

2.16

Presenter: 2.16. Lesson 2.8. Learning new speaking skills: Repairing communication

Exercise A2. Listen, check and practise.

Voice: a. accept
b. accident
c. adopt
d. institute
e. inventor
f. standard
g. system
h. worldwide

2.17

Presenter: 2.17. Exercise B3. Listen, check and practise.

Voice: a. He was born in a small town near Paris.
b. He wasn't blind from birth.
c. He left normal school three years later.
d. He invented a system of reading.
e. He became a teacher at his old school.
f. He died in Paris in 1852.

2.18

Presenter: 2.18. Exercise C3. Listen to the extract. Check your answers.

Voice A: He was playing with an awl when he hit his eye with the tool.
Voice B: Sorry. What's a nawl?
Voice A: It's not a nawl. It's an awl.
Voice C: I don't understand. Was he blinded in both eyes at once?
Voice A: No. He damaged his right eye and then his left eye got infected.
Voice B: That's dreadful!
Voice A: Yes, it is. Anyway, where was I?
Voice B: I can't remember.
Voice C: I've forgotten, too.
Voice B: Oh, yes. You were talking about the accident.
Voice A: That's right.

2.19

Presenter: 2.19. Pronunciation Check. Listen and copy the linking and suppressing.

Voice A: He was blinded in an accident.
It's a pointed tool.

2.20

Presenter: 2.20. Lesson 2.9. Grammar for speaking: Using the past continuous

Grammar box 7. Listen to the sentences in the tables.

Voice: Braille was playing with an awl when he hit his eye.
When he hit his eye, he damaged it.
While the children were studying at the institute, they learnt a system of reading.

3.1

Presenter: 3.1. Theme 3: Media and advertising
Lesson 3.1. Vocabulary for listening: Violence in stories for children

Exercise B1. Listen to part of a talk about fairy tales. Answer the questions.

Lecturer: So, as we have heard, psychologists say that young children need to experience fear. Fairy tales, like Little Red Riding Hood, bring fear into the child's life. Fairy tales were very violent, originally. People were eaten, burnt in an oven, poisoned. The violence is often against children or young people – think of Hansel and Gretel, and Goldilocks. People are aggressive. Even animals are aggressive – the Father Bear in the Goldilocks story deals with Goldilocks with aggression. In the 18th century,

many fairy tales ended with the violent act. Initially, in the Little Red Riding Hood story, the weak people died – the girl and the old lady – and the wolf went free. Later, the girl is rescued but the old lady and the wolf die.

Nowadays, extreme violence is banned in fairy tales – people are not allowed to be hurt. Even animals are safe from harm. The violence and aggression have been toned down in recent years. So, in Little Red Riding Hood now, the old lady is put in a cupboard, the girl is rescued and the wolf escapes. Some people say that the message of this fairy tale has also changed, as a result. Originally, it was a story with an important message for young women. It said: *Be careful of men. They may not be what they seem to be.* They may be wolves. Now the message of the story for children is much simpler. It is just: *Don't speak to strangers.* Perhaps there is a message for adults, incidentally. *Always supervise your children when they are young. Do not send them off on their own to do chores for you.* Some people say this is dumbing down – in other words, taking a complex idea and making it so simple that it is not useful.

3.2

Presenter: 3.2. Exercise B2. Listen to part of the talk again. Number each word from the list on the right as you hear it.

[REPEAT OF SCRIPT FROM 3.1]

3.3

Presenter: 3.3. Exercise B4. Listen and check your answers.

Lecturer:

- a. Young children need to experience fear.
- b. Fairy tales were very violent, originally.
- c. The violence is often against children or young people.
- d. The Father Bear in the Goldilocks story deals with Goldilocks with aggression.
- e. Initially, in the Little Red Riding Hood story, the weak people died.
- f. Nowadays, extreme violence is banned in fairy tales.
- g. The violence and aggression have been toned down in recent years.
- h. Some people say that the message has changed, as a result.
- i. Now the message of the story for children is: *Don't speak to strangers.*
- j. Perhaps there is a message for adults too, incidentally.
- k. *Always supervise your children when they are young.*
- l. Some people say this is dumbing down – in other words, taking a complex idea and making it so simple that it is not useful.

3.4

Presenter: 3.4. Lesson 3.2. Real-time listening: Violence on television

Exercise A1. Listen to statements about television from adults and children.

Teacher:

Violent television produces violent children. I see it every day at school.

Dad:

When the kids are watching television, they're not getting under my feet.

