
AP German Language and Culture

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Task 2 — Persuasive Essay

- 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 Writing: Persuasive Essay (Task 2)

Clarification Note:

There is no single expected format or style for referring to and identifying sources appropriately. For example, test takers may opt to: directly cite content in quotation marks; paraphrase content and indicate that it is “according to Source 1” or “according to the audio file”; refer to the content and indicate the source in parentheses “(Source 2)”; refer to the content and indicate the source using the author’s name “(Smith)”; etc.

5: STRONG performance in Presentational Writing

- Effective treatment of topic within the context of the task
- Demonstrates a high degree of comprehension of the sources’ viewpoints, with very few minor inaccuracies
- Integrates content from all three sources in support of the essay
- Presents and defends the student’s own viewpoint on the topic with a high degree of clarity; develops a persuasive argument with coherence and detail
- Organized essay; 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
- Develops paragraph-length discourse with a variety of simple and compound sentences, and some complex sentences

4: GOOD performance in Presentational Writing

- Generally effective treatment of topic within the context of the task
- Demonstrates comprehension of the sources’ viewpoints; may include a few inaccuracies
- Summarizes, with limited integration, content from all three sources in support of the essay
- Presents and defends the student’s own viewpoint on the topic with clarity; develops a persuasive argument with coherence
- Organized essay; 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
- Develops mostly paragraph-length discourse with simple, compound, and a few complex sentences

3: FAIR performance in Presentational Writing

- Suitable treatment of topic within the context of the task
- Demonstrates a moderate degree of comprehension of the sources’ viewpoints; includes some inaccuracies
- Summarizes content from at least two sources in support of the essay
- Presents and defends the student’s own viewpoint on the topic; develops a somewhat persuasive argument with some coherence
- 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
- Uses strings of mostly simple sentences, with a few compound sentences

AP[®] GERMAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2018 SCORING GUIDELINES

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

Presentational Writing: Persuasive Essay (Task 2) (continued)

2: WEAK performance in Presentational Writing

- Unsuitable treatment of topic within the context of the task
- Demonstrates a low degree of comprehension of the sources' viewpoints; information may be limited or inaccurate
- Summarizes content from one or two sources; may not support the essay
- Presents, or at least suggests, the student's own viewpoint on the topic; develops an unpersuasive argument somewhat incoherently
- Limited organization; ineffective use of transitional elements or cohesive devices
- Partially understandable, with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the reader
- Limited vocabulary and idiomatic language
- Limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage
- Uses strings of simple sentences and phrases

1: POOR performance in Presentational Writing

- Almost no treatment of topic within the context of the task
- Demonstrates poor comprehension of the sources' viewpoints; includes frequent and significant inaccuracies
- Mostly repeats statements from sources or may not refer to any sources
- Minimally suggests the student's own viewpoint on the topic; argument is undeveloped or incoherent
- 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
- Very simple sentences or fragments

0: UNACCEPTABLE performance in Presentational Writing

- 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
- Not in the language of the exam

- (hyphen): BLANK (no response)

Alle lieben reisen, Wir lieben wandern zu gehen und Fremdtiere zu sehen, wir lieben Städte zu besuchen und Essen zu probieren. Aber, ~~das ist nicht unser Planet~~ ~~das ist nicht unser Planet~~ alle Reisende müssen auch etwas anderes akzeptieren: Reisen ist für die Umwelt schlimm. Wenn wir unser Planet wirklich lieben, und wenn wir die Sachen die wir toll finden wirklich schätzen wollen, müssen wir weniger reisen.

