

Subject 1

“Shops should open on Sundays unconditionally”

VOCABULARY: the consumer society	FACTS AND FIGURES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ad(vert)/advertisement : une publicité • Brick and mortar : en dur • Consumer goods : biens de consommation • Consumer society : société de consommation • Consumption : consommation • Convenient : commode • Customer: client • Extravagant = spendthrift: dépensier • Home delivery: livraison à domicile • Online shopping: commerce en ligne • Peak hours: heures de pointe • Shop-keeper = salesman : un vendeur • To be overdrawn: à découvert • To decrease = diminish = to plummet: diminuer • To entice = coax the consumer into buying : pousser le consommateur à acheter • To go bust: faire faillite • To go on a shopping spree: faire des folies • To keep a customer loyal : fidéliser un client • To meet customers' expectations: répondre aux attentes des clients • To rise = increase = rocket: augmenter • To save: économiser • To shop around : comparer les prix • To squander money: dilapider l'argent • To vie: rivaliser • Trading legislation : législation commerciale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typical opening times in the UK: • Mondays - Saturdays: 9am to 5:30pm • Some shopping centres stay open until 8pm or later. • Sunday: 10am to 4pm (or 11am to 5pm). Shops are only allowed to trade for 6 consecutive hours on Sundays between 10am and 6pm. • Large supermarkets: open for 24 hours except for Sundays. • The first liberalisation of Sunday trading hours in the mid 1990s in the UK coincided with the birth of online shopping websites like Amazon and ebay. • Three quarters (76%) of British adults support the Sunday Trading Act in its current form. • Two thirds of internet users in 2016 made online purchases (41% in 2014). The share of e-shoppers in internet users is growing, with the highest proportions being found in the 16-24 and 25-54 age groups (68 % and 69 % respectively). • Online sales are expected to reach \$427-443 billion in the US in 2017 (\$231 billion in 2012). • According to a 2015 survey looking at the different experiences of 30 European countries between 1999 and 2013, the change in Sunday trading legislation has resulted in a 7-9% net increase in employment and in consumer spending for many products, particularly food (up to 12.5%).



Up to you!

1. Faire, à l'oral ou à l'écrit, une synthèse structurée des arguments

PROS	CONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a religious day for all religions: everyone could work or shop everyday of the week. • More convenient for employees (work on Sundays = a day off in the week to do important things when offices are still open). • More practical for shoppers (fewer people, not stressed on Saturdays)/ increase in consumers' demand. • An idea of outing and activity in family. • Paid twice as much/reduce unemployment. • Boost the economy of the city whereas online shopping benefits multinationals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sunday: reserved to relaxation, charity work and family (spend time with children...). • Induce extra expenses and increase addiction to consumerism/shopping. • Unfair competition for small shops (can't compete with malls and hypermarkets). • Incur added costs of doubling wages (hard for small and medium-sized enterprises). • Rising prices due to higher wages for Sunday workers. • Extra pressure on workers: no choice (risk of being fired); discrimination.

Cf. proposition de corrigé p. 221

2. Questions

- Can Sunday shopping be economically viable?
- Should there be a national or a local law to legislate about Sunday trading?
- Can it be acceptable to oblige employees to work on Sundays?
- Do you think online shopping will kill brick-and-mortar shops?
- Given the economic crisis, is it legitimate to reject Sunday trading and working?

Suggestions de réponses aux questions

- It may be economically viable insofar as people spend more money, therefore stores can increase their profits. However, they have to pay their employees more, which may turn out to be less profitable if customers do not turn up.
- There should be a local law because not all regions benefit from the same conditions, such as weather, transport, economic development and attractiveness.
- Working on Sundays should definitely be a personal choice and not a decision imposed by the employer. Indeed, workers might be penalised if they refuse to work.
- I don't think traditional shops will disappear but those which can't vie with websites might go bust. Shopping malls are not really jeopardised, unlike smaller shops.
- Opening shops on Sundays may be an economic boost to a region and a company, provided the store is well located and is likely to attract customers. That is why I don't think it is legitimate to reject Sunday trading, unless you have very specific reasons.

