1. LISTENING (40 points) (50 minutes)

Lecture 1: 20 points - 24 minutes

Lecture 2: 20 points - 26 minutes

LECTURE 1

GENERAL INFORMATION

You will listen to a lecture about happiness $\underline{\text{twice}}$. The lecture lasts about 7 minutes. The exam consists of 3 parts.

Now you will hear the lecture. Before the lecture begins you will have 3 minutes to study the questions in Part A and B. At the end of the lecture you will be given 3 minutes to go over your answers. Next, you will have 2 minutes to look at the questions in Part C. Then, you will listen to the lecture again. At the end of the lecture you will be given 2 minutes to go over your answers.

Part A: While you are listening to the lecture, first you must take notes and complete the following outline with the correct personality factors. Also add one detail about each personality factor. ($10 \times 1=10$ points)

HAPPY PEOPLE

1.5		<u>isfied with themselves</u>
	a.	Feeling comes from inside, not outside
2.		
	b	
3.		
	c.	
		A PROVIDE ON P
UI	NHA	APPY PEOPLE
1		
1.		
	0	
	a.	
2		
۷,		
	h	
	D	
3.		
٠.		
	_	
	C.	

	Now use your notes and put a tick next to the three most important factors for happiness. $\bf 3$ points $\bf)$
1	Having a lot of money
2	Being satisfied with yourself
3	Being optimistic
4	Being successful at work or school
5	Being healthy
6	Having good relationships
	Now you will listen to the lecture again. You have 2 minutes to look at the questions. Whil
listening	Now you will listen to the lecture again. You have 2 minutes to look at the questions. While write if the following statements are (T) true or (F) false. At the end of the lecture you iven 2 minutes to go over your answers. (7 x 1 = 7 points) 1. Psychologists talked to hundreds of people to find out why they were or weren't happy.
listening will be g	g write if the following statements are (T) true or (F) false. At the end of the lecture you iven 2 minutes to go over your answers. ($7 \times 1 = 7$ points)
listening will be g	write if the following statements are (T) true or (F) false. At the end of the lecture you iven 2 minutes to go over your answers. (7 x 1 = 7 points) 1. Psychologists talked to hundreds of people to find out why they were or weren't happy.
listening will be g	g write if the following statements are (T) true or (F) false. At the end of the lecture you iven 2 minutes to go over your answers. (7 x 1 = 7 points) 1. Psychologists talked to hundreds of people to find out why they were or weren't happy. 2. Happy people don't want to change anything about their lives.
listening will be g	g write if the following statements are (T) true or (F) false. At the end of the lecture you iven 2 minutes to go over your answers. (7 x 1 = 7 points) 1. Psychologists talked to hundreds of people to find out why they were or weren't happy. 2. Happy people don't want to change anything about their lives. 3. Unhappy people think they will be happy if something changes.
listening will be g	write if the following statements are (T) true or (F) false. At the end of the lecture you iven 2 minutes to go over your answers. (7 x 1 = 7 points) 1. Psychologists talked to hundreds of people to find out why they were or weren't happy. 2. Happy people don't want to change anything about their lives. 3. Unhappy people think they will be happy if something changes. 4. Happy people usually don't have problems.

Answer Key:

LECTURE 1

Part A:

HAPPY PEOPLE

- 2 Optimistic
- b Don't worry about problems
- 3 Many close relationships
- c Family and friends

UNHAPPY PEOPLE

- 1 Always want to change
- a Lose weight
- 2 Assume things will get worse
- b Worry about their problems
- 3 Few friends
- c Work too much

PART B:

- 2. Being satisfied with yourself
- 3. Being optimistic
- 6. Having good relationships

PART C:

- 1 T
- 2 F
- 3 T
- 4 F 5 F
- 6 F
- 7 T

HAPPINESS:

PART 1:

TEACHER: Hi, good morning. Did you hear about the lottery winner last night? The man won ... what ?... Two million dollars?...

STUDENT: No, three.

