



We appreciate your interest in this study, which investigates how unpublished or unreported findings may affect experimental philosophy. Our aim is to examine researchers' experiences, practices, and attitudes regarding data sharing, publication, and reasons for non-publication. This survey is anonymous; we do not collect any identifying information. The entire survey should take about 15–20 minutes to complete. We recommend taking part in this survey using a desktop (not mobile) web browser.

This study seeks participants who

have completed or are currently pursuing a doctoral or other terminal degree (e.g., PhD, EdD, JD, MFA, MBA) in philosophy or a closely related field, conduct quantitative experimental or empirical research, and are affiliated with a university or research institution.

Some of the questions in this survey are inspired by studies conducted on researchers in other fields, such as psychology, neuroscience, and applied linguistics. This allows us to compare the challenges faced in experimental philosophy with those observed in other disciplines. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the research team at b.mackiewicz@uw.edu.pl. This study has been approved by the Rector's Committee for the Ethics of Research Involving Human Participants, University of Warsaw (Decision Number: 361/2024).

By continuing, you acknowledge that you have read and understood this information and consent to participate.

Section A: Prescreening

A1. Have you completed a doctoral degree (or equivalent terminal degree, e.g., PhD, EdD, JD, MFA, MBA)?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

A2. Are you currently pursuing a PhD in philosophy or a related field (e.g., cognitive science, psychology)?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>



- A3. Do you conduct quantitative experimental or empirical research in experimental philosophy or related to experimental philosophy?**
(Note: By quantitative research, we mean research with data collection that results in numerical data)

Yes
No

- A4. Are you currently affiliated with a university/research institution (e.g., as a student, faculty member, or researcher)?**

Yes
No

Section B: Demography

This section collects demographic and background information to contextualize your responses.

For the following questions, consider your publication activity over the past 5 years and provide an average estimate. *Note: If you began your doctoral (or equivalent terminal) degree fewer than 5 years ago, base your responses only on the period since you started that degree.*

- B1. In which year did you complete your first doctoral (or equivalent terminal) degree (e.g., PhD, EdD, JD, MFA, MBA)?**

- B2. In which year did you begin your first doctoral (or equivalent terminal) degree program?**

- B3. How many years have you been actively conducting research in experimental philosophy?**

- B4. In which country did you complete your doctoral (or equivalent terminal) degree?**

Afghanistan
Albania
Algeria
Andorra
Angola
Antigua and Barbuda
Argentina
Armenia
Australia



- Austria
Azerbaijan
Bahamas
Bahrain
Bangladesh
Barbados
Belarus
Belgium
Belize
Benin
Bhutan
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Botswana
Brazil
Brunei Darussalam
Bulgaria
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cabo Verde
Cambodia
Cameroon
Canada
Central African Republic
Chad
Chile
China
Colombia
Comoros



- Congo
Cook Islands
Costa Rica
Côte d'Ivoire
Croatia
Cuba
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Democratic People's Republic of Korea
Congo
Denmark
Djibouti
Dominica
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
El Salvador
Equatorial Guinea
Eritrea
Estonia
Ethiopia
Fiji
Finland
France
Gabon
Gambia
Georgia
Germany
Ghana



- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Greece | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Grenada | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Guatemala | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Guinea | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Guinea-Bissau | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Guyana | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Haiti | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Honduras | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Hungary | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Iceland | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| India | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Indonesia | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Iran (Islamic Republic of) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Iraq | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ireland | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Israel | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Italy | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Jamaica | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Japan | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Jordan | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Kazakhstan | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Kenya | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Kiribati | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Kuwait | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Kyrgyzstan | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Latvia | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Lebanon | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Lesotho | <input type="checkbox"/> |



- Liberia
Libya
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Madagascar
Malawi
Malaysia
Maldives
Mali
Malta
Marshall Islands
Mauritania
Mauritius
Mexico
Micronesia (Federated States of)
Monaco
Mongolia
Montenegro
Morocco
Mozambique
Myanmar
Namibia
Nauru
Nepal
Netherlands
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Niger
Nigeria



- Niue
Norway
Oman
Pakistan
Palau
Palestine
Panama
Papua New Guinea
Paraguay
Peru
Philippines
Poland
Portugal
Puerto Rico
Qatar
Republic of Korea
Republic of Moldova
Romania
Russian Federation
Rwanda
Saint Kitts and Nevis
Saint Lucia
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Samoa
San Marino
Sao Tome and Principe
Saudi Arabia
Senegal
Serbia



