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Abstract: This article analyzes the cultural relevance of the Program of Intercultural Bilingual Education (PBIE) in the Region of La Araucanía (southern Chile), emphasizing the perspective of teachers, traditional educators and Mapuche parents. The methodology is qualitative, with an ethnographic and participatory orientation. The results of this study show consensus among the actors involved, regarding the systematic obscuring of the logics of meaning that guide the actions of Mapuche people, as well as their agency, which, in turn, would explain their shared perception of the program’s lack of cultural relevance and their feelings of not being sufficiently considered in the setting into motion of PBIE. We hope this work can serve as a contribution to the inclusion of interculturality in teacher training and innovation in the design of public policies for indigenous development in our country.
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Resumen: Se analiza la pertinencia cultural de la implementación del Programa de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe (PEIB), en escuelas de La Araucanía en el sur de Chile, desde la perspectiva de docentes, educadores tradicionales y adultos mapuche, quienes son destinatarios de esta política pública. La metodología es de carácter cualitativo y de orientación etnográfica y participativa. Los resultados muestran que existe una percepción compartida sobre la falta de pertinencia cultural que tiene para ellos la actual implementación del PEIB, así como el sentimiento de no haber sido considerados suficientemente en sus modos de instalación. Se constata la sistemática invisibilización de las lógicas de sentido que orientan el accionar de las personas mapuche y el no reconocimiento de su agencia. Se espera que este trabajo pueda contribuir a la inclusión de la interculturalidad en la formación docente y al rediseño de la implementación de políticas públicas de educación y desarrollo indígena en nuestro país.
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Introduction

This article is part of a research,\textsuperscript{1} whose purpose is to contribute to the cultural relevance of setting up the Program of Intercultural Bilingual Education (PEIB) in Chile. The study has as a main objective to jointly build proposals and recommendations to improve the cultural relevance of setting up PEIB policies in schools in the Region of La Araucanía, in the south of the country, by means of acknowledging the teachers’, traditional educators’\textsuperscript{2} and Mapuche\textsuperscript{3} guardians’\textsuperscript{4} perceptions on such relevance in schools where most students are indigenous.

Work focuses on gathering evidence on these perceptions with due contextualization, as it is always assumed that knowledge is built in relation to the environment and as stated by Habermas (1989), paradigms in social sciences are always internally connected to the social context where they come from and wherein operate. It is in the relational process where such knowledge emerges that such knowledge is rooted and in the social history of the subject who holds such knowledge (Toren, 1999; Varela, 1990); or else, in Maturana’s (1990: 109) words: “knowledge is always acquired in coexistence [...] knowledge always has to do with actions”.

In this context, the present study intends that the reformulation of Mapuche participants’ experience in the development of a methodological joint-construction process —guided by non-Mapuche researchers— allows gathering and making visible their valorizations and expectations, as regards the implementation of PEIB in their schools, from their own ways of signification and order of senses, assuming that, in an intercultural relationship, “procedures need to be articulated to the reflexive ways operating in each culture” (Salas, 2013: 66).

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1} Pertaining to the research line on Diversity and Interculturality of the program of Doctorate in Education of Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación (UMCE), funded by the Ministry of Education of Chile, through Fund for Research and Development in Education (Project FONIDE F811345, assigned via competition 2013).
\textsuperscript{2} As a part of PEIB implementation, the traditional educator is a person chosen by the indigenous community they belong to, to take the teaching of their culture to school, making a duo with the teacher to teach the Learning sector of Indigenous Language, incorporated to the national curriculum in 2010, at schools with indigenous students.
\textsuperscript{3} Mapuche means “people of the land”.
\textsuperscript{4} Guardian in Chile is an adult responsible for the student before the school. By and large, either parent of the child.
\end{flushleft}
We will succinctly present the epistemological stance of the study, its background, context and methodology. In like manner, the most relevant results as regards the participants’ valuations and expectations, as well as the projections of the present work in the set of efforts in Chile, and in general in Latin America, to improve the cultural relevance of the programs in education and indigenous development.

