

Intercultural Bilingual Education in Chile: The Challenge of a Traditional Educator

Tatiana Aguayo
Independent Researcher

Sylvia Contreras
University of Santiago

Cornelia Giebeler
HSBI Hochschule Bielefeld University of Applied Studies and Arts

The educational policy related to the intercultural, in its aspect of recognition of the indigenous population, continues to be rooted in a functional and assimilationist approach, in which intercultural education is developed without touching the structures of power-knowledge, generating a hegemony of school learning. In this context, an ethnographic research is carried out, which was implemented in a school located in the commune of Alto Biobío, in Chile. Individual and group interviews, participant observation, audio and image records were used, in order to understand the experience of a traditional educator in an educational establishment, within the framework of the Intercultural Bilingual Education Program. The educator's stories were analyzed from the phenomenological perspective of inhabiting and identifying those categories that show how the traditional Educator promotes the recognition and self-creation of her own, that is, of the Pewenche. Among the findings, it is established that the main processes that the educator mobilizes to inhabit the school are translation-articulation. However, these processes are not exempt from the epistemological challenges originating from the school structure. It is concluded that intercultural education depends on the pedagogical practice of going to the community's own places, trying to rescue the meaning that the community in its materiality has given to the various experiences. Among the recommendations, it is suggested to consider in the pedagogical reflections the translation and articulation processes that make up the practices proposed by the traditional educator; in addition to making these processes explicit and problematizing, since they are not only important in intercultural education initiatives, but in all practices pedagogical that tries to be relevant and culturally sustainable.

Keywords: interculturality, bilingual intercultural education, intercultural dialogue, traditional education, Indigenous knowledge, decolonization

INTRODUCTION

Intercultural Bilingual Education (EIB by its Spanish acronym) is established in Chile in a context loaded with references that account for a long and complex relationship, marked by various conflicts

between the Chilean State and the native peoples, such as dehumanization, through the configuration of a negative image of the indigenous, associated with a barbarian, incapable of becoming a civilized being (Pinto, 2012), the violent incorporation into the nation-state through the usurpation of land and Chileanization (Pizarro, 2014). In addition to the denial or invisibility of their language and culture (Pulido, 2009), among other elements. Regarding *indigenous* or *pre-Columbian* terms, these are discussed at length, concluding that neither is completely satisfactory. This article focuses particularly on the Pewenche people, using terms from their pre-Columbian heritage, in addition to naming them as they call themselves.

In this context, organized by the struggles of the Mapuche/Pewenche people to maintain their identity, as well as their access to land, health and education, in addition to their organization and existence as a people, EIB emerged under the umbrella of the Organic Law of the Constitution of Education, enacted in 1996. Its main goal was to improve the learning achievements of children from communities located in culturally and linguistically diverse contexts, by strengthening their ethnic identity. The following year, the Intercultural Bilingual Education Program (PEIB by its Spanish acronym) is created as a pedagogical proposal for the recovery and valuation of the local culture; in addition to considering the relevance and contextualization of the contents delivered (García, 2018).

Subsequently, within the framework of the 1998 Educational Reform, the Origins program developed a pedagogical proposal in 150 targeted schools with children from the Aymara, Atacameño and Mapuche peoples, whose objective was to achieve maximum personal development considering their cultural origins, in addition to projecting their insertion into the global society (PEIB, 2011). Thirteen years after the enactment of the law, through Decree 280, all schools can include the Indigenous Language subject in their curriculum, while its implementation and obligatory nature is sequenced from 1st to 8th grade, between 2010 and 2017, in consideration of the enrollment percentage (Mineduc, 2009). In addition, in order to implement the program, schools must subscribe to the PEIB, which allows them to receive advice and pedagogical material.

Accordingly, educational establishments must present a proposal for a study program to be developed in the *Indigenous Language* field; in addition to defining the personnel in charge of this field, implementing a pedagogical pair integrated, on the one hand, by the so-called traditional educator (Matus and Loncon, 2012), which corresponds to a person validated by the local indigenous community as a source of linguistic and cultural knowledge, and on the other hand, a mentor teacher, in charge of ensuring compliance with the didactic and pedagogical standards of the prescribed curriculum.

Both are expected to have the required intercultural skills, understood as the capacity for dialogue, knowledge and sociocultural appreciation, allowing adaptation to a new environment, characterized by coexistence with other cultures (Matus and Loncon, 2012; Arias-Ortega and Quintriqueo, 2021).

This initiative is intersected by discussions in the field of studies and theorizations on interculturality, in which there are different views on the concept, depending on where and by whom it is articulated, in line with the geopolitics and body politics of knowledge. As Dietz (2017) states, the different notions of interculturality are the fruit of the combination of three semantic axes, the axis of its descriptive and prescriptive nature, the static and dynamic notions of culture, and finally the understanding of interculturality as a transformation or programmatic strategy of a functional nature. Semantic axes that are established in certain paradigms.

From here, it makes sense to recognize that the Pewenche people are confronted with their worlds, which are no longer original, pre-colonial, nor *indigenous*, a discredited word to imagine an entity that never existed. Thus, the group called and self-defined as Pewenche, would be composed of those subjects who inhabit a specific place -the Alto Biobío-, a space where they recreate a way of living, speaking, interacting, growing and dying, which gives meaning to interculturality, since their ways of life are restricted by the particular geographical and natural conditions that frame the development of this peculiar community.

However, this is where the Chileans arrived, *people from outside*, speakers of Spanish who introduced formal education more than a century ago, at which time it could be said that there was intercultural contact. This, of course, could never be defined as interculturality, since it was, rather, a confrontation between the Pewenche people and the Chilean State, the latter imposing its centralized education plans. In other words,

when speaking in terms of intercultural education, it is necessary to address the definition of the powers around and within society, especially in educational implementation. Specifically, in the epistemological strains generated by incorporating the mother tongue and some cultural expressions, as well as the universal principles and values imposed by the dominant society in the school discourse (Arias-Ortega and Quintriqueo, 2021).

