

Tapescripts

2B Pronunciation exercise 3

1.11

I'll just give you a brief example let's say er in playing cards let's say you have three cards the ten of diamonds erm the queen of clubs and the seven of hearts now the ten of diamonds to me is Bill Gates the richest man in the world and the queen of clubs is Kylie Minogue if you know her erm the singer and the seven of hearts would be er an international heart throb like erm James Bond double 0 seven so that's the association now to get the three in sequence I would have a journey round my house take taking the bedroom bathroom staircase et cetera

3B Speech feature exercise 3

1.14

1
Four years old it is, and it's only got 7,000 miles on the clock. Apparently, he had an operation on his leg not long after he bought it, so it's been sitting in the garage these last few years. Why he didn't ask more for it, though, I really don't know. Maybe he didn't realize its true value. £4,000 we paid for it, and its book price is well over twice that – a real bargain, don't you think? And the boot's enormous – with three young children we need lots of space to put their things in when we go away anywhere. So of course, we're absolutely delighted.

2 1.15

What a ridiculous present this is! Why on earth he thought I'd want one of these I cannot imagine. I mean, I don't like travelling. I've never been one for hotels – like my own bed too much. And look at it – it's not even very good quality. Made of cheap plastic it is. Five quid that must have cost him. And he chose the smallest one he could find, of course – there's just about enough room in that for a pair of pyjamas and a toothbrush. How you're supposed to get anything else in there, I just don't know. What a cheapskate he is. Always has been, always will be.

4B Listening exercise 3

1.19

P = Presenter

EW = Ellen Wainwright

P: ... report there on complaining from Julie Somersdale. Now, we move on from the subject of voicing complaints to ... well, the whole area of voice complaints, that is, medical problems with our voice. According to a recent report, one in three workers in the world's modern economies rely on their voice to carry out their job and around one in four experiences voice problems on a regular basis. Now, I'd certainly include myself in those figures – in the last year or so I've been decidedly hoarse on more than a couple of occasions. But why do so many of us suffer in this way? With me to help answer that question is voice expert, Ellen Wainwright. Ellen, why is the voice taking such a beating?

EW: Well, as you mentioned, the most important tool for many of us now is our voice, particularly as we shift to more service-based economies. Broadcasters like yourself are at risk of course, but so too are people like shopworkers, receptionists, politicians, performers, fitness instructors and teachers. In fact, the report singles out teachers and call centre workers as the most regularly affected types of worker. Too much talking in the wrong environment can lead to voice loss, and in some cases, more serious damage.

P: What kind of damage can people suffer to their voice?

EW: Well, there's a whole range of complaints, including 'odynophonia', which is soreness in the throat that makes speaking painful, and 'vocal cord paresis', which is partial paralysis of the vocal cords. There's also, of course, 'laryngitis' – inflammation of the larynx, that organ in our throat which actually contains the vocal cords. People like catchy names they can remember, though, and we've now got a new term that's come into the language to describe this phenomenon – 'repetitive voice injury', based of course on the more familiar RSI, or 'repetitive strain injury'. It covers all manner of ills, but basically means overuse of the voice.

P: And are these problems treatable?

EW: Well, unfortunately, in some cases permanent damage can be caused

– chronic laryngitis, for example, can mean having to give up work. Generally, though, people with prolonged voice loss can recover some or all of their ability to speak with the help of a good speech therapist. Occasionally, an operation such as vocal cord surgery may be needed.

P: Not very pleasant. Though I saw recently that people are actually opting to have vocal cord surgery in order to make them sound younger. Apparently, they can turn old shaky voices into strong clear ones by injecting collagen into the vocal cords to bring them closer together.

EW: Yes, that's the so-called 'voice lift' – another kind of cosmetic surgery. Once you've had your face lift, you can have a voice lift to match. The vocal cords become stiffer with age and move further apart – and this helps put that right. This can occur in younger people too, when their vocal cords become damaged, and that's the original, more serious purpose of this kind of surgery. But of course, as with everything, prevention is ten times better than cure, and if we look after our voice, we can avoid the need for any intervention of this type.

P: And how do we go about that? I mean, a teacher has to speak if she wants to do her job, and she probably has to raise her voice to make herself heard. And the poor call centre worker inevitably has to talk all day on the phone.

EW: Well, there are two considerations here: what our employers can do for us, and what we can do for ourselves. The working environment is crucial in all of this, and the employer has a responsibility to make sure conditions are right. Centrally heated offices in winter with low humidity are bad for the vocal cords and can lead to throat infections. Erm, high levels of background noise in factories, for example, can cause voice strain if we're forced to shout above it – that's particularly true of people who have to give instructions. And teaching in overlarge classrooms with poor acoustics can have the same effect. In the case of the call centre workers – well, they often don't have enough breaks to enable them to drink an adequate amount of water. The employer should ensure that this is possible.

P: Yes, and I'll be talking to mine right after the programme. Now, Ellen, what can we do ourselves? How can we look after our voice?

