

I Read this article and answer the questions below.

“All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others.” This famous slogan from George Orwell’s novel *Animal Farm* captures the current state of affairs in nature conservation quite well. Though conservationists are uncomfortable admitting that we might have to let some animal species go extinct, they also know that it is impractical to try to distribute their efforts evenly.

This makes prioritizing inevitable. Every organization involved in conservation does it, and many focus on the same species—the cute and the colorful, the ones we feel emotionally drawn to. As a result, most mammal conservation projects target “charismatic” species like the panda and the tiger, leaving three-quarters of endangered mammals unprotected. Birds suffer a similar bias, and other life forms rarely appear on the radar at all. But even if we become less emotional in our choices, deciding what to save isn’t just about biology—it is political and economic, too. If we want to assign conservation time and money more effectively, we have some hard choices to make.

Even identifying the species in most trouble isn’t straightforward. In the past, they were more likely to be the high-profile animals that still get a lot of attention today. When hunting was one of the main threats of extinction, the species at greatest risk tended to cluster together on the tree of life—carnivores wearing fashionable fur coats or large, tasty herbivores, some with attractive horns or tusks. As global warming takes over as a main driver of extinction, however, this pattern is changing. “Smaller animals may be more vulnerable to climate change than they were to hunting,” says Jonathan Davies at McGill University in Montreal, Canada. “And once ecosystems start to collapse, extinctions may appear at random—a classic signal of mass extinctions.”

Today, the Red List of the International Union for Conservation of Nature provides a catalog of the extinction risk faced by as many species as possible. But with 4,000 listed as “critically endangered,” just one step from “extinct in the wild,” it still leaves the enthusiastic conservationist with a vast range of choices.

One solution might be to focus on areas that are home to the largest number of species—so-called hotspots of biodiversity. (A)

Then there is the problem of judging which hotspots most need protection. It isn’t as simple as measuring overall reductions in biodiversity. Although biodiversity is decreasing globally, Maria Dornelas and Anne Magurran at the University of St. Andrews, U.K., found that on a smaller scale, it is increasing in the sites they looked at almost as often as it is decreasing. But rising biodiversity isn’t necessarily a sign that an area is thriving: it may be due to colonization by alien species that do well in rapidly changing or human-made environments.

Maybe, instead of counting species, we should be looking at the larger branches of the tree of life and trying to preserve regions with high evolutionary diversity. In the early 1990s, Dan Faith of the Australian Museum in Sydney (B) using phylogenetic trees, a sort of evolutionary family tree where the length of the branches represents the years of evolutionary history separating the species. “It occurred to me that if you were to take such a tree and add up the lengths of the branches connecting all the species in a region, that would give an idea of what I decided to call its ‘phylogenetic diversity’—the longer the distance, the higher the diversity,” says Faith.

Together with Felix Forest of the Royal Botanical Gardens in London, Faith used this approach to assess the plant life in the Cape region of South Africa. “We were able to show that areas with high phylogenetic diversity scores may not necessarily contain the most species, but they tend to have the greatest variety of useful features, such as edible parts, medicinal properties, construction materials, and so forth,” says Forest.

What’s more, phylogenetic diversity could boost conservation by creating a source of national pride. “The government in Australia is quite interested in this measure,” says Faith, noting that, with its kangaroos and other unusual animals, the country scores high on phylogenetic diversity. “They would like to add a biological dimension to the notion of what we inherit from the past, so that we might strive to

protect not just our cultural heritage, but our evolutionary heritage as well.”

While Faith’s approach allows conservationists to compare the evolutionary history contained in entire ecosystems, it doesn’t tell us about the evolutionary distinctness of individual species, which are still the main focus of many conservation efforts. That’s where the Zoological Society of London comes in. Its researchers have been busy calculating species’ so-called EDGE (Evolutionarily Distinct and Globally Endangered) scores. They first divide the length of each branch of a phylogenetic tree by the number of species at its tip. Then, to assess how evolutionarily distinct (ED) any given species is, they simply add up these values starting at the root of the tree and ending at the tip where the organism is to be found.

