PINIARIS - AUDIOSCRIPT FOR TEST 1

**PART 1**

1. - I can't wait to see that new movie.

- Is it still here? Rumor has it that it's not very scary.

- That's not what I heard.

1. - Are you ready for the test?

- Ready as I'll ever be.

- Well, I sure hope it's easier than the last one.

1. - I've been in line for half an hour! This is ridiculous!

- Please stay calm. We're doing the best we can.

- Well, I've sure learnt my lesson. I'll be buying my tickets online from now on!

1. - The evening would've been better if the restaurant hadn't been so smoky.

- I know. The food wasn't that bad, but I just couldn't enjoy it.

1. - Do you think she'll marry him?

- If you ask me, it's just a matter of time.

- Well, I hope she knows what she's doing.

1. - Why's Peter staying at his parents' house tonight?

- I'm afraid you've got me there.

- I hope everything's OK.

1. - My computer's still not working. I've tried everything.

- Sounds like you're in a fix.

- Do you think I should take it back?

- That's what I'd do.

1. - Couldn't you just explain the situation to him?

- Oh no. I simply can't face him after what I've done.

1. - You did water the plants, didn't you?

- Uh, actually, I couldn't find the time.

- Some friend you are. Thanks for nothing.

1. - I've only had three customers so far.

- I'm sure things'll pick up in time.

- Sometimes I wonder.

1. - You mean you don't plan on seeing any sights while you're in Paris?

- Well, I may be able to squeeze in the Eiffel Tower, but most of the time I'll be tied up in meetings.

- Seems a shame. There's so much to see and do there.

1. - So are you going to hold off buying a new car?

- That's the plan. Things are a bit tight right now.

- Well, I hope everything works out.

1. - I couldn't make heads or tails of that lecture.

- Me neither. It was way over my head.

1. - That's a lot of responsibility for such a young woman.

- I know, but so far she's proven herself more than capable.

1. - Is housing expensive in the city?

- I'll say, especially when you compare it to what I was used to in the suburbs!

1. - Are you thinking about graduate school?

- Not quite yet. I was hoping to shift gears and travel for a while.

- Sounds like a good idea, if you can afford it!

1. - So what did you decide to do?

- I gave in my two weeks' notice this morning.

- Good for you! How soon do you start the new job?

- Not soon enough!

**PART 2**

1. Did you check out that movie I was telling you about?
2. Why doesn't anybody tell me about these things?
3. Couldn't you have bought something a little nicer?
4. Don't you just hate it when Luther starts talking about his job?
5. Weren't you supposed to lock up after we left?
6. When were you planning to invite me? The party's tomorrow.
7. Won't you be too busy to take in the sights?
8. Do you really think she'd give our plan away?
9. If John doesn't show up soon, would you mind if I sat next to you?
10. [annoyed] Are you just going to sit there all day?
11. [complaining] How come you don't want me to drive?
12. Could I just sneak a peek at what you're cooking?
13. [annoyed] Isn't there a place I can get a little peace and quiet around here?
14. I've forgotten. Where're we supposed to go after the ceremony?
15. I've never seen you look so fit! What's your secret?
16. Is his new job really as awful as he makes out?
17. Are you coming back any time soon? If so, please give me a call.
18. How come you got home so late tonight?

**PART 3**

*SEGMENT 1*

- Should animals be used in scientific and medical research? It's a controversy that has raged for centuries and is still going on. In the first segment of today's "Learning from the Experts", I'll be talking to Professor Earl Young, a science historian who has been keeping a close eye on the continuing debate. Professor Young, welcome to the show.

- Thanks. I'm happy to be here.

- Professor Young, we hear a lot about animal activists fighting to limit the role that animals play in research. Can you comment on the current state of affairs? How would you assess the role that animals play in scientific and medical research?

- Well, there's no doubt that animals continue to play an essential role in research- between 18 and 22 million are used yearly in the USA alone. What has changed, however, is that the total number of animals used in experiments in the United States is falling and the number has also declined in Britain and Europe.

- I hadn't realized that. Has anything happened to bring about this decline?