EW: Well, I've mentioned water already. That's essential if we want to keep our vocal cords well lubricated. And try and avoid anything with caffeine – things like coffee, tea or soft drinks with caffeine in them, as these dry out the vocal cords. That's the first point. Also, if you feel you've been speaking too much, try asking a question or two – that puts the onus on the other speakers and gives you a bit of a rest. And when you speak, don't push your voice from your throat – instead, your navel, your tummy button should move towards your backbone. If not, you won't get the best from your voice and it may suffer damage.

P: And how about vocal exercises, the kind of thing actors or singers do before they go on stage? Do they help?

EW: Certainly. Vocal warm-ups are excellent for helping voice projection and ensuring you use your voice correctly. Proper breathing from the diaphragm and a good posture are important though. Make sure you keep your head up, your chin level and your shoulders sloping, not dropped or hunched. Oh, and relax – that's very important.

P: And not very easy! Can you give us a couple of examples of vocal warm-ups?

EW: Yes, alright. Well, the obvious one is: *Do re me fa so la te do*. Then there are those that combine the same vowel sounds with different consonants: *Ma me mi mo mu, Ba be bi bo bu, Ta te ti to tu*. And then you have sentences such as *'Bring back my bonny baby's beautiful blue bonnet'*.

P: Marvellous, Ellen. Unfortunately, on that note, we have to finish I'm afraid. But if you want to find out more about looking ...

50 Grammar exercise 1

2.9

1

It quickly became clear when I was pregnant with Jamie that they were going to make life difficult for me. My boss said he felt 'let down' – can you believe it? – and he wouldn't give me time off work for antenatal appointments. And then when I got back from maternity leave I found I'd been demoted to a junior position. Five years I'd been with them and that was the thanks I got. They were very obviously trying to force me out of the

company. The Equal Opportunities Commission were very supportive and gave me funding to bring my case before the Employment Tribunal. If it hadn't been for the EOC and the Sex Discrimination Act, my fight wouldn't have been possible. But isn't it just incredible that something like this can still happen in the 21st century?

2 2.10

When I was studying at university, I spent my summer holidays working as a temporary secretary. This was the late 70s and in those days male secretaries were even rarer than they are now. In one marketing firm I temped at, I was told by the personnel manager soon after I started that I wasn't needed anymore. He said it was better for the company's image to have women on the front desk. Blatantly sexist of course, and clearly against the law, but in those days I was very green and it never occurred to me that the Sex Discrimination Act might also apply to me. Had I made the connection, I would definitely have taken them to an employment tribunal. The SDA is such an important piece of legislation, and is obviously there for men as well as women. I just wish I'd realized that at the time.

3 2.11

When I found out that the male sales reps in my company were getting a higher basic salary than me I was furious. They were being paid 15% more for doing exactly the same job. I was even more upset when management refused to listen to my complaint. Part of me wishes I hadn't taken my case to the Employment Tribunal – the whole thing put a lot of pressure and strain on my family and myself, and it was both emotionally and financially very draining. OK, the result was positive and I received compensation, but I was fortunate – if I hadn't recently inherited some money, I might never have been able to take my claim to the Employment Tribunal. To my mind, the law doesn't go far enough to protect ordinary people – it depends too heavily on individuals to bring cases against offending employers. The Government could certainly do more to help.

4 2.12

I can safely say that I have never discriminated against any of my workers because of their sex. That's not to say of course that all employers are like me, and yes, of course, we need laws to protect individuals

against more unscrupulous types – I'm all in favour of that. But there needs to be a balance, and I don't think they've got that quite right yet. I mean, I have to be so careful – if I give promotion to a man, you can be sure there'll be two or three women knocking on my door the next day claiming they've been treated unfairly. And you know, last year, there was a woman here who told me the day after I gave her the job that she was three months pregnant. Now if I'd known that at the interview, I'd never have taken her on.

5 2.13

We've come a long way since the 1970s. If the SDA hadn't been brought in, we almost certainly wouldn't have so many women in full-time employment now, and doing jobs they would never have dreamed of doing a generation or two before. I read the other day that nearly a quarter of all Britain's coastguards today are women – and before 1978 there wasn't a single one! Some things take a bit longer to change though. My sister works in the City and she tells me that although there's no active discrimination, there are certain differences in male and female culture which affect how you get on. She works extremely hard but she doesn't go to the pub after work, she doesn't like talking about football and she's not one for telling jokes. And she's convinced this has held her back. There are still a number of unspoken barriers in some male-dominated professions – the so-called 'glass ceiling'.

7D Vocabulary exercise 1

P = Presenter JS = Jenny Sanders

L = Lawyer SB = Sally Blofeld

1 2.25

P A pensioner who stabbed a would-be burglar with a kitchen knife has been cleared of assault. Sixty-eight-year-old Peter Simpson had been charged with the offence following a failed burglary at his home in March. Having been knocked to the floor by James Boyle, an unemployed plumber who had climbed in through an open window in the kitchen, Mr Simpson grabbed a knife from a drawer and stabbed the intruder three times in the leg. In his trial last Monday, Boyle, who had stolen from a number of neighbouring houses in the same morning, pleaded guilty to six counts of burglary and one of attempted

burglary. He was given a six-year jail term.

Jenny Sanders was in court to hear Peter Simpson's acquittal.