TEACHER: Three million dollars? Three million. That's a lot of money, isn't it? Do you think that three million dollars would make you happy?... I'm asking you this because when you ask people what they need to be happy, many people will answer "more money". We assume that money will make us happier. But is this true? Will winning the lottery help you achieve happiness?

Today we are going to look at the idea of happiness, at the psychology of happiness – what makes some people happier than others. We'll look at three personality factors that we find in happy people. To find out about these personality factors, psychologists talked to hundreds of people. Now, first, they asked the people how happy they felt – you know, from "very happy" to "not happy at all". Then they asked some more questions. They wanted to find out about people's personalities, such as their attitudes about life, and so on. They looked at the differences between happy people and unhappy people. They found three factors that are very important for achieving happiness. So let's look at those factors now.

The first personality factor is that happy people are satisfied with themselves. This means that they like themselves as they are, and they're happy with what they have. Happy people may not like everything about their lives – they may be a little bit overweight, or may not have the best job, or may not live in a big, fancy house, but they don't need to change those things to be happy. They think more about the things they are satisfied with, not the changes they want to make. This feeling of happiness comes from the inside, not from something outside.

PART 2:

TEACHER: So....happy people feel satisfied with themselves. On the other hand, unhappy people are often dissatisfied with themselves. Theyuh....feel that something must change so they can be happy. They think if they lose some weight or get a better job or a nicer house they will be happy. They are always looking for something outside themselves to make them happy. But the problem is – they never find it! No matter what they get, they're still dissatisfied and unhappy.

The second personality factor is that happy people are optimistic – they look at the positive side of life, not the negative. Now, we all have problems, whether we're happy or not. But when happy people have problems, they assume that things will improve. They don't worry a lot and think about all the bad things that can happen. Instead, they have a positive attitude. However, unhappy people are the opposite. They aren't optimistic and don't have a positive attitude. When they have a problem, they think about how bad everything is assume that it will get worse. So they make themselves even more unhappy when they think about all the bad things that might happen.

Finally, the third personality factor is that happy people have good relationships with other people. They try to have close, loving relationships with friends and family. Studies show that close, loving relationships are one of the most important factors in achieving happiness. So, happy people don't spend all their time building their careers or trying to make money. They also spend time building relationships with friends and family. Now, on the other hand, unhappy people don't have as many close relationships. They may have trouble making friends. Or they may spend all their time working and then find that they're very lonely and unhappy. But for whatever reason, they don't have the close relationships and this makes them unhappy.

So...what does this tell us? Well, if you want to be happier, don't assume that winning the lottery will help. There are other more important factors for achieving happiness. Now, let's take a break, and when we come back we'll talk about the factors that make a person happy.

LECTURE 2

GENERAL INFORMATION

You will listen to a lecture about violence on television twice. The lecture lasts about 7 minutes. The exam consists of 2 parts. Now you will hear the lecture. Before the lecture begins you will have 3 minutes to study the sentences in Part A. At the end of the lecture you will be given 3 minutes to go over your answers.

Pa	rt A: While you are listening to the lecture, complete the follo	wing sentences. ($4 \times 2 = 8$ poir	ıts)
1.	American children watch	every day.	
2.	Some people even feel that	_ on television is teaching kids	
	·		
3.	Children saw someone hit and kick a doll on video. Then,children imitated the same behaviors.		the
4.	According to one study, when children watch a lot of TV at age eigenstely	ght, they use more physical force	
Th co an	rt B: Now you will listen to the lecture again. You have 3 minutere are $\frac{4 \text{ mistakes}}{4 \text{ mistakes}}$ in the summary. While listening, cross out rrect information. At the end of the lecture you will be given 3 swers. • x 3 = 12 points)	the mistakes and write the	

SUMMARY: TV VIOLENCE AND CHILDREN

- Almost 50% of American families have a television.
- 2. Kids spend more time watching TV than going to school.

Research:

Amount of violence

- 3. Cartoons have fewer acts of violence than adult TV shows.
- 4. A child sees about 32 acts of violence on TV by age 12.

