



University of Nebraska at Omaha  
DigitalCommons@UNO

---

Student Work

---

4-1-1999

Synthesizing an understanding of the nature of culture with literary theories sensitive to culture's presence in texts.

Janet L. Sutherland  
*University of Nebraska at Omaha*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

---

#### Recommended Citation

Sutherland, Janet L., "Synthesizing an understanding of the nature of culture with literary theories sensitive to culture's presence in texts." (1999). *Student Work*. 2682.  
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2682>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).



SYNTHESIZING AN UNDERSTANDING  
OF THE NATURE OF CULTURE  
WITH LITERARY THEORIES SENSITIVE TO  
CULTURE'S PRESENCE IN TEXTS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of English

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Masters of Arts

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Janet L. Sutherland

April 1999

UMI Number: EP74226

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74226

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.

789 East Eisenhower Parkway

P.O. Box 1346

Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College,  
University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the Master of Arts.  
University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

*Brandon H. Mundell*

*Tatyana Novikov*

*Reborah M. Jura*

Chairperson *Owen G. Mordasunt*

Date *4-16-99*

## ABSTRACT

### SYNTHESIZING AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF CULTURE WITH LITERARY THEORIES SENSITIVE TO CULTURE'S PRESENCE IN TEXTS

Janet L. Sutherland

University of Nebraska at Omaha, 1999

The selection of the theme "Cross-Cultural Criticism" for the 1990 Summer Institute of the National Council of Teachers of English signaled that "multiculturalism" had become more than a buzzword; it was a "prized awakening" (Burton 115), but not without its critics. Burton criticizes the "habit of 'othering' or 'differentiating'" which invites value judgments about inferiority which lay behind the awakening. In academic applications, Agger (1-2) notes the "mounting tendency to turn cultural studies into a vacuous methodology for reading cultural texts that has no real political grounding," and, in literary studies, Purves (5-8) concludes that two contradictory approaches, a thematic and a cultural ethos, exist today. These criticisms and concerns regarding current practices are juxtaposed on the reality as expressed by Clifford (13-14) that "this century has seen a drastic expansion of mobility. . . . The 'exotic' is uncannily close. . . . Difference is encountered in the adjoining neighborhood, the familiar turns up at the ends of the earth." A review of the current status of the literature curriculum and pedagogical practices argues that literary criticism long applied to the traditional canon is inadequate to interpret texts purposefully chosen because they represent diverse culture. The modern literature classroom requires synthesizing a clear understanding of the complex nature of

culture with literary theories sensitive to culture's manifestation in texts. This paper reviews literary theories, including those of Davidson, Said, and Bakhtin, and cultural insights by social scientists, including those of Geertz, Clifford and Wagner to provide tools for accessing the "culture" of multicultural texts. The models of cultural values by Schwartz and by Hofstede provide two options to aid readers in recognizing cultural factors present in literary texts. The final sections combine the presented cultural and literary theories and models in interpretations of "Piggy" by Svetlana Vasilenko and "I'm Not Talking About That, Now" by Sindiwe Magona.

## Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Status of cultural and literary studies in American schools	2
Critical theories appropriate for multicultural texts	13
Theories of culture	22
Cultural value models	31
Schwartz's motivational goals model	42
Hofstede's dimensional model of cultural values	45
Power distance orientation	50
Masculinity versus femininity orientation	56
Uncertainty orientation	60
Long-term orientation versus short-term orientation	66
Individualism versus collectivism orientation	73
Synthesization in the classroom	83
“Piggy” by Svetlana Vasilenko	90
“I’m Not Talking About That, Now” by Sindiwe Magona	98
Works Cited	106

SYNTHESIZING AN UNDERSTANDING OF CULTURE  
WITH LITERARY THEORIES SENSITIVE TO  
CULTURE'S PRESENCE IN TEXTS

Wagner explains that mankind is a constant inventor of life, creating things and ideas, "and yet everything that he is he also is not, so his more constant nature is not one of being but of becoming" (139). Clifford describes the present world, one changed by mankind's inventions of technology in which "difference is encountered in the adjoining neighborhood, [and] the familiar turns up at the ends of the earth" (13-14). Multicultural education, an idea created to come to terms with the increasingly multicultural nature of the nation and world, is described by Banks, as "a movement to empower all students to *become* [italics mine] knowledgeable, caring, and active citizens in a deeply troubled and ethnically polarized nation and world" (70). The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education multicultural standard, effective 1979, stimulated the growth of multicultural education for teachers (Banks 73). However, in Burton's opinion, the habit of "othering" or "differentiating" lay behind the "prized" awakening of multiculturalism in the 1990 National Council of Teachers of English Summer Institute (115), an opinion shared by the naturalized American author, Mukherjee, who suggests that the "sinister fallout of official multiculturalism and of professional multiculturalists is the establishment of one culture as the norm and the rest as aberrations" (8). The "exponential growth of cultural studies has produced a highly specialized and sometimes cultic discourse" (Hartman 42). As one of the leading proponents of multicultural education, Banks acknowledges a persistent problem both within and without the education profession is



the tendency to oversimplify the complexity and multidimensional character of multicultural education by focusing on only one dimension (74).

The literature curriculum in American schools is a part of this debate with multicultural education, in Sollar's characterization, as having taken on an "undreamed of centrality in literary and cultural studies" (151). American high school teachers participating in the 1991-95 National Research Center in Literature Teaching and Learning project on the study and teaching of multicultural texts express both excitement and frustration in their endeavors to include multicultural texts in their teaching; however, in spite of the difficulties, the teachers agree on the increasing necessity to include multicultural texts in today's classrooms (Ostrowski 48). Evaluative comments on the status of literary studies in the American classroom range from Purves' characterization of literary studies being "a mess" (8) to the overall impression emerging from the 1988 National Research Center on Literature Teaching and Learning that it is less a matter of "confusion than of complacency," (Applebee 192) with the specific observation that recent literary theories have failed to deal with pedagogical issues (200), the focus of this paper.

### **Status of cultural and literature studies in American schools**

The modern literature classroom requires synthesizing a clear understanding of the complex nature of culture with literary theories sensitive to culture's manifestation in

texts. Several writers speak directly to the unique value of literature in understanding culture. Hartman says literature has the power to “move and offend - as well as instruct. . . as a force that challenges a monolithic or complacent culturalism” (1-3). Holetin reports that readers’ response to his first edition of *Encountering Cultures: Reading and Writing in a Changing World* indicate that fiction “opens up cultural issues more vividly and memorably than essay alone” (viii), and Miller concludes that “literary study. . . is a powerful and indispensable means of the critique of ideology” (120). To capitalize on the unique value of literature as it relates to culture requires, first of all, to address the most basic question posed by a group of teachers in the 1991-95 study, “What is culture?” (Ostrowski 51) and, then, to review the current status of the literature curriculum and pedagogical practices. Such a review argues that literary criticism long applied to the traditional canon is inadequate to interpret texts purposefully chosen because they represent diverse cultures. The term “multiculturalism,” as one teacher in the study pointed out, is “woefully imprecise” (Ostrowski 51). Although multiculturalism frequently implies the cultural minority populations in the United States, this paper expands the meaning of multicultural texts to include world literature, thus better reflecting immigration trends in the United States and global cultural changes. The literary theories of Davidson, Said, and Bakhtin provide needed insights into the interpretation of the cultural aspects of texts, and social scientists, including Geertz, Clifford and Wagner, shed insights on culture and provide models of cultural dimensions such as Schwartz’s value orientation and Hofstede’s cultural dimensions to assist readers

in identifying certain cultural aspects present in literary texts. This paper concludes with an interpretation of the short stories, “Piggy” by Svetlana Vasilenko and “I’m Not Talking About That Now” by Sindiwe Magona, using the insights of literary theorists sensitive to the cultural dimensions of texts and cultural theories and models to recognize the significance and presence of cultural differences within literary texts.

The challenge is to provide better means for teachers and students alike to synthesize cultural and literary theories in order to reap the benefits to literary interpretation and to cultural awareness. The most basic need is to address the question of culture itself, its illusive definition and nature. The interdisciplinary nature of the study of culture has resulted in widely varying definitions which change as new theories and practices emerge. Damen concludes that definitions seemingly agree on three points: (1) Culture and human being studies must be examined holistically, (2) cultural groups use selectivity in ways to serve their needs, and (3) change is inevitable in culture (80-81). Using a computer age analogy, Hofstede defines culture as the “collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one category from another,” including such categories as nation, gender, age, and profession (*Consequences* 1). Hecht’s holistic definition is that “culture is the manifold ways of perceiving and organizing the world that are held in common by a group of people and passed on interpersonally and intergenerationally” (163). Said describes culture as “an environment, process, and hegemony in which individuals (in their private circumstances) and their works are embedded” and adds that it is within culture “that we can seek out the range of meanings

and ideas conveyed by the phrase ‘belonging to’ or ‘in a’ place, being ‘at home in a place’” (*World* 8). Both Said and Bakhtin view culture as composed of “an heterogeneous and even contradictory set of patterns and experiences,” according to Cruz and Meléndez (86). Wagner, Said, Bakhtin and Clifford provide important insights into culture’s inherent nature of selectivity. Wagner describes mankind as a constant inventor, “a mediator of things, a kind of universal catalyst. . . . [in] a program of increasingly intensive involvement” (138). Cruz and Meléndez derive their definition of a common culture, the “interplay of unity, heterogeneity, and discrepancy,” from Said’s concept of “discrepant experiences” which assumes that cultures are hybrid entities and from Bakhtin’s description of the interplay between culture’s centrifugal forces of uniformity and centripetal forces of decentralization and diversification (77-79). Clifford conceives of culture as a “deeply compromised idea” containing both differentiating functions and a collective identity, a “hybrid,” resulting from “an effect of inventive syncretism” (10). The implication in all of the above descriptions is that culture is constantly changing and evolving, in what Wagner calls the “invention and convention” in a dialectical relationship at the “core of all human. . . culture” (52).

Recognition of the complexity and changing nature of culture as revealed in the above definitions and descriptions appears weak in the field of education with some very serious consequences. Much of education, according to Cruz and Meléndez, equates culture “with nationality, ethnicity, quaint and exotic customs, learning modes and behavioral phenomena” (81-82). The lack of understanding of the essence of culture

---

shows in the goals for teaching multicultural texts, the selection of the texts, and pedagogical approaches in the 1991-95 study. Teachers' stated goals tend to be in three categories: to help students understand, appreciate and respect people of other cultures; to emphasize the universality of people and to use texts from the ethnic background of the classroom's students (Ostrowski 51-53). Selection of texts to meet these goals is very problematic. Ninety-one percent of the representative sample of public school teachers use anthologies (Applebee 82) and, according to Applebee's review of the 1989 editions of the seven most widely used anthologies, selections are of primarily white, male, Anglo-Saxon writers (85). On the other hand, teachers cannot expect anthologies to include texts representative of the diverse populations in American schools which consist not only of various categories within the American national culture but also of the world's cultures. Other problems remain which question the validity of these goals as well. Teachers themselves raise the legitimate concerns of "weighting" a selected text with the responsibility of representing the culture from which its author comes, of suggesting that "multiculturalism" can become "tokenism," and of selecting texts to equally represent the diversity of their class without the text being offensive to other class members (53-56). In using literature to teach culture, Seelye sees dangers lurking in the types of literary texts selected, suggesting that experimental, psychological and surreal texts are inappropriate, and in the tendencies to minimize the varieties of values and behaviors within a culture, to assign universal values to a target culture and to identify culture without understanding social science as the source of cultural knowledge (16-18).

Assuming that any specific text can represent a culture, as the above discussion might suggest, denies the complexity and changing nature of culture while identifying differences and emphasizing universalities in a text seem contradictory goals. Student reactions in the 1991-95 study also suggest the inappropriateness of the goals or, perhaps, the means to achieve them. Purves found students suspicious and resentful about the new of culture studied in schools even while accepting the new in popular culture (5-6). In reviewing student responses, Cruz and Meléndez also found negative reactions to multicultural texts with some students, particularly whites, unaware of their own cultural backgrounds (69). Applebee concludes the “mosaic” approach to the selection of texts reinforces stereotypes in some cases (192-93). Reasons for reinforcement, Cruz and Meléndez suggests, could be students’ resistance to changing their own stereotypes of others and their resistance to engaging other cultures (69).

Issues of ethnocentrism are also of concern to Sollar who observes that ethnicity is too often focused on politically defined ideas of ethnic typicality and when applied to the selection of texts and authors is often found wanting (153). Also relating to ethnocentrism is Said’s seminal treatise on orientalism which Said indicates began roughly in the late 18th century:

Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as a corporate institution for dealing with the Orient - dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient. (“Crisis” 295)

Steele credits Said with “unmasking of the imperialism” (102), but Clifford’s conclusions

apply even more directly to education, suggesting that “if all essentializing modes of thought must be held in suspense,” as Said claims, then culture itself must be seen as “negotiated, present processes,” rather than “organically unified or traditionally continuous,” and from this perspective, Said’s work is “exemplary” (273).

The pedagogy of the classroom does not recognize the concerns raised by Sollar, Said and Clifford as Purves demonstrates in his review of three typical approaches to multiculturalism. Purves describes the “Grand Tour” as an exclusionist approach named for a traditional 17th century practice in which a grand tour from the perspective of the “purity of Western tradition” culminated a young man’s education. The “Bazaar,” the inclusionist approach based on universality, has dominated modernist and positivist approaches to social sciences. The “Young Anthropologist,” a pluralist, comparative approach, argues for both the exclusionism and inclusionism and is the cultural studies approach. Purves argues that each of the approaches “is an abstraction of the complexity of reality of a society” (1-5). Hartman also expresses grave concerns of the consequences of current practices:

. . .in order to legitimate creative energies coming from a more diffused center and use everything cultural as fodder for spectacle and entertainment, the seriousness of the concept of ‘culture’ seeks shelter from inauthenticity and trivialization in that of ‘a culture’ for otherwise we risk losing entirely the idea of radical poiesis: that man is made by what he makes. . . has transformative potential. (9)

Jordan concludes that the problem of making multicultural texts more accessible to students is two-fold: the limited selection in anthologies and the difficulties teachers face to approach “other” texts with new eyes through which both they and their students can

read (17). This paper does not address the limited selection problem of anthologies, but, instead, focuses on the challenges of finding better means for teachers and students alike to synthesize appropriate cultural and literary theories which do justice to the complexity and changing nature of culture while enhancing meaningful interpretation of texts.

The investigation of the problems students encounter in understanding multicultural texts, Jordan concludes, reveals that high school students generally read for the basic story and fill in the parts of the texts they cannot understand in order to find meaning, but that deeper analysis depends on what they've been taught by their teachers (9-10). In looking at texts, Ostrowski found that most teachers believe that the thematic approach is the best way to reach their goals and that many teachers also include the reader response approach or variations of it in conjunction with the thematic approach (58-60). The incorporation of both text and reader response approaches leads Purves to state, "Taken as extremes and as slogans, the two positions are mutually exclusive and the pedagogy of literature becomes a mess" (8). Applebee confirms that many professionals see text and student centered approaches in opposition; however, over 90% of the classroom teachers consider both approaches "somewhat" important in their teaching (194-95). In reviewing the history of teaching English, Applebee identifies three forces: an emphasis on the importance of a common cultural heritage which has often been fused with the New Critical approach, an emphasis on the development of essential language skills which favors practical texts in preference to "great books," and an emphasis on the child rather than the subject (3-4). A variety of approaches in the past twenty years,



according to Applebee, challenges New Criticism's dominance of the 1950s and 1960s, but the challenges play in the area of literary criticism and, with the exception of reader response, not in pedagogy (116-17). At the higher education level, Miller cites a Modern Language Association study indicating that the traditional canon is still the backbone of the English curricula and that perhaps the majority of courses are still taught using the methods and assumptions of the New Criticism (131-32).

In a more complete history of the development of literary studies in the United States, Miller also identifies three presuppositions which are "to a considerable degree contradictory" and "marked by fissures" which are seldom acknowledged openly. These three presuppositions which Miller contends are still strong and active, but inappropriate, justifications for the study of literature in the United States include teaching students "to write and speak well in professional and public life," adapting the tradition of scientific philology developed to interpret Biblical and classical texts to the study of vernacular literatures, and "making available knowledge of 'the best' that is known and thought in the world" (119-20). The New Criticism entered American literature studies in the 1940s and dominated until the mid-1960s when historical events of the Vietnam War, feminism, and the Civil Rights movement made conventional theories seem irrelevant. The final phase of literary studies was the introduction and adaptations of continental theories which began in the 1950s and resulted in American teachers and students feeling the need to have expertise in the disciplines of philosophy, social theory, psychoanalysis, anthropology, linguistics, and history to interpret texts (126-29). Jordan reports on what

is known about students reading in English class: they “read to understand,” evidenced in book reports consisting of the retold story; “look for connections” to themes which emphasizes universals over cultural understanding; read text in terms of personal response and devoid of context; have little knowledge of other cultures on which to interpret texts so they rely upon familiar ways; and:

respond according to how they are taught. . . . Thematic teaching and literature anthologies serve to teach students to read for universals and to seek out happy endings if possible. (31-32)

The 1991-95 study confirms, according to Cruz and Meléndez, Applebee’s more extensive study showing that students focus on “the right answers” and “text comprehension” over cultural questions (90-91). Curricular ethnotheories with emphases on such things as performance, discrete and measurable skill development and behavioral changes also influence literature reading by encouraging identification of the main ideas, plots, settings and so forth (Cruz and Meléndez 90). This brief review of the history and current pedagogy of literary studies demonstrates that neither students nor teachers have the necessary tools to accomplish the task of interpreting literary texts specifically selected to reflect cultural diversity.

“A good interpretation of anything - a poem, a person, a history, a ritual, an institution, a society - takes us into the heart of that of which it is the interpretation” (Geertz, *Interpretation* 18). The questions become what do teachers and students need to get into the heart of multicultural texts and what are the desired outcomes? Miller begins by addressing the ethics of reading which:

involves questions of an obligation or responsibility incurred by the act of reading or teaching a work of literature, an obligation to the text read, to the students to whom one teaches it. . . , (136)

and continues by asserting that in the United States, at least, it should become a social function having “as its primary goal the teaching of good reading” with skills to “read all the signs of our surrounding” (136-37). Applebee believes in the “effort to involve students in the ongoing cultural dialogue about the human condition that literature at its best demands and to which it contributes” (153). Burton’s and Hall’s objectives direct attention to the changes within the reader. Hall says that:

years of study have convinced me that the ultimate purpose of the study of culture is not so much the understanding of foreign culture as much as the light that sheds on our own. (*Dance* 59)

According to Burton:

the point is that we must now find better ways to talk across the spaces between readers, texts, and cultures. We might find that we are not so much talking to ‘the other’ as we are to parts of ourselves that have lain undiscovered and unarticulated. (122)

The objectives of the above writers focus on the learning values of multicultural texts, to read the signs of one’s surroundings, to learn and dialogue about the human condition, and to discover and understand oneself and one’s culture. These goals differ significantly from the teacher stated goals (Ostrowski 51-53) which focus on the attitudinals of understanding the other and of societal change. The goals stated by Geertz, Miller, Burton and Hall as referenced above seem more appropriate than the classroom teachers’ stated goals in addressing the need for students to successfully adapt to the modern world, rich in diversity, but also challenged by clashing cultures adapting to changes thrust upon

them by technology and politics. To ask less is to risk oversimplification and trivialization of the complexity and changing nature inherent in all cultures.

