	MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA, ALIMENTACIÓN Y MEDIO AMBIENTE	TRIBUNAL CALIFICADOR DEL PROCESO SELECTIVO PARA INGRESO EN EL CUERPO DE OBSERVADORES DE METEOROLOGÍA DEL ESTADO ORDEN AAA/760/2016, BOE núm. 121 de19 de mayo de 2016

Tercer ejercicio: prueba voluntaria y no eliminatoria de inglés

Esta prueba consta de 40 preguntas con respuestas alternativas, siendo sólo una de ellas correcta. Las contestaciones erróneas serán valoradas negativamente con un cuarto del valor de una respuesta acertada (-0,25).

Esta prueba se calificará con una única puntuación y un máximo de 20 puntos, siendo necesario obtener un mínimo de 10 para que puntúe. Los puntos por encima de 10 de la calificación que obtuviera el opositor, será la calificación obtenida en este ejercicio.

Tiempo máximo para la realización de este ejercicio: 2 horas.

I. GRAMMAR. Complete each sentence with the correct form:

1. He didn't stop shouting until 3 in the morning, ... was very annoying.
a) where b) when c) which d) whom

2. She adores ..... flowers but she didn't like ..... flowers I bought for her birthday.
a) the/the b) Ø/the c) Ø/ Ø d) the/Ø

3. I'm afraid the books ..... yet.
a) hadn't arrived b) haven't arrived c) didn't arrive d) won't arrive

4. ..... he is an engineer, he has a great deal of experience with machines.
a) Since b) Because of c) Due to d) If

5. ..... you I'm not very interested in making money.
a) Despite b) Even c) Besides d) Unlike

6. The concert was not as good as .....
a) last years's b) last years c) last year's d) last year

7. I've never met ..... interesting person.
a) so b) so an c) such d) such an

8. "Can you imagine how long it took us to get here last night?" He asked her if .....
a) she could imagine how long it took us to get here last night.
b) she could imagine how long it took them to get here the previous night.
c) she could imagine how long it had taken them to get there the previous night.
d) she could imagine how long it had taken them to get there last night.

9. I ..... go by car than walk this afternoon.
a) 'd rather b) prefer c) intend d) 'd like

10. I look forward to ..... from you soon.
a) hear b) hearing c) heard d) have heard

II. VOCABULARY. Complete each sentence with the correct form:

11. He's very ..... of apples.
a) keen b) fond c) devoted d) addicted

12. The ..... cost of making a movie has risen 20%.
a) average b) medium c) half d) mid

13. The play was so funny that the audience ..... with laughter.
a) giggled b) cackled c) chuckled d) roared

14. She was ..... on her back.
a) laying b) lying c) lied d) laid

15. The ..... of the bike race passed through the town.
a) avenue b) street c) track d) road

16. I hardly ..... watch that programme.
a) never b) seldom c) always d) ever

17. I'm not ..... excuses for them, but you can't expect them to ..... us such a favour.
a) making/make b) making/do c) doing/do d) doing/make

18. The police pulled out the ..... on the murderer to learn more details about him.
a) file b) diary c) register d) book

19. The government will have to ..... taxes or reduce spending.
a) raise b) boost c) extend d) rise

20. Newton's work forms the ..... of much of modern physics.
a) motive b) grounds c) basis d) arguments

III. USE OF ENGLISH. Fill in the blanks with the appropriate word/s.

Melting Greenland glacier threatens to raise sea levels 'for decades'

http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/melting-greenland-glacier-threatens-to-raise-sea-levels-for-decades-a6732331.html

A giant glacier in Greenland has started "calving" into the Atlantic, threatening to raise sea levels, scientists have warned. Warming air and sea temperatures associated with climate change mean that the Zachariae Isstrom glacier is now melting at an accelerated rate of five billion tons of ice a year.

Up to 95 per cent of the floating, sea-based part of the glacier has been lost (21) ..... 2002 and the ice is now retreating steadily inland, said the study by the University of California, Irvine. The glacier is now melting (22) ..... fast that it could recede 20 to 30km further inland over the next 20 to 30 years, warns Dr Jeremie Mouginot, lead author of the report.

"We know glaciers are melting (23) ..... what is surprising and worrying is that this glacier is breaking down in the coldest part of Greenland," Dr Mouginot said.

(24)....., the northern part of Greenland was not thought to be losing ice in significant quantities but this latest research finds that large-scale melting has now spread to all parts of the country, he added.

"The shape and dynamics of Zachariae Isstrom have changed dramatically over the last few years. The glacier is now breaking up and calving high volumes of icebergs into the ocean, (25) ..... will result in rising sea levels for decades to come," said Dr Mouginot.

