

[CD 10 Track 30]

Listening Test

1. don't hit it – don't heat it
2. test it – taste it

[CD 10 Track 31]

Exercise 30: /i^y/ as in heat vs. /ɪ/ as in hit

seen sin leave live steal still feel fill
 1. seen seen 2. leave live 3. still still 4. feel fill

1. That was a chip shot.
2. I keep trying to fill the empty space.
3. The students want to leave here.
4. They need better heaters.
5. When the men came around the bend, they saw the ship.

[CD 10 Track 32]

Exercise 31: /e^y/ as in late vs. /ɛ/ as in let

wait wet late let main men date debt
 1. wait wet 2. late let 3. men men 4. date debt

1. She sure has a lot of *debts*.
2. Don't you think that there's too much *pepper*?
3. Gus had a *pen* behind his ear.
4. Give that sauce a *taste test* to see if it needs more salt.
5. Cynthia likes to wear *lace* in the summer.

Narrator: This is the end of the Speaking Tutorial.

[CD 10 Track 33]

Section 4: Guide to Writing**The Integrated Writing Task****Narrator:** Listen to a lecture in a secondary education class.

Professor: Now, as your textbook points out, there are two types of tests: objective and essay. Your textbook author takes a pretty strong stand in favor of essay tests, doesn't he? Well, I happen to agree with some of his ideas. I have nothing against essay tests, and they do get at different things than . . . objective tests do. They test students' ability to think critically, to . . . solve problems. That's why I generally include a couple of essay questions in every test I give. But I also use multiple-choice items.

It's true that objective tests check your memorization skills—but what's wrong with that? Sometimes, in some classes at least, you need to memorize basic facts and information!

And it's also true that . . . that essay tests emphasize writing skills. It's true—and it's part of the problem! Good writers can get good grades on essay tests even if they don't know very much about the topic.

And as far as saving time—sure, it may take less time to write essay tests. But . . . it takes a lot more time to grade them. Not only that, but you really should grade all the essays at the same time, because . . . well, studies show that the same teacher will grade the same essay differently at different times. To be fair, you've got to grade all the tests at one sitting. Now, with a small class, this isn't a big problem, but if you have a large class . . . well, it's a lot easier to grade objective tests, and lots of times, you can have them machine graded.

So, when you start teaching, and giving tests yourself . . . by all means, use essay tests, but for some classes, for some material, for some situations . . . objective tests, or combinations of objective and essay tests, may be best.

[CD 10 Track 34]

Integrated Writing Preview Test

Narrator: This Writing Section tests your ability to write academic English. It consists of two writing tasks. The first writing task is an "integrated" task. It involves reading a short passage and listening to a short lecture on the same topic. You will then have twenty minutes in which to write a response based on the information in the passage and the lecture. Now read the directions for the first writing task.

Narrator: Directions: Take three minutes to read the short passage on the following page. You may take notes as you read. After three minutes, start the Audio Program. You will hear a lecture on the same topic as the reading. Again, you may take notes as you listen. You will have twenty minutes to write your response. Your response should include information from both the reading and the lecture. Your essay will be rated on the completeness and accuracy of your response as well as on the correctness and quality of your writing. A typical response should be 150 to 225 words. You may use your notes and look at the reading passage as you write. (During the actual exam, you can view the reading passage on the computer screen after the lecture is over.) You will have twenty minutes in which to finish the Integrated Writing Task. If possible, you should write your response on the computer. Begin reading now. [3-minute pause]

Narrator: Now listen to part of a lecture in a biology class.

Professor: Now, most of you in the class know how I feel about medical research done on animals. I oppose it, no matter why . . . no matter what the justification. But . . . for the sake of fairness, I wanted you to see this article that my colleague in the biology department, Professor White, wrote for our departmental journal.

At the heart of his argument is the professor's claim that animal experimentation has led to the discovery of some important drugs, useful drugs, like penicillin. Well, that may be true, but who knows if these drugs wouldn't have been discovered without animal testing? And, you know, here's the thing—there are plenty of important drugs that were discovered without the benefit of animal testing. Quinine, used to treat malaria, ether, used as an anesthesia, and of course aspirin, they were all discovered without harming any animals. In fact, if some drugs had been tested on certain animals, well, they probably wouldn't be used today. Morphine, for example, kills pain in people but it stimulates cats. And large doses of aspirin poison cats and dogs and have no effect on horses.

