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L'épreuve de langue vivante B est obligatoire pour l'EEIGM Nancy (filières MP, PC et PSI)
Mercredi 2 mai : 17 h 30 - 18 h 30

N.B. : si un candidat croit repérer ce qui paraît être une erreur d'énoncé, il le signalera par écrit :
- en cochant la case 40 A (1re ligne) ;
- en expliquant au verso de la grille réponse les raisons des initiatives qu’il a été amené à prendre et
poursuivra normalement son épreuve.

L'usage d’un dictionnaire et de machines (calculatrice, traductrice, etc.)
est strictement interdit.

INSTRUCTIONS GÉNÉRALES

Définition et barème :
QCM en trois parties avec quatre propositions de réponse par item.

I. Compréhension : 12 questions (10 points sur 20)
II. Lexique : 12 questions (5 points sur 20)
III. Compétence grammaticale : 15 questions (5 points sur 20)

Réponse juste : +3
Pas de réponse : 0
Réponse fausse ou réponses multiples : -1

Instructions :
Lisez le texte et répondez ensuite aux questions.
Choisissez parmi les quatre propositions de réponse (A, B, C ou D) celle qui vous paraît la mieux
adaptée. Il n'y a qu'une seule réponse possible pour chaque item.
Reportez votre choix sur la feuille de réponse.

Index "alphabétique" :
Anglais : pages 2 à 5
Espagnol : pages 6 à 10
ANGLAIS

LONDON IN THE GLOBAL LIVEABILITY REPORT

There’s something perverse about placing cities in a “liveability” list and then doling out winners and losers. Nevertheless, the Economist Intelligence Unit’s 2016 Global Liveability Report makes for fascinating reading. Presumably the former residents of Damascus, currently sat in muddy slum conditions on the Macedonian borders, have already figured out that a life in the list’s winner Melbourne, Australia might be a lot lovelier than either staying put or “going home”. [...] However, whether residents of London, ranked at number 53 in the index, expected to find themselves 52 places behind Melbourne is highly debatable. To set up a life here in London and to be consumed by it, as I have done for 20 years, forces a person to become numb, or even cheerfully fond, of its inhospitality.

Yet here are Melbourne, Adelaide and Perth all wiping the floor with our capital city on factors related to safety, healthcare, educational resources, infrastructure and environmental matters. If I’m honest, the clues about Australia have been plastered all over Facebook for years, as multiple friends and ex-colleagues have sidled off on Qantas Airlines to “see how things work out”, never to return. Ben Swain from The Thick Of It may well have written off Australia as “full of people in khaki squinting” and “just the world’s largest collection of poisonous things”, but the reality is that Australia’s distinct liveability is borne out in those photos of our emigrated friends, steeped in Vitamin D, playing some sort of sport by floodlight and jovially wrestling enormous spiders out of their “second utility room”. [...] 

Interestingly, it’s not just London doing badly in the liveability list, but other European cities such as Zurich, Geneva, Frankfurt, Berlin, Oslo, Luxembourg, Brussels, Paris, Rome and Lisbon. All of the cities have seen declines in appeal, said to be “mostly stemming from heightened fears of terrorism in the wake of attacks in Paris and Brussels”. [...]

But perhaps the Economist Intelligence report is being rather defeatist by admitting this. I’ve heard many times that altering one’s life in any way due to terrorism is “letting the terrorists win”. And in that case, they’ve certainly gained some ground because number 2 in the 2016 global liveability list is the frankly surprising Vienna in Austria. Who dreams of moving to Vienna? Clearly everybody, in the fullness of time.

Less surprising to me about Economist Intelligence’s findings were Vancouver, Toronto and Calgary at places 3, 4 and 5. My relatives, over the past century, have fled to Vancouver in droves from Cumbria and never returned, falling in love with scenery, the simplicity of life and well, the unabashedly masculine men, if I’m honest. But a recent work trip to Toronto made me reassess everything I felt to be true about my salary-sapping London life of black snot, random stabbings and blaring police sirens. Life in Toronto was slower – not backwards, but certainly a less stressful affair fuelled by Tim Horton’s double-double coffees, boxes of Timbits donuts and news reports made up mostly of “threats of humidity”.

