

---

# AP Japanese Language and Culture

## Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

### Inside:

- ☑ Presentational Writing — Compare and Contrast Article
- ☑ Scoring Guideline
- ☑ Student Samples
- ☑ Scoring Commentary

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

## 2017 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 2017 SCORING COMMENTARY

## Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article

### Sample: A

今日はグループプロジェクトと個人でやるプロジェクトについて話して生きたいと思います。

まずはじめに、グループプロジェクトは個人プロジェクトに比べて、プロジェクトについての意見や作成方法のアイデアが豊富です。一人だけの頭脳ではなく、皆さんの工夫力を使えば、プロジェクトの完成度はとても高い区なると思います。だが、グループのなかで反対に意見やどうしても納得がいなくて反論が出ると、グループのなかで混乱がでて、完成から遠ざかる恐れがあります。個人プロジェクトを作ってる場合はそんな恐れはありません。自分のプロジェクトだと、そのトピックについて個人的な意見も入れてもいいし、プロジェクトを作ってる際に反論してくる人がいないのでスムーズに自分のペースでプロジェクトを完成できます。

二つ目のポイントは個人プロジェクトはすべて自分でやらなければいけません。確かにこっちのほうが自分の理想に作っていただけますが、一人でやると疲労の負担が大きい可能性があります。グループでやると、部分的に人にプロジェクトに参加させれば、一人がやらなければいけない量が少なくなります。

最後のポイントとするところは、プロジェクトが完成する時間です。グループでやると、みんながちゃんと参加したらあっという間に終わると思います。比べて個人でやると、すべて自分でやるので時間がけっこうかかる恐れがあります。

私は個人プロジェクトのほうがやりやすいです。ほこの人に頼らなくていいし、自分の意見をいれるのが好きなのでほかの人たちと意見の違いで反論したくないので個人プロジェクトのほうを好みます。

### Sample: B

グループでやるプロジェクトと一人でやるプロジェクトはととえもちがいがおおいだとおもいます。まず、人が多い時もっとはやくプロジェクトをおわれることがあります。だが、一人のメンバーがしっばいすると、みんなのめいわくになります。一人でプロジェクトをすると自分がしっばいしたら、ほかのひとのめいわくにはなりません。グループできょうりよくする時、けんかもよくあります。これは時間のむだであまりよくありません。けんかしすぎるとプロジェクトはかんせいできません。それにくらべて一人でわけんかをするあいてはいません。つまり時間をむだにはなりません。一人でプロジェクトをする時とグループでする時はいっぱい違いがあるかもしれないけども、おんなじところもありますりょうほ難しいものだと思います。そもそもプロジェクトっていうものはむずかしいと思います。どりよくと時間をいっぱいつかって、もしもしっばいしたらせいさが多くさがるかもしれません。

### Sample: C

こんにちは、皆さん。私はグッロブプロジクトや一人でプロジクトです。グルブプロジクトは難しいけど、一人は仕事がないです。ときどき仕事でプロジクトは外で学校。一人プロジクトほうけど、あなたの仕事。あなたはグッロブ人を話しくない。グッロブプロジクトであなたはグッロブ人を話します。あなたはグッロブで好きです、私もないです。

# AP<sup>®</sup> JAPANESE LANGUAGE AND CULTURE 2017 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 opposing sides of a single topic and details how they should be compared in the article. Student must also state their preference for one of the sides and provide a reason for it. 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 tasks.

On this year's exam students were asked to compare and contrast group projects and individual projects. To successfully respond to the prompt, students had to describe at least three aspects of each type of project, to state which type they preferred, and to give reasons for their preference.

### Sample: A

#### Score: 6

This article demonstrates excellence in presentational writing, addressing all aspects of the prompt with thoroughness and detail. The progression of ideas is clear and signaled by appropriate transitional devices (まずはじめに; 二つ目のポイントは; 最後のポイントとするところは;).

In terms of delivery, the expression is natural and easily flowing throughout. There are minimal orthographic errors (話して生きたい; 高い区なる; ほこの人) that do not impede comprehensibility, but otherwise there are no errors in use of *kanji* according to the AP *kanji* list.

Language use demonstrates ample use of rich vocabulary and idioms (e.g., 作成方法, 豊富, 頭脳, 工夫力, 完成度, 納得, 完成から遠ざかる恐れが, 混乱, 際に, 理想, 疲労, 負担, 可能性, 部分的に, 参加, あっという間に終わる). In addition, a variety of appropriate grammatical and syntactic constructions are used with minimal or no errors (e.g., embedded constructions in グループのなかで反対に意見やどうしても納得がいかなくて反論が出ると、グループのなかで混乱がでて、完成から遠ざかる恐れがあります。; e.g., clause linkage in グループでやると、部分的に人にプロジェクトに参加させれば、一人がやらなければいけない量が少なくなります。).

### Sample: B

#### Score: 3

Suggesting emerging competence in presentational writing, this response addresses the topic directly with three aspects of each type of project (time, possibility of causing trouble to others, possibility of arguing and wasting time), along with some elaboration. The student's preference and reason, however, are missing. Cohesive devices and transitional elements are effective in providing sentence cohesion (だが, これは, それにくらべて, つまり) but few such elements are provided at the discourse level (まず, だが), with the result that each point of comparison is not clearly highlighted.

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

## 2017 SCORING COMMENTARY

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

In terms of delivery, there are errors in mechanics that interfere with comprehensibility (e.g., missing period in おんなじところもありますりょうほ難しいものだと思います。). Non-use of AP *kanji* at times impedes readability throughout (e.g., おもいます, はやく, あいて, つかって). Several errors in orthography appear (たとえば should be とても; 一人でわ should be 一人では; せいさがが should be せいせきが or 成績が).

Language use contains some inappropriate vocabulary items that interfere with comprehensibility (e.g., せいさがが多くさがる).

If this response had stated a preference for which type of project and a reason for that preference, it could have earned a higher score.

#### **Sample: C** **Score: 1**

With insufficient vocabulary and limited control of grammatical structures that significantly interfere with comprehensibility, this article demonstrates a lack of competence in presentational writing. The article addresses the prompt only minimally, and does so by referring to the two items of comparison (私はグッロッププロジェクトや一人でプロジェクト). Due to limited control of grammar and vocabulary, however, the article lacks organization and coherence (e.g., ときどき仕事でプロジェクトは外で学校。), making it difficult to identify any points of comparison.

In terms of delivery, labored expression constantly interferes with comprehensibility (e.g., the following looks like an expression of preference, but is not quite intelligible: 一人プロジェクトほうけど、あなたの仕事。). In terms of orthography and *kanji*, there are several spelling errors (e.g., グッロップ should be グループ; プロジェクト should be プロジェクト; グループ should be グループ) but AP *kanji* use is without error. There is one mechanical error, use of a comma instead of a period (あなたはグッロップで好きです、私もないです。). The use of register is inconsistent, with a single sentence in plain style (あなたはグッロップ人を話しくない。), while the remainder of the sentences are in polite form. There are two sentences that lack a predicate (ときどき仕事でプロジェクトは外で学校。; 一人プロジェクトほうけど、あなたの仕事。).

In terms of language use, limited control of grammar (e.g., あなたはグッロップ人を話しくない) interferes with intelligibility, as does inappropriate or insufficient vocabulary (e.g., 一人は仕事がないです).

If this response had addressed the prompt more directly, and demonstrated better control of grammar, and used a greater variety of vocabulary, it could have earned a higher score.