



Inglés Secundaria

Volumen práctico

26 de octubre de 2026

Síguenos en Instagram y entérate de nuestras últimas actualizaciones:

 [opositando.shop](https://www.instagram.com/opositando.shop)

Índice

1.	Bloque 1: Communicative Language Teaching Design and Classroom Intervention	1
1.1	Ejercicio 1	1
1.2	Ejercicio 2	6
1.3	Ejercicio 3	13
1.4	Ejercicio 4	20
1.5	Ejercicio 5	24
1.6	Ejercicio 6	31
1.7	Ejercicio 7	37
1.8	Ejercicio 8	43
1.9	Ejercicio 9	49
1.10	Ejercicio 10	56
1.11	Ejercicio 11	60
1.12	Ejercicio 12	65
1.13	Ejercicio 13	71
1.14	Ejercicio 14	75
1.15	Ejercicio 15	82
2.	Bloque 2: Phonetic Transcription, Pronunciation and Oral Interaction	90
2.1	Ejercicio 16	90
2.2	Ejercicio 17	97
2.3	Ejercicio 18	102
2.4	Ejercicio 19	109
2.5	Ejercicio 20	113
2.6	Ejercicio 21	118
2.7	Ejercicio 22	125
2.8	Ejercicio 23	129
2.9	Ejercicio 24	136
2.10	Ejercicio 25	144
2.11	Ejercicio 26	147
2.12	Ejercicio 27	151
2.13	Ejercicio 28	156
2.14	Ejercicio 29	161
2.15	Ejercicio 30	165
3.	Bloque 3: Grammar Analysis and Functional Language Use	173
3.1	Ejercicio 31	173
3.2	Ejercicio 32	176

3.3	Ejercicio 33	180
3.4	Ejercicio 34	185
3.5	Ejercicio 35	188
3.6	Ejercicio 36	193
3.7	Ejercicio 37	201
3.8	Ejercicio 38	207
3.9	Ejercicio 39	212
3.10	Ejercicio 40	216
3.11	Ejercicio 41	220
3.12	Ejercicio 42	225
3.13	Ejercicio 43	232
3.14	Ejercicio 44	236
4.	Bloque 4: Lexical-Semantic Analysis, Word Formation and Language Variation .	242
4.1	Ejercicio 45	242
4.2	Ejercicio 46	248
4.3	Ejercicio 47	252
4.4	Ejercicio 48	257
4.5	Ejercicio 49	263
4.6	Ejercicio 50	267
4.7	Ejercicio 51	273
4.8	Ejercicio 52	279
4.9	Ejercicio 53	283
4.10	Ejercicio 54	286
4.11	Ejercicio 55	293
4.12	Ejercicio 56	297
4.13	Ejercicio 57	305
4.14	Ejercicio 58	310
5.	Bloque 5: Text Analysis, Discourse Organisation and Written Communication .	315
5.1	Ejercicio 59	315
5.2	Ejercicio 60	321
5.3	Ejercicio 61	328
5.4	Ejercicio 62	332
5.5	Ejercicio 63	336
5.6	Ejercicio 64	343
5.7	Ejercicio 65	347
5.8	Ejercicio 66	352
5.9	Ejercicio 67	358
5.10	Ejercicio 68	361
5.11	Ejercicio 69	367
5.12	Ejercicio 70	372
5.13	Ejercicio 71	376
5.14	Ejercicio 72	382
6.	Bloque 6: Literary Commentary, Genre Analysis and Contextual Interpretation .	388

