
AP German Language and Culture

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Task 4 — Cultural Comparison

- 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

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[®] GERMAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

Identical to Scoring Guidelines used for French, Italian, 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[®] GERMAN 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 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 students 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 needed to compare the student's own community to an area of the German-speaking world, demonstrating understanding of cultural features of the German-speaking world. Furthermore the presentation had to be organized clearly.

In this exam, within the theme of Everyday Life (*Alltag*), students were asked about how the school system influences the life of people in their social environment. (*Wie beeinflusst das Schulsystem das Leben der Menschen in Ihrem sozialen Umfeld?*) In their oral presentations, students compared perspectives on this question in their home communities with those in a German-speaking region and were also invited to describe their own observations, experiences, or what they had learned in school.

Sample: 4A

Score: 4

Transcription of Student Response

Das Schulsystem in Deutschland ist sehr anders als der, das Schulsystem im der Vereinigen Staaten. In Deutschland gibt es Grundschule, und dann Studenten, Schüleren, gehen zu Hauptschule oder Gymnasium nach die hat die Abitur genommen. In den USA es gibt Grundschule und dann Schüleren gehen zu der Hochschule und dann gehen zum einer Universität — oder nicht. Nicht alle Studenten gehen zum Universität. In Deutschland es gibt auch eine Note. Es gibt eins, zwei, drei, vier, oder fünf. Aber in den Vereinigten Staaten gibt es eine A, B, C, D oder ein F. Ah, in Deutschland das Schulsystem ist sehr praktischer. Es, es hilft mit, es hilft die Schüleren zu, zu bereiten für deine Lieben. Aber in den USA es ist nicht so praktischer. Ah, Eltern sagen: du kannst alles geworden. Du kannst, ah, Präsident geworden. Aber das, das stimmt nicht. In den Vereinigten Staaten es . . es ist nicht so . . Was man sagt, es ist nicht alles der Wahrheit. Für meiner Schule ich wohne im einer klein Ort. Ah, meine Schule hat wie 2.500 Schüleren. Aber im Deutschland es gibt es, gibt auch kleine Ort, aber es gibt auch große Stadten wie Berlin, oder Köln oder, äh, München. So die Schule, das Schulsystem da ist, es ist viel gleich aber nicht, nicht immer. Äh, im die Vereinigten Staaten Schüler, Schul, ah

Commentary

This response constitutes a good performance in Presentational Speaking with a generally effective treatment of the topic *Schulsystem* within the context of the task. The response demonstrates some factual knowledge of the German school system (“*In Deutschland gibt es Grundschule und dann Studenten ah Schülerinnen gehen zu Hauptschule oder Gymnasium*”; “*Abitur*”) despite minor inaccuracies (“*Es gibt eins zwei drei vier oder fünf*”). The response is only generally effective because it does not consistently portray the **influence** of the school system on the lives of people, as would be expected from a 5. The student does present a rudimentary thesis that the German school system is more effective in preparing young people for life (“*in Deutschland das Schulsystem ist sehr praktischer. Es, es hilft mit, es hilft die Schüleren zu, zu bereiten für deine Lieben. Aber in den USA es ist nicht so praktischer*”), but the comparison is left hanging as an assertion and is not rooted in any observation about the specific institutions. There is some effective use of transitional elements and cohesive devices (*In*

AP[®] GERMAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 4: Cultural Comparison (continued)

Deutschland es gibt ... Aber in den Vereinigten Staaten gibt es”), which give the response organization. The language is generally appropriate and fully understandable, despite some errors (“*du kannst alles geworden*”). The student’s control of grammar, syntax, and usage is at a “general” level that includes a number of errors in areas such as word order or verb structure (“*Schüleren, gehen zu Hauptschule oder Gymnasium nach die hat die Abitur genommen*”; “*Für meiner Schule ich wohne*”; “*Du kannst, ah, Präsident geworden*”). The response accordingly received a score of 4.

Sample: 4B

Score: 3

Transcription of Student Response

Ah, Hallo. Ah, vielen Dank vor, äh, meines Vortrags, äh, gehören. Ahm . . . äh, meine Thema ist über, äh, das Skulsystem in die, in der USA und Deutschland. Ahm, in, in USA, ah, Schüleren, ah, beginnen in Kindergarten, ahm, und dann, äh, Grundschule, ahm, dann Hohe-chule. Äh, der ist viel Universitäts und, und viel Jobben für Post, äh, Schüler. Ahm, in Deutschland, äh, Sch-, Schüleren, äh, beginnen in, äh, Grundschule und dann, ahm . . . äh studieren in, uh, drei andere Schule. Ah, beim Austausch haben ich gelernt, dass viel intelligent Studieren, äh, zu der Gymnasium gehen, ahm, und in Deutschklasse habe ich gelernt, dass nicht viel Studieren Uni gehen. Ahm, im beide USA und Deutschland, äh, studieren haben viel Jahren in Schule. Ah, Schule helfen für Arbeiten. Ah, meiner Meinung nach