Mum:

I think my children learn a lot from television.

Child:

I'm not allowed to watch the best programmes. All my friends are.

Adult:

Some children are just naturally violent. I have to deal with it on a daily basis, in the centre of town.

Teenager:

Obviously, children know the difference between TV and the real world.

3.5 DVD 3.A

Lecturer:

Today, we're going to look at television – well, not look at it, actually. Talk about it. Looking at it could be a problem, as we shall see. In particular, we are going to talk about children's television – at least, children's television in the United States and Britain. Television is a powerful force. I think everybody agrees about that. But a powerful force for what? Let's see what people say. Now, I'm not here to tell you what I think, but it will probably become obvious as we go along.

Let's start with some facts. Firstly, children all over the world watch a lot of television. For example, in the US, a young child spends an average of 28 hours per week watching television. That's four hours a day, of course, which is a very high proportion of their free time. The second fact is this. Nobody can deny that children see a lot of violence on television. Researchers have calculated that a 12-year-old American child has witnessed over 8,000 fictional murders on television, and probably quite a few real ones as well, on news programmes. Yes, that's right. Eight *thousand*. According to research by Huesmann and others, reported in the book *Aggressive Behavior* – it's on your reading list – children become so used to seeing aggression as a response to conflict, that they *predict* that an adult will respond to conflict with aggression. Oh, I should say, that is by the age of eight. Just think about that for a minute. Parents keep telling them not to fight, and saying things like 'Violence solves nothing,' and then the children go and watch television and see that it is the only solution in most cases.

In fact, children's programmes are actually more violent than adult programmes. That's quite astonishing, isn't it? Research suggests there is five times more violence during children's programmes than during prime-time TV. So children watch a lot of television and see a lot of violence. This brings us to a simple proposition. Watching TV violence is a bad thing and has bad consequences. If children see a lot of violence, you expect them to behave violently, don't you? But is that proposition actually correct?

Now, I accept that children have to experience fear, and learn how to deal with it. Clearly, this is why we have fairy tales, which are full of murders, kidnappings and violent acts. I agree that these stories are just as violent as kids' TV programmes. Just think of Hansel and Gretel, who push the witch into the bread oven and kill her. Or Little Red Riding Hood, in which Grandma is eaten by the wolf and then cut from his stomach, in some versions of the story at least. Fairy tales are very old and presumably perform a useful function in education, so this is a very powerful argument.

But we must take into account several factors. Firstly, children are visual learners, and television is a visual medium. It actually *shows* the violence, whereas fairy tales *talk* about it. There is a big difference. Also, most fairy tales are initially told to a child by a parent. So the parent has a chance to mediate the experience for the child – in other words, to tone it down, if they think the child will not be able to cope with the events as written. Actually, that's an interesting word – *mediate*. It comes from *media*, of course. The parent is the medium by which the child receives the story, and he or she can change the story if necessary. But television is a very different medium. It is unvarying. It does not change to suit the viewer, even if the viewer is eight years old, alone with the television in the sitting room and terrified.

OK. So, that's the first point. Children are visual learners. Secondly, and it is related to the first point, children model behaviour of other people – in other words, they copy what they see. They copy the hero in a television programme, and the problem is, that hero often uses violence to resolve a conflict. Comic book superheroes do not have great intellectual powers. You have probably noticed. Superman is not a PhD in Psychology. The X Men do not have degrees in Philosophy or Economics. They do not solve a problem by thinking about it. They use violence – in many cases, ridiculous, excessive violence, like throwing a train at a villain or creating an earthquake. Children model behaviour – it is what they do – and they model some of their behaviour in the playground on their cartoon heroes and superheroes. When they are older, they use real violence to resolve conflict.

Television executives, of course, deny being responsible for real-life violence in society. Sometimes they say: *It's true that there is violence in some of our children's programmes. But we do not show people dying in our programmes for children.* It's true. In most cases, when a baddie is hit by a train or blown up by a booby-trap mine, he flies through the air, and then gets up and runs away. But what message does this send to the child, watching on his or her own? This says: *Violence solves the problem, but it does not really hurt the victim.* In many ways, this is worse than showing the real effects of being hit by a train. Just moving away from our subject for a moment, a well-known news reporter in Britain, Kate Adie, recently made the point that if news programmes showed the real effect of war, rather than distant shots of bombs falling and exploding, people would see the true horror of war and be much more careful about starting conflicts. Anyway, what was I talking about? Ah, yes. Violence causes pain – but you wouldn't know it from watching children's television.

