



Generalitat de Catalunya
Departament d'Ensenyament
Escoles Oficials d'Idiomes

ANGLÈS

Prova Mostra

LLEGIU ATENTAMENT AQUESTES INSTRUCCIONS

Aquest quadernet conté les proves de:

Comprensió escrita _____ 60 minuts

Comprensió oral _____ 40 minuts

Durada total aproximada _____ **100 minuts**

En acabar aquest quadernet, hi haurà un descans de 30 minuts i, a continuació, s'administrarà la prova d'Expressió i interacció escrita. S'assignarà dia i hora per a la prova d'Expressió i interacció oral.

Important

- Contesteu al **Full de respostes**, no en aquest quadernet.
- Les anotacions que feu en aquest quadernet no es tindran en compte.
- Al final de la prova, heu de lliurar el **Full de respostes**, amb totes les dades, i aquest quadernet.



Read the texts and the questions that follow them. Choose the correct answers and mark them with a cross (X) on your answer sheet.

a ☒ b ☐ c ☐

Task 1.

Moving on up

- 1 HUNDREDS of years ago, nobody worried about the deleterious effects of deliberately transplanting species. When Europeans migrated overseas, they brought wheat, barley, rye, cattle, pigs, sheep, and goats for food and horses for transport. An angling society brought European fish to Australia. A group of birdophiles introduced all the species of birds Shakespeare mentioned into the United States. They released 100 pairs of starlings in New York's Central Park; today it is one of America's most common birds.
- 2 These days, people are more cautious about moving flora and fauna. The list of alien species that have upset ecosystems around the world is long and growing: the Japanese knotweed, Nile perch, Asian tiger-mosquito, brown tree-snake and even rabbits in Australia are just a few of the species that have turned from part of a balanced whole at home into invasive predators abroad. Roughly 40% of America's threatened native species can partly blame their decline on newcomers.
- 3 This phenomenon is called "ecological release": native species freed from their usual predators, diseases and parasites sometimes become hyper-successful, and thus seriously upset the ecological balance of their new home.
- 4 Nonetheless, some conservationists have proposed the radical notion of "human-assisted migration": a species in danger of extinction, they say, should be relocated to a place where it has a better chance of surviving. Earlier this year, the magazine *Conservation* reported that a group of American eco-vigilantes called the Torreya Guardians were trying to save a species of Floridian yew tree called *Torreya taxifolia* by spreading its seeds up to 1,000 km north of its current geographic range.
- 5 The tree's decline is blamed on global warming, which is why cooler, more northerly spots are being sought. This is not unique to Florida, either: around the world species are responding to climate change by moving either to higher (and therefore cooler) ground or northwards –sometimes up to 300km. But some species move too slowly, while others may find themselves hemmed in by towns, roads, geographic barriers or different habitats. So groups like the Torreya Guardians have started to lend a helping hand to species that look doomed to extinction.
- 6 This creates something of an ecological dilemma, pitting conservationists who want to prevent extinctions against those who want to preserve native ecosystems. But if current climate trends continue, the latter group may find their position increasingly untenable. It may not be possible to breed in captivity every species that gets into difficulty. Places will have to be found for them. More fundamentally, most ecosystems will probably change. Many plants and animals will be able to move without our help, and when they do, it will not be an orderly march northwards as one cohesive unit. New communities will form.
- 7 Past periods of climate change produced arrangements of species that are no longer extant. Plants and animals that today are strangers to each other may once have co-existed; species foreign to a particular area today may once have dominated it. They came about through unusual combinations of temperature, rain, seasonality, fire, floods, soil type and topography –combinations that today do not exist.
- 8 Current climate trends might well produce climatic anomalies that allow new communities of species to form. They would be perfectly natural, yet entirely unlike any that we know. Who is to say that deliberately moved species do not belong in these new assemblages of species, and would not have made it there themselves had they not been trapped by human modification to the environment? Our concept of what is **pristine** –and therefore worth preserving– is informed by human experience, and therefore takes into account only a tiny fragment of evolutionary time.
- 9 Still, leaving native ecosystems alone provides an ecological baseline. Without this, deciding what is natural or right for a piece of land becomes more subjective and therefore more difficult. Witness, for instance, the British tendency to hold up the countryside as a great example of **pristine** nature, rather than as a deeply and extensively man-modified habitat. People come to like what they know.

