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Below you will find a description of typical English behaviour from the point of view of an anthropologist. Read texts B-K and headings 1-8 carefully. IN BLOCK CAPITALS, write the letter of the text next to the corresponding heading in the space provided, as in example 0. Notice that:

**There are two texts which do not go with any of the headings.**

Answers must be based exclusively on the information in the texts.

### WATCHING THE ENGLISH

**A.**
The plots, themes and storylines may well be very similar— the usual mix of adultery, violence, death, incest, step –siblings, unwanted pregnancies, paternity disputes and the like— but only in England does all this take place among just ordinary, plain-looking, working-class people, often middle-aged or old, doing menial or boring jobs, wearing cheap clothes and eating beans and chips.

**B.**
In work meetings, as soon as the initial introductions are completed, there is always an awkward period in which all or some of the parties think that it would be rude to start “talking business” straight away and everybody tries to pretend that this is really just a friendly social gathering. We fill in the blanks by talking about the weather, enquires about journeys, humorous traffic moans and the like.

**C.**
The front garden is more carefully arranged, designed and tended than the back garden. This is not because the English spend more time enjoying their front gardens. Quite the opposite: the English spend no time at all in their front gardens, in fact you would be considered odd if you ever stood there for very long without squatting to pull up a weed or stooping to trim the hedge.

**D.**
“No, you don’t understand” I explained, “As they have some problems to socialize, this is probably the only normal, healthy, functional, relationship these people have”. Odd though it might seem, however badly your host’s ghastly, leg-humping shoe-eating dog behaves, you must not speak ill of the beast. This would be a worse social solecism than criticizing their children.

**E.**
English “male” celebrity chefs who appear on television tend to go out of their way to use bloke-ish language and adopt a tough attitude, parade their passion for football; mention their wives; and dress as scruffily as possible. Jamie Oliver, the chef who has done so much to make cooking a more attractive career for English boys, is a prime example of this.
F. In the last SIRC surveys, 90% of respondents admitted to some form of “debauchery” at office Christmas parties. By debauchery, however, I don’t mean anything particularly depraved or wicked, just a higher degree of disinhibition than is regularly permitted among the English. Simple over indulgence is the most common "sin", followed by flirting; “snogging”, telling rude jokes and “making a fool of oneself”, which are also standard features of the party.

G. The idea that English street fashion is characterized by being bizarre and by its imaginative creativity has become a universally accepted fact among fashion writers, but it is really the opposite: English street fashion represents tribalism, a form of conformity, a uniform. Punks, Goths and the like may look outlandish but this is every one of them being outlandish in exactly the same way.

H. I will now stick my neck out and say that English drivers are quite rightly renowned for their orderly, sensible courteous conduct. You never have to wait too long before someone lets you out of a side road, and you are always thanked when you let someone else out; almost no one tailgates or lean on their horns when they want to overtake and above all, drivers stop for pedestrians.

I. It is common, and considered entirely normal, for English commuters to make their morning and evening train journeys with the same group of people for many years without ever exchanging a word. If you see the same person each morning on the platform, you may start to just nod to each other when you arrive, but that is as far as it gets.

J. People on mobiles often seem to go about in a little personal bubble, connected only to the person at the other end of the phone. They will happily discuss the details of their domestic or business affairs in tones loud enough for half of the train carriage to hear. Not that the passengers will actually do anything about it though, except tut and sigh or roll their eyes.

K. An English person’s social class can be gauged immediately from his or her attitude to expensive brand-new furniture: if you think it is “posh” you are no higher than middle-class at best; if you think it is “naff”, you are upper-middle or above. The implication is that only nouveaux have to buy their own furniture: genuinely upper class furniture is inherited.

Adapted from “Watching the English. The Hidden Rules of English Behaviour” by Kate Fox
You are going to read an article about the effects of learning a language on the human brain. Read the text and the statements carefully. Decide whether statements 1-10 are TRUE or FALSE and mark the correct option (X) on the answer sheet. You must also write the FIRST FOUR WORDS of the sentence which justifies your answer on the answer sheet, as in example 0.

