

AUDIO SCRIPT

Listening

Task 1

For items **1-10**, listen to a lecture given by Assistant Professor in the Marketing unit at Harvard Business School. Decide which of the statements (**1-10**) are **True** according to the text you hear (**A**) and which are **False (B)**. You will hear the text **TWICE**. You have **20 seconds** to look through the items.

(pause 20 seconds)

Now we begin.

One of the most puzzling paradoxes in social science is that although people spend so much of their time trying to make more money, having more money doesn't seem to make them that much happier. My colleagues Liz Dunn and Lara Aknin - both at the University of British Columbia - and I wondered if the issue was not that money couldn't buy happiness, but that people simply weren't spending it in the right way to make themselves happier. Liz had the great idea of exploring whether, if we encouraged people to spend money in different ways, we could uncover the domains in which money might lead to happiness. We conducted a number of studies in which we showed that money can buy happiness, when people spend that money prosocially on others (for example, giving gifts to friends, donating to charities, etc.) rather than on themselves (say, buying flat-screen televisions).

So, what are the psychological factors involved when it comes to individuals and the feelings they encounter when they are giving away their money? Does it matter how wealthy they are? We found that it was the relative percentage of their money that people spend on others - rather than the absolute amount - that predicted their happiness. We did a study to look at the happiness of 16 employees of a Boston-based company before and after they received bonuses of between \$3,000 and \$8,000. This showed that the size of the bonus that people received had no impact on their long-term happiness.

It was the percentage of that bonus they spent on others that increased their well-being. In another study, we showed that spending as little as \$5 over the course of a day, on another person, led to demonstrable increases in happiness. In other words, people needn't be wealthy and donate hundreds of thousands of dollars to charity to experience the benefits of prosocial spending; small changes - a few dollars reallocated from oneself to another - can make a difference. Of course, many of us equate having money with happiness, and a large body of research does show that people become happier as they move from being very poor to lower middle class, but after this point the impact of income on happiness is much weaker. Think of someone who makes \$100,000 one year and \$110,000 the next - do we really expect this additional income suddenly to make this person fulfilled, without a care in the world? Being informed about a raise certainly makes us happy, but the \$10,000 doesn't make our siblings or in-laws any less difficult to deal with over the course of the following year. Although people believe that having money leads to happiness, our research suggests that this is only the case if at least some of that money is given to others. We had one final question. We wanted to know whether knowing about the effect of prosocial spending might erase it, if people engaged in prosocial spending in a calculated manner in order to get happy. We conducted a research project in conjunction with the *New York Times* in which readers who had been told about our findings were invited to complete a brief survey in which they reported their happiness, as well as how much money they'd spent on others and on themselves so far that day. Consistent with our previous research, we found that spending more on others was associated with greater happiness among this sample of approximately 1,000 *New York Times* readers, even though the respondents had been exposed to our previous findings.

You have 20 seconds to check your answers.

(pause 20 seconds)

Now listen to the text again.

(text repeated)

You have **20** seconds to check your answers.

(pause 20 seconds)

Task 2

For items **11-15** listen to a conversation and answer the questions. Choose the correct answer (**A**, **B** or **C**) to answer questions **11-15**. You will hear the text only **ONCE**.

You now have 25 seconds to study the questions.

(pause 25 seconds)

Now we begin.

M = Mark, B = Bridget

M: Hey, Bridget. How was your school reunion? Wasn't that last weekend?

B: Yeah, yeah ..., it was good. Well, it was OK - only that I didn't recognize quite a lot of the people and...

M: Well, it has been nearly 15 years.

B: Yeah, I know, and boy do some people change! You know, I'd find myself talking to someone who obviously knew who I was and I hadn't a clue who they were.

M: And I don't suppose you could have asked.

B: No, how rude would that have been? Oh, but I did recognize Judith. The dreaded, jolly Judith. She hasn't changed at all..., unfortunately! I tried to avoid her but she sought me out.

M: So?

B: So, I'm like, 'Hello Judith, how are you?' Big mistake because then of course I get it from her - every detail of the last 15 years - you know, her ups and downs, her two failed marriages – no surprise there! - her fabulous third husband, the operation on her sinuses, the time she was made redundant, etc., etc. Yeah, go on, quiz me about Judith! I could write her biography.

M: I bet you promised to keep in touch though.

B: Well, you have to, don't you?

M: You hypocrite!

B: Ah, but I managed to get away before giving my email address or mobile number.

M: Oh, well done!

This is the end of the listening comprehension part. You have 1 minute to complete your answer.

Integrated listening and reading

Read the text below, then listen to a talk on the same topic. You will notice that some ideas coincide and some differ in them. Answer questions **16-25** by choosing **A** if the idea is expressed in both materials, **B** if it can be found in the **reading** text only, **C** – if it can be found in the **audio recording** only, **D** – if **neither** of the materials expresses the idea.

Now you have 7 minutes to read the text below.

(pause 7 minutes)

Now **listen** to a talk made by a Columbia University professor and then do the tasks (16-25), comparing the text above and the talk. You will hear the talk **TWICE**.

We always hear that texting is a scourge. The idea is that texting spells the decline and fall of any kind of serious literacy, or at least writing ability, among young people in the United States and now the whole world today. The fact of the matter is that it just isn't true, and texting is a miraculous thing, it helps to create new meanings. In order to see texting in another way we have to look at what language really is, in which case, one thing that we see is that texting is not writing at all. What do I mean by that?

Texting is very loose in its structure. What texting is, despite the fact that it involves the brute mechanics of something that we call writing, is "fingered speech". And in order to understand it, what we want to see is the way, in this new kind of language, there is a new structure coming up.

For example, there is in texting a convention, which is LOL. Now LOL, we generally think of as meaning "laughing out loud." And of course, theoretically, it does, and if you look at older texts, people used it to actually indicate laughing out loud. But if you text now, you'll notice that LOL does not mean laughing out loud anymore. It's evolved into something that is much subtler. LOL is being used in a very particular way. It's a marker of empathy. It's a marker of accommodation. We linguists call things like that pragmatic particles. Any spoken language that's used by real people has them. If you happen to speak Japanese, think about that little word "ne" that you use at the end of a lot of sentences. If you listen to the way black youth today speak, think about the use of the word "yo." Whole dissertations could be written about it, and probably are being written about it. A pragmatic particle, that's what LOL has gradually become. It's a way of using the language between actual people.

And so, the way I'm thinking of texting these days is that what we're seeing is a whole new way of writing that young people are developing and creating, which they're using alongside their ordinary writing skills, and that means that they're able to do two things. Increasing evidence is that being bilingual is cognitively beneficial. That's also true of being bidialectal. That's certainly true of being bidialectal in terms of your writing. And so, texting actually is evidence of a balancing act that young people are extensively using today, not consciously, of course, but it's an expansion of their linguistic repertoire.

So, in closing, if I could go into the future, I would ask 'Please show me a sheaf of texts written by 16-year-old girls, because I would want to know where this language had developed since our times.'

You'll hear the talk again in 30 seconds.

(pause 30 seconds)

Now listen to the talk again.

(Text repeated)

Now you have five minutes to finish the task and transfer your answers to the answer sheet.

This is the end of the integrated task. Now you can start working on your reading task.