



Министерство образования и науки Украины
Севастопольский национальный технический
университет

МЕТОДИЧЕСКИЕ УКАЗАНИЯ
по переводу текстов
к практическим занятиям по дисциплине
«Письменный перевод»
для студентов 4-5 курсов
специальности 6.020303
дневной формы обучения

Севастополь
2009

2

УДК 800

Методические указания по переводу текстов в дополнение к практическим занятиям по дисциплине «Письменный перевод» для студентов 4-5 курсов дневной формы обучения специальности 6.020303 /Состав. Калошина Н.А. - Севастополь: Изд-во СевНТУ, 2009. – 20 с.

Цель: методические указания предназначены помочь студентам переводческого факультета в развитии навыков перевода аутентичного неадаптированного англоязычного текста с применением переводческого поиска.

Методические указания рассмотрены и утверждены на заседании кафедры теории и практики перевода (протокол № 6 от 23.01.2009 г.).

Допущено учебно-методическим центром СевНТУ в качестве методических указаний.

Рецензент: старший преподаватель кафедры ТПП Фомина О.А.

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

Часть 1.....	2
Часть 2	13
Часть 3.....	18



Часть 1.

1. Прочитайте текст “The \$100 Distraction Device: Why giving poor kids laptops doesn't improve their scholastic performance”, дайте его краткую стилистическую характеристику. Определите характер трудностей, с которыми придется столкнуться при переводе (обилие незнакомых реалий? терминов? фразеологизмов? сложные синтаксические конструкции? особенности индивидуального авторского стиля?...)
2. Некоторые слова в тексте, которые могут оказаться трудными для перевода, выделены курсивом. В качестве пояснения к этим словам в конце Части 1 приведены соответствующие фрагменты статей из «Википедии» (универсальной многоязычной онлайн-энциклопедии). Прочитайте эти фрагменты, продумайте и запишите рабочие варианты перевода выделенных слов.
3. Познакомьтесь с откликами читателей на статью “The \$100 Distraction Device: Why giving poor kids laptops doesn't improve their scholastic performance”. переведите их устно (пояснения к выделенным словам также можно найти в конце Части 1). Изложите собственную точку зрения на проблему.
4. Письменно переведите текст “The \$100 Distraction Device: Why giving poor kids laptops doesn't improve their scholastic performance”.

The \$100 Distraction Device:

Why giving poor kids laptops doesn't improve their scholastic performance

By Ray Fisman

http://www.slate.com/id/2193208/pagenum/all/#page_start

More than three decades ago, *Commodore* introduced the *PET*, the world's first personal computer, apparently so-named to take advantage of the '70s craze for *pet rocks*. My ever-doting and education-obsessed parents brought home a PET for me and my siblings, hoping to put us at the vanguard of the digital revolution-to-be. The results were mixed at best. Though the machine was entirely unsuited to mindless fun—it had 4 kilobytes of memory and a

tiny green display of monochrome *ASCII* characters—my friends and I found a way to turn this supposedly educational device into a toy. We spent endless hours watching a little green cursor race around the screen in a rudimentary, freestyle version of *Pac-Man*. Once an early edition of *Space Invaders* appeared, I think my parents came to regret their attempt to prepare us for the computer age.

A generation later, parents are more worried than ever about making sure their kids can compete in today's high-tech world, and the growing *digital divide* is a subject of great concern for educators and policymakers. Federal subsidies in the United States provide billions of dollars for computer access in schools and libraries, and billions more may soon be spent in the developing world through programs such as *One Laptop per Child*. But even OLPC's *\$100 laptop* comes loaded with more distractions than my PET ever had. So will kids use these subsidized computing resources to prepare for the demands of the 21st-century job market? Or do computers just serve as a 21st-century substitute for that more venerable time-waster—the television?

New research by economists Ofer Malamud and Cristian Pop-Eleches provides an answer: For many kids, computers are indeed more of a distraction than a learning opportunity. The two researchers surveyed households that applied to Euro 200, a voucher distribution program in Romania designed to help poor households defray the cost of buying a computer for their children. It turns out that kids in households lucky enough to get computer vouchers spent a lot less time watching TV—but that's where the good news ends. "Vouchered" kids also spent less time doing homework, got lower grades, and reported lower educational aspirations than the "unvouchered" kids.

