



Generalitat de Catalunya  
Departament d'Educació  
**Escoles Oficials d'Idiomes**

## ANGLÈS

Prova mostra

### LLEGIU ATENTAMENT AQUESTES INSTRUCCIONS

Aquest quadernet conté les proves de:

**Comprensió escrita** ..... 60 minuts

**Comprensió oral** ..... 45 minuts

**Mediació escrita** ..... 35 minuts

Durada total aproximada ..... **140 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 les proves d'Expressió i interacció oral i Mediació 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**.



CERTIFICAT DE NIVELL C1

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  c

## Task 1.

### Science as salvation?

#### Marcelo Gleiser wants to heal the rift between humanists and scientists by deflating scientific dreams of establishing final truths

- Whether or not scientists are from Mars and humanists from Venus, the “two cultures” debate about the arts and sciences has never been down to earth. For decades we’ve endured schematic sparring between straw men: humanists claim that scientists are reductive, scientists find humanists reactionary. (A recent bout between the cognitive scientist Steven Pinker and the literary critic Leon Wieseltier in the pages of *The New Republic* ran true to form.) Marcelo Gleiser, a physicist with strong ties to the humanities, is alarmed by the hubristic stance of his discipline and the backlash it is liable to provoke. He has written *The Island of Knowledge* as “a much needed self-analysis in a time when scientific speculation and arrogance are rampant... I am attempting to protect science from attacks on its intellectual integrity.”
- Perhaps this well-meant intervention is unnecessary, given the many signs of interdisciplinary concord today. These include the growth of science studies, technocultural studies and the digital humanities within the liberal arts; successful popularizations of science in the media—the new *Cosmos* had the largest debut of any series in television history; and the ongoing enthusiasm for science fiction in mass culture. (True, the genre is often light-years away from genuine science, but at its best it’s an exemplary merger of the two cultures.) From such portents alone, we seem poised to embrace the ideal of “one culture, many methods.” But might this be a pious platitude, if not a colossal category mistake? Are the arts and sciences actually fated to be an estranged couple, burdening their offspring with crippling complexes?
- Gleiser hopes to heal the rift between the two cultures by denying the scientific dream of establishing final truths. He insists that while the arts and sciences have different methods, they are fundamentally united in their search for humanity’s roots and purposes; they also share the human limitation of finding only provisional and incomplete answers. He traces Western science’s misguided aspiration to omniscience, and its consequent devaluing of human fallibility, to its beginnings in classical Greece. This is certainly an appropriate place to start for a history of science’s Platonic aspirations. However, the origin of the “two cultures” debate that Gleiser implicitly addresses is more recent, and thus less entrenched, than his own chronology implies. The unhappy couple stands a good chance of being reconciled through judicious interventions such as his.
- Their current disaffection commenced in the early nineteenth century, when the “natural philosopher,” a man of parts, began to be replaced by the specialized “scientist,” a term coined in the 1830s. A new division of labor emerged. Scientists claimed to establish objective facts and laws about the natural world by stifling their imagination and relying on empirical observation, testing and prediction; humanists embraced the Romantic imagination, interpreting the ambiguous nature of human experience through empathy as well as analysis. At the dawn of the twentieth century, reconciliation beckoned within the new domain of the “social sciences.” Economists, anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists and historians combined rational inquiry with intuitive insight—the sort of “scientific use of the imagination” proposed by the scientist John Tyndall and exemplified by the fictional icon Sherlock Holmes. Nevertheless, methods clashed and philosophies jostled. Should social scientists seek simple, encompassing laws like the natural sciences, or should they highlight particularity and uniqueness, like the humanities? The debate revolved around approaches deemed “nomothetic” (generalizing) or “idiographic” (individualizing)—terms so ugly they assured public disinterest.
- The battle lines became firmly drawn** in the years following World War II. In *Science and Human Values* (1956), Jacob Bronowski attempted to overcome the sullen suspicions between humanists and scientists, each now condemning the other for the horrifying misuse of technology during the conflict. Bronowski was a published poet and biographer of William Blake as well as a mathematician; he knew that artists and scientists had different aims and methods. Yet he also attested that both engaged in imaginative explorations of the unities underlying the human and natural worlds.
- The “two cultures” debate has continued for decades, often rehashing the same issues and generating more heat than light—a metaphor that reminds us of how entwined the arts and sciences are in everyday life. In recent years, however, the tone and substance of the debate have changed. There is a revived tenor of nineteenth-century

scientific triumphalism, owing in part to the amazing successes of the natural sciences, from the standard model in physics to DNA sequencing and the Human Genome Project. Numerous physicists are convinced that they will discover a final “theory of everything” proving the unity of nature’s laws and defining its constituent elements. Not all scientists share this reductionist outlook, but the wider culture unintentionally reinforces it, thanks to information technology’s colonization of everyday life. We’re more primed than ever before to think in terms of keyword searches, algorithmic sequences and Big Data.