What should we do about this issue? Dr Jerome Singer is a professor of Psychology at Yale University. He makes a very interesting point. He says that television is like a stranger in your house. This stranger is teaching your kids all sorts of bad behaviour while you are in another room, or distracted by daily chores. Would you invite a real stranger into your house and leave them alone with your children? Perhaps you should have the same attitude to unsupervised television. Actually, he also makes the point that this stranger in the corner is trying to sell your kids junk food and high-sugar-content sweets while you are not there, but that's another matter entirely. So I guess what Dr Singer is saying is that we should stop children watching certain types of programme, and we should not use television as an unpaid childminder. We shouldn't let young children watch TV unsupervised. I have two children and I remember letting them watch television on their own when they were very young. I really regret doing that now, but anyway ...

Of course, we must consider the counter-arguments. Some people say if we don't allow our children to watch popular TV programmes – by popular, I mean violent – then they will not be able to socialize with their friends. Again, it's a powerful argument. We know that generally people want to conform, and this impulse is even more powerful in children and teenagers. But actually, research shows that children who spend a higher than average amount of time watching violent programmes are *less* popular than other children. This finding again comes from the Huesmann research – it's on your handout. Huesmann and Miller (1994). Incidentally, they also found that those same children – the ones who watch a higher than average amount of violent programmes – are more likely to commit aggressive acts. They are also more likely to get into trouble with the authorities.

OK, finally ... We've talked of ideas and theories. What about the research studies? You can look up all the details for yourselves, but, basically, the vast majority concluded that violent television promotes violence. In fact, according to the American Medical Association, out of 3,000 studies, 2,888 come to this conclusion. For example, Berkovitz carried out a laboratory experiment with university students in 1969. The study involved participants watching violent films to see if they acted more violently than the control group. Parke et. al. worked with young offenders in an institution. That was in 1977. The result was similar to Berkovitz. Williams did a study with 6- to 11-year-olds in Canada. This is an interesting study, actually. The researcher looked at the impact of television on a community which did not have television before. The introduction of TV led to a significant increase in aggression in the community. And on the other side? Well, nothing really, although there is one well-known study – this was Charlton et. al., 1999 – which looked at the introduction of television on the island of St Helena. There, results were not significant. There was no increase in aggression.

OK. So that's it from me. Over to you. Any questions?

3.6

Presenter: 3.6. Lesson 3.3. Learning new listening skills: The concessive argument structure

Exercise A3. Listen and check your ideas.

Lecturer:

- But we must take into account several factors.
- Fairy tales are initially told to a child by a parent.
- Nobody can deny that young children see a lot of violence.

- d. Of course, there are counter-arguments.
- e. There was no increase in aggression.
- f. These children are more likely to get into trouble with the authorities.

3.7

Presenter: **3.7. Exercise B1. Listen to part of the lecture again. How does the lecturer introduce the counter-argument?**

Lecturer: *[fade in]* Watching TV violence is a bad thing and has bad consequences. If children see a lot of violence, you expect them to behave violently, don't you? But is that proposition actually correct?

Now, I accept that children have to experience fear, and learn how to deal with it. Clearly, this is why we have fairy tales, which are full of murders, kidnappings and violent acts. I agree that these stories are just as violent as kids' TV programmes. Just think of Hansel and Gretel, who push the witch into the bread oven and kill her. Or Little Red Riding Hood, in which Grandma is eaten by the wolf and then cut from his stomach, in some versions of the story at least. Fairy tales are very old and presumably perform a useful function in education, so this is a very powerful argument.

But we must take into account several factors. *[fade out]*

3.8

Presenter: **3.8. Exercise C. Listen to sections from three lectures. What's the lecturer's argument in each case? What counter-arguments does he or she concede?**

Lecture 1: Friendship in the 21st century

Lecturer 1: I'm here today to talk about friendship. Clearly, it's as old as human life on Earth. But there is evidence that it is changing for this new generation. Friendship used to mean meeting people, talking to them face to face, doing things together. Surely that is real friendship? Well, not according to some sociologists. They say that virtual friends are as real as physical friends. In fact, research in America suggests that some children do not distinguish between the two kinds of friend at all. I am not sure that this is a good thing. In my view, having friends involves meeting people face to face.

OK. I accept that online acquaintances serve a purpose. I agree that it is very nice to be able to exchange information with people in different towns, even different countries and continents. Obviously, a lot of people get a lot of benefit from virtual relationships. But people who you only meet online are not friends in the true sense of the word. Friendship means meeting people, talking to them face to face, doing things together.

