

Intézményi Struktúraátalakítási Projekt – „FSA”

Test-based listening exercises for the MA Language Development for Teachers' courses

LEVEL: C 1

Készült a „Külföldi hallgatók számának növelését célzó szervezetfejlesztés és képzések fejlesztése, angol tananyag fejlesztés, oktatás módszertani képzési programok az idegen nyelvű képzésben résztvevő vagy a jövőben valószínűleg résztvevő oktatók számára” c. 023. moduljához kapcsolódó *Test-based listening exercises for the MA Language Development for Teachers courses* (feladatsor beszédértés elősegítésére) c. projektének keretében.

Financed from the financial support ELTE won from the Higher Education Restructuring Fund of the Hungarian Government.

Készítették:

**Dr. Dávid Gergely, Dr. Király Zsolt, Kövér Ármin,
Mák Éva, Matuz Bence**

2016

This page is intentionally left blank.

**Test-based listening exercises for
the MA Language Development for
Teachers' courses – level C1**

TEST # 1

TEACHER'S BOOKLET

TEST 1 – KEY

TASK 1: Nietzsche on Superman

1. more powerful
2. psychological qualities
3. massively enhanced
4. most admired
5. independently minded
6. accept suffering
7. practical applications
8. salvation-mankind

TASK 2: Neon Indian

9. C
10. B
11. A
12. C
13. A
14. A

TASK 3: Cleese

15. a complete disaster
16. (he promised to do TV-shows with them but) he never promised he'd marry them
17. participate in the third series, the BBC would not do the third series
18. pointing out/imitating her American accent
19. liars
20. was trivial/a complete write-off/didn't matter
21. married four times
22. it was almost charity, i.e. very low pay
23. very few of them (about 10%) can really help

TASK 4: The Psychiatrist

24. A
25. B
26. B
27. B
28. AB
29. AB
30. A

TEST 1 – TRANSCRIPT

TASK 1: Nietzsche on Superman

Reference: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bxiKqA-u8y4>

The concept of the superman is one of the strangest, most fascinating ideas in philosophy we find it coined by Friedrich Nietzsche in his book of 1883 *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. On first hearing it we can't help but think of the action hero Superman described by his creators as faster than a speeding bullet, more powerful than a locomotive and able to leap tall buildings in a single bound. These are actually very good starting points.

DC Comics were asking themselves what someone would be like who was physically far superior to all current human beings. Nietzsche is asking himself a very similar question only he's interested in psychological qualities. In *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* Nietzsche points out that evolution cannot be assumed to have finished: human beings have evolved from apes. But what is ape to man, he asks. In some respects, like imagination and science, we are obviously far superior to our ancestors. So how might people of the future be superior to who we are today? Nietzsche's character *Zarathustra*'s task is to speculate about what the superman, the more advanced person of tomorrow, will be like.

Nietzsche wasn't interested in massively enhanced brain power, an ability to do hugely complex sums in one's head or to learn a language in three days. Rather he was developing a crucial thought experiment. Suppose we were psychologically superior to people today what would we be actually like, what is the ideal kind of human being? And he came up with a very surprising and challenging answer. Nietzsche's strategy for answering his own question was to identify the person he most admired, the person he thought had the best approach to life, and then home in on the qualities that made this person the way they were.

He was particularly impressed by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe whom he regarded as the nearest anyone had yet come to being a superman. He also took some hints from Napoleon, Montaigne, Voltaire and Julius Caesar. He concluded that supermen are going to have some wonderful and sometimes unexpected characteristics: they'll be very independently minded, they'll be gentle towards the weak out of consciousness of their own great strength. Supermen will never be resentful of the success of others, they'll not be humble but rather delight in their own abilities. Supermen accept that they might need to hurt people in the name of great things they'll accept suffering as a necessary component of good things. They'll understand they're hard to understand and that therefore they may often be lonely. They'll be interested in the practical application of culture to raise the mentality of society.

Nietzsche thought we will be surprised and sometimes a bit shocked by his list. He thought we'd be expecting that the superhumans of tomorrow would be deeply compassionate, very egalitarian, uninterested in rivalry and perhaps have ambitions to make breakthroughs in science. But Nietzsche was arguing something else: that maybe being great involves some qualities that are a bit disturbing and also that greatness means being interested in the salvation of mankind through culture.

The word "superman" is useful for getting us to think about who we would like to evolve into. Each of us should, under Nietzsche's guidance, have a sense of what we would like to be if

we could be the super version of ourselves. The idea of the superman helps us to refine our own ambitions.

TASK 2: Neon Indian

Reference: <http://www.npr.org/2015/11/01/453157757/neon-indian-a-musician-with-the-mind-of-a-filmmaker>

Host: And now on this Sunday afternoon – every now and again, we like to tell you about an artist we think you might like to meet. Here’s somebody who’s generating a lot of buzz right now for a sound that’s somehow both art house and nightclub.

