

ERASMUS LANGUAGE EXAM (ELE) DESCRIPTION

Section 1: Reading

Text Length:

1 text (700-1000 words, consisting of 9-12 paragraphs)

Items:

- **Number:** 8 items
- **Format:** Multiple Choice (3 options), Matching

Aims:

To test the ability to

- identify the main ideas of the paragraphs and the text,
- identify specific information and details
- guess the meaning of unknown words from the context,
- infer implied meaning, author's purpose and attitude, and the intended audience.

Task demands: Careful reading (global & local)

Nature: Assessed

Section 2: Writing

Aims:

To test the ability to write a response paragraph of about 300+ words which

- provides a critical response to the reading text with reflection on the content in a logical and meaningful way.
- provides relevant supporting details and expands them with reasons and relevant examples from the primary text (effectively develops the controlling idea in a logical and coherent way).
- develops an argument systematically (composing a logical, well structured, and organized paragraph).
- applies ideas to a wider perspective (local & global context).

- synthesizes the key ideas of the text and applies them to a specific context (e.g. personal experiences).
- organizes writing in a clear, lucid, and logical way making it easy for the reader to follow.
- exercises high level of linguistic accuracy where errors do not interfere with meaning.
- uses language that is appropriate to genre and task.
- follows the academic conventions by referring to the text through paraphrasing or quoting arguments using APA style.

**Özyeğin University
School of Languages
Erasmus Language Exam
(ELE)
Practice**

Student's Name		ID#	
Department		Date & Time	
Duration	90 mins.	Grade	____ / 100 pts.

- 1 Climate change and global pollution cannot be adequately tackled without addressing the neglected issue of the world's booming population, according to two leading scientists.
- 2 Professor Chris Rapley, director of the British Antarctic Survey, and Professor John Guillebaud, vented their frustration yesterday at the fact that overpopulation had fallen off the agenda of the many organisations dedicated to saving the planet. The scientists said dealing with the burgeoning human population of the planet was vital if real progress was to be made on the other enormous problems facing the world. "It is the elephant in the room that nobody wants to talk about" Professor Guillebaud said. "Unless we reduce the human population humanely through family planning, nature will do it for us through violence, epidemics or starvation."
- 3 Professor Guillebaud said he decided to study the field of human reproduction more than 40 years ago specifically because of the problems he envisaged through overpopulation. His concerns were echoed by Professor Rapley, an expert on the effects of climate change on the Antarctic, who pointed out that this year an extra 76 million people would be added to the 6.5 billion already living on Earth, which is twice as many as in 1960.
- 4 By the middle of the century, the United Nations estimates that the world population is likely to increase to more than nine billion, which is equivalent to an extra 200,000 people each day. Professor Rapley said the extra resources needed to sustain this growth in population would put immense strains on the planet's life-support system even if pollution emissions per head could be dramatically reduced. "Although reducing human emissions to the atmosphere is undoubtedly of critical importance, as are any and all measures to reduce the human environmental 'footprint', the truth is that the contribution of each individual cannot be reduced to zero. Only the lack of the individual can bring it down to nothing," Professor Rapley says in an article for the BBC website. "So if we believe that the size of the human 'footprint' is a serious problem - and there is much evidence for this - then a rational view would be that along with a raft of measures to reduce the footprint per person, the issue of population management must be addressed."
- 5 Professor Rapley says the explosive growth in the human population and the concomitant effects on the environment have been largely ignored by many of those concerned with climate change. "It is a bombshell of a topic, with profound and emotive issues of ethics, morality, equity and

practicability," he says. "So controversial is the subject that it has become the Cinderella of the great sustainability debate, - rarely visible in public or in even in private". **In interdisciplinary meetings addressing how the planet functions as an integrated whole, demographers and population specialists are usually notable by their absence.**

6 Professor Guillebaud, who co-chairs the Optimum Population Trust, said it became politically incorrect about 25 years ago to bring up family planning in discussing the environmental problems of the developing world. The world population needed to be reduced by nearly two-thirds if climate change was to be prevented and everyone on the planet was to enjoy a lifestyle similar to that of Europeans, Professor Guillebaud said.