Particularly, in Ralco, Alto Biobio, the same Maripi chief (Riquelme, 2014) promoted at the end of 1900 the installation of a school in Pewenche territory, probably considering that learning Spanish would allow them to protect themselves from abuses, especially the fraudulent purchase of land, through writings that were then formalized in notary offices. From here, the first informal type of schools supported by the provincial government of Los Angeles taught Spanish and prohibited the use of the vernacular language (Riquelme, 2014). Some time afterwards, and for more than ninety years, the Pewenche people have been demanding a return to their origins and education in their own language.

Later, EIB appeared, a concept that emerged in the 1930s in countries such as Mexico, Peru and Ecuador (UNICEF, 2021) and later spread to all countries in the Americas as a way out of the forced monolingualism of Spanish.

However, the historical domination of one culture over another persists in this understanding of interculturality in education. In the Argentine case, some voices reflecting on EIB and what interculturality implies in science didactics maintain that “we continue to bring to teaching the typical distinction or classification of scientific and vulgar knowledge, and classifying indigenous knowledge in this last link, we continue to speak of a colonized EIB”. (Vergara and Albanese, 2017). Similarly, reflection arises in the case of Bolivia and extrapolating to the whole of Latin America, it is argued that its implementation focuses on the “instrumental, nominal and institutional (normative), from the logic of the global and dominant culture as part of globalization that seeks to establish homogeneous and universal ways of life” (Iño, 2021, p. 83).

In the local case, it is soon recognized that this proposal emerges in an asymmetric and unidirectional way from the State towards the Pewenche students, seeking in them the valuation of their language and culture, in addition to incorporating them into the global society. These two goals are almost impossible challenges to meet, among other things, because they contain in themselves a certain degree of contradiction. Consequently, the place that indigenous students have in education has not changed substantially since the origins of their schooling, i.e., it is a matter of educating them as Chileans, therefore, they continue to be the subject of manipulation, persisting over them the social representations that visualize them as subordinate. Someone to be educated and civilized, “with no voice or agenda of their own, precarious conditions, low status and whose local systems of knowledge production/transmission lack legitimacy” (Lagos, 2015, p. 84). In this sense, Arias and Quintriqueo (2021) point out that it is necessary to generate educational processes from an epistemological pluralism and activities that promote awareness and the addressing of values, attitudes and behaviors to face racism, stereotypes and prejudices.

In the context of the implementation of intercultural bilingual education, the relevance of the traditional educator as a promoter of activities focused on the permanent practice of *Chedungun* (language of the Pewenche culture) is noted. Currently, this school practice is not only a way to achieve a certain degree of legibility for *Chedungun* speakers, but also to revitalize the language of the territory, promoting the intracultural. In this way, the relevance of students interacting in their own language is understood as an essential component to keep it alive and in force in the community. This prompts a reflection on the scope of the traditional educator’s work in this framework, especially in terms of achieving bilingualism in students.

As a consequence, the practice of intercultural bilingual education - an official term within the education system - makes traditional educators responsible for revitalizing the native languages in “the school communities where they work, without considering the situation of linguistic vitality in the broader contexts surrounding the school” (Castillo et al., 2016, p. 411). All this, refers to point out that interculturality emerges as a commonplace in educational rhetoric or as a tool to bridge cultural differences and break the nihilistic tendencies of the confinement of individuals within divided cultures (Aman, 2017).

This paper reports on the experience of being a traditional educator, in that to attend to her actions in this space is to talk about how practice and knowledge are embodied and materialized in the teaching of *Chedungun*. In the school setting, this happens once a week in each course, in two-hour classes. This activity is carried out in collaboration with the mentor educator (a teacher with a professional degree in pedagogy), and involves teaching planning, the learning evaluation process and didactics for language teaching. This collaborative work between the traditional educator and the mentor teacher is framed within the ministerial guidelines and is guided by the manuals for teaching the indigenous language sector provided by the PEIB.

In its structure, the article addresses the state of the art, reflects on the intercultural-intracultural relationship in the light of decolonial discourses. Then, it addresses methodological matters, to subsequently report some findings, in which interrelated forms of interculturality-intraculturality are identified, materializing in two categories, articulation and translation. From there, this materialization is exposed from the educator's sayings and doings, emphasizing its tensions: the notion of *beyond*, the distraction of the classroom, writing in an oral culture and the notion of teaching as correction.

INTERCULTURAL-INTRACULTURAL RELATIONSHIP

Interculturality is conceived as a connection between all human beings or as an experience of otherness, in the sense of being able to co-inhabit the world. Picking up notions promoted from the South, which emphasize their close link with indigenous movements, "which aim to decolonize asymmetrical knowledge systems, and which start from memory as a trope and from state-society relations" (Dietz, 2017, p. 201). In other words, interculturality should be seen as interepistemic rather than simply intercultural (Aman, 2017).

At this point, it is possible to note that, as a political project, it is based on the existence of local cultures and, therefore, of delimitation mechanisms between them, such as identity policies and recognition of particular groups, the axis of which are the processes of defining what is one's own and what is perceived as foreign, generating strategies aimed at the recovery, strengthening and cohesion within groups or cultures. Referring to intraculturality processes (Dietz, 2017; Iño, 2021), this notion emphasizes the interrelation between interculturality and intraculturality, since for the former to develop, processes of strengthening the cultural identity of a people are required (Iño, 2021). Within the framework of this interrelationship, intercultural education has among its objectives the promotion of interaction patterns that expand or restrict the specific stereotypes of "us" versus "them", ethnic landmarks or emblems, processes of self-construction and self-creation of one's own (Dietz, 2017; Iño, 2021). In this regard, ideally intercultural education is based on decolonial pedagogical praxis and discourses that are concerned with the processes of exclusion, denial, ontological, epistemic-cognitive subalternization and their effects on the subjects and their communities (Walsh, 2010). It is evident that factors such as the content of reciprocity relations or the underlying historical debt with indigenous peoples should not be forgotten or invalidated (Huencho, 2016).

