

Read the text. Then complete the task.

I have always been puzzled by people who spend their time in health shops buying so-called 'miracle' foods. I know all about this. My own wife used to be obsessed with such foods, until she was admitted to hospital with an illness caused by one of them!

Just remember what the word actually means. According to the dictionary, a 'miracle' is *"an extraordinary event that cannot be explained by natural or scientific laws"*.

So why do intelligent people like my wife believe in 'miracle' foods? Is it a deep fear of illness and death? I don't think so. In my view, they are just looking for a quick, easy, trouble-free way of 'solving' a difficult problem! Of course, the media, especially the newspapers, play a massive role in encouraging people to think in this way. Without their constant stories about so-called 'healthy lifestyles', the manufacturers and health shops would not be able to make the huge profits that they do.

For years, whenever patients asked me about these foods, I just dismissed them as a total waste of time and money. However, after what happened to my wife, I began to take things more seriously. I decided to spend some time doing research in this area. And when I did this, I was really shocked! I found that 'miracle' foods are promoted everywhere, even when there is no scientific evidence at all to support their use.

Let's look at some examples. Coconut oil is, we are told, useful for losing weight, controlling blood sugar and preventing strokes. Apple cider vinegar can help with digestive disorders, sore throats, and even dandruff! Manuka honey — which I must admit does taste delicious! — is said to be anti-bacterial, helping with a wide range of infections. Spirulina can, apparently, overcome cancer, as well as mental conditions like depression. It seems that there is no disease in the world that cannot be cured by these foods!

Unfortunately, there is, scientifically speaking, very little truth in all these claims. None of the supposed health benefits of these foods have actually been shown to work on real-life human beings. They have only ever been tested on mice and monkeys, not even on human cells!

I'm not, of course, saying that these foods are bad. Only this: instead of buying them in fancy bottles in expensive health shops, why don't we just add small quantities of them to ordinary food? If you want to add a flavour to your sauces and salads, fine!

I must admit that we doctors are partly to blame, too. We have known about these issues, but focused our attention elsewhere, on new drugs, new operating techniques, and so on. We have left the field of diet open to unqualified business agents who spread misleading information. We must now try to communicate with people and tell them the truth about these foods — that there is no such thing as a 'miracle'! The best we can all do is simply to follow a sensible, balanced diet and life-style.

For each item, shade in the bubble (☐) next to the correct option.

- 1. The writer is a _____.
☐ journalist ☐ researcher ☐ doctor

- 2. The writer started investigating 'miracle' foods because of a _____.
☐ magazine article ☐ personal experience ☐ documentary film

- 3. He believes that people who buy these foods are _____.
☐ lazy ☐ anxious ☐ stupid

- 4. He particularly blames _____ for the problem of 'miracle' food addiction.
☐ manufacturers ☐ the newspapers ☐ health shops

- 5. He complains especially about adverts which promise _____.
☐ cures for everything ☐ cures for mental illness ☐ instant cures

- 6. The writer has himself tried _____.
☐ apple vinegar ☐ coconut oil ☐ Manuka honey

- 7. _____ is said to be useful against cancer.
☐ Coconut oil ☐ Apple vinegar ☐ Spirulina

- 8. He distrusts these 'miracle' foods because scientific tests have _____.
☐ only been done on animals ☐ produced negative results ☐ not been carried out at all

- 9. He recommends that people _____ these foods.
☐ do not use ☐ use small amounts of ☐ consult their doctors about

- 10. At the end, he says that doctors have _____ the problem.
☐ kept silent about ☐ not been aware of ☐ made money from

Read the text. Then complete the task.

Some of my colleagues in the press seem to enjoy scaring the public, especially by telling them that particular foods are dangerous for their health. My question is: why do many newspapers — fortunately, not the one I work for — devote so many pages to spreading all these stories?

For example, at the moment, there seems to be campaign against eggs. Now, one reason why this annoys me is because, I have to admit, I love eggs! When I was away at university, I practically lived on omelettes. It was the only food I knew how to cook!

However, I shall try to be objective and look at the facts. Now, the first thing they try to scare you with is allergies. They say that, if you are allergic to eggs, even a small amount can make you ill, and may even kill you! They also say that children are at the greatest risk of having this kind of allergy, which is itself a frightening thought. Both these points are perfectly true. But what they forget to say is that very, very few people are actually allergic to eggs, far less than one per cent of the total population.

The next 'scary' thing is cholesterol, which can, I agree, be bad for our health. As I read in a recent article, the recommended maximum daily intake of cholesterol for your blood is 400 mg per day. Now, one egg contains about 200 mg, so it *sounds* as if eating more than two eggs a day is very dangerous indeed! However, the writer does not mention one important fact: most of the 200 mg in the egg does not actually get into our blood stream!

In fact, far from being harmful, eggs are considered by scientists to be one of the most nutritious of all foods. They contain several vitamins essential to the human body, such as Vitamins A, B2, B12 and E. Less well-known are the benefits of the minerals contained by eggs: such as iron, which prevents tiredness, especially among women; zinc, which is good for your immune system; and phosphorus, which is important for healthy bones. This combination of vitamins and minerals is also said to be helpful in the body's fight against cancer.

It has also been proved that people who eat eggs for breakfast lose more weight than those who eat other types of food. Eating eggs at that time helps limit calorie intake for the rest of the day. It does this by keeping the stomach full for a longer time. Scientists estimate that this alone will help a person to lose one kilogram or more per month.

So, despite all the scary stories about eggs, I am convinced that, unless you have a serious condition like diabetes or heart disease, you can safely eat them every day if you like. Of course, that doesn't mean that I myself eat a lot of eggs. I enjoy them for breakfast, but not every day; sometimes I have cereal, sometimes just bread and cheese. The important thing is not to eat the same foods all the time; variety is the key to a balanced, healthy diet.

