

2017

AP[®] CollegeBoard

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

2017 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 2017 SCORING GUIDELINES

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

- 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 2017 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 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 *Scienza e tecnologia*. The task consisted of a question that asked students about the opinion of people in their own community and in the target language community regarding the importance of using small-sized cars. Students had to plan and produce a spoken presentation, comparing their own community to an area of the Italian-speaking world in relation to the given topic.

Sample: 4A

Score: 4

Transcription of Student Response

“Sono una studentessa um deji Stati Uniti e vivo in New Jersey nella uh paese vicino a la città di New York. Uh . . neli Stati Uniti um le persone guidano diversi macchine e qualche qualche grandi e qualche piccole macchine. Uh . . le persone negli Stati Uniti portano le famiglie e um ai molti lo um locali diversi con i grandi um macchine e anche usano um le macchine grande andare in vacanza. Uh . . negli Stati Uni . . . ma in Italia . . um . . da . . parte . . di solito le persone guidano le macchine di piccoli dimensione come un FIAT, um perché um le . . gli italiani um hanno le famiglie piccole uh e non è necessario avere una grande macchina perché portano meno persone. Anche perché um più persone in Italia cammina . . um . . Ma, uh . . ne . . anche . . ma in entrambi culturali nella città, uh le persone usano le gli autiomobili di piccoli dimensione ma se non usano i . . p um . . i . . gli automobili um le persone in entrambi culturali nella città usano i mezzi pubblici. Uh, insomma, penso che um le due cultures hanno diverse opinioni di . . um . . delle usando um dei macchine um . . Negli Stati Uniti è pu più comune usare uh una macchina grande ma in Italia . . .”

Commentary

The response presents a generally 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 mostly relevant examples (*“le persone negli Stati Uniti portano le famiglie e um ai molti lo um locali diversi con i grandi um macchine e anche usano um le macchine grande andare in vacanza . . . ma in Italia . . . di solito le persone guidano le macchine di piccoli dimensione come un FIAT, um perché um le . . gli italiani um hanno le famiglie piccole uh e non è necessario avere una grande macchina perché portano meno persone. Anche perché um più persone in Italia cammina”*). The presentation is well organized, with some effective use of transitional elements (*“ma”*; *“perché”*; *“insomma”*). There is general control of grammar, and the vocabulary is generally appropriate. The response is fully understandable, with some errors that do not impede comprehension. Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response mostly comprehensible. The response earned a score of 4.

AP[®] ITALIAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2017 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 4: Cultural Comparison (continued)

Sample: 4B

Score: 3

Transcription of Student Response

“L’opinione, l’opinione nella realtà in cui vivo riguardando . . . usare automobili piccole non è tanto importante in America comparando all’Italia. In Italia la benzina costa molto e le strade sono più piccole delle strade americane. Sono più . . . um . . . sono più giunte e non stanno molte, non stanno molte . . . um . . . highways che stanno qua nell’America . . . um . . . e mentre in America si usano più le macchine grande per le famiglie che sono di cinque, di sei persone quando vogliono andare alle case de la famiglia o si vogliono andare a fare una . . . un . . . o se vogliono andare a vacanza a un altro paese, usano gli macchine che si chiamano SUV, che sono macchine che portano otto a nove persone e la ragione e pure le macchine più grande si usano qua per le gente che tengono famiglia come ha detto, e la benzina americana no è tanto . . . um . . . no è tanta co costosa como la benzina italiana.”

Commentary

The response presents 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 (“*In Italia la benzina costa molto e le strade sono più piccole delle strade americane*”; “*e mentre in America si usano più le macchine grande per le famiglie che sono di cinque, di sei persone quando vogliono andare alle case de la famiglia*”). The presentation is generally understandable, with errors that may impede comprehension ([*le strade*] “*Sono più . . . um . . . sono più giunte*”). Vocabulary is generally appropriate but basic. The response shows some control of grammar (“*e le strade sono più piccole delle strade americane*”). Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response generally comprehensible. The response earned a score of 3.

Sample: 4C

Score: 1

Transcription of Student Response

A Italia ci sono molti . . . automobili di piccole dimensioni. Men . . . uh mentre . . . qui . . . guidiamo grande automobil mobili . . . uh e . . . automibi automobili di piccole. Automobili di piccole dimensione sono pericoloso se un automobilo più grande che il tu . . . schiaffa il tuo automobilo . . . si può morire molto veloce. Sarà un un accidente grande . . . sniff . . . e . . . um in un autimobilo grande . . . hai um . . . hai più di . . . zone per il . . . um . . . impact . . . laughs

Commentary

The response presents almost no treatment of the topic within the context of the task. The student demonstrates minimal understanding of the Italian culture. The presentation has little organization, with very few vocabulary resources and little control of grammar and syntax. It is barely understandable, with frequent errors that impede comprehensibility. The response earned a score of 1.