So you want to write a tutorial?
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**Open research requires many new skills, which are increasingly required by journals and funders. Most researchers rely on tutorials to keep up to date. How do you write a tutorial that is useful to both the field and your own career?**

As researchers, we need to constantly update our skills, a challenge that has become especially important for research transparency,1 such as coding for reproducibility of data processing and statistical analysis, or data simulation to improve pre-registration plans. A lack of resources for learning these skills is one major barrier to open research,2 which researchers have started to address by creating open tutorials.

Writing tutorials allows researchers to have a [positive impact on the field](https://twitter.com/LisaDeBruine/status/1458052400456011787) that can also be personally deeply rewarding. However, creating a useful tutorial takes time and experience. Researchers also bemoan the lack of recognition for this work by tenure and grant committees. So how do you write a great tutorial, make sure your colleagues get the maximum benefit from it, and you get appropriate credit for it? Below, we share our advice on some key questions to address, based on our experience creating open-source tutorials for psychology research methods.

## Who is it for?

Before writing a tutorial, it’s important to think about your audience. What problems do they have that the skills in your tutorial will solve?

Prior knowledge plays a key role in learning and has been shown to predict success in MOOCs.3 Consider what skills learners will require to understand your tutorial, such as competence at a particular programming language or statistical procedure. State prerequisites at the start to allow learners to decide if the tutorial is for them. Also be clear about the time commitment. For instance, retraining to use R for statistics requires a considerable time investment – [in our own experience](https://psyteachr.github.io/), it takes approximately three months of weekly classes or three full days to gain introductory skills.

Acquiring new knowledge is easier when it’s directly related to prior experience, so consider examples that will resonate with your intended audience. While it can be easier to discuss a hypothetical study of the effect of factor A on outcome B, concrete example-based learning is a more beneficial approach.4 Work through a few realistic examples or provide exercises for the learners.5 For instance, Richard McElreath’s [tutorials on Bayesian inference](https://github.com/rmcelreath/stat_rethinking_2022) use examples from ecology and anthropology to allow learners to practice making realistic inference, whilst the [Open Stats Lab](https://sites.google.com/view/openstatslab/) uses open datasets from papers published in *Psychological Science* to support lessons on introductory statistical concepts.

## How do I make it useful?

Consider the strategic use of multimedia principles.6 For example, the multiple representation principle suggests adding illustrations and pictures to verbal explanations makes it easier to understand because images engage different representations of the same idea. The coherence principle recommends succinctness – it is easier to understand concepts explained in fewer words. Don’t structure a tutorial like a paper; subheadings make it easy to skim for the most relevant parts.

Adding interactive elements such as [self-checking quizzes](https://psyteachr.github.io/webexercises/) or [web apps for demonstrations](https://rpsychologist.com/viz) can be helpful. Video tutorials are an engaging way to talk learners through the material. For example, Erin Buchanan’s [Statistics of DOOM](https://www.youtube.com/c/StatisticsofDOOM) YouTube channel, with more than 18K subscribers, contains video walk-throughs of statistical techniques that have earned hundreds of thousands of views.

## How do I make it accessible?

Accessibility is an important aspect of any open resource, including tutorials. Make sure you reach as wide an audience as possible and allow reuse of your materials as FAIR-ly as possible.7

While methods journals will publish tutorial-style articles, this process can be slow and the static article format isn’t always pedagogically ideal. Luckily, most journals accept preprints or article versions of interactive tutorials, so we advise self-publishing first. This can also give you the opportunity to get feedback from learners and refine your tutorial. For example, Nordmann and colleagues8 included a link to a feedback form on their first preprint of [Data visualisation using R, for researchers who don’t use R](https://psyarxiv.com/4huvw). The feedback received from early users of the tutorial was then used to refine the materials before being submitted for publication.