This is certainly not the first attempt to measure the costs and benefits of giving computers to kids. Some earlier studies also found that computers have a negative effect on scholastic achievement. Others found the opposite. But it's hard to know what to make of these earlier studies because they compare families that have decided to buy computers with those that haven't, and compare kids who choose to spend their days parked in front of a computer versus those who spend their time doing other things (like studying, playing soccer, or getting up to no good). This makes any study of computer versus noncomputer kids an apples-to-oranges comparison: Parents who buy computers tend to place more value on education—they're also more likely to live in good school districts, pay for extra math classes, and generally provide a richer learning environment for their kids than



parents who don't buy computers. (In my case, it's probably a lot more than access to a PET that accounts for my decision to spend 22 years in school.)

Malamud and Pop-Eleches chose the Euro 200 program because it solved the apples-to-oranges problem. While Euro 200 didn't exactly hand out computers at random, it came pretty close. The program provided vouchers worth 200 euros (about \$240 at the time, nearly \$315 today) for computer purchases by poor families with kids. (The income cutoff was \$50 per month per household member.) But there weren't nearly enough vouchers to go around. In 2005, for example, nearly 52,000 qualified families applied, but the government had funding for only 27,555 of them. As a result, vouchers were given only to families with incomes below \$17 per household member. This means that some of the families that got vouchers—those with, say, incomes between \$16 and \$17—were basically identical to some of those that didn't (families with \$17-\$18 incomes). These families all have similar computing aspirations (they all applied to the program) and differ only in which side of the \$17 cutoff they happened to sit on. [...]

So what happens when good fortune delivers vouchers (and hence computers) into the homes of Romanian youths? Obviously a lot more time logged on to a computer—about seven hours more per week for vouchered versus unvouchered kids. Much of this computer time came at the expense of television-watching: Children in families that received a voucher spent 3.5 fewer hours in front of the tube per week. But computer use also crowded out homework (2.3 hours less per week), reading, and sleep. Less schoolwork translated into lower grades at school—vouchered kids' *GPA*s were 0.36 grade points lower than their nonvouchered counterparts—and also lower aspirations for higher education. Vouchered kids were 13 percentage points less likely to report an intention to attend college. And, interestingly, vouchered students who were college-bound were not more likely to express interest in majoring in computer science.

When my friends and I figured out how to transform my PET from a learning tool to a proto-*video-game console*, my parents stepped in to make sure Space Invaders didn't crowd out homework. Where were Romania's parents? The voucher program was specifically designed to help poor households, and their dire financial circumstances meant that these families were probably less able to afford after-school care or otherwise see to it that the computers were used for learning and not just recreation. Indeed, the authors found that when they looked specifically at families with stay-at-

home moms who may be more present and able to police computer use, the negative effects of vouchers were greatly reduced.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the lesson from Romania's voucher experiment is not that computers aren't useful learning tools, but that their usefulness relies on parents being around to assure they don't simply become a very tempting distraction from the unpleasantness of trigonometry homework. But this is a crucial insight for those tasked with designing policies to bridge the digital divide. The express intent of Euro 200 was to give a boost to poor kids' educations. Through programs such as One Laptop per Child, governments around the world have similarly committed to purchasing millions of computers to improve computer access for children. But Malamud and Pop-Eleches' results suggest that merely providing access may be more of a curse than a blessing. If we really want to help poor kids, whether in Romania, sub-Saharan Africa, or America's housing projects, we may want to focus on approaches that provide structured, supervised access through *after-school programs* or subsidies that bring technology into low-income schools. But just giving kids computers? Might as well just ship them PlayStations.

Отклики читателей на статью “The \$100 Distraction Device: Why giving poor kids laptops doesn't improve their scholastic performance”

(Remarks from the Reader Discussion Forum)

(1) I agree with the main point in this story, that parental involvement is definitely necessary to help push kids in the right direction when using new technology. This is true for pretty much anything kids can get their hands on. No matter what the device or tool is kids will abuse it for their own enjoyment. Sometimes that abuse is beneficial and sometimes it hurts them as is the case with computers. However the Romanian study, like many other studies, cannot give you a complete picture of the benefits that having a computer bestows upon the user.