Therefore, it is appropriate to ask what happens to intercultural education on the basis of a decolonial view, which focuses on the creation and maintenance of differences about cultural identities? In response to this, Contreras et al. (2019) state, "liberation from colonialism demands that interculturality be reclassified as inter-epistemic" (p. 74). In this regard, colonial and postcolonial discourses constitute a possibility to build new places of expression, which are complemented by the learning of those who live and think from colonial and postcolonial legacies, generating theories and reflecting by themselves about their history and culture, as in the case of the *traditional educator* who is summoned in this text and who should meet the challenge of not consenting to colonialism.

In this context, it is possible to appreciate the complexities of the dialogical commitments expected in educational meetings. In other words, how "processes of development of one's own identity are carried out in balance, complementarity and respect for other cultures" (Iño, 2021, p. 87). Meetings that are temporally and culturally gestated, being, in addition, unpredictably complex, alive and never neutral; besides culminating in some moments, in situations that inhabit fear and vulnerability. It is a challenge to highlight the critical importance of an ethic attentive to dialogic commitments, in order to avoid a lifeless dialogue and, finally, silence (Giebeler, 2010).

It is assumed that this dialogue is a logical and implicit consequence of the meeting and relationship between the different cultures present in an educational institution, which accounts for the way of living the institution in the different interactions of daily life, as well as in pedagogical practices. In other words, intercultural dialogue is present, occupying a space that vitalizes the relationship and school life, confirming that, specifically, in the case of teaching *Chedungun*, this cannot be separated from learning about the Pewenche culture, since its elements are so intertwined that it is difficult to recreate the first without the second. Requiring in the intercultural relationship processes of self-affirmation of one's own, rather than a confrontation with others (Iño, 2021). From this emerges the relevance of a research that attends to the figure of the traditional educator, since the Pewenche way of relating to the world relies on her ability to mediate experiences of intracultural and intercultural dialogue with those who do not define themselves as Pewenche. Therefore, the pedagogical practice of the traditional educator articulates the knowledge of all the elements of the so-called Pewenche culture, since she knows the history and daily life of this society, in other words, she recreates a knowledge that is gestated in her own community and that, as Kusch (1973) states, is a knowledge in signs:

A semiotics [...] that is constructed of multi-vocal terms and multi-dimensional indicative concepts. Therefore, metaphor, personification, the subjunctive mode and the symbolic use of language are the elements with which local knowledge is constructed as an instrument of communication with a double track: empirical and symbolic at the same time. Hence, the symbolic meanings of its most important concepts transform the discourse [...] into an inter-subjective dialogue with its natural environment, which this trick of language personifies and divinizes. (p.7).

That happens, especially, in circumstances in which the production of knowledge shapes the challenges of an intercultural project that is rather intracultural in a decolonizing sense (Dolhare and Rojas-Lizana, 2017; Iño, 2021; Tubino, 2005; Walsh, 2014).

From this perspective, questioning its presence in the way of living the school is considered necessary and pertinent, especially if we think that within the framework of EIB experiences, the intercultural relationship implies going beyond the purely linguistic dimension, and advancing in the meaning of traditions and memories.

Considering that the term place includes all the materiality that converges in that which begins as space and ends as place in the co-existence of diverse histories. In this way, dialogue could overcome the restricted understanding of linguistic practices; transforming the space into a place of relation of diverse cultural practices, shaping its own place. A meeting and exchange area in which a relationship unfolds where each human being recreates his or her culture and traditions and exchanges them to give an account of his or her history.

Thus, the dialogue takes shape in the inhabiting of the place, discovering the experience of inhabiting the school, far from universal social and cultural practices, so that no culture substitutes or absorbs the practices of the other, because each one has its place just by the mere fact of existing.

Accordingly, dialogue could take place when inhabiting the school, making it an identifying, relational and historical place (Auge, 2009). Identifying, because it is recognized as a place of its own and loaded with meanings by those who inhabit it and self-identify themselves as Pewenche, exchanging their knowledge with others. Relational, because the arrangement of the elements of the place is not random, but, on the contrary, it maintains a certain order, typical of an overall relationship. Historical, because it contains signs and signals recognizable by those who inhabit it and are part of its history and memory. Unlike individuals who find themselves in a place that is not their own, where they are viewers of other stories and are forced to live it in loneliness. For them, this would be a non-place (Auge, 2009), a place that is not possible to inhabit and that can make dialogue impossible by experiencing exclusion.

It follows that in order for inter- and intracultural dialogue to take place in the school, it is necessary to have a set of systems of relationships with the place, including practices, but also meanings related to territoriality, that is, the way of linking human beings with their lives. From this point of view, the educator

represents a specific geografication in the here and now, understood as part of a set of symbolic, significant and imaginary referents.

In short, it is assumed that the traditional educator brings with her territories of distant, close, extensive and narrow practices. In this regard, we presume that she lives knowing herself to be other, in a world that is not her own; first as a student and then as an educator. In other words, the place from which the narrative is based is that of its own life, in the experience of teaching and learning in a school. A space in which it is challenged by a series of epistemological tensions generated by the colonial power structures rooted in the educational relationship (Arias-Ortega and Quintriqueo, 2021).