Lecture 2: Time management

Lecturer 2: We've talked a lot about time management today. Let me end with a key point. It's called the Work–Life Balance. It means simply, you must balance your work and your social life. Now, of course, you have to keep up-to-date with your current work. Clearly, you must not get behind with projects and assignments because it is so much harder to manage your time if you have previous work to do as well as current. And I accept that work comes first a lot of the time.

But you must make sure you save enough of your time and your energy for your friends and your family. If you don't, you will find one day you have a wonderful job and a terrible life.

Lecture 3: Going green

Lecturer 3: I want to finish talking about environmental projects with a personal plea. Be careful about making so-called green decisions. The environment is a very complex place. It's absolutely true that we can make a big difference if every one of us makes a number of small changes to the way we live. It's right to turn down the thermostat on your central heating. Of course, you should save energy by switching off lights when you leave a room, and not leaving appliances on standby for hours and hours. But sometimes things are more complex than they seem. For example, growing tomatoes in Spain and shipping them to the UK uses less energy than growing them in greenhouses in the UK. So buying local produce may not be the greenest option.

3.9

Presenter: **3.9. Pronunciation Check. Listen to the pronunciation of each phrase. Can you hear the extra sound?**

Voice: a twelve-year-old
Grandma is eaten
used to aggression
you expect the average child
be able to cope

3.10

Presenter: **3.10. Skills Check. Listen. What other words and phrases can you use in place of each word in italics?**

Voice: I accept that children have to experience fear.
It's true that children have to learn how to deal with fear.
Clearly, this is why we have fairy tales.
I agree that these stories are just as violent as kids' TV programmes.
It's a fact that Hansel and Gretel are violent.
Obviously there is violence in Little Red Riding Hood.
I realize that fairy tales perform a useful function in education.
Of course, this is a very powerful argument.

3.11

Presenter: **3.11. Lesson 3.4. Grammar for listening: verb + gerund; verb + *that*. Grammar box 10.**

Voice: Children are used to seeing aggression.
Parents keep telling them not to fight.
TV executives deny being responsible for real-life violence.
Children spend a lot of time watching television on their own.
We should stop TV companies broadcasting violent children's programmes.
I recall my mother telling me fairy stories.

3.12

Presenter: **3.12. Exercise A. Listen to some sentences. Number the gerund you hear in each case.**

Voice 1: I remember using the television as a childminder.
Voice 2: I regret doing it now.
Voice 3: Have you finished reading the article about TV habits?
Voice 4: How can we prevent children watching too much television?
Voice 5: My lecturer suggested controlling TV for young children.
Voice 6: Dr Singer proposed stopping young children from watching TV on their own.
Voice 7: Do you mind your children seeing violence on TV?
Voice 8: I really resent people telling me how to bring up my children.
Voice 9: The TV executive defended producing violent cartoons for children.

3.13

Presenter: **3.13. Grammar box 11.**

Voice: I accept that children need to experience fear.
Research suggests that children's programmes are more violent than adult TV.
Parke et. al. concluded that there was a significant increase in aggression.

3.14

Presenter: **3.14. Exercise B. Listen to some sentences. Number the function of the sentence in each case.**

Voice: 1. I predict that the problem will get worse.
2. I imagine that you have all seen violent children's programmes.
3. Researchers have calculated that children spend more time watching television than attending school.
4. Newton demonstrated that each force has an equal and opposite force.
5. Dr Singer said that TV should be treated as a stranger.
6. Doctors suspect that the disease started in chickens.
7. I recognize that many programmes are educational.
8. The results suggested that there was a serious problem.
9. People thought that the Earth was flat.

3.15

Presenter: 3.15. Exercise C. Listen to the start of some sentences. What do you expect to hear next – gerund or *that*?

- Voices:
1. I realize ...
 2. The lecturer dislikes ...
 3. Doctors suspect ...
 4. Dr Singer said ...
 5. Have you finished ...?
 6. People thought ...
 7. How can we prevent children ...?
 8. I imagine ...
 9. I predict ...
 10. Do you mind your children ...?
 11. Researchers have calculated ...
 12. I really resent people ...
 13. I recognize ...
 14. I remember ...
 15. Newton demonstrated ...
 16. The results suggested ...

3.16

Presenter: 3.16. Lesson 3.5. Applying new listening skills: Let's ban television!

Exercise A. Listen to the stressed syllables from each word or phrase. Number the correct word in each case.