7. No wonder that science, for many, has become a secular holy writ, goading its believers to denounce all forms of religion as empty superstition while converting the humanistic disciplines into mere disciples of science. **The new priesthood** even performs last rites, as Stephen Hawking did in 2011: “Philosophy is dead,” he pronounced, because “philosophers have not kept up with modern developments in science. Particularly physics.” Gleiser is troubled by the fatuous preening of some prominent scientists, who risk alienating a public otherwise predisposed to appreciate the marvels of scientific discovery and the mysteries of scientific exploration: “**To claim to know the ‘truth’** is too heavy a burden for scientists to carry. We learn from what we can measure and should be humbled by how much we can’t. It’s what we don’t know that matters.”

Michael SALER, *The Nation*, 09/15 [edited]

1. What do we learn about Marcelo Gleiser in paragraph 1?
  - a) He favours the objective point of view of science.
  - b) He thinks science is partly to blame for the confrontation.
  - c) He is shocked by humanists’ view on science.
2. Why is science fiction mentioned in the article?
  - a) To point out the weaknesses of the genre.
  - b) To show the presence of science in popular art forms.
  - c) To illustrate advances in science in a clear way.
3. What is Marcelo Gleiser’s aim in writing *The Island of Knowledge*?
  - a) To present science as a more uncertain discipline.
  - b) To maintain science’s methods of finding knowledge.
  - c) To warn about humanists’ disregard for science.
4. What does the word entrenched mean in paragraph 3?
  - a) established
  - b) suitable
  - c) valid
5. What was the scientists’ stance regarding imagination in the 19th century?
  - a) They exploited it.
  - b) They depended on it.
  - c) They suppressed it.
6. What does the phrase *The battle lines became firmly drawn* imply? (paragraph 5)
  - a) The controversy came to its final stage.
  - b) The disagreement became pronounced.
  - c) The conflict took on a new perspective.
7. What does the author say about information technology in paragraph 6?
  - a) It has helped boost the reductionist outlook of some scientists.
  - b) It has contributed to recent scientific discoveries.
  - c) It has made everyday life more complicated.
8. Who does the phrase *The new priesthood* refer to? (paragraph 7)
  - a) Philosophers.
  - b) Humanists.
  - c) Scientists.
9. How does Gleiser regard scientists’ claim to know the ‘truth’? (paragraph 7)
  - a) As visionary.
  - b) As understandable.
  - c) As arrogant.

**Task 2.****Relative success**

1. Today real power is rarely inherited. Monarchs spend their lives cutting ribbons and attending funerals. Landed aristocrats have to climb the greasy pole if they want to wield serious influence. Even in the United States great dynasties such as the Clintons and Bushes have to go to the trouble of getting themselves elected. The one exception to this lies at the heart of the capitalist system: the family firm.
2. Leading students of capitalism have been pronouncing the death rites of family companies for decades, arguing that family firms would be marginalised by the arrival of industrial capitalism. They also insisted that the Dallas-style downsides of family ownership would become more destructive: family quarrels would tear these companies apart and the law of regression to the mean would condemn them to lousy management. Most countries have a variation of the phrase “clogs to clogs in three generations”. For a long time, they appeared to be right: in both America and Europe, family firms were in retreat for much of the 20th century.
3. Yet that decline now seems to have been reversed. The proportion of Fortune 500 companies that can be described as family companies increased from 15% in 2005 to 19% today. That is largely because of the rise of emerging economies, in which family firms are more common. But even in the rich world family companies are these days holding their own. Of the American firms in the Fortune Global 500, 15% are family firms—only slightly less than a decade ago. In Europe, families control 40% of big listed companies.
4. You can happily go through a day consuming nothing but the products of family concerns: reading the *New York Times* (or the *Daily Mail*), driving a BMW (or a Ford or a Fiat), making calls on your Samsung Galaxy, munching on Mars Bars and watching Fox on your Comcast cable. And the growth is likely to continue. McKinsey predicts that in 2025, family companies from the emerging world will account for 37% of all companies with annual revenues of more than \$1 billion, up from 16% in 2010.
5. Why have family companies defied their obituarists? Many of them continue to suffer from serious problems: witness the recent debacle at Portugal’s Espírito Santo. But, particularly in the West, family firms have far fewer defects than in the past, largely because they have got better at addressing their obvious weaknesses.
6. These days it is rare for a family boss to hand his job on to an obvious dud. Most family companies train future leaders by sending them to business schools and putting them through their paces in a succession of lower level jobs. A growing number (particularly in Germany) have become masters at moving family members from executive jobs to supervisory roles in the boardroom. An entire consulting industry exists to help families deal with the peculiar dynamics of their companies, such as managing personal conflicts and sidelining thick relations without hurting their feelings.
7. Family firms’ strengths, meanwhile, are just as important today as they were in the early days of capitalism. They solve the “agency problem” that Adam Smith put his finger on in “The Wealth of Nations” when he argued that hired managers would never have the same “anxious vigilance” in running companies as the owners. Family managers are often parsimonious: companies such as Walmart, Koch Industries and Mars & Co are famous for running a tight ship with humble headquarters, lean management and an obsession with operational efficiency. They are good at thinking in terms of generations rather than quarterly results: Roche makes long-term bets on developing pharmaceuticals; the Murdochs and Newhouses have stuck with print media in difficult times.
8. But the emerging world is currently witnessing a battle for the soul of the family firm. Old-model family companies are sprawling conglomerates that rely on political connections to protect them from global competition and complex cross-ownership structures designed to give families maximum control for minimum cash. New-model family firms are professionally managed, transparent outfits whose owners maintain long-term vision and quality but eschew the sort of wheeling and dealing that made them rich in the first place.
9. The best way to ensure that the right side wins is to increase competition: India’s great liberalisation of the late 1990s persuaded Tata and Mahindra & Mahindra to transform themselves. Emerging-world governments