And Professor White says that there are no substitutes for animal testing. There are plenty! For example, now we can cultivate human tissues and test the effects of drugs on these tissues. There are clinical studies, and . . . most important of all, these days, computer simulations. There are lots of other ways too.

People in favor of animal research always say that animals in labs are treated as humanely as possible. Don't believe that! It may be true some of the time, but I've spent a lot of time in biology labs and I've seen many animals undergoing tests with terrible diseases and toxic chemicals. Many times these animals were not adequately anesthetized or they were routinely abused by handlers or experimenters.

No, I believe that no one should be forced to undergo experimentation without giving their . . . their consent, their agreement. Since animals can never do that, I believe it is immoral to experiment on them, no matter what the benefits might be.

Narrator: Now get ready to answer the question. Remember you may look back at the reading passage. You may also use your notes to help you. You have twenty minutes to prepare and write your response.

Question: Summarize the main points made in the lecture that you just read, discussing how they cast doubt on points made in the reading. You can refer to the reading passage as you write.

[CD 10 TRACK 35]

Lesson 21: Taking Notes and Planning the Integrated Response

Sample

Narrator: Now listen to part of a lecture in a biology class.

Professor: Now, most of you in the class know how I feel about medical research done on animals. I oppose it, no matter why . . . no matter what the justification. But . . . for the sake of fairness, I wanted you to see this article that my colleague in the biology department, Professor White, wrote for our departmental journal.

At the heart of his argument is the professor's claim that animal experimentation has led to the discovery of some important drugs, useful drugs, like penicillin. Well, that may be true, but who knows if these drugs wouldn't have been discovered *without* animal testing? And, you know, here's the thing—there are *plenty* of important drugs that were discovered without the benefit of animal testing. Quinine, used to treat malaria, ether, used as an anesthesia, and of course aspirin, they were all discovered without harming any animals. In fact, if some drugs had been tested on certain animals, well, they probably wouldn't be used today. Morphine, for example, kills pain in people but it stimulates cats. And large doses of aspirin poison cats and dogs and have no effect on horses.

And Professor White says that there are no substitutes for animal testing. There are plenty! For example, now we can cultivate human tissues and test the effects of drugs on these tissues. There are clinical studies, and . . . most important of all, these days, computer simulations. There are lots of other ways too.

People in favor of animal research always say that animals in labs are treated as humanely as possible. Don't believe that! It may be true some of the time, but I've spent a lot of time in biology labs and I've seen many animals undergoing tests with terrible diseases and toxic chemicals. Many times these animals were not adequately anesthetized or they were routinely abused by handlers or experimenters.

No, I believe that no one should be forced to undergo experimentation without giving their . . . their consent, their agreement. Since animals can never do that, I believe it is immoral to experiment on them, no matter what the benefits might be.

[CD 10 Track 36]

Exercise 21.1

Narrator: Task 1

Listen to part of a lecture in an ecology class.

Professor: Okay, that article I gave you to read—I just want you to know, it makes me really angry! I mean . . . well, I've told you this before, but I spent a year at McMurdo Station, at the Antarctic research station. I had a chance to experience what a beautiful . . . incredible . . . but unforgiving place Antarctica is.

It's true, Antarctica is a huge continent, and it is largely lifeless. However, like the Arctic regions, like high mountaintops, it's a very fragile region, very easily damaged. The article mentions that only the coastline supports life. But isn't it from these coastal areas that oil or gas would have to be shipped? The southern oceans are some of the most dangerous waters anywhere. Imagine . . . imagine a super-tanker hitting an iceberg. I mean, imagine, if there were a big oil spill, what effects that would have on the penguins, the whales, the seals, the sea birds . . . terrible!

Besides, people who haven't been to Antarctica—and I'll bet the author hasn't set foot there—they just can't imagine how harsh conditions there are. He compares Antarctica with Alaska and the North Sea, but it would be much more difficult to drill for oil in Antarctica, or in the seas nearby. And it would be unbelievably expensive, prohibitively expensive, no matter how much a barrel of oil is selling for. Here's what I think—I think it would be better, much better, to invest all that money in alternative fuel sources like, uh, say, hydrogen.

The 1993 treaty wasn't just agreed to by scientists. It was agreed to by . . . by government representatives from all over the world. Putting the southern continent into the care of scientists and . . . and out of the reach of politicians, of multinational corporations, well, it was a wise decision, it . . . it made sure Antarctica will remain undeveloped for generations to come.

Narrator: Task 2

Listen to part of a lecture in an astronomy class.