Only answers in which both the TRUE/FALSE and the FIRST FOUR WORDS of the sentence which justifies your choice are correct will be considered valid.

Answers must be based exclusively on the information in the text.

---

**WHAT HAPPENS IN THE BRAIN WHEN YOU LEARN A LANGUAGE?**

Learning a foreign language can increase the size of your brain. This is what Swedish scientists discovered when they used brain scans to monitor what happens when someone learns a second language. The study is part of a growing body of research using brain imaging technologies to better understand the cognitive benefits of language learning. Tools like magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and electrophysiology, among others, can now tell us not only whether we need knee surgery or have irregularities with our heartbeat, but reveal what is happening in our brains when we hear, understand and produce second languages.

The Swedish MRI study showed that learning a foreign language has a visible effect on the brain. Young adult military recruits with a flair for languages learned Arabic, Russian or Dari intensively, while a control group of medical and cognitive science students also studied hard, but not at languages. MRI scans showed specific parts of the brains of the language students developed in size whereas the brain structures of the control group remained unchanged. Equally interesting was that learners whose brains grew in the hippocampus and areas of the cerebral cortex related to language learning had better language skills than other learners for whom the motor region of the cerebral cortex developed more.

In other words, the areas of the brain that grew were linked to how easy the learners found languages, and brain development varied according to performance. As the researchers noted, while it is not completely clear what changes after three months of intensive language study mean for the long term, brain growth sounds promising.

This sort of research might eventually lead to advances in the use of technology for second-language learning. For example, using ultrasound machines like the ones used to show expectant parents the features and movements of their babies in the womb, researchers in articulatory phonetics have been able to explain to language learners how to make sounds by showing them visual images of how their tongue, lips, and jaw should move with their airstream mechanisms and the rise and fall of the soft palate to make these sounds.

Ian Wilson, a researcher working in Japan, has produced some early reports of studies of these technologies that are encouraging. Of course, researchers aren’t suggesting that ultrasound equipment be included as part of regular language learning classrooms, but savvy software engineers are beginning to come up with ways to capitalise on this new knowledge by incorporating imaging into cutting edge language learning apps.

Kara Morgan-Short, a professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago, uses electrophysiology to examine the inner workings of the brain. She and her colleagues taught second-language learners to speak an artificial language – a miniature language constructed by linguists to test claims about language learnability in a controlled way.

In their experiment, one group of volunteers learned through explanations of the rules...
of the language, while a second group learned by being immersed in the language, similar to how we all learn our native languages. While all of their participants learned, it was the immersed learners whose brain processes were most like those of native speakers. Interestingly, up to six months later, when they could not have received any more exposure to the language at home because the language was artificial, these learners still performed well on tests, and their brain processes had become even more native-like.

In a follow-up study, Morgan-Short and her colleagues showed that the learners who demonstrated particular talents at picking up sequences and patterns learned grammar particularly well through immersion. Morgan-Short said: “This brain-based research tells us not only that some adults can learn through immersion, like children, but might enable us to match individual adult learners with the optimal learning contexts for them.”

Brain imaging research may eventually help us tailor language learning methods to our cognitive abilities, telling us whether we learn best from formal instruction that highlights rules, immersing ourselves in the sounds of a language, or perhaps one followed by the other.

However we learn, this recent brain-based research provides good news. We know that people who speak more than one language fluently have better memories and are more cognitively creative and mentally flexible than monolinguals. Canadian studies suggest that Alzheimer's disease and the onset of dementia are diagnosed later for bilinguals than for monolinguals, meaning that knowing a second language can help us to stay cognitively healthy well into our later years.

Adapted from: www.guardian.co.uk
Here is a review of David Remnick's book *Lenin's Tomb: The Last Days of the Soviet Empire*. Read the text carefully. For statements 1-9 choose the option (a, b or c) that best completes them. Mark (X) the correct option in the space provided, as in example 0. Only one option is correct.