### **Critical theories appropriate for multicultural texts**

In his forty years as an anthropologist, Hall claims that his work at the “interface” of cultures has revealed much about both cultures as contrasts are revealed (*Dance* 54). Bakhtin credits “outsideness” as the most important factor in understanding culture. “It is only in the eyes of *another* [italics author’s] that foreign culture reveals itself fully and profoundly” (*Speech* 86). Interpreting multicultural texts is working at the “interface” between cultures where one’s “outsideness” may afford special insights; however, one’s location in relation to the text also presents special challenges to recognizing one’s own cultural assumptions of meanings and pedagogy at work in interpretation. In Holquist’s eyes, Bakhtin’s “extraordinary sensitivity to the immense plurality of experience more than anything else distinguishes Bakhtin from other moderns who have been obsessed with language” (xx), adding that Bakhtin’s basic model is two people talking but each “would be a consciousness at a specific point in the history of defining itself through the choices it has made. . . .” (xx). Both American teachers and students who focus on “the right answers” (Meléndez 90-91) may find Bakhtin’s view of the temporal world “where there is no first word (no ideal word), and a final word has not yet been spoken” (“Epic” 30) and Said’s concept that “no text is finished since its potential range is always being

examined” (“Road” 54) difficult concepts to accept and incorporate into their methodology. Bakhtin’s belief that literature cannot be understood outside of the entire culture of a given epoch (*Speech* 2-3) poses special difficulties for American students who lack knowledge of other cultures (Jordan 31-32) and other world literature. This difficulty cannot be overcome within the classroom incorporating texts from various cultures. It may be somewhat mitigated by emphasizing the tentativeness of any interpretation and by limiting text selection to the modern era in which students may be somewhat more cognizant with, at least, the political, economic, and social factors currently affecting the world’s cultures. Bakhtin offers yet another precaution, that, in general, world literature is seldom “single-voiced, and yet we look at world literature from a tiny island limited in time and space . . .” (“Discourse” 374). Said views texts as having existence “enmeshed in circumstances, time, place, and society - in short, they are in the world” which means that interpretation is more than “the private process of reading” (*World* 35). Said also cautions that the “secular” world is not “reducible to an explanatory or originating theory, much less to a collection of cultural generalities” (27). A specific suggestion Said offers the reader is to view the text as a “dynamic field” with a certain range of references which he calls “tentacles” to the author, the reader, the historical situation and to other texts, past and present (“Roads” 53-54). Cruz and Meléndez also recognize “cultural multiplicity at many levels,” including that of the teacher, students and school participating in the “literary event” of interpreting a text within a classroom which includes the cultures related to the author, the reader, the

reading situation and the literary work (94-95). The elements required for interpreting texts revealed in the views of Said and Bakhtin expressed above are missing from the dominant contemporary critical theories as reviewed by Steele, who concludes that the dominant paradigms of contemporary theory “block out rather than enable the analysis of gender, race and differences that lie at the heart of today’s cultural reflections” (1). Both Bakhtin and Said see the obligation to the interpretation of a text requires greater sensitivity to all the voices of the texts and awareness that an interpretation is never complete.

Among the reasons teachers give for not teaching literature of other cultures is that they don’t understand and are not “experts” of the cultures represented by the texts, both unacceptable reasons to Dasenbrock, who argues that one always experiences as a “first time” (35-41). The importance that Said and Bakhtin place upon recognizing the various cultural influences within a text adds an understanding to teachers’ resistance, even though both of these critics also speak of the special insights “outsideness” can bring to interpretation. Dasenbrock suggests the starting point for a theory of cross-cultural interpretation begins with the three aspects of Davidson’s passing theory. The first aspect is readers always begin with an assumption of meaning based upon their own experiences and then move to the location and understanding of the difference. The process, a movement from assumption to changed interpretations as anomalies are faced, leads to an ability to communicate across the difference. When faced with an anomaly, the reader’s interpretation changes, or “passes,” to a new theory of interpretation. The

third aspect, and the one Davidson stresses, is that the process of passing theory changes not only the interpretation, but also the interpreter (41-45). The stated goals of the teachers (Ostrowski 51-53) focus upon students' learning to value and understand the differences between cultures but fail to include students' understanding their own cultural assumptions, the process of moving from those assumptions to interpreting text from another culture, and an appreciation of the incompleteness inherent in all interpretations. Text and reader centered theories most used in American classrooms also fail to fully acknowledge the cultural perspectives of texts, an irony when the criterion of text inclusion is its cultural origin.

Davidson's passing theory seems as much a learning theory as a literary theory which emphasizes, in the case of literary interpretation, the importance of locating teachers' and students' cultural starting points as they "pass" to what Geertz calls "the heart of that of which it is the interpretation" (*Interpretation* 18). Jordan's conclusions that the students involved in the 1991-95 study filled in the parts of the texts they could not understand (9-10) and that students who have little knowledge of other cultures rely upon familiar ways to interpret texts (31-32) are examples of passing theory. Bakhtin's literary theories of utterances, dialogism, and heteroglossia are guides through the passes and provide the necessary understanding of the cultural dynamics within texts. Bakhtin's belief that understanding a foreign culture requires, in part, seeing through another's eyes but "*creative understanding* [italics author's] does not renounce itself, its own place in time, its own culture; and it forgets nothing" further illustrates his understanding of the

plurality of experiences, including those of the interpreter's of the text (*Speech* 7). It also emphasizes the importance for students and teachers to have a better understanding of cultural and literary theories as they reflect upon their own abilities to access meaning in multicultural texts.

Bakhtin argues, according to Kent, that utterance is the most fundamental element in communication interaction, that discourse is holistic in nature, and that utterances are dialogic in that the communicants must work out meaning in public, connecting the speaker/text with the other. Kent argues that this corresponds to “an open-ended and uncodifiable strategy for hermeneutic guessing” (282-87). Bakhtin's claimed three features of utterances, as identified by Kent, are the clear-cut boundary characterized by the change of speaking subject, finalization of the utterance and its specific semantic content. Boundaries are recognized by pauses for responses. The finalization of an utterance is indicated by a listener/reader sense that the speaker/writer has said/written everything they want at a particular moment. The pause and the utterance together represent the finalization of the utterance. Utterances do not mean the end of a sentence, are not subject to semantic or grammatical definitions and do not represent the end of a dialogic exchange. Utterances include non-language evaluative elements of the speakers and represent the temporary wholeness signaling time for a response. Finalization can be triggered by three factors, semantic exhaustiveness of the theme such as a question, the speaker's plan or will, which the listener has to determine, and the typical compositional and generic forms of finalization. Boundaries of utterances are determined by a change of



subject (288). Kent recognizes Bakhtin's "considerable influence" in literary hermeneutics as deriving from his opposition to the Cartesian view that discourse is internal in perception and meaning. A hermeneutic strategy of guessing theory, an extension of Bakhtin's views proposed by Kent, argues that if "genre has been traditionally considered to be a form of discourse that derives from a set of conventions that may be codified" (such as novel, drama, poetry and subgenres) then the response to an utterance is the genre. Communicants' expectations are derived from the "communities of readers and writers at specific historical moments" according to the literary theorists of the times and are public constructions (296). Bakhtin adds credence to Kent's guessing theory by saying that:

to some extent, primacy belongs to the response, as the activating principle. . . . Understanding comes to fruition only in the response. Understanding and response are dialectically merged and mutually condition each other; one is impossible without the other. ("Discourse" 282)

Bakhtin claims that concentration on the linguistic significance and language unity in discourse focuses on language and ignores the specific phenomena of discourse:

that are determined by the dialogic orientation. . . . [This] orientation, first, amid others' utterances inside a *single* language, the primordial dialogism of discourse, amid other 'social languages' within a single *national* language. And finally amid different national languages within the same *culture*, that is, the same socio-ideological conceptual horizon [italics author's]. ("Discourse" 275)

Bakhtin refers to these language stratifications in literature as heteroglossia, whose origins spring from genres, professions, social, generational, age group, historical moment, family and cohabitations from different socio-ideological life. These languages

combine in various ways to form new languages, and within the intersections of the language stratifications, meaning is found (“Discourse” 288-93). Bakhtin sees that “in the novel. . . internal dialogization becomes one of the most fundamental aspects of prose style” (“Discourse” 284):

Language is present to the novelist only as something stratified and heteroglot. . . . Thus heteroglossia either enters the novel in person (so to speak) and assumes material form within it in the images of speaking persons, or it determines, as a dialogizing background, the special resonance of novelistic discourse. (“Discourse” 332)

Many genres have these features as well but they do not assume the distinguishing character of the genre itself. An understanding of utterance, dialogism and heteroglossia will benefit students interpreting most texts from cultures different from their own. They are also concepts young people can understand when applied to communications and miscommunications in their daily lives. Students can understand Bakhtin’s explanation that:

what matters is not the direct meaning the word gives to objects and emotions. . . . (but) rather the actual and always self-interested *use* to which this meaning is put and the way it is expressed by the speaker, a use determined by the speaker’s position. . . and by the concrete situation. *Who* speaks and under what conditions he speaks: this is what determines the word’s actual meaning [italics author’s]. (“Discourse” 401)

Concepts similar to Bakhtin’s dialogism are found among writers of other disciplines as well. Wagner refers to Geertz’s explanation that communication is dependent on context and “only possible through the sharing of association derived from certain contentional contexts among those who wish to communicate” (39) but the associations are never completely shared and are always in the process of change. These contexts

provide a:

collective relational base, one that can be actualized explicitly or implicitly through a variety of possible expressions. They include such things as language, social 'ideology,' what is called 'cosmology,' and all the other relational sets that anthropologists delight in calling 'systems'. . . . (40)

Each section of Said's book "affirms the connection between texts and the existential actualities of human life, politics, societies, and events." The "realities of power and authority, as well as resistance" to them, Said claims, make texts possible, deliver texts to the reader, and draw the attention of critics. These realities "should be taken account of by criticism and the critical consciousness" (*World* 5). Bakhtin's influence in the concept of self is also acknowledged by Taylor who says that the dialogic self recognizes how the other fits into practices (310-11), by Herman who recognizes the upsurge of the narrative approach in the past decade by psychology and related fields in *The Dialogic Self: Meaning as Movement* (10-11), and Richardson who cites Bakhtin's conception of "thought as inner speech," a process involving many voices, and adds that the mature self is a "scene or locus of dialogue" in *Toward a Dialogical Self* (10). Recognition of the influence of Bakhtin's concepts offers opportunities for cross-curriculum exploration within the school setting.

Bakhtin, in addressing the difficulties of literary analysis, identifies rhetorical forms as having the closest relationship to artistic prose in general but claims it alone cannot access novelistic discourse because rhetorical form relates language to the poles of "monologic utterance of the individual and the system of the *unitary language* [author's italics]" ("Discourse" 267-69). Stylistic analysis cannot be directed at the whole because

it does not take into consideration the stratification and interrelationships of the languages, the social dialogue, within the novel. Stylistic analysis results in substituting analysis of the novelist or by isolating “a subordinated style. . . as if it were the style of the whole” (263). Bakhtin further explains that stylistic analysis depends upon “a profound understanding” of the socio-ideological meanings, distribution and ordering of the era. This becomes particularly difficult in texts from “distant times and alien languages, where our artistic perception cannot rely for support on a living feel for a language,” but Bakhtin adds that “artistic and ideological penetration into the whole of the novel must at all times be guided by stylistic analysis” (416-17). Ultimately, Bakhtin claims:

the decentralizing of the verbal-ideological world that finds its expression in the novel begins by presuming fundamentally differentiated social groups, which exist in an intense and vital interaction with other social groups. . . . This verbal-ideological decentering will occur only when a national culture loses its sealed-off and self-sufficient character, when it becomes conscious of itself as only one among *other* [author’s italics] cultures and languages. . . . It is this knowledge that will sap the roots of mythological feeling for language, based as it is on an absolute fusion of ideological meaning with language; there will arise an acute feeling for language boundaries (social, national and semantic), and only then will language reveal its essential *human* [italics author’s] character from behind its words, forms, styles, nationally characteristic and socially typical faces begin to emerge, the images of speaking human beings. (370)

Could this not be the underlying philosophy of proponents of multicultural education, and a better approach in literature classes than goals and methodologies commonly practiced?

## Theories of culture

If the reader must find the author's meaning by "leaping over time and culture," as Steele suggests (9), then students must also be given help in learning how to leap. A review of social scientists' perceptions of the nature of culture is indispensable to this challenge. Geertz describes what ethnographers seeking to understand a culture face, "a multiplicity of complex conceptual structures, many of them superimposed upon or knotted into one another, which are at once strange, irregular, and inexplicit" (*Interpretation* 10). This same description applies to interpreters of literary texts, with the difference lying in the purpose of their endeavors, ethnographers to describe a culture and interpreters to seek meaning within a text. The difficulty of the task faced by ethnographers as described by Geertz should reinforce teachers' apprehension of selecting texts to represent cultures and introduce a strong cautionary note against making assumptions about any culture based upon text analysis, a precaution that appears to be missing in the five ways of studying culture through literature as described by Purves. Purves chooses five metaphoric descriptions of the methods: The "Literary Canon as an Art Museum" approach is the "high culture" approach which admits only such texts as *Don Quixote* and *Macbeth*. The "Adding a New Wing: The Ethnic Hall" approach, comparable to the "salad bowl" and "additive" approaches, suggests that a few texts illustrate a culture. Representation and the size of the wing are significant problems in this approach, although Purves suggests that this is a good way to begin an exploration of

pluralism. “Culture as an Accident, or Bazaar” approach rests on the idea of universality and is frequently used by teachers in thematic approaches to literature. Such an approach is seriously flawed by distorting other cultures based upon one’s own cultural assumptions. The “Literary Reader: Alias the ‘Young Anthropologists’” approach views texts as cultural documents. Such an approach trivializes the complexity of culture and misjudges the professional skills required of social scientists analyzing texts for cultural insights. Purves’ fifth approach, the “Literary Reader as a Cultural Being” incorporates the idea that both reading and writing are culturally determined (79-81), an approach coming nearest to synthesizing an understanding of culture and appropriate literary theories when interpreting multicultural texts.

Geertz endorses Max Weber’s web theory which envisions “man as an animal suspended in webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an *interpretive* [italics author’s] one in search of meaning” (*Interpretation* 5). The web image of culture maintains an appreciation for culture’s complexity, accepting the idea of the universality of mankind’s predicament but not the universality of cultural adaptations and assumptions which form the basis for thematic approaches in literature classes. The fundamental question, as seen by Clifford, is determining the basis for distinguishing groups, suggesting that all dichotomic concepts of divisions, such as the West/rest and developed/undeveloped, are suspect. Clifford credits Said’s discourse on Orientalism most significant as it reflects on the question of distinctions (273). A major contribution of the cultural concepts held by these social

scientists to literary interpretation of multicultural texts is the challenge they pose to the curricular ethnotheories and pedagogical practices promoting definitive answers and measurable skill development and behavior changes.

Social scientists have proposed various criteria for distinguishing cultural groups. Social anthropologists in the first half of the 20th century, according to Hofstede, concluded that all societies face the same basic problems and only the answers differ. Hofstede cites results of Alex Inkeles and Daniel J. Levinson's 1954 survey of the English language literature on national cultures which suggest three basic problems: relation to authority, conception of self in relationship to society and to gender roles and ways of dealing with conflicts (*Software* 13). Gundykunst and Kim look at cultural variability as reflected in communications, and, for explanatory theories, they look at pattern variables by Parsons (1951), value orientations by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1960) and dimensions by Hofstede (1980). Patterns, as seen by Parsons, are dichotomies which must be chosen, largely unconsciously since socialization is learned at an early age, in any given situation. The five patterns Parsons identifies, as stated by Gundykunst and Kim, are self versus collective orientation; affectivity versus neutrality which concerns the nature of gratification sought; universalism versus particularism concerning the modes of categorizing people and objects; diffuseness versus specificity or how one responds to people or objects; ascription versus achievement concerning whether people are treated in terms of qualities ascribed to them or those achieved and instrumental versus expressive orientation which concerns the nature of the goals sought in interacting

with others (51). Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's models, explained in greater detail than Parsons' patterns by Gudykunst and Kim, are based on the assumptions that all cultures face a limited number of human problems for which they must find solutions, that the range of available solutions varies widely but is not unlimited, and that all potential solutions are present in all cultures but one solution is preferred. The preferred solutions fall along continuums of value orientation in each of the five areas identified by Kluckhohn: human nature orientation, person to nature orientation, time orientation, activity orientation and relational orientation. Assumptions regarding the innate character of humans range from mankind being essentially evil to being essentially good, with six points identified along the continuum. "Predominant view in the middle-class subculture of the United States is probably the view of human nature as a mixture of good and evil." Three potential orientations exist for people to relate to nature, ranging from mastery over nature which dominates in the United States to harmony with nature as reflected by many Native American cultures to an orientation that nothing can be done to control nature (48). Contemporary studies of values reflect two tracts, according to Smith and Schwartz. Rokeach's contribution was the Rokeach Value Survey developed in 1973, with Schwartz's 1992 contribution of a new theory and methodology based on Rokeach's work; the second tract is that pursued by Hofstede and Triandis (84-85). Schwartz's and Hofstede's works will be presented later as models to help students recognize cultural elements within literary texts.

The many elements making up a culture are classifiable into the four elements of



symbols, heroes, rituals and values, concludes Hofstede (*Software 7*). Hofstede explains that symbols derive their meaning from conventions recognized by insiders only. These include words, objects and gestures which carry meanings. Heroes possess desired characteristics and are models for behavior; heroes need not be real or alive. The collective rituals people participate in are “technically superfluous” and involve such things as ceremonies, greetings, and showing respect, but, within a particular culture, they are socially essential. Values reside at the deepest level of cultures and reflect broad tendencies to prefer certain states. Values are largely unconscious and cannot be directly observed but must be inferred from actions. Development psychologists believe, Hofstede continues, that most children have implicitly learned their basic value system, which is difficult to change, by age ten. The values reflect assumptions along continuums of good or bad, clean or dirty, beautiful or ugly, rational or irrational, normal or abnormal, paradoxical or logical and irrational or rational. Hofstede provides an onion diagram of the manifestations of these values to illustrate relationships of the four elements of culture. Symbols, heroes and rituals form the onion layers and are subsumed within practices which cuts through all the layers to the value core (8-9). Hofstede cautions that “systematic research on values, inferring them from people’s actions is cumbersome and ambiguous” (8). In determining values, distinctions must be made:

between the *desireable* and the *desired*: how people think the world ought to be versus what people want for themselves. . . . What distinguishes the desireable from the desired is the nature of the *norms* [all italics author’s] involved. . . the standards for values that exist within a group or category of people. In the case of the desireable, the norm is absolute, pertaining to what is ethically right. In the case of the desired, the norm is statistical: it

indicates the choices actually made by the majority. The desirable relates more to ideology, the desired to practical matters. (9-10)

People almost always belong to several levels of cultures at the same time.

Hofstede names a few cultural levels: nations; affiliations of regionalism, ethnicity, religion, and language; gender; generation; social class and employment and adds that much research is based on nationality for expediency and availability of data reasons. In reference to national culture, Hofstede reminds readers that the concept of culture, strictly speaking, belongs to societies which, historically, are “organically developed forms of social organizations”; however, many nations do form wholes consisting of clearly identifiable groups. Particular problems apply to nations whose boundaries reflect colonial logic of boundaries rather than cultural ones dividing populations (10-12). Hofstede’s major research is at the national cultural level.