Subject 2

"Reality TV"

VOCABULARY: television	FACTS AND FIGURES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour : comportement • Cast member : participant • Confidence : confiance • Designer clothes : vêtements de marque • Distressing : affligeant, bouleversant • Fist fight : bagarre à mains nues • Flawless = perfect • Inappropriate : inadapté • Lavish : fastueux • Nosey (adj) : fouineur • Private : privé • Producer : réalisateur • Ratings : audimat • Scandalous • Self-worth = self-esteem : estime de soi • Show : émission • Standards of beauty : critères de beauté • Stultifying : abrutissant • The cast : distribution • To act : jouer • To binge-watch : regarder en excès • To desensitise : désensibiliser • To entertain : divertir • To get drunk : s'enivrer • To show off : frimer • To unwind : se détendre • Underhandedness : manigance • Unhealthy : malsain • Viewer : spectateur • Vulgar = rude : grossier 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reality TV is television programming in which there are no writers, actors or scripts. Instead, the shows focus on "real" events or situations. Some reality programming comes in the form of competition shows, such as <i>Survivor</i>, <i>America's Got Talent</i> or <i>The Voice</i>. Others, such as <i>Teen Mom</i> focus on specific lifestyles or celebrities' personal and professional lives like <i>Keeping Up with the Kardashians</i>. • In 2001, reality TV accounted for 20% of prime-time television programming. In 2017, it represents 40%. • Depending on the network and content, budgets for reality shows can range from \$100,000 to more than \$500,000 per episode. • It is estimated that 2/3 of infants and toddlers are exposed to onscreen media (TV and Internet) for 2 hours a day, and kids under age 6 spend the same amount of time overall. Children 8 to 18 spend nearly 4 hours a day in front of TV, and another 2 hours on the computer and playing video games. • An average child will have witnessed at least 13,000 murders by the age of 16. • 10% of British teenagers say they would abandon their chances of a good education if they could become a star on reality television. They were motivated by money and success.



Up to you!

1. Faire, à l'oral ou à l'écrit, une synthèse structurée des arguments

PROS	CONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help to relax, unwind; no need to think. • Feel concerned; identification with the characters, situations or events. • Raise interest in new fields: cooking, classical music, ballroom dancing. • An escape from reality; forget one's own problems; cathartic function: their lives are not that bad in comparison. Feel superior. • Promote some positive messages: warning against teen pregnancy, important information about diet, health and fitness. • Engage people in humanitarian or environmental causes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate messages: illusion of perfection. Helplessness, failure. • Inappropriate behaviour: drink, smoke, party; physical or verbal violence. Promote infidelity. Set a bad example. • Low social, family and moral values: cult of personality, appearances and selfishness. Conflicts as a norm. • Illusion of easy success, based on good looks, spoilt or aggressive behaviour. False sense of confidence. Disillusions. • Encourage unhealthy relationships: become intimate with strangers without communication or mutual understanding. • Self-esteem, self-worth and abilities based on people's votes and opinions.

Cf. proposition de corrigé p. 221

2. Questions

- What is reality TV's influence on culture?
- How does TV change kids' moods?
- What can be done to make TV-watching a positive experience?
- What is the impact of TV reality on the actors?
- How much reality is there in "reality TV"?

Suggestions de réponses aux questions

- It degrades traditional values to make stars of ordinary people who have little talent. Yet, it is also a means to reflect and affect current cultural and societal changes.
- TV exposure affects children's emotional state in different ways: it can increase their anxiety, prompt violent behaviour, reduce their capacity to interact and concentrate, and slow down their moral development.
- Parents should watch alongside their children and select programmes carefully; they should engage discussions to help them express their feelings.
- Most of them are picked from obscurity and end up back there; a handful knows fleeting fame, but others desperately try to hold on to fame and celebrity.
- Very little reality is actually present in these shows because the cast is paid to act and behave according to a producer's guidelines, often overdoing reactions.

