Teacher's Integration Guide

Practical Guide for the Teacher: To maximize the impact of this lesson on your Advanced students, follow this logical sequence:

1. **Engagement & Video Introduction:** Start by showing the video and having students identify the "game" words. Use the **flashcards** immediately after to check for concept awareness, as Advanced students often know the word but might lack the precision to explain it in English.
2. **Accuracy Focus (Worksheet):** Assign the **self-study worksheet**. This ensures students can distinguish between the nuanced terms "injury," "disease," and "illness"—a common area of confusion even at high levels.
3. **Concept Deep-Dive (Mind-Map):** Use the **Mind-Map** task to bridge the gap between vocabulary and fluid speech. Show the model paragraph first, then give them the empty mind-map. This forces them to organize their complex thoughts about medical ethics before they speak.
4. **Communicative Production (Speaking Activity):** Move into the **speaking activities**. Having just mapped out their thoughts, students will be better prepared to participate in the "Public Health Committee" roleplay using the target phrases like "for the foreseeable future."
5. **Extension & Review:** Finally, direct students to the **website article** as a post-class resource to solidify their understanding of the formal collocations and to review common pitfalls. This sequence ensures a move from receptive skills (video/worksheet) to structured production (mind-map) and finally to free, high-stakes communication (speaking activity).

Communicative Speaking Activities: Drug Trials and Ethical Risk

Teacher Instructions & Activity Guide

Purpose: To engage Advanced ESL students (C1/C2) in communicative tasks requiring the use of sophisticated speculative language and formal phrases for negotiating complex ethical and scientific risks.

Activity 1: The Emergency Regulatory Hearing (Role-Play)

Component	Instruction for Teacher
Grouping & Setup	Divide students into groups of four. Assign the following roles: **1. CEO of the Pharmaceutical Company**, **2. Chief Regulatory Officer (CRO)**, **3. Patient Advocate**, **4. Investigative Journalist**. The goal is for the CEO to persuade the CRO to *granting emergency approval*, while the Advocate and Journalist present critical opposition.
Preparation Phase	Allow 10-15 minutes. Students should brainstorm 3-5 points to defend their role's position based on the case study of Favipiravir in Section 1.
Target Language Focus	**Negotiating Risk:** Require students to use phrases such as: *weighting the outcomes, the risk-benefit ratio, mitigating long-term risks, premature authorization, granting emergency approval.* **Formal Register:** Ensure students maintain formal, argumentative language throughout.
Assessment Focus	Ability to defend a complex position using risk-negotiation vocabulary and structured argumentation.

Activity 2: Counterfactuals and Crisis (Speculative Debate)

Component	Instruction for Teacher
Grouping & Setup	Divide the class into two opposing teams (Team A: Pro-Speed/Team B: Pro-Caution). Present the following scenario: *It is 2020. The decision must be made: Do we bypass Phase III trials to fast-track a vaccine based on promising Phase I/II data?*
Preparation Phase	Allow 10 minutes. Team A prepares arguments focusing on the potential loss of life due to delay; Team B focuses on the catastrophic potential of long-term, unforeseen side effects.
Target Language Focus	**Speculative Language:** Require minimum five uses of: *It is highly probable that..., Given the circumstances..., It seems unlikely that..., Should the data prove conclusive..., We must anticipate...* **Advanced Conditionals:** Encourage the use of Inversion (e.g., *Had we waited another month, the outcome would have been far worse.*)
Assessment Focus	Grammatical accuracy and strategic use of advanced speculative and hypothetical structures to explore cause and effect in a crisis.