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ENGULUTURATION IS THE PROCESS BY WHICH individuals acquire and assimilate the values and behavior patterns of a parent society. Yet while serving to strengthen the common bonds between the members of a group, the enculturation process also gives rise to an essential ethnocentrism, or deep-rooted sense of cultural superiority. And as Kohls (p. 11) points out, that largely unconscious ethnocentric impulse, when unrestrained or unscrupulously manipulated within a particular social or political context, can have far-reaching, and sometimes tragic consequences. Uncontrolled ethnocentrism has often led to prejudice, hatred, oppression, and war. Would it not then be vitally important for educators, especially for those in the field of foreign languages and literatures, to instill in their students a sense of cross-cultural awareness by providing them with the tools for identifying their own cultural value orientations as well as those of others? In so doing these students would come away from the typical language course with more than just a minimal exposure to literature and varying degrees of linguistic skill. They would, in addition, be enriched with a global perspective and the ability to recognize the diversity of methods by which different peoples attempt to solve humanity’s common problems.

Kohls (p. 21) proposes the Kluckhohn model as a systematic means of analyzing a particular culture’s value system. After several years of experimentation in the classroom, I have adapted a slight modification of that model to teaching the cultural component in elementary language courses, on a limited basis, and on a broader scale, in third- and fourth-semester Spanish literature courses. The model, I have found, is: 1) a workable tool; 2) a framework for analyzing one’s own dominant and variant cultural values; and 3) an effective means of making cross-cultural comparisons. When differences in behavior patterns do emerge, they can be shown to have a logical justification for their existence, one rooted in a society’s: 1) perception of self and others; 2) world view; 3) temporal orientation; 4) forms of activity; and 5) social relations. While acknowledging the dangers of oversimplification and the trap of cultural determinism, this taxonomy nevertheless may be successfully superimposed upon textbook culture capsules, and upon works of literature (poetry, drama, short story, novel), and even upon examples of popular culture (such as folk songs), to derive dominant, or variant, value orientations within or about a foreign culture.

The purpose, then, of the present work is first, to explain the Kluckhohn model; second, to show how it can be applied to teaching the cultural component of elementary and intermediate foreign language courses.

THE KLUCKHOHN MODEL

In the early 1950s, Florence Kluckhohn, together with fellow anthropologist Frederick Strodtbeck, embarked on a research project to study value orientations in the American southwest (8: p. 21). They chose an area where there were five culturally distinct communities, all within a forty mile radius: 1) a Texas homestead; 2) a Mormon village; 3) a Spanish-American village; 4) a band of Navaho Indians; and 5) a Zuni pueblo. After Kluckhohn collected her data and examined them philosophically and analytically, an ordered variation in the value orientations of each culture became apparent. Undergirding these variant beliefs and behaviors, she discovered, were three basic
assumptions. First, a limited number of common human problems exists for which all peoples at all times must find solutions. Second, while there is variability in solutions of all problems, it is neither random nor limitless within a range of possible solutions. And third, all alternatives to all solutions are present in all societies at all times but are differentially preferred (7: pp. viii & 10).

Logically, then, the next question is what exactly are the problems common to all human groups? Kluckhohn narrowed down the possibilities to five basic concerns: 1) What is man’s assessment of innate human nature (Perception of Self and Others)? 2) What is man’s relation to nature (World View)? 3) What is the temporal focus of life (Temporal Orientation)? 4) What is the group’s principal mode of activity (Forms of Activity)? 5) What is the modality of the group’s relationships to others (Social Relations)?

Based on the data collected from her observation of the five southwestern communities, Kluckhohn noted three ranges of possible responses to the five basic human problems or orientations, as they are termed.3 With the aid of the statistician Strrodbeck, she organized her findings in chart form. The Kluckhohn model is given in Figure I.

Some of the terms above are self-explanatory. Others may require brief explanation. For instance, Kohls (p. 84) explains past orientation as tradition-bound, present as situational, and future as goal-oriented. The being mode places little emphasis on personal achievement while the being-in-becoming category stresses inner development, for example, through meditation. The doing mode is action-oriented. Effort will be rewarded with material success.

Lineality, Kohls explains, is an authoritarian mode, where dominant-subordinate relationships are clearly defined. Collaterality sees man as an individual but also as a member of certain groups making collective decisions. And finally, individualism, or the egalitarian mode, emphasizes personal autonomy.