7 An environmental assessment by the conservation charity WWF and the World-watch Institute in Washington found that humans were now exploiting about 20 per cent more renewable resources than can be replaced each year. Professor Guillebaud said this meant it would require the natural resources equivalent to four more Planet Earths to sustain the projected 2050 population of nine-billion people. "The figures demonstrate the folly of concentrating exclusively on lifestyles and technology and ignoring human numbers in our attempts to combat global warming," he said. "We need to think about climate changers - human beings and their numbers - as well as climate change."

8 Some environmentalists have argued that is not human numbers that are important, but the relative use of natural resources and production of waste such as carbon dioxide emissions. They have suggested that the planet can sustain a population of nine billion people or even more provided that everyone adopts a less energy-intensive lifestyle based on renewable sources of energy rather than fossil fuels. But Professor Guillebaud said: "We urgently need to stabilise and reduce human numbers. There is no way that a population of nine billion - the UN's medium forecast for 2050 - can meet its energy needs without unacceptable damage to the planet and a great deal of human misery."

9 **Crowded Earth**

- * The human population stands at 6.5 billion and is projected to rise to more than 9 billion by 2050.
- * In less than 50 years the human population has more than doubled from its 1960 level of 3 billion.
- * China is the most populous country with more than 1.3 billion people. India is second with more than 1.1 billion.
- * By about 2030 India is expected to exceed China with nearly 1.5 billion people.
- * About one in every three people alive today is under the age of 20, which means that the population will continue to grow as more children reach sexual maturity.
- * Britain's population of 60 million is forecast to grow by 7 million over the next 25 years and by at least 10 million over the next 60 years, mainly through immigration.
- * This is equivalent to an extra 57 towns the size of Luton (pop 184,000)
- * By the time you have finished reading this column, an estimated 100 babies have been born in the world.

Adapted from Connor, S. (2006, January 7). Overpopulation "is Main Threat to Planet" Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/overpopulation-is-main-threat-to-planet-521925.html>

Question 1 (5 points):

Which is the best title for this passage?

- a. Overpopulation vs Epidemics and Starvation
- b. Overpopulation: "Main Threat to Planet"
- c. Overpopulation: Population Specialists' Overreaction

Question 2 (5 points):

How would you describe the author's attitude to rising global population?

- a. humorous
- b. ironic
- c. alarmed

Question 3 (5 points):

Which sentence taken from the article provides the best evidence for the answer to question 2?

- a. "Explosive growth in the human population is the elephant in the room nobody wants to talk about". (parag.2)
- b. "Dealing with the burgeoning human population is vital if real progress was to be made on the other enormous problems facing the world. (parag.2)
- c. "It became politically incorrect about 25 years ago to bring up family planning in discussing the environmental problems of the developing world". (parag.6)

Question 4 (5 points):

In Paragraph 5, what can be inferred from the statement, **"In interdisciplinary meetings addressing how the planet functions as an integrated whole, demographers and population specialists are usually notable by their absence."**

- a. Demographers and population specialists fail to see the fact that the planet functions as an integrated whole.
- b. Population specialists do not talk about the impact of demographics as it is politically incorrect to do so.
- c. Although population growth should be the priority issue during such conferences, it has long been ignored.

Question 5 (5 points):

What is the main idea of paragraph 7?

- a. WWF and World-watch Institute findings about renewable resources provides invaluable contribution.
- b. Mankind need to concentrate on lifestyles and technology to sustain projected 2050 population.
- c. Dramatic population growth is the root of all other problems such as the depletion of natural resources.