Using data from aerial surveys and satellite observations the researchers were able to monitor and record changes in the shape, size and position of glacial ice over 40 years. They found that the bottom of the Zachariae glacier is being rapidly eroded by warming sea water mixed with growing amounts of relatively warmer meltwater from the ice sheet surface. The research (26) ..... found that a similarly huge neighbouring glacier in north-east Greenland, Nioghalvfjerdsfjorden, is also melting but at a slower rate because the glacier is protected by an inland hill.

The two glaciers make up 12 per cent of the Greenland ice sheet and would boost the world's sea level by 1m (27) ..... they both fully collapsed.

Glaciers play a particularly key role in the battle against climate change. (28) ..... their decline is relatively easy to see and to measure, they act as an important barometer. (29) ....., melting ice accelerates climate change because the darker surfaces that replaces it absorb far more of the sun's heat and reflect much less of it back into the atmosphere.

(30) ..... a University of Washington researcher calls on world leaders to pay more attention to how climate change will affect coastal societies around the world. Professor Edward Allison said: "When people see headlines on science findings, they feel a sense of helplessness in the face of inexorable change."

21. a) from	b) since	c) between	d) on
22. a) very	b) extremely	c) so	d) as
23. a) moreover	b) despite	c) even	d) but
24. a) Until now	b) Afterwards	c) As a result of	d) Although
25. a) thus	b) which	c) whom	d) whether
26. a) as well	b) besides	c) also	d) too
27. a) whether	b) how	c) as	d) if
28. a) Because	b) Besides	c) Due to	d) Thus
29. a) By cause of	b) At the same time	c) As a result of	d) After
30. a) Even though	b) Since	c) Meanwhile	d) However

IV. READING COMPREHENSION

Part 1. Read the following newspaper headlines and indicate their meaning.

Hazardous 9/11 Dust Made Newborn Babies Smaller

31. a) The smoke in New York City on September 11, 2001 had adverse health effects on newborns.

b) Between 9 and 11 newborns are smaller due to air pollution.

c) Air pollution has ill-effects on children aged 9-11.

d) Dangerous dust clouds contribute to reduce the number of newborns.

Experts highlight media role in promoting action against climate change

32. Experts claim that

a) climate change can be promoted through mass communication and advertising.

b) mass communication and advertising should fight to protect the environment.

c) climate change can be avoided with the help of the media.

d) mass communication and advertising can be crucial to raise awareness for the protection of the environment.

Temporary bridge option nixed

33. a) The possibility of building an interim bridge has been rejected.

b) The option of demolishing an interim bridge has been offered.

c) It will take some time to build a new bridge.

d) The possibility of building a bridge is being considered.

Parking bans lifted Thursday

34. On Thursday

a) car parks have been closed with bands.

b) the prohibition to park has been removed.

c) the parking conditions have changed.

d) lifts have been built in car parks.

Cops seized explosives

35. The police

a) burnt some explosives.

b) deactivated some explosives

c) found some explosives.

d) bought some explosives.

Part 2. Read the following text and answer the questions.

Was that climate change? Scientists are getting faster at linking extreme weather to warming

Graham Readfearn, theguardian.com

Attribution studies are letting researchers respond quickly to questions about human influence – before the news cycle turns elsewhere. Is it still true to say you can't point to any single extreme weather event and claim you can't link it to human-caused climate change? Plenty of people seem to think this is still the case. But a rapidly evolving field of climate science suggests that it's not. Take Australia's prime minister, Malcolm Turnbull, for example, who was touring Tasmania after the devastating flooding there in June. Turnbull pointed out that "larger and more frequent storms" were predicted by climate scientists, but then followed up with that stock standard caveat:

But you cannot attribute any particular storm to global warming, so let's be quite clear about that. The same scientists would agree with that point.

But in fact, climate scientists are finding ways to examine the influence of increasing levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere on extreme events. This is a field of science called attribution research. Dr Andrew King, at the University of Melbourne, has been involved with several attribution studies. So is it time to throw out that old stock response that you can't blame climate change for any single event? He says:

I would reframe the question – has climate change altered the likelihood of an event happening, like a flood in Louisiana or a heatwave in Melbourne? We can usually say with those types of events that climate change has increased the likelihood of an event happening.

When extreme weather events do strike, questions about human influences are coming up more and more. Some scientists want to be able to respond quickly with more relevant answers, before the news cycle turns elsewhere.

For example, King joined colleagues to look at the record warm sea temperatures that caused the mass bleaching of corals on the Great Barrier Reef last summer. The results were out in April while the reef's plight was still making headlines.

