
AP[®] Japanese Language and Culture

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Interpersonal Writing—Text Chat

- ☒ **Scoring Guidelines**
- ☒ **Student Samples**
- ☒ **Scoring Commentary**

Question 1: Text Chat

6 points

General Scoring Note

When applying the scoring guidelines, the response does not need to meet every single criterion in a column. You should award the score according to the preponderance of evidence.

| | 1 Very weak | 2 Weak | 3 Adequate | 4 Good | 5 Very good | 6 Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| | Demonstrates lack of competence in interpersonal writing | Suggests lack of competence in interpersonal writing | Suggests emerging competence in interpersonal writing | Demonstrates competence in interpersonal writing | Suggests emerging excellence in interpersonal writing | Demonstrates excellence in interpersonal writing |
| TASK COMPLETION | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses prompt minimally or marginally | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directly addresses prompt and provides an appropriate but incomplete answer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directly addresses prompt and provides a basic but appropriate answer | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directly addresses prompt and provides an appropriate response | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directly addresses prompt and provides a thorough and appropriate response; may include elaboration and detail | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directly addresses prompt and provides a very thorough and appropriate response; includes elaboration and detail |
| DELIVERY | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labored expression constantly interferes with comprehensibility Errors in orthography and mechanics very frequent or significantly interfere with readability Constant use of register and style inappropriate to situation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labored expression frequently interferes with comprehensibility Errors in orthography and mechanics frequent or interfere with readability Frequent use of register and style inappropriate to situation | <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 Use of register and style appropriate to situation is inconsistent or includes many errors | <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 lapses in otherwise consistent use of register and style appropriate to situation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally exhibits ease of expression Infrequent or insignificant errors in orthography and mechanics Consistent use of register and style appropriate to situation except for occasional lapses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural, easily flowing expression Orthography and mechanics virtually error free Consistent use of register and style appropriate to situation |
| LANGUAGE USE | <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 | <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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some inappropriate vocabulary and idioms interfere with comprehensibility Errors in grammatical and syntactic structures sometimes interfere with comprehensibility | <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 | <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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rich vocabulary and idioms Excellent use of grammar and syntax, with minimal or no errors |
| Score of 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 “I don’t understand,” “Please repeat,” or equivalent in Japanese Not in Japanese | | | | | | |
| NR (No Response): BLANK (no response) | | | | | | |

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 1

Sample: A

私は、個人的にあまり日本への有名な場所に行ったことがない。ですが、一度経験してみたいことは富士山でした。きれいし、自然もいいし、静けさを感じれそうです。

Sample: B

私は日本には有名な場所が何もあると思います。富士山やお寺などが有名です。

Sample: C

こんにちはおさかときょうがゆめい

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 1 (continued)

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

Overview

The question overviews can be found in the “Chief Reader Report on Student Responses” on [AP Central](#).

Sample: A

Score: 6

This response demonstrates excellence in interpersonal writing. The response directly addresses the prompt with a thorough, appropriate response, providing elaboration and detail. The response indicates a lack of direct personal experience (i.e., 個人的にあまり日本への有名な場所に行ったことがない), yet displays knowledge related to the prompt and a desire for experiences related to the topic (i.e., ですが、一度経験してみたいことは富士山でした). It also shows an awareness of relevant details (e.g., きれいし、自然もいいし、静けさが感じれそうです). The delivery is natural and incorporates easily flowing expressions (e.g., きれいし、自然もいいし、静けさが感じれそうです). The use of orthography and mechanics are solid. This response does contain one inconsistency in style in the first sentence (i.e., ない vs. でした and です). The response incorporates rich use of vocabulary (e.g., 個人的に; 一度; 経験; 自然; 静けさ; 感じれそう). There are few errors in the use of grammar and syntax (e.g., きれいし should be きれいだし, and 日本への有名な場所 should be 日本の有名な場所). 感じれそう is a colloquial and acceptable variant of 感じられそう. Although not an error per se, 富士山です is preferred to 富士山でした in this context.

Sample: B

Score: 4

This response demonstrates competence in interpersonal writing. It directly addresses the prompt by referring to the variety of famous places in Japan (i.e., 有名な場所が何もあると思います) and provides examples (i.e., 富士山やお寺など). It includes an unnatural expression, which does not interfere with comprehensibility (i.e., 何もある). Orthography and mechanics are used appropriately. The style is consistent (e.g., 思います and です). The response includes appropriate but limited vocabulary (e.g., 何もある; the repetition of 有名な). The use of grammar and syntax is appropriate, but somewhat limited (e.g., には; 有名な場所; と思います; や; など). This response would have earned a higher score with a greater variety of vocabulary and more complex syntax.