In a graphic of intersecting circles, Bøegger illustrates the relationships of literature, language and culture. Language encompasses all of literature; however, most of language and literature is located within culture while over half of culture remains outside of both language and literature (108-09). Bøegger’s graphic of complex relationships emphasizes the importance of combining appropriate literary theories with a basic understanding of culture when interpreting literary texts. Bøegger’s suggestion to teach literature in ways which recognize the expression of and resistance to culture within the text (108-09) echoes Said’s proposition that the realities of power, authority and resistance should be of concern to the “critical consciousness” (*World 5*). All cultural texts, says Brøegger, use figures of speech. Similes and metaphors are linguistic texts

used to highlight meaning in the immediate context, whereas cultural symbols are often non-linguistic, are important to a larger frame of reference and whose recurring nature becomes “a thematic repository for a range of different ideas and associations” (65-68). Bakhtin stresses the importance of “the intentional dimension of stratification in literary language” which enables location:

in a single series such methodologically heterogeneous phenomena as professional and social dialects, world views and individual artistic works, for in their intentional dimension one finds that common plane on which they can all be juxtaposed, and juxtaposed dialogically” (“Discourse” 292-93).

Bakhtin explains literary techniques pertaining to the actions and language of characters; refraction and hybrid constructions; symbolic images of the rogue, clown and fool; and use of the authoritative and persuasive word within the dialogism of the text. Bakhtin’s explanations pertain specifically to the novel whose distinguishing features are heteroglossia and dialogism, but the techniques are applicable to other genre when discourse is present. Zalygin claims that all of the classic Russian novelists wrote short stories because the short story is the genre closest to conversational speech and is more traditional than any other literary form (9). Space does not allow for more than a cursory, but necessary, review of these techniques. Bakhtin states that all action is highlighted by ideology, with the hero speaking and acting from his own ideological world. “The speaking person in the novel need not necessarily be incarnated in a character” but may also be represented by inserted genre and parodied stylizations (“Discourse” 334-36). Within the heteroglossia of the novel, every character is autonomous and contains their

own belief system. The autonomy and the belief system of the characters influence authorial speech and subjects the work to stratification and speech diversity of characters. The author works through the characters' direct, indirect and quasi-direct speech to overlap and infect their languages, in "replicating frames and re-stratifying them." Characters always have a zone of their own with influence beyond the direct discourse allowed them. The zone of the major characters is "stylistically profoundly idiosyncratic" which allows dialogic play between the character and the author (315-20). Nondirect speech such as chronicles, narrators and storytellers distance the real author and allows more than one point of view and level. This refractioning allows the author an air of neutrality and a variety of distancing. "If one fails to sense this second level, the intentions and accents of the author himself, then one has failed to understand the work" (313-15). Comic-parodic re-processing of strata of language, the authorial unmasking of a parody, is called "hybrid construction" and consists of an utterance which belongs by syntax and composition to one speaker but in reality is a mixed utterance. The hybrid "pseudo-objective motivation" conceals another's speech through use of subordinate conjunctions and link words. The diversity of language allows the work of the comic style of another's speech, "O, what a wonderful man. . . -in one word, what a rich man!" (301-08).

Prose offers two responses to high pathos and to seriousness and conventionality of any sort: the gay deception of the rogue - a lie justified because it is directed to liars - and stupidity - also justified, as it is the failure to understand a lie. Between the rogue and the fool there emerges, as a unique coupling of the two, the image of the *clown* [italics author's]. (404)

Stupidity, incomprehension, is always polemical and “tears away” the mask of “lofty pseudo intelligence” with which it polemizes (403). “The rogue’s gay deception parodies high languages,” the clown maliciously distorts them, and the fool naively fails to comprehend. These three dialogic categories, with “origins at the dawn of its history emerge in modern times with extraordinary surface clarity and are embodied in the symbolic images of the rogue, the clown and the fool” (404-05).

The final technique expounded upon by Bakhtin involves the authoritative and persuasive word. Bakhtin claims that the authoritative word is not successful in novels because it permits no play, allowing only acceptance or rejection of the whole of the unquestioned truth of a prior discourse such as science or religion. The authoritative word is fused with its authority which can be political power, person or institution (342-44):

Internally persuasive discourse - as opposed to one that is externally authoritative - is, as it is affirmed through assimilation, tightly interwoven with ‘one’s own word.’ In everyday rounds of our consciousness, the internally persuasive word is half-ours and half-someone else’s. Its creativity and productivity consist precisely in the fact that such a word awakens new and independent words, that it organizes masses of our words from within, and does not remain in an isolated and static condition. (345-46)

The factors determining the persuasive word determines the “methods for formulating internally persuasive discourse during its transmission, as well as methods for framing it in contexts.” Certain kinds of persuasive discourse can be imparted through the image of a speaking person, such as a priest for ethical discourse or a leader for sociopolitical discourse (346-49):

The means of formatting and framing internally persuasive discourse may be supple and dynamic to such an extent that this discourse may literally be *omnipresent* [italics author's] in the context, imparting to everything its own specific tones and from time to time breaking through; to become a completely materialized thing, as another's word fully set off and demarcated (as happens in character zones). (346)

The individual struggles with the internally persuasive word. Literary theories and techniques as described above access the voices of the text; an understanding of the nature of culture adds meaning to the significance of those voices.

### **Cultural values models**

The methods explained by Bøegger and Bakhtin provide stylistic analysis guidelines for readers accepting Bakhtin's opinion that stylistic analysis must guide the artistic and ideological interpretation of the text at all times ("Discourse" 416-17).

Cultural value models by Schwartz and Hofstede provide two options to aid readers in recognizing cultural factors present in the context of the text. Schwartz's theory provides a structural model portraying the pattern of conflict and compatibility of ten motivational types of values (Smith and Schwartz 87). Hofstede's dimensional model includes a set of five values he identifies as existing in all cultures. Both of these models, along with an overview of other models, are further described below to provide additional information to aid teachers and students in their synthesizing an increased awareness of the nature and complexity of culture with the literary theories discussed above.

The basic question of philosophers and social scientists, according to Kagitcibasi,

is, “How is social order possible?” If the amount of printed discourse supporting a single organizational model is an indication of acceptance, individualism versus collectivism, however it is defined, is a distinguishing factor of cultures. Kagitcibasi discusses the recent upsurge in interest in individualism and collectivism, which may indicate a possible “general trend toward universals. . . . accumulating evidence pointing to individualism and collectivism as a factor in explaining several kinds of variance” (8-9). Reinforcing Kagitcibasi’s conclusion, Berry notes in his introduction to the *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology* that in most chapters contributors mention individualism and collectivism and that an ecocultural framework is “at least implicit in many chapters,” suggesting that most researchers are accepting the frameworks of these concepts. Beginning in the late 1990s most “cultural social psychologists tend to conceptualize relations between environments (both physical and social) and behaviors (both overt and inferred internal psychological states) as a complex of interacting variables” (xxxiii). Challengers to such conclusions include Smith and Schwartz who warn the conclusion that “the major dimensions of culture-level variation in values have now been identified must be treated with caution” (110), citing two specific concerns, the evidence of important and continuous global change in values over the past decades and the under representation of major areas of the world, including Arab and African countries. Smith and Schwartz also emphasize the importance of maintaining a sharp difference between the individual and cultural levels of analysis (110-12). Referring to the numerous conceptualizations of the individualism/collectivism dimension which results in diversity

of meaning, the amount of research derived indirectly and the causal assumptions made with insufficient research prompt Kagitcibasi to ask, “Have the individualism/collectivism proponents overreached?” (22-29). Citing studies of more narrowly defined scales, Smith and Schwartz also suggest that this construct “has probably been defined in an overly inclusive global manner that is not justified conceptually” (89-90).

Methodology problems which concern Smith and Schwartz are researcher value interference when cultural values are inferred indirectly and, when values are determined directly, the significant difficulties regarding response bias and meaning equivalency in different languages and cultures (80-81).

Smith and Schwartz’s and Kagitcibasi’s specific warnings regarding research conclusions are applicable to students and teachers interpreting literary texts as well. Interpretations are indirect inferences by readers and, therefore, are also subject to reader value bias. Concerns regarding meaning equivalency in test instruments across cultures and languages are also present in translations of literary texts. Dingwaney, et al. propose literature classroom analysis of the problems inherent in literary translations as an approach to multicultural texts, suggesting students need to be aware of the many factors influencing translations, including such things as the translators’ language and literary abilities and their personal ideology, experiences and familiarity with the various voices within the texts (47-62). The fact that translators and interpreters must always act as mediators between peoples of different languages does not negate the need for student awareness of the translator’s voice and the potential fallacies of all cultural research. In



systematic sampling research, Van de Vijver suggests that selecting cultures with great differences helps in the detection of cultural differences and universal features (28).

Selection of multicultural texts from world literature benefits students in the same manner, demonstrating that individuals and people can address life's problems in a great variety of ways and in ways clearly distinguishable from one's own. Hofstede identifies gender, generation and class cultures as categories of people, which are only parts of social systems and, as such, should be described in their own terms, based upon special studies of such cultures (*Software* 17). This explanation illustrates the significance of the statement by a teacher in the 1991-95 study that the term "multicultural" is "woefully imprecise" (Ostrowski 51). "Multicultural" is usually applied equally to texts of the integrated categories of America's national culture and to texts of America's immigrant cultures as represented by world literature where greater "outsideness" offers the advantage of more easily recognized differences. Interpretation of multicultural texts from categories within one's own culture may evoke more evaluative judgments based upon one's own cultural preferences and perceived cultural familiarity; in other words, students may be too close to recognize the differences as cultural.

Hofstede addresses an issue of importance, equating nationality to culture, by explaining that nationality and gender are involuntary attributes which are present from birth, reinforced by social institutions and, therefore, reflect mostly basic level values, while other organizational cultures like occupation differ more superficially and reflect practices level culture more (*Software* 17). Although, say Smith and Schwartz,

correlational studies cannot form a strong basis for inferences of causal relationships between national cultures, as measured by culture level values, and behavior of residents, comparisons with other possible causal links and careful reasoning suggest how these values affect lives through social policies (107). Like many writers, Hofstede adds cautions about stereotyping, describing and predicting individual behavior based on societal factors. “Ecological fallacy” is confusing the level of the individual with the level of society, confusing the personality with culture (*Software* 112). This also represents one of the hazards of the selection and interpretation of texts based on cultural expectations; societal preference norms, if known, should not be used to make assumptions about the individual. Statistical norms of cultural values are derived from averages of individual values. Readers face the challenge of recognizing the societal factors affecting characters and events in the text, the multiple voices of dialogism present and the voices of resistance to societal norms without assuming the societal preferences identified in the texts are applicable to the entire culture represented by the text.

Gundykunst and Kim say “individualism - collectivism is the major dimension of cultural variability used to explain cross-cultural differences in behavior,” the distinction determined by whether individual or group goals are emphasized (42). Hofstede’s 1980 model is the most extensive cultural variabilities study in the number of countries and respondents involved and the one most referenced in later individualism/collectivism studies. Individualism/collectivism is one of the four dimensions Hofstede identified

through a fourteen work-goal item questionnaire administered to 117,000 IBM employees in forty countries, later expanded to include fifty countries and three regions. (Kagitcibasi 10-11). Hue and Triandis in 1986 studies, according to Bhawuk and Triandis, further extended Hofstede's individualism/collectivism research. Results of their questionnaire, answered by psychologists and anthropologists around the world, conclude that collectivism is a "cluster of a wide variety of beliefs and behaviors" categorized into seven groups (19-21). Fernandez et al. credit Hofstede's 1980 frequently cited research as being "instrumental in furthering an understanding of cross-cultural management theory and practice" but they also have concerns over his methodology. Fernandez, et al's replication of Hofstede's study twenty-five years later found significant shifts in value classification, concluding that "although a nation's work-related values are deep-seated preferences for certain end states, they are subject to change over the years as external environmental changes shape a society" (43-52). Gundykunst and Kim conclude that Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's 1960s relational value orientation model is consistent with the broad dimension of the cultural variability of individualism/collectivism. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck see three potential ways to define relationships: individualism, in which the individual is seen as a unique, separate entity with individual goals over group goals; lineality, which focuses on the group and group goals over time, such as the aristocracies of Europe; and collaterality which focuses on the group but not through time (50). Smith and Schwartz conclude that the seven cultural level value types identified by Schwartz in 1990s research are remarkably similar to the conclusions reached by

Hofstede with the suggestion that differences may simply reflect different samples and the two-decade time span between the studies (104-05). Hofstede sees his own research as empirically substantiating Inkeles and Levinson's 1954 survey of English-language literature on national culture which suggested four common problems cultures worldwide face: relation to authority; conception of self, particularly as it relates to gender roles and relation to society and ways of dealing with conflicts (*Software* 13-14). The apparent wide-spread acceptance of the universality of the dimension of individualism/collectivism as revealed in Hofstede's research, despite concerns regarding definition, methodology and assumptions, suggest it is an important present and active voice in dialogism of literary texts whose influence on the character and events needs recognition and assessment.

Social organizations can be characterized by a variety of models. Hofstede acknowledges that the division of societies into typologies of ideal types such as first, second and third world countries or more sophisticated ones like family types has an advantage in ease in imagining, but, because societies are hybrids and arbitrary rules of division are empirically problematic, dimensional divisions are preferable for research. A dimension can be measured numerically and plotted at a point along a continuum. Two dimensions can also be plotted along a line to create a dimensional model but envisioning the multidimensionality of culture to show relationships between the four or five dimensions identified by Hofstede becomes difficult (*Software* 13-15). Hofstede classifies national cultures measured along the continuums of five dimensions:

collectivism versus individualism, power distance ranging from small to large, feminism versus masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance, and long-term versus short-term orientation which Hofstede adds later as a missing dimension of his own studies (14).

Hofstede's research, conducted primarily in the IBM business settings, focuses on social organizations. Gundykunst and Kim identify patterns of values of cultures, reflecting more perception and interaction expectations than social organization, along five continuums of comparisons. The first pattern explained is the affectivity/neutrality orientation pattern which refers to the preference for immediacy of gratification and ranges from a preference for immediate gratification which is associated with emotions, to a preference for delayed gratification, associated with cognition. The diffuseness/specificity preference pattern refers to how people and objects are perceived.

Gundykunst and Kim explain this pattern orientation through the perception of a waiter as a whole person illustrating diffuseness contrasted to seeing the waiter in a waiter role illustrating specificity. The ascription/achievement orientation pattern refers to how people are perceived on the basis of ascription, the qualities inherent in the group to which they are born such as gender and family status, versus achievement, the results of one's own efforts, such as profession and social class. Instrumental/expressive orientation concerns how interactions are perceived as means to reach other goals, instrumental, or valued as ends in themselves, expressive. The fifth pattern orientation, universalism/particularism, described by Gundykunst and Kim, also refers to how people and objects are perceived. Universalism reflects a general frame or reference while

particularism refers to dividing into specific categories unique to situations. The United States' cultural value patterns tend to reflect, claims Gudykunst, more neutral, specificity, achievement, instrumental and universalism preferences (51-53). To provide an explanatory system for nonverbal behaviors important in cross-cultural communications, Hecht chooses from the models of others: the four dimensions of Hofstede's original IBM research, Hall's high/low context classification determined by the degree cultures rely on context rather than explicit language for communication and immediacy, the actions communicating closeness, approach and accessibility, which include nonverbal behavior such as expressions, body positions and movement, touch and space closeness (167). Although all societies display the same nonverbal behaviors, the meanings attached to them are culture specific and, when included in texts, should be interpreted very carefully to avoid one's own ethnocentric assumptions regarding meanings.

This brief overview of research of cultural classifications by social scientists illustrate the wide range of conceptualizations available to researchers and, also, the wide range of options available to people as they invent and reinvent their worlds. Each of the above classifications is based upon elements of primary cultural values, rather than the symbols, myths, and rituals evident in cultural practices whose meanings are difficult to determine, including by those who practice them. People in every culture must make choices along the continuums of the various choices proposed by social scientists. The dimensions and the available choices are the presumed universals of humanity; the

choices are cultural and personal. Looking at the core values of another culture also means looking at one's own culture and its location along the same continuums. Looking at practices, the focus of much multicultural education, is looking at differences which students may find exotic, boring, or interesting; however, it does not require students to look at their own culture or culture in the broad sense. Appreciation and understanding of differences if seen apart from one's own world is a personal option much like appreciation of another's choice of music and art. A more appropriate goal of instruction is understanding oneself through a greater understanding of the nature of culture and its influence on the way one thinks, feels, and acts. World literature offers an opportunity to see culture's influences in contexts sharply contrasting to one's own, but along the same continuums of options.

The theories and explanations of culture as presented above cover a broad spectrum of cultural factors which may be present in texts, but recognizing these aspects in texts remains difficult. In order to narrow the focus of cultural aspects to look for in literary texts, the models of cultural values proposed by Schwartz and by Hofstede are presented below. Choosing either does not preclude the use of parts or all of other dimensions and models which may seem more appropriate for specific texts or more familiar to the teacher through his/her own educational and personal experiences. In reading literary texts, students need a clear understanding of what "cultural values" implies. Hofstede defines values as:

attributes of individuals as well as of collectivities; culture presupposes a collectivity. . . . I define a value as a tendency to prefer certain states of

affairs over others (*Software* 13).

Schwartz and Sagiv, “following Kluckhohn (1951) and Rokeach (1973),” define “human values as desirable goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in people’s lives” (2). Distinguishing between the desirable, “how people think the world ought to be,” and the desired, “what people want for themselves,” is important to avoid paradoxical results in interpretations of value surveys, according to Hofstede (*Software* 9-10). Referring to the importance of value priorities, Smith and Schwartz claim that value priorities may be the key element in a society’s culture and that individuals’ value priorities relate to all aspects of their behavior. Changing sociopolitical and ecological influences and experiences directly influence individual and society values (79). In describing values, Damen says that they “bring affective force to beliefs” to what we value as good and bad, are learned and are seldom shared in specifics by different generations, although certain themes prevail (191). This relationship between individual and societal value priorities exists because, according to Smith and Schwartz:

the shared cultural values emphases in a society help to shape the reward contingencies to which people must adapt in the institutions in which they spend most of their time - families, schools, factories, businesses, and so forth. . . . The *average* [italics author’s] value priorities of societal members reflect the central thrust of their shared enculturation, independent of individual differences due to unique experiences or heredity. (95)



### **Schwartz's motivational goals model**

Schwartz & Savig, postulating that the content of values, which have psychological, practical and social consequences, determines their motivational goals, derive a typology to reflect the conscious goals of values, reasoning that goals would reflect the universal needs of human existence, “biological needs, requisites of coordinated social interaction and demands of group functioning.” The typology Schwartz derives includes ten motivationally distinct types of values (2). Smith and Schwartz explain that Schwartz, using values determined by previous researchers and those found in the world's religious and philosophical writings, grouped the fifty-six selected values into ten motivational value types. Survey respondents usually include a sample from urban school teachers because of their role in value socialization and one from college students (56-57). Schwartz and Savig list the motivational types in terms of goals and the single values which represent them:

- **Power:** Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources. (Social Power, Authority, Wealth) [Preserving My Public Image, Social Recognition] [a]
- **Achievement:** Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards. (Successful, Capable, Ambitious, Influential) [Intelligent, Self-Respect]
- **Hedonism:** Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself. (Pleasure,

Enjoying Life)

- **Stimulation:** Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life. (Daring, A Varied Life, An Exciting Life)
- **Self-Direction:** Independent thought and action-choosing, creating, exploring. (Creativity, Freedom, Independent, Curious, Choosing Own Goals) [Self-Respect]
- **Universalism:** Understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature. (Broadminded, Wisdom, Social Justice, Equality, A World at Peace, A World of Beauty, Unity With Nature, Protecting the Environment)
- **Benevolence:** Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact. (Helpful, Honest, Forgiving, Loyal, Responsible) [True Friendship, Mature Love]
- **Tradition:** Respect, commitment and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self. (Humble, Accepting My Portion in Life, Devout, Respect for Tradition, Moderate)
- **Conformity:** Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms. (Politeness, Obedient, Self-Discipline, Honoring Parents and Elders)
- **Security:** Safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships and self. (Family Security, National Security, Social Order, Clean,

Reciprocation of Favors) [Sense of Belonging, Healthy]

- a. Values in brackets are not used in computing indexes for value types (12-13).

