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CULTURE, CONSTRUCTIVISM, AND MEDIA:
DESIGNING A MODULE ON CARLOS SLIM

ABSTRACT
Mexican tycoon Carlos Slim Helú has been a fixture on Forbes’s list of billionaires since 1991, and for the past three years, he has topped the magazine’s list of the world’s richest men. Although he is exceptionally well-known in his native Mexico, the majority of American college students have never heard of Carlos Slim. This article presents a curricular module built around this charismatic and controversial figure. The module requires students to navigate Internet-supported news media in the target language (Spanish), and engages them in independent, small-group, and larger, teacher-led activities designed to foster critical and comparative skills in cultural competency and analysis through process-based, student-led inquiry. Pedagogically and methodologically, the author engages with the recommendations and conclusions of recent studies by ACTFL and MLA committees, as well as by other leading scholars, regarding both the use of technology in the classroom and the idea of “teaching culture.” The unit’s content significantly deepens and enriches students’ understanding of social, economic, and political issues in modern Mexico. The article carefully situates each stage and aspect of the curricular unit presented in relation to recent studies of constructivism in foreign language acquisition and on the hierarchy of Bloom’s taxonomy of learning objectives.
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I. INTRODUCTION
This article presents and analyses a week-long module first designed for use in a sixth-semester language class called Spanish for the Professions at Boston University. After minimal direction, students searched for and retrieved information written by Mexican journalists intended for a Mexican audience.

Global Business Languages (2012)
They formulated hypotheses about the target culture based on their reading of the authentic resources. Using “structured induction” (Reagan 1999, 414), the hypotheses were successively refined in guided classroom activities. The course was most recently taken by students of different majors and class-years, the majority of whom intended to complete a minor or major in Spanish and/or an internship program abroad. The module can be easily adapted to different curricular needs and formats.

The unit opens with a question, “Who is Carlos Slim?” *Forbes Magazine* first put Carlos Slim Helú on their “World’s Billionaires” list in 1991, and he has been a fixture on it ever since.¹ Slim has been ranked by *Forbes* as having one of the top three fortunes continuously since 2006, and has topped the list for three consecutive years (2010–12). Slim has only recently gained popular notice in the United States. In Mexico, however, he has been a source of both fascination and controversy for some time. His admirers point to Slim’s distinction as the first Latin American to top *Forbes*’s list, to his philanthropic work in Mexico, and to the position of strength he maintains in the international market through his holdings in the media, telecommunications, tobacco, infrastructure, retail, and energy. Critics portray Slim as a present-day robber baron in a country where average per-capita income hovers around an amount comparable to $14,500, and where, according to the Mexican government estimates, 51% of the population lives below the poverty line (Passel et al. 2012). They also deride Slim for what they consider monopolist practices, for instance, using his wealth and power to crush rivals in the landline and mobile phone sectors, thus rendering virtually impossible any significant competition. Moreover, these critics also claim that Slim’s acquisition of Telmex, the previously state-owned telephone company sold to Slim in 1990 by the cabinet of then-president Carlos Salinas de Gortari, and which is now the cornerstone of his empire, was the result of cronyism and corruption.

Despite Slim’s immense fortune and his controversial status, his name remains largely unknown to a majority of American college students. The unit described in this article seeks to answer the question, “Who is Carlos Slim?” in a way that deepens and enriches students’ understanding of social, economic, and political issues in modern Mexico. The week-long module is based on the idea that students can arrive at fairly sophisticated conclusions about a target culture through the structured exploration of authentic media sources. The sequence is based on the ACTFL’s Five Cs: communications,

cultures, connections, comparisons, communities (ACTFL 1996), and on the MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages’s recommendations for incorporating content-rich units into the language curriculum (MLA 1997). In the course of this unit on Carlos Slim, students: (a) advance through a sequence of increasingly complex learning objectives, (b) use all four language skills, (c) communicate orally in distinct groups and contexts, each of which builds on a preceding activity, (d) learn specialized vocabulary, (e) review discourse strategies for expressing opinions and arguments, (f) expand their knowledge of recent Mexican history, (g) familiarize themselves with Mexican news media, and (h) use technology both to gain access to information and as a means of communication. The questions they ask, and answer, include: How did Slim start out, and how did he become the richest person in the world? How do the Mexican media present Slim? What does Carlos Slim represent in contemporary Mexico? Is his career indicative of Mexico’s business culture? What makes Slim such a controversial and divisive figure?

