A survey on researchers' attitudes and practices towards Open Science

Start of Block: 指导语

**Q1** Welcome! Thank you very much for participating in this questionnaire, which is designed to study the attitudes and practices of Chinese researchers towards open science and will contain a maximum of 37 questions, depending on your answers. Depending on your answers, there will be a maximum of 37 questions. **Your answers will greatly impact the results of this study, so we hope you will fill in the questionnaire carefully in light of the real situation. Thank you very much!**

End of Block: 指导语

Start of Block: 知情同意书&公开数据知情同意书

**Q2 Informed Consent:**

**Objective:** To learn about the attitudes and practices of Chinese researchers towards open science.

**Your Tasks:** In this questionnaire, you will be asked to respond to open science-related questions in your own situation. We will provide a detailed explanation of the questions and answers within the introduction of each chapter.

**Time Required:** This questionnaire includes a number of extended questions, and you will be required to answer a maximum of 37 questions, with a response time of approximately 10-15 minutes.

**Risk:** There are no foreseeable risks of participating in this investigation, but you may feel tired or bored due to the volume of the questionnaire. If you feel uncomfortable or offended by some of the questions, you are free to give up answering the questionnaire.

**Benefits:** Your participation will greatly improve our awareness of Open Science development in China, and this questionnaire will help you gain more knowledge of Open Science.

**In addition, for every valid piece of data, we will donate RMB 0.5 to Tencent Public Welfare's Rural Youth Depression Assistance Program.**

**完整内容请见线上文档：**https://docs.qq.com/doc/DSFNYS2RnWk5pcGF2

* Yes, I fully understand. (1)

**Q3 Disclosure of Informed Consent:**  
       This questionnaire was answered by you personally, so you are the owner of this data. We plan to upload the data from this study to a web-based public database and make it fully public. This aims to maximise the use of public funds so that other researchers may not have to spend resources to collect similar data. This will also maximise your contribution to scientific research and human society.   
       Note that disclosure of the data from this questionnaire means that the information you provide may be used in other future research projects that may or may not be related to the topic of this study.   
       **We will ensure that the public data does not contain your name or any information that can be traced back to you.** To protect your privacy, we will also treat other potentially sensitive information confidentially, ensuring that no one who knows you can deduce your identity from this data.

* Yes, I fully understand (1)

End of Block: 知情同意书&公开数据知情同意书

Start of Block: 结构性问题

**Q4** Which of the following research practices do you know about? (tick all the options you know)

* **1- Study Preregistration** (e.g pre-analysis plan, prospective registration) (1)
* **2- Registered Reports** (format of empirical article where a study proposal is reviewed before the research is undertaken) (2)
* **3- Replication Studies** (research attempting to reproduce the methods and findings of prior research) (3)
* **4- Open Data** (making research data publicly available, e.g FAIR data) (4)
* **5- Open Code** (making analysis code publicly available) (5)
* **6- Preprints** (making research papers available prior to journal peer-review in an online repository) (6)
* **7- Open Access Publication** (making peer-reviewed papers or other publications publicly available) (7)
* **8- Open Peer Review** (journal or grant peer review where authors and reviewers are aware of each other's identity) (8)
* ⊗**0- I don't know any of the above.** (11)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page Break |  |

Q5 What is your attitude towards the following research practices?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1- Strongly disagree (1) | 2- Disagree (5) | 3- Neutral (6) | 4- Agree (7) | 5- Strongly agree (8) |
| 1. **Study Preregistration** (e.g pre-analysis plan, prospective registration) (1) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2- Registered Reports** (format of empirical article where a study proposal is reviewed before the research is undertaken) (2) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3- Replication Studies** (research attempting to reproduce the methods and findings of prior research) (3) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **4- Open Data** (making research data publicly available, e.g FAIR data) (4) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5- Open Code** (making analysis code publicly available) (5) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6- Preprints** (making research papers available prior to journal peer-review in an online repository) (6) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **7- Open Access Publication** (making peer-reviewed papers or other publications publicly available) (7) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **8- Open Peer Review** (journal or grant peer review where authors and reviewers are aware of each other's identity) (8) |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page Break |  |

Q6 What research practices have you done before?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1- I have done (including as a principal author or participant) (1) | 2- No (5) | 3- My research doesn't involve this. (6) |
| **1- Study Preregistration** (e.g pre-analysis plan, prospective registration) (1) |  |  |  |
| **2- Registered Reports** (format of empirical article where a study proposal is reviewed before the research is undertaken) (2) |  |  |  |
| **3- Replication Studies** (research attempting to reproduce the methods and findings of prior research) (3) |  |  |  |
| **4- Open Data** (making research data publicly available, e.g FAIR data) (4) |  |  |  |
| **5- Open Code** (making analysis code publicly available) (5) |  |  |  |
| **6- Preprints** (making research papers available prior to journal peer-review in an online  repository) (6) |  |  |  |
| **7- Open Access Publication** (making peer-reviewed papers or other publications publicly available (7) |  |  |  |
| **8- Open Peer Review** (journal or grant peer review where authors and reviewers are aware of each  other's identity) (8) |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page Break |  |

