
AP[®] French Language and Culture

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Task 3—Conversation

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

AP[®] FRENCH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2019 SCORING GUIDELINES

Identical to Scoring Guidelines used for German, 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.

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[®] FRENCH 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[®] FRENCH 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 the conversation task was Global Challenges. In the task the student had a simulated telephone conversation with Thomas, a classmate who wanted to organize an event at school for Environment Day. The student needed to respond to the following five audio prompts:

1. Thomas greets the student and notes that they have not spoken recently. He asks how the student is and what is new in the student's life.
2. Thomas explains the reason for his telephone call: to see if the student is interested in helping with the organization of a school event the next month for Environment Day.
3. Thomas notes that there are many ways to help but that they only have one month to plan the event. He asks whether the student has any ideas for how to raise student awareness of ecological questions.
4. Thomas notes that there are many ways to publicize such an event. He asks the student what they should do to get other classmates interested.
5. Thomas suggests that the student meet with interested classmates the next Friday to discuss the event and asks if he can count on the student to join them.

Sample: 3A

Score: 5

Transcript of Student Response

Bonjour Thomas. Ça va très bien! Je ne t'ai vu depuis longtemps. On est ensemble dans la classe, mais je n'peux, je ne te parle jamais. Alors, avec moi il n'y a rien de nouveau vraiment. Je fais beaucoup de devoirs, j'ai beaucoup de travail, donc, je n'ai pas besoin, n-, alors, je n'ai pas beaucoup de temps pour faire beaucoup de choses. Mais je nage, je parle

Oui, j'aimerais bien vous aider! J'adore l'environnement, je, j'adore le jour de la terre, et je pense que c'est très important de aider, ah, les gens à comprendre que la terre est en danger. Et, mais j'aimerais savoir, euh, quand est le jour que tu veux faire cet, euh, evenement, seulement parce que j'ai beaucoup à faire mais

Euh, oui, je pense qu'on peut faire une présentation devant tout l'école et les dire de le réchauffement global et la serre de la cap, la couche d'ozone, et on peut aussi faire des projets pour aider la terre, alors peut-être on peut faire

AP[®] FRENCH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2019 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 3: Conversation (continued)

Je pense que si on les inspire, on peut, euh, faire un grand dîner, le l'envoie à tout l'école pour les inviter à savoir sur le jou- la journée de la terre et sur notre projet et on, aussi on peut envoyer des lettres et peut-être aussi si on veut faire beaucoup d'advertisements, on peut

Oui, tu peux, peux compter sur moi, je, je veux bien participer dans cet événement. Je, j'adore la terre comme j'ai déjà dit et je fais beaucoup de projets pour l'aider. Il faut aussi sauver de l'eau et ne gaspiller l'énergie ni le lit donc, oui, euh, j'aimerais bien parler avec

Commentary

This is an example of strong performance in Interpersonal Speaking. The response maintains the exchange with a series of responses that is clearly appropriate within the context of the task (“*Oui, j'aimerais bien vous aider*”; “*je pense qu'on peut faire une présentation*”; “*je veux bien participer dans cet événement*”). It provides required information with frequent elaboration (“*Je ne t'ai vu depuis longtemps. On est ensemble dans la classe, mais je n'peux, je ne te parle jamais. Alors, avec moi il n'y a rien de nouveau vraiment. Je fais beaucoup de devoirs, j'ai beaucoup de travail, donc, je n'ai pas besoin, n-, alors, je n'ai pas beaucoup de temps pour faire beaucoup de choses. Mais je nage, je parle*”; “*j'aimerais bien vous aider*”; “*je pense qu'on peut faire une présentation*”). The response is fully understandable, with ease and clarity of expression; occasional errors do not impede comprehensibility (“*quand est le jour que*”; “*les dire de le réchauffement global et la serre de la cap*”; “*advertisements*”; “*ni le lit*”). Vocabulary and idiomatic expressions are varied and appropriate (“*le réchauffement global*”; “*la couche d'ozone*”; “*la terre*”; “*gaspiller*”). There is accuracy and variety in grammar, syntax, and usage (“*mais je n'peux, je ne te parle jamais*”; “*il n'y a rien de nouveau*”; “*aider, ah, les gens à comprendre que la terre est en danger*”; “*j'ai beaucoup à faire*”; “*comme j'ai déjà dit*”). The response demonstrates a mostly consistent use of register that is appropriate for the conversation (“*On est ensemble dans la classe*”; “*j'aimerais bien vous aider*”; “*j'aimerais bien parler avec*”). Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response comprehensible, and errors do not impede comprehensibility (“*événement*”). Self-correction improves comprehensibility (“*je n'ai pas besoin, n-, alors, je n'ai pas beaucoup de temps*”).