Values, located along continuums emanating from a center, give rise to the circular configuration conceptualized by Schwartz in which the proximity of value types around the circle indicate the degree of compatibility and conflict among the values. The intermixing of values from adjacent types which are found in empirical studies indicates the basic character of value priorities and the overlapping nature of value types; conflicting values are clearly distinguishable. Superimposed on this circular figure, and representing its most basic structure, is the two-dimensional organization of values, Openness to Change versus Conservation, encompassing self-direction and stimulation versus security, conformity and tradition value types, and Self-Transcendence versus Self-Enhancement, encompassing universalism and benevolence versus power and achievement value types. Hedonism is found in both Openness to Change and Self-Enhancement (2-3). Schwartz and Savig research using data from eighty-eight samples from forty countries confirms Schwartz's previous conclusions regarding the presence of the ten motivational types across cultures, the universality of the two-dimensional organization system and the high consistency of meaning of forty-four of the fifty-six values across cultures (10). Smith and Schwartz's suggestions on the implications of national value priorities and suggestions for further cultural research are of value to literary interpretation as precautionary notes. Although correlational studies of national

culture combined with “careful reasoning and empirical comparisons” can suggest how value priority studies affect social policy and lives of people, according to Smith and Schwartz, they “cannot form a strong basis for inferences about causal relationships” (107) to such things as “national wealth, economic growth, latitude, population size, growth and density” as suggested by Hofstede’s studies (106). Although comparative data and causal suppositions are available from research data, providing students with such information risks students forming cultural assumptions which may not reflect cultural values within specific texts and looking for evidence within the texts to validate such assumptions. Two guidelines Smith and Schwartz propose for cultural research addressing global cultural diversity, to maintain a distinction between individual and culture-level analysis and to focus on the dimensional structure of values (112), are also of value in literary interpretations. An understanding of culture and cultural differences can inform teachers and students interpreting literary texts; however, making assumptions about a culture based upon specific texts is not warranted, distracts from the literary interpretation objective of a literature class and trivializes the complexities and nature of cultures.

### **Hofstede’s dimensional model of cultural values**

The purpose and instrument design of Hofstede’s research, the dimensional model of cultural values, reflect the internal needs of the international operations of IBM,

Hofstede's employer. Only after the data was collected did Hofstede make national cultural comparisons based upon that data. Recognizing the origins of his research, Hofstede discusses the strengths and weaknesses of research which is based on the personal work-related values of employees of a multinational corporation who, admittedly, are not representative of their respective countries. The representative issue is not a problem for cross-national comparison as long as subjects are functionally equivalent, Hofstede contends, adding that, in fact, the assumed similarity of IBM employees worldwide, except for their nationality, is a strength of the research, providing clarity to the interpretation of data because employee basic differences lie in national cultures which they acquire through childhood and possess at the time of employment. Survey respondents representing thirty-eight occupations in seventy-two IBM international subsidiaries completed the survey which was developed in twenty languages. The initial material for Hofstede's cross-national study is based on IBM employee surveys conducted in 1968 and again in 1972 resulting in over 116,000 questionnaires composed of over one hundred questions. A problem of this instrument for exact replication purposes is meaning equivalency in questions containing company jargon; however, Hofstede contends that "scores on many conceptually related measures from other sources are correlated sufficiently strongly with the IBM dimension scores to eliminate chance explanation" (*Software* 251-52). A second weakness which Hofstede acknowledges is that, although the construction of the instrument in twenty languages was a cooperative project among native speakers, the design and testing was

done only in Western countries (160). Hofstede's research argues that because the four identified dimensions were present in every country surveyed they are universals; however, it is of significant importance to recognize that these dimensions represent only forty-nine percent of the revealed country differences with the remaining differences attributed to country specific values (252). The significance of this for literary interpretation is the recognition that no research model can account for all cultural differences and that cultural models cannot fully account for individuals' values and behaviors. Hofstede specifically warns that country scores describe the likely social systems in which a person has grown up, but must not be the basis for stereotypical assumptions about individuals who may not represent their national norms (252).

Hofstede addresses *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* to "any interested reader," in contrast to the publication of his original research in *Culture's Consequences* (1980) which was "written for a scholarly public" (*Software* ix). In *Software*, Hofstede discusses each of the five cultural dimensions and the "consequences of the dimension for family life, school, workplace, organization, state, and the development of ideas" (xi). Hofstede emphasizes that his descriptions are the extremes for each dimension while actual country scores are relative to each other along the continuum between these extremes. With these parameters firmly in mind and with the recognition that empirical research does not directly validate Hofstede's general descriptions, readers, unaccustomed to looking for primary cultural influences within literary texts, will find them of value whether they use Hofstede's model or any other

methodology to access the “culture” of the text and to speculate on their own location relative to the cultures represented in the text along the same continuums.

Hofstede’s research reveals four dimensions of national cultures which he initially labeled as Power Distance, Individualism, Masculinity, and Uncertainty Avoidance, and, on the strength of results of Bond’s later Chinese Value Survey (CVS), added Long-term Orientation as the missing cultural value in his own research (*Software* xv). Smith and Schwartz compared results of Bond’s 1987 research which was based on an instrument designed by Chinese to reflect Eastern rather than Western cultures and tested on students from twenty-three countries. Bond’s country-level factor analysis, like Hofstede’s, yielded four orthogonal factors, of which three correlated to Hofstede’s research. Bond’s research supports the universality of power distance and individualism factors but reinforces doubts about the distinctiveness of these two factors from one another; fails to reveal an uncertainty avoidance factor, raising questions about this dimension’s universality; and identifies the fourth dimension which Bond labeled the Confucian Work Dynamism and Hofstede later adopted as a missing dimension from his own model. Although Bond’s research identifies a masculinity factor, Smith and Schwartz have questions whether it truly is supportive of Hofstede’s research, as Hofstede claims, since items defining the factor seem to contradict Hofstede’s items (98). Hofstede views Bond’s work as revealing the cultural Western bias of Hofstede’s instrument which did not include items revealing the long-term orientation, or the Confucian Work Dynamism (*Software* 14). Hofstede’s research recognizes the close relationship between

individualism and power distance, with their distinctiveness revealed in the country scores of only a few countries (55). In explaining the missing uncertainty avoidance dimension which is “associated among other things with man’s search for Truth,” Hofstede concludes “that the Chinese minds which composed the CVS questions related to Truth were not relevant,” (164) and questions relating to time orientation were not relevant to the Western minds composing the IBM survey; but, “Confucius teachings are lessons in practical ethics without any religious content” (165) and, therefore, reflect this dimension.

Hofstede uses computer analogies and a pyramid to explain differences in the thinking, acting and behavior of individuals in *Cultures and Organization: Software of the Mind*. The software “indicates what reactions are likely and understandable, given one’s past” (*Software* 4). Computer analogies are appropriate to help technologically savvy students understand culture. Hofstede points out that, like computer software, one’s mental programming does not prevent individuals from deviating in “new, creative, destructive, or unexpected” (4) ways. Hofstede’s software analogy could be expanded to explain that cultural “default settings” determine action unless the operator using the “software” deliberately chooses a different action. Hofstede’s three-level pyramid model to explain “human mental programming” could also be explained through computer analogies, with the exception that the levels of human programming are not sharply defined as computer technology is. The base of the pyramid, representing “human nature,” could be envisioned as a universal operating system which includes such things



as the innate human need for social interaction, human communication through language and the human ability to feel emotions. The middle of the pyramid, “culture,” is learned and is specific to a group or category. The apex of the pyramid, “personality,” could be envisioned as the computer operator who ultimately determines the behavior.

Personality, specific to an individual, is both inherited and learned by experiences within one’s own culture (4-6).

In summarizing the main cultural differences among nations, those lying in values, Hofstede identifies the:

systematic differences (that) exist. . . with regard to values about power and inequality, with regard to relationship between the individual and the group, with regard to the social roles expected from men or women, with respect to ways of dealing with the uncertainties in life, and with respect to whether one is mainly preoccupied with the past or the present. (236)

Each of these is described below in greater detail, using Hofstede’s descriptions of consequences of the dimensions in the home, school, workplace, state and ideas. These descriptions should not be looked upon as definitive descriptions for any of the cultural influences readers will find in literary texts. Their value lies in providing readers some guidelines of how and where to look for evidence of primary level culture within literary texts.

### **Power distance orientation**

Inequalities exist in physical and intellectual abilities, power, wealth and status,

and these inequalities do not necessarily go together as evidenced by powerful, wealthy businessmen without status and artists with status but not wealth. How cultures view and deal with such inequalities is reflected in the power distance index (PDI). Like all of the dimension scores, a country's position on the power distance index represents relative rather than absolute value (*Software 25*) in comparison to other country scores. Hofstede sees both the Christian Bible's praise of poverty and Karl Marx's ideology of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as examples of a strong belief in social equality (24). Factor analysis of data from the IBM employee value survey reveals the presence of the power distance dimension reflected in questions regarding boss/subordinate relation preferences, or degree of dependency as answered by subordinates who, according to Hofstede, are better observers of leaders than leaders are of themselves. Power distance is "defined as the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally," where as, the institutions are represented by family, school, and community and organizations by the work setting (28-29).

Power distances also exist within different social classes, education levels and occupations. Power distance scores are based upon IBM's sales and service employees, the only occupation found in all IBM subsidiaries. France, Germany and Great Britain subsidiaries having the fullest range of industrial activities allowed for a less extensive analysis but one in which all levels of IBM employees were represented. Results of the comparison within these three subsidiaries show that employees in the occupations

requiring the lowest levels of education, unskilled and low skilled workers, have the highest PDI while managers of professional workers such as engineers and scientists have the lowest PDI. The range of PDI scores between occupations in these three subsidiaries represent the same range found among the IBM sales/managers employees of all countries. Further data analysis reveals that if a country has a large PDI, the score applies to employees at all levels, but, for countries having a smaller PDI, the score applies to the middle and higher status employees while those in jobs of lower status the PDI is nearly as high as in the countries with high power distance, a fact Hofstede claims had been discovered by several sociologists in previous studies (28-31).

Hofstede finds correlations between his and other quantitative studies suggesting that differences in power distance found among countries is strongly rooted in families and further evidenced in the institutions of school, workplace, state and in ideas within the countries. The polarized extremes can best illustrate the range along the power distance continuum where countries' PDI lies, but, Hofstede emphasizes, few countries are located near the extremes. In large power distance situations, children are expected to be obedient to parents and, perhaps, to older siblings. Independent behavior by children is discouraged but considerable affection and protection of younger children by older children and parents are often present. Respect for elders remains throughout adulthood as do patterns of need for dependence. The opposite end of the continuum is reflected in families which encourage independence in children as soon as they can act and allow children to contradict parents. Respect for others is not dependent on status and the adult

child and parent relationship is one of equality where “a need for independence is supposed to be a major component of the mental software of adults” (32-33). Hofstede indicates that “psychoanalysts are aware of one’s family history, but not always of its cultural context” (33). Hofstede’s caution that mental health helpers must be aware of their own cultural biases versus those of their clients also applies to teachers in relations to their students and parents of students from diverse cultural backgrounds. Examining the power distances evidenced in literary texts compared to one’s own is an example of Miller’s claim that literary study is a powerful tool in the “critique of ideology” (120).

Hofstede presents the consequences of power distance orientation as reflected in societal institutions. When a child enters school the parent-child role is extended to the teacher-child relationship. At the large power distance extreme, teachers are treated with respect even to the point that children may have to stand when a teacher enters; education is teacher-centered and children contribute only when asked; parents become involved when children misbehave; corporeal punishment for children at the pre-pubertal age, at least, is much more acceptable; and, especially at higher educational levels, education is highly personalized in the teacher, and, therefore, the quality of education is highly dependent on the excellence of the teachers. In the small power distance extreme, teachers and students are seen as equals and education is child-centered. Students are encouraged to challenge, ask questions and show initiative. Content truth is independent of the teacher and parents often side with a child against a teacher in cases of misbehavior. A child’s success in such a system is dependent upon whether effective

communication is developed between teacher and child and upon the student's "need for independence" and the "excellence of the students." Hofstede suggests that able children of working class parents who often have large power distance values are at a disadvantage in classrooms assuming a small power distance norm (*Software* 33-35).

The cultural "software of the mind" begins with the parent-child relationship, extends to the teacher-child role, and finally transfers to the boss-employee role which reflects, in particular, the father-child relationship. The boss-subordinate relationship in large power distance countries typically with tall hierarchies of supervisory people reporting to higher ups are often loaded with emotions with the ideal being the "benevolent autocrat" or "good father," and, Hofstede claims, in difficult situations redress lies in people joining together in revolt. At the opposite end of the power distance continuum, subordinates and superiors are considered equals. Hofstede claims that management theories have rarely recognized the existence of these cultural models which determine in large part whether any packaged organizational plan, such as management by objectives (MBO), will work (35-37) and that much management literature forgets that "authority survives only where it is matched by obedience" (28).

State-citizen relationships, Hofstede says, also reflect the power distance of a country. At the large power distance extreme, power is a basic fact of life while the legitimacy of a state is irrelevant. "There is an unspoken consensus that there should be an order of inequality in this world in which everybody has his or her place." At the small power distance extreme, citizens expect the use of power to be based on legitimacy

and subjected to good/evil judgments. Sources of power are position, expertise and ability to reward, not on the use of force or whom one knows or is related to as in large power distance countries. Ideas regarding political power such as democracy and human rights issues cannot simply be adopted by countries with vastly different values regarding inequalities (38-39).

To lessen the temptation to make evaluative judgments about power orientation which differs greatly from one's own, it is instructive to recognize that the world's greatest philosophers have viewed the inherent inequalities among mankind and arrived at quite different positions. Hofstede provides examples of philosophers' views. Confucius maintained that the stability of society is dependent upon unequal relationship and distinguished five basic relationships with mutual and complementary relationships. Plato believed in equality but also defended leadership by the elite. Machiavelli distinguished two models, the cunning fox and the strong lion. And, Marx wanted to give power to the powerless and proposed revolution to achieve that purpose (40-41).

Hecht addresses how power distance affects nonverbal communications. Societies with high power distance may limit interactions such as dating, marriage and contracts, (173-74) practices which should not be difficult to identify in texts. However, readers must rely upon authorial description of the nonverbal behaviors of kinesics, proxemics and paralinguistic or vocalic cues. If such information is present, readers need to look at it carefully for cultural meaning and significance known to readers from the same culture as the text and hidden from readers of other cultures.

## Masculinity versus femininity orientation

*roles of gender depends on society*

Hofstede's label of the dimension of masculinity versus femininity has been challenged although the presence of both masculine and feminine values within cultures is basically recognized. To explain and defend his label, Hofstede points out that it is the only derived 'work goal' dimension in which IBM men and women employees consistently scored differently except for cultures at the extreme feminine pole. Hofstede defines his masculinity/femininity dimension as:

*masculinity* pertains to societies in which social gender roles are clearly distinct (i.e., men are supposed to be assertive, tough, and focused on material success whereas women are supposed to be more modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life); *femininity* pertains to societies in which social gender roles overlap (i.e., both men and women are supposed to be modest, tender, and concerned with the quality of life) [italics author's]. (*Software* 82-83)

Best and Williams suggests that by Hofstede's own definition it would have been more appropriate to have labeled this dimension "materialism" because the term "masculinity" has cross-cultural variations including cultural attitudes toward rape, sexual stereotypes, and appropriateness of professions based upon gender associated with the term "masculine" (176-77). Hofstede himself has referred to this dimension as the "tough/tender dimension," acknowledging that men's and women's values can differ in other respects, that individuals can learn to function in the gender role of the opposite sex, and that what is considered masculine and feminine varies among cultures (*Software* 80-86). The absolute biological differences pertaining to procreation and statistical

differences such as height and weight between males and females are universal, explains Hofstede, but the social roles assigned to genders are culture specific and are only partly determined by biological differences between the sexes (80). Best and Williams agree that “human males and females are only slightly variant members of the same species” whether one speaks of biology or psychology and the focus on the sexual differences tends to unintentionally magnify their importance (163). Although Best and Williams argue with Hofstede’s labeling of the dimension, they refer to a thirty-two country project of gender stereotyping which confirms the existence of “psychological characteristics believed to be more characteristic of one gender than the other.” The scoring system:

based on fifteen psychological needs revealed that across all countries, dominance, autonomy, aggression, exhibition, and achievement were associated with men while nurturance, succorance, deference and abasement were associated with women” (169-170).

The fundamental issue, as seen by Hofstede, is the division of roles between the sexes which are arbitrarily assigned and vary among cultures. The masculinity/femininity classification is determined by whether a society tries to maximize or minimize gender roles. In cultures where the divisions are sharp, men always have more “assertive and dominant roles” and women have “more service oriented and caring roles.” In these societies which Hofstede labels “masculine,” the “traditional masculine social values *permeate the whole society* - even the thinking of women [italics author’s]” (“Relativity” 396). In masculine countries, both male and females learn to be “ambitious and competitive, although the ambition of girls may be directed toward achievement of brothers, and later of husbands and sons” where “in feminine countries both boys and



girls learn to be nonambitious and modest” and behaviors which are valued in masculine countries, such as asserting oneself and excelling, “are easily ridiculed in feminine ones” (*Software* 89-90). Masculine behaviors permeating society indicate the “importance of showing off, of performing, of achieving something visible, of making money, of ‘big is beautiful,’” while, in feminine countries, importance is placed on not showing off; putting relationships with people before money; minding the quality of life and preservation of the environment; helping others, in particular, the weak; and “small is beautiful.” “Individual brilliance in a feminist society is suspect” (“Relativity” 396). Popular movies provide role models for behavior much like the role myths play in traditional societies, adds Hofstede (*Software* 89).

\* A “dimensional model” is “a set of dimensions used in combination in order to describe a phenomenon” (261). The masculinity/femininity index of a country is also related to the other dimensions identified by Hofstede. Best and Williams refers to a 1991 study by Gibbons, et al. of adolescent students from forty-six different countries studying in The Netherlands. Students were divided into two groups according to the individualism versus collectivism index of their native countries as determined by Hofstede’s surveys. Results show that countries identified as collectivist had more traditional attitudes (168).