Conceptual and epistemological frame

For the present study, we assume the reconceptualization proposed by Long (1988 and 1996) as regards the notions of knowledge, power and agency, which implies focusing on social actors, paying attention to how they interact in their lifeworlds, to analyze the social construction of knowledge and disputes, negotiations and consensuses that establish around them and whose contexts the author above calls “arenas”. These arenas, even being spatially and temporally distant, influence on the macro-representations present in local practices.

Consequently, the close relation of theoretical and pragmatic knowledge is considered to understand the actors’ rationalities in the various social arenas in which they establish negotiations or dispute meanings in their knowledge construction process. This aspect is particularly relevant, as the Mapuche individuals who participated in the study largely live in indigenous communities, while traditional teachers and educators work in rural schools in their communities or in nearby ones with a majority of Mapuche students.

The setting up of educational and developmental projects from public policies focused on groups that belong to other cultures than the dominant will always involve tensions between diverse interests and necessarily imply spaces for intersection or interphase between the spheres of life.

Therefore, it is a priority, in methodological terms, to pay attention to the production of meanings that takes place in daily life, since the local practices include macro-representations influenced by spatially and temporally distant arenas and supported on the senses and meanings people attribute them as a result of their everyday processes, this way they are only understandable in concrete contexts.

As Long and Arce (1992: 9) point out: “the focus on the actor requires a complete analysis of the ways in which various social actors manage and interpret new elements in their lifeworlds, comprehending the organization, strategies and interpretative elements involved”. Here, the notion of
knowledge is that both scientific and non-scientific knowledge —or daily life knowledge— is built by means of the modes in which people categorize, codify, process and provide their experiences with meaning.

Therefore, knowledge develops on the basis of the existing sense frameworks and is built as a result of a “large number of decisions and selective incorporations of ideas, beliefs and previous images, but at once destructive of other possible spheres of sense and understanding” (Long y Arce, 1992: 211). This is to say, this construction involves ways to build the world and, simultaneously, it also excludes other ways of doing it, this is why understanding how the processes of production, reproduction and transformation of knowledge has to be located in the people’s life worlds, which is a central consideration in the present study.

The proposals of standardized solutions aimed at the people who belong to minority cultures are defined from the expert knowledge of the hegemonic culture, often not paying attention to the conflicts produced between the role of expert knowledge and the role of local knowledge, decreasing the importance of the latter (Hobart, 1993). This would imply the generation of systems of ignorance regarding the others, the subjects of intervention, in circumstances that local knowledge are the people’s potential agencies and the agent subject is the subject of practice, the subject of social action (Venegas, 2017).

In this sense, the participants’ sociohistorical and sociopolitical aspects are taken into account to try to fully understand the projections of their potential agencies and bring to light the implications that the social construction of knowledge and the ignorance regarding “the others” have (Quarles, 1993), without suppressing or hiding the conflict that historically has remained between Mapuche people and the Chilean State, from the dispossession experienced by this people in the past by such State (Bengoa, 1999; Pinto, 2012; Torres et al., 2016).

Background and context

At global level, Chile holds one of the highest indexes of school segregation (Concha, 2011). The Chilean society is not characterized by gather diversity, mainly regarding indigenous peoples, as demonstrated by a number of studies and surveys (Observatorio Ciudadano, 2013; Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo, 2013; Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos, 2011; Naciones Unidas, 2009; Aymerich et al., 2003).

Long and Arce’s quotations are the authors’ translations.
To contribute to modify the collective image that the dominant society has regarding indigenous people and to bridge the large educational gaps in Chile, it is considered that the comprehension and valuing of diversity must be two of the fundamental supports in education, and especially in teachers’ training.

The results of our previous studies in culturally differed school and familial contexts, which at once allowed noticing the high agency potential of Mapuche and Aymaras\(^6\) individuals who participated, verified the logic that guide the makings of the families in indigenous communities are different and sometimes opposed to those in the school culture (Ibáñez et al., 2014 and 2009). This would explain that the autonomy and capacity to solve problems that children learn in their primary socialization processes gradually blur in the classroom and that schools with indigenous majority are the ones with the lowest results in national schools measurements (Mineduc, 2015; Webb et al., 2017).