- At least in part, the decline reflects society's changing views about animal right. Animal experimentation has long drawn protest from people committed to the protection of animals, but in the 1970s the animals rights' movement gained new momentum, particularly with the 1875 publication of the book *Animal Liberation* by Peter Singer, in which animal experimentation is presented as morally indefensible.

- Yes, I remember it. Wasn't that the book that's said to have inspired animal activists to stage protests at research facilities?

- That's absolutely right. In the 1970sn and 1980s, protest often took the form of late-night raids on research facilities. Activists broke into laboratories, freed animals and destroyed data and equipment, causing millions of dollars of damage. Subsequent media coverage of these raids brought animal experimentation into wider public view, and the public was shocked by evidence of serious animal mistreatment that the activists brought to light. And as public acceptance grew, the movement continued to grow and gain momentum. Animal rights groups soon pressed for - and got - changes in the laws governing the protection of lab animals. In the USA, for example, the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act was amended in 1970 to require that lab animals receive painkilling drugs whenever appropriate. In 1985 the legislation was amended again, the time requiring that each research facility receiving federal money create a committee to oversee animal research. The new act also required that funds be devoted to the physical and emotional well-being of lab animals and that federally funded researchers consider alternatives to animal use.

- So the animal activists really have had a significant impact on the situation.

- Absolutely, and as a result, researchers worldwide have begun experimenting with an exciting new range of humane alternatives. The first are so-called in vitro - or test tube - methods which use cell and tissue cultures instead of whole animals. One such method is designed to replace rabbits in evaluating the skin--irritating properties of chemicals that are used in cosmetics. It's already won approval from the US government. A second promising avenue involves developing more sophisticated methods of statistical analysis known as "data mining". When scientists use statistical models in their work, it means that fewer animals are required for tests. A third alternative is the use of powerful computer programs that simulate biological functions and demonstrate how a living organism reacts to toxins or disease pathogens.

- So, are you saying that science will reach a point where it is no longer necessary to use animals for research?

- Well, despite these exciting new developments, many scientists still believe that there is no substitute for the complex response of a whole animal. In their opinion, animal research is vital for continued biomedical progress. It would seem that there are no easy answers and the complex issue is certain to be the center of heated debate for years to come.

- It will certainly be interesting to see how things develop. Thank you, professor, for your fascinating insights.

*SEGMENT 2*

- "No guts, no glory." It's the battle cry of thrill-seekers everywhere as they dive off cliffs, jump out of planes and ski down avalanche chutes - and they do it all just for the rush. But where do these daredevils get the guts to risk their lives over and over again? Some scientists believe there's something about adventure junkies that's different from the rest of us. Something they're born with. Could it be that thrill-seeking is literally in their blood? Dr. Julia Farnesworth is here to explore the latest research with us. Dr. Farnesworth, welcome to the show. What does the latest research show? Is thrill-seeking really inborn?

- Thanks, Larry. Yes, there is now evidence that thrill-seeking has a strong genetic component. Researchers have identified at least two distinct genes that they believe are responsible for thrill-seeking behavior. Both of these genes have to do with the brain chemical called dopamine, the brain's pleasure chemical. Dopamine is the substance that makes your brain feel all warm and wonderful inside. What researchers have found is that the brains of thrill-seekers don't produce and absorb enough dopamine. This prompts them to go the extra mile to get a dopamine fix - and that means charging into high0sensation activities, ones that really make palms sweat and heart rates soar.

- That's fascinating. Are there any figures about how many people may actually have these genes?

- Researchers believe that at least 30 percent of us carry the thrill-seeking genes, but not everyone who has them, they say, feels the need to jump out of airplanes. For some people intellectual challenges can provide the same satisfaction. And just having the genes doesn't mean that you will necessarily crave new sensations all the time - which leads the critics to argue that the researcher's genetic theory is a little too simplistic. But whether flirting with danger is nature, nurture or a combination of both, there's no question that it can quickly become a deadly habit. Hundreds of thrill-seekers a year are killed pursuing a rush. Researchers are also exploring whether or not the same genes may play a role in self-destructive adventure-seeking such as drug and alcohol abuse.

- So where to from here? What will scientists do with their new-found knowledge?