Question 6 (5 points):

The author references a quote from Professor Guillebaud in paragraph 7 “**The figures demonstrate the folly of concentrating exclusively on lifestyles and technology and ignoring human numbers in our attempts to combat global warming**”, primarily in order to

- a. Emphasize the divergence in scientists’ attitudes to global warming and rising population.
- b. Reinforce his concern about the centrality of the rising global population in combatting global warming
- c. Prove that if everyone adopts a less technology and energy-intensive life, population rise will have little impact on global warming.

Question 7 (5 points):

What is the most likely reason that the author gives the heading “Crowded Earth” to paragraph 9?

- a. To provide an example of a previous failed attempt to solve the rising global population problem.
- b. To disagree with those who suggest that stabilising and reducing population numbers will slow down the depletion of natural resources.
- c. To offer evidence for the claim that the world’s rising population will put great strains on the planet’s life-support system.

Question 8 (5 points):

What is the author’s purpose in writing this article?

- a. To warn the readers about the population issue, which is a major climate changer.
- b. To emphasize how epidemics, violence or starvation will reduce the human population.
- c. To describe how interdisciplinary meetings have started to emphasize overpopulation.

Question 9 (60 points):

Write a well-organised paragraph of 300+ words in which you discuss the ideas raised in the article. You are expected to justify your opinions of whether you find the main argument(s) convincing* with examples and evidence from the article by using in text-citation: (either direct quotations from the text or paraphrases in a proper referencing style) as well as application of your ideas to a local & global context.

Glossary:

***Convincing:** satisfactory, acceptable, believable, rational

Points will be awarded for language skills, organisation, development of ideas and content, and your ability to integrate evidence in academic referencing styles.

Now take five minutes to brainstorm before you write your response: Your notes will not be graded.

Özyeğin University
School of Languages
Erasmus Language Exam (ELE)-Practice Answer Key

Student's Name		ID#	
Department		Date & Time	
Duration	90 mins.	Grade	____ / 100 pts.

- 1 Climate change and global pollution cannot be adequately tackled without addressing the neglected issue of the world's booming population, according to two leading scientists.
- 2 Professor Chris Rapley, director of the British Antarctic Survey, and Professor John Guillebaud, vented their frustration yesterday at the fact that overpopulation had fallen off the agenda of the many organisations dedicated to saving the planet. The scientists said dealing with the burgeoning human population of the planet was vital if real progress was to be made on the other enormous problems facing the world. "It is the elephant in the room that nobody wants to talk about" Professor Guillebaud said. "Unless we reduce the human population humanely through family planning, nature will do it for us through violence, epidemics or starvation."
- 3 Professor Guillebaud said he decided to study the field of human reproduction more than 40 years ago specifically because of the problems he envisaged through overpopulation. His concerns were echoed by Professor Rapley, an expert on the effects of climate change on the Antarctic, who pointed out that this year an extra 76 million people would be added to the 6.5 billion already living on Earth, which is twice as many as in 1960.
- 4 By the middle of the century, the United Nations estimates that the world population is likely to increase to more than nine billion, which is equivalent to an extra 200,000 people each day. Professor Rapley said the extra resources needed to sustain this growth in population would put immense strains on the planet's life-support system even if pollution emissions per head could be dramatically reduced. "Although reducing human emissions to the atmosphere is undoubtedly of critical importance, as are any and all measures to reduce the human environmental 'footprint', the truth is that the contribution of each individual cannot be reduced to zero. Only the lack of the individual can bring it down to nothing," Professor Rapley says in an article for the BBC website. "So if we believe that the size of the human 'footprint' is a serious problem - and there is much evidence for this - then a rational view would be that along with a raft of measures to reduce the footprint per person, the issue of population management must be addressed."
- 5 Professor Rapley says the explosive growth in the human population and the concomitant effects on the environment have been largely ignored by many of those concerned with climate change. "It is a bombshell of a topic, with profound and emotive issues of ethics, morality, equity and practicability," he says. "So controversial is the subject that it has become the Cinderella of the great

sustainability debate – rarely visible in public or in even in private”. **In interdisciplinary meetings addressing how the planet functions as an integrated whole, demographers and population specialists are usually notable by their absence.**

6 Professor Guillebaud, who co-chairs the Optimum Population Trust, said it became politically incorrect about 25 years ago to bring up family planning in discussing the environmental problems of the developing world. The world population needed to be reduced by nearly two-thirds if climate change was to be prevented and everyone on the planet was to enjoy a lifestyle similar to that of Europeans, Professor Guillebaud said.

