

**2023**



---

# **AP® Italian Language and Culture**

## **Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary**

### **Inside:**

#### **Task 4—Cultural Comparison**

- Scoring Guidelines**
- Student Samples**
- Scoring Commentary**

**Question 4: Cultural Comparison**

**5 points**

**General Scoring Note**

When applying the scoring guidelines, the response does not need to meet every single criterion in a column. You should award the score according to the preponderance of evidence.

AP® Italian Language and Culture 2023 Scoring Guidelines

<b>1 Poor</b>	<b>2 Weak</b>	<b>3 Fair</b>	<b>4 Good</b>	<b>5 Strong</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Almost no treatment of topic within the context of the task</li> <li>Presents information only about the target culture or only about the student's own or another community, and may not include examples</li> <li>Demonstrates minimal understanding of the target culture; generally inaccurate</li> <li>Little or no organization; absence of transitional elements and cohesive devices</li> <li>Barely understandable, with frequent or significant errors that impede comprehensibility</li> <li>Very few vocabulary resources</li> <li>Little or no control of grammar, syntax, and usage</li> <li>Minimal or no attention to register</li> <li>Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response difficult to comprehend; errors impede comprehensibility</li> <li>Clarification or self-correction (if present) does not improve comprehensibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsuitable treatment of topic within the context of the task</li> <li>Presents information about the target culture and the student's own or another community, but may not compare them; consists mostly of statements with no development</li> <li>Demonstrates a limited understanding of the target culture; may include several inaccuracies</li> <li>Limited organization; ineffective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices</li> <li>Partially understandable, with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the listener</li> <li>Limited vocabulary and idiomatic language</li> <li>Limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage</li> <li>Use of register is generally inappropriate for the presentation</li> <li>Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response difficult to comprehend at times; errors impede comprehensibility</li> <li>Clarification or self-correction (if present) usually does not improve comprehensibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitable treatment of topic within the context of the task</li> <li>Compares the target culture with the student's own or another community, including a few supporting details and examples</li> <li>Demonstrates a basic understanding of the target culture, despite inaccuracies</li> <li>Some organization; limited use of transitional elements or cohesive devices</li> <li>Generally understandable, with errors that may impede comprehensibility</li> <li>Appropriate but basic vocabulary and idiomatic language</li> <li>Some control of grammar, syntax, and usage</li> <li>Use of register may be inappropriate for the presentation with several shifts</li> <li>Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response generally comprehensible; errors occasionally impede comprehensibility</li> <li>Clarification or self-correction (if present) sometimes improves comprehensibility</li> </ul> <p><b>Scoring note:</b> A response that does not explicitly compare may earn a score of 3 if it provides a suitable treatment of the topic, including a basic understanding of the target culture and the student's own or another community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally effective treatment of topic within the context of the task</li> <li>Compares the target culture with the student's own or another community, including some supporting details and mostly relevant examples</li> <li>Demonstrates some understanding of the target culture, despite minor inaccuracies</li> <li>Organized presentation; some effective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices</li> <li>Fully understandable, with some errors that do not impede comprehensibility</li> <li>Varied and generally appropriate vocabulary and idiomatic language</li> <li>General control of grammar, syntax, and usage</li> <li>Generally consistent use of register appropriate for the presentation, except for occasional shifts</li> <li>Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response mostly comprehensible; errors do not impede comprehensibility</li> <li>Clarification or self-correction (if present) usually improves comprehensibility</li> </ul> <p><b>Scoring note:</b> A response that does not explicitly compare may earn a score of 4 if it provides a generally effective treatment of the topic, including some understanding of the target culture and the student's own or another community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective treatment of topic within the context of the task</li> <li>Clearly compares the target culture with the student's own or another community, including supporting details and relevant examples</li> <li>Demonstrates understanding of the target culture, despite a few minor inaccuracies</li> <li>Organized presentation; effective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices</li> <li>Fully understandable, with ease and clarity of expression; occasional errors do not impede comprehensibility</li> <li>Varied and appropriate vocabulary and idiomatic language</li> <li>Accuracy and variety in grammar, syntax, and usage, with few errors</li> <li>Mostly consistent use of register appropriate for the presentation</li> <li>Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response comprehensible; errors do not impede comprehensibility</li> <li>Clarification or self-correction (if present) improves comprehensibility</li> </ul> <p><b>Scoring note:</b> A response that does not explicitly compare cannot earn a score of 5.</p>

**Score of 0: UNACCEPTABLE**

- 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 any language
- Clearly responds to the prompt in English

**NR: no response although recording equipment is functioning**

---

**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.
-

## Question 4

**Note:** Students' responses are quoted verbatim and may contain grammatical errors. In the transcripts of students' speech quoted in the commentaries, a three-dot ellipsis indicates that the sample has been excerpted. Two dots indicate that 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 presentation had to compare an area of the Italian-speaking world to students' own community or another community of their choice, demonstrating understanding of cultural features of the Italian-speaking world. Furthermore, the presentation had to be organized clearly. The response received a single holistic score based on how well it accomplished the assigned task.

The course theme for the cultural comparison task was Contemporary Life (*Vita contemporanea*). The task consisted of a question that asked students about the role of eating habits (e.g., consuming organic food, gluten-free food, local and seasonal food, etc.) in an Italian-speaking community with which they are familiar and in another community of their choice. Students had to plan and produce a spoken presentation, comparing an area of the Italian-speaking world with another community in relation to the given topic.