Professor: Okay, class, I want you to imagine something.

Imagine a little lake in the middle of a forest, far from any other lakes. This lake is full of fish. One day, one of the fish says this: "We've never seen any other lakes and we've never seen any other fish. Therefore, we must be the only fish in the world."

We know, just in our own galaxy—our Milky Way galaxy—there are over 400 billion—that's right, four hundred billion stars. Now, our star, the Sun, has one habitable planet. Suppose our star is really unusual. Suppose only one in a thousand stars has planets that have ideal conditions for life. That means that there are 400,000,000 planets with life on them just in our galaxy. And remember, life on Earth, at least, has developed under some pretty harsh conditions, so really, you don't even need ideal conditions.

Of course, that doesn't mean that this life is intelligent life. But, according to the famous scientist Carl Sagan . . . Carl Sagan . . . "smart is better." According to his theory, some species like sharks and tigers become strong and fast because these qualities help them hunt, help them survive. Some species, like man, become intelligent, because this quality helps them survive. Anyway—suppose only one in a thousand worlds with life developed intelligence. That means there are 400,000 intelligent species just in our galaxy.

Now, why haven't we heard from these species? For one thing, their interests and ours may not be the same. They may not be interested in technology, in developing radio transmitters—maybe they're interested in philosophy, or religion, or . . . who knows, maybe in basket weaving. Maybe they have no interest in communicating with other worlds.

Anyway, I think we are being very self-centered if we don't at least admit the possibility of intelligent life on other planets. We're just like those fish I mentioned—the ones who think they are the only fish living in the only lake in the world.

Narrator: Task 3

Listen to part of a lecture in a political science class.

Professor: Everyone read the article I gave you about mandatory voting? Okay, good. Well, in recent general elections in both the U.S. and the U.K., voter turnout has been quite low, and so, there have been editorials in newspapers and commentators on TV talking about . . . about forcing people to come out and vote, about making them vote if they want to or not.

Now I know, as it says in the journal article that I gave you, that Australia and a number of other countries have this mandatory voting system. And . . . I'm sure that in these places, that they have a, a really good turnout. I mean, it's the law, you gotta vote. But personally, I think it's better to have a smaller number of people who vote really well, who vote smart, than to have a really big turnout. If there's no compulsion to vote, no law that says you have to vote, then the people who *do* vote really want to vote, and they're the ones who are well informed about the candidates, about the issues and so on . . .

To me, there's a huge difference between voting and paying taxes. If, say, 40% of citizens don't pay taxes, what happens? The government runs out of funds, it stops functioning. What happens if 40% of the people don't vote? Think about it. Nothing. Nothing happens. Officials are still elected, and the government goes along just fine.

Now, it may be true that, if you don't vote, you're not giving your active consent to your choice of government, but you are exercising a freedom, your freedom *not* to vote. In fact, some people use not voting as a way to make a statement. You may be saying, for example, that you don't agree with any of the candidates, or that you feel the political process has nothing to offer you.

In a democracy, you have lots of rights. You have the right to, say, open your own business if you want. That doesn't mean that you should have to open your own business. It should be the same way with voting. Because you have the right to do something shouldn't mean that you have the obligation, the duty to do it.

Narrator: Task 4

Listen to part of a lecture in a geo-science class.

Professor: All right, now, we're going to continue our discussion of extinction, extinction at the end of the Ice Ages. I gave you a couple of articles to read over the weekend. I'd like to talk about . . . let's see, let's talk about the woolly mammoth article first. Everyone pull that one out, okay?

Now, the article seems to imply that one of these three theories about the mammoths is probably the right one, but in fact, there are some problems with . . . well, with all three theories. First off, there's the idea that humans directly killed off the mammoths by hunting them to death. Sure, it's tempting to blame humans because mammoths were doing just fine until people showed up in North America. But think about this: mammoths were huge, strong, dangerous, well-armed creatures—look at those tusks! They had thick, thick skin and thick layers of fat—hard to pierce with any spear, no matter how sharp. Why should humans hunt these giants when there were other animals around that were smaller, easier to kill? The Clovis People were few in number and they were widely scattered. A computer study shows that they could've eaten only 10% of the mammoths that they supposedly killed. Why would they have killed so many if they weren't going to eat them?

Then, there's the theory that humans killed off mammoths indirectly, by bringing disease to the New World. This is an interesting theory, but a theory needs evidence. Scientists have examined the remains of many dead mammoths and found no sign, none, of any infectious disease.