THE KLUCKHOHN MODEL & CROSS-CULTURAL AWARENESS

As stated earlier, if we are not always consciously aware of the values inherited from our parent culture, how can we begin to compare, let alone understand, those of others? Most of us do not even question the assumptions underlying our cultural beliefs and behaviors (11: p. 20). They are so much a part of what we perceive to be “real life” that the philosophical division between existential premises and normative assumptions becomes blurred (7: p. 5).

Our cultural myopia causes us to equate what is with what we think ought to be. So when confronted with values different from our own—and such confrontations are inevitable in a foreign language class—without the ability to conceptualize cultural variables, we often react judgmentally. We may retreat even deeper into our own ethnocentric shell, all the while justifying our defensiveness in a very typically American way, through a bipolar comparison with our own culture as the universal yardstick:3 “We do things the right way. They are simply wrong” (11: p. 30). With Figure I providing a coherent frame of reference, we can begin to draw students away from cultural presumptuousness. By analyzing systematically what may be termed dominant white American middle-class cultural patterns, we take a vital first step toward cross-cultural awareness.
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The Kluckhohn Model

The Five Value Orientations and the Range of Variations Postulated for Each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Postulated Range of Variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>human nature</strong></td>
<td>Mixture of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evil</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutable</td>
<td>immutatble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immutable</td>
<td>Subjugation-to-Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man nature</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutable</td>
<td>Mastery-over Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immutable</td>
<td>Being-in-Becoming Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imutable</td>
<td>Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immutable</td>
<td>Lineality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>Individualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kluckhohn (p. 12)
Consider for a moment the American perception of self and others, or human nature orientation. For our purposes in defining dominant value orientations we may say that Americans are basically optimistic group, believing in the essential goodness of all people, and the ultimate perfectibility of mankind. This perception of human nature explains why Americans are such strong proponents of social reform programs (8: p. 23). We need only eliminate negative environmental factors to enable man to prosper and reach his full potential. Americans readily identify the self with the individual, and then rigidly distinguish between self and other (11: p. 32). From early childhood we are encouraged to be autonomous, to make up our own minds, to be our own best judge. Americans solve their own problems independently, and only occasionally do they seek the advice of others. This attitude obviously results in an intense self-focusing. And while viewed positively in our culture, it easily becomes the basis for the cultural stereotype of the arrogant American. The self, then, is the quantum or organizational unit of our culture, a reference point around which our society functions (11: p. 75).

Americans see a very distinct separation between man and nature. They perceive the world to be external, physical, material, and inanimate, without soul or spirit (11: p. 17). How alien this view is to other cultures, such as American Indian or Oriental, which visualize human beings in complete harmony with nature, indeed if not at times totally subjugated to it. This view does not admit the conception of human uniqueness or superiority over nature, or the idea that nature is at our personal disposal, all of which are basic to the American anthropocentric perception. Americans believe they can and must control nature. And while substantial numbers of people now support environmental restraints and the conservation of natural resources, many others still feel completely justified in making use of what nature offers, for personal profit, and for the general betterment of society. In fact, mastery over nature is almost divinely ordained as part of humanity's duty to overcome obstacles. The solemn pronouncement: "God helps those who help themselves" embodies this attitude quite well.

All societies must deal with past, present, future, or cyclical time orientations. However, the "rank-order emphasis" (7: p. 14), or preferencial ordering especially of past, present, and future time conceptions, distinguishes one culture from another. Middle-class Americans believe in the idea of progress and have a strong task orientation with a generally optimistic view of the future (Kohls: p. 23). We do not overly concern ourselves with tradition or the past (a feature which differentiates us from the British, our Anglo-Saxon cultural cousins), nor do we dwell upon the present moment. Today is simply a bridge to a better tomorrow. One need only consider the Chinese and Japanese cultures with their history of ancestor worship to conceptualize a contrasting value orientation (7: p. 14), and one diametrically opposite to our future-projected temporal focus.

The dominant mode of activity in American society, of course, is "doing." Because individuals are judged and valued primarily by what they can do or accomplish, Americans adhering to standard middle-class values tend to be somewhat restless given the recurrent need to prove themselves (11: p. 39). Identity and success are gained through achievements which should be personal, visible, and measurable by external standards (7: p. 17). The deeply engrained Protestant work ethic further predisposes one to action and constant productivity, with the intensity of this drive at times assuming the proportions of a moral imperative because "Idle hands are the devil's workshop." We pride ourselves on our activity, on being a nation of decision-makers and problem-solvers. Combine this almost compulsive need for personal achievement with exploitation of the environment and heavy reliance on technology, and it is easy to understand how these attitudes and corresponding behaviors have led to unparalleled economic abundance. Again, for the opposite view, consider the non-Western world (or indeed even some Western societies with rigid class distinctions), where emphasis is on what a human being is rather than on what he does. In such societies, role and social status determine behavior. There, the nobleman, the intellectual, or perhaps the contemplative man, has cultural prestige, a prestige which is often not based at all on the performance of visible deeds (11: p. 37).

