

**TASK 1: HOW POP CULTURE WENT MULTIPOLAR**

<b>GAP</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>PARAGRAPH</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>B</b>

**TASK 2: IS MODERN LIFE RUINING OUR POWERS OF CONCENTRATION?**

<b>QUESTION</b>	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
<b>ANSWER</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>

**TASK 3: 'I MISS EATING': THE TRUTH BEHIND THE WEIGHT LOSS DRUG THAT MAKES FOOD REPULSIVE**

<b>ITEM</b>	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
<b>ANSWER</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>

### TASK 1: LINGUISTIC PEDANTRY

<b>EXTRACT</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>HEADING</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>

### TASK 2: WRITING ABOUT TOTAL WAR

10	<b>COERCE</b>
11	<b>BEQUEATHED</b>
12	<b>ENDURE</b>
13	<b>(THE) BATTLEFIELDS</b>
14	<b>SOCIETAL HATRED/ SOCIAL HATRED</b>
15	<b>EASTERN PERSPECTIVE / EAST EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE</b>
16	<b>SIEGE</b>
17	<b>GENOCIDES</b>
18	<b>RAVAGED</b>

*Nota:*

- *No se penalizarán los errores de ortografía que no alteren esencialmente el significado de la palabra, frase o expresión requeridas.*
- *En el ítem 13, la palabra que aparece en paréntesis es opcional y no altera la puntuación.*
- *En los ítems con dos o más palabras, será necesario que todas estén presentes para poder otorgar 1 punto al alumno. Ningún ítem podrá puntuarse con 0,5 puntos.*

### TASK 3: INFLATION

<b>EXTRACT</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>HEADING</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>D</b>
	[19]	[20]	[21]	[22]	[23]	[24]	[25]

## TRANSCRIPT

### TASK 1: LINGUISTIC PEDANTRY

WOMAN: You're listening to *Not the Queen's English*, the podcast about British English and life in the UK. My name is Holly.

MAN: And my name is Murray, and this week we're talking about "Linguistic Pedantry".

MAN: **[0] My name is Murray and I am a former linguistic pedant.** I used to be what people, and I think... I don't know if we can use this term, but people do use it.

WOMAN: People do

MAN: Grammar Nazi.

WOMAN: **[1] Yeah, People say this.**

MAN: Which seems, you know, especially now that there are, you know, fairly real Nazis on the go in various places.

WOMAN: On the go...uhm...

MAN: Haha... It seems like a fairly sort of flippant thing to say.

WOMAN: But **people yeah, about themselves**, they... don't they? Now, they're like, "oh, the Grammar Nazi is like...well..."

MAN: Well, this is the thing, and this is why, and I think you're probably the same. **[2] At points in both of our lives, namely adolescence, I think we've both been guilty of being pedantic grammar Nazis.** And, like, as there is a certain kind of person who sees it as a badge of honor to be a pedant about grammar and matters of language, and **I think both of us have been that person, at a much younger, more naive phase of our lives**, and we both kind of got past it now.

WOMAN: Aha.

MAN: But, yeah, I think it's I think that's left us with quite a keen appreciation both of the mistakes that people do make when speaking, uhm...but also the sort of the beauty and variety and language that that creates.

WOMAN: Well, that's the thing, because, like, yeah, people get... people do get really annoyed, especially about stuff like, I don't know, punctuation mark, like apostrophes being used incorrectly, stuff like that, or people not putting them in. I think something that people get very annoyed about, for example, is people saying something like, oh, "we was in the shop". **[3] And that, okay, yeah, is sort of grammatically incorrect, but that is just the way that people in certain dialects, like with certain dialects or accents speak.**

MAN: Yeah. And also, I will say, although we are both like reformed characters in this respect and we've learned to embrace the diversity of language, I think both of us still have things, certain things that, even though we know better, uhm... do annoy us when people say them.

WOMAN: **[4] What's worrying me here is you using the voice you use when you were about to say something nasty about me. Hahaha.**

MAN: Hahaha What? Oh my god!

WOMAN: So... Come on, spit it out!

MAN: No, I genuinely...Because I think...

WOMAN: "Even though some of us..."

MAN: No!

WOMAN: "Some of us more than others...", hahaha.

MAN: No, I recognize this in myself. So, okay, so to prepare for this episode, what I've done, right? **[5] I've written down ten things, just the first ten things that popped into my head that I think other people are a bit fascistic about.**

WOMAN: Haha, yeah.