Answers must be based exclusively on the information in the text.

### UNVEILING THE EVIL EMPIRE'S UGLY SECRETS

If ever there were a topic ripe for definitive treatment in a book, it is the profound and swift collapse of Soviet communism in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Journalists in the Soviet Union at the time scored impressive scoops. But events have moved too fast for book authors, since publishers need nearly a year to get a work into print. Most books issued so far have been outdated long before release. Until now. David Remnick's *Lenin's Tomb* is a brilliant effort - a delightful read, full of pathos and humor, woven of keen reporting and a deep understanding of Russian and Soviet culture. Remnick, a Moscow correspondent for The Washington Post from 1988 to 1991, sidesteps the problem of chronicling a country in constant flux by focusing instead on why the mighty Soviet monolith fluttered away like a stack of cards.

His answer: The empire could not survive once the evils of communist rule were known and absorbed. True, many Russian writers and activists, from Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn to Andrei Sakharov, had long struggled to expose the horrors of Stalinism and other atrocities. But not until a clever communist apparatchik, Mikhail Gorbachev, unleashed glasnost in 1987 could the full weight of that history be felt. The result was hardly what Gorbachev intended. Once out of the bottle, the truth genie brought the demise not only of Gorbachev but also of the communist state he wanted to modernize. Remnick writes: "Whether he relished the task or not, Gorbachev was acting as [...] the chief curator of the Party's criminal history."

Criminal indeed. Remnick, a skillful writer, uses chilling flourishes to convey the horrors of Stalin's terror. [...] The point is not just the horror but its sheer scale. As Remnick relates, tens, if not scores, of millions have died since the Bolshevik Revolution. Think of the gulags: From 1935, when Joseph Stalin's great purges began, to January, 1953, just before Stalin's death, nearly 20 million people were arrested, and at least 7 million were killed in prison. Add to that several million who perished earlier, during forced farm collectivization and intentional starvation, and the 22 million soldiers and civilians who died in World War II. These numbers are not news, but Remnick's interviews with historians and survivors give them meaning. Public response to such monumental evil, Remnick asserts, fueled the country's breakup even more than the failing economy.

A fascinating aspect of the book is its exploration of the conservatives' backlash against the trashing of the country and ideology they believe in. Remnick scorns right-wing chauvinists, including ultranationalist racists and the boozy, inept leaders of the abortive 1991 coup. To his credit, though, he doesn't exaggerate the threat from the far right. He's evenhanded in his treatment of such conservatives as Nina Andreyeva, the grandmotherly Leningrad chemistry teacher who in 1988 wrote a notorious defense of Stalinism. In a memorable scene, Andreyeva, in her cozy apartment, staunchly defends her views while slaving over lunch for Remnick. Right-wingers, he writes, tend to be excellent cooks.

Remnick's heroes are people, famous or obscure, who forced Russia to face its past. Chief among them are Aleksandr Yakovlev and Eduard Shevardnadze, top Gorbachev deputies who fearlessly pushed honest assessments of communism.
Russian President Boris Yeltsin is presented favorably by Remnick, who forgives his boorish shortcomings and praises his valor during the coup. The biggest hero, though, is the late Andrei Sakharov, the H-bomb scientist turned human-rights activist who epitomized the Russian people’s spirituality and bravery. After Gorbachev freed him from internal exile in 1986 as a political tactic, much of the population seized upon Sakharov as its guiding light. In fact, the book’s high point is the acrid interplay between the two at a Soviet Parliament session, when they clashed over limiting the Communist Party's power. Gorbachev, for all his glory, is shown up as a petty careerist unwilling to face the inevitable, while Sakharov, unyielding, "represented the hard and inescapable truth." Remnick's excellent work might have given more weight to the declining economy as a factor in the Soviet collapse. But in the end, his analysis hits a bull's eye: The Russian people’s respect for truth toppled what was arguably the bloodiest political regime of this century.