Chapter 1

Giving Dimension to *Mappaemundi*: The Matter of Perspective

Vicki Galloway
Georgia Institute of Technology

En este imperio, el Arte de la Cartografía conoció una Perfección tal que el Mapa de una sola Provincia ocupaba toda una ciudad y el Mapa del Imperio toda una Provincia. Con el tiempo, esos Mapas Desmesurados dejaron de constituir una satisfacción y los Colegios de Cartógrafos elaboraron un Mapa del Imperio que tenía el Formato del Imperio y que coincidía con él punto por punto. Menos apasionadas por el estudio de la Cartografía, las Generaciones Siguientes pensaron que ese Mapa Dilatado era inútil y, no sin impiedad, lo abandonaron a la Inclemencia del Sol y los Inviernos. En los Desiertos del Oeste subsisten Ruinas muy deterioradas del Mapa. Animales y mendigos las habitan. En todo el país, no hay otras huellas de las disciplinas geográficas.

Jorge Luis Borges
"Del rigor de las ciencias"

The *Ser* and *Estar* of "Worlds"

The class was Intermediate Spanish, and I had planned a grammar lesson that would review uses of *ser/estar/haber* while introducing the next grammatical item on the agenda, the *"se pasivo."* Since the chapter vocabulary was geographical terms *(río, lago, océano, montaña, frontera,* etc.), I had posted a large "classroom" map obtained from the campus bookstore. The students' first task was to generate questions a map could answer: *¿Dónde está? ¿Cómo es? ¿Quién(es) son de...? ¿Qué ... hay?* and so on. We then moved quickly to the second task: Students were to look at the map and express any and all observations they could make, using *ser, estar, hay* and the passive constructions *se ve(n), se encuentra(n).* Each student was asked to make one statement of observation and then join to this statement an explanation or logical expansion, selecting from a list of connectors, such as *sin embargo, por ejemplo, porque, por eso,* and so on. For example:

Initial statement: *Se ven los nombres de los países.*
Expansion: *Sin embargo, los nombres están en inglés, no en español.*

However, as I looked at the map with the students and listened to their statements, I sensed a

From Teaching Cultures of the Hispanic World: Products and Practices in Perspective, AATSP Professional Development Series handbook Vol. IV 1st edition by GALLOWAY. © 2001. Reprinted with permission of Heinle, a division of Thomson Learning: www.thomsonrights.com. Fax 800 730-2215.

culture lesson emerging. I began to jot down some of their rather startling observations [the ? indicates a teacher prompt for clarification or expansion].[1]

Student 1: *Se ve el tamaño de los países. (?) Por ejemplo, Estados Unidos, con Alaska, es como Sudamérica.*

Student 2: *Se ve dónde están los países. Por ejemplo, Estados Unidos está en el centro* (laughter). *Canadá está al lado de Estados Unidos; México está bajo...debajo de nosotros.*

Student 3: *Sí y... también hay...fronteras. (?) Por eso, se ve la separación de los países. (?) Por ejemplo, México es no...no es como los Estados Unidos.*

Student 4: *Se ve el...la...forma de los países. Por ejemplo, Chile es como una ... serpiente...Además, Centroamérica.*

Student 5: *Se ve el agua...mucho agua...mucha? Por ejemplo, hay océanos. (?) Cuba está rodeada de agua. También Puerto Rico.*

Student 6: *Se encuentran los continentes.. Por ejemplo, Norteamérica es mucho más grande que Sudamérica ...(?) Aquí África también, pero no es verdad. Además Europa es...se ve más grande que Sudamérica. ¡Pobre Sudamérica!*

Student 7: *Se ven los colores de los países* (laughter). *Por ejemplo, Perú es verde, Colombia es amarilla... muy feliz.*

Student 9: *¡Es las drogas!* (more laughter)

The expressions on students' faces indicated that even as they were speaking they were aware that some of the things they were saying about the world were simply not "true." Yet, here were the facts—concrete, standardized and graphically displayed—courtesy of the 16th-century Flemish cartographer, Gerardus Mercator. Indeed, still hanging in many U.S. schoolrooms, for the consumption of all learners in all disciplines, may be some Mercator-like map, in which Alaska appears three times the size of Mexico, in which Europe is larger than South America, and in which center stage belongs to the United States.

