
AP[®] Psychology

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary Set 2

Inside:

Free-Response Question 2

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

FRQ 2: Evidence-Based Question (EBQ)

7 Points

General Considerations

1.

Answers must be cogent enough for the meaning to come through. Spelling and grammatical mistakes do not reduce a score, but spelling must be close enough so that the reader is convinced of the word.
2.

A student can earn points only if the student is clearly addressing the topic of the source material in their response.
3.

The response must apply the concept to the prompt. A definition alone will not earn the point, but a clear definition can support the application.
4.

Examples provided in the Scoring Guidelines for each of the points are not to be considered exhaustive.
5.

Within a question part, a response will not be penalized for incorrect information unless it directly contradicts correct information that otherwise would have earned the point(s). For example, if a student applies a concept by defining it in two contradictory ways (such as applying proactive interference as both interference from older and newer information), the point is not earned.

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Part A Claim (0–1 points)	0 points Does not propose a claim that is relevant to the question	1 point Proposes a claim that is relevant to the question
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The response describes the question without making a claim.The response proposes a claim unrelated to the question.The response proposes an oversimplified conclusion or evidence from a provided source.	Responses that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The response proposes specific effects on the question.The response proposes a claim that suggests a positive or negative effect on the question.The response proposes recommendations for the application of the question.
	Examples that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none">“Studying the factors that influence helping behavior is important to social psychologists.”“People should help others during an emergency.”“Social conditions allow people to feel more likely to help because it makes themselves feel better.”	Examples that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none">“People are most likely to help another person in an emergency due to social norms.”“The fewer people that are present during an emergency, the more likely someone will help.”“To receive help during an emergency, research shows that the number of people present makes a difference.”
	Additional Note: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A claim that meets the criteria can be awarded the points regardless of whether the responses in Parts B and C successfully support the claim.	

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Part B (i) Evidence (0–1 points)	0 points Does not identify nor correctly cite one piece of specific evidence from one of the provided sources to support the claim. Any evidence provided is not relevant to the question.	1 point Uses one piece of correctly cited, specific, accurate, and relevant evidence from one of the provided sources to support the claim
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response identifies no evidence. • The evidence is not correctly cited. • The evidence is nonspecific or inaccurate. • The response provides evidence not relevant to the claim. 	Responses that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence is correctly cited and provides specific and accurate evidence relevant to the claim.
	Examples that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Research shows helping people is a good thing to do. (Source 1).” [No evidence.] • “According to Source 2, which was a meta-analysis of 53 articles, helping is more likely to occur when fewer people witnessing a situation are present. Groups with 3 or more members were least likely to intervene in a situation.” [Incorrect source cited.] • “In one study, they found that 85% of participants who thought they were alone called for help.” [No citation.] • “In one study, people helped others more. (Source 1).” [Nonspecific evidence.] • “It’s good to avoid dangerous situations (Source 3).” [Evidence not relevant to the claim.] 	Examples that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “In Source 3, researchers found that when people know each other they are more likely to help in an emergency situation.” • “In Source 1, they found that 85% of the participants who thought they were alone in witnessing an emergency reported the emergency and called for help. However, 31% of those who thought 4 other bystanders were present reported the emergency and called for help.” • “According to Source 2, at least one person intervened 90.9% of the time and the number of people was positively correlated with chances of intervention.”
Additional Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses that use a correct citation style other than the methods prescribed by the question can earn this point for citing the source. • “Accurate evidence” refers to the accuracy of the general pattern of the evidence cited. Since citing specific numbers is not required to score the point, slight errors in reporting specific data can still score when the direction of the difference or relationship of the data cited is correct. 		

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Part B (ii) Explanation and Application (Reasoning) (0–2 points)	0 points Does not explain the relationship between the evidence and the claim	1 point Explains the relationship between the evidence and the claim	2 points Applies a psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding to explain how the evidence supports the claim
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Responses that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response does not accurately interpret the evidence. The response identifies evidence without explanation of how it relates to the claim. The response provides opinions with no reference to the sources provided. 	Responses that earn 1 point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response correctly interprets the evidence in supporting the claim, but does not apply a psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding. 	Responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response correctly interprets the evidence and correctly applies a psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding.
	Examples that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“The study showed that people say they want to help even when they don’t really do it.”</i> <i>“Researchers found that at least one person intervened in 90.9% of the situations.”</i> <i>“The evidence shows that helping is good to do.”</i> 	Examples that earn 1 point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“The study showed that the more people that are present in an emergency, the less likely an individual will help.”</i> <i>“It didn’t seem to matter if the people witnessing the event were friends or just acquaintances. If they knew each other they were more likely to help the person.”</i> 	Examples that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Onlookers to an emergency that know each other might be more likely to help a victim because of in-group bias. They identify the other onlooker as part of their group and immediately trust them believing that they can work together to help someone.”</i> <i>“Their findings show that the more bystanders that are around during an emergency, the less likely someone will help. This is called the bystander effect.”</i>
	Additional Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The explanation and application points can be earned even if the response did not earn the point in B (i) due to incorrectly cited and/or non-specific evidence. The psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding must be explicitly identified in the <i>AP Psychology Course and Exam Description</i> (2024). The presence of a citation indicates the sentence or phrase is intended to be evidence. All text before the citation will be considered evidence. Text after a citation will be considered reasoning, unless accompanied by another citation. Concepts used in the sources that are not eligible to be used for the application point are “confederate,” “independent variable,” “dependent variable,” “experiment,” and “meta-analysis.” 		