6.1	Ejercicio 73	388
6.2	Ejercicio 74	393
6.3	Ejercicio 75	399
6.4	Ejercicio 76	405
6.5	Ejercicio 77	409
6.6	Ejercicio 78	414
6.7	Ejercicio 79	420
6.8	Ejercicio 80	425
6.9	Ejercicio 81	431
6.10	Ejercicio 82	437
6.11	Ejercicio 83	442
6.12	Ejercicio 84	446
6.13	Ejercicio 85	452
6.14	Ejercicio 86	456
7.	Bloque 7: Sociocultural, Historical and Intercultural Analysis of the English-Speaking World	463
7.1	Ejercicio 87	463
7.2	Ejercicio 88	470
7.3	Ejercicio 89	476
7.4	Ejercicio 90	481
7.5	Ejercicio 91	487
7.6	Ejercicio 92	492
7.7	Ejercicio 93	496
7.8	Ejercicio 94	503
7.9	Ejercicio 95	507
7.10	Ejercicio 96	512
7.11	Ejercicio 97	519
7.12	Ejercicio 98	522
7.13	Ejercicio 99	528
7.14	Ejercicio 100	534

1. Bloque 1: Communicative Language Teaching Design and Classroom Intervention

1.1 Ejercicio 1

A teacher plans a communicative lesson on making arrangements.

- State the communicative objective of the lesson.
- Select one pair-work activity consistent with Communicative Language Teaching.
- Identify one observable indicator of successful communicative performance.

Solución

Paso 1: Identification and strategy

The task requires three tightly connected decisions: a **communicative objective**, one **pair-work activity** consistent with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), and one **observable indicator** showing that learners have achieved the objective. It is not enough to mention a grammar item such as *the present continuous for future arrangements* or vocabulary about days and times. Those are linguistic resources, whereas the objective must describe what learners will be able to **do through language**.

The relevant syllabus areas are communicative approaches, communicative competence, oral interaction, language functions, negotiation of meaning, communication strategies, and assessment of spoken performance. Making arrangements is a transactional and interpersonal communicative situation: speakers propose plans, check availability, accept or reject alternatives, negotiate changes, and finally confirm an agreement.

A reliable strategy for tasks of this kind is to maintain alignment among the three required elements. First, formulate an objective in terms of an observable communicative action. Then select an activity that creates a genuine reason to exchange information and negotiate. Finally, write an assessment indicator that directly evidences successful completion of that same action. In other words, the activity and the indicator must test exactly what the objective states.

Paso 2: Reasoned solution

Communicative objective

A suitable objective would be:

By the end of the lesson, learners will be able to make, negotiate and confirm a mutually acceptable arrangement with a partner, stating and asking about availability and agreeing on a day, time, place and activity.

This formulation is appropriate for several reasons. First, it is learner-centred: it begins with what learners will be able to do. Second, it specifies a communicative purpose, namely arranging a meeting or activity. Third, it includes the interactional sequence which normally constitutes this speech event: making a proposal, negotiating alternatives, and confirming the final plan.

The objective also incorporates essential semantic content: day, time, place and activity. This prevents the objective from being too vague. A learner who only says *Let's meet sometime* has initiated an arrangement, but has not completed a usable communicative outcome.

Relevant functional language may include expressions such as *Are you free on Friday?*, *Would you like to go to the cinema?*, *How about Saturday afternoon?*, *I'm afraid I can't make it*, *Could we meet later?*, *That sounds great*, and *So, we're meeting at six outside the station*. However, these expressions should be regarded as resources supporting the objective, not as the objective itself. In CLT, communicative success depends on whether learners can use available language appropriately and effectively in context.

Pair-work activity consistent with CLT

A suitable activity is an **information-gap calendar negotiation**.

Each learner receives a different weekly diary or schedule. The diaries contain a mixture of available and unavailable time slots, but learners must not show their diary to their partner. They are also given a short list of possible activities, for example going to a concert, studying together, having lunch, playing sport, or visiting an exhibition. Their task is to arrange one activity together during the week.