As flat, textureless depictions of the world, maps of necessity give deceptive lessons in geography. To show the form of landmasses, size must be compromised; to display accurately the size of territories, trueness of form must be sacrificed. Likewise, on the rotating sphere where we reside, there are no north, south, east or west edges; it is only human selection that designates one pole as North and the other as South, putting Australia "down under" rather than "up above."[2] It is human selection as well that gives maps their focal points, targeting some parts of the planet for central position and others for the periphery of our vision. Maps are ways of seeing and, as such, they are themselves a

powerful lesson in the *ser* and *estar* of the world.

I then invited students to consider what they did not see, what was missing from the map:

Student 1: *No se ven...estados en Estados Unidos... [?] Porque el mapa es muy general....[?] Es importante porque los estados son importantes. [?]Son diferente...diferentes. [?] Yo no soy de Georgia...por ejemplo. Soy de Nueva York. Soy diferente. Todos son diferentes en Estados Unidos.*

Student 2: *¡No hay gente en el mapa!* (laughter) *[?] Porque... personas son el mundo.*

Student 3: *No hay lenguas...no sé la lengua...por ejemplo, no sé la lengua en ...*[I want to say I don't know what language people speak in different countries...] *No sé qué idioma se habla en....India...o idiomas porque hay muchos en India. El mapa no dice...No se dice.*

Student 4: *No hay acción...¿Cómo se dice* movement? *Todo... no movimiento... No hay movimiento. Todo es... ¿cómo se dice* static?

On our map there was no indication of life—no sense of movement, interaction, change. There were no histories, no traditions, no cultures. There really was, in fact, no "world" at all, merely a bland surface sectioned off into political entities. On our map, of course, there were no people. We could not see, for example, that regardless of territorial size, the population of North America (including Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean) only exceeds that of South America by twenty percent. And while students had been quick to point out their distinctiveness within the borders of their own country, on this world map– the kind we have all looked at throughout our lives—the color fill of separate countries lures the viewer into assuming homogeneity inside, heterogeneity outside, the borders of political territories. Indeed, we would require a very different map, one with a very different purpose, to see the rainbow of nations and mosaic of communities that lie inside the boundaries of a given country. Even then, we might only be able to imagine the rich cultural and linguistic variation that resides therein, visually uncapturable. It is perhaps only from our personal experiences that we would be able to know, deeply, that peoples inside the boundaries of a country are as diverse and resistant to generalization as those outside that country's boundaries, or that borders themselves do not confine or separate people as cultures migrate, interact and continually modify each other. And deeper still than the level of peoples, on our map, as students had observed, there were no *persons*—there was no way of capturing the diversity that lies inside a particular "culture" within a country, or inside a particular gathering of individuals within that culture. It is indeed such realizations that complicate any culture-learning mission, for "cultures" are in essence 'organizations of their diversity.'

> *Y es que cada individuo tiene una versión particular de todo aquello que le rodea, una versión particular de la cultura a la que decimos que pertenece (si es que se puede hablar de pertenecer a una única cultura), mostrándose en sus comportamientos o puntos de vista particulares divergen-*

> *cias con respecto a lo que aparece como norma establecida en el discurso homogeneizador...Cada miembro tiene una versión personal de cómo funcionan las cosas en un determinado grupo y, de este modo, de su cultura. Lo que se presenta ante nosotros como la cultura de ese grupo no es otra cosa que una organización de la diversidad, de la heterogeneidad intragrupal inherente a toda sociedad humana.* (García Castaño et al. 3)

While every map teaches something in its depiction of the planet, each also is inherently biased, conflictive and incomplete for more (or less) than simple geography, maps reflect theories, values, specific purposes—not "world" but "worldview." Maps, as culture products, are projections, each impelling outward a (one) "reality"—that of the beliefs, priorities and perspectives of their cartographers. Maps are interpretations that need to be interpreted (Smith).