In the area of social relations, Americans strive for personal autonomy. Each individual's motivation to externalized achievement is valued and respected. Hence, we tend to be egalitarian in outlook, but then again, quite competitive. Our social obligations lack the
binding formal quality of other countries and cultures (11: p. 49). We are informal, friendly on a superficial level, outgoing, and feel somewhat uncomfortable with rank and authority (8: p. 24). Extended kinship ties are weaker than in other societies, the nuclear family having become the dominant social unit. On the other hand, non-Westerners, and indeed many Europeans, are more likely to show strongly developed affiliation for family and community as well as strong territorial loyalty (11: p. 43).

If one now consults the Kluckhohn model, quite obviously the dominant value orientations of American society can be traced straight down the right-hand column. But quite obviously, it will be impossible to plot a culture so unilaterally. Kohls (p. 25) offers three other examples of how to plot cultural value orientations. The values in the far left column of Figure I (with an even split between the first two human nature orientations), characterize a tradition-oriented culture, such as the Chinese. Arab cultures would also fall to the left side of the chart, with a split between humans subjigated to nature and in harmony with it. As an intracultural variant orientation in conflict with dominant American middle-class values, Kohls gives as an example the hippie counter-culture of the sixties, neatly coming down the center of the chart.

Although the Kluckhohn model does not deal with all aspects of all cultures, the taxonomy is nevertheless remarkably useful for explaining behaviors and attitudes through its cohesive schematization of a particular cultural ethos. For instance, one especially striking example is the diagram below of the complex Japanese culture which finds itself split between several contradictory value orientations.

Despite its limitations, the above schema can serve admirably as a bridge to understanding between vastly divergent cultures. Dominant white middle-class American cultural patterns, shown coming straight down the right-hand side of Figure I, place us within a minority of the world’s cultures. By comparing these patterns to those of other cultures, differences are dramatically thrown into relief, thus making easier the task of predicting where areas of potential conflict or misunderstanding might lie.

AMERICAN & HISPANIC VALUE ORIENTATIONS

Edward Hall states (p. 48): "Until recently, man did not need to be aware of the structure of his own behavioral systems, because, staying at home, the behavior of most people was highly predictable. Today, however, man is constantly interacting with strangers, because his extensions have both widened his range and caused his world to shrink. It is therefore necessary for man to transcend his own culture, and this can be done only by making explicit the rules by which it operates." With the aid of the Kluckhohn model as a cognitive organizer, we have taken that crucial step toward transcending our own culture, and are now in a much more receptive position to accept the differences of another system, in this case, the Hispanic one. "Hispanic" is defined here as that which pertains to Spain and Spanish-speaking America.

When it comes to human nature orientation (7: p. 343), Hispanics view the rest of humanity as a mixture of good and evil, subject to change owing to circumstances. They use a very "person-centered" set of criteria for the evaluation of others, taking into account human beings as social interaction (11: p. 22). The American view of the world is good, because "we're in it together". Therefore all the same failures of cultural blinders, such as outgroup, ingroup sameness, make it possible, to focus on the positive. Thus when interacting with others, they may mistake their different cultural orientations, arrogance.

The very pattern of thinking and communicating people to formulate their own identity and to learn about themselves and others (11: p. 26). The dominant American model of thinking lies somewhere between the extremes of the Kluckhohn model and empirical descrip tive studies of human behavior. The empirical studies tend to distort the data that can be applied. For them to be of value, the data must be analyzed in the light of the theoretical framework that enables one to reason without the data being generalized. In this operational style, the theories are stressed. Hispanics, on the other hand, are more likely to think inductively. They do not have the same kind of logical structure to build their theories. Their thinking is more holistic and they are more likely to think in terms of "constructs" or "ideas".