The teacher gives instructions such as: **“Do not show your diary. Talk to your partner and find a day and time when you are both free. Choose an activity and decide where to meet. You must both agree on one complete plan.”**

The interaction may develop naturally as follows:

- Learner A proposes an option: *Are you free to study together on Wednesday afternoon?*
- Learner B checks the proposal against their private schedule and rejects it with a reason: *I'm sorry, I have basketball practice then. What about Thursday?*
- Learner A offers an alternative: *Thursday is fine, but I can only meet after five.*
- Both learners establish the details and confirm the arrangement: *Great. Let's meet at the library at half past five.*

This is a genuinely communicative CLT task because it contains an **information gap**: each learner holds information the other needs. It also involves **choice**, since several dates, times and activities are possible, and **feedback**, since the pair can only know whether communication has succeeded when they reach a shared arrangement. These three features distinguish meaningful communication from a controlled dialogue in which students simply read predetermined lines.

The task is also compatible with the principles of CLT because meaning is primary, learners interact in pairs, and the activity requires negotiation of meaning. If a learner does not unders-

tand *Thursday morning* or needs to clarify a time, they can use communication strategies such as asking for repetition, checking understanding, or reformulating: *Do you mean ten o'clock?* or *Sorry, are you available before lunch?* Accuracy remains relevant, but it serves comprehensibility and successful interaction rather than being the sole criterion.

A brief final confirmation stage is advisable. Each pair reports its agreed plan orally, for example: *We are going to the exhibition on Saturday at eleven. We are meeting at the museum entrance.* This gives the task a clear outcome and allows the teacher to monitor achievement without transforming the whole activity into a grammar drill.

Observable indicator of successful communicative performance

One precise observable indicator is:

During the pair-work task, the learner participates in the negotiation and reaches a mutually understood arrangement including an agreed activity, day, time and meeting place, using appropriate proposals, responses and confirmation.

This is an observable indicator because the teacher can hear and record whether the learner actually performs the specified behaviours. The teacher does not need to infer an internal ability; the final arrangement and the interaction leading to it provide evidence.

The indicator is also aligned with the objective. The objective requires learners to make, negotiate and confirm an arrangement, and the indicator checks whether they have done so. It includes both the **process** of interaction, through proposals and responses, and the **product** of communication, through an agreed plan with essential details.

For classroom assessment, the teacher could use this indicator while circulating and listening to pairs. The focus should be on intelligibility, appropriacy, interaction and completion of the task. Occasional grammatical inaccuracies should not automatically imply failure if the learner's message remains clear and the arrangement is successfully negotiated. Conversely, grammatically accurate isolated sentences would not demonstrate full achievement if the learner cannot sustain interaction or reach an agreement.

Paso 3: Keys for the examination

A frequent mistake is to formulate a linguistic objective rather than a communicative one. Statements such as *Students will learn the present continuous* or *Students will practise vocabulary about free time* are incomplete for this task. They identify language content, but not the communicative action learners should perform. A stronger formulation uses a verb describing purposeful language use: *arrange, negotiate, agree, invite, clarify, or confirm.*

Another common weakness is choosing a nominally pair-based activity that is not genuinely communicative. For example, a dialogue-completion exercise or a scripted conversation may offer useful preparation, but it does not necessarily create an information gap, learner choice, or a real communicative outcome. In an examination answer, explicitly justify the proposed task

through CLT principles: meaningful interaction, information gap, negotiation, learner autonomy, and feedback.

Candidates should also avoid confusing an assessment indicator with a general aim. *Students understand how to make arrangements* is neither directly observable nor sufficiently specific. An effective indicator includes a visible or audible performance, conditions if necessary, and success criteria. In this case, successful completion can be evidenced by an agreed plan containing specific details.

Clarity and internal coherence are especially important. The following three elements must match:

- The **objective** states that learners will negotiate an arrangement.
- The **activity** obliges them to exchange unavailable and available times in order to negotiate.
- The **indicator** verifies that they reached and confirmed an arrangement.

In a concise examination response, it is useful to name the methodological principle after presenting the activity. For instance, state that the calendar task is an information-gap activity with a negotiated outcome. This demonstrates theoretical knowledge without replacing the practical classroom proposal with abstract terminology.