I was 12 when my Dad bought us our first computer, a 486 with 8mb of RAM. Before that time I was using a *word processor* for writing reports. The new computer didn't give me anything new in the way of academics. The internet was just beginning, and writing reports was exactly the same, although now I had a fancy laser printer instead of the Dot matrix style printing of a word processor. I primarily used my computer for games, and AOL connectivity when I finally got my 14.4 modem. I may have even had the same stats that these Romanian kids had with their computer in terms of



less time watching TV and doing homework but what the computer did give me was familiarity with the technology and a no fear attitude when it came to discovering all that this new technology had to offer. I learned about file formats and programs to run them by looking at lo-res partially nude pictures of entertainment stars that I received from a friend on a 3.5" floppy. I learned about hardware architecture when my computer crapped out because of a busted power supply. I familiarized myself with DOS and software installation as I made the jump from Windows 3.1 to 95, and I learned about web pages from the horrendous web page builder on AOL...version 3.0.

These are all things that are not measured in a survey but which all contributed to my semi-expertise with computers today, 15 years later. The point is there are benefits that can't be readily measured by a survey, parents, or even the kids that are using the devices that may pop up years from now. Because a kid is playing solitaire and sharing .mp3's on a LAN network and not writing the introduction to his Master's thesis does not mean that the computer is being totally misused. Also, who had the bright idea to ask children if using this computer made them more open to going to college? What kind of answer do you expect to receive from a kid who just found and loves *Minesweeper*?

(2) Professor Fisman's extrapolations are based on one study in Romania. He uses the findings from Romania to imply that none of the mentioned programs will work.

A few facts from the post need to be considered. First it is only one study. Earlier studies have shown that computers had BOTH negative and positive effect on "scholastic achievement." The claim that students with free computers GPAs "were 0.36 grade points lower than their nonvouchered counterparts" doesn't seem that serious. In a US school that would mean the students GPA went from a B+ to a B.

Students with computers are easily distracted. We as teachers deal with that everyday. Fisman also states that "...Malamud and Pop-Eleches' results suggest that merely providing access may be more of a curse than a blessing. If we really want to help poor kids, whether in Romania, sub-Saharan Africa, or America's housing projects, we may want to focus on approaches that provide structured, supervised access..."

That "supervised access" is the key to any new tool. It can be the afterschool programs Fisman suggests or parental involvement.

Another key issue when dealing with is the amount of information you are providing to students with Internet access when you provide computers. Will most of them use it to learn? Probably not, but what about the ones that do? What will they accomplish for their community and the world? Fisman's post doesn't deal with this very key issue.

Пояснения к выделенным словам

Commodore International

Commodore, the commonly used name for Commodore International, was an American electronics company based in West Chester, Pennsylvania which was a vital player in the home/personal computer field in the 1980s. The company is also known under the name of its R&D operation, Commodore Business Machines (CBM). Commodore developed and marketed the world's best-selling desktop computer, the Commodore 64 (1982). The company declared bankruptcy in 1994, but since then, there have been several attempts to revive its Amiga systems. [...]

Pet Rock

Pet Rocks were a 1970s fad conceived in Los Gatos, California by advertising executive Gary Dahl. The first Pet Rocks were ordinary gray pebbles bought at a builder's supply store and marketed as if they were live pets. The fad lasted about six months, ending with the Christmas season in December 1975. During its short run, the Pet Rock made Dahl a millionaire.

In 1975, Dahl established Rock Bottom Productions, a company that sold the rocks for US\$3.95 each. The pebbles, imported from Rosarito Beach in Baja California, Mexico, were swaddled in packing material and nestled in a small cardboard box, similar to a pet carrier. A "Pet Rock Training Manual", with instructions on how to properly raise and care for one's newfound pet (notably lacking instructions for feeding), was included. The instruction manual contained several commands that could be taught to the new pet. While "sit" and "stay" were effortless to accomplish, "roll over" usually required extra help from the trainer. "Come" was found to be impossible to teach. [...]



ASCII

There are 94 printable ASCII characters, numbered 33 to 126 (decimal) in the original code.