It was this 'interpretation' that I sought from students in the next class session, when I removed the Mercator and replaced it with a Peters' Projection.[3] This map, devised by the German historian Arno Peters, surrenders conformity or accuracy of shape to portray all areas—countries, continents, oceans – according to their actual size, proportion and position in the world. On this map, students could see that the "South" is in reality over twice the size of the "North" and that those areas they had referred to as "Third World" actually *dominate* the planet in size. Hence, I asked them to explain what they meant by *tercer mundo,* a term of European origin:

1. *Es los países de Africa, de Latinoamérica, de Asia... algunos de Asia, no todos...No tienen desarrollo.*

2. *Quiere decir que son pobres. (?) ¿Pobres? Es no tener dinero. (?) Y no tienen educación. (?) Sí, porque si no se tiene educación no se puede trabajar. (?) Es necesario* ambition... *¿ambición? Aquí si no trabaja... si no se trabaja significa no tener ambición.(?) Ambición es ... determinación. (?) Cuando quieres ser mejor. (?) Para ser...*proud *...¿cómo se dice? (?)* Proud *significa sentir muy bien...(?)...cuando haces bien... (?)... ¡Ah, no sé! No puedo describir. Es imposible.*

3. *No hay progreso. No se usa la tecnología... (?) Se encuentra la tecnología, pero no como nosotros. (?) Televisores, computadoras, teléfonos celulares, cosas así. (?) No es pobre no tener tecnología.. no... pero no es desarrollo.*

4. *Las personas no tienen cosas que tenemos... No se encuentran (?) Vida moderna... no se encuentra vida moderna. Cosas típicas...electrodomésticos. (?) Sí, quieren las cosas. Pero no tienen...(?) No todos tienen las cosas aquí, pero pueden...si trabajan.*

5. *No soy de Estados Unidos, pero para mí, pobreza no significa educación o tecnología. Significa que no hay agua, no hay comida, no hay medicina...y no hay..*.hope...*espera...esperanza. Aquí no existe pobreza, realmente, no se ve pobreza en Estados Unidos.*

6. *Para mí, tercer mundo quiere decir que no tienen democracia, no tienen libertad. (?) Con democracia se puede votar. (?) Libertad para...hacer cosas, ganar dinero (?)...porque hay* competition *y eso es bueno (?)* Competition... *¿cómo se dice? Cuando quieres ser mejor que la otra persona y ... por eso tratas mucho.*

7. *Eso es capitalismo... no democracia. Cada democracia no tiene capitalismo. No es necesario.*

8. *En esos países hay muchas peleas y no se puede hablar. Hay mucha discriminación. (?) Sí, aquí hay discriminación...un poco, pero no mucho ahora. (?) Hay mucha diversa...diversidad pero está tolerancia aquí....hay tolerancia (?) Porque la ley dice...se dice en la ley.*

9. *Es por qué todos quieren vivir aquí. (?) En Estados Unidos. (?) todos de otros países. (?) Sí... todos quieren el "sueño americano." (?) El sueño americano es .... hmmmm. No sé... se dice tener casa y coche y todo. Para mí es ser millonario.*

In these discussions (only fragments of which are reported here), students found themselves resorting constantly to several key threads that contribute to the fabric of U.S. individualistic culture: work, ambition, competition, pride. In their use of *ambición,* they wished to connote meanings of diligence and entrepreneurship that lie within the semantic field of their word "ambition" (certainly not the connotations of *codicia* or *avidez* that the Spanish word may evoke). "Competition" was a word for which they repeatedly sought translation in varied contexts. Yet, there is no easy way to package into Spanish such U.S.-meritocracy-based meanings as "peer competition," "grade competition," or acquisitive competition. Though times are changing and the corporate tentacles of *McMundo* are grabbing hold and digging deep, the semantic fields of *competitividad* and *competencia* tend to be much more confined in Hispanic cultures to the politics, sports and world-trade arenas. Moreover, while "competition" has enormously positive connotations in the U.S. mainstream, competitividad, especially amongst classmates, may evoke other sorts of images, such as those captured by two advisors of Madrid's *Consejería de Educación.*

