
The question has three parts: Part A, Part B, and Part C. Use the three sources provided to answer each part of the question.

For Part B and Part C, you must cite the source that you used to answer the question. You can do this in two different ways:

- Parenthetical Citation:
For example: “...(Source 1).”
- Embedded Citation:
For example: “According to Source 1...”

Write the response to each part of the question in complete sentences. Use appropriate psychological terminology.

2. Using the sources provided, develop and justify an argument about a specific social condition that leads people to be more likely to help another person in an emergency.
- A. Propose a specific and defensible claim based in psychological science that responds to the question.
- B.
- i. Support your claim using at least one piece of specific and relevant evidence from one of the sources.
 - ii. Explain how the evidence from Part B (i) supports your claim using a psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding learned in AP Psychology.
- C.
- i. Support your claim using an additional piece of specific and relevant evidence from a different source than the one that was used in Part B (i).
 - ii. Explain how the evidence from Part C (i) supports your claim using a different psychological perspective, theory, concept, or research finding learned in AP Psychology than the one that was used in Part B (ii).

Source 1

Introduction

In this study, researchers investigated environmental factors that may influence whether a person will help in an emergency.

Participants

Students in introductory psychology courses at a university in New York took part in the experiment as part of a class requirement. Fifty-nine of the participants were women and 13 of the participants were men. Researchers did not report race/ethnicity data for participants in the study.¹

Method

When each participant arrived at the laboratory, they were taken to a separate room with a microphone that would allow them to communicate with others. Each participant was alone in their room. Researchers explained to the participants that they would take part in a discussion about problems associated with college life and that the discussion would be held over an intercom system and not face-to-face to preserve the anonymity of the students.

Only one participant's microphone would be on at any given time, and a mechanical switching device would regulate the discussion sequence. During the discussion, one of the other students (who was a confederate of the researchers) pretended to experience a medical emergency in which they at first made a few relatively calm comments and then grew increasingly louder and more incoherent as they spoke. During the medical emergency, participants' microphones were off, so they could hear the confederate but could not speak to other group members to find out what, if anything, they were doing about the emergency.

The independent variable in the study was the number of people the participant thought was included in the discussion group. Researchers told each participant how many other people would be in the discussion, creating three different conditions: a two-person group (participant and victim), a three-person group (participant, victim, and one other), and a six-person group (participant, victim, and four others).

The dependent variable in the study was the speed with which the participants left their room and reported the emergency to the experimenter. If six minutes elapsed without the participant leaving their room, the experiment was terminated. As soon as the participant reported the emergency, or after six minutes had elapsed, the researcher disclosed the true nature of the experiment and debriefed the participant, making sure to address any emotional trauma the experience might have triggered.

Results and Discussion

The number of onlookers that the participant perceived to be present had a major effect on the likelihood that they would report the emergency. Eighty-five percent of the participants who thought they were alone reported the emergency by the time the confederate stopped their scripted performance. Sixty-two percent of the participants who thought one other was present responded by the end of the emergency. Thirty-one percent of those who thought four others were present responded by the end of the emergency. The results are reported in the table.

Effects of Group Size on the Likelihood and Speed of Response

Condition	% Responding by the end of the Emergency	Time in Seconds
2 (Participant and Victim)	85	52
3 (Participant, Victim, and 1 Other)	62	93
6 (Participant, Victim, and 4 Others)	31	166

Darley, J.M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8(4), 377-383.

1: Language referencing racial, ethnic, or gender identities may be outdated or fail to reflect the complexities of identity that participants represent.

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. 	