Then there's the climate-change theory, that mammoths died because it got warmer. The thing is, mammoths endured much more violent climate changes in the past and survived them just fine. Besides, their relatives in the Old World, the ancestors of the African and Indian elephants, managed to survive this climate change without any problems.

So, maybe one of these theories is correct. Maybe a combination of these factors doomed the mammoths, killed them all off. But . . . maybe, just maybe, none of these theories is true, and we still don't know the true cause of the mammoths' extinction.

Narrator: Task 5

Listen to part of a lecture in an art class.

Professor: Now, um, it may surprise you to hear this, because I don't just teach art, I'm a working artist myself, as you know, but . . . I don't agree with the idea of government support for individual artists. Why not, you ask?

Well, plumbing is an important occupation. Where would we be without plumbers, huh? But are there special grants for plumbers? Plumbers can't take a year off at taxpayers' expense to . . . to finish a special plumbing project, now can they? To me, it's not fair to treat artists as any different from plumbers or from anyone else. There were great American artists before there were government grants. How did they make it? Well, they sold their works of art on the marketplace.

Okay, you say, what about the unpopular artists, the controversial artists that the author mentions? Well, no one is saying these artists can't produce what they like, but . . . if they can't sell their works . . . they can always . . . gasp! . . . get jobs! There are jobs for artists—they can work as commercial artists, they can teach art . . .

Sure, artists once had wealthy patrons. Of course, these were private sponsors, not government sponsors. What I object to is giving public money to one special group. Some artists today have corporate sponsors. Personally, I wouldn't take money from a corporation. But if that's what an artist wants to do, that's fine with me . . .

The author mentions a study exploring how the arts generate economic activity. I'd like to point out that this study was done on groups of performing artists, on art organizations like ballet companies or theater groups. Giving grants, giving money to art organizations may be a good investment, but I don't think that spending money on individual artists generates much economic activity. And there's always the possibility that government programs meant to help artists may end up wasting money, wasting huge amounts of money. Let me give you an example: There was a program in France which provided certain artists grants to make their lives better, to make them more secure financially. Everyone connected with arts applied for this program—I mean everyone, even people who cut actors' hair, applied for these grants. This program generated a deficit approaching one billion—that's one *billion*—euros. So, you see, investments in the arts are *not* always good investments.

Narrator: Task 6

Listen to part of a lecture in a psychology class.

Professor: All of you know I'm no big fan of television, especially of commercial TV . . . still, I have to disagree with the author's view of children's TV and especially with her assessment of the study that she refers to. For one thing, I'm a mom myself, and I know how difficult it is to ban television altogether from your house, to prevent kids from watching. Anything that's forbidden . . . that just makes it more attractive to kids! Kids'll just go watch TV at their friends' houses if you don't let them watch at home. So . . .

yeah, parents do need to monitor their children's TV watching, but it's gonna be very, very difficult to unplug the TV until your kids are 18.

Now, I took a look at the study the author mentions. Yeah, the study says kids 6 to 7 who watch a lot of TV get lower test scores. But there's something the author doesn't mention in her article. According to this same study, kids aged 3 to 5 who watch a lot of television every day score higher on reading recognition tests than kids who don't!

What I think is important, is monitoring how much TV children watch. For children 2 and under, most psychologists suggest *no* television, and I agree. For kids over 2, I'd set strict limits. I'd limit children to two hours a day. That leaves plenty of time for play and study. I'd mostly let young children watch only educational shows . . . shows that are designed to teach children things they need to know, like how to count, how to recognize the letters of the alphabet. I wouldn't let younger kids watch much entertainment TV. And I'd only let kids watch Public Television, where there are no commercials.

And sure, physical fitness is a problem, a lot of kids are overweight these days, but we can't blame this problem entirely on television. If you limit kids to no more than two hours a day in front of the tube, there's plenty of time for them to get outside and get some exercise, get some fresh air. And of course, you need to teach kids about good nutrition.

So . . . like a lot of things, television is not purely good or purely bad, it just depends on how it's used. If television is used wisely, it's not such a bad thing.

[CD 11 TRACK 2]

Lesson 22: Summarizing, Paraphrasing, Citing, and Synthesizing for the Integrated Writing Response

Sample

Narrator: Listen to part of a lecture in a biology class.