Einfach reisen zu gehen ist für die Umwelt unglaublich schlecht. Obwohl wir normalerweise ~~nicht~~ uns nicht daran kümmern, ~~Flugzeuge, Hotels, und~~ Flugzeuge und Hotels nützen viele Energie. Laut Quellenmaterial 2, wird eine Reise von Deutschland nach Mexiko 7218 kg CO₂ produzieren. Und wenn wir unsere Welttemperatur nicht ändern wollen, sollen wir persönlich ~~2500 kg~~ nur 2500 kg CO₂ pro Jahr produzieren. (QM 2)

Do Not Write Beyond This Border

Do Not Write Beyond This Border

Reisen dauern normalerweise 1-2 Wochen,
so viele Energie zu verschwenden und
so viele CO₂ zu produzieren für so
eine kleine Teil des Jahres ist einfach
unpraktisch ~~ist~~ und eine Verschwendung.

Viele meinen dass ~~Reisen~~ die
Gesundheit deiner Seele von einer
Reise ~~ab~~ abhängig ist, aber das ist
auch falsch. Die stimmen, dass wenn
man reisen geht, lernt man über seine
eigene Identität (QM1), dass Herausforderungen
zu überwinden und fremde Leute ~~ist~~
zu treffen unsere Persönlichkeit baut,
(QM2). Aber man kann auch solche
Ergebnisse haben, ohne ^{weit} ~~man~~ reisen
zu gehen, (QM3) Und Herausforderungen
~~ist~~ Besondere zu erleben,
kann man immer ^{zu Hause} neue Sachen
machen, zum Beispiel ein ~~Sport~~ ~~ist~~
kann man einen neuen Sport machen.
Und wenn Reisende Vielfältigkeit
wollen, können sie immer neue
Freunde machen die von einer anderen
Kultur kommen, oder eine neue
Sprache lernen. Ich meine, es ist

Do Not Write Beyond This Border

Do Not Write Beyond This Border

unvorstellbar dass jemand eine ganze Stadt erlebt hat^(QMS) Um die Umwelt zu schützen, sollen sie solche Stadtbliche-Erlebnisse machen

Ich verstehe warum so viele Reisen lieben und total gerne reisen: unsere Planet ist wirklich toll

Wir haben Vielfaltigkeit von Kulturen, von Natur, und von Leute. Aber, unsere Klima ändert sich und wird jeden Tag schlimmer. Obwohl reisen zu

gehen deine persönliche Erlebnisse baut, ~~ANNA~~ hätte es auch Luftverschmutzung und Klima warming. ~~ANNA~~ Und wie ich schon erklärt habe, ~~KONTRA~~

kann man persönlich entwickeln ohne reisen. Wenn wir einfach fortfahren, und ~~so~~ weiter reisen wird unsere Umwelt nur schlimmer, und wird es in Zukunft nichts mehr schönes ^{durch reisen} zu besuchen. Deshalb soll man für Umweltgründen weniger reisen und fliegen.

Do Not Write Beyond This Border

Do Not Write Beyond This Border

Do Not Write Beyond This Border

Do Not Write Beyond This Border

So viel Personen ~~die~~ ~~die~~ liebe reisen, Es macht ein Mann oder eine Frau sehr froh und es macht Leben besser. Alle Familien reisen und sie ~~hat~~ hat viel Spass, Aber reisen ist nicht ein hundert ~~per~~ Prozent Perfekt, es kostet viele und es ist nicht Geld, Quellenmaterial Nummer zwei sagt so viel CO₂ eine reise für ~~zwei~~ ~~zwei~~ wochen für eine ~~Person~~ Person. Wenn geht zu Mexiko mit einem Flugzeug und du Schlafst in einem 5-Sterne-Hotel du machst 7218 kg von CO₂. Das ist so viel! Die Welt ist krank und ~~CO₂~~ CO₂ ist die Problem, Mann macht so viele CO₂ und wir haben Problem und Problem mit die Welt. Es is zu heiss und die wetter ist schlecht und alle kommt von CO₂. Quellen material Nummer eines spricht über so schön reisen ist und sagt es ist interessant. Es ist interessant und helfen viele Menschen lernen und ~~lieben~~ lieben in ein Komfortzone nicht. Aber, nicht alle Menschen kanno fliegen und fahren für reise! Die Welt werden tot weil alle Menschen reisen!