Accordingly, this paper aims to give an account of the experience of being a traditional educator in the framework of the PEIB that is constituted in the school space. Understanding that, as the educational experience generates a symbolic space, the cultural practices, knowledge, stories and memory that the educator recreates, take on a certain meaning when they are placed in the time and space of the school.

METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS

The implementation of this research is carried out in Mapuche Pewenche territory in the commune of Alto Bío-Bío, in the Province of Bío-Bío, Eighth Region of Chile. It has an area of more than 2,000 km², mostly rural, with a population of 6,000 inhabitants, 84.18% of whom are considered Pewenche. Specifically, in a municipal school located in one of the ten communities that make up the commune and which is made up of approximately 190 Pewenche families. They keep alive cultural elements such as *Nguillatun* (ceremony performed in community, in gratitude and/or petition to nature), *Wetripantü* (ceremony of gratitude for the end of a cycle and the beginning of a new one), *Lakutun* (ceremony of giving the name or character to a boy or girl) and others, in addition they speak Mapudungun/chedungun mainly in community situations (MINEDUC, 2017). It is important to add that in the school where the research was conducted, 95% of the children belong to this community.

In this context, the research intends, through observation and deep listening, to know in depth how intercultural-intracultural relations are experienced and given meaning at school in concrete situations of interaction. Therefore, it is inscribed in the comprehensive paradigm, which tries to respond globally to the situation studied; interpreting actions, ideas and proposals, managing to explain the phenomenon as unique. The method used is ethnographic, which was chosen due to its great flexibility (Restrepo, 2016), a fundamental aspect to assume a respectful approach to the dynamics and customs of the place, in addition to accepting consensus and negotiation in the participation of the spaces.

The research design corresponds to a case study, as it allows understanding the phenomenon in its context. The sample selection of the participants is intentional, defined by the representativeness and accessibility of the researcher. The techniques used to collect information are participant observation and interviews. Participant observation was chosen, mainly because of its characteristic of unspecificity, since its objective is “to understand behaviors, lifestyles, religions, cultures, human and non-human tribes”, its basic strategy being “in situ observation of the phenomena to be understood” (Krohling, 2017, p. 173). This enables a direct and active intervention of the researcher in the environment in which he/she is located, in order to generate information (Restrepo, 2016). Similarly, the interview was chosen, since it seeks to obtain representations of the life world of the interviewee, from his or her particular way of interpreting the phenomena (Kvale, 2011). Thematic analysis was used as an analysis procedure, which allows identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns, considering that the subjects possess significant structures that define the huge complexity in which they live in everyday life and that this can be made explicit through processes that safeguard logical consistency, intersubjective interpretation and appropriateness. Principles that are embodied in premises such as familiarization with the data, generation of codes, in addition to the search, review, definition and naming of topics (Mieles et al, 2012).

Specifically, the participant observation was carried out by accompanying the only traditional educator who works at the educational institution in the development of various activities during a period of six months, with an average of four hours per week, considering her participation in the dynamics of school life, such as interaction with her peers and teachers outside the classroom, in her activity in classes of the

subject of indigenous language in basic level courses, in planning activities and implementation of evaluation instruments, participation in community ceremonies, as well as visits to her home. The interviews were carried out outside the institution, in a relaxed context, with predefined questions and in free conversation.

SOME FINDINGS

This paper will expose some findings related to the experience of the traditional educator in the processes of interrelation between intercultural and intracultural. In other words, reference is made to the identification of forms related to the dwelling of the traditional educator and how she tries to transform the non-place of the school space into a place. Considering the school as a space of synthesis or condensation. From this point of view, the thematic analysis of the educator's narratives presents two ways of inhabiting. We call one of them translation and the other articulation. In the process of realization of these forms, the nature of intercultural and intracultural dialogue and its respective tensions can be appreciated.

ARTICULATION AND TRANSLATION

In this way, in the collection and analysis of the information, two interrelated processes that account for the educational work developed by the traditional educator were recognized as a theme: articulation-translation, which responds to the premise that each culture/inhabitant increases its repertoire of meanings by establishing bridges between the diverse referents and the ways of symbolizing of those who think about it. Proposing that the term articulation alludes to the diverse processes that take place when interrelating the intercultural and the intracultural. Reserving for the term a more comprehensive epistemological dimension, from which it becomes possible to discriminate specific forms and modes, as a result of the articulating function of the multipertenancy of the subjects to diverse places-territories.

Adding to this, the category of translating action, which we understand as the practice of "finding in the language, culture and knowledge to which one translates, an attitude that can awaken in that language or culture an echo of the original" (Benjamin, 2017, p. 136).

Obviously, translation requires an articulation in order to respect the specificity of each language or culture, so as to overcome the complication produced as a result of "the oppositions translatability/untranslatability, universality/relativism as theoretical barriers that hinder the encounter with the other and self-recognition" (Flores, 2015, p. 28). This entails being able to understand, in the deepest sense, the words and expressions of the other person, as this must then be translated as accurately as possible.

In this framework, the process of articulation and, therefore, of translation of the traditional educator is hindered in her possibility of producing coherence and intelligibility, in the space of coexistence of the Pewenche community and the school. This is reflected in her teaching practices, where she must make an effort to translate from the way of learning the language in her culture to the format established for the classroom, a situation that involves multiple complexities linked to the normative level and the rhetoric of the official discourse on EIB and its effectiveness (Arias-Ortega and Quintriqueo, 2021).