\* In discussing the masculinity/femininity value dimension of countries, Hofstede also looks at how the dimension manifests itself at four institutional levels, the home or family, school, workplace, state and ideas. In the home, cultural programming reflecting

inequalities shows up in the parent-child role in the power distance dimension and in the husband-wife role in the masculine/feminine dimension. Family structures vary a great deal and do not easily fit a typology. In collective societies, a grandfather may retain an authoritarian role while in an individualistic society single parent homes may have a missing role (*Software* 87-88). Gender roles in the family may determine the appropriate roles for boys and girls but they do not have immediate implications in the wider society, concludes Hofstede, who leaves open the question regarding the ultimate effect that greater career choices for women in the industrialized world may have on “the distribution of gender roles *outside* [italics author’s] the home” (89-90).

Hofstede suggests ways that the masculinity/femininity orientation of a country is reflected in the school: whether the classroom is competitive or not, whether students strive to be “the best” or to be “average,” whether course work “failures” are considered bad or only minor problems, whether careers are chosen for subject interest or for career opportunities, and whether students are praised or if praise is a source of embarrassment because it elevates the students above their peers. The distribution of teachers and the criteria to evaluate teachers also differ between masculine and feminine societies.

Masculine societies value brilliance and academic reputation over friendliness and social skills of teachers, perhaps, accounting for the presence of more male teachers at the university level and more female teachers in the lower grades. The male/female teacher ratio is more mixed in feminine societies. In rich masculine societies, men and women students tend to be more segregated according to subjects at the university level than in

rich feminine societies; boys are given priority in all poor countries (90-91). It should be noted that the questions identifying the masculinity/femininity dimension among IBM employees pertain directly to the work values of respondents and do not not directly indicate how this dimension is reflected in the broader society. Value preferences for earnings, recognition, advancement and challenge are associated with masculinity while value preferences for management relationship, cooperation, living area and employment security are associated with feminine values (81).

In an overall view of the presence of the masculinity/femininity dimension within cultures, Hofstede states,

{ The males in virtually all societies dominate in politics, in the community, and at the workplace; so the subcultures of politics, community affairs, and work are relatively masculine. The subcultures of the family and the school vary more from one society to another. (86)

Fig 20

In the work place, Hofstede claims that masculinity/femininity value preferences show up in such things as preferences for resolving conflicts, management hero types, and ways to “humanize” work when under employment becomes an issue and work ethics.

Aggressive management has positive connotations only in masculine societies (92).

### **Uncertainty avoidance orientation**

Hofstede’s uncertainty avoidance dimension measures the extent that societies accept the uncertainty of not knowing what will happen in the future which “any human institution in any country” must deal with. Societies handle the intolerable anxiety that

“extreme uncertainty creates” through the means of technology to deal with nature, of law to control human behavior and of religion to relate to the “transcendental forces that are assumed to control man’s personal future (110). The definition of uncertainty avoidance offered by Hofstede is “the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations” (113). Uncertainty is a “subjective experience” in which:

. . . feelings of uncertainty are acquired and learned. Those feelings and the ways of coping with them belong to the cultural heritage of societies and are transferred and reinforced through basic institutions like the family, school, and the state. . . . Their roots are nonrational. They lead to collective patterns of behavior in one society which may seem aberrant and incomprehensible to members of other societies. (111)

Anxiety, a term from psychology, refers to a state of unease or worry about what *may* happen, while fear *knows* its object. The earliest suggestion that anxiety is associated with societies, and, in turn, affect personal behavior is attributed to Emile Durkheim’s study, published in 1897, showing “that suicide rates in different countries and regions are remarkably stable from year to year” (114). Societal anxiety levels are reflected in such things as behavior, attitude and types of illnesses, suggests Hofstede. People from countries with strong uncertainty avoidance tend to be more expressive and to use their hands more when they talk. Hofstede cites research which indicate that types of illnesses and attitudes toward one’s subjective well-being and feelings of health correlate with uncertainty avoidance orientation. Attitudes are also reflected in how citizens’ view behavior of people from cultures with a different level of uncertainty avoidance than their own:

In countries with strong uncertainty avoidance people come across as busy, fidgety, emotional, aggressive, active. In countries with weak uncertainty avoidance people give the impression of being quiet, easy-going, indolent, controlled, lazy. These impressions are in the eyes of the beholder; they depend on the level of emotionality to which the observer has been accustomed in his or her own culture. . . . Uncertainty avoidance should not be confused with risk avoidance: uncertainty is to risk as anxiety is to fear. Fear and risk are both focused on something specific: an object in the case of fear, an event in the case of risk” (115-16).

To remove an ambiguity is to remove that which uncertainty avoidance cultures seek to avoid. This accounts for the seeming paradox of the willingness of those with high uncertainty avoidance orientation to also engage in risky behavior if such behavior also removes the ambiguity (116).

Within the family, Hofstede explains, children begin learning at a very young age what is “dirty,” “clean,” “safe” and “dangerous.” When such descriptions are applied, they are “tight and absolute” in strong uncertainty avoidance cultures while weak uncertainty avoidance cultures allow for a wider range of interpretations of norms. Application of these attributes extends to defining “dangerous others” which is the basis for racism. What is good and what is taboo is also learned in the family. Extremes in uncertainty avoidance extends from a xenophobic attitude of “what is different is dangerous” to “what is different is curious” (116-17).

What is learned at home regarding uncertainty avoidance carries over to the school, workplace and state as Hofstede’s descriptions of extremes of this dimension suggest. The extremes in the school setting range from being highly structured to being open-ended where originality is allowed and encouraged. What teachers are expected to

be is also reflected in these extremes: an expectation to have teachers with expertise which is not challengeable to the extreme of respecting teachers who admit they don't know all the answers and who welcome well-argued disagreements from students. In the workplace, the extremes range from having a strong emotional need for rules whether the rules work or not to having only strictly necessary rules. A paradox also exists in the workplace arena in which weak uncertainty avoidance cultures generally respect rules more than strong uncertainty avoidance cultures which have more rules and a greater emotional need for them. There are economic advantages and disadvantages of both types. Citizens in high uncertainty avoidance cultures are more pessimistic about changing the state and less willing to protest strongly than citizens in weak uncertainty avoidance countries. This tendency toward conservatism also provides fertile grounds for extremism (119-28). "The xenophobia which is fostered in the strong uncertainty avoidance family is reflected in chauvinism at the national level. Here, too, 'what is different, is dangerous'" (128).

"The effect of the strength of uncertainty avoidance in a society depends also on its degree of individualism or collectivism" (128). The individualist country with a strong uncertainty avoidance score can be expected to operate with explicit and written rules, a low-context situation. How cultures deal with conflict also varies: a collectivist culture with a strong uncertainty avoidance index will be more apt to treat people according to standards based upon the group to which the person belongs, a pattern called particularism, while an individualistic culture with a weak uncertainty avoidance index is

more likely to try to integrate minorities and guarantee equal rights to all, a pattern of thinking called universalism (127-30).

Religion and ideas relate to uncertainty avoidance in many of the same ways; in fact, political ideologies are frequently difficult to separate from religion, according to Hofstede. To a certain extent, country uncertainty avoidance groupings reflect the dominant religion in a country; however, this does not mean that religious conversion changes cultural values. Groupings reflecting religion may actually reflect cultures with their dominant religion determined by the religion's acceptability for adoption and adaptation within the particular culture. Orthodox and Catholic religions tend to score high on uncertainty avoidance, Jewish and Muslim in the middle, Protestant Christian low and Eastern religions medium to very low, excepting Japan. A religion's view of Truth and the amount of certainty needed regarding this Truth are the determining factors of its uncertainty avoidance index. Strong uncertainty avoidance cultures' beliefs tend to be that there is only one Truth, they have it and it is the salvation and purpose of life. Weak uncertainty avoidance cultures may believe in one Truth, they are looking for it and God wants nobody prosecuted for his/her beliefs. Western and Eastern religions view Truth quite differently, a distinction which is quite important as it reflects uncertainty avoidance values. Eastern religions are less concerned with Truth, assuming there is no one Truth (130-33). Bond's research using the Chinese Value Survey (CVS) fails to identify an uncertainty avoidance dimension. As noted earlier, Hofstede does not see this as a negation of the dimension, only as a failure of the Eastern minds developing the

instrument to include questions dealing with Truth (165). Lest students, looking for evidence of an uncertainty avoidance value in literary text, be too quick to associate the Islamic religion with modern terrorism, an historical reminder is in order: With some exceptions, the Islamic religion has been more tolerant of other religions than Roman Catholicism which was badly marred by the years of Inquisitions and burning of witches in earlier times (132). The political ideology supporting human rights presents an example of a clash of cultural values between cultures with high tolerance for different political ideas and cultures with low tolerance. Violations of human rights are the result of strong uncertainty avoidance in some cultures and in others are related to power distance struggles or collective intergroup strife. The generation of ideas also reflects cultural values. “In the areas of philosophy and science, grand theories are more likely to be conceived within strong uncertainty avoidance cultures than weak ones” (133). Hofstede claims that “scientific disputes sometimes hide cultural assumptions,” logics of deductive thinking more typical of high uncertainty avoidance orientation or of inductive thinking more typical of weak uncertainty avoidance orientation (133). Hofstede cites Richard Lynn’s data from 1935 to 1970 to show that national anxiety levels do fluctuate, especially during times of war and economic cycles:

Since about 1968 we have watched such a new wave of anxiety manifested in forms of uncertainty avoidance like fundamentalism and xenophobia. Unlike earlier waves, however, this one is not likely to be associated with a new world war because this would evidently destroy the entire world civilization. . . . The future will show whether humanity can find ways to release its anxiety waves without destroying itself. (137).

Hecht says that little is known about nonverbal behavior and uncertainty (175)



while Gundykunst says that avoiding anxiety is a critical motivating factor in communicating with strangers, adding that if attempts are not successful we tend to retreat to known territory and limit interactions to people (107-09). This description is not unlike the teachers' descriptions of students' mixed reactions to reading multicultural texts in the 1991-95 study. This association coupled with Hofstede's views on cultural differences and concern about humanity's future emphasize the importance of helping students understand culture and the influences cultures have on thought and behavior. Literary texts can open vistas and better prepare students to encounter the differences in the adjoining neighborhood, as Clifford describes the modern world (13-14).

### **Long-term versus short-term orientation**

Hofstede's inclusion of long-term orientation as a cultural dimension is important, both as a dimension and as an example of the difficulties inherent in cultural research. Making "extensive use of an article by Hofstede and Bond (1988)," Hofstede explains some cultural assumptions responsible for differences between the CVS and the IBM survey and resulting data. "Decentering" is a process in which researchers from different cultures work together to include questions from different cultural environments. A five-nationality team developed the IBM survey and pre-tested it in ten countries; however, all team members and testing locations were in the Western world. Bond, in contrast, involved several Chinese social scientists in development of the CVS. Each team's

inclusion of questions to elicit responses to team-identified cultural values resulted in its failure to distinguish a specific dimension revealed in the other survey, long-term orientation in the case of the IBM survey and uncertainty avoidance in the CVS.

Hofstede sees the religion-based “search for Truth” aspect of the uncertainty avoidance related to the practical ethics of Confucianism, and, in that sense, a part of the Confucian work dynamism dimension identified by Bond. Questions on the surveys also differ on whether intended responses were to evoke desirable, the abstract, values as in the CVS or the desired, personal, as in the IBM survey. Since desirable and desired goals do not necessarily overlap, Hofstede argues, that the CVS questions actually do reflect a masculine-feminine dimension in the intertwining of the masculine (yang) and feminine (yin) elements of Chinese philosophers. Hofstede interprets the CVS human-heartedness dimension representative of this postulate of Taoism, with patriotism and righteousness representing the feminine pole (*Software* 161-65). The key principles of Confucian teaching, according to Hofstede, are:

1. The stability of society is based on unequal relationships between people. . . .
  2. The family is the prototype of all social organizations. . . .
  3. Virtuous behavior towards others consists of not treating others as one would not like to be treated oneself. . . .
  4. Virtue with regard to one’s tasks in life consists of trying to acquire skills and education, working hard, not spending more than necessary, being patient, and persevering.
- (165)

Bond associates Confucian values with the dimension which Hofstede renames long-term orientation because both poles of this dimension “seem to be taken straight from the teachings of Confucius.” “Persistence (perseverance), ordering relationships by status

and observing this order, thrift and a sense of shame” (165) represent the long-term orientation. “Personal steadiness and stability, protecting your ‘face,’ respect for tradition, and reciprocation of greetings, favors, and gifts” (166) represent short-term orientation. “Face” describes the proper relationships with one’s social environment which are as essential as the front of one’s face to the individual and to his/her ingroup, a result of living in a high context society (61). The “surprisingly fast economic growth over the past decades” in certain Asian countries is correlated with “*certain* [italics author’s] Confucian values” although a causal link has not been proven (167). Few economists predicted the growth of the Asian economy, a fact Hofstede attributes to culture’s influence on our way of thinking:

Eastern religions, Hinduism, Buddhism, Shintoism, and Taoism, are separated from Western religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, by a deep philosophical dividing line. The three Western religions belong to the same thought family; historically, they grew from the same root. . . . In the East, neither Confucianism, which is a nonreligious ethic, nor any major religion is based on the assumption that there is a Truth which a human community can embrace. They offer various ways in which a person can improve him/herself, however, these do not consist in believing, but in ritual, meditation, or ways of living. . . . That is why a questionnaire invented by Western minds led to the identification of a fourth dimension dealing with Truth; a questionnaire invented by Eastern minds found a fourth dimension dealing with Virtue.” (171)

Edward T. Hall elaborates on an expanded concept of “time as culture” in *The Dance of Life: The Other Dimension of Time*:

Time is a core system of cultural, social, and personal life. . . . nothing occurs except in some kind of time frame. . . . each culture has its own time frames in which the patterns are unique. . . . it is just as necessary to learn the language of time as it is to learn the spoken language.” (3)

The bonus is that through “truly know[ing] others who are different” we discover ourselves (8). Hall, like Hofstede, claims that one’s cultural ways of thinking often get in the way of understanding other cultures. Linear logic, typical in many Western cultures, is ill-suited to describing time with its “cluster of concepts, events, and rhythms covering an extremely wide range of phenomena” (13). Hall designed a four-sided mandala, a matrix-like classification design, to show the types and relationships of the nine kinds of time Hall identifies. At the center is meta time, an abstraction that includes everything written and spoken about time, such as this discussion. Much confusion about time arises when individuals look at one concept of time from the perspective of another. The other eight time concepts include pairs of time: biological and physical times which are measured in explicit and technical terms; metaphysical and sacred times which are philosophical and conscious in nature; profane and micro times which are associated with our daily lives and are culture specific, and sync and personal times which incorporate the unconscious emergent time concept. Space does not allow for more than brief examples from each time frame. When we talk of jet lag, biorhythms and seasons we are referring to biological time while solstices and astrological measurements are within physical time. The metaphysical is time in the realm of the occult, deja vu and other intimate, personal experiences which are difficult, if impossible to explain, while, sacred time, a concept particularly difficult for modern American-Europeans (AE) to comprehend, involves placing oneself in another imaginary time where time stands still, as in some sacred ceremonies. Profane time is absolute time and is measured in hours, days, and years in

the line of Newtonian thinking; micro time, one of the basic building blocks of culture determines how we view and manage time in such things as adherence to schedules which depend upon a monochronic/polychronic frame of reference (13-27). Much of Hall's book is devoted to discussion of monochronic and polychronic time, which Hall identifies as one of the major patterns of micro time.

Hall says that "to gain insight into the time systems of others, we must know more about own own," and, Hall finds much of his discovery of "people's preoccupation" to time in literature. He finds it fascinating to discover how characteristic of AE cultures Proust's and Bergson's preoccupation with time is, while, as a novelist, Joyce's handling of time is an index to the "mastery of his craft." Other writers Hall singles out for their use of time as literary devices include Virginia Woolf, Aldous Huxley, Franz Kafka, Thomas Mann, Thomas Wolfe and William Faulkner. These writers recognize "clock time and mind time as two distinct and separate forms":

All of these authors implicitly and explicitly accept duality as axiomatic in nature; individual and universal, will and idea, concrete and abstract, artistic and materialist, separation and merging, present and past, past and future, present and future, outside looking in and inside looking out, life and art, humanism, instantaneity and eternity, and symbolic and allegorical. Yet duality is nothing more or less than the way in which AE cultures categorize virtually everything. . . The reader should know that duality comes naturally if one is an American of North European heritage and that it will be less natural for him or her to look for multiple causes than for people brought up in cultures that take a pluralistic view. (134-35)

Humans experience or perceive time in many ways: when one is concentrating or enjoying oneself time may "fly," "drag" when bored or facing a dreaded job, "speeds up"

as one ages, and distorts in life threatening emergencies. Hall also considers an understanding of human extensions, including time devices, telephones, televisions, cranes, telescopes, cameras and computers necessary to understanding time (131-46):

One of the most important central issues to be understood about extensions is that they are rooted in specific biological and physiological functions. They originated in us! . . . that whenever something is extended, the extension begins to take on a life of its own and quickly becomes confused with the reality it replaces. . . . Because of extension transference, the schedule is the reality and people and their needs are not considered. (130-31)

“How time is experienced is then a function of many things. It is situation- as well as culture-dependent” (152).

Through years of experience to other cultures, Hall came to realize that “complex societies organize time in at least two different ways: events scheduled as separate items - one thing at a time. . . (or) involvement in several things at once.” Hall identified these as monochronic (M-time) and polychronic (P-time) models, which are “logically and empirically quite distinct” (45). This time orientation aspect is not specifically recognized by Hofstede’s long-term versus short-term orientation; however, the importance of time in literary texts and the frequency of psychological stress in intercultural encounters due to this time orientation difference (47) suggest that students and teachers should become familiar with the manifestations of M-time and P-time orientations. M-time oriented people may find the crowded, pushing market place or private business being handled in semi-public reception rooms in P-time cultures quite stressful. The way appointments are handled in P-time is particularly distressing to M-

time oriented people where things seem to be constantly in a state of flux. “Being on time” carries different meanings in each culture. M-time orientation is schedule-driven with some significant consequences to lives. The system becomes a system of prioritizing people and functions by who and what gets scheduled, for how long, and what gets left undone if time runs out. Arbitrary and imposed schedules take priority over task completion. Scheduling tends to seal off a few people from the group and intensifies those relations for an arbitrarily set time. The reduced context of M-time schedule orientation which concentrates on one-thing at a time tends to alienate us from ourselves and others. P-time orientation requires intense knowledge of each other with the needs of family and friends taking precedence over others. Hall claims that there is also a gender issue involved in time orientation. In most cultures, feminism is associated with the human relations side of personality, and, since polychronic cultures are by their very nature people-oriented, at the preconscious level P-time can be considered female time and M-time, male time. Hall describes time orientation in the extremes but acknowledges that there are loose versions of each where M-time is observed in certain settings and P-time in others (44-58). This view agrees with Hofstede’s frequent warning to view the cultural dimensions as continuums in which country indexes are located relative to each other, with few countries located at either extreme of any dimension.

