

**Proves d'accés a cicles formatius de grau superior de formació professional inicial,  
d'ensenyaments d'arts plàstiques i disseny, i d'ensenyaments esportius 2011**

---

# **Llengua estrangera anglesa**

## **Sèrie 1**

**SOLUCIONS,  
CRITERIS DE CORRECCIÓ  
I PUNTUACIÓ**

---



A. Read the text below and choose the correct answer.

[1.25 marks: 0.25 for each correct answer]

### EARTHQUAKES<sup>1</sup> STILL A MYSTERY

1 At the beginning of last year, G. Giuliani, a technician who was working on an experiment at a national laboratory in Italy, issued an urgent **warning** that a large earthquake was about to strike the Abruzzo region. The prediction was based on measurements he had made of high levels of radon<sup>2</sup> gas, **presumably** released from rocks  
5 that were being moved by the pressure of a coming quake.

On April 6, a magnitude 6.3 earthquake hit L'Aquila, in central Italy, killing almost 300 people. Mr. Giuliani claimed recognition for his prediction, which had been ignored by officials.

10 But earthquake experts are **skeptical**. Scientists studied radon as a possible earthquake warning signal as far back as the 1970's, and while they found convincing cases of radon releases before some earthquakes, the correlations were not strong enough for useful predictions.

One example of confusing radon signals occurred in 1979. Two detectors in Southern California, 20 miles apart, measured unusually high **levels** of radon beginning in the  
15 summer. The radon levels then decreased in October, shortly before three earthquakes struck.

One earthquake, of magnitude 6.6, occurred 180 miles to the southeast, and the two smaller ones, of magnitudes 4.1 and 4.2, were 40 miles away. In addition, a radon detector close to one of the smaller earthquakes did not observe high radon levels, although it  
20 observed a radon drop a few days earlier.

That left scientists confused about how they could construct a prediction based on the radon levels. Data on other gases like carbon dioxide and on electromagnetic emissions that have sometimes been detected before earthquakes are also confusing.

To complicate **matters**, Mr. Giuliani's prediction was wrong in time and place. He had  
25 predicted that the quake would hit a week earlier in a town 30 miles away. If officials had acted on his prediction, they would have evacuated the wrong town at the wrong time.

Adapted from an article published at  
*Speak Up*, no. 291

1. Mr. Giuliani's prediction was based on
  - a) information obtained in a laboratory experiment.
  - b) information obtained on a rocky piece of land.
  - c) information obtained analyzing the quantity of a type of gas.
  
2. After the earthquake April 6
  - a) Mr. Giuliani admitted his conclusions were wrong.
  - b) Mr. Giuliani asked officials to accept the validity of his conclusions.
  - c) Mr. Giuliani was not interested in the opinion of officials.

1. *Earthquake*: terratrèmol/terremoto.

2. *Radon*: element químic que pertany als gasos nobles / elemento químic perteneciente a los gases nobles.

3. Earthquake experts
  - a) support the idea that radon is an indicator of earthquakes.
  - b) have not found enough evidence to support the idea that radon is an indicator of earthquakes.
  - c) have totally ignored the idea that radon is an indicator of earthquakes.
  
4. In 1979
  - a) the level of radon gas diminished and then there were three earthquakes.
  - b) there were three earthquakes of very similar intensity.
  - c) there were three earthquakes but the level of radon gas was stable.
  
5. According to evidence,
  - a) if Mr. Giuliani's predictions had been taken into account, a lot of lives would have been saved.
  - b) Mr. Giuliani's predictions were correct chronologically but not geographically.
  - c) it would have been a mistake to take action based on Mr. Giuliani's predictions.

<i>Pregunta</i>	<i>Resposta</i>	<i>Text de referència</i>
<b>1</b>	<b>c</b>	Línies 3 i 4: «The prediction was based on measurements he had made of high levels of radon gas».
<b>2</b>	<b>b</b>	Línia 7: «Mr. Giuliani claimed recognition for his prediction».
<b>3</b>	<b>b</b>	Línies 11 i 12: «the correlations were not strong enough for useful predictions».
<b>4</b>	<b>a</b>	Línia 15: «The radon levels then decreased in October, shortly before three earthquakes struck.»
<b>5</b>	<b>c</b>	Línies 24 i 25: «If officials had acted on his prediction, they would have evacuated the wrong town at the wrong time.»

- B.** Choose the correct words or definitions (*a*, *b*, *c*, or *d*) for the words below as they are used in the text. The words appear in bold type in the text.

[1.25 marks: 0.25 for each correct answer]

La solució correcta està destacada en lletra negreta.

1. warning

- a*) prophecy      *b*) example      *c*) instruction      *d*) **danger signal**

2. presumably

- a*) **apparently**      *b*) certainly      *c*) definitely not      *d*) undoubtedly

3. skeptical

- a*) **unconvinced**      *b*) confused      *c*) worried      *d*) surprised

4. levels

- a*) numbers      *b*) **degrees**      *c*) speeds      *d*) characteristics

5. matters

- a*) the material      *b*) **the situation**      *c*) the gases      *d*) the scientists

C. Read the text below and choose the correct answer.

[2.50 marks: 0.25 for each correct answer]

La solució correcta està destacada en lletra negra.