- Well, it's still rather unclear. When I asked one researcher if he thought scientists should come up with a cure for self-destructive adventure-seeking, he replied: "Without thrill-seekers in the world, we wouldn't have any United States of America because Columbus never would've taken off. We never would have a man on the moon, and we wouldn't have Wall Street. I don't think we want to get into the business of treating core personality traits unless they're really harmful to the person."

- So, at least for the moment, listeners, it appears that there's no new wonder drug on the way to take away the urge of adventure. Nor will a blood test be available any time soon to find out whether you have the thrill-seeker genes... but there IS good news in store for those who are couch potatoes; scientists say they may also have discovered the gene for "laziness."

*SEGMENT 3*

- The therapeutic value of amusement parks has been largely overlooked by doctors. Until just recently that is! With us in the studio today is Steven Mansfield, a medical journalist, who is here to tell us about an amazing letter that he read in *The New England Journal of Medicine* recently. Steven, welcome to the show.

- Thanks for having me.

- So give us a bit of background on the letter you read.

- I'd be happy to! It was written by a Swiss eye surgeon named Michael Thiel. It seems that a young man, 19 years old, presented himself to the doctor at his hospital in Zurich, Switzerland, complaining that something strange had happened to the pupil of his right eye after being punched in the eye in a bar fight. The pupil - the black part at the centre of the eye - had become a long, narrow, vertical slit. In fact, it bore an odd resemblance to the eye of a cat. Thiel and his colleagues soon figured out what had happened. Ten years before, it would seem, surgeons had removed the patient's natural lens and implanted a plastic one inside his eye. The barroom punch had knocked the plastic lens out of place. The lens had slipped forward, out through the pupil, but the two tiny wires used to anchor the lens had remained in place farther back in the eye and were tugging on the edges of the lens. The backward pull distorted the pupil into a cat's-eye shape.

- So what did Dr. Thiel and his colleagues do next?

- Well, first they tried a simple remedy: eye drops and gravity. They had the man lie on his back and dilated his pupil with drops. Their hope was that if the pupil opened wide enough, the lens would drop through it and wind up back where it belonged. But, according to Thiel, the procedure didn't do the trick. Only half the lens went back, and the other part was stuck.

- How awful!

- Well, actually, it sounds worse than it was. The patient's eye didn't hurt, his vision was good, and he was in no danger. But he wanted the lens fixed anyway. His girlfriend and everyone complained that he looked funny.

- And then what happened?

- Well, a brief operation was scheduled to reposition the lens but in the end the surgery was never performed. As Dr. Thiel tells it, the weekend before the surgery date, the patient went to the Europa Park in Germany, one of the biggest amusement parks in Europe. There he took three rides in a row on the Silver Star, one of the biggest, fastest roller coasters in Europe. The ride climbs up an incline of 240 feet and zooms down into a curve at 80 miles an hour. The force on passengers is four Gs, four times that of gravity. Apparently, after the third ride, the patient went to the Men's Room. While washing his hands, he glanced at himself in the mirror and noticed that his eye looked normal. The pupil was round again. He called Dr. Thiel and explained what had happened. The unbelieving surgeon examined him the following day and, to his amazement, found that the surgery was no longer needed. The lens had slipped back into place.

- How did he explain what happened?

- The lens obviously needed quite some force to move it back into place. When the patient was on the roller coaster, he was in a state of anxiety combined with a lot of adrenaline. Apparently, the adrenaline enlarged the pupil, and it was probably the combination of this and the enormous G-force that brought the lens back into place.

- Amazing. So, does Dr. Thiel and his team of Swiss surgeons recommend roller coaster therapy to others with misplaced implants?

- In fact, Thiel has realized that the story is actually a cautionary tale. The obvious lesson to be learnt here is that if a roller coaster can jolt an implanted lens back into place, it may also be able to jerk one out of place. Until recently, that might not have been so much of a concern, because most lens implants were used after cataract surgery on older people who probably did not ride roller coasters anyway. But now, implants are being used in Europe to correct nearsightedness in younger people.

- So even though riding a roller coaster was therapeutic in this case, the pastime may actually do more harm than good.

- That's exactly right. A dislocated lens can be more than a nuisance; if it slides far enough forward, it may seriously injure the cornea.

- Well, it's a good thing that I'm afraid of roller coasters! Thanks for the fascinating report.