Inside:

Presentational Speaking—Cultural Perspective

☑ Scoring Guideline
☑ Student Samples
☑ Scoring Commentary

© 2019 The College Board. College Board, Advanced Placement, AP, AP Central, and the acorn logo are registered trademarks of the College Board. Visit the College Board on the web: collegeboard.org.

AP Central is the official online home for the AP Program: apcentral.collegeboard.org.
## Presentational Speaking: Cultural Perspective Presentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK COMPLETION</th>
<th>DELIVERY</th>
<th>LANGUAGE USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6 EXCELLENT**
Demonstrates excellence in presentational speaking and cultural knowledge | • Presentation addresses all aspects of prompt with thoroughness and detail, including explanation of view or perspective
• Well organized and coherent, with a clear progression of ideas; use of appropriate transitional elements and cohesive devices
• Cultural information is accurate and detailed | • Natural, easily flowing expression
• Natural pace with minimal hesitation or repetition
• Pronunciation virtually error free
• 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 speaking and cultural knowledge | • Presentation addresses all aspects of prompt, including explanation of view or perspective
• Well organized and coherent, with a progression of ideas that is generally clear; some use of transitional elements and cohesive devices
• Minimal errors in cultural information | • Generally exhibits ease of expression
• Smooth pace with occasional hesitation or repetition, which does not distract from the message
• Infrequent or insignificant errors in pronunciation
• 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 speaking and cultural knowledge | • Presentation addresses almost all aspects of prompt, including explanation of view or perspective, but may lack detail or elaboration
• Generally organized and coherent; use of transitional elements and cohesive devices may be inconsistent
• Generally correct cultural information with some inaccuracies | • Strained or unnatural flow of expression does not interfere with comprehensibility
• Generally consistent pace with some unnatural hesitation or repetition
• Errors in pronunciation do not necessitate special listener effort
• 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 speaking and cultural knowledge | • Presentation 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
• Cultural information may have several inaccuracies | • Strained or unnatural flow of expression sometimes interferes with comprehensibility
• Inconsistent pace marked by some hesitation or repetition
• Errors in pronunciation sometimes necessitate special listener effort
• 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 speaking and cultural knowledge | • Presentation 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
• Cultural information has frequent or significant inaccuracies | • Labored expression frequently interferes with comprehensibility
• Frequent hesitation or repetition
• Frequent errors in pronunciation necessitate constant listener effort
• 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 speaking and cultural knowledge | • Presentation addresses prompt only minimally
• Lacks organization and coherence
• Cultural information almost entirely inaccurate or missing | • Labored expression constantly interferes with comprehensibility
• Constant hesitation or repetition
• Frequent errors in pronunciation necessitate intense listener effort
• 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 prompt; completely irrelevant to the topic
• Not in Japanese
• Blank (although recording equipment is functioning) or mere sighs | | |
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Presentational Speaking: Cultural Perspective Presentation

Note: Students’ responses are quoted verbatim and may contain grammatical errors. In the transcripts of students’ speech quoted in the commentaries, a three-dot ellipsis indicates that the sample has been excerpted. Two dots indicate that the student paused while speaking.

Overview

The Cultural Perspective Presentation assesses speaking skills in the presentational communication mode by having students present their perspectives on a specific topic related to Japanese culture. The prompt is comprised of one statement in English identifying the audience, context, and a presentation prompt to which the candidate is to respond.

On this year’s exam the prompt instructs students to present their perspectives on Japanese housing and buildings, begin with an introduction, and present five examples or aspects of Japanese housing and buildings with a concluding remark. The student has four minutes to prepare an outline and two minutes to record their responses. The response receives a holistic score based on how well it accomplishes the task in terms of task completion, delivery, and language use. In addition, the score reflects the level of cultural knowledge exhibited in the presentation.

Sample: A
Score: 6

Transcript of Student Response
日本の家（いえ）や建物は、アメリカの家（いえ）や建物に、比べてとても違います。一つ目に、日本の、uh 家（いえ）は、外から見て、表札や、表札が、あります。表札には、家族の、名前が、あります。それから、た いてい二階建ての、家（いえ）が、多いです。あー、日本の家は、よく、隣の家（いえ）と近く、近い、近く に、建てられています。二つ目に、日本の家（いえ）に入ったら、たいてい玄関があります。玄関では、よく配 達、配達、の人が、行きます。配達の人は、パッケージを、家（いえ）の人に玄関、で、あげます。三つ目に、あ ー、いっ、三つ目に、日本の家（いえ）は、たいてい、畳、で、畳があります。床はたいてー畳で、ドアは障子 です。四つ目に、日本の家は、たいてい庭があります。に、庭には、花や、自然があって、日本人は、よく、障 子を開けて、外を見ます。五つ目に、日本の、日本の、のっ、は、たいてい、アパート、もあります。あー、結論 として、私は、日本の、の、家に、住んでみたいですね。アメリカと、とても違います。