The ED will be highest for those species with a long evolutionary history and few relatives. “This gives you a measure of each species’ individual contribution to the phylogenetic diversity of a region, expressed in millions of years of evolutionary history,” says Sam Turvey at the Zoological Society of London. ED is then multiplied by a number reflecting how globally endangered (GE) it is, based on its Red List status. “The resulting EDGE score allows us to rank animals by phylogenetic uniqueness as well as extinction risk.”

The approach has generated top-100 lists of mammals, amphibians, corals and, most recently, birds “on the EDGE of existence,” as the EDGE website puts it. “That’s not an exaggeration,” says Turvey. “As soon as we launched in 2007, we found ourselves in the very unfortunate position of having to declare the Yangtze river dolphin—the number-one species on our list—to be extinct.” Interestingly, some of the usual suspects targeted for conservation are well outside EDGE’s mammal top 100, including the tiger (“plenty of other big cat species”) and the African elephant (“not as highly threatened as it was previously thought to be”). “I would never want any resources to be taken from existing conservation projects, if these species still need them,” says Turvey. “But we’d like to highlight that there are many other species that also need conservation.”

Perhaps one day there will be EDGE scores for all life—invertebrates, plants, even microbes. “That would be interesting,” says Faith. It would also expose the fact that emotional considerations will always play a part in our choices. “I don’t think anybody would seriously consider giving up on a mammal to conserve a larger amount of phylogenetic diversity in beetles or bacteria,” he says.

As for the human EDGE score, that is rather humbling. “In terms of evolutionary distinctiveness, we don’t even make the top 1,000,” says Turvey. And when it comes to conservation risk, we are in the “least concern” category, which drops us even further down the list. “Of course we are a serious concern for conservation—but in a rather different way.”

Adapted from <http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg22329780.500-sorry-tiger-why-we-should-save-weird-species-first/>

- 1 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to complete the following sentence.
Focusing conservation efforts on animals like pandas and tigers has the disadvantage that
 - (a) some conservation groups disagree politically with the governments of the countries where these animals live.
 - (b) such animals require more time and effort to save than smaller animals like birds.
 - (c) such decisions only consider the emotions felt by animals.
 - (d) the majority of mammals in danger of extinction are ignored by conservationists.
 - (e) trying to save such animals becomes economically unthinkable.

- 2 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to complete the following sentence.
Identifying endangered species has changed over time because
- (a) climate change produces different species than hunting once did.
 - (b) global warming has introduced new patterns of animal extinction.
 - (c) hunting has become more popular in some regions than ever before.
 - (d) most rare animals have already disappeared from the earth's ecosystems.
 - (e) there are now more plant-eating animals than meat-eating animals in the world.
- 3 Choose the most suitable order of sentences from those below to fill in blank space (A).
- (a) For a start, it isn't always clear what counts as a single species.
 - (b) However, this can be surprisingly contentious.
 - (c) Likewise, when scientists successfully argue that their favorite species should be split into two or more, some conservationists consider the resulting species or subspecies to be less important than long-established ones.
 - (d) Where an individual species has recently and rapidly diversified into a large group of closely related species, these may not be valued as highly as more distinct species.
- 4 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to complete the following sentence.
Signs of increasing biodiversity are not always a good basis for protection because
- (a) an error may have been made in counting the species found in one particular area.
 - (b) diversity could simply be the result of outside species achieving success.
 - (c) less diversity may actually benefit a greater number of species.
 - (d) reduced diversity overall is now considered a scientifically proven fact.
 - (e) the increased diversity may cause damage to the human environment.
- 5 Use six of the seven words below to fill in blank space (B) in the best way. Indicate your choices for the second, fourth, and sixth positions.
- (a) a
 - (b) devised
 - (c) diversity
 - (d) measure
 - (e) of
 - (f) to
 - (g) way
- 6 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to complete the following sentence.
The approach taken by Faith and Forest highlights
- (a) the benefits of conducting research in a relatively isolated area.
 - (b) the efforts of the Australian government to protect animals like kangaroos.
 - (c) the importance of generating a large number of plant and animal species.
 - (d) the usefulness of plant and animal life to human activities.
 - (e) the value of our cultural heritage over our evolutionary heritage.
- 7 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to complete the following sentence.
Species that have a high EDGE score tend to
- (a) appear at the top of the Red List of endangered species.
 - (b) be species that live in water rather than species that live on land.
 - (c) face the highest risk of extinction today as a result of human behavior.
 - (d) have existed for a long time but are not related to many other living things.
 - (e) stay closely related to species that share a long evolutionary history.