Four principles that inform the activity: the incorporation of culture into the language curriculum in the wake of the 1996 ACTFL Standards and the 2007 MLA Report, particularly as they relate to business language classes; constructivist approaches to cultural competence in the language classroom; Bloom’s taxonomy of learning objectives; and the use of technology for foreign language learning. A detailed description the unit’s activities in terms of their content, learning objectives, skills used, and sequence will then be provided.

II. BACKGROUND

Culture

Culture has been at the top of the foreign language community’s research priorities for more than two decades; this research has focused on the term’s very definition, on its incorporation into the language curriculum, and on the urgency of producing speakers competent in the cultures of the target languages they are learning (Schulz et al. 2005; Paige et al. 2003). The reasons for this concentration of energy lie both outside and inside our profession. Externally, the twenty-first century’s increasingly globalized economy and geopolitical tensions have made speaking foreign languages in ways that are culturally appropriate to professional environments an economically valuable skill (Kramsch 1993; ACTFL 1996; Hoecherl-Alden 2000; MLA 2007). Internally, this movement was led by Claire Kramsch’s influential Context and Culture in Language Teaching (1993), and the publication of ACTFL’s
Standards for Foreign Language Learning (1996), both of which decisively influenced later research on culture and language teaching. More recently, the report of the MLA’s Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages (MLA 2007) has rekindled discussion on how to incorporate culture into the language curriculum. In the decade which followed Kramsch’s 1993 book, a large body of literature on culture and foreign languages appeared (Paige et al. 2003), and this trend continues. For teachers of Language for Specific Purposes (LSP), especially teachers of courses aimed at professional applications, cultural competence has been a particularly pressing priority, both in practice and in research. The proliferation of business-oriented language courses itself responds to the needs of an increasingly global economy (Grosse and Voght 1991; Lafford 2012; Doyle 2012; Long and Uscinski 2012). The review Global Business Languages alone has featured no fewer than 51 articles with variations on the term culture in their titles since it first appeared in 1996.

However difficult it has been to provide a widely accepted definition of culture (Levy 2007; Schulz et al. 2005; Schulz 2007) or to test cultural/intercultural/cross-cultural/transcultural competence (Schulz 2007), almost everybody agrees that language and culture are indissolubly linked (Kramsch 1993; Schulz 2007), that they should be integrated in language teaching (Kramsch 1993; Hoecherl-Alden 2000; Furstemberg et al. 2001; Levy 2007), and that cultural competence commensurate with linguistic competence is a desirable outcome for students of foreign languages (Hoecherl-Alden 2000; Schulz et al. 2005; Levy 2007).

For this unit on Carlos Slim, the distinctive nature of acquired culture—at the threshold between native and target culture as manifested in the prefixes inter-, cross-, or trans- that often precede the word cultural—is of particular importance (Kramsch 1993; Hoecherl-Alden 2000; Levy 2007). To reach the goal of cultural comparison, the ACTFL Standards urges language teachers to help students “develop insight into the nature of language and culture” (1996, 4) through a comparison of their native language and culture (L1/C1) and the target ones (L2/C2). Because students have access to “distinctive viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and its cultures” (4), and also their own, they are in a unique position to recognize where cultural differences are at play, reflect on them, and act accordingly. In contrast,
	ranslingual and transcultural competence … places value on the ability to operate between languages. Students are educated to function as informed and capable interlocutors with educated native speakers in the target language. They are also trained to reflect on the world and themselves through
the lens of another language and culture. They learn to comprehend speakers of the target language as members of foreign societies and to grasp themselves as Americans—that is, as members of a society that is foreign to others. (MLA 2007, 237)

For example, American students tend to approach Carlos Slim’s wealth through the cultural narrative of the successful, self-made man, and have a hard time understanding why Slim would be so disliked by so many Mexicans. At the end of the unit, most students are at least able to recognize how culture determines both these views, and to understand the perspective of his critics, whatever their own opinions may have been or may become.

