



Junta de Andalucía  
Consejería de Educación y Deporte

## Pruebas Específicas de Certificación 2021/2022

### Comprensión de Textos Escritos

#### NIVEL C2 | INGLÉS

Apellidos: .....

Nombre: .....

Alumno/a OFICIAL del grupo: .....

Indica el nombre de tu profesor/a-tutor/a: .....

Alumno/a LIBRE.

#### INSTRUCCIONES

- Duración máxima: 75 minutos.
- Esta prueba consta de tres tareas:
  - En la Tarea 1 tendrás que identificar las ideas generales del texto.
  - En la Tarea 2 tendrás que entender las ideas principales del texto.
  - En la Tarea 3 tendrás que comprender los detalles importantes de un texto.
- En cada tarea obtendrás: 1 punto por cada respuesta correcta; 0 puntos por cada respuesta incorrecta o no dada.
- Solo se admitirán respuestas escritas con bolígrafo azul o negro.
- Por favor, no escribas en los espacios sombreados destinados a la calificación de las tareas.

PUNTUACIÓN	NOTA FINAL	CALIFICACIÓN
/ 26	/ 10	<input type="checkbox"/> Superado <input type="checkbox"/> No Superado

## TASK 1

Read the following newspaper opinion article and follow the instructions on page 3.

### WE NEED SCHOOLS FOR MESSERS, DREAMERS AND MISFITS

#### [0] Pleasant surprise

The great explosion in English rock music was the unforeseeable result of art schools. Charlie Watts, the Rolling Stones drummer who died last year, went to art school. So did at least one member of almost every great English rock band of the 1960s and early 1970s. This is a lovely example of unintended consequences – and one of the reasons we should think again about how education works.

#### [1]

Even if you leave aside the pleasure these bands have given generations of people around the world, they were also a vast national asset. They helped rescue Britain from a self-pitying narrative of decline. Out of post-war austerity and the loss of empire, they drew vigour and innovation and creative zest. They gave Britain a soft power to replace the hard power it was rapidly losing.

#### [2]

So how did this happen? In large measure, through something that is unimaginable now: a socialist experiment in publicly subsidised education for messers, dreamers and misfits.

Keith Richards, the other art school alumnus in the Stones, was a council estate job, expelled from secondary school. But, as he put it, "In England, if you're lucky, you get into art school. It's somewhere they put you if they can't put you anywhere else."

The postwar expansion of art schools in England was driven by a wild idea: give working- and lower-middle-class kids who can't or won't go to university an alternative place to be. They were specifically for those deemed "temperamentally allergic to conventional education".

In the 1950s, entry requirements for art schools were lax. The teaching was often loose and informal. The qualification, the National Diploma in Design (NDD) was known by the students as the Nothing Doing Diploma.

#### [3]

Yet all these students were given generous grants and access to cheap housing. They were pampered layabouts. The whole system was a managerialist's nightmare: money wasted on wasters. And it was vastly productive. It produced artists and designers. But it also did something nobody planned or imagined. It was the petri dish in which a new popular culture grew.

The art school kids helped to make the Stones, but also The Beatles (John Lennon), The Who (Pete Townshend), The Kinks (Ray Davies), The Yardbirds (Jeff Beck), Cream (Eric Clapton), The Animals (Eric Burdon), Pink Floyd (Syd Barrett), Fleetwood Mac (Christine McVie), Led Zeppelin (Jimmy Page), David Bowie, Queen (Freddie Mercury), Roxy Music (Bryan Ferry and Brian Eno) and The Clash (Joe Strummer).

These asylums for nonconformists did more for Britain's international standing than the entire Foreign Office. If there really was a post-imperial global Britain, they were crucial to its creation.

**[ 4 ]**

The flowering of rock music was a happy accident. But it could not have happened without two political ideas that have long since gone out of fashion.

One was that everyone has a right to a higher education – even those who are “temperamentally allergic” to the traditional disciplines of the university. This was a socialist principle. It was a matter of justice that the state should not subsidise only those who meet a narrow range of educational criteria. Bad boys and girls had the same rights as good ones.

**[ 5 ]**

The other, related, idea was a socialist optimism about human potential. The art schools were an act of faith: if you give young people a chance and don't fret too much about trying to control what they're doing, they will find a way to do something good.