### Sample: 4A

Score: 5

### Transcript of Student's Response(s)

*Buongiorno classe. Oggi vi parleremo del ruolo dell'abitudine alimentari di mangiare al ristorante. Eh . . quest'attività esiste in tutto il mondo . . uh . . ma in Italia e li Stati Uniti la cultura delle risto... dei ristoranti è differente. Primo, in Italia è normale che la famiglia mangia insieme. Questo è il centro della vita, la famiglia, e non è tipico come l'individualismo, come il baabo . . ehm . . va al ristorante . . ristorante con gli amici, ma il resto della famiglia è qui. Non è così in Italia. La famiglia non solamente mangia insieme ma fa il cibo insieme ed a volte la gente invita agli amici alla casa per provare la sua cucina, perché la cucina è molto importante, la gastronomia. Ma a volte, sì, la gente va al ristoranti specialmente quando sta... quando stamo in viaggio e . . ci sono varie tipi di ristoranti. Ci sono . . ci so... ci sono come osterie, trattorie, i ristoranti di molta alta qualità che turisti . . uhm . . anda... sono andati a Italia specificamente per visitare e il cibo è molto . . molto focuzato in . . ingredienti naturali e . . e locali, per esempio . . eh . . sevne McDonald's in Italia utilizza pollo naturale, verdure, tutti naturali e la gos... gastronomia è centrale alla casa in Italia e questa anche...*

**Question 4 (continued)****Commentary**

The response earned a score of 5 because it shows an effective treatment of the topic within the context of the task. It clearly compares various aspects of the topic in both the U.S. and Italy (“*Primo, in Italia è normale che la famiglia mangia insieme.*”; “*ma il resto della famiglia è qui. Non è così in Italia*”; “*e locali, per esempio . . eh . . sevne McDonald's in Italia utilizza pollo naturale, verdure, tutti naturali?*”). It demonstrates understanding of the target culture (“*La famiglia non solamente mangia insieme ma fa il cibo insieme ed a volte la gente invita agli amici alla casa per provare la sua cucina, perché la cucina è molto importante*”; “*ci sono come osterie, trattorie, i ristoranti di molta alta qualità*”). The response offers a well-organized presentation, with a clear introduction (“*Buongiorno classe. Oggi vi parleremo del ruolo dell'abitudine alimentari di mangiare al ristorante.*”). It is fully understandable. A few occasional errors, such as some errors in agreement (“*sono andati a Italia specificamente per visitare e il cibo è molto . . molto focuzato in . . ingredienti naturali*”), do not impede comprehensibility. The language within the response is strong, including varied and appropriate vocabulary (“*non è tipico come l'individualismo*”; “*gastronomia è centrale alla casa in Italia*”).

**Sample: 4B****Score: 3****Transcript of Student's Response(s)**

*I ruoli delle abitudini alimentari . . di cibo nella Italia e nella Croazia sono molto simili e molto importante. Nella Italia, molti personi cucino e man... mangio... mangiano il cibo biologhico . . il cibo naturale e il cibo molto salute. . . Ehm . . nella Italia, i personi . . ehm . . man... mangiano paste, salse con tomate, la . . molto frutta fresca . . e anche, nella Croazia . . il tutti cibo biologhico, il cibo tutti naturale e il cibo salute e . . i tutti cibi deliciosi . . e nella Croazia . . non molto paste . . ma molto carne e anche frutta fresca . . simili di Italia. Italia e Croazia sono in dentro . . ah . . eh . . questo è perché il loro cibo sono molto simili . . e la cultura della Italia e Croazia anche sono molto simili . . e . . questo . . è...*

**Commentary**

The response earned a score of 3 because it presents a suitable treatment of the topic within the context of the task. It compares the target culture with that of the student's culture and includes a few examples (“*I ruoli delle abitudini alimentari . . di cibo nella Italia e nella Croazia sono molto simili e molto importante.*”). It demonstrates a basic understanding of the target culture (“*Nella Italia, molti personi cucino e man... mangio... mangiano il cibo biologhico . . il cibo naturale e il cibo molto salute.*”). There is some organization, including an introduction (“*I ruoli delle abitudini alimentari*”), but the response shows limited transitions to help move the argument forward. It is generally understandable, with errors (“*molti personi cucino*”) that may impede comprehensibility. The response uses appropriate but basic vocabulary (“*cibo biologhico*”; “*il cibo naturale*”; “*paste*”). There is some control of grammar, syntax, and usage (“*sono molto simili*”; “*mangiano paste*”). Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response generally comprehensible.

### Question 4 (continued)

**Sample: 4C**

**Score: 1**

#### Transcript of Student's Response(s)

*Ciao . . eh . . in Italia, le persone piacciono a mangiare i festivi perché è molto festivi in Italia. Per esempio, Mardi Gras. In America, le persone piacciono mangiare con la famiglia . . eh . . eh . . per ami... perché non è molto festive come Italia. In Italia, le persone piacciono studiato in scuola o alla casa perché locazione è molto assessibile. In America, le persone studiato restauro... restorante, libreri, scuala, alla casa, tutti locazione . . uhm . . perché le persone ha molto transpoto e . . ehm . . le . . le persone è molto assessibile . . mo... molto locazione per studiato . . ah . . grazie.*

#### Commentary

The response earned a score of 1 because it presents almost no treatment of the topic within the context of the task and includes unrelated, irrelevant statements (“*In Italia, le persone piacciono studiato in scuola o alla casa perché locazione è molto assessibile.*”). It demonstrates minimal understanding of the target culture (“*in Italia, le persone piacciono a mangiare i festivi perché è molto festivi in Italia.*”). It is barely understandable, with frequent errors that impede comprehensibility (“*Per esempio, Mardi Gras.*”). The response shows very few vocabulary resources and little control of grammar, with many errors that impede comprehensibility (“*In America, le persone studiato restauro... restorante, libreri, scuala, alla casa, tutti locazione . . uhm . . perché le persone ha molto transpoto*”).