Finally, do not demand native-like grammatical perfection in an indicator for a communicative task unless the question specifically concerns linguistic accuracy. CLT assessment should reflect communicative competence: whether learners can convey and interpret meanings appropriately, manage interaction, use compensatory strategies when needed, and achieve the intended outcome.

Paso 4: What you should learn

To solve similar tasks, you should distinguish clearly between **communicative objectives**, **language resources**, **learning activities**, and **assessment indicators**. A communicative objective expresses what learners can accomplish in a realistic communicative context; grammar, lexis, pronunciation and discourse markers are the tools used to accomplish it.

You should be able to design pair-work tasks that embody central CLT principles. Particularly useful task types are information-gap activities, role-plays with different goals or information, problem-solving tasks, ranking and decision-making activities, and jigsaw tasks. Their quality depends not on their label but on whether learners need to exchange meanings, make choices, respond to one another, and achieve a meaningful outcome.

For oral interaction, remember the usual stages of many communicative exchanges: opening the interaction, making a proposal or request, responding, negotiating difficulties or alternatives, reaching agreement, and closing or confirming. For making arrangements, the essential functions are proposing, accepting, declining politely, suggesting alternatives, checking details and confirming the final plan.

You should also master the construction of observable indicators. A robust indicator normally specifies an action that can be heard or seen, the communicative content or strategy involved, and a criterion for successful completion. In this type of lesson, an indicator should normally assess whether learners can interact with a partner and reach a clear, mutually understood arrangement, rather than merely whether they can produce an isolated grammatical structure.

1.2 Ejercicio 2

A Year 10 class has completed several grammar-based units and can accurately complete controlled exercises, but learners hesitate when speaking spontaneously. During a discussion about environmental habits, many students wait for the teacher to provide vocabulary, switch to Spanish, or abandon their turn after a lexical gap. The department requires that the next sequence should preserve explicit attention to language while increasing meaningful interaction. Available resources include mobile devices, short authentic videos, collaborative documents, and a forty-minute lesson period. The teacher must also ensure that participation is not monopolised by the most fluent students.

Design a task-based activity for this class, explaining the pre-task, task cycle and language-focus stages, and justify how the activity promotes interaction and communication strategies.

Solución

Paso 1: Identification and strategy

The prompt asks for the design and justification of a **task-based learning (TBL)** sequence for a Year 10 class. The central pedagogical problem is clear: learners perform well in controlled, grammar-oriented practice, but they lack fluency, confidence and strategic competence when they have to communicate spontaneously. The solution must therefore preserve **explicit attention to language** without returning to a lesson in which language is merely practised through decontextualised exercises.

The most relevant syllabus areas are communicative approaches, theories of second-language acquisition and interlanguage, communicative competence, oral interaction, communication strategies, linguistic macrofunctions, discourse organisation, and task-based teaching. A strong answer should also connect the proposal with inclusion and classroom management, because the prompt explicitly requires that more fluent learners should not dominate participation.

The appropriate overall framework is a three-stage TBL sequence: **pre-task, task cycle and language focus**. The task should have a meaningful non-linguistic outcome, a genuine reason for exchanging information, and an audience beyond the individual student. In this case, students can collaborate to produce a short, realistic environmental action plan for their school or class.

The proposed activity will be entitled “**Our Class Green Challenge**”. Groups will use a short authentic video as a stimulus, discuss environmentally responsible habits, select feasible actions for their school, and create a brief collaborative digital proposal. Their final outcome will be a ranked plan containing three actions, reasons for each choice, anticipated difficulties and a persuasive message for classmates. This is more than a grammar exercise because students must negotiate, make decisions and communicate a jointly agreed product.

Paso 2: Reasoned solution

Pedagogical rationale and learning objectives

The activity is designed for a forty-minute lesson. Its communicative purpose is to enable learners to agree on practical environmental habits for their school community. The linguistic content is not ignored; instead, it emerges from communicative need and is subsequently examined explicitly.

