

LISTENING COMPREHENSION

Критерии оценивания: За каждый правильный ответ дается **1 балл**.

Максимальное количество баллов, которое можно получить за конкурс

Listening Comprehension - **20**

1	toe
2	balloon
3	gone
4	substance
5	soldiers
6	wounds
7	paved
8	proteins
9	resistance
10	conquering
11	T
12	T
13	T
14	F
15	F
16	T
17	T
18	F
19	T
20	F

READING COMPREHENSION

Критерии оценивания: За каждый правильный ответ дается **1 балл**.

Максимальное количество баллов, которое можно получить за конкурс Reading Comprehension - **15**

1.	C
2.	C
3.	B
4.	D
5.	B
6.	B
7.	D
8.	A
9.	C
10.	A
11.	E
12.	A
13	B
14	D
15	E

USE OF ENGLISH

Критерии оценивания: За каждый правильный ответ дается **1 балл**.

Максимальное количество баллов, которое можно получить за конкурс Use of English - **25**

Орфографические ошибки в заданиях учитываются, при наличии орфографической ошибки в листе ответов балл за правильный ответ не начисляется.

ANSWER SHEET

1.	e
2.	d
3.	g
4.	f
5.	c
6.	b
7.	h
8.	a
9.	find
10.	set
11.	cast
12.	change
13.	B
14.	D
15.	A
16.	C
17.	C
18.	B
19.	A
20.	D
21.	B
22.	C
23.	C
24.	B
25.	A

Transcript

Task 1

Penicillin: breaking the mould

Alice Hello and welcome to 6 Minute English. I'm Alice...

Neil And I'm Neil. [rattles a bottle of pills]

Alice What have you got there, Neil?

Neil Antibiotics. I had a blister on my big toe, and it got infected. My whole toe swelled up like a balloon! The swelling has gone down now with these little wonder drugs. Look, I'll show you.

Alice No, Neil. Please keep your socks on. Thank you. Now, the subject of today's show is penicillin, which was one of the first antibiotics to be discovered. So, Neil, can you tell me how many lives penicillin has saved since its first use as a medicine in 1942? Is it... a) 20 million? B) 200 million? Or c) 2 billion?

Neil Well, I'll say b) 200 million. That sounds like a good number.

Alice OK, well, we'll see if you're right or wrong later on in the show. Now, penicillin is a common antibiotic – or substance that kills microorganisms – that acts very effectively against certain bacteria. And it was discovered in 1928 by a Scottish scientist called Alexander Fleming who noticed some mould growing on a petri dish of bacteria in his lab, which had a halo – or circle – around it where no bacteria were growing.

Neil Mould, by the way, is the soft green fuzzy stuff that grows... for example, in the bottom of my coffee cups when I forget to wash them up, Alice.

Alice We didn't need to know that, Neil.

Neil OK, well, moving on, it took decades before scientists learned how to successfully manufacture penicillin. But they got there just in time to treat huge numbers of soldiers in World War Two where so many men were dying from infected wounds.

Alice And you could have died from your infected toe, Neil, before penicillin!

Neil That is a sobering thought, isn't it Alice? Let's listen now to Christopher Tang, Professor of Cellular Pathology at the University of Oxford, talking about how penicillin has been a game changer in the field of medicine.

Christopher Tang, Professor of Cellular Pathology and Professorial Fellow at Exeter College, University of Oxford The sort of cancer chemotherapy which we currently use, with immunosuppress people, we couldn't

possibly consider that without the use of antibiotics. So not only has penicillin opened the door for treating people with infection, it's also essentially paved the way for modern medicine, modern interventional medicine that we benefit from now.

Alice Chemotherapy is a chemical treatment used to kill cancer cells that also suppresses – or stops – the body's immune system from working. The immune system is our body's defence against infection and disease. So cancer patients have to take antibiotics to prevent infections that the body can't fight off by itself.