Task 1: For each question, write a short answer (*not more than FOUR WORDS*).

11. What was the main crop grown on the writer's farm?

12. Who nearly died in the first dust storm?

13. How many people lost their homes during the *Dust Bowl* period?

14. How did the government try to help?

15. What was the **worst** year for the writer and his family?

Task 2: For each item, shade in the bubble (☐) next to the correct option.

16. The American *Dust Bowl* was **mainly** caused by _____.

☐ deforestation

☐ dry weather

☐ pollution

17. The worst affected region was _____ of the country.

☐ south

☐ west

☐ north

18. The writer's farm was also badly affected by _____.

☐ wildfires

☐ rats

☐ insects

19. The writer's brother _____.

☐ was killed in an accident

☐ died of an illness

☐ went to live in California

20. '*Wasted Time*' is a _____.

☐ film

☐ book

☐ song

Read the text. Then complete the two tasks.

"During the 1920s, there was no better place to be a farmer than on the southern plains of the USA. As wheat farming expanded to replace the natural treeless grassland, it had become one of the richest regions in the country. However, this expansion also exposed the earth to the winds and dust storms that first hit the region in the early 1930s.

Huge areas of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado and New Mexico were affected. Four million people were forced to leave their farms and migrate west to California. The nine-year drought known as the Dust Bowl was one of the worst environmental disasters of the 20th Century." With these words, a modern reporter ended his TV documentary: 'Wasteland'.

I am very old now, but as a child I had personal experience of what he was describing. Before the Dust Bowl, we were doing very well on our family farm. We sold a lot of wheat and earned a lot of money. We were even able to buy our own tractor!

Then, on 15th June 1930, the first storm arrived. That day, the weather was calm. I was with my Dad, happily riding on our new tractor. It was a very hot day, well over 30 degrees. But then, suddenly, the sun was blocked out, and the temperature dropped to lower than 10 degrees. Swirling black dust clouds were rolling towards the farm at an incredible speed. We were totally taken by surprise.

My Dad and I were able to reach the house, but my grandfather was on the other side of the farm. I remember my parents and my older sister putting wet masks over their faces and going out through the choking dust to search for him. Luckily, after the storm passed, he got back safely and, despite inhaling a lot of dust, fully recovered.

That was just the beginning. During the next nine years, there was hardly any rain. We ourselves were able to survive using windmills to get drinking water from deep wells. But the fields were all dried up and there was nothing for the animals to eat. Even the rats left the farm! The worst storm of all was in April 1935 – it lasted for three whole days! In the same year, we were also attacked by millions of locusts flying across the land eating everything that remained. Fortunately, some relief arrived the following year, when the government bought hundreds of our starving animals to provide some meat for poor people. They gave us a very good price, and we were just able to live on that income for the rest of the decade.

But there was a bitter personal loss. In 1938, my younger brother, like thousands of others, died from 'dust pneumonia', which slowly destroyed his lungs. By 1939, we were about to give up and leave, when thankfully, the rain finally came, ending years of drought, dirt and dust.

The Dust Bowl years are remembered in many books and films. However, for me, the atmosphere of the time is best portrayed in the haunting words of folk-singer, Jack Guthrie, in his famous ballad, 'Wasted Time'.

Task 1: For each question, write a short answer (not more than FOUR WORDS).

11. What is the purpose of the Buncefield Depot?

12. At what time of day did the depot explode?

13. Where was the writer when this happened?

14. Which type of transport was still able to operate after the explosion?

15. For how long did the fire burn?

Task 2: For each item, shade in the bubble (☐) next to the correct option.

16. Damage was caused up to _____ away from the depot.

☐ 2 km

☐ 8 km

☐ 30 km

17. Firefighters could not put out the fire because of _____.

☐ further explosions

☐ a shortage of water

☐ the weather

18. The writer went to hospital with _____.

☐ a broken arm

☐ serious burns

☐ damaged lungs

19. The explosion was caused by _____.

☐ some petrol escaping

☐ a worker smoking

☐ a tanker crashing

20. The Buncefield disaster resulted in _____.

☐ several deaths

☐ few long-term effects

☐ serious water
pollution

Read the following newspaper article. Then complete the tasks.

It was Sunday 11th December 2005, and the sun was just coming up. I was just finishing my night duty and was about to hand over to a colleague when, all of a sudden, there was a massive explosion followed by a huge orange light. The doors of the fire station were blown in and parts of the ceiling fell down.

A few moments later, we heard the emergency alarm, so we rushed to our fire engines as fast as we could. The Buncefield Depot was on fire! It is one of the largest fuel stores in the UK, distributing petrol, diesel, kerosene and aviation fuel. Every day over 400 road tankers call there to deliver or collect this valuable cargo.

The explosion was heard from about 30 km away. Even at a distance of 8 km, it smashed windows and light bulbs, knocked down front doors, and cracked ceilings and walls. A smaller area — up to 2 km — was badly affected by fire or smoke. Motorways were blocked, causing severe traffic delays. River boats were also prevented from sailing. Because of the direction of the wind, however, nearby Luton Airport was unaffected.

With the help of hundreds of police officers, we managed to evacuate about 2,000 people living near the depot. Others, further away, were told to stay indoors and close their windows and doors to keep smoke and fumes out.

At the site of the fire, I had to work quickly and divide my men into four groups. We worked hard to stop the blaze from spreading. After 24 hours of continuous work, we ran out of water. So we had to watch helplessly while twenty more blazing tanks were left to burn themselves out. That took five more days! The whole time, a thick cloud of smoke rose as high as 3,000 metres into the sky.

