
LISTENING PART 4



MASTER
CENTRO DI ALTA
FORMAZIONE

LISTENING PART 4

- La parte della comprensione orale si divide in QUATTRO parti e dura 30 minuti.
 - Nella quarta parte ascolterai una conversazione (due volte) e bisogna rispondere correttamente alle domande a risposta multipla in base a ciò che si sente.
 - Prima di procedere, ti invito a scaricare il pdf sulla parte di Listening. In questo modo, sarai in grado di seguire questa lezione con più facilità e svolgere gli esercizi in modo più accessibile.
-

COME SVOLGERE QUESTO ESERCIZIO?

- Leggi le domande per capire il contesto, così saprai a cosa prestare attenzione quando inizia l'audio. Sottolinea le parole chiavi per capire quali sono i concetti principali.
 - Se la prima volta non capisci quale sia la risposta giusta, avrai la seconda possibilità per prestare maggiore attenzione.
 - Una volta terminato il compito, rileggi le risposte e controlla che tutto sembri giusto.
-

Listening Part 4

You will hear a conversation. You will hear the conversation twice. Choose the correct answers.

1. Paul tries to reassure Sue that letting the flat
 - a) makes financial sense.
 - b) doesn't involve legal fees.
 - c) is the most secure option.
2. Sue thinks that gathering references appears to be an
 - a) awkward process.
 - b) expensive business.
 - c) invasion of privacy.
3. Paul says that Winnie would know about any disadvantages of
 - a) renting out a property.
 - b) getting suitable tenants.
 - c) using a management company.
4. When discussing getting their deposits back when they were younger, Sue is
 - a) boastful.
 - b) reassuring.
 - c) sarcastic.
5. What would be the main reason for ensuring the flat is in good order?
 - a) To support the guarantee by the landlord.
 - b) To forestall any tenant complaints.
 - c) To discourage abuse of the property.
6. At the point of discussing tenants being in residence, what does Paul rebuke Sue for?
 - a) Wanting to call Winnie.
 - b) Being too intrusive.
 - c) Not listening to him.
7. How would permission be agreed for the landlord to enter the flat?
 - a) It would be stated in the contract.
 - b) It would be left up to the tenant.
 - c) It would be negotiated at the time.



ECCO LE SOLUZIONI...

Question	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
Answer	a	c	c	a	b	b	a

M: Now that Peter's going to live in Spain, we need to think about what's going to happen to the flat.

F: Well, we could sell it. We don't really need it.

M: Yes, but the market's terrible. Property prices have been falling. I think it'd be better to hold on to it until there's an upturn.

F: But it's an appalling waste to have a property lying around empty with so many people homeless and...

M: Sue, I wasn't thinking of leaving it unoccupied. I thought about letting it.

F: Mmm, not sure about that.

M: Why not? It's financially worthwhile, certainly. We can make a proper tenancy agreement – you know, all legal and so on. Then in a year or so, if the property market is on the up, we can sell. We won't lose and we'll get rent 'til it goes on the market.

F: Yes, Paul, but you hear terrible stories. You know, awkward tenants...

M: And awful landlords too! I'm sure we could screen prospective tenants carefully.

F: How d'you mean?

M: Well, up-to-date references for a start. Information about their credit history. Banker's reference. One from their current landlord. Even one from their employer?

F: Oh, that seems very intrusive...

M: That's what people do, Sue. You have to safeguard your interests.

F: Yes, but checking up on people...snooping about...

M: Well, you can employ a property management company if you want. Winnie – you know, at work – she'd know of any pitfalls cos she's got a flat rented out through one of these companies.

F: Mmm, that seems to be defeating the purpose of letting the flat. A big chunk of the rent will go to the company, lawyers...

M: It's still a decent option for a couple of years.

F: So, what do these companies do exactly?

M: I'm not, like, a hundred per cent sure, but I guess they'd produce a written tenancy agreement so it's legally binding for all parties. They'd do the screening, I suppose, and

-
1. Paul tries to reassure Sue that letting the flat
 - a) makes financial sense.
 - b) doesn't involve legal fees.
 - c) is the most secure option.
 2. Sue thinks that gathering references appears to be an
 - a) awkward process.
 - b) expensive business.
 - c) invasion of privacy.
 3. Paul says that Winnie would know about any disadvantages of
 - a) renting out a property.
 - b) getting suitable tenants.
 - c) using a management company.
-

would probably deal with the security deposits.

F: The what?!

M: Security deposits. Where the tenant gives a sum of money to cover any damage they cause and then they get it back if they leave the flat in a decent state. I always had to do it when I was a student, though I never seemed to get the full amount back.

F: [boastfully] Oh, really? I always did, Paul!

M: Well, you would, wouldn't you? Anyway, it does mean the flat would have to be in perfect nick before it's rented out.

F: Oh, it's pretty good, newly-decorated and if any jobs need doing...

M: [laughs] I can see to them!!

F: Well, if everything's in good working order, tenants aren't likely to have any issues and any there are can be nipped in the bud.

M: So, are you warming to the idea, Sue?

F: It's worth finding out more, I agree, but there're a number of questions I'd want answering.

M: Me too. Might be an idea to jot them down before I give Winnie a call.

F: Once the tenants are there, are we allowed to go in, I wonder.

M: [rebuking] Oh, come on Sue! That really would be a bit too nose!

F: Not at all. There may be lots of reasons you'd need to get into the flat.

M: Well, I'm sure that'd be included in the agreement. Like we'd have to give the tenant twenty-four hours' notice before turning up. It'd be fine. Oh, that reminds me – we'd have to let the insurance company know what's happening.

F: Another expense!

M: But the flat itself doesn't need much doing. Security isn't an issue. The locks are good, security lights, alarm... But there can be hazards.

F: [amazed and taken aback] Hazards?

M: I read a story. Old property that was rented out had lead pipes. The tenant reckoned he was entitled to a rebate as it was a health hazard. Ended up in court.

F: Mmmm [slight pause]... Wonder if we could specify non-smokers for tenants? The smell gets into the furniture.

M: Hmm. No idea. I'm going to call Winnie!

4. When discussing getting their deposits back when they were younger, Sue is

- a) boastful.
- b) reassuring.
- c) sarcastic.

5. What would be the main reason for ensuring the flat is in good order?

- a) To support the guarantee by the landlord.
- b) To forestall any tenant complaints.
- c) To discourage abuse of the property.

6. At the point of discussing tenants being in residence, what does Paul rebuke Sue for?

- a) Wanting to call Winnie.
- b) Being too intrusive.
- c) Not listening to him.

7. How would permission be agreed for the landlord to enter the flat?

- a) It would be stated in the contract.
 - b) It would be left up to the tenant.
 - c) It would be negotiated at the time.
-

GRAZIE PER L'ATTENZIONE E BUONO STUDIO!
