

2025



AP[®] Psychology

Scoring Guidelines

Set 1

FRQ 1: Article Analysis Question (AAQ)

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 Research Method (0–1 points)	0 points Does not accurately identify the research method used in the study	1 point Accurately identifies the research method used in the study
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The response does not accurately identify the research method used in the study.The response includes no identification of the research method used in the study.	Responses that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The response accurately identifies the research method used in the study as an experiment.
	Examples that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>“The researchers used a correlational study.”</i><i>“The researchers studied memory.”</i>	Examples that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>“The researchers used an experiment.”</i><i>“The researchers included a questionnaire in their experiment.”</i><i>“Since students were randomly assigned to groups, this was an experiment.”</i>

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Part B Research Variable (0–1 points)	0 points Does not state a measurable or quantifiable definition of the identified variable used in the study	1 point States a measurable or quantifiable definition of the identified variable as used in the study
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response states a definition of the identified variable in the study that is not measurable or quantifiable. • The response does not state a measurable or quantifiable definition of the identified variable as used in the study. 	Responses that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response states that the operational definition of high misinformation is having 80% of the sentences in the narrative include incorrect information. • The response states that high misinformation is defined as having 32 misleading sentences.
	Examples that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“The researchers studied how much misinformation people can handle.”</i> • <i>“The researchers gave more misinformation to one group than another.”</i> 	Examples that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“The researchers operationally defined high misinformation as 80% of the sentences in the narrative including incorrect information.”</i> • <i>“The researchers defined high misinformation as a story having 32 misleading sentences in it.”</i>

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Part C Statistic Interpretation (0–1 points)	0 points Does not accurately describe what the identified statistic indicates in relation to the study	1 point Accurately describes what the identified statistic indicates in relation to the study
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response restates the means for the high misinformation group and/or low misinformation group without directly relating them to the study. • The response does not accurately describe the meaning of the difference in means between the correct responses of the high misinformation group and the low misinformation group. • The response provides a definition of any mean within the study but does not accurately describe its meaning in relation to the study. 	Responses that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response accurately describes exposure to a higher percentage of misinformation being associated with a lower mean percentage of correct responses to questions about the video. • The response accurately describes participants in the high misinformation group as having recalled less correct information (i.e., mean = 63%) about the video than those in the low misinformation group (i.e., mean = 74%).
	Examples that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“The mean of the high misinformation group is 63%.”</i> [No explanation of what that means in the study.] • <i>“The differences in the means between the groups shows that the high misinformation group did not rely on the misinformation when the low misinformation group did.”</i> • <i>“The mean is the average of the responses in the study.”</i> 	Examples that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“The high misinformation group got less correct responses than the low misinformation group.”</i> • <i>“The group that got 80% misinformation relied on more misleading information than the group with 20% misinformation, since the mean averages of the high misinformation group was 63% compared to 74% for the low misinformation group.”</i> • <i>“The low misinformation group scored 11% higher in their correct responses than did the high misinformation group.”</i>

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Part D Ethical Guidelines (0–1 points)	0 points Does not accurately identify at least one ethical guideline applied by researchers in the study	1 point Accurately identifies at least one ethical guideline applied by researchers in the study
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response does not identify an ethical guideline applied by researchers in the study. • The response identifies an ethical guideline that researchers should have applied but was not mentioned in the study. • The response identifies an ethical guideline not applied by the researchers in the study. • The response identifies other features of the study that are not ethical guidelines. 	Responses that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response identifies that the researchers obtained informed consent.
	Examples that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“It’s important to researchers to act ethically when conducting a study.”</i> • <i>“The researchers should have debriefed participants at the end of the study.”</i> • <i>“The researchers protected the confidentiality of the participants in the study.”</i> • <i>“The researchers gave students course credit when they participated in the study, which is unethical.”</i> 	Examples that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“The researchers obtained informed consent from the participants.”</i> • <i>“The article says that after the researchers obtained consent, the participants got to watch the video of the robbery.”</i>