> *El obscurantismo que ha dominado tantos años...ha dejado secuelas difíciles de erradicar, ha potenciado "ad nauseam" el individualismo y la competitividad fomentando un comportamiento inconscientemente insolidario...la utilización de los demás y el ver en los otros al enemigo o, cuando menos, al competidor molesto.* (Chazarra Montiel and Cilleruelo López)

In short, in defining *tercer mundo,* students had revealed some of the structure of their own mental maps. They had identified some of the OECD's so-called indicators of development[4] in economic and social well being but, although living in a country that consumes nearly one-quarter of all fossil fuels and creates fifty percent of the world's solid waste (Karliner), they were unaware of those developmental indicators that lay in the areas of environmental sustainability and regeneration. Wrapped up in their use of the word "technology" was the idea of a clean, fresh, rapid road to "progress" and, in fact, absence of visible technology in its most ubiquitous U.S. forms was for them the most obvious sign of *tercermundismo.* "Poverty"—equated with absence of "U.S. lifestyle" and a low level of education (which in turn was related to lack of initiative or desire to work) was not perceived to exist on any large scale in the U.S.; yet, Karliner has noted that the U.S. now has the

widest gap between rich and poor of any industrialized nation in the world. "Democracy" (not one of OECD's specific development indicators) was linked to freedom of voice, but was also confused with the capitalist system and freedom to "earn." And "discrimination" was viewed as a problem of the past in the U.S., where a newfound "tolerance of diversity" (as mandated by law) now beckons *todos* to climb our shores in search of the (it-is-what-I-want-it-to-be) "American Dream."

Indeed, the notion that "everyone wants what we have in the U.S." has surely echoed in every U.S. classroom and is in large part the foundation of many a cross-cultural conflict as more students travel abroad to mingle with foreign nationals. Data reported by González (this volume) indicate, in fact, that students' *patriotismo cerril* displayed on foreign soil can not only offend with its perceived air of arrogance but effectively impede self-awareness in intercultural communication. Implicit in the soulless labels "Third World" and "underdeveloped" is a certain worldview that societies all cherish the same things, share the same notions, pursue the same model. Perhaps the word "pride," whose meaning of resplendent self-actualization students found so impossible to convey, captures a different dimension of the term *desarrollo*—one best expressed in the words of the late Octavio Paz:

> *Desarrollo y subdesarrollo con conceptos exclusivamente socioeconómicos con los que se pretende medir a las sociedades como si fuesen realidades cuantitativas. Así no se toman en cuenta todos los aspectos rebeldes a la estadística y que son los que dan fisonomía a una sociedad: su cultura, su historia, su sensibilidad, su arte, sus mitos, su cocina, todo eso que antes se llamaba el alma o el genio de los pueblos, su manera propia de ser.*

To summarize our class discussions, I transcribed some of the comments students had made and asked them to separate each pair of statements in terms of "observation" or "interpretation" of observation, with the caveat that both might be considered observations, or both interpretations. The following is a fragment of the class handout, which was given in Spanish.

	Observation	Interpretation
Mexico is a territory separate from the U.S. Mexicans are not like "Americans."		
"Drugs" enter the U.S. from Colombia. Colombians are drug addicts.		
That person doesn't have a job. That person is lazy.		
That person does not have a computer. That person is poor.		
That city does not look modern. That city is underdeveloped.		
There is tolerance for diversity in that country. There are laws against discrimination in that country.		
That person does not seem competitive. That person has no pride.		

In the two class sessions of Intermediate learners sketched here, we used maps as metaphors to find our place—where and who we think ourselves to be, what we see and how we see it—and to begin to identify some of the pitfalls that would await our cross-cultural journey. Our "culture" lesson did not come attractively packaged in a pre-planned module; in fact, it was rather messy and unstructured-looking. It did not deal with "topics" one might typically associate with a classroom culture lesson (see Moore, this volume); in fact, it focused only on us as a class group and on our "truths" in their multiple versions. But to accept and appreciate that, as individuals and members of cultures, we carry inside our heads our own constructed realities – frames of awareness, ways of perceiving self and others, sets of assumptions and expectations, beliefs and values and meanings– is a quite important step in acknowledging the truth of different realities for which, rather than an attitude of absolutism, what is needed is a *theory of relativity*.