Commentary

This response constitutes a fair performance in Presentational Speaking because its treatment of the topic of *Schule* is at a “suitable” level. The response fulfills the basic requirements of the Cultural Comparison task by comparing and contrasting one community (“*in USA, aah, Schüleren, ah, beginnen in Kindergarten, ahm, und dann, äh, Grundschule, ahm, dann Hoh-Schule*”) with a community in the target culture (“*in Deutschland Schülerin beginnen in Grundschule*”). The response demonstrates a basic understanding of the target culture with its portrayal of a trifurcated secondary system; it does not rise above this level because of a lack of specificity (for instance, the three parts remain unnamed: “*in, uh, drei andere Schule*”), a confusing, Anglicized misuse of the verb *studieren* to apply to school students, and a number of observations where it is unclear what exactly is being said and if the two communities are being contrasted in any way (“*in Deutschklasse habe ich gelernt, dass nicht viel Studieren Uni gehen*”). The response is not clearly organized; pairs of contrasting statements are made without much transition, and the occasional transition phrase is wrongly deployed (“*im beide USA und Deutschland*”). There is only “some” control of grammar, syntax, and usage, as evidenced in phrases such as “*vielen Dank vor, äh, meines Vortrags, äh, gehören*”; “*viel Jobben für Post, äh, Schüler*”; “*Schule helfen für Arbeiten*”; although the response is generally understandable, such errors impede comprehensibility. The response accordingly received a score of 3.

Sample: 4C

Score: 2

Transcription of Student Response

Hallo! Heute ich werde über wie beeinflusst das Schulsystem das Leben in der Menschen, der Menschen in Ihrem social, in meiner social Umfeld. Äh, so in der USA ich, ich sah, dass der, da sind mehr Gruppe, Gruppe, kleine Gruppe mit nur kleine Nummer mit Leute. And, ahm . . . äh . . . and es schaut, dass wenn du hast, ahm, nur, äh . . . kleine Int-, Interessst und das sagt wie viele Freunde you, du hast. Und, ahm, deine, wan-, hm. Und dann in Deutschland, äh, neh, alle Leute ist egal. Sie alle, äh, versuch zu haben die, ahm . . . ah, some, egal Dinge. Hm. In beide Länder, ich denke in beide — nicht ich denke, ich weiß, in beide Länder, beide, äh, Leut-, Student, äh,

**AP[®] GERMAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE
2018 SCORING COMMENTARY**

Task 4: Cultural Comparison (continued)

Schülern, äh, versuch, ah, so viel Fre-, Freunde, gem-, äh, machen, weil da, äh, da wollen, äh, so viele Freunden und, ahm, hmm . . Wa-, wann du bi-, wann du bist hat so viele Freunde es schau, dass du bist auf Englisch popular, populär, und dass du bi-, du, Leute können, äh sprechen

Commentary

This response is a weak performance in Presentational Speaking. It is an unsuitable treatment of the topic of *Schule* in that it consists mostly of statements with no development (“*Nicht ich denke, ich weiß, in beide Länder, beide, äh, Leut-, Student, äh, Schülern, äh, versuch, ah, so viel Fre-, Freunde, gem-, äh, machen, weil da, äh, da wollen, äh, so viele Freunden und, ahm, hmm*”). While the response presents evidence from both the U.S. and Germany (“*in der USA*”; “*in Deutschland*”; “*In beide Länder*”), the contrast that is attempted is not coherent and is not developed enough for a 3 (“*in der USA ich, ich sah, dass der, da sind mehr Gruppe, Gruppe, kleine Gruppe mit nur kleine Nummer mit Leute*”; “*in Deutschland, äh, neh, alle Leute ist egal*”). The response demonstrates a limited understanding of the school system in the target culture, evidenced by lack of references to institutions. The only apparent point made is about the size of the groups of friends, and even this point seems to be contradicted by the end of the presentation. The limited vocabulary, control, and pacing in this response make it difficult to comprehend at times (“*in beide Länder, beide, äh, Leut-, Student, äh, Schülern, äh, versuch, ah, so viel Fre-, Freunde, gem-, äh, machen*”; “*Wa-, wann du bi-, wann du bist hat so viele Freunde es schau*”). The response, therefore, received a score of 2.