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria	
Part E Generalizability (0–1 points)	0 points Does not propose a claim regarding the generalizability of the study to a population (general or specific) OR Does not use specific and relevant evidence that references participant variables that would impact the generalizability of the study	1 point Explains the extent to which the study is generalizable using specific and relevant evidence referencing participant variables from the study
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes	
	Responses that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response proposes no claim regarding the generalizability of the conclusion of the study. • The response proposes a claim regarding the generalizability of the conclusion of the study but makes no reference to a population (general or specific). • The response uses evidence that does not apply to the generalizability of the conclusion of the study (e.g., reliability, validity, sample size). 	Responses that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response proposes a claim about generalizability that references a population (the “larger population” or a population relevant to the study’s participants) to explain the extent of the generalizability of the study. • The response proposes that the study is or is not generalizable to the population relevant to the study because of specific and relevant evidence derived from the participant information from the study.
	Examples that do not earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“The study used both men and women.”</i> [The response does not propose a claim about generalizability.] • <i>“The study is generalizable.”</i> • <i>“The study is generalizable to the larger population.”</i> • <i>“The study is generalizable because the sample was large.”</i> 	Examples that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“The study is generalizable to a larger population because the participant sample was diverse.”</i> • <i>“The study is not generalizable because they only used university students in their study.”</i>
	Additional Note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If students assert the study is “partly” generalizable or asserts the study is both generalizable and not generalizable, their evidence must support their assertion by showing ways the study is generalizable and is not generalizable to earn the point. 	

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Part F Argumentation (0–2 points)	0 points <p>Does not accurately explain how the results of the study support or refute the psychological concept or hypothesis presented in the question.</p>	1 point <p>Uses the results of the study but does not explain how the psychological concept or hypothesis is supported or refuted.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Explains that the psychological concept or hypothesis is supported or refuted but does not use any results from the study.</p>	2 points <p>Uses a specific result from the study to explain how the results support or refute the psychological concept or hypothesis presented in the question. The results are accurately interpreted.</p>
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Responses that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response does not explain how at least one of the research findings supports or refutes the misinformation effect. The response does not accurately explain how at least one of the research findings supports or refutes the misinformation effect. 	Responses that earn 1 point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response proposes that the evidence alone is sufficient to demonstrate the misinformation effect without additional explanation. The response uses at least one of the research findings to explain the misinformation effect. However, the interpretation of the results of the study includes some inaccuracies. 	Responses that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response uses at least one of the research findings to accurately explain the misinformation effect. The results of the study are accurately interpreted.
	Examples that earn 0 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“The study shows that the misinformation effect happens in the study.”</i> <i>“Since each group got 7% incorrect on the questionnaire, the misinformation effect is refuted.”</i> [Does not accurately support or refute misinformation effect.] <i>“The study shows that people are susceptible to misinformation.”</i> 	Examples that earn 1 point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“The high misinformation group answered more questions using misleading information.”</i> [Evidence only.] <i>“This study supports the misinformation effect, which is when people remember incorrect information that is presented to them.”</i> [Explanation without evidence.] 	Examples that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“The study showed that the misinformation effect is supported because the data shows that participants in the high misinformation group were more likely to use the misleading information when answering questions (30%) than those in the low misinformation group (19%).”</i> <i>“This study provides evidence for the misinformation effect because it shows that when participants were exposed to a high level of misinformation, they were more likely to incorporate misleading information into their memories.”</i> <i>“One of the research findings that refutes the misinformation effect is that the participants performed best if they had distrusted the accuracy of the summary. The more that they were presented with misinformation, the more distrustful that they were, which meant that they had resisted more information in comparison to those who didn’t receive as much misinformation.”</i>