Fortunately, nobody was actually killed, and the only injuries were suffered by fire-fighters, police officers and ambulance staff. It was dangerous work. I remember getting trapped in the fire with three of my men while trying to save some workers. I lost my protective helmet, inhaled a lot of smoke and collapsed. I don't remember what happened next. When I woke up in hospital, I was surrounded by my loving family. But the first thing I did was complain about the pain in my chest!

After the fire was over, scientists from the Environment Agency visited the area several times. They were worried that oil and gas might have escaped from the site, polluting the local land or water. Fortunately, this didn't actually happen. Medical experts also found that there were no serious public health problems resulting from the huge cloud of smoke.

A three-year investigation revealed that the primary cause of the incident was the overfilling of a tank containing petrol. 250,000 litres of fuel spilled over, causing huge gas clouds, which then exploded.

For each item, shade in the bubble (☐) next to the correct option.

1. The writer is a medical _____.
☐ journalist ☐ doctor ☐ researcher
2. He says he ate a lot of eggs when he was _____.
☐ a child ☐ ill ☐ a student
3. Egg allergies are most often found among _____.
☐ women ☐ men ☐ children
4. However, these allergies _____.
☐ never cause people to die ☐ only affect people who eat a lot of eggs ☐ are in fact extremely rare
5. An article he read said that, because of cholesterol, eating _____ is harmful.
☐ any eggs at all ☐ two eggs a day ☐ three eggs a day
6. He disagrees with this statement because _____.
☐ eggs contain very little cholesterol ☐ not much cholesterol reaches the blood ☐ cholesterol is not harmful at all
7. If you want to have strong teeth, you should increase your intake of _____.
☐ phosphorus ☐ iron ☐ zinc
8. Eggs eaten _____ can help you lose weight.
☐ in the morning ☐ during the day ☐ before sleeping
9. The writer says you should be careful with eggs if you have _____.
☐ diabetes ☐ a weak immune system ☐ cancer
10. The writer himself _____ eats eggs.
☐ rarely ☐ sometimes ☐ often

READING 1 (cont'd)

For each item, shade in the bubble (☐) next to the correct option.

1. The writer's views have been strongly influenced by _____.
☐ an article ☐ a teacher ☐ a film
2. Mammoths became extinct _____ thousand years ago.
☐ two ☐ four ☐ ten
3. The writer thinks the main cause of this extinction was _____.
☐ hunting ☐ an asteroid ☐ climate change
4. A well-preserved mammoth was recently discovered by _____.
☐ explorers ☐ scientists ☐ hunters
5. The body of this mammoth is now in _____.
☐ Japan ☐ Korea ☐ Siberia
6. Scientists hope to get DNA from the mammoth's _____.
☐ fur ☐ muscles ☐ blood
7. They predict that it will take about _____ years to produce a living mammoth.
☐ 20 ☐ 30 ☐ 50
8. The writer is concerned about the animal's _____.
☐ physical health ☐ psychological state ☐ ability to breed
9. She fears that they will not be able to provide it with _____.
☐ a suitable diet ☐ suitable care ☐ a suitable home
10. The writer believes they should use these resources to _____.
☐ save endangered animals ☐ slow down global warming ☐ find cures for human diseases

READING 1 (Items 1 – 10)**(10 marks)***Read the text. Then complete the task.*

Twenty years ago, Steven Spielberg made a film called 'Jurassic Park', in which a mad scientist uses cloning techniques to re-create ancient dinosaurs — with disastrous results! It is a warning that I have not forgotten! So I was really horrified when I recently read an article in 'National Geographic' magazine about plans to 'clone' the woolly mammoth!

The mammoth has, of course, been extinct for thousands of years. It was a huge mammal closely related to the modern elephant, but even bigger. Mammoths lived during the Ice Age in northern areas of Europe and Asia. Humans hunted them for their warm skins as well as their tasty meat, and largely because of this all the mammoths disappeared, except for a small group that lived on a remote island in Siberia until finally becoming extinct around 2000 BC.

Will we ever see a woolly mammoth again? There is a chance, scientists say. Due to global warming, the frost in Siberia is melting and the bodies of ancient dead animals have been revealed. Last year, Japanese ivory hunters looking for tusks found the almost complete body of a baby mammoth preserved under the ice and snow. About 10,000 years old, and in astonishingly good condition — with even its fur intact — it was recovered and is currently on display at a museum in Tokyo.

However, Japanese scientists have now revealed that frozen blood was also found beneath the animal's body. They intend, they say, to extract DNA from this blood in order to make a mammoth! How would this be done? They are thinking of taking the DNA cells and cloning them with eggs from a female Asian elephant that will then carry the baby. However, they estimate that this will take until at least 2060, because it is a very complicated process and the technology is not yet developed!

My question is: what is the point of doing all this? Even if they succeed, which I think is very unlikely, all they would have is a single woolly mammoth! Now, we know that mammoths were intelligent, social animals, who lived in extended groups. So our 'one-off' mammoth would live out its life all alone and, no doubt, entirely miserable!

We should also think about the practicalities. Even by itself, a giant animal like the mammoth requires a huge area of frozen land, similar to its original habitat. How will we provide this, after years of climate change have heated up the whole planet?

Instead of spending money, time and effort on cloning an extinct animal, we should focus on trying to save a threatened species which is still alive! Asian elephants are themselves at risk of extinction, and now we want to waste thousands of eggs to clone them with the DNA of a long-dead mammoth! It's a crime against living elephants!

Read the text. Then complete the task.

Twenty years ago, Steven Spielberg made a film called 'Jurassic Park', in which a mad scientist uses cloning techniques to re-create ancient dinosaurs — with disastrous results! It is a warning that I have not forgotten! So I was really horrified when I recently read an article in 'National Geographic' magazine about plans to 'clone' the woolly mammoth!