By the end of the lesson, learners should be able to:

- interact in English to exchange opinions, agree and disagree politely, ask for clarification and reach a group decision;
- use environmental vocabulary related to waste, transport, energy, water consumption and reusable materials;
- use language for suggestions, obligation, possibility and consequence, for example: *We could install recycling bins; Students should bring reusable bottles; If we reduced food waste, we would save resources;*
- use communication strategies when a lexical item is unavailable, rather than immediately switching to Spanish or abandoning the turn;
- contribute equitably to a shared oral and written outcome.

This design develops **communicative competence** in its different dimensions. It develops grammatical competence through focused work on modal verbs, conditionals and lexis; socio-linguistic competence through polite disagreement and collaborative decision-making; discourse competence through the organisation of a persuasive proposal; and strategic competence through paraphrase, clarification requests, circumlocution and turn-management.

Pre-task stage: activating meaning, resources and strategies

The pre-task stage should take approximately eight minutes. Its purpose is not to pre-teach every lexical item that may arise, as this would remove the need for learners to develop compensatory strategies. Instead, it should provide enough support for students to enter the task confidently while making them aware that communication can continue despite lexical gaps.

The teacher begins by showing a short authentic video, approximately forty-five to sixty seconds long, about simple environmental actions taken by young people or schools. Students watch first for the general question: *Which environmental problems can you identify?* They then compare answers in pairs for one minute. This brief pair discussion gives all learners initial speaking time before whole-class interaction, reducing the risk that only confident volunteers speak.

The teacher elicits a limited set of useful vocabulary from the video and records it in a shared collaborative document. Possible items include *recycle, waste, reusable, packaging, public transport, switch off, save water* and *carbon footprint*. Crucially, this is presented as a **resource bank**, not as a list to memorise before speaking.

The teacher then models communication strategies through a short, natural exchange. For example, if the teacher cannot remember *reusable bottle*, they may say: *What do you call a bottle that you can use again and again?* The class can supply the expression. The teacher explicitly highlights that a speaker can:

- describe the object or idea: *It is something you use to carry water;*
- use a more general word: *a thing for water;*
- ask for help: *How do you say...?* or *What is the word for...?*;
- ask for clarification: *Do you mean that students should...?*;
- gain time and maintain the turn: *Let me think, What I mean is... ,* or *I am not sure of the word, but...*

This modelling directly addresses the problem described in the prompt: learners currently wait for teacher vocabulary, switch to Spanish or abandon their turn. The teacher makes the expectation explicit: English is the normal medium of interaction, but communication strategies are legitimate tools, not evidence of failure.

Finally, learners are placed in mixed-ability groups of four. Each learner receives a rotating role: facilitator, vocabulary strategist, evidence checker and reporter. The roles are functional rather than merely decorative. The facilitator invites contributions, the vocabulary strategist encourages paraphrase before consulting a device, the evidence checker ensures that proposals are realistic, and the reporter prepares the final oral presentation. This structure distributes responsibility and reduces monopolisation.

Task cycle: meaningful interaction and a shared outcome

The task cycle should take approximately eighteen minutes and includes the task itself, planning and reporting.

During the first ten minutes, each group receives a digital set of eight environmental action cards in a collaborative document. Examples may include bringing reusable bottles, reducing photocopies, organising a walking-to-school day, placing recycling bins in classrooms, reducing food waste, switching off lights, planting trees and avoiding single-use packaging. Each action card includes a short benefit and one practical challenge. Different group members initially receive different cards or information, creating an **information gap**: no individual has all the material needed to make the final decision.

The group must select the three most realistic actions for its school and produce a concise proposal. To complete the task, students must discuss four questions:

- Which three actions would have the greatest positive impact?
- Why are these actions realistic for our school?
- What problem might each action create?
- How could the school encourage students to participate?

The required final product is a shared digital document containing three agreed actions, a reason for each one, one foreseeable difficulty and one persuasive slogan. For example: *We should install recycling bins because students produce a lot of plastic waste. The main difficulty is keeping the bins clean. Our slogan is: "Sort it today, save tomorrow."*

This is a genuine task because learners are not simply producing predetermined structures. They must compare alternatives, express preferences, justify views, negotiate agreement and adapt their language to their communicative aims. The fact that there may be several valid solutions is important: it gives interaction a real purpose.