- Voice:
1. cour
 2. gree
 3. rea
 4. stand
 5. ob
 6. clear
 7. ev
 8. rect

3.17 DVD 3.B

Guest speaker: I'm here today to ask for the impossible. I want you all to stop watching television. I'm not asking this because television programmes are bad, although that is a small part of the argument. I'm asking this because *television* is bad – bad for physical health, bad for mental health, bad for critical thinking and bad for good government. Where does this idea come from? In 1978, a man called Jerry Mander wrote a book called *Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television*. Let's have a look at each of those arguments.

OK. So ... What's the first argument against television? It is that television reduces everything to very simple messages. Television is not a good medium for complex ideas. You need books for that. So instead, it gives us very simple ideas and repeats them again and again. There is only a small number of programmes which convey real information about the world, but those programmes are split into many small sections, with adverts in between, and, at the beginning of each section, the previous sections are quickly recapped. This is not the way to put across complex ideas. AC Nielsen, an organization that monitors television output, estimates that an average American child spends 900 hours a year at school, and 1,500 hours watching television. Incidentally, most of the statistics in this lecture are from Nielsen. Check them out on Nielsen.com. Anyway, I accept that television brings the world into your living room. I realize that television occasionally inspires children to learn something, do something, become something. And of course there are programmes about other countries, about the natural world and about history. But in most cases, the information is very limited.

Mander said that information is turned into repeated slogans. For example, foreign countries are 'exotic or scary'. Animals are 'furry or scary'. History is a few very famous events, particularly the Second World War, because they have lots of film of that historic event. On average, people in the United States see 20,000 adverts a year. People can recognize thousands of brands but only a few countries on the world map, a few plants, birds and trees. Television brings the world into our living rooms but it stops us having the time to go out and experience it for ourselves. Americans may think they know about the world because they have seen it on TV, but researchers have calculated that more than 75 per cent of Americans don't even own a passport. In the end, most people only know the world that is brought to them by television. Celebrity and sport, mindless quiz shows and reality shows – which aren't anything like reality – are more important than the environment and politics. Of course, people need to relax, and television is a wonderful way of unwinding. But the quality of programmes is getting worse and worse – we call it 'dumbing down' in Britain ... and we'll come back to this later.

3.18 DVD 3.C

Guest speaker: The second argument concerns the control of television. The medium reaches millions of people in each country, but only a small number of people in each case – perhaps only one person – controls *all* of the broadcast output. That puts him – it is always a man – in the position of a dictator. According to *freepress.net*, six companies own nearly all of the television output in the United States. In many cases, they own the complete production and broadcasting process. The same six companies own large percentages of television output in many other countries in the Western world. Obviously, democratic countries have regulators who try to control the controllers. I agree that there are often laws which try to ensure some competition and some balance in news reporting. But television companies and their owners have become more powerful in many cases than the lawmakers in many countries. People watch Fox News – they don't look for news balance on a number of different channels.

The third argument involves the effect of television upon individual minds and bodies. Firstly, minds. The medium is addictive. According to psychologists, there are a number of measures of *dependency*, a mental health condition. If a person reports that two of the measures apply to them for a particular item – like drugs, or alcohol, or gambling – they are suffering from a clinical condition. They are dependent on the item. Just think about your use of television. Firstly, do you use it as a sedative – to wind down at the end of a stressful day? Secondly, do you use it indiscriminately – do you plan your viewing, or do you channel hop? Do you find there is nothing interesting on, but keep watching anyway? Thirdly, do you have control over your viewing – or do you just do it? The fourth measure is: Do you feel angry that you have wasted your time watching it? Number 5: Are you upset if you are not able to watch – because the hotel room doesn't have a television, for example? As I said, if you answered yes to two or more of those, you are dependent on television.

The problem is, watching television is largely a solitary occupation. I realize that, in a golden age, television brought the family together in one room. Everyone sat down together and watched the same programme, discussed it, laughed or cried at it. My parents recall watching television with their parents. But now many houses have three, four, five televisions. For example, 66 per cent of Americans have three or more televisions so, in most cases, each person is on their own, in a different room, watching a different, probably pointless programme. Research shows that, on average, parents spend 1,680 minutes a week watching television, and 3.5 minutes having meaningful conversations with their children. This must have an effect on the relationship between children and parents. And research indicates that it does. In a recent survey, 54 per cent of American children said they preferred the TV to their father.

