

2025



AP[®] Psychology

Scoring Guidelines

Set 2

FRQ 1: Article Analysis Question (AAQ)

7 Points

General Considerations

- 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.
- A student can earn points only if the student is clearly addressing the topic of the source material in their response.
- 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.
- Examples provided in the Scoring Guidelines for each of the points are not to be considered exhaustive.
- 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 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: - 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: The response accurately identifies the research method used in the study as an experiment.
	Examples that do not earn this point: "The research method used in the study is a case study since the researchers are examining a dog's reactions to a person's emotions." [Incorrect research method.] "The researchers studied whether a dog's reaction to a person's emotions differ based on the dog's experience with the person." "The research method in this study is the experimental method, but they were specifically using a naturalistic observation." [Direct contradiction.]	Examples that earn this point: "The researchers used an experiment." "The researchers used a within-subject experiment."

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: - The response states a definition of person-oriented dog behaviors in the study that is not measurable or quantifiable. - The response does not state a measurable or quantifiable definition of person-oriented dog behaviors as used in the study.	Responses that earn this point: - The response states that person-oriented dog behaviors are defined as the number of times a dog looked at a person, contacted a person, approached a person, and/or vocalized at a person in the study. - The response states researchers measured person-oriented dog behaviors as the dog looking at, making contact, approaching, or vocalizing at the people.
	Examples that do not earn this point: <i>“The researchers studied how emotionally close the dogs were to their owners.”</i> <i>“The operational definition of person-oriented dog behavior is the 2-minute lighthearted conversation the stranger-researcher and the owner had.”</i> <i>“The operational definition of person-oriented dog behaviors includes passive behavior like lying down or sitting.”</i>	Examples that earn this point: <i>“The researchers operationally defined person-oriented dog behaviors as the number of times they looked at the person or barked at the person.”</i> <i>“The researchers defined person-oriented dog behaviors as making contact or approaching the people.”</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: - The response restates the mean of the person-oriented behaviors for the laughing group as compared to the talking group without directly relating them to the study. - The response does not accurately describe what the mean of the person-oriented behaviors for the laughing group as compared to the talking group indicates in relation to the study. - The response provides a definition of the mean of the person-oriented behaviors for the laughing group as compared to the talking group but does not accurately describe what it indicates in relation to the study.	Responses that earn this point: - The response accurately describes the mean of the person-oriented behaviors for the laughing trials as being larger than the mean of the talking trials, which indicates that the dogs showed more person-oriented behaviors when the people laughed than when they were just talking. - The response accurately describes the means for the laughing and talking trials as not significantly different from each other, meaning that the difference in means between the talking trial and the laughing trial was likely due to chance or not due to the emotion.
	Examples that do not earn this point: <i>“The mean of the laughing group is 1.3 and the mean for the talking group is .75.”</i> <i>“The mean of the laughing group is significantly more than the mean of the talking group.”</i> [No explanation of what that indicates in the study.] <i>“The mean is the average of the responses in the study. The dogs in the laughing group had a mean of 1.4 person-oriented behaviors.”</i>	Examples that earn this point: <i>“The dogs showed more person-oriented behaviors to people who were laughing than those who were just talking.”</i> <i>“The dogs responded more to laughing than to talking.”</i> <i>“Since the difference between the means of the laughing and talking trials was not significant, this means that the difference in means was probably due to chance.”</i> <i>“There was not a significant difference between the two. This just indicates that the animal’s response was not due to laughing or talking.”</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: - 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: - The response identifies informed consent as an ethical guideline applied by researchers in the study. - The response identifies doing no unnecessary harm to the animals as an ethical guideline applied by the researchers in the study.
	Examples that do not earn this point: <i>“It’s important to researchers to act ethically when conducting a study.”</i> <i>“The researchers should have obtained the dog’s consent.”</i> <i>“The researchers protected the confidentiality of the participants in the study.”</i> <i>“The researchers gave dog biscuits as compensation, which is unethical.”</i>	Examples that earn this point: <i>“The researchers obtained informed consent from the dog owners.”</i> <i>“The researchers made sure they did no harm to the animals, who could not give consent to be studied.”</i> <i>“The researchers had the stranger and the dog owner have a cheerful conversation between trials to reset the emotional tone of the experience for both the dogs and the owners. This demonstrates that the researchers took steps to protect the participants from harm.”</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: - 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: - 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: “The study yielded some good results.” “The study is generalizable.” “The study is generalizable because they had a large sample size.”	Examples that earn this point: “The study is generalizable to dogs of all kinds because they used several different kinds of dogs in the study.” “The study is only generalizable to nonaggressive dog breeds because although they used a variety of dogs, they recruited only nonaggressive dogs for their sample.” “The study is not generalizable to dog owners younger than 25 or older than 60.”
