



PRUEBA DE CERTIFICACIÓN DE  
NIVEL C1 DE INGLÉS  
CUADERNILLO DE PREGUNTAS  
MUESTRA

COMPRENSIÓN DE LECTURA (Duración: 1 hora)

- Las respuestas deben escribirse en la **HOJA DE RESPUESTAS** adjunta, con **bolígrafo negro o azul** (no con lápiz) y en el espacio indicado. **No escriba en las zonas sombreadas.**
- Haga todas las tareas.** Al principio de cada tarea hay un ejemplo ilustrativo con el número cero.
- Al final de la prueba entregue dentro del cuadernillo todo el papel de borrador utilizado.
- Permanezca en su asiento hasta que el profesor indique el final de la prueba.
- NO SE EVALUARÁ NINGUNA RESPUESTA ESCRITA EN ESTE CUADERNILLO.**

TASK 1

Read the text and complete the gaps with a word from the list given below. Each word can only be used **ONCE**. There are **SEVEN** words that you do not need to use. Number **0** has been completed as an example.

(Marking: 7 x 1 = 7 points)

TITANIC VIOLIN FETCHES £900,000 RECORD PRICE

The violin that was apparently played to calm passengers on the Titanic as it sank was sold for £900,000 in just 10 minutes at an **0** \_\_\_\_\_ in Wiltshire.

It was played by band leader Wallace Hartley, who died **1** \_\_\_\_\_ with 1,517 others as the ship went down. It had a guide price of £300,000.

The BBC's Duncan Kennedy said the buyer was believed to be British.

Alan Aldridge, in charge of the event, said the violin was the "rarest and most iconic" piece of Titanic **2** \_\_\_\_\_.

Many of the other items up for sale, such as photographs, newspapers and **3** \_\_\_\_\_, were sold for between £10 and a few hundred pounds.

Mr Aldridge set the **4** \_\_\_\_\_ at £50 for the violin, which was lot 230 of 251, but after just a couple of minutes it had passed £100,000.

It eventually sold for £900,000 after fierce competition between two potential telephone buyers.

Hartley has become part of the ship's legend after leading his **5** \_\_\_\_\_ musicians in playing as the vessel sank. They are famously said to have played the hymn "*Nearer My God To Thee*".

Some people still doubt whether the violin is the genuine article, however, and believe it could not have survived being submerged in the sea.

But it is claimed the violin survived in a leather case **6** \_\_\_\_\_ to Mr. Harley's body who was found wearing his cork and linen lifejacket.

A diary entry by his fiancée, Maria Robinson, said it was saved from the water and returned to her.

Following her death in 1939, the violin was given to her local Salvation Army citadel.

The auction house had attracted interest from collectors all over the world as more than 315,000 people **7** \_\_\_\_\_ it during a three-month exhibition in the United States.

The most money previously paid for pieces rescued from the Titanic is thought to have been a plan of the ship used in the 1912 research into the sinking, which was bought by a private collector for £220,000 in 2011.

Adapted from © BBC

ACTUAL  
ALONG  
AUCTION  
BIDDING

BOUND  
COLLEAGUE  
CROCKERY  
FELLOW

MEMORABILIA  
ONGOING  
SOUVENIRS  
STRAPPED

TOKENS  
VIEWED  
WATCHED

## TASK 2

Read the following text. For statements 1-7 choose the correct option (a, b, c, or d). Number 0 has been completed as an example.

(Marking: 7 X 1 = 7 points)

### ARE YOU A TOURIST OR A TRAVELLER?

Less than 40 years ago, tourism was encouraged as an unquestionable good. With the arrival of package holidays and charter flights, tourism could at last be enjoyed by the masses. Yet one day, it seems feasible that there will be no more tourists. There will be 'adventurers', 'fieldwork assistants', 'volunteers' and, of course, 'travellers'. But the term 'tourist' will be extinct. There might be those who quietly slip away to foreign lands for nothing other than pure pleasure, but it will be a secretive and frowned upon activity. No one will want to own up to being one of those. In fact, there are already a few countries prohibiting tourists from entering certain areas where the adverse effects of tourism have already struck. Tourists have been charged with bringing nothing with them but their money and wreaking havoc with the local environment.

