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**SECTION I. LISTENING (50 points):**

***Part 1 (14 pts)***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. heavy | 2. surgery |
| 3. beetles | 4. gas |
| 5. moving | 6. surface area |
| 7. tubes | 8. pressure |
| 9. submarines | 10. Fuel |

***Part 2 (16 pts)***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11. obelisks | 12. sticks of incense |
| 13. (on) (board) ships | 14. International Atomic Time |
| 15. 40/ forty |

***Part 3 (10 pts)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 16. Not given | 17. True | 18. True | 19. False | 20. False |

***Part 4 (10 pts)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 21. A | 22. D | 23. D | 24. B | 25. A |

**LEXICO – GRAMMAR**

***Part 1 (15 pts)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 26. B | 27.D | 28.B | 29.B | 33.A |
| 31.D | 32.D | 33.A | 34.D | 35.A |
| 36.B | 37.A | 38.B | 39.C | 40.A |

**Part 2 *(5 pts)***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Line | Mistake | Correction |
| 41 | 1 | make | do |
| 42 | 3 | studies | learns |
| 43 | 4 | possible | able |
| 44 | 6 | which | where |
| 45 | 7 | or | and |

**Part 3 *(10 pts)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **46.** groundbreaking | **47.** unassailable | **48.** offhandedly | **49.** expressionless | **50.** maladroit |
| **51.** stronghold | **52.** unhindered | **53.** misalignment | **54.** belittled | **55.** grittily |

**SECTION III. READING (60pts)**

***Part 1 (10 pts)***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 56. | 57. | 58. | 59. | 60. | 61. | 62. | 63. | 64. | 65. |
| C | A | D | D | C | B | B | A | A | D |

**Part 2 *(10 pts)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 66. opposed | 67. scale | 68. line | 69. towards | 70. around/round |
| 71. other | 72. characteristic/ typical | 73. class | 74. serving | 75. course |

**Part 3 *(10 pts)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 76. A | 77.C | 78.B | 79.D | 80.A |
| 81.B | 82.A | 83.D | 84.A | 85.D |

**Part 4 *(20 pts)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 86. iii | 87. vii | 88. iv | 89. viii | 90. vi |
| 91. injuries | 92. sneakers | 93. safety | 94. hackers | 95. journalism |

**Part 5 *(10 pts)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 96. C | 97.B | 98.A | 99.B | 100.D |
| 101.C | 102.D | 103.A | 104.B | 105.A |

**WRITING**

**Part 1: (15 points)**

**The summary should cover these main points: (10 pts)**

* **Health Improvement:** Active lifestyles enhance physical and mental health, reduce mortality, and increase life expectancy.
* **Economic Savings:** More physical activity cuts costs related to chronic disease and transport.
* **Environmental Benefits**: Cycling and walking lower traffic congestion, pollution, and support environmental health.
* **Lifelong Value:** Regular physical activity benefits all ages, from early development to older years, with more activity leading to greater health gains.

**Language use (5 pts)**

**The summary should:**

* Show attempts to convey the main ideas of the original text by means of paraphrasing (structural and lexical use)
* Demonstrate correct use of grammatical structures, vocabulary, and mechanics (spelling, punctuations, ...)
* Maintain coherence, cohesion, and unity throughout (by means of linkers and transitional devices)

**Penalties:**

* A penalty of 1 point to 2 points will be given to personal opinions found in the summary.
* A penalty of 1 point to 2 points will be given to any summary with more than 30% of words copied from the original.
* A penalty of 1 point will be given to any summary longer than 150 words or shorter than 110 words

**Part 2: (15 points)**

**The mark given to part 2 is based on the following criteria:**

**Contents (8.0 points)**

The report MUST cover the following points:

* Introduce the chart (1.5 points) and state the striking features (1.5 points)
* Describe main features with relevant data from the charts and make relevant comparisons (5 points)
* Write at least 150 words

The report MUST NOT contain personal opinions. A penalty of 1 point to 2 points will be given to personal opinions found in the answer.

**Language use (7.0 points)**

**The report should:**

* demonstrate a wide variety of lexical and grammatical structures,
* have correct use of words (verb tenses, word forms, voice, ...); and mechanics (spelling, punctuations, ...).