In this articulation-translation process, it is identified that these complexities refer to the fact that in Pewenche cultural practices, learning the language is learning to be a person. To be Pewenche is to learn the *küme mongen* or good life. Learning to live in harmony with nature, where the human is a constituent part of it. Similarly, learning the language is also learning the *kimün*, the knowledge, which is transmitted by the grandfathers and grandmothers, who are responsible for teaching the symbolism to the children, because they know how to interpret it from nature (Pereira et al., 2014). That is, a notion of the educational act, as a social relationship, experiential and in connection with nature, carried out in activities of daily life. Because of this, the learning of the students and, therefore, the teaching of the traditional educator is not in tune with the way of learning in the classroom, disconnected from nature and with the use of technological resources. A space where language is learned only from its instrumental function and in written form and in the predominance of a teaching and evaluation system based on production and control, restricting the

de-colonial processes of students from their respective social, cultural and epistemic frameworks (Arias-Ortega and Quintriqueo, 2021).

In this context, the articulation-translation is strained, especially in the following aspects:

THE NOTION OF BEYOND

The traditional educator points out that the learning process in the classroom is a knowing for the sake of knowing. Understanding that knowledge is perceived as assimilation, that is, something that fails to put them in connection with the truly Other, since there is no presence of being, but only realizes the desire and need to apprehend (Contreras, 2012). Together, she argues that children fail to sense and understand the meaning that lies beyond what is known. So, beyond... *they do not know*, indicating that the new generations do not manage to take root in their world, that is, to inhabit a space and make it their place. Interpreting, that the experience of their own community is not reinvented and, therefore, the possibilities of connection and articulation with other worlds and/or pluralities are reduced.

In this regard, she states that the children know what a wetripantu is, *what she/he does, but beyond that they don't know, they don't know anything else*. (C. Callaqui, personal communication, May 3, 2018).

In the understanding that wetripantu materializes a diverse world, which mobilizes intellectual, corporal, political and affective aspects. The point is that, from the traditional educator's point of view, it is necessary to experience the ceremony in order to understand its deepest meaning, what the relationship with their deities means for their culture.

From this perspective, it would seem that the space that constitutes the educational institution does not allow for a translation that articulates specific aspects, while the deepest knowledge transcends what is known and thought in the school, becoming unpronounceable in the space it inhabits.

This suggests the enormous challenge for the traditional educator to translate the experiences so that the new generations can learn *beyond*. This process must take place in the school as a reality that is not exhausted in its narrative in the classroom, so that it becomes, for those who embody the Pewenche culture, a place charged with meanings that are proper to them, consequently, in an identifying space.

If the *beyond* is understood as something that escapes the gaze and this, in turn, is associated with nature, to see *beyond* would be to observe its codes, the messages in the spiritual, the knowledge that allows us to understand what it means to be Pewenche. Specifically, a conception of the spiritual united with the material.

From this perspective, learning the language is learning to be, practicing a knowledge that accounts for a particular understanding of the human being in the universe, which is only possible to learn from the hand of grandparents, because they have lived it; therefore, they can teach children to see *beyond* that moment and the physical material.

Together, for intercultural dialogue to be possible and to take place in the school, relational ontology must be present in the ways assumed to think the world and must be understood as existing; otherwise, inhabiting the school space will leave out signs and signals recognizable by the Pewenche culture. In this regard, it can be seen that the traditional educator seeks to produce contact zones in her work at school. Areas where different knowledge and life worlds meet, colliding and interacting (De Sousa Santos, 2013). In other words, intercultural-intracultural dialogue is only possible when those who embody both cultures experience the space, becoming actors of a history and part of the same memory.

DISTRACTION OF THE ROOM

De Sousa Santos (2013), states that in and from dialogue, different lifeworlds are connected. These worlds involve not only the human worlds, but especially the other worlds. Therefore, it is necessary to highlight what the traditional educator proposes in the processes of translation and articulation.

In the room there is a lot of distraction, they lose concentration, it is better to go for a walk or be in the ruca. (C. Callaqui, personal communication, August 11, 2018). It is clear that the geography of the room limits the translation and articulation of the different elements of the Pewenche culture. For this reason, she

states that it is more appropriate to go for a walk or take them to the ruca, as a way to enable concentration and connection with the elements of nature and their culture, since the classroom, in its radical materiality, fails to become the place for Pewenche cultural practices.

From the traditional educator's perspective, teaching in the classroom is impossible, because they are not in the world of nature, and what they learn are only words that have no echo or connection with it.

It is impossible, because the corresponding places are not there; for example, a tree, I don't know... a water tree, which is next to the cliff; if I change it to another place, it will not be the same, it will dry up, right, so it is not the same; and to reach a person who learns or teaches... no, it will not fit or join, it will always be out of level, it will not be well transmitted. (C. Callaqui, personal communication, April 22, 2018).

This reflection regarding the fact that teaching and learning are born from *the corresponding places*, that is, those in contact with nature, allows us to visualize another way of understanding the pedagogical action, one of understanding, which generates reflections about human existence in the Pewenche culture. It was found that for an inter and intracultural dialogue in the school from translation and articulation, it would be advisable to leave the school space, going beyond the materiality that makes up the institution. Therefore, if the school wishes to consolidate processes of self-creation, it should try to get out of the classroom.

WRITING IN AN ORAL CULTURE

The traditional educator suggests the difficulty of teaching *Chedungun* by means of writing, highlighting the existence of a contradiction, since it is a language of oral transmission.

Before it was not like that... it was not written, therefore writing makes the person... become more Spanish, so he/she loses that essence... that true Chedungun, that... now it is no longer like that... pure. (C. Callaqui, personal communication, August 11, 2018).

In this perspective, the impossibility of connecting different worlds of life in writing becomes evident, due to the fact that in the Pewenche culture orality accounts for what is essential, however, when learning by writing, such learning is mediated by translation, losing the meaning, extent and depth of what is said.

