

ESCUELAS OFICIALES DE IDIOMAS INGLÉS

Número de
control

NIVEL INTERMEDIO

SEPTIEMBRE 2012

COMPRENSIÓN DE LECTURA

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LA REALIZACIÓN DE ESTE EJERCICIO:

- **NO escriba su nombre en ninguna hoja de esta prueba o de las sucesivas.**
- **Escriba su nombre SÓLO cuando se le requiera más tarde en una hoja aparte. El número de su examen es el que figura arriba a la derecha en el recuadro.**

Duración: **60 minutos**

- Este ejercicio consta de **dos tareas**. Deberá realizar ambas.
 - En la tarea 1 deberá indicar si las afirmaciones sobre el texto son verdaderas (true) o falsas (false) marcando una cruz (✖) en el recuadro que hay junto a las preguntas **1-10**. Cada respuesta correcta obtendrá dos puntos. Se restará un punto por cada opción incorrecta que marque. No se restarán puntos por respuestas en blanco. El número 0 es un ejemplo.
 - En la tarea 2 deberá elegir **UNA palabra adecuada** para rellenar cada espacio numerado en blanco (**11-20**) y escribirla en la tabla que aparece debajo del texto. Puede utilizar cada palabra sólo **una vez**. Entre las opciones hay tres palabras que no necesitará. Cada respuesta correcta obtendrá dos puntos. No se restarán puntos por respuestas incorrectas o en blanco. El número 0 es un ejemplo.
- **No escriba en los cuadros sombreados:** son para la calificación de las tareas.
- Sólo se admiten respuestas escritas con **bolígrafo azul o negro**.

NO ESCRIBA AQUÍ:

PUNTUACIÓN DEL EJERCICIO: _____ / 40

CALIFICACIÓN: Superado No Superado

Task 1. (10 x 2 = 20 marks)

Read the following text. For questions 1-10 mark a cross (✖) in the box provided on the next page, indicating whether the statements are true or false. You will lose one mark for each wrong answer you choose. The first one has been done as an example.

MARK

BACKPACKERS' GURU AIMS TO REDUCE TRAVEL

Mark Ellingham, founder of *Rough Guides* and the man who encouraged a generation of travellers to pack a rucksack and explore the world, has compared the damage done by tourism to the impact of the tobacco industry. Ellingham now says that travelling is so environmentally destructive that there is no such thing as a genuinely ethical holiday. He wants the industry to educate travellers about the damage their holidays do to the environment. The development he regrets most is the public's appetite for 'compulsive-flying'.

Although the aviation industry now is responsible for just 5.5 per cent of the carbon dioxide generated in the UK, it is one of the fastest growing generators of pollution. Some experts estimate that flying could treble in the next 20 years. 'Climate change is a crucial problem and the impact of flying is key to this,' says Ellingham, 'and all of us involved have a responsibility to inform travellers as clearly and honestly as possible about the environmental cost of their journeys.'

It was 25 years ago when Ellingham sat down at his mother's kitchen table and wrote his first guidebook on an old typewriter. Together with *Lonely Planet*, Ellingham's publication revolutionised the travel industry, particularly by encouraging young people to explore the world. At that time travelling, as distinct from a two-week holiday, was of small interest. Students went Inter-Railing, While the more adventurous went island-hopping in Greece.

In the past twenty-five years, however, there has been a spectacular growth in expectation of what people think they can do on holiday. People have more money and flights cost a fraction of what they did then but as Ellingham says, 'it is hard to say the positive impact travelling has can ever compensate for the damage done by simply travelling to the destination. Balancing all the positives and negatives, I'm not sure there is such a thing as a "responsible" or "ethical" holiday.'

Together with guides encouraging travellers to fly, Ellingham also publishes environmental titles, including the *Rough Guides to Climate Change*. Even so, he is completely aware of the fact that he is contradicting himself when he expects people to moderate their behaviour. 'I realise that I am speaking about all of this from an apparently contradictory position but it is a question of working with what's realistic: if *Rough Guides* was to disappear all of a sudden, I don't think anybody would fly less. I think that it is a completely ethical position of mine to work with what is realistic by encouraging people to make up their own minds about how they live their lives.'

While determined to encourage people to reduce the number of flights they take, Ellingham admits he has no intention stopping himself, and he does not expect others to do so either. 'As a "recovering travel writer", I fly less than I would like to, but more than I know that I ethically should. The deal I have made with myself is to limit the number of flights I take to one long distance destination and two or three shorter flights each year,' he said.

Ellingham is aware of another contradiction. It would be disastrous to the economics of many nations if tourism were to stop or even be reduced. Encouraging people to cut down on the number of flights they take, however, is no easy task. Ellingham says that he has been horrified by a new travelling trend. 'If there was just one thing I could change, it would be the new British obsession for compulsive flying. We now live in a society where, if people have nothing to do on Saturday night, they go to Budapest for 48 hours. We fly anywhere at the slightest opportunity, maybe ten times and more a year'. Despite all this, Ellingham believes that there is an urgent need to deal with the problem.