Quellenmaterial ~~Nummer~~ Nummer Drei spricht über ~~Flugzeug~~ Flugzeug und neue Autos. Sie sagt "neue Autos sind besser für die Welt," und sie sind richtig. Neue Autos sind besser für die Welt aber sie

Sind nicht gut für die Welt, Ja, sie sind besser aber nicht am besten! Was ist am besten für die Welt ist keine Flugzeug und keine Autos aber das ist nicht realistisch.

Ende des Tages wir muss arbeiten für die Welt, wir muss mehr Menschen in eine sehr gutes Auto zu ein Platz gehen, wir muss bessere Flugzeug machen und wir muss fliegen nicht so viele, Reise ist gut, aber nicht für die Welt, und das ist eine grosses Problem,

Do Not Write Beyond This Border

Do Not Write Beyond This Border

2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

Sample 2C

Do Not Write Beyond This Border

Reise dich. Interessant ist richtig. Reisen ist sehr
Spaß und Leute lieben es. Es ist dem Mind helfen.
Die Sonne und heiße klimaten ist gut für Leute.
"Reisen" holen uns aus unserer Komfortzone. Deine
Komfortzone ist schlecht. Leute laufen aus.

Die klimaschädlich ist sehr important. Leute fahren
ein Auto zu die Ostsee. Leute fliegen zu Spanien
und Mexiko. Mehr Geld ist verkauft. Leute kaufen ein
5-Sterne-Hotel ins Mexiko. Mexiko hat ein
-7218 CO₂. Diese ist die großen. Das ist schlecht
für die klimaschädlich. ~~Wenig~~ Leute gehen auf reise,
even though es ist schlecht für die klimaschädlich.

Do Not Write Beyond This Border

AP[®] GERMAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 2: Persuasive Essay

Note: Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain grammatical errors.

Overview

This task assessed writing in the presentational communicative mode by having students write a persuasive essay on a given topic while referencing three sources of information about the topic. Students were first allotted 6 minutes to read the essay topic and the two printed sources. Then they listened to the one audio source twice. Afterward they had 40 minutes to write the essay. The response received a single, holistic score based on how well it accomplished the assigned task. Students needed to be able, first, to comprehend the three sources, and then to present their different viewpoints. They also had to present their own individual viewpoint and defend it thoroughly, using information from all the sources to support the essay. As they referred to the sources, they needed to identify them appropriately. Furthermore the essay had to be organized into clear paragraphs.

In this exam, within the theme of Global Challenges (*Globalisierung*), students wrote essays in response to the question of whether one should reduce travel and flying for environmental reasons (*Sollte man aus Umweltgründen weniger reisen und fliegen?*)

The first print source (*Quellenmaterial 1*) offers a variety of reasons why travel is important. The opening paragraph points out the benefit of creating physical distance to one's home by traveling and breaking out of the everyday routine of one's life. Travel is presented as a means of self-discovery and personal growth through an experience of one's own challenges, limitations, and fears. Simultaneously, travel helps us develop our own identity by forcing us to switch the perspective from which we view ourselves. The article concludes by stating that traveling broadens our horizons and provides us with new inspiration for our lives.

The second print source (*Quellenmaterial 2*), a table entitled "Touristic Climate-Footprint" (*Touristischer Klima-Fußabdruck*), offers six examples of journeys to different destinations, using different means of transportation and stays in various classes of accommodations; for contrastive purposes, it also provides details for just staying at home. The last column lists the overall ecological footprint in kilograms of carbon dioxide emissions for each option. A footnote to the table states that international climate experts have recommended an annual CO₂ emissions goal of 2,500 kg per individual, the equivalent of a single plane trip from Germany to New York City.

