



AP[®] German Language and Culture

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Task 2—Argumentative Essay

- ☒ **Scoring Guidelines**
- ☒ **Student Samples**
- ☒ **Scoring Commentary**

Question 2: Argumentative Essay

5 points

General Scoring Note

When applying the scoring guidelines, the response does not need to meet every single criterion in a column. You should award the score according to the preponderance of evidence.

1 Poor	2 Weak	3 Fair	4 Good	5 Strong
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 position 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 an argument • Presents, or at least suggests, the student's own position on the topic; develops an 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 an argument • Presents and defends the student's own position on the topic; develops an 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 an argument • Presents and defends the student's own position on the topic with clarity; develops an 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 an argument • Presents and defends the student's own position on the topic with a high degree of clarity; develops an 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

Score of 0: UNACCEPTABLE

- 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

NR: no response, pages are blank

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.

● **Important:** Completely fill in the circle that corresponds to the task you are responding to on this page.

Task 1:
Email Reply



Task 2:
Argumentative Essay



Begin your response to each task at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

Klimawandel ist der grösste Problem für unsere Generation; damit, wir müssen bessere Entscheidungen machen für den Zukunft. Kostenlos öffentliche Verkehrsmittel schützt unser Umwelt und ist positiv für alles in unsere Gesellschaft. Erstens, es wie beschrieben in Quellenmaterial 1, es produziert es weniger Lärm, Stickoxide, und anderes ~~lassen~~ toxischen Giften. Wie gezeigt in Quellenmaterial 2, öffentliche Verkehrsmittel ist ~~mehr~~ umweltfreundlicher pro Mensch als privates Autos. Ein auto produziert 240 g CO₂ Pkm, während z.B. ein Bus produziert nur 63,7 g CO₂ Pkm. Weniger als einen Halb! Wenn wir kostenlos öffentlich Verkehrsmittel machen, mehr Leute werden Busse und Straßenbahnen benutzen. Das ist auch beschrieben in Quellenmaterial 2: 62 prozent von Personen sagten das die Preise zu hoch ist. Wie gesagt in den Hörtext, es macht bessere die Lebensqualität. Wenn wir schützen unser Umwelt, halten unser Luft rein und sauber, frei aus gefährlich Produkte gemacht bei autos, es macht unseren Welt gesund. Zaren

Zweitens, kostenlos öffentliche Verkehrsmittel offener wahlen für alle und hilft unser Gemeinschaft überall. Wie beschrieben in Quellenmaterial 1, "Dann könnte jeder ihn benutzen, ob arm oder

Page 3

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.

Important: Completely fill in the circle that corresponds to the task you are responding to on this page.

Task 1:
Email Reply ☐

Task 2:
Argumentative Essay ☒

Begin your response to each task at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

reich." Wenn Hamburg 3,458,000 Einwohnern hat, kostenlos Straßenbannen meinen das alles können irgendwo in den Stadt besuchen. Es öffnet neue Möglichkeiten, Arbeiten, Sozialorten und Erfahrungen!

In Gegensatz dazu, den Hörtext hat über den Kost gesprochen. Öffentliche Verkehrsmittel verdienen viele Geld für die Stadt.* Die Stadt bezahlt diese Geld für die Öffentlichkeit, die Sicherheit, und andere Quellen. Aber, die guten ist wichtiger als die befahren. Eine gesunde Umwelt und eine glück Stadt sind gute Entscheidungen. Abschließend, es ist klar: kostenlos öffentliche Verkehrsmittel ist der Weg zu eine besserer Zukunft.

* Es würde sehr teuer sein.

Page 4

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.

0004364

● **Important:** Completely fill in the circle that corresponds to the task you are responding to on this page.

Task 1:
Email Reply



Task 2:
Argumentative Essay



Begin your response to each task at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

meiner Meinung ist, dass die öffentlichen Verkehrsmittel in Städten kostenlos sein, denn Sie sind besser für die Umwelt als Auto, ~~und mehr würden bei Sie reisen als bei Auto.~~ und mehr würden bei Sie als bei Auto reisen.

Erste, im Quellen 1 steht es, "[Öffentlichen Verkehrsmittel] ~~gäbe~~ gäbe weniger Lärm, weniger Stickoxide, einen geringeren Kohlendioxid (CO₂)-Ausstoß und weniger Verkehrstote." Laut der Text, öffentlichen Verkehrsmittel gäbe weniger ~~stet~~ Dinge dass für die Umwelt schlecht sind. Dieses hilft meine Argument, weil kostenlos öffentlichen Verkehrsmittel würden weniger Verschmutzung bringen.

