



TASK 1

Below are some statistical findings from the Pew Research Center about immigration in the United States. 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.

IMMIGRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

A.

The U.S. foreign-born population reached a record 44.4 million in 2017. Since 1965, when U.S. immigration laws replaced a national quota system, the number of immigrants living in the U.S. has more than quadrupled. Immigrants today account for 13.6% of the U.S. population, nearly triple the share (4.7%) in 1970. However, today's immigrant share remains below the record 14.8% share in 1890, when 9.2 million immigrants lived in the U.S.

B.

Roughly half (45%) of the nation's 44.4 million immigrants live in just three states: California (24%), Texas (11%) and New York (10%). California had the largest immigrant population of any state in 2017, at 10.6 million. Texas and New York had more than 4.5 million immigrants each. In terms of regions, about two-thirds of immigrants lived in the West (34%) and South (33%). Roughly one-fifth lived in the Northeast (21%) and 11% were in the Midwest.

C.

Since the creation of the federal Refugee Resettlement Program in 1980, about 3 million refugees have been resettled in the U.S – more than any other country. In fiscal 2018, a total of 22,491 refugees were resettled in the U.S. The largest origin group of refugees was the Democratic Republic of the Congo, followed by Burma (Myanmar), Ukraine, Bhutan and Eritrea. Among all refugees admitted in that fiscal year, 3,495 are Muslims (16%) and 16,018 are Christians (71%). Texas, Washington, Ohio and California resettled more than a quarter of all refugees admitted in fiscal 2018.

D.

Most immigrants (77%) are in the country legally, while almost a quarter are unauthorized, according to new Pew Research Center estimates based on census data adjusted for undercount. In 2017, 45% were naturalized U.S. citizens. Some 27% of immigrants were permanent residents and 5% were temporary residents in 2017. Another 23% of all immigrants were unauthorized immigrants.

E.

More than 1 million immigrants arrive in the U.S. each year. In 2017, the top country of origin for new immigrants coming into the U.S. was India, with 126,000 people, followed by Mexico (124,000), China (121,000) and Cuba (41,000). By race and ethnicity, more Asian immigrants than Hispanic immigrants have arrived in the U.S. in most years since 2010.



F.

Looking forward, immigrants and their descendants are projected to account for 88% of U.S. population growth through 2065, assuming current immigration trends continue. In addition to new arrivals, U.S. births to immigrant parents will be important to future growth in the country's population. In 2017, the percentage of women giving birth in the past year was higher among immigrants (7.5%) than among the U.S. born (5.8%).

G.

Immigrants in the U.S. as a whole have lower levels of education than the U.S.-born population. In 2017, immigrants were three times as likely as the U.S. born to have not completed high school (27% vs. 9%). However, immigrants were just as likely as the U.S. born to have a bachelor's degree or more (31% and 32%, respectively).

H.

In 2017, about 29 million immigrants were working or looking for work in the U.S., making up some 17% of the total civilian labor force. Lawful immigrants made up the majority of the immigrant workforce, at 21.2 million. An additional 7.6 million immigrant workers are unauthorized immigrants, less than the total of the previous year and notably less than in 2007, when they were 8.2 million.

I.

Around 295,000 immigrants were deported from the U.S. in fiscal 2017, down since 2016. Overall, the Obama administration deported about 3 million immigrants between 2009 and 2016, a significantly higher number than the 2 million immigrants deported by the Bush administration between 2001 and 2008. In 2017, the Trump administration deported 295,000 immigrants, the lowest total since 2006.

J.

The number of apprehensions at the U.S.-Mexico border has sharply decreased over the past decade or so, from more than 1 million in fiscal 2006 to 396,579 in fiscal 2018. Today, there are more apprehensions of non-Mexicans than Mexicans at the border. In fiscal 2018, apprehensions of Central Americans at the border exceeded those of Mexicans for the third consecutive year. The first time Mexicans did not constitute a large majority of Border Patrol apprehensions was in 2014.

K.

While immigration has been at the forefront of a national political debate, the U.S. public holds a range of views about immigrants living in the country. Overall, a majority of Americans have positive views about immigrants. Six-in-ten Americans (62%) say immigrants strengthen the country "because of their hard work and talents," while about a quarter (28%) say immigrants burden the country by taking jobs, housing and health care.

Adapted from: <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/06/17/key-findings-about-u-s-immigrants>



TASK 2

You are going to read an article about British film director Ken Loach. Read the text and the statements carefully. Decide whether statements 1-8 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. The first four words of each sentence have been underlined. You must write these four underlined words on the answer sheet, as in example 0. There may be more than one correct answer for the justification.