MAN: When it comes to other people's use of language.

WOMAN: Okay.

MAN: So, these things: grammar rules, like, sort of vocabulary things, just, like, general things about the way people speak.

WOMAN: Yeah. Is...is people saying, like, "we was"... is that on your list?

MAN: Uhm...No.

WOMAN: Oh, my gosh!

MAN: Well, kind of. So, what I've got is something similar, which is people saying, like, "I done, I seen".

WOMAN: Alright, aha.

MAN: Uhm...which is actually, I'm starting to think it's a feature of Scottish dialects...

WOMAN: Yeah...

MAN: Or... or maybe, like, the other way round saying, like, "I've went"

WOMAN: Yeah

MAN: "I've saw". People in Scotland do that all the time. And, like, that's probably the sort of thing...

WOMAN: You say it sometimes.

MAN: I do know, this is the thing. **[6] Now that I've become less judgmental about these things, my grammar has become much more, I mean, quote and quote, "wrong" slash "authentic and charming".**

WOMAN: Aha, you embrace it, haha.

MAN: Yeah, I catch myself saying stuff like that all the time, and I find it difficult to get link up there about it.

WOMAN: No, it's not worth it.

MAN: One that really annoys my mom. **[7] My mom's a teacher, and something that annoys her, that the kids say is: "he gave me into trouble"; meaning "he got me into trouble".**

WOMAN: "He gave"... I've never heard that!

MAN: It must be a Scottish thing again. That really annoys her. She's like: "it's wrong". And I'm like: "well, why is 'got' better than 'gave' in that situation?"

WOMAN: Well, that's true.

MAN: Other than just it is more of what people say as adults. "He gave me into"... like, he "delivered" me into trouble.

WOMAN: "Into the path of trouble." Very literary!

MAN: Yeah, it makes a kind of sense.

WOMAN: What did you say there was something that you had in your French oral exams? No, your French listening exams, where it was like they marked people as incorrect...

MAN: Oh my god!

WOMAN:...because it was like, a Scottish way of saying something.

MAN: Well, this is actually an example where being snobby about languages I think is really harmful. So, in Scotland, "how" can mean "why".

WOMAN: Yeah

MAN: Colloquially, like, to say...everyone at my school did this. It's really, really common. It's just part of Scottish dialect. You say "how", and it means "why". I'm trying to think of an example. Like, the classic thing would be like, the teacher would be like: "Right, you're getting detention." And the wrongdoer would be like: "how?".

WOMAN: Hahaha

MAN: Like, "what have I done?". Like, so...one year, this sort of French standard grade exam. I think it was like a reading exam, so, the one that you do when you're, like, 14 or something, the question was, like, "how is this guy raising money?", and lots of people had answered, like: "he's raising money to go on a trip" because they'd interpreted the question is "why is he raising money?". And the reason I know about this is because my teacher, who had been involved in marking this exam, told us really proudly that she had fought really hard, like, at the exam board meeting to not give the mark to kids who'd interpreted that question as meaning "why?", even though they'd got it right, which showed that they had understood the French...

WOMAN: Yeah.

MAN: ...which is the point of the exam. It's not an English language exam. Like, so, that...I think that is so harmful, and it's essentially just penalizing kids for being, like, too working

class to have had anyone say to them, like- "oh, no, you shouldn't, like... in formal context that's not what that means".

WOMAN: That's really harsh.

MAN: It's just so harsh, yeah. I think that's the worst example that I've personally had of that sort of, like, linguistic nonsense.

Adapted from © Not The Queen's English

## TASK 2: WRITING ABOUT TOTAL WAR

DAVID: My guess today is Professor Alexander Watson, he's professor of History at Goldsmiths, University of London. Professor Watson's research focuses on conflict and identity in East Central Europe, and he works on the social, cultural and military aspects of total war and on the rise of national consciousness, minority integration and pre-Holocaust plans of **[0] ethnic cleansing**. He has written extensively on these topics, concentrating particularly on the era of the First World War. His first monograph, *Enduring the Great War: Combat Morale and Collapse in the German and British Armies 1914 to 1918*, is a comparative and interdisciplinary investigation of German and British military resilience on the Western Front. He examines how soldiers cope psychologically and how military institutions function to support and **[10] coerce** them; and it provides a new explanation for why the German army ultimately broke down in 1918. You followed that up with the book we will talk about today, the widely acclaimed *Ring of Steel: Germany and Austria-Hungary at War, 1914 to 1918*, which offers a history of the Great War from the central powers perspectives and explains how this total war **[11] bequeathed** a fateful legacy of impoverishment, political extremism and racial hatred to East Central Europe. Professor Watson, welcome to the show.