So that's minds. What about bodies? Well, during their 28 hours per week watching television, children see a lot of adverts. Let's just think about one horrific statistic. In an average four-hour programme of Saturday morning cartoons, American children see 200 adverts for junk food. Is this why 11 per cent of 6- to 17-year-olds in the US are now obese – double the figure 20 years ago? Oh, and of course, all those beautiful people on television have a bad effect too. Seventy-five per cent of American women think that they are too fat. Of course, if they only eat the junk food from the adverts, it might be true.

Finally, the fourth argument claims that television has no *democratic* potential. In other words, it is impossible for ordinary people to become involved. Obviously, ordinary people are *on* television all the time now, as participants, in silly quiz shows and talent contests. Of course, they are asked their opinions in the street, and they are interviewed after a crime or an accident. But they cannot contribute to the *making* of programmes, or the decision-making on the content of programmes. I realize that there is community television in some areas but this is a tiny, tiny percentage of the total output, which nobody watches anyway.

OK. So, to sum up ... Mander had four arguments against television. He believed that television reduces everything to simple messages in a complex world. He thought that a small number of people controlled television and therefore could control people. He said that television was bad for minds and bad for bodies. And finally, he maintained that television was bad for democracy – the people could not get involved. What do you think? Thank you very much.

3.19

Presenter: 3.19. Exercise E2. Listen and check.

- Voice:
- AC Nielsen estimates that an American child spend 900 hours a year at school and 1,500 hours watching television.
 - On average, people in the States see 20,000 adverts a year.
 - Researchers have calculated that 75 per cent of Americans don't own a passport.
 - Only six companies own the majority of television output in the United States, and in large parts of the Western world.
 - Sixty-six per cent of Americans have three or more televisions.
 - On average, an American parent spends 1,680 minutes a week watching television and 3.5 minutes having a meaningful conversation with their children.
 - In a survey, 54 per cent of American children said they preferred television to their father.
 - In the average four-hour programme of Saturday morning cartoons, children see 200 adverts for junk food.
 - In the US, 11 per cent of 7- to 17-year-olds are obese.
 - Seventy-five per cent of American women believe they are too fat.

3.20

Presenter: 3.20. Lesson 3.6. Vocabulary for speaking: Selling a product

Exercise A2. Listen to a group of students doing the first choice in the assignment. Complete the advertising brief.

Student A: So, how are we going to sell this product?
Student B: We could use a star from the movies ... or is that too expensive?
Student C: Yes, I think so. What about a TV personality, someone from sports television – Elliot Horn?
Student A: OK. Do we ask him to present the advert?
Student B: No, just to endorse it. You know, he says: 'I always drive Hitoshi,' or something like that.
Student C: Is that the slogan?
Student B: No, that's the endorsement. We need something catchy for the slogan.
Student C: Yes, something that will appeal to the target market. What is the audience, by the way?
Student B: It says here: 'Young men' ... and sporty women, perhaps?
Student A: OK. It's a convertible, right? And a sports car? So what about 'Get in the open air ... fast!'
Student B: Maybe ... Shall we have a special offer of some sort?
Student A: There's one already. The manufacturers will pay the VAT if you order before 31st July.
Student C: That's fantastic!
Student A: But we should have a competition, too. Maybe get them to register for a test drive to enter, then we get their names and e-mail addresses for future marketing.
Student C: What's the prize? A brand new ZX, I suppose.
Student B: The car will be released on 1st August, by the way.
Student C: So what's the main selling point?
Student B: Value for money. It's a sports car but they say it does 80 kilometres to the litre.
Student A: They're exaggerating, of course.
Student B: Yes, but the tests show that it's very economical.

3.21

Presenter: 3.21. Exercise B2. Listen and check.

Voice: a. endorse, order, audience, August, money, sports
b. appeal, release, litre, competition, e-mail, need
c. slogan, show, product, offer, suppose, economical
d. exaggerate, catchy, value, star, personality, address

3.22

Presenter: 3.22. Exercise C2. Listen and check.

Voice A: So, how are we going to sell this product?
Voice B: We could use a star from the movies.
Voice A: Do we ask him to present the advert?
Voice B: No, just to endorse it.
Voice A: We need something catchy for the slogan.
Voice B: Yes, something that will appeal to the target market.

Voice A: Shall we have a special offer of some sort?
Voice B: There's one already.
Voice A: We should have a competition, too.
Voice B: What's the prize?
Voice A: What's the main selling point?
Voice B: I think it's 'value for money'.