The ignorance and lack of comprehension of these particular cultural logics would be the basis to contest the cultural relevance of setting up education and development programs for indigenous populations by the very recipients (Díaz and Druker, 2007; Lagos, 2015; Mineduc/Unicef, 2012; Mineduc, 2011; Organizaciones Territoriales Mapuche, 2006).

The above is a challenge to train teachers, as the indigenous population in Chile accounts for about one million eight hundred individuals, of which more than 87% corresponds to Mapuche population, largely residing in the capital city and in La Araucanía Region (32%).\(^7\) It is worth pointing out that such region has the highest poverty indexes in the country (Ministerio de Desarrollo Social, 2016) and one of the poorest results in education measurements (Mineduc, 2015). The Mapuche population in this region holds lower human development than the non-indigenous, which configures an utterly critical situation within the context of the country (Gobierno de Chile-Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo, PNUD, 2009, Universidad de La Frontera, 2015), added to the sociopolitical tension existing for long time in the region between Mapuche people and the Chilean State, which recently has only worsened.

With the recognition that from the restoration of democracy, especially in recent years, efforts have been made to increase the equality

\(^6\) Aymara people are the second most numerous indigenous group in Chile, after Mapuche, and mainly live in the northern part of the country.

\(^7\) Results of 2012 Census were published and later retracted for revision.
in the relations with the indigenous Chilean population,\(^8\) while the official discourse has been charged with the so called “development with identity” (Fondo Indígena, 2007), stressing what the dominant culture understands as participation and accountability, the programs set into motion from the public policy seem to exclude the ancestral ways to communally manage common natural resources (Torres \textit{et al.}, 2016) and do not sufficiently consider intangible cultural aspects, particular symbolical dimensions and the fact that the logics that orient the activities of original peoples and their traditional conceptions are different.

Therefore, it was frequent that relations, actions and objects that we used the same words for, mean something else for them, partly or wholly different meanings and senses (Agurto, 2004; Bartolomé, 1997; Ibáñez, 2003; Ibáñez \textit{et al.}, 2012; Quilaqueo, 2007). This adds to the fact that the conception of symbolic and actual time is different from the one in the dominant culture, which is noticed in the temporariness of interactions, in which each party “waits” for the other, never hurries or interrupts Serrano and Rojas, 2003; Ibáñez, 2006).

By and large, intercultural education policies are conflicted by the general education policies, which in Chile seem to have the purpose of standardizing everything, under a paradigm that does not consider diverse cultural realities and that neglects the current theoretical development and the actual needs of the original peoples (Carvajal and Dresdner, 2013). All the above influences on the scarce cultural pertinence that the ways of implementing the education and development programs for indigenous populations have on their recipients (Gobierno de Chile-PNUD, 2009).

PEIB was set up as a public policy dependent on the Ministry of Education (Mineduc) in 1996, supported on Law No. 19253 of 1993, known as Indigenous Law. In 2001, an agreement is established with the Inter-American Development Bank to foster the development of indigenous communities in Chile. As of 2010, PEIB moves to the Division of General Education of Mineduc and relieves two components: strengthening of the indigenous language sector and interculturality at school.

\(^8\) One of the latest initiatives is Program of Indigenous Fostering and Development, 2016, funded by the inter-American Development Bank, whose general objective is to increase the incomes of Chilean indigenous households. On the other side, President Bachelet’s Government Program includes the constitutional recognition of indigenous peoples, as well as their political representation in the Congress. The presidential commission in charge of studying and present proposals to meet these two objectives delivered its report in 2017.
The aim of PEIB is to preserve the original peoples’ languages and cultures and contribute to educate intercultural citizens. In the context of this program and as one of its components, in 2010, the Sector of Indigenous Language Learning (SLI) is incorporated into the national curriculum with a compulsory nature for schools with an indigenous enrolment over 50% and annually progressive to reach 20% of the enrolment; its inclusion by school grade was also progressive, extending it to 8th grade, which is the last basic school level as of 2016.