- 10 As soon as conservationists start deliberately tinkering with ecosystems, might society not have more of a right to have an opinion about the aesthetics of what is produced? What if the majority of people want something that the scientific minority doesn't like? And might some say that if they can't keep something the way it is now –the way they like it– then why bother keeping it at all?
- 11 Once the tinkering has started, who takes responsibility for negative outcomes, like losses to agriculture or changes to the aesthetic value of an area? There are too few good answers to these questions, and we need them, as the trend toward deliberate ecological modification looks set to continue.

“Conservationists have begun to broach a taboo”, Economist.com, November 26th 2007, <http://www.economist.com/>

1. What is the main point in paragraph one?
 - a) Historically, travellers had to transport food from their place of origin.
 - b) Society used to be unconcerned about shifting livestock and vegetation.
 - c) A love of literature led to overpopulation of starlings in North America.
2. What has been the outcome of the introduction of foreign breeds into new environments?
 - a) Indigenous species have been harmed.
 - b) An increase in the number of new diseases.
 - c) The exportation of parasites.
3. What does ecological release mean?
 - a) Sheltering a species from extinction by breeding it in captivity.
 - b) Removing a species to avoid upsetting the balance of an ecosystem.
 - c) Unleashing a species from its natural restraints by relocating it.
4. A group of eco-vigilantes...
 - a) reintroduced an extinct species to new areas.
 - b) monitored the movement of a species caused by global warming.
 - c) switched a jeopardized species to more suitable living areas.
5. What is claimed about those who want to preserve native ecosystems?
 - a) Their standpoint could become unpopular.
 - b) Their posture could become indefensible.
 - c) Their suggestions may be harmful.
6. What have past periods of climate change led to?
 - a) Alterations in the combination of species that dwell together.
 - b) Plants and animals in conflict and destroying one another.
 - c) The development of new species suitable to their locations.
7. What might ongoing climate tendencies bring about?
 - a) The uncontrolled growth of existing species.
 - b) The creation of new combinations of breeds.
 - c) Alterations in the balance of nature.
8. Choose the best definition for the word **pristine** in paragraphs 8 and 9:
 - a) healthy, fit and vibrant
 - b) new and in very good condition
 - c) wild, virgin and unspoiled
9. If conservationists start meddling with ecosystems...
 - a) they may produce hideous life-forms.
 - b) society should be consulted about its tastes.
 - c) scientists' opinions may differ on what should be produced.
10. Mankind's tampering with nature...
 - a) will have to stop.
 - b) is sure to be detrimental.
 - c) is likely to carry on.

Task 2.

When restaurants get ridiculous

Would you listen to an iPod, cook your own steak on a hot rock or lick a caramel-coated house brick if a chef wanted you to?

- 1 Ben Spalding wants you to lick his bricks. No, that isn't a euphemism. The ex-Roganic chef, a much-tipped rising star, is about to start cooking at a new Islington bar and restaurant, John Salt, where the menu will include his signature "chicken on a brick". The dish is an elaborate combination of chicken liver mousse and crispy chicken skin, served on –you guessed it– a caramel-glazed house brick. Forget slate. That's so 2010. Now, we're all about eating off other building materials. In fact, customers will be encouraged, says Spalding, to "actually lick the brick".
- 2 This outbreak of brick-licking started spontaneously, insists Spalding, with curious diners **slurping** at the caramel, which, when warm, releases bitter flavours that offset the liver's fattiness. I'm all for injecting a bit of fun into restaurants. I'm all for sensory adventure. But –and I suppose it depends on how much you have had to drink– I can't help but think that I'd feel a bit self-conscious, sat in a restaurant, licking a brick. I would be plagued by the nagging doubt that, behind the swing doors, the kitchen staff were sniggering into their Thermomix. "Look at that knobhead, he's actually licking the brick."
- 3 But perhaps this reflects the general trajectory of the modern restaurant. Increasingly chefs are playing with the customers' senses –in a way that often **challenges people to step outside of their comfort zone**– to heighten the dining experience. More and more we are asked to entertain ideas which, 10 years ago, would have seemed ridiculous. The benign end of this spectrum is a waiter relaying how the chef suggests that a dish should be eaten or, as at Goodman, a pre-dinner, tableside preview of that night's meat cuts. Personally, I would find that butchery class unnecessary; an intrusion into what would ideally be a relaxing night out.
- 4 Sucking on an amuse bouche of "pebbles" at Mugaritz may be a hurdle for some, but Noma's sometime serving of live shrimps takes the whole process of forcing the diner to perceive, engage with and question what they are eating to a new and confrontational level. By contrast, eating at the Fat Duck is more likely to make you feel a bit daft rather than guilty.
- 5 When I ate there, I'd promised that when it came to the Sound of the Sea (the dish where you're asked to pop in iPod headphones and listen to a shoreline soundscape), I was going to start singing Live Forever, point at the headphones and shout at my wife: "I THINK THEY'VE GIVEN ME THE WRONG ONE."
I didn't, of course. And I'm glad I didn't, because while I can't say that the soundtrack transported me to the seaside or, so far as I could consciously tell, enhanced the fishiness of the dish, it's too easy for us Britons –with our admirable but occasionally debilitating fear of being seen as pretentious– **to take the piss**.
- 6 Undoubtedly, there is something in that kind of sensory manipulation. Even if we don't fully understand it yet. For years, those blacked-out restaurants where you dine "blind" have insisted that it enhances your experience of taste and smell. If licking a brick adds a new dimension to a dish, why deny yourself that pleasure? Surely a kind of open, curious scepticism is the best approach to these things?
- 7 Licking a brick is certainly more enjoyable than what you might encounter elsewhere. From being told to sit up straight and chew your food properly, to having to cook your own steak on a volcanic rock, there are many things that you might be asked to do in restaurants, which, frankly, I don't want to. Not if I'm paying for the privilege.