“For the death penalty”

VOCABULARY: justice	FACTS AND FIGURES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assailant/mugger : agresseur • Capital punishment : peine de mort • Charge/accusation : inculpation, accusation • Cold-blooded : de sang-froid • Convict = inmate = prisoner • Culprit (n) : coupable • Death row (US) : couloir de la mort • Defendant : accusé • Deterrent : moyen de dissuasion • Fair : juste ≠ unfair • Guilty : coupable (adj) • In self-defence : en légitime défense • Lawyer (GB) = attorney (US) : avocat • Miscarriage of justice : erreur judiciaire • Multiple offender : récidiviste • Plaintiff : plaignant • Premeditated murder • Presumption of innocence • Rape : viol/rapist : violeur • Release : libération • Revenge = retaliation : représailles • Sentence : condamnation • To be convicted of : être accusé de • To be sentenced to : être condamné à • To charge with : inculper de • To provide closure : permettre de faire son deuil • To sue = take sb to court : poursuivre • Trial : procès • Without parole : sans liberté conditionnelle ≠ on parole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2016, 56 countries retained the death penalty; 31 had not executed anyone in 10 years; 6 had kept it for special cases; 102 had abolished it totally. • 1,634 people were executed in 25 countries in 2015 (1,061 executions in 22 countries worldwide in 2014). Most executions took place in China, Iran, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and the USA. • In the USA, the number of yearly death sentences dropped from 279 in 1999 to 49 in 2015. More murders take place in states where capital punishment is allowed. • Over 75% of the murder victims in cases resulting in an execution were white, even though nationally only 50% of murder victims generally are white. • 55.8% of defendants who were executed were white, 34.4% were black and 8.3% were Hispanic (2016). • In the USA capital punishment costs a lot. For example, executing Timothy McVeigh for the Oklahoma City Bombing cost over \$13 million. • 3/4 of all offenders who are allocated a legal aid lawyer can expect execution, versus 1/4 if the defendant could afford to pay for a lawyer. • In the USA, 144 people sentenced to death have been found innocent since 1973 and released (=1.6 % of all deaths). But the innocence rate is 4.1%.



Up to you!

1. Faire, à l'oral ou à l'écrit, une synthèse structurée des arguments

PROS	CONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Useful to prevent re-offending/ reduce criminality. • Deter other criminals from committing crimes and thinking they can be unpunished. • Provide closure for victims: fair for the victim's family if the murderer is not lying in some prison with three meals a day, clean sheets, cable TV and family visits. • A proportionate punishment: an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth: take the life of someone who took a life. • Less strain on over-populated prisons. • Why should taxpayers bear costs of supporting a murderer for a lifetime? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cruel, unethical and inhumane suffering: incompatible with human rights. Majority of people (61%) for another punishment for murder (2010). • Unfair: depend on whether you can afford a good lawyer. • Useless: not bring the victim back to life; fail to deter others. • Double loss = double suffering: victim's and murderer's families. • Risk of killing innocents; the case of insane people: not conscious of killing, should not be executed unless guilty mind. • High cost of the death penalty.

Cf. proposition de corrigé p. 222

2. Questions

- Is the death penalty morally acceptable in a democracy?
- If it is dissuasive, why are there still so many murders in the United States?
- Should the death penalty be systematic in certain cases (child murder, rape...)?
- Can the death penalty damage the image of a country?
- Is it fair for taxpayers to pay the price of death penalty cases?

Suggestions de réponses aux questions

- It aims at sanctioning a criminal proportionately to a crime, which seems quite acceptable. On the other hand, I think that in a democracy there are other, less cruel and violent means to get justice done.
- The death penalty is not so widely enforced. Moreover, criminals don't always think about the consequences of their misdeeds or think they will not be caught.
- I think each case is unique and there needs to be a close examination of each situation so as to avoid disproportion or injustice.
- The image of a country may be tarnished by a country's practices, like cultural customs or the treatment of some people as second-class citizens.
- The death penalty is quite costly and it may be unfair for ordinary citizens to pay for a criminal. Yet, the death penalty also aims at ensuring the security of the country, so it may be logical to participate.