Seychelles	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sierra Leone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Singapore	<input type="checkbox"/>
Slovakia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Slovenia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Solomon Islands	<input type="checkbox"/>
Somalia	<input type="checkbox"/>
South Africa	<input type="checkbox"/>
South Sudan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Spain	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sri Lanka	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sudan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Suriname	<input type="checkbox"/>
Swaziland	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sweden	<input type="checkbox"/>
Switzerland	<input type="checkbox"/>
Syrian Arab Republic	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tajikistan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thailand	<input type="checkbox"/>
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Timor-Leste	<input type="checkbox"/>
Togo	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tokelau	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tonga	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trinidad and Tobago	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tunisia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Turkey	<input type="checkbox"/>
Turkmenistan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tuvalu	<input type="checkbox"/>



Uganda	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ukraine	<input type="checkbox"/>
United Arab Emirates	<input type="checkbox"/>
the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	<input type="checkbox"/>
United Republic of Tanzania	<input type="checkbox"/>
United States of America	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uruguay	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uzbekistan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vanuatu	<input type="checkbox"/>
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Viet Nam	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yemen	<input type="checkbox"/>
Zambia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Zimbabwe	<input type="checkbox"/>

B5. During your undergraduate or graduate studies (e.g., MA, PhD), how many courses or training sessions did you complete that focused primarily on quantitative research methods and/or statistics?

B6. In which country is your current university/institution located?

Afghanistan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Albania	<input type="checkbox"/>
Algeria	<input type="checkbox"/>
Andorra	<input type="checkbox"/>
Angola	<input type="checkbox"/>
a and Barbuda	<input type="checkbox"/>
Argentina	<input type="checkbox"/>
Armenia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Australia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Austria	<input type="checkbox"/>
Azerbaijan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bahamas	<input type="checkbox"/>



- Bahrain
Bangladesh
Barbados
Belarus
Belgium
Belize
Benin
Bhutan
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Botswana
Brazil
Brunei Darussalam
Bulgaria
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cabo Verde
Cambodia
Cameroon
Canada
Central African Republic
Chad
Chile
China
Colombia
Comoros
Congo
Cook Islands
Costa Rica



- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Democratic People's Republic of Korea
- Congo
- Denmark
- Djibouti
- Dominica
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- Egypt
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Ethiopia
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- Gabon
- Gambia
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Greece
- Grenada
- Guatemala



Guinea	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guinea-Bissau	<input type="checkbox"/>
Guyana	<input type="checkbox"/>
Haiti	<input type="checkbox"/>
Honduras	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hungary	<input type="checkbox"/>
Iceland	<input type="checkbox"/>
India	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indonesia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Iraq	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ireland	<input type="checkbox"/>
Israel	<input type="checkbox"/>
Italy	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jamaica	<input type="checkbox"/>
Japan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jordan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kazakhstan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kenya	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kiribati	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kuwait	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kyrgyzstan	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lao People's Democratic Republic	<input type="checkbox"/>
Latvia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lebanon	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lesotho	<input type="checkbox"/>
Liberia	<input type="checkbox"/>
Libya	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lithuania	<input type="checkbox"/>



- Luxembourg
Madagascar
Malawi
Malaysia
Maldives
Mali
Malta
Marshall Islands
Mauritania
Mauritius
Mexico
Micronesia (Federated States of)
Monaco
Mongolia
Montenegro
Morocco
Mozambique
Myanmar
Namibia
Nauru
Nepal
Netherlands
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Niger
Nigeria
Niue
Norway
Oman



- Pakistan
Palau
Palestine
Panama
Papua New Guinea
Paraguay
Peru
Philippines
Poland
Portugal
Puerto Rico
Qatar
Republic of Korea
Republic of Moldova
Romania
Russian Federation
Rwanda
Saint Kitts and Nevis
Saint Lucia
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Samoa
San Marino
Sao Tome and Principe
Saudi Arabia
Senegal
Serbia
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
Singapore



- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Swaziland
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syrian Arab Republic
- Tajikistan
- Thailand
- The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates



the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

United Republic of Tanzania

United States of America

Uruguay

Uzbekistan

Vanuatu

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Viet Nam

Yemen

Zambia

Zimbabwe

B7. What is your current professional title or role?

Full Professor (or equivalent)

Associate Professor (or equivalent)

Assistant Professor (or equivalent)

Post-Doctoral Fellow

Graduate Student

Other [please specify]

Other [please specify]

B8. Which of the following disciplines most closely aligns with your primary research area in experimental philosophy?

philosophy of action

ethics

epistemology

philosophy of language

philosophy of mind

metaphysics



foundations of experimental philosophy

1

logic and argumentation theory

1

aesthetics and philosophy of art

1

philosophy of law

1

philosophy of religion

1

Other [please specify]

1

Other [please specify]

- B9.** On average, how many experimental philosophy projects (e.g., research articles, book chapters) do you publish per year? Please consider both theoretical and empirical research, including single-and co-authored projects.