Immediate effects of TV violence

5. Children copy the violence they see on TV.

For example; hit and kick a doll

Long term effects of TV violence

6. When children watch a lot of TV, they have trouble in school when they are older.

ANSWER KEY

LECTURE 2

Part A:

- 1. three to four hours of TV
- 2. the violence/ to be more violent
- 3. 100 percent of
- 4. at age 18

Part B:

- $1.50\% \rightarrow 98\%$
- 3. fewer \rightarrow more
- 4. 32 → 100.000
- 6. have trouble in school → are more violent

VIOLENCE ON TV

PART 1:

TEACHER: Hello, everyone. Are you ready to get started? ...OK.Today I'd like to continue our discussion of violence in the media by focusing on television – on TV violence and its impact on children. There's a lot of debate about this issue today because children watch a lot of TV, right?

TV has a huge impact on children; kids today watch a lot of TV. In the U.S., almost all families have a TV – ninty eight percent. Many families have more than one TV. Fifty two percent of children have televisions in their bedrooms, so they can watch TV whenever they want. And how much TV does the average watch each day? Can anyone guess?

STUDENT: Two hours.

TEACHER: OK, that's one guess. Any others?

STUDENT 2: Four.

TEACHER: Yes, it's about.....about three to four hours of TV everyday, or almost 1.500 hours a year. Now compare that to the amount of time that kids spend in school each year, about 900 hours, and you can see that TV must have a big impact.

Now many people feel that children's shows, such as cartoons, are much too violent. Some people even feel that the violence on television is teaching kids to be more violent. But is this true? Is there a link between the violence children see on TV and real violence? To answer this question, I want to focus on some of the research – research that has been done to access the violence on television and how it affects children.

To assess how much violence is on TV, research has focused on couting the number of acts of violence on TV in an average day. Now, this includes any act that could hurt or kill people in real life. Surprisingly, cartoons for the children have the most violence – more than many shows for adults. Cartoons have an average of thirty-two violent acts per hour. So, thirty-two times every hour, one cartoon character hurts another character in some way. Well, you've seen this in cartoons, I'm sure. The characters hit each other on the head, or shoot each othermany different violent acts.

Other kids' shows have a lot of violence as well. For example, many kids' shows have characters that fight each other – hit and kick and punch each other – so those are violent as well.

PART 2:

TEACHER: So, by counting all these acts of violence, we can estimate that by the time a child is twelve, he or she will have seen an average of about 100.000 acts of violence on television. That's about thirty violent acts per day! But does the violence really cause children to act more violently? Well, that leads us to our second question: How do we assess the impact of TV violence on children?

First, we'll focus on some immediate effects of watching TV violence – what happens immediately after a child watches something violent on TV. In the first study we'll look at today, a group of children saw a TV show of a child hitting and kicking a doll. Then, after they watched the video, each child was left alone in a room with the same type of doll. And guess what ? All the children in this study – 100 percent – hit and kicked the doll, just like they saw on TV. So the link here between what kids see and what they do seems quite strong.

Another way to assess the effects of TV violence on children is to focus on the long-term effects – what happens many years after a child watches violent TV. Now let's talk about the second study. In 1960, researchers studied eight-year-old children in a typical American city. They studied how much violent TV the children watched and whether the children acted violently at home or at school. Then, ten years later, they studied the same children at age eighteen. The researchers found that children who watched a lot of violent TV at age eight were more violent at age eighteen. Children who watched less violent TV were less violent at age eighteen. So this study suggests that there is a link between TV violence and real violence – that watching violent TV has long term impact on these kids.

So do these studies prove that TV violence causes children to be violent? Even with the research, many people still disagree about that. So, when we come back, we'll talk more about the impact of TV violence...

