

## PART I

## Text 1

An annual sampling of major newspapers in the United States over the past eight years by an organization called “Women, Men, and Media” has revealed repeatedly that while women make up 52 percent of the U.S. population, only 15 percent of the references on the front pages of the newspapers were references to women.

5        Whatever the other reactions might be, this fact leaves many people unsurprised. One can point to three reasons why women aren’t on the front pages. The first has to do with news *judgment* - the definition of what is news. The second has to do with news *makers* - the demographics of the groups seen as worthy of being in the news. And the third has to do with news *staffs* - the people who decide what goes on the front page.

10        All in all it seems that most of us believe that only certain subjects merit front page treatment: war, politics, government, the economy and the like. Men conduct wars, politics, governments and economies, so the stories are about men. Someone, of course, makes the daily decisions about what stories to put on the front page. Around the country, however, newsroom staffs rarely move from the well-worn paths. So for these  
15 three reasons women are little seen or heard on front pages. And since news media both reflect and shape public views, there is a continual renewal of the current situation.

          However, a slow change seems to be occurring on all three fronts. With declining readership, newspaper editors are beginning to reexamine news judgments. They are asking whether their front pages are rich and inclusive enough, and whether their  
20 traditional focuses are those that matter most to readers. News makers are changing too, though again slowly. For example, the “Women, Men and Media” study noted these

changes in the business world: Women own nearly 8 million businesses - about a third of the nation's companies - and employ one out of every four workers in the country. The study also pointed out that references to women on the first five pages of the business sections averaged only 14 percent. Still, reality has a way of overtaking tradition in newspapers, if only slowly.

As for news staffs, women now make up the majority of journalism school graduates and newspaper applicants. So far, they're not revolutionizing news judgments. Maybe their interests and views about what matters most are not different from those of men. What seems more likely is that they're not yet comfortable enough, nor highly placed enough, to *effect* different judgments.

The next study will probably not look much different from this year's. Nevertheless, newspapers are considering many things these days - from broader definitions of front page news to blurring of the lines between what's "hard" news and what's "soft," and from a renewed respect for good old story - telling to a reemphasis on community and local news. Little of this is aimed directly at women. Still, it just might reach them.

53. What is the writer's main point in this text?
- The "Women, Men and Media" group is biased toward women.
  - Newspapers should run more major news stories on women.
  - Newspapers must change quickly or lose their readership.
  - Front page references to women are likely to gradually increase.
54. What is causing newspaper editors to rethink their policies about what stories to put on the front pages?
- Pressure from women's groups.
  - Decrease in sales of newspapers.
  - Competition with other newspapers.
  - Belief that too much news is bad news.
55. What is the writer's opinion of newsroom staffs?
- They tend to be very conservative.
  - They are too often dominated by men.
  - They ought to resist fashionable changes.
  - They have too much power to control public opinion.
56. Which of the following is an example of one of "the three fronts" referred to in the first line of paragraph 4?
- The front page of a newspaper.
  - The front of a war zone or economic problem.
  - The problem of declining readership.
  - The definition of what is news.
57. In paragraph 4, the discussion about the changes in the business world is an example of which of the following?
- A change in news judgment.
  - A change in demographics.
  - A change in news staffs.
  - A change in public opinion.

58. What best accounts for the relatively small number of stories about women in the business sections of newspapers?
- News judgments.
  - News makers.
  - News staffs.
  - Public opinion.
59. What does the statement: “Still, reality has a way of overtaking tradition newspapers” mean in this context?
- Women should accept the reality of their situation.
  - Women need to begin their own news traditions.
  - We can expect to find more business news about women.
  - We can expect to find more women entering the business world.
60. What does the writer think about the relationship between the news media and public opinion?
- The news media is too powerful a shaper of public opinion.
  - News decisions need to be more sensitive to public opinion.
  - The news media affects opinion and opinion affects the news.
  - News decisions ought to be independent of public opinion.
61. What does the writer conclude from the fact that a majority of journalism school graduates and newspaper applicants are women?
- This demographic shift has revolutionized news judgments.
  - Women’s and men’s opinions about what is news are similar.
  - Once these women are secure in their jobs, things will change.
  - Women cannot be relied upon for maintaining news traditions.
62. What does “this” (in the last line of the text) refer to?
- Changes in news room staffs.
  - New thinking on the definition of news.
  - Shifts in the demographics.
  - Development of women’s pages in the news.