### **Individualism versus collectivism orientation**

Many researchers have focused on the individualism/collectivism dimension of culture. As noted above, Fernandez credits Hofstede's IBM studies with furthering an understanding of cultural issues regarding business, while, Kagitcibasi credits Triandis with "popularizing" the individualism/collectivism cultural dimension in the field of cross-cultural psychology (12-13). Triandis, Chen and Chan see the 1990s as "even more fertile ground for the development of theory and method around these constructs" (275). "The vast majority of the people of our world live in societies in which the interest of the group prevails over the interest of the individual" (*Software* 50). Hofstede defines this dimension of cultural relationship as follows:

Individualism pertains to societies in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family. Collectivism as its opposite pertains to societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive ingroups, which throughout people's lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty. (51)

In the continuing research of individualism and collectivism, researchers have clarified, challenged and refined this dimension. Although Hofstede writes that "the degrees of individualism obviously vary within countries as well as between them" (51), Kagitcibasi notes a tendency to treat individualism and collectivism as "polar opposites," and cautions that:

recent theorizing and empirical evidence suggests that constructs do not necessarily form opposite poles and may co-exist in individuals or groups within societies at the same time in different situations or with different



target groups or toward different interactional goals. (31)

The significance that social scientists attach to this dimension also indicates the importance of locating individualistic and collectivist influences within literary texts, understanding the multidimensional aspects of this dimension and avoiding assumptions about a culture based upon tendencies identified within the text. Space permits only a glimpse at the multi-dimensional aspects and at cautions researchers have raised regarding this dimension. A particular concern expressed by Kagitcibasi are the significant problems of applying cultural level characteristics to individuals (33-34). For conscientious interpretation of literary texts, this reinforces the importance Bøgger (108-09) and Said (*World 5*) place on not only recognizing the culture but also the voices of resistance to prevailing cultural norms and realities within texts.

Among the multi-dimensional aspects is the degree of hierarchy within both individualist and collectivist societies. This dimension, which Triandis, Chen and Chan identify, results in four models: Horizontal collectivism consists of family, tribe or nation in-groups in which members do not feel subordinated to each other. In vertical collectivism, individuals submit to the norms of in-groups, including a willingness to sacrifice for them. Horizontal individualism allows individuals to do their own thing but does not include distinguishing individuals or comparing them with others. In vertical individualist societies, individuals not only do their own things, but also want the distinction of winning or being the “best” (276).

Kagitcibasi reviews the distinctions Triandis makes between cultural and

individual levels of individualism and collectivism. At the individual level, family integrity and distance from ingroups relate to collectivism while interdependence, sociality and self-reliance with hedonism or with competition relate to individual level. Triandis replaces the term “collectivism” with “allocentrism” and “individualism” with “idiocentrism” when they apply at the individual level. A problem, Kagitcibasi continues, is that the terms individualism and collectivism are used at both the cultural and the individual levels and is further complicated by a lack of independent measurements at the two levels combined with the use of correlations between them (13). Schwartz, Kagitcibasi adds, also finds the dichotomy model insufficient because universal goals such as social justice, peace and the environment which do not serve the ingroup are left out, leading Schwartz to replace individualism/collectivism with openness to change versus conservation at the individual level and autonomy versus conservation at the cultural level (19). Bond, Kagitcibasi indicates, accounts for universal goals with social integration versus cultural inwardness (15-16).

Some sociologists, Kagitcibasi contends, think that individualism is associated with modernization and some equate modernization in a unilateral convergence toward Westernization. However, individualism and collectivism are manifested differently in different situations and certain characteristics of individualism are required by urban life styles. For these reasons, Kagitcibasi sees a need to disassociate individualism from modernization, suggesting that new styles of individualism and collectivism may emerge and co-exist (29-31). The individualism/collectivism concept also needs to be refined,

Kagitcibasi suggests. The concept is viewed in two ways: The norm type or value orientation stresses ideology and how people think individual and group relations should be organized which has dominated research and theorizing in cross-cultural psychology. The second type is human relatedness of the self with others. These two are interrelated, but are distinctively different. Norms, having to do more with societal values and conventions, are more relevant at the cultural level. "Since normative orientations, customs, and practices change in response to socioeconomic development, normative collectivism weakens with changing lifestyles and is replaced by normative individualism as predicted by modernization theory" (35), prompting Kagitcibasi to suggest that the practices and needs may change but the bonds of emotions may continue at the interpersonal psychological level with new styles of individualism and collectivism emerging and co-existing. Some converging between the different conceptualizations by researchers is indicated by their combining various dimensions with collectivism, Hofstede with power distance, Fiske with authority ranking, Schwartz with hierarchy, Bond with cultural inwardness and Triandis with vertical collectivism (34-35).

There has been a "renewed interest in the 'self' in social psychology and cross-cultural psychology in the last two decades" claims Kagitcibasi (19). Three models of self-development, individualistic or the separated self, the collectivist or relational self and the autonomous-related self, provide a micro, an individual/interpersonal, level framework for collectivism. These models represent more of a combined variability than sharp contrast. Kagitcibasi combines the autonomy with relational which is:

seen particularly in developed urban areas of societies with collectivist cultures, where material intergenerational interdependencies weaken but emotional interdependencies continue. (19-20)

Which self is seen is dependent on environmental requirements. Kagitcibasi expects the main shift in family and self configurations with the socioeconomic change in the world will be autonomy because it “better satisfies the two basic human needs for agency (autonomy) and relatedness” (20).

Looking for multi-dimensional aspects of individualism/collectivism in literary texts does not fit as neatly into current curricular ethnotheories of “right answers” as well as using the single dimensional model which Hofstede presents might. Teachers and students need to keep in mind Hofstede’s purpose, to use empirical studies to describe national cultures, and their own purpose in using Hofstede’s or any other cultural knowledge base, to recognize cultural elements within a text in order to hear the voices of dialogism and resistance to cultural forces. Those voices may or may not represent the national culture from which they arise, and, without an in-depth knowledge of the culture represented by the text, readers should not draw conclusions about a culture based upon their interpretation. In describing each of the cultural dimensions, Hofstede emphasizes that the dimensional indexes represent only relativity between national cultures. This pertains to interpretation also because the reader’s cultural ideology is always a voice of dialogism and the inevitable point of relative reference for all other voices. This, then, is the “powerful tool” which Miller finds in literary texts, the “critique of ideology” (120).

As in the previously described dimensions, Hofstede looks at extremes of the

manifestations of the individualism/collectivism dimension from the perspective of the family, school, workplace, state and ideas. The first group in all people's lives is the family, and, for most collectivist societies, this means the extended family. For most persons born into families in individualist societies, it means the nuclear family (50).

Both Hofstede and Bond found that power distance is highly correlated with the individualism/collectivism dimension in most, but not all, countries. Its evidence is reflected in most extended families having patriarchal structures with the head of the family exercising strong moral authority (54-55). It is within the family that a child begins his/her acculturation. They learn that within the collective societies:

in a situation of intense and continuous social contact the maintenance of *harmony* [italics author's] with one's social environment becomes a key virtue which extends to other spheres beyond the family. In most collectivist cultures direct confrontation of another person is considered rude and undesirable. The word 'no' is seldom used. . . . In individualist cultures, on the other hand, speaking one's mind is a virtue. (58)

In the case of voicing opinions, children learn that in collectivist societies “‘personal opinions’ do not exist: they are predetermined by the group,” whereas, a child born into an individualistic society is encouraged to develop and express opinions. “A child who repeatedly voices opinions deviating from what is collectively felt is considered to have a bad character” while “a child who only ever reflects the opinions of others is considered to have a weak character” in an individualistic society. What is considered desirable character, therefore, is culturally determined (59). Other evidence of collectivist societies are the sharing of resources, the obligatory nature of family celebrations and a high context level of communications which requires little explicitness because most of the

information is already known from the physical environment or within the person.

Shame is associated with collectivism and guilt with individualism, explains Hofstede. Shame caused by personal violations of social rules is shared by the entire family; guilt caused by personal violations in individualistic society reflects only upon the person. Shame is dependent on an infringement being known by others; guilt resides within the violator and is not dependent upon others knowing. Face in collectivist societies and self-respect in individualistic societies are also paired concepts, each “defined from the point of view of the social environment.” “Losing face” in the sense of humiliation in the English language derives from the Chinese concept of face; however, face can also be given in the sense of honor or prestige in collectivist societies. “The importance of face is the consequence of living in a society that is very conscious of social contexts” (60-61).

As in the other dimensions described by Hofstede, the individualistic/collectivist orientation begun in the family is further developed and reinforced in the school. This is reflected in such things as taking turns, speaking up, harmony and face. Students from individualistic societies “expect to be treated as individuals and impartially, regardless of their background” in classrooms which are open to confrontations and discussions. The purpose of education even varies: Collectivist societies stress “skills and virtues necessary to be an acceptable group member.” Individualistic societies look to prepare students for new experiences in a society of individuals. In this manner, one stresses tradition, the other prepares for change. Diplomas mean self-respect and have economic

worth in individualistic societies while they reflect honor upon the individual and his or her ingroup and access to higher status in collectivistic societies (62-63).

In the workplace environment of individualistic societies, work is directed to the combined interests of the employee and employer. The workplace environment in a collectivist society more closely resembles family relations, in which poor performance is tolerated and relatives of the employers and employees are given preference in hiring. Whether one manages a group or individuals depends upon the individualism/collectivism orientation of the culture. Rural and migrant subgroups often reflect collectivist orientation which creates management/employee conflict in the individualistic workplace. Particularism versus universalism orientation is present in the workplace. Universalism is treating everybody alike, an expectation within individualistic societies; however, within collectivist societies, particularism applies and how one is treated is dependent upon his or her relationship to the group. A consequence of particularism is that relationships of trust need to be established prior to making business decisions:

In summary: in the collectivist society *the personal relationship prevails over the task* and should be established first; in the individualist society *the task is supposed to prevail over any personal relationships* [italics author's]. (63-67)

The state is expected to have a greater role in collectivist societies; however, collectivist in a cultural sense does not refer to a political system as Americans most frequently use the term. Hofstede suggests that it is the collectivist cultural system which supports the collectivist political system (68). Individualism versus collectivist

orientation also influences the arena of ideas. American's positive views of individualism is not shared by collectivist societies. Chairman Mao Tse Tung of China viewed it as evil and, like many in collectivist societies, a source of selfishness and putting of one's own personal interests above those of the group. Economics as a discipline has its roots in England, and, in Hofstede's views, its development in the individualistic cultures of the West makes it unsuitable for collectivist societies.

“Unfortunately there are few alternative economic theories yet to deal with collectivist economies” (71-72). The ideas of liberty and equality also reflect individualism/collectivist orientation. “In politics there is an inescapable trade-off between freedom and equality” (72). Hofstede refers to the French sociologist Jean Stoetzel's data indicating that the more individualistic a society the more it prefers liberty over equality. Certain ideas and concepts are difficult to translate because the very idea or concept may not exist in a culture with a quite different individualism/collectivism orientation. Examples Hofstede provides are “doing your own thing” and “personality” which have no equivalence in Chinese (72-74).

Other researchers see other differences between individualistic and collectivist societies. Kagitcibasi provides several examples of tendencies of behavioral differences: In social perception and cognition, individualists tend to describe persons in terms of their personal traits while collectivists tend to describe in relational terms, illustrated by the descriptions of an individual as “friendly” versus “brings my family cakes” (22). Ego-focused emotions such as anger, frustration and pride are found more often in



individualist countries; other-focused emotions like sympathy, shame and interpersonal communion in collectivist societies. Subdued emotions in hierarchial societies may have more to do with power distance, hierarchy, and vertical collectivism. Self-serving bias such as self-promotion which are more prevalent in individualist societies are seen in a negative light in collectivist societies. Self-serving bias also has implications for self-esteem and modesty, one focusing on the individual, the other reflecting less self-focused orientation (23-25). Achievement motivation which relates to self-esteem is less in collectivist societies. “A socially-oriented achievement motivation would exalt both the self and a collectivity (usually the family) encompassing the self. . . . elevating both” (25). There is long-standing evidence for competition to be more prevalent in individualist than in collectivist and in the middle class groups than in lower social economic states or rural groups within the same country (26). In issues involving distributive justice equality orientation, conflict avoidance and nonadversarial conflict resolution, which is believed to be most likely to reduce animosity, all point to collectivist society (26). Research indicates distinct differences in style and “communication-linked phenomena” between individualist and collectivist societies. Collective societies pay attention and have greater sensitivity to context and draw meaning from context. This results in cognitive and emotional states “through the mediation of interdependent self” (27).

Gundykunst notes some nonverbal communications differences. Face is especially important in collectivist societies. “Stylin” is a form of saving face in the black sub-culture of America. People from collectivist societies may use the “we” as a

pronoun to express personal opinion (93). Individuals handle conflict differently with individualist preferring direct styles such as domination and control or a style which is solution-oriented; collectivist prefer indirect styles which allow all persons to save face (129). Interpreting nonverbal communications and interaction styles from the perspective of a reader's own culture may result in misinterpretation and leads to misunderstanding in personal encounters.

### **Synthesization within the classroom**

Questions of how to put the above information into practice in the American classroom remain. Practical application requires re-evaluating goals for the literature classroom; challenging current pedagogy while also recognizing that schools *are* cultural institutions and, as such, impose their own restraints; changing the interpretive literary theories and methodology; and introducing the cultural concepts necessary to accomplish the desired goals of the multicultural classroom within an increasingly multicultural nation and world.

A good starting point for re-evaluation of objectives is Miller's view that the "ethics of reading" impose responsibilities to the text and to the students taught, to good reading and to development of skills to "read all the signs of our surroundings" (136-37). Miller's insight that literature provides a vehicle for the "critique of ideology" (120) is consistent with Hall's opinion that the ultimate purpose of the study of culture is the

“light that sheds on our own” (“Power” 59) and with Burton’s suggestion that in finding ways to “talk across the spaces between readers, texts, and cultures” we find “parts of ourselves that have lain undiscovered and unarticulated” (122). Perhaps, these implied goals re-focus more than conflict with current multicultural objectives for students to gain an understanding and appreciation for the diversity within American society. It would seem that focusing on understanding oneself rather than what we think of others as the above implies fits the American cultural tendencies of individualism better and, ironically, produces results more in line with often stated objectives celebrating diversity. Locating oneself along continuums shared by all mankind entails recognition of the many situational and relational factors affecting cultural choice and increasing one’s skills to “read” the surroundings focuses on the shared “predicament of culture” (Clifford) rather than the different, preferred and largely unconscious choices made by individuals and cultures which are the focus of much multicultural education. The goals adopted by the classroom teacher need to address the elements identified above: to give or enhance students’ ability to interpret literary texts from cultures other than their own; to increase students’ understanding of basic concepts of culture, particularly as reflected in literary texts; to challenge students to recognize their own cultural preferences and ideology and to recognize and appreciate the many voices within texts and cultures which influence the choices all cultures must make. If the opinions of the above writers are valid, teachers’ goals and objectives must address issues pertaining to the text, to the student and to society.

Ethnocentric pedagogical theories and methods along with student and societal demands on the schools must be taken into account whenever challenging pedagogy. Insights regarding culture from Wagner that mankind is a constant inventor of life (139) and regarding literature from Bakhtin that there is “no first word” and “no final word” (Cruz and Meléndez 30) and from Said that “no text is finished” (Cruz and Meléndez 54) illustrate the inappropriateness of current pedagogical practices which emphasize definite answers and measurable skill and behavior development. Skill development in accessing the “culture” of multicultural texts is learning to recognize one’s own location on the “tiny island limited in time and space” (Bakhtin, “Discourse” 374); to recognize the “tentacles” to the author, the reader, the historical situation and to other texts which Said indicates makes up the “dynamic field” of references for interpretation of literary texts (*World* 53-54); to recognize the cultural elements within texts and to increase one’s abilities to analyze and defend his or her interpretation which may differ from those of other readers. How do you measure sensitivity to all the voices of texts and to an acceptance that interpretation is never complete? Although some cultural practices may remain constant, culture in the larger sense is always in the process of adapting to events and situations from relatively stable frameworks of cultural preferences and assumptions. To ask students for definitive answers is asking for “final words” and, perhaps, risks creating and/or reinforcing stereotypes. What *may* be measurable is the ability to recognize some of the cultural forces within the text, to identify some of the dialogical voices within the texts, and to recognize the author’s introduction of voices through

literary techniques. What is *most* important and *most* difficult, if not impossible, to objectively measure is the synthesization of cultural and literary insights into a defensible literary interpretation and the intrapersonal discovery of “parts of ourselves that have lain undiscovered and unarticulated” (Burton 122). Both are very time-consuming, necessary and worthwhile endeavors in the study of multicultural texts.

In a sense, both Davidson’s passing theory and Kent’s hermeneutic guessing theory recognize reader-centered literary interpretation as the inevitable beginning location for all interpretation. Kent’s theory pertains directly to negotiating dialogic meaning utterance by utterance, whereas, Davidson’s theory pertains to negotiating conceptual meaning by amending old concepts as new information becomes available. Both emphasize the necessity for students to recognize their own location in relation to the text. Maintaining an awareness of one’s location and revisiting it as new interpretive questions arise acknowledges one’s cultural reference framework and the relativity of one’s culture to the one(s) represented by the text.

While claiming that stylistic analysis must at all times guide the “artistic and ideological penetration into the whole,” Bakhtin also acknowledges the difficulty of stylistic analysis without “a profound understanding” of the socio-ideological meanings which readers of multicultural texts certainly will not have, at least, for all cultures. Armed with an acceptance that there is no “final word” of text to be found and with a knowledge of stylistic techniques to watch for, students are better prepared for the challenging and valuable experience of reading another culture’s literature. The authorial

stylistic techniques used to insert stratification and heteroglossia into texts which Bakhtin explains include indirect speech, hybrid construction, comic-parodic relief and the authorial and persuasive word. Students need to be able to recognize and to evaluate the significance of indirect speech upon the text. Indirect speech, such as chronicles, storytelling, letters and so forth allows for the insertion of additional voices, including an authorial voice with an element of detachment (“Discourse” 334-36). Hybrid constructions offer “responses to high pathos and to seriousness and conventionality of any sort,” and, therefore, students’ ability to recognize and analyze their symbolic significance is of great importance. The gay deception of the rogue parodies high language, stupidity unmasks “pseudo intelligence,” and the clown combines the two by distorting high language (“Discourse” 404-05). The persuasive word becomes a part of the internal voice with which an individual must struggle, a powerful, silent voice dialogizing within. Figurative speech is also a part of all cultural texts (Bøegger 65-68) and, as such, needs to be recognized and its significance analyzed. Students must also learn to recognize, analyze and pay attention to the public negotiation character of utterances, the holistic nature of discourse and the multiple strata of languages within texts. Strata of heteroglossia which Bakhtin identifies include genres, professions, social, generational, age, historical moment, family and co-habitation from different socio-ideological life (*Speech* 275). Bakhtin provides guidelines to access the many voices of literary texts. Knowledgeable, experienced literature teachers, willing to challenge their own current methodology, are best prepared to join with their students in approaching

“other” texts with new eyes (Jordan 17).

One of the most important cultural concepts to keep in mind is Said’s warning that the “secular” world is not “reducible to an explanatory or originating theory, much less to a collection of cultural generalities” (*World* 27). None of the cultural theories presented in this paper are adequate to “understand” culture. They can only provide suggestions of the nature and complexity of primary level culture, evidence of it in people’s lives, and tools to begin an interpretation of a cultural artifact from another culture. Readers can look for evidence of how the culture(s) of the text have organized to address the universal problems faced by all societies and the values they’ve adopted to inform their assumptions of life. Equally important is looking at one’s own cultural assumptions, providing standards against which to gage limitations in understanding the thinking and behavioral patterns revealed in the text. The dialogical nature of interpreting “other” literature by identifying and differentiating the dialogical voices of the text and of one’s own life is what Bakhtin calls the “decentralizing of the verbal-ideological world. . . . This verbal-ideological decentering will occur only when a national culture loses its sealed-off and self-sufficient character, when it becomes conscious of itself as only one among *other* [italics author’s] cultures and languages” (“Discourse” 370). Synthesizing appropriate literary criticism, the verbal world, with an understanding of culture, the ideological world, enlightens the student and teacher to their own cultural selves as well as the culture of others. In the words of Bakhtin, from that emerges “the images of speaking human beings” (“Discourse” 370) and, in the dreams of multiculturalists, that

which “empower[s] all students to become knowledgeable, caring, and active citizens in a deeply troubled and ethnically polarized nation and world” (Banks 70).