...when it is pronounced faster or slower... it is not the same, so it should not be... translated... it is something as well as it is surrounded by so many things. (C. Callaqui, personal communication, April 22, 2018).

This quote reflects the importance of tonalities and rhythms, as they give meaning to what is said and heard; thus one learns by hearing and discovering the associated relationships of meaning, that which surrounds what is said. In other words, writing determines a way of learning, of practicing, where the being of the other, of the Pewenche, has no translatability and no place in the alphabet for its articulation. Therefore, writing becomes a barrier for the school to teach the real *Chedungun*, an obstacle that must be overcome by leaving the classroom. Outside, the unwritten takes place.

THE NOTION OF TEACHING AS A CORRECTION

According to the traditional educator, teaching is done by the grandparents. *they are the ones who know everything that had happened before... they are the right people to... correct.* (C. Callaqui, personal communication, March 19, 2018). From this perspective, to teach children is to *correct*, because from birth they are considered persons. Thus, the child lives the experience of daily life in a free way. From this perspective, they learn the language and culture, and they are corrected so that they do not deviate from the path of respect, in order to become better people. From the traditional educator, *it is... more respect to teach.* (C. Callaqui, personal communication, May 3, 2018).

According to Pereira et al. (2014), "the Mapuche is Mapuche when he/she respects the codes of nature, when he/she relates in the amplitude of experience, receiving the energy of the sun, of the Puel¹, of the Wall², of all the immensity of his/her being" (p. 169).

The challenge then arises for the traditional educator to articulate and translate in the school space, in the absence of the grandparents. Considering that they account for what lies *beyond*, alluding to a past or future time, while, on the contrary, boys and girls are situated in the immediate present.

they are in a world now... everything is at hand, but they don't see how it went further. (C. Callaqui, personal communication, June 12, 2018).

From this statement it can be seen, on the one hand, that children know the current world, as well as the moment they are living in, but that they do not know the history, that is, how it was in the past and how it will be in the future. Although, from this perspective, the past should be something known; since it can be seen and recognized because it has been lived, so it is represented as something that lies ahead or *beyond*. Under this temporal understanding, it is possible to identify the distance with the dynamic and linear vision of modern time, which operates as a dominant category of interpretation, where the past and history are left behind in time; and the future is posed as a temporal place, which lies ahead. Something new, to be discovered, uncertain, for which it is necessary to prepare and be attentive, in order to enter this period of time in the best conditions, with the purpose of controlling and appropriating it.

In this framework, the translation and articulation carried out by the traditional educator depend, in part, on her ability to critically read the format established by the school, especially that of the classroom; making it visible, challenging it and transforming it, and going far beyond the assumptions and expressions from which the practices and thoughts that predominate in the present act, the one in which writing and the exacerbated use of technology prevail, are understood and oriented. Thus, to the extent that the classroom is understood in a relationship of continuity with the diverse places/territories of belonging of the students, the possibilities of establishing relationships of connection and encounter with the worlds symbolized by the ruca, the orchard, the natural, communal and ceremonial spaces of the Pewenche culture are expanded.

In other words, articulation is at stake in the possibility of recognizing and positioning different ways of perceiving reality and constructing knowledge. In the capacity of the traditional educator to connect symbolic territories that host an intricate network of particular and specific meanings, with other worlds and pluralities. Therefore, translation is based on the actions of the educator aimed at incorporating the meanings of being Pewenche in the echoes of the symbols of the Spanish language and its practice, trying that the students experience, discover and interpret the deepest knowledge, incorporating themselves into a web of relationships and meanings that move between the material and the non-material, between nature and culture (Escobar, 2014), to recognize themselves in the difference, projecting themselves in the present, past and future space; inhabiting the school, rooting themselves in it and recognizing it as a place of their own.

CONCLUSIONS

Steiner (2001) states that reality is thought by someone who links present and past. The action of turning to the past to represent the present, forces the one who undertakes this journey to a translation that implies a material, embodied, situated and semantic organization of the memories and recollections of a community. In this sense, the context in which the traditional educator's activity develops, added to the challenges and tensions she faces in her work, leads us to think that the educational action she promotes involves a real process of translation and articulation. A process that, according to the degree of effectiveness achieved, allows us to affirm that the school is defined by the educator as a place, but not *her place*. Because of this, she needs to visit the community's own places, since it is in them that translation and articulation are developed, in addition to allowing her to approach from the materiality, the meaning given by the diverse experiences, knowledge and practices. This point is a contribution of the article's authorship, as it emphasizes educational reflection and the broad notion of education as an activity that is not limited to the symbolic-material space of the school. In accordance with a de-colonial pedagogy, this work contributes to the recommendation of dealing with the processes of articulation and translation that educational agents put in place, which are frequently made invisible and naturalized, proposing as a field to problematize the articulations and translations that are carried out, scrutinizing the interests that sustain them.

Consequently, the practice of teaching the language will only be possible to imagine (Ricoeur, 2005), since the role of the traditional educator is shaped in the constructive work on the level of meaning, constituting a challenge for her the creation of equivalent spaces in the school, in order to transform it into a place of the community. With this, it is assumed that the educator's work is mainly about herself, that is, about her language.