It won't be easy to wipe out this massive, ever growing tribe. Today there are more than 700 million 'tourist arrivals' each year. The World Tourism Organisation forecasts that by 2020, there will be 1.56 billion tourists travelling at any one time. The challenge to forcibly curtail more than a billion tourists from going where they want is immense. It is so immense as to be futile. You cannot make so many economically empowered people stop doing something they want to do unless you argue that it is of such extreme damage to the welfare of the world that only the truly malicious, utterly selfish and totally irresponsible would ever even consider doing it. This is clearly absurd. Whatever benefits or otherwise accrue from tourism, it is not, despite what a tiny minority say, evil. It can cause harm. It can be morally neutral. And it can, occasionally, be a force for great good.

So tourism is being attacked by more subtle methods, by being re-branded in the hope we won't recognise it as the unattractive entity it once was. The word 'tourist' is being removed from anything that was once called a holiday in the pamphlet that was once called a holiday brochure. Adventurers, fieldwork assistants and volunteers don't go on holidays. 'Un-tourists' (as I will call them) go on things called 'cultural experiences', 'expeditions', 'projects' and most tellingly, 'missions'. The word 'mission' is, perhaps unintentionally, fitting. While this re-branding is supposed to present a progressive approach to travel, it is firmly rooted in the viewpoint of the Victorian era. Like nineteenth-century Victorian travellers, the modern day un-tourists insist that the main motive behind their adventure is to help others. Whereas the mass tourists and the area they visit are condemned as anti-ethical and at loggerheads, the ethos of the un-tourist and the needs of the area they wander into are presumed to be in tune with each other.

The re-packaging of tourism as meaningful, self-sacrificing travel is liberating. It allows you to go to all sorts of places that would be ethically out of bounds to a regular tourist under the guise of a mission. Indeed, the theory behind un-tourism relies upon exclusivity; it is all about preventing other people travelling in order that you might legitimise your own travels. Mass tourists are, by definition, excluded from partaking of this new kind of un-tourism. Pretending you are not doing something that you actually are - i.e. going on holiday - is at the heart of the un-tourist endeavour. Every aspect of the experience has to be disguised. So, gone are the glossy brochures. Instead, the expeditions, projects and adventures are advertised in publications more likely to resemble magazines with a concern in ecological or cultural issues. The price is usually well hidden, as if there is a reluctance to admit that this is, in essence, a commercial transaction. There is something disturbing in having to pay to do good.

Meaningful contact with and respect for local culture also concerns the un-tourist. In the third world, respect for local culture is based on a presumed innate inability within that culture to understand that there are other ways of living to their own. They are portrayed, in effect, as being perplexed by our newness, and their culture is presented as so vulnerable that a handful of western tourists poses a huge threat. This is despite the fact that many of these cultures are more rooted, ancient and have survived far longer than any culture in the first world. None of this ought to matter as un-tourism makes up less than 4% of the total tourism industry. But un-tourists have been so successfully re-branded that they have come to define what it means to be a good tourist.

All tourism should be responsible towards and respectful of environmental and human resources. Some tourist developments, as well as, inevitably, individual tourists, have not been so and should be challenged. But instead, a divide is being driven between those few privileged, high-paying tourists and the masses. There is no difference between them - they are just being packaged as something

different. Our concern should not be with this small number but with the majority of travellers. But why should we bother? We who concern ourselves with this debate are potentially or probably un-tourists. We aren't interested in saving leisure time abroad for the majority of people: we're interested in making ourselves feel good. That's why we've succumbed to the re-branding of our enjoyment, and refuse to take up a term we believe to be tainted. How many times have you owned up to being a tourist?

Adapted from © *The Guardian*

**0 The writer infers that 40 years ago**

- a masses of people were put on charter flights.
- b nobody was allowed to criticise tourism.
- c **the arrival of new forms of travel meant that tourism became available to the masses.**
- d the value of tourism was not appreciated.