~~Zweite~~ Nächste, es steht im Quellen 2, dass von 3.100 Personen, über 60 Prozent denkt dass die Ticketpreise sind zu hoch. Dieses Grafik hilft meine Argument, denn es zeigt dass die größte Problem Leute hat mit öffentliche Verkehrsmittel ist wie Teuer ~~es ist. Wenn es~~ Sie sind. Wenn Sie kostenlos ~~sein~~ sein, mehr würden bei Sie reisen ~~dann~~ als bei Auto.

Zum Schluss, ich ~~denke~~ denke dass die öffentlichen Verkehrsmittel in Städten kostenlos sein, weil Sie bessere für die Umwelt als Auto ~~se~~ sind, und mehr Leute würden bei Sie als bei Auto ~~reisen~~ reisen.

Task 2 - Sample 2C

- **Important:** Completely fill in the circle that corresponds to the task you are responding to on this page.

Task 1:
Email Reply



Task 2:
Argumentative Essay



Begin your response to each task at the top of a new page. Do not skip lines.

Verkehrsmittel in Städten ist ein wichtiges Thema zu sprechen über. Ich denke, dass Verkehrsmittel ist ^{nicht} sehr wichtig.

Ein Argument ^{dagegen} dafür ist das da wird ein kostenlos sein und das ist nicht sehr gut für Person. Im Quelle 1 das sprechen über Auto fahren und kostenlos, und wie diese Dinge sind nicht gut für Person oder die Umwelt. Person werde gehen platze, und wenn Dinge sind viele geld oder die kostenlos, das ist nicht sehr gut für sie. Quelle 3 sprechen über die Umwelt, und wie wenn ~~da machen diese~~ da sind zu viel Geld mit Dinge wie Autos und Dinge, das konnte nicht gut für die Umwelt, weil dann wie konnte nicht machen keines mit für die Umwelt, weil wer haben kein mehr Geld.

Ein weiteres Argument ^{dagegen} dafür ist das wie viele Autos, Fahrrats, und Dinge wie das sind sehr viel mehr kompletziert. Quelle 2 sprechen über Fahrt dauert zu lange, und wie kompletziert das sind. Das auch sprechen über wie viel die Tickets für Bus ~~und~~ sind viel zu hoch im preise, und das sie sind zu voll.

Im Großen und Ganzen, ich denke das Verkehrsmittel in Städten ist nicht sehr gut.

Page 3

Use a pen with black or dark blue ink only. Do NOT write your name. Do NOT write outside the box.

Question 2

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

Overview

This task assessed writing in the presentational communicative mode by having the student write an argumentative 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. 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 the sources' different viewpoints. They also had to present their own position and defend it thoroughly, using information from all of the sources to support the essay. As they referred to the sources, they had to identify them appropriately. Furthermore, the essay had to be organized into clear paragraphs.

The course theme for the argumentative essay task was Global Challenges (*Globalisierung*). Students had to write an argumentative essay on whether public transportation in cities (e.g., buses, subways, or street cars) should be free. The article, titled "Should public transportation be free?", cites a failed experiment with free public transportation from the northern German city of Hamburg. Comfort, speed, and reliability of public transportation turned out to be just as important as price. The second section of the article focuses on the tremendous costs to the taxpayer that supposedly "cost-free" transportation would have. It argues that those without access to, or willingness to use, public transportation would be disadvantaged. The second print source is a two-part infographic. The top section of the graphic, titled "Doing without a car to fight climate change?", shows the environmental impact of four different kinds of transportation via their respective CO₂ emissions. The bottom section gives the results of a survey of 3,100 Germans who were asked why they rarely or never use public transport. The answers, reported as percentages, range from high ticket prices to security and reliability concerns. The three-minute audio source, published by two student bloggers as "Should public transportation be free?", presents facts supporting the argument for free public transportation. The points are organized into three categories: economic (high up-front cost, but substantial savings later environmental (reduced CO₂ production), and social (increased quality of life).

