AP | CollegeBoard

AP German Language and Culture

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Task 3 — Conversation

☑ **Scoring Guideline**

☑ **Student Samples**

☑ **Scoring Commentary**

AP® GERMAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE
2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Identical to Scoring Guidelines used for French, Italian, 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.

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

Interpersonal Speaking: Conversation (Task 3) (continued)

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)

AP® GERMAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE
2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 3: Conversation

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 interpersonal communicative mode by having students 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.

In this exam, within the theme of Everyday Life (*Alltag*), the interlocutor (Thomas) opens the conversation by expressing to the student that he has had a really bad day stating, "You won't believe what happened to me today." (*Du wirst nicht glauben, was mir gerade passiert ist.)* The directions contained in the outline of the conversation tell the student to respond by expressing sympathy and asking Thomas for details about his situation. In the second turn, Thomas tells the student that his bicycle was stolen and asks what he should do about it. The student is directed to react to the situation Thomas has described. In the third turn, Thomas provides additional details and asks for advice; he is very upset because only last week he received the expensive bicycle as a present from his parents. He asks what he should tell his parents. The student is directed to react and give advice. In the fourth turn, Thomas describes some options for what he could do, and he asks for the student's opinion about one option: He has been planning a trip to Italy, but he is now considering cancelling the trip in order to save the money to buy a new bicycle. What would the student do in his place? (*Was würdest du an meiner Stelle tun?*) The student is supposed to both state an opinion and back it up with a rationale. In the final turn, Thomas asks for input into another problem: How will he get home now without a bicycle? The directions tell the student to make a suggestion.

Sample: 3A
Score:

Transcription of Student Response
1. Ach nein, was ist mit dir passiert? Ich hoffe, dass es nicht zu schlecht war. Ich kann dir helfen.
2. Das ist so schade, dass du dein, äh, Fahrrad . . dass dein Fahrrad gestohlen war. Ahm, ich glaube, dass du musst nach der Polizei gehen, aber ich weiß nicht, was sie machen könnten.
3. Oh, das ist nicht gut, dass es teuer war, und dass es war nur letzte Woche, dass du den Fahrrad bekommen hat, aber ich glaube, dass du musst . . dass du musst deine Eltern erklären was ist passiert, und dass es
4. Ich bin der Meinung, dass du soll nicht die Geld, ähm, für eine neue Fahrrad kau-, ähm, benutzen. Aber, ja, ich glaube, dass du soll nach Italien gehen, und du kannst deine Eltern fragen für noch ein Fahrrad, ich glaube.
5. Ich kann dir fahren, aber, ja ich kann dir fahren . . oder du kannst mit mir nach meine Hause gehen, und wir können Fußball spielen, aber wenn du das nicht will, dann kann ich dir nach Hause fahren.

Commentary
This response is a good performance in Interpersonal Speaking. It maintains the exchange with a series of utterances that, taken together, constitute a "generally" appropriate response to the interlocutor in this conversation task. The student addresses each prompt by providing the explicitly required information along

with some elaboration (e.g., "*ich glaube, dass du musst nach der Polizei gehen, aber ich weiß nicht, was sie machen könnten*"; "*oder du kannst mit mir nach meine Hause gehen, und wir können Fußball spielen*"), although occasionally an utterance does not go very much further than employing repetition and making a fairly minimal new contribution to the conversation ("*Oh, das ist nicht gut, dass es teuer war, und dass es war nur letzte Woche, dass du den Fahrrad bekommen hat, aber ich glaube, dass du musst . . dass du musst deine Eltern erklären was ist passiert, und dass es*"). This is an important factor that keeps the response from rising to the level of a 5.

The response is fully understandable with some errors, which do not impede comprehensibility (e.g., "*Ich kann dir fahren*"); the frequency of the errors, however, keeps the response from exhibiting the ease and clarity of expression that would be typical for a strong performance. The response shows varied and generally appropriate vocabulary, with correct usage of expressions such as "*schade*"; "*ich glaube*"; "*erklären*"; "*Ich bin der Meinung*"; it is different from a typical response at the level of a 5; however, in that these are all relatively high-frequency expressions and because there are clear mistakes in word choice as well (*nach der Polizei*, *fragen für*). Grammar and syntax show only "general" control in that word order is mostly correct, even in dependent clauses, but some errors remain (e.g., "*du soll*"; "*für eine neue Fahrrad*"; "*du … will*"). Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response mostly comprehensible. Self-correction improves comprehensibility ("*Geld, ähm, für eine neue Fahrrad kau-*"; "*benutzen*"). This response accordingly received a score of 4.