Alan Palomo: My name is Alan Palomo from the musical project *Neon Indian*.

Host: Palomo was born in 1988, well after the rise of David Bowie and Prince. But Palomo sounds as if the three have been hanging out backstage. Palomo’s synth-pop sound though is his own. Palomo was born in Mexico and came to the U.S. as a child. The family settled in San Antonio, Texas.

AP: I think we arrived when I was about 6 years old. And I have a very vague recollection of kind of driving through the desert, approaching the border and, you know, just kind of not really understanding that I was going to be there indefinitely - just being like, did I bring enough toys? And my parents were like yeah, you've got – it's fine.

Host: His first introduction to music came from his dad, who was also a singer in the late 1970s.

AP: He was teaching my brother guitar and singing since a pretty early age. I was always kind of more of a spectator just because I think from pretty early on, I was kind of more interested in, like, movies. And - but I feel like, you know, by proxy, I definitely absorbed some sensibilities from watching them work. And my dad did, in fact, teach me how to sing. You know, he would find some, like, hokey Frank Sinatra duet that he would make me do the second part of. And then that's, like, the kind of thing that I would be forced to do on Christmas or something.

AP: When I was studying film in college and, you know, simultaneously making music for the first time, because I didn't have any formalized training, I kind of just approached it through the skill set that I did have and that I had been sort of obsessing over since I was, like, 12 or something. But it just made sense to speak about music in terms of film scenes and movies. And to some extent, it's kind of become the ethos of what *Neon Indian* is, which is, like, to kind of create these isolated aesthetic statements and kind of treat them like their own films. I think it's interesting that it's kind of grown into the actual narrative of this record, where I was trying to make what to me felt like, you know, this screwball comedy about night-time New York. But what makes sense about that is, like, New York is a city that gets mythologized by all these different filmmakers, and I really just wanted to make my own kind of grotesque, cartoonish reimagining of what my previous years in New York have been like. And if I couldn't through film, then I would totally just do it in a record.

I really wanted to take my time with the record, if only because I see what the construct of the music industry is becoming. And it's kind of, like, you know, bands are, like, these horses to bet on, just kind of being, like, yep, that's a hot ticket right there this year. You know, like, they're going to do well. And they write a record, they tour it for, you know, almost two years. And then once the popularity kind of wanes and they put you back in the studio, you take six months, you write another record and you do it all over again. And at some point, I

was just kind of, like, I don't want to spend my 20s in a van. I still to this day have a hard time making music, you know? Sometimes I have these little moments of inspiration, but a lot of it is definitely perspiration. And it's just about putting the hours in. And whenever I'm looking at, you know, that record that's still ahead of me is, that surrender of being, like, oh, yeah, this is, like, going to be a while so you'd better, you know, pace yourself and make sure it's fun. And that's kind of what I did with this one.

TASK 3: Cleese

References:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k7HXdtS9BJY>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U5yWkf_iqLM

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hDwtYgcx1to>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jwx_XDEGqv4

Smith: Was “Fawlty Towers” an immediate hit?

Cleese: Not at the beginning, no. At least not among the press. There were quite negative interviews.

Smith: You framed one of those negative reviews.

Cleese: Oh, yeah, it wasn't a review, it was the guy at the BBC whose job was to assess comedy scripts to help the head of light entertainment. And he read the “Fawlty Towers” first script that Connie and I wrote and he said, “This is... I cannot see this as being anything other than a complete disaster.”

Smith: A complete disaster?

Cleese: He said cliché situations and stereotypical characters, it would be a disaster. And I love the fact that it was his job to assess comedy scripts. He wasn't a parsing plumber or an astronaut who happened to be sitting around in the lounge and asked whether you could read that and tell us what you think of it... This was his job.

Smith: What happened to him? Any idea?

Cleese: No. But I'd love to find out. His name was Muir, I think. I'd love to find out. I'll put it in the second book.

Smith: You left Python after three seasons.

Cleese: Yes, three seasons.

Smith: Why'd you quit?

Cleese: Because I was an awful purist in those days. I took it all too seriously. And whereas the other Pythons were just having a good time, thinking it was fun. I was genuinely bothered that by the third series we weren't really doing original material. We were doing permutations and combinations of sketches from the first two series. I don't think the other Pythons minded. They were having fun. And to me, with this sort of puritanical streak of me, professionally, in those days, I just thought, “We're not getting anywhere. We're not doing new stuff. So, we should stop.” And, of course, when I did that with “Fawlty Towers,” I was almost universally praised, because very seldom do people stop when the thing's successful. I got lots of points for stopping. But when I left Python, the other Pythons (or two of them, the two who I think were most insecure about life after Python) were really, really very angry with me that I went. And my attitude was, “Well, I said I'd do some TV shows with you. I didn't say I'd marry you.”