**Part 3: (30 points)**

**The mark given to part 3 is based on the following criteria:**

**1. Task achievement (5.0 points)**

* All requirements of the task are sufficiently addressed. State opinion (or position clearly) throughout the essay.
* Ideas are adequately supported and elaborated with relevant and reliable explanations, examples, evidence, personal experience, etc.
* Write at least 350 words.

**2. Organization (10 points)**

* Ideas are well organized and presented with coherence, cohesion, and unity.
* The essay is well-structured:
* Introduction is presented with a clear thesis statement introducing the points to be developed.
* Body paragraphs develop the points introduced with unity, coherence, and cohesion.
* Each body paragraph must have a topic sentence and supporting details and examples when necessary.
* Conclusion summarizes the main points and offers personal opinions (prediction, recommendation, consideration, ...) on the issue.

**3. Language use (10 points)**

* Demonstration of a variety of topic-related vocabulary
* Excellent use and control of grammatical structures

**4. Punctuation, spelling, and handwriting (5.0 points)**

* Correct punctuation, no spelling mistakes, and legible handwriting.

**Listening transcript:**

**Part 1:**

**Creating artificial gills**

In my talk today I’ll be exploring the idea of artificial gills. I’ll start by introducing the concept, giving some background and so forth and then I’ll go on to explain the technological applications, including a short, very simple, experiment I conducted.

Starting with the background ... As everyone knows, all living creatures need oxygen to live. Mammals take in oxygen from the atmosphere by using their lungs, and fishes take oxygen from water by means of their gills, which of course in most fishes are located either side of their head.

But human beings have always dreamt of being able to swim underwater like the fishes, breathing without the help of oxygen tanks. I don’t know whether any of you have done any scuba diving but it’s a real pain having to use all that equipment. You need special training, and it’s generally agreed that tanks are too heavy and big to enable most people to move and work comfortably underwater. So scientists are trying a different tack: rather than humans carrying an oxygen supply as they go underwater, wouldn’t it possible to extract oxygen in situ, that is, directly from the water, whilst swimming?

In the nineteen sixties the famous underwater explorer Jacques Cousteau, for example, predicted that one day surgery could be used to equip humans with gills. He believed our lungs could be bypassed and we would learn to live underwater just as naturally as we live on land. But of course, most of us would prefer not to go to such extremes.

I’ve been looking at some fairly simple technologies developed to extract oxygen from water - ways to produce a simple, practical artificial gill enabling humans to live and breathe in water without harm. Now, how scientists and inventors went about this was to look at the way different animals handled this - fairly obviously they looked at the way fishes breathe but also how they move down and float up to the surface using inflatable sacs, called swim bladders. Scientists also looked at animals without gills, which use bubbles of air underwater, **notably** beetles. These insects contrive to stay underwater for long periods by breathing from this bubble which they hold under their wing cases.

By looking at these animal adaptations, inventors began to come up with their own ‘artificial gills’. Now making a crude gill is actually rather easy - more straightforward than you would think. You take a watertight box ... which is made of a material which is permeable to gas, that is, it allows it to **pass through,** inwards and outwards. You then fill this with air, fix it to the diver’s face and go down underwater. But a crucial factor is that the diver has to keep the water moving, so that water high in oxygen is always in contact with the gill, so he can’t really stay still. And to maximise this contact it’s necessary for your gill to have a big surface area. Different gill designers have addressed this problem in different ways but many choose to use a network or lattice-arrangement of **tiny** tubes as part of their artificial gills. Then the diver is able to breathe in and out - oxygen from the water passes through the outer walls of the gill and carbon-dioxide is expelled. In a nut-shell, that’s how the artificial gill works.

So, having read about these simple gill mechanisms, I decided to create my own. I followed the procedure I’ve just described and it worked pretty well when I tried it out in the swimming pool ... I lasted underwater for nearly forty minutes! However, I’ve read about other people breathing through their gill for several hours.

So the basic idea works well, but the real limitation is that these simple gills don’t work as the diver descends to any great depth because the pressure builds and a whole different set of problems are caused by that ... Research is being done into how these problems might be overcome . but that’s another story which has to be the subject of another talk!

Despite this serious limitation, many people have high hopes for the artificial gill and they think it might have applications beyond simply enabling an individual to stay underwater for a length of time. For example, the same technology might be used to provide oxygen for submarines ... enabling them to stay submerged for months on end without resorting to potentially dangerous technologies such as nuclear power. Another idea is to use oxygen derived from the water as energy for fuel cells. These could power machinery underwater, such as robotic devices ...