- B10.** How many of your experimental philosophy projects published per year appear in peer-reviewed journals?

- B11. How many of your experimental philosophy projects published each year include quantitative data analysis?**

- B12.** If you have any additional comments or wish to clarify any responses, please enter them below.



Section C: Prevalence

- C1. In the past 5 years, how many of the research projects involving quantitative data analysis you have been involved in (including your students' work) has stopped or terminated at each of the following stages?**

Note: If you started your doctoral or terminal degree (e.g., PhD, EdD, JD, MFA, MBA) fewer than 5 years ago, please focus only on the time since you began that degree.

Data analysis	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Formal Presentation (e.g., unpublished report, thesis)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Professional Presentation (e.g., conference presentation, talk)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Submitted Manuscript (Editor's Rejection Reasons)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Reviewed Manuscript (Reviewer's Rejection Reasons)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Published paper	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

- C2. In case of research projects that have stopped or terminated at the stage of data analysis, what were the reasons for termination?**

Loss of interest or lack of resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional studies needed (follow-ups, replications, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conceptual, methodological, or statistical concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unimportant or unanticipated results	<input type="checkbox"/>
Null results (non-significant findings)	<input type="checkbox"/>

- C3. In case of research projects that have stopped or terminated at the stage of formal presentation, what were the reasons for termination?**

Loss of interest or lack of resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional studies needed (follow-ups, replications, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conceptual, methodological, or statistical concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unimportant or unanticipated results	<input type="checkbox"/>
Null results (non-significant findings)	<input type="checkbox"/>

- C4. In case of research projects that have stopped or terminated at the stage of professional presentation, what were the reasons for termination?**

Loss of interest or lack of resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------	--------------------------



Additional studies needed (follow-ups, replications, etc.)

Conceptual, methodological, or statistical concerns

Unimportant or unanticipated results

Null results (non-significant findings)

C5. In case of research projects that have stopped or terminated at the stage of submitted manuscript, what were the reasons for termination?

Not aligned with the journal's scope or profile

Results considered unimportant by the editor

Manuscript quality concerns (e.g., poor writing, excessive length)

Null results (non-significant findings)

C6. In case of research projects that have stopped or terminated at the stage of reviewed manuscript, what were the reasons for termination?

Conceptual, methodological, or statistical concerns

Results considered unimportant by reviewers

Manuscript quality concerns (e.g., poor writing, excessive length)

Null results (non-significant findings)

Section D: Awareness/implications

D1. Before participating in this study, were you aware of the issue of many scientific results remaining unpublished for reasons not related to their scientific quality (sometimes referred to as the “file drawer problem” or “publication bias”)?

Yes

No

Not sure

D2. How familiar are you with this issue?

1 - Not at all familiar

2

3

4

5 - Very familiar



D3. In your opinion, does the “file drawer problem” apply to experimental philosophy research?

1 - Definitely not	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 - Definitely yes	<input type="checkbox"/>

D4. Please indicate your familiarity with the following possible consequences of the file drawer problem, as well as how severe you believe each consequence is for the quality of research in experimental philosophy. 1 - Not familiar at all, 5 - Very familiar

1 2 3 4 5

Biased understanding of research results (e.g. overestimation of effect sizes, overestimation of how common certain phenomena are).

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Difficulty in evaluating the replicability of research findings.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Bias toward novelty over replication.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Lack of negative result replications.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Wasted research efforts due to redundant studies.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Reduced study quality due to pressure for significance.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Career setbacks for early-career researchers or other underprivileged groups.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

D5. Please indicate your familiarity with the following possible consequences of the file drawer problem, as well as how severe you believe each consequence is for the quality of research in experimental philosophy. 1 - Not severe at all, 5 - Very severe

1 2 3 4 5

Biased understanding of research results (e.g. overestimation of effect sizes, overestimation of how common certain phenomena are).

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Difficulty in evaluating the replicability of research findings.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Bias toward novelty over replication.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Lack of negative result replications.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Wasted research efforts due to redundant studies.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Reduced study quality due to pressure for significance.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------



1 2 3 4 5

Career setbacks for early-career researchers or other underprivileged groups.

D6. Below is a list of research practices that are sometimes considered problematic in scientific research, including the file drawer problem. Please rate how acceptable you believe these practices are within the community of experimental philosophers.