Q7 What is the probability that you will perform the following practices in the foreseeable future?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1- Extremely low probability (1) | 2- Low probability (5) | 3- Probable (6) | 4- High probability (9) | 5- Very high probability (10) |
| **1- Study Preregistration** (e.g pre-analysis plan, prospective registration) (1) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2- Registered Reports** (format of empirical article where a study proposal is reviewed before the research is undertaken) (2) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3- Replication Studies** (research attempting to reproduce the methods and findings of prior research) (3) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **4- Open Data** (making research data publicly available, e.g FAIR data) (4) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5- Open Code** (making analysis code publicly available**)** (5) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6- Preprints** (making research papers available prior to journal peer-review in an online repository) (6) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **7- Open Access Publication** (making peer-reviewed papers or other publications publicly available (7) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **8- Open Peer Review** (journal or grant peer review where authors and reviewers are aware of each  other's identity) (8) |  |  |  |  |  |

End of Block: 结构性问题

Start of Block: 影响开放科学在国内传播/发展的因素

Q8 Which factors would affect your motivation to conduct a replication study?

* ⊗**I am not involved in replication studies.** (17)
* 1- Replicating the research of others requires raw data or code, but sometimes the data and code may not be publicly available, or the data storage may be irregular and difficult to access. (6)
* 2- The original research methodology was not made public. (7)
* 3- I want to contribute to advancing new theories in the limited time I have rather than replicating past research. (8)
* 4- Some research questions are very complex and require expertise and skills in many areas, making it more challenging to conduct repetitive studies. (9)
* 5- Colleagues didn't replicate other people's research much, which made me think I didn't need to do it either (10)
* 6- My supervisor did not want me to conduct replication studies. (11)
* 7- Some authors didn’t like others replicating their research (12)
* 8- Journals or peers prefer studies with novel results or with positive results; replication studies are not well-published (13)
* 9- Institutes and publishers do not have adequate incentives to encourage replication studies, resulting in poor motivation among researchers. (14)
* 10- Replication studies lack financial support. (15)
* 11- Other reasons (16) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* ⊗**There is no obstacle for me.** (5)

Q9 Which of the following factors would affect your motivation to make your data public?

* ⊗**I am not involved in open data.** (23)
* 1- I don't know how to share my data; not familiar with the process or the platform to share the data. (6)
* 2- There is a lack of long-term data storage solutions, and short-term data storage solutions require frequent maintenance, which is inconvenient (7)
* 3- Data sharing will cost lots of time (8)
* 4- Sharing data requires manual and cumbersome processes. (9)
* 5- The volume of data is too large to upload. (10)
* 6- My data have no academic value, and other researchers will not be interested in my data. (11)
* 7- Other researchers may find errors in my data, then laugh at or accuse me. (12)
* 8- Concern that others will use my data incorrectly or inappropriately, which may lead to misleading results (13)
* 9- I have exclusive ownership of my own data, and sharing it violates my rights. (14)
* 10- Sharing sensitive data leads to less privacy, and the inability to anonymise it raises some related issues. (15)
* 11- My colleagues are unwilling to share data, so I would not share my data either (16)
* 12- My supervisor asked me not to share data (17)
* 13- No foreseeable benefits or the returns don't match the cost of the time and effort expended (18)
* 14- Privacy and confidentiality agreements require that data not be disclosed (19)
* 15- Sensitive data is not available (20)
* 16- Business conflicts of interest result in lack of access to data. (21)
* 17- Other reasons\_\_\_\_ (22) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* ⊗**No reasons** (5)

Q10 Which of the following factors would affect your motivation to make your code public

* ⊗**I am not involved in open code** (21)
* 1- I don't know how to share my code; not familiar with the process or the platform to open code. (6)
* 2- There is a lack of long-term code storage solutions, and short-term code storage solutions require frequent maintenance, which is inconvenient. (7)
* 3- Open code will cost lots of time. (8)
* 4- Open code requires manual and cumbersome processes. (9)
* 5- My code has no academic value, and other researchers will not be interested in my code (11)
* 6- Other researchers may find errors in my code, then laugh at or accuse me (12)
* 7- Concern that others will use my code incorrectly or inappropriately, which may lead to misleading results. (13)
* 8- I have exclusive ownership of my own data, and sharing it violates my rights (14)
* 9- Sharing sensitive code leads to less privacy, and the inability to anonymise it raises some related issues (15)
* 10- My supervisor asked me not to open code (16)
* 11- My colleagues are unwilling to open code, so I would not share my data either (17)
* 12- No foreseeable benefits or the returns don't match the cost of the time and effort expended (18)
* 13- Privacy and confidentiality agreements require that code not be disclosed. (19)
* 14- Other reasons\_\_\_\_ (20) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* ⊗**No Reasons**(5)

Q11 Which of the following factors would affect your motivation to submit a manuscript to an open peer-reviewed journal or to participate in an open peer review paradigm?