**1 The writer suggests that in the future**

- a holidays will not exist in the same form as we know them now.
- b people going on holiday to relax will feel obliged to feel ashamed.
- c there will be a limited choice of destinations available to tourists.
- d tourists will be required to pay more for any holidays they take.

**2 The writer says that tourists**

- a have been blamed for environmental damage in some areas.
- b have not yet caused too much damage.
- c offer little to local environments apart from money and goods.
- d travel too light and should bring more things for the benefit of the local population.

**3 The writer says that if tourism were stopped**

- a countries economically dependent on tourism would suffer from any restrictions.
- b the expansion of the tourism industry will continue.
- c the industry will not be able to cope once tourist numbers reach a certain limit.
- d tourists must be persuaded that having a holiday is ethically wrong.

**4 According to the writer, the aim of re-branding tourism is to**

- a deceive travellers about the purpose of their trip to foreign countries.
- b ensure the skills of travellers match the needs of the area they go to.
- c make travellers aware of the harmful effects of traditional tourism.
- d offer types of holidays that bring benefits to poor communities.

**5 In paragraphs three and four, the writer suggests that 'un-tourists' are**

- a able to take holidays without a sense of guilt.
- b more concerned with environmental issues than other tourists.
- c pressing for the introduction of laws to ban mass tourism.
- d unwilling to pay for the experience of helping people.

**6 The writer states that third world cultures**

- a are not so different from western cultures.
- b are said to be good at comprehending other cultural traditions.
- c are unlikely to be disturbed by the presence of foreigners.
- d can only be encountered through careful integration.

**7 According to the writer, the belief that mass tourism is bad has resulted in**

- a certain people being hypocritical about their reasons for travelling.
- b more tourists deciding to take holidays in their own country instead.
- c the increasing construction of environmentally friendly tourist resorts.
- d the possibility of charging different prices for identical holidays.

### TASK 3

Read the text and complete the gaps with a word from the options given below. Number 0 has been completed as an example.

(Marking: 6 x 1 = 6 points)

#### The Price of Being Single

If you listen to politicians and certain parts of the media, you'd **0** \_\_\_\_\_ that only "hardworking families" were affected by the rising **1** \_\_\_\_\_, hikes in energy bills and extortionate housing costs. If you dare to live alone you don't get a mention.

But, contrary to popular belief, being romantically unattached and child free isn't cheap. Arguably, single people contribute more to society than everyone else, but get less back **2** \_\_\_\_\_ tax credits, child benefit and tax breaks.

Worse still, single people are penalised in numerous ways, some more obvious than others. Of course it costs more to live alone rather than **3** \_\_\_\_\_ the cost of a mortgage or rent and bills with a partner. But singles also pay more than couples for everything, from flights to insurance.

If you are **4** \_\_\_\_\_ to fork out your hard-earned cash for a seat at the theatre, you would think the box office would be keen to accept your money – but think again. Some **5** \_\_\_\_\_ and ticketing websites refuse to sell single tickets to shows if all the remaining seats are in pairs.

Actor Matthew Field, 47, wanted to spend a Ticketmaster **6** \_\_\_\_\_ he received for his birthday on a solo trip to see "*The Cripple of Inishmaan*" at the Noel Coward Theatre in London's West End earlier this year. But when he tried to buy a ticket for the play, which starred Harry Potter actor Daniel Radcliffe, Ticketmaster refused his custom as all the available seats were in pairs. Field says: "I complained and Ticketmaster was dismissive and blamed the theatre. I felt disappointed, angry and frustrated. The tickets were advertised as single tickets, so I feel discriminated against as a single person because I wasn't allowed to buy one."

Adapted from © *The Guardian*

A	B	C	D
<b>0</b> come up with	<b><u>get the impression</u></b>	make out	suppose
<b>1</b> costs of life	cost of living	price of life	standard of life
<b>2</b> as far as	by and large	instead of	in terms of
<b>3</b> cutting	shrinking	splitting	tearing
<b>4</b> disposed	intended	thankful	willing
<b>5</b> locations	showrooms	stages	venues
<b>6</b> gift receipt	gift voucher	present card	present ticket