

SÈRIE 3**Comprensió escrita****THE RIGHT TO VOTE****Part 1: Reading Comprehension**

Choose the best answer according to the text. Only ONE answer is correct.

[0.5 points each correct answer. Wrong answers will be penalized by deducting 0.16 points. There is no penalty for unanswered questions.]

1. Women in Switzerland got their right to vote...
 - a) when female residents were accepted by assembly.
 - b) thanks to two women who took legal action for it.**
 - c) as part of their traditional rights.
 - d) before canton Appenzel Innerrhoden accepted it.

2. In the text, which ONE of these arguments for not giving women the right to vote is FALSE?
 - a) Women were considered less intelligent than men.
 - b) Women in rural areas had more advantages than urban women.**
 - c) Pregnant women would be too shy to go out to vote.
 - d) Men feared they would lose their control over women.

3. According to the text, when the Swiss parliament proposed to pass the vote for women in 1958,
 - a) the majority of male voters rejected it.**
 - b) all European countries had already given it the green light.
 - c) only women in Finland had the right to vote.
 - d) the arguments were not convincing at all.

4. The text explains that Swiss women...
 - a) had never become involved in political action before 1991.
 - b) were peacefully waiting for their rights to be granted to them.
 - c) had been fighting for their rights since the nineteenth century.**
 - d) ignored the quarter million signatures petition for votes in 1929.

5. Although Switzerland's system of direct democracy kept women out of their right to vote in federal elections...
 - a) women started taking political posts in local government in the 1960s.**
 - b) some small communities allowed women extensive autonomy.
 - c) most cantons always resisted the legislation.
 - d) in 1968 Geneva gave the first woman mayor the chance to vote.

6. At the human rights Convention of the Council of Europe, Switzerland...
 - a) demanded governments to change their position on equal vote.
 - b) called on a referendum on equal vote in Europe.
 - c) suggested to revise those parts on sexual equality.
 - d) refused to sign the parts on sexual equality.**

7. According to Emilie Kempin-Spyri, the Swiss constitution...
- a) should give more rights to women.
 - b) gave equal rights to both men and women.**
 - c) needed an article on equal rights.
 - d) rejected her proposals before the Federal Court.
8. Swiss women finally gained full right to federal vote...
- a) in spite of the criticism of the Federal Court.
 - b) thanks to the claims of the first woman lawyer, Emilie Kempin-Spyri.
 - c) when 50% of male voters signed a petition.
 - d) in the 1971 referendum, with more than 50% of male voters.**

Comprensió Auditiva**DO SCHOOLS DESTROY CREATIVITY?**

Do schools kill creativity? That's one of the ideas we'll explore in a special conversation with Professor Mila Saunders, an internationally recognized expert on creativity and education innovation. Professor Saunders has worked with governments and cultural organizations to make creativity a more integral part of education.

DAVID Peterson: Professor Saunders, welcome and thank you for accepting our invitation.

MILA Saunders: It's my pleasure to be here, thank you for inviting me!

DAVID: Well, one of the things that we all have in common about going to school is that we have very mixed feelings about our own schooling, really. I mean, some of it was great, but I also spent a lot of time doing things I didn't really care for all that much. Are your memoirs any different? What started your interest in education?

MILA: I guess not, I'm afraid. I recall doing some things simply because I had to. I can't say I was motivated and this must have remained as part of my school memory. So, I would say my interest in education must be related back to my own schooling experience.

DAVID: After University, you took up a position as a teacher, didn't you?

MILA: Yes, and as a young teacher I realized that there were pupils whose capacities were underestimated. And there were some bright people who often didn't think they were very **smart**. There were smart people who didn't think they were good enough just because they were never given the chance.

DAVID: What did you do, then?

MILA: I had become involved in theatre at the school, even directing some of the school plays. And it was then I became aware of the potentiality of the students' **skills**. I became very interested in theater in education. That was something I enjoyed more than anything. And I eventually did a master in creative education, and eventually became a teacher trainer; that is how it all really started. So that's how I started being involved in education.

DAVID: In fact, you spent ten years until 2001 as a professor of arts education. Why did you leave that post? You were after all influencing the next generation of teachers so that they could perhaps do a better job than some of the teachers did when you were coming up?

MILA: That might be true, er...Yes, but I'd never planned to be a professor. I mean I never quite had a plan. People think that life is linear, that you can plan it all out. And one of the problems I think is that our educational systems are based on that principle: that everything must be planned.