Quellenmaterial 3, the 3-minute audio which students are able to hear twice, presents an interview between the moderator, Stefan Siller, and the economist and growth critic, Professor Niko Paech. The interview begins with Paech narrating the circumstances of the only flight in his life, when he went to visit his doctoral adviser in Washington, D.C. Apart from that flight, he has decided to not use planes for transportation because of their adverse environmental impact. The conversation broadens into a wider discussion of the luxuries that we think we can allow ourselves, despite their environmental ramifications. Paech observes that if everyone were to travel to South Africa to see the wildlife there, it would lead to dark times for the planet. People may have the right to travel, but they should consider the competing rights of other people and future generations before making use of this right.

AP[®] GERMAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 2: Persuasive Essay (continued)

Sample: 2A
Score: 5

This response constitutes an effective treatment of the topic within the context of the task, beginning with a strong introductory paragraph that clearly sets out the student's own viewpoint: "*Wenn wir unser Planet wirklich lieben, und wenn wir die Sachen die wir toll finden wirklich schützen wollen, müssen wir weniger reisen.*" A persuasive argument is developed that integrates both the student's thesis ("*Einfach reisen zu gehen ist für die Umwelt unglaublich schlecht*") and the source material in paragraph-length discourse.

The essay builds its argument by first drawing out the implications of source 2, which is mined not only for a factual example of CO₂ emissions from a trip to Mexico but also for a key scientific recommendation about emission levels that was included in the footnote to the chart. Showing a high degree of comprehension, the student skilfully summarizes these pieces of information and integrates them seamlessly into a very persuasive position that condemns the high cost of short vacation trips in terms of energy and emissions and labels them "wasteful" ("*einfach unpraktisch und eine Verschwendung*").

Having effectively established the thesis that we should travel less ("*weniger reisen*"), the student then refutes at length the implicitly pro-travel arguments of source 1. The student demonstrates a high degree of comprehension of the source by succinctly recapitulating some of its key statements about travel ("*Viele meinen dass die Gesundheit deiner Seele von einer Reise abhängig ist; Und wenn Reisende Vielfältigkeit wollen*"); having thus elucidated the values at the heart of the position, the student is then able to argue that these values can be realized in a way that involves less travel. Paraphrasing source 3, the student states that the challenges ("*Herausforderungen*") of travel and a confrontation with people from other cultures ("*fremde Leute*") can be experienced closer to home. Adventure is at your doorstep ("*es ist unvorstellbar dass jemand eine ganze Stadt erlebt hat*"), and stay-at-homes are just as able to connect with other cultures: "*neue Freunde machen die von einer anderer Kultur kommen.*" Travel turns out to be inessential to the "*persönliche Erlebnisse*" and growth at the core of the pro-travel position, for "*man kann auch solche Erlebnisse haben ohne weit reisen zu gehen.*" In this way the response integrates content even from the source most opposed to the student's position and makes a truly convincing argument.

With respect to language, this response effectively uses transitional elements ("*wenn*"; "*obwohl*"; "*aber*") as well as varied and appropriate grammar ("*Verschwendung*"; "*abhängig*"; "*Vielfältigkeit*"; "*unvorstellbar*"). The response is fully understandable, at times, with ease and clarity of expression ("*Um besondere Herausforderungen zu erleben, kann man immer zu Hause neue Sachen machen*"), as well as some errors that do not impede comprehensibility ("*Obwohl reisen zu gehen deine persönliche Erlebnisse baut, hilft es auch Luftverschmutzung und Klimawarmung*"). This is a strong performance in Presentational Writing, and the response accordingly received a score of 5.

Sample: 2B
Score: 3

This response is a relatively focused discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of travel that draws on the assigned sources and which meets the basic expectations of the essay format; as such it constitutes a suitable treatment of the topic within the context of the task. The student's viewpoint in this response is critical of travel; in the opening lines of the essay the reasoning behind the viewpoint is somewhat vague ("*reisen ist nicht einhundert perzent perfekt, es kostet viele und es ist nicht Geld*"), but it is developed and reformulated in a summation of source 2, which is used to underscore the finding that travel-based CO₂ emissions are a problem:

AP[®] GERMAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2018 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 2: Persuasive Essay (continued)

