

**STELLA MARIS COLLEGE (AUTONOMOUS) CHENNAI 600 086**  
**(For candidates admitted from the academic year 2007–08)**

**SUBJECT CODE: EN/FC/SW23**

**B. A. /B.Sc./B.Com./B.S.W. DEGREE EXAMINATION, APRIL 2008**  
**SECOND SEMESTER**

**COURSE : FOUNDATION ENGLISH: GROUP A**  
**PAPER : LISTENING SKILLS AND ADVANCED WRITING SKILLS**  
**TIME : 2 HOURS** **MAX. MARKS : 50**

**I. Edit the passage given below. You may have to correct punctuation, spelling, vocabulary and usage. You may also have to rewrite or combine sentences for brevity and to avoid repetition. (15 marks)**

**Additives: How they Effect us**

Food have been treated with additives from very early times, many people believe that returning to nature and the ‘good old days’ is returning to food without additives. Yet, as David Briggs and Mark Walqvist in their book Eating Matters points out, “In terms of what was added to food, the good old days were not so good”. The Ancient Egyptians used vegetable and fruit extracts and peelings to colour their food. The ancient Romans used chalk to colour his bread! Salts, honey, vinegar, herbs or spices were some of the first food additives used for preservation.

Food additives are even more common today. Food additives are used to enhance the appearance or flavour of food items. Today, we are constantly being told that one kind of food or the other is harm-ful to our health. Though, many of these cautions seems to be exaggerated we do need to be careful about the quality and safety of the food we eat. When we go to supermarkets, the shelves are full of food contains artificial colours, additions, preservatives and emulsifiers. Do we know enough about these to weightage the benefits from the use of a particular additive against its hazards?

We all have some idea of what food additives are. We have also become cautious when selecting food items. We take time to look at the packaging to see what they contains. Manufacturers are also legally bound to list, clearly and accurately, the additive that have been used on the package.

Chemicals are often regarded as poisonous. We associate them with fly-sprays, pesticides, industrial processes, drugs. We do not associate them with the idea of food. Because this is incompatible with the idea of food as pure, natural and wholesome. However, all food is made up of chemicals which are, the building block of all living

things and non living things. So what do we do when we look at a package of foodstuff and read that it contains Methyl Acetate of Furural? Very often, even common food items are made to sound unfamiliar, even, threatening, when their chemical names are used. Salt, for example, can be disguised as sodium chloride, baking powder as sodium bicarbonate and so on. These names tend to make us feel *uncomfortable* only because we are unfamiliar with the terminology.

**II. Reorganise this essay. You may have to shift sentences (within a paragraph) and rearrange paragraphs appropriately to make it coherent and logical. (15 marks)**

Those who propose barring the children of illegal immigrants from our schools have understandable worries. And finally, they worry that even more illegal immigrants will cross our borders because of the lure of free education. They worry that their state taxes will rise as children of illegal immigrants crowd their school systems. They worry about the crowding itself, given the loss of quality education that comes with large class sizes. They worry that school resources will be deflected from their children because of the linguistic and social problems that many of the newcomers face.

Immigration laws have been a subject of debate throughout American history, especially in states such as California and Texas, where immigrant populations are high. While this issue is steeped in emotional controversy, we must not allow divisive “us against them” rhetoric to cloud our thinking. Recently, some citizens have been questioning whether we should continue to educate the children of illegal immigrants. Yes, educating children of illegal immigrants costs us, but not educating them would cost us much more.

So far, attempts to bar children of illegal immigrants from public schools have failed. In the 1982 case of *Plyler v. Doe*, the Supreme Court ruled on the issue. In a 5–4 decision, it overturned a Texas law that *allowed schools* to deny education to illegal immigrants. Martha McCarthy reports that Texas had justified its law as a means of “preserving financial resources, protecting the state from an influx of illegal immigrants, and maintaining high quality education for resident children”. The Court considered these issues but concluded that in the long run the costs of educating immigrant children would pale in comparison to the costs—both to the children and to society—of not educating them.

This last worry is probably unfounded. It is unlikely that many parents are crossing the borders solely to educate their children. As Charles Wheeler of the National Immigration Law Center asserts, “There is no evidence that access to federal programs acts as a magnet to foreigners or that further restrictions would discourage illegal immigrants”. More likely, they are in desperate need of work, economic opportunity, and possibly political asylum.

The other concerns are more legitimate, but they can be addressed by less drastic measures than barring children from schools. One way to help these and other states is to have the federal government pick up the cost of educating children of illegal immigrants, with enough funds to alleviate the overcrowded classrooms that cause parents such concern. Currently the responsibility of educating about 75% of children of illegal immigrants is borne by just a few states—California, New York, Texas, and Florida. Such cost shifting could have a significant benefit, for if the federal government had to pay, it might work harder to stem the tide of illegal immigrants.

The costs to innocent children are obvious: loss of the opportunity to learn English, to understand American culture and history, to socialize with other children in a structured environment, and to grow up to be successful, responsible adults. It isn't hard to figure out what the costs of not educating these children would be.

Do we really want thousands of uneducated children growing up on the streets, where we have little control over them? Surely not. Only by inviting all children into safe, nurturing and intellectually engaging schools can we combat that power. Our efforts will be well worth the cost. The lure of the streets is powerful enough already.

The costs to society as a whole are fairly obvious as well. An uneducated populace is dangerous to the fabric of society, contributing to social problems such as vandalism and crime, an underground economy, gang warfare, teenage pregnancy, substance abuse, and infectious and transmissible diseases. That is why we work so hard to promote literacy and prevent students from dropping out of school. The health issue alone makes it worth our while to educate the children of illegal immigrants, for when children are in school, we can make sure they are inoculated properly, and we can teach them the facts about health and disease.

**III. Write an essay in about 500 words on any one of the following: (20 marks)**

- a. Describe your favourite holiday destination **or** a person you really admire.
- b. Present your arguments on the need for advertisements to be censored.
- c. Should the minimum legal age of marriage for girls be raised?