### THE POSTMAN

I work as a postman in Nebraska. One day two years ago, I drove up to a house with a mailbox<sup>1</sup> outside. Christy, the divorced woman who lived there, \_\_\_(1)\_\_\_ outside on the road. She said she had a story to \_\_\_(2)\_\_\_ me. Six months earlier, by mistake, I \_\_\_(3)\_\_\_ a letter to her \_\_\_(4)\_\_\_ had the correct number on it but was addressed to another house with the same number on a different street. She had to go out anyway, so she decided \_\_\_(5)\_\_\_ the letter to the correct house.

The letter was for Stan, a single man.<sup>2</sup> They talked for \_\_\_(6)\_\_\_ time and later on he called her. They started \_\_\_(7)\_\_\_ together.

\_\_\_(8)\_\_\_ I was unhappy about delivering<sup>3</sup> the letter to the wrong person, I was pleased that I had brought these people together.

Sometime later, a *For Sale* sign was put in Christy's garden; she and Stan got married and she moved into his house.

A few months later, I saw a *For Sale* sign in their yard. I thought maybe they had separated so I invented an excuse to go to their door and check.

Christy opened the door and pointed to her enormous stomach. "We're having two babies!" she said. "This house isn't \_\_\_(9)\_\_\_ now so we have to move".

I was touched by the thought that one letter was giving two little people, who were not born \_\_\_(10)\_\_\_, the chance<sup>4</sup> to live.

Adapted from *True Tales of American Life* by Paul Auster

1. **a) was waiting**    b) had waited    c) were waiting    d) wait
2. **a) talk to**    b) say    c) explain    d) **tell**
3. **a) delivered**    b) **had delivered**    c) was delivering    d) have delivered
4. **a) where**    b) **which**    c) who    d) what
5. **a) to take**    b) take    c) taking    d) to taking
6. **a) a few**    b) little    c) **some**    d) much
7. **a) going out**    b) going outside    c) going away    d) going along
8. **a) Meanwhile**    b) However    c) But    d) **Although**
9. **a) enough big**    b) too much big    c) big sufficiently    d) **big enough**
10. **a) yet**    b) still    c) already    d) ever

1. *Mailbox*: bústia/buzón.

2. *Single man*: home solter / hombre soltero.

3. *To deliver*: entregar.

4. *Chance*: oportunitat/oportunitat.

D. Write 80-100 words about ONE of the following topics.

[5 marks]

1. You live in a city where a low-intensity earthquake happened a month ago, while you were in your apartment. Write **an e-mail** to a friend describing what you were doing when the earthquake struck, what happened inside your apartment and how it affected your city.
2. A big earthquake has struck in a very populated area. You are a journalist who works for a local newspaper. Write **an interview** with one of the survivors. Ask him/her about what he/she was doing when the earthquake struck and about what he/she did after it.

Valoreu l'exercici globalment de 0 a 5 punts segons els criteris següents:

5 punts	<b>Molt bon resultat</b> Text coherent, amb cohesió i ben puntuat en el qual s'utilitzen de manera correcta estructures gramaticals complexes i variades. El vocabulari és adequat al registre del text i no es repeteix. Les errades ortogràfiques, lèxiques o gramaticals són minoritàries i no dificulten, en cap cas, la comprensió del text.
4 punts	<b>Bon resultat</b> Text coherent, amb cohesió i ben puntuat en el qual s'utilitzen de manera correcta estructures gramaticals simples però variades. El vocabulari és adequat al registre del text i no es repeteix. Hi ha algunes errades ortogràfiques, lèxiques o gramaticals que no dificulten la comprensió del text.
3 punts	<b>Resultat adequat</b> Text coherent, amb cohesió i ben puntuat en el qual s'utilitzen estructures gramaticals simples i vocabulari senzill però variat i adequat al registre del text. Hi ha errades ortogràfiques, lèxiques o gramaticals que no dificulten la comprensió del text, en la major part dels casos.
2 punts	<b>Resultat inadequat</b> Text poc coherent, amb poca cohesió i manca de puntuació en el qual s'utilitzen estructures gramaticals i un vocabulari pobres i repetitius. Hi ha nombroses errades ortogràfiques, lèxiques o gramaticals que dificulten la comprensió del text.
1 punt	<b>Resultat pobre</b> Text gens coherent, sense cohesió ni puntuació correcta. El text és difícil d'entendre a causa de les nombroses errades ortogràfiques, lèxiques o gramaticals.
0 punts	<b>Mal resultat</b> Text que no s'adequa a l'opció escollida i la comprensió del qual és molt difícil o impossible.

Descompteu 0,5 punts si el text redactat no té la llargària mínima demanada.