## Text 2

In the summer of 1996 the US Congress agreed to revise the 1958 Delaney Clause, a law which prohibited even the smallest amounts of cancer-causing pesticides(\*1) in processed foods. Experts argue that adjusting the 38-year-old pesticide regulatory law to a “negligible risk” standard, which allows small amounts of pesticides to be present in

5 food products, will actually protect the public and encourage the development of safer pesticides. According to Dr. Carlos Martinez, director of the University of California’s Food Safe Program, this new law is a win-win situation, protecting consumers on the one hand, and satisfying both farmers and regulators on the other. “It is a good law. It replaces a rigid, outdated standard with a more flexible one, and by doing so, it allows

10 regulators to use the best science available,” he said.

Still, there is concern among some legislators and food experts that many consumers may not understand the new law and may worry about how safe foods will be. Worse, they may cut down on their consumption of fruits and vegetables out of this fear. Martinez argues that such concerns are unnecessary. What needs to be stressed to the

15 public is that it is the amount of a chemical consumed by the body that makes something poisonous, not the mere presence of a chemical.

Because there is no such thing as “completely safe,” food safety issues are best based on the concept of reasonable threat. This is normally defined as a one-in-one-million chance that a pesticide residue(\*2) would cause cancer or other

20 life-threatening illnesses in humans. Today, modern technology can detect residues as small as one part per trillion - a level posing no reasonable threat to humans. It is precisely this advance in science’s ability to detect the presence of tiny amounts of

substances that has now made the old Delaney Clause an unrealistic standard.

There are several additional advantages of the updated law. One is that it now  
25 applies to both raw and processed foods, making fruits and vegetables safer. The revised  
law will mean that farmers can continue using common pesticides which would have  
been outlawed by the old Delaney Clause, and companies will have more freedom to  
develop safer chemicals. Furthermore, the old law focused only on cancer-causing  
elements. But many other life-threatening illnesses such as brain disorders and  
30 developmental problems have also been attributed to pesticides. These illnesses will be  
covered by the revised law.

(\*1) Pesticides are chemical substances used to kill insects and small animals that  
destroy crops.

(\*2) Residue is the small amount of something that remains after the main part is used  
or taken away.

63. Basically, what is the writer's purpose in this text?
- a. To persuade people that pesticides are not as dangerous as most people think.
  - b. To persuade lawmakers not to support a weakening of safety standards.
  - c. To convince people not to be worried about the change in the Delaney clause.
  - d. To support arguments that the Delaney Clause was not an outdated standard.
64. What is the main reason the Delaney Clause needed to be changed?
- a. People have become more concerned about chemicals in food.
  - b. More cancer - causing substances have been discovered.
  - c. Certain kinds of residues in food are now believed harmless.
  - d. Scientists' ability to measure chemicals has improved greatly.
65. Why does Martinez claim that the revised law is a "win-win" situation?
- a. Both government officials and scientists think it is a good law.
  - b. It helps solve both food cost and health problems.
  - c. It is good for the public, food producers, and the government.
  - d. It makes regulation of pesticides easier and less expensive.
66. If raw carrots were found to have a chemical residue great enough to cause cancer, which law would keep them off the market?
- a. Only the revised one.
  - b. Only the old one.
  - c. Both the old and the revised one.
  - d. Neither the old nor the revised one.
67. According to the article, what do food experts think about the new law?
- a. They think it is better than the old one.
  - b. They think the old one is better.
  - c. They think that it is not strict enough.
  - d. Some favor it while others do not.
68. What do some legislators and food experts fear will happen under the new law?
- a. Cancer deaths will increase as pesticide levels go up.
  - b. Regulators will be unable to examine all the food that is produced.
  - c. The government will become too involved in the food industries.
  - d. People will eat less fruit and fewer fresh vegetables.