- JS** Former army officer Peter Simpson explained how on the morning of March 15th he had heard a noise in his kitchen and gone to investigate. When he ordered 22-year-old Boyle to leave his home, the younger man had shouted insults at him and pushed him to the floor. Simpson said he had used the nearest available knife and applied his army training to overcome his attacker, without at any moment attempting to cause him permanent harm.

Judge David Westwood expressed regret that charges had been brought against Mr Simpson, who, he said, had clearly acted with reasonable force to defend himself and his property. The incident has revived debate about exactly how far homeowners should be allowed to go when confronting intruders. Under current legislation, anyone can use what is described as 'reasonable force' to protect themselves against burglars who enter their homes. The government recently issued a set of guidelines explaining the law.

Speaking after the trial, Anna Coleby from the organisation 'House Defence' insisted that householders should have the right to use any force they consider necessary to defend themselves and their homes, without having to worry whether it is reasonable or not. She said that burglars should lose all their rights when they trespass on other people's property and be prepared to face the consequences.

Members of James Boyle's family refused to comment.

2 2.26

- P** In the first case of its kind in the Radio Ambria area, a single mother has been jailed for allowing her daughter to play truant. Thirty-five-year-old Sheila Danbury was sentenced to 60 days' imprisonment by Brenton magistrates yesterday for failing to ensure that her eldest daughter attended school regularly. Parents can be fined a maximum of £2,500 for each child playing truant, or imprisoned for up to three months. Speaking after the trial, Educational Welfare Officer Paula Banes said that the local education authorities had been working closely with Ms Danbury for over 18 months and she had been warned repeatedly that

she faced a prison sentence if she continued to allow her daughter to miss lessons.

Sheila Danbury was said to be shocked and upset by the decision. Her four children, including 14-year-old Sandra, who attended only 25% of classes in the last academic year, are currently being cared for by their aunt. Earlier, I spoke to Ms Danbury's lawyer, Ian Stride, and asked him for his reaction to the sentence.

- L** Well, it's excessive. I think, I think the legislation is there, or should be there at least to persuade, to convince parents of the need to send their children to school, but I but I really don't think a jail term will help to get my client's daughter back into the classroom. The very person the girl needs won't be there to encourage her.
- P** Does your client regret not doing enough?
- L** Well, she did everything she could. She got the girl ready in the morning and drove her to the school gates, but even if she'd dragged her in screaming, she couldn't have forced her to stay. Clearly, the school has to accept some of the responsibility for that.
- P** In a statement yesterday, the local education authority welcomed the decision, saying that it hoped it would send out a clear message to parents that truancy will not be tolerated. Ms Danbury's lawyer said his client would be appealing against the sentence.

3 2.27

- P** Fines imposed on companies convicted of polluting the environment are insufficient, according to environmental groups. The criticism comes after yesterday's decision by Redford Magistrates to fine the Ambrian Water Authority £15,000 for allowing sewage to leak into Lake Carston last year. The leakage killed a large proportion of the lake's wildlife as well as making it unfit for water sports. Our environmental correspondent, Sally Blofeld reports.
- SB** In yesterday's court hearing, the Ambrian Water Authority pleaded guilty to allowing raw sewage to enter Lake Carston last November. The sewage had overflowed from a blocked sewer, causing the death of the lake's entire fish population as well as frogs and other wildlife. The penalty brings the total of the company's fines for environmental offences to nearly half a million pounds this year alone, drawing

criticism from the region's environmental groups. Jerry Wexford of 'Action Now' called for tougher penalties for organizations found guilty of causing pollution. He said that £15,000 was just a 'drop in the ocean' for large companies and urged courts to increase fines and impose prison sentences on company officials who are shown to be negligent. Larger fines, he said, would pay for the costs of clean-up operations, and jail sentences would serve as an encouragement to businesses to prevent such incidents occurring again.

Daniel Roberts, a spokesman for the Water Authority, accused the environmentalists of exaggerating the extent of the problem. He maintained that sewage leaks were inevitable, but had been kept to a minimum in the region. He also pointed out that the Water Authority had paid the entire bill for Lake Carston to be cleaned and was investing over a million pounds in new treatment technology.

8D Grammar exercise 1

1 2.32

You see, the fact is, I don't need a man to feel complete as a woman. And some people just find that difficult to accept. You know, they still have this image of the single woman as some kind of lonely spinster, on the shelf, with only her dogs or cats to turn to. But that's just so old fashioned. For me, being single is a lifestyle choice and I don't need to be pitied. You know, I hate it when people say 'Oh, you poor thing, it must be terrible.' Well, no, actually, it isn't. Anything but. I like my own company and my life is very full, thank you very much. In fact, I think as a rule, women are much better able to cope on their own than men. We're far more self-sufficient.

2 2.33

Well, yeah, OK, living with your parents *does* have its advantages, I suppose. I mean, I don't have to do any housework, my mum does all my ironing and she won't even let me *near* the kitchen. Even so, I'd rather be in my own place and sharing it with someone – you know ... a woman ... as in, er, 'serious relationship'. No disrespect to my mum, of course, but her hugs and kisses just aren't ... well, they're not the same, are they? Anyway, there's not much chance of a move in the

near future, I'm sad to say. For one thing, I'll need to save up a lot more – property prices round here are sky-high at the moment and I just haven't got enough to pay a deposit. Plus, of course, I have to find someone to be in a serious relationship with. And I'm afraid I'm not having much luck in that department right now.