* ⊗**I am not involved in open peer review** (18)
* 1- There are numerous formats for open peer review, but no sufficiently standardized and quantitative way of determining which one is best (6)
* 2- Open peer review can be flooded with comments and feedback, causing the review process to become too lengthy (7)
* 3- Open peer review may introduce more non-specialists to comment, which may result in reviewers of varying academic calibre, thereby reducing the quality and accuracy of the review. (8)
* 4- Disclosure of the reviewers' identity may lead to reviewers' reluctance to offer controversial opinions or comments, as they may fear that they will be attacked or discredited by others. (9)
* 5- Some may abuse the opportunity for open peer review to undermine an author's reputation or diminish the credibility of a publication by making offensive or negative comments. (10)
* 6- Some people may be reluctant to provide honest feedback and comments because they want to maintain a positive relationship, so there may be more praise and less criticism, which may affect the quality of the review. (11)
* 7- Open peer review may reveal personal information such as the **author's** identity, workplace, etc., leading to privacy disclosure issues. (12)
* 8- Open peer review may reveal personal information such as the **reviewer's** identity, workplace, etc., leading to privacy disclosure issues. (20)
* 9- My colleagues are less involved in open peer review, so I don't want to be either. (13)
* 10- No particular reason or concern, don't want to submit to open peer-reviewed journals. (14)
* 11- The participation rate in open peer review is low, and most open-review articles are not widely discussed. (15)
* 12- Participating in open peer review is no reward or benefit. (16)
* 13- The journals I regularly submit to do not support open peer review (19)
* 14- Other reasons\_\_\_\_ (17) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* ⊗**No reasons** (5)

Q12 Which of the following factors would affect your motivation to submit in the form of a registered report?

* ⊗**My studies are not involved in registered reports** (4)
* 1- There is no access to learn about registered reports or which journals accept registered reports. (6)
* 2- The number of journals accepting registered reports is low, while the existing registered reports journals do not cover a wide enough range of disciplines. (7)
* 3- It takes too long to publish a registered report compared to traditional publication models. (8)
* 4- Registered reports would require me to submit a study proposal before the beginning of the study and would limit flexibility. (9)
* 5- I was worried that if I didn't do what was written in the registered report, it would affect my career, which made me quite stressed. (10)
* 6- My colleagues don't submit registered reports much, which makes me think I don't have to do it either. (11)
* 7- My supervisor would not like me to submit my dissertation as a registered report. (12)
* 8- Submitting by registered report doesn't generate enough returns, and it will cost extra time. (13)
* 9- Other reasons\_\_\_\_ (14) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* ⊗**No reasons** (5)

Q13 Which of the following factors will affect your motivation to upload or review preprints by other authors?

* ⊗**My discipline does not involve preprints.** (4)
* 1- There is no access to learn about preprint platforms or the process of publishing preprints. (6)
* 2- Fewer journals involve preprints, which is not conducive to the subsequent publication of preprints in academic journals. (7)
* 3- Preprint articles without peer review are less credible and prone to erroneous conclusions affecting public perception and trust. (8)
* 4- Preprints may lead to some academic dishonesty, such as data falsification and plagiarism. (9)
* 5- The preprint platform is less authoritative than traditional journals, and publication had no significant positive impact on my career. (10)
* 6- Worried that others will see my preprint and rush to publish. (11)
* 7- Publishing research in preprints affects my copyright. (12)
* 8- My supervisor doesn't want me to upload a preprint. (13)
* 9- Publishing research results in preprints would affect my academic reputation and career development, as preprints are not usually counted in academic evaluation metrics such as impact factor. (14)
* 10- Lack of sufficient incentives for me to change my habits. (15)
* 11- Most research institutions and universities do not recognise preprints. They cannot be equated with journal papers for graduation, title appraisal and project applications. (16)
* 12- Other reasons\_\_\_\_ (17) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* ⊗**No reason** (5)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page Break |  |

Q14 How did you learn about the above open science practices

* 1- Conferences, lectures, etc. on open science (1)
* 2- Social media and blogs such as Twitter, WeChat, etc. (2)
* 3- Open access academic journals and publications, such as PLOS (3)
* 4- Open science-related academic societies, such as COSN, AIMOS etc. (4)
* 5- Publications containing open science theory and practice. (5)
* 6- Open science-related tools such as Github (6)
* 7- Advocacy from supervisors, colleagues or university/college (9)
* 8- Others： (7) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Q15 To what extent are you willing to participate in international open science collaborations, e.g. ManyLab projects?