One Canadian colleague wanted quite genuinely to know why people in London and Manchester – which also does badly in the liveability list – are so fond of beating each other up. He felt, as a traveller, that he’d seen dozens of fights in bars, the street and on public transport: “And the thing is, in Toronto, we’d stop and stare! We’d film it! But in Britain, it’s just, well, normal.”

After several attempts to explain to Canadians our intricate modern British dissatisfaction with our healthcare, politics, educational resources, infrastructure, and the way we treat the
environment, I had to conclude, “We also just really love fighting.” On another telling occasion, I failed dismally to convince a bunch of Toronto-dwellers that Britain really does have a thriving republican movement composed of people who loathe the Queen and Prince Charles and would have them all turfed out and stripped of their assets. “But, but... why?” they cried, shaking their heads, refusing to believe that anyone could really be against such nice harmless things such as street parties, horse-drawn carriages and Kate Middleton shaking hands in a lovely frock.

Canada is far from a wonderland, but it does seem in 2016 to have a distinct dearth, in relative terms, of angry, embittered, dissatisfied headbangers – and I count myself among them – who could start a fight in an empty room. Let’s all move to Canada. They’ve had it too good for far too long.

Adapted from *The Independent*
September 19, 2016

I. COMPRÉHENSION
*Choisissez la réponse qui vous paraît la plus adéquate en fonction du sens du texte.*

1. From line 1 to line 9, it should be understood that Syrian refugees:
   (A) will never go to Australia.
   (B) dream of going to Australia.
   (C) prefer to stay on the Macedonian borders.
   (D) have already crossed the Macedonian borders.

2. From line 1 to line 9, it should be understood that the British capital city:
   (A) is a hospitable city.
   (B) is top ranked as for hospitality.
   (C) is better ranked than Melbourne.
   (D) is not a nice place to live in.

3. From line 10 to line 18, it should be understood that compared with several Australian cities, London:
   (A) is less secure.
   (B) is more environmentally-friendly.
   (C) has a better education system.
   (D) has a better healthcare system.

4. From line 10 to line 18, it should be understood that Facebook:
   (A) has harmed Australia’s image.
   (B) rarely shows any Australian picture.
   (C) has never shown any interest in Australia.
   (D) has helped convey an idyllic image of Australia.

5. From line 19 to line 22, it should be understood that:
   (A) Paris is more liveable than London.
   (B) Brussels is the least liveable city.
   (C) Many European cities are now less attractive.
   (D) Many European cities have increased their attractiveness.

6. From line 23 to line 27, it should be understood that:
   (A) The cities’ liveability is not linked to terrorism.
   (B) Vienna is the least attractive city.
   (C) Vienna is not safe at all.
   (D) Terrorism has played a big role in the cities’ liveability.

7. From line 28 to line 35, it should be understood that:
   (A) Vancouver is better ranked than Toronto.
   (B) Canada is a pleasant country.
   (C) Neither Vancouver nor Toronto is safe.
   (D) Life is not comfortable in Toronto.

8. From line 28 to line 35, it should be understood that:
   (A) Toronto is more peaceful than London.
   (B) London is less noisy than Toronto.
   (C) Both London and Toronto are stressful.
   (D) Toronto is as humid as London.
9. From line 36 to 39, it should be understood that in Manchester:
(A) people behave the same way as in Toronto.
(B) violence is quite common.
(C) people are more peaceful than in London.
(D) public transport is rather quiet.

10. From line 40 to line 47, it should be understood that:
(A) The British are critical about the Canadians.
(B) The Canadians despise the British people.
(C) The Canadians misunderstand the British.
(D) The British never complain.