Sample: 2A

Score: 4

This response is a good performance in Presentational Writing. The response is a generally effective treatment of the topic as it expresses the student's own position about the benefits of free public transportation with limited integration of content from the sources. While the response demonstrates comprehension of elements from sources 1 and 2, the limited inclusion of details from source 3 detracts from the overall impact of the argument. The response begins with the importance of making better decisions to protect the environment due to climate change and presents the student's position ("*Kostenlos öffentliche Verkehrsmittel schützt unser Umwelt und ist positiv für alles in unsere Gesellschaft*"). There is some integration of all three sources to show improved quality of life due to reduced CO₂ emissions when more people use buses and streetcars. The response also cites the benefits of public transportation as mentioned in source 1 ("*weniger Lärm, Stickoxide, und andere toxischen Giften*") and later the benefits to the community as a whole ("*Dann könnte jeder ihn benutzen,*

Question 2 (continued)

ob arm oder reich”). The student misunderstands the overall viewpoint of source 3 (*“Öffentliche Verkehrsmitteln verdienen viele Geld für die Stadt”*), but then concludes, (*“Es würde sehr teuer sein.”*) Although the response does not include clear paragraph breaks, there is a logical organization with transitional devices (*“Erstens”; “Zweitens”; “In Gegensatz dazu”; “Abschließend”*). There is varied and generally appropriate vocabulary and general control of grammar so that the response is fully understandable. It includes a mix of simple and complex sentences and detail in support of the student's own viewpoint. This good performance received a score of 4.

Sample: 2B**Score: 3**

This response is a fair performance in Presentational Writing. The response constitutes a suitable treatment of the topic within the context of the task because it completes the assigned essay but does so at a basic level. The essay opens with a clear statement of the student’s position: *“Meiner Meinung ist, dass die Öffentlichen Verkehrsmittel in Städten kostenlos sein, denn Sie sind besser für die Umwelt als Auto.”* This aligns with the core question of whether public transit should be offered free of charge; yet, the response thereafter contains merely some coherence and is appropriate but basic in its use of language, underscoring the inaccuracies found in the essay. While the response cites source 1, the respondent focuses on reasons to favor the general use of public transit and neglects to mention and integrate the overall negative stance of the author toward making public transit cost-free. That train of thought is continued with the citation of nicely matched details from the source 2 charts, but the respondent does not mention or integrate any details from source 3. The response uses limited transitional elements (*“Erste,” “Nexzte,”* and *“Zum Schluss”*) in this fair attempt to organize the essay in paragraphs. Vocabulary is appropriate but basic, and the language breaks down when attempting more complex structures in statements, such as *“Wenn sie kostenlos sein, mehr würdet bei Sie reisen als bei Auto.”* This example underscores that the essay is limited to some control of grammar, syntax, and usage. Another example of this is the closing statement (*“Zum Schluss, ich denke dass die öffentlichen Verkehrsmittel in Städten kostenlos sein, weil sie bessere für die Umwelt als Auto sind, und mehr Leute würdet bei Sie als bei Auto reisen”*). Overall, the essay is generally understandable but does not rise to the bar of fully understandable, and the errors may impede comprehensibility at times. This essay received a 3 for its fair performance.

Sample: 2C**Score: 2**

This response represents an unsuitable treatment of the topic because while it attempts the assigned task, it produces a weak result. The opening statement creates confusion by simultaneously stating that modes of transportation constitute an important discussion topic along with the respondent’s viewpoint that the topic is not that important. While the essay does contain mention of whether transportation should be offered for free, it concludes by stating that modes of transit in cities are not a good thing, rather than addressing the prompt’s question. In citing material from source 1, a position is suggested in an incoherent fashion (*“Ein Argument dagegen ist das da wird ein kostenlos sein und das ist nicht sehr gut für Persone”*). This suggests the respondent somewhat grasps the issue but lacks the ability to convey this above the weak level. While all three sources are cited, the comprehension of material from source 3, in particular, is filled with inaccuracies. The response often remains at the level of partially understandable and often the reader must force the interpretation in an attempt to deduce

Question 2 (continued)

the author's intent ("*Persone werde gehen platze, und wenn Dinge sind viele geld oder die kostenlos, das ist nicht sehr gut für sie*"). The response is marked by limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage. And while an attempt to use the transitional element "*Im Großen und Ganzen*" is a nice touch in the final paragraph, the overall response remains an unsuitable treatment of the topic within the context of the task, marked by a low degree of comprehension of the sources' viewpoints. This essay received a 2 for its weak performance.