PINIARIS - AUDIOSCRIPT TEST 2

PART 1

1. - Whatcha got there? Mind if I take a look?

- Oh, this? It's just a bunch of old letters. But they're personal.

- Have it your way.

1. - Are you coming or not?

- Not me. I don't like the looks of that old house.

1. - That new CD wasn't at all what I was expecting.

- Yes, but at least the group's trying different things.

1. - Had Mark ever been out of the country before?

- As far as I know, never.

- It'll be interesting to hear his impressions.

1. - We keep running into each other.

- Isn't it odd? Maybe it's fate.

1. - If you're so miserable, why don't you give in your notice?

- If only I could.

- Well, you're the boss. You'll know when it's time.

1. - Are you sure I won't be putting you out?

- Of course not. Don't even give it a second thought.

1. - Shouldn't we put Sue in the picture?

- Well, I suppose she deserves that much.

1. - We should never've taken Ed's advice about this hotel.

- I'd like to wring his neck! Guess we'll just hafta make do for tonight.

1. - Sorry. I didn't catch that.

- 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 10:00 to 6:00 on the weekends.

1. - Have you done anything about that car you were interested in?

- Well, I read through some brochures and magazines, but I haven't been to the showroom yet.

- Why are you putting it off?

- Well, money's a bit tight right now .But I guess a test drive can't hurt.

1. - How'd the meeting go today?

- The boss was called away on business so we've called it off till next week.

1. - Have you bought Mary's gift yet?

- Frank was supposed to do it. I'm seeing him tonight.

1. - Was the restaurant any good?

- Not bad, but not as good as the Italian one we ate at last week.

1. - Shopping online is really easy.

- I hate having to pay all those shipping costs, though.

- I agree, but considering how much it costs to drive back and forth to the mall, I'd say it comes out just about the same. And when you consider having to stand in line, well, for me, there's just no contest.

1. - Are you going to the party on Saturday night?

- I don't see how I can. My finals start on Monday.

1. - If it hadn't rained yesterday, we would've gone camping.

- Well, what about next weekend?

- Not a chance. Come rain or shine, We'll be spending it at my mother-in-law's.

PART 2

1. - Haven't you stayed long enough?
2. - Who's gonna be in charge while you're gone?
3. - Isn't that just like Gwen to forget her keys?
4. - Don't you think you were a bit hard on Gary?
5. - What's the big deal of I go out tomorrow night?
6. - How can you tell when it's about to rain?
7. - I don't understand. Why am I the one in hot water?
8. - Can't you just make an exception in this case? I simply left my ID at home.
9. - You will visit Aaron in Texas, won't you?
10. - Is there anything else you haven't told me about what happened?
11. - Can you believe the nerve of that waiter?
12. - Have you got a handle on all that paperwork yet?
13. - Did Carol end up with the shoes she wanted?
14. - Wouldn't you rather stay in tonight?
15. - Do you have any idea where we might find a decent meal?
16. - What he's trying to say?
17. - Wouldn't you rather have been a doctor?
18. - When was it that you said you'd be away?