3 2-34

When he walked out, I thought, 'Good riddance! I'm glad he's gone. I don't want him here and I don't need him here. I don't need anyone.' And if it was just me, if I only had myself to look after, I'd still feel the same way. But I've got my two boys to think of and they really need to have a man about the house. Darren, stop that this minute! Put it down. Now! You see – they're a bit of a handful. They need a dad and I need the extra pair of hands. Mind you, they're bone idle, most men, aren't they, so there's no guarantee the next one would be any better than the last. But of course, that's not the only reason for being in a relationship, is it?

4 2-35

On balance, I'd say I'm better out of a relationship than in at the moment. Of course, I do enjoy the companionship of a steady girlfriend – I split up with someone recently, and I think one of the things I miss most is the regular conversation – you know, politics, the planet, a film we've seen – whatever. But my job's taking up a lot of my time at the moment – my boss keeps sending me away on business – Eastern Europe mostly – so I'm hardly ever around during the week. And anyway, there's a lot to be said for being single. I get to see my chums more often, for one thing, and we all go out partying and clubbing together at the weekend – a whole group of us. We have a great time. And there's not that same pressure to be somewhere or do something at any specific time – I don't feel tied down like I used to.

5 2-36

To be perfectly honest I just couldn't imagine going out with another man, let alone being married to one. I mean, relationships are all about compromise, aren't they, and I'm just hopeless at that. Like, why should I have to spend the evening watching football on the telly or going out with his boring friends? I know, I know – I'm just selfish and inflexible, but at least I admit it. Let's be honest,

though, men have some pretty unendearing qualities of their own. They leave their dirty handprints all over the walls, they spill coffee on the sofa and don't clean it off, and they go on and on about their problems as if everyone else was really interested. I should know, I've been married twice. No, it's not always easy being single, but that's how I want it. I'm much better off that way.

6 2-37

Nine years to go to my retirement, and I still haven't found that elusive 'woman of my dreams'. I've tried – believe me, I've tried – but she just hasn't shown her face yet. Perhaps she's hiding from me. Haven't given up hope yet, though. In fact, I've just started going to a singles club – every Friday down at the Beach Hotel. The Tropical Bar. I've already got my eye on somebody. Dorothy, her name is – she works in Gamidges in Brent Street. I might pop in there one day this week and surprise her. Nothing to lose.

9B Listening exercise 4 3-1

P – Presenter A – Annie Taylor
G – Gerry Burnham

- P: Messy, long-haired layabouts in dirty, scruffy clothes; rowdy parties that keep the neighbours awake, and crumbling run-down houses and flats that bring down property values in the local area. That, at least, is the traditional image of squatters and the buildings they inhabit. But according to a recent study that's all changing. The number of squatters in the UK has risen dramatically in the last ten years, from around 9,500 to almost 15,000 – that's an increase of 60% – and around 10,000 of those are to be found in the London area alone. With me is Annie Taylor from the SRA, the Squatters' Rights' Association, the group that carried out the study. Annie, why are so many people squatting?
- A: Several reasons, really. Principally, though, it's a question of necessity. Most people squat simply because they have to. Property prices and rents are currently just too high for many people and there is a serious lack of social housing up and down the country.
- P: That's homes provided at low cost by non-profit organizations, right?
- A: That's right. Rented accommodation, mainly. There are over 100,000 families queuing up for this type of housing, so it's absurd – criminal, even – that there are so many empty homes in Britain – 750,000 at the last count. That's three quarters of a million unused flats and houses that are going to waste – in many cases because of property speculation.
- P: Hardly surprising, then, that so many people decide to squat.
- A: Indeed.
- P: And what type of people are they? How would you describe this new generation of squatters?
- A: Well, for one thing there are more students squatting than before. Erm ... but we're also seeing large numbers of graduates, young people in career jobs who just cannot afford to get on the property ladder. Erm, and then increasingly we're offering advice to people who come here from the Continent ... from other European countries.
- P: Interesting. And do you find yourself having to speak their languages as a result?
- A: We try. We do our best. But to be honest many of these people have a very good level of English, and all our technical, legal advice is printed out in a number of different languages, anyway. So ... yeah ... that means they're, they're clear on all aspects of squatting in Britain.
- P: You mention there the legal aspects – because of course, what surprises many visitors to this country is that squatting here is a civil offence, not a criminal offence.
- A: That's right. You can legally occupy a vacant building as long as there's no sign of a forced entry. In other words, you mustn't break any windows or locks to get inside. And once you're in, then you have to prove you have exclusive access to the property, which basically means changing all the locks.
- P: Uh huh? The law is very clear on that, is it?
- A: Yes, it is, but we also tell squatters to put up a copy of Section 6 on the outside of the building – on the doors and windows. Just in case.
- P: And what is a Section 6?
- A: It's a document, a legal warning, spelling out clearly to the owner – or even the police – exactly what your rights are. It begins 'Take notice that we live in this property, it is our home and we intend to stay here'.
- P: But the landlord can still evict you.
- A: Yes, he can, or she can. But they have to go through the courts and that can take time – usually up to four weeks,

sometimes months. Even years, in some cases.

