



**TASK 1: WHY THE WORLD STILL LOVES 1970 DETECTIVE SHOW *COLUMBO***

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

**TASK 2: WHY GERMANY IS THE WEST'S SANEST COUNTRY**

<b>STATEMENT</b>	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
<b>PARAGRAPH</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>J</b>	<b>B</b>

**TASK 3: RESEARCHERS FIND APPLE PAY, VISA CONTACTLESS HACK**

<b>GAP</b>	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
<b>LETTER</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>A</b>

**TASK 1: DUDE**

<b>QUESTION</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>LETTER</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>B</b>

**TASK 2: HOW TO MAKE FASTER DECISIONS**

9	<b>ASTOUNDING</b>
10	<b>INTUITIVE</b>
11	<b>DECISION-MAKING</b>
12	<b>NON-EXISTENT</b>
13	<b>SHATTERING</b>
14	<b>CRITICAL THINKING</b>
15	<b>IMPLICATIONS</b>
16	<b>DOWNSIDE</b>
17	<b>BUILT-IN</b>

*Nota:*

- *No se penalizarán los errores de ortografía que no alteren esencialmente el significado de la palabra, frase o expresión requeridas.*
- *En los ítems con dos palabras, será necesario que ambas estén presentes para poder otorgar 1 punto al alumno. Ningún ítem podrá puntuarse con 0,5 puntos.*

**TASK 3: BBC REPORTS**

<b>QUESTION</b>	1 (18)	2 (19)	3 (20)	4 (21)	5 (22)	6 (23)	7 (24)	8 (25)
<b>LETTER</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>J</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>D</b>

## TRANSCRIPT

### TASK 1: DUDE

HELEN: Broadly, I'm not a huge fan of terms where people say, 'Well, they're gender neutral now, you can `dudes´ about all genders, you can say `guys´ about all genders because the terms that people say are gender neutral in that way always **originated as male specific terms. And it doesn't happen the other way round** where, you're like, oh, `gals´ is now gender neutral, `ladies´ is gender neutral. If you say that about male identified people, that tends to be insulting.

CALLIE: Let's talk about where `dude´ came from. Let's talk about the etymology, what do you know?

HELEN: I was very interested to find out about this because it kinda meant the opposite of the association it has now as this sort of macho guy term that's in inverted commas `gender neutral´, sorry to harp on about it. There's a couple of origins that are possible, and one is that there was this word `duds´, you know `duds´ like clothes, it's still a slang word kinda now. Um, that's from the 1300s, then it became `ragged and scruffy clothes´ a couple of hundred years later, and you had `dudman´ or `dudeman´ which was a scarecrow made of raggedy clothes in the 1670s, **so people are like `maybe it was because of that´, but I don't really see the leap from scarecrow to `dude´!**, whereas in the 1880s, you had these hipster guys, essentially the Yankie Doodle Dandies. And these were guys who, you know, from the song the Macaronis,... `Macaroni´ was also this word for young effeminate-leaning **men who were really dressed up**, and I think it was specifically a very east coast US city type of trend. So, you had these Yankie Doodles and then, they started using the shortening `dood´ spelt with a double `o´ at the time. And so they were foppish; they were considered effeminate. And then, the word headed west in that you had a lot of east coast people going to ranches in the west for this sort of wildwest experience, and they were called `Dood ranches´ because they were supposed to appeal to these `doods´ who were still these foppish people from east coast cities. **But then, you had the people on the Dood ranches who were more like cowboys or butch guys on horses and that's where that connotation of `dude´ came in, I think. It switched, it leapt from one kind of person to the other.**

CALLIE: That's so wild!

HELEN: Right? I was very surprised.

CALLIE: There's also another thread we can follow through the 1930s and 40s. **Mexican American Pachuchos [sic] and black Zoot Suiters took to using the word `dude´ to refer to each other as an in-group term.** These were groups of folks who had a style very much centred on their clothing, and it developed into more of **a general term of address among the men in those groups.** As tends to happen, it made its way from there into the broader culture through black music.