2. READING (40 points) (60 minutes)

Reading 1: 20 points - 30 minutes

Reading 2: 20 points - 30 minutes

Reading 1

DIVORCE TRENDS

Today many couples who are considering marriage, or even those who are already married, have one very strong consideration to keep in mind: divorce. According to research from the 1990s, in the United States about 4 out of every 10 recently married couples see their marriage end in divorce. Although this number is quite high, it is actually lower than the divorce rate during the years of the 1970s and 1980s. At that time, the national divorce rate was about 5 of every 10 couples, or about 50%. (1)

So why do so many marriages end so tragically? Increasing divorce rates have been linked to the rise in wives' earning power and a consequent reduction in their dependence on a man to earn the family income. Modern trends in marriage and employment rates suggest that economic incentives for marriage weaken as women's earning power increases and more men become unemployed. However, after a divorce women are more likely to fall into poverty than are men. With this in mind, there appears to be no direct evidence that the fear of poverty deters people from divorcing. (2)

Another factor influencing divorce appears to be the age at which a couple marries. In a sense, age relates to socio-economic classes in that younger people (for example, teenagers or people in their early twenties) have less money, a factor which can potentially lead to a stronger chance for problems in marriage. It has been found that those in lower income groups are more likely to marry as teenagers and these disadvantaged circumstances create more risk of divorce and consequent single parenthood. Better employment and an increased salary attained after years of hard work may subsequently lessen these risks and stabilize many relationships. (3)

A couple's religious and geographical circumstances are a final factor often considered when studying divorce trends. For example, it is frequently noted that couples living in the "Bible Belt" (western-central states such as Oklahoma and Utah) experience divorce at a higher rate than couples in other regions. The Bible Belt divorce rate is almost 50% higher than the national average. Yet one must be careful when considering this claim for several reasons. (4)

Researchers have pointed out that divorce among a large number of Christian couples living in the Bible Belt might depend on the couples' low income rather than religious beliefs. In addition, the total number of married couples in the Bible Belt may be higher than in other states. Therefore, the number of divorces within a small state may appear high, but this rate may actually be average when compared to the total number of married people in the state. (5)

Surely the possibility of divorce is a concern to any couples who enter a marriage or are considering getting married. The rate of divorce in the United States is certainly high, but it must be kept in mind that although divorce is common, there is no reason for a couple to give in to these statistics at times of difficulty. If couples view divorce as a last chance rather than as an option or opportunity, the current decline in the divorce rate may continue over the years, rather than become worse. (6)

Part I:	Mark each statement as True (T) or False (F) according to the reading text (4x1= 4 pts.)
2. 3.	Researchers have found the primary reason why people get divorced. It is clear from evidence that poorness seems to discourage people from divorce. More Christians get divorced in the Bible Belt than in other parts of the US.
	A couple where the woman earns more than the man would be less likely to divorce. Find the words in the text that mean similar to the words given below (4x1=4)
2. 3.	motivation (parag. 2) prevents (parag. 2) gained (parag. 3) decrease (parag. 6)
Part III:	Answer the following questions <u>in your own words</u> and avoid including irrelevant information in your answers. (4x3=12 pts.)
1.	According to the text how does a woman's income affect marriage?
2.	Why is it more likely for younger people to have problems in their marriages?
3.	Name two main factors that determine the higher rate of divorce in the Bible Belt. a. b.

4. What is advised in the text to keep the rate of divorce low?

ANSWER KEY

Part I:	Mark each statement as True (T) or False (F) according to the reading text $(4x1=4 \text{ pts.})$		
2.		Researchers have found the primary reason why people get divorced. It is clear from evidence that poorness seems to discourage people from	
	vorce.		
	<u>T</u>	More Christians get divorced in the Bible Belt than in other parts of the US.	
4.	F	A couple where the woman earns more than the man would be less likely to	

Part II: Find the words in the text that mean similar to the words given below (4x1=4 pts.)

1. motivations (parag. 2)	incentives
2. prevents (parag. 2)	deters
3. gained (parag. 3)	attained
4. decrease (parag. 6)	decline

Part III: Answer the following questions <u>in your own words</u> and avoid including irrelevant information in your answers. (4x3=12 pts.) (Suggested answers)

1. According to the text how do women's incomes affect marriage?

As women's earning power increases, they are less dependent on men. Also economic motivations for marriage gets weaker and more men are unemployed.

2. Why is it more likely for younger people to have problems in their marriages?

When people get married at a younger age, they have less money and therefore, they are more likely to have problems in marriage.