P: My goodness me. Thank you, Annie. Very enlightening. It's time now, I think, to bring in our other guest today - Gerry Burnham, who is a squatter. Good morning, Gerry.

G: Morning.

P: Gerry lives in a squat - a semi-detached house - with three other people in Chiswick, West London. Gerry, how did you get into the property? Or rather, before that, how did you know it was empty in the first place?

G: Well, firstly, er, it's er, it's a detached house, actually, not a semi. Only the best.

P: Sorry, yes, of course. I do beg your pardon.

G: Anyway, er, my mates and I, we, er, we were about to be evicted from our last place so we went looking for somewhere else to live - house-hunting, like - and, er, we saw this place looking a bit run-down. The, er, garden was overgrown and the whole place needed a coat of paint. It was, er, well it looked pretty abandoned really.

P: So you moved in.

G: Not straightaway, no. You have to make sure it really is empty first. We gave it a couple of weeks. We, er, we looked in the dustbin every day to make sure no one was throwing any rubbish out, like, and, er, we watched the postman to see if he brought any letters or not.

P: Which he didn't, presumably?

G: No, nothing.

P: So what did you do next?

G: We got in through the kitchen window - it was in such a bad state, like, that it more less just fell open. Then we did what Annie was just talking about - changed the locks and all that.

P: And how do you feel about squatting? Because you're a computer programmer, aren't you? Can't you afford to rent?

G: Well, I could, yeah, but in London all I'd get for my money'd be a tiny flat, with nothing left over to save. At least this way I'm putting money in the bank. Should be able to get a mortgage soon, with a bit of luck. Hope so, anyway.

P: So you can't wait to get out.

G: Well, no, I wouldn't say that. I suppose I've got mixed feelings about it all, really. I mean, it's pretty depressing when you first move in to a place - no running water, no gas, no electricity. Sometimes you

never do get connected - especially electricity - they can be really difficult, they can, when it comes to squatters. Some refuse point blank. But then, you know, you're with your mates and little by little you get settled in, and before you know it you've made a little home for yourself.

P: And then you get evicted.

G: Yeah, that's a bit of a hassle, but, er, it makes it all interesting as well, though. I mean, you're always on the move. Always busy, too - I've got quite good at DIY and all that, since I've been squatting, like. Fact, I think landlords benefit quite a bit from people like us. We do their houses up for them, keep them maintained and so on.

P: Yes, I'd like to come back to you, Annie, on that, if I may. I understand there are now squatting co-operatives, who move into places and actually restore them. Is that right?

A: Yes, it is, particularly in the Manchester area. There are several groups of people, students ...

9D Speech feature exercise 2

3.3 Excerpt 1

I = Ian S = Sally
A = Alison J = John

S: That's what they say and you know, I think wearing it really did kind of sharpen my other senses. I put it on when I was on the train to get used to it and I sort of became aware of every sound - every little knock or scrape - and I could smell every coffee or sandwich or whatever.

I: And what about when you got to York, Sally? What was it like?

S: Well, we did all the sights and everything - the cathedral, the city walls, the historic buildings and so on - except of course they weren't really 'sights' because I couldn't actually see them. Paul, though, did a marvellous job of describing everything to me and by the end of our day there I felt as if I knew the city really well.

A: What about things like eating and washing and all that - how did you get on with that?

S: Yeah, all those little things that form part of our daily routine - they were a real challenge. I had to sort of learn to sit down again or eat with a knife and fork. In this restaurant we went to, they had these tall kind of tube-shaped glasses and every time I reached out to pick mine up I

knocked it over and spilt everything all over the place. Disastrous!

J: Did you do anything else when you were there? Did you like go into any museums or anything?

S: Yeah, we did actually. Paul took me into an exhibition by some local sculptor - Anna Kirby, or something. I think her name was. It was all modern stuff, from local stone - lots of curves and holes and that sort of thing.

I: And he described everything to you?

S: Well, yeah, some things. But luckily for me, many of the works there were hands-on exhibits - which is great if you're visually handicapped.

J: Or a child.

A: Or an adult! It must be brilliant feeling your way around an exhibition.

S: Yeah, it really was something else. Paul had to describe the rest to me but it was the tactile experience I most enjoyed.

J: Obviously.

3.4 Excerpt 2

I = Ian D = Dave
T = Tom A = Alison

I: Dave, you went a bit further than Sally, didn't you?

D: Yeah, not as far as the place I had on my sign, though.

A: What was that?

D: Tokyo.

All: Tokyo!

D: Yeah, that was my 'faraway place'. It was a good conversation starter, helped break the ice and all that. But apart from that it's just like the normal version. Well, I imagine it is, anyway - I was a complete novice, you see - a real rookie.

A: Really? So what did you think of it?

D: Well, pretty dull really - not my cup of tea. I mean, I met some nice people and practised my languages and everything, but the bits in between, all that waiting next to busy roads, it's not my idea of fun. And it was really hard to get lifts, especially in France.

T: Maybe they just thought you were a bit crazy or something - standing on a French roadside trying to get to 'Tokyo'.

