of corpus planning, the rationalist vision enables simple solutions regarding English, however, the idea that indigenous languages are different in terms of linguistic particularities and their necessary connection to culture means a set of issues in term of standard regulations.

In terms of status planning, the utilitarian vision of English commonly associated to social and economic progress in the globalized society allows its position as the official foreign language in Chile. However, the idea that Mapudungun is restricted solely to Mapuche communities has reduced the language to a lower status as poorly functional language that has no official recognition.

In terms of language-in-education or acquisition planning, it is also explained that the English language is positioned across the country while Mapudungun is reduced to school with high indigenous density. English is regarded as globally

useful and as a need to participate in the modern society, thus everyone needs it. However, Mapudungun, as it can be only be used in some small communities, it is only taught to the Mapuche population.

In terms of prestige planning, English holds a higher prestige as it is associated to social and economic progress, as well as it is associated to population with such advantages. Mapudungun, on the contrary, is regarded as non-functional language that only has historical and cultural value, and it is spoken by indigenous population normally associated to marginal groups in Chilean society.

In terms of usage planning, it is already stated that English is conceived of as a language that it can be, and it is actually used in real contexts of communication. It is regarded as vehicle of communication and a key to many different opportunities worldwide. Mapudung, however, can only be used in informal and local contexts in Mapuche communities, with no real use outside those contexts.

Finally, in terms of discourse planning, the ideologies presented along this analysis are the ones that are actually being shared through the programmes and English and Mapudungun classes to the Chilean and Mapuche population, reinforcing these same ideologies across the general society.

Therefore, the disparity between the English programme and IBE programme is clearly explained. Multilingualism is only justified if the second language has a central position, meaning having high prestige or high functional value, usually associated to economic and social progress. Thus, the large sums of money spent on English language learning are justified, while other languages such as Mapudungun are commonly left behind in terms of investment.

These ideologies do not only motivate the language planning initiatives but are also shared and transmitted through them to the target audience shaping their language ideologies. Therefore, these particular visions of the languages taught in Chile are being taught along with the programmes to learners, both indigenous and non-indigenous.

8. CONCLUSIONS

Although Chile has no overt language policies, covert language planning initiatives are constantly at work. These initiatives are motivated by particular language ideologies. These ideologies have an impact on all levels of language planning to

some extent, and through activities and programmes they are transmitted to the general society.

English has gained great importance in Chile. It is the official foreign language taught in all schools across the country, while Mapudungun and other indigenous languages are only taught in locations in which the indigenous communities concentrate. This policy is clearly explained when we notice that in the official discourse, English is considered as a lingua franca that is required in the modern globalized society, while Mapudungun is only meant to be used in Mapuche communities.

Also, the focus of both programmes differs abruptly. On the one hand, the focus of English is on communication, because is English is seen as a communicative tool whose main purpose is to achieve communication between different people and cultures. On the other hand, Mapudungun, due to its association to culture, is commonly even disregarded and the focus of Mapudungun classes is on culture. Mapudungun is considered a cultural knowledge rather than a language by Western standards. Therefore, programmes follow the same principles. Through the teaching of English, it is expected that all Chilean students become able to use it as a tool to access information in the media and to achieve meaningful communication with other English speaking people. But through Mapudungun, it is expected that only Mapuche students use it in their communities, mainly for simple purposes such as greetings and simple interactions, but mainly it is expected that through Mapudungun they can gain a better knowledge of their own culture.

Therefore, the choice of educators is also explained. While professional certified language teachers are needed to teach English, sages or wise men with command of their language and culture are required for the teaching Mapudungun. English, on the one hand, is deprived of any cultural content, but and it is conceived of as a vehicle to link cultures. Mapudungun, on the other hand, is linked to the Mapuche culture and cannot be conceived of independently.

In other words, two complete different language paradigms are being applied in the understanding of English, on the one hand and Mapudungun on the

other hand. While a rationalist vision is applied to English focusing on its functional value, a romantic vision is applied to Mapudungun focusing on its historic value as an indigenous language that should be respected.

Thus, we can see how the language ideologies of the authorities behind the education programmes are key to understand what initiatives are being carried out and why. And Chile is no exception.