II Read this speech given by U.S. President John F. Kennedy and answer the questions below.

It is with great pride that I participate in this ceremony of the American University, sponsored by the Methodist Church, founded by Bishop John Fletcher Hurst, and first opened by President Woodrow Wilson in 1914. Professor Woodrow Wilson once said that every man sent out from a university should be a man of his nation as well as a man of his time, and I am confident that the men and women who carry the honor of graduating from this institution will continue to give from their lives, from their talents, a high measure of public service and public support.

“There are few earthly things more beautiful than a university,” wrote John Masefield in his tribute to English universities—and his words are equally true today. He did not refer to spires and towers, to campus greens and ivied walls. He admired the splendid beauty of the university, he said, because it was “a place where those who hate ignorance may strive to know, where those who perceive truth may strive to make others see.” I have, therefore, chosen this time and this place to discuss a topic on which ignorance too often abounds and the truth is too rarely perceived—yet it is the most important topic on earth: world peace.

What kind of peace do I mean? What kind of peace do we seek? Not a Pax Americana (A) of war. Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children—not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men and women—not merely peace in our time but peace for all time.

(B) But we have no more urgent task.

We must reexamine our own attitude—as individuals and as a nation. And every graduate of this school, every thoughtful citizen who despairs of war and wishes to bring peace, should begin by looking inward—by examining his own attitude toward the possibilities of peace.

First, let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is (C). Too many think it (D). But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is (E)—that mankind is doomed—that we are gripped by forces we cannot control.

We need not accept that view. Our problems are man-made—therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings. Man’s reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable—and we believe they can do it again. I am not referring to the absolute, infinite concept of peace and good will of which some fantasies and fanatics dream. I do not deny the value of hopes and dreams, but we merely invite discouragement and incredulity by making that our only and immediate goal.

Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace—based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned. There is no single, simple key to this peace—no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process—a way of solving problems.

With such a peace, there will still be quarrels and conflicting interests, as there are within families and nations. World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together in mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement. And history teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever. However fixed our likes and dislikes may seem, the tide of time and events will often bring surprising changes in the relations between nations and neighbors.

So let us persevere. Peace need not be impracticable, and war need not be inevitable. By defining our goal more clearly, by making it seem more manageable and less remote, we can help all peoples to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it.

Finally, my fellow Americans, let us examine our attitude toward peace and freedom here at home. The quality and spirit of our own society must justify and support our efforts abroad. Wherever we are, we must all, in our daily lives, live up to the age-old faith that peace and freedom walk together. In too many of our cities today, the peace is not secure because the freedom is incomplete.

It is the responsibility of the executive branch at all levels of government—local, state, and national—to provide and protect that freedom for all of our citizens by all means within their authority. It is the responsibility of the legislative branch at all levels, wherever that authority is not now adequate, to make it adequate. And it is the responsibility of all citizens in all sections of this country to respect the rights of all others and to respect the law of the land.

All this is not unrelated to world peace. Is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights—the right to live out our lives without fear of devastation—the right to breathe air as nature provided it—the right of future generations to a healthy existence?

While we proceed to safeguard our national interests, let us also safeguard human interests. And the elimination of war and arms is clearly in the interest of both. No treaty, however much it may be to the advantage of all, however tightly it may be worded, can provide absolute security against the risks of deception and evasion. But it can—if it is sufficiently effective in its enforcement and if it is sufficiently in the interests of its signers—offer far more security and far fewer risks than an unabated, uncontrolled, unpredictable arms race.

This generation of Americans has already had enough—more than enough—of war and hate and oppression. We shall be prepared if others wish it. We shall be alert to try to stop it. But we shall also do our part to build a world of peace where (F). We are not helpless before that task or hopeless of its success. Confident and unafraid, we labor on toward a strategy of peace.