D: Yeah, maybe. Mind you, the ones who did pick me up were often madder than me. There was this one guy who kept swerving onto the wrong side of the road - I couldn't work out if he was doing it for fun or he was just a lousy driver, but we very nearly had a head-on collision at one point with this oncoming lorry.

- A: Ooh, sounds hairy.
 D: Yeah, it was. And then after that bit of excitement – if you can call it that – I had to wait for about four hours outside this town called Bar-le-Duc, or something. Great laugh – I got really cheesed off, I can tell you.
 I: So how far did you get eventually?
 D: Munich.
 I: And then what? You gave up?
 D: Well, some guy who gave me a lift there put me up for a couple of nights – he gave me a key and I could sort of come and go as I pleased – just like a hotel.
 A: That was good of him.
 D: Yeah, and it meant I could do a bit of good old, non-experimental, conventional sightseeing ...
 All: Aha
 D: ... before I got the overnight train back to London.
 All: What? Cheat!

3.5 Excerpt 3

T = Tom H = Helen

- T: Helen, you actually *flew* to Lithuania, didn't you?
 H: Yeah, I managed to get a cheap flight. And I also took in the main sights as well – like Dave.
 All: Aah? Oh yeah?
 H: Yeah, I wanted to compare the two types – as in 'experimental', you know.
 T: Hm hm. So what did you discover?
 H: Well, the first day I did all the left-right business, and I have to say I was very pleasantly surprised. I had a lovely time, it was fascinating.
 T: In what way?
 H: Well I saw all those parts of Vilnius that I wouldn't otherwise have seen if I'd just done the typical tourist thing – you know, off the bits of the city that are kind of all the main tourist routes. I saw some lovely old buildings with these really pretty courtyards and everywhere there was loads of greenery, you know, trees and grass and stuff like that.
 T: Sounds lovely.
 H: Yeah, it was. But I think what I enjoyed most about the whole thing was not knowing what I was going to discover every time I turned a corner. When I went sightseeing the next day, I knew what I was going to find because I'd already seen it in the brochures and things. This was different.
 T: But presumably it wasn't *all* quite so pretty – I mean, you must have seen some unattractive places as well.

- H: Oh yeah, of course. I mean I walked through some really ugly run-down housing estates – some of the buildings were in a terrible condition. But I mean you expect that in a city, don't you, wherever you are. And anyway, it all helped to give me a true flavour of the place, to see both sides of the coin. And as the day went on, I got to realize that there was always a park or a river or something close to every built-up area, so I never got down or fed up or anything.
 T: And when did you decide to stop?
 H: When I came to a brick wall.
 H: No, seriously, the book says something about carrying on until something blocks your path, and for me it was a brick wall in a dead-end street – I couldn't go left or right. I can't say I was sorry, mind – I was worn out. I'd been walking for something like six hours.

3.6 Excerpt 4

I = Ian S = Steve E = Emma
 A = Alison T = Tom

- S: I mean, the thing is, it's like, do you go where you *want* to go, or do you go where you think *your partner* will go, or do you go where you think your partner will think *you* will go?
 A: Ooh, tricky.
 T: Very.
 E: Yes, and if I'd gone where I thought Steve would go, I'd have headed straight for the district with all the bars.
 S: She knows me too well.
 A: Got some good bars in Madrid.
 E: Hmm. Quite. But that's not my idea of a good time.
 S: No, and I figured that was what she'd think. So I went to all the main tourist sights instead.
 A: You as well!
 T: Looks like everyone did.
 S: Yeah, I did the lot – the Puerta del Sol, Plaza Mayor, the Royal Palace ...
 E: And I was following in his footsteps, would you believe? Though I didn't know it at the time, of course.
 I: What, everywhere?
 S: Yep. About ten minutes behind me, she was.
 I: Wow! What a coincidence.
 E: Not really – I mean, it's the tourist thing, isn't it? Everyone does what the guidebook tells you to. Understandable, really, I suppose. And anyway, I had a marvellous time. It's a lovely city, Madrid.
 S: Better if you can see it with someone, though.
 A: Oh, did you miss her?

- S: Well, yeah, you know, I mean, it's a bit boring walking all day round a city on your own.
 T: So you didn't bump into each other? You didn't meet up at all?
 S: Well, yeah, but only because we cheated.
 A: How come?
 E: We had a plan B in case we didn't find each other. We didn't want to go to Madrid and not have a romantic meal together, did we? Lovely, it was.
 S: Yeah, lovely and expensive.
 E: Ooh, you old misery guts.

10B Grammar exercise 1

1 3.7

What is success? That's easy – you just have to look at my sales figures to know the answer to that. Best in the whole southern region, they are. I've sold more policies this quarter than anyone else on the sales team did for the whole of last year. Mick the Machine, they call me. They all say to me 'What's the secret, Mick – how do you do it?' Of course, personality's important – you've got to have a bit of spark, you've got to know how to win people over. But most of all I put my success down to self-discipline and perseverance. You've got to get up in the morning, get out there and do the business – it doesn't matter what the weather's like, how you're feeling, how unsure you are of pulling off a deal – you've just got to keep going.

