

大学英语六级阅读冲刺班

第14讲

主讲人：Agnes

5. What will business owners do when they become aware of the benefits of the Internet of Things?

- A) Employ fewer workers in their operations.
- B) Gain automatic control of their businesses.
- C) Invest in more smart buildings and cities.
- D) Embrace whatever new technology there is.

However, this is just the tip of the proverbial iceberg as smart buildings and even cities increasingly become the norm as leaders and business owners begin to wake up to the massive savings that technology can deliver through connected sensors and new forms of automation coupled with intelligent energy and facilities management.

- 不定细节题

问题类型和答案出处标志性词汇：

- What ... say about
- What ... learn about
- What ... learn from
- What ... know about
- _____

注：say—mention, point out, express, comment, remark, add, state, claim, maintain, confirm, insist, argue, protest, deny, assert, testify, certify

1. What does the author say about the shrinking spending of international tourists in the U.S.?

- A) It is attributable to the rising value of the U.S. dollar.
- B) It is a direct result of the global economic recession.
- C) It reflects a shift of their interest in consumer goods.
- D) It poses a potential threat to the retail business in the U.S.

Macy's reported its sales plunged 5.2% in November and December at stores open more than a year, a disappointing holiday season performance that capped a difficult year for a department store chain facing wide-ranging challenges. Its flagship stores in major U.S. cities depend heavily on international tourist spending, which shrank at many retailers due to a strong dollar. Meanwhile, Macy's has simply struggled to lure consumers who are more interested in spending on travel or dining out than on new clothes or accessories.

2. What do we learn about chemist John Pemberton?

- A) He used a strangely potent ingredient in a food supplement.
- B) He created a drink containing alcohol without breaking law.
- C) He became notorious because of the coca drink he developed.
- D) He risked breaking local law to make a drink with coca leaves.

You may have heard that Coca-Cola once contained an ingredient capable of sparking particular devotion in consumers: cocaine. The “coca” in the name referred to the extracts of coca leaf that the drink's originator, chemist John Pemberton, mixed with his sugary syrup (浆汁). ...

2. What do we learn about chemist John Pemberton?

- A) He used a strangely potent ingredient in a food supplement.
- B) He created a drink containing alcohol without breaking law.
- C) He became notorious because of the coca drink he developed.
- D) He risked breaking local law to make a drink with coca leaves.

... At the time, coca leaf extract mixed with wine was a common tonic (滋补品), and Pemberton's sweet brew was a way to get around local laws prohibiting the sale of alcohol. But the other half of the name represents another ingredient, less infamous (名声不好的), perhaps, but also strangely potent: the kola nut.

3. What do we learn about designers of American sportswear?

- A) They catered to the taste of the younger generation.
- B) They radically changed people's concept of beauty.
- C) They advocated equity between men and women.
- D) They became rivals of their Parisian counterparts.

Could utility alone justify the new ideas of the American designers? Fashion is often regarded as a pursuit of beauty, and some cherished fashion's trivial relationship to the fine arts. What the designers of American sportswear proved was that fashion is a genuine design art, answering to the demanding needs of service. Of course these practical, insightful designers have determined the course of late twentieth-century fashion. They were the pioneers of gender equity, in their useful, adaptable clothing, which was both made for the masses and capable of self-expression.

4. What does the author say about Asimov's robots?

- A) They know what is good or bad for human beings.
- B) They are programmed not to hurt human beings.
- C) They perform duties in their owners' best interest.
- D) They stop working when a moral issue is involved.

Isaac Asimov evaded the whole notion of morality in devising his three laws of robotics, which hold that 1. Robots cannot harm humans or allow humans to come to harm; 2. Robots must obey humans, except where the order would conflict with law 1; and 3. Robots must act in self-preservation, unless doing so conflicts with laws 1 or 2. These laws are programmed into Asimov's robots—they don't have to think, judge, or value. They don't have to like humans or believe that hurting them is wrong or bad. They simply don't do it.

5. What do we learn about American cities twenty years ago?

- A) They were divided into residential and business areas.
- B) Their housing prices were linked with their prosperity.
- C) There was a clear divide between large and small cities.
- D) They were places where large investment capital flowed.

Twenty years ago, the Urban Land Institute defined the two types of cities that dominated the US landscape: smaller cities that operated around standard 9-5 business hours and large metropolitan areas that ran all 24 hours of the day. Analyzing and comparing cities using the lens of this basic divide gives interesting context to how investment capital flows and housing prices have shifted.

仔细阅读真题精讲2—2019年6月

- Passage A
- When I re-entered the full-time workforce a few years ago after a **decade** of **solitary** self-employment, there was one thing I was looking forward to the most: the **opportunity** to have work friends once again. It wasn't until I entered the **corporate** world that I realized, for me at least, being friends with colleagues didn't **emerge** as a **priority** at all. This is surprising when you consider the **prevailing emphasis** by scholars and trainers and managers on the importance of cultivating close interpersonal relationships at work. So much research has explored the way in which collegial (同事的) ties can help **overcome** a **range** of workplace issues affecting **productivity** and the **quality** of work output such as team-based **conflict**, **jealousy**, undermining, anger, and more.
- Perhaps my expectations of lunches, water-cooler **gossip** and caring, deep-and-meaningful conversations were a **legacy** of the last time I was in that kind of office
- **environment**. Whereas now, as I near the end of my fourth **decade**, I realize work can be fully **functional** and entirely fulfilling without needing to be best mates with the people sitting next to you.