> There may be something we can call the truth if we keep it so simple it doesn't matter. Frankly, life is hard enough already without pretending it [life] is only one true thing. (Kaiser & Wood).

In these two class sessions, no effort was made to support or counter the views expressed by students. For learners to develop the capacity to analyze their individual perspectives as well as the values and norms that, to greater or lesser extents, have become institutionalized in their society, they must have the opportunity both to express these and to hear them expressed openly and unsanctioned. To criticize, counter or feign insult at what learners are, of their own volition, revealing about what they think will likely serve only to raise defensive shields and result in reticence, fabrication, or even hypercritical backlash at the other culture. If we take the whole culture mission seriously, view it in whole and as a long-term mission, our very first step is to plot where we are—where our learners are—in their awareness of self and attitudes toward others. Indeed, squelching expression at this or any other stage may send a message contrary to the one we are most intent on delivering:

> We cannot strip people of their common sense constructs or routine ways of seeing. They come to us as whole systems of patterned meanings and understandings. We can only try to understand, and to do so means starting with the way they think and building from there. (Trompenaars, et al. 19)

Bennett contends that intercultural sensitivity emerges through stages of personal growth ranging from denial, in which one's own culture is experienced as the only real one, to integration, the state in which one's experience of self is expanded to include the movement in and out of different cultural worldviews. He asserts that each stage indicates a particular cognitive structure that is expressed in certain kinds of attitudes and behaviors related to cultural differences and further, that as an individual progresses through different stages, different kinds of activities are better or worse suited to taking the learner to the subsequent stage. **Table 1** summarizes both the stages and the types of cross-cultural activity recommended at each.

Table 1. Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

	Stage	Activity
Ethnocentrism		
Denial	Distance, disinterest, view of own culture as only real one	Exposure to difference
Defense	Denigration or resistance of difference as threatening; hyper-criticism; sense of own superiority	Building, but not overemphasizing cultural pride, self-esteem coupled with objective information about other culture
Minimization	Own cultural assumptions viewed as universal; expectation of sameness; difference interpreted from own perspective, trivialized or romanticized; insistence on correcting other's behavior	Discussion to place own behavior in cultural context; self-discovery; clarifying values, examining dilemmas from different viewpoint
Ethnorelativism		
Acceptance	One's own acknowledged as one perspective; Notice of profound differences; curiosity, respectfulness. Acceptance of own and other worldview; values and assumptions seen as creative processes	Focus on behaviors relative to perspectives; cross-cultural simulations to improve relations
Adaptation	Ability to experience or imagine other cultural reality and understand another perspective; attitudes and skills to function in another cultural frame of reference; willingness to adapt to another style	Intensive or prolonged real-life interaction; fostering empathy without betraying cultural roots
Integration	Ability to analyze situations from different cultural perspective, shift cultural context and self-awareness to exercise choice, engage in on-going creation of worldview that is not dependent upon a single culture perspective	

According to this model, in the Intermediate classroom depicted here, learners' stages of inter cultural sensitivity ranged from the *ethnocentric* defense stage to the *ethnorelative* acceptance stage, thus suggesting types of culture-learning tasks that would focus on self-awareness and values reflec tion in their own culture while providing rich information and opportunities for examining differe viewpoints of other cultures. It should be noted that models such as Bennett's, however, cannot specif cally prescribe what needs to take place in the classroom. Nor can such models truly capture a learner' "cognitive framework" for cross-cultural understanding as, in truth, individuals move up and down in their stages of intercultural sensitivity with the encounter of each novel experience. Especially given th myriad and very distinct cultures of the Hispanic world, a learner may achieve the "acceptance stage" i interacting with one, yet find herself at the "defense stage" in confronting another.