- **3.** Name two main factors that determine the higher rate of divorce in the Bible Belt.
 - a. low income

divorce.

- b. higher number of married couples than in other states.
- 4. What is advised in the text to keep the rate of divorce low?

 Couples should not consider divorce as an option or opportunity, but as a last chance. Also when they are going through difficult times, they should not give in to the statistics of high divorce rate.

Reading 2

GREENPEACE

Greenpeace, which is an international, non-profit organization, has offices in countries throughout the world, and each sets its own agenda based on the needs of the region. At the same time, Greenpeace has a unified worldwide agenda, with representatives meeting each year to discuss environmental issues and concerns of the global community. In setting its agenda, Greenpeace tries to maintain independence and objectivity. For these reasons, the organization does not accept donations from any political parties, governments or corporations, relying instead on membership donations. (1)

Greenpeace aims to change public thinking and actions through education and publicity. To achieve this, the organization stages creative, non-violent confrontations between activists and those responsible for harming the environment. For example, in a recent effort to protest the cutting of old trees and clear-cutting of forest land, Greenpeace delivered the US Department of Interior a large piece of a 440-year-old tree which came from an old-growth forest in the state of Oregon. Old-growth forests in Oregon are home to the endangered spotted owl. They move drew media attention around the nation to USDI policies that threaten old-growth forests and various endangered species. (2)

Greenpeace is currently fighting in six major areas for the defense of our planet. The first two of these address radiation and chemical contaminants. As their initial action against the nuclear test on Amchitka showed, Greenpeace stands firm in its commitment to end the production and use of nuclear weapons. As part of their anti-nuclear stand, Greenpeace opposed the US missile defense plan called Star Wars, a multi-layered set of land, sea, air and space systems including nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. (3)

Greenpeace is also engaged in an active campaign to eliminate toxic chemicals, especially those that are released into the environment through the use of certain types of plastics, such as vinyl. A third area of concern is the threat posed to the environment by genetically engineered foods. Many consider these foods capable of causing irreversible biological pollution and creating various health risks. (4)

Next on the Greenpeace agenda is protection of marine life. Of particular concern are commercial fishing practices that do not follow quotas to protect endangered species. Although the organization seeks protection for many kinds of sea creatures, its whale campaigns are among the most widely publicized. (5)

Greenpeace is also greatly concerned about global warming. With climate changes come many serious problems such as the melting of polar ice caps, rising sea levels, and extreme weather conditions. To begin counteracting these problems, scientist urgently recommend that emissions, primarily from burning oil, coal, and gas, be cut dramatically. Greenpeace supports the 1997 Kyoto Protocol that set emission targets for developed countries. (6)

Finally, Greenpeace actively supports measures that will protect the remaining ancient forests of the world. With over 80% of the world's forests already gone, the work of activists in this area of environmental protection seems more urgent than ever. In a recent victory, the Maisin people of Collingwood Bay in Papua New Guinea won a three-year legal struggle to deny loggers access to their land. Greenpeace played an important role in defending the interests of the Maisin in the court case. (7)

Greenpeace is committed to the preservation of the world environment through non-violence, political independence, and internationalism. John Passacantando, Executive Director of Greenpeace USA, expressed his belief about the organization in these words: "It comes down to hope.I keep working steadily with Greenpeace and the rest of the environmental community, keeping hope alive, believing that some day we will break through and redirect our world onto a far more peaceful path." (8)

Part I: Mark each statement as True (T) or False (F) according to the reading text (5x1=5 pts.)

- 1. ___ All Greenpeace offices follow the same agenda.
- 2. ___ The campaign against the nuclear test on Amchitka achieved its goals.
- 3. ___ Greenpeace does not list nuclear weapons as a major issue for its campaigns today.
- 4. ___ The 1997 Kyoto Protocol prohibits the developed countries from using burning oil, coal, and gas.
- 5. ___ Greenpeace doesn't involve in violent protest of environmental abuses.

Part II: Match the definitions with the words from the text. There are $\underline{\text{TWO EXTRA}}$ definitions. (5x1=4 pts.)