“Wenn geht zu Mexiko mit einem Flugzeug und du schlafst in einen 5-Sterne-Hotel du machst 7218 kg von CO₂ ... Die Welt ist krank und CO₂ ist die Problem.” The student’s thesis accordingly makes sense but is everywhere burdened by linguistically unclear or imprecise formulation: *“nicht alle Menschen kanne fliegen und fahren für Reise! Die Welt werden tot weil alle Menschen Reisen!”*

Another reason why this essay is ultimately only somewhat persuasive is because this viewpoint based on source 2 is not well integrated into a confrontation with the other sources, whose content is moreover less well comprehended. Source 3, which in fact would support the student’s viewpoint, is almost entirely misunderstood as advocating for advanced automobiles (*“Neue Autos sind besser für die Welt”*); the only phrase that could be construed as relating to this source is a blanket rejection of airplanes (*“am besten für die Welt ist keine Flugzeug”*). Characteristically for this essay, this stark conclusion is left standing, unmediated and unresolved: *“aber das ist nicht realistisch.”* Source 1 is treated similarly. The student gives a rough idea of the source’s content with an opening statement that travel is enjoyable, and later cites the source explicitly, summarizing it in basic terms as *“Quellen material Nummer Eines spricht über so schön Reisen ist und sagt es ist interessant ... und helfen viele Menschen lernen und lieben in sein Komfortzone nicht.”* This positive estimation of travel is allowed to stand right through to the end of the essay, whose conclusion is an unsatisfying dichotomy: *“Reise ist gut, aber nicht für die Welt und das ist eine grosstes Problem.”*

The response is organized, with an introductory section and a concluding paragraph bracketing a discussion of the sources. The student’s attempt at a smoothly integrated argument is unsuccessful, however, and the effectiveness of the individual points is weakened because of the appropriate but basic vocabulary and only some control of grammar (*“Mann macht so viele CO₂ und wir haben Problem und Problem mit die Welt. Es is zu heiss und die wetter ist schlecht und alle kommt von CO₂”*). As a result this response is only “suitable” in terms of the scoring guidelines. Still the response is somewhat persuasive with generally understandable language, despite the fact that some errors impede comprehensibility: *“es ist nicht Geld”*; *“Menschen kanne fliegen”*; *“Die welt werden tot”*; *“Wir muss mehr Menschen in eine sehr gutes Auto zu ein Platz gehen.”* Overall this is a fair performance in Presentational Writing, and the response, therefore, received a score of 3.

Sample: 2C **Score: 2**

This response is an unsuitable treatment of the topic within the context of the task, as the discussion of travel is inadequate when measured against the expectations for a source-based persuasive essay. Key features of a successful argument are either missing or present only in fragments. For example, the first short paragraph appears to endorse the pro-travel position of source 1 with an unattributed summary (*“Reisen ist sehr Spaß und Leute liebt es. Es ist dem Mind halten.”*), while a contradictory anti-travel viewpoint is suggested in the second paragraph that appears to reference source 2 (*“Leute kaufen ein 5-Sterne-Hotel ins Mexiko. Mexiko hat ein 7218 CO₂ ... Das ist schlecht fur die Klimaschäldich”*). There is no indication that source 3 is understood or consulted. What remains at the end of the response is an incoherent and unpersuasive position that merely registers two facts: *“Leute gehen auf reise, even though es ist schlecht für die klimaschädlich.”*

Recourse to the use of English (“Mind”; “climaten”; “even though”) suggests limited vocabulary resources. The language is partially understandable with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the reader (*“Deine Komfortzone ist schlecht. Leute laufen aus.”*). A low degree of comprehension is demonstrated for source 2 (*“Mehr Geld ist verkauft. Leute kaufen ein 5-Sterne-Hotel ins Mexiko.”*). This response summarizes content from two sources, which may not support the essay (source 3 is omitted). This is a weak performance in Presentational Writing, and the response accordingly received a score of 2.