should also outlaw cross- ownership and strengthen the rights of non-family shareholders, as America did in the 1930s and other countries have done more recently.

- 10.** The other great problem with family companies, which plagues the West as well as the emerging world, is that the weaker members of the breed have failed to learn from the stronger members. Too many fail to make even the most basic plans for the future: PricewaterhouseCoopers discovered that only 16% of the family firms it surveyed had put a formal succession plan in place. Too many lack the ambition to think that they can compete with the best in the world: convinced that they are a bit of an anachronism, they tend to keep themselves to themselves. The remarkable record of the best family firms should remind millions of business owners that, in the corporate world at least, you do not have to surrender family control in order to prosper.

*The Economist*, 11/14

- 10.** According to the article, what distinguishes family firms from other people who wield power?  
Family firms...
- work much harder than royalty.
  - are the only ones that inherit real power.
  - lack the courage of great dynasties.
- 11.** What have leading students of capitalism proclaimed about family firms?
- That industrial capitalism would diminish their power.
  - That they would remain as they were in the 20th century.
  - That the law of regression to the mean would cause them to disappear.
- 12.** What is stated about emerging economies in the article?
- They have influenced family-run companies of the rich world.
  - They host the largest proportion of big-listed family firms.
  - They have contributed to the rise of family-run firms.
- 13.** What is the point about family firms in paragraphs 5 and 6?
- To enumerate their strengths.
  - To show they have overcome their defects.
  - To expose their weaknesses.
- 14.** Which of the following qualities do family firm managers have? They are...
- generous.
  - confident.
  - productive.
- 15.** What is the difference between old-model and new-model family firms?
- Vision is not tarnished by greed and profiteering in the latter.
  - Dishonest practices are more common in the latter.
  - Political correctness is common in the former.
- 16.** Why is competition mentioned in paragraph 9? Because...
- it helps new-model family firms thrive.
  - it worked in America in the 1930s.
  - it strengthens the rights of non-family shareholders.
- 17.** What is the conclusion of the article?
- Family firms are an anachronism today.
  - More ambition and plans for the future is what family firms need.
  - Business owners cannot learn anything from family firms.



