AP[®] JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2009 SCORING GUIDELINES

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article

		TASK COMPLETION	DELIVERY	LANGUAGE USE
6	EXCELLENT Demonstrates excellence in presentational writing	 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 	 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 	 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	 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 	 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 	 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	 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 	 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 	 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	 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 	 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 	 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	 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 	 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 	 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	 Article addresses prompt only minimally Lacks organization and coherence 	 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 	 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	 Mere restatement of the prompt Clearly does not respond to the prom Not in Japanese Blank 	npt; completely irrelevant to the topic	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

© 2009 The College Board. All rights reserved. Visit the College Board on the Web: www.collegeboard.com.

Compare and Contrast Article

Sample: A

私は自分の家で映画を見るのも、映画館で映画を見る事もよくします。でも僕は映画館で映画 を見るほうがいいと思います。映画館で映画を見る人はたくさんいるので僕と同じ強い意見がある人 もたくさんいると思います。

最初に、映画館で映画を見ると映画の中にいる感じがします。音が回りから出てくるし、画面 がすごく大きいので見てるだけではなく、入ている感じがします。映画を映画館で見るのはアドベン チャーです。

次に、映画館には人がたくさんいるので、面白いです。たとえば、面白いところがあったら、 映画館の中のぜんいんが笑います。こうなると自分も笑ってしまいます。映画がもっと楽しく見れま す。

最後に、映画館では画面が家のテレビよりお起きです。ぼくのテレビは小さいので映画を見る とあまり面白くありません。でも映画館で見るといろんなものが見えて面白いです。

以上のことでぼくは自分の家で映画を見るより映画館でえいがを見るほうがいいと思います。映画 館でえいがを見ると映画の中には入ている気分がするし、人がたくさんいるし、画面も大きいです。 面白い映画を見たいと映画館に行くのが一番です。

Compare and Contrast Article

Sample: B

これから、映画館で映画を見るのと、家で映画を見るのをくらべてみます。映画館で見るのと家で見るのと違うところも同じところもある。

一つ目の違うところは、映画館で映画をみると、お金がたくさんかかる。しかし、家で見ると、お金 はらわなくてもいい。二つ目の違うところは、映画館で映画をみるつもりなら、映画館までに行かな くちゃ。家でみると、どこでも行かなくてもいい。三つ目の違うところは、人たくさん映画館に行く から、映画館のいすは家のいすより汚いです。

しかし、一つ目の同じところは、映画館にいても、家にいても、友達と映画を見ることできる。

僕は、映画館で映画を見るより家で見るほうがいい。映画館は汚くて高い。だけど、家で映画を見る と、きれいで安い。

Compare and Contrast Article

Sample: C

映画かんにいっではたんのしい、でも、ぼくの家に映画をみってがすきです。映画かんはたかい。で も、映画かんの映画はあたらしいです。家の映画は古いから、古い映画はいいです。家の映画をパー ズとリーワインドをします。むずかしいじゃあない!映画かんもきれいじゃあない。あなたのいつで ガムは下にありましょう。いいたべものにあなたの内があります。やすいとおいしい、家のたべもの はいいですね。映画かんのたべものはグリシとわるいです。映画かんはいいです。でも、それからぼ くの家に映画をみってがすきです。

AP[®] JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2009 SCORING COMMENTARY

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article

Note: Students' responses are quoted verbatim and may contain grammatical errors.

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 comprises 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 2009 students were required to compare and contrast watching a movie at home and watching a movie in a movie theater. 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. This well-organized and coherent article contains a clear progression of ideas and uses appropriate transitional elements and cohesive devices (最初に、次に、最後に、and 以上のことで). The student exhibits ease of expression and good flow of language, with consistent use of register and style appropriate to the situation (except that the clause 入ている感じがします is missing a subject, which might be 映画の中に or 話しの 中に). アドベンチャーです is unnatural and might better be replaced with a phrase such as 面白いです or 楽しいです. A variety of vocabulary and idioms, as well as grammatical and syntactic structures, is used, with sporadic errors (e.g., 映画を見るのも, 僕と同じ強い意 見がある人も, and いろんなもの). With the exception of ほう, ぜんいん, お起きです, and えいが, there are no mistakes in the use of kanji from the AP kanji list. This response suggests emerging excellence in presentational writing.

Sample: B Score: 4

This response demonstrates competence in presentational writing. The article addresses all aspects of the prompt, including expression of preference and reasoning, but it lacks elaboration. The flow of expression is mostly natural, and the unnatural elements, such as お金はらわなくてもいい, どこでも行かなくてもいい, どこでも行かなくてもいい, and 人たくさん, do not interfere with comprehensibility. There are several lapses in otherwise consistent use of register and style appropriate to the situation; although this response is otherwise written in plain form, the phrases くらべてみます and 汚いです also appear. There are several mistakes in use of kanji, for example, みるつもり should be 見るつもり and 見るほうがいい should be 見る方がいい. Use of vocabulary and idioms is appropriate but limited. If the response had included more elaboration and detail and exhibited stronger and more consistent control of grammar and orthography, it could have earned a higher score.

AP[®] JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2009 SCORING COMMENTARY

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article (continued)

Sample: C Score: 2

This response addresses the prompt marginally and lacks organization and coherence. Labored expression constantly interferes with comprehensibility (e.g., in 映画かんにいっではたんのしい, 映画をみってがす きです, あなたのいつでガムは下にありましょう, and いいたべものにあなたの内があります). Errors in katakana use (パーズ, リーワインド, グリシ), as well as insufficient control of vocabulary and idioms (e.g., たんのしい, やすいとおいしい、家のたべものはいいですね), significantly interfere with readability. Production of kanji on the AP Japanese kanji list is lacking: たんのしい、すきです, たかい, あたらしいです, むずかしい, たべもの, やすい, わるいです, and すきです should all be written in kanji. Limited control of grammatical and syntactic structures, as in むずかしいじゃあない! and やすいとおいしい, results in very fragmented language and interferes with comprehensibility. Addressing the prompt more thoroughly and in a more organized fashion would help this response earn a higher score. A better control of orthography would make the response more readable.