As development of a cross-cultural mind is ongoing and never-ending, what takes place in the classroom can only be considered priming for the real events of intercultural encounters. Trompenaars and colleague remind us that culture is not a physical substance, a set of formulae or finite body of knowledge. Culture "is made by people interacting, and at the same time determini further interaction" (24) and thus: "It is our belief that you can never understand other cultures…it is impossible to ever completely understand even people of your own culture" (1). Such a realization, rather than provoke defeatism, should serve to energize us with the importance of the culture-teaching mission and, rather than deter our efforts, inspire us to go as far as we can in purposeful and individually meaningful activity. To respect the complexity of culture teaching yet not be dauntec by it constitutes a tremendous challenge, one that requires dedication and planning. As Lessard-Clouston advises, a laissez-faire approach is not adequate—just as we are intentional in our gramma instruction, we must also be systematic about our culture teaching.

In this chapter, we will look at the many kinds of maps that exist to aid (or derail) our important culture-teaching mission. Some of these are "pocket maps" that attempt to harness and encapsulate culture for ease of delivery, making us feel immediately smarter without provoking the slighte internal change. Others of these maps are teacher maps, intended to guide us in our very difficult journey as lesson-planners and curriculum-developers; yet, as with all maps, their value lies only in what we feed into them in interpretation and use. And still others of these are perceptual maps that aim to expose the similar and different ways people see and make sense of the world; their value will lie in how we use them not to stereotype communities of people, but to deepen awareness of our own perspectives and, ultimately, to expand *intercultural* discourse. Along the way, we will look at how, as Kramsch says, we can not only teach language *and* culture, but language *as* culture. The question of language *or* culture, however, is simply no longer an option for, as one student puts it:

> This is what I want to learn—what it feels like to be someone else (even though I know I can never feel that exactly) and what we look like to others and why. I really want to understand and I know that's going to take knowing a lot more about myself than I do, than I think I do. I know it will take forever. (Kara, Intermediate Spanish student)

The Map vs. the Territory: Pocket Guides and Thin Descriptions

When map-makers hit just the main points—ignoring all the tiny twists and turns of a coastline, for example—they call it generalization (Smith) and for some non-navigational purposes a generalized view of the terrain may be appropriate or even precisely what is required. Like these generalized maps, however, attempts to describe a culture – any culture– in terms of general territory, will not serve the needs of our students as intercultural navigators. Such "culture maps" abound in tourist guidebooks and executive-training manuals and typically consist of handy phrases accompanied by brief sketches of customs and strikingly different behaviors. They also, unfortunately, tend to characterize current foreign language textbooks and, to a great extent, foreign-language classrooms (see Moore, this volume). The following is one such culture map of Mexico, for example, taken from a website for students of International Studies. It is prefaced by the admonition that "all cultures have variability within them, perhaps even more than the differences between them." Indeed, as Octavio Paz has said of this same Mexico:

> *...lo español no está menos vivo en México que lo indio. En nada parecen lo indio y lo español salvo en la complejidad: lo indio es una pluralidad de culturas y sociedades y lo mismo ocurre con lo español...*

MEXICO[5]
Social Customs

Greetings customarily include smiles, nod of the head and\or handshake. Close male friends may embrace; women embrace and kiss the cheek. Common greetings are *¡Buenos días!* (Good morning), *¿Cómo está?* (How are you?), and the casual *¡Hola!* (Hello).

Unannounced visits are common, and hospitality is welcomed and includes refreshments (which would be rude to refuse). When eating, keep both hands above the table. Gifts are not customary in exchange for hospitality, but may be appreciated. Avoid flowers that are yellow (symbolic of death for some classes), red (cast spells), and white (cancel spells).

Appropriate conversational topics include art, parks, museums, fashion, travel, and weather. Avoid unpleasant topics such as the Mexican-American War and illegal aliens. Relationships are important and one may stop for a conversation even if it means being late for an appointment. The theme of death is common and celebrated, and may seem unusual to Americans.