The mammoth has, of course, been extinct for thousands of years. It was a huge mammal closely related to the modern elephant, but even bigger. Mammoths lived during the Ice Age in northern areas of Europe and Asia. Humans hunted them for their warm skins as well as their tasty meat, and largely because of this all the mammoths disappeared, except for a small group that lived on a remote island in Siberia until finally becoming extinct around 2000 BC.

Will we ever see a woolly mammoth again? There is a chance, scientists say. Due to global warming, the frost in Siberia is melting and the bodies of ancient dead animals have been revealed. Last year, Japanese ivory hunters looking for tusks found the almost complete body of a baby mammoth preserved under the ice and snow. About 10,000 years old, and in astonishingly good condition — with even its fur intact — it was recovered and is currently on display at a museum in Tokyo.

However, Japanese scientists have now revealed that frozen blood was also found beneath the animal's body. They intend, they say, to extract DNA from it to make a mammoth! How would this be done? They are thinking of using stem cells and cloning them with eggs from a female Asian elephant that will produce a baby. However, they estimate that this will take until at least 2060, because it is a very complicated process and the technology is not yet developed!

My question is: what is the point of doing all this? Even if they succeed, which I think is very unlikely, all they would have is a single woolly mammoth! Now, we know that mammoths were intelligent, social animals, who lived in extended groups. So our 'one-off' mammoth would live out its life all alone and, no doubt, entirely miserable!

We should also think about the practicalities. Even by itself, a giant animal like the mammoth requires a huge area of frozen land, similar to its original habitat. How will we provide this, after years of climate change have heated up the whole planet?

Instead of spending money, time and effort on cloning an extinct animal, we should focus on trying to save a threatened species which is still alive! Asian elephants are themselves at risk of extinction, and now we want to waste thousands of eggs to clone them with the DNA of a long-dead mammoth! It's a crime against living elephants!

In the modern world, there is a huge demand for products made of plastic — from bottles to bowls to food containers — so our sales are good, and the company is growing all the time. As a result, we have to recruit hundreds of new employees every year, mostly young people fresh from school. I am not actually in the Personnel Department, but they like to have input from 'Production', so they often ask me to take part in interviewing candidates. This means that over the last fifteen years, I have been able to observe the whole recruitment process very closely.

Based on this experience, I have some comments which I hope will be of interest and will lead to some kind of action. My first point concerns the way we advertise job vacancies. Our standard method is to place adverts in the local newspaper. However, my worry is that potential candidates may not see these adverts. So I think we should try something new. I understand that adverts on TV would be too expensive, but why not use the local radio station, perhaps on one of their music programmes?

My second concern is the enormous amount of time we spend on interviewing. Sometimes we spend a whole week interviewing candidates. The frustrating thing is that many of them should never have been invited at all! As soon as they start speaking, we can tell right away that they are unsuitable for the job. But then we have to be 'polite' and give them a chance, so half-an-hour is wasted on someone we know we're not going to accept! What we need is a new kind of application form, one which gives us the right information, so that our selection process is more reliable.

However, even if we do interview the right people, the interview itself still needs to be conducted in the right way. Unfortunately, some of my colleagues are not very professional in this regard. For example, when one colleague — I'll call him 'Mr X' — interviews candidates, it is easy to see that he has not actually read their CV! So he wastes valuable time asking for information which we already have! Another — 'Ms Y' — asks questions in such a way that it is very obvious what answer she is looking for! So we never find out what the candidate really thinks. And then there's 'Mr Z', who spends so much time talking that the poor candidates hardly get a chance to speak! So again we find out very little about them.

Another issue is what happens afterwards. At the end of every interview, we thank the candidate and promise to inform them 'within a week' of the result. However, in practice, we only ever contact the candidates who have been accepted! The rest — in other words, 80% of the people interviewed — we leave to sit around waiting and wondering what has happened. This gives them a very bad impression of our company. Surely it would be possible to prepare a standard letter or e-mail, and make sure it is sent to all 'failed' candidates? They are, after all, human beings, who have feelings!

READING 2 (cont'd)

Task One: For each item, write a short answer (not more than Five WORDS).

11. How old was the child who died?

12. According to Linda, how did this child die?

She was _____

13. What was Linda doing when this happened?

14. Where was her husband?

15. How much time did she later spend in prison?

Task Two: For each item, shade in the bubble (☐) next to the correct option.

16. Police found blood in the Chamberlains' _____.

☐ tent

☐ home

☐ vehicle

17. The jury's decision to convict Linda was especially influenced by _____.

☐ comments from
the judge

☐ scientific evidence
from experts

☐ her behaviour
in court

18. The general public were _____ about her guilt

☐ convinced

☐ very doubtful

☐ divided

19. Later, Linda was released after the child's _____ was found.

☐ body

☐ doll

☐ clothing

20. This happened as a result of a _____.

☐ fatal accident

☐ new investigation

☐ newspaper
campaign

Read the text, Then complete the tasks.

One of the most famous trials in Australian legal history took place in 1982. A young mother named Linda Chamberlain was accused of murdering her baby daughter during a camping trip. She herself said that the baby had been killed by a 'dingo' or wild dog, and because of this the case soon became known as the 'Dingo Trial'.

The events leading up to the trial happened two years earlier, in August 1980. Michael and Linda Chamberlain were on holiday with their sons Aidan (10) and Reagan (4) and their ten-week-old daughter Azaria. They were visiting Ayer's Rock, a well-known tourist attraction in the centre of Australia.

According to Linda, the incident occurred when she was cooking meat on a barbecue. Her husband, Michael, was away with Aidan, visiting the local Aborigine museum. Suddenly, she heard a scream coming from the tent where she had left Reagan and Azaria sleeping. She ran back to the tent and found the boy still asleep, but the baby girl was missing. Earlier in the day, she had twice seen a dingo following the family, so she now believed that this animal had attacked and taken away her child.