7 An environmental assessment by the conservation charity WWF and the World-watch Institute in Washington found that humans were now exploiting about 20 per cent more renewable resources than can be replaced each year. Professor Guillebaud said this meant it would require the natural resources equivalent to four more Planet Earths to sustain the projected 2050 population of nine billion people. "The figures demonstrate the folly of concentrating exclusively on lifestyles and technology and ignoring human numbers in our attempts to combat global warming," he said. "We need to think about climate changers - human beings and their numbers - as well as climate change."

8 Some environmentalists have argued that is not human numbers that are important, but the relative use of natural resources and production of waste such as carbon dioxide emissions. They have suggested that the planet can sustain a population of nine billion people or even more provided that everyone adopts a less energy-intensive lifestyle based on renewable sources of energy rather than fossil fuels. But Professor Guillebaud said: "We urgently need to stabilise and reduce human numbers. There is no way that a population of nine billion - the UN's medium forecast for 2050 - can meet its energy needs without unacceptable damage to the planet and a great deal of human misery."

Crowded Earth

- 9 * The human population stands at 6.5 billion and is projected to rise to more than 9 billion by 2050.
- * In less than 50 years the human population has more than doubled from its 1960 level of 3 billion.
- * China is the most populous country with more than 1.3 billion people. India is second with more than 1.1 billion.
- * By about 2030 India is expected to exceed China with nearly 1.5 billion people.
- * About one in every three people alive today is under the age of 20, which means that the population will continue to grow as more children reach sexual maturity.
- * Britain's population of 60 million is forecast to grow by 7 million over the next 25 years and by at least 10 million over the next 60 years, mainly through immigration.
- * This is equivalent to an extra 57 towns the size of Luton (pop 184,000)
- * By the time you have finished reading this column, an estimated 100 babies have been born in the world.

Adapted from Connor, S. (2006, January 7). Overpopulation "is Main Threat to Planet" Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/overpopulation-is-main-threat-to-planet-521925.html>

Question 1 (5 points):

Which is the best title for this passage?

- a. Overpopulation vs Epidemics and Starvation
- b. Overpopulation: "Main Threat to Planet"
- c. Overpopulation: Population Specialists' Overreaction

Question 2 (5 points):

How would you describe the author's attitude to rising global population?

- a. humorous
- b. ironic
- c. alarmed

Question 3 (5 points):

Which sentence taken from the article provides the best evidence for the answer to question 2?

- a. "Explosive growth in the human population is the elephant in the room nobody wants to talk about". (parag.2)
- b. "Dealing with the burgeoning human population is vital if real progress was to be made on the other enormous problems facing the world. (parag.2)
- c. "It became politically incorrect about 25 years ago to bring up family planning in discussing the environmental problems of the developing world". (parag.6)

Question 4 (5 points):

In Paragraph 5, what can be inferred from the statement, "**In interdisciplinary meetings addressing how the planet functions as an integrated whole, demographers and population specialists are usually notable by their absence.**"

- a. Demographers and population specialists fail to see the fact that the planet functions as an integrated whole.
- b. Population specialists do not talk about the impact of demographics as it is politically incorrect to do so.
- c. Although population growth should be the priority issue during such conferences, it has long been ignored.

Question 5 (5 points):

What is the main idea of paragraph 7?

- a. WWF and World-watch Institute findings about renewable resources provides invaluable contribution.
- b. Mankind need to concentrate on lifestyles and technology to sustain projected 2050 population.
- c. Dramatic population growth is the root of all other problems such as the depletion of natural resources.