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Part C (i) Evidence (0–1 points)	0 points Does not identify nor correctly cite a different piece of specific evidence from either of the other two provided sources to support the claim	1 point Uses a different piece of correctly cited, specific, accurate, and relevant evidence from either of the other two provided sources to support the claim
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response identifies no evidence. • The evidence is not correctly cited. • The evidence is nonspecific or inaccurate. • The evidence is from the same source as the one used in Part B. • The response provides evidence not relevant to the claim. 	Responses that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response provides specific, accurate, and correctly cited evidence relevant to the claim that is from a different source than the one used in Part B.
	Examples that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Research shows helping people is a good thing to do (Source 1).” [No evidence.] • “In Source 3, they found that 85% of participants who thought they were alone called for help.” [Incorrect citation.] • “In one study, they found that 85% of participants who thought they were alone called for help.” [No citation.] • “In one study, people helped others more (Source 1).” [Nonspecific evidence.] • “In Source 1, they found that 85% of the participants who thought they were alone in witnessing an emergency reported the emergency and called for help.” [The response used the same source as used in Part B.] • “It’s good to avoid dangerous situations (Source 2).” [Evidence not relevant to the claim.] 	Examples that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “In Source 2 there is support for the research findings that the more bystanders present the more likely the person will give aid in an emergency.” • “Source 3 found that people are more likely to help in a situation where there are other people around who they know as friends.” • “According to Source 3, one additional person present in a situation increased the chances that someone would help.”
Additional Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses that use a correct citation style other than the methods prescribed by the question can earn this point for citing the source. • “Accurate evidence” refers to the accuracy of the general pattern of the evidence cited. Since citing specific numbers is not required to score the point, slight errors in reporting specific data can still score when the direction of the difference or relationship of the data cited is correct. 		

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Part C (ii) Explanation and Application (Reasoning) (0–2 points)	0 points Does not explain the relationship between the evidence and the claim	1 point Explains the relationship between the evidence and the claim	2 points Applies a different psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding to explain how the evidence supports the claim. The psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding is not the same one used in Part B (ii).
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Responses that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response does not accurately interpret the evidence. The response identifies evidence without explanation of how it relates to the claim. The response provides opinions with no reference to the sources provided. 	Responses that earn 1 point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response correctly interprets the evidence, but does not apply a psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding. The response applies the same psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding that was used in Part B; however, the response explains the relationship between the evidence and the claim that does not rely on the application. 	Responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response correctly interprets the evidence and applies a psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding that is different from the one used in Part B.
	Examples that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“These findings suggest that emergencies do not matter when deciding to help.”</i> <i>“The evidence shows that people do help others in emergencies.”</i> <i>“I think it is important for people to help those who need help.”</i> 	Examples that earn 1 point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“These findings support the idea that when there are more people present in an emergency, the less likely a person will help.”</i> <i>“This pattern suggests people are not going to help if the other people present are unfamiliar.”</i> <i>“This finding suggests people are more willing to help in more dangerous situations.”</i> 	Examples that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“The finding that the more bystanders present, the more likely that they will help a person in need supports the idea of conformity. When one person makes a move to help, the others in the group feel that unspoken pressure to also join in and help.”</i> <i>“This evidence supports my claim because according to the sociocultural perspective, people are more likely to help when there are others around, especially in collectivist cultures.”</i> <i>“The finding that the more bystanders that are present the greater likelihood that help will be given contradicts the first source. This study showed that in a larger group of onlookers, the diffusion of responsibility doesn’t always happen.”</i>
	Additional Notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The explanation and application points can be earned even if the response did not earn the point in C (i) due to incorrectly cited and/or non-specific evidence. The explanation and application points can be earned if the response uses the same source in both Parts B and C, provided that the evidence used in Part B and Part C is different. The psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding must be explicitly identified in the <i>AP Psychology Course and Exam Description (2024)</i> and is different from the perspective, theory, concept, or research finding used in Part B. The presence of a citation indicates the sentence or phrase is intended to be evidence. All text prior to the citation will be considered evidence. Text after a citation will be considered reasoning, unless accompanied by another citation. 		

