

# AP<sup>®</sup> JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

## 2013 SCORING GUIDELINES

### Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article

		TASK COMPLETION	DELIVERY	LANGUAGE USE
6	<b>EXCELLENT</b> Demonstrates excellence in presentational writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article addresses all aspects of prompt with thoroughness and detail, including expression of preference and reasoning</li> <li>Well organized and coherent, with a clear progression of ideas; use of appropriate transitional elements and cohesive devices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural, easily flowing expression</li> <li>Orthography and mechanics virtually error free</li> <li>Virtually no mistakes in use of kanji according to AP Japanese kanji list</li> <li>Consistent use of register and style appropriate to situation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rich vocabulary and idioms</li> <li>Variety of appropriate grammatical and syntactic structures, with minimal or no errors</li> </ul>
5	<b>VERY GOOD</b> Suggests emerging excellence in presentational writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article addresses all aspects of prompt, including expression of preference and reasoning</li> <li>Well organized and coherent, with a progression of ideas that is generally clear; some use of transitional elements and cohesive devices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally exhibits ease of expression</li> <li>Infrequent or insignificant errors in orthography and mechanics</li> <li>Occasional mistakes in use of kanji according to AP Japanese kanji list</li> <li>Consistent use of register and style appropriate to situation except for occasional lapses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Variety of vocabulary and idioms, with sporadic errors</li> <li>Appropriate use of grammatical and syntactic structures, with sporadic errors in complex structures</li> </ul>
4	<b>GOOD</b> Demonstrates competence in presentational writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article addresses all aspects of prompt, including expression of preference and reasoning, but may lack detail or elaboration</li> <li>Generally organized and coherent; use of transitional elements and cohesive devices may be inconsistent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strained or unnatural flow of expression does not interfere with comprehensibility</li> <li>Errors in orthography and mechanics do not interfere with readability</li> <li>May include several mistakes in use of kanji according to AP Japanese kanji list</li> <li>May include several lapses in otherwise consistent use of register and style appropriate to situation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate but limited vocabulary and idioms</li> <li>Appropriate use of grammatical and syntactic structures, but with several errors in complex structures or limited to simple structures</li> </ul>
3	<b>ADEQUATE</b> Suggests emerging competence in presentational writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article addresses topic directly but may not address all aspects of prompt</li> <li>Portions may lack organization or coherence; infrequent use of transitional elements and cohesive devices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strained or unnatural flow of expression sometimes interferes with comprehensibility</li> <li>Errors in orthography and mechanics may be frequent or interfere with readability</li> <li>May include frequent mistakes in use of kanji according to AP Japanese kanji list</li> <li>Use of register and style appropriate to situation is inconsistent or includes many errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some inappropriate vocabulary and idioms interfere with comprehensibility</li> <li>Errors in grammatical and syntactic structures sometimes interfere with comprehensibility</li> </ul>
2	<b>WEAK</b> Suggests lack of competence in presentational writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article addresses topic only marginally or addresses only some aspects of prompt</li> <li>Scattered information generally lacks organization and coherence; minimal or no use of transitional elements and cohesive devices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Labored expression frequently interferes with comprehensibility</li> <li>Errors in orthography and mechanics frequent or interfere with readability</li> <li>Frequent mistakes in use of kanji according to AP Japanese kanji list</li> <li>Frequent use of register and style inappropriate to situation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient, inappropriate vocabulary and idioms frequently interfere with comprehensibility</li> <li>Limited control of grammatical and syntactic structures frequently interferes with comprehensibility or results in fragmented language</li> </ul>
1	<b>VERY WEAK</b> Demonstrates lack of competence in presentational writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article addresses prompt only minimally</li> <li>Lacks organization and coherence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Labored expression constantly interferes with comprehensibility</li> <li>Errors in orthography and mechanics very frequent or significantly interfere with readability</li> <li>Minimal use of kanji according to AP Japanese kanji list</li> <li>Constant use of register and style inappropriate to situation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient, inappropriate vocabulary and idioms constantly interfere with comprehensibility</li> <li>Limited control of grammatical and syntactic structures significantly interferes with comprehensibility or results in very fragmented language</li> </ul>
0	<b>UNACCEPTABLE</b> Contains nothing that earns credit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mere restatement of the prompt</li> <li>Clearly does not respond to the prompt; completely irrelevant to the topic</li> <li>Not in Japanese</li> <li>Blank</li> </ul>		