HELEN: White culture, of course, can't get enough of pinching vocabulary from black music and a big appearance for `dude´ was in the song *All the young dudes* written by David Bowie in 1972 for Mott the Hoople. Till about the 1950s `dude´ still had this connotation of `a person out of place´ or `a tourist trying to dress like a local and failing´, and in that sense, it was gender neutral, for a bit. Then, somehow, it became cool. Perhaps thanks to 1960s surf culture, perhaps thanks to movies. **Apparently, the first sort of big moment of it appearing on film was in 1969, in *Easy Rider*, where Peter Fonda's character explains to Jack Nicholson's character that `dude´ means `nice guy´, `dude´ means `regular sort of person´.** So, even though as recently as the 1950s it was still used to mean these kind of foppish tourists, by the late 60s it was like `oh, a regular kind of guys´ guy. And I guess that film would have been quite influential to a lot of filmmakers who came up in the 70s and 80s. In *Fast Times at Ridgemont High* you have this Jeff Spicoli character who's this surfer dude. At the time were you supposed to think that he's kind of a useless

dick for being like that or were you supposed to think he's rebelling against the capitalism of the 80s and he doesn't want to be part of that culture?

CALLIE: And this illustrates some of the tension in the word, right? **It's connection to surfer culture is very much about this sort of laid-back, easy-going attitude. It positions you in opposition to this hard-working careerism of the 80s, sort of a rebellion of chilling out.**

I was delighted to find out there's actually been some research done on the various usages of the word 'dude'. In 2004, Scott Kiesling, a linguistics professor at the University of Pittsburgh, published a paper just called 'Dude'. Kiesling assigned his students a task: **Over the course of three days record the first twenty instances of the word 'dude' that you hear. Record the entire utterance as best you can remember, and record the gender and ethnicity of the speaker, the addressee, the relationship between them and the situation in which the word was used.** They collected five hundred and nineteen examples and Kiesling assembled them into what he calls 'the dude corpus'. The data showed what I already generally thought was true: Most commonly, it's used with men talking to other men. Over three hundred of the recorded uses were men talking to other men. Far less often, less than a hundred times, were women using it to address other women, and its use across genders was slightly less common still.

HELEN: **There's a few things that that brings to mind, and one is that the word is used to denote in-group; and that is quite a common linguistic thing, where you use these words quite freely but only with certain people or certain circles that you move in to delineate those circles.** So, I can imagine that if you used it between the genders, binary, as described in this paper, but as you and I both know, not in reality, the understanding of it would change. And maybe if the men in the study used it for women freely, it might be perceived as an insult because they were implying those women were masculine, and maybe the women don't use it for the men because it would imply more equality than perhaps was there.

Adapted from © [www.theillusionist.org](http://www.theillusionist.org)

## **TASK 2: HOW TO MAKE FASTER DECISIONS**

You're probably familiar with FOMO. That's short for "Fear Of Missing Out." It's that feeling you get when it seems everyone else is doing something better than what you're doing now. But there's another FO you need to know about, and it's far more dangerous. It's called FOBO, and it's short for "Fear Of a Better Option."

We live in a world of overwhelming choice. Even decisions that used to be simple, like choosing a restaurant or making everyday purchases, are now fraught with overanalysis. Technology has only made the issue more pronounced. If you want to buy a pair of white shoelaces online, you have to sort through thousands of items and read through hundreds of reviews. That's an **astounding** amount of information to process to just buy two pieces of string that cost less than your morning latte.

Chances are you've experienced FOBO when you've struggled to choose just one from a group of perfectly acceptable outcomes. It's a symptom of a culture which sees value in collecting and preserving as many options as possible.

You might wonder why all of this is so bad. It seems counter-**intuitive**. Shouldn't it be a privilege to have so many good options to choose from? The problem is FOBO induces such severe analysis paralysis that it can negatively impact both your personal and your professional life. When you can't make decisions with conviction, you waste precious time and energy.

Luckily, there is a way to overcome FOBO. Here's a secret. With any decision you make, you first have to determine the stakes, as this will inform your **decision-making** strategy. When

it comes down to it, you only really face three types of decisions in life: high stakes, low stakes and no stakes.