Subject 2

“Companies should give a part of their profits to charities”

VOCABULARY: poverty/charity	FACTS AND FIGURES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aid recipients : bénéficiaires • Corporate philanthropy : mécénat d'entreprise • Desperation = despair • Embezzlement : malversation • Expenses : dépenses • Food aid : aide alimentaire • Fundraising : collecte de fonds • Grant : subvention, allocation • NGO : non-governmental organisations • Penniless = badly-off = underprivileged • Purchasing power : pouvoir d'achat • Rehabilitation : réinsertion • Rent : loyer • Self-reliant = autonomous • Shelter = refuge : abri • Standard of living : niveau de vie • Staple food : aliments de base • Subsidies : subventions • The haves (les nantis) ≠ the have-nots • To afford : avoir les moyens • To fend for oneself = sustain oneself : se débrouiller tout seul • To give away : faire cadeau • To live below the poverty line : vivre sous le seuil de pauvreté • To make ends meet : joindre les deux bouts • To provide board and lodging : fournir le gîte et le couvert • To rely on : compter sur • To starve : mourir de faim/ starvation • To supply : fournir, approvisionner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25.3% of Americans over the age of 16 volunteered for an organisation between September 2010 and September 2014. • Charitable contributions by individuals, foundations, bequests, and corporations reached \$373.25 billion in 2015, a 4.1% increase since 2014. • Individuals gave \$264.58 billion, accounting for 71% of all giving. Foundations gave \$58.46 billion (15.6%). Corporations donated \$18.45 billion (5%). • Of these charitable contributions: • Religious organisations received the largest share (32% of total contributions). • Educational institutions received 15% of total estimated contributions. • Human service charities accounted for 12% of total contributions in 2014. • In 2013, public charities reported over \$1.74 trillion in total revenues and \$1.63 trillion in total expenses. • The 20 most generous companies donated \$3.5 billion in cash in 2015 (Walmart: \$301 million; Google: \$167.8 million; Microsoft: \$135.2 million). • Starbuck's, which markets its coffee as beneficial to the growers who produce it, in part justifies the fact that its prices are higher than a generic cup of coffee by its social responsibility.



Up to you!

1. Faire, à l'oral ou à l'écrit, une synthèse structurée des arguments

PROS	CONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help reduce inequalities between the haves and the have-nots: create a fairer, more equal society. Create more solidarity. • Limited loss for large companies: make millions/leave a small percentage. • Boost the economy: money given can be reinvested in purchases. • Reduce poverty: richer country more attractive for foreign companies to come and invest. • Give a chance to poor talented people to get by (companies = sponsors). • A good marketing strategy: show that you are a company that cares for the community. Positive image. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard for some companies: fluctuating revenues. Already lots of taxes to pay. • Get nothing in return. • Not know where the money goes: hard to control (risk of embezzlement). • Up to the government to provide for poor people and to charities to reduce costs and demonstrate their social value to individual donors and foundations. • A deterrent to foreign entrepreneurs/relocate or outsource to poor countries to increase profits (use underage workers). • Charities: only a temporary solution (dependence). Ideal: provide access to capital, knowledge and work.

Cf. proposition de corrigé p. 223

2. Questions

- Should the percentage be the same for all companies?
- Why could it lead to a vicious circle?
- What can companies get in return from helping charities?
- Shouldn't it be the government's role to help needy people?
- Is it the best way to help poor people?

Suggestions de réponses aux questions

- Given that companies' profits vary year in year out and according to their size, a fixed percentage might be difficult to sustain for smaller companies, therefore the larger and more affluent the company is, the more money it should give.
- Charities may become dependent on these contributions.
- They can't get any money. However, they may embellish their image, which would be a marketing asset and attract customers. Companies can 'do well by doing good'.
- The government must definitely help needy people; they can't let them down, but it all depends on the source of the grants: if it consists in taxing middle-class workers to help poor people, it might be unfair and create more needy people.
- Support should be temporary not to make people over-reliant on grants. We need to help them get education, experience and work so that they can fend for themselves.