For this implementation, the pedagogical couples are set up, with which the teacher in charge of the course, who performs the role of mentor teacher, and the traditional educator, an individual speaker of an indigenous language previously approved by the community, mainly from the consideration that such person has the ancestral cultural wisdom and knowledge of their people, as well as the capability to transmit such knowledge.

The Araucanía Region is the one with the largest number of schools comprised in PEIB and which as of 2010 have had to incorporate SLI in their curriculum. The inclusion of traditional educators to address together with the teachers the new curricular sector might generate an unseen space for intercultural dialogue, since traditional educators have dual validation: on the one side, as previously stated, they are validated by their own communities, and on the other, they are validated at the school, for actually being the object of such selection, which also implies holding formal training recognized by the hegemonic culture.

Moreover, given the average age of teachers and Mapuche traditional educators hired in La Araucanía (Acuña, 2012), it can be supposed that a part of them are also guardians in the same or other schools, becoming what we have called the cultural-contextual triad, as an unseen group of educational actors, which by means of their agency may contribute to build a new path to enable set up the interculturality of right in Chilean schools (Ibáñez, 2015).

However, this new scenario for intercultural education requires specific supports to overcome the problems already detected in the earliest studies in this regard: lack of support for the traditional educator by the mentor teacher, insufficient appropriateness in the work guides delivered by PEIB, tendency to assume that the traditional educator must behave as a teacher, the distance between school and local community (Acuña, 2012; Mineduc/Unicef, 2012) and as pointed out by Quintrileo et al. (2013), the fact that the curricular activities proposed in SLI would tend to promote an static and stereotyped indigenous identity.
In this context, the present research points at disclosing the actors’ perceptions so that their conceptualizations, valorizations and expectations contribute to the cultural relevance, as they understand it, that the implementation of the public policy which is addressed to them must have.

Methodological aspects

The investigative process is conceived as a reflexive process of constant formulation and reformulation (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1994), in which data gathered are understood as a historic cultural process, whose specificity is given by the particularities of the time and space where they occur (Goetz and Le Compte, 1998).

The study group was selected by means of purposive sampling on the basis of specific criteria (Flick, 2004), which include the interest in participating and self-identification as Mapuche. Additionally, the criterion for tutors was to have at least a child at a SLI school, while for teachers and traditional educators, to be hired in a school of the region.

Owing to space reasons, the main aspects of the methodology employed are succinctly described, which is framed in a qualitative approach, ethnographic and participatory orientation, whose focus is the co-construction process between researchers and researched. The conceptions, valorizations and expectations of the guardians, teachers and Mapuche traditional educators on the implementation of PEIB in general and SLI in particular are analyzed and compared; these individuals are part of various schools in La Araucanía region, most of them rural. The study group comprises 30 people: 22 women and 8 men —residing in eight communes of the region—, of which 10 are teachers, 9 traditional educators —all of them experienced in PEIB— and 9 guardians. Teachers and traditional educators work in 10 different schools, most of them rural and 14 make pedagogical couples. Guardians belong to seven of these schools. The ethical protocol is kept and data are gathered in conversations, visits, semi-structured individual interviews, conversation groups by territorial closeness and co-construction workshops with all the participants.

In these workshops, consensuses are discussed, prioritized, produced and established on analysis categories and partial results in view of ensuring their cultural pertinence from the Mapuche participants’ standpoint.

---

9 For details about the methodological design see the Final Report of Research, in Mineduc (2011a).
In correspondence with the purposes and goals of the study, the analysis unit is composed of valorizations and expectations of the various actors as regards of what they consider “cultural relevance” in the implementation of PEIB, before and after the incorporation of SLI into the curriculum, which is operationalized in dimensions that take contextual aspects into consideration. The analysis is carried out in consecutive stages and focuses on disclosing the meanings and senses the participants have regarding the object of study, on establishing what is shared in each dimension and reach consensus with the participants, on the co-construction workshops, the main contents and their prioritization.