Through the above findings, it is possible to conclude that the traditional educator undergoes the permanent tension of performing the articulation-translation trying to give life to her language, going beyond the place and the moment of its enunciation. It is appreciated that her work is inevitably contingent, precarious and risky. Where the *chedungun*, in her teaching, cannot be separated from the teaching of the Pewenche culture. Hence, each didactic proposal in the classroom has an echo of meaning and a socio-historically situated trajectory. In other words, all her educational action is defined from a specific place, from where she tries to recreate a particular phenomenon. In this sense, her actions are especially volatile and circumstantial, especially when what is expected of her role is that she adopts a transgressive character of the assumption that configures the school, due to the impossibility and impertinence of a unique knowledge or language. Therefore, this traditional educator, from her narrative, confirms that a de-colonial intercultural education requires an intracultural education, in which the experience of translation and articulation refers to the conversion of a hegemonic practice into a counter-hegemonic one, to advance from a single language to a plurality of languages and voices; to set in motion a counter-hegemonic doing as opposed to the usual routine of permanence in the classroom in the teaching-learning process. Therefore, it is essential to accompany and promote traditional educators, since they live in a permanent tension in the deployment of a pedagogical practice whose purpose is to mobilize the interrelation of local and universal identities, subjective and intersubjective processes, the recognition of one's own cultural incompleteness with references to other cultures and the processes of local creation and formation (Iño, 2021), in which, unquestionably, it sets in motion processes of translation and articulation with those elements that make up cultural knowledge and practices and that are in a border or marginal zone. At this point, it would be advisable to provide support and reflection processes that allow them to get in touch with those less risky elements that guarantee a considerable success rate in the first approaches, so as to allow them to continue advancing in the most relevant knowledge and practices of their group or culture.

In addition to this, defining as an axis of decolonial educational processes the work of articulation-translation, in order to give clues as to what could be the paths to possible meeting points between very dissimilar practices, as well as in the identification of the unconsensual cores. In other words, what is the limit that cannot be exceeded, so as not to jeopardize the entire translation work (Liendo, 2011). In addition, to recognize in its wide complexity the premise that each knowledge brings to the contact zone a topic that is not admitted as evident by the other; so that in translation, topics are transformed into arguments and only with practice is the subject matter of the contact zone constructed. This generally represents "a demanding job, without insurance against risks and always close to collapse" (De Sousa Santos, 2013, p. 149). Specially in the context that the main objective of Intercultural Bilingual Education is for native peoples to revitalize and strengthen their culture and language within the school (MINEDUC, 2017).

In this regard, to reiterate as a contribution of this research, to go beyond the premise that the work of the traditional educator is limited to making adjustments, to a traditional response to the way of teaching and learning, perpetuating the assimilationist matrix from which pedagogical processes are understood. It is clear that the work done by the traditional educator in the articulation and translation, evidences the agency of her figure, not free of risk in the process, which demands permanent epistemological vigilance of her pedagogical action.

Based on these findings and conclusions, it is recommended that the processes of translation and articulation that constitute the educational practices proposed by the educational agents be considered in the instances of pedagogical reflection. Making these processes explicit and problematizing them is not only important in intercultural education initiatives, but also in any pedagogical practice that seeks to be relevant and culturally sustainable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Translated & edited by American Publishing Services (<https://americanpublishingservices.com/>).

ENDNOTES

1. Puel: specific place of the sunrise and of the living spirits.
2. Wall: cosmic space.

REFERENCES

- Albanese, V. (2017, September 5–8). *Repensar la enseñanza de las ciencias en la educación intercultural bilingüe: ¿un nuevo modelo de enseñanza?* [sesión de congreso]. X congreso internacional sobre investigación en didáctica de las ciencias. Sevilla, España. Retrieved from https://ri.conicet.gov.ar/bitstream/handle/11336/75398/CONICET_Digital_Nro.8ce95516-6460-443e-8ac2-0f722afe5e20_A.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed=y
- Aman, R. (2017). Colonial Differences in Intercultural Education: On Interculturality in the Andes and the Decolonization of Intercultural Dialogue. *Comparative Education Review*, 61(1), 103–120. <http://doi.org/10.1086/690459>
- Arias-Ortega, K., & Quintriqueo, S. (2021). Tensiones epistemológicas en la implementación de la Educación Intercultural Bilingüe. *Ensaio: Avaliação e Políticas Públicas em Educação*, (29), 503–524.
- Auge, M. (2009). *Los “No Lugares” Espacio del Anonimato. Una Antropología de la sobremodernidad*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Benjamin, W. (2006). *Ensayos escogidos*. Ciudad de México: Coyoacán.
- Benjamin, W. (2017). *La tarea del traductor*. Madrid: Sequitur.
- Castillo, S., Fuenzalida, D., Hasler, F., Sotomayor, C., & Allende, C. (2016). Los educadores tradicionales Mapuche en la implementación de la educación intercultural bilingüe en Chile: Un estudio de casos. *Literatura y Lingüística*, 33, 391–414. <http://doi.org/10.4067/S0716-58112016000100019>
- Contreras, S. (2012). Saber campesino: Otra forma de experimentar la escuela rural. *Estudios Pedagógicos*, 38(1), 367–381. <http://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052012000100023>
- Contreras, S., Miranda, P., & Ramírez, M. (2019). Los tropos como figuraciones de los saberes: Una forma de contribuir al pensamiento decolonial. *Cinta de Moebio. Revista de Epistemología de Ciencias Sociales*, (64), 68–81. <http://doi.org/10.4067/S0717-554X2019000100068>
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2013). *Descolonizar el saber, reinventar el poder*. Santiago: LOM Ediciones.
- Dietz, G. (2017). Interculturalidad: Una aproximación antropológica. *Perfiles Educativos*, 39(156), 192–207. Retrieved from http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0185-26982017000200192
- Dolhare, M., & Rojas-Lizana, S. (2017). The Indigenous Concept of Vivir Bien in the Bolivian Legal Field: A Decolonial Proposal. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, pp. 1–11. <http://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2017.31>
- Escobar, A. (2014). *Sentipensar con la tierra: Nuevas lecturas sobre desarrollo, territorio y diferencia*. Medellín: UNAULA.
- Flores, V. (2015). Nuevos modos de comprender el diálogo intercultural y el contacto entre lenguas en China a principios del siglo XX: Los aportes desde la traducción y la historia. *Journal de Ciencias Sociales*, 3(5), 19–37.
- García, F. (2018). *Manual Instructivo para la implementación del PEI intercultural*. Retrieved from <https://bibliotecadigital.mineduc.cl/bitstream/handle/20.500.12365/529/MONO-448.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

