
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 2025 Scoring Guidelines

1 Poor	2 Weak	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Strong
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Almost no treatment of topic within the context of the task Presents information only about the target culture or only about the student's own or another community, 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unsuitable treatment of topic within the context of the task 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 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suitable treatment of topic within the context of the task Compares the target culture with the student's own or another community, 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 Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response generally comprehensible; errors occasionally impede comprehensibility Clarification or self-correction (if present) sometimes improves comprehensibility <p>Scoring note: 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"> Generally effective treatment of topic within the context of the task Compares the target culture with the student's own or another community, 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 <p>Scoring note: 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"> Effective treatment of topic within the context of the task Clearly compares the target culture with the student's own or another community, 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 <p>Scoring note: 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 spelling and 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

The question overviews can be found in the “Chief Reader Report on Student Responses” on [AP Central](#).

Sample: 4A

Score: 5

Transcript of Student’s Response(s)

Oggi vi parlerò delle attività preferite dei giovani e farò un confronto tra l’Italia e gli Stati Uniti. Si in Italia che in America eh ai giovani piacciono fare cose insieme e questa cosa è molto importante per le sue vite. Per esempio sempre vanno al centro commerciale o al parco a fare tutte queste cose. Però gli studenti americani . . per gli studenti americani la scuola è come il centro della vita perché la scuola ha i sport, la musica e tantissime altre cose in cui gli adolescenti possono essere insieme. È meno così in Italia perché c’è la scuola e poi c’è la vita fuori della scuola e sono cose separati così quando finisce la scuola inizi a fare altre cose con i tuoi amici. Per esempio in Italia dopo la scuola ho i . . ho cugini che vanno fuori per camminare con i suoi amici mentre negli Stati Uniti non facciamo questo solo magari andiamo a a casa per fare i compiti oppure abbiamo sport dopo la scuola. Eh ma una similarità è anche che ci sono modi e eventi solo per gli adolescenti si in Italia che in America. Per esempio i musei hanno cos . . hanno offerti speciali per gli adolescenti. Così, in conclusione, gli adolescenti in America e in Italia sono molto molto simili però in America la scuola è il centro della vita degli adolescenti e meno così in Italia. Grazie.

Commentary

This response is a strong performance in Presentational Speaking because it fully addresses the core theme of the task, preferred activities by young people, by using the following keywords/concepts: “giovani” and “attività preferite”. It constitutes an effective treatment of the topic within the context of the task because it carries out the assigned comparison in a clear and detailed manner – first, by stating that there is an overarching similarity between young people in Italy and the United States (“Si in Italia che in America eh ai giovani piacciono fare cose insieme . . . Per esempio sempre vanno al centro commerciale o al parco”) and then by explicating some of the nuances and contrasts that exist underneath this common umbrella. Transitional elements are deployed effectively to mark the different components of the argument (“Però gli studenti americani”; “Così, in conclusione, gli adolescenti in America e in Italia”). The response’s organization is clear, as the introduction aptly notes how young people like the same things in both communities while contrasting in the body where young people in Italy and in the U.S. perform such activities (“Però gli studenti americani . . per gli studenti americani la scuola è come il centro della vita perché la scuola ha i sport, la musica e tantissime altre cose in cui gli adolescenti possono essere insieme”; “È meno così in Italia perché c’è la scuola e poi c’è la vita fuori della scuola e sono cose separati”). There are relevant examples throughout the response that demonstrate understanding of the target culture, e.g., the reference to young Italians’ habit of spending time outside, even if only to walk, in contrast to their U.S. counterparts, who mostly go home (“per fare i compiti oppure abbiamo sport dopo la scuola”).

Question 4 (continued)

The reference to museums' *offerte speciali* both in Italy and the U.S. further reinforces the strength of the response, which is fully understandable and organized, and also makes use of transitional elements (“*per esempio*”; “*però*”; “*così*”; “*in conclusione*”) and coordinating devices despite minor errors in pronunciation (“*Si in Italia che in America*”). Overall, this response illustrates an effective treatment of the topic, and it therefore earned a score of 5.