Nonetheless, it is important to keep in mind that this research focused on the language ideologies emanating from the authorities and elites. Further research on the ideologies held by the target audience of the education programmes is needed in order to shed light on the relations established between the authorities and the general society, the target audience of these initiatives and policies.

9. REFERENCES.

Amery, R. (2001). Amery, R. (2001). Language planning and language revival.*Current issues in language planning*, *2*(2-3), 141-221.

Amorós, C. (2008). Diferentes perspectivas en torno a la planificación lingüística. In I. Olza, M. Casado, and R. González (Eds.),*Actas del XXXVII Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística (SEL).* Departamento de Lingüística hispánica y Lenguas modernas (pp. 25-37). Pamplona, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Navarra.

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and Language.*Multilingual Matters.

Baldauf, R. B, Jr. (1994). "Unplanned" language policy and planning. In W. Grab et al. (Eds.),*Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *14* (pp. 82-89). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Baldauf, R. B, Jr. (2004, May*). Language planning and policy: Recent trends, future directions.* American association of applied linguistics, Portland, Oregon.

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. &Liddicoat, A. J. (2008). Language planning in local contexts: Agents, contexts and interactions. In R. B. Baldauf Jr. & A. J. Liddicoat (Eds.), *Language planning and policy: Language planning in local contexts* (pp. 3-17). Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.

Bangbose, A. (1987). When is language planning not planning?. *Journal of West African Languages*,*17*(1), 6-14.

Bizer, G. Y. (2004).Attitudes.In C. Spielberger (Ed.),*Encyclopedia of Applied Psychology.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 245-249.

Blommaert, J. (1999). *Language ideological debates.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

BrattPaulston, C., &Heidemann, K. (2006).Language policies and the education of linguistic minorities. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 292-310). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Cameron, D. (2003). Gender and language ideologies. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 447.467). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Cooper, R. L. (1989): *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 29-45.

Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language.*Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language.*Cambridge UniversityPress.

De los Heros, S. (2008). Ideologías lingüísticas sobre el estándar y las variantes regionales del español en dos textos escolares secundarios. *Revista de lenguas para fines específicos*, 93-126.

Del Valle, J. & Gabriel-Stheeman, L. (2002). "Nationalism, hispanismo and monoglossic culture". In J. Del Valle & L. Gabriel-Stheeman (Eds.),*The Battle over Spanish between 1800 and 2000 Language ideologies and Hispanic intellectuals* (pp. 1-13).London: Routledge.

De Swaan, A. (2001). *Words of the World: The Global Language System.* Polity, Cambridge.

Dornyei, Z. &Skehan, P. (2003).Individual differences in second language learning. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.),*Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 589–630). Oxford: Blackwell.

Eagleton, T. (1991).*Ideology: An Introduction.* London: Verso.

Edwards, J. (2006), Language Attitudes*,* in K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, Vol.6, second edition (pp. 324-31). Amsterdam and Boston, MA: Elsevier.

Errington, J. (2001). Ideology.In A. Duranti(Ed.),*Key Terms in Language and Culture* (pp. 110–112). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

García, O. (2011). Language spread and its study in the 21st century. In R. Kaplan (Ed.),*Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics.*Rev. 2nd edition.(pp. 398-411). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Geeraerts, D. (2003). Cultural models of linguistic standardization. In R. Dirven, R. Frank& M. Pütz (Eds.),*Cognitive Models in Language and Thought. Ideology, Metaphors and Meanings* (pp. 25-68). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gorman, Th. P. (1973). Language allocation and language planning in a developing nation. In J. Rubin &R. Shuy (Eds.),*Language Planning: current issues and research* (pp. 72-82). Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Hall, R. A. Jr. (1951). American linguistics, 1925-1950.*ArchivumLinguisticum*, 4(1): 1-16; (2): 41-43.

Hamel, R. E. (2008). La globalizacion de las lenguas en el siglo xxi. In D. Da Hora & R. M. De Lucena (Eds.), *Política lingüística na America Latina*. 1st. edition. (pp. 45-77). Joao Pessoa: Idéia/EditoraUniversitária.

Haugen, E. (1959): Planning for a Standard Language in Modern Norway.*AnthropologicalLinguistics,* 1/3, 8-21.