Let's start with no-stakes decisions. These are the minor details of life, where there is almost never an incorrect answer, and in a few hours, you won't even remember making the decision in the first place. A good example of this is choosing what to watch on TV. With thousands of shows, it's easy to get overwhelmed, yet no matter what you pick, the consequences are basically **non-existent**. So spending more than a few moments on FOMO is a massive waste of energy. You just need to move on.

When it comes to no-stakes decisions, the key is to outsource them to the universe. For example, you can whittle down your choices to just two and then flip a coin. Or try my personal favourite—ask the watch. Assign each one of your choices to one half of your watch, then let the second hand tell you what you're going to do.... Looks like I'll be having the fish.

That brings us to low-stakes decisions. These have consequences, but none are earth-**shattering**, and there are plenty of acceptable outcomes. Many routine things at work, like purchasing a printer, booking a hotel or choosing between possible venues for an off-site are classically low-stakes in nature. Some thinking is required, but these aren't make-or-break deliberations, and you'll probably have forgotten about them in a few weeks. Here, you can also outsource decision-making, but you want some **critical thinking** involved, as there are some stakes. This time, you'll outsource to a person.

Set some basic criteria, select someone to present a recommendation, and then take their advice. Make sure to avoid the temptation to canvas. Your goal is to clear your plate, not to kick the can down the road.

Now that you tackled low-stakes and no-stakes decisions, you've created the space and time you'll need to handle high-stakes decisions. These are things like "which house should I buy" or "which job should I accept." Since the stakes are high and there are long-term **implications**, you absolutely want to get it right.

Before we get to work, let's establish a few basic principles to guide you through the process. First, think about what really matters to you, and set your criteria accordingly.

Second, gather the relevant facts. Make sure you collect data about all of the options, so you can be confident that you're truly making an informed decision.

And third, remember that FOMO, by nature, comes when you struggle to choose just one from a group of perfectly acceptable options. So no matter what you choose, you can rest assured that the **downside** is limited.

Now that you've established some ground rules, the process can begin. Start by identifying a front-runner based on your intuition, then compare each of your options head-to-head with the front-runner, one-by-one. Each time choose the better of the two based on the criteria and discard the other one. Here's the trick to avoiding FOMO. When you eliminate an option, it's gone forever. If you keep returning to discarded options, you risk getting stuck. Now repeat this process until you get down to one final choice.

If you follow this system, you will usually end up with a decision on your own. On the rare occasion that you get stuck, you will outsource the final decision to a small group of qualified people who you trust and who are equipped to provide you with guidance on this particular topic. Engage a group of five or less, ideally an odd number of people so that you have a **built-in** tiebreaker if you need it.

Now that you've made your choice, one last challenge remains. You have to commit. I can't promise you that you'll ever truly know if you've made the perfect decision, but I can tell you this: A significant percentage of people in the world will never have to worry about FOMO. Unlike the billions of people who have few options, if any, due to war, poverty or illness, you have plentiful opportunities to live decisively. You may not get everything you want, but the mere fact you get to decide is powerful.

In fact, it's a gift. Make the most of it.

Adapted from © [www.ted.com](http://www.ted.com)

### **TASK 3: BBC REPORTS**

#### **EXAMPLE: SIMULATED SPACESHIP TRIP [I]**

It has been one of the more extraordinary space experiments of recent years, six men living together in total isolation for 520 days. They've been staying in a mock spaceship in a warehouse in Moscow communicating with the outside world with a delay of up to 20 minutes just as they would on a real mission to Mars. The idea was to test whether the men's minds and bodies could endure such a long journey from the Earth. As they return to their lives the answer appears to have been yes though the devisors of the experiment concede that without the dangers of a real space mission and the weightlessness this was a less stressful experience.

#### **EXTRACT 1: HESITANT TO DONATE [C]**

The charge against the international community over the famine in Somalia and the humanitarian crisis in the surrounding countries is that there was too much aversion to taking risk. Many donors, according to the two aid agencies in this hard-hitting report, wanted proof that it was a full-blown emergency and so, a full-scale response was not launched until July, a six-month delay. Apart from the lives that were lost the report says some aspects of the aid operation were then unnecessarily expensive such as having to bring in water by lorry. Save The Children and Oxfam say donors should now act more swiftly here too if the lessons from the other side of this continent are to be heeded.