## Task 3.

## Casino rule 1: the house always wins

1. Crockfords in Curzon Street is one of my favourite casinos, redolent with clickety chips and glittering history. Its name comes from the old 19th-century gaming house on St James's, set up by William Crockford: a Cockney fishmonger who was such a talented gambler that he made enough money to open his own club and bankrupt half the aristocracy. **My kind of guy.**
2. American gambling history glows with the seedy glamour of saloons and riverboats, cowboys slicing and dicing their way across the outlaw south with big guns and marked decks. The British equivalents were the old racecourses where dukes and dustmen bet and cursed together, and the marble gaming halls where Regency dandies went skint.
3. I find this all romantic; I can't help it. Even though what I mostly do, these days, is play respectable and regulated poker tournaments in rented conference centres full of young German maths graduates, I try to let this quirky cultural history add some colour.
4. I'm particularly fond of Crockfords because, when I wrote my gambling memoir *For Richer For Poorer*, they let me hold the book launch there. Everyone was very nice. I liked them. And it's a beautiful club. I hope I don't have my membership revoked for what I'm about to write.
5. Last week's story about Phil Ivey, who sued Crockfords for non-payment of a £7.7m punto banco win, reminded me that casinos are – and will always be – the enemy. Ivey, probably the greatest poker player in the world, had been “edge sorting”. This involves noticing when a deck of cards has an asymmetrical pattern, then turning key cards upside-down so they can be identified from the back. In punto banco, the player has a big edge if the first card dealt is a 6, 7, 8 or 9 – so, if Ivey could turn those cards upside down, he'd know when to make big bets. In Crockfords, you aren't allowed to touch the cards. So Ivey's lady companion, Cheung Yin Sun, asked the unwitting croupier, in Mandarin, to turn the cards “for superstitious reasons”. Phil Ivey won £7.7m but, realising what had happened, Crockfords paid out only his original stake. So he sued them for his winnings and lost. The judge ruled that Ivey was cheating. I see a sting – maybe a con – but I'd say the house was outwitted rather than cheated.
6. Titanic Thompson once bet a guy that he could work out how many watermelons were piled on a passing truck, by sight alone. The guy had no idea that Thompson had met the truck driver the previous day, counted the watermelons and paid him to drive past at an agreed time. The guy paid out and learned from his mistake.
7. Phil Ivey himself, a few years ago, lost several thousand dollars playing golf against a couple of British poker players. One of the Brits made the mistake of boasting widely that Ivey was “a golf fish”. The proud American went away, took lessons, played obsessively, then came back and (claiming he'd “hardly played”) suggested upping the stakes. He won a million dollars. Some argued that it was cheating not to declare a changed handicap. Others replied that this was not an official match; Ivey had been taken for a mug, so he mugged his opponents in return.
8. Why should casinos be exempt from the traps that face all gamblers? They hustle in their own ways, after all. No windows or clocks, so we lose a sense of time. Free drinks; friendly dealers; no open declaration of their statistical advantage. If they think you're going to lose a fortune (as they did in Ivey's case), they will pander to your “superstitions”, whether it's providing a Mandarin-speaking dealer or flipping cards around. It's all about making you feel important, to ensure you keep betting your money at unfavourable odds. They make you feel “lucky” when you don't have a chance.
9. Ivey interfered with the run of play. That is one definition of cheating; the judge accepted it and I can see why. But my *heart* says he was just cleverer than the house. He didn't smuggle in a set of loaded dice or x-ray specs; he didn't mark the cards with his fingernails or bribe the staff. He just spotted something about the deck they didn't spot. He exploited their readiness to give him special treatment because they anticipated fat losses. I believe the casino should have ground its teeth, tipped its hat, paid £7.7m for the lesson and stopped using asymmetrical cards.

10. I play poker, a game where there is no edge but the luck of the deal and the skill of the player. Casino games such as roulette, blackjack, baccarat, slot machines and so on, are stacked in favour of the house. But don't hustle the hustler: a judge has said that simply isn't allowed. If you want to gamble on licensed premises, you just have to bend over and take it.
11. We all dream of "a system" to break the bank at Monte Carlo. What neater way to illustrate the muggery of that dream, what handier Belloc-like lesson, than a court's official ruling: if you actually come up with such a system, *they don't have to pay you.*

Victoria COREN, *The Observer*, 10/14

18. What does the line *My kind of guy* suggest about the author in the opening paragraph?
- She praises Crockford's background.
  - She approves of Crockford's cleverness.
  - She hints at her dislike of the wealthy.
19. How do American and British gambling history compare in the author's eyes?
- Both are picturesque.
  - Gambling confronted the social classes in Britain.
  - Cheating was more common in America.
20. In what way does paragraph 4 set the tone of the article?
- It is used to describe how casinos should behave.
  - It tells the reader of the writer's bias against Crockfords.
  - It tries to entice the reader to keep on reading.
21. What does the writer state about Phil Ivey's case? (*paragraph 5*)
- He was doomed to lose the case in the first place.
  - He was cleverer than the house.
  - He should have clearly played a fair game.
22. What is the point of Titanic Thompson's story? To show that...
- gambling relies on sheer luck.
  - mistakes are inevitable in gambling.
  - cheating in gambling can't be ruled out.
23. What is the writer's say on casinos in paragraph 8?
- They should protect themselves from gamblers.
  - They somehow deserve to be tricked by gamblers.
  - They shouldn't exploit gamblers' superstitions.
24. What is the writer's view on Phil Ivey's casino ruling?
- The judge taught him a lesson.
  - The casino used its power to win.
  - The player did not deserve to lose.
25. What is the conclusion of the article?
- It's no use trying to break the bank at a casino.
  - Poker is the only game likely to favour casinos.
  - More gamblers should attempt to cheat in casinos.