An unshakable belief in the human nature of others guides the American model. All natural processes have a logical or spiritual basis. Man, as the supreme being, is at the core of human relations. He is the center of the universe. Humans are not part of nature; they are above it. He lives in the world, in conflict with nature, only to survive. Fate, spirits, and goals are set by man, not by nature. Their influence on one's life is almost totally at
of others, taking into account the dignity of individual human beings, their social status, and social interaction (1: p. 69). In contrast, the American view of human nature as basically good, because “we’re all human, after all,” and therefore all the same, provides a unique set of cultural blinders. We, in effect, by evaluating others according to this standard of emphasizing sameness, make it difficult, if not often impossible, to focus upon cultural differences. Thus when interacting with foreigners we often mistake their differing perceptions for antagonism, arrogance, or elitism (11: p. 21).

The very patterns of thinking which enable people to formulate a particular perception of themselves and others, are modified by culture. The dominant American pattern of thinking lies somewhere between theoretical speculation and empirical description (11: p. 22). Americans tend to distrust theories which cannot be applied. For them the world is composed of facts, not ideas. And according to the American mode of reasoning which is inductive, facts ineluctably lead to ideas. Americans need to systematize their perception of the world into a form that enables them to act (11: p. 23). In this operational style of thinking, consequences are stressed. Hispanic thought processes, on the other hand, are more conceptual and tend more toward the philosophical or theoretical, the deductive pattern of reasoning. Hispanics are not obsessed with measurement as are their American counterparts. As deductive thinkers, Hispanics need not amass facts and statistics since they have confidence in their ideas and power of logic which enable them to generalize from one concept to another. Ideas for them are alive, a part of the real world, not mere “constructs” or “inventions” (11: p. 22).

An unshakeable faith in reason and practicality guides the American’s relationship with nature. All natural phenomena are thought to have a logical or scientific explanation. And man, as the supreme life form on earth, dominates, controls, and exploits the natural environment for personal profit, and for the benefit of society. In the Hispanic conception, man is an integral part of surrounding nature. He lives in the world and with the world, exploiting nature only for the purposes of survival. Fate, spirits, magical and mysterious forces beyond man’s control affect all aspects of life. Their influence is even more dramatic on some mestizo cultures where the individual is almost totally at the mercy of the invisible and dangerous powers of nature: “Sun, moon and stars, wind and rain, heat and cold, light and shadow—all are believed to have occasionally harmful powers over body and mind. The cool air near the river, or the reflected heat from the rocks or trails, are thought to be dangerous, the same as the shadow of certain trees or the damp of the forest. Dangers are seen everywhere in nature and to try to understand them would be considered as foolishness.” (Cited in 11: p. 63.)

The American views the natural world as an inexhaustible source of wealth. Theoretically, then, there should be plenty for everybody provided the individual is willing to work hard enough. In some Hispanic societies, and indeed in much of the rest of the world, wealth is like land, inherent in nature, a fixed and limited quantity. It is divided up and passed around (11: p. 45). If some individuals have more, others will of necessity have less. Often time and tradition, and even luck or fate, determine how much each family will have (11: pp. 45-46). The tremendous American motivation for achievement predicated on the concept of inexhaustible wealth is replaced in some Hispanic cultures with an absence of motivation, or the so-called “lottery mentality.” In these societies people prefer to believe that inexplicable outside intervention can bring about change in one’s economic status with minimal disruptions to family and community relationships. Thus the “virtues” of hard work, frugality, and initiative are seen from a less urgent perspective than in the United States.12

Concerning temporal orientation, Americans are essentially future-oriented while Hispanics are oriented toward the present moment. La vida es para vivirla (11: p. 70). Life is to be enjoyed in a casual, unhurried manner for the purposes of developing social relationships.13 El futuro es pasado mañana, says the proverb, so why cast a shadow over the present moment by concentrating on the uncertainties of tomorrow?

Monochronic time and polychronic time are terms used to describe the two variant solutions to the problem of activity organization mentioned above. Americans are, for the most part, monochronic. For them, time is linear, like a road extending forward into the future and backward into the past. As a valuable commodity, it is rationed, segmented, scheduled. Metaphorically we say time is, “saved, spent, wasted, lost, made up, accelerated, slowed
down, crawling, and running out" (*: pp. 14-16). Hispanic peoples are generally polychronic, very loosely scheduled, if at all, with many things going on at once. Thus in a business setting it is not uncommon for Americans to feel they are not being given un-divided attention. Imagine for a moment, as Condon does (p. 66), the impatience and frustration of an American client with a bank teller who tells her nails and talks to her boyfriend on the telephone while awaiting a check approval. In a social setting, guests often will arrive late, *a la hora española* (2: p. 66), having just come from one party, and perhaps planning to go on to yet another later in the evening. The negative effect which this behavior has on the American hosts is, certainly, unintended. It is merely the result of a cultural clash between two very different perceptions of time.

