
AP[®] Spanish Language and Culture

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Task 3—Conversation

- Scoring Guideline**
- Student Samples**
- Scoring Commentary**

AP[®] SPANISH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2019 SCORING GUIDELINES

Identical to Scoring Guidelines used for French, German, and Italian 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.

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.

**AP[®] SPANISH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE
2019 SCORING GUIDELINES**

Interpersonal Speaking: Conversation (Task 3) (continued)

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[®] SPANISH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2019 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 3: Conversation

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 interpersonal communicative mode by having the student 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.

The course theme for this task was "Personal and Public Identities." The students were asked to engage in a conversation with Marta, a friend from the Hispanic Community Center. They are working on a mural that represents famous people from the Spanish-speaking world.

1. In the first prompt, Marta greets the student and asks who should be included in the mural and why. The outline directs students to respond and explain why.
2. In the second prompt, Marta accepts the suggestion, then asks how they can find information about that person. The outline directs students to respond with details.
3. In the third prompt, Marta suggests a location for the mural. The conversation outline indicates that the student should reject the suggestion and to offer another option.
4. In the fourth prompt, Marta agrees on the location and asks for ideas to raise funds for the project. The student is asked to respond with details.
5. In the fifth prompt, Marta comments that it will be a lot of work, and asks how they can involve more people to help out, and again the students should respond with details.

Sample: 3A

Score: 5

Transcript of Student Response

Hola Marta . . ah . . pues ah pienso que debemos incluir a Pablo Picasso por . . ah sus cuadros muy abstractos uh y también uh apreciar la música como Celia Cruz . . ah . . es un cantante muy famoso que representa . . a . . personas en . . Latinoamérica.

O sí para Pablo Picasso estoy en un clase de historia . . ah . . y yo sé mucho información sobre él y sus . . ah . . arte tus cuadros famosos . . ah . . y en la Internet y por mi maestro . . uh yo sé mucho, y uh también uh la gui . .

Mmm . . pues no . . pienso que ah . . puede poner ah podemos poner ah el mural enfrente de la catedral . . es muy bonita y muchas personas les gustan este ubicación y puede . . uh in . . formar mucho uh turismo.

Oh, sí . . uh . . por escuela . . ah yo pode . . o . . nosotros podemos uh colectar . . uh . . donaciones ah y alrededor de la comunidad . . uh . . es muy fácil . . uh . . uh . . podemos . . uh . . cam cami caminar uh la puerta a puerta en los vecinos.

AP[®] SPANISH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2019 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 3: Conversation (continued)

O sí uh pienso que hay muchas personas en la escuela que quieran ayudarnos uh . . y voy a hablar sobre esta tema un otro día . . uh . . pero es mucho trabajo . . uh . . adiós Marta espero que tenga . . tengas un buen día . . y estoy emocionada para este proyecto.

Commentary

This is an example of a strong performance in Interpersonal Speaking. The responses maintain the exchange in a clearly appropriate manner, given the context of the task. The responses provide the required information with frequent elaboration (e.g., “*Celia Cruz . . ah . . es un cantante muy famoso que representa . . a . . personas en . . Latinoamérica*”; “*estoy en un clase de historia . . ah . . y yo sé mucho información sobre él y sus . . ah . . arte tus cuadros*”; “*puede poner ah podemos poner ah el mural enfrente de la catedral . . es muy bonita y muchas personas les gustan este ubicación y puede . . uh in . . formar mucho uh turismo*”). The responses are fully understandable, and the occasional errors do not impede comprehensibility (e.g., “*un cantante famoso*”; “*podemos . . uh . . cam cami caminar uh la puerta a puerta en los vecinos*”). There is accuracy and variety in grammar, and self-correction improves comprehensibility (e.g., “*yo pode . . o . . nosotros podemos*”). The register is appropriate, and the pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response comprehensible. Self-correction improves comprehensibility (e.g., “*puede poner ah podemos poner*”).

Sample: 3B

Score: 3

Transcript of Student Response

Hola ¿qué tal? . . deberíamos de poner a . . Frida Kahlo . . y porque es que haym haym hay muchas personas que . . en el en la en el en el mundo hispanohablante . . que podríamos eh . .

Hay muchas fuentes de información por el Internet que pongas po podramos . . encontrar como en . . artículos de Wikipedia o en un archivo . . de Inter en el Internet . .