DAVID: Didn't you enjoy it as a professor of arts education?

MILA: Oh, Yes, I loved it! But I felt I had come to the end of it. You know, I always feel it's important to know when the time is right to move on and I just wanted to do things that interested me directly.

DAVID: Can we now move onto motivation? In your book of 2009, *The Element*, you talk about Gillian Lynn. Gillian is this famous choreographer who did the choreography for *Cats* and the *Phantom of the Opera*, besides other musicals.

MILA: Oh, Yes, Gillian. That was a wonderful case. You know, when she was a little girl she was constantly **fidgiting** at school, looking out of the window and being distracted. No one cared to teach her anything. Her parents were quite desperate. And one day her mother took her for a medical test. Gillian was left alone in the room, while the doctor and the mother were discussing. The minute they were out of the room she was on her feet, circling harmonically to the music all around the room. Then the doctor turned to her mother and said, "Mrs. Lynn, Gillian isn't sick. She's a dancer! Take her to a dance school".

DAVID: And she became an international dancer and choreographer!

MILA: Precisely! Kids are kids. They are restless. They have this energy. This inability to sit still could be channeled into something. Most people don't seem to know what their real talents are and many doubt that they have any talents at all.

DAVID: In your book you also talk about educational systems around the globe that are introducing reforms to meet the **challenges** of the 21st century. And most of them you say don't need reform, they need transformation.

MILA: Something that really worries me is that in public education now there is something like a 30 percent **dropout rate** from between the ninth grade and the twelfth grade. At this point, it is obvious you can't blame the kids. You can't say, well this 30 percent of the kids cannot be educated. There's something wrong in the system. And I am not criticizing teachers or principals; they have a really challenging job to do. The problem is the system. It's the way it's organized. They are being driven by this obsession with **standardized** testing. We have to get everything to the same standards.

DAVID: And yet teachers are teaching to that test.

MILA: They have to!

DAVID: So how or who can encourage the students' creative capacity?

MILA: It is probably the teachers themselves. Teachers are the people who **turn you on or turn you off**. Somebody who realized there was something happening in you (the pupil) that they should encourage. Everybody should bear in mind, you know, that if you invest in people's natural talents, something good will come of it!

DAVID: Well Professor, thank you so much for sharing your ideas with us today.

MILA: It's been my pleasure!

1. What memories do both the interviewer and Dr. Saunders have about school when they were young?
 - a) Both of them liked everything they did at school.
 - b) Neither of them can recall much of their school memories any more.
 - c) They both disliked everything they did at school.
 - d) Both of them feel some of the things they did were good but not all.**

2. As a young teacher, Saunders noticed that ...
 - a) some students had little interest in learning..
 - b) most students were never given due attention.
 - c) some clever students thought they were not good.**
 - d) only clever students were taught properly.

3. How did Professor Saunders' interest in education arise?
 - a) She had always planned to become a teacher.
 - b) It was through her interest in the school theatre.**
 - c) She loved acting, and teaching was very similar.
 - d) When she was not accepted as a theatre director.

4. Why did Dr. Saunders leave her post as arts and education professor?
 - a) She was fed up with education and university.
 - b) She was no longer interested in teaching her pupils.
 - c) She lost her job and looked for another place.
 - d) She wanted a change in her career.**

5. What did Gillian Lynn do when she was left alone in the doctor's office?
 - a) She started fidgeting and moving around.
 - b) She remained still, looking out of the window.
 - c) She sat at the doctor's table doing nothing.
 - d) She started moving to the sound of music.**

6. According to the conversation, what is Dr. Saunders' most worried about?
 - a) The challenging jobs teachers and principals have.
 - b) Teachers and principals who criticize the school system.
 - c) The students who do not want to be educated.
 - d) The number of kids who leave school between 9th and 12th grade.**

7. Which one of the following is NOT TRUE about Dr. Saunders' views on education?
 - a) Students should be given more standardized tests.**
 - b) The problem is not in the children, but the system.
 - c) School should be more motivating for students and teachers alike.
 - d) The educational system is badly organized.

8. Who can encourage the students' creative capacity, according to Dr. Saunders?
 - a) Good teachers who motivate the students' talents.**
 - b) Only the most talented and motivated teachers.
 - c) Those who can plan the school of the future.
 - d) Teachers who can invest more time educating them.

