

## MML ADMISSIONS WRITTEN TEST specimen paper

Please read the following passage carefully and then answer the questions following it.

Your response to Section A **MUST** be in ONE of the languages that you are applying to study here. If you are studying at A-level (A2) or equivalent both of the languages you wish to study here, you are free to write in either language. Please write APPROXIMATELY 250 WORDS in your answer.

Your response to Section B **MUST** be in English. Please note that you will not be penalised if you don't know the correct terminology to describe the use of English in the passage.

Our attitudes to accidental phone rings are stuck in the 80s. Even though the mobile has long since ceased to be a cutting-edge gadget possessed only by the high-earning early-adopting few, when one goes off inappropriately, we still visualise a shameless yuppie in red braces, Aston Martin double-parked outside, closing deals—an offensive symbol of profligate and faddish modernity.

This is hopelessly out of step with what these machines now mean to us. Research just published by a team at the University of Missouri shows that, when a sample of 40 people were temporarily deprived of their iPhones, their heart rate and blood pressure rose, and their ability to perform tasks suffered. Our mobiles, the paper suggests, are now “an extension of our physical selves, an umbilical cord, anchoring the information society’s digital infrastructure to our very bodies”. We hate to be parted from them and we don’t much like turning them off.

Many will lament this, but it’s not altogether bad. Our phones reassure us because they make us feel connected – because if your mobile is turned on, in range and not ringing, it probably means that no work crisis has developed and no disaster has befallen a close friend or loved one. It’s a constant everyone-in-your-life-is-more-or-less-OK monitor. Maybe we should learn to live without such reassurance, but it doesn’t reflect entirely badly on us that we’re comforted by it.

People often criticise one another for talking or texting on their phones in preference to live interaction. Such critics forget that, in the heyday of the landline, a ringing telephone—the phone in the hall—was always answered. The notion of call screening is entirely modern. It never used to be rude to answer – it was rude not to.

The onus of politeness, in those days, was on the caller. Except in an emergency, you didn’t telephone someone at a mealtime, during their favourite television programme or after 10 o’clock. When you thought someone might not want to be disturbed, you didn’t disturb them unless you had to. It’s the passing of that etiquette, rather than the prevalence of mobile phones, that I think is a shame.

## **SECTION A**

What are the main points of the author's argument? Do you agree or disagree? Explain your answer.

***Remember to answer this section in APPROXIMATELY 250 WORDS in a foreign language you intend to study at Cambridge.***

***You should spend approximately 40 minutes on this exercise.***

**[32 marks]**

## **SECTION B**

How does the writer persuade us of his point of view? Please give examples from the text to support your answer.

***Remember to answer this section in English.***

***You should spend approximately 20 minutes on this exercise.***

**[16 marks]**