11. From line 40 to line 47, it should be understood that among the British people:
(A) some are critical about the Monarchy.
(B) no one criticises the Monarchy.
(C) every one is attached to the Crown.
(D) no one would dream of another system of government.

12. From line 48 to line 51, it should be understood that Canada:
(A) remains an unstable destination.
(B) is finally not as pleasant as Britain.
(C) is the tourists’ current favourite destination.
(D) Canada is a nice destination for many reasons.

II. LEXIQUE
Choisissez la réponse qui vous paraît la plus appropriée en fonction du contexte.

13. « doling out » (line 1) means:
(A) calling
(B) comparing
(C) publishing
(D) rewarding

14. « numb » (line 8) means:
(A) desperate
(B) insensible
(C) surprised
(D) accustomed

15. « sidled off » (line 13) means:
(A) flew away
(B) took off
(C) moved furtively
(D) fell down

16. « steeped in » (lines 16-17) means:
(A) lost in
(B) absorbed by
(C) fixed into
(D) dipped in

17. « wrestling » (line 17) means:
(A) struggling with
(B) looking at
(C) looking for
(D) contemplating

18. « unabashedly » (line 31) means:
(A) unashamedly
(B) incompletely
(C) imperfectly
(D) inadequately

19. « dismally » (line 43) means:
(A) successfully
(B) joyfully
(C) lamentably
(D) instantaneously

20. « thriving » (line 43) means:
(A) aggressive
(B) powerful
(C) very small
(D) growing

21. « loathe » (line 44) means:
(A) love
(B) hate
(C) fight
(D) admire

22. « turfed out » (line 45) means:
(A) decorated
(B) ejected
(C) adored
(D) criticised

23. « dearth » (line 48) means:
(A) number
(B) account
(C) increase
(D) lack

24. « embittered » (line 49) means:
(A) involved
(B) informed
(C) resentful
(D) surprised
III. COMPÉTENCE GRAMMATICALE

Choisissez la réponse adéquate.

25. (A) They ought not to travel to those countries.
(B) They ought to not travel to those countries.
(C) They ought travel not to those countries.
(D) They don’t ought to travel to those countries.

26. (A) The people are unlikely agree.
(B) The people are unlikely to agree.
(C) The people unlikely will agree.
(D) The people agrees unlikely.

27. The situation has become ....
(A) the worse and the worse.
(B) worse and worse.
(C) more worse and worse.
(D) the more and more worse.

28. (A) The movement is said to be successful.
(B) The movement is told to be successful.
(C) The movement is said being successful.
(D) They movement is told being successful.

29. (A) He was told not to reveal the truth.
(B) He was told not reveal the truth.
(C) He was told not revealing the truth.
(D) He was told to not revealing the truth.

30. After .... the report, he phoned the president.
(A) completing
(B) he completes
(C) completed
(D) complete

31. She left the room without .... behind her.
(A) look
(B) looking
(C) to look
(D) looked

32. We are used .... this kind of event.
(A) to attending
(B) attending
(C) attend
(D) to attend

33. If he .... here, he .... help us.
(A) was / will
(B) were / would
(C) had been / would
(D) has been / would

34. .... they complain .... they will be satisfied.
(A) More / less
(B) The more / the less
(C) Most / least
(D) The most / the least

35. The citizens would rather .... again.
(A) to not vote
(B) not to vote
(C) not voting
(D) not vote

36. When .... the results?
(A) have they got
(B) have they been getting
(C) did they get
(D) were they getting

37. .... they won’t succeed.
(A) However hard they try,
(B) However they try hard,
(C) However try they hard,
(D) Hard however they try,

38. They .... a long time.
(A) are trying since
(B) are trying for
(C) have been trying for
(D) have tried since

39. Britons keep on .... their Queen.
(A) love
(B) to love
(C) loving
(D) in love

FIN