The priority aspects that give an account of the participants’ frames of meaning are divided for the analysis into: 1) conceptual, referred to ways of thinking; and, 2) the relationship styles mainly regarding makings, considering the pedagogical relation in the classroom between teacher-traditional educator-student and the participation and role of community in intercultural education. At a second analysis level, the results from both priority aspects were systematized for all cases and a correspondence analysis by role and gender of the participants is carried out.

Valorizations and expectations. Main results

Valorizations regarding PEIB set up: the participants in the study consider that PEIB appears as an answer to their historic demands, as a space conquered by Mapuche people, an issue which has been ignored in the official discourse (Samaniego, 2005), in which it appears rather as an initiative from the State to include all the citizenry, without relieving the Mapuche people agency in the setting up of intercultural education in Chile. The following expressions account for the above:

[...] because this was not proposed by the State, these leaders had to knock on doors, had to be demanding so that the topic of Mapuche education was considered in traditional State education, [...] and think of the years that had to pass so that this topic has just appeared (traditional educator, interview, April 2014, Temulemu).

[...] even if it is true, this battle was won and become Mapudungun and reached the school, and I believe there is some gain there, that gain has to be potentiated (traditional educator, co-construction workshop, August 2014, Temuco).

[...] well, we the Mapuche fought for it, it is known this didn’t come for free, it has been said for more than 100 years now [...] more than 100 years, and just now (traditional educator, co-construction workshop, October, 2014, Temulemu).
Valorizations regarding school and Mapuche education: despite the existing consensus about the disregard for intercultural education, school is deemed as a space for such education, however there is a clear distinction between intercultural education and Mapuche education: school is in charge of intercultural education; Mapuche education corresponds to the family and community, so its details are not discussed in other spaces:

I am talking about school, I’m not referring to Mapuche education (teacher, co-construction workshop, August 2014, Temuco).

[…] do we want Mapuche education or bilingual intercultural education? […] if we want Mapuche education, then let us leave school and stay at the communities having Mapuche education (teacher, co-construction workshop, August 2014, Temuco).

If we talk about Mapuche education there is another logic, it has another context, and which is somewhere else, which is not the school, but the community. And if we talk about bilingual intercultural education its logic is in a school, inside the State structure, inside State education (teacher, co-construction workshop, August 2014, Temuco).

According to Long (1988; Long and Arce, 1992), it is possible to identify two distinct dynamics of knowledge production with their consequential ignorance production systems: on the one side, schools is valorized in function of its traditional role to deliver a type of knowledge, associated to the hegemonic culture, considered the only possible for the students’ successful development in the dominant society. This process, owing to its proper nature, excludes other knowledge part of the life world of Mapuche people and their microhistory (Toren, 1999; Quarles, 1993), turning such knowledge into systems of ignorance and excluding them from the school space.

It is worth underscoring, albeit, there is a positive valorization of intercultural education, which would refer its potential as interstitial space open to knowledge and logics of meaning, previously excluded from the school contexts.

Conversely, as an opposition to what could be inferred from the valorization of intercultural education as a concept, it is considered there is proper and fundamental knowledge, in the frame of Mapuche culture, which is part of an own episteme, of logics and meanings of the world that are represented as essentially separated from school knowledge.

The idea of essence is important here, as it refers to the identification of a difference in the nature of the Mapuche community and family spaces with those the school settles or may settle. This way, school is seen as a space where, because of its nature, it is impossible to build key knowledge on
Mapuche culture. In this context, the recognition of a Mapuche knowledge system also implies the generation of ignorance systems in relation to the hegemonic culture, whose values are stated in the so called school culture.

*Valorizations regarding SLI:* even if SLI is implemented in the context of PEIB as one of its components, various actors perceive them as different programs at similar levels. This is, from the way these people categorize and provide their experiences with meaning (Long and Arce, 1992), SLI is not for them a PEIB component, but replaces it: “PEIB concluded and now it is the Sector of Indigenous Language” (teacher, interview, July 2014, Chol Chol), which also accounts for the inexistence of other activities of PEIB at their schools.