The authorities had no clue about what that something would be. If they had been told that they were investing in the production of “A Day in the Life” (the Beatles) and “Satisfaction” (The Rolling Stones) and “My Generation” (The Who) and “Ziggy Stardust” (David Bowie) and London Calling (the Clash), they would have been dumfounded. But they made the space for these things to happen. How did we get to a point where these thoughts have become unthinkable? How did these ideals of educational equality and creative freedom become far-out utopianism?

**[ 6 ]**

In post-Thatcher Britain, many of the art schools were closed, amalgamated or absorbed into mainstream universities. This was part of a broader international effort to make education more and more managerial, to insist on a rational relationship between inputs and outcomes, to reproduce only those forms of knowledge that we already have. It is now anathema to tolerate a system that allows people to do things we have not planned and cannot measure.

Some aspects of education do have to be rigorous and standardised and minutely tested. But there has to be room for happy accidents. And room, too, for the misfits and the dreamers and the people who don't know what they're doing until they stumble into it.

We have increasingly divided society into the conformists who make it because they obey the rules and play the games necessary to get into, and qualify from universities, and those who don't or can't. Those who cannot conform are, in our mechanistic world, useless. But it's mostly useless people who have made art and come up with new ideas and generated new cultural energies. To adapt the Rolling Stones, we have forged an educational culture in which authority always gets what it thinks it wants. We would be better with one in which young people get what they need: time and space to be what no one intended.

*Source: Fintan O'Toole. The Irish Times.*



### TASK 1

Read the newspaper opinion article on pages 1 and 2. Then, match the headings A-H to the corresponding sections 1-6. There are TWO extra headings which cannot be used. You will get 1 point per correct answer. Item 0 is an example.

	ANSWER	
EX. Pleasant surprise	0	✓
A. Statistics Count		
B. Breeding ground for the spoilt rotten		
C. Utilitarianism shackles creativity		
D. Stifling of enlightened outlook		
E. Levelling up		
F. Academic rigour across the board		
G. Accommodating the louts		
H. Cultural bonus		

MARK / 6

**Apellidos y Nombre:** .....

## TASK 2

**Read the following article and answer the questions on page 8.**

### **COMPETITION IS RUINING CHILDHOOD. THE KIDS SHOULD FIGHT BACK**

Like the crack of a starting pistol, November begins the official college application season. But for students, this race started long ago.

Many of today's kids have lived their entire lives, from sunup until midnight, in a fierce tournament with their peers. [ 0 ]. That means it's not enough for students to do their best. Whether in the classroom, on the athletic field or at home on the computer, they must always be better. Youth has become a debilitating endurance test. The thing is, we don't even really know what we are racing for, much less how to tone down the competition. And most people don't seem to be benefiting from this frantic contest, either as students or as adult workers. [ 1 ]. Everyone tells students that the harder they work to develop their job skills — their "human capital" — the better off they will be. It's not true. In fact, the result is the opposite: more and better educated workers, earning less.

An analysis in September of Census Bureau data by the Economic Policy Institute, a think tank, found that between 2000 and 2016 — years when many millennials first entered the job market — there was "little to no gain" in median annual earnings. [ 2 ]. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, over the same period (2000 to 2016), the portion of graduates seeking and obtaining both two- and four-year degrees increased consistently, and the percentage of people aged 25 to 29 with postgraduate degrees jumped to 9 percent from 5.

Not only is more education not leading to higher wages, there isn't even a positive correlation between the two. If anything, the flood of human capital puts employers in a position to offer workers a shrinking slice of the pie and get more in return. [ 3 ].

In the '70s, the economist Gary Becker theorized that employers would shift the costs of developing human capital onto workers, from paid on-the-job training to unpaid schooling. He figured that, though they need skilled labor, corporations would be disinclined to pay for training since other companies could then lure away "their" human capital.

[ 4 ]. They get their pick from all the qualified applicants, and the oversupply of human capital keeps labor costs down. Competition between workers means lower wages for them and higher profits for their bosses.



The struggle for success has heavy financial and psychological costs for the participants. Constant competition has affected how young Americans see themselves in relation to the world. That's why the United States has measured huge increases in youth anxiety and depression, as well as a sharp decline in social trust. Disappointingly, [ 5 ] .

This system may work for a small number of bosses and shareholders, but it's not in the interest of education in a broad, exploratory sense — and it's clearly not in the interests of young people themselves. [ 6 ] policymakers will never scale back academic competition, and most educators and parents are understandably loath to tell children, "Don't work so hard."