Adapted from <http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/BWC7I4C9QUmLG9J6I8oy8w.aspx>

- 1 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to complete the following sentence.
Kennedy uses Masfield's words to argue that
 - (a) students are often unaware of the natural beauty of their own universities.
 - (b) the campuses of American universities are as beautiful as those of English universities.
 - (c) the true beauty of universities originates from the pursuit of truth.
 - (d) those who graduate from universities deserve the honor of being called beautiful.
 - (e) universities are beautiful because of their commitment to providing public services.

- 2 Use the seven words below to fill in blank space (A) in the best way. Indicate your choices for the second, fourth, and sixth positions.
 - (a) American (b) by (c) enforced (d) on
 - (e) the (f) weapons (g) world

- 3 Choose the most suitable order of sentences from those below to fill in blank space (B).
 - (a) And frequently the words of the pursuer fall on deaf ears.
 - (b) But surely the acquisition of such idle stockpiles—which can only destroy and never create—is not the only, much less the most efficient, means of assuring peace.
 - (c) I speak of peace, therefore, as the necessary rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war.
 - (d) Today the expenditure of billions of dollars every year on weapons acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them is essential to keeping the peace.

- 4 Choose the most suitable combination of answers from those below to fill in blank spaces (C), (D), and (E).
- (a) acceptable—difficult—worse
 - (b) costly—troublesome—manageable
 - (c) impossible—unreal—inevitable
 - (d) necessary—just—valuable
 - (e) uncertain—hopeless—desirable
- 5 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to complete the following sentence.
Kennedy argues that
- (a) genuine peace comes from following our dreams wherever they lead.
 - (b) human beings create problems that they cannot solve satisfactorily.
 - (c) international treaties are not valuable because they can never be fully enforced.
 - (d) specific steps must be taken for a more peaceful world to emerge.
 - (e) true peace can be realized through the leadership of one powerful nation.
- 6 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to complete the following sentence.
Kennedy argues that
- (a) city legislatures especially are responsible for ensuring personal freedom.
 - (b) each individual in society must recognize the rights of all fellow citizens.
 - (c) freedom at home and peace abroad can be achieved independently of each other.
 - (d) religious faith must be the foundation for a peaceful world.
 - (e) the protection of human rights is mostly a matter of domestic politics.
- 7 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to fill in blank space (F).
- (a) the gentle are kind and the wild are tamed
 - (b) the poor are few and the rich are many
 - (c) the unlucky are secure and the hardworking are rewarded
 - (d) the weak are safe and the strong are just
 - (e) the young are healthy and the old are wise
- 8 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to complete the following sentence.
On the whole, Kennedy's speech can be described as
- (a) emphasizing a practical rather than idealistic approach for achieving world peace.
 - (b) encouraging university undergraduates to continue their studies in graduate school.
 - (c) expressing pessimism about the possibility of establishing world peace.
 - (d) making it clear that the United States would not sign treaties for disarmament.
 - (e) noting that American society had few problems with regard to human rights.

III Read this blog post and answer the questions below.

I was in an American-style steakhouse here in Barbados a few weeks ago, trying to write but being distracted instead by the TVs in every corner of the room beaming out different cable channels: sports to the left of me, news to the right, an action movie front and center. One program particularly caught my eye: a piece on happiness, by CNN.

The news hook was the publication of a World Happiness Report, in which countries were (A). The puzzle for CNN was why the United States, despite its wealth, came in only 11th in the survey, with a happiness score similar to that of Costa Rica, and why, throughout decades of rising wealth in the U.S., happiness levels had remained essentially unchanged.

Yet instead of engaging with these issues, CNN invited on a happiness expert, and put up these three keys to achieving happiness:

- *Sleep*
- *Fake it*
- *Enjoy now*

That's it, folks. Human happiness, in three easy steps! Don't worry, America, your misery has nothing to do with rising inequality, job insecurity, lack of health coverage, racial oppression, shrinking pensions, broken family structures, longer working hours, or the huge holes in the social safety net. It's not because your economic system puts you on a treadmill in which permanent dissatisfaction is the only logical outcome, because if you were ever truly satisfied you might stop consuming. No, don't worry, America. All you need is a good night's sleep, a bit of fakery, and to "enjoy now."