SÈRIE 4**Comprensió escrita****WHY BILINGUALS ARE SMARTER****QUESTIONS**

1. Recent scientific studies have proved that bilingual people...
 - a. obtain greater benefits in today's world.
 - b. are better conversationalists.
 - c. have better cognitive skills than monolinguals.**
 - d. will not suffer from mental diseases in old age.

2. As opposed to the 20th century view, we now know that...
 - a. bilingual children had more learning advantages in the past.
 - b. when two languages interfere, they cause many disadvantages.
 - c. language interference is good because it makes the mind stronger.**
 - d. the brain of bilingual people is obstructed more easily.

3. In the first part of a study by Bialystok and Martin-Rhee, both mono and bilingual kids...
 - a. had difficulty in classifying the colours in the corresponding circle.
 - b. found it similarly easy to classify the figures according to colour.**
 - c. had problems using the computer.
 - d. put circles and squares together in the same box.

4. In the second part of the study, which was more difficult,
 - a. bilingual kids were faster at solving the problem.**
 - b. there was no difference between the performance of mono and bilingual kids.
 - c. monolingual kids could not classify the figures according to shape.
 - d. both groups of kids encountered the same difficulties.

5. According to the text, which one of the following tasks is NOT carried out by the brain's executive function?
 - a. Making plans and decisions.
 - b. Retaining a sequence of information.
 - c. Giving directions to people who drive.**
 - d. Changing your focus of attention.

6. According to Albert Costa, changing from one language to another all the time...
 - a. makes you observe the changes around you.**
 - b. may improve your driving skills.
 - c. allows you to talk to your father and mother in different languages.
 - d. makes you quicker at changing the things around you.

7. In Mr Costa's study,
 - a. German-Italian bilinguals required more brain activity on their monitoring tasks.
 - b. Italian monolinguals were not as active as German-Italian bilinguals.
 - c. Italian monolinguals got better results in their monitoring tasks.
 - d. German-Italian bilinguals did their monitoring tasks better and more efficiently.**

8. A study at the University of California revealed that...
- a. monolinguals suffer from more mental illnesses like dementia.
 - b. bilinguals developed some mental diseases at a more advanced age.**
 - c. Alzheimer's disease is more resistant in monolingual people.
 - d. some people were more resistant to bilingualism than others.

Comprensió Auditiva**ARE WE ALONE IN THE UNIVERSE?**

Some scientific discoveries can be fascinating, but sometimes it is hard to believe that they are true. That's the case with an article in the March issue of the Journal of Cosmology. In it, Richard Hoover, a scientist at NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center, says he found signs of bacterial life in a group of meteorites, and that raises the exciting possibility that life had once arrived on Earth from **outer** space. In the following conversation, journalist Johanna Palmer talks with George Cody, a NASA expert on meteorites. They discuss Prof. Hoover's discoveries concerning the existence of life on Mars.

JOHANNA PALMER: Mr. Cody, thank you very much for accepting our invitation.

GEORGE CODY: You're welcome. Thank you for inviting me and for giving me the opportunity to talk about meteorites.

JOHANNA: I'd like to begin by asking you about Prof. Hoover and his fascinating discovery. His **findings** seem to give firm evidence that we are not alone in the universe!

CODY: Indeed, this is an amazing theory. And if this was true, those alien life forms may have a lot more in common with life on Earth than we had previously thought.

JOHANNA: All right Mr. Cody, but, as someone said once, extraordinary discoveries require extraordinary **proof**. As far as I understand, in this case the proof seems to be missing. Could you tell us your opinion about Prof. Hoover's discovery?

CODY: Well, first of all, I have to say that if Prof. Hoover's **claim** was true, this would be one of the most important scientific discoveries ever made. Unfortunately, I agree with most other scientists who say that there is no proof that this is true.

JOHANNA: This isn't the first time that NASA scientist Richard Hoover has claimed to see signs of life in meteorites. Why do you think that this particular article and not others got special attention?

CODY: I really have no idea; it is one of those media mysteries!

JOHANNA: Could you explain, for those of us who are not experts on meteorites, what

Prof. Hoover's main **claim** actually is?

CODY: The main idea defended by Prof. Hoover is that a microscopic evaluation of these meteorites shows that they contain filaments that might have been formed by a living organism, such as bacteria. But there are other possible explanations, too. There are all sorts of chemical processes that might have created those filaments.

JOHANNA: But, does that mean that the bacteria found on meteorites might possibly not come from space?