Smith: Was it hard to walk away?

Cleese: Yes because I felt very guilty. But a lot of pressure was put on me. I mean the BBC... When I didn't really want to do the third series, the BBC said to my agent, “If Cleese doesn't

do the third series, we're not doing the third series. It was a lot of pressure. So, I said, "Okay, I'll do it." But after three series I remember just thinking, "I just don't want to do this anymore." Now, of course, I'm grateful that we did do three series. But that was how I felt at the time.

Smith: You were headed toward a career in law.

Cleese: Yeah.

Smith: Do you think that you have a different take on...

Cleese: Lahw? Law! (laughs) Law. Law.

Smith: Law. I'm sorry. It sounds –

Cleese: Lah.

Smith: – much ... I'm from Ohio!

Cleese: Sorry. Where were we? Law!

Smith: You were going to be a lawyer.

Cleese: A lawyer.

Smith: And practice law.

Cleese: A liar.

Smith: Do you think you have a different take on show business, because it wasn't a childhood dream of yours?

Cleese: I always thought of show business as essentially trivial.

Smith: Trivial?

Cleese: It's a complete write-off. And then I did a talk show, it was Graham Norton, and Neil Diamond came on and sang. And the whole audience sang "Sweet Caroline." And I looked at this audience and I thought, "They're really happy. They were benevolent and warm and were having a good time." And I suddenly thought, "My God, show business is important."

Smith: Maybe you are pretty wonderful.

Cleese: (laughs) Well, I think I am. And my wife does, which is the only important thing that matters. She thinks I'm terrific. Isn't that nice?

Smith: That is nice.

Cleese: Took me a long time to find one who thought that! (laughs)

Smith: Fourth time around, right?

Cleese: Fourth time around and I love it. Hope for everyone. If I can do that at the age of 75 – Arian – you may be in terrible relationships now, but you keep going, keep going.

Smith: Now you're still paying off the third marriage?

Cleese: July, final payment.

Smith: That's it?

Cleese: Yes.

Smith: And you actually had to go on tour to pay off the alimony?

Cleese: Oh, yeah. \$20 million. I didn't say, "Oh hang on, I've got that in a drawer."

Smith: Well, people think you're a big-time movie star. Maybe you would have that in a drawer.

Cleese: They forget I spent my life working for charity. I mean, the BBC (laughs), which is a form of charity. Do you know what I got for the first series of "Fawlty Towers," writing and performing? I got £6,000.

Smith: The whole first series?

Cleese: The whole first series of Monty Python, £4,000. I mean, these are not huge sums. Six here, four there, ooh, four over there. That's 14! Well, that's some way towards \$20 million, but not a very long one. (laughs) It's all crazy. (laughs) It's so completely crazy. I mean, why would you ever – if you wanna get rich, what do you do? You go to California. You find someone who has a lot of money, and you marry them. And then fairly soon after that, you

leave them. But, of course, first you stop work, so that you could say “Well, I can’t support myself.”

Smith: This is what happened with your third wife.

Cleese: Oh yes, oh yes. So the question of them, actually providing money by working is so fusty. Why would they do that? You’re the breadwinner. It’s very unhealthy morally.

Smith: She was a therapist, right?

Cleese: She was a therapist.

Smith: You believe in therapy?

Cleese: I believe that if you’re lucky enough to get the right therapist it can have a wonderful effect. But I think that there’s a lot of nonsense talked about it. It’s wonderful if you can find a relationship with a professional therapist that later gives you the experience of trust. And I think that’s what really changes you. I mean, I think all the insights sometimes help. But I think an awful lot of people who do therapy don’t really want to change. And I think there’s an awful lot of therapists operating who really don’t know what they’re talking about. I wrote two books with a therapist, a famous psychiatrist in London called Robin Skynner. And I said to him once, “Robin, what percentage of therapists do you think are really able to help people?” And he said, “About 10%.”

Smith: 10%?

Cleese: Yeah.

TASK 4: The Psychiatrist

Reference: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yk-5Ft4GNm8>

Braintree: Come in. Hello, Roger.

Roger: Hello, Doctor Braintree.

B: Hello, come in.

R: I’m sorry I’m late.

B: That’s quite all right – how are you?

R: I’m very well, thank you.

B: Would you like to sit down, or would you prefer to lie?

R: Uhm, I’ll sit, thank you.

B: Right, well, sit right down. Now tell me, how are you in yourself?

R: Well...I’m...I’m really feeling rather in the pink.

B: Oh, this is terrific.

R: Yes. It’s funny really you know, if anybody had told me that talking to psychiatrists would have helped me at all, I would have laughed in their faces, you know.