Professor: At the heart of his argument is the professor's claim that animal experimentation has led to the discovery of some important drugs, useful drugs, like penicillin. Well, that may be true, but who knows if these drugs wouldn't have been discovered without animal testing? And, you know, here's the thing—there are plenty of important drugs that were discovered without the benefit of animal testing. Quinine, used to treat malaria, ether, used as an anesthesia, and of course aspirin, they were all discovered without harming any animals. In fact, if these drugs had been tested on certain animals, well, they probably wouldn't be used today. Morphine, for example, kills pain in people but it stimulates cats. And large doses of aspirin poison cats and dogs and have no effect on horses.

[CD 11 TRACK 3]

Exercise 22.1

Narrator: Task 1

Listen to part of a lecture in an astronomy class.

Professor: Most astronomers agree that asteroids pose some danger to Earth, but they . . . they don't really agree as to just how much of a danger they pose. Large asteroids, you know, the kind that can cause global problems, probably only hit Earth about every 100,000 years. Right now, our technology is not able to detect all asteroids coming in our direction. For example, if . . . uh . . . well, if asteroids approach us from the direction of the Sun, they're invisible, invisible until after they've already passed us by. Besides, unless we develop some way to destroy an asteroid in

space before it reaches the planet, it won't help us to be able to detect it in space.

Narrator: Task 2

Listen to part of a lecture in a political science class.

Professor: Today I'm gonna talk about the presidential system . . . which is the system used in the United States—as compared to the parliamentary system, which is the British system, the system used in the U.K. Now, uh, under the presidential system, there is a strict separation of powers. In other words, all three branches of government—the executive, legislative, and judicial branches—they're all very much independent of each other. They all have their own powers. The chief executive, who is called, unsurprisingly, the president—is not part of the assembly—which of course is called the Congress in the United States. Neither are the members of his or her cabinet. So . . . that's one major difference . . .

Narrator: Task 3

Listen to part of a lecture in a linguistics class.

Professor: Very well, I'd next like to talk about the journal article I showed you, the one that calls English a so-called "killer language." Now it's true, certainly, that languages are disappearing at an increasingly rapid rate, and, let's face it, when a language disappears, that's, er, it's tragic, there's no doubt about it. But I don't think . . . well, it's not entirely fair to put all the blame on the English language. Regional languages play a big role too in destroying languages. As a regional language, English has done its share of damage to smaller languages in the British Isles. Same in North America, Australia, other places. But other regional languages have been every bit as destructive. A 1992 study showed that it was the Hindi language—not English—that was replacing smaller languages in India. In West Africa, Hausa has weakened minority languages. Swahili has done the same in East Africa. The same is true for Russian, Spanish, Arabic. It's ten or so regional languages, not one global language . . . these are the real killer languages.

Narrator: Task 4

Listen to part of a lecture in an ecology class.

Professor: Now, uh, this article is perfectly correct: wind generators do pose a danger to birds at the Altamont Pass Wind Farm. That particular site was chosen because the wind blows almost constantly through that mountain pass, and at the time, the engineers building it didn't realize that they were locating the plant in the middle of a major migration route for birds. However, the Altamont Pass site—well, it's an exception. No other wind farm has resulted in so many bird kills. In some places, like Denmark, wind energy is already generating a big percentage of energy needs. A Danish study showed that a wind farm in Denmark killed only a few birds a year, less than the average housecat. Now definitely, we should make sure that we're not putting a wind farm in a place that endangers birds. The Altamont plant probably needs some kind of screening to protect birds, or it needs to be relocated. However, we should not stop building wind farms! Wind power is a much cleaner, much safer source of power than fossil fuels or nuclear energy. We should be building more wind farms, and as quickly as possible.

Narrator: Task 5

Listen to part of a lecture in an astronomy class.

Professor: Okay, I'm going to give you part of an article that was written to defend the use of nighttime lighting. Now,

we've already talked about how difficult this "light pollution" makes things for astronomers, so I'm not going to say any more about that. But to address the question of lighting as a crime deterrent . . . well, there are just as many studies showing that increased lighting has no effect on crime. That's right, zero effect. But the letter that I wrote to the editor of the campus newspaper, and the ones that my colleagues wrote, did not ask the university to get rid of outdoor lighting, it simply asked the university to get smarter lights. The typical unshielded street lamp, the kind that is in use on the campus now, it sends 20% of its light upwards and 20% out to the side—only 60% goes downward! By shielding these streetlamps, you direct light where it's needed—on the ground—and keep it out of the sky. By just taking this step and a few other simple steps, we can still have well-lit streets and a well-lit campus but, uh, everyone—not just astronomers, but everyone—can see the stars at night.

