

	Examen final	NOTA:
		11/06/25

1. Listening.

What does Marianne Nolan say about entering the senior surfing championships?

- A She is pleased to have the chance to learn from experienced surfers.
- B She is realistic about the amount of training that will be involved.
- C She has confidence that she will succeed in the early rounds.
- D She has mixed feelings about competing at such a high level.

According to Marianne, women surfers today

- A are prepared to take more risks than they did in the past.
- B are mainly concerned with having a beautiful surfing style.
- C are more likely to think in terms of becoming professional surfers.
- D are determined to achieve the same recognition for their skill as men.

In Marianne's opinion, young girls who surf should

- A find creative ways to promote surfing as a sport in top international events.
- B thank previous generations for pioneering surfing as a serious sport for women.
- C push their friends to take up surfing as a way of staying fit and healthy.
- D join surfing clubs that encourage boys and girls to compete with each other.

What does Marianne say about being considered a good surfer?

- A She thinks it could lead to sponsorship in the future.
- B It gives her hope that she will win the same title.
- C She feels it is both a burden and a compliment.
- D It surprised her to receive so much publicity.

When asked about her future, Marianne says she

- A has been too busy with her sport to make decisions about a job.
- B expects that a career will develop naturally out of her sport.
- C wonders how well she will adjust to having a routine job.
- D has changed the idea she previously had for a career.

What lesson does Marianne say she has learned from competitive surfing?

- A Prepare for the unexpected.
- B Be generous to people you defeat.
- C Know when you have reached your limit.
- D Do not let victory make you too confident.

De-extinction

Developments in genetic science mean that scientists may be able to bring extinct species back to life. Four scientists give their views on this topic.

A

Thanks to advances in genetic technology, scientists may eventually be able to revive species we thought were gone forever. The idea is stunning and would revolutionise the way we think about science. Having destroyed countless species over the last 10,000 years, humans could, through science, begin to reverse the damage we have caused. It would deliver a profoundly hopeful message. Knowledge and techniques developed for de-extinction would also be directly applicable to living species that are endangered, so conservation would benefit. Revived species would also help to restore a great deal of ecological richness. Returning certain birds to the forests of North America would bring much greater plant diversity to these areas that are so important for humans, as well as for other wildlife. De-extinction may be difficult to achieve but it would undoubtedly be worth it.

B

Major breakthroughs, such as species revival, would have various consequences, one being that they can restore our faith in science, progress and even in ourselves. Species revival would show that science can be used for good, not simply to feed our lower appetites. We could also apply what we learn from it to efforts to conserve living species. Achieving de-extinction would require considerable time and effort, of course, but the idea that it would divert resources from conservation rests on a false assumption. The truth is that money invested in high-tech solutions would not otherwise be available for the protection of wild environments and species; it would probably go into such activities as plant research for commercial use. What we do need to think through carefully, however, is how we would re-introduce species into nature. The ecosystem of a vanished species will have changed since it last inhabited it, and anyway, its extinction almost certainly resulted from the deterioration of its natural habitat. But we have time to consider this, and it doesn't mean de-extinction isn't worth pursuing.

C

Work on genetic techniques that may help restore species will happen whether we approve of it or not, and the funds required would not alternatively be available for conservation but would instead be directed at some other cutting edge field like medical science. So scientists and the general public alike may as well go along with it. The fact is, it is likely to be widely welcomed and will help create a favourable climate for science. What does concern me is how animals that have been brought back to life could be put into the wild once again. Besides the challenge of recreating conditions within which they might survive – which in many cases would require changing the biodiversity of huge geographical areas, for example – there is the thought that they might pose a serious threat to existing species, either because they could carry diseases or because they invade and destroy habitats for other creatures.

D

Just suppose we managed to bring a species back to life and that it was able to reproduce. What then? It's hard enough introducing zoo-raised species into the wild, let alone ones that are no longer with us and whose disappearance was due to changes in the environments they depended on. Our endeavours to conserve living species and the ecosystems they rely on are already starved of resources. Diverting funds to work on de-extinction would only deprive them further. But the most dangerous aspect of the de-extinction notion is that it reinforces the idea that advanced science can solve all our problems. If we can reclaim extinct species in a laboratory, then why bother protecting forests, wetlands, rivers and oceans? Why worry about endangered species if we can simply keep their DNA and revive them some time later? De-extinction only distracts us from safeguarding out planet's biodiversity for future generations.

Which scientist

has a similar opinion to scientist B about the financial implications of investing in de-extinction?

37

has a different opinion from the others about how attitudes towards science would be influenced by working on de-extinction?

38

expresses a different view from the others about environmental issues associated with de-extinction?

39

shares scientist A's view of how de-extinction research would contribute to other areas of science?

40

3. Complete with one word.

Independent television

People going to the UK for the first time are often surprised that there are no advertisements at (0) on the BBC television channels. Their absence is (9) to the fact that the constitution of the BBC forbids it to accept advertising. So, (10) does the BBC get the money it needs to keep it going? The answer is that, (11) selling BBC programmes to other broadcasters around the world, the BBC is financed from revenue raised by the sale of television licences. The fee for the licences is set by the government, but (12) this, the BBC is not state run, and it retains an independence of (13) it is very proud. It can be said that the viewers themselves pay for the BBC, since (14) single household that owns a television in Britain has to purchase a licence. Some viewers prefer other channels, but a valid licence is obligatory, (15) or not you watch the BBC. Failure to buy one is (16) the law.

4. Read the definitions and match them with an expression and a preposition.

Crack on, the house, pul, cotton, see eye eye with, stick your guns,

to begin to understand or realize something without being told:

to get better after a serious illness, operation, etc.:

to refuse to change your mind about something even when other people are trying to persuade you that you are wrong:

to try harder to prevent an illegal activity and deal more severely with those who are caught doing it:

provided free by the pub or restaurant and you do not have to pay:

to not share the same views as somebody about something:

5. Word formation.

From coin to paper

In 9th-century China, at the (0) of the Tang dynasty, the government became concerned about the serious (17) of carrying around large amounts of coins in order to conduct business (18) Consequently, they devised a method of paying merchants with money certificates, which could be exchanged for coin money on demand at the capital. These certificates had an unfortunate (19) to blow away if there was any wind, but they were (20), so merchants began exchanging them with each other instead of using coins.

HIGH

CONVENIENT

TRANSACTION

TEND

TRANSFER

It was not until the Song dynasty that actual paper money was created. Initially introduced by a group of merchants and (21), each banknote had images of houses, trees and people printed on it. These were (22) by various intricate markings, the identification of which could be made only by the issuing banks. Then, in 1023, the government decided to (23) the banknotes and issue government notes in their place. These could be exchanged for government-issued coins, and so could be used to buy simple groceries. As a result, the use of paper money soon became (24)

FINANCE

COMPANY

DRAW

SPREAD

6. Vocabulary:

Restar importancia

Tener poca paciencia

Alma gemela

A falta de

Llevarse a las mil maravillas

Indignado

Empezar con buen pie

A la primera de cambio, en un santiamén

Mantenerse serio, contener la risa

Vacunarse contra

Conocido (noun)