*School of Languages (ScOLa)
Undergraduate English Programmes*

Question 6 (5 points):

The author references a quote from Professor Guillebaud in paragraph 7 “**The figures demonstrate the folly of concentrating exclusively on lifestyles and technology and ignoring human numbers in our attempts to combat global warming**”, primarily in order to

- a. Emphasize the divergence in scientists’ attitudes to global warming and rising population.
- b. **Reinforce his concern about the centrality of the rising global population in combatting global warming.**
- c. Prove that if everyone adopts a less technology and energy-intensive life, population rise will have little impact on global warming.

Question 7 (5 points):

What is the most likely reason that the author gives the heading “Crowded Earth” to paragraph 9?

- a. To provide an example of a previous failed attempt to solve the rising global population problem.
- b. To disagree with those who suggest that stabilising and reducing population numbers will slow down the depletion of natural resources.
- c. **To offer evidence for the claim that the world’s rising population will put great strains on the planet’s life-support system.**

Question 8 (5 points):

What is the author’s purpose in writing this article?

- a. **To warn the readers about the population issue, which is a major climate changer.**
- b. To emphasize how epidemics, violence or starvation will reduce the human population.
- c. To describe how interdisciplinary meetings have started to emphasize overpopulation.

Question 9 (60 points):

Write a well-organised paragraph of 300+ words in which you discuss the ideas raised in the article. You are expected to justify your opinions of whether you find the main argument(s) convincing* with examples and evidence from the article by using in text-citation: (either direct quotations from the text or paraphrases in a proper referencing style) as well as application of your ideas to a local & global context.

Glossary:

***Convincing:** satisfactory, acceptable, believable, rational

Points will be awarded for language skills, organisation, development of ideas and content, and your ability to integrate evidence in academic referencing styles.

Now take five minutes to brainstorm before you write your response: Your notes will not be graded.

The international efforts to deal with the problem of global warming have always concentrated on persuading people to change their lifestyle so that they use fewer resources and less energy in order to reduce the global carbon footprint. Additionally, advances in technology have given people hope that solutions will be found to combat the climate change threat. The article warns, however, that this is a mistaken approach and that overpopulation remains the most serious threat to a sustainable future. It is misleading, according to Connor (2006), to focus all sustainable development efforts on reducing carbon footprint when the increasing number of humans on the planet will inevitably mean more emissions. No matter how much we decrease energy consumption per person, “the truth is that the contribution of each individual cannot be reduced to zero. Only the lack of the individual can bring it down to nothing” (Connor, 2006, p. 1). In other words, instead of aiming to convince people to change their lifestyle, we should focus our efforts on controlling population growth. I agree with the arguments provided in the article because the advances in technology and health care have meant that more humans are born every day than ever before, with the rate currently being 200.000 humans a day according to figures quoted by the writer. Moreover, as the writer points out, even renewable resources cannot cope with the increase in human population (Connor, 2006, p.2). I therefore find the writer’s arguments convincing because the combination of overpopulation and lack of resources will ultimately lead to other significant dangers, such as wars and uncontrollable diseases, something we have already been witnessing around the world. Turkey, for example, is a country where the population growth is resulting in pressure on environment and society. Because of the lack of enough employment opportunities and good living conditions for the rising population in the small cities and rural areas, there has been a steady increase in the migration of people to the urban centres, which are turning into megacities swallowing up resources and producing alarming amounts of emissions. What’s more is that the lifestyle of cities means using cars and enjoying a consumerist lifestyle, something the writer refers to in paragraph 6. Connor (2006) mentions that population planning is a complex moral and political issue, and perhaps this is why it is considered taboo in international discussions. Yet I agree with him that it cannot be ignored, simply because it will have catastrophic consequences in the future. To conclude, in order to have a sustainable planet and avoid causing misery to future generations, introducing population control policies and raising awareness of the importance of family planning should be added to the efforts to reduce the carbon footprint.