

## **TRANSKRYPCJA NAGRAŃ**

### **Task 1.**

Internships can offer a boost to eager graduates looking to start their careers – but is it fair to ask young people to pay for work experience? We asked a few listeners for their opinions.

#### **Speaker A**

I represent a web-based agency that matches up companies with undergraduates and graduates. We have worked out good contacts with many established businesses, and we pay them to take people on for work experience. Not many companies are willing to cooperate. Let's face it, inexperienced employees can hardly guarantee a high quality of work. Added to which is the decline in productivity that companies have to accept and frequent inspections from either state or university administrations, which is a nuisance. Making graduates pay for an internship sweetens the pill for those firms, and from my point of view, the amount of money involved, about £65 a day, is not much to develop your expertise. Am I wrong?

#### **Speaker B**

I'm sure the practice of paid internships has its advantages, especially for the efficiency of small businesses, but sometimes I wonder if it doesn't close the door in the face of many people. In my case, I studied hard, made good contacts at university, played by the rules and now I need a salary to support myself, not another burden to add to my expenses! During my years at university, I didn't assume that I had to put something aside to finance an internship. And if it really must be that way, the government has to make sure the companies offering paid internships are inspected on a regular basis. That would guarantee that people get what they are paying for. Otherwise, it's highly possible it will become nothing more than a money-making opportunity, especially for small businesses.

#### **Speaker C**

I graduated 10 years ago but even then the competition on the job market was fierce. I realised I had to get work experience first. After a year of trying to get a free placement, eventually I decided to pay for a month of work experience with a company in London. My present job as a financial advisor definitely compensated for the investment in millions! After completing my internship, I quickly got a good job. But not everyone is that lucky. I've heard stories of people paying for an internship and getting very little out of it, or struggling for months to get a contract. Well, a big part of my success story was actually networking and meeting the right people in the different companies I cooperated with while I was an intern. I listed all of them on my CV and I'm sure that was the key element.

*adapted from www.bbc.com*

## Task 2.

### Text 1

*Interviewer:* **The American night has become steadily brighter. In his latest book, Paul Bogard aims to draw attention to the naturally dark night as a landscape in its own right. Paul, how did you get interested in this topic?**

*Paul Bogard:* People take darkness for granted, believing they experience it every night, but they don't. That's one of the reasons I borrowed the Bortle scale for the table of contents in my book. I think John Bortle's point, when he created this tool for measuring the darkness of skies, was that we have no idea what darkness really is. Until the advent of electric light people experienced darkness that would classify as 2 or 3 on the Bortle scale, even in cities. This means the Milky Way was clearly visible without any specialised instruments. It's not the case today. Nowadays we spend nights in what we'd call Class 6 or 7 and the majority of cities would classify as 9, that is the brightest. With so much light pollution, observing the Milky Way with the naked eye is not an option anymore.

*Interviewer:* **For most people darkness seems inherently dangerous, yet you show how the connection between light and security is often a false promise.**

*Paul Bogard:* Historically, that connection is really interesting. The state encouraged light, because officials believed they could control a well-lit city better. Louis XIV, the Sun King, decreed that candles should be hung in the streets. Banishing darkness was a means of demonstrating might. Consequently, as illumination was associated with the power of the state, oil-lamp smashing became a regular thing. There are historical reports that prove that for many Parisians public street lighting stood for tyranny.

Nowadays the problem is different. We have so much light that we feel safe, which is misleading because we stop noticing what's going on around. So it turns out we have actually made life easier for the bad guys. Studies show that criminals prefer well-lit areas, just as we do.

I spent a lot of time researching the problem. The minute you start talking about light pollution, or the importance of darkness, people's first response is, "Yeah, but we need light for safety and security." It touches a nerve. But my personal view is that we don't need so much light for safety and security. We use way more than necessary, and it isn't making anybody safer.

