
AP Italian Language and Culture

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Task 4 — Cultural Comparison

- 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

Presentational Speaking: Cultural Comparison (Task 4)

Clarification Notes:

The term “community” can refer to something as large as a continent or as small as a family unit. The phrase “target culture” can refer to any community, large or small, associated with the target language.

5: STRONG performance in Presentational Speaking

- Effective treatment of topic within the context of the task.
- Clearly compares the student’s own community with the target culture, including supporting details and relevant examples.
- Demonstrates understanding of the target culture, despite a few minor inaccuracies.
- Organized presentation; effective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices.
- 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 presentation.
- 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 Presentational Speaking

- Generally effective treatment of topic within the context of the task.
- Compares the student’s own community with the target culture, including some supporting details and mostly relevant examples.
- Demonstrates some understanding of the target culture, despite minor inaccuracies.
- Organized presentation; some effective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices.
- 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 presentation, 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 Presentational Speaking

- Suitable treatment of topic within the context of the task.
- Compares the student’s own community with the target culture, including a few supporting details and examples.
- Demonstrates a basic understanding of the target culture, despite inaccuracies.
- Some organization; limited use of transitional elements or cohesive devices.
- 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 presentation with several shifts.

AP[®] ITALIAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

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

Presentational Speaking: Cultural Comparison (Task 4) (continued)

- 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 Presentational Speaking

- Unsuitable treatment of topic within the context of the task.
- Presents information about the student's own community and the target culture, but may not compare them; consists mostly of statements with no development.
- Demonstrates a limited understanding of the target culture; may include several inaccuracies.
- Limited organization; ineffective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices.
- 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 presentation.
- 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 Presentational Speaking

- Almost no treatment of topic within the context of the task.
- Presents information only about the student's own community or only about the target culture, and may not include examples.
- Demonstrates minimal understanding of the target culture; generally inaccurate.
- Little or no organization; absence of transitional elements and cohesive devices.
- 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 Presentational Speaking

- Mere restatement of language from the prompt
- Clearly does not respond to the prompt; completely irrelevant to the topic
- "I don't know," "I don't understand," or equivalent in English
- Clearly responds to the prompt in English

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

AP[®] ITALIAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 4: Cultural Comparison

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 presentational communicative mode by having the student make a comparative oral presentation on a cultural topic. Students were allotted 4 minutes to read the topic and prepare the presentation and then 2 minutes to deliver the presentation. The response received a single, holistic score based on how well it accomplished the assigned task. The presentation had to compare the student's own community to an area of the Italian-speaking world, demonstrating understanding of cultural features of the Italian-speaking world. Furthermore the presentation had to be organized clearly.

The course theme for the cultural comparison task was *Famiglia e società*. The task consisted of a question that asked students about the importance of the *piazza*, or similar places where people can meet and socialize, in both their own community and in a target language community they know well. Students had to plan and produce a spoken presentation that compares their own community to an area of the Italian-speaking world in relation to the given topic.

Sample: 4A

Score: 5

Transcription of Student Response

Oggi parlerò della importanza della piazza e luoghi di incontro fra negli Stati Uniti e Italia. Secondo me, l'importanza della piazza o luoghi d'incontro per socializzare è diverso perché . . . negli Stati Uniti . . . le persone non .. negli Stati Uniti non si vede molto, ma in Italia sì. In Italia . . . le per ... gli italiani gli piacciono parlare molto perché è parte della sua cultura. In negli Stati Uniti le persone vanno ai ristoranti eh . . . non tanto in piazza perché, negli Stati Uniti non si vede . . . non esistono molto le piazza la piazza. In Italia la piazza è molto molto comune per socializzare e comunicare con le persone. Per esempio, in Italia il Coliseo di Roma, io in la mia classe d'italiano ho visto che gli italiani vanno al Coliseo de Roma per comunicare con la sua cultura e socializzare con . . . il passato. Quindi, negli Stati Uniti Uniti e in Italia i ristoranti sono molte comuni per socializzare eh . . . coughs quindi in Italia la piazza serve per una passeggiata con i tuo amici, per parlare della tua vita, o dei tuoi problemi, quindi per me . . . la piazza in Italia è fondamentale perché è molto importante per la sua cultura e mostra la sua architettura e e quindi . . . nel nelli Stati Uniti ...

