



AIM Awards & Anglia Examinations

Level 3 (Masters C2)

Speaking Test

2020 Set 2

Instructions for Candidates

- The test will take 20 minutes.
- You will take the test with another candidate.

© AIM Awards, 3 Pride Point Drive, Pride Park, Derby, DE24 8BX

© Anglia Examinations Ltd. Reg. in England Co. No. 2046325

CHICHESTER COLLEGE, WESTGATE FIELDS, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO19 1SB, ENGLAND

These materials may not be altered or reproduced, stored in any retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, electrical, chemical, optical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

Procedure

The Anglia Masters Speaking Test consists of three tasks and should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. There are two candidates at each session. The examination will be recorded. The recording is sent to Anglia Examinations, Chichester College for moderation.

AFTER the examination, you must not return to the area where candidates yet to take the test are still waiting.

Preparation

Two articles to read and think about. You should be prepared to talk briefly on one of them before discussing it.

Task One: up to 4 minutes: Introductory warm-up.

The assessor will ask you to talk about who you are, why you are taking the examination and so on.

Task Two: up to 8 minutes: Prepared discussion (newspaper article).

The assessor will ask you to talk briefly about the article you have chosen to prepare, and then you must be prepared to discuss the issues arising from it.

Task Three: up to 8 minutes: Unprepared discussion (topic only).

The assessor will ask you to choose a statement card. He/She will then indicate to you which of the statements on your chosen card you should talk about. You can talk alone for a moment and then you must be prepared to engage in discussion about the proposition in the statement.

LEVEL 3 (MASTERS) SPEAKING EXAMINATION, Set 2 2020

Task Two: Readings for Discussion

READING ONE

FREE SPEECH AND CENSORSHIP

Censorship and free speech are hot topics in today's society, but how would you explain these ideas to somebody unfamiliar with them? Most governments laud the abstract concept of free speech but have very different definitions of it in practice. At its most basic level, free speech is the right to express opinions without restraint or retribution. But expressions of what are defined as hate speech, for example, or ideas deemed inconvenient for a certain audience, are often prohibited or censored. Can a society that does this still claim to practise free speech, and would doing this even be desirable?

The subject has been thrust into the forefront of modern life with the predominance of the internet and especially social media. People are freer to vocalise their opinions than ever before, and to a far bigger audience. People who project controversial opinions often cite free speech when they are challenged. Social media companies like Twitter are reluctant to ban certain controversial accounts even when there is widespread consensus for them to do so, on the basis of free speech. Where does this concept start and end, and is there a definitive answer?

READING TWO

PSEUDOSCIENCE

Pseudoscience consists of statements and beliefs that are claimed to be both scientific and factual, but are in fact incompatible with the scientific method and have no basis in verifiable evidence. Pseudoscientific practices include such pursuits as *astrology*, which claims that our fates are somehow linked with the stars, and *alchemy*, which is about changing the nature of materials such as metal. Other pseudosciences include 'alternative' medicine such as homeopathy, which says that extremely diluted substances can have healing functions, and certain diets with exaggerated claims.

Pseudoscience was more prevalent in the past, when much less was known about the natural world and superstition was rife. However, entire schools of thought and institutions today are dedicated to pseudoscience. The homeopathy industry is worth many millions of dollars in the west. The anti-vax campaign, which believes that traditional vaccines are harmful, enjoys no backing from reputable scientists but has an enormous amount of support across many different countries. Sociologists frequently puzzle over why such movements attract support or to what extent they are harmless or dangerous to society.