69. Which of the following is closest in meaning to “negligible risk”?
- a. Completely safe.
  - b. Life-threatening.
  - c. Residual danger.
  - d. No reasonable threat.
70. What level of pesticide residue do experts consider to be safe enough in foods?
- a. It depends on the kind of pesticide used.
  - b. One-in-a-million.
  - c. One-in-a-trillion.
  - d. No level is safe.
71. Why might the general public be alarmed by the changes in the law?
- a. They will be more aware of how foods are processed now.
  - b. The law appears to relax standards for safety.
  - c. The law favors pesticide producers and farmers, not consumers
  - d. They are unlikely to understand how the technology works.
72. What can we infer about food in the United States in the 1960s?
- a. It was more likely to be free of pesticide residues.
  - b. It was not as closely regulated as food is today.
  - c. It probably contained chemicals that could not be detected.
  - d. It probably cost more to make it “completely safe.”



## PART II

The gradual change and development, or evolution, of the modern knife and fork from flint and stick, and the evolution thousands of years ago of the spoon from shells, seem reasonable stories. But they are more than stories, constructed after the fact

5    \_(73)\_ imaginative social scientists; the way our common tableware has developed to its

   \_(74)\_ form is but a single example of a fundamental principle by which all things come to look and function the way they do. That principle depends on our perception of how existing things

   \_(75)\_ to do what we expect them to do

   \_(76)\_ well and conveniently and economically as we think they should or wish they

   \_(77)\_. In short, they leave something to be desired.

10    Yet whereas the shortcomings of an existing thing may be expressed as a need

   \_(78)\_, it is really desire rather than need that drives the process of technological evolution.

   \_(79)\_ we may need air and water, but generally we

   \_(80)\_ air conditioning or ice water in any fundamental way. We may find food indispensable, but it is not

   \_(81)\_ to eat it with a fork. Luxury, rather than necessity, is the mother of invention. Every

15    artifact is somewhat wanting in its function, and this is

   \_(82)\_ its evolution.

Here, then, is the central idea: the form of made things is always subject to change

   \_(83)\_ their real or perceived shortcomings, not failure to function properly. This principle governs

   \_(84)\_ invention, innovation, and ingenuity;

   \_(85)\_ all inventors, innovators, and engineers. And from this comes another principle:

   \_(86)\_ nothing is

20    perfect, and, indeed, since even our ideas

   \_(87)\_ are not static, everything is subject to change

   \_(88)\_ time. There can be no such thing as a “perfected” artifact; the “future perfect” can only be a verb tense, not a thing.

73. a. by  
b. for  
c. through  
d. with
74. a. current  
b. outdated  
c. perfect  
d. used
75. a. fail  
b. failed  
c. failing  
d. failure
76. a. as  
b. so  
c. that  
d. very
77. a. did  
b. do  
c. will  
d. would
78. a. by improvers  
b. for improvement  
c. of improving  
d. to be improved
79. a. Additionally,  
b. Besides  
c. Nevertheless,  
d. Thus
80. a. demand  
b. don't require  
c. need  
d. needn't
81. a. advantageous  
b. dispensable  
c. essential  
d. luxurious
82. a. driving force of  
b. the force of driving  
c. what drives  
d. what forces
83. a. along with  
b. for part of  
c. in response to  
d. on behalf of
84. a. all  
b. entire  
c. total  
d. whole
85. a. it is this what motivates  
b. it is what motivates  
c. then it motivates  
d. the thing to motivate
86. a. Because  
b. Besides  
c. Despite  
d. Due to

87. a. of perfection  
b. perfected  
c. perfectly  
d. to perfect

88. a. ahead of  
b. all the  
c. by  
d. over