AP® GERMAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE
2019 SCORING GUIDELINES

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

Interpersonal Writing: E-mail Reply (Task 1)

5: STRONG performance in Interpersonal Writing
• Maintains the exchange with a response that is clearly appropriate within the context of the task
• Provides required information (responses to questions, request for details) 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 situation; control of cultural conventions appropriate for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing), despite occasional errors
• Variety of simple and compound sentences, and some complex sentences

4: GOOD performance in Interpersonal Writing
• Maintains the exchange with a response that is generally appropriate within the context of the task
• Provides most required information (responses to questions, request for details) 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 situation, except for occasional shifts; basic control of cultural conventions appropriate for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing)
• Simple, compound, and a few complex sentences

3: FAIR performance in Interpersonal Writing
• Maintains the exchange with a response that is somewhat appropriate but basic within the context of the task
• Provides most required information (responses to questions, request for details)
• 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 situation with several shifts; partial control of conventions for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing), although these may lack cultural appropriateness
• Simple and a few compound sentences

2: WEAK performance in Interpersonal Writing
• Partially maintains the exchange with a response that is minimally appropriate within the context of the task
• Provides some required information (responses to questions, request for details)
• 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
• Use of register is generally inappropriate for the situation; includes some conventions for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing) with inaccuracies
• Simple sentences and phrases

1: POOR performance in Interpersonal Writing
• Unsuccessfully attempts to maintain the exchange by providing a response that is inappropriate within the context of the task
• Provides little required information (responses to questions, request for details)
• 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; includes significantly inaccurate or no conventions for formal correspondence (e.g., greeting, closing)
• Very simple sentences or fragments

0: UNACCEPTABLE performance in Interpersonal Writing
• Mere restatement of language from the stimulus
• Completely irrelevant to the stimulus
• “I don’t know,” “I don’t understand,” or equivalent in any language
• Not in the language of the exam

- (hyphen): BLANK (no response)
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

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

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)
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 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.
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)
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.
• 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.
Presentational Speaking: Cultural Comparison (Task 4) (continued)

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)