3.23

Presenter: 3.23. Lesson 3.7. Real-time speaking: Jingles, tag lines, punchlines and other tricks

Exercise B3. Listen to some students and complete the information about the second method.

Tutor: So, I hope you all know about TV ads now, and you've got lots of examples of TV advertising to share with us today.
Joe: OK. Um. I worked with Sarah on this research. We chose BOGOF, which is Buy One, Get One Free.
Student 1: Sorry. I don't understand.
Joe: What I'm saying is, it's the first letter of each one. Buy One, Get One Free.
Student 1: Oh, I see.
Joe: So, customers who buy a packet of biscuits, for example, get another packet free.
Sarah: The advertisers who use this method usually start with the normal price, then give the offer. They emphasize the value for money.
Student 2: So what's the science behind this method?

Sarah: I'm just coming to that. Apparently, people don't want cheap products. They want expensive products cheaply.
 Student 3: Did you find any good examples of BOGOF on TV at the moment? We couldn't find any.
 Sarah: Sorry. Can I deal with that in a second? So they pay full price for one product and get the second one free. And, um ... ah. I've forgotten what I was going to say.
 Student 3: You were going to give us examples on TV at the moment.
 Sarah: Oh, yes. There's an advert which uses BOGOF for Superbuy supermarkets. Twenty products which are basics are in the promotion, like bread and milk.
 Student 2: But going back to Joe's example for a minute. BOGOF is the same as half price, isn't it? You get two of them for the price of one. So why don't they just say 'Get these biscuits half price'?
 Joe: Yes, I wondered about that too. So I did a bit more research. Psychologists say that the word *free* is very powerful, more powerful than *half price*.
 Student 3: So BOGOF sells more products than 'Get one half price'?
 Joe: Apparently, it does.
 Student 3: That's weird.
 Joe: Not really. As Sarah has said, people want something for nothing.
 Student 3: I still think they're the same thing.
 Joe: Perhaps you're right.
 Student 4: I don't know if this is relevant, but I read that supermarkets use BOGOF with products that are loss-leaders.
 Tutor: Yes, that's a good point.
 Student 5: Sorry I'm late!
 Tutor: That's OK. We're talking about adverts that use BOGOF. We've discussed customers who want free things. The example is the Superbuys campaign.
 Student 5: Right. Has anyone mentioned that BOGOF products are often loss-leaders?
 Tutor: Yes, we've just talked about that.
 Joe: That's it, really.
 Sarah: Yes. That's what we found.

3.24

Presenter: **3.24. Exercise C2. Listen to some expressions from the extracts. Repeat, copying the stress and intonation.**

Voice: I worked with Sarah on this research.
 We chose BOGOF, which means Buy One, Get One Free.
 Sorry. I don't understand. Is it a word?
 I still don't get what you mean.
 What I'm saying is, it's the first letter of each word. Buy One, Get One Free.
 Apparently, people don't want cheap products.
 I'm just coming to that.
 Sorry. Can I deal with that in a second?
 And, um, ah. I've forgotten what I was going to say.
 You were going to give us examples on TV at the moment.

3.25

Presenter: **3.25. Everyday English: Complaining**

Exercise B1. Listen to the conversations below. What is the complaint in each case?

Conversation 1.

Voice A: Hello, reception.
 Voice B: Ah, yes. This is Mr Adams in Room 306.
 Voice A: Yes, Mr Adams. How may I help you?
 Voice B: I'm afraid the air conditioning isn't working.
 Voice A: Have you tried changing the thermostat?
 Voice B: Yes, it doesn't do anything.
 Voice A: OK. I'll send someone up.
 Voice B: Thank you.

Presenter: **Conversation 2.**

Voice A: Excuse me.
 Voice B: Yes, madam?
 Voice A: Well, we have been waiting a long time.
 Voice B: I'm sorry. Have you ordered yet?
 Voice A: No. We haven't even seen the menu.
 Voice B: OK. Sorry. Here you are.
 Voice A: Thanks.
 Voice B: Now, what would you like?
 Voice A: Could you give us a moment?
 Voice B: Oh, yes. Sorry.

Presenter:

Conversation 3.

Voice A: Can I help you?
Voice B: I hope so. I bought this iPod here a few days ago but when I unpacked it, I found the screen was cracked. See?
Voice A: Oh, dear. OK, so have you got the receipt?
Voice B: No, I think I've lost it.
Voice A: Well, we can replace the item but I'm afraid we can't give you a refund.
Voice B: No, that's OK. I want a replacement.
Voice A: Right. Just give me a moment. I'll get the form.
Voice B: Thanks.