Constructivism

Constructivism is a theory about learning (Fosnot, Preface 1993; Reagan 1999; Allen 2004) based on the work of Piaget (1972), Vygotsky (1978), and von Glasersfeld (1995). In recent years, it has provided the theoretical backbone behind education reforms that de-emphasize traditional behavioralist, teacher-centered views of learning in favor of process-oriented, student-centered ones (Reagan 1999). Although its proponents emphatically insist that constructivism is not a pedagogical theory, constructivist approaches to teaching aim to provide students with the conditions needed to construct their own knowledge (Fosnot, Constructivism 1996; Kaufmann and Brooks 1996; Reagan 1999). “Constructivist teaching typically involves more student-centered, active learning experiences, more student-student and student-teacher interaction, and more work with concrete materials” (Winitzky and Kauchak 1997, 62–63, quoted in Reagan 1999, 417). Constructivism quickly made its way to language teaching (Kaufmann and Brooks 1996; Nunan 1999), where it was first used as a way to present grammar (Reagan 1999; Felix, “E-Learning” 2005; Hampel 2006; Mojica-Diaz and Sanchez-Lopez 2010), and soon afterwards for the teaching of culture as well (Furstenberg et al. 2001; Allen 2004; Hampel 2006). The creators of the Cultura Web site, for instance, framed their project as being “within a fully constructivist pedagogical approach to learning—an approach whereby students themselves gradually construct an understanding of the subject matter, at the intersection of language, communication, and culture” (Furstenberg et al. 2001, 56). Their approach is implicitly endorsed by the ACTFL Standards, whose second standard for “comparisons” (“demonstrate understanding of the concept of culture through comparisons of the cultures studied and their own” [1996, 5]) called on students to “develop the ability to hypothesize about cultural systems in general” (1996, 5).
In the sequence of activities that will be described in greater detail below, each student is assigned to research one of the following topics related to Carlos Slim’s career: the origins of his wealth, his grip on the telecommunications sector, his philanthropic activities, his international expansion, and his Carso Grupo holding company. Students then reciprocally share their findings with a small group of their peers, and then with the whole class. The activity refines and tests the students’ opinions, but it also engages them in a process of making ever-expanding connections between old and new elements in the information they gathered during their initial research.

Bloom’s Taxonomy

Originally, the term Bloom’s taxonomy referred to a hierarchy of learning objectives in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains (Bloom 1956; Anderson and Sosniak 1994) developed collaboratively in the late 1940s and early 1950s by a group of psychologists who specialized in education. In its popular use, the phrase has become nearly synonymous with its objectives in the cognitive domain (Anderson and Sosniak 1994). These six goals are, in order of increasing sophistication, knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation (Bloom 1956). In recent years, Bloom’s original taxonomy has been revised in light of research in education (Anderson et al. 2001) and the availability of digital technology (Churches 2009). The new taxonomy alters slightly the hierarchy of the higher order thinking skills, and emphasizes process over result. Each objective in the taxonomy is paired with a set of actions typically associated with it (see Appendix, Table 1). The new taxonomy progresses as follows: remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating—this last term was previously labeled synthesis.

