

Correction DS 4 – TB1 – 2025-2026

Average mark : 9.25

Commentaire général : Ce devoir a été moins bien réussi que les précédents car certains gèrent mal le temps, beaucoup ne maîtrisent pas encore bien la méthodologie et il y a eu beaucoup de hors sujets pour l'expression écrite. Mais ce sont des points que vous pouvez améliorer facilement. Quant à la l'anglais, il faut poursuivre vos efforts.

i- Compréhension Ecrite

Do the two texts suggest that Brexit was mainly harmful (=negative) or ultimately manageable (=controllable) for UK universities and European students? Compare how each article presents the consequences and justify your answer with evidence from both texts.

Voici des rappels méthodologiques:

a. Répondre à la question et uniquement à la question...

La question n'était pas « quels sont les impacts du Brexit ? ». Vous deviez apporter une réponse, ici en l'occurrence montrer si les textes s'engageaient sur une note plus optimiste ou pessimiste. En dehors de la réponse elle-même (*it was harmful at first, but with the new agreement it seems manageable*) seulement 2 étudiants ont répondu à la question !!! Il suffisait d'une phrase de conclusion pour y répondre mais cela montre que vous avez organisé votre réponse pour apporter cette réponse. Ce n'est pas une liste d'éléments que vous avez trouvés dans le texte !

b. ...en reformulant

Globalement vous maîtrisez mieux cette compétence mais j'ai pu encore trouver des citations ou des passages complètement recopiés. Vous serez pénalisés.

c. ...de manière organisée, logique et cohérente

La construction de votre réponse est nécessaire. Ici elle était simple : une première partie qui pouvait montrer les impacts négatifs du Brexit et une deuxième qui se focalisait sur la réintégration du Royaume-Uni dans le programme Erasmus. Vous devez faire des paragraphes avec des alinéas, sans retour à la ligne, qui témoignent d'une organisation de votre réponse. Les mots de liaison sont essentiels pour relier de manière logique (et non seulement juxtaposer) les éléments de réponse.

Par ailleurs, vous devez imaginer que votre jury n'a pas lu les articles. Votre réponse doit être cohérente, expliquer suffisamment tout en cherchant l'efficacité (la synthèse) pour que le lecteur comprenne bien tous les enjeux. Ainsi vous ne pouvez pas donner des noms de personnes sans expliquer un minimum qui ils sont. Par exemple Priti Patel, *shadow secretary of state*, déclare que le nouvel accord est une mauvaise utilisation de l'argent publique. Ce qu'il fallait indiquer donc, était que l'opposition critiquait les choix du gouvernement (il n'est pas nécessaire de donner le nom de celle qui émet la critique).

Langue

- ~~The~~ Brexit, **the** UK, **E**uropean students, the government.
- Les frais de scolarité :
- Une perte :

Suggested answer:

Both articles were published **shortly** after the announcement that the UK would rejoin the Erasmus programme. The articles from *Ouest-France* and *The Guardian* **assess** the impact of Brexit on UK and EU students, as well as on their universities, while also discussing the new agreement made with the EU.

Document 1 (*Ouest-France*) clearly **emphasises** the negative impact of Brexit. It focuses on the dramatic increase in tuition fees for European students, which rose from £9,250 per year to as much as £38,000. This sharp rise has made British universities far less accessible, especially for students from poorer EU countries. The text provides striking statistics: the proportion of European students among international students fell drastically from 2020 to 2023. However, British universities still **host** a large number of international students, who **account for** about a quarter of all students. Similarly, the number of British students studying in Europe also fell sharply.

However, with the announcement of the UK rejoining Erasmus+, new opportunities will open up not only for students but also for apprentices and teachers (1+2). The agreement is presented as a new **stage** in UK–EU relations and is portrayed as a fair and **balanced** solution for both students and the country. However, despite the **rebate** granted to the UK, opponents of the Labour government describe the deal as a waste of public money (2).