Completely acceptable	Mostly acceptable	Neither acceptable nor unacceptable	Mostly unacceptable	Completely unacceptable	Prefer not to answer
-----------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------	----------------------

Selecting variables out of convenience and/or familiarity when more theoretically grounded variables are available

Fishing for results by collecting information on unnecessary variables

Not being transparent with regard to the reporting on what steps were taken for data cleaning (e.g., removing cases/items without a stated criterion or justification for doing so)

Removing whole items/cases knowingly / purposefully to obtain favorable results

Employing selective reporting of results/instruments

Cherry-picking data to analyze

Not attempting to publish results in a timely manner

Not reporting or publishing results because they are not statistically significant

Section E: Solutions

E1. Do your research sponsors (e.g., your institution, ethics review committee, or funding agency) require you to do any of the following?

Develop a data management plan before starting the research.

Make research data publicly available.

Publish in open access journals.

Upload preprints or articles to a public repository.

None of the above.

E2. Does your current organization or institution provide any of the following resources or support?

An institutional repository for scientific publications.

A research data repository.

Funding for publishing in open access journals.



Assistance in disseminating research results or preprints.

Citable digital object identifiers (DOIs) for datasets or research reports.

None of the above.

E3. Are you familiar with any repositories, sites, or tools suitable for experimental philosophy, such as the following?

Online databases of null results. Specify, if known:

Comment

Online databases of replication studies. Specify, if known:

Comment

Data journals. Specify, if known:

Comment

Preprint publication platforms. Specify, if known:

Comment

Journals that publish null results. Specify, if known:

Comment

None of the above.

Comment

E4. Please indicate whether you are currently engaging in or planning to engage in the following activities:Currently

Yes	No	I don't know
-----	----	--------------

Publish a preprint

Publish in an open access journal

Deposit an author's accepted manuscript of a non-open access journal article in a repository to make it openly available



	Yes	No	I don't know
Cite a dataset	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cite code or software used for data analysis or visualization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publish a data paper or publish a dataset independently from a journal article or scholarly work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Make data available, but only to researchers with appropriate credentials (e.g. via a data access committee)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Share or publish other research materials (e.g. stimuli, questionnaires) independently from a journal article or scholarly work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Share or publish a study protocol, workflow, or method independently from a journal article or scholarly work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pre-register a study	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Submitting a registered report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Take advantage of a data curation or research data management service offered by a publisher or other third party	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publish a direct replication of a previously published study (possibly as part of another study)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publish my results in a form of micropublication (research note or a very short publication designed for unpublished observations, neutral or null results)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

E5. Please indicate whether you are currently engaging in or planning to engage in the following activities: In the future

	Yes	No	I don't know
Publish a preprint	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publish in an open access journal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deposit an author's accepted manuscript of a non-open access journal article in a repository to make it openly available	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cite a dataset	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cite code or software used for data analysis or visualization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publish a data paper or publish a dataset independently from a journal article or scholarly work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Make data available, but only to researchers with appropriate credentials (e.g. via a data access committee)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Share or publish other research materials (e.g. stimuli, questionnaires) independently from a journal article or scholarly work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Share or publish a study protocol, workflow, or method independently from a journal article or scholarly work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pre-register a study	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Submitting a registered report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Take advantage of a data curation or research data management service offered by a publisher or other third party

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Publish a direct replication of a previously published study (possibly as part of another study)

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Publish my results in a form of micropublication (research note or a very short publication designed for unpublished observations, neutral or null results)

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

E6. Below is a list of potential reasons why researchers might not publish their data, code, or research reports. Please rate how much each reason applies to you or your research.

Not a reason at all	Slightly a reason	Moderately a reason	Strongly a reason	Extremely a reason
---------------------	-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	--------------------

Concerns about intellectual property or ownership issues.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Fear of misuse or misrepresentation of the data/code.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Desire to maintain a competitive advantage (e.g., worry that others might use the data to produce competing publications before the original authors can).

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Lack of direct benefits, rewards, or incentives for the time and effort required to prepare data, code, or reports.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Technical challenges (e.g., issues with compatibility, version control, or documentation of code or data).

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Journal policies that do not require sharing supplementary materials.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Fear of criticism or the possibility of exposing errors.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Pressure to publish in high-impact journals, leaving little time to ensure reproducibility or share materials.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Restrictions imposed by funding agencies, commercial partners, or collaborative agreements.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Lack of training or skills (e.g., no expertise in formatting or preparing data/code/reports).

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Extra effort that feels overwhelming amidst other responsibilities.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

E7. If some other reason comes to your mind, please put it here and rate how much it applies to you or your research.

Not a reason at all	Slightly a reason	Moderately a reason	Strongly a reason	Extremely a reason
---------------------	-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	--------------------

Other:

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

E8.