In spite of its significant influence in the field of education, where it is typically associated with the development of critical thinking skills across disciplines, Bloom’s taxonomy of learning objectives is rarely mentioned in the literature on the teaching of foreign languages. Perhaps Bloom’s taxonomy is largely absent from specialized FL publications because of the functional, instrumental status that foreign languages and foreign language acquisition have traditionally occupied in American universities. The 2007 MLA Report vindicated the intellectual relevance of language education beyond functionality, and advocated “a broader and more coherent curriculum in which language, culture, and literature are taught as a continuous whole, supported by alliances with other departments and expressed through interdisciplinary
courses” (MLA 2007, 237). It seems an ideal moment to draw attention to the relevance of Bloom’s taxonomy for language teaching. Moreover, the development of students’ capacity for critical thinking, and in particular their ability to think critically from an intercultural perspective, makes a contribution of rare importance to their preparation for the “global” world that awaits them at graduation. It is central, as Abbott and Lear (2010) have suggested, to what authors of the MLA Report called “humanistic learning” (MLA 2007, 235).

The course unit devoted to Carlos Slim develops a sequence of increasingly complex objectives, making full use of the potential range of capacities and functions that Bloom’s taxonomy describes. Each of the three days principally develops two stages of learning, sequentially arranged in ascending duos. Using the terms of the revised taxonomy, the first day is focused on remembering and understanding, the second on applying and analyzing, and the third and final day on evaluating and creating (see Appendix, Table 2).

**Media**

If there is one keyword in the language learning literature of the last 20 years more ubiquitous than culture, that term is technology. The proliferation of content platforms and relatively affordable equipment, leading to ever-expanding modes of interaction and communication, has reshaped language education (Furstenberg 1997; Kramsch and Andersen 1999; Lear 2003). These innovations are now generally taken for granted, including computer-equipped classrooms, computerized language labs, the availability of student laptops and smartphones, and supporting media and technology such as CD-ROMs, DVDs, or online e-books. For many educators, the toolbox has expanded to include not just email, but “chat,” forums, blogs, podcasts, wikis, voice-over-Internet phone, video-conferencing, audio- and video-recording software, and social media. Language teachers have long been trying to categorize technology-enabled resources and tasks (Kramsch 1993; Felix, “Web” 2002; Felix, “E-Learning” 2005; Hampel 2006), and to define best practices for enhancing language teaching through technology (Furstenberg et al. 2001; Felix, “Web” 2002; Hampel 2006). Randy Bass, for instance, identifies “inquiry-based learning, communication (building community), and constructionism” as the three categories of effective educational uses of technology (Bass 2000, quoted in Furstenberg et al. 2001, 59). Tasks designed to use the “exploratory, multidimensional, interactive” capacities of media (Furstenberg 1997, 24; Felix, “Web” 2002; Hampel 2006) are strongly preferred over the more mechanic activities of early CALL (Computer Assisted
Language Learning; Felix, “Web” 2002; Hampel 2006), thus mirroring the preference for classroom activities that promote communicative and meaningful interactions over drills and repetitions.

Media and technology have been recognized for their potential to enhance the acquisition of culture, perhaps too complacently. Some authors have pointed skeptically to uncritical attitudes toward complex notions like “authenticity” (Nostrand 1989; Kramsch 1993; Kramsch and Andersen 1999) or commercially produced multimedia platforms selling “authenticity” (Lear 2003). Such promises and miracle-solutions might fairly be called the “snake oil” of language-learning technology, and they are rarely worldview changing. Still, it is undeniable that technology has enhanced and facilitated our ability to integrate context and culture-rich content into language courses (Kramsch 1993; Furstenberg 1997; Kramsch and Andersen 1999; Hoecherl-Alden 2000; Furstenberg et al. 2001). If we narrow our scope to the integration of culture through the use of media and technology in specifically business-related courses, we find extremely valuable resources like Orlando Kelm’s “Cultural Interviews” (2004), which demonstrate the full potential of Web-based media to bring target culture within students’ reach.