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.

KEN LOACH: REBEL WITHOUT A CAUSE

When Ken Loach and his regular screenwriter Paul Laverty were researching *I, Daniel Blake*, their 2016 film about a punitive unemployment benefits system, they noticed something alarming. The people visiting food banks were by no means all without jobs. A substantial number were trapped in *zero-hours* contracts and relied on charity to feed themselves and their families. It soon became clear to Loach and Laverty that there was a film to be made about the working poor. Their new film *Sorry We Missed You*, also set in Newcastle upon Tyne, is an archetypal Loach/Laverty examination of the life of a working-class family stuck on the treadmill of relentless graft, with debts accruing.

It was, Loach tells me when I meet him in the unassuming Soho offices of his production company, conceived as a companion piece to *I, Daniel Blake*, both formally and thematically. “That’s one of the reasons we went back to Newcastle, apart from it’s a great place to work. The idea was to tell a story in the same way: as economically, as simply. It’s a kind of spare way of filming so that there’s nothing surplus. But the aim is that it should be very simple so that the complexity of the relationships and the nuances of the parent, child, sibling [interactions]—there’s space for that not to be over simplified.”

His approach works. These films are two of the finest of his career. *I, Daniel Blake* won the Palme d’Or in Cannes, the second time that Loach has won the top prize at the festival (the first was for the harrowing *The Wind that Shakes the Barley*, a 2006 work about a family tearing itself apart during the Irish war of independence). *Sorry We Missed You* also premiered in competition in Cannes to glowing reviews. In both recent films, the economy of approach magnifies the power of key moments: the food bank scene in *I, Daniel Blake*, where a desperately hungry single mother eats beans from a can using her fingers, is matched in impact by a devastating hospital scene in *Sorry We Missed You*, in which a mild-mannered wife launches into an expletive-heavy tirade on the phone to the manager who has worked her husband to breaking point. These are blunt, brutally effective moments designed to give the audience pause.

A deft blend of dry humour and (mostly) understated outrage, *Sorry We Missed You* portrays a struggling family. Ricky (Kris Hitchen) is a former builder who takes on a contract as a parcel delivery driver; his wife Abbie (Debbie Honeywood) sells her car to bankroll his new position, placing additional pressure on her own job as a care worker and home visitor. Their precarious existence is upended when the couple’s teenage son gets into trouble.



Loach is not a man who pulls his punches. Over a career spanning five decades, the 83-year-old director has produced films such as Kes, the seminal 1969 drama about a working-class boy and his pet kestrel; Ladybird, Ladybird, about a woman's battle with social services to keep her children; and My Name is Joe, starring Peter Mullan as a recovering alcoholic. He believes in blistering candour—both as a filmmaker and as a public figure. And, despite making modestly budgeted, left-wing, arthouse-friendly films rather than mass-market multiplex fare, a public figure he most certainly is. Depending on your perspective, he's either a vocal thorn in the side of an uncaring political establishment or a hectoring ideologue. This slight, bespectacled football fan is a scourge of the right-wing and, occasionally, the liberal press. Having previously cut his ties with the Labour Party during the Blair years, he was involved with Arthur Scargill's breakaway Socialist Labour Party and in 2004 went so far as to stand for the European Parliament for George Galloway's Respect Party. He is now a firm supporter of Jeremy Corbyn.

Loach prides himself on holding up a mirror to the problems of ordinary folk. But he does not merely produce worthy entertainment. He wants to encourage the audience to engage with issues, to motivate them to organise. Cinema can be a sop. But Loach believes it can also be a force for political change.

In person, Loach cuts a spry figure. Not frail exactly, but whittled down to essentials. He's a bracing conversationalist: springy, engaged, questioning, but with the occasional touch of the caution that comes with knowing that his quotes make headlines—not always in the context that they were intended.

Adapted from <https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/magazine>

ITEM NUMBER	STATEMENTS
Ex.0.	"I, Daniel Blake" explores the precariousness of the working poor.
1.	Loach's unsophisticated story-telling allows the reader to explore content in greater depth.
2.	The key moments in Ken Loach's most recent films are intended to spark reflection.
3.	"Sorry We Missed You" is a skillful display of contradictory emotions.
4.	Ken Loach has a frank and forthright approach to his views.
5.	He has criticized conservatives bitterly.
6.	Disappointed with Blair's office, Loach never resumed his engagement in politics thereafter.
7.	His films are considered politically minded but not precisely fit for enjoyment.
8.	Loach is aware of the fact that his opinions are scrutinized and often misunderstood.