- In an **academic analysis** just published in the profoundly-**respected** Journal of Management, researchers have looked at the **concept** of "**indifferent** relationships". It's a simple term that encapsulates (概括) the fact that relationships at work can reasonably be non-**intimate, inconsequential**, unimportant and even, dare I say it, **disposable** or substitutable.
- Indifferent relationships are neither positive nor **negative**. The **limited** research conducted thus far indicates they're especially **dominant** among those who value **independence** over **cooperation**, and **harmony** over **confrontation**. Indifference is also the preferred **option** among those who are so cially lazy. Maintaining relationships over the long term takes effort. For some of us, too much effort .
- As noted above, **indifferent** relationships may not always be the most helpful **approach** in resolving some of the issues that pop up at work. But there are **nonetheless** several **empirically** proven benefits. One of those is **efficiency**. Less time chatting and socializing means more time working and (产出) .
- The other is self-**esteem**. As human beings, we're primed to compare ourselves to each other in what is an **anxiety-inducing phenomenon**. Apparently, we look down on acquaintances more so than Mends. Since the former is most common among those inclined towards **indifferent** relationships, their predominance can **bolster** individuals' sense of self-worth.
- Ego aside, a third **advantage** is that the **emotional neutrality** of **indifferent** relationships has been found to **enhance critical evaluation**, to **strengthen** one's focus on task **resolution**, and to gain greater access to **valuable** information. None of that might be as fun as after-work socializing but, hey, I'll take it anyway.

- 46. What did the author realize when he re-entered the corporate world?
 - A) Making new Mends with his workmates was not as easy as he had anticipated.
 - B) Cultivating positive interpersonal relationships helped him expel solitary feelings.
 - C) Working in the corporate world requires more interpersonal skills than self-employment.
 - D) Building close relationships with his colleagues was not as important as he had ejected.

When I re-entered the full-time workforce a few years ago after a **decade** of **solitary** self-employment, there was one thing I was looking forward to the most: the **opportunity** to have work friends once again. It wasn't until I entered the **corporate** world that I realized, for me at least, being friends with colleagues didn't **emerge** as a **priority** at all.

- 47. What do we learn from many studies about collegial relationships?
 - A) Inharmonious relationships have an adverse effect on productivity.
 - B) Harmonious relationships are what many companies aim to cultivate.
 - C) Close collegial relationships contribute very little to product quality.
 - D) Conflicting relationships in the workplace exist almost everywhere.

This is surprising when you consider the **prevailing emphasis** by scholars and trainers and managers on the importance of cultivating close interpersonal relationships at work. So much research has explored the way in which collegial (同事的) ties can help **overcome** a **range** of workplace issues affecting **productivity** and the **quality** of work output such as team-based **conflict**, **jealousy**, **undermining**, anger, and more.

- 48. What can be inferred about relationships at work from an academic analysis?
 - A) They should be cultivated.
 - B) They are virtually irrelevant.
 - C) They are vital to corporate culture.
 - D) They should be reasonably intimate.

In an **academic analysis** just published in the profoundly-
respected Journal of Management, researchers have looked at the **concept** of "**indifferent** relationships". It's a simple term that encapsulates (概括) the fact that relationships at work can reasonably be non-**intimate, inconsequential**, unimportant and even, dare I say it, **disposable** or substitutable.

- 49. What does the author say about people who are socially lazy?
 - A) They feel uncomfortable when engaging in social interactions.
 - B) They often find themselves in confrontation with their colleagues.
 - C) They are unwilling to make efforts to maintain workplace relationships.
 - D) They lack basic communication skills in dealing with interpersonal issues.

Indifferent relationships are neither positive nor **negative**. The **limited** research conducted thus far indicates they're especially **dominant** among those who value **independence** over **cooperation**, and **harmony** over **confrontation**. Indifference is also the preferred **option** among those who are socially lazy. Maintaining relationships over the long term takes effort. For some of us, too much effort .

- 50. What is one of the benefits of indifferent relationships?
 - A) They provide fun at work.
 - B) They help control emotions.
 - C) They help resolve differences.
 - D) They improve work efficiency.

As noted above, **indifferent** relationships may not always be the most helpful **approach** in resolving some of the issues that pop up at work. But there are **nonetheless** several **empirically** proven benefits. One of those is **efficiency**. Less time chatting and socializing means more time working and (产出) .

The other is self-

esteem. As human beings, we're primed to compare ourselves to each other in what is an **anxiety**-inducing **phenomenon**. Apparently, we look down on acquaintances more so than Mends. Since the former is most common among those inclined towards **indifferent** relationships, their predominance can **bolster** individuals' sense of self-worth.