- 1. donations (parag. 1)
- 2. counteracting (parag. 6)
- **3.** endangered species (parag. 5)
- **4.** dramatically (parag. 6)
- **5.** deny (parag. 7)

- a. not making money after expenses are met
- **b.** life forms that are in danger of dying out
- **c.** refuse
- d. opposing; acting against
- e. money given
- **f.** severely; in a very large way
- g. arranging; carrying out

Part III: Answer the following questions <u>in your own words</u> and avoid including irrelevant information in your answers. (5x2=10 pts.)

- 1. What does Greenpeace take into consideration when establishing its own schedule?
- 2. Why does Greenpeace not accept money from governments or businesses?
- **3.** Why did Greenpeace oppose US Department of Interior?
- **4.** Why does Greenpeace consider that genetically engineered foods are dangerous for the human health?
- **5.** Of all the movements Greenpeace is involved in, which one needs more immediate action? Why?

6. ANSWER KEY

Part I: Mark each statement as True (T) or False (F) according to the reading text (5x1=5 pts.)

- 1. __F__ All Greenpeace offices follow the same agenda.
- 2. __T__ The campaign against the nuclear test on Amchitka achieved its goals.
- 3. _F_ Greenpeace does not list nuclear weapons as a major issue for its campaigns today.
- 4. _F_ The 1997 Kyoto Protocol prohibits the developed countries from using burning oil, coal, and gas.
- 5. _T_ Greenpeace doesn't involve in violent protest of environmental abuses.

Part II: Match the definitions with the words from the text. There are $\underline{\text{TWO EXTRA}}$ definitions. (5x1=4 pts.)

1 e

2 d

3 b

4 f

5 c EXTRAS : a – g

Part III: Answer the following questions <u>in your own words</u> and avoid including irrelevant information in your answers. (5x2=10 pts.)

- 1. What does Greenpeace take into consideration when establishing its own schedule? Different needs depending on the region are taken into consideration by Greenpeace.
- 2. Why does Greenpeace not accept money from governments or businesses? In order to sustain independence and objectivity, Greenpeace avoids outside influence.
- 3. Why did Greenpeace oppose US Department of Interior?

 Because old-growth forests and numerous endangered species are not protected by USDI policies.
- 4. Why does Greenpeace consider that genetically engineered foods are dangerous for the human health?

Because they can lead to biological pollution which can not be reversed and also it may cause numerous health risks.

5. Of all the movements Greenpeace is involved in, which one needs more immediate action? Why?

Preserving the ancient forests of the world is their priority because the majority of the world's forests have been destroyed.

3. WRITING (20 points) (40 minutes)

Read the text below. By referring to the given text, discuss the question and write a well-organized opinion essay of about 200-250 words. You have 40 minutes to read the text and write the essay.

PRENUPTIAL AGREEMENTS

Making financial arrangements before entering a marriage is nothing new. Families and couples have been doing it for thousands of years. But these agreements have become more complicated. Today, the creation of a binding prenuptial agreement (a legal contract signed before marriage) typically takes the expert knowledge of two lawyers, one for each spouse.

Although prenuptial agreements of movie stars and the super-rich may be the ones people hear about, prenuptial agreements are actually becoming more and more common with ordinary couples as well. Men and women who are getting married for the second or third time often make prenuptial agreements because they are entering a new marriage with more assets than younger people getting married for the first time. In addition, single professionals getting married for the first time late in life also typically ask their partners to sign a prenuptial agreement.

But there are still plenty of people who think prenuptials are a bad idea and may even hurt the chances of a marriage succeeding. They say it is like checking to make sure a room has an easy exit even before you go inside, and prenuptials kill the romance of marriage.

One couple made a unique agreement. After considering the kind of arrangements to list in their agreement, the couple simply wrote, "Divorce is not an option. Loving compromise will be the way." Then they both signed the document and put it in a safe place with their other legal documents. And so far, neither of them have asked to change the terms of that agreement.

Question: "Would you ever sign a prenuptial agreement? What kind of agreement would you like to have?"