- Concepts used in the sources that are not eligible to be used for the application point are “confederate,” “independent variable,” “dependent variable,” “experiment,” and “meta-analysis.”

Part A: Claim

People are more likely to help another person in an emergency when the crowd around them is smaller.

Part B: (i) Evidence and (ii) Explanation and Application (Reasoning)

According to Source 1, 85% of participants who thought they were alone reported the emergency in 52 seconds, 62% of participants who thought there was another person present reported the emergency in 93 seconds, and 31% of participants who thought 4 other people were present reported the emergency in 166 seconds. This shows a significant decrease in both percentages of participants to report the emergency and speed it took them to, due to the group size becoming bigger each time.

A term from AP Psychology is conformity and this is when people do things usually to fit in because everyone else around them is doing it, like "following the leader". This supports the evidence in Source 1 because when participants thought there were more people, nobody wanted to speak up. Which almost no one did but when someone did end up speaking up to report the emergency, it had took them a significantly longer time to do so compared to when there were no/less people.

Part C: (i) Evidence and (ii) Explanation and Application (Reasoning)

According to Source 3, the results mention how if there are groups of 3+ people, they would be least likely to help in a situation compared to a group of 1 to 2 people, who were more likely to help. This shows how people in a bigger group setting are less likely to help in a situation compared to those in a smaller group setting.

A term from Ap Psychology is the bystander effect. This is when people will not help in a situation simply due to the fact that they see there are other people around. Instead of anyone trying to help, everyone just stays and watches, therefore supporting the results from Source 3.

Part A: Claim

A. The likelihood that an individual (that is capable of helping another person in an emergency) will help others within an emergency is dependent and proportional to the quantity of other individuals that are present and perceived as capable of helping the other person within an emergency.

Part B: (i) Evidence and (ii) Explanation and Application (Reasoning)

i. According to Source 2, researchers found that with a higher number of people present at an incident was positively associated with the likelihood of intervention, and that each additional person present increased the odds that an intervention occurred. This evidence shows that the number of individuals that were present was proportional to the likelihood of intervention, and in other words, increased the likelihood of helping another person within an emergency.

ii. The concept of social facilitation supports my claim. Social facilitation is the concept that individuals tend to perform an action more often or better if they are in the presence of more people or in other words, if more people are present to watch someone perform the action. This supports my evidence because with the increased likelihood of intervention with more individuals present, the concept of social facilitation is present as the action is performed more often as the individual perceives that they are being watched by more people.

Part C: (i) Evidence and (ii) Explanation and Application (Reasoning)

i. According to Source 3, when additional people were present, in the situation, there was an increased likelihood of helping during the emergency. Moreover, participants whom were with those were they were familiar with were more likely to help. This supports my claim, as the amount of individuals helping during the emergency was proportional to the amount of people present. Furthermore, as individuals knew each other, they were more likely to help as they perceived that there were more people present who were also capable of helping within the situation.

ii. A concept that supports this is groupthink. Groupthink states that in a group, individuals are more likely to follow the beliefs and act in a way that is similar to the ideological consensus of the group. This supports my claim, as while individuals are in a group that they perceive as wanting to and being capable of helping and thus there is an ideological consensus, they tend to help or act in the direction of the consensus of the group.

Part A: Claim

People are most likely to help another person in an emergency due to social norms.

Part B: (i) Evidence and (ii) Explanation and Application (Reasoning)

i. Cognitive dissonance is one reason why a person will most likely help another person in an emergency.

ii. With the concept of cognitive dissonance, a person can think that person may need help and instead of disragrding them, they will instead change their behavior and help them out.

Part C: (i) Evidence and (ii) Explanation and Application (Reasoning)

i. The Id and superego is also another reason why a person is most liekly to help another in an emergency.

ii. This may be because their moral conscience is telling the person to help another person in an emergency, but also do it out of the kindness of their heart with no reward or expectations in return. The little angel on their shoulder is telling them to do the right thing.

Question 2

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

Overview

NEW for 2025: The question overviews can be found in the *Chief Reader Report on Student Responses on AP Central*.

Sample: 2A

EBQ A Claim Score: 1

EBQ B(i) Evidence Score: 1

EBQ B(ii) Reasoning Score: 2

EBQ C(i) Evidence Score: 1

EBQ C(ii) Reasoning Score: 2

Total Score: 7

Part A: Claim (0–1 points): 1

The response earns the point because the proposed claim is relevant to the question (“People are more likely to help another person in an emergency when the crowd around them is smaller.”).

Part B(i): Evidence (0–1 points): 1

The response earned the point because one piece of correctly cited, specific and relevant evidence is provided from one of the sources (“According to Source 1, 85% of participants who thought they were alone reported the emergency”).