# AP<sup>®</sup> JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2013 SCORING COMMENTARY

## Compare and Contrast Article Sample A

これから、日本語を手で書く事とタイプする事を比べてみます。両方が日本の授業のために、いるのに、類似点も相違点もあります。

まず、一つ目の相違点は日本語でタイプする事の方がやさしい事です。日本語のレポートをタイプしたら、手が痛くないです。しかし、手でレポートを書いたら、一時間の後で手が本当に痛くなります。

二つ目の相違点は、日本語でタイプする事の方が早い事です。このレポートを手で書いたら、四十五分ぐらいかかります。なぜなら、間違ったら、消しゴムで直して、もう一度書かなければなるからです。しかし、タイプしたら、二十分だけかかります。

一つの類似点は両方をしたら、日本語を上手になる事です。日本語の先生はいつも「皆さん、練習したら、ぺらぺらになりますよ。」と言われました。だから、日本語での書く事を練習したら、日本語を上手になります。そして、タイプする事と手で書く事は同じ結果をもらいます。

結論として、日本語でタイプする事も手で書く事も好きです。しかし、タイプする事の方が好きです。なぜなら、痛くないし、早いし、日本語を上手になれるからです。

**AP® JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE  
2013 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Compare and Contrast Article  
Sample B**

日本語のタイプと日本語の書くは違う所がたくさんありますが、同じ所もあります。今日、違う日本語の書き方について話します。

まず、日本語を自分の手で書くのはやさしいです。コンピューターがいりません。そして、自由に紙に好きなことを書くことができます。ペンしかありません。ペンとえびつの方が安いです。

日本語をタイプをする時、漢字とカタカナとひらがなのボタンがあったら、使いにくいです。でも、もしコンピューターを使うのは上手ですから、問題がありません。そして、タイプの方が早いです。時々、コンピューターが追われたら、タイプが出来ません。違うスタイルで選んで、書くことが出来ます。

どちらも使うのはも自分を書きたい字です。私は手で書く方が好きです。なぜなら、私はタイプが出来ません。そして、間違った時、消しゴムを使うはやさしいと思います。もし、私をもっと練習したら、私も日本語をタイプするところが上手になります。

**AP<sup>®</sup> JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE**  
**2013 SCORING COMMENTARY**

**Compare and Contrast Article**  
**Sample C**

日本語タイピングと日本語のかくは、時々おなじ時々違うです。よくアメリカ人のさいとは、「日本語はむずかしです」とおもいます。よくかくときアメリカ人生徒は、日本語のカリクダが和からない。タイピングとき時々せいとは、カリクダがさがしています。それからどちらむずかしです。でも日本語タイピングはカリクダがまなばなければなりませんのでやざしです。日本語のかくは、たくさんかんじをかきなればなりません。それは、ながいときです。それから日本語のかくは、むずかしです。私は、日本語タイピングが好きです。タイピングは、少し早いです。でもよくアメリカ人の日本語は、とてもはやくないです。アメリカ人は、日本人の日本語がととてもはやいとおもいます。

# AP® JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2013 SCORING COMMENTARY

## Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article

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

### Overview

This task assessed writing skills in the presentational communicative mode by having students write an article for the student newspaper of a school in Japan. It comprised a single prompt in English, which identified two related topics and details how they should be discussed in the article. Students were asked to compare and contrast typing in Japanese and handwriting in Japanese. They were asked to describe at least three aspects of each and highlight the similarities and differences between the two. They were also asked to state their preference and give reasons for it.

Students were given 20 minutes to write an article of 300 to 400 characters or longer. The article received a single holistic score based on how well it accomplished the assigned task.

### Sample: A

#### Score: 6

This article addresses all aspects of the prompt including preference, reason, and at least three points of comparison or contrast, all of which are elaborated upon with additional detail. The article contains well-organized and coherent paragraphs including an introduction and conclusion. It properly uses a conventional paragraphing format as well as transitional elements and cohesive devices such as *まず*, *一つ目*, *一つの類似点*, *しかし*, *なぜなら*, and *結論として*. The article has easily flowing expression with consistent use of register and style throughout. There are some collocational errors, such as *授業のために*, *いるのに* (should be *授業のためにいりますが* or *いるけれど*), *一時間の後* (should be *一時間後*), and *二十分だけかかります* (should be *二十分しかかかりません*) that do not interfere with comprehensibility. The article includes an honorific expression (*言われました*). Kanji from the AP Japanese kanji list are used correctly with one exception in *早い* (for *速い*).