To guarantee individual participation, the teacher establishes two participation routines. First, groups use a **round-robin first response**: before open discussion begins, every student must express one initial preference and one reason. Secondly, the facilitator should not allow a second contribution from one learner until all members have had the opportunity to speak. These procedures are particularly useful with adolescents because they make equitable participation visible without penalising fluent speakers.

Mobile devices are permitted, but under a clear protocol: students should first attempt paraphrase, ask a peer, or consult the shared vocabulary bank; only then may they use a dictionary or translation tool. This avoids turning the task into silent individual searching while preserving mobile devices as realistic learning tools. The teacher circulates, observes interaction and provides minimal intervention. Rather than supplying every missing word, the teacher can prompt strategically with questions such as *Can you explain it in another way?* or *Can someone help with that expression?*

The next five minutes are devoted to planning. Groups revise their collaborative document and prepare a thirty- to forty-second oral pitch. Planning is an essential TBL component because it allows students to improve accuracy and clarity after spontaneous interaction. At this point, the teacher may provide optional language support on the board, such as:

- *I see your point, but...*
- *What if we...?*
- *I agree because...*
- *I am not convinced that...*
- *Could you explain what you mean?*
- *If we did this, we could...*

The final three minutes are for reporting. Two groups present their proposal orally, while the remaining groups post their plans in the shared document and listen actively. Since time is limited, each listener selects one proposal and writes one supportive comment or one question in English. In a subsequent lesson, all groups could report orally or vote on the class proposal. This ensures that the activity has a meaningful audience and that listening remains purposeful.

Language-focus stage: explicit attention to form after communication

The final fourteen minutes preserve the department's requirement for explicit language teaching. However, language focus follows communication rather than replacing it. This reflects the principle of **focus on form**: attention is drawn to linguistic features that are relevant to the meaning-focused task and to difficulties observed during interaction.

The teacher first displays anonymised examples collected while monitoring. These should include successful student language and selected errors that are frequent, teachable and relevant to the communicative objective. For instance:

- *We should reduce plastic in the cafeteria.*
- *If students bring reusable bottles, we can reduce waste.*
- *We must to recycle more.*
- *If we will use less paper, we save trees.*

Students work briefly in pairs to identify which examples are effective and to improve the problematic ones. The teacher then confirms the relevant patterns. For example, modal verbs are followed by the bare infinitive, so *We must recycle more* is correct, not *We must to recycle more*. In a likely conditional pattern, the if-clause normally takes the present simple and the result clause can take *will* or another modal: *If we use less paper, we will save trees*; *If we use less paper, we can save trees*.

The teacher should avoid treating every deviation as equally important. In an interaction-focused lesson, correction must be selective and proportionate. Errors that seriously affect intelligibility, recur across groups or concern the day's target language deserve attention. Minor slips that do not obstruct meaning can be noted for later work. This approach recognises learner language as **interlanguage**: a developing system in which errors can provide evidence of learning and areas for instruction.

The lesson ends with a very short individual exit task, lasting two or three minutes. Each student writes one environmentally focused suggestion using a modal verb or conditional and one communication strategy they used or could use next time. For example: *If we turn off the lights, we can save energy*. *When I forget a word, I can describe it*. This gives the teacher evidence of individual learning, not only group performance.

Assessment and evidence of learning

Assessment should be formative and aligned with the task objectives. The teacher can use a simple observation checklist while circulating. The criteria should assess whether each learner contributes, attempts English, uses or responds to a communication strategy, provides a reason for an opinion and collaborates respectfully. Accuracy in the target language can be assessed, but it should not be the sole criterion.

A suitable success criterion would be that every learner contributes at least one idea and one response to a peer, every group reaches a justified decision, and students demonstrate at least one strategy for handling a lexical gap. This makes assessment consistent with the identified

problem: the aim is not merely to produce correct grammar, but to sustain communication when grammar and vocabulary are not immediately available.