* 1- Strongly unwilling (4)
* 2- Unwilling (5)
* 3- Neutral (6)
* 4- Willing (7)
* 5- Highly willing (8)

Q16 Please select “Strongly unwilling”

* 1- Strongly unwilling (1)
* 2- Unwilling (2)
* 3- Neutral (3)
* 4- Willing (4)
* 5- Highly willing (5)

Q17 As a Chinese researcher, do you think it is challenging to participate in international open science collaborations?

* 1- Very difficult (4)
* 2- Difficult (5)
* 3- Neutral (6)
* 4- Easy (7)
* 5- Very easy (8)

Q18 What do you think are the reasons why Chinese researchers struggle to participate in international open science collaborations?

* ⊗ **I don't think there's an obstacle.** (12)
* 1- There are language barriers that make communication difficult (1)
* 2- Differences in academic culture and research practices (2)
* 3- Legal restrictions on international data sharing and privacy protection issues (3)
* 4- Inadequate funding and resources for research (4)
* 5- Challenges of policy or administrative constraints on international cooperation (5)
* 6- Copyright Issues and Open Access Challenges in Academic Publishing (6)
* 7- Research area specialisation and technical barriers (7)
* 8- Collaboration challenges posed by time zone differences (8)
* 9- International differences in science evaluation and incentive mechanisms (9)
* 10- Potential impact of political and economic factors on cooperation (10)
* 11- Other reasons (11) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page Break |  |

Q19 What sources do you generally access for publications?

* 1- Literature resources purchased by the university library (5)
* 2- Google Scholar, web of science and other free indexing engines (6)
* 3- Professional paid academic databases such as CNKI, Wanfang, and CQVIP (not purchased by the university, individual payment required). (7)
* 4- SCI-HUB (8)
* 5- Paid access to the journal's official website (9)
* 6- ChinaXiv、arXiv, bioRxiv. (10)
* 7- Databases of societies such as the Royal Physical Society database (11)
* 8- Write an email to the author requesting the article. (12)
* 9- Ask friends or academic community for help. (13)
* 10- Others\_\_\_\_ (14) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

End of Block: 影响开放科学在国内传播/发展的因素

Start of Block: 影响研究质量的关键因素（QRP&样本代表性）

Q20 How likely do you think researchers around you are to undertake the following (%)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | My discipline does not involve this practice |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1- Not reporting studies or key variables that failed to reach statistical significance (e.g., p < .05) () |  |
| 2- Collecting more data for a study after first inspecting whether the results are statistically significant () |  |
| 3- Adding or dropping covariates in order to reach statistical significance (e.g., p < .05) on a key variable () |  |
| 4- Reporting a set of results as the complete set of analyses when other analyses were also conducted but these are not reported () |  |
| 5- Rounding off a p value to meet a prespecified threshold (e.g., reporting p = .054 as p = .05 () |  |
| 6- Adopting another type of statistical analysis after the analysis initially chosen failed to reach statistical significance. For instance, using OLS instead of logit () |  |
| 7- Excluding data points, such as outliers, after first checking the impact on statistical significance () |  |
| 8- Reporting an unexpected finding or a result from exploratory analysis as having been predicted from the start () |  |
| 9- Filling in missing data points without reporting that those data were imputed, e.g., through multiple imputation, mean substitution, etc () |  |
| 10- Falsification of research data (tampering with a very small amount of data or completely falsifying data) () |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page Break |  |

Q22 Have you ever done any of the following actions yourself? (We will keep the information you fill in completely confidential; please feel free to fill in)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes, I have done it before (1) | No, I have never done it before (2) |
| 1- Not reporting studies or key variables that failed to reach statistical significance (e.g., p < .05) (14) |  |  |
| 2- Collecting more data for a study after first inspecting whether the results are statistically significant (15) |  |  |
| 3- Adding or dropping covariates in order to reach statistical significance (e.g., p < .05) on a key variable (16) |  |  |
| 4- Reporting a set of results as the complete set of analyses when other analyses were also conducted but these are not reported (17) |  |  |
| 5- Rounding off a p value to meet a prespecified threshold (e.g., reporting p = .054 as p = .05) (18) |  |  |
| 6- Adopting another type of statistical analysis after the analysis initially chosen failed to reach statistical significance. For instance, using OLS instead of logit (19) |  |  |
| 7- Excluding data points, such as outliers, after first checking the impact on statistical significance (20) |  |  |
| 8- Reporting an unexpected finding or a result from exploratory analysis as having been predicted from the start. (21) |  |  |
| 9- Filling in