Sample: 3B

Score: 3

Transcript of Student Response

Salut Thomas, euh, je suis bien. Ça va bien, euh, et toi? Euh, pourquoi tu me téléphoner? Euh, est-ce qu'il y a un problème? Euhm, oui. .. Est-ce qu'il y a besoin à me parler?

Oh, oui, c'est très intéressant, euh, oui, je je peux tu aider. Euhm, est-ce que ce, est-ce que ce événement avec un club, euh, ou, euh. Où est l'événement, à l'école ou des, des autres places? Euhm

Oh, écologique. Ah, oui, il y a beaucoup des, des, euh, suggestions, ah, que je peux, je peux, euh, donner. Euh, tu peux faire les papiers pour l'advertisement, euh, ou

Ou, je pense que, euh, tu dois, ah, demander à les professeurs si, si les professeurs peuvent donner le crédit supplémentaire à leurs étudiants pour l'attente de votre événement, euhm, si l'événement est

Oui, tu peux, tu peux, tu peux. Euhm, si il y a des autres, ah, questions ou des autres demandes, euh, questions ou problèmes, euh, laissez-moi savoir

AP[®] FRENCH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2019 SCORING COMMENTARY

Task 3: Conversation (continued)

Commentary

This is an example of fair performance in Interpersonal Speaking. The response maintains the exchange with a series of responses that is somewhat appropriate within the context of the task (“*Ça va bien, euh, et toi?*”; “*Où est l'événement?*”). It provides most required information (“*il y a beaucoup des, des, euh, suggestions, ah, que je peux, je peux, euh, donner?*”; “*tu peux, tu peux, tu peux?*”). The response is generally understandable, with errors that may impede comprehensibility (“*Est-ce qu'il y a besoin à me parler?*”; “*je je peux tu aider?*”; “*des autres places?*”; “*advertisement?*”; “*l'attendance?*”). The vocabulary is appropriate but basic (“*l'événement?*”; “*l'école?*”; “*suggestions?*”; “*étudiants?*”). The response demonstrates some control of grammar, syntax and usage (“*c'est très intéressant?*”; “*tu peux faire?*”; “*je pense que, euh, tu dois, ah, demander?*”; “*si les professeurs peuvent donner?*”; “*leurs étudiants?*”). Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response generally comprehensible, but errors occasionally impede comprehensibility (“*crédit?*”). Self-correction sometimes improves comprehensibility (“*si il y a des autres, ah, questions ou des autres demandes, euh, questions ou problèmes?*”).

Sample: 3C

Score: 2

Transcript of Student Response

Euh, ça va, je suis, euh, très bon, euh, je, euh, je, euh, je, euh, je fais plus de d'activités, euh, en l'école. Et, euh, tu es, tu es bon, euh, tu es bon, euh, dans

Oh ouais, c'est une bonne idée, euh, je suis, euh, très, euh, intéressant, euh, euh, euh, c'est, euh, c'est un bonne idée pour, euh, protester l'environnement, ah, quoi est les détails? Euh

Euh, il y a, euh, euh, j'ai, euh, euh, plus de suggère, suggère pour ton, euh, ton événement, euh, euh, il y a, euh, euh, beaucoup d'ética, d'éducation, euh, que, euh

Euh, euh, euh, c'est une, c'est un bon idée, euh, euh, le, le caméra est une, une, euh, une, euh, et c'est important pour communiquer le les problèmes

Oui, euh, je, je, euh, très, euh, je, très intéressant, euh, avec ton idée et, euh, euh, euh, je, euh, je, euh, je, euh, parler avec toi à

Commentary

This is an example of a weak performance in Interpersonal Speaking. The response partially maintains the exchange with a series of responses that is minimally appropriate within the context of the task (“*ça va?*”; “*c'est une bonne idée?*”). It provides some required information (“*le caméra est une, une, euh, une, euh, et c'est important pour communiquer le les problèmes?*”) and is partially understandable with errors that force interpretation and cause confusion for the listener (“*je suis, euh, très bon?*”; “*protester l'environnement?*”). It demonstrates limited vocabulary resources (“*activités?*”; “*l'école?*”; “*une bonne idée?*”; “*événement?*”) and limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage (“*je suis, euh, très, euh, intéressant?*”; “*quoi est les détails?*”; “*un bon idée?*”; “*je, euh, je, euh, parler avec toi à?*”). Pronunciation, intonation, and pacing make the response difficult to comprehend at times, and errors impede comprehensibility (“*Euh, il y a, euh, euh, j'ai, euh, euh, plus de suggère, suggère pour ton, euh, ton événement, euh, euh, il y a, euh, euh, beaucoup d'ética, d'éducation, euh, que, euh?*”). Self-correction does not improve comprehensibility (“*Et, euh, tu es, tu es bon?*”).