11. What does the writer imply in the first paragraph?
- a) Modern cuisine can be absurd.
 - b) Eating in a modern restaurant can be complicated.
 - c) Licking a brick can be an interesting experience.
12. What is a possible definition of **slurping**? (*paragraph 2*)
- a) eating with your fingers
 - b) making noises with your mouth when eating
 - c) refusing a certain type of food
13. How would the writer feel if he had ordered **chicken on a brick**?
- a) intrigued
 - b) uncomfortable
 - c) important
14. In this text, what is the meaning of **challenges people to step outside of their comfort zone**? (*paragraph 3*)
- a) suggests doing difficult things
 - b) guarantees comfort
 - c) provokes uncontrolled reactions
15. What does the writer suggest about the The Fat Duck and their attempt to appear modern/original?
- a) They have succeeded.
 - b) They haven't reached their limit.
 - c) They have overdone it.
16. What is a synonym of **to take the piss**? (*paragraph 5*)
- a) Make fun of someone
 - b) Criticise someone with cruelty
 - c) Look ridiculous
17. What does the writer conclude?
- a) You must always be open to new experiences.
 - b) Some restaurants have gone too far.
 - c) Sometimes he has to do things he doesn't enjoy.

Task 3.

Book Review: *To Be Frank* by Shalom Auslander

Henry Hitchings reviews *To Be Frank*, a book by Shalom Auslander, about a Jewish salesman who finds Anne Frank, the 20th century's most famous diarist, in the attic of his farmhouse.

Shalom Auslander has a lot of nerve – or chutzpah, as he might prefer to call it. For his first novel, he's come up with an outrageously iconoclastic concept.

The novel's main character is Solomon Kugel, a Jewish salesman who specialises in "composting equipment" – a job he loathes. Approaching 40, he lives in a farmhouse with his wife and sickly son. His mother shares their home; supposedly dying, she revels in the myth that she survived the concentration camps – though in fact the closest she's ever been to conflict is pushing and shoving at the autumn sales.

Already Solomon sounds like a character straight out of Woody Allen, and that's before history pungently catches up with him. One night he hears a scrabbling coming from the attic. He suspects that it must be rodents or perhaps an arsonist hiding in the eaves – his morose thinking tends towards paranoia. But on investigation the noise is caused by an old woman who has been living there in squalor. And not just any old woman: this is Anne Frank.

The most celebrated diarist of the 20th century isn't exactly a benign presence; Auslander imagines her in wickedly irreverent terms. She's narcissistic, foul-smelling and bitchy. She growls and throws bottles. Yet even if she's out of touch with a lot of everyday niceties, she seems well-informed about her success. "Thirty-two million copies," she yells, using her bestselling track record to justify the efforts she has poured into her new book, a novel she hopes will put her diaries in the shade.