Many approaches to incorporating media in the language curriculum advocate, either explicitly or implicitly, a constructivist approach (Kramsch 1993; Furstenberg 1997; Furstenberg et al. 2001; Felix, “Web” 2002; Hampel 2006). Bass (cited above) identifies three categories of effective uses of technology—inquiry-based, communicative, and constructionism; while Kramsch identifies five characteristics of computer-enhanced learning: non-linear, context-bound, recursive, constructivist, and learner-directed (1993, 200–01). Furstenberg mentions language learners’ “autonomy,” “sense of empowerment,” and “opportunity to become an active participant[s] in language learning” as distinct advantages of successfully integrating media and technology in language teaching (1997, 22). Felix argues that “learners are active constructors of knowledge who bring their own needs, strategies and styles to learning, and that skills and knowledge are best acquired within realistic contexts and authentic settings, where students are engaged in experiential learning tasks” (“Web” 2002, 3). He adds that “the Web has the potential to engage students more fully in the construction of knowledge, especially at an intermediate and advanced level” (“Web” 2002, 6). In that sense, a constructivist approach to media and technology offers unparalleled possibilities of realizing ACTFL’s goals, not only as regards communications and cultures, but also and especially for comparisons, connections, and com-
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munities. Autonomy for accessing authentic materials and “guided discovery” (Reagan 1999, 414) empower students to make cross-cultural comparisons. Technology also facilitates making connections with other disciplines, another of ACTFL’s goals, and one of the MLA’s recommendations.

In multimedia programs, which are increasingly multidisciplinary, the traditional boundaries between disciplines tend to disappear. Many CD-ROMs and Web-based projects eliminate the boundaries between such disciplines as language, history, literature, and art. Language becomes more and more not an end in itself but an entry point into a multidimensional cultural world. Language study is no longer a separate entity, and language recaptures its natural function as a tool for exploring a foreign reality. (Furstenberg 1997, 25)

By encouraging students to be autonomous users of media in the target language, we make it possible for them to realize ACTFL’s often-neglected fifth “C,” communities. It then becomes possible for students to begin to “use the language both within and without the school setting” and to “show evidence of becoming life-long learners by using the language for personal enjoyment and enrichment” (1996, 6).

III. A WEEK WITH CARLOS SLIM

The course unit occupied one of the semester’s final weeks. Throughout the semester, students had worked with Spanish and English articles of comparable length on parallel topics. This technique of juxtaposition (Furstenberg et al. 2001, 58) allowed students to compare stylistic and rhetorical differences between English and Spanish news media on the one hand, and differences in perspective on the other. News articles and discussion questions were initially selected and prepared exclusively by the instructor. With each iteration of the exercise, students worked with increasing autonomy at selecting and discussing authentic media and other materials. By the time the Carlos Slim activity began, students were expected to select their own articles from a list of sources, working exclusively in the target language.

Groundwork for the Slim unit began one week in advance. The fifteen students were divided into three groups of five, and each group member was assigned a topic regarding Carlos Slim—the list included philanthropy, telecommunications, Grupo Carso holdings, international expansion, and origins of his wealth. Students were then provided a list of news sources (all available online) from which to draw information. Students searched for appropriate media coverage of their topics within these sources, and then submitted to
the instructor copies of a selection of their results, from which they then read three or four articles to prepare for the activities that followed.

Day 1: Carlos Slim in the Mexican News Media (Bloom’s “Remember and Understand”)

To prepare for the first class, students wrote a one-paragraph summary for their peers and drew up a list of relevant vocabulary. When the week started, students had a narrow view of Carlos Slim, thus turning the first day into an information-gap activity. Students began the hour by sharing vocabulary from their readings and presenting the topic of their articles in a small group setting. They used concept maps and charts to keep track of new information presented by their peers. Once everybody had had the opportunity to present their findings to their group, the whole class collaborated in a collective brainstorming session to identify and discuss recurring themes in this media coverage. The instructor divided the blackboard into five parts (one for each assigned topic); each student then wrote keywords, proper names, and ideas that had come up in the group discussion in the appropriate section. These notes on the board served as the basis for the instructor-guided discussion that wrapped up the first day.

