
AP[®] Japanese Language and Culture

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Presentational Writing—Compare and Contrast Article

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

Question 2: Compare and Contrast Article

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 presentational writing	Suggests lack of competence in presentational writing	Suggests emerging competence in presentational writing	Demonstrates competence in presentational writing	Suggests emerging excellence in presentational writing	Demonstrates excellence in presentational writing
TASK COMPLETION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Article addresses prompt only minimally Lacks organization and coherence 	<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"> 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"> 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"> 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"> 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
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 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"> 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"> 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"> 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"> 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"> 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
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 Variety of appropriate grammatical and syntactic structures, with minimal or no errors

Score of 0: UNACCEPTABLE—Contains nothing that earns credit

- Mere restatement of the prompt
- Clearly does not respond to the prompt; completely irrelevant to the topic
- Not in Japanese

NR (No Response): BLANK (no response)

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article

Sample: A

今から、私は人と話すことメールを送ることを比べてみます。人と話すこととメールを送ることにはたくさんの同じことも違うこともあります。初めに、一つ目の違うことはメールはいつでも送れます。メールを送ることはスマホだけあったら、できますが、人と話すことは他の人と一緒に時だけです。例えば、私は学校の後で、家で宿題をしている時、友達にメールを送ることができます。でも、友達と一緒に話すことができません。次に、二つ目の違うことは人と話している時、他の人の感じが分かりやすいです。メールを送ったら、他の人の顔が見えないから、うれしい顔かかなしい顔があまり分かりません。しかし、一つの同じことは人と話すこともメールを送ることも友達や家族に何でも話します。例えば、私は問題があったら、友達にメールを送ることも友達と話すことも相談ができます。そして、質問を聞いたら、へんじがもらえます。結論として、私はメールを送るほうが人と話すより好きだと思います。なぜなら、メールを送るのはもっと便利だからです。

Sample: B

これから、他の人にテクスをしてと他の人にお話をしてことを比べます。同じことも違うこともあります。まず、一つ目の違うことは、他の人にテクスをしてために質問があると答えるために時間がたくさんあると思います。他の人にお話をしてために質問があると答えるために早くにすると良かったと思います。二つ目の違うことは、他の人にテクスをしてために顔が見えないので、エクспレシヨンが全然見えないと思います。他の人にお話をしてために顔が見えるので、エクспレシヨンが簡単に見えると思います。一つの同じことは、他の人にテクスをして、他の人にお話をして、色々なことに話すができると思います。私の考えとして、他の人にお話をするためは、他の人にテクスをするより好きです。なぜなら、他の人にテクスをするためは難しいろいろな難しいことがあります。他の人にお話をしてために、簡単で質問に答えると思うからです。

Sample: C

話す 今から社会のはなし感じについて話します。まずに携帯を話して、気持ちもらって出来ません。このせいでふたりとも人にぜんぜん分かりません。ですから、本気の話すの方が携帯ことよりいいと思います。たとえば、人1：“今、なにしてんの？”人2：“何も、なんで？”人2の気持ちがちょっと違いますから起こる感じみたいなのだと思います。でもこのせいで信じられなません。

Presentation Writing: Compare and Contrast Article (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 presentational writing. It thoroughly addresses all aspects of the prompt with elaboration and details, including a detailed comparison of texting versus talking with a person, supported by reasoning (e.g., 人と話すことは他の人と一緒に時だけできます。例えば、私は学校の後で、家で宿題をしている時、友達にメールを送ることができます。でも、友達と一緒に話すことができません。). It also includes a clearly stated preference (結論として、私はメールを送るほうが人と話すより好きだと思います。なぜなら、メールを送るのはもっと便利だからです。). It is well organized and coherent, with a clear progression of ideas with cohesive devices and transitional elements (e.g., 初めに; 次に; しかし; そして; 結論として). It has natural, easily flowing expressions and uses consistent register and style appropriate to the situation with no orthographic or mechanical errors. It contains rich vocabulary and idioms (e.g., 問題; 相談; 結論; 便利) and makes excellent use of syntactic structures with minimal error (e.g., 私は人と話すことメールを送ることを比べてみます misses the particle と; 他の人と一緒に時だけできます should be 他の人と一緒にいる時だけです).

Sample: B

Score: 4

This response demonstrates competence in presentational writing. It addresses all aspects of the prompt, including reasoning and preference, but lacks detail or elaboration (e.g., 一つの同じことは、他の人にテクスをしても、他の人にお話をしても、色々なことに話すができると思います。). The response is generally organized and coherent, but use of transitional devices may be inconsistent (e.g., これから; 一つ目; 二つ目; 私の考えとして). There is strained flow of expression, but it does not interfere with comprehensibility (e.g., 他の人にテクスをしてために質問があると答えるために時間がたくさんあると思います; 他の人にお話をしてために顔が見えるので、エクспレションが簡単に見えると思います; 他の人にお話をするためは、他の人にテクスをするより好きです). There is an error in orthography which does not interfere with comprehensibility (i.e., テクス). The use of register is consistent, but it uses inappropriate, limited vocabulary (e.g., 他の人にお話をするためは、他の人に should be 誰かにお話をするためはその人に) in this context. This response has appropriate use of grammatical and syntactic structures, but with several errors in complex structures (e.g., 他の人にテクスをしてために質問があると答えるために should be 誰か何かを聞きたい時; 色々なことに話すができる should be 色々なことが話すことができる; 他の人にお話をしてために、簡単で質問に答えると思うからです should be 誰かにお話をする時に簡単に質問に答えることができるからです). This response would have earned a higher score if it included more accurate grammar to fully illustrate the points being made.

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article (continued)**Sample: C****Score: 2**

This response suggests lack of competence in presentational writing. It addresses the topic only marginally, with scattered information lacking in coherence, making the points of comparison difficult to identify (e.g., たったえば、人1：“今、なにしてんの？”人2：何も、なんで？”人2の気持ちがちよつと違いますから起こる感じみたいなのと思います。). Labored expressions frequently interfere with readability (e.g., 携帯を話して；気持ちもらって出来ません；本気の話すの方). There are also errors in orthography (e.g., ついて should be ついて；たっとえば should be たとえば；起こる should be おこる；思います should be 思います) and frequent mistakes with respect to kanji included in the AP Japanese kanji list (e.g., ふたり should be 二人；はなし should be 話す；起こる should be おこる). This response includes minimal use of transitional devices (e.g., 今から社会のはなし感じについて話します。まずに携帯を話して、気持ちもらって出来ません。), where transitional phrases such as まず or それから could have been used to improve coherence. Inappropriate vocabulary also interferes with comprehensibility (e.g., 社会のはなし；起こる感じみたいなの；本気 in 本気の話すの方が携帯ことよりいいと思います could be either 気持ち or 感情). Limited control of grammatical structures frequently results in fragmented language (e.g., たっとえば、人1：“今、なにしてんの？”人2：何も、なんで？；信じられなません). This response would have earned a higher score if transitional devices were used to organize the ideas. Additionally, more consistent use of basic grammatical structures would have improved the readability of the argument and contributed to a higher score.