- Giebeler, C. (2010). Conceptos de la Inter-Trans- E Intraculturalidad en la Educación. In J. Ströbele-Gregor, O. Kaltmeier, & C. Giebeler (Comp.), *Construyendo Interculturalidad: Pueblos Indígenas, Educación y Políticas de Identidad en América Latina* (pp. 15–20). Frankfurt: Druckreif.
- Guerrero, A., & Neira, H. (2014). *La nueva lucha del pueblo pehuenche*. Diario La Tercera. Retrieved from <http://www2.latercera.com/noticia/la-nueva-lucha-del-pueblo-pehuenche/>
- Huencho, V. (2016). El proceso de formulación de políticas públicas indígenas en Chile: El caso del gobierno de Patricio Aylwin (1990–1994). *Latin American Research Review*, 51(2), 107–127. <http://doi.org/10.1353/lar.2016.0029>
- Illich, I. (2014). *El mensaje de la choza de Ghandi y otros textos*. Ciudad de México: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos.
- Iño, W. (2021). In-surgir la educación desde lo intracultural y lo de-colonial: Aportes a las pedagogías con identidad propia. *Trenzar. Revista de Educación Popular*, 3(5), 79–104.
- Krohling, C. (2017). Metodología, métodos, técnicas. *Pressupostos epistemológicos e metodológicos da pesquisa participativa: Da observação participante à pesquisa-ação. Estudos sobre las Culturas Contemporáneas*, 3(23), 161–190.
- Kusch, R. (1973). *El pensamiento indígena y popular en América*. Aguascalientes: ICA.
- Kvale, S. (2011). *Las entrevistas en investigación cualitativa*. Madrid: Morata.
- Lagos, C. (2015). El Programa de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe y sus resultados: ¿Perpetuando la discriminación? *Pensamiento Educativo*, 52(1), 84–94. <http://doi.org/10.7764/PEL.52.1.2015.7>
- Liendo, M. (2011). Diálogo entre saberes: Acerca del problema de la traducción. *Encuentro Interdisciplinario de Ciencias Sociales y Humanas*, 1(1), 1–8.
- Matus, C., & Loncon, E. (2012). *Descripción y análisis de planes y programas propios PEIB-Conadi*. Santiago de Chile: UNICEF.
- Mieles, M., Tonon, G., & Alvarado, S. (2012). Investigación cualitativa: El análisis temático para el tratamiento de la información desde el enfoque de la fenomenología social. *Universitas Humanística*, (74), 195–225. Retrieved from <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/791/79125420009.pdf>
- MINEDUC. (2011). *PEIB-ORÍGENES. Estudio sobre la implementación de la Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*. Retrieved from https://peib.mineduc.cl/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Libro_publicacion_ed_20-09-2011.pdf
- MINEDUC. (2017). *Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*. Retrieved from <http://peib.mineduc.cl/educacion-intercultural-bilingue/>
- Ministerio de educación [MINEDUC]. (2009, September 25). *Decreto 280 modifica decreto n° 40*. MINEDUC. Retrieved from <https://www.bcn.cl/leychile/navegar?idNorma=1006477>.
- Municipalidad de Alto Biobío. (2020, August 20). *La comuna de Alto Biobío*. Municipalidad de Alto Biobío. Retrieved from <https://munialtobiobio.cl/alto-biobio/>
- Pereira, J., Reyes, M., & Pérez, F. (2014). *Ecos de las palabras de la tierra desde un último confín del mundo: Reencontrando el ser mapuche pewenche en el valle del Queuco*. Santiago: Andros.
- Pinto, J. (2012). El conflicto Estado-Pueblo Mapuche, 1900-1960. *Universum*, 27(1), 167–189. <http://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-23762012000100009>
- Pizarro, J. (2014). *Conflicto Mapuche. Un análisis histórico mediático*. Arica: Ediciones Parina.
- Restrepo, E. (2016). *Etnografía: Alcances, técnicas y ética*. Popayán: Envión.
- Ricoeur, P. (2005). *Sobre la traducción*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Riquelme, F. (2014). Adaptaciones y acomodos en los primeros años de las comunidades Pewenche del Alto Bío Bío. *Cuadernos de Historia*, 41, 59–82. <http://doi.org/10.4067/S0719-12432014000200003>
- Steiner, G. (2001). *Después de Babel. Aspectos de lenguaje y traducción*. Ciudad de México: Fondo de cultura económica.
- Tubino, F. (2005, January 24–28). *La interculturalidad crítica como proyecto ético-político*. [Sesión de congreso]. Encuentro continental de educadores agustinos, Lima. Retrieved from <https://oala.villanova.edu/congresos/educacion/lima-ponen-02.html>

- UNICEF. (2021). *Educación Intercultural Bilingüe en América Latina y el Caribe. Avances y retrocesos en el marco de la pandemia de la COVID-19*. UNICEF. Retrieved from <https://www.unicef.org/lac/media/22251/file/EIB-AMERICA-LATINA-SPA.pdf> Vergara, T. y Walsh, C. (2010). Interculturalidad crítica y educación intercultural. *Construyendo Interculturalidad Crítica*, 75(96), 167–181.
- Walsh, C. (2014). ¿Interculturalidad? Fantasmas, fantasías y funcionalismos. *Revista NuestrAmérica*, 2(4), 17–30. Retrieved from <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/5519/551956254003.pdf>