By comparing what was made before and after the inclusion of SLI into the curriculum, there is a positive valorization on the previous implementation as for its cultural relevance and available resources. Both traditional educators and teachers state that before 2010, even if in general there was no interest from other teachers, they had more liberty to decide on the contents, to develop strategies, and especially, to carry out activities away from the classroom, practical, which implied a greater participation and better disposition of the students. What teachers and traditional educators emphasize the most is that the configuration of SLI as another subject does not allow them to carry out any practical activity with their students, which are necessary to learn and understand culture.

The above refers to the valorization that Mapuche people have for learning by doing, for situated learning, in context; as pointed out by Venegas (2017: 25): “the individual internalizes the structural order —makes it their own—, to reproduce by means of action”. It is important for them to be able to show the student why certain concept is utilized to refer to a usual activity in the community, show where medicinal herbs are grown and the reason for the name given to such place, preserve the place people take in conversations when it is led by someone in particular, the way to address people, show how visits are received at home or in the community and the right words and actions for such situations, depending on whether the visit is an authority, on age, gender, etc.

For them, it has no meaning, for instance, to read about the sorts of greetings or the importance of rogations to the land or traditional dances, as this has to be learnt in context:

Boys and girls must live the experience to understand it (teacher, April 2014, Temuco).

[…] when a Mapuche teaches at home they do not teach stating the objective first, the Mapuche first sets the example (traditional educator, May 2014, Didaico).
The importance of the context in teaching-learning activities is fundamentally linked to the specific challenges involved in the project of facilitating the learning of cultural contexts, which have not undergone a historic process of segmentation nor have been decontextualized, as it has been the case of the occidental scientific episteme. Mapuche cultural knowledge is only meaningful in the context of the ways it is used by concrete individuals in concrete social relationships that shape the ways of life they share.

In this sense, between the logics of Mapuche cultural knowledge and those of the school culture is that in the former, knowledge is put first as regards social usefulness, this is, its value in the production and reproduction of significant social practices for the group; conversely, school links knowledge with evaluative usefulness, losing then the contextual value that characterizes the non-segmented knowledge systems.

As regards participation in decisions regarding PEIB, everyone agrees on considering they have not actually participated, in the sense which for them has to feel themselves participants in the construction of a new project. However, they value the impact of SLI regarding the conservation and recovery of Mapuche language, as this subject propitiates contact of children with Mapudungun speakers, a very important aspect in communities where only the elderly speak it.

The generalized criticism is to the fact that SLI, as the other learning sectors of the official curriculum, has a coverage based on the occidental logic, which hinders transmitting and preserving Mapuche culture, for the situated learning, proper to this culture, is limited by teaching the language in a classroom as there is no articulation with the other subjects and teachers nor with the context in which the school is immersed. The opinion of a teacher evinces the general feeling:

Naturally, language and culture have to be loyal, they must not be separated, they must be together, otherwise they betray one another (co-construction workshop, August 2014, Temuco).

Learning the language is relevant, but it must relate to contextualized practices in the students’ life world, which requires different forms of interaction and school organization, as some participants expressed:

I think the program is a copy of other programs, of mathematics, languages, and it is structured in the same way to be developed in the same way […] the indigenous language program must be different because Mapuche culture is different (teacher, interview, May 2014, Nueva Imperial).

10 Native language of Mapuche people.
As if it was English language [...] and I didn’t think it was intercultural education, because for me it isn’t intercultural education, for me that was Mapudungun language teaching (teacher, interview, April 2014, Nueva Imperial).

When it turned into a subject the interest was lost (guardian, interview, July 2014, Huampomallin).

To turn up, the way in which it is asked to implement language teaching is considered by them not culturally suitable. SLI is designed in the framework of the occidental logic which separates knowledge; the standardization of contents and examples neglects the territorial character in which Mapuche culture sits, including its language. Mapuche territorial identity is of great importance, because not only it is fruit of historic processes, but from the indigenous standpoint it also implies reconstructions of a past (Le Bonniec, 2002), which is also given political, economic, social, cultural and religious context (Molina, 1995).