Despite a huge search operation, Azaria's body could not be found. So nobody knew whether Linda Chamberlain's story was true or not. With the mystery still unsolved, newspapers started spreading stories about her, and suggesting that she was lying. Police detectives then made an important discovery. They found blood in the family car, as well as a blood-stained pair of scissors. So, after a long delay, it was finally decided to charge Linda with murder.

From the start, the trial attracted a lot of public interest and was highly controversial. Defence lawyers argued that — with no dead body, no eye witnesses, and no motive — there was no basis for a charge of murder. However, government lawyers produced a series of expert witnesses giving detailed evidence which seemed to show that the baby was murdered. In the end, it was this evidence which convinced the court. So, on 29th October 1982, Linda Chamberlain was found guilty and sentenced to life imprisonment.

Linda then spent just over three years in prison. She still had many supporters, who said that the trial had been unfair and questioned the evidence provided by the scientific experts. However, nothing changed until, in January 1986, when she had an extraordinary piece of luck. An English hiker named David Brett fell to his death while trying to climb Ayer's Rock. Eight days later, his dead body was found by the police, who also discovered, not far away, a small white jacket, which had obviously been torn by a dingo's teeth. The jacket belonged to Azaria Chamberlain.

So her mother had been telling the truth all the time! On 7th February 1986, she was declared not guilty and released from prison. A great injustice was finally corrected.

READING 2 (cont'd)

Task 1: For each item, write a short answer (not more than **FOUR WORDS**).

11. How many animals escaped from the zoo?

12. How long did it take to kill or capture them all?

13. How many people were attacked by animals during this time?

14. What happened to the owner of the zoo?

15. Who used to help him to look after the animals?

Task 2: For each item, shade in the bubble (☐) next to the correct option.

16. Most of the escaped animals were _____.

☐ monkeys

☐ bears

☐ big cats

17. The animals living in the zoo were mostly _____.

☐ imported by the owner

☐ donated by people

☐ born there

18. The owner got some income from _____.

☐ selling tickets to the zoo

☐ working as a pilot

☐ writing articles

19. We are told that he had serious _____ problems.

☐ financial

☐ marriage

☐ health

20. Government officials _____ about the problems at the zoo.

☐ didn't know

☐ had warned him

☐ did nothing

Read this news story. Then complete the tasks.

Calm Returns after Mass Escape from Zoo

Calm has been restored to the small Ohio town of Zanesville with the shooting or re-capture of dozens of wild animals which had escaped from a private zoo.

The zoo had for several years been home to large numbers of bears, big cats and other dangerous animals. Then suddenly, on Tuesday morning, for reasons which are still unclear, the owner, Terry Thompson, opened the cages and set the animals free. Then he shot himself in the head. His body was later found near one of the cages.

On receiving '999'-calls from terrified residents, the police swung into action and began shooting the animals on sight. In all, they killed 50 animals, including 18 tigers, 17 lions, 9 bears and 6 monkeys in a hunt across the Ohio countryside that lasted nearly 24 hours. They were also able to re-capture 20 other animals.

"We're very sorry about the death of all those animals," said local sheriff, Martin Lutz, at a press conference, "but we really had no choice. Our priority was to protect people from big cats and bears hiding in the dark or among the trees. Of course, we also cancelled classes at schools and told people to stay indoors until the emergency was over. We're glad to say that we have received no reports of anybody actually being injured or killed by the animals."

The sheriff also said that he had spoken with Thompson's wife, who was understandably devastated over the loss of both her husband and the animals. "You have to understand, these animals were like kids to her," he said. "She didn't have any children of her own."

A neighbour told us that many of big cats had been given to him by people who had bought baby animals as pets, but then no longer wanted them once they started to grow. "Thompson and his wife spent much of their time caring for these animals," he said.

The motive behind Mr Thompson's actions remains a mystery. However, a friend of the family did make this comment: "It must have been very difficult for him to cover the cost of looking after so many animals for so long. The zoo itself wasn't open to visitors, so there was no income from that. He did have a pilot's license, and sometimes got extra cash from flying people around in his private plane — but then he had to sell it."

Another friend confirmed that Thompson was, in fact, deep in debt and owed the government a large amount of money in unpaid taxes. This probably also explains why the US Agency for Agriculture recently received two complaints about the zoo, stating that the animals were no longer being properly fed. Unfortunately, the agency decided that it had no authority to act on these complaints. Ohio has some of the nation's weakest laws on exotic pets, and among the highest numbers of injuries and deaths caused by them.

READING 1 (cont'd)

For each item, shade in the bubble (○) next to the correct option.

1. The company manufactures _____.
☐ office furniture ☐ household items ☐ food products
2. The writer works in the _____.
☐ personnel ☐ sales ☐ production
3. Most of the company's recruits are _____.
☐ school leavers ☐ experienced workers ☐ college graduates
4. The writer thinks the company should start putting job adverts _____.
☐ on TV ☐ in the newspaper ☐ on the radio
5. The recruitment process is not effective because _____.
☐ there are too many interviews ☐ candidates often don't show up for interviews ☐ interviews are too short
6. He complains that one interviewer, 'Mr X', is _____.
☐ too talkative ☐ very rude ☐ not well prepared
7. He says that 'Ms Y' asks _____ questions during interviews.
☐ too few ☐ the wrong kind of ☐ too many
8. About _____ of the people interviewed are offered jobs by the company.
☐ 20% ☐ 50% ☐ 80%
9. He believes the company should be more _____ candidates.
☐ honest with ☐ considerate towards ☐ strict with
10. He wrote this text for _____.
☐ a newspaper ☐ potential candidates ☐ the management

Read the text. Then complete the task.

Prisoners Escape By Helicopter

Two prisoners have made a daring daylight escape from a prison in Canada, but are now safely back in police custody.

