PRUEBAS DE CERTIFICACIÓN

COMPRENSIÓN DE LECTURA

Apellidos: .....

Nombre: .....

Marca con una X lo que corresponda:

☐ Alumno/a **OFICIAL** (Indica el nombre de tu profesor/a tutor/a durante el curso 2017-2018): ..... **Grupo:** .....

☐ Alumno/a **LIBRE**

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LA REALIZACIÓN DE ESTE EJERCICIO:

- Duración: **75 minutos.**
- Este ejercicio consta de **dos tareas**. Deberás realizar las dos.
  - En la tarea 1 deberás leer un texto y completar cada hueco con el extracto correspondiente.
    Obtienes: 1 punto por cada respuesta correcta; 0 puntos por cada respuesta incorrecta o no dada.
  - En la tarea 2 deberás leer un texto y completar cada enunciado con una de las opciones dadas (A, B, o C).
    Obtienes: 1 punto por cada respuesta correcta; 0 puntos por cada respuesta incorrecta o no dada.

  Muy importante: al final, comprueba que has elegido una sola opción (como en los ejemplos); si eliges dos opciones, se anulará la respuesta para ese ítem.
- **No escribas en los espacios sombreados** destinados a la calificación de las tareas.
- Sólo se admiten respuestas escritas con **bolígrafo azul o negro**.

NO ESCRIBAS AQUÍ

PUNTUACIÓN DEL EJERCICIO: _____ /18

CALIFICACIÓN: ☐ Superado ☐ No Superado

TAREA 1 - 10 puntos: Read the following article about the science of humour and complete each gap [0] to [10] with the most suitable fragment from the list A to K. Capital letters and punctuation have been removed from the fragments. Write your answers in the appropriate box. Letter K is an example. You will get 1 point per correct answer.

THE LAUGHTER CIRCUIT

One winter morning in 1931, at a cemetery in London, Willy Anderson solemnly bowed his head and watched his mother's casket descend into the earth. Suddenly, and to the collective horror of those in attendance, he began to laugh. The outburst was muffled at first, as Anderson desperately covered his mouth, but it soon grew so intense that he had **[0]** . Hours later, when Anderson still couldn't contain himself, his family took him to a hospital emergency room. The attending doctor checked his pupils and vital signs and **[1]** that the patient be kept for observation. Two days later, Anderson died. The post-mortem revealed that a large aneurysm in an artery at the base of his brain had ruptured, compressing part of his hypothalamus and other adjacent structures.

[2] . For centuries, thinkers from Aristotle to Darwin tried to discern the nature and origin of humor, only to have their ideas trail off without a punch line. But studies of brain-damaged patient like Willy Anderson (his real name is unknown; the medical literature mentions only this pseudonym) have recently been bolstered by sophisticated brain scans of living subjects. Humor researchers, after decades of study -and some ridicule from their colleagues- have zeroed in on the brain's laughter circuit at last.

[3] , but lots of animals like to laugh. In his 1872 treatise, *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*, Charles Darwin pointed out that "very many kinds of monkeys, when pleased, utter a reiterated sound, clearly analogous to our laughter." Since then, studies have found funny bones in any number of beasts -even a laboratory rat, which **[4]**.

In a study published two years ago in the journal *Behavioral Brain Research*, rats responded with playful nips and ultrasonic chirps when psychologists tickled their ribs and bellies. The rats that chirped loudest were also the most eager to be tickled. More interesting, when these ticklish rats were interbred for four generations, the offspring chirped twice as often as their great-grandparents.

Whether or not **[5]** , a true sense of humor involves more than sensitive ribs. At the Institute of Neurology in London, neuropsychologists Vinod Goel and Raymond Dolan describe successful jokes as "a cognitive juxtaposition of mental sets, followed by an affective feeling of amusement." Thankfully, that definition, though mildly humorous in its way, can be subdivided into three more familiar categories: Phonological jokes, or puns ("Why did the golfer wear two sets of pants? He got a hole in one"); semantic jokes that go beyond wordplay ("What do engineers use for birth control? Their personalities"); and nonverbal jokes such as cartoon and slapstick. Each kind of joke draws on a series of mental capacities -each located in a different part of the brain- that seem to set off one another like tumbling dominoes.

To tighten the focus on those early findings, psychologists Prathiba Shammi and Donald Stuss **[6]** at the University of Toronto. They began by testing the reaction of a group of control subjects to a series of verbal and nonverbal jokes. They then took the jokes that most subjects had rated as "unambiguously humorous" and showed them to 21 patients each of whom, as an adult, had suffered damage in a different part of their frontal lobes. The results, published in the journal *Brain* in 1999, were as unambiguous as the jokes: Patients who had damaged right frontal lobes had the worst senses of humor. "There was no problem in simple logic," the psychologists wrote. "When required to provide a logical conclusion to a non-humorous story, they correctly elected the logical ending." But when asked to finish a funny story, these patients tended **[7]** , slapstick punch lines -even if the story required something quite different. Humor, they assumed, was all about the element of surprise.