3.26

Presenter:

3.26. Learning new speaking skills: Linking to a previous speaker

Exercise A3. Listen, check and practise.

Voice: a. BOGOF products are often loss-leaders.
b. I worked with Sarah on this research.
c. It's on TV at the moment.
d. So I did a bit more research.
e. The word *free* is very powerful.
f. You get two of them.

3.27

Presenter:

3.27. Exercise C. Listen to some sentences about information in this course so far.

Voice: 1. Visual learners don't like noise.
2. Whales are the largest mammals on Earth.
3. Carbon is released by trees at night.
4. Braille was not allowed to teach his system.
5. The Ogallala Aquifer will be dry in 200 years.
6. Aural learners need to talk about information.
7. Fleming was studying bacteria at the time.
8. Rote learning is useful for lists of things.
9. British sign language is different from American sign language.
10. The Indian government may privatize water supply.

3.28

Presenter:

3.28. Pronunciation Check. Listen and copy the intrusive sounds.

Voice: They are all in the promotion.
They are all in the promotion.
Have you all looked at the examples?
Have you all looked at the examples?

3.29

Presenter:

3.29. Skills Check. Listen to some sentences with linking expressions.

Voice: As Joe has said, advertisers sometimes use bribes.
Taking up Sarah's point, tag lines are very important.
Going back to Joe's point, jingles sell products.
Returning to Sarah's point, people believe big lies.
I don't know if this is relevant, but the word *free* is very powerful.
I'm not sure if this is related, but advertisers use bribes a lot to sell children's products.
Has anyone mentioned that viral advertising is very important nowadays?

3.30

Presenter:

3.30. Lesson 3.9. Grammar for speaking: Noun phrases with relative clauses

Grammar box 12. Listen to the sentences. Where do the speakers pause?

Voice: We are talking about adverts which use BOGOF.
Adverts are targeted at people who might buy the product.

3.31

Presenter: 3.31. Exercise A. Listen and check.

- Voice:
- There are many ads which use BOGOF.
 - A jingle is a tune which is memorable.
 - A tag line is a slogan which contains the name of the product.
 - A big name is a person who is famous for movies, sport or television.
 - A big name ad contains a personality who endorses the product.
 - A bribe is money which encourages someone to do something.
 - A punchline is an ending which is funny and makes people laugh.
 - Ads with punchlines have a set-up which prepares people for a particular ending.
 - A narrative is a story which is usually in many episodes.
 - People may like the characters who appear in narrative ads.

3.32

Presenter: 3.32. Grammar box 13. Listen to the sentences. Where does the speaker pause?

- Voice:
- Customers who buy a packet of biscuits get another packet free.
Twenty products which are basics are in the promotion.

3.33

Presenter: 3.33. Exercise B2. Listen and check your ideas.

- Voices:
- Advertisers who use BOGOF start the advert with the normal price.
 - People who are aural learners need to hear new information.
 - Farmers in the States who use irrigation are worried about the future.
 - A third of the water which is used for irrigation comes from the Ogallala Aquifer.
 - People who apologize a lot often give a reason for their actions.

4.1

Presenter: 4.1. Theme 4: Living life to the full
Lesson 4.1. Vocabulary for listening: Cells, tissues and organs

Exercise A1. Listen and write the number of each word in the correct place on the diagram.

- Voice:
- ankle
 - arm
 - chest
 - elbow
 - foot
 - hand
 - hip
 - knee
 - neck
 - ribs
 - shoulder
 - thigh
 - wrist
 - head

4.2

Presenter: 4.2. Exercise C1. Listen to part of a lecture about physiology. When the lecturer stops, number the next word.

- Lecturer:
- OK. So first let's look at the levels of organization that make up the human ...
 - At the lowest level, we have the cell. This is the smallest unit of life and every part of the body is composed of ...
 - These cells can take in nutrients, convert nutrients to energy or carry out specialized ...
 - Cells are grouped into tissues. Each kind of tissue is designed for a particular ...
 - For example, muscular tissue is able to contract while nervous tissue conducts ...
 - At the next level, some tissues combine to achieve a particular objective. These tissues are called organs. For example, the stomach, the lungs and the ...
 - At an even higher level of organization, we have organ ...
 - In each system, different organs work together – for example, the mouth, the stomach, the small intestine and the large intestine all play a role in ...
 - The highest level is a group of organs working ...
 - Groups of organs in the same body are called organisms. For example, humans, animals and ...