Commentary

The response earned a score of 5 because it represents an effective treatment of the topic within the context of the task. It compares the student's own community with the target culture community and includes some supporting details and examples that demonstrate understanding of the target culture (“*In negli Stati Uniti le persone vanno ai ristoranti eh . . . non tanto in piazza perché, negli Stati Uniti non si vede . . . non esistono molto le piazza la piazza. In Italia la piazza è molto molto comune per socializzare e comunicare con le persone. Per esempio, in Italia il Coliseo di Roma, io in la mia classe d'italiano ho visto che gli italiani vanno al Coliseo de Roma per comunicare con la sua cultura e socializzare con . . . il passato.*”). The response is well organized, with an effective use of transitional elements (“*quindi*”; “*Per esempio*”). It is fully understandable, with ease and clarity of expression. There are some errors that do not impede comprehensibility (“*gli italiani gli piacciono parlare molto*”; “*non esistono molto le piazza la piazza*”). Vocabulary is varied and appropriate. Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response comprehensible.

AP[®] ITALIAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 4: Cultural Comparison (continued)

Sample: 4B

Score: 3

Transcription of Student Response

Penso che la piazza sia molto importante. Penso che . . . anche social . . . socializzazione sia molto importante. Nella mia realtà, i giovani parlano con i suoi amici con i cellulari. Loro mandano i sms ma non parlano faccia a faccia. C'è terribile. È molto importante per parlare con altre ragazzi. La mia zia viva in Italia. Lei va alla piazza ogni sabato sera con la sua amiche. Lei ha molto divertente. Penso che i giovani nella mia realtà dovrebbe andare a un piazza o un ristorante con i suoi amici. I cellulari è male per socialazione. . . È molto importante per incontrare altre ragazzi e il cellulare non è un . . . è molto male per incontrare nuove persone. . . Un altre ragione è in Italia loro incontrare nuove persone a piazza o un club. Mia zia incontrare incontra suo marito a un club . . con la sua . . le sue amiche. Lei ha molto divertente durante quest tempo con sue amiche.

Commentary

The response earned a score of 3 because it represents a suitable treatment of the topic within the context of the task. It compares the student's own community with the target culture community and includes a few supporting details and examples (“*Nella mia realtà, i giovani parlano con i suoi amici con i cellulari.*”; “*La mia zia viva in Italia. Lei va alla piazza ogni sabato sera con la sua amiche.*”). There is some organization, with limited use of transitional elements. The response is generally understandable. Vocabulary is generally appropriate. There is some control of grammar (“*Loro mandano i sms ma non parlano faccia a faccia.*”). Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response generally comprehensible.

Sample: 4C

Score: 1

Transcription of Student Response

Nella piazza social . . zazione e vive è importante. In mia città è . . piccolo e molto molte persone. Socialazione è importante perché . . molto molti persone . . per felice vi . . vivere. Vivere è non divertente con non imici. Molte amici e famiglia è bene per vivere. In mia città, scuola è divertente per .. studen . . studenti. Mo . . molti persone è bene per visito e . . negozio e . . uh . . e la camara . . scusa . . nella piazza . . bisogno di socializzazione e vivere. . . Con non persone . . ci sono non . . vivi.

Commentary

The response earned a score of 1 because it represents almost no treatment of the topic within the context of the task. The student mentions the importance of socialization in general and in relation to one's own community. There is no reference to the Italian culture. The presentation has little organization, with very few vocabulary resources and little control of grammar and syntax (“*Mo . . molti persone è bene per visito*”). It is barely understandable (“*Mo . . molti persone è bene per visito e . . negozio e . . uh . . e la camara . . scusa . . nella piazza . . bisogno di socializzazione e vivere. . . Con non persone . . ci sono non . . vivi.*”), with frequent errors that impede comprehensibility.