Narrator: Task 6

Listen to part of a lecture in a biology class.

Professor: Now this little paragraph in your book illustrates a basic problem. Of course, as . . . uh, as I've said, the system we use for classifying organisms, the Linnaean system, it used the two-kingdom system of classification for over 200 years. It was hard for biologists to think outside this basic two-part model for classifying living things. Organisms had to be plants or animals 'cause . . . well, those were the only two possibilities. Protozoa, as our book points out, weren't much like fish or horses or any other animals, but they had to be classified as something, so they were called animals. Bacteria weren't much like oak trees, but they had to be classified as something too, so they were called plants. It was like putting square pegs in round holes. Finally, in the late 1950's, someone got a brilliant idea: let's change the classification system! At first, one new kingdom was added. Protozoa and other microorganisms were put in this kingdom. Later, there was a five-kingdom model. Today there is an even more complicated model. There are now three domains divided up into from eight to fifteen kingdoms, depending on who's doing the classifying. So anyway . . . the lesson to be learned here is—if you're classifying something, and it doesn't fit into the system—take another look at the classification system—maybe the problem is there!

[CD 11 TRACK 4]

Writing Review Test

This Writing Section tests your ability to write academic English. It consists of two writing tasks. The first writing task is an "integrated" task. It involves reading a short passage and listening to a short lecture on the same topic. You will then have twenty minutes in which to write a response based on the information in the passage and the lecture. Now read the directions for the first writing task.

Narrator: Directions: Take three minutes to read the short passage on the following page. You may take notes as you read. After three minutes have passed, start the Audio Program. You will hear a lecture on the same topic as the reading. Again, you may take notes as you listen. You will have twenty minutes to write your response. Your response should include information from both the reading and the lecture. Your essay will be rated on the completeness and accuracy of your response as well as on the correctness and quality of your writing. A typical response should be 150 to 225 words. You may use your notes and look at the reading passage as you write. (During the actual exam, you can view the reading passage on the left side of the computer

screen after the lecture is over.) You will have twenty minutes in which to finish the Integrated Writing Task. Begin reading now. [3-minute pause]

Narrator: Now listen to part of a lecture in an economics class.

Professor: Morning, everyone. Hope you had a chance to look at the articles I gave you Friday. I want to start by talking about one of the articles, the . . . uh, the one by Professor Woodall that . . . that takes a stand against Free Trade, and in favor of Protectionism. The thing is, in a global economy, the concept of Protectionism . . . it just doesn't work. It's not effective. Look at those developing countries whose economies have been the most successful; they're the countries that have been most open to Free Trade. And those countries whose economic growth has stalled or died, they're the ones that have closed themselves off to international trade.

Now, it's true, international competition can cause problems for local businesses. Some local companies will go bankrupt when you invite in the global big boys, the multinational corporations. Workers will lose their jobs, and labor groups will get upset. But the companies that do survive, the ones that learn to compete with global companies, they'll be stronger than ever. And global companies always hire local people. These local people have well-paying jobs and they learn how international corporations work. That's what's called a transfer of technology, and that's a good thing for local economies.

It's also true that governments that throw open their borders to trade no longer have income from tariffs. But . . . governments that collect tariffs on foreign goods are often the same ones that spend lots of money subsidizing local farmers, or steel manufacturers. A truly free-market country will not subsidize inefficient sectors of the economy, and so the government saves money that way.

The author says that Free Trade doesn't always lead to peace between nations. Perhaps not, but just look at Europe. For centuries, the great powers of Europe fought wars among themselves. Then, after World War II, the European Common Market was set up, and for once there was truly Free Trade among the members. Today, a war between, say, France and Germany or France and Britain is unimaginable. When you're engaged in a trading relationship that helps both your country and other countries, there's no reason to . . . to risk this relationship with war or aggression.

Narrator: Now get ready to answer the question.

Remember, you may look back at the reading passage. You may also use your notes to help you. You have twenty minutes to prepare and write your response. Summarize the main points made in the lecture that you just heard, discussing how they differ from the points made in the reading. You can refer to the reading passage as you write.

Narrator: This is the end of the Review Test and the end of Section 4, Writing.

[CD 12 Track 1]

Practice Test 1

Listening Section

Narrator: Directions: This section tests your understanding of conversations and lectures. You will hear each conversation or lecture only once. Your answers should be based on