As stated earlier, middle-class Americans see themselves as individuals in an inanimate world with personal success as their goal (11: p. 17). Impersonal cooperation with others is desirable, and "doing" is the preferred activity. The emphasis on not wasting time gives the impression of a very fast-paced existence here in the United States, where work and play are rigidly separated. In the Hispanic world, no such distinctions exist, and businessmen, for instance, will often mix socialization with work. Ascription replaces achievement as the dominant source of motivation. The affiliative tendencies of being a person, a member of a family, a community, or a profession, override individualistic personal advancement. One is born with a more or less fixed identity in an ascriptive society, a narrower self-definition, so "being" is the preferred mode of activity. Understanding this basic difference between American and Hispanic activity orientation shows how competition, essential for those in the "doing" mode, becomes less important, and even unacceptable, in communities where dependency on others is desirable (11: p. 42).

In such ascriptive societies, status and inequality characterize the value system (11: p. 46). The wealthy, the nobility, are by nature prestigious and powerful, their status transmitted by heredity, and rigidly maintained by authority. As previously mentioned, wealth in this value system is perceived to be limited, so that a few have most of it while many others have little. Very frequently, an absolutist government will ensure the status quo, giving little or no attention to improving the general lot of the populace. So authority, or an authority figure, becomes a source of social control and motivation. 17

In our highly mobile society, Americans seldom make profound and lasting friendships of the type seen in other cultures. Reluctant to get involved with others, we keep even our friends at a safe, depersonalized distance. We then compartmentalize them according to areas of common interest. Thus we have our work friends, our church friends, our friends from our children's school, etc. By minimizing hierarchical social differences and by treating everyone with the same basic formality we ensure control over our highly valued privacy of life. On the contrary, friendships in the Hispanic world are deep, often extending from one generation to the next. The social institution of the *compadrazgo*, for instance, ritually elevates certain friends to the status of family. Such friends are jealous guarded and not easily shared, lest the bonds of a particular relationship be weakened. Ardila Espinel (pp. 75-76) explains this very different attitude toward friendship and the emotional and per-

FIGURE III
Hispanic Value Orientations

The Five Value Orientations and the Range of Variations Postulated for Each Orientation | Postulated Range of Variations | Mixture of Good-and-Evil
--- | --- | ---
human nature | mutable |
time | Being | Linlineity, (Authoritarian) | Collaterality, (Group Oriented)
activity | relational |

Application of the Model

With the present model, Kluckhohn might point out that understanding of the social institutions is essential. For instance, the *compadrazgo* in a given society depends upon how the individual is placed within the social system of that society. And in North America there are no analogues to the *compadrazgo* in Spain. Spaniards have a system of position and the *compadrazgo* (6: p. 43). To the extent that this comes across at all, it is through the nagging guilt that is large for the most part. On the other hand, with an emphasis on a reference, a dancer, and Others, For Spanish Relations can lead to a different interpretation of the variations in Hispanic value orientations: "Courtesan," meaning what differentiates the two American United States. Mores are those that exist by being open, and those that have feelings. Latin American expatriates tend to use their pride in these ways: they want to hear how they stand with the unspoken statement above.
sonal investment Hispanics are willing to make for its preservation:

Un amigo es realmente algo especial: por un amigo los latinoamericanos pueden inclinar el vaso, tal es el compromiso emocional de la amistad entre los latinos. Este tipo de interacción social también tiene dos caras: desde el punto de vista positivo un amigo es alguien en quien se puede confiar en cualquier lugar o circunstancia, es como otro miembro de la familia, amigo se es en el buen o mal tiempo. Desde el punto de vista negativo la intrusión en la vida familiar es mucho mayor que en la sociedad latinoamericana, así como la interferencia en la toma de decisiones, en los familiares y en la vida privada en general. 19

Now that all five Hispanic value orientations have been discussed in some detail, we can see how they fall into place on the Kluckhohn model. 19

APPLICATION OF THE KLUCKHOHN MODEL

With the preparation provided by the Kluckhohn model, even a beginning foreign language student will gain a deeper understanding of the standard culture capsules found in most elementary grammar texts. Consider, for instance, the following piece of cultural information: 