So, in my view, this is an area of technology with great potential. Now, if anyone has any questions, I’d be happy to answer ...

**Part 2**

We check the time every day, all day long. But did you ever wonder, where did telling time come from? Why does it matter what time it is? Who determine the clock and why in the world are there so many different time zones? The first form of telling time was the sandal and the earliest sandals known from the archeological record or **obelisks** from nearly 5,000 years ago. Sandals indicate the time by casting a shadow onto a surface. The object that cast the shadow is a stick in the center known as a nomen. A well-constructed sandal can measure time with remarkable accuracy, and sandals were used to monitor the performance of clocks until the modern era. But sandals have their limitations, too. Obviously, they require the sun to shine, so they don't work at all during the night when it's dark. Many different devices have been used over the years to estimate the passage of time. Candles and **sticks of incense** that burn down at fairly predictable speeds have been used, along with the hourglass hourglasses. Hourglasses are devices in which fine sand pours through a tiny hole at a constant rate and indicates a predetermined passage of an arbitrary period of time.

The origin of the hourglass is uncertain. Although beginning In the 14th century, the hourglass was used commonly, especially **on board ships**. The motion of the boat on the water did not affect the hourglass, unlike other time-measuring devices. The mechanical clock was invented in the 13th century, which sparked a big change in traditional timekeeping methods. This modern clock relied on the swing of a pendulum or the vibration of a Quartz crystal, which was far more accurate than sand or candles. Today, the basis for scientific time a continuous count of seconds based on atomic clocks all around the world, known as the **international atomic time**. Why does it matter that we keep track of time? Well, time regulates our daily lives and makes it possible to accurately communicate with people all over the world. Without a time system, we would have many challenges in farming, social structures, communication, and business. Take the American railroad system, for example. In the mid-19th century, Each railroad used its own standard time, generally based on the local time of its headquarters, and the railroads train schedules were published using its own time. Some major railroad junctions served by several different railroads had a separate clock for each railroad, each showing a different time.

The difference between New York and Boston is about two degrees or eight minutes, which can be the difference between making or missing your train connection. If the difference between New York and Boston is eight minutes, imagine the difference between Boston and Australia. The use of time zones irons out these differences and makes communication significantly smoother. A time zone is a region on Earth that has a uniform standard time. There are **40 time zones** on land. Because the earliest and latest time zones are 26 hours apart, any given calendar date exists at some point on the globe for 50 hours. So the next time someone asks you, What time is it? Your answer may be a whole lot more complicated than it used to be.

**Part 3**

If I asked you to describe a great leader, I'd be willing to bet certain traits come to mind … someone charismatic, dynamic, inspiring, a confident public speaker. You're probably imagining a man too, but that's a bias we'll save for another talk! **We tend to think of great leaders as people who naturally take to the stage, who draw other people to them by their sheer presence, who are extroverts. But history has also been transformed by people who don't fit these descriptions. People like Rosa Parks, Eleanor Roosevelt and Gandhi. These people would have described themselves as shy, quietly spoken … as introverts.**

Of course we're drawn to extroverts. They're usually charming and persuasive, fun to be around. They're not quietly in the corner somewhere reading a book where we might not notice them. Introverts are mostly happy to let the extroverts take the attention; they'd rather not be in the spotlight, they'd rather finish that book**. If they become leaders,** **it's not because they want to be the centre of attention, it's because they feel compelled to act.** They lead not because they enjoy giving orders but because circumstances have put them in a position to make change. If they're the boss, they allow space for the ideas of others to grow because they're not trying to make their mark. An introvert sounds like a pretty good boss, right? You won't need to worry about them stealing your ideas or talking over you in a meeting.

Some of our great creators are introverts too. People like the writer JK Rowling, the great thinker Darwin and the designer of the first Apple computer, Steve Wozniak. **It turns out coming up with good ideas is easier when you're engaged in quiet, solo contemplation than when you're leading the cheerleading squad.** Not that I'm saying there's anything wrong with cheerleaders! Extroverts are great – some of my favourite people are extroverts. But why is the world so set up for extroverts and so hard for introverts? Why are we always encouraging our kids to speak up, join in, work as a team?