On Sunday afternoon, at about two-thirty local time, police received a call from staff at the St-Jerome prison near Montreal. They reported that two prisoners named Benjamin Barbeau and Danny Provencal had succeeded in escaping by climbing a rope which had been let down from a helicopter flying above the prison yard.

The police swung into action, and followed the helicopter until it landed in a remote rural area about fifty kilometres north of St-Jerome prison. The two men then got into a waiting car, but after a twenty-kilometre chase, they were forced to stop. "When they got out of their car, they started shooting at our officers", said a police spokesman. "But fortunately, none of our men were hit."

Barbeau was arrested on the spot, but Provencal managed to escape on foot and hide in a nearby house, which was then surrounded by the police. Police negotiators kept him talking for six hours and persuaded him to surrender, which he finally did just before midnight. Police are still searching for two other men who were in helicopter.

Meanwhile, the pilot was taken to hospital and treated for shock, before being questioned by police. Apparently, he is claiming that he was forced to fly his helicopter over the prison by two men who held him at gunpoint. "We believe he is probably telling the truth," said a senior detective, "but, to be on the safe side, we are currently checking his background to see if he has any criminal connections."

Regarding the two escapees, Provencal is already back in his prison cell, while Barbeau is under police guard in the hospital. It seems that he was injured, not during the shoot-out with police, but earlier, while he was hanging onto the rope beneath the helicopter. Both prisoners have a history of violent crime. Barbeau, 33, was arrested in February and is charged with a series of murders. Provencal, 36, is serving a seven-year prison term for involvement in drug-dealing.

While expressing satisfaction that the two men had been re-captured, prison boss Raymond Galarneau announced that there would be a full and immediate investigation into the escape itself. "I have to admit," he said, "we were taken totally by surprise. In three decades on the job, I have never seen an escape as dramatic as this. No one ever expected that a helicopter would be used in this way. But, I promise you, we will be better prepared next time!"

One thing that Mr Galarneau did **not** mention during that press conference was the support given to the two escapees by their fellow-prisoners. It seems that, seconds before the escape, some of the other prisoners set fire to a mattress, hoping that the smoke would draw the prison staff's attention away from what was really happening!

READING 1 (cont'd)

For each item, shade in the bubble (☐) next to the correct option.

1. Yahoo employees know about the new policy from _____.
☐ a staff meeting ☐ a memo ☐ the newspaper
2. The policy is intended to make them more _____.
☐ innovative ☐ independent ☐ hard-working
3. It will start _____.
☐ immediately ☐ at the beginning of August ☐ at the end of August
4. The CEO believes that the best work discussions take place _____.
☐ at formal meetings ☐ at people's desks ☐ while eating
5. The writer has been with Yahoo for _____ years.
☐ two ☐ seven ☐ fifteen
6. She started 'working from home' in order to _____.
☐ look after a child ☐ recover from an illness ☐ take a course
7. She says she works better at home because she is _____.
☐ not tired from driving to work ☐ able to make her own work schedule ☐ not disturbed by noisy colleagues
8. She doesn't like communicating with people by _____.
☐ e-mails ☐ video-conferencing ☐ text messages
9. She thinks the CEO should _____.
☐ listen more ☐ work harder ☐ pay her more
10. She will _____.
☐ complain to the CEO ☐ decide later what to do ☐ leave her job

Read the text. Then complete the task.

Is it important for colleagues to work together in the same place? Or is it better to have more flexible arrangements, allowing some of them to 'work from home', at least for part of the time?

Debate over this issue has just been revived by a surprise decision from Internet giant, Yahoo, where I myself work. Fifteen years after the company pioneered 'work-from-home' arrangements for its workforce, it has suddenly changed its policy. Every Yahoo employee, including me, has now received an official memo from the company's new Chief Executive Officer, Marissa Meyer. It tells us that, from the 1st August, all work-from-home arrangements will end. From that date onwards, every employee will be required to report to the office in person.

Ms Meyer probably realised that this might be unpopular, so in her memo she spends some time explaining her decision. She emphasizes that it's not about 'checking up' on employees, or 'forcing' them to work harder. The key word for her is 'creativity'. She argues that creating things is a social activity, and that the best ideas are generated when people interact with each other. In fact, she says that the best place for this to happen is not in formal meetings, but actually in the staff canteen, where people can talk about things freely and informally over a tasty meal.

This is a very interesting argument — and she's certainly right about formal meetings! — but personally I'm not convinced. After five years at Yahoo head office, I switched to working-from-home. That was two years ago, just after I'd given birth, and it's been ideal for me. At home, I actually work much better, and am much more productive. For a start, I don't have to listen to people with their nasty gossip, silly jokes and waste-of-time discussions! The other advantage is that I don't have to worry about my baby — I know that if anything happens, I'm right there and can do something.

Of course, it is useful to exchange information, ideas and feedback with my colleagues. But what I don't understand is this. How come a world-famous high-tech company doesn't seem to have heard of modern communication technology!? Over the last two years, I've written e-mails; attached documents; taken part in video-conferencing; talked to people on my mobile phone; the only thing I haven't done is send text messages, which I've always hated! Surely, with all of these tools available, distance is no longer an obstacle. So why not use them to work from home?

As you can see, I'm not very happy with the management's decision. I've even thought of going to see Ms Meyer myself, but in the short time she has been here, she hasn't shown much sign of listening to us, so I probably won't bother! So what am I going to do in August? It would be easy to leave, but the problem is I love the job — and the money's very good! So I'll probably just try the new system and see what it's like.

READING 1 (cont'd)

For each item, shade in the bubble (☐) next to the correct option.

