

AP[®] JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2016 SCORING GUIDELINES

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article

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

AP[®] JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2016 SCORING COMMENTARY

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article

Sample: A

家の中で色々なことができるけど、家の外でも色々なこともできると思います。家の中でことと家の外のことについて比べています。

まず、家の外で色々なスポーツをできるけど、家の中でスポーツをあまりしないんです。外ではバスケットボールとか野球とかサッカーができるので、とても楽しいんですよ。でも、家で、それはできないし、両親はちょっと怒るし、家でスポーツをするのはダメです。

第二目は、外でも家でも友達と色々なことをできるんです。家で友達と一緒に料理を作ったりビデオゲームをしたりできて、外では一緒にスポーツもできるんです。

最後に、雨が降れるなら、外でスポーツや運動できないんです。例えば、スポーツをしたいのなら、雨が降るので、外に行けないから、困ります。でも、ビデオゲームをしたいなら、家の外に行けなくても大丈夫で、家ではビデオゲームをしたり、本を読んだりできるんです。

私にとって、家でより外の方が一番いいと思うます。外の方でいろいろなことをできるし、体にいいアクチビティができるし、とてもいいんです。以上です。

Sample: B

これから、私は外にする事と中にする事を比べてみます。両方ともいい所と悪い所があります。

まず始めに、外にする事はいろいろな違うアクティバティがあります。例えば、散歩をしたり、ハイキングをしたり、する事ができます。外のいい所は環境を見えます。でも、天気が悪いたら、どこでも行きませんです。

次に、中にする事もたくさんあります。例えば、買い物をしたり、ビデオゲームをあそんだり、映画を見たり、するできます。それに、建物の中にいますから、天気を心配しなくてもいいです。特別に、夏にはとても暑いですから、中にいるの方がいいです。

第三に、たいてい町はこんでいますから、外にするできな事があんまりあります。外にいたいたら、田舎のところはいいと思います。

最後に、私の意見は中にする事の方がいいです。私は外があまり好きじゃないですから。

Sample: C

これから、日本のスポルタについて話します。高校にたくさんスポルタがあります。でもう、ソッカとテニスとバスバルがよいをします。私はアウトサイドのスポルタもインドのスポルトもはアウトサイドのスポルタをよいが方がいいですと思います。いと、高校の先輩はアウトサイドがありますが方がいいですと思います。いじょ

AP[®] JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2016 SCORING COMMENTARY

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article

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

Overview

This task assesses writing skills in the presentational communicative mode by having students write an article for the student newspaper of a school in Japan. It comprises a single prompt in English, which identifies two related topics and details how they should be discussed in the article. Students are given 20 minutes to write an article of 300 to 400 characters or longer. The article receives a single holistic score based on how well it accomplishes the assigned task.

Sample: A

Score: 5

This article addresses all aspects of the prompt, including an expression of preference and reasoning. It is well organized and coherent, with a progression of ideas that is generally clear. This is aided by the use of transitional elements and cohesive devices including *まず*, *第二(番)目は*, *最後に*, *でも*, and *例えば*.

In terms of delivery, the response exhibits an ease of expression despite infrequent and insignificant errors in orthography and mechanics, including *家の中でこと* in the first paragraph, which should be *家の中のこと*; and in the second paragraph, *スポーツをできる* should be *スポーツができる*. The error of using *を* instead of the correct *が* is repeated in the following section. In the final paragraph, *家でより外の方が一番* should be *家より外の方が一番*.

The use of kana orthography is inconsistent, with sporadic errors such as *スポツ* should be *スポーツ* and *アクチビエテ* should be *アクティビティ*. Additionally, in the final paragraph, *思うます* should be *思います*.

A variety of vocabulary and idioms are used, including: *野球*、*両親*、*怒る*、*料理*、*運動*、*困ります*. The response exhibits the appropriate use of various grammatical and syntactic structures, with sporadic errors in more complex structures including *雨が降れるなら* for *雨が降ったら* (this same error occurs a second time with *スポーツをしたいんなら*、*雨が降るので*, which should be *降ったら*). There is a missing nominalizer in *スポーツをするはダメ*, which should be *スポーツするのはダメ*.

The response displays a consistent use of register and style appropriate to the situation, with occasional lapses. Overall, this response suggests an emerging excellence in presentational writing. The response could have earned a higher score had it contained fewer orthographical errors and more complex grammatical structures.

AP[®] JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2016 SCORING COMMENTARY

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article (continued)

Sample: B

Score: 4

This article addresses all aspects of the prompt, including the expression of preference and reasoning.

The task compares locations and activities with a statement of preference and a basic reason provided. The information is generally organized through the use of transitional elements, an opening and a conclusion, such as *まず始めに*, *次に*, *第三に*, and *最後に*.

Instances demonstrating strained or unnatural flow of expression do not interfere with comprehensibility. For example: *外にする事と中にする事* should be *外でする事と中でする事*, *天気が悪いたら* should be *天気が悪かったら*, *ビデオゲームをあそったり* should be *ビデオゲームで遊んだり*, *映画を見たり*, *することができます* should be *映画を見たりすることができます*, and *外にできる事があんまりあります* should be *外でする事があんまりありません*.

Errors in orthography generally do not interfere with overall readability. For example, the meaning of *アクティバティ* can be easily understood. Some AP kanji are not included for *あそび* (遊び), *ところ* (所), and *いい* (良い).

The response uses appropriate but limited vocabulary and idioms. Grammatical and syntactic structures are mostly limited to simple structures with one or two more complex structures used: *散歩をしたり*; *ハイキンをしたり*; *する事ができます* and *建物の中にいますから*; *天気を心配しなくてもいいです*.

There are some particle errors such as *外に*, which should be *外で*; *環境を*, which should be *環境が*; and *ところでも*, which should be *どこにも*; *中にする事*, which should be *中でする事*; *夏には中* *にいるの方*, which should be *夏には中* *にいる方*; and *外にいたいたら*, which should be *外にいた* *いなら*. However, such errors do not significantly impair comprehension.

This is a good response which demonstrates basic competence in presentational writing. The response could have earned a higher score had it contained more accuracy in complex grammatical structures, fewer particle errors, and better orthography.

**AP[®] JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE
2016 SCORING COMMENTARY**

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article (continued)

Sample: C

Score: 2

This response addresses the prompt marginally through discussion of アウトサイドのスポルタ (outdoor sports) and インドのスポルト(indoor sports). The terms are generally comprehensible despite orthographic errors in their katakana presentation. The student has expressed a preference in the sentence アウトサイドのスポルタをよいが方がいいですと 思います, but there is no reason provided for the preference and three fully realized points of comparison are also not present.

Information is scattered and lacks coherence in places. Instances of strained expression and unnatural flow are present, and frequently interfere with comprehension such as in でもう、ソッカと テニスとバスバルがよいをします (でも、サッカーとテニスとベースボールをよくします). Frequent errors in katakana orthography that can impair readability are present: スポルタ (スポーツ); ソッカ (サッカー); テニス (テニス); バスバル (ベースボール); インド(インドア), as well as in hiragana でもう (でも) and いと (あと).

The response exhibits a limited control of grammar and syntactic structures, and this frequently interferes with overall comprehensibility and results in fragmented language.

This is a weak response which suggests a lack of competence in presentational writing. The response could have earned a higher score had it contained better control of grammatical and syntactic structures, and had it included the required elements.