Adapted © <http://www.guardian.co.uk/travel/2007/may/06/travelnews.climatechange>

Your answers

		TRUE	FALSE	
0	Mark Ellingham thinks that all forms of travelling are ethical.		✗	✓
1	According to experts, people might fly three times as much in the future.			
2	Mark Ellingham has been writing guidebooks for 25 years.			
3	Ellingham's early publications gave a different orientation to travelling.			
4	Flying is more and more expensive every day.			
5	Ellingham says that travelling involves more benefits than negative aspects.			
6	Ellingham is sure that people will fly less.			
7	With all his publications, Ellingham wants people to be responsible.			
8	Ellingham admits his travelling habits are not entirely ethical.			
9	Ellingham thinks that travelling less would have little impact on national economies.			
10	Ellingham thinks immediate action is required.			

Task 2. (10 x 2 = 20 marks)

Read the text and choose **ONE suitable word** from the box provided for each numbered blank (11-20). Write your answers in the box provided on the next page. Each word can be used only **ONCE**. There are three words you will not need. The first one has been done as an example.

MARK

WE DON'T TALK ANY MORE – IS TECHNOLOGY HARMING COMMUNICATION?

In a world of tweets and texts, email and instant messaging, are we communicating any better? 0 is modern technology making us lazy about actually talking to each other, with damaging effects on both business and society?

This was the issue that the Today programme guest editor Sir Victor Blank asked me to investigate. Having only had a brief email explaining what he wanted, I was still rather unclear about his thesis - until I got him on the phone for a chat. Which sort of made his point ...

"Technology is a massive aid to communication," he told me, "but if it takes away regular face-to-face or direct conversations, 11 you lose something of the softer edges."

Sir Victor, the former chairman of Lloyds TSB, seemed particularly concerned about the impact that modern methods were having in the business world, with executives firing off emails in anger, and making deals they might later regret, 12 than seeing the whites of the eyes of their counterparts in face-to-face negotiations.

That was a concern shared by the former Times editor Lord Rees-Mogg, who told me that if he 13 in the newspaper business today he would of course use the most modern methods. But he felt that many people could become addicted to email and social networking.

Perhaps surprisingly, that view might get a sympathetic hearing at the technology firm Atos, which has decided to phase out email as an internal communications tool. Atos is not rejecting modern communication techniques, simply recognising that a new generation already thinks email is old hat. Its new recruits arrive from university accustomed to instant messaging and social networks - far more rapid methods of communication.

14 major corporation has recognised that forcing its employees to be "always on" has its limits. Volkswagen's Works Council has decreed that the German firm's Blackberry server should stop sending emails to employees thirty minutes after their shift ends.

But what I really needed was someone who had taken an objective, scientific look at the way we use communications technology - and that was Dr Monica Bulger of the Oxford Internet Institute. 15 from dumbing down the way we communicate, technology had made us smarter, she told me. In particular, executives like Sir Victor Blank had been made more literate by the arrival of computers and word processing. Dr Bulger conceded that face-to-face communication was important, but said it also had its dangers: "I've sat in meetings where people have said things they shouldn't have." Whereas email gave more time for considered reflection: "You can do the count to ten rule and think a bit before you respond." Overall, the academic's conclusion was that the different technologies now available to us were helping not hindering communication.

Tell me about it. As someone who is addicted to these technologies, I still find 16 oppressed by the sheer quantity of emails, phone messages and social media activity that need to be dealt with each day. I can't imagine 17 I would do my job without tools like Twitter. Yet I sometimes wonder whether I communicated better 30 years ago.

In my student days, before the age of the mobile or email, we used to simply drop in on people or bump into them in the street – but we **__18__** to have rich and varied social lives and make enduring friendships.

So I decided to go back to university to give the final word to members of today's Facebook generation. One of the students I interviewed hardly ever used social networks and said he just bumped into people in the street; another mentioned the danger of becoming obsessed with Facebook at the expense of face-to-face communication. And a **__19__** summed it up: "You use social networking and modern technology to arrange meeting people face to face, when otherwise you might not see them for a few weeks - you might not bump into them." We agreed that new communication technologies provided an addition, not a replacement, for traditional means.

__20__ what shall I tell Sir Victor? It seems to me that his concerns about the impact of email, social networking and instant messaging on our ability to communicate, are somewhat exaggerated. But maybe we need to meet face to face to talk it through...

Adapted from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-16313832>

The words you can choose

ANOTHER	FAR	HOW	INSTEAD	MANAGED	MYSELF	OR
OTHERS	RATHER	SO	THEN	THIRD	WERE	WOULD

Your answers

0	or	✓
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		