2 3.8

A successful person for me is not someone who makes pots of money. Success is not about accumulating *wealth*, it's about achieving *happiness*. It means enjoying whatever you do. Life is so short, we have to make sure our stay on this planet is a pleasant one. Have a good time, let your hair down, that's what I say – as long as you treat others with respect. And if you want to enjoy life, you've got to adopt a positive outlook on everything. If things don't turn out well, don't let it get you down. We all come up against problems – we just have to face up to them, try and solve them. And we all make mistakes at some time – in all areas of our lives. The important thing is to try and learn from them, not let them destroy you.

3 3.9

I'll be 83 next month – and I've just signed up for a computer course. How about that, then? It starts next Monday. I told my son about it – I

said 'I'm going to learn to use the computer,' and he said 'What? At your age? Never.' He seems sure I won't be able to do it but I know I will. You see, all through my life I've been successful - I've always got what I wanted. And the key to that success has always been the same - confidence. Being sure of yourself and knowing you can achieve anything if you really want to. And you know, success for me here won't only be learning to use the computer - in a sense, that's the least of it all. No, I'll get most satisfaction out of proving that son of mine wrong.

4 3.10

Success is all about achieving goals - accomplishing what you set out to do. But it's not so much *what* you achieve as *how* you achieve it that counts. You have to earn your success. For instance, people tell me I'm an excellent cook - now, whether that's true or not is not for me to say, but it's always a great source of satisfaction to me when my dinner guests express their appreciation of one of my meals. I feel valued - and that, for me, is success, but particularly because I know that I have invested an enormous amount of time and effort in preparing the meal and organizing the whole evening. If I just threw something together in half an hour, they'd probably still enjoy it, but it wouldn't be quite the same, would it?

5 3.11

When, or rather, if I get to old age, I hope I'll have had a useful life. That for me is a true measure of success - doing something positive with your life and at the same time making the world a better place. My dad always said you should aim to leave a legacy when you've gone, something useful for people to remember you by. He wrote several books - very good ones too - but he wasn't suggesting that everyone has to do that. It could be something more simple, like planting trees, doing up a house or even having children. I expect I'll have my own kids one day, but for now I'm happy just to keep it to planting trees. In fact, I'm driving up into the mountains with some friends of mine next week to do just that.

6 3.12

You often hear people say it's not the winning, it's the taking part that's important. That's fair enough,

particularly if, like me, you're an amateur, rather than a professional. Though I reckon it's more the doing your best that's important - after all, there's no point taking part if you don't at least *try* to win. Round about this time next week I'll be setting off for Stockholm to take part in a European club competition. Success for me in Sweden will be knowing I've gone out there and given it my best shot, both for me and for my club - even if I don't win any medals - which is more than likely given the strength of the other runners! Anyway, to give ourselves the best chance of doing well, we've been training hard all season. Preparation is obviously an essential factor in achieving success.

11D Speech feature exercise 1

3.26

- S: What are you working on at the moment, Mike?
- M: New Music Award. Don't know what I'm going to send in, though - something metallic probably. Hmm. Yeah. 'Metallic.' It's a good title, that. I like it. Yep. I could use all sorts of things - just things I've got in the house, nothing special. Coins, keys, saucepans. Bracelets, maybe.
- S: Mm. They make a nice jingly sound, bracelets.
- M: Yeah. Jingles, jangles, clinks. Knives and forks, too - you can get a good clatter out of them.
- S: Yeah. Cutlery. Good idea. Thought about the venue?
- M: Ooh, no, don't know. It's early days yet.
- S: Yeah, right.
- M: That abandoned cinema on the edge of town, is it still there?
- S: Think so.
- M: Could do it there.

12C Listening exercises 2-4

P = Presenter GW = Geoff Winning
SP = Sally Plumtree

Part 1 3.40

- P Hello and welcome to *For and Against*, where this week we'll be discussing the following statement: *There is too much technology in sport.* And by 'technology' we mean any human-made means, any method, machine, device or piece of clothing or equipment which is developed using scientific knowledge for practical purposes. Exactly what those purposes are in sporting terms, I'll leave for our guests to say, but it's

clear that in recent times technology has revolutionized the world of sport.

In athletics, for example, marathon runners are now electronically tagged and their progress during a race can be followed online; materials technologists are constantly working on improving footwear and clothing for the different athletics events; and their work extends to equipment, such as the pole in the pole vault - we've seen there a progression from hard wood to bamboo in the early 1900s, followed by steel in the 1950s and the more flexible fibreglass in the 60s.

Many swimmers now wear full-length swimsuits which are made from material designed to reduce friction in the water. These made their first appearance as recently as the year 2000, in Sydney, Australia. And tennis rackets - both their material and their design - now bear little resemblance to those used in the 1970s when personalities like Bjorn Borg or John McEnroe graced the tennis courts. It would be strange, unthinkable even, for players of the calibre of Rafa Nadal to appear on court now with a racket made of wood.

And then of course there is the use of microphones and earphones by football referees, who are now able to communicate more easily with their linesmen and the fourth official.

Now, our two studio guests today will be debating the extent to which these developments and others like them are beneficial to sport; whether technology should continue in the same way to help us achieve our sport-related goals or whether it is having too much influence and should be kept out of sport, or at least be subject to more restrictions.