#### **EXTRACT 2: NO HOMELAND, HIGH RISKS [E]**

The United Nations has said 12 million people around the world are being denied their human rights because they don't have citizenship of any country. Those affected can find it difficult to get education, healthcare or to own property. Erika Feller from the UN's Refugee Agency said stateless children were especially vulnerable. Being stateless they are under increased threat of being trafficked for example because there's no record of them, you can take the children, you traffic them and they disappear. Without the protection of the law and protection that a state responsible for you gives you, you are fair game.

#### **EXTRACT 3: PRICES MODIFY ATTITUDES [H]**

Universities across the UK will be able to charge as much as £9,000 a year for a degree course, Scottish students won't pay fees if they study in Scotland, Northern Ireland students who stay at home will only see a modest rise, Welsh students will be subsidised wherever they study, but this survey suggests students who will incur higher fees are already beginning to change their behaviour. More than a thousand A-level students were questioned, only one in 10 said they'd been put off university but half said they would now consider choosing a local university to keep down living costs, a quarter said higher fees had made them reconsider what they want to study and two thirds said they would consider taking up an apprenticeship if it gave them the right qualifications.

#### **EXTRACT 4: SUCCESSFUL CRIME MAPPING [J]**

The website crashed when it launched and there have been concerns about the reliability of the information provided but over the past eight months the government believes the police.uk website has been a hit. It attempts to provide a single point where people with access to the Internet can discover the crimes that have been reported in their neighbourhood down to the specific street. From today it will also tell them how their police force compares with others on crime rates and victim satisfaction. It will also include a wider range of offences such as possession of weapons, theft, criminal damage and drugs. Critics say the mapping exercise can alarm and mislead people, but the government sees it as a powerful tool to hold local police to account.

#### **EXTRACT 5: ONLINE THREATS [F]**

Attempts to steal British ideas and designs from the technology, defense, engineering and energy sectors represent an attack on the UK's economic well-being according to Ian Lobben, the head of GCHQ. In an article for the Times, he reveals that as well as intellectual property

theft cyber-attacks have been used to try and acquire sensitive information from government computer systems including, he says, one significant but unsuccessful attempt on the Foreign Office and other government departments this summer. His warnings of the threats in cyberspace comes as the Foreign Office prepares to host a major conference to look at international cooperation which opens in London tomorrow.

**EXTRACT 6: DIGITAL RIGHTS ARE AN ISSUE [A]**

Addressing radio and music industry leaders and producers Pete Townshend pulled no punches in his criticism of the Internet and one of its leading commercial players. The Who guitarist accused Apple's online music store iTunes of creaming off profit without providing enough support for music acts. He called it a digital vampire and compared it with Northern Rock saying it existed in the wild west Internet land of Facebook and Twitter. The rock musician also argued against unauthorized file sharing saying the Internet was destroying copyright as we know it. In fact, iTunes accounts for more than 75% of legally paid-for downloads. An Apple spokesman declined to comment.

**EXTRACT 7: FAIR CHILD SHARING PROCESS [B]**

David Norgrove describes delays in care proceedings as shocking. He proposes a strict six-month limit on cases unless there are exceptional circumstances. To achieve these judges must trust social workers more and step back from the detailed scrutiny of the local authority's plans for the child. His proposal, endorsed by the government, has caused concern within some family courts. One London judge told me she did not know how the limit could be implemented. Most cases in the family courts involve couples separating or divorcing, for children in these cases David Norgrove advocates no change in the law though both the government and fathers' groups wanted one which would promote a meaningful relationship for children with both parents.

**EXTRACT 8: IMPOSED DONATIONS CONTROVERSY [D]**

Ten thousand people across the UK are waiting for an organ transplant, every day three die. The government in Cardiff wants everyone in Wales to be placed on an organ donor register. A consultation on the plan begins today, but church leaders are opposing the move. They say organs should be given as a gift and not seen as an asset of the state. The Welsh government says families will still be consulted when a death occurs and those who don't want to become organ donors will be able to opt out of the register. If the changes are approved, Wales could become the only part of the UK to move to a system of presumed consent.

Adapted from © www.bbc.com