The following sections combine cultural and literary theories in interpretations of “Piggy” by Svetlana Vasilenko and “I’m Not Talking About That Now” by Sindiwe Magona. There is no attempt to draw conclusions about the Russian or South African cultures or any segment of them through these stories, only an attempt to identify the various voices of the characters and the dialogizing background within the culture of the text, the heteroglossia, and the “tentacles” of the “dynamic field” (Said, *World* 53) represented by the author, reader, historical situation and other texts. This reader/interpreter “tentacle” is an American woman who remembers butchering a hog on the farm of her childhood in rural mid-America and, as a high school student, the fear and hurt national pride at the surprise launching of Sputnik. More recent years include visits to Russia, hosting Russian guests and studies in Russian culture, literature and language. Tentacles to South Africa include knowledge gained primarily through the news media and personal friendships with two South Africans. Other readers must also acknowledge the cultural and experiential biases informing their interpretations. In the final analysis, readers who are able to identify the many voices of “Piggy” and “I’m Not Talking About That Now” will recognize that they are embedded in “an heterogeneous and even contradictory set of patterns and experiences” (Cruz and Meléndez 86) which are, as is the nature of culture, changing and evolving within the text itself. These readers will also understand that there can be no “final word” on these stories since their potential range



will be examined by other readers with different experiential and knowledge bases from different “tiny island[s]” (Bakhtin, “Discourse” 374) of the world’s readers.

### **“Piggy” by Svetlana Vasilenko**

As Bakhtin would insist, literary stylistics will guide this analysis. To get to the heart of meaning requires identifying the voices informing the text, both those heard and those silent, the ones identified by the cultural reality of place and time and the ones represented by characters, authors and readers. From these voices, identified by both cultural and literary means, emerge the dialogism from which meaning derives. The reader’s knowledge of literary stylistics determines the recognition of authorial means of revealing voices and meaning. Hofstede’s cultural dimensions will guide readers whose cultural orientation, assumptions and restraints differ from those of voices within any text, but particularly from cultures other than one’s own.

The voices of the author and reader are outside the text, but, because they create and interpret meaning within, they are very important to recognize. According to information provided in the anthology, Vasilenko was born in 1956, the contemporary generation of America baby boomers, and raised in a military site equivalent to Cape Canaveral during the epoch of the cold war and the beginning of the space age. “She aligned herself from childhood with the female half of the world” (198). Vasilenko’s life experiences are seen in the “garrison” town setting and in the heroine’s determined

resistance to the cultural realities which affect the happiness and well-being of her mother, her son and herself. American readers need to also locate their own cultural bearings as they relate to this story. What are their experiences and assumptions regarding the stratification within towns dominated by military installations and high levels of security? What are their personal identifications and assumptions regarding socio-economic levels and power differentials inherent within them? How closely do they identify with or care about their “street” and co-workers? Can they relate to the slaughtering of animals, particularly those raised as pets, as a fact of life? What assumptions do they have regarding appropriate or typical occupations, activities, and attitudes for each gender? These issues have to do with uncertainty avoidance, power distance, individualism, and masculinity orientation of the reader and are important to recognize when evaluating attitudes and behaviors of characters within the story who will have different cultural assumptions. Locating one’s own voice must be a continuous process throughout the story.

The story’s name indicates that Piggy is far more than a farm animal; its presence in the story symbolizes conflict between cultural groups, between mother and daughter, between mother and son, and, ultimately, its slaughter becomes the vehicle for understanding. The daughter “hated the pig from the very first day” (25). As she kissed and hugged her mother at the station the smell of her mother’s dress “made me wince” (25), and from that encounter forward, smells identify, describe, and evaluate socio-economic strata of the story. The daughter prefers carrying her heavy luggage to riding

on the bus with “men who smell of wine and eau de cologne, and their sweet-scented wives, and their children who smell of oranges. . . . I wouldn’t let anyone, not anyone, turn their backs on my mother” (26). The pig’s smell, rather than the pig itself, is the source of shame. “She is prepared to be poor, as long as her poverty is proud and pure. Her mother has taken in a pig, and her poverty has become shameful” (28). In American culture, smells also have very strong evaluative powers of associations which readers can easily identify.

The pig’s presence is felt at all levels within “Piggy,” between mother and daughter greeting each other at the station, between the mother and the “girls at work” who tell her she smells of “that pig of yours” (25), between the good smells associated with higher socio-economic families and the “sharp, unpleasant smell” of Vaska’s pen. The daughter is well aware that her mother’s personal and economic reasons for keeping the pig conflict with the values of the “the real town.” The heroine’s “internal monologue,” directly inserted by the authorial voice who is “also a daughter of this town” (28), reveals cultural stratifications which form the realities of life in a “garrison town”. “Alongside the wives of officers. . . there is no place to hide yourself and your poverty” (28). “In her internal monologue,” she will “even use the words ‘majors’ and colonels’ wives,” but is “afraid of betraying some military secret” if she says it aloud (28). “She is a daughter of this taciturn town, and she honors its laws and secrets” (28). There is both loyalty and resentment in the cultural predicament of her life. The “town despises those who have a child without a husband” and “people without a higher education” (28). The

mother works to provide an education for her daughter who is a single parent and to clothe and feed her daughter's son. The daughter describes her poverty not in concrete terms but as it relates to the powerful of the town, as "a gaping hole in an officer's overcoat" (28). The "girls" with whom her mother works and wants to impress are the wives of the bosses, directors and managers in town who live in "five-story block" buildings while the "civilians" live in "Finnish-style houses." (26). "In this town it is forbidden to keep chickens, rabbits, and other filthy beasts" (28) but the civilians do anyway. "Now do you understand?" asks the narrator of readers. (28) The reader understands that the mother and daughter are not members of a powerful group and that mother's keeping a pig, a very "filthy beast," reduces their respectability and even shames them in the eyes of the real town's people.

The heroine seeks respectability and membership in the "real town": however, she feels at home when they enter "our street," "where everything was familiar and dear to me," "my sun. . . my sunset. . . my street. . . ." (29). Aunty Galya and Uncle Kolya's names indicate a special friendship with the daughter, but not familial relationship. Only by walking down her street with the heroine can the reader understand the dialogic voices within the daughter. She wants respectability among the people in the "real town" but her street is part and parcel of her very being. Here she greets her "neighbors whose names I had learned to pronounce with my very first word, the neighbors who never went away anywhere or grew old. . . . I knew what the neighbors would ask and what I would answer" (30). This description indicates a high context level of interaction within a

strong collective identity. The daughter is struggling with what Bakhtin would call the “persuasive word” which requires her to assimilate the personal views as a daughter who’s been away to college and the cultural values she learned from her mother and neighbors. The authorial voice tosses in a few reminders of the infringement of other cultures and technology upon life on her street: the child playing airplane, TV aerials, plastic lids, improvised mopeds, and cars ( 30).

This inner struggle is evident in the confrontational exchange between mother and daughter once they get out of sight of the town’s people. The daughter “went on shouting for a long time, repeating the same things over and over again. . . at this hateful woman in the faded dress, at my stupid mother, whom I loved more than anyone else on earth, with a broken, pitiful, stupid love” (28). The scene is highly contextual and full of descriptions of a nonverbal dialogue between mother and daughter. The mother responds by the nonverbal behaviors of “hunch(ing) over,” “draw(ing) her head into her shoulders, as though I was beating her about the head,” “suddenly straighten(ing) up,” looking bored, and closing her eyes in sleep (28). This scene is an example of utterances between conversants negotiating meaning. The daughter stops shouting “because I didn’t understand what was wrong with her” and the mother responds by saying, “You’re only shouting because you don’t understand a thing,” (29) and proceeds to explain why she keeps the pig. The discourse ends with the mother drawing “herself up straight and proud as could be” followed by the daughter’s words, “You’re crazy,” but with a deeper understanding that:

Vaska meant more to her than all the girls at work. . . and even meant more to her now than I did, because all this was her life now. I understood it all. And from that moment I hated Vaska. (29)

At this point the real significance of Vaska begins to emerge. Vaska represents much more than the strong emotional attachment possible between humans and animals. Vaska represents the conflicts when generational and cultural values clash. Vaska becomes a metaphor for cultural differences in the physical attributes assigned it, a brown eye “with a fixed, malicious stare” and a blue eye “half-covered by short white eyelashes.” “It seemed to be winking” (31) at the daughter, perhaps a reminder of the expressions of the “girls” when they confirm that Maria Stepanovna’s earrings are not gold, a precious metal appropriate for them, but not for Maria. “Its snout was long and predatory, somehow not like a pig’s. . . .” When the daughter fears her three-year-old son will fall into the pen she grabs him and carries him off “the way some female animal would carry off her cub” (33). As she races back to the house with the child, she steps on the nail that has always stuck up, and, “blinded by the pain I yelled, “‘Slaughter’ it!” (33)

The town’s women are identified in relationship to men early in the story, an indication of the masculinity value of the culture. The pig also sheds light on the high masculinity dimension reflecting the value placed on toughness within the culture. Uncle Kolya is responsible for killing all the animals on their street, but, women also participate without hesitancy in the slaughter, including Mother who had earlier resisted its slaughter. The daughter permits her three-year-old son to watch the slaughter because she has a “feeling that my son must not be like my effeminate contemporaries, who felt sick

at the sight of a severed cock's head" (35). In the final scene when the daughter catches her son and he cries out, "Don't kill piggy!" the idea that she must not spare him the "truth" seems "written in large crooked letters on a piece of paper there in my head. . . We have to, we have to kill him and that's the way life is! And he began to struggle again" (38). The literary response is the child playing the role of the fool, of incomprehension, to relieve high pathos and remove the mask of pseudo intelligence.

Religious symbols increasingly emerge as the slaughtering process begins. The symbols of the Christian crucifixion are everywhere: the cross beam, the piercing of the body, the red blood, wrangling over remains of the crucified one, forgiveness by the one crucified, lack of understanding by the sinners, life after death, and, even the nail which pierced the daughter's foot earlier. The daughter clearly recalls that, as a child, she watched her godfather, a veterinary surgeon, slaughter a pig on a pig farm and from that point she began to hate him. She remembers the blood gushing from the slit throat of the pig "hanging on the rope on the pillar with the cross beam. . . . as though it had been crucified" (36). Now, as Vaska is killed while her son watches:

She wrangled with the female neighbors who had come running to buy the meat. . . . I did everything I had to, but my calmness nagged at me and stopped me doing what I had to do calmly" (36):

In the trough the dark red liver trembled as though it were alive. And suddenly I saw the pig again, with a smile that seemed to be asking me forgiveness for some offense that I had actually committed against it. A sharp, unpleasant smell reached me. It was the wind blowing from Vaska's pen, and it was as though Vaska were still alive. . . . I raised my head and saw my son. . . . His gaze was entirely adult and unfamiliar. His blue eyes watched me with intent malice. (37).

When she calls for her son to come he runs from her in terror “with that same hunted look” (37) and she runs after him. The scene is a virtual replay of the early scene in which the mother, like a gangly blue bird, tries to catch up to her daughter who seems to be:

running away from her with two heavy suitcases. . . . I could hear my mother’s rapid breaths growing shorter and jerkier, and for an instant I had the unpleasant feeling that it was a dog chasing me” (27).

The daughter stops only when her mother calls “Daughter”; the son stops only when the daughter calls, “Son.” The mother, son and pig share an association with the color blue. Could it represent the softer side of life - that represented by the innocence of children, the gentle wisdom of old women and “dumb” animals? The mother’s repeated portrayal as a gangly blue bird, a symbol representing dreams in Russian literature, strengthens the interpretation that the daughter is caught in a cultural bind between past and future, a challenge to the dreams and assumptions of past generations. Vasilenko never gives names to the mother and son, perhaps emphasizing the unknown cultural changes lying ahead, perhaps emphasizing that culture lives as it is reinvented and passed from generation to generation. The closing scene is the daughter and son crying and holding each other. “I knew that we would never be so happy again” (39) while Maria Stepanovna, shouting, runs to them “but I couldn’t hear what she was shouting, somehow I could only hear the loud beating of her heart” (39). The daughter knew that her son was right, “we mustn’t, we mustn’t,” and, at last, she understood “that someone irrefutably logical. . . , this faceless person was taking away my son, mother, and me and



sadly repeating the standard truth. ‘We have to, that’s the way life is,’ and together with my son I shouted, ‘Don’t! Don’t.’ That person wouldn’t dare to take them away from me, they wouldn’t die, as long as I kept on shouting” (39). Could this not be Vasilenko’s voice of feminism protesting the strong masculine values which allow the calm killing of an animal loved by a small child and his grandmother because “that’s the way life it?” The significance of the surprise discovery of thirteen nipples on Vaska’s carcass is left to the imagination of readers.

### **“I’m Not Talking About That, Now” by Sindiwe Magona**

The cultural and literary theories as reviewed above and Schwartz’s model of ten motivational values types will guide this interpretation. In a biographical profile, Magona speaks directly of her intent in this story in which:

an ordinary family living in one of South African townships takes center stage during the post-1976 political upheavals in the country. . . . My aim was to show how the political impinged on the personal; people’s lives were affected in ways they had perhaps never imagined. . . . I suppose you could say I’m grappling with the transmogrifying power of a certain type of event. Understanding that, perhaps, might we come to judge less harshly? Or not judge at all? I really don’t know. Like a lot of other people, I’m just trying to understand what really happened to the gentle, humane, kindly people of my childhood (270-71).

The voice of the reader is informed mostly by public media accounts of current events and the personal friendships in later years of a white South African and a black South African, who is a naturalized American citizen, both with doctoral degrees. This

reader, like most American students, has never experienced such a “transmogrifying event” nor political upheaval with which the characters in this story must live. The “obligation to the text read” (136) of which Miller speaks requires readers to suspend judgment as they seek to understand the clash of cultures and the impact of political upheaval upon individuals and cultures.

The conflict in this story results directly from the resistance to the apartheid power and authority of South Africa. Intergenerational cultural values clash, but, evidence of deep seated cultural values remains even as the culture changes and evolves to deal with the political realities of the era. Magona establishes the setting of one “ordinary family” early in the story and few insights are given of other families. Since insight into family life comes only from Mamvulane, the reader must cautiously assume how strongly these values and behaviors represent the dominant cultural standards in which Mamvulane’s family lives; however, Magona’s stated purpose of depicting an ordinary family lends credibility to the typicality of the family and situation.

Mdlangathi’s obvious position of power in the family and Mamvulane’s accommodations to his power suggest that power is a strong motivational value, and, as evidenced by clearly delineated gender roles, a strong masculine cultural setting dominates. Mamvulane’s role as mother and homemaker while her husband and children gave little consideration to the difficulties imposed by the boycott show how strongly gender roles are defined. “Mdlangathi and the children expected to eat-boycott or no boycott. Whether she had gone to the shops or not didn’t much concern them” (275). In

Mdlangathi's views, mothers are directly accountable for their children's upbringing and behaviors: "No wonder your children are as bad as they are, where would they learn to listen and obey since you, our wives, who are their mothers, have stopped doing that? Mmhhh?" (274). Evidence of these gender roles also appear in the children's behavior. Their son Mteteli has joined the group of young people enforcing the boycott through attacks on those violating it, and, when he comes home after his involvement in the "disciplining" of his mother earlier in the day, he is "demanding food when no one had sent him on an errand anywhere that he should have been absent during dinner"(285). "Mdlangathi roared at his son: '*Kwedini!* What gives you the right to go about causing mischief that I, your father, have not asked you to perform and then, as though that were not grief enough to your poor mother here, come back here in the middle of the night and wake us up with demands of food?" (285) Mamvulane also reveals her expectations to be defended by her husband when she tells him about her encounter with the youth: "Mdlangathi had been more upset about the drunkard. . . . than for his own wife. She was sure she didn't know what to make of it. His lack of indignation on her behalf galled her, though." However, her expectation is tempered with relief that a fight had not broken out between father and son over the encounter (283). Mteteli did not physically respond to "the shaking he was receiving at the hands of his father. . . . 'Are you lifting a hand, fighting with me, your father?' 'All I want is my food. I'm not fighting anyone,' said Mteteli sullenly" (285). The rigid gender roles and the power motivational factor may also be the source of the daughter's behavior. "The girl, Fezeka, for some reason that

wasn't clear to the mother, was not that involved in the doings of the students, although she was the older by three years" (284). The son is involved with enforcing the boycott; the daughter eats in the kitchen with the two youngest children. Magona does not specifically reveal the gender make-up of the youth group but Mdlangathi's references only to boys attacking suggests that it is predominantly male. The issue of power is directly addressed in Mamvulane and Mdlangathi's conversation about the behavior of children: "Do you know what's wrong with the world today?" And quickly answered himself, 'All of us parents are very big cowards. . . .' She hummed her agreement with what he was saying. But in her heart she didn't believe that what he said was wholly true. Powerless, perhaps. That is what she thought parents were-overwhelmed by a sense of powerlessness in the face of the children's collective revolt, where the mildest child had become a stranger. . . ." (284).

Generational value differences come out strongly in values reflecting openness to change. Children were enforcing the boycott to force change in the political system, albeit without recognizing its total ramifications. Throughout the story, Mdlangathi's commitment to tradition and conformity is also revealed through his frequent "ranting and raving about the gross lack of respect of today's young people. . . ." (273) and his references to traditional cultural practices. "Do you know that a group of boys accosted a man? A grown man, who was circumcised? Boys laid their filthy hands on such a man. . . a man old enough to be their father?" "Even a witch doctor does not put his own hand into the throat of the man he is helping to bring up poison from his craw.' . . None too

sober himself, Mdlangathi embarked upon a bitter tirade directed at all of today's children, miserable creature who had no respect for their elders" (275). Mamvulane's resistance to change was more practical: "It's all very well for the comrades to stop people from going to the shops, she fumed. They were fighting the businessmen, they said. But as far as she could see, it was only people like herself, poor people in the township, who were starving" (276). Mdlangathi's resistance to change were revealed in Mamvulane's reflections of his expectations. "With all that was happening. But still, he wanted and expected no changes in his life. Didn't he still go to work every day? That's what he'd asked her when she told him they were running out of food. What did she do with the money he gave her? As though, in these mad and crazy day, money were the only issue, the sole consideration" (276). Mamvulane defies the power of the collective enforcement of the boycott and dares to accomplish the ordinary chore of shopping, for a very practical reason, to feed her children.