If change is going to come, it should come from students, in the classroom. As individuals, students have no choice but to compete. [ 7 ] . They face an age-old collective action problem, but they are smart. Schools can't run without students, and the economy can't run without schools; their work matters, and they can withdraw it.

Unions aren't just good for wage workers. [ 8 ] . The idea of organizing student labor when even auto factory workers are having trouble holding onto their unions may sound outlandish, but young people have been at the forefront of conflicts over police brutality, immigrant rights and sexual violence. In terms of politics, they are as tightly clustered as just about any demographic in America. They are an important social force in this country, one we need right now.

It is in students' shared interest to seek later start times for the school day to combat the epidemic of insufficient sleep among high schoolers. [ 9 ] . They could start by demanding an end to class rank or a cap on the number of Advanced Placement courses each student can take per year. It is also in their shared interest to make life easier and lower the stakes of childhood in general. [ 1 0 ] .

*Source: The New York Times*

## TASK 3

**Read the following text and answer the questions on page 9.**

### **HOW A LATE-BLOSSOMING CLASSICS DON BECAME BRITAIN'S MOST BELOVED INTELLECTUAL**

The first time I saw Mary Beard, I was 17. It was 1989, and she was speaking at a joint open day for the Oxford and Cambridge classics faculties. She was utterly unlike the other speakers, who were Oxbridge dons straight from central casting: tweedy, forbidding, male. Instead of standing at a lectern like everyone else, she perched rakishly on the edge of a desk. She was dressed in a vaguely hippyish, embroidered black dress, and a cascade of black hair tumbled around her shoulders.

In public, in private and in her academic writing she is sceptical, wary of consensus, the kind of person who will turn any question back on itself and examine it from an unexpected angle. She is not afraid to take apart her own work. She doesn't let herself off – she's not one of those scholars who is building an unassailable monument of work to leave behind her.

The learned but approachable figure you see on TV translating Latin inscriptions, carving up a pizza to explain the division of the Roman empire, or arguing about public services on Question Time, is precisely the Beard you encounter in private, except that in real life, she swears magnificently and often. At one point, she sketched out an argument for a second referendum on Britain's membership of the EU. Her case rested on the very nature of democracy. "Democracy cannot properly operate without knowledge, which the entire electorate of summer 2016 lacked. The referendum then, should not be treated as the final word, but as a straw vote. Sure, say we want to leave, but you can only in the end say we are going to leave when we know what it means. Otherwise, it's wanking in the dark."

As recently as a decade ago, it would have seemed unlikely, even outlandish, that a middle-aged classics don, her appearance a million miles away from the groomed perfection expected of women in the public sphere, would end up so famous and, by and large, so loved.

Beard radiates authority and expertise, but she does not hesitate to get mixed up in messy public arguments, which often puts her on the frontline of the culture wars. Her expert interventions are oftentimes met with what she has described as a "torrent of aggressive insults, on everything from my historical competence and elitist ivory tower viewpoints to my age, shape and gender".

For Beard, this is evidence that such battles cannot be shirked. Embedded in her refusal to be silenced, in her endless online engagement, is a kind of optimism: her notion is that if only we argued more cogently, more tolerantly and with better grace, then we could make public discourse something better than it is.

Around 1990, she won a one-year fellowship, which she hoped would give her space and time for research. "I wrote absolutely fuck all. I wrote pages of crap. I couldn't do it. I wept over endless drafts."

Her career stands, in a way, as a corrective to the notion that life runs a smooth, logical path. "It's a lesson to all of those guys – some of whom are my mates," she said, remembering the colleagues who once whispered that she had squandered her talent. "I now think: 'Up yours, actually.' Because people's careers go in very different trajectories and at very different speeds. Some people get lapped after an early sprint." She added softly, with a wicked grin: "I know who you are, boys."

Her position, poised between tradition and transgression, holds true for public life, too. The notion that she is "wickedly subversive" is always tempered by the fact that she emerges from a discipline with an enormous weight of inherited cultural capital. That she is able to draw on this double identity – a fierce feminist with an unassailable expertise in Latin; someone whose left wing politics are twinned with a deep knowledge of Cicero – is part of the reason she appeals so broadly. She is as much of interest to the readers of the Telegraph as the Guardian.