Nowadays, most schools and most workplaces are set up with the extrovert in mind. Children no longer sit in rows in desks, they sit in groups of four or six, doing group projects. **Even subjects like maths and creative writing are taught with an emphasis on group collaboration**, even though most writers sit alone in front of their computer or typewriter, with nothing between them and the blank page. A kid who prefers to go off into a corner and work alone starts to look like a problem. What's wrong with Janie? Why isn't she joining in? **Studies show teachers think extroverts make better students, even though introverts actually tend to get higher grades.** We're telling our introverted kids something is wrong with them, that they need to be more sociable, more outgoing. We're giving them fewer opportunities for the quiet contemplation they need in order to produce the best work and be their best selves.

**Part 4**

Interviewer: Jed Stone’s best known now for his talents as a garden designer – but he and his wife Helena ran a highly successful jewellery business in the nineteen nineties, which brought them fame and high living. Then they lost it all and, some years later, bought a derelict house which they renovated and now together they’ve created a garden. They join me in the studio today. You do seem to do most things in partnership, like the jewellery business, but using Jed’s name. Why’s that? Helena?

Helena: Well, this is a bit of a bone of contention, actually. We have a friend in PR who said, “You have a great name, Jed Stone. People would pay a fortune for such a good name.’ **But, sadly, at the time, it never crossed my mind that I wouldn’t get the credit for what we do, and that does get to me sometimes** – but, there again, I’m very bad at putting myself forward. People see Jed as a figurehead, which is fine, actually, because I don’t enjoy being recognised or get any thrill out of that, whereas Jed loves it.

Interviewer: Is that right, Jed?

Jed: Obviously, I’d love to say, ‘No, I don’t,’ but yeah, I do. Even as a child, I thought it must be marvellous to walk down a street and have people know who you were. **Ironically, that’s the worst of it now. It would be nice just to go and buy a paper without somebody saying something. But I suppose I do like being a public figure. It gives me a sense that I’ve done something people appreciate.** It doesn’t stop me doing anything, but it does modify how I do it.

Interviewer: But Helena, you did appear on our television screens briefly as a presenter on The Travel Show. That must have been a dream job, travelling around the world?

Helena: Actually, I thought I was being heroic taking that job. I’d actually rather have gone down a coal mine. It was ironic really, because Jed adores travelling, whilst I hate it. The timing was critical though; I mean, we were living in this derelict house. **We’d knocked huge holes in the walls to make windows and we could hardly afford to get the job finished and I wanted to be there when it was done. So I genuinely didn’t want to do the job they were offering, but I felt I had no choice** because, apart from anything else, it would provide us with a reasonable income.

Interviewer: So what about this jewel garden? Did you have a clear idea of what you wanted to do when you bought the house?

Jed: Not at all. In fact, we were provoked into action. I was giving a lecture on gardening and I was including some snaps of our own wilderness to show what certain plants looked like. But these photos hadn’t loaded onto my laptop properly, and you couldn’t see a thing. So I started to make it all up – describing this jewel garden with magical colours – it came straight out of my imagination, it hadn’t been a long-term plan or anything. Anyway, as soon as I’d finished, these **journalists came rushing up saying**, ‘We must come and take pictures of your jewel garden.’ **And I heard myself replying, ‘Fine, but come when the colours are good, don’t come now.’ To cut a long story short, we had to make the jewel garden before they came, and actually, we did ninety per cent of the work that summer**. That was our incentive!

Interviewer: And why did you call it a ‘jewel garden’? Having read about the disasters with

the jewellery business, one would have thought you wouldn’t want the word ‘jewel’ in your house at all.

Helena: Well, I like to work on projects and if you have a project where you’re thinking only of jewel colours then that starts to limit you, and design is all about reduction. **Really it was just a good, positive way of tackling what plants we were putting in, and the way we were going to design the garden,** wasn’t it, Jed?

Jed: Yeah. But for me it was also partly a metaphor, it’s making something worthwhile out of a failure. We did spend years doing the jewellery and it wasn’t all disastrous; there were good things about it too and we wanted to salvage them and treasure them. It seemed a waste not to take that bit of our lives and to somehow incorporate it into our new design venture– to take the bad experience and use it in a creative way. Jed and Helena, thank you for telling us about it today.
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