Of course, I know the reasons why CNN opted for gross simplification over serious engagement. I used to be a journalist myself, and I'm aware of the pressure of deadlines, the limited time, and limited space. I also know that in news, particularly in TV news, there's a lot of pressure to provide viewers with a clear, actionable "takeaway." In other words, don't just leave people confused by bad news. Give them something easy they can do right now to improve things. You'll hear the same advice if you read any tips on blogging or writing for magazines. Always provide a takeaway.

It's a nice idea, and sometimes it works. If you're writing about something simple, it's great to give readers a takeaway. *Frustrated by filling out your taxes? Here are three things you can do to simplify the process.* Fine.

(B)

I should point out that I have (C) CNN's guest, Gretchen Rubin, author of *The Happiness Project*. I haven't read her book, so it would be unfair to judge it, and I know her arguments were probably greatly simplified. I've read quite a few self-help and personal development books in my life, and got a lot from them. There are definitely some things that you can do to make yourself happier and improve your life.

But there are also some things that need to be looked at on a larger scale, on a societal level, and that's the main problem I had with the CNN segment. It tries to provide individual solutions for social problems. This is something I notice all the time, particularly in the U.S. but also elsewhere: an individualistic approach being considered more important than the social.

My personal theory is that the failure of so many of the grand social-engineering experiments of the 20th century has made us inherently distrustful of anything too big. We've retreated into our shells, concerning ourselves only with self-improvement, not wanting to get involved with anything that even suggests ideology. This is why the world is heading for catastrophic climate change, and all we're doing in response is religiously sorting our garbage into different-colored boxes.

It's understandable, of course. We've grown up in the shadow of the 20th century and the millions who died at the hands of ideology-obsessed regimes. Yet big ideas are just what we now need if we want to deal successfully with a highly complex, "globalized" world. (D) isn't enough anymore. We're all (E) now. We need big ideas again, grand social schemes, transnational agreements to

safeguard the environment, to secure basic standards of living for everyone, to share resources more fairly, to make us happier. But we're like the proverbial generals who always base their strategies on previous wars. The tragedy of the 20th century was that big ideas killed millions of people; the tragedy of the 21st may be that the lack of big ideas kills millions of people.

The World Happiness Report, if you read it, has plenty of suggestions for policy changes. The authors (F) on GDP as a measure of social success, and towards a broader set of goals incorporating happiness, health, family relationships, community and governance, quality of work, and the like.

To me, this is long overdue. GDP is a measure of output, an adding up of all economic activity, all exchange of goods and services. But not all exchange is good or useful. If I crash my car on the motorway and sustain life-threatening injuries, it's good for the economy—my purchase of a new car, hospital services, crutches, etc., all adds to GDP. But does it make anyone happy? There are plenty of other things that add to GDP but don't make anyone happy: think of the arms industry, which accounts for an estimated \$1.7 trillion of spending *every year*. Is that a good thing? And besides, aren't we already producing and consuming too much? According to the U.K. government, if everyone in the world lived like people in the U.K., it would take about three planets' worth of resources to support us.

Don't we need to start defining success a little differently?

My point in this post is that sometimes a topic is too big to be given the takeaway treatment. Sometimes we just need to think, and read widely, and come to our own conclusions, and take action on a broader level than that of our own home. If we want to be happy, maybe we first need to make ourselves a little uncomfortable, by confronting some unpleasant truths about the world we live in, the power structures that dominate it, and our place in those structures.

What's your take on all this? Am I wildly off-target in my criticism? Am I hypocritical for criticizing CNN, and then trying to solve the world's problems in a blog post? What makes you happy? Do you think we need to think big thoughts again, or is individualism OK? How should we measure the success of our societies? Share your reaction, whatever it is: it would make me happy, at least for a while.

Adapted from <http://andrewblackman.net/2012/06/achieve-happiness-in-three-easy-steps/>

1 Use the seven words below to fill in blank space (A) in the best way. Indicate your choices for the second, fourth, and sixth positions.