PROFESSOR WATSON: Thank you very much. Pleasure to be here.

DAVID: So, I'd like to begin our conversation today by asking you about the genesis of this book. I'm curious: what made you want to write this book? Because I mentioned in the introduction your first book was about the British and German armies and how they managed to get through the conflict, to **[12] endure**, um, this kind of conflict. So, in a way, it was a more specialized monograph. What made you want to write or to focus on the experience of the central powers in the war?

PROFESSOR WATSON: There were a few things that made me want to write this. The first was that, um, since this book came out, there'd been quite a big historical shift, a historiographical shift. People before have been, when they wrote books about war, they've written about the battlefields and about the high politics. But what makes 20th century war so distinctive is that it's not just about the **[13] battlefields**, and it's not just about high politics, either. These are people's war: *Volkes Kriega*. They're wars which involve the entirety of nations, the entirety of empires, whole populations. And so, actually, thinking about the First World War and these much broader terms, not only taking in the political and the military, but also taking in the socio-cultural and seeing ordinary people as actors in this seemed to me to be really important in terms of understanding the war and also understanding the consequences of the war, that **[14] societal hatred**, the political polarization that come out of this catastrophic conflict. So that was one thing. Second thing was I thought there was loads of opportunity to shift to the East as well. Everything on Germany is the general histories, and, Austria-Hungary, they've been very Germany-centric. And of course, Austria-Hungary is a key player in this war. It's an empire which has 11 different languages. I speak Polish as well as German, and I thought, you know, there's more to this than just simply the German point of view. So, I wanted to bring in the East as well, and of course Timothy Snyder's *Bloodlands* that had come out quite recently, to people thinking more about East Central Europe. And it seemed to me that you could roll that story back to 1914. If, yeah, if you could give a much more **[15] eastern perspective** on it rather than just simply looking at that central Germany.

DAVID: Let me give you an opportunity to tell us about your most recent book, which, as you mentioned, is called *The Fortress*, and well, I'll let you tell us. Tell us what it's about.

PROFESSOR WATSON: So, the first, thanks for that. So, *The Fortress* is about, um, still that First World War, about events [happened] in 1914-15, it centers around one fortress city, um, on the edge of the Habsburg empire, in what today is southern Poland, called Pryzemyśl. And the book is...the book does two things, one is [that] it's just a great story. It's... a great story of the longest **[16] siege** in the First World War, a siege between the...this Habsburg garrison and, um, and a much larger Russian army. And it's about how the war radicalized very quickly in this area. It tells, it tells the story of that siege and how that siege affected the First World War. That's the first part of that.

And I've got lots of really great personal testimonies and jokes from the garrison and diaries and all sorts of other things which really bring it alive. But the other reason why I wrote the book is to really cement this idea that if we want to understand what goes so horribly wrong in Europe in the 20th century, why especially east Central Europe, which is the epicenter of the disaster in the mid 20th century, with both Nazi and Soviet cleansings and **[17] genocides**, that it's not enough simply to start with Hitler and Stalin; then in fact, it's not even enough to start with the Russian Revolution; actually, the "year 0" for Europe's 20th century catastrophe is 1914. With the outbreak of this cataclysmic war and zooming down on one city right in the middle of this disaster, right in the epicenter, a multi-ethnic city, lots of Jews, their Poles, Ukrainians. I just wanted to bring out the human consequences of that and make this argument that to understand why this part of the world is so **[18] ravaged**, it's 1914 that we need to begin.

DAVID: Professor Watson, it's been a pleasure. Thank you so much for your time.

PROFESSOR WATSON: Thank you for having me.