Neil So the discovery of penicillin paved the way for chemotherapy and other types of medical treatment – and to pave the way means to make something possible. But surely, Alice, there are some bacteria that penicillin doesn't kill?

Alice You're right. It only works against bacteria with proteins that are sensitive to penicillin. Other types are less sensitive, and also have systems built into the structure of the cell that sweep out harmful compounds, such as penicillin.

Neil And what about that superbug, what's it called... MS... MR...MSR...?

Alice MRSA, Neil. This bacterium was sensitive to penicillin but has developed a resistance to it, and to other antibiotics, meaning the drugs can't harm it any more.

Neil Are we returning to the past, then, Alice, where people like me might die from an infected toe?

Alice Well, it's possible, Neil. But drug-resistance isn't new. Here's Professor Steve Jones to tell us more.

Steve Jones, Emeritus Professor of Genetics, University College, London Penicillin is not new. It's been around for millions, probably hundreds of millions of years in the soil. And it's because the moulds protect themselves with it. And in fact you find resistance to penicillin in the most unlikely places. You find it for example in corpses from before Columbus in the New World.

Neil Professor Steve Jones. So penicillin was discovered in 1928 but it's actually been around for hundreds of millions of years.

Alice Yes. And scientists have been able to test bacteria present in very old corpses – or dead bodies – discovered in the New World – that's North and South America – and found that some of it was resistant to penicillin.

Neil But penicillin resistance is growing, isn't it?

Alice Yes. These days we overuse penicillin both in agriculture and human medicine, which has given bacteria the chance to adapt and fight back. So it's now up to scientists to adapt penicillin to extend its lifespan, and to search for new types of antibiotics.

Neil But prevention is better than cure, isn't it? We should all wash our hands more – it's a fantastic way of killing bacteria.

Alice Yes. Good point, Neil, but washing your hands didn't cure your toe, did it? Now, remember I asked you earlier: How many lives has penicillin saved since its first use as a medicine in 1942? Was it... a) 20 million, b) 200 million or c) 2 billion?

Neil And I said b) 200 million. Alice And you were right! Penicillin became the most effective life-saving drug in the world, conquering diseases such as tuberculosis, gangrene, pneumonia, diphtheria, and scarlet fever and made Alexander Fleming an international hero for discovering it.

Task 2

Should the English also have a right to decide on Scottish independence, asks Roger Scruton.

In all the complex changes leading to the Scottish bid for independence the English have never been consulted. The process has been conducted as though we had no right to an opinion in the matter. It was all about Scotland, and how to respond to Scottish nationalism.

As an Englishman I naturally ask why my interests in the matter have never been taken into account. When the Czechs and the Slovaks achieved their amicable divorce it was by mutual agreement between elected politicians. What is so different about Scotland, that it decides everything for itself?

The Union of England and Scotland was formally declared in the Act of Union of 1707. But it had been an emerging reality throughout the preceding century. In the conditions and conflicts of those days it was impossible for the two nations to regard themselves as fundamentally distinct. They shared an island, a religion, a language, and a monarch. And both had espoused the Protestant cause.

It's true there was a border between them. And things on one side of the border were not always replicated on the other. Scots law was, and remains, a separate system from the English. Styles of dress, architecture, popular entertainment and speech were for a long time quite distinct, in part because of the striking difference in climate. And, since the Reformation, organised religion has taken a very different form in the two countries, the lowland Scots opting for the Calvinist and Presbyterian version, and remaining largely hostile to the elaborate episcopal offices that appealed to the English. But the differences were less important than the history and geography that held the two nations together.

It is true that the union was resented by the highlanders, many of whom had retained their Catholic faith, their Gaelic language and their loyalty to the deposed Stuart kings. The cruel suppression of the Jacobite rebellions, the forbidding of the tartan, the persecution of Catholics and the expulsion of the crofters from their homes - all these things are well known, and don't cast credit either on the English or on the lowlanders who principally benefited from the union. Nevertheless during the years of empire building, merchants from both countries combined to reap the benefits of British naval power, and to explore the far corners of the earth in search of profit. And in their wake they brought the imperial government that they shared.