Haugen, E. (1966): *Language Conflict and Language Planning: the Case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge/Mass: Cambridge University.

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

Kachru, B. B. (1990). World Englishes and applied linguistics. *Studies in Linguistic Sciences*, 19, 127–52.

Kachru, Y., Nelson, C.L., (2006). *World Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Hong Kong University Press, Hong Kong.

Kachru, B. B. & Smith, L. E. (1985).Editorial.*World Englishes*, 4, 209–12.

Kachru, B. B. & Smith, L. E. (1988). World Englishes: an integrative and cross-cultural journal of WE-ness. In E. Maxwell (Ed.), *Robert Maxwelland Pergamon Press: 40 years' serviceto science, technology and education* (pp. 674–48). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kloss, H. (1969) *Research possibilities on group bilingualism*. Québec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

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

Lagos, C., Espinoza, M., & Rojas, D. (2013).(2013): Mapudungun according to its speakers: Mapuche intellectuals and the influence of standard language ideology. *Current Issues in Language Planning.* 14(3-04): 403-418.

LaPonce, J. A. (1987). *Languages and their territories.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Liddicoat, A.J. (2007, 27-29 September). Models of national government language-in-education policy for indigenous minority language group. Paper presented at the *2007Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, Adelaide.

Lo Bianco, J. (2004). Language planning as applied linguistics. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics.* 1st ed. (pp. 738-762). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Truscott, A. & Malcolm, I. (2010).Closing the policy-practice gap: making Indigenous language policy more than empty rhetoric. In J. Hobson, K. Lowe, S. Poetsch& M. Walsh (Eds.),*Re-awakening languages: theory and practice in the revitalisation of Australia's Indigenous languages*(pp. 6-21). Sydney University Press.

May, S. (2006). Language policy and minority rights. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*(pp. 255-272). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

McGuire, W.J. (1969). The nature of attitudes and attitude change. In G.Lindzey& E. Aronson(Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology,* 3 (pp. 136-314). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

McKenzie, R. (2010). *The social psychology of English as a global language: Attitudes, awareness and identity in the Japanese context.* Dordrecht/New York: Springer.

Miller, G. A. (1950). Language engineering.*Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 22(6): 720-725.

Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization.*Journal of Sociolinguistics.* 5(4): 530-555.

Mineduc (2009a).*Bases CurricularesInglés 7ºB a 4°M.*

Mineduc (2009b). *Mapas de Progreso del Aprendizaje 2009. Sector Idioma Extranjero: Inglés. Mapa de Progreso de Comprensión Lectora.*

Mineduc (2009c). *Marco Curricular Lengua Indígena 1° a 8° Básico.*

Mineduc (2012a). *Bases Curriculares Inglés 1° a 6° Básico.*

Mineduc (2012b). *Respuesta del ministerio de educación a las recomendaciones formuladas por el consejo nacional de educación en el oficio n°556/2011 y oficio n°559/2011 sobre la propuesta de programas de estudio tercer año básico para lengua indígena.*

Noss, R. (1967). *Language Policy and Higher Education*. Vol. 3, part 2 of *Higher Education and Development in Southeast Asia*. Paris: UNESCO and the International Association of Universities.

Pan, L., & Block, D. (2011). English as a "global language" in china: An investigation into learners' and teachers' language beliefs. *System*, *39*, 391-402.

Preston, D. R. (2006).Folk linguistics. *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics,* Vol.6, second edition, 521–533.doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/01501-7

Ricento, T. (2006). Language policy: Theory and practice - an introduction. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 10-23). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Romaine, S. (2002).The Impact of Language Policy on Endangered Languages. International Journal on Multicultural Societies, Vol. 4, No. 2

RotaetxeAmusategi, K. (1990).*Sociolingüística*. Madrid: Síntesis.

Rumsey, A. (1990). Wording, Meaning and Linguistic Ideology.*American Anthropologist 92*, 346-361.

Sallabank, J (2012). Diversity and language policy for endangered languages.In B. Spolsky (Ed.),*Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seargeant, P. (2009). *The idea of english in japan: Ideology and the evolution of a global language.* (1st ed.). Bristol, UK: Cromwell PressGroup.