In the valorizations regarding SLI insistently appears a tension related to the ways of transmission and appropriation the school favors and the ways in which for them culture is learnt, which ratifies the existence of various meaning frameworks to conceptualize learning. As an eminently oral culture, they disregard learning their language when it is reduced to contents in paper:

We weren’t taught with pencil and a notebook, for us it was more like sharing experiences (guardian, focal group, July 2014, Temelemu).

 [...] we were told, I remember, to make the yoke, and one had to look for timber, with an ox! Now, what do children do? They are told to draw something and bye (guardian, interview, July 2014, Cullinco).

Mapuche culture has a systemic vision of nature and relationships among individuals, far from the conceptions in the larger society, which is not considered in the current structure of SLI. When analyzing the cultural relevance of such implementation, this is a highly relevant aspect that negatively influences on the expectations and contents deemed priority by those who partook of the study. As pointed out by Toren (1999), human beings embody or incarnate the history of their own interactions in contexts determined by the history of interactions of their ancestors; therefore, the intercultural values learnt in their life worlds “are part of symbolic and narrative supports which are always born from the contexts (Salas, 2013: 65).

Expectations regarding PEIB: the participants in the study concur that intercultural education shall not be restricted to schools with indigenous students, as:
the non-Mapuche child must learn Mapuche culture, for a fairer society (traditional educator, interview, April 2014, Traiguén).

Chilean society must understand that Mapuche culture is present not past (traditional educator, interview, May 2014, Nueva Imperial).

Traditional educators and teachers consider it necessary to contextualize the support materials, where territorial identities are recognized, which vary in the ways of doing and saying things. As expressed by a teacher: “the book considers one greeting, but it turns out that there are different sorts of greeting” (interview, April 2014, Temuco). This lack of recognition for the various territorial identities has been clearly noticed by the last assessment panel of PEIB (Dirección de Presupuesto, 2013).

Valorizations regarding the role of the traditional educator: another aspect that noticeably appears and has deep implications to accomplish the objectives of PEIB is that teachers and traditional educators feel they are required to behave as teachers trained in occidental culture, under circumstances that, with no exception, both teachers and guardians make explicit their great respect for their work as traditional educators.

Mapuche teachers point out that with the contribution of the traditional educator the context becomes relevant as their work enables the recognition of territorial identities and their practical knowledge can be related so as to adapt the main contents and their sequence, making them more relevant for the context the school is inserted in. Guardians deem this knowledge as a product of life worlds, founded on symbolic and narrative aspects that come from their particular contexts, which concurs with statements by Toren (1999) and Salas (2013), among others.

There is clarity between the participants as regards the lack of understanding for the frames of meaning and vision of the world of Mapuche culture by non-Mapuche individuals; they know that the meanings of their words and actions can be differently understood, as expressed by a traditional educator:

Frequently, there are things we say and someone would hear and won’t do it in the way we do it, they are going to do it otherwise (con-construction workshop, October 2014, Temulemu).

All the above makes it evident that PEIB, in spite of being an advance in terms of its contribution with the incorporation of certain contents important for Mapuche people, it perpetuates a hegemonic knowledge system that excludes their meaning logics, particularly in terms of the methodologies to build knowledge, as well as the nature contextualized and relational of it.
No dissents are noticed according to the roles of the participants nor differences by gender. This is a valuable finding, as the members of the group hold various educational levels, come from different communities, communes and sectors and belong to ten schools located in various localities.

**Some conclusions**

The implementation process of PWIB is an arena (Long Arce, 1992) where senses and meanings regarding the educational, from different knowledge systems, have come into play in a context of deeply asymmetric power relations. Exclusion in the official discourse of what is deemed by Mapuche traditional educators and teachers as the central role of Mapuche people in the establishment of PEIB, is the evidence of a larger process of systematic neglecting of their projects and agency. The previous results describe the context that frames the daily participation of Mapuche people in the implementation of PEIB, mainly in terms of their perceptions on their relations with the State and its agents.