... success for them [Spaniards] depends upon how one conducts oneself within a given social role, rather than where one is within the social frame-work. Social mobility in North American terms does not exist in Spain. Spaniards are proud of their designated position and they attempt to live it honorably" (6: p. 43). To the unprepared this information comes across at best as a particularity of behavior. At worst it could lead to misinterpretation and the reinforcement of stereotypes. The nagging question of "But why?" looms large for the more inquisitive student. On the other hand, with the Kluckhohn taxonomy as a reference, a discussion of Perception of Self and Others, Forms of Activity, and Social Relations can lead to enlightened acceptance of the variations between American and Hispanic value orientations. Another example follows: 

"Courtesy in Latin America is somewhat different from its counterpart in the United States. Most North Americans believe in being open, frank, and direct about their feelings. Latin Americans consider such verbal expressions too blunt and rude. They take great pride in their tact and diplomacy, generally believing that it is better to tell people what they want to hear rather than to disturb them with the unpleasant truth." (6: p. 394) The statement above could conceivably strike some students as bizarre, indeed. The Hispanic view, however, appears less like an endorsement of dishonesty when seen within the framework of Perception of Self and Others and Social Relations. Americans identify the self with the individual while members of other cultures derive their identity from relationships to others. Once this is understood, then it is not so difficult to see how in group-oriented societies congruency in social interactions takes precedence over the expression of objective truth (11: p. 69). In other words, one must not be "too serious and un-símpatico... where simpatía counts for more than objectivity." (2: p. 44)

Consider how easily the following cultural differences can be explained in terms of Time Sense, Forms of Activity, and Social Relations:

Americans and Canadians sometimes say that "time is money." This expression suggests that they treat time as a precious commodity not to be wasted. Except for occasional short breaks, many North Americans consider it dishonorable not to be working during hours for which they will be paid. In comparison, Spaniards and Latin Americans think of a job as an integral part of life, not just something to occupy the hours between eight and five o'clock. Occasionally, they may not arrive at work on time, and they may spend a lot of time engaged in what North Americans would call "闲 talk" (6: p. 176).

Third- and fourth-semester courses typically witness the introduction of literature into the curriculum. Standard fare might include such a work as Azorín’s Vida de un labrantín. Although this piece is set in early twentieth-century rural Spain, it nevertheless exemplifies certain attitudes and modes of behavior which in a more limited sense, are today still part of the Spanish cultural mentality. Moreover, when understood within the frame of reference provided by the Kluckhohn model, the student can go beyond one particular country and one particular situation to integrate differing value orientations into a wider comparative context. Familiarity with the structure of his own cultural attitudes will be a point of comparison. Then, the fatalism, the lack of motivation, the inability to see beyond the present moment, and the total resignation to the forces of nature in Vida de un labrantín become eminently understandable. Using the Kluckhohn model these Hispanic variations, in so many ways alien to the American view, are readily explained in terms of Perception of Self, World View, Time Sense, and Forms of Activity:
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NOTES

1. Robert Kohl, Director of the Wagoner House in Wagoner, MO, in the Kluckhohn model, can help American foreign language students better understand their own culture and gain a more relativistic perspective on the values of the target culture. When used for comparing value orientations within and between cultures, the Kluckhohn model suggests reasons for observed differences and similarities. These reasons derive from a society’s 1) perception of self and others; 2) world view; 3) temporal orientation; 4) forms of activity; and 5) social relations. After an explanation of how the Kluckhohn model can be used to systematize the value orientations of several different cultures, in particular the Hispanic, specific examples of typical classroom cultural material (textbook culture capsules, a folk song, and literary passages), are given a socio-cultural interpretation.

When studying cultural patterning, one inevitably has to rely on generalizations in order to contrast other cultures with one’s own. As major differences surface, exposing areas of potential cultural clashes, so very often there will also be a cross-cultural universality revealed in the way some societies have found the same solutions to similar human problems (7:

The life-death cycle completes itself with the Indian united to the earth from which he came. The description of this union as a love relationship is one which most North Americans might find a bit surprising as it clashes sharply with our self-perception as masters of nature:

De ti naci y a ti vuelvo, arciila vaso de barro. Por mi muerte pase en ti, en tu polvo enanomado. 23

The shared Man-Nature orientations of the Spanish and Indian cultures account, at least in part, for the similar attitudes toward death. That resignation and acceptance of death contrasts radically with the North American’s general fear and desire to control and escape the inevitable.