At first Solomon is unconvinced by her explanation of who she is. "I know Anne Frank died in Auschwitz," he reflects. "And I know that she died along with many others, some of whom were my relatives. And I know that making light of that, by claiming to be Anne Frank, not only is not funny and abhorrent but it also insults the memory of millions of victims of Nazi brutality." His uninvited guest fixes him with a menacing yellow eye: "It was Bergen-Belsen, jackass."

Anne's squatting in the roof has an unhappy symbolism: she is the burden of history weighing down on Solomon. Even putting this to one side, he can't help reflecting that, "While there's never a good time to find Anne Frank in your attic, this was a particularly bad time." The Kugels have just moved to the countryside from Brooklyn and in a community defined by its blandness (the "birthplace of nothing") they are guaranteed to be the objects of nosy curiosity.

His relationship with the woman in the attic harms his marriage. It also exacerbates his morbid obsessions. He repeatedly jots down ideas about what his last words might be. He spars with his brother-in-law, Pinkus Stephenor, a fully paid-up optimist whose arguments bear a hardly coincidental resemblance to those of the Harvard psychology professor Steven Pinker.

Solomon's analyst – and he must have an analyst, as surely as mice must have cats to chase them – tells him that hopefulness is a sort of madness. Why did the chicken cross the road? Because of misplaced confidence; the other side won't be better, and in any case he will probably be run over trying to get there. "We're all in quicksand," the analyst says. "Up to our eyeballs, from the moment we're born." According to this view, all suffering is the result of optimism.

Mired in neuroses, Solomon believes he is doomed to compete forever in what he calls a "Misery Olympics". He wants a "lemon-scented" life but there is no household cleaning product capable of masking the aroma of the past with all its indignities and atrocities. On the Fourth of July, he sees an image of the Twin Towers and the accompanying instruction "Never forget". "What's the harm in forgetting?" he asks.

Anne Frank's unexpected longevity prompts other unsettling questions. Should we care about the story she wants to tell? Given how much has been invested in the legend of her death, can the fact of her being alive be appreciated or even accepted? Do we maybe prefer martyrs to survivors?

Auslander's method is to dwell on the unpalatable. He fearlessly pursues a course of

maximum provocativeness. The result is a comic novel of the most caustic kind. It mocks the solemnity with which Jews regard the Holocaust. It's an assault on the very idea of good taste, treating piety as something toxic.

At the outset this is dazzling. Yet the novel seems a succession of smart sketches rather than a sustained, authentic narrative. Anne and Solomon aside, the characters are wispily drawn. While the jokes are often inspired, the splenetic acts of transgression become repetitive. Auslander purveys an intelligent line in wounded existentialism, but the virtuosity of his performance is exhausting.

Review by **Henry Hitchings**, *Financial Times Magazine*, February 24, 2012. www.ft.com/intl

18. What is the best way to describe Shalom Auslander's writing?
 - a) Mystic.
 - b) Bold.
 - c) Orthodox.
19. The character Solomon Kugel is portrayed as...
 - a) frail.
 - b) sorrowful.
 - c) bereft.
20. What does Solomon initially attribute the sound in the attic to?
 - a) Vermin.
 - b) A burglar.
 - c) A spy.
21. How does Auslander's Anne Frank come across?
 - a) As an eerie character.
 - b) As a gracious lady.
 - c) As a conceited old woman.
22. What is Solomon's initial reaction to Anne Frank's explanation of who she is?
 - a) She is playing some kind of sick joke.
 - b) She is suffering from some kind of dementia.
 - c) She is a distant relation of his.
23. Why does Solomon consider this a bad time to find Anne Frank in his attic?
 - a) No one will believe him.
 - b) His neighbours will start to nose around.
 - c) The community is adverse to Jews.
24. How does having Anne Frank in his attic affect Solomon?
 - a) It makes him more passive.
 - b) He becomes unfit.
 - c) It affects his family life.
25. What does Solomon's analyst tell him?
 - a) Not to get his hopes up.
 - b) He needs to be more confident.
 - c) He is doomed.
26. What kind of existence does Solomon long for? One that is...
 - a) neat and tidy.
 - b) free from the burden of the past.
 - c) devoid of competition.
27. The critic draws attention to the fact that if Anne Frank were still alive...
 - a) society would worship her.
 - b) her story would fail to have meaning.
 - c) she would be mistrusted.
28. How does the critic describe Auslander's use of humour?
 - a) Tiresome.
 - b) Obnoxious.
 - c) Offensive.