Moreover, empire building had to be backed up by military force. The Napoleonic wars sealed the union between the Scots and the English, who happily adopted Great Britain as the name of their united country.

Neither people could have survived the wars of the 20th Century had they not fought side by side and with total commitment to the union. As a result of those wars, however, the empire was lost and an entirely new political landscape emerged from beneath the smoke. It is no longer possible for us to see the union as it was seen throughout the course of the 19th Century - as something natural and unquestionable. The enterprise that joined us has vanished, so too (we hope) have the military threats. Each nation is, for the time being at least, wrapped in its own internal problems.

It can be said the Scots are still reeling from the effect of Margaret Thatcher's radical economic policies and her introduction of the poll tax.

They are bound to ask themselves whether they have had a fair share of the prosperity that is visible nearly everywhere in the south of England. And the English tend to blame the migrations that threaten to overwhelm them on a succession of Labour governments.

By allowing mass immigration into England, and refusing to confront the European Union's commitment to the free movement of peoples, the governments of Blair and Brown seriously undermined the English sense of identity. At the same time, through the creation of a Scottish parliament, they gave a new identity to the Scots.

The effect of the Scottish Parliament, however, was not only to ensure that the Scots would govern themselves, but also to make it more likely that they would continue to govern the English. The Labour Party did not want to lose those Scottish MPs, since it was thanks to them, and to the Scottish vote, that the Labour Party had achieved such a large majority in Westminster. Scots were disproportionately represented in the cabinets of both Blair and Brown. Tony Blair was born and partly educated in Scotland, and owed his position in the Labour hierarchy in part to the networks that had grown in that country.

Elections to the Scottish Parliament show that the Scots have shifted their allegiance from Labour to the SNP. But they still want the English to be governed by the Labour Party. Hence they vote to place Labour politicians, whom they don't particularly want at home, in Westminster.

As a result of this the English, who have voted Conservative more often than Labour in post-war elections, have to accept a block vote of Labour members of parliament sent to Westminster by the Scots. The process that brought this about was one in which the Scots themselves were given the final say, in a referendum from which the English were excluded. In other words the process of devolution can be seen as a piece of gerrymandering, the effect of which has been to secure a Labour bias in the Westminster Parliament, while allowing the Scots to govern themselves in whatever way they choose.

And the process continues. In response to Alex Salmond's bid for independence the people of Scotland have been granted another referendum. But again the people of England have been deprived of a say. Why is this? Are we part of the union or not? Or are the politicians afraid that we would vote the wrong way? And what is the wrong way? What way should we English vote, given that the present arrangement gives two votes to the Scots for every vote given to the English? Should we not vote for our independence, given that we risk being governed from a country that already regulates its own affairs, and has no clear commitment to ours?

The Scottish economy is subsidised by the English. But this does not mean that England would be better off without Scotland. You give subsidies to your dependants because you depend on them. Subsidies are also investments, which have returns in the long run that may more than justify the cost.

On the other hand, it could be that the Scottish economy has suffered from the union overall. Boswell attributes to Dr Johnson the remark that "the noblest prospect that a Scotchman ever sees, is the high road that leads him to England". Johnson's purpose was to ridicule the romantic adulation of the Scottish landscape, which was all the rage at the time, except perhaps among those who had to live there. But he touched, without intending it, on the principal cause of Scotland's economic problems, which is the loss of human capital.

Educated Scots have constantly taken Dr Johnson's high road to England, carrying with them their knowledge and their energy, and investing it outside the borders of their homeland. In just the way that the EU today is siphoning away the young middle class from Poland and the Czech Republic, so has our union served to deprive the Scots of some of the people their economy most needs.