The general perception of not having enough participation in decision making in aspects that directly affect them comes, among other aspects, from the fact that public policy has nor recognized the capacity of the local agency that exists in each territory, from lack of knowledge on the effective commitment of the Mapuche teachers, traditional educators and guardians to their children’s education, from the insufficient consideration to the existence of various meaning frames within which conceptions are built regarding the meaning of participation in Mapuche culture and participation in the dominant culture.

This lack of understanding of the vision of the Mapuche world and the meaning of Mapuche culture in the public policy and the general educational system is the main aspect that explains the criticism from Mapuche people to the implementation of PEIB.

Furthermore, traditional educators and teachers have the perception that in the implementation of SLI, it is intended that traditional educators behave as teachers trained in the hegemonic culture, under circumstances that if such thing happened, the country would lose the opportunity to configure an unseen space for intercultural coexistence in the classroom between traditional educators and teachers, especially in cases in which both come from different cultural traditions (Ibáñez, 2015), this is a relevant aspect that should be considered by public policy.
Co-construction workshops, as milestones in the methodological process, produced results validated by the participants as in this workshops the results of partial analysis presented by the research team were discussed and reflected upon to reach a consensus regarding their meanings and senses. This is the same for the final results, so these faithfully reflect the shared perceptions of Mapuche people, part of the study group.

The above allows stating that even if we have verified that various frames of meaning of the knowledge systems proper to each culture make it difficult to understand what people of a different culture really think or feel, even if they speak the same language, it also shows that the horizontal collaborative work which deals with the existence of these various logics and is based on mutual trust and respect enables this comprehension, and thus, the joint construction of possible ways to accomplish shared objectives.

The results of this project, which for the first time involve Mapuche teachers, traditional educators and guardians from various schools and territories, ratify what the available research has already shown, including our previous studies: Mapuche people considers the cultural relevance of the implementation of PEIB insufficient, which is detrimental to the objectives of this program, and so the equity and quality it is intended to improve.

We expect to contribute to innovate the design of public policy as for the implementation of PEIB, since the current state of Indigenous Language seemed to propitiate that the pedagogical couple becomes a reflex of the dominant culture-subordinate culture, which implies the continuation of the conditions of educational inequality in which people who belong to our indigenous peoples develop. Our study reflects the need of PEIB to consider other systematic activities for the students and of SLI, as a learning sector, to innovate in its programmatic structure.

Beyond affirmative actions in favor of indigenous individuals, for SLI the pedagogical couples may be the beginning of a structural change that ends with the confusion between intercultural project and project for indigenous people, as long as public policy takes charge of the fact that intercultural dialogue is interchange and interaction between contextual words (Fornet-Betancourt, 2006), where those who represent such different contextual worlds must necessarily be in equal conditions.

The existing consensus reached between the participants in our research that intercultural education in Chile should be for the entire education system, concurs with the commitment of the current government of President Bachelet to foster interculturality for everyone, to do so, in the first place interculturality has to be incorporated to the education system as a whole. In
this context, teacher training is the space to make the difference in the near future, being charged with the transversal incorporation of interculturality in such training.

As Ansión (2007: 61) points out, new forms of citizenship from an intercultural perspective imply the appearance of new sorts of leaders, intercultural themselves and aware of the need to articulate forms of organization and comprehension of reality that come from a fertile debate on the ways to approach the world and the problems of life.

In this regard, it is important that these diverse ways are considered equally legitimate. The group of Mapuche participants showed its commitment and reflexive, analytical and proactive capacity, once more evincing what we have repeatedly stressed in results of previous works developed in collaboration with Mapuche individuals: the existence of a powerful local agency which if considered and channeled via public policy will indubitably enable advance on the solution of many present problems, not only in the education sphere, which still tension the relation between the Chilean State and Mapuche People.
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Primary references

They correspond to extracts of interview transcriptions: individual, conversation focal groups and co-construction workshops, recorded in audio, held between April and October 2014, in eight communes of the Araucanía Region, most of them rural communes. The locations where such interviews were held were: the participants’ houses (most of them), public places (cafés) and schools. Co-construction workshops took place in communal places in rural Mapuche communities in Temulemu and in Colegio de Profesores in Temuco. Responsible: Nolfa Ibáñez Salgado.
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