American Standard Code for Information Interchange (ASCII), pronounced /æski/ is a character encoding based on the English alphabet. ASCII codes represent text in computers, communications equipment, and other devices that work with text. Most modern character encodings — which support many more characters than did the original — have a historical basis in *ASCII*.

Historically, ASCII developed from telegraphic codes and its first commercial use was as a seven-bit teleprinter code promoted by Bell data services. Work on ASCII began in 1960. The first edition of the standard was published in 1963, a major revision in 1967, and the most recent update in 1986. Compared to earlier telegraph codes, the proposed Bell code and ASCII were both reordered for more convenient sorting (i.e., alphabetization) of lists, and added features for devices other than teleprinters. Some ASCII features, including the "ESCape sequence", were due to Robert Bemer.

ASCII includes definitions for 128 characters: 33 are non-printing, mostly obsolete control characters that affect how text is processed; 94 are printable characters (excluding the space). The ASCII character encoding — or a compatible extension — is used on nearly all common computers, especially personal computers and workstations. [...]

Pac-Man

Pac-Man [...] is a Japanese arcade game developed by Namco and licensed for distribution in the U.S. by Midway, first released in Japan on May 22, 1980. Immensely popular in the United States from its original release to the present day, Pac-Man is universally considered as one of the classics of the medium, virtually synonymous with video games, and an icon of 1980s popular culture. Upon its release, the game became a social phenomenon that sold a bevy of merchandise and also inspired, among other things, an animated television series. It also inspired the Buckner & Garcia single Pac-Man Fever, which in the first half of 1982 became a #9, million-selling pop single. [...]

Space Invaders

Space Invaders [...] is an arcade video game designed by Tomohiro Nishikado in 1978. It was originally manufactured by Taito and licensed for production in the United States by the Midway division of Bally. Space Invaders was one of the earliest shooting games and featured two-dimensional graphics. The aim is to defeat waves of aliens with a laser cannon. In designing the game, Nishikado drew inspiration from popular media; Breakout, The War of the Worlds, and Star Wars. Though simplistic by today's standards, it was one of the forerunners of modern video gaming. [...]

Digital divide

The term digital divide refers to the gap between those people with effective access to digital and information technology and those without access to it. It includes the imbalances in physical access to technology as well as the imbalances in resources and skills needed to effectively participate as a digital citizen. In other words, it's the unequal access by some members of the society to information and communications technology, and the unequal acquisition of related skills. Groups often discussed in the context of a digital divide include socioeconomic (rich/poor), racial (majority/minority), generational (young/old) or geographical (urban/rural). The term global digital divide refers to differences in technology access between countries. [...]

One Laptop per Child

The One Laptop per Child association (OLPC) is an ICT4D non-profit organization, created by faculty members of the MIT Media Lab, set up to oversee The Children's Machine project and the construction of the XO-1 "\$100 laptop". Both the project and the organization were announced at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland in January 2005. According to the home page of the project's wiki at laptop.org, "OLPC espouses five core principles: (1) child ownership; (2) low ages; (3) saturation; (4) connection; and (5) free and open source." [...]

\$100 Laptop (OLPC XO-1)

The XO-1, previously known as the \$100 Laptop or Children's Machine, is an inexpensive laptop computer intended to be distributed to children in developing countries around the world, to provide them with access to knowledge, and opportunities to "explore, experiment and express themselves" (constructionist learning). The laptop is developed by the One



Laptop per Child (OLPC) social welfare organization, and manufactured by the Taiwanese computer company, Quanta Computer. [...]

GPA

In education, a grade (or mark) is a teacher's standardized evaluation of a student's work. In some countries, evaluations can be expressed quantifiably, and calculated into a numeric grade point average (GPA), which is used as a metric by employers and others to assess and compare students. A cumulative grade point average (CGPA) is the mean GPA from all terms, whereas GPA may only refer to a single term.

The concept of grading students' work quantitatively was developed by a tutor named William Farish, and first implemented by the University of Cambridge in 1792.

Video game console

A video game console is an interactive entertainment computer or electronic device that manipulates the video display signal of a display device (a television, monitor, etc.) to display a game. The term "video game console" is used to distinguish a machine designed for consumers to buy and use solely for playing video games from a personal computer, which has many other functions, or arcade machines, which are designed for businesses that buy and then charge others to play. [...]

