ANSWER KEY
MODEL EXAM PAPER

PART I | LISTENING

Exercise 1

1 C
2 C
3 A
4 A
5 C
6 A

Exercise 2

1 (obstacle) course
2 (the very nature of) intelligence
3 (small) brains
4 video camera / camcorder
5 (the) training / teaching (of) (a/an) dog(s) / animal(s)
6 shorthand
7 vacuum cleaner

PART II | READING

TEXT A

Exercise 1

A 5
B 2
C 8
D 7
E 1
F 4

Exercise 2

1 C
2 B
3 A
4 C
5 A

Exercise 3

1 onboard computer
2 ultrasound signals
3 a touchscreen

TEXT B

1 data sets
2 aggregated
3 connections
4 queries
5 orderly
6 files
7 consolidate
8 sizeable
9 tabular
10 spreadsheet or database

PART III | WRITING

Open - see evaluation criteria & Writing help

TAPESCRIPT

Extract One

Man: You know, I think privacy as we used to understand it is a thing of the past.

Woman: Why do you say that? Not another scare story in the papers? They're always full of fanciful tales of doom and gloom ...

Man: You may laugh, but after what happened yesterday ...

Woman: What did happen?

Man: So I was discussing the whole issue with an uncle of mine, who's just turned 85. He proudly informed me that there couldn't be any data relating to him on the internet, because he'd never used a computer.

Woman: Oh, fair enough, surely?

Man: Well, I only spent a couple of minutes searching and was still able to come up with quite a bit of stuff about him. **[1]**

Woman: Really? That's a bit worrying. I bet he was taken aback, wasn't he?

Man: He was stunned ... speechless - Asked me to remove it all from 'cyberspace'. But it doesn't work like that, of course. What's there is there.

Woman: That does seem an erosion of privacy. Mind you, come to think of it, I suppose there's also been some information available on us for a while, way before the days of the internet.

Man: But it wasn't so easy to get at. And the situation's not going to improve.

Woman: No, I guess not. Quite the opposite. **[2]**

Extract Two

Woman: We're all using digital technology more these days but it can be isolating in spite of the fact that we use it for social networking. So, when it comes to playing games, it's understandable that digital multiplayer games are featuring more and more. I feel strongly that even this can't replace the personal connection. **[3]**

Man: The point is we're living in an age where digital information networks seem to get into every aspect of our lives. In a way, games are a cultural reflection of this. Playing against another person lets you try something out, play with cause and effect in a safe environment - no personal contact. In that sense, digital games are kind of helpful.

Woman: People want leisure activities that let them do something; they want to actively interact with the media they use. I think board games fulfil our need for the face-to-face contact of the past. With board games, we're doing something but also connecting with each other on a personal level.

Man: But you have to look at this surge in the popularity of board games, in context. There's a big retro-trend going on now [**4**] - you know, like, with clothes and even vinyl records! It's niche, but significant. And it's true that most modern board game enthusiasts are also keen digital games players.

Extract Three

Woman: Technology is generally used for archiving information and we have this idea about it that it's

part of a kind of movement of progress which began with the first written records on stone tablets and continued developing without a hitch to the present day's sophisticated level of technological expertise. [5]

Man: Whereas, in fact, it can be compared to the science of biology, where many species along the way simply died off and never made it.

Woman: Archivists joke about how digital information either lasts forever or five years, whichever comes first. What they mean is, it's ridiculously intricate because formats change, operating systems get updated and the hardware running those systems becomes outdated. So over the long term, things we'd like to pass on from now might actually be more difficult to access than, for example, finding out about a dead civilization.

Man: It might be painstaking work but we can learn a lot of amazing things about how people in the past lived simply by digging up clay tablets.

Woman: Whereas there's the possibility that there will be an enormous gap in history covering the period from the rise of the internet to whenever we reach a point where methods of archiving settle down. [6]

Exercise 2

Interviewer: Professor John Shepherd is the inventor of Jeremy, a rather remarkable robot, who has just completed some significant trials. Professor Shepherd, how did Jeremy get on?

Prof. Shepherd: Well, he came through with flying colours. He showed that he can whistle while he works, and that he can negotiate a pretty demanding obstacle course without bumping into anything. [1]

Interviewer: Tell me, what's the point of robots like this?

Prof. Shepherd: There are two major reasons for constructing robots. One is quite practical: to build useful devices. Robots are now common in medical laboratories, for instance, to handle potentially hazardous materials, such as blood. In factories, they make cars. They can carry out repetitive tasks for long periods accurately, whereas boredom causes people to make mistakes. And they aren't affected by working conditions that we would find intolerable. There's also a growing demand from the general public for robots for the home, both to take over household chores - polishing, perhaps - and as what you might call gimmicks - the robot as butler or pet dog.

Interviewer: And the other reason for making them?

Prof. Shepherd: Well, fun though it would be to have robots around the house, this is really by way of being a by-product of a more important and challenging goal. You see, through constructing robots, we're trying to gain insight into the very nature of intelligence. [2] At first, researchers tried to make robots intelligent, loading them with complicated computer programmes. But that didn't really work, because the real world is simply too complex and changeable. Then we considered ants, which are very successful at what they do, even though they don't have large brains. [3] And we thought, maybe we should design something simpler - robots that do just a few tasks. In effect we've moved from trying to make them second-rate human beings to making them particularly sophisticated machines.

Interviewer: And does Jeremy look like a mechanical man, as in all films?

Prof. Shepherd: Far from it. He's just over a metre tall, and is actually more like a dustbin that can trundle around than anything else - big, round and black. He has his own computer on board, and he's got sensors around his middle, which transmit pulses of sound to detect any obstacles in his environment. And where you'd expect his lid, he's got a video camera. [4] All this input goes into the computer, which stops him from bumping into things.

Interviewer: And can he learn from experience, like humans?

Prof. Shepherd: That's one thing we're interested in studying. We have to put him in the same situation a number of times and get him to choose a behaviour each time. If he picks the right one, he gets a sort of reward, and if he picks the wrong one he's punished. It's very much like training a dog. [5]

Interviewer: It sounds very human actually, all this talk of reward and punishment. Surely you can't talk about robots in the same way as you would talk about a person, because well they don't have feelings, do they?

Prof. Shepherd: No. No, no, no, they certainly don't, and we simply use that vocabulary as a sort of shorthand. [6] Of course notions like reward and punishment are misleading, because they rather suggest consciousness, which I'm sure that no one working with computers think they have. It'd be better to use terms like 'reinforce' and 'inhibit', which mean more or less the same, but have different connotation. The trouble is they're less accessible to the general public.

Interviewer: So how close are we to robots that can do the housework?

Prof. Shepherd: Oh, we've still got a long way to go. There is a kind of vacuum cleaner that you can leave to get on with the job, but of course the trouble is that it doesn't know what you want to throw away and what you don't. [7]

Interviewer: Professor Shepherd, thank you.

Prof. Shepherd: Thank you.