

# 原力英语全能提升训练营

## CI 高级别学术阅读 高级别考试阅读题型解题技巧2

# 篇章分析 I

Corporate gender quotas reinforce privilege

Progressives often support diversity mandates as a path to equality and a way to level the playing field. But all too often such policies are an insincere form of virtue-signaling that benefits only the most privileged and does little to help average people.

A pair of bills sponsored by Massachusetts state Senator Jason Lewis and House Speaker Pro Tempore Patricia Haddad, to ensure "gender parity" on boards and commissions, provide a case in point.

Haddad and Lewis are concerned that more than half the state-government boards are less than 40 percent female. In order to ensure that elite women have more such opportunities, they have proposed imposing government quotas. If the bills become law, state boards and commissions will be required to set aside 50 percent of board seats for women by 2022.

The bills are similar to a measure recently adopted in California, which last year became the first state to require gender quotas for private companies. In signing the measure, California Governor Jerry Brown admitted that the law, which expressly classifies people on the basis of sex, is probably unconstitutional.

But are such government mandates even necessary? Female participation on corporate boards may not currently mirror the percentage of women in the general population, but so what?

The number of women on corporate boards has been steadily increasing without government interference. According to a study by Catalyst, between 2010 and 2015 the share of women on the boards of global corporations increased by 54 percent.

Requiring companies to make gender the primary qualification for board membership will inevitably lead to less experienced private sector boards. That is exactly what happened when Norway adopted a nationwide corporate gender quota.

Writing in *The New Republic*, Alice Lee notes that increasing the number of opportunities for board membership without increasing the pool of qualified women to serve on such boards has led to a “golden skirt” phenomenon, where the same elite women scoop up multiple seats on a variety of boards.



Next time somebody pushes corporate quotas as a way to promote gender equity, remember that such policies are largely self-serving measures that make their sponsors feel good but do little to help average women.

1. The author believes that the bills sponsored by Lewis and Haddad wills \_\_\_\_\_

[A] help little to reduce gender bias.

[B] pose a threat to the state government.

[C] raise women's position in politics.

[D] greatly broaden career options.

2. Which of the following is true of the California measure?

[A] It has irritated private business owners.

[B] It is welcomed by the Supreme Court,

[C] It may go against the Constitution.

[D] It will settle the prior controversies.

3. The author mentions the study by Catalyst to illustrate \_\_\_\_\_

[A] the harm from arbitrary board decision.

[B] the importance of constitutional guarantees.

[C] the pressure on women in global corporations.

[D] the needlessness of government interventions.

4. Norway's adoption of a nationwide corporate gender quota has led to \_\_\_\_\_

[A] the underestimation of elite women's role.

[B] the objection to female participation on boards.

[C] the entry of unqualified candidates into the board.

[D] the growing tension between labor and management.

5. Which of the following can be inferred from the text?

[A] Women's need in employment should be considered.

[B] Feasibility should be a prime concern in policymaking.

[C] Everyone should try hard to promote social justice.

[D] Major social issues should be the focus of legislation.

# 篇章分析2

**Academic publishing: Disastrous capitalism**

Scientific publishing has long been a licence to print money. Scientists need journals in which to publish their research, so they will supply the articles without monetary reward. Other scientists perform the specialised work of peer review also for free, because it is a central element in the acquisition of status and the production of scientific knowledge.



With the content of papers secured for free, the publisher needs only find a market for its journal. Until this century, university libraries were not very price sensitive. Scientific publishers routinely report profit margins approaching 40% on their operations, at a time when the rest of the publishing industry is in an existential crisis.

The Dutch giant Elsevier, which claims to publish 25% of the scientific papers produced in the world, made profits of more than £900m last year, while UK universities alone spent more than £210m in 2016 to enable researchers to access their own publicly funded research; both figures seem to rise unstoppably despite increasingly desperate efforts to change them.

The most drastic, and thoroughly illegal, reaction has been the emergence of Sci-Hub, a kind of global photocopier for scientific papers, set up in 2012, which now claims to offer access to every paywalled article published since 2015. The success of Sci-Hub, which relies on researchers passing on copies they have themselves legally accessed, shows the legal ecosystem has lost legitimacy among its users and must be transformed so that it works for all participants.

In Britain the move towards open access publishing has been driven by funding bodies. In some ways it has been very successful. More than half of all British scientific research is now published under open access terms: either freely available from the moment of publication, or paywalled for a year or more so that the publishers can make a profit before being placed on general release.

Yet the new system has not worked out any cheaper for the universities. Publishers have responded to the demand that they make their product free to readers by charging their writers fees to cover the costs of preparing an article. These range from around £ 500 to \$5,000. A report last year pointed out that the costs both of subscriptions and of these “article preparation costs” had been steadily rising at a rate above inflation. In some ways the scientific publishing model resembles the economy of the social internet: labour is provided free in exchange for the hope of status, while huge profits are made by a few big firms who run the market places. In both cases, we need a rebalancing of power.

I. Scientific publishing is seen as "a license to print money" partly because \_\_\_\_\_

[A] its funding has enjoyed a steady increase .

[B] its marketing strategy has been successful.

[C] its payment for peer review is reduced.

[D] its content acquisition costs nothing.

2. According to Paragraphs 2 and 3, scientific publishers Elsevier have \_\_\_\_\_

[A] thrived mainly on university libraries.

[B] gone through an existential crisis.

[C] revived the publishing industry.

[D] financed researchers generously.

3. How does the author feel about the success of Sci-Hub?

[A] Relieved.

[B] Puzzled.

[C] Concerned

[D] Encouraged.



4. It can be learned from Paragraphs 5 and 6 that open access terms \_\_\_\_\_

[A] allow publishers some room to make money.

[B] render publishing much easier for scientists.

[C] reduce the cost of publication substantially.

[D] free universities from financial burdens.

5. Which of the following characterises the scientific publishing model?

[A] Trial subscription is offered.

[B] Labour triumphs over status.

[C] Costs are well controlled.

[D] The few feed on the many.