Sample: 4B

Score: 3

Transcript of Student's Response(s)

Uh nella mia comunità uhm nelle State Uniti uhm penso che tutti i giovani uh fanno un sport uh come . . come football americano, uh lacrosse, uh calcio o hock . . or hockey uhm e molti giovani creando che uh il loro sport uh sia più importante uh che scuola o . . o uhm il suo uh i i loro a amici. Uhm ma uh l'estate scorso ho andato a Roma in Italia e ho uh ho vissuto un . . una cosa uh molto differente. Uhm uh I giovani uh uh . . penso che i giovani in Roma uhm . . uh . . uhm . . uscite uhm con i amici più uh di i giovani uh negli s . . negli Stati Uniti uhm e penso che loro non uh . . non si preoccupata con uh . . i sport o uhm . . you know . . sì uh i giovani sono . . i giovani in Italia sono molto atletico sì ma uh i giovani in Italia sono m . . più uhm . . più fle . . flessibile uhm e . . uh non . . uhm . . non deve uh partecipare uhm in un sport.

Commentary

This response is an example of a suitable treatment of the topic within the context of the task because it adequately compares the two cultures by saying what young people do in both Italy and the United States, concentrating primarily on sports culture versus friend culture. It states that while young people in the U.S. mostly practice a sport (“*nelle State Uniti uhm penso che tutti i giovani uh fanno un sport*”), those in Rome prefer going out with their friends (“*penso che i giovani in Roma uhm . . uh . . uhm . . uscite uhm con i amici più uh di i giovani uh negli s . . negli Stati Uniti*”) and are not very interested in sports. The examples provided demonstrate a basic understanding of the target culture because the response does not provide additional details on the favorite activities performed by young Italians. However, despite some inaccuracies, (“*ma uh i giovani in Italia sono m . . più uhm . . più fle . . flessibile uhm e . . uh non . . uhm . . non deve uh partecipare uhm in un sport*”) the response carries out the assigned comparison at a suitable level. In terms of linguistic abilities, the response remains appropriate but basic. Vocabulary, for instance, revolves heavily around the words “*giovani*” and “*sport*”. While there is some control of grammar, there are linguistic inconsistencies in the use of predicates, subject-verb, and noun-determiner agreement (“*ho andato*”; “*i giovani in Roma uhm . . uh . . uhm . . uscite*”; “*loro non uh . . non si preoccupata*”; “*i giovani in Italia sono molto atletico*”). Overall, the response is fair, and it accordingly earned a score of 3.

Question 4 (continued)

Sample: 4C

Score: 2

Transcript of Student's Response(s)

In mia opinione il ruolo delle attività preferite dai giovani è molto differenze tra giovani in Italia e giovani negli Stati Uniti. Negli Stati Uniti . . uh i giovani . . uh giocare di TV uh . . molto e . . penso che i . . uh giovani . . uh . . giocare di sta . . oh giovani di Stati Uniti uh vadano gioco . . più con gli amici e . . uh . . i giovani in Italia uh giocare con i sport e i compiti e . . preferito che loro sono con gli amic . . gli amici molto e per i giovani negli Stati Uniti preferito che loro sono gioco molto. Uh visto più giovani di Stati Uniti giocare di TV e non visto i giovani in Italia giocare di TV . . perché sono fuori molto ma non . . i giovani negli Stati Uniti.

Commentary

This response demonstrates a weak performance in Presentational Speaking. Within the context of the assigned comparison, this is an unsuitable treatment of the topic, because it confines itself largely to unconnected statements about activities performed by young people in Italy and in the United States. An actual comparison is only vaguely hinted at (for instance, in the somewhat contrastive statement “*visto più giovani di Stati Uniti giocare di TV e non visto i giovani in Italia giocare di TV*”). It is notable that the opening line of the presentation, which seems to thematize the assigned comparison (“*il ruolo delle attività preferite dai giovani*”) is a mere restatement of the prompt. It may be that the “*preferito*” was intended to express a contrast (“*e . . preferito che loro sono con gli amic . . gli amici molto*”; “*e per i giovani negli Stati Uniti preferito che loro sono gioco molto*”), but limited vocabulary and limited control of grammar (“*vadano gioco*”; “*loro sono gioco molto*”; “*giocare di TV*”) impede comprehensibility and render the intended meaning unclear. In addition to linguistic comprehensibility challenges, the hesitations and pauses of the presentation confirm the overall weakness of the response, which earned score of 2.