After-school activity

An after-school activity is an ungraded, voluntary elective, set up by a primary or secondary school. Some schools feel that this allows students to take courses or compete in intramural sports they would not otherwise enroll in, for fear of failure.

Students that participate in after-school activities tend to be victims of violent crime less often- daily occurrences of violent crimes peak between 3 and 4 PM, directly after the end of the school day. These students also experience lower rates of drug use and teen pregnancy. [...]

PlayStation

PlayStation (often abbreviated PS, PSone or PS1, and informally as the PSX) is a 32-bit video game console of the fifth generation that was first released by Sony Computer Entertainment in December 1994.

The PlayStation was the first of the ubiquitous PlayStation series of console and hand-held game devices, which has included successor consoles and upgrades including the Net Yaroze (a special black PS with tools and instructions to program PS games and applications), PS one (a smaller version of the original), PocketStation (a handheld which enhances PS games and acts as a memory card), PlayStation 2, a revised, slimline PS2, PlayStation Portable (a handheld gaming console), a revised "PSP slim & lite", PSX (Japan only; a media center, DVR and DVD recorder based on the PS2), and PlayStation 3 (20GB, 40GB, 60GB, & 80GB). By March 31, 2005, the PlayStation and PS one had shipped a combined total of 102.49 million units,[5] becoming the first video game console to reach the 100 million mark. [...]

Word processor

A word processor (more formally known as document preparation system) is a computer application used for the production (including composition, editing, formatting, and possibly printing) of any sort of printable material.

Word processor may also refer to an obsolete type of stand-alone office machine, popular in the 1970s and 80s, combining the keyboard text-entry and printing functions of an electric typewriter with a dedicated computer for the editing of text. Although features and design varied between manufacturers and models, with new features added as technology advanced, word processors for several years usually featured a monochrome display and the ability to save documents on memory cards or diskettes. Later models introduced innovations such as spell-checking programs, increased formatting options, and dot-matrix printing. As the more versatile combination of a personal computer and separate printer became commonplace, the word processor disappeared. [...]

AOL

AOL LLC. (formerly America Online, Inc.) is an American global Internet services and media company operated by Time Warner and was headquartered in Loudoun County, Virginia until late April 2008 when it was moved to new offices at 770 Broadway in New York City. It has franchised its services to companies in several nations around the world, or set up international versions of its services.[2]

AOL is perhaps best known for its online software suite, also called "AOL", that allowed millions of customers around the world to access the world's largest "walled garden" online community and eventually reach out to the



internet as a whole. At one time AOL's membership was over 30 million members worldwide, most of whom accessed the AOL service through the AOL software suite.

Minesweeper (computer game)

Minesweeper is a single-player computer game. The object of the game is to clear an abstract minefield without detonating a mine. The game has been rewritten for nearly every system platform in use today. The most well-known version is Minesweeper for the Windows platform, which comes bundled with versions of the operating system from 3.1 and on. [...]

Часть 2

1. Прочитайте текст, определите трудности перевода.
2. Самостоятельно выясните значения выделенных слов, дайте рабочие варианты их перевода.
3. Перечитайте текст еще раз, стараясь уяснить смысл каждого предложения. При необходимости пользуйтесь словарем.
4. Проверьте, остались ли в тексте слова или словосочетания, смысл которых в данном контексте вам не вполне понятен. Уясните их значение, пользуясь любыми источниками.
5. Письменно переведите указанный преподавателем фрагмент текста.

Can a Night Owl Become a Morning Person?

By Deepa Ranganathan

http://www.slate.com/id/2193208/pagnum/all/#page_start

When I told my friends I had found a way to transform myself into a morning person, they responded in one of two ways. The night people leaned in as if I were about to reveal the location of a stash of pirate gold. The morning people simply regarded me with pity and wonder. "I just don't understand why it's so hard," said one friend, a Danish medical student. "I can get up anytime I want."

This sort of smugness is prevalent among morning people, who count among their ranks Nelson Mandela, Mahatma Gandhi, nearly every American president, and even Jesus. (See Mark 1:35: "And in the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a solitary

place, and there prayed.") Night people are stuck with psychopaths like Adolf Hitler and Juan Arreola, the guy in Pennsylvania who nearly killed his girlfriend's 2-year-old last year, explaining to a judge, "I'm not a morning person."