In their summary of the study, Stuss and Shammi point out that the right frontal lobe has long been considered "the most silent of brain areas." But their findings suggest it may instead be a kind of cerebral clearinghouse, a place where all the

components of self-awareness –memory, logic, language, sensation, and emotion– come together. Understanding humor is a serious business, Stuss says. "You need the ability to make an inference; you also need the ability to have a self-awareness concept. Then you need the connectivity to your emotional reactions. The right frontal lobe has the ability, because of its connectivity to different brain regions, **[8]** ."

Stuss and Shammi's most humourless patients had a damaged area in the frontal lobe known as the medial ventral prefrontal cortex. More recently, that same area figured prominently in a related study published in *Nature Neuroscience* by Vinod Goel and Raymond Dolan. There researchers took 14 subjects with unimpaired brains and asked them to listen to a series of semantic and phonological jokes. As the subjects listened, their brains were scanned with functional magnetic resonance imaging, which tracked their mental activity. As expected, semantic jokes lit up the brain's posterior temporal lobe, where the semantic network is located; phonological jokes lit up the right temporal lobe, where alternative word meanings are processed. But **[9]** , the subjects' medial ventral prefrontal cortex always lit up. "If you find the joke funny, the medial ventral prefrontal cortex will activate; if you don't find it funny, it will not activate;' Goel says. And the funnier the joke, the greater the activity.

It's tempting **[10]** . The laughter circuit is built like any good joke, Fried concluded. It has physical, emotional, and cognitive components, any one of which can send the others into hysterics. "We tapped into the network through its motor end," he says. And the medial ventral prefrontal cortex, for all its comedic sophistication, had no choice but to laugh along.

EXTRACTS	GAPS	
A. conducted a follow-up study		
B. could find no wrong but recommended		
C. doesn't have much to laugh about		
D. humans are the only creatures that crack jokes		
E. regardless of the type of joke		
F. the science of comedy is rooted in such tragedies		
G. there are genes for laughter or ticklishness		
H. to actually pull that all together		
I. to choose surprise		
J. to conclude that the search is over		
K. to leave the grave	**0**	✓

Adapted from www.discovermagazine.com

PUNTOS: / **10**

TAREA 2 – 8 puntos: Read the text on the Great Barrier Reef on pages 5 and 6 and choose the best option (A, B, or C) for each question. Write your answers in the appropriate box (only one answer in each box). The first one, number 0, is an example. You will get 1 point per correct answer.

Example: 0. Why did the government abandon the protectionist plan? A. Because experts have suggested another plan. B. Because of the causes of climate change. C. Because of the consequences of climate change.	**C**	✓
1. What was the original plan about? A. To list the Great Barrier Reef as a site in danger. B. To fight central government's endangering plans. C. To foster the Great Barrier Reef's qualities.		
2. What is the main reason the government does not back up the plan now? A. The advisory committee talked them out of it. B. There is no financial support to carry it out. C. They realised that its goals will not happen.		
3. How is the new scope for the Great Barrier Reef different from the previous one? A. A broader general approach will improve the reef's conservation. B. It is more focused on the reef's function than the reef itself. C. The UNESCO World Heritage Centre will list the reef as endangered.		
4. What does the communique from the Independent Expert Panel imply? A. A sense of blame and responsibility for the destruction. B. Damage is so severe that it is now irreversible. C. There is no hope for at least the following ten years.		
5. What is Mr. Sydes' concern about the label 'world heritage site in danger'? A. It could jeopardise the UNESCO category for the reef. B. It would imply the government did not protect the reef. C. It would officially admit the existence of climate change.		
6. What is Mr. Hoagh-Guldberg's perspective on the matter? A. A sentimental one. B. A utilitarian one. C. An optimistic one.		
7. Considering the "50 reefs" project, what qualifies a reef to be saved? A. Its biological superiority. B. Its potential and strength. C. Its regeneration abilities.		
8. According to Mr. Leck, what is the real problem? A. Climate change and its consequences on Australian reefs. B. Government's inactivity about carbon emissions. C. The approach to environmental issues on the plan.		

PUNTOS: / 8

Apellidos y Nombre: .....

GREAT BARRIER REEF 2050 PLAN NO LONGER ACHIEVABLE DUE TO CLIMATE CHANGE, EXPERTS SAY

Environmental lawyers say advice means reef might finally be listed as a 'world heritage site in danger'.