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 1 (continued)**Sample: C****Score: 2**

This response suggests a lack of competence in interpersonal writing. It attempts to address the prompt and includes appropriate information, yet it is incomplete (i.e., おさかときょうがゆめい). There are errors in mechanics such as a lack of punctuation, which impedes readability (i.e., こんにちははおさかときょうがゆめい). The response uses hiragana for words normally written in kanji (e.g., おさか; きょう; ゆめい), which also affects readability. It demonstrates insufficient control of vocabulary (e.g., おさか for おおさか and ゆめい for ゆうめい) and limited control of grammar, as evidenced by the incomplete sentence (i.e., おさかときょうがゆめい). The response would have earned a higher score with greater control of vocabulary and grammar and the correct use of orthography.

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 2

Sample: A

僕はその子を渋谷クロッシングにつれていきたいです。なぜなら、いっぱい人と店がありますからです。

Sample: B

わたしがゆめなレストランにいきたいです。たとえばしばいぬ

Sample: C

ビーチと同ントwん

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 2 (continued)**Sample: A****Score: 5**

This response suggests emerging excellence in interpersonal writing. It directly addresses the prompt by expressing a desire to take the friend to an intersection in Shibuya (i.e., 渋谷クロッシングにつれていきたいです). The second sentence uses a cohesive device (i.e., なぜなら～からです) to explain why Shibuya is worth a visit (i.e., いっぱい人と店がありますからです). The response generally exhibits ease of expression, with a progression of ideas between the two sentences. Register and style are consistent and appropriate to the situation. It contains appropriate use of grammatical and syntactic structures, except 店がありますからです would be better as 店があるからです. The demonstrative その to reference the friend is very good and creates a natural flow. However, the use of 子 without any information on the friend's age may be less common than 人. All AP kanji are typed, with the exception of one word written in hiragana (i.e., いきたい). This response would have earned a higher score had it included more complex syntactic structures and richer vocabulary.

Sample: B**Score: 3**

This response suggests emerging competence in interpersonal writing. The main body (i.e., ゆめなレストランにいきたいです) directly addresses the prompt with a basic statement about wanting to go to a famous restaurant. However, there is an unnatural flow in the second sentence because the initial word たとえば suggests that the student will follow up by naming a specific restaurant. しばいぬ appears instead and its connection to restaurants is unclear. Readability is affected by an orthography error (i.e., ゆめ instead of ゆうめい) and mechanics (i.e., absence of a comma after たとえば), and compounded by the complete lack of kanji from the AP kanji list. The use of grammatical structures is mostly sound, although わたし should have been followed by topic particle は instead of subject particle が. A response that clearly articulated a reason for wanting to go to a famous restaurant would have earned a higher score.

Sample: C**Score: 1**

This response demonstrates a lack of competence in interpersonal writing. The inclusion of a place ビーチ constitutes a minimal connection to the prompt. Orthographic errors in the remainder of the response, with a mixture of kanji, katakana, hiragana, and an English letter (i.e., 同ントwん), results in very fragmented language. Both readability and comprehensibility are significantly impeded. This response would have earned a higher score if it had provided a more direct answer to the prompt and exhibited better control of syntactic structures.

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 3

Sample: A

なぜなら、歴史的な場所からです。昔の侍が住んでいた所はとてもカッコいい事だと思います。それを友達に見せたいなと思います。.

Sample: B

なぜならきれい山があつたり、木があつたり、かんきょうがあつたりからです。

Sample: C

桜フェスティバルにとっておもしろいと

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 3 (continued)**Sample: A****Score: 6**

This response demonstrates excellence in interpersonal writing. It directly addresses the prompt and provides a thorough and appropriate reply (i.e., なぜなら、歴史的な場所からです). The response exhibits natural, flowing expressions following a clear, direct answer (e.g., 昔の侍が住んでいた所は とてもカッコいい事だと思います). It is well organized, coherent, and consistently uses register and style appropriate to the situation, including effective expressions (e.g., 友達に見せたいなと思います). Orthography and mechanics are virtually error free. The response displays rich vocabulary (e.g., 歴史的 and 昔の侍) and excellent use of syntactic structures, with only sporadic errors (i.e., 歴史的な場所からです instead of 歴史的な場所だからです; カッコいい事だと思います instead of カッコいいと思います).

Sample: B**Score: 4**

This response demonstrates competence in interpersonal writing. It directly addresses the prompt and provides an example (i.e., なぜなら、きれい山があつたり、木があつたり、かんきょうがあつたりからです). It generally exhibits ease of expression, with minor orthographic errors that do not interfere with readability (e.g., きれい山; かんきょうがあつたり). The response maintains a consistent use of register and style appropriate to the situation. It demonstrates appropriate but limited vocabulary (e.g., きれい山; かんきょうがあつたり). It shows an appropriate choice of grammatical and syntactic structures, though it is missing the final word (i.e., かんきょうがあつたりからです should be かんきょうがあつたりするからです). The response would have earned a higher score if it had included more specific details about the place and made greater use of kanji.

Sample: C**Score: 2**

This response suggests a lack of competence in interpersonal writing. It addresses the prompt and provides an appropriate but incomplete answer (i.e., 桜フェスティバルにとっておもしろいと). Errors in orthography interfere with readability (e.g., フェスティバル for フェスティバル). In addition, limited vocabulary frequently hampers comprehensibility. The response shows limited control of grammatical and syntactic structures, which often interferes with meaning or results in fragmented language (e.g., unclear use of にとって – it's unclear who finds the festival fun; the sentence is also incomplete, ending with おもしろいと for おもしろいと思います). This response would have earned a higher score with better control of orthography and mechanics, as well as a more detailed explanation of why the Sakura Festival is fun.

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 4

Sample: A

私は日本語のクラスを取っていますから、日本の有名なところを勉強しています。そして、春休みに都響と京都と大阪に行きました。すごいたのしかったです。私は日本の文化について習いました

Sample: B

私は、一回東京に行ったことがあるので、いいなばしょうがわかるのです。

Sample: C

私はデスニランドトキョウはたのしくてくるです。

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 4 (continued)**Sample: A****Score: 6**

This response demonstrates excellence in interpersonal writing, as it directly addresses the prompt by stating a visit to Tokyo, Kyoto, and Osaka during spring break. The response provides a thorough and appropriate reason for familiarity with these places, such as studying Japanese and learning about famous locations in Japan. The third and fourth sentences add meaningful detail, expressing that the experience was a lot of fun. The writing flows naturally, with a well-organized structure and clear progression of ideas. Cohesive devices (e.g., から and そして) are used effectively to connect thoughts. While there are some errors in orthography and mechanics (e.g., 都響 instead of 東京 and 習いました instead of 習いました) these do not affect the overall readability of the response. The response maintains a consistent and appropriate register throughout. Minor grammatical errors (e.g., using すごい instead of すごく and ついた instead of ついて) are present but do not interfere with overall comprehensibility.

Sample: B**Score: 4**

This response demonstrates competence in interpersonal writing. The response directly addresses the prompt by stating a visit to Tokyo, using the cohesive device ので to provide reasoning. While there is an unnatural flow in certain expressions (e.g., いいなばしょう), it does not interfere with overall comprehensibility. An orthographic error is also present (e.g., ばしょう instead of ばしょ), but this does not hinder readability. Additionally, the use of kana for ばしょ and わかる could have been improved by using their kanji forms (i.e., 場所 and 分かる) to enhance clarity and polish. The response maintains a consistent and appropriate register throughout the response. The vocabulary and expressions used are appropriate for the context, though somewhat limited. Grammatical and syntactic structures are generally correct, but there is a minor error in the adjective form (e.g., いいな which should be いい), but it does not impede understanding. Overall, the response is comprehensible and on-topic, but it would have earned a higher score with more elaboration, greater variety in vocabulary, and stronger command of grammatical forms.

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 4 (continued)**Sample: C****Score: 2**

This response suggests a lack of competence in interpersonal writing. The response directly addresses the prompt with an appropriate statement that Tokyo Disneyland is fun and that is the reason to go (i.e., 私はデスニランドトキョウはたのしくてくるです) but provides an incomplete answer. Its labored expression frequently interferes with comprehensibility (i.e., 私はデスニランドトキョウはたのしくてくるです), while errors in orthography interfere with readability (e.g., デスニランドトキョウ should be 東京ディズニーランド). Additionally, insufficient vocabulary and idioms frequently interfere with comprehensibility (e.g., デスニランドトキョウ should be 東京ディズニーランド; たのしくてくるです could be たのしいから行きます). More problematic is the limited control of grammatical and syntactic structures, which frequently interfere with comprehensibility (e.g., 私はデスニランドトキョウはたのしくてくるです could be 私は東京ディズニーランドが楽しいから行きます). Overall, the response would have earned a higher score by addressing the prompt more completely and by demonstrating more accurate and effective control of language, including grammar, vocabulary, and syntax.