	Additional Note: 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 Does not accurately explain how the results of the study support or refute the psychological concept or hypothesis presented in the question	1 point Uses the results of the study but does not explain how the psychological concept or hypothesis is supported or refuted OR Explains that the psychological concept or hypothesis is supported or refuted but does not use any results from the study	2 points 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.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Responses that earn 0 points: - The response does not explain how at least one of the research findings supports or refutes the idea that dogs’ expression of person-oriented behaviors demonstrates stimulus discrimination in operant conditioning. - The response does not accurately explain how at least one of the research findings supports or refutes the idea that dogs’ expression of person-oriented behaviors demonstrates stimulus discrimination in operant conditioning.	Responses that earn 1 point: - The response proposes that the evidence alone is sufficient to demonstrate the idea that dogs’ expression of person-oriented behaviors demonstrates stimulus discrimination in operant conditioning without additional explanation. - The response uses at least one of the research findings to support or refute the idea that dogs’ expression of person-oriented behaviors demonstrates stimulus discrimination in operant conditioning. However, the interpretation of the results of the study includes some inaccuracies.	Responses that earn 2 points: The response accurately interprets at least one of the research findings to explain the idea that dogs’ expression of person-oriented behaviors demonstrates stimulus discrimination in operant conditioning.
	Examples that earn 0 points: “The study shows that stimulus discrimination happens in the study.” “The dogs are demonstrating stimulus discrimination in how they respond to the people in the study.”	Examples that earn 1 point: “The study showed that dogs can tell the difference between the emotions their owners show.” [No evidence from the study.] “The study shows that the dogs’ responses to crying were significantly more than when the people were laughing or talking.” [No explanation.] “The study shows the dogs responded to crying more than laughing or talking only to their owners, showing that they discriminate which type of emotion to respond to.” [Inaccurate interpretation of results.] “This study showed that they did not discriminate between the owners and the strangers.” [No evidence from the study.]	Examples that earn 2 points: “The study shows that the dogs showed person-oriented behaviors more toward people who were crying than people who were laughing or talking, which supports the idea that dogs have learned to discriminate.” “The dogs responded more to crying than laughing, so they discriminated between the emotions.” “The study showed the dogs offered more person-oriented behaviors to the crying person than the laughing person, which means they had stimulus discrimination about the emotions that were being expressed.” “The research findings refute the main hypothesis, as the hypothesis was that a dog’s reaction would differ based on how well they knew the person, and while they did slightly differ, they stayed relatively the same throughout each test.”

		“The difference between 75% and 73% is not a lot, which refutes that the dogs demonstrate stimulus discrimination, as they did not respond differently to who was crying, the owner or the stranger.”
--	--	---

FRQ 2: Evidence-Based Question (EBQ)**7 Points****General Considerations**

- 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.
- A student can earn points only if the student is clearly addressing the topic of the source material in their response.
- 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.
- Examples provided in the Scoring Guidelines for each of the points are not to be considered exhaustive.
- 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: - 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: - 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: “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: “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: 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: - 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: The evidence is correctly cited and provides specific and accurate evidence relevant to the claim.
	Examples that do not earn this point: “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: “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: - 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: - 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: 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: The response correctly interprets the evidence and correctly applies a psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding.
	Examples that earn 0 points: "The study showed that people say they want to help even when they don't really do it." "Researchers found that at least one person intervened in 90.9% of the situations." "The evidence shows that helping is good to do."	Examples that earn 1 point: "The study showed that the more people that are present in an emergency, the less likely an individual will help." "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."	Examples that earn 2 points: "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." "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."
	Additional Notes: - 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: - 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: 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: "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: "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: - 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: - 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: - 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: 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: <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: <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: <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: - 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.”		