AP® CollegeBoard

AP Italian Language and Culture
Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Task 3 — Conversation

- ☑ **Scoring Guideline**
- ☑ **Student Samples**
- ☑ **Scoring Commentary**

AP® ITALIAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE
2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Identical to Scoring Guidelines used for French, German, and Spanish Language and Culture Exams

Interpersonal Speaking: Conversation (Task 3)

5: STRONG performance in Interpersonal Speaking
• Maintains the exchange with a series of responses that is clearly appropriate within the context of the task.
• Provides required information (e.g., responses to questions, statement and support of opinion) with frequent elaboration.
• Fully understandable, with ease and clarity of expression; occasional errors do not impede comprehensibility.
• Varied and appropriate vocabulary and idiomatic language.
• Accuracy and variety in grammar, syntax, and usage, with few errors.
• Mostly consistent use of register appropriate for the conversation.
• Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response comprehensible; errors do not impede comprehensibility.
• Clarification or self-correction (if present) improves comprehensibility.

4: GOOD performance in Interpersonal Speaking
• Maintains the exchange with a series of responses that is generally appropriate within the context of the task.
• Provides most required information (e.g., responses to questions, statement and support of opinion) with some elaboration.
• Fully understandable, with some errors that do not impede comprehensibility.
• Varied and generally appropriate vocabulary and idiomatic language.
• General control of grammar, syntax, and usage.
• Generally consistent use of register appropriate for the conversation, except for occasional shifts.
• Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response mostly comprehensible; errors do not impede comprehensibility.
• Clarification or self-correction (if present) usually improves comprehensibility.

3: FAIR performance in Interpersonal Speaking
• Maintains the exchange with a series of responses that is somewhat appropriate within the context of the task.
• Provides most required information (e.g., responses to questions, statement and support of opinion).
• Generally understandable, with errors that may impede comprehensibility.
• Appropriate but basic vocabulary and idiomatic language.
• Some control of grammar, syntax, and usage.
• Use of register may be inappropriate for the conversation with several shifts.
• Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response generally comprehensible; errors occasionally impede comprehensibility.
• Clarification or self-correction (if present) sometimes improves comprehensibility.

2: WEAK performance in Interpersonal Speaking
• Partially maintains the exchange with a series of responses that is minimally appropriate within the context of the task.
• Provides some required information (e.g., responses to questions, statement and support of opinion).
• Partially understandable, with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the listener.
• Limited vocabulary and idiomatic language.
• Limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage.
• Use of register is generally inappropriate for the conversation.
• Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response difficult to comprehend at times; errors impede comprehensibility.
• Clarification or self-correction (if present) usually does not improve comprehensibility.

1: POOR performance in Interpersonal Speaking
• Unsuccessfully attempts to maintain the exchange by providing a series of responses that is inappropriate within the context of the task.
• Provides little required information (e.g., responses to questions, statement and support of opinion).
• Barely understandable, with frequent or significant errors that impede comprehensibility.
• Very few vocabulary resources.
• Little or no control of grammar, syntax, and usage.
• Minimal or no attention to register.
• Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response difficult to comprehend; errors impede comprehensibility.
• Clarification or self-correction (if present) does not improve comprehensibility.

0: UNACCEPTABLE performance in Interpersonal Speaking
• Mere restatement of language from the prompts
• Clearly does not respond to the prompts; completely irrelevant to the topic
• "I don't know," "I don't understand," or equivalent in English
• Clearly responds to the prompts in English

NR (No Response): BLANK (no response although recording equipment is functioning)

Task 3: Conversation

Note: Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain grammatical errors. In the transcripts of student speech quoted in the commentaries, a three-dot ellipsis indicates that the sample has been excerpted. Two dots indicate the student paused while speaking.

Overview

This task assessed speaking in the interpersonal communicative mode by having the student respond as part of a simulated oral conversation. Students were first allotted 1 minute to read a preview of the conversation, including an outline of each turn in the conversation. Then the conversation proceeded, including 20 seconds for students to speak at each of five turns in the conversation. The series of five responses received a single, holistic score based on how well it accomplished the assigned task. The responses had to appropriately address each turn in the conversation, according to the outline as well as the simulated interlocutor's utterance.

The course theme for the conversation task was *Famiglia e società*. For this task students needed to respond to five audio prompts spoken by Sofia, a friend that the student has not seen for a while. The question assessed the students' performance in Interpersonal Speaking by engaging them in a series of exchanges on a familiar topic — neighborhood changes and events — generated by Sofia's inquiries. The students had to interact with the interlocutor to produce language that appropriately responded to Sofia's questions. They were expected to understand Sofia's utterances by relying on familiar vocabulary or by using the context to infer the meaning of unfamiliar words. They needed to maintain the conversation in a culturally appropriate fashion consistent with the informal register. Moreover the conversation required students to perform a series of language functions — answer questions, express agreement, state and justify opinion and preference, and make a counterproposal — through simple, compound, and complex sentences and the use of different time frames.

1. Sofia meets the student in a place far away from the student's home. She is surprised and asks why the student is in that neighborhood. The student had to respond by indicating the reason(s).

2. Sofia talks enthusiastically about the modernization of her neighborhood and asks if the student agrees that modern neighborhoods are more attractive. The student had to express agreement with Sofia's opinion and explain why.