B: Yes.

R: But I can honestly say that our little chats together have...have really been of tremendous benefit to me.

B: I’m so glad, Roger. Of course, a lot of people are instinctively very suspicious of psychiatry, and possibly, you know, with reason but it can help in times.

R: Well, I really think it can, because you know, I’ve got so much more self-confidence now. I’m much less self-conscious in the company of the opposite sex, which I wasn’t, as you know.

B: Yes, yes, yes, yes. You’re less inhibited, are you?

R: Oh, I should say.

B: Good, this is terrific.

R: And the wonderful thing is really about it all ... well, I'm... I'm in love.

B: Well, this is wonderful news, Roger – you're in love. – With a woman?

R: Yes.

B: So much the better – that's terrific.

R: You know, it's so wonderful to be in love – I can't tell you the...the absolute joy I have...

B: Well, love is a wonderful thing, I've been there myself, it's a wonderful thing.

R: I mean, she's...this girl, this...this creature, this goddess...

B: Yes ...

R: She's so, you know, it's so right. Everything is so wonderful, you know.

B: Yes, yes – you really click together.

R: Yes. Oh, it's so marvellous, but – the only trouble is that, apart from this wonderful light-hearted love that I have, I seem to be saddled with this tremendous burning sense of guilt.

B: You have guilt as well as love: well, this is...this is...this is unfortunate, Roger. You know, sex is the most natural, healthy thing in the world. There's no reason at all to have any guilt about it. I mean, why would you have guilt about sex? It's a lovely beautiful thing, Roger.

R: Well, it's...it's not really as simple as that, you know – it's...it's rather difficult to explain. Uhm, I don't really know where to start.

B: Well, begin at the beginning. That's always the best place. What's the girl's name?

R: Stephanie.

B: Stephanie. That's a lovely name, isn't it – well, it's my wife's name in fact, isn't it?

R: Yes, it's... it's Stephanie.

B: Yes, it's Stephanie.

R: No, it's Stephanie.

B: Yes, it's Stephanie, Roger.

R: Yes, it's Stephanie: it's your wife.

B: Oh, you're in love with my wife, Stephanie. Well, this is a perfectly understandable thing, Roger. She's a very attractive woman – I married her myself. I don't see why you should feel upset about that.

R: But she's in love with me.

B: Well, this again is perfectly understandable, Roger. I mean, you're a perfectly attractive human being, as I've told you over the last few weeks. There's nothing repulsive about you, is there? There's no reason why a highly sexed woman such as Stephanie shouldn't fall in love with you. And I must explain to you, Roger, that I'm a very busy man: I have many, many patients to see – I see rather less of my wife perhaps than I should, and I think it's very understandable that she should seek some sort of companionship outside the marriage – I don't think that's unreasonable at all.

R: But she's not...she's not seeking anything outside marriage Doctor Braintree – and nor am I. We want to get married.

B: Well, this again – I think – is perfectly...perfectly understandable. After all, you're two young people in love. You want to manifest your love feelings within the confines of a bourgeois society through marriage. I think this is very appropriate.

R: The awful thing is, you see – I should feel so grateful to you for what you've done for me. And all I can feel is this burning jealousy – I can't bear the thought of you touching her.

B: Well, of course, you can't, I can understand it. One is tremendously possessive about someone one loves, one is tremendously possessive ... it would be unhealthy not to have this jealousy reaction, Roger.

R: But don't you see – I-I hate you for it.

B: Of course you hate me, Roger.

R: I hate you for being so near her.

B: Yes, of course you hate me, Roger. You love to hate the one who loves the one you hate to love to love the one you hate. This is a very old rule, Roger – there's nothing to feel ashamed about. It's absolutely reasonable.

R: Don't you understand? – I want to kill you.

B: Of course, you want to kill me. Because by killing me, Roger, you eradicate the one you hate. This is a perfectly natural reaction, Roger.

R: You're so reasonable, aren't you?

B: Yes, I am.

R: You understand it all so much ...you are so logical.

B: Yes, I am – it's my job.

R: I'm going to have to kill you now!

B: Ah – Roger – this is a little inconvenient, because I have another patient at six-thirty and then there's somebody else at seven after that. I wonder if you could make it some time next week. Could you make it early in the week, say?

R: When...When do you think?

B: How are you fixed on Wednesday morning? Say at nine-thirty – would that be convenient?

R: Yes, that's perfect.

B: Right, well, if you could pop along at nine-thirty and kill me then.

R: Once again, Doctor Braintree, I'm amazed, you know, really. I'm so grateful to you for, you know, showing me the way.

B: That's what I'm here for, Roger.

R: Thank you so much.

B: Thank you. And with a bit of luck, this should be the last time you need to visit me.