Paso 3: Keys for the examination

A common mistake is to describe an attractive classroom activity without demonstrating that it is genuinely task-based. A task must involve a meaningful goal, learner choice, interaction and an outcome. A worksheet in which students fill in modal verbs about recycling is not a task, even if the topic is environmental awareness. The final product in this proposal is a negotiated school action plan, not a set of completed grammar sentences.

Another frequent weakness is to present the three TBL stages as labels without explaining their distinct functions. In a convincing examination answer, the pre-task should activate background knowledge, provide strategic scaffolding and clarify the outcome; the task cycle should include interaction, planning and reporting; and the language-focus stage should explicitly analyse language emerging from the task.

Candidates should also avoid an artificial opposition between fluency and accuracy. The scenario explicitly demands both. The strongest justification is that the sequence starts with meaning-focused interaction and then directs learners' attention to useful forms, thereby combining fluency development with explicit grammar instruction. Terms such as **focus on meaning**, **focus on form**, **scaffolding**, **interlanguage**, **negotiation of meaning** and **strategic competence** should be used accurately, not simply inserted as fashionable terminology.

Participation cannot be guaranteed merely by stating that students work in groups. Group work can actually intensify inequality if confident students take over. A robust answer should name concrete mechanisms: mixed-ability grouping, rotating roles, individual preparation time, compulsory first-round contributions, information gaps, speaking turns, peer feedback and individual exit evidence.

Time management is especially important because the lesson lasts only forty minutes. The examiner should be able to see that the proposal is realistic. The timing in this sequence is coherent: approximately eight minutes for pre-task work, eighteen minutes for the task cycle and fourteen minutes for language focus and individual reflection. If adapting the activity to another duration, the candidate should preserve the pedagogical sequence while adjusting the number of resources, groups or reports.

Finally, the answer should explain the teacher's role. In TBL, the teacher is neither absent nor the constant supplier of correct language. The teacher designs the communicative conditions, models strategies, monitors participation, records useful language, gives selective feedback and guides reflection. This is particularly relevant in the present case because excessive teacher provision of vocabulary would perpetuate learner dependence.

Paso 4: What you need to learn

To solve similar examination tasks, you should be able to identify the classroom problem behind the prompt. Here, the issue is not a lack of grammatical knowledge alone; it is the gap between controlled accuracy and spontaneous communicative performance. This diagnosis determines the methodology.

You should master the architecture of task-based learning: a pre-task that prepares learners without over-controlling them, a task cycle that requires meaningful interaction and produces an outcome, and a language-focus stage that makes form explicit on the basis of communicative experience. The order matters because it allows learners to notice what they need after trying to communicate.

You should also know how to operationalise communication strategies. Do not merely write that learners will use strategies; specify which ones they will use and how they will be taught. Useful strategies include paraphrasing, approximation, asking for lexical help, clarification requests, confirmation checks, stalling devices and turn-management expressions. These strategies help learners maintain interaction and negotiate meaning when linguistic resources are incomplete.

A transferable planning procedure is to begin with a real-world outcome, identify the language functions required to achieve it, provide limited lexical and strategic scaffolding, design an information or opinion gap, ensure individual accountability, and finally select a small number of language points for explicit feedback. This procedure can be applied to topics such as travel, health, technology, local culture or future careers.

Above all, remember that a high-quality answer integrates methodology, language learning theory, inclusion, assessment and practical feasibility. It does not simply state that students will communicate: it explains why they need to communicate, how every learner will be enabled to do so, what language support they will receive, and how the teacher will transform communicative difficulties into focused learning opportunities.



Fin de la muestra

Has visto los dos primeros ejercicios de esta relación.

La relación completa, con todos los ejercicios resueltos paso a paso, está disponible en opositando.shop.

Síguenos en Instagram y entérate de nuestras últimas actualizaciones:

