

AP[®] JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

2008 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 Inconsistent use of register and style appropriate to situation 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 		

Compare and Contrast Article

Sample: A

今日は日本語の使い方についての比較をしたいと思います。日本語には使い方が二通りあります。一つはかなと漢字、もう一つはローマ字です。それらにはさまざまな共通点と相違点があります。まず漢字とローマ字の共通点は、二つとも日本語から生まれる使い方である点です。もうひとつの共通点は二つがパソコンで使い方が似ていること。なぜならローマ字から漢字に変換されたりするからです。そして二つとも日本人に親しみやすく、多くの人に使われているという点です。二つの相違点は、まずローマ字は漢字やかなに比べて、英字で出来ている点です。また、ローマ字は漢字やかなに比べて割とシンプルですし、使いやすいです。そしてローマ字は漢字やかなに比べて読みやすいです。それは何故かと言うと、ローマ字は文字種類が少なく、漢字のように珍しくて読めないという時がありませんからです。

私は日々両方を使う中で、ローマ字の方が使いやすく、漢字やかなよりも好きです。それはやはり簡単に打ち込めますし、変換も漢字みたいに必要がないからです。皆さんも是非使い比べてみて下さい。

Compare and Contrast Article

Sample: B

カナや漢字とローマ字を比べてみるといろいろな違いがあります。それぞれ長所と短所があります。

まず、いつもローマ字を使ったら時々言葉の言い方がわからないから大変です。反対にカナや漢字の読み方がわかると言葉の意味がわかりやすいです。

第二に、英語や外国語を書く時、ローマ字は便利です。なぜなら日本語で外国語の言葉のために時々漢字やカナがないからです。でもいつも日本語を書いたら、漢字やカナはローマ字より便利で使いやすいです。

最後に、ローマ字を使うと言葉の後でいつもスペースがあります。このスペースはローマ字の読み方をもっとやさしくなります。でも漢字やカナを使ったら、スペースの代わりに字があります。スペースがなかったら、時々言葉や文の意味が分かれません。

これらの理由から漢字やカナは便利で使いやすいと思います。なぜなら僕は日本語を勉強しているから僕のために漢字とカナはもっと大切です。そして僕はローマ字の方より漢字とカナの方が好きです。

Compare and Contrast Article

Sample: C

今日はかたかなや漢字やろマジを話しています。漢字は難しいです。漢字は色々がたくさんですね。カタカナはろマジは外人のフォーズにひつよがいました。ろマジはまとめると私はろマジを好きです。ろマジはやさしいです。

AP[®] JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2008 SCORING COMMENTARY

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article

Overview

This task assesses writing in the presentational communicative mode by having students write an article for the student newspaper of a school in Japan. It consists of a single prompt, 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 300–400 characters or longer. The response receives a single, holistic score, based on how well it accomplishes the assigned task.

In 2008 students were asked to compare and contrast using only kana and kanji and using only romaji. They were asked to describe at least three aspects of each and to highlight the similarities and differences. They were also asked to state their preference and give reasons for it.

Sample: A

Score: 5

This response addresses all aspects of the prompt, including expression of preference and reasoning. However, more elaboration and clear comparison would strengthen the answer (ローマ字は漢字やかなに比べて、英字で出来ている点です。ローマ字は文字種類が少なく、and ローマ字の方が使いやすく、漢字やかなよりも好きです。). This well-organized and coherent response contains a generally clear progression of ideas and uses appropriate transitional elements and cohesive devices (まず、そして、and また). The student exhibits ease of expression and good flow, with consistent use of register and style appropriate to the situation (except 使い方が似ていること is missing です). A variety of vocabulary and idioms as well as grammatical and syntactic structures are used, with sporadic errors such as 文字種類, 珍しくて, and 生まれる使い方. With the exception of ひとつ, there are no mistakes in use of kanji from the AP kanji list. This response suggests emerging excellence in presentational writing.

Sample: B

Score: 4

This response addresses all aspects of the prompt, including expression of preference and reasoning, but it lacks elaboration. While it is well organized, the use of transitional elements and cohesive devices is inconsistent (まず、第二に、最後に、and これらの理由から). The flow of expression is mostly natural, and the unnatural elements do not interfere with comprehensibility. Errors in orthography and mechanics (の法が、同じな) do not interfere with readability. There are no mistakes in use of kanji from the AP kanji list. Vocabulary and idioms are appropriate, and a variety of appropriate grammatical and syntactic structures are used. However, there are several errors in complex structures (e.g., 日本語で外国語の言葉のために時々漢字やカナがないからです and 読み方をもっとやさしくなります。意味が分かれません。). This response demonstrates competence in presentational writing.

**AP® JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE
2008 SCORING COMMENTARY**

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article (continued)

Sample: C

Score: 1

This response only minimally addresses the prompt and lacks organization and coherence. Labored expression constantly interferes with comprehensibility (e.g., in these sentences: 色々がたくさんですね。外人のフーズにひつよがいました。ろマジはまとめると私はろマジを好きです。). Errors in katakana use (ろマジ, フーズ), as well as insufficient vocabulary and idioms, significantly interfere with readability (e.g., 色々がたくさんですね。ひつよがいました。ろマジはまとめると). Limited control of grammatical and syntactic structures results in very fragmented language. This response demonstrates lack of competence in presentational writing.