Ego aside, a third **advantage** is that the **emotional neutrality** of **indifferent** relationships has been found to **enhance critical evaluation**, to **strengthen** one's focus on task **resolution**, and to gain greater access to **valuable** information. None of that might be as fun as after-work socializing but, hey, I'll take it anyway.

- Passage B
- In a few decades, **artificial intelligence** (AI) will **surpass** many of the abilities that we believe make us special. This is a grand **challenge** for our age and it may require an "**irrational**" **response**.
- One of the most significant pieces of news from the US in early 2017 was the efforts of Google to make autonomous driving a reality. According to a report, Google's self-driving cars clocked 1,023,330 km, and required human **intervention** 124 times. That is one **intervention** about every 8,047 km of autonomous driving. But even more **impressive** is the progress in just a single year: human interventions **fell** from 0.8 times per thousand miles to 0.2, a 400% **improvement**. With such progress, Google's cars will easily **surpass** my own driving ability later this year.

- Driving once seemed to be a very human skill. But we said that about chess, too. Then a computer **beat** the human world **champion**, repeatedly. The board game Go (围棋)

took over from chess as a new test for human thinking in 2016, when a computer **beat** one of the world's leading **professional** Go players. With computers conquering what used to be deeply human tasks, what will it mean in the future to be human? I worry about my six-year-old son. What will his place be in a world where machines **beat** us in one area after another? He'll never **calculate** faster, never drive better, or even fly more safely. Actually, it all comes down to a fairly simple question:

What's so special about us? It can't be skills like arithmetic, which machines already excel in. So far, machines have a pretty hard time emulating **creativity**, **arbitrarily** enough not to be **predicted** by a computer, and yet more than simple **randomness**.

- Perhaps, if we continue to improve information-processing machines, we will soon have helpful **rational** assistants. So we must aim to **complement** the **rationality** of the machine, rather than to **compete** with it. If I'm right, we should **foster** a **creative** spirit because a **dose** of illogical **creativity** will **complement** the **rationality** of the machine. Unfortunately, however, our education system has not caught up to the approaching reality. Indeed, our schools and universities are structured to mould pupils to be mostly **obedient** servants of **rationality**, and to develop **outdated** skills in interacting with **outdated** machines. We need to help our children learn how to best work with **smart** computers to improve human **decision**-making. But most of all we need to keep the long-term **perspective** in mind: that even if computers will outsmart us, we can still be the most **creative**. Because if we aren't, we won't be providing much value in future ecosystems, and that may put in question the **foundation** for our existence.

- 51. What is the author's greatest concern about the use of AI?
 - A) Computers are performing lots of creative tasks.
 - B) Many abilities will cease to be unique to human beings.
 - C) Computers may become more rational than humans.
 - D) Many human skills are fast becoming outdated.

In a few decades, **artificial intelligence** (AI) will **surpass** many of the abilities that we believe make us special. This is a grand **challenge** for our age and it may require an "**irrational**" response.

- 52. What impresses the author most in the field of AI?
 - A) Google's **experimental** driverless cars require little human **intervention**.
 - B) Google's cars have surpassed his driving ability in just a single year.
 - C) Google has made huge progress in autonomous driving in a short time.
 - D) Google has become a world leader in the field of autonomous driving.

One of the most significant pieces of news from the US in early 2017 was the efforts of Google to make autonomous driving a reality. According to a report, Google's self-driving cars clocked 1,023,330 km, and required human **intervention** 124 times. That is one **intervention** about every 8,047 km of autonomous driving. But even more impressive is the progress in just a single year: human interventions fell from 0.8 times per thousand miles to 0.2, a 400% **improvement**. With such progress, Google's cars will easily **surpass** my own driving ability later this year.

- 53. What do we learn from the passage about creativity?
 - A) It is rational.
 - B) It is predictable.
 - C) It is human specific.
 - D) It is yet to be emulated by AI.

So far, machines have a pretty hard time emulating **creativity**, **arbitrary** enough not to be **predicted** by a computer, and yet more than simple **randomness**.

- 54. What should schools help children do in the era of AI?
 - A) Cultivate **original** thinking.
 - B) Learn to work independently.
 - C) Compete with **smart** machines.
 - D) Understand how AI works

Perhaps, if we continue to improve information-processing machines, we will soon have helpful **rational** assistants. So we must aim to **complement** the **rationality** of the machine, rather than to **compete** with it. If I'm right, we should **foster** a **creative** spirit because a **dose** of illogical **creativity** will **complement** the **rationality** of the machine.

Unfortunately, however, our education system has not caught up to the approaching reality. Indeed, our schools and universities are structured to mould pupils to be mostly **obedient** servants of **rationality**, and to develop **outdated** skills in interacting with **outdated** machines. We need to help our children learn how to best work with **smart** computers to improve human **decision**-making.

- 55. How can we humans justify our future existence?
 - A) By constantly outsmarting computers.
 - B) By adopting a long-term perspective.
 - C) By rationally compromising with AI.
 - D) By providing value with our creativity.

But most of all we need to keep the long-term **perspective** in mind: that even if computers will outsmart us, we can still be the most **creative**.
Because if we aren't, we won't be providing much value in future ecosystems,
and that may put in question the **foundation** for our existence.