Most business meetings occur during the two to three hour lunch break, but relationships are built before business begins. *Respeto* (respect) is important and may involve a mixture of fair play, democratic spirit, power pressure, and love-hate affections. Status is important (social, age, class), and you may be told what makes you happy rather than objective facts.

The gesture for "no" is shown by extending the index finger with palm outward and shaking the hand side to side. Items should not be tossed to a person, but handed. Sneezing is responded to by *¡Salud!* (Good health). Only an animal's height is shown using the whole hand; use the index finger.

But what "Mexico" is this depicted here? Assuming we could even consider such a vast, lush and incredibly diverse terrain to hold one homogenous culture, it is easy to see how this type of map would cast a rather freakish image of it. The random, decontextualized mix of *saludos*, spells and sneezes presents not Mexico itself, but an imaginary land, a hybrid "culture" construed from the most striking strangeness. Is this information wrong? Yes and no. Yes, for example, one may greet with *¡Hola!* and *Buenos días, ¿cómo está?* And, in fact, this is where the issue of *saludos* may even be left in our textbooks and classrooms. Indeed, we have in this information, some icons of a shorthand map—if we know the territory in which they are referenced, we can perhaps navigate certain rudimentary situations as a passing tourist—perhaps. But what happens if we do not know the "lay of the land?" Are we not likely to assume the environment of our own culture, simply superimposing these Spanish-language icons upon it?

There are, in this example, some issues that require reflection of every Spanish teacher: When we claim to teach culture in our classrooms, are we really teaching culture, or are we merely disseminating a map—one so referenced to our own ways that difference looms monstrously and inexplicably large, one that joins and compacts parts of many unique cultures under the label "Hispanic," one that projects more of its cartographer than of the authentic territory? Throughout the past few decades, it has been popular to condemn foreign language textbooks for just such treatment of culture as that represented here in the "Mexico culture" map for, in truth, we would want our textbooks to do it all, to give us the "language and culture of the Hispanic world" in 460 attractive, colorful pages. Yet, if textbook publishers' readings of teacher-consumer surveys are correct, the cry is that there not be "too much culture" mixed into "language" lessons, because there is "not enough time for both." It would appear that we want "culture" extricated from language and delivered as a side dish, so that we know where it is and may take it or leave it as time and interest permit. Publishers, hence, convey to authors this teacher perspective: that "culture" must be separate, brief and unobtrusive, for change is too risky when the old formula sells. The fact is that even the best textbook can only be a springboard. Teaching is not the textbook's job—it is ours, and if such a thing as "Hispanic culture" existed and if, additionally, it were no more than a set of behavioral inventories, our culture-teaching job would be easy indeed. Yet, as Firth reminds us, in "culture" we are dealing with a massively encompassing and complex term comparable to such concepts as gravity in physics, disease in medicine, or evolution in biology.

Learning a new territory involves raising issues beyond the basic "what to say and do" generalities to sensitize learners to phenomena that may have no coordinates on their mental maps, may lie outside the perceptual field of their own culture's reality. Often overlooked in our introductory Spanish lesson on greetings, for example, are such things as *where* does one greet, and *whom* does one greet, and *why* does one greet? What is implicitly communicated by a particular greeting, done in a particular way, between two particular people in a particular context of a particular culture? How is the greeting used to signal in-group status or power distance in both social and business contexts? [See García, this volume.] How does one greet "in passing," and what is the proximity in standing face to face? How important are greetings in general, what role do they play, and what assumptions and expectations are packaged into them in particular interactions? In this regard, even being a mem-

ber of the Spanish-speaking world does not ensure comfortable navigation through its multitude of cultures, as the following webchat comment of a Spaniard in Argentina illustrates:[6]

> *Todo es diferente, la ciudad, la gente, incluso el idioma. Y aunque hablamos la misma lengua, existen muchísimas diferencias, no sólo en ciertas palabras o frases, sino también en la entonación. Hay veces en las que me hablan y no entiendo nada. Lo mismo me pasa al saludar, es decir, dar un beso en vez de dos ...ya me he quedado más de una vez con la cara puesta sin saber qué hacer...*