Commentary

This response demonstrates excellence in presentational speaking and cultural knowledge. The presentation directly addresses the prompt and provides a very thorough and appropriate answer, including elaboration and detail (e.g., 庭には、花や、自然があって、日本人は、よく、障子を開けて、外を見ます). It includes detailed cultural information by mentioning the residence name plate (表札), the entryway (玄関), and the close proximity of the houses (日本の家は、よく隣の家と近く、近い、近くに建てられています). It is well organized, with consistent use of transitional elements (一つ目に；二つ目に；三つ目に；四つ目に；五つ目に), and ends with a concluding remark (結論として、私は日本の家に住んでみたいですね). The pace is natural, with minimal hesitation (あー), and the pronunciation is virtually error free. The response contains rich vocabulary (e.g., 表 札; 配達).
Sample: B
Score: 4

Transcript of Student Response
これからー、日本の家（うち）と、建物について、話します。えっとー、まず、日本の家（うち）で、たいてー、
えっとー、げつ、げっ、げっかんがあります。えっとー、・・・げっかんで、えっとー、くつを、ぬいで、えっとー、家
（うち）、を、入ります。そして、二番目の特徴は、床の間です。えっとー、たいてい日本の家（うち）で、床
の間が、あって、掛け軸と、えっとー、生け花が、あります。えっとー、だーい三に、日本の一、台所は、わふ
うを、りょうするために、本当に、ひじょうだって、えっとー、便利と思います。えっとー、・・・あー、そして、第
四に、・・・えっとー、最近みんな車が、あるなってきました、から、ガレージは、本当に、大切な物です。大切
の部屋です。えっとー、ここで、あー、えっとー、三台くるまー、まで、三台車が、あります。そ、あー、だい
一、五に、えっとー、日本の家（うち）は、ベランダ、も、あります。えっとー、ベランダは、いい景色を、見たこ
とができる。

Commentary
This response demonstrates competence in presentational speaking and cultural knowledge. It addresses
several aspects of the topic: げっかん（玄関）; 床の間; 台所; ガレージ; ベランダ, and includes an explanation
of the student's perspective (e.g., げっかんで; くつを、ぬいで; 家を、入ります; 最近みんな車が、あるなってき
ました、から、ガレージは、本当に、大切な物です). The response is relatively well organized with the use of
cohesive devices (e.g., まず; 二番目の特徴は; 第四に) and contains cultural information that is generally
correct, but with some inaccuracies (三台車; まで、三台車が、あります). The pace is generally consistent with
some unnatural hesitation (e.g., えっとー), but the response includes several lapses in the use of register (ベラ
ンダは、いい景色を、見たことが、できる). The vocabulary is appropriate but limited. The use of grammatical
structures is appropriate, but there are several errors in complex structures (e.g., 第三に、日本の台所は、わふ
うをりょうするために、本当に、ひじょうだって、便利と思います). This response could have earned a higher
score had it contained more detail or elaboration, exhibited less hesitation, and demonstrated a better control
of grammatical structures.

Sample: C
Score: 2

Transcript of Student Response
私の名前は、[name of candidate]です。私は、日本の家（うち）を、話しまあす。日本の家（うち）を、小さい
ところがす。日本の家（うち）を、短いと、みじかないです。日本の家（うち）を、とってもきれいです。日本の家（うち）、と、アメリカの家（うち）がとってもかえーss。日本の家（うち）が、とってもきれいです。私は、日本の家（うち）を、好きです。
Presentational Speaking: Cultural Perspective Presentation (continued)

Commentary

This response suggests a lack of competence in presentational speaking and cultural knowledge. It addresses the topic only marginally by talking about Japanese houses in general (e.g., 日本のうちを、とってもきれいです; 私は、日本のうちを、好きです). The information is generally scattered, and the response lacks organization and includes no cohesive devices. The response includes frequent repetition (e.g., 日本のうち). Insufficient vocabulary and idioms (e.g., 日本のうちを、短い) frequently interfere with comprehensibility, and the limited grammatical control results in fragmented language (e.g., 日本の家を、小さいとこわいです; 日本の家を、短い、と、みじかないです) and interferes with comprehensibility. This response could have earned a higher score had it provided sufficient cultural knowledge and used vocabulary and grammatical patterns correctly to express the student’s views and opinions.