The article contains sporadic grammatical and structural errors, such as incorrect use of the “must do” phrase (*もう一度書かなければなる* for *もう一度書かなければならない*); a particle error (*を* of *日本語を上手になる* should be *が*); and an error in verb conjugation (*なられる* should be *なれる*). A vocabulary error is observed in an attempt to use a high-level verb (*もらいます* in *同じ結果をもらいます*, which should be *もたらします*). However, these errors do not interfere with comprehensibility. This article includes sentences with proper endings such as *相違点は... 事です* and *なぜなら ... からです*, the correct use of which is hard to achieve for learners of Japanese at this level.

This article earned a score of 6 for the excellent organization, coherent and detailed explanation of preference and reasons, rich vocabulary, and correct use of higher-level expressions and sentence structures.

### Sample: B

#### Score: 4

This article addresses all aspects of the prompt, including three points of comparison or contrast, expression of preference, and reasoning.

# AP<sup>®</sup> JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

## 2013 SCORING COMMENTARY

### Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article (continued)

It is written in four well-organized and coherent paragraphs, including introduction, points about handwriting and typing in Japanese, and a conclusion. The article appropriately uses transitional elements and cohesive devices (まず, そして, でも, なぜなら). However, the paragraph about handwriting in Japanese is rudimentary and lacks detail and elaboration. The strained or unnatural flow of expression does not necessarily interfere with comprehensibility. There are several orthographic errors (早い for 速い, コンピューター for コンピューター or コンピュータ, ボタン for ボタン), which may not significantly impede readability. Some orthographic or typing errors such as 追われたら (for こわれたら) and タイプするころ (for タイプすること) do not interfere with comprehensibility. The use of register and style is consistent and appropriate. Vocabulary and idioms are limited but appropriate. Grammatical and syntactic structures are mostly appropriate, but there are several errors in both simple and complex sentence structures, such as the absence of a nominalizer in 日本語の書くは (should be 書くのは or 書くことは) and 使うはやさしい (使うのは or 使うことは), and particle errors in 日本語の書く (日本語で書く or 日本語を書く), 自由で (自由に), and 違うスタイルを選んで (違うスタイルを選んで), but these errors do not interfere significantly with comprehensibility. The article demonstrates competence in presentational writing and earned a score of 4. With more detailed explanation and fewer errors in language use, this response could have earned a higher score.

#### Sample: C

#### Score: 2

This article addresses only some aspects of the prompt. Although it includes one's preference (私は、日本語タイピングが好きです) and a reason (タイピングは、少し早いです), the description of three aspects of each is insufficient. It states that handwriting in Japanese and typing in Japanese have similarities and differences, but it is difficult to ascertain what the points of comparison are. The article lacks organization and coherence, and the use of transitional elements and cohesive devices are limited to それから, それは and でも. Labored expression frequently interferes with comprehensibility. Some sentences, combined with grammatical and syntactic errors, are incomprehensible; アメリカ人の日本語は、とてもはやくないです; それからどちらむずかしです; タイピングはカリクダがまなばなければなりませんのでやさしです; アメリカ人は、日本人の日本語がとてもはやいとおもいます. Frequent errors in orthography and kanji (さいと for せいと; カリくダ for キャラクター; 和からない for わからない; やざし for やさしい; ありません for なりません; 早い for 速い) interfere with readability. The register and style are mostly appropriate, but that alone does not make delivery any better. Numerous lexical, grammatical and syntactic errors result in a lack of comprehensibility. The errors include the absence of a nominalizer (日本語のかくは for 書くこと or 書くの), particle errors (カリクダがさがして for カリクダをさがして), and verb conjugation errors (おもいます for おもいます, かきなければ for かかなければ).

This article suggests a lack of competence in presentational writing because of incomprehensibility of the message caused by an array of inappropriate elements in task requirements, delivery, and language use and earned a score of 2.