Indeed, just on the issue of whom to greet, data collected by González (this volume) indicate that U.S. students' apparent lack of attention to the *saludo* on entering the home was a primary source of irritation to their Spanish host families. In the U.S., for example, one enters an office, a store, a restaurant, with a certain purposeful tunnel vision and moves directly toward a specific goal—to consult with a person, to make a particular purchase, to seat oneself at a table. Greeting and leave-taking are not commonly part of the mental script for these occasions. Greeting, in fact, may not be perceived as having a critical role in many contexts of our students' lives, even in their own homes. In how many of the following situations, for example, would our students say they always greet? In which of these might it almost never occur to them to greet? (The same questions may be asked of leave-taking.)

____ your family members immediately on entering the house, before doing anything else.
____ your professors when you/they enter the classroom
____ the store clerk on entering a small shop
____ the waiter in a restaurant
____ the person who answers the phone when you are calling for someone else.
____ at the beginning of a letter or email message
____ the person you stop on the street when you ask directions
____ the host of a party as soon as you enter
____ all other guests at a party
____ the people in the waiting room of an office
____ the others in the elevator
____ the person you sit next to on the plane, train, metro or bus
____ an acquaintance you pass on the street
____ a taxi driver
____ your Spanish profesor when s/he greets you

In an Intermediate Spanish class of twenty-eight students (to which this survey was delivered in Spanish), only "the host of a party" was marked by some students as an always-greet case. In terms of family-member greeting, students remarked 'I usually go straight to the refrigerator,' or 'I don't have to greet them—they're my family.' Whom would they almost never greet? Students marked professors ('they would think I'm brown-nosing'), store clerks ('I don't know them'), flight companions ('they'll think I want to talk'), person who answers the phone ('I just say, is so-and-so there, but I guess that's kind of rude'), and waiting-room strangers ('that would really be impolite, I think; they'd think I was strange'). The following student comments perhaps capture a sense of the meaning of greetings for youth in U.S. mainstream culture as residing in an individual choice that depends on factors of familiarity, desire to engage, and perceived "need."

> I do not typically greet people I don't know.
>
> If I greet someone, it may be perceived as an intrusion or invasion of their privacy.
>
> If I greet someone it signals to them that I want to converse with them.
>
> I do not need to greet my family because they're my family and I don't need to be polite.
>
> When you see someone everyday, you don't need to greet them.
>
> Why ask someone "How are you?" if I'm not really interested in their answer?
>
> I only usually greet people who greet me first.
>
> I only greet strangers I want to meet or get to know.

Having examined their own greeting habits and implicit meanings, students became alert to the possible, indeed probable, existence of other sets of behaviors and meanings in other cultures. They were then asked to use the Internet to gain some sense of norms for greeting in the Hispanic world. The following, excerpted from one such website students identified for Spain, reveals *saludos* embedded in a quite different meaning network—one of social obligation, "upbringing," and respect for hierarchy of authority in which *un saludo vale mucho más de lo que nos cuesta*[7]

- *Quien ve primero debe saludar primero: Por ejemplo, si ves a un amigo tuyo que no te ha visto por ir despistado, eres tú quien debe saludar.*

- *Quien llega a un sitio público debe saludar a quien está. Si entras en una tienda, debes saludar a la gente que está allí. En parte para que el dependiente note tu presencia y te atienda, en parte por educación. Esto no es aplicable si llegas a casa de alguien. En este caso seríais los dos quien deberíais saludaros primero. Tanto el invitado como el anfitrión.*

- *Quien está en movimiento debe saludar a quien está parado. Si andando por la calle, pasas al lado de un bordillo en el cual está sentado un amigo tuyo, debes saludar tú.*

- *La persona superior en el rango jerárquico es quién debe saludar primero a su subordinado, si lo considera oportuno. El jefe es quien suele saludar a su empleado, sobre todo cuando le acaba de conocer.*

Having glimpsed such fragments of different cultural-meaning frameworks, students were asked how they, themselves, might be perceived in the Hispanic world were they to follow their own culture's "rules" for greeting. An essay from the Canarias newspaper *El Día Digital*, excerpted here, lent