In Mamvulane's negotiation of her plans, Magona reveals complex stratifications of culture, the internal persuasive voice and nonverbal communication behaviors of the culture. Mamvulane calls her plan daring but its significance is made evident by her not revealing it to anyone. "Without a word even to her very good neighbor and friend, Nolitha, she made her way out of her yard" (277). She dressed in her "day clothes" and walked with a "gait slow and steady, not once hesitating" (277) and re-bags her purchases to conceal their origins in her apparent knowledge of the behavior necessary to insure the success of her plan. She squatted in the thicket so "she would look like someone

relieving herself or digging up some root to use for an ailment. Either way, she should be left alone-unless the passersby happened to be people with more on their minds than she bargained for” (280). In her internal persuasive dialogue, she is hungry, her anger is mounting “with the growing realization that she faced a hard day with no answers to questions raised,” (276) and she “bitterly” thinks that it is “time to start the evening meal. For those who could do that” (277). At the store, “she began to wonder whether the boycott had been lifted and she and her neighbors were maintaining a boycott long past because they had not heard the good news” (278). And, as though she had reached an understanding in her the internal dialogue, “soon, her own timidity left her. She forgot that what she was doing was forbidden. Once more, it had become to her too, a normal and very ordinary activity” (278). Mandaba, “suspecting the cause of her neighbor’s reticence and disheveled appearance, remarked, ‘*Hayi*, you are naughty, Mamvulane.’ To which the latter said not a word but just continued walking to her home as though the other had not spoken at all” (281). Mdlangathi also struggles with an internal persuasive dialogue. He is very vocal in his indignation about the boys forcing poison down the drunkard who violated the boycott and about children’s lack of respect in general; however, he becomes uncharacteristically “so calm that his wife became resentful of exactly that calmness that she had so frequently and desperately sought from him” (282). Mdlangathi shakes his son and suggests he “get out of my house and go seek your food elsewhere. I do not work hard so that I shall feed thugs,” (285) but, then he “got back into bed and covered himself with the blankets till not even his hair could be seen” (286).

The reader assumes that Mdlangathi did not intend to kill his son in “one of those cruel accidents. How often does one stroke of a stick, however strong, end up in a fatality?” (287). One assumes he strikes him with the intention of enforcing the traditional role of powerful father and submissive son.

The legal structures of apartheid become apparent in Mumvulane’s travels through her zone and the “indistinct border between the two” townships in a “kind of administratively forgotten no-man’s-land. And there one finds all sorts of people, including some not classified as Africans or as Coloured-those who somehow escaped government classification. . . . No one really knows what does happen in that place” (279). Since the bag she used to re-bag her groceries “had long lost its crispness it could be taken that she was a domestic worker carrying home goodies her madam had given her” (279). The final scene reveals both the political and cultural turmoil in which the characters live their lives. “Ambulances had stopped coming to the townships because they had been stoned by the comrades” (287) reveals results of political turmoil. The refusal of a neighbor to take Mteteli to the hospital, some sentiment that his refusal “taught the comrades a lesson long overdue” (287), the mixed reactions to the tragic “accident” itself and reactions to Mdlangathi’s not asking permission to attend his son’s funeral are the realities of culture under assault.

Mamvulane is facing the dilemma of understanding the “transmogrifying” of her family and people, the stated aim of the author. Mumvulane replies to Mdlangathi comment that families all over the townships are having dinner not knowing where their

children are by reminding him “that our children live in times very different to what ours were when we were their age” ( 282). Mdlangathi does not ask for permission to attend Mteteli’s funeral because “I do not want.” Mamvulane is so afraid of being “bruised even more by events that seemed to her to come straight out of the house of the devil himself that she could not find the courage to ask what he meant: whether what he did not want was to come to the funeral or to ask to be allowed to attend the funeral. She did not know which would hurt her more. And did not dare find out” (287). One would hope, like Magona, that readers of “I’m Not Talking About That, Now” from “tiny islands” (Bakhtin, “Discourse” 374) of the world would “judge less harshly” (271) the actions of people whose personal lives and culture are under assault and that those readers also gain a greater appreciation of the complexity of cultural clashes.



### Works Cited

- Applebee, Arthur N. Literature in the Secondary School: Studies of Curriculum and Instruction in the United States. NCTE Research Report No. 25. National Research Center in Literature Teaching and Learning. NY: SUNY, 1993.
- Asante, Molefi Kete and William B. Gudykunst, eds. Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication. NY: Sage, 1989.
- Bakhtin, M. M. "Discourse in the Novel." Holquist, 259-422.
- . Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986.
- Banks, James A. "Multicultural Education: Development, Dimensions, and Challenges." Phi Delta Kappan. (Sept. 1993): 22-28. Rpt. in Bennett, 69-84.
- Bennett, Milton, J., ed. Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication: Selected Readings. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural P, 1998.
- Berry, John W., Marshal H. Segall and Cigdem Kagitcibasi, eds. Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 2nd ed. Vol. 3 Social Behavior and Application. Boston: Allyn, 1997.
- Best, Deborah L. and John Williams. "Sex, Gender and Culture." Berry, Segall and Kagitcibasi, 163-212.
- Bhawuk, Dharm P.S. and Harry C. Triandis. "The Role of Culture Theory in the Study of Culture and Intercultural Training." Handbook of Intercultural Training. 2nd ed. Ed. Don Landis and Rabi S. Bhagat. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 1996. 17-34.

Brøgger, Fredrick Chr. Culture, Language, Text: Culture Studies within the Study of

English as a Foreign Language. NY: Scandinavian UP, 1992.

Burton, Roberts. "Talking Across Cultures." Trimmer and Warnock. 115-123.

Clifford, James. The Predicament of Culture: 20th-Century Ethnography, Literature, and

Art. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1988.

Cruz, Gladys, et al., eds. Beyond the Culture Tours: Studies in Teaching and Learning

with Culturally Diverse Texts. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Association, 1997.

Cruz, Gladys and José Meléndez. "A Case Study of the Responses to Multicultural

Literature." Cruz, et al., 35-47.

Damen, Louise. Culture Learning: The 5th Dimension in the Language Classroom.

Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1987.

Dasenbrock, Reed Way. "Teaching Multicultural Literature." Trimmer and Warnock.

35-47.

Dingwaney, Anuradha and Carol Maier. "Translation as a Method for Cross-Cultural

Teaching." Trimmer and Warnock. 47-63.

Fernandez, Denise Rotondo, et. al. "Hofstede's Country Classification: 25 Years Later."

The Journal of Social Psychology 137.1 (1997): 43-54.

Geertz, Clifford. The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz.

NY: Basic, 1973.

Gudykunst, William. Bridging Differences: Effective Intergroup Communication.

Number 3 Interpersonal Commtexts Series. Knapp, Mark L. And John A. Daly, eds. 1991.

Gudykunst, William B. and Young Yun Kim. Communicating with Strangers: An Approach to Intercultural Communications. 2nd ed. St. Louis: Addison-Wesley, 1992.

Gudykunst, William B. and Michael Harris Bond. "Intergroup Relations Across Cultures." Berry, Segall and Kagitcibasi, 119-161.

Hall, Edward T. The Dance of Life: The Other Dimension of Time. NY: Doubleday, 1983.

---. "The Power of Hidden Differences." Bennett, 53-68.

Hartman, Geoffrey. The Fateful Question of Culture. The Wellek Library Lecture Series at the University of California, Irvine. NY: Columbia UP, 1997.

Hecht, Michael L., Peter A. Andersen and Sidney A. Ribeau. "The Cultural Dimensions of Nonverbal Communications." Asante and Gudykunst, 163-185.

Hermans, Hubert J. M. and Harry J. G. Kempen. The Dialogical Self: Meaning as Movement. NY: Academic, 1993.

Hiley, David R., James F. Bohman and Richard Shusterman, eds. The Interpretive Turn: Philosophy, Science, Culture. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991.

Hofstede, Geert. "The Cultural Relativity of Organizational Practices and Theories."

Journal of International Business Studies 14.2 (Fall 1983): 75-89. Rtp. in Inkeles, Alex and Masamichi Sasaki, eds. Comparing Nations and Cultures: Readings in a Cross-Disciplinary Perspective. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice, 1996. 387-401.

---. Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values.

Abridged Edition. Cross-Cultural Research and Methodology Series, Vol. 5. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1984.

---. Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind. 2nd ed. Institute for Research on Intercultural Cooperation (IRIC), University of Limburg at Maastricht, The Netherlands. St. Louis: McGraw, 1997.

Hofstede, Geert, ed. Encountering Cultures: Reading and Writing in a Changing World. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice, 1995.

Holquist, Michael, ed. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.

Kagitcibasi, Cigdem. "Individual and Collectivism." Berry, Segall and Kagitcibasi, 1-50.

Kent, Thomas. "Hermeneutics and Genre: Bakhtin and the Problem of Communicative Interaction." Hiley, Bohman and Shusterman, 282-303.

Jordan, Sarah. "Student Responses to Culturally Diverse Texts." Cruz, et al., 9-34.

Magona, Sindiwe. "I'm Not Talking About That, Now." Under African Skies. NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux. 1997. 271-287.

Mukherjee, Bharati. Beyond Multiculturalism: Surviving the Nineties. Address. Iowa Humanities Lecture presented by the Iowa Humanities Board, 1994.

Meléndez, José. "A Theoretical and Practical Conclusion." Cruz, et al., 69-98.

Miller, J. Hillis. "The Role of Theory in the Development of Literary Studies in the U.S." Divided Knowledge: Across Disciplines, Across Cultures. Ed. Easton, David and Corinne S. Schelling. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1991. 118-139.

Ostrowski, Steven. "Teaching Multicultural Literature." Cruz, et al., 47-68.

Purves, Alan. "Introduction: The Grand Tour and Other Forays." Cruz, et al., 1-8.

Richardson, Frank C., et al. "Toward a Dialogical Self." American Behavioral Scientist 41.4 (1998): 496-516.

Said, Edward W. "Crisis [in orientalism]." Rpt. in Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader. Ed. David Lodge. NY: Longman, 1988. 294-301.

---. "Roads Taken and Not Taken in Contemporary Criticism." Rpt. in Directions for Criticism: Structuralism and Its Alternatives. Eds. Krieger, Murray and L. S. Dembo. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1977. 33-55.

---. The World, the Text and the Critic. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983.

Schwartz, Shalom H. and Lilach Sagiv. "Identifying Culture-Specifics in the Content and Structure of Values." Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 26.1 (Jan. 1995): 92-116. <http://www.epnet.com/cgi-bin/epwbird/Ebsco>, (2/21/99).

Seelye, H. Ned. Teaching Culture: Strategies for Intercultural Communications. 3rd ed. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook, 1993.

Smith, Peter B. and Shalom H. Schwartz. "Values." Berry, Segall and Kagitcibasi, 77-118.

Sollar, Werner. "Notes on Contributors." Cultural Difference and the Literary Text: Pluralism and Limits of Authenticity in North American Literatures. Ed. Siemerling, Winfried and Katrin Schwenk. Iowa City: U of I Press, 1996. 163-65.

Steele, Meili. Critical Confrontations: Literary Theories in Dialogue. U of SC: Columbia, 1997.

Triandis, Harry C., Xiao Ping Chen and Darius K.-S. Chan. "Scenarios for the Measurement of Collectivism and Individualism." Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 29.2 (1998): 275-289).

Trimmer, Joseph and Tilly Warnock. eds. Understanding Others: Cultural and Cross-Cultural Studies and the Teaching of Literature. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1992.

Taylor, Charles. "The Dialogical Self." Hiley, Bohman and Shusterman, 304-314.

Vijver, Vande and Kwok Leung. Methods and Data Analysis for Cross-Cultural Research. Cross-Cultural Psychology Series 1. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997.

Vasilenki, Svetlana. "Piggy." Present Imperfect: Stories by Russian Women. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996. 25-39.

Wagner, Roy. The Invention of Culture. Englewood, CA: Prentice, 1975.

Zalygin, Sergei, (compiled by). The New Soviet Fiction: Sixteen Short Stories. NY: Abbeville. 1989.

### Works Cited

- Applebee, Arthur N. Literature in the Secondary School: Studies of Curriculum and Instruction in the United States. NCTE Research Report No. 25. National Research Center in Literature Teaching and Learning. NY: SUNY, 1993.
- Asante, Molefi Kete and William B. Gudykunst, eds. Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication. NY: Sage, 1989.
- Bakhtin, M. M. "Discourse in the Novel." Holquist, 259-422.
- . Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986.
- Banks, James A. "Multicultural Education: Development, Dimensions, and Challenges." Phi Delta Kappan. (Sept. 1993): 22-28. Rpt. in Bennett, 69-84.
- Bennett, Milton, J., ed. Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication: Selected Readings. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural P, 1998.
- Berry, John W., Marshal H. Segall and Cigdem Kagitcibasi, eds. Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 2nd ed. Vol. 3 Social Behavior and Application. Boston: Allyn, 1997.
- Best, Deborah L. and John Williams. "Sex, Gender and Culture." Berry, Segall and Kagitcibasi, 163-212.
- Bhawuk, Dharm P.S. and Harry C. Triandis. "The Role of Culture Theory in the Study of Culture and Intercultural Training." Handbook of Intercultural Training. 2nd ed. Ed. Don Landis and Rabi S. Bhagat. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 1996. 17-34.

Brøgger, Fredrick Chr. Culture, Language, Text: Culture Studies within the Study of

English as a Foreign Language. NY: Scandinavian UP, 1992.

Burton, Roberts. "Talking Across Cultures." Trimmer and Warnock. 115-123.

Clifford, James. The Predicament of Culture: 20th-Century Ethnography, Literature, and

Art. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1988.

Cruz, Gladys, et al., eds. Beyond the Culture Tours: Studies in Teaching and Learning

with Culturally Diverse Texts. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Association, 1997.

Cruz, Gladys and José Meléndez. "A Case Study of the Responses to Multicultural

Literature." Cruz, et al., 35-47.

Damen, Louise. Culture Learning: The 5th Dimension in the Language Classroom.

Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1987.

Dasenbrock, Reed Way. "Teaching Multicultural Literature." Trimmer and Warnock.

35-47.

Dingwaney, Anuradha and Carol Maier. "Translation as a Method for Cross-Cultural

Teaching." Trimmer and Warnock. 47-63.

Fernandez, Denise Rotondo, et. al. "Hofstede's Country Classification: 25 Years Later."

The Journal of Social Psychology 137.1 (1997): 43-54.

Geertz, Clifford. The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz.

NY: Basic, 1973.



Gudykunst, William. Bridging Differences: Effective Intergroup Communication.

Number 3 Interpersonal Commtexts Series. Knapp, Mark L. And John A. Daly, eds. 1991.

Gudykunst, William B. and Young Yun Kim. Communicating with Strangers: An Approach to Intercultural Communications. 2nd ed. St. Louis: Addison-Wesley, 1992.

Gudykunst, William B. and Michael Harris Bond. "Intergroup Relations Across Cultures." Berry, Segall and Kagitcibasi, 119-161.

Hall, Edward T. The Dance of Life: The Other Dimension of Time. NY: Doubleday, 1983.

---. "The Power of Hidden Differences." Bennett, 53-68.

Hartman, Geoffrey. The Fateful Question of Culture. The Wellek Library Lecture Series at the University of California, Irvine. NY: Columbia UP, 1997.

Hecht, Michael L., Peter A. Andersen and Sidney A. Ribeau. "The Cultural Dimensions of Nonverbal Communications." Asante and Gudykunst, 163-185.

Hermans, Hubert J. M. and Harry J. G. Kempen. The Dialogical Self: Meaning as Movement. NY: Academic, 1993.

Hiley, David R., James F. Bohman and Richard Shusterman, eds. The Interpretive Turn: Philosophy, Science, Culture. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991.

Hofstede, Geert. "The Cultural Relativity of Organizational Practices and Theories."

*Journal of International Business Studies* 14.2 (Fall 1983): 75-89. Rtp. in Inkeles, Alex and Masamichi Sasaki, eds. Comparing Nations and Cultures: Readings in a Cross-Disciplinary Perspective. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice, 1996. 387-401.

---. Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values.

Abridged Edition. Cross-Cultural Research and Methodology Series, Vol. 5. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1984.

---. Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind. 2nd ed. Institute for Research on Intercultural Cooperation (IRIC), University of Limburg at Maastricht, The Netherlands. St. Louis: McGraw, 1997.

Holetin, Richard, ed. Encountering Cultures: Reading and Writing in a Changing World.

2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice, 1995.

Holquist, Michael, ed. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin. Trans.

Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.

Kagitcibasi, Cigdem. "Individual and Collectivism." Berry, Segall and Kagitcibasi, 1-50.

Kent, Thomas. "Hermeneutics and Genre: Bakhtin and the Problem of Communicative Interaction." Hiley, Bohman and Shusterman, 282-303.

Jordan, Sarah. "Student Responses to Culturally Diverse Texts." Cruz, et al., 9-34.

Magona, Sindiwe. "I'm Not Talking About That, Now." Under African Skies. NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux. 1997. 271-287.

Mukherjee, Bharati. Beyond Multiculturalism: Surviving the Nineties. Address. Iowa Humanities Lecture presented by the Iowa Humanities Board, 1994.

Meléndez, José. "A Theoretical and Practical Conclusion." Cruz, et al., 69-98.

Miller, J. Hillis. "The Role of Theory in the Development of Literary Studies in the U.S." Divided Knowledge: Across Disciplines, Across Cultures. Ed. Easton, David and Corinne S. Schelling. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1991. 118-139.

Ostrowski, Steven. "Teaching Multicultural Literature." Cruz, et al., 47-68.

Purves, Alan. "Introduction: The Grand Tour and Other Forays." Cruz, et al., 1-8.

Richardson, Frank C., et al. "Toward a Dialogical Self." American Behavioral Scientist 41.4 (1998): 496-516.

Said, Edward W. "Crisis [in orientalism]." Rpt. in Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader. Ed. David Lodge. NY: Longman, 1988. 294-301.

---. "Roads Taken and Not Taken in Contemporary Criticism." Rpt. in Directions for Criticism: Structuralism and Its Alternatives. Eds. Krieger, Murray and L. S. Dembo. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1977. 33-55.

---. The World, the Text and the Critic. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983.

Schwartz, Shalom H. and Lilach Sagiv. "Identifying Culture-Specifics in the Content and Structure of Values." Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 26.1 (Jan. 1995): 92-116. <http://www.epnet.com/cgi-bin/epwbird/Ebsco>, (2/21/99).

Seelye, H. Ned. Teaching Culture: Strategies for Intercultural Communications. 3rd ed. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook, 1993.

Smith, Peter B. and Shalom H. Schwartz. "Values." Berry, Segall and Kagitcibasi, 77-118.

Sollar, Werner. "Notes on Contributors." Cultural Difference and the Literary Text: Pluralism and Limits of Authenticity in North American Literatures. Ed. Siemerling, Winfried and Katrin Schwenk. Iowa City: U of I Press, 1996. 163-65.

Steele, Meili. Critical Confrontations: Literary Theories in Dialogue. U of SC: Columbia, 1997.

Triandis, Harry C., Xiao Ping Chen and Darius K.-S. Chan. "Scenarios for the Measurement of Collectivism and Individualism." Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 29.2 (1998): 275-289).

Trimmer, Joseph and Tilly Warnock. eds. Understanding Others: Cultural and Cross-Cultural Studies and the Teaching of Literature. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1992.

Taylor, Charles. "The Dialogical Self." Hiley, Bohman and Shusterman, 304-314.

Vijver, Vande and Kwok Leung. Methods and Data Analysis for Cross-Cultural Research. Cross-Cultural Psychology Series 1. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997.

Vasilenki, Svetlana. "Piggy." Present Imperfect: Stories by Russian Women. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996. 25-39.

Wagner, Roy. The Invention of Culture. Englewood, CA: Prentice, 1975.

Zalygin, Sergei, (compiled by). The New Soviet Fiction: Sixteen Short Stories. NY: Abbeville. 1989.