PART 3

*Segment 1*

* We live on a blue planet, two-thirds of which is covered by water. Yet many political forecasters predict that, during the 21st century, shortages of water are going to become a major source of international tension – a cause of social and possibly even military conflict. Here to talk about the problem today is Dr. Jean McDuff, an expert on water management. Dr. McDuff, we're hearing a lot these days about the dwindling water supplies around the world. What's responsible for the problem?
* The sad fact is that we have grossly mismanaged the earth's water supply. Take agriculture, for example, which is by far the biggest use to which water is put. Between 70 and 80 percent of the water withdrawn globally is used to irrigate fields. But irrigation is fantastically wasteful. It is estimated that only 40 percent or so of all irrigation water gets to where it is needed. Most farmers use traditional, very inefficient, methods of irrigation. Modern methods such as drip drip irrigation deliver water exactly where it is needed and in exactly the right amount. But such systems are costly to install; and because water for agriculture is heavily subsidized in many countries, there is no incentive for farmers to economize on the amount of water they use. What's worse, over-irrigation is not only wasteful but potentially damaging for the soil. If soil becomes waterlogged and the water table rises, salts from the deep in the ground are carried to the surface, where they can form a crust when the water evaporates. This salty soil is then infertile – a problem called “salinization”. And that's only irrigation. We also need to consider the problems caused by factory emissions, fertilizer run-off, the draining of wetlands and the building of great dams for hydro-electric power.
* Is anything being done to address these problems?
* Well, the good news is that the paradigm in water management is slowly shifting. In the past, there was often a blind faith in large-scale hydro-engineering projects, which mean the building of massive dams. But there is a sense now that the era of such ventures is at an end. The Three Gorges Dam on the Yangtze River in China has made it clear how controversial and (most of all) impractically expensive such solutions can be. Instead of continuing to engage in such projects, there is now a growing recognition that the answer lies not in finding more water, but in making better use of what we have already. In developed countries, many industries are already recycling the water they need (largely for cooling), rather than discharging it after one round of use. This is in everyone's interest as it lowers and industrial plant's water bill (sometimes by as much as 90 percent). It also reduces the stress on local resources and cuts pollution. Water recycling can also be applied to municipal water use. Instead of regarding sewage as “waste”, for example, it can be transformed into nutrient-rich irrigation water with only relatively light treatment. Seventy percent of the domestic water discharged from communities in Israel is now used for irrigation. “Sewage farming” may sound unappealing, but it makes great ecological sense.
* Do you expect to see any other solutions in the near future? Is there any way that sea water can be used?
* Absolutely, what you're referring to is a process that the experts call desalinization – the removal of salt from sea water. At present, desalinization is very expensive, mainly because it consumes so much energy. Currently, it provides less than 0,2 [zero – point - two] percent of all the water used in the world. But cheap and efficient solar power could, if it becomes feasible, make a big difference.
* Well, that certainly sounds like a hopeful option. Thanks for being with us today.

*Segment 2*

* If you're one of those people who spend the week looking forward to the weekend and then spend the weekend dreading the thought of Monday, the rest of this broadcast should give you even more cause to pull the covers over your head come Monday morning. Our next guest is cardiologist Philip Wright, who is here to tell us a rather curious study that was recently published in *The British Medical Journal.* Dr. Wright, tell us about the study.
* Well, strange as it might sound, the study finds that across all age groups there are significantly more deaths from coronary heart disease on Mondays than on any other day of the week. Scottish researchers brought together their results from Scottish morbidity records gathered between 1986 and 1995. The group most seriously at risk seems to be men and women under 50 who have not previously been hospitalized for heart disease – 20% more of this age group died on Monday than on any other day. What's interesting is that the “die on Monday” trend does not seem to hold true for those who died of coronary heart disease in hospital or for heart patients who had previously been hospitalized. Researchers believe that these groups may be partly protected from sudden cardiac death because they are already under treatment. It may also be that they are more likely to seek medical help at the weekend because they are familiar with the symptoms – sort of a case of “Once bitten, twice shy”, as the saying goes.
* Amazing, is this the only study that has turned up this kind of evidence?
* Actually, no. The study is only the latest in a very long line of research showing that Monday is a dark day for health and happiness. Similar statistics have emerged in the past from other countries such as Russia, Germany, and the United States. On an even more morbid note, Monday has also been shown to be the peak day for suicides, But, as yet, n one knows why.
* Are there any theories floating around that might give us more insight?
* Actually there are, though we don't have hard evidence to back them up yet. One theory regarding Monday heart attacks is that people engage in weekend “binge-drinking” - that is, they drink considerably more over the weekend than they do during the week. As a result, they put extra, often unbearable strain on their hearts, especially when they go into alcohol withdrawal as the week begins. This is supported by the fact that emergency admissions for alcohol-related problems peak on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays. Researchers feel that if there is a link between binge drinking and coronary episodes, it has potentially important public health implications. Certainly it is an area that merits immediate further investigation.
* Is there anything else that might play a role?
* Well, it's also been proposed that the surge of post-weekend work-related stress may be to blame. Several studies lend credence to this possibility in that the “Morbid Monday effect” seems to pertain primarily to the working population.
* Fascinating. It will be interesting to see what further research brings to light. Thank you for being here.