*Interviewer:* **In the book, you argue that the loss of darkness leads to disturbed sleep patterns. Can you explain?**

*Paul Bogard:* If our rooms are dark at night, our bodies pump out the hormone melatonin needed for healthy sleep. Artificial light in our homes impedes the release of the hormone, making us alert longer, so we get less sleep. Another hormone whose secretion is affected by lighting is cortisol. Chronic exposure to room light during usual hours of sleep unnaturally elevates cortisol levels, which has a detrimental effect on sleep. Interestingly, scientists also believe that disruption to sleep affects hormones controlling our metabolism. People suffering from sleep disturbance are more likely to put on weight. There's also an interesting discovery of cells in our retinas that are sensitive to changes in daylight and seasonal light. The wavelengths to which they are most responsive are the blue wavelengths produced by electronic devices. Consequently, people watching TV before going to sleep receive the message "Wake up!" instead of "Go to bed".

*Interviewer:* **Paul, thanks for being here with us.**

## **Text 2**

Do you think a lottery win would make you happy forever? Before you place all your hopes and dreams on another ticket, here's something you should know. New research has found that people who had big wins on the lottery ended up no happier than those who had bought tickets but didn't win. One way of accounting for this is something researchers call the "hedonic treadmill". Studies have shown that lottery winners quickly get used to their new level of wealth, and after a while simply adjust back to their baseline level of happiness. It also seems that as long as you can afford to avoid the basic miseries of life, having loads of spare cash doesn't make you happier than having very little.

Another explanation is that our happiness depends on how we feel relative to other people. If you win the lottery, you may feel richer than your neighbours, and think that moving to a mansion in a new neighbourhood will make you happy, but then you look out of the window and realise that all your new neighbours live in even bigger mansions.

The findings also prove that wealth alone doesn't provide any guarantee of a contented life. What matters a lot more than a sizeable income is how people spend it. Giving money away often makes people much happier than lavishing it on themselves. If you can see your money making a difference in other people's lives, it will boost your spirits even if the amount you gave was quite small, say the researchers. And when people do spend money on themselves, they are a lot happier when they use it for experiences like travel or learning new things because life experiences give us more lasting pleasure than material things. Money is legitimately useful, the study concludes, but it can also distract us from what we really enjoy.

*adapted from www.bbc.com*

### TASK 3.

*Interviewer:* **Ellen, in your latest book, *Writing With Scissors*, you're saying that today's obsession with posting material on Pinterest, Facebook and Twitter has a very American history...**

*Ellen:* That's right. How much information do we get from mass media in a single day?

*Interviewer:* **I guess more than we need...**

*Ellen:* Exactly, editors will make sure you have a lot to read. In the next 24 hours, the New York Times will write more than 700 stories, the Huffington Post will add another 1,200. Of course, this is just the tip of the iceberg. Throw in, say, YouTube, and you've got 144,000 hours of new video material to watch every day. The numbers make it practically impossible for us to get through this overload. Back in the 19<sup>th</sup> century we had a similar explosion of media which were then newspapers and magazines and people then also felt overwhelmed. And then they invented the scrapbook. It let them take the short-lived media, select the most interesting or useful parts from the press, and give them a longer life by clipping and sticking them into a book. For many, scrapbooks became a sort of personal Wikipedia. Today we do the same by cutting and pasting things we find interesting on social networking sites.

*Interviewer:* **How popular were scrapbooks then?**

*Ellen:* Extremely. Teachers, writers, curators and housewives, thousands of people kept scrapbooks. They left a permanent record of their times for us. Even President Abraham Lincoln kept scrapbooks. Mark Twain literally had his hands all over scrapbooks. He kept a glue pot at hand to stick his clippings in them. It was quite time-consuming, so he designed what he called Mark Twain's self-pasting scrapbook. It had pages with a strip of glue on them which you could moisten with a sponge, like a postage stamp, and stick in your clipping. That was wonderful! Imagine that with that invention he made more money than from some of his writing.

*Interviewer:* **Really? Why was that so?**

*Ellen:* It has a lot to do with what we today call intellectual property. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century copyright laws were not very strong and things were reprinted freely. Newspaper editors, some even called scissor editors, would cut articles from other newspapers and put them into theirs. Very often they dropped the names of the authors and as long as it said it was *in exchange from* another newspaper, the editors didn't worry much. Twain, as a writer, wasn't happy about it, because a lot of his stories were re-printed in popular press without the name of the author. That's why in one of his stories he included a character called Mark Twain so that nobody else could claim credit for that story.

*Interviewer:* That's very interesting. Could you tell us ...

*adapted from transatlantica.revues.org*