I'd always been a night owl, but for years I'd longed to defect to the other side. In my fantasies, I was a *Fortune 500*-type who threw off the covers at 5 and engineered a *hostile takeover* by 7. Instead, I generally stayed up until 1:30 in the morning, reading magazines or clicking aimlessly through Wikipedia, waking up grumpy and remorseful at 9:30, if not later. Over the years I'd tried all the usual tactics—multiple alarms, earlier bedtimes, *lab-rat* levels of caffeine—and nothing had worked.

When I left my office job and started *freelancing*, things got worse. One day, after crawling out of bed at 10:30, I decided enough was enough. I needed help. So, I called up a battery of doctors and sleep researchers and put the question to them: Can a night person rewire herself to fall asleep at a reasonable hour and jump out of bed in the morning like a farmer with chickens to feed?

They all said it could be done. "I do think there are people for whom genetically this is going to be much harder," said Dr. Gary Richardson, senior research scientist at the Henry Ford Hospital Sleep Disorders Center in Detroit, "but nobody for whom it's impossible."

Genetics play an important role in making morning people perky. Five years ago, researchers at the University of Surrey isolated a gene called Period 3 that appears to regulate our preferences for morning or night. But genes aren't the whole story. For as much as 80 percent of the population, the doctors said, what matters most is lifestyle—the people you befriend, the career you choose, how you use your free time. If you like watching *Letterman*, chances are you'll find a way to stay up for it.

So, how to counter my natural urges for late-night *Scrabulous*? First off, the doctors told me, I had to choose a new wake-up time—no more than two hours earlier than usual—and stick to it. No exceptions, including weekends. "You have to be rigid initially," insisted Dr. Donna Arand, clinical director of the *Kettering* Sleep Disorders Center at Kettering Memorial Hospital in Dayton, Ohio. "If you're a diehard night owl, you're trying to set a rhythm your body doesn't naturally cling to."



The next rule was that upon waking, I had to leave the house immediately for a half-hour walk. "Can't I just look out the window?" I asked. The answer was no: I needed bright morning light and lots of it. In your *hypothalamus* is a clump of cells called the *suprachiasmatic nucleus* that controls *circadian rhythms*. When light hits your retina, your SCN tells your body to stop pumping out melatonin, a hormone that makes you drowsy. When the light wanes, the melatonin production resumes, and in a few hours, you're ready for bed. By exposing myself to light earlier in the day, I'd train my SCN to shift the whole operation forward a few hours.

At night the routine was just the opposite: I had to avoid bright light starting a few hours before bedtime. But with five housemates and nary a dimmer switch, I was pretty sure I couldn't swing this one. A solution came from Timothy Monk, professor of psychiatry and director of the Human *Chronobiology* Research Program at the University of Pittsburgh. I should wear yellow sunglasses in the evening, he said. The colored lenses would block blue light—the part of the spectrum your internal clock is most responsive to—without making it impossible to see.

The doctors also suggested that I take an over-the-counter melatonin supplement six or seven hours before my old bedtime each day to help me adjust to the earlier bedtime. And I was supposed to swear off caffeine and alcohol—both of which can interfere with sleep—after 3 p.m. or so. If all went well, I'd make the shift in as little as two weeks. My boyfriend promised to make the transition with me. Which was good, since night owls and morning larks are more likely to bicker and spend time apart than are couples who share the same sleep habits.

At 6:30 on a weekday evening, I popped my first melatonin pill. Dr. Richardson had warned me that the pill might make me drowsy as soon as I took it, and sure enough, 15 minutes later my brain was shrouded in a thick fog. It felt like I had taken a teaspoon of *Nyquil* and I would now drift into a blissful, drugged sleep. Except that bedtime wasn't for another four hours.

The yellow glasses went on at 8 p.m. I looked like *a cross between Bono and Henry Kissinger*. At a get-together at a friend's house that evening, I wandered around in a sleepy, self-conscious haze. I went home at about 10 and picked up a novel to read in bed. A half-hour later, the book was slipping from my lifeless hands. So this is what being a morning person is like, I thought. It's like being 80 years old.