In conclusion, both texts **acknowledge** that Brexit caused serious damage. Nevertheless, they also suggest that renewed cooperation through Erasmus+ may help repair the situation, making the long-term impact more manageable. (250 words – slightly too long)

Shortly		A stage	
To assess		Balanced	
To emphasise		A rebate	
To host		To acknowledge	
To account for			

ii- Expression Ecrite

a) **Should school prepare students for future jobs? Support your answer with examples.**

- Le mot clef ici était « should ». La majorité d'entre vous n'avez pas répondu à cette question. Vous partiez du principe que c'était à l'école de préparer à des futurs métiers et vous questionniez si oui ou non l'école remplissait bien sa mission.
- Or, vous deviez avant tout répondre à la question. Ainsi votre problématique devait obligatoirement mettre en avant le rôle de l'école.

- Autre point important pour cet exercice : les exemples (et arguments) doivent porter sur le monde anglo-saxon en priorité.

LANGUE

Suggested answer :

School is a place where people learn together. Its role goes beyond education. Critics often argue that it only provides theoretical knowledge and leaves students **ill-equipped for the job market**. But is it the school's role to **train** future workers?

It's true that school is supposed to help **individuals** learn the **skills** that will be required in their future jobs. A common foundation in several **subjects** is necessary for any job – basic maths and language, for example. Yet with the rise of AI, many jobs **are expected to** disappear and others will be completely transformed. In this context, school is even less prepared to offer students the **tools** to adapt to the job market. It would be **detrimental** to believe that it is school's role to train students for a particular job. **Instead**, school should teach other skills- soft skills - that will always be needed: communication, collaboration, adaptability, empathy, etc.

Moreover, school should not only prepare students for future jobs, because its role is also to prepare young individuals to become citizens. School is the place to learn to live and work together, to develop **critical thinking**, and to confront one's beliefs with those of others.

To conclude, believing that school should prepare students for future jobs is an extremely limited view and would only lead to dissatisfaction. School should be seen as a first experience of living in society and developing skills that will be useful both for future jobs and for personal life. (246 words)

Ill-equipped		To be expected to	
The job market		A tool	
To train		detrimental	
An individual		Instead	
A skill		Critical thinking	
A subject			

b) George Orwell said “international football is the continuation of war by other means”. Do you agree? Support your answer with examples.

- La plupart des copies se sont contentées de montrer que le football est un sport violent (violence des spectateurs, des joueurs) et qu'il pouvait être utilisé pour faire passer des messages politiques. Ces éléments peuvent être utilisées dans votre développement mais ne suffisent pas à mettre en avant la spécificité du sujet. En effet il faut questionner les termes du sujet en amont pour bien comprendre ce qu'il faut démontrer (et non...il ne fallait pas seulement montrer que le football est violent).

- Des essais un peu plus réussis ont su montrer que le football peut aussi être envisagé comme un moment d'unité.

International = one nation against another

Football = a team plays for a nation and must win against another one

Continuation of war by other means = another form of war, another way to wage war

War = armed conflict between two countries

- George Orwell was an English novelist (1903 – 1950): **What do you know about him?**

Suggested answer:

Little has changed from the time George Orwell described football and compared it to **warfare**. Today still, football can be violent, players and supporters alike defend their nations. Is football an extension of international conflicts?

Comparing the football pitch to a **battlefield** is **an apt metaphor** because it is a violent combat: two nations oppose each other, there is a loser and a winner. Such games **spark** patriotism in the audience who support their teams sometimes even violently. Hooligans are a case in point. What's more, it's important to notice that the amount of money that a country can invest in football is quite largely reflected in the team's success. That's why European nations often win the World Cup. Just like for weapons, **the more a country can invest, the more dangerous it is**.

Secondly, believing that football and sports in general are apolitical and are a way to reinforce international **bonds** is **wishful thinking**. Quite the opposite, they generate more conflicts between nations, as the recent **feud** between Senegal and Morocco testifies. Football games become a political arena in which players represent their countries and must defend it – and **host** countries or federations often have a word to say about who is accepted or not.

To conclude, while George Orwell is right and while football hasn't changed much, modern warfare has changed so much that the nature of international conflicts is much different and cannot be described as a direct opposition between two nations. 245 words

Warfare		A bond	
Battlefield		Wishful thinking	
An apt metaphor		A feud	
To spark		A host (country)	

LANGUE

- What's the difference between "the school" and "Ø school"? the football and Ø football?
- VOULOIR QUE
- ~~In first, in a first time~~
- Teach and learn