Day 2: Sizing Up Carlos Slim (Bloom’s “Apply and Analyze”)

The second day of the sequence was devoted to analyzing media portrayals of Carlos Slim. As a transition, students were assigned to review the vocabulary and to submit a concise profile of Carlos Slim before the second session in the unit. This session incorporated the previous session’s foundations, but centered on a television news segment viewed collectively in class. The instructor selected the television news segment (“Riqueza” 2008; “Fortuna” 2008) from the many available online. The choice of the video segment is paramount, and should be made on the basis of its connection with the themes and controversies identified during the previous session’s discussion. For the sake of making a valid comparison, it is essential that the video be selected from mainstream sources analogous to those used by the students. Warm-up activities to refresh the unit’s vocabulary combined with other pre-viewing activities enabled the instructor to maximize aural comprehension. The viewing itself was then followed by a discussion during which students formulated, expressed, and defended opinions about Slim, the video segment, and Slim’s broader media portrayal.

In the post-viewing activity, students were given statements taken from the video and from the first day’s selection of articles, to which they responded
individually. These responses were then shared and defended with the whole class. The focus of this in-class comparative discussion centered on how success stories like Slim’s might be presented in the American media in juxtaposition with how Slim is often portrayed in his native Mexico. Since students had taken a position during this conversation, class discussion progressed into the last activity for the day: preparing for the debate that anchors the final day’s lesson plan. Working in two teams, students concluded the session by drafting arguments, planning strategies, and formulating the questions to be used in the following class. To provide students with further practice in expressing and defending their point of view, they were assigned to review discourse connectors and to record a video response to the segment discussed in class as homework.

Day 3: National Hero or National Villain? (Bloom’s “Evaluate and Create”)
The debate on Carlos Slim provides the unit’s culminating activity. Having learned about and then analyzed what Carlos Slim represents in modern Mexico, students evaluated his impact and formulated their own opinion(s). The title of this debate, “Carlos Slim: National Hero or National Villain?” framed the debate in deliberately polarizing terms, and draws attention to cultural differences in the perceptions of Slim’s “rags-to-riches” narrative. The instructor’s options for managing this classroom debate are flexible, provided that its structure and opportunities/requirements for participation are clearly stated. Class began with a guided practice on discourse connectors, progressed into the debate proper, and concluded with a debriefing activity. At this concluding stage, students were given the opportunity to reflect on their prior knowledge about Slim and on how their perspectives had evolved during the unit. Students were then given the assignment of writing a letter to the editor based on their assigned initial theme. In the letter, students had to voice the opinion of an imagined person of their choice: a disgruntled Telmex customer, the chairman of a rival company, or a lawyer working for Slim’s Grupo Carso. The letter had to incorporate the facts and perspectives the students had familiarized themselves with during the week.

IV. SUMMARY
In the three sessions devoted to this unit, students used all skills in content-based activities that integrate cultural input with proficiency-oriented activities. Students worked individually, and also interacted in small group and instructor-led discussions. Students learned about recent Mexican history and economics, discussed the social and economic implications of Slim’s
accumulation of power and wealth, and gained greater autonomy in reading and interpreting unedited media in the target language. They used technology meaningfully as part of their learning in ways that are contiguous with the role technology plays in their daily life. In terms of cognitive skills, the unit presents a sequence of interlinked, increasingly complex learning objectives. On the first day, students worked mostly on remembering and understanding new information (listing and memorizing vocabulary, reproducing basic information about a subject matter, repeating arguments, and stating a position, on the one hand; identifying key elements in a profile, and paraphrasing media sources, on the other). Day 2 corresponded roughly with Bloom’s mid-level thinking skills: applying (selecting evidence, using new information, dramatizing a conflict) and analyzing (contrasting editorial positions, questioning assumptions, testing hypotheses). Building on their work throughout the week, on the last day students moved up to the higher-order thinking skills: evaluating (appraising ideas, judging the evidence, defending a position) and creating (writing a letter to the editor). The unit touched on all the goals expressed in ACTFL’s Five Cs: communications (conversing with peers, exchanging information, understanding and interpreting written and spoken language, presenting concepts to an audience), cultures (understanding the relationship between the practices, products, and perspectives of the target culture), connections (using their knowledge of other disciplines, acquiring information and viewpoints available only through cultural artifacts of the target language), comparisons (especially understanding the concept of culture through a reflection on C1 compared with C2), and communities (by enabling students to use their autonomy and familiarity with authentic, unedited media in the target language to become life-long learners). Indeed students accessed the target culture through a process-based approach. This process was guided by the instructor, but students were also given the autonomy to formulate and revise their hypotheses about the target culture, about the differences between C1 and C2, and, eventually, to arrive at their own conclusions.