My alarm went off at 7 the next day. After a panicky wake-up, I realized I wasn't tired at all—I was full of bounce and vim. The melatonin pill had worked a miracle. "Time to get up!" I sang out, pulling up the blinds.

Outside, sleet fell from a heavy, gray sky. "This is the kind of morning that makes you glad to be alive," my boyfriend grumbled. As we embarked on our inaugural morning walk, I tried to appreciate the quiet streets and the small stores I had never noticed before. They were all closed. We were the only ones dumb enough to be outside at this hour.

The allure of being up first thing in the morning wasn't immediately apparent. By the third morning, however, the weather had cleared, and we were discovering that 7 a.m. was our new favorite time of day. The pale sun glinted off the rooftops as we stepped outside. The world was especially beautiful at this hour, and we were under doctor's orders to stroll around and enjoy it. We found a playground nearby and went down the tandem slide together. We explored unknown side streets. We discovered a park that was full of signs with interesting facts about our town. "The *Edsel* was manufactured here!"

Unfortunately, staying up late hadn't lost its appeal. One night early in my experiment, I was drifting off to sleep around 11 when my roommate came in. "We haven't caught up in a while," she said. By the time we finished chatting, it was midnight. Another evening a friend coaxed me out to a Brazilian dance club, and I didn't get to sleep until 1.

As the experiment wore on, waking up became more painful, not less, and not just on mornings after I'd stayed up late. When people asked me how I was doing, I invariably said, "Tired." By Day 9, there were dark bags under my eyes. That afternoon I gave in and took a two-hour nap at my desk.

I realized I'd made a tactical error. I'd budgeted for eight hours of sleep a night, but I was discovering I truly needed eight and a half, and the debt was accruing quickly. My boyfriend and I discussed shifting our bedtime back to 10:30—which seemed positively *geriatric*—or our wake-up time forward to 7:30—which seemed like a cop-out.

We liked our new schedule the way it was. It had given us a newfound sense of control over our lives. We started each morning with an act of will that set the tone for the day. We went to work early and finished early. And if the evenings were a bit less fun than before—even a lot less fun—we also



remembered how we often stayed up late into the night, zombified, both of us staring silently into our laptops. Our new routine seemed like a commitment to live a more virtuous life.

Still, I was so tired I was losing the will to live at all. By Day 11, I had developed two distinct personalities: "Mel," my melatonin-induced alter ego, who walked briskly around the block as the sun was rising, and "Deepa," who emerged three hours later, cranky and easily provoked.

On Day 13, I ended the experiment one day early. The decision was easy. The alarm went off, and I stayed put. No more melatonin, no more glasses, no more mandatory walks. But in the days that followed, I still got sleepy around 10:30 and ended up going to bed about an hour later. My wake-up time crept forward, but settled at a still-respectable 8 a.m., where it has remained since. According to the doctors, the key is incremental change—so if I were to push for 7 a.m. now, I might find it easier than I did the first time.

But I probably won't try. Being a morning person has its drawbacks. Morning people get sleepy just when all the fun begins. What I really wanted when I started this experiment, I now realize, was to be one of those crazies who functions well on just five hours of sleep. That's never going to happen.

And hey, I'm not not a morning person. Recently, I took the bold step of signing up for a 7 a.m. gym class that meets twice a week. The woman at the reception desk was a little concerned. "You know what time it starts, right? That's OK with you?"

"Yep," I said.

"Good," she said, shaking her head and smiling. "Because I couldn't do it."

For a split second, I wanted to give her a condescending smile and say, "I just don't understand why it's so hard." That smugness! That total lack of compassion! I kept my mouth shut, but I knew I had arrived.

Часть 3

1. Прочитайте текст, определите трудности его перевода.
2. Выпишите слова и сочетания, смысл которых в данном контексте вам не вполне понятен. Пользуясь любыми источниками, уясните их значение.
3. Письменно переведите текст.

Teach Your Children Well: The economic case for preschool

By Joel Waldfogel

<http://www.slate.com/id/2166852/>

Softhearted people always advocate spending more on kids. But according to a new and authoritative synthesis of available evidence, there's a hardheaded case for investing more in young kids over older ones.

