
AP[®] Japanese Language and Culture

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Presentational Writing—Compare and Contrast Article

- Scoring Guideline**
- 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 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 	<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 	<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 	<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 	<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
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

- 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

紙で何かを読むこととパソコンで何かを読むことと比べてみたいと思います。違うところと似ているところもあります。でも、私は紙で読むことのほうが好きです。

まず、紙で本を読むことのほうが楽しいと思います。紙のとき、本の話は一番集中になることです。でも、オンラインで読むと他のことに気にしてしまうことが多いです。例えば、時々パソコンの明るさは明るすぎることに気にする人が多いと思います。何を読んでいることに集中するより、パソコンに集中してしまいます。それから、パソコンを使いすぎると目が疲れてしまいます。

次に、パソコンで読むのいい点です。パソコンで読むと、紙を使わなくてもいいです。だから、多分パソコンで読むことのほうが地球にいいかもしれません。そして、パソコンで何冊も読めます。でも、本の一冊の中に一つの話しか入っていないです。

最後に、学校で何かを読ませたとき、紙で読むとメモを取るのほうが簡単だと思います。そして、その紙を授業に持つことができます。パソコンで読むと、他の紙でメモを取らなければなりません。そして、多くの授業でパソコンを使うことはできません。だから、読む課題をパソコンで読むと授業中読んだものを見られません。

結論として、私は紙で読むのほうが好きです。簡単で、目が疲れないからです。他の人にとって、他の意見があると思いますから好きなように読んだほうが良いと思います。

Sample: B

かみの読んだ事とコンピューターの読んだ事がくらべてみます。ちがう事も同じ事があります。一つ目にちがう事がかみの読んだ事のは、やさしいが、コンピューター事のは、目が悪いです。かみの読んだことがとてもやさしいでした。コンピューターの読んだ事が目が悪いです。二つ目にちがう事がかみの読んだ事のは、ちょっとお金が、コンピューターの読んだ事のは、たかいです。かみがいつもちょっと円でした。コンピューターがたいてい高いです。しかし、同じ事はかみの読んだもコンピューターの読んだも楽しいみにしています。かみとコンピューターが世界にりゅうこをします。最後に、かみの読んだ事方が、コンピュータの読んだ事より、もっと好きです。かみがやさしくてたのしいです。かみの読んだ事が一番好きです。

Sample: C

学生は本を読むはとてもいいです。でも、ピャーパの方スクリヌより読ますか。ピャーパの読むは目が悪いでわ、スクリヌの読むはとても目が悪いです。そして、学生はスクリヌの読むはアッテンションがとてもわるい。ピャーパの読むはアッテンションは良いです。でも、スクリヌの読むの方ピャーパよりとてもやさしですから、私はスクリヌの方ピャーパより好きです。そして、スクリヌの読むで私の一番ほんを読みます。ゾーヌは私の一番本を読ました。とても良いの本はピャーパの本はありませんから、学生はピャーパの本を読みます、でも私はスクリヌのほんが好きです。

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article

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

Overview

The Compare and Contrast Article task assesses presentational writing skills by having students write an article for the student newspaper of a school in Japan. The prompt is given in English. It asks students, based on their own experience, to compare and contrast two sides of a single topic by identifying three aspects of the topic and highlighting similarities and differences between the sides. In addition, students are asked to express their preference for one or the other of the sides and to provide their reasoning for that choice. The responses are expected to demonstrate the ability to identify, to compare and contrast, to elaborate, to choose, and to explain in presentational writing. Students are also expected to display their ability to write using the AP kanji, to make use of a robust vocabulary, and to demonstrate control over grammatical structures.

The 2021 prompt asked students to compare and contrast reading something on a screen and reading something on paper.

Sample: A

Score: 6

This article demonstrates excellence in presentational writing. It addresses all aspects of the prompt with thoroughness and detail, including expression of preference and reasoning (私は紙で読むのほうが好きです。簡単で、目が疲れないからです). It is well organized and coherent with frequent use of transitional elements and cohesive devices (まず; 次に; 最後に; 結論として). The article exhibits natural, easy flowing expression. Orthography and mechanics are virtually error free except for a minor error (メーも). There are virtually no errors in the use of AP kanji. The use of register and style is consistent and appropriate to the situation. Rich vocabulary and idioms are used (集中, 課題). The language uses a variety of appropriate grammatical and syntactic structures (ーことです; ーすぎる; ーより; ーてしまいます; ーも; ーにとって), with minimal errors (明るすぎることに気にする人; その紙を授業に持つことができます).

Sample: B

Score: 3

This article suggests emerging competence in presentational writing. It addresses the prompt directly, including expression of preference (かみの読んだ事方が、コンピュータの読んだ事より、もっと好きです。かみがやさしくてたのしいです). It is generally coherent, with some use of transitional devices (一つ目に; 二つ目に; しかし; 最後に). The strained flow of expressions sometimes interferes with comprehensibility (ちがう事がかみの読んだ事のは、ちょっとお金が、コンピュータの読んだ事のは、高いです。かみがちょっと円でした). There are some errors in orthography and mechanics, though they do not interfere with comprehensibility (世界に りゅうこをします). The grammatical errors sometimes impede comprehensibility (かみの読んだ事方が、コンピュータの読んだ事より、もっと好きです). This response could have earned a higher score had it exhibited better language control to express preferences and reasons.

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article (continued)

Sample: C

Score: 2

This article suggests a lack of competence in presentational writing. It addresses the topic marginally (ピャーパの読むは目が悪いでわ、スクリヌの読むはとても目が悪いです) though the information is scattered and lacks coherence. Unnatural flow of expression frequently interferes with comprehensibility. (ピャーパの読むはアッテンションは良いです) There is minimal use of transitional devices (そして) and cohesive expressions (でも). The labored expression frequently interferes with readability, as in ピャーパの方スクリヌより読ますか; ズーヌは私の一番本を読ました). There are frequent errors in orthography (ピャーパ, スクリヌ, アッテンション, ズーヌ). Limited control of grammatical structures frequently results in fragmented language (スクリヌの読むので私の一番ほんを読みます). This response could have earned a higher score with greater control over grammatical structures, more attention to organization, and fewer errors in orthography.