Her breakthrough book, *Pompeii* (2008), combined her academic methods with a relaxed, approachable address. It was a work of sceptical history that debunked myth after myth, and battled against received opinion. But it was her moment: at the time, the BBC was being sued for age discrimination and the paucity of older women on air was becoming painfully obvious.

Her feisty gobbiness was partly a performance, an identity forged to fit into the male world of work. There was, she said, a lot of predictable sexism. But, she said: "My colleagues were structurally male and really male, but what they didn't do was treat me as anything other than an intellectual equal."

The presiding genius of the Classics Department was Keith Hopkins, the ancient historian, who was notorious for his withering put-downs of colleagues' work. He was adversarial, terrifying and inspirational all at once. Fortunately for her, she thrived – and, necessarily, developed a thick skin.

Her interventions in public life offer an alternative mode of discourse, one that people are hungry for: a position that is serious and tough in argument, but friendly and humorous in manner, and one that, at a time when disagreements quickly become shrill or abusive, insists on dialogue. Still, it is these precise qualities that can, equally, land her in deep water.

Trying to calm the fury and aggression of public speech is, quite possibly, a futile endeavour. Friends worry about the toll such a publicly exposed existence takes on her. Withstanding appalling online abuse is draining. She abhors a comfortable consensus. She is never tempted, she told me, to abandon the day job and focus purely on her media career. Cambridge is grounding. It is her home. She is respected by her peers as a standard bearer and she has never lost academic credibility.

Yet Beard is also aware that her time in the limelight may one day come to an end. No one knows better than she that empires rise and fall.

*Adapted from an article by Charlotte Higgins, The Guardian.*





Apellidos y Nombre: .....

### TASK 2

Read the article on pages 4 and 5 and match the number (1-10) with the removed extract (A-L) below. Capital letters and punctuation have been removed from the options. There are TWO extracts you do not need to use. Item 0 is an example. You will get 1 point per correct answer.

		ANSWER	
EX.	from kindergarten to 12th grade, schools brag about how "competitive" they are	0	✓
A.	kids are getting conned		
B.	but together, there's no telling what kind of power they could exercise		
C.	students are dropping out of the rat-race		
D.	at the end of their journey into adulthood they are not reimbursed for their efforts		
E.	only young people, united, can improve their working conditions and end the academic arms race		
F.	students can use collective bargaining, too		
G.	Americans are improving themselves, but the rewards keep flowing uphill to the 1 percent		
H.	however, the early bird always catches the worm		
I.	it is equally in their shared interest to improve their mental health by reducing competition		
J.	there are some winners, but the real champions are the corporate owners		
K.	but even though older adults are ostensibly worried about the kids		
L.	educational achievement, on the other hand, follows a different trend		

MARK / 10



### TASK 3

Read the article about Mary Beard on pages 6 and 7, and choose the correct statement (A, B or C) for questions 1-10, which follow the order in which the article is written. Only one of the statements is correct. The first one (0) is an example. You will get 1 point per correct answer.

	ANSWER	
0. A. In garb and demeanour, her peers seemed to be typecast. B. Her peers seemed unthreatening. C. Her peers were far from formidable.	A	✓
1. A. She came across as shy. B. The image of her is that of a carefree bird. C. Her vibe was lackadaisical.		
2. A. She is characterized primarily by her desire to influence. B. She ought to exercise self-criticism. C. She is loath to be unquestioning.		
3. A. She looks down her nose at others. B. Although she is lettered, she is down-to-earth. C. Her aloofness is striking.		
4. A. She equates an uninformed referendum to stumbling in obscurity. B. The uninformed referendum should be seen as a false vote. C. She likens an uninformed referendum to self-gratification.		
5. A. Heretofore, women of her ilk were frowned upon. B. It is not bizarre that attitudes have changed so much. C. Age and looks still rule.		
6. A. She refuses to call out discrimination. B. She draws the line on discrimination. C. She is dismayed by narrow-mindedness.		
7. A. Some of her colleagues failed to manage the hurdles. B. She gives the two fingers to those who derided her. C. She refuses to get a dig in at her colleagues.		
8. A. She appeals across the board due to her dissident nature. B. She veers more towards lore. C. She wins hands down by dint of her breadth of insight.		
9. A. As a survival strategy, she didn't mince her words. B. She was outspoken in order to attract attention. C. She sat on the fence in order to get ahead.		
10. A. Being a don does not protect her from media fallout. B. She remains blasé as regards media exposure. C. She could be making the best of it while it lasts.		

MARK / 10