CONCLUSION

This study explains how the Kluckhohn model can help American foreign language students better understand their own culture and gain a more relativistic perspective on the values of the target culture. When used for comparing value orientations within and between cultures, the Kluckhohn model suggests reasons for observed differences and similarities. These reasons derive from a society’s 1) perception of self and others; 2) world view; 3) temporal orientation; 4) forms of activity; and 5) social relations. After an explanation of how the Kluckhohn model can be used to systematize the value orientations of several different cultures, in particular the Hispanic, specific examples of typical classroom cultural material (textbook culture capsules, a folk song, and literary passages), are given a socio-cultural interpretation.

When studying cultural patterning, one inevitably has to rely on generalizations in order to contrast other cultures with one’s own. As major differences surface, exposing areas of potential cultural clashes, so very often there will also be a cross-cultural universality revealed in the way some societies have found the same solutions to similar human problems (7:

The tone of the song is more nostalgic than melancholy in the Indian’s yearning to be buried like his ancestors in an earthen jar metaphorically described as a cool, fresh, womb. The uterine shape of the jar and the fetal position of the deceased within suggest highly visual images of enclosure and protective containment. Death is but a mirror image of life, and certainly nothing to be feared. There is even the suggestion of a cyclical view of time with death as the gateway to rebirth and new life—life in another form, in no way inferior to the former, as all manifestations of nature are of equal value. By equating the clay of the burial urn—the very “soul of the green mountains”—with flesh and blood and the same
In today's multicultural, interrelated world, these similarities can serve as a bridge to a common ground of mutual understanding between different cultures. One must also not forget that a wide range of acceptance of intracultural variants is built into each individual system as well. These variant patterns should not be ignored for they help keep a society in a state of equilibrium by providing potential sources for change. Nevertheless, the greatest value for the educator lies in focusing on dominant value orientations within a culture. For even today, in the face of rapid technological development, a society will tenaciously adhere to so-called "traditional values" (8: p. 25). The typical language student, exposed haphazardly to these different cultural values, be it through culture capsules in an elementary grammar text or through an anthology of literature, does not usually have a systematic way of interpreting this information. The Kluckhohn taxonomy of value orientations provides just such a means of evaluating and understanding the significance of cultural differences within a wider, global context.

NOTES

1. Robert Kohls is a cultural historian and Executive Director of the Washington International Center at Meridian House in Washington, D.C. He has successfully used the Kluckhohn model in his training program for US embassy personnel, businessmen, Peace Corps volunteers, military officers, teachers, students, and missionaries.

2. Because a perception of space (whether it be territoriality in the widest sense, or merely physical distance between two persons), forms an essential part of all human interaction, a sixth orientation could well be added to the model. Possible variations, reading from left to right, might be: "Close Proximity," "Moderate Proximity," and "Privacy/Distance." The problem, of course, with a spatial value orientation is that it is subject to a greater number of variables than the original Kluckhohn five.

3. The terms "American" and "North American," though admittedly broad and therefore inexact, will in the present work refer to the inhabitants of the United States. Non-English speakers might also be included in this cultural definition.

4. Kluckhohn points to the historical past of our nation stating that our Puritan ancestors believed that human nature was essentially evil, but mutable (first position to the left of the model). Today in the US, many anthropologists assert that human nature is more a mixture of good and evil (second column), the goal achieved through constant effort and self-control (p. 14). All of this shows that sometimes a certain amount of flexibility and subjectivity in plotting a culture's value orientations exist, as does a dynamic interrelationship of variants. Kohls (p. 23), for instance, chooses the third slot on the right for today's dominant American human nature orientation, one which I believe is a more accurate allocation.

5. One aspect of nature over which Americans cannot exercise control is, of course, death. This leads to a general attitude of avoidance, one which stands in sharp contrast to the Mexican view as the poet Octavio Paz observes: "The word death is not pronounced in New York... because it burns the lips. The Mexican, in contrast, is familiar with death, jokes about it, caresses it, sleeps with it, celebrates it; it is one of his favorite toys and his most steadfast love." (Cited in 2: p. 15.)

6. One of the weaknesses of Kluckhohn's schema is that the Western conception of time as linear, that is, moving from past, present, to future, does not apply to cultures where time is perceived as cyclical. This flaw, however, should not preclude the model's general usefulness. Indeed, even within Hispanic culture, Mexican for example, time in the historical sense is sometimes seen as cyclical rather than linear (2: p. 4).

7. Consider for a moment that we in the United States have only two major holidays, the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving, on which we are encouraged to remember the past (2: pp. 63-64). Yet as Kluckhohn (p. 22) explains: "... it is mainly unimmediacy rather than traditionalism which characterizes the attitudes of Americans toward yesterday's patterns."