- (a) by (b) citizens (c) happiness (d) of
(e) ranked (f) the (g) their

2 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to complete the following sentence.

Regarding the advice given on the program by the happiness expert, the writer suggests that

- (a) a complex issue like happiness cannot be approached through such a simplistic solution.
(b) America is fortunate not to have problems like inequality and job insecurity.
(c) Americans would be even less happy without the economic system they already have.
(d) confusion would be the most likely initial reaction for those watching the program.
(e) providing viewers with a "takeaway" point is poor journalistic practice.

- 3 Choose the most suitable order of sentences from those below to fill in blank space (B).
- (a) But I'd argue that some subjects demand a different approach.
 - (b) It needs more careful treatment.
 - (c) Some subjects are simply more complicated than spring rolls and egg-fried rice, and they can't just be packed up neatly into a Styrofoam box for you to take away and consume at your convenience.
 - (d) To me, human happiness is such a subject because it resists being made into a takeaway.
- 4 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to fill in blank space (C).
- (a) full agreement with
 - (b) little sympathy for
 - (c) many problems with
 - (d) no quarrel with
 - (e) some responsibility for
- 5 Choose the most suitable set of words from those below to fill in blank spaces (D) and (E).
- (a) Imperialism—undervalued
 - (b) Individualism—interconnected
 - (c) Liberalism—suppressed
 - (d) Regionalism—isolated
 - (e) Socialism—disappointed
- 6 Use six of the seven words below to fill in blank space (F) in the best way. Indicate your choices for the second, fourth, and sixth positions.
- (a) away (b) emphasis (c) from (d) improve
 - (e) moving (f) suggest (g) the
- 7 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to complete the following sentence.
The writer can be said to conclude that
- (a) blog posts can provide a simpler answer to the happiness problem than TV shows can.
 - (b) defining happiness requires thinking about issues that are challenging and unpleasant.
 - (c) GDP is finally the best measure of happiness that we can imagine today.
 - (d) the greater the volume of economic activity, the higher the level of happiness.
 - (e) the U.K. government offers a successful model for achieving happiness.

IV **Read this dialogue and answer the questions below.**

Emily: Hi, Ruth. Say, that's a pretty big dog you've got. Is it safe to come in?

Ruth: Oh, you don't have to worry about Bruiser.

Emily: Bruiser? Wow, he's certainly a friendly fellow. Do you think you could stop him from jumping up on me?

Ruth: Down, Bruiser, down. Down, boy. Sorry, I'm afraid I'm still having trouble (A).

Emily: Have you tried using treats? Professional trainers do that, you know.

Ruth: Of course I know that. Look, here's the bag of treats I've been using. Watch. Here you go, Bruiser. Good dog. Now sit, boy, sit.

Emily: Hold on. It hardly (B) to give a dog a treat *before* he's supposed to do something. You've got to give him the treat afterward, as a reward.

Ruth: So they say. But it never seemed to work, so I thought I'd (C).

Emily: Actually, Ruth, I get the feeling the problem may be yours rather than Bruiser's.

Ruth: Oh, dear. Maybe I just don't (D) to train a dog.

1 Use six of the seven words below to fill in blank space (A) in the best way. Indicate your choices for the second, fourth, and sixth positions.

- (a) do (b) him (c) I (d) making
(e) say (f) to (g) what

2 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to fill in blank space (B).

- (a) comes true
(b) leaves time
(c) makes sense
(d) takes pride
(e) wears thin

3 Use the six words below to fill in blank space (C) in the best way. Indicate your choices for the second, fourth, and sixth positions.

- (a) a (b) approach (c) chance (d) give
(e) opposite (f) the

4 Choose the most suitable answer from those below to fill in blank space (D).

- (a) have what it takes
(b) hope for the best
(c) know when to stop
(d) reach for the stars
(e) say where it goes

V **Read the statement below and write a paragraph giving at least two reasons why you agree or disagree with it. Write your answer in English in the space provided on your written answer sheet.**

(It is suggested that you spend no more than 15 minutes on this section.)

“Gay marriage should be made legal in Japan.”

[END OF TEST]