Mm parecía muy bien. Porque con la . . con el con el ambiente del municipio, muchas personas lo van a mirar y se van se van a ser informadas, van a tener . . honor de ver su cultura su todo eso . .

Una idea para recordar fondos poder ser . . eh . . un . . una manera de fond de una fonda de hacer platos de comida . . eh . . por supues . . eh como tacos, tamales, y todo eso pero para vender y sucurar segurar los fondos.

Podríamos eh entrar un . . sistema de . . internación con personas que están en colegio . . y . . para para que tengan más crédito a sus resumes resúmenes.

Commentary

This response is an example of a fair performance in Interpersonal Speaking. The responses result in a somewhat appropriate exchange, given the context of the task. The response provides most information (e.g., “*Hola ¿qué tal? . . deberíamos de poner a . . Frida Kahlo*”; “*podramos . . encontrar como en . . artículos de Wikipedia o en un archivo . . de Inter en el Internet*”; “*hacer platos de comida . . como tacos, tamales, y todo eso pero para vender*”). However, the first response includes no reason for selecting Frida Kahlo. The response accepts the location suggested in the third prompt when the outline indicated that they were to reject it, and no other option is included (i.e., “*Mm parecía muy bien. Porque con la . . con el con el ambiente del municipio, muchas personas lo van a mirar y se van se van a ser informadas, van a tener . . honor de ver su cultura*”). There is some control of grammar, syntax, and usage (e.g., “*deberíamos de poner*”; “*para que tengan*”) and appropriate

AP[®] SPANISH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2019 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 3: Conversation (continued)

but basic vocabulary (e.g., “fuentes de información”; “un archivo . . . de Internet”; “van a mirar”; “platos de comida . . . como tacos, tamales, y todo eso”). Overall, the response is generally understandable with errors that could impede comprehensibility (e.g., “Hay muchas fuentes de información por el Internet que pongas po podramos . . . encontrar”; “un . . . sistema de . . . internación”; “para para que tengan más crédito a sus resumes resúmenes”).

Sample: 3C

Score: 2

Transcript of Student Response

Hola ¿qué tal amiga? . . . ¿cómo estás? . . . ah . . . ¿cómo anda? . . . Um pienso que necesitamos incluir Frida Kahlo en um . . . nuestra mural . . . um ojalá que podamos nos veremos pronto . . . te hecho mucha de menos.

Ah . . . quizás ah . . . ah . . . podemos va a la biblioteca am pera enseñar . . . ah . . . pera aprender mucho más . . . um porque será importante enseñar los niños en el futuro sobre . . .

Um sí . . . ah . . . me gustaría poner en marcha ese mural porque es ah muy importante . . . um . . . ah y me gustaría poner el mur . . . el mural.

Um podemos recar fondos um en el parque . . . ¿qué te parece? . . . um no hay rosas sin espinas . . . así que es muy difícil para recordar fondos en el pública.

Sí . . . um . . . podemos . . . ah . . . poner marcha con nuestras amigas . . . um . . . Alicia . . . y . . . uh dice que quiere ayudar . . . quiere ayudarnos.

Commentary

This is an example of a weak performance in Interpersonal Speaking. The series of responses is minimally appropriate in the context of the task. The response provides some required information (e.g., “Um pienso que necesitamos incluir Frida Kahlo en um . . . nuestra mural”; “podemos va a la biblioteca”; “podemos . . . ah . . . poner marcha con nuestras amigas”). However, there is no explanation of why Frida Kahlo should be included in the mural. The suggestion for the location is not rejected nor is another option provided. The response is partially understandable, with errors that force interpretation at times (e.g., “Um podemos recar fondos um en el parque”). The sample includes little vocabulary, and there is limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage (e.g., “quizás ah . . . ah . . . podemos va a la biblioteca”; “ojalá que podamos nos veremos pronto”). While there is an attempt to insert idiomatic expressions, they are not altogether appropriate to the conversation (e.g., “te hecho mucha de menos”; “me gustaría poner en marcha ese mural”). Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response difficult to comprehend at times (e.g., “es muy difícil para recordar fondos en el pública”). There is self-correction that at times improves comprehensibility (e.g., “va a la biblioteca am pera enseñar . . . ah . . . pera aprender mucho”).