CODY: It's hard to be certain that any signs of life you see in meteorites found on Earth came from **outer** space. In fact, it's more likely that the bacteria infected the meteorite after it arrived on Earth, or even when they were picked up by scientists for examination.

JOHANNA: So, in other words, you pick this thing up –this fragment of meteorite—from the ground and, almost immediately, if you're not careful, even from the bacteria on your hands, you've contaminated the meteorite!

CODY: Absolutely. This is a more than probable conclusion. Contamination is almost **unavoidable**.

JOHANNA: So, if human contamination is more than likely, why do you think Prof. Hoover is defending the idea that the bacteria came from outer space?

CODY: Well, you must remember that scientists are obsessed with discoveries. We always want to discover something new, that's why we're in the game! And if you discover something that seems like it might be extraordinary,[...] well, there's this in human nature: you tend to think, “wow, I've made this great discovery, I have to share it with the world!”

JOHANNA: But scientists must be very careful and absolutely sure before they publish their **findings**, don't you think?

CODY: Absolutely! Fifteen years ago, another group of scientists claimed they'd found signs of life in a meteorite from Mars recovered in Antarctica. The media also gave it full **coverage**; even other scientists supported the theory. But only a few years later, most scientists were convinced the finding was false. So this time, most scientists are skeptical about Prof. Hoover's claim for evidence of bacterial life in meteorites.

JOHANNA: So, if a scientific discovery turns out to be wrong, is that necessarily a bad thing?

CODY: Well, no; not necessarily. It often happens that we learn more from mistakes than we do from successes! These meteorites from Mars probably don't have any evidence of life in them, but they surely have some fascinating chemistry.

JOHANNA: So would you say that there is any chance at all that Prof. Hoover's new finding is correct, this time?

CODY: Well, there have been some extraordinary claims in the past that turned out to be right. You see, sometimes it takes years for scientific findings to be confirmed right. But this only happens once in a while.

JOHANNA: But what will happen if the new claim is wrong?

CODY: Then it will be corrected. There's no question about it. Scientists will come up with the correct explanation for these structures, and we'll move on. And that's the way science progresses.

JOHANNA: Well, Mr. Cody, thank you so much for your time and for sharing your views with us.

CODY: Thank you. It's been my pleasure!

QUESTIONS

1. Johanna Palmer has invited George Cody...
 - a) to talk about his scientific discoveries.
 - b) to discuss his work at NASA.
 - c) to talk about Prof. Hoover's discovery.**
 - d) because she wants to specialize on meteorites.

2. What does George Cody think about the possibility of life in outer space?
 - a) He would like this to be true.
 - b) He firmly believes in this possibility.
 - c) If it were true, it would be like living on Earth.
 - d) He thinks there is no evidence of it yet.**

3. What is Prof. Hoover's main **claim** about meteorites?
 - a) The bacteria found in meteorites prove that there is life on Mars.**
 - b) Microscopic fragments from meteorites are like those on Earth.
 - c) Microscopic filaments in meteorites were not created by bacteria.
 - d) The filaments found in meteorites were brought alive from Mars.

4. What is George Cody's opinion about Prof. Hoover's findings?
 - a) He believes scientists should not manipulate contaminated meteorites.
 - b) He thinks that Prof. Hoover's discovery is not scientific.
 - c) He believes the meteorites may have been contaminated on Earth.**
 - d) He doesn't like experiments made on meteorites.

5. According to George Cody, scientists publish some discoveries before they have proved them, because...
 - a) they want other people to know about their findings.**
 - b) they want to show their superiority.
 - c) they are obsessive people.
 - d) they like to play with extraordinary things.

6. When a group of scientists claimed they'd found signs of life in a meteorite from Mars in the Antarctica,
 - a) most of the media talked about the discovery widely.**
 - b) scientists didn't want to hear anything about this theory.
 - c) the newspapers ignored that important discovery.
 - d) only a few scientists thought it was a false discovery.

7. According to the interview, what happens when a discovery turns out to be wrong?
 - a) It hardly ever happens that scientific discoveries go wrong.
 - b) It is very bad for scientists as their reputation will be damaged.
 - c) Scientists have to wait for many years before they find a new theory.
 - d) Scientists have to accept it and learn from what goes wrong.**

8. Which sentence is FALSE? What will happen if Prof. Hoover's theory is not proved?
 - a) George Cody will provide correct structures.**
 - b) Scientists will continue and learn from the error.
 - c) Scientists will give a correct explanation for his findings.
 - d) Science always progresses through correcting mistakes.