Part 2 3.41

- P: Let me introduce our guests. Firstly, we have Geoff Winning, who's a sports scientist and regular columnist for the magazine *Technosport*. Good morning, Geoff.
- GW: Good morning.
- P: And we also have with us Sally Plumtree, the successful former athlete and now an equally successful freelance sports journalist. Good morning, Sally.
- SP: Hello, Peter.
- P: Right, let's begin. For listeners who are new to our programme, both Geoff and Sally now have approximately one minute each to put

forward their main arguments. Geoff, let's begin with you – you're very much pro-technology. Tell us why.

GW: Well, the effects of technology in sport cannot be understated. And there are basically three areas where its application is of tremendous benefit. The first of these, of course, is the fact that it enables athletes to improve their performance, to surpass their own limits. Some of the examples of developments you mentioned just now have led to humans running or swimming faster, jumping higher or in the case of tennis, hitting harder. Technology helps us to push out the boundaries of human achievement, to see just what the human body is capable of. Secondly, it helps to maximize safety in sport. Helmet design in cycling and hockey is an example of this, and so is the headgear used in amateur boxing, those heavily padded hats that protect boxers from soft tissue damage. And then finally, technology ensures a greater degree of fairness in sport. Now you mentioned the use of microphones in football, but there is also the use of video evidence to help the referee in his job, and now in tennis, the HawkEye system which creates virtual 3D images to help the umpire in disputed line calls. Performance, safety and justice – the three reasons why technology should continue to be used in sport.

P: Thank you, Geoff. Now, Sally, over to you. Why are you in favour of more restrictions in the use of technology?

SP: Well, like Geoff I, too, have three main arguments to support my case. Firstly, technology has come to dominate sport, so much so that I believe it overshadows human achievement and we are losing the raw physical challenge that is central to sporting competitions. When I was competing we depended much more on ourselves, on our own abilities and efforts, not on the work of scientists and engineers. It really was human achievement and not technological achievement that was on show. Secondly, I think that spectators realize this and their enjoyment of sporting events has been diminished as a result. This is particularly true with the video and computer technology used in the control of football and tennis matches. It reduces the human touch of sport, makes it more mechanical, less entertaining. Human error in refereeing decisions has always added that extra excitement to sport, particularly when there are fiery characters around like Wayne Rooney

or John McEnroe, who you mentioned earlier. And finally, the prevailing climate of using technology to run that extra thousandth of a second faster encourages sportsmen and women to bend the rules, or to put it another way, to cheat. We see them using technologies which endanger health, such as blood doping, gene doping and all manner of drugs. So ...

P: Thank you, Sally, have to stop you there. Time's up, but I think you've made your points.

Part 3 3-42

P: Now, let's pick up on one or two of those points you made there. Interestingly, you both mentioned the role of technology in decision-making during football and tennis matches. Sally said it reduces the spectator's enjoyment. Would you agree with that, Geoff?

GW: Not at all, no. I'm absolutely certain that the cameras will only serve to heighten interest, to intensify the drama and the tension. And we'll still see the same displays of passion and anger from competitors – but they'll be directed more at themselves rather than at the referee or the umpire.

S: Hmm, they'll certainly be good for match officials, but I really cannot see that they'll make a game more exciting. Anyway, I think there are other reasons why tennis in particular no longer captivates spectators like it used to. And it's all down to technology.

P: In what way?

S: Well, it was always such an exciting sport before, with long rallies that had everyone on the edge of their seats. Then in the late 1970s, early 80s, players began using the oversize racket – the one with the very large head. And sure, tennis became a much faster sport, but there aren't so many of those rallies now, and there's a lot more dead time without any action, time when nothing's happening. And as a spectator, I find that dull.

GW: Maybe, but the oversize racket makes it easier to hit the ball, and that can only be a good thing for amateur players – let's not forget them.

P: OK. Some interesting points there. Geoff, let's go back to what you said about technology helping us to push out the boundaries of human achievement. Are all forms of technology acceptable in your book?

GW: Yes, I think if everyone has access to the same equipment, then virtually any technological innovation is acceptable.

S: Oh right. So presumably then, doping is acceptable, as long as everyone has access to it. That's brilliant.

GW: I'm not suggesting that at all.

That should be obvious. There is no way we can justify the use of performance-enhancing drugs or any kind of interference with our blood or genetic make-up. These practices are not permitted by sporting authorities, and for good reason. There are moral issues involved here, quite apart from the legal aspects and the potential dangers to our health.

P: Yes, you did use the word *equipment*, perhaps we should emphasize that.

GW: That's right. And its use has to be standardized by the relevant sporting authority. A good example of this is in the sport of cycling. Radical new designs in the 1980s and 90s meant that previous records were being smashed beyond recognition. The International Cycling Federation felt these so-called 'superbikes' were having too much influence on the sport and their huge cost gave richer countries an unfair advantage. So consequently they were banned from certain competitions such as the Olympics or the world hour record. It just shows that there are controls on the use of technology and we should feel safe in that knowledge.

P: Anything to say on that, Sally?

S: Well, I'm pleased the Federation saw sense in the end, but I just think the whole episode highlights the uneasy relationship that exists ...