Sichra, I. (2003). *¿Qué hacemos para las lenguas indígenas? ¿Qué podemos hacer? ¿Qué debemos hacer? La situación sociolingüística en América Latina y la planificación lingüística.* Seminario Mineduc - UNAP: Contexto sociolingüístico en comunidades escolares indígenas de Chile. Iquique: Universidad Arturo Prat.

Siegel, J. (2006). Language ideologies and the education of speakers of marginalized language varieties: Adopting a critical awareness approach. *Linguistics and Education.* 17: 157-174.

Silverstein, M. (1979). Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology, in P. R. Clyne, W. F. Hanks&C. L. Hofbauer (Eds.),*The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels* (pp. 193-247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Silverstein, M. (1981).*Sociolinguistic working paper: the limits of awareness.* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000).*Linguistic Genocide in Education – Or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?*Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Van Dijk, T. (1998). *Ideology.A multidisciplinary approach.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Van Dijk, T. (2000).*Ideology and Discourse.A Multidisciplinary Introduction.*English version of an internet course for the UniversitatOberta de Catalunya (UOC).

Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard& P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 3-47). New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, Inc.

APPENDIX A: ORIGINAL QUOTES

The following quotes belong both to the ministry documents and selected segments from the interviews with the authorities. The quotes are displayed according to the order of appearance in section 7: Analysis.

The following quotes are segments taken from ministry documents.

"el propósito de la asignatura Idioma Extranjero Inglés es[…] responder a las demandas de comunicación global" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 222).

"Los cambios que ha experimentado el país como resultado de su creciente inserción en el mundo globalizado exigen que alumnos y alumnas egresen con un manejo de un idioma extranjero" (Mineduc 2009a, p. 85).

"la necesidad de responder a los requerimientos de la sociedad chilena de hoy, que demanda que los y las estudiantes mejoren su nivel de inglés para enfrentar los desafíos del mundo global" (Mineduc 2009a, p. 86).

"el conocimiento del idioma inglés [es] fundamental para enfrentar con éxito las demandas de la sociedad del siglo XXI" (Mineduc 2009b, p. 3).

"La relevancia del aprendizaje del idioma inglés es reconocida en todos los ámbitos" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 222).

"[el Estado debe] asegurar a niños y niñas de culturas y lenguas diferentes, el acceso a oportunidades de aprendizaje de las lenguas indígenas" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 121).

"De este modo, se valora su existencia por ser parte esencial de las raíces de la Nación chilena y por el reconocimiento a su integridad y desarrollo, de acuerdo consus costumbres, valores y cosmovisión" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 121).

"La importancia del respeto y promoción de las Culturas Indígenas" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 121).

"[…] promoción y valoración de las lenguas Indígenas" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 122).

"Los contenidos de los programas de Lengua Indígena refuerzan la diversidad cultural" (Mineduc 2012b, p. 6).

"Frente al fenómeno de globalización, la cultura, la lengua de los pueblos originarios son un soporte a la construcción de identidades locales" (Mineduc 2012b, p. 6).

"se aprecia el alto valor de la coexistencia de la diversidad cultural y social que son aportes no solo a la conformación de una identidad nacional, sino también como contribución a la riqueza de la humanidad" (Mineduc 2012b, p. 6).

The following quotes are segments taken from the interview with Javier Quidel.

"Toda lengua por derecho lingüístico es un idioma y tiene derecho a desarrollarse".

"las lenguas indígenas tienen derecho a desarrollarse, a proyectarse, a implementarse, y aquellas que se están perdiendo a revitalizarse, a rescatarse".

"cuando se pierde una lengua se pierde mucho, no solamente para el pueblo, para la humanidad. Porque perdemos una riqueza increíble de conocimiento, de la comprensión del mundo, de todo".

The following quote is a segment taken from the interview with Mauricio Huircán.

"En el ámbito de la revitalización en particular, primero, el mantenimiento, que se mantenga que se logre recuperar la cultura y elementos de la lengua, porque son lenguas vulneradas y es un derecho que tienen los pueblos, que lo afirma la constitución, que lo afirma el convenio 149, que lo reafirma la ley indígena, entonces es un deber como país que esos elementos de las culturas y de las lenguas de los pueblos indígenas, no se pierdan y sigan extinguiéndose".