V. CONCLUSION
This module proposes one possible way to incorporate effectively culture-rich content and cross-cultural sensitivity, understood in terms similar to those of the MLA Report (MLA 2007) and ACTFL’s Standards (ACTFL 1996), into a language class. While originally intended for a business-themed language class, the unit lends itself to other settings. It advocates a constructivist approach to culture acquisition, an approach implicit in the MLA and ACTFL
documents. The underlying assumption is that a process-based, student-led discovery of the target culture, even if it requires successive steps of hypothesis forming and revision, will have a longer-lasting impact—in other words, be more effective—than receiving the same information from the instructor (Hoecherl-Alden 2000; Wright 2000). Its ultimate goal is not for students to regard Slim from an acculturated perspective, but rather to be cognizant of the viewpoints through which the controversial billionaire is seen in his native Mexico, and of the nuances in the different perspectives Americans and Mexicans might have about this iconic figure. Media and technology are not the focal point of the unit, but they enhance it significantly by providing easier access to materials in the target culture and facilitating the formulation and expression of opinions.

APPENDIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original taxonomy (Bloom 1956)</th>
<th>Revised Taxonomy (Anderson et al. 2001)</th>
<th>Key Actions (Johnson 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Creating</td>
<td>Design, construct, plan, produce, invent, devise, make, mix/mash, synthesize, assemble, formulate, broadcast, publish, modify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>Justify, critique, compare, judge, detect, monitor, review, appraise, argue, hypothesize, comment, summarize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Analyzing</td>
<td>Compare, organize, deconstruct, attribute, outline, integrate, extrapolate, quantify, diagram, relate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Applying</td>
<td>Implement, use, solve, prepare, react, discover, change, graph, modify, predict, upload, operate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Interpret, summarize, infer, paraphrase, classify, compare, explain, convert, estimate, defend, tag, categorize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Remembering</td>
<td>Recognize, describe, list, recall, identify, name, locate, match, select, label</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Carlos Slim Helú: Day-by-Day Sequences and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Objectives for the day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1: Carlos Slim in the media</td>
<td>Media assignment</td>
<td>Reading, writing</td>
<td>Remembering (memorizing, reproducing information, repeating arguments, stating positions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group briefing</td>
<td>Speaking, listening, writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brainstorming and discussion</td>
<td>Speaking, listening, writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2: Sizing up CS</td>
<td>Profile write up</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Applying (selecting evidence, using new information, dramatizing conflict)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video segment</td>
<td>Listening, writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class discussion</td>
<td>Speaking, listening</td>
<td>Analyzing (contrasting editorial positions, questioning assumptions, testing hypothesis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debate preparation</td>
<td>Speaking, listening, reading, writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3: National Hero or National Villain?</td>
<td>Video response</td>
<td>Speaking, (writing)</td>
<td>Evaluating (appraising bias, judging evidence, defending a position)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debate</td>
<td>Speaking, listening, reading, writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debriefing</td>
<td>Speaking, writing</td>
<td>Creating (writing a letter to the editor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter to the editor</td>
<td>Reading, writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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