Sample: 3B
Score: 3

Transcription of Student Response
1. Ah, hallo Thomas, ah, was ist dein Problem, und w-, warum hast du ein nicht so gut day, Tag?
2. Es tut mir leid, das ist nicht so gut. Ahm . . was ist das Problem mit dein Fahrrad? Kann ich helfen du? Kann ich helfst du?
3. Ja, das ist nicht so gut, ahm, aber ich würde sprechen mit dein, deine Eltern über, ahm, Geld . . und du, du kannst, kannst du
4. Meine Meinung nach, ahm . . Geld ist sehr wichtig mit ein Fahrradproblem, . . aber ich würde, ahm . . kaufen ein
5. Du kannst . . ähm, wandern und, ähm . . fahren die Bus, ja? Das ist mein Lösung für dich.

Commentary
This response is a fair performance in Interpersonal Speaking as it maintains the exchange with a series of responses that are only somewhat appropriate within the context of the task. While the student is able to respond to each of the interlocutor's utterances, some of the answers don't completely address the interlocutor's explicit requests and suggest a lack of comprehension. In turn 2, for example, the student reacts only somewhat appropriately to the news that Thomas' bike has been stolen, expressing sympathy ("*Es tut mir leid, das ist nicht so gut*"), but then asking a redundant question ("*was ist das Problem mit dein Fahrrad?*"). Less jarring but still frustrating is the student's reaction in turn 3, where Thomas asks: "*Was soll ich bloß meinen Eltern sagen?*" The student gives a vague piece of advice to "talk about money" ("*ich würde sprechen mit dein, deine Eltern über, ahm, Geld*").

The response also provides only very little elaboration (turn 5 is perhaps the best: "*Ja, das ist mein Lösung für dich*"). The response is generally understandable and is characterized by appropriate but basic vocabulary and idiomatic language (e.g., "*was ist dein Problem*"; "*kann ich helfen*"; "*Geld ist sehr wichtig*"; "*meine Meinung nach*"). Occasionally, errors impede comprehensibility (e.g., "*Du kannst . . ähm, wandern*"). The response shows some control of grammar and syntax, with several errors ("*Kann ich helfen du?*"; "*ich würde sprechen mit*

… deine Eltern"). Self-correction is frequently not successful (*"Kann ich helfen du? Kann ich helfst du?"*), although it sometimes improves comprehensibility (*"day, Tag"*). Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response generally comprehensible, with occasional errors that impede comprehensibility (e.g., *"Problem"*). This response received a score of 3.

Sample: 3C
Score: 2

Transcription of Student Response
1. Es tut mir leid. Es ist schade. Was passiert?
2. Ahm, es tut mir leid. Ah . . können ich helfen ihr?
3. Du sollst deine Eltern fragen, ähm, für Geld. Du könnst, ah, um die Hause helfen . . und bekommen Geld.
4. Ahm, ich glaube, dass du . . arbeitet . . und Geld, bekommen Geld.
5. Ja, das hört gut zu mir. Bis später. Tschüs.

Commentary
This response is a weak performance in Interpersonal Speaking. It only partially succeeds in maintaining the exchange with a series of responses that are only minimally appropriate within the context of the task. The student's utterances in turns 4 and 5 of the conversation do not appear to respond to the interlocutor's specific concerns at all. In turns 1 through 3 of the conversation, though, the student is able to respond to the interlocutor in ways that are minimal, but mostly appropriate within the context of the task. For example, in turn 3, the student answers Thomas' question about what he should tell his parents with the suggestion that he ask his parents for money or to maybe do chores to earn the money (*"Du könnst, ah, um die Hause helfen . . und bekommen Geld."*), although there is no acknowledgement of his dilemma that the bicycle was a recent gift from the parents. However, the response in turn 4 is not a clearly appropriate response to Thomas' question about whether he should use his pocket money for a trip to Italy or a new bike; instead, the student simply repeats the previous suggestion that Thomas should try to earn money (*"ich glaube, dass du . . arbeitet . . und … bekommen Geld"*), while the response in turn 5 suggests that the student has not understood Thomas' question about suggestions for alternative transportation at all (*"Ja, das hört gut zu mir"*). While the response is mostly comprehensible, it includes errors that force interpretation (e.g., *"Du könnst, ah, um die Hause helfen*; *ich glaube, dass du . . arbeitet . . und … bekommen Geld"*; *"das hört gut zu mir"*) to an extent much greater than in a typical response receiving a score of 3. The response contains only limited vocabulary and idiomatic language (e.g., *"Was passiert"*; *"können ich helfen ihr"*; *"Bis später"*), as indicated by its brevity, and shows limited control of grammar and syntax (*"ich glaube, dass du . . arbeitet . . und … bekommen Geld"*). This response accordingly received a score of 2.