1. Guillaume works as _____.
☐ a tourist guide ☐ an architect ☐ a journalist
2. Poitiers is _____ city.
☐ an industrial ☐ a coastal ☐ a historic
3. Its power station was opened _____.
☐ last year ☐ five years ago ☐ ten years ago
4. Nuclear energy is now an issue because of an accident at a _____ power station.
☐ Japanese ☐ French ☐ German
5. Guillaume knows about nuclear energy from _____.
☐ the Internet ☐ his studies ☐ his father
6. At present, France has _____ nuclear power stations.
☐ 48 ☐ 58 ☐ 78
7. Most of these power stations have been built near _____.
☐ sources of uranium ☐ cities ☐ water
8. The writer says the French use a lot of nuclear power because they have _____.
☐ very little oil
☐ no worries about the environment
☐ a large population
9. Using nuclear power also reduces the country's _____.
☐ tax bills ☐ carbon emissions ☐ energy costs
10. He is especially annoyed by criticism from _____ people.
☐ Japanese ☐ German ☐ local

Read the text. Then complete the task.

My name is Guillaume Balzac, and I live and work in Poitiers, a beautiful old city in central France. Every day I meet visitors from different countries, introduce them to Poitiers' famous sights and answer all their questions about the city's past. However, since last year's nuclear disaster in Japan, they have started asking me some new questions — about the huge nuclear power station, which lies just outside the city. I can tell from their questions that they — especially the Germans! — are strongly against nuclear power. They seem to think that it is dangerous for the environment.

However, personally, I think that nuclear power is not only the safest, but also the most efficient form of energy. Actually, I've never been inside the power station, but I know something about it from my father, who has been working there for five years. It is situated on the banks of the River Vienne, 15 km south-east of Poitiers. It is one of France's most modern plants, designed for a total power output of 1495 megawatts. Actually, it has had an excellent safety record, with no accidents at all since it began operations in 2002.

I know that some of my countrymen have similar fears to the Germans, who have in recent years started phasing out nuclear power stations altogether. However, two-thirds of the French population still favour nuclear energy, and I am one of those people. The fact is, it produces a million times more energy as compared to hydro- or wind-energy, and a single kilogram of uranium can produce as much energy as 20,000 barrels of oil. Today, approximately 16% of the world's electricity comes from nuclear power stations.

Like Japan, France lacks natural resources such as oil, which is why these two countries lead the world in nuclear energy. 48% of Japan's electricity comes from nuclear energy, while in France the figure is a massive 78%! All this power comes from our fifty-eight reactors, mostly located on the coast or near rivers. Nuclear energy is very expensive, but due to our very heavy investment, we are able to satisfy all our energy needs, and can even export 18% of our total production to Italy, Belgium and — would you believe it! — Germany.

Another point is that nuclear reactors provide emission-free energy. My father tells me that nuclear fission produces virtually no 'greenhouse gas' emissions — unlike the burning of fossil fuels such as coal and oil. According to recent estimates, our use of nuclear energy has enabled us to lower our carbon emissions by more than 80% over the past 30 years. At present, these stand at only 10% of those in Germany.

Of course, even though I don't really like all these questions, I always remain patient, and avoid getting into any arguments. Being polite is part of my job!

READING 2 (cont'd)

Task 1: For each item, write a short answer (not more than **FOUR WORDS**).

11. How did the two prisoners get into the helicopter?

12. How far did they fly after that?

13. How many people were injured during the shootout?

14. Where was Provencal when he was captured?

15. How many men are the police still looking for?

Task 2: For each item, shade in the bubble (☐) next to the correct option.

16. The escape took place _____.

☐ in the morning

☐ at night

☐ in the afternoon

17. The other prisoners helped the men escape by _____.

☐ starting a fire

☐ attacking the guards

☐ giving them guns

18. The police will _____ put the pilot of the helicopter on trial.

☐ definitely not

☐ probably not

☐ certainly

19. Bardeau is in prison for _____.

☐ robbing a bank

☐ killing several people

☐ selling drugs

20. The two prisoners were free for _____.

☐ less than 24 hours

☐ two days

☐ more than a week

Read the text. Then complete the task.

Nellie Bly was the pen-name of a pioneering American female journalist, Elizabeth Cochrane. She was born on 5th May 1864 in Pittsburgh. Her father died when she was just six, leaving her mother with fifteen children to raise.

After her father's death, the family lived in poverty. Looking for an interesting career and a way to support her mother, Elizabeth went to college at the age of fifteen to train to become a teacher. However, she had trouble paying the tuition fees and spent only one semester there. She then helped her mother run a boarding house.

When Elizabeth was only eighteen, she managed to get a job at the 'Pittsburgh Dispatch' newspaper. The editor gave her the pen-name, 'Nellie Bly', because he thought it was improper for a woman to write for a newspaper using her real name.

Nellie focused her attention on women's rights issues. She was the first to launch undercover investigative journalism. She went to work in a Pittsburgh factory to investigate the life of poor female factory workers, who suffered from low salaries and unsafe working conditions. However, factory owners complained about her and threatened to stop buying advertising space in the newspaper. So the editor was forced to put an end to Nellie's articles. Instead he pushed her to cover the women's pages, writing about fashion, society and gardening.

Dissatisfied with these duties, she travelled to Mexico. Still only twenty-one, she spent six months writing freelance articles about poverty and politics. When the Mexican government discovered what she had been writing, they ordered her out of the country.

Nellie returned to the United States and moved to New York. She was recruited by the 'World' newspaper and took on a new undercover assignment, in which she pretended to be mad in order to investigate dirty conditions, rotten food and physical abuse from doctors and nurses in a hospital for mentally ill people. Her report was later published in a book entitled 'Ten Days in a Mad House'. As a result of Nellie's investigations, New York officials provided more money for the care of people in the city's mental hospitals.

However, Nellie's most famous story began in 1889, when she was twenty-five. After reading Jules Verne's novel, 'Around the World in Eighty Days', she suggested to her editor that she turn this story from fiction into fact. So she began a rapid journey around the world, steamships and trains. It took only seventy-two days — two days longer than she had planned, after rough weather in the Pacific Ocean. When she arrived back in New York, she was greeted by huge crowds of men and women.