Adaptado de ©David's Politic Show

### **TASK 3: INFLATION**

#### **EXTRACT 0: STOCKPILING TO PUT OFF A HARD DECISION [J]**

*Is... Does every business have to rise prices - raise prices? I don't think so. I think – I think there are also other ways to mitigate that, for example, if you are getting a specific price for a specific product, maybe you may just have to buy some additional storage space and store it, and have an inventory, so that you are able to mitigate the price rise, until a point that you can defer it, and then you are still able to have the – you know – meet the commitments that you've made, and then the fact that – uh you know – you have been having this track of how much components have costed you over time. This is actually tracked in your system, like I said, any system.*

#### **EXTRACT 1: A PROBLEM GOVERNMENTS CAN PATCH UP BUT NOT FULLY SOLVE [C]**

The government should try and mitigate the consequences of the higher inflation, and there, there are things that they can do: they can either look at benefits that are being paid to try and help people afford the higher prices, or where something is taxed, they might feel: "OK. We could temporarily lower the tax on oil. We could reduce sales taxes on other products to try and make it a little bit more affordable for people." So there are things that governments can do to mitigate the effects of higher prices in the short term, but, you know, governments can't change oil supply and demand themselves, at least, not in the short term.

#### **EXTRACT 2: SHRINKING INFLATION WILL TAKE A TOLL ON THE ECONOMY [I]**

We will get a mixture, because what policymakers have to do when they have to balance uncomfortable things is accept pain on both dimensions, and so we're likely to have inflation not get all the way back to the stated absolute goal of two percent, and, at the same time, in the effort to reduce it, we're likely to have some slowing of the economy and a recession, so I think that a best guess – not a certainty but a best guess – would be that there will be a *stagflationary* tendency in our economy for the next several years.

#### **EXTRACT 3: A FIRM POSITIVE OUTLOOK AFTER A TIME OF CONFUSION [B]**

But I think the transition from where we are in this high inflation environment, to that, is not gonna be linear, I mean, there's going to be... We may be in a recession in the near future, you know, I don't know yet, but I agree with Chair Powell, we're gonna do our best to avoid it, but we are gonna get inflation back down to two percent. The transition is the part that's most uncertain. Once we get there, I don't see any reason why we cannot have a robust economy with low unemployment, with real wage growth, with decent economic growth and low inflation, so I don't see any reason why we shouldn't be able to get there, but I agree that the transition period from here to there is gonna be challenging.

**EXTRACT 4: FINANCIAL STABILITY AND DEBT REDEMPTION ARE CRUCIAL NOW [E]**

Any form of saving right now is one of the best things that people can do: paying off credit card debt, as interest rates go up, it is possible, but the unemployment rate will tick up just a bit, as policymakers do everything within their power to slow down the economy. The hope is that there won't be widespread layoffs or anything close to the kind of unemployment that we saw at the beginning of the pandemic, but there certainly is a fear that in order to control inflation, that there might have to be tradeoffs in the other direction in order to slow the economy down, especially since officials can't really do that with the kind of precision that would avoid layoffs, but, as you mentioned, saving, making sure you're in a secure job, paying off credit card debt are some of the key things people can do now.

**EXTRACT 5: GOING BACK TO PRE-PANDEMIC LEVELS IS NOT ENOUGH [F]**

There's – you know – jobs are way down in certain sectors: service, you know, leisure and hospitality; they're up in others: warehouse and transportation, so while we do see people returning, we see them returning in different places, but you also point to a – you know – underlying challenges in the labor market. Even if we return to 2019 labor force participation rates, labor force participation rates are very low by historical standards, so only 85% of men between the ages of 25 and 54 were working before the pandemic. So even after these challenges resolve, we're still gonna need to deal with low labor force participation rates in order to generate a more dynamic productive economy.

**EXTRACT 6: A FINANCIAL INSTITUTION CARRYING THE LOAD [A]**

Well, there's been a consensus for about three decades or so, that the primary responsibility for controlling inflation is the responsibility of the central bank, uhm, and that the way in which you control inflation is by raising interest rates when inflation is too high, which reduces the amount of spending in the economy, reduces the amount of money chasing; a limited pool of goods and services, which is ultimately what causes people to put their prices up. At the moment, with inflation too high, the question is: how high are central bank going to raise interest rates in order to fight it?

**EXTRACT 7: FEEBLE GREEN SHOOTS BUT A LONG WAY AHEAD [D]**

I think it's the wallow of uncertainty. First of all, the geopolitical uncertainty makes monetary policy more difficult right now. As we've seen, the war in Ukraine in particular has had a pretty big impact – an unpredictable impact – on energy prices, and that going forward could suddenly change, uh, what we see, as our last guest just said, we've seen some positive changes on energy prices, but that could quickly reverse. Like there's a lot of uncertainty facing the US economy right now and I think that's what's made the FED's job particularly difficult and also the forecast for in on the future path of inflation. You know, again, I think we've seen some positive data recently, but I don't think we are out of the woods yet.

Adapted from © youtube.com