In the United States, we've spent trillions of dollars over decades on K-12 schooling in the hopes of making young people more productive, or at least less criminally delinquent. The results have been mixed. About 20 percent of the American workforce is essentially illiterate (compared with 5 to 10 percent in Sweden or Germany), creating a major drag on our international competitiveness. And an astronomical 5.6 million adults in the United States have served time in state or federal prison, with 1.3 million there currently. Their incarceration, along with other costs of crime, costs us around \$1.3 trillion a year.

Why doesn't all our spending on education buy better results? Nobel Prize winner James Heckman of the University of Chicago and Dimitriy Masterov of the University of Michigan argue that by waiting until kindergarten, we throw money at kids when it's too late. Their evidence urges shifting educational spending to younger children.

The early investment is needed, the authors argue, to supplement the role of the family. Recent developments in neuroscience have shown that the early years are vital to cognitive development, which in turn is important to subsequent success and productivity in school, life, and work. Early-childhood nurturing has traditionally been the province of families. But families are deteriorating. Roughly one in six kids was born into poverty or single parenthood or both in 1970. In 2000, the rate was about one in four. What's more, almost 10 percent of children were born to unmarried teenage



mothers in 1999; these kids tend to receive especially low levels of emotional and intellectual support and cognitive stimulation. They arrive at kindergarten cognitively disadvantaged, and the gap widens as they get older, eventually leading to early babies, lousy jobs, and elevated crime.

Heckman and Masterov look at a number of pilot programs in early-childhood education that have targeted high-risk kids in disadvantaged families, and studied them into adulthood. These programs are like Head Start, only more intensive. For example, between 1962 and 1967, the Perry Project in Ypsilanti, Mich., provided two years of intensive preschool to a group of disadvantaged 3-year-old black children, chosen from an eligible pool by a coin flip. The program consisted of a daily session of two and a half hours and a weekly 90-minute teacher home visit. In today's dollars, it would cost \$10,000 per child per year.

Perry participants have been followed through age 40, and the program has shown substantial benefits in educational achievement and other social outcomes. Participants achieved greater literacy and higher grades, and they were more likely to graduate high school. Later in life, they were more likely to be employed—and to earn more—and less likely to be on welfare. They also committed less crime and had lower rates of teen pregnancy.

The authors estimate the rate of return for programs like the Perry Project to be a substantial 16 percent. While some of this payback accrues directly to the kids, in the form of higher earnings when they're grown up, about three-quarters of it goes to the rest of us in the form of lower crime and savings on prison spending. Heckman and Masterov compare the return from investing in preschool kids with the returns from lower class size in high school (smaller than the return to preschool) and to GED programs (smaller still). They propose that the return on investment declines with age, although they don't offer a ton of quantitative evidence on this point.

The big economic return for intensive preschool for disadvantaged kids has two implications. First, while many people advocate spending on these kids for reasons of fairness or justice, Heckman and Masterov make a different case. They're saying this preschool spending is a sound economic investment. Each dollar we spend on targeted, intensive preschool returns more than a dollar invested in, say, a pretty good mutual fund.

Many families already make this investment on their own, either by spending time with their kids or by purchasing high-quality child care. Why

involve governments? Well, Heckman and Masterov show that if your kid goes to one of these programs, the rest of us get most of the benefit. Economists assume that even if parents of disadvantaged kids are rational and forward-looking—as if they didn't have enough to worry about—they will invest in preschool only to boost their kids' earnings and not to reduce crime and prison costs, which are borne by the rest of us. As a result, even conscientious parents will under-invest. So, Economics 101 tells you—granted, in an end-of-semester lecture that you probably skipped—that clearly this is a job for government.

The hardheaded case for Perry-like preschool extends beyond higher pay and reduced crime. Unlike many efforts to boost productivity—think trickle-down—this one would reduce inequality as well, by raising the incomes of the disadvantaged. Investing in preschools can also enhance international competitiveness. Much of the growth in American standards of living over the past half-century has flowed from our population's ever-increasing educational attainment. But for the generations born since 1950, the growth has stopped. The problem is not that a college education costs too much, but rather that many disadvantaged kids aren't academically ready for college when they finish high school. And Heckman and Masterov argue that it stems from the academic deficits they bring to kindergarten. If preschool whips them into shape, they'll be better prepared for all the other steps along the way.