The security that we have enjoyed in Europe since the collapse of the Soviet Union has brought with it a certain complacency in the matter of defence. During the Cold War the Scottish landmass was absolutely fundamental to our strategy. Our nuclear deterrent is housed in Scottish waters, and the Scottish airbases were constantly called upon to deter Soviet violations of our airspace. Scottish regiments are at the forefront of our campaigns today, and without them we would be much less capable of defending ourselves in a serious crisis.

In my opinion defence is the sole reason for thinking that the breakup of the union might be bad for both our countries. The union would have to be replaced by a strong and committed alliance. But I think this would happen, just as the colonial administration of America transformed itself, in time, into the Western alliance, which brings the British and the Americans together and fighting side by side in every major crisis.

Suppose then we English were finally allowed a say in the matter, which way would I vote? I have no doubt about it. I would vote for English independence, as a step towards strengthening the friendship between our countries. It was thanks to independence that the Americans were able at last to confess to their attachment to the old country, and to come to our aid in two world wars. Independence is what real friendship requires. And the same is true for those, like the Scots and the English, who live side by side.

WRITING - КРИТЕРИИ ОЦЕНИВАНИЯ

Максимальное количество баллов: 20

(Полученные баллы суммируются и удваиваются)

**Внимание! При оценке 0 по критерию "Содержание" выставляется
общая оценка 0.**

**Если письмо состоит из 221 или более слов, проверке
подлежат первые 200 слов.**

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ Е (максимум 3 балла)	ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ И ЯЗЫКОВОЕ ОФОРМЛЕНИЕ ТЕКСТА (максимум 7 баллов)			
3 балла Коммуникативная задача полностью выполнена – написано эссе по заданным параметрам. 1. Участник придерживается нейтрального стиля письма; 2. Участник выражает свою точку зрения на предложенную проблему; 3. Участник приводит 2-3 аргумента в	Организация (максимум 2 балла)	Лексика (максимум 2 балла)	Грамматика (максимум 2 балла)	Орфография и пунктуация (максимум 1 балл)

<p>защиту своей точки зрения; 4. Участник делает заключение.</p> <p>Объем работы либо соответствует заданному, либо отклоняется от заданного не более чем на 10% (в сторону увеличения – не больше 220 слов) или на 10 % в сторону уменьшения (не меньше 135 слов).</p>				
<p>2 балла Коммуникативная задача выполнена частично – составленный текст является эссе с заданными параметрами. Однако в работе не выполнен 1 из перечисленных выше аспектов. Или 2 аспекта раскрыты не полностью.</p>	<p>2 балла Текст правильно разделен на абзацы.</p>	<p>2 балла Логика построения текста не нарушена.</p>	<p>2 балла Участник демонстрирует лексический запас, необходимый для написания эссе.</p>	

<p>1 балл Коммуникативная задача выполнена частично – составленный текст является эссе с заданными параметрами. Однако в работе не выполнены 2 из перечисленных выше аспектов.</p>	<p>1 балл Имеются отдельные нарушения логики или абзацного членения текста.</p>	<p>1 балл Участник демонстрирует лексический запас, необходимый для написания эссе.</p>	<p>1 балл В работе имеются 3 - 4 незначительные лексические ошибки.</p>	<p>1 балл Участник демонстрирует грамотное и уместное употребление грамматических структур.</p>
<p>0 баллов Коммуникативная задача не выполнена. Содержание написанного текста не отвечает заданным параметрам. Или не выполнены 3 и более из перечисленных выше аспектов.</p> <p>Или: Объем менее 135 слов.</p>	<p>0 баллов Абзацное членение текста отсутствует.</p>	<p>0 баллов Участник демонстрирует крайне ограниченный словарный запас. Или: имеются многочисленные ошибки в употреблении лексики (5 и более).</p>	<p>0 баллов В тексте присутствуют многочисленные грамматические ошибки, затрудняющие его понимание (5 и более).</p>	<p>0 баллов В тексте присутствуют многочисленные орфографические и пунктуационные ошибки, затрудняющие его понимание (5 и более).</p>