The following quotes are segments taken from the interview with Javier Quidel.

"En Chile, el tema de la EIB es una demanda de los pueblos indígenas […] es una respuesta a las demandas concretas que los pueblos indígenas".

"La intercultural es el reconocimiento, el respeto y la negociación".

"[es importante] reconocer y validar otros espacios".

"Ellos son un pueblo con sistemas propios, y hacia ahí [la EIB] se debe ir abriendo. Y no se debe entender sólo para pueblos indígenas, la interculturalidad debe ser de doble vía".

"[debe existir] el diálogo, el entendimiento, el reconocimiento".

"Tenemos que apuntar hacia […] la diversidad, pero también bajo el enfoque de la interculturalidad. No es incorporar a los indígenas a este sistema para que sean igual que yo. La idea es que se respete y se construya una sociedad distinta".

"hay reconocer al otro como otro distinto, con todas sus particularidades y riquezas".

The following quote is a segment taken from the interview with Marisol Besa and Carolina Laage.

"Usar el inglés como una herramienta".

The following quotes are segments taken from ministry documents.

"Es una herramienta de comunicación global" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 222).

"Herramienta para desenvolverse en situaciones comunicativas" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 222).

"Herramienta […] para resolver situaciones comunicativas" (Mineduc 2009a, p. 85).

"[Herramienta] que favorezca[una] participación activa en la educación superior o en el mundo laboral" (Mineduc 2009a, p. 85).

"Herramienta que les permita acceder a la información" (Mineduc 2009a, p. 85).

"Propósitos de orden instrumental para fines académicos, laborales y otros propios del mundo juvenil" (Mineduc 2009a, p. 85).

"Herramienta de acceso a la información y a la tecnología y como un vehículo de comunicación a otras realidades y culturas" (Mineduc 2009b, p. 3).

"[Permite] la participación activa de nuestro país en diversas áreas del ámbito internacional, así como los cambios producidos por los fenómenos de la globalización" (Mineduc 2009b, p. 3).

The following quote is a segment taken from the interview with Marisol Besa and Carolina Laage.

"el idioma como herramienta para, principalmente comunicarse, pero también para adquirir información".

The following quotes are segments taken from ministry documents.

"una vía de acceso a mayores conocimientos" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 222).

"acceder a nuevos conocimientos y aprendizajes […] a través de los medios y tecnologías actuales" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 222).

"un medio para […] adquirir información" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 223).

"el idioma inglés se utilice como un medio para ampliar el conocimiento de otras realidades y formas de vida, y para conocer y valorar aspectos de la propia realidad" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 230).

"Amplio uso a nivel internacional, en el ámbito de las comunicaciones en general y, en particular, en los ámbitos comercial, tecnológico y científico" (Mineduc 2009a, p. 85).

"Amplía las oportunidades de acceso a la información en otras áreas de estudio" (Mineduc 2009b, p. 3).

The following quotes are segments taken from the interview with Marisol Besa and Carolina Laage.

"Acceder a información de interés para los alumnos".

"Acceso a información que ven sobre todo en la web, que es a lo que están más expuestos".

"Acceso a cualquier cultura".

"Permite aprender de montones de culturas".

The following quotes are segments taken from ministry documents.

"La lengua es un conocimiento esencial en la comprensión y valoración de la cultura" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 121).

"a través de la lengua, [aproximarse] a la cultura" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 121).

"Se pueden aprender aspectos fundamentales de una cultura, tales como la circularidad del tiempo, la relación de parte a todo con la naturaleza, la posición y definición de la persona en relación con el entorno, la armonía entre pares" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 121).

"La construcción de un idioma se relaciona directamente con las significaciones culturales del pueblo que la utiliza" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 121).

"Incorporando elementos culturales" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 121).

"Al ser bilingües, poseen acceso a dos sistemas de códigos o formas de representación de la realidad" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 122).

The following quotes are segments taken from the interview with Javier Quidel.

"[Poseer] competencias lingüísticas y culturales".

"los conocimientos que ahí se han construido".