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 5

Sample: A

絶対いいと思うよ！夏だったらユニバーサルのアイスやソーダがすごくおいしいんだよ！富士山の周りは花がいっぱい咲いてて無に行くのが最高の季節なんだ。僕も去年の夏に行ったよ。

Sample: B

夏に海を見ることいいと思います。タンをしたり、みずをあそんだり、することができます。

Sample: C

いいともいます。あなた

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 5 (continued)**Sample: A****Score: 6**

This response demonstrates excellence in interpersonal writing. It directly addresses the prompt by stating an opinion (i.e., 絶対いいと思うよ!) with elaboration and details (i.e., 夏だったらユニバーサルのアイスやソーダがすごくおいしい; 富士山の周りは花がいっぱい咲いてて). Delivery is natural and easily flowing. There are no errors in the use of katakana (e.g., ユニバーサル; ソーダ) and AP kanji, except for 無に行く instead of 見に行く. Register and style are consistent and appropriate to the situation. Rich vocabulary and idioms (e.g., 富士山の周りは; 咲いてて; 最高の季節) are used. The response demonstrates excellent use of grammar and syntactic structures, including a conditional form (i.e., 夏だったら) and a noun modifier (i.e., 無に行くのが最高の季節).

Sample: B**Score: 4**

This response demonstrates competence in interpersonal writing. It directly addresses the prompt and provides an appropriate response by providing an opinion (i.e., 夏に海を見ることいいと思います) and a justification (i.e., タンをしたり、みずをあそんだり、することができます). The unconventional use of an English word transcribed in katakana (i.e., タンをする for 日焼けする) does not significantly interfere with comprehensibility. AP kanji are used accurately, except for みず, which could have been written in the kanji 水. Register and style are consistent and appropriate to the situation. Vocabulary is appropriate but limited (e.g., タンをする; みずをあそぶ), but it barely interferes with comprehensibility. The use of grammatical and syntactic structures is appropriate (e.g., 海を見ること; ~たり~たりする; ことができる) with some minor errors such as misuse of particles (e.g., 海を見ることいい should be 海を見ることはいい; みずをあそぶ should be 水であそぶ). This response would have earned a higher score had it used more complex structures with more advanced vocabulary.

Sample: C**Score: 2**

This response suggests a lack of competence in interpersonal writing. While it appears that the response directly addresses the prompt (i.e., いいともいます), the incomplete second sentence (i.e., あなた) significantly interferes with comprehensibility. A labored expression with an orthography error (i.e., いいともいます for いいと思います) interferes with readability, suggesting limited control of syntactic structures. The response would have earned a higher score had it provided sufficient information with better control of language use.

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 6

Sample: A

僕はハワイですんでいます。ハワイでいちばん有名な場所はワイキキビーチ。長いし、きれいし、あかるいうみがあります。観光客はハワイに止まるときに、ワイキキビーチで泳ぎます。

Sample: B

アメリカでマイアミのビーチはゆめです。なぜなら、うみはきれいからです。

Sample: C

そうですね、こっちは、ニューヨークにスタチューオブー

Interpersonal Writing: Text Chat 6 (continued)**Sample: A****Score: 6**

This response demonstrates excellence in interpersonal writing. It directly addresses the prompt providing at least one example of a famous place in the student's country. Furthermore, elaboration is provided through details about the famous places (e.g., 長いし、きれいし、あかるいうみがあります; 観光客はハワイに止まるときに、ワイキキビーチで泳ぎます). The response flows naturally and expresses ideas clearly. Orthography and mechanics are virtually error free, except for ハワイ instead of ハワイ; 止まる instead of 泊まる. The register and style are consistent and appropriate to the situation. The response contains rich vocabulary (e.g., いちばん有名な; 観光客). Excellent use of grammar and syntax are evident, with only minimal errors (i.e., きれいし for きれいだし). A minor error in particles (i.e., ハワイですんでいます for ハワイにすんでいます) does not interfere with comprehensibility.

Sample: B**Score: 4**

This response demonstrates competence in interpersonal writing. It directly addresses the prompt providing at least one example of a famous place in the student's country (e.g., アメリカでマイアミのビエチはゆめです). Strained or unnatural flow of expressions does not interfere with comprehensibility (i.e., うみはきれいからです). Errors in orthography and mechanics (e.g., ビエチ; ゆめ) do not interfere with readability. This response contains appropriate but limited grammatical structures (e.g., ビエチはゆめです; うみはきれいからです). This response would have earned a higher score with a wider variety of vocabulary, more complex grammatical structures, and greater elaboration and detail.

Sample: C**Score: 2**

This response suggests a lack of competence in interpersonal writing. The response is incomplete because it does not clearly provide an example of a famous place in the student's country. Labored expression frequently interferes with comprehensibility (i.e., こっちは、ニューヨークにスタチューオブー). Errors in orthography interfere with readability (e.g., ニュヨーク for ニューヨーク; スタチューオブー for スタチュー・オブ・リバティー). It includes insufficient vocabulary and demonstrates limited control of language (i.e., ニュヨークにスタチューオブー). The response would have earned a higher score if it had answered the question more directly, shown better control of orthography, and demonstrated stronger command of language use.