3. Sofia proposes a visit to a fountain in a nearby piazza. The student had to decline the invitation and make a counterproposal.

4. Sofia informs the student about two upcoming events and invites the student to choose one of the two to attend together. The student had to express a preference and explain the reason(s) for the choice.

5. Sofia informs the student that two of her art-enthusiast friends will be visiting the following Sunday and asks for advice about something to do with them downtown. The student had to offer suggestions.

Sample: 3A
Score: 4

Transcription of Student Response
1. *Ah . . ciao Sofia . . um . . lavoro qui come una dottoressa all'ospedale Vittorio Emanuele perché sono una ragio … radiolista e lavoro con . . um . . le gente qui in Italia.*

Task 3: Conversation (continued)

2. *Sì, penso che è buona per mettrere moderno questa casa di musica perché la cultorale in Italia è . . molto bene e noi possiamo . . um, salvare questo per . . i …*

3. *Um . . mi dispiace ma devo ritornare al lavoro perché sono . . um . . impegnata e ho molte . . persone di verdere oggi ma . . um, forse possiamo andare domani.*

4. *Um . . volio andare al* new *al nuovo museo perché noi possiamo . . um, imparare qualcosa di questo museo e . . ah . . la cultura e . . um . . è buona per fare questo con te e …*

5. *Ah . . noi possiamo . . um, andare al al bar per prendere un caffè perché io devo bevere caffè ogni giorno e noi possiamo fare quest insieme con i tuoi amici e . . è divertente.*

Commentary
The response earned a score of 4 because it represents a good treatment of the topic within the context of the task. The student maintains the exchange with a series of responses that is generally appropriate ("*penso che è buona per mettrere moderno questa casa di musica"*) and provides most required information ("*lavoro qui come una dottoressa all'ospedale Vittorio Emanuele*"; "*mi dispiace ma devo ritornare al lavoro … forse possiamo andare domani*"; "*volio andare al* new *al nuovo museo perché noi possiamo . . um, imparare qualcosa di questo museo*"). There is varied and generally appropriate vocabulary and idiomatic language ("*lavoro qui come una dottoressa";* "*possiamo . . um, andare al al bar per prendere un caffè*") and general control of grammar. Pace is consistent. Intonation and pronunciation are good. Self-correction improves comprehensibility ("*volio andare al* new *al nuovo museo*").

Sample: 3B
Score: 3

Transcription of Student Response
1. *Ciao Sofia uh,* coughs, *sono … uh . . faccio il shopping, lo shopping uh perché . . devo comprare . . nuovi vestiti.*

2. *Sì, mi piace molto la musica . . da un'eta giovane . . ho, uh, mi ho piaciuto molto la musica di molte artisti americani come Elvis e . . uh …*

3. *Ah, devo andare a casa . . ho devo andare a cena con la mia famiglia . . posso fare . . doman … domani?*

4. *Perferisco la musea di archelogico perché . . uh, sono molto interess … eh, l'arcoli . . logico sono molto interessato a me.*

5. *F … uh . . io penso . . che . . tu vada al centro . . al museo di musica perché la musica è molto importante per molte persone.*

Commentary
The response earned a score of 3 because it represents a fair treatment of the topic within the context of the task. The student understands the gist of the conversation and maintains the exchange with responses that are somewhat appropriate ("*io penso . . che . . tu vada al centro . . al museo di musica perché la musica è molto importante per molte persone*") The response provides most required information ("*faccio il shopping, lo shopping uh perché . . devo comprare . . nuovi vestiti";* "*devo andare a cena con la mia famiglia . . posso fare . . doman …*

Task 3: Conversation (continued)

domani?"; "*Perferisco la musea di archelogico perché . . uh, sono molto interess*"*)*. The response is generally understandable ("*Perferisco la musea di archelogico*") but uses basic vocabulary (frequent repetitions of words and expressions) and shows only some control of grammar.

Sample: 3C
Score: 1

Transcription of Student Response

1. *. . La mi casa . . è . . è, lontano di tu perché mio, mia famiglia.*

2. *Sì, è vero perché . . um, la la musicata è . . è muy bueno bene per tu.*

3. *. . Uh . . una . . una . . la mia eppinione di . . questa proposìa è . . è mol muy, molto tempo.*

4. *Uh . . el museo di archeologico . . è muy bueno perché . . è b … muy bueno ma io non . . anda ando al museo perché mia famiglia . . ci sono un una …*

5. *. . Ah sì becau … perché io adoro la il museo e io . . io potrebbe . . posso andare con tu.*

Commentary

The response earned a score of 1 because it represents a poor treatment of the topic within the context of the task. The student unsuccessfully attempts to maintain the exchange with responses that are inappropriate within the context of the task ("*La mi casa . . è . . è, lontano di tu perché mio, mia famiglia*"; "*Sì, è vero perché . . um, la la musicata è . . è muy bueno bene per tu*"; "*la mia eppinione di . . questa proposìa è . . è mol muy, molto tempo*"; "*ma io non . . anda ando al museo perché mia famiglia*") and provides little required information. There are very few vocabulary resources and almost no control of grammar and syntax. The response is barely understandable, with significant errors that impede comprehensibility.