8. It is interesting to note how the "doing" modality has invaded our everyday language with such expressions as, "How are you doing?" "Let's do something about it," and "getting things done" (7: p. 17).

9. For a cultural explanation of United States economic success and Latin American underdevelopment (a theory which meshes nicely with the Kluckhohn model, I might add), see 5.

10. Kluckhohn (pp. 16-17) explains the difference between the first two activity modes on the model (which incidentally have nothing to do with active/passive dichotomies): "The Being-in-Becoming orientation shares with the Being one a great concern with what the human being is rather than what he can accomplish, but here the similarities end. The idea of development, so little stressed in the Being orientation, is paramount in the Being-in-Becoming one. A less favorably predisposed and, for our purposes, a more accurately limited statement would be: The Being-in-Becoming orientation emphasizes that kind of activity which has as its goal the development of all aspects of the self as an integrated whole."

11. How to discover whether a value is dominant or variant is a major problem of Kluckhohn's approach and one who she addresses in the first chapter of the reprint edition of 7. Despite this drawback, it nevertheless seems to me that a specialist in language and literature, who is rather a native of the culture he or she teaches or someone who has lived
in the foreign environment, has sufficient experience to at least begin to recognize dominant cultural values. Of course, to confirm one's assumptions, some research in the area of cultural patterns would be in order. Khuckhohn's extensive anthropological study is the source of the Hispanic value orientations referred to later in the present work.

This phenomenon is observed even in countries where economic opportunities are not limited. See Stewart (p. 46): "Indifference to personal achievement, associated with a belief in 'luck,' can also be found among people for whom the attitude has little relation to the economic conditions in which they live. It reflects their perception of the self and of the world as well as their concepts of motivation and fate."

"Ardilla Espinal (p. 70) points out, interestingly, how the Spanish equivalent of a well-known proverb is modified to fit Latin American cultural values. En Latinoamérica, con el fin de hacer a la gente más activa, algunos libros para niños tienen esta frase. "No dejes para mañana lo que puedes hacer hoy," pero en general la gente hace cosas de hoy y consiente el viaje en "Tu puedes hacer mañana lo que no puedes hacer hoy." En Latinoamérica, para los fines de encantar a la gente a ser más activa, algunos libros para niños contienen la siguiente: "Nunca pases a mañana lo que puedes hacer hoy."

At first glance, one might argue that the importance of the individual is a value shared equally by Hispanics and Americans. Colson (pp. 70–78) attempts to show that this is not the case, although he notes that the Hispanic American is more oriented towards the community than the American. The following is a translation of a quote from Colson: "La importancia del individuo es una característica que se comparte igualmente por los hispanos y los americanos. Pero testigos, por ejemplo, el individuo hispano es más orientado hacia la comunidad que el americano." (pp. 70–78)
can we do? God's will be done."

22I want to be buried / like my ancestors, / in the cool, fresh mouth / of an earthbound vessel of clay."

23Baked and hardened clay, / soul of the green mountains, / light and blood of my blood, / the sum of my ancestors."

24"You gave birth to me, and to you I return, / clay vessel / of mud. / In death I lie in you, / in your loving dust."

6. Hendrickson, James M. *Pico a pico. Spanish for Professors*.


---

**Table: MLA Survey of College Foreign Language Enrollments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>1986 Total Number</th>
<th>1990 Total Number</th>
<th>% Change 1986-90</th>
<th>% Share of Net Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16,891</td>
<td>16,490</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>275,328</td>
<td>272,555</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>121,022</td>
<td>133,380</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, Ancient</td>
<td>17,608</td>
<td>16,414</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>15,630</td>
<td>12,995</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>40,945</td>
<td>49,726</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>23,454</td>
<td>45,717</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>25,038</td>
<td>28,178</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>5,071</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>33,961</td>
<td>44,384</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>411,293</td>
<td>533,609</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>989,658</td>
<td>1,166,079</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13,576</td>
<td>17,393</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,003,234</td>
<td>1,183,472</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RANK ORDER: Spanish, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Russian, Latin, Chinese, Greek (Ancient), Hebrew, Portuguese, Arabic.

*Note: The total for Hebrew represents the sum of separate tallies for Biblical Hebrew (5,724) and Modern Hebrew (7,271). For further information, call Phyllis Franklin: (212) 614-6301. Fax: (212) 477-8663.