- E9.** Evaluate how the following incentives would motivate you to engage in open and transparent research practices, such as sharing data, code, or other research materials, publishing preprints, depositing manuscripts or datasets in open access repositories, citing data or software, pre-registering studies, and submitting registered reports.

	1- Not motivating	2	3	4	5 - Highly motivating
Including these practices in researcher evaluations or project assessments.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Additional funding specifically designated to support these practices.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Availability of experimental philosophy-specific databases or repositories for data, materials, and code.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Assignment of a permanent DOI for datasets, pre-registrations, reports, preprints, or any additional materials.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Standardized templates or guidelines for pre-registration, open reporting, dataset preparation, and other transparent research activities in experimental philosophy.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Section F: Reports/micropublication

- F1.** Do you publish micropublications, eg., research notes or reports of unpublished studies, negative results, or failed replications?

Always	<input type="checkbox"/>
Often	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sometimes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rarely	<input type="checkbox"/>
Never	<input type="checkbox"/>

- F2.** Where do you publish micropublications?

ResearchGate	<input type="checkbox"/>
Open Science Framework (PsyArXiv)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Github	<input type="checkbox"/>
Personal website / blog	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other [please describe]	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other [please describe]



Section G: Data sharing/publishing

G1. Have you ever archived, deposited, or published a dataset to make it available to others?

Yes, I have published my data as part of a journal article (e.g. sharing a full dataset as part of the supplementary materials).

Yes, I have deposited my data in a government or funder sponsored repository (e.g. NIMH Data Archive).

Yes, I have shared my data using the Open Science Framework (OSF).

Yes, I have deposited my data into a general purpose repository besides the OSF (e.g figshare, Zenodo).

Yes, I have deposited my data in a discipline-specific repository.

Yes, I have deposited my data in my institutional repository.

No.

Yes. Other [Please describe]

Yes. Other [Please describe]

G2. What is your motivation for sharing your data (for example, by uploading some or all of it to a general or discipline-specific repository)?

To communicate my results and/or add to the scholarly literature.

To allow other researchers to assess the validity of my conclusions.

Professional incentives (e.g. authorship or citations).

To establish intellectual property or patent claims.

It is mandated by a funder, publisher, or my institution.

To foster transparency and reproducibility.

To foster re-use (e.g. facilitate meta-analyses).

Other [Please describe]

Other [Please describe]

**G3. Please indicate your level of need for training or education for each of the following data-sharing practices:**

1 - No need	2	3	4	5 - High level of need
<input type="checkbox"/>				

Sharing data in a form that ensures it will be useful to others (e.g. in open file formats, with proper documentation, etc).

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Use of different platforms, repositories, or tools for sharing data (e.g. Open Science Framework, figshare, institutional repository options).

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Protecting participant confidentiality in shared data.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Understanding reuse rights related to data (e.g. copyright, licensing, citations).

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Best practices for preserving or archiving data over the long term.

<input type="checkbox"/>				
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

G4. How would you rate your willingness to change your data management practices during the data collection phase in response to new technologies, opportunities, or requirements?

1 - Unwilling	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 - Willing	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section H: Final Comments and Additional Information**H1. If you have any comments on this questionnaire or additional information to share, please enter them below.**



Thank you for participating in our study! Your responses have been recorded, and we greatly appreciate your time and input. If you have any questions or would like to learn more about the study's findings, feel free to contact us at b.mackiewicz@uw.edu.pl. Your contribution is invaluable to our understanding of research practices in experimental philosophy.

In designing this questionnaire, we drew on the following studies:

- Bernard, R., Weissgerber, T. L., Bobrov, E., Winham, S. J., Dirnagl, U., & Riedel, N. (2020). fiddle: a tool to combat publication bias by getting research out of the file drawer and into the scientific community. Clinical Science, 134(20), 2729-2739.**
- Borghi JA, Van Gulick AE (2018) Data management and sharing in neuroimaging: Practices and perceptions of MRI researchers. PLoS ONE 13(7): e0200562. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0200562>**
- Borghi JA, Van Gulick AE (2021) Data management and sharing: Practices and perceptions of psychology researchers. PLoS ONE 16(5): e0252047. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0252047>**
- Larsson, T., Plonsky, L., Sterling, S., Kytö, M., Yaw, K., & Wood, M. (2023). On the frequency, prevalence, and perceived severity of questionable research practices. Research Methods in Applied Linguistics, 2(3), 100064.**
- Lishner, D. A. (2022). Sorting the file drawer: A typology for describing unpublished studies. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 17(1), 252-269.**