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	1 point
	Does not propose a claim that is relevant to the question	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">“Does the presence of others influence performance?”“Using animals in research can tell us a lot about ourselves.”“Studying the factors that influence performance is important to social psychologists.”	Examples that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none">“The presence of others makes a difference in whether someone performs well on a specific task or set of tasks.”“When someone else is present during a performance, it is more likely that the participant will perform well.”“The presence of others will make them do worse at what they are doing.”“People should have an audience for tasks they are good at.”
Additional Note: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A claim that meets the criteria can be awarded the point 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"> • “The presence of others impacts what we do.” [No evidence.] • “The baboon study shows that the presence of other baboons made the baboons do worse on the task that required more cognitive control.” [No citation.] • “The baboons were influenced by other baboons.” [Nonspecific evidence.] • “In Source 2, researchers used rewards to change the baboon’s behavior.” [Evidence not relevant to the claim.] 	Examples that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The results of the bar graph (Source 1) show a longer amount of time for participants to complete a new and difficult task in front of an audience than when they were alone.” • “According to Source 3, performance was improved when participants were observed by an evaluator and when they were monitored electronically.” • “According to Source 2, researchers found that the delayed reaction time was greatest for male baboons in the presence of older males with a higher social rank.” • “According to Source 1, participants were able to perform a well-learned task quicker than those who were alone.”
	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>“Performance on tasks is not impacted by the presence of others.”</i> • <i>“When people feel they are being directly evaluated by either an in-person or electronic observer, they perform better.”</i> • <i>“It’s good to have others around when you are completing a task.”</i> 	Examples that earn 1 point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“The evidence demonstrates that the presence of others is generally helpful for improving performance, but if a task is difficult, performance can suffer.”</i> • <i>“Since the time needed to complete the new and difficult task increased in the presence of others, this shows that the presence of others has a negative effect on performance.”</i> • <i>“The studies show that if you are an expert at something, having an audience helps.”</i> 	Examples that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“The study showed that participants who completed the task when being observed detected more correct pairs than those who did it alone. This is called social facilitation.”</i> • <i>“The reason for the delayed reaction times of younger male baboons was probably due to social norms. Because the younger males must be submissive to dominant older males, their awareness of that made their performance worse.”</i> • <i>“The study showed that participants were able to perform a well-learned task such as putting on their socks quicker than those who were alone. This is an example of the Yerkes-Dodson Theory, which states that well-learned tasks can be performed well even if under high states of arousal such as being watched.”</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,” “statistically significant,” and “operant conditioning.” 			

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"> • <i>“The presence of others impacts what we do.”</i> [No evidence.] • <i>“In one study, people who just thought they were being monitored performed better.”</i> [No citation.] • <i>“Research shows that behavior changes when in a group.”</i> [Nonspecific evidence.] • <i>“In Source 2, researchers found that baboons performed worse on the conflicting trial task when they were in the presence of other baboons.”</i> [The response used the same source as used in Part B.] • <i>“In Source 2, researchers used rewards to change the baboon’s behavior.”</i> [Evidence not relevant to the claim.] 	Examples that earn this point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Source 3 shows that when people believe they are being monitored, either by a human or a web cam, they will perform better on a task than when they think they are not being monitored.”</i> • <i>“Source 2 shows that when the baboons did the harder task, they did worse in the presence of other baboons.”</i> • <i>“When participants were taking off and putting on their shoes, they did better with an audience (Source 1).”</i>
Additional Note: <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>“The evidence supports my claim.”</i> <i>“The evidence shows baboons perform better if they are being watched.”</i> [The response provides an incorrect interpretation of the evidence.] 	Examples that earn 1 point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“The research shows that being in the presence of others improves performance if you are doing a task that is well-learned.”</i> <i>The research shows that if you are doing something with superiors watching, you will do worse.”</i> <i>“The research shows that whether you are being watched live or by video, you will do better on an easy task such as subtraction.”</i> 	Examples that earn 2 points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“When doing an easy, well-learned task, like putting on or taking off your own shoes, people might be extrinsically motivated to complete the task better in order to get the approval of others.”</i> <i>“Since the baboons performed worse in front of an audience, that could be an example of increased distress, which could get in the way of their ability to complete a complex task.”</i> <i>“The participants in Source 3 did an easy task, such as subtraction, better when they were being watched directly than when they were alone. The participants were not affected by an imaginary audience where people think that others are watching and judging them.”</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,” “statistically significant,” and “operant conditioning.” 			