Self-publishing is faciliatted by making your tutorial findable by archiving a copy on a reliable platform. Code-based tutorials are often hosted on [GitHub](https://github.com), where you can archive multiple versions of code and other materials, as well as host a website. For example, our [psyTeachR](https://psyteachr.github.io/) materials are hosted on GitHub. The [Open Science Framework](https://osf.io/) offers free archiving of materials and preprints, as well as an optional DOI. You can also get a DOI and version archiving by uploading your materials to [Zenodo](https://zenodo.org/).

To reach a wider audience, you can submit the tutorial to a curation list like the [Open Scholarship Knowledge Base](https://www.oercommons.org/hubs/OSKB) or [FORRT](https://forrt.org/). You can also start a curation list for your own subdiscipline or methodological expertise, following great examples like [OpenLists](https://github.com/openlists/Overview) or [Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Brain](https://learn-neuroimaging.github.io/hitchhackers_guide_brain/).

Once you’ve created a few tutorials, you might want to organise them into a website or online book, like Danielle Navarro’s popular [Learning Statistics with R](https://learningstatisticswithr-bookdown.netlify.com/). For a well-developed series of tutorials, partnering with an online course company can give your tutorials a huge reach. For example, Daniel Lakens’ Coursera course [Improving Your Statistical Inferences](https://www.coursera.org/learn/statistical-inferences/) has enrolled nearly 60K students.

Consider writing the tutorial in an open format, such as html. PDFs may look pretty, but they are difficult to adapt or use translation and screen reading tools on – and copying code or text is often impossible. Then, make your tutorial accessible by giving it an [open source license](https://choosealicense.com/). For example, the PsyTeachR book series written by our group are all published under a Creative Commons [CC-BY-SA 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license, which allows others to copy, redistribute, remix, and transform, as long as the original source is cited and derivatives use the same license. Because of this, our books have been translated into [French](https://corelab.blog/354/) and [Chinese](https://rstat-project.github.io/).

## How do I get credit for it?

Now that you’ve created a tutorial and archived it somewhere accessible for your audience, how do you get credit for it? Providing useful learning materials is a great way to gain visibility and reputation in your field, but it can be challenging to evidence their impact.

The first step is making sure it’s easy for people to find and use a standard citation for the tutorial. Get a DOI through a service like the OSF or Zenodo and highlight the full citation prominently. Most preprint services allow you to register the DOI of a published version in the future so that citations can be amalgamated.

While tutorials for advanced statistical methods can be highly cited, especially when they are published in methods journals, tutorials that explain the fundamentals of a technique or cover non-technical subjects are seldom cited, despite arguably having a larger impact on research and teaching. This can also be a problem with non-standard formats such as webpages, videos, and interactive apps, despite their potential for better learning. Web analytics can help you keep track of and evidence engagement with your tutorials. Materials hosted on a platform like YouTube or a preprint server will automatically track engagement. If you advertise materials with a link to the DOI, metrics platforms can track their use in publications and social media (e.g., one of our in-press tutorials8 already has an [Altmetric score of 284](https://www.altmetric.com/details/107978078)). You can access detailed [Google analytics](https://analytics.google.com/) by adding a few lines of javascript to any webpage.

## How can tutorial users help?

The advice above is meant to help aspiring tutorial writers to create the best materials they can, but what can the rest of us do to help? Researchers and tutorial users can make sure to cite any tutorials that have influenced their research, even if the materials are not journal articles or the topics are more general than advanced methods. Journals can help by explicitly encouraging the citation of all relevant materials and eliminating citation limits for methods. Methods journals can also create more innovative article formats so that tutorial writers don’t have to choose between the pedagogical and accessibility advantages of interactive online formats versus the prestige and reach of journal articles. Most importantly, hiring and tenure committees, as well as funders, should recognise the expertise, effort, and altruism involved in producing high-quality tutorials and recognise that they may not have the traditional evidence of citations in journal articles. A good tutorial can take as long as a research paper or book to write, reflect decades of experience, and have an enormous positive impact on the field.
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