*Segment 3*

* In the final segment of “Talking to the Experts”, we'll be focusing on a rather worrisome development in school science labs across the country. Here to talk to us today is Stephanie Rawlings of the National Association of Science Teachers. Stephanie, there's been a lot of attention in the media recently about the dangers facing students and teachers in school science labs. Can you give us the background?
* Well, what started it off was a horrible accident that occurred during a routine experiment in a high school chemistry class in Genoa, Illinois. One second the teacher was at the front of the lab mixing chemicals and the next an alcohol-fueled fireball shot through the classroom, seriously burning three students in the front row. As the teacher pulled burning jeans off of one of the girls, the rest of the class scrambled for the door, leaving burning backpacks and books behind.
* And from what I've read, this wasn't an isolated event.
* That's right. Some terrible accidents have occurred. In California, for instance, the School Excess Liability Fund reports that they recently paid claims of $1 million and more than $3 million in two cases involving chemistry lab accidents. A settlement is pending in a third involving a girl who was burned over 20 percent of her body. And according to interviews with researchers, school officials and insurance companies, it appears that the stage is set for a significant increase.
* What makes them think that the situation will get worse?
* It all boils down to the fact that schools are trying to meet tough new science education standards that were recently set by the National Academy of Sciences.
* Why has that changed things?
* Well, in the past, most students got their chemistry from textbooks, but now students are spending more time doing experiments in science labs. This is because the standards advocate hands-on, inquiry-based science. And that's where the problems start. Some labs are crowded. Some are rum by teachers with no safety training. And some are in old buildings that are ill-equipped for 21st-century science.
* Has anyone gathered statistics to document the problem?
* Unfortunately, there is no government or private agency that collects official data on this kind of thing, but the state of Iowa, which adopted an early version of the standards more than ten years ago, has done some research and the statistics are telling. In the three school years before the new standards were introduced , schools around the state reported 674 accidents. In the three years following the introduction of the standards, more than a thousand accidents were reported – more than a 30% increase. The number of lawsuits related to these accidents also soared – from 96 in the three years before the standards were set, to 245 in the three years following. My guess is that if accurate statistics were gathered around the country, we'd find the actual numbers would be much, much higher. I hate to say it, but it's the kind of problem nobody wants to face.
* Can anything be done?
* Well, for starters, experts say that almost all of the lab accidents and injuries that we know about could have been prevented with simple safety measures. But a high percentage of science teachers have never had safety training. In North Carolina, for example, a recent study has revealed that more than 70 percent of North Carolina science teachers had never received safety training. Surveys in 17 other states found an average of 55 percent to 65 percent of teachers have not had safety training. So our first priority needs to be providing teachers with the safety training they need. We also need to insure that all labs are provided with the safety equipment they need.
* How do these accidents happen and what can be done to prevent them?
* A typical scenario is that teachers do not have or bother to use an exhaust system. Then they might leave the cap off an alcohol jug or pour too much alcohol into the dishes. In such cases, fumes can build up. When the fumes are exposed to flame, they can create a flash fire.
* So, what you're saying is that if teachers were trained to follow a few simple safety procedures, then fewer accidents might occur.
* Absolutely. For starters, having and using an exhaust system is an absolute must. Injuries can also be minimized if teachers use a plastic shield and require their students to wear goggles. Teachers also need to learn how to store chemicals safely and to know which chemicals can cause dangerous reactions if they accidentally mix or are allowed to sit on the shelf for too long.
* Will teacher training alone make the labs more safe?
* It's a step in the right direction, but other things must also be done, like getting the state and federal governments to become more actively involved. Aside from eye protection requirements, too few laws are aimed specifically at the safety of students, and those that do exist are usually not strictly enforced. Lawmakers can start by passing laws that oblige school labs to undergo regular safety inspections. They can also require that all accidents – no matter how minor – be reported to a centralized agency that will accurately track and report on the problem. This way science educators will be able to learn from the mistakes of their colleagues.
* Thanks, Stephanie. You've certainly given us a lot to think about.