"los contenidos culturales para que se incorporen en los planes y programas propios".

"contenidos culturales en los espacios naturales".

"trabajar los contenidos culturales en lengua mapuche particularmente".

"Lo fundamental es el trabajo de la lengua, y a través de la lengua la cultura. No puede ir la lengua sin conocimientos culturales".

Thefollowingquotes are segmentstakenfromministrydocuments.

"Medio de comunicación con otras realidades" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 222).

"Enfoque comunicativo" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 222).

"[desarrollar] la competencia comunicativa" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 223).

"[Poner] el énfasis en la comunicación" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 222).

"Un medio para comunicar significados y una herramienta de interacción" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 222).

"Desarrollar la capacidad de comunicarse" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 223).

"[Poder] comunicarse en forma efectiva y significativa" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 222).

"Desenvolverse en situaciones comunicativas contextualizadas, cercanas a la realidad" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 222).

"Énfasis en la comprensión y la comunicación significativa" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 223).

"Importancia de la naturaleza interactiva del idioma" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 223).

"Medio para comunicar significados y adquirir información" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 223).

"Uso más frecuente de diversas tecnologías para la comunicación" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 224).

"Expresar mensajes significativos en el idioma en forma comunicativa y contextualizada" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 224).

"Posibilidad de usar el idioma para comunicarse en situaciones reales" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 224).

"Contribuir a alcanzar los propósitos comunicativos" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 225).

"Apoyo a la comunicación y al uso real del idioma" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 225).

"principalmente en los establecimientoscon matrícula escolar indígena" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 121).

"en aquellas unidades educativas con presencia mayoritaria de niñas y niños de ascendencia indígena" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 122).

"Uso y conservación de los idiomas indígenas, junto al español en las áreas de alta densidad indígena" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 121).

"Se recomienda especialmente su aplicación a niñas y niños de ascendencia indígena que no hablan la lengua" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 122).

The following quotes are segments taken from the interview with Javier Quidel.

"Fundamentalmente con las escuelas donde hay mayor concentración de población indígena, donde hay vitalidad lingüística y cultural".

"Desarrollar de la lengua donde hay vitalidad lingüística y cultural".

"En espacios donde efectivamente se está hablando la lengua".

"integrar la vida familiar y la escuela de manera complementaria".

The following quotes are segments taken from ministry documents.

"Forma de transmisión del conocimiento ancestral" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 122).

"Prácticas lingüísticas asociadas a la cultura, que forman parte del patrimonio histórico de cada pueblo" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 122).

"Escuchar y comprender relatos fundacionales de la memoria local y territorial" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 122).

"Interacciones cotidianas, prácticas discursivas y conocimiento y manejo de la lengua" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 122).

"relaciones cotidianas entre las personas de una comunidad, formas de saludos, de convivencia, los principios de pertinencia ante los mayores y los pares" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 123).

"Demostrar curiosidad e interés por conocer tanto su propia realidad como otras realidades y culturas, valorando lo propio y ampliando su conocimiento de mundo" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 230).

"Demostrar respeto ante otras personas, realidades o culturas, reconociendo sus aportes y valorando la diversidad de modos de vida" (Mineduc 2012a, p. 230).

The following quotes are segments taken from the interview with Marisol Besa and Carolina Laage.

"Promover que los estudiantes conozcan y valoren otras culturas y realidades distintas de las propias".

"Debido a la globalización, conocer no sólo culturas de países de habla inglesa sino que cualquier cultura".

"Interés por conocer otras realidades y culturas y ampliar su visión del mundo".

The following quote is a segmenttaken from ministry documents.

"Herramientas tanto para entender creativamente el mundo en que viven, como para adaptarse con mayor facilidad a los cambios" (Mineduc 2009c, p. 122).

The following quotes are segments taken from the interview with Javier Quidel.

"si yo comprendo más sistemas culturales, entiendo y aprendo otras lenguas, significa que tengo mayores competencias que el otro que no lo tiene".

"[los niños] tendrían mayores competencias para resolver distintas situaciones problemáticas, por tanto no sería obstáculo, porque la interculturalidad me abre, me permite, y puedo desarrollar mayores competencias en distintos contextos".