In 1895, Nellie married millionaire manufacturer, Robert Seaman, who was forty years older than her. She retired from journalism and managed her husband's company. Unfortunately, it went bankrupt, and after her husband's death in 1905, she went back to what she knew best — journalism.

Read the text. Then complete the task.

I was born in Valente, a small town with a population of 20,000 people, situated in the state of Bahia, in north-east Brazil. The land is semi-arid and too infertile to produce much vegetation. Most people make their living by cultivating and harvesting sisal, the only crop which grows well on this barren land. With its strong fibre, sisal is traditionally used to make clothes, ropes, and baskets, but nowadays carpets and rugs are more popular. Since Bahia is the largest producer of sisal in the country, it has attracted the attention of large businesses. Five days ago, a well-known company held a meeting in my town and presented their plan to build a new factory nearby. What really disappoints me is that many local people oppose this proposal. They claim that the new factory will cause damage to the local environment. But, in my view, it will change things for the better and bring us a lot of benefits.

Let me tell you why I believe this. In Valente, over fifty percent of the people live below the poverty line. Although public education is free at all levels, most children from poor families leave school from the age of 12 in order to help their parents with the cultivation and harvesting of sisal. All my younger brothers and sisters did the same. However — maybe because I'm the oldest — my parents insisted on supporting me to study Engineering until I graduated from Bahia State University in 2009. After graduation, I was offered a job with a company in Salvador, a city with a population of one million. Unfortunately, it is 120 km away from my home town. So I have now spent three years travelling to and from work every day and struggling to support my large family.

In Valente, only a few local government jobs are currently available. The unemployment rate is high and the only hope of improving the situation is to find another source of jobs. The construction and running of this new factory will create lots of work opportunities. According to the company's plan, they will immediately provide 800 permanent jobs in the factory, in addition to 100 casual jobs during construction. Then, after the first year of production, they will employ 400 more full-time workers. Priority will be given to the local people, both men and women. This will definitely be a great opportunity for most young people in my town to get suitable jobs and make their own living.

There is one more important benefit. For the factory to run smoothly, workers will have to get to work on time. But the road conditions here are terrible! So the company knows that it will have to provide better transportation. It will have to rebuild and broaden the main roads and replace muddy tracks with concrete-paved roads. It will also have to supply our town with a low-cost bus service, which will give people easy access to any destination in the area. All of this is covered in the company's proposal.

Read the text. Then complete the tasks.

Alistair Cooke was a British-American journalist, television personality and broadcaster. He was born as Alfred Cooke on 20th November 1908 in Salford in north-west England. His background was poor, but he was educated at a local grammar school and won a scholarship to Cambridge University. He received this award on condition that he would become a teacher, but he was never really interested in joining that profession.

At Cambridge, Alfred was very active in extra-curricular drama activities. He even set up a theatre that was the first at the university to allow female students to perform on stage. In 1930 — when he was twenty-two — Alfred changed his name to Alistair. He thought that 'Alistair' sounded more artistic.

After graduation, he was able to avoid the teaching requirement by gaining a fellowship for further studies at Yale University in the USA. After leaving Yale, he headed for Hollywood in 1934, hoping to start an acting career. While there, he saw a newspaper headline saying that the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) had fired its film critic. Despite his lack of experience in this kind of work, he immediately sent a telegram to the director, asking to be considered for the job.

He was invited for an interview, and sailed back to England, arriving at BBC headquarters just in time. In order to show his ability, he asked the interviewers to name a film — any film — and then typed out a complete review on the spot! A few minutes later, he was offered the job. As well as writing film reviews for the BBC, Alistair also worked as London correspondent for the American news network, NBC. Each week he recorded a 15-minute talk for American listeners on life in Britain under the title, 'London Letter'.

In 1936, Edward VIII gave up his position as British king. Alistair used his NBC broadcasts to provide his American listeners with detailed reports on the royal drama. Alistair was keen to return to America, so he used the money he got from covering the crisis to move to New York in 1937. He lived there for the rest of his life and became an American citizen in 1941, although his connections with Britain remained strong.

After the end of the Second World War, Alistair suggested to the BBC the idea of doing the 'London Letter' in reverse: a 15-minute talk for British listeners on news, events and famous people in the USA. The first 'American Letter' was broadcast on 24th March 1946, and the series only came to an end in March 2004, fifty-eight years later! Along the way, in 1950, it picked up a new name: 'Letter from America'. It also picked up a huge audience, being broadcast not only in Britain but throughout the world. It was so popular that it became the longest-lasting programme by a single person in broadcasting history.

In March 2004, following advice from his doctors, Alistair was finally forced to give up broadcasting. He died very soon afterwards at the age of ninety-five.

READING 2 (cont'd)

Task 1: For each item, write a short answer (not more than FOUR WORDS).

11. How old was she when her father died?

12. What was the *first* occupation that interested her?

13. What new type of investigative journalism did she invent?

14. Which country was she thrown out of by the government?

15. What occupation did she try (unsuccessfully) after getting married?

Task 2: For each item, shade in the bubble (☐) next to the correct option.

16. Her first editor gave her a pen-name because she _____.

☐ was a woman

☐ asked for one

☐ was married

17. He stopped her writing about factories because her articles _____.

☐ annoyed the owners

☐ were not interesting

☐ were always late

18. When this happened, her reaction was to _____.

☐ apply for a job with
another newspaper

☐ quietly accept her
boss's decision

☐ leave the newspaper
and go abroad

19. In New York, her reporting had an important impact on the city's _____ policy.

☐ employment

☐ mental care

☐ environmental

20. In 1899, she travelled around the world in just _____ days.

☐ 70

☐ 72

☐ 80