"We found that the warm sea temperatures were made at least 175 times more likely

because of climate change," King says.

To carry out the research, King looked at two sets of climate models. One was set up to reproduce the levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere that we have now and the other had those human influences removed.

In short, the models showed the kind of conditions that eventually killed about a quarter of the corals on the reef are now expected to come around once every four years. But in a world without the extra greenhouse gases, you might expect to see those ocean temperatures once every 1,000 years, if at all.

The reef research is about to be submitted to a journal and so the results could change. But King says the methods being used had been peer-reviewed.

King also looked at the heatwave that had world leaders sweating during the November 2014 G20 summit in Brisbane. Getting a 38C day in November was "at least 44% more likely" thanks to climate change, his study found.

From torrential downpours to record ocean temperatures, heatwaves and the monotonous breaking of monthly and yearly global temperature records, more and more studies are finding a distinct human fingerprint on events.

There have been a bunch of attribution studies looking at heat records in Australia. A study of its consecutive run of record warm springs in 2013 and 2014 found it would have been almost impossible without all that extra carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

Another study found that without the added greenhouse gases, Australia's record hot 2013 would only have come along once every 12,000 years. But now, thanks chiefly to the burning of fossil fuels since the industrial revolution, we might expect a record breaker every six years.

Dr Sophie Lewis, at Australian National University, was involved in both those studies. She says climate attribution is a "fast-evolving field" thanks to quicker computers, better collaborations and established methods.

But like King she's not a fan of simply asking if climate change "caused" something, or was "to blame" for particular events. She says:

A better question is to ask if climate change has influenced a particular event. That's an important distinction.

An example she gave is 2015 – the planet's warmest year on record that coincided with an El Niño climate system.

El Niños are natural events that tend to deliver hotter temperatures, but they are happening over the top of human-induced warming that pushes temperatures to record-breaking levels. Lewis says:

We know that both natural and human-caused climate change have impacts on events and we don't want to lose that complexity. People do understand that the environment and the climate system are complicated.

Speed counts. Getting results out faster gives the media, the public and policymakers more informed answers soon after events hit.

In early August, for example, Louisiana was struck by torrential rains that caused severe flooding – killing 13 people and damaging about 60,000 homes. Less than a month later, a team of scientists concluded that human-caused climate change had probably doubled the chances of Louisiana being hit by downpours like that.

The lead author of that study, Dr Karin van der Wiel, of Princeton University and the US government's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, told me:

Extreme events have always happened and this could have happened a hundred years ago. But it would have been much more rare.

Van der Wiel says researchers managed to carry out the analysis quickly because the data from the climate models was readily available and they had good rainfall data for the area.

The Louisiana study has been submitted to a journal where the peer-review process happens out in the open so, again, the conclusions could change.

Now, some scientists are uneasy about research being publicised before it has been through peer review, for obvious reasons. What if, for example, there's a mistake in the analysis that completely changes the conclusions?

Both Van Der Wiel and King say they can have a degree of confidence in their results because the methods have already been tested. I'll leave you with King's thoughts on this.

As far as I see it, one purpose of event attribution is to communicate to the public and policy makers that climate change is altering how extreme events are occurring – both their frequency and how bad they are.

That's why we're moving towards doing this work more quickly. If we can better inform the debate, then that provides some useful information that's grounded in science, when often there has been just speculation.

36. Attribution research

a. accuses human beings for extreme weather events.
b. attributes any extreme weather event to the increasing levels of greenhouse gases.
c. examines the effect of the levels of greenhouse gases on extreme weather events.
d. finds quick answers to extreme weather events.

37. The research led by Dr. Andrew King on the bleaching of corals on the Great Barrier Reef suggested that the conditions that killed the corals

a. depended on two sets of climate models.
b. are likely to occur more regularly.
c. will come around once every 1,000 years.
d. show the levels of greenhouse gases.

38. According to Dr. King, the methods used to examine the bleaching of corals

a. have been submitted to a journal.
b. will change the results of the study.
c. have been tested by a group of experts.
d. will be published in a journal.

39. According to the text, some scientists

a. are reluctant to publicize their work without a peer-review process.
b. change the conclusions of their work once it has been submitted to a journal.
c. make mistakes in the analysis of the data so as to change the conclusions.
d. are confident in their results because they will go through a peer-review process.

40. Scientists agree that climate change affects

a. the availability of the data related to climate models.
b. the reactions of the public and policy makers on extreme weather events.
c. the conclusions of the research on extreme weather events.
d. the frequency and the magnitude of extreme weather events.