The central aim of the government's plan to protect the Great Barrier Reef is no longer achievable due to the dramatic impacts of climate change, experts have told the government's advisory committees for the plan.

Environmental lawyers said the revelation could mean the Great Barrier Reef might finally be listed as a "world heritage site in danger", a move the federal and Queensland governments have strenuously fought.

The federal and Queensland government's Reef 2050 Long Term Sustainability Plan was released in 2015, with its central vision to "ensure the Great Barrier Reef continues to improve on its outstanding universal values". The plan was created to satisfy the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, which was considering adding the Great Barrier Reef to its list of world heritage sites in danger, so that its condition could be improved.

But in a meeting of the Reef 2050 advisory committee, whose role is to provide advice to state and federal environment ministers on implementing the plan, two experts from government science agencies said improving the natural heritage values of the reef was no longer possible.

With climate change causing unprecedented back-to-back mass bleaching events in 2016 and 2017, killing almost half of the coral, and with the risk of those events set to increase in the coming years, loss of coral cover and biodiversity was virtually assured.

The experts told the meeting the plan should be revised to aim for something more achievable, suggesting it could aim to "maintain the ecological function" of the reef, while accepting that its overall health would inevitably decline.

The Great Barrier Reef serves many "ecological functions". For example, the coral provides shelter and food for fish, it provides fish for humans, the various ecosystems provide experiences for tourists, and the reef structure itself provides protection to the coast from waves.

A spokeswoman for the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, where one of the presenters was based, said: "The concept of 'maintaining ecological function' refers to the balance of ecological processes necessary for the reef ecosystem as a whole to persist, but perhaps in a different form, noting the composition and structure may differ from what is currently seen today."

Members of the advisory committee would only speak on the condition of anonymity, but several told the Guardian about the details of the discussion.

The view presented reflects that previously expressed by a group of scientists who called themselves the Great Barrier Reef Independent Review Group, some of whom sit on Reef 2050 advisory committees. In their review of the plan's implementation, published in February, they said improving the heritage values of the reef, as it aimed to, was "no longer attainable for at least the next two decades". That assessment was made before the latest mass bleaching.

The language was echoed in a communique from the Independent Expert Panel – another body advising on the implementation of the Reef 2050 plan – dated 5 May. The communique said: "There is great concern about the future of the reef, and the communities and businesses that depend on it, but hope still remains for maintaining ecological function over the coming decades."

It continued: "Members agreed that in our lifetime and on our watch, substantial areas of the Great Barrier Reef and the surrounding ecosystems are experiencing major long-term damage which may be irreversible unless action is taken now."

Both advisory bodies have recommended that the Reef 2050 plan must address climate change, the biggest threat to the reef, which it does not.

Brendan Sydes, a lawyer and CEO at Environmental Justice Australia, said the news should be a wake-up call, and could result in the reef being considered again by UNESCO for inclusion on the in-danger list.

"There's a real risk that this new information will cause a renewed scrutiny for what Australia is or is not doing to protect the reef – particularly around climate change," Sydes said, adding that if the outstanding universal values continued to degrade, the very listing of the reef as a world heritage site at all could come into question. "That would be a tragic situation."

Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, who sits on the Independent Expert Panel, declined to comment on discussions in the meetings. But he said the shock of what had happened in the past two years had made people reassess what was possible.

"We're managing reefs in a rapidly changing world," Hoegh-Guldberg said. "So managing to restore the reefs of the past – the way they were prior to the big insults of the 80s, 90s and 2000s ... maybe we need to be looking at this in a different sense. What are the key ecological functions? Essentially, what roles do they play that are important to humans?"

He said that idea had a similar "cold hard light of day" feel to his own "50 reefs" project, which aims to identify 50 reefs around the world that have the best chance of being saved – and which could one day potentially help repopulate other reefs.

Despite the advice, the federal environment minister, Josh Frydenberg, and the Queensland environment minister, Steven Miles, told the Guardian they remained committed to the aims of the Reef 2050 plan.

Frydenberg said: "The Turnbull government is firmly committed to protecting the Great Barrier Reef for future generations and delivering the Reef 2050 plan.

Richard Leck, a campaigner at WWF, said the recent bleaching events, as well as Cyclone Debbie, showed that "the Great Barrier Reef is a system in crisis".

"And the elephant in the room, that is not included in the plan, and Australia is not performing well on, is climate change," Leck said. "Until Australia gets serious about playing its part in limiting emissions to 1.5C temperature rise, we are not taking saving the reef seriously."

Adapted from www.theguardian.com