Part B(ii): Explanation and Application (Reasoning) (0–2 points): 2

The response earned the first point because the evidence supports the proposed claim of smaller crowds leading to more helping behavior (“This supports the evidence in Source 1 because when participants thought there were more people, nobody wanted to speak up.”). The response earned the second point by correctly applying a psychological concept as part of the explanation of how a smaller crowd is related to more helping behavior (“A term from AP Psychology is conformity and this is when people do things usually to fit in because everyone else around them is doing it. ... Which almost no one did but when someone did end up speaking up to report the emergency, it had took them a significantly longer time to do so compared to when there were no/less people.”)

Part C(i): Evidence (0–1 points): 1

The response earned the point because one piece of correctly cited, specific and relevant evidence is provided from a different source than the one used in Part B(i) (“According to Source 3, the results mention how if there are groups of 3+ people, they would be least likely to help in a situation compared to a group of 1 to 2 people, who were more likely to help.”).

Part C(ii): Explanation and Application (Reasoning) (0–2 points): 2

The response earned the first point because the evidence supports the proposed claim about smaller crowds leading to more helping behavior (“Instead of anyone trying to help, everyone just stays and watches, therefore supporting the results from Source 3.”). The response earned the second point because by correctly applying a psychological concept as part of the explanation of how the evidence supports the claim (“A term from Ap Psychology is the bystander effect. This is when people will not help in a situation simply due to the fact that they see there are other people around”).

Question 2 (continued)**Sample: 2B****EBQ A Claim Score: 1****EBQ B(i) Evidence Score: 1****EBQ B(ii) Reasoning Score: 2****EBQ C(i) Evidence Score: 0****EBQ C(ii) Reasoning Score: 0****Total Score: 4****Part A: Claim (0–1 points): 1**

The response earned the point because the proposed claim is relevant to the question (“The likelihood that an individual ... will help others within an emergency is dependent and proportional to the quantity of other individuals that are present”).

Part B(i): Evidence (0–1 points): 1

The response earned the point because one piece of correctly cited, specific, accurate, and relevant evidence is provided from one of the sources (“According to Source 2, researchers found that with a higher number of people present at an incident was positively associated with the likelihood of intervention, and that each additional person present increased the odds that an intervention occurred”).

Part B(ii): Explanation and Application (Reasoning) (0–2 points): 2

The response earned the first point because the evidence supports the proposed claim about how the number of people is related to the likelihood of helping in an emergency. The response earned the second point by correctly applying a psychological concept as part of the explanation of how the evidence supports the claim (“Social facilitation is the concept that individuals tend to perform an action more often or better if they are in the presence of more people or in other words, if more people are present to watch someone perform the action. This supports my evidence because with the increased likelihood of intervention with more individuals present, the concept of social facilitation is present as the action is performed more often as the individual perceives that they are being watched by more people”).

Part C(i): Evidence (0–1 points): 0

The response did not earn the point because the evidence provided is not correctly reported and does not support the claim. Source 3 indicates that, while an additional person can increase helping, groups with three, four, or five or more members were least likely to help in a situation.

Part C(ii): Explanation and Application (Reasoning) (0–2 points): 0

The response did not earn the first point because the evidence is not correctly explained to support the claim. The response did not earn the second point because the psychological concept applied (“Groupthink”) is not used accurately to explain how the evidence supports the claim. A key feature of groupthink is when a person suppresses their opinions or beliefs to promote group harmony. Acting in ways that are similar to the “ideological consensus” of the group is more indicative of conformity instead of groupthink.

Question 2 (continued)**Sample: 2C****EBQ A Claim Score: 1****EBQ B(i) Evidence Score: 0****EBQ B(ii) Reasoning Score: 0****EBQ C(i) Evidence Score: 0****EBQ C(ii) Reasoning Score: 0****Total Score: 1****Part A: Claim (0–1 points): 1**

The response earned the point because the proposed claim is relevant to the question (“People are most likely to help another person in an emergency due to social norms.”).

Part B(i): Evidence (0–1 points): 0

The response did not earn the point because one piece of correctly cited, specific, accurate, and relevant evidence is not provided.

Part B(ii): Explanation and Application (Reasoning) (0–2 points): 0

The response did not earn the first point because the explanation does not support the claim of helping behavior and social norms. The response does not earn the second point because the psychological concept provided (“cognitive dissonance”) is not applied accurately as part of the explanation of how the evidence supports the claim.

Part C(i): Evidence (0–1 points): 0

The response did not earn the point because one piece of correctly cited, specific, accurate, and relevant evidence is not provided.

Part C(ii): Explanation and Application (Reasoning) (0–2 points): 0

The response did not earn the first point because the explanation does not support the claim of helping behavior and social norms. The response does not earn the second point because none of the psychological concepts provided (“id,” “superego,” “conscience,” or “reward”) are applied accurately as part of the explanation of how the evidence supports the claim.