TASK 3

Here is a newspaper article on difference in MBA (Master in Business Administration) education in Asia. 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.

HOW EXECUTIVES GET TAUGHT IN HONG KONG

ASIA'S RISING economic power is remaking the world. Chinese corporate champions like Alibaba and Tencent are challenging their Western counterparts. Are they bringing with them a specifically Asian management style?

First, temperament. Yuk-fai Fong is a professor of management, strategy and economics. During a stint at the Kellogg School of Management in Illinois, he recalls, his Asian students tended to be quiet. On arriving at Hong Kong University (HKU), he discovered that students there were not diffident at all but instead stereotypical, opinionated MBAs. Mr Fong concludes that, in America, Asian students were unfamiliar with corporate culture and even company names. They may have been more self-conscious about speaking in a second language in a second country. In Hong Kong they felt, naturally, more at home.

Where Mr Fong did find a difference was in the attitudes of MBA students towards leadership styles. He conducted a survey of MBA alumni and current and past students on HKU's executive MBA course (which, like other such courses, is part-time and aimed at people already involved in running companies). It asked respondents about their views of behaviours that are broadly desirable (for example, having integrity, being visionary or prizing performance), broadly undesirable (being dictatorial, asocial or non-explicit when communicating), or culturally contingent (the extent to which managers were, say, bureaucratic or status-conscious).

The survey found that Asian respondents were more tolerant than their Western counterparts at HKU of undesirable leadership characteristics such as authoritarianism and asociality (each group disliked such traits, but Western respondents disliked them more). It also revealed that those who worked for local companies were more enthusiastic about performance-oriented leaders than peers employed at Western firms.

There's a lot of focus in the West these days about equality in the workplace. Back in 2013, we started to see the "bossless office trend" appear in everything from New York magazine to the Harvard Business Review. The pin-up example is Semco, a conglomerate that's distributed decision-making since the 1980s and has witnessed 20% annual growth rates for over three decades now. It could sound great, but ideas like that simply don't fly in much of Asia.

Confucian philosophy is the polar opposite of the above ideology, whereby relationships must have a non-linear structure. A "bossless office" is considered a bizarre notion of the West and, in some cases, that's putting it politely. Some research suggests that many people in Asia go as far to say that a lack of acceptance for the inevitably hierarchical order of things is a root cause of many "Western problems" such as the degeneration of morals and the idea that the individual is more important than the collective.

In China, questioning authority can result in "losing face". It's a bad thing to have this happen to you in a business context and, if you're trying to source products globally, it's your savings that are on the line. Such a fact may reflect prevailing organisational structures in Asia, where family businesses, often led by a founding patriarch, are



more common. Steven Dekrey, the associate dean of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST), says that the classic case studies of large Western corporations developed by American business schools are less pertinent in the Asian context. So HKUST uses more cases based on family businesses, with their executive MBA programme allowing students to bring examples from their own experience, much of which also comes from family firms. And because the family orientation of Asian companies means that few businesses are used to being challenged by their boards, Mr Dekrey runs a programme for developing independent directors to plug the gap.

His school is also encouraging students to think of corporate “purpose”, beyond making money. Whereas firms in America or Europe increasingly profess to care about things other than the bottom line (with varying degrees of sincerity), that is a novel idea in Asia, where executives are mostly guided by the pure profit motive.

Of course, business schools can teach all this only to students who enroll. Corporate Asia has yet fully to appreciate the benefits of an MBA education. That is the last big difference from the West. But Mr Dekrey sees encouraging signs for the growth of business education in Asia. Among those students who are interested in an MBA, more appear willing to choose an Asian school such as the HKUST—nicknamed the “University of Stress and Tension” but in fact a rather attractive place to study, with views of Clearwater Bay conducive to reflection and learning.

Indeed, having set up its executive MBA programme with the help of Kellogg, the school has now itself begun to mentor colleges in other countries, such as the Skolkovo School of Management in Moscow. And this month HKUST will break ground on a new campus in the Chinese province of Guangdong. Many faculty members are expected to move to the mainland.

When the British empire was expanding, the saying was that “trade followed the flag”. Perhaps today business education follows economic power. One day Chinese management styles may come to be seen as exemplars for international companies—and Chinese business schools may rival the top American ones.

Adapted from <https://www.economist.com/business/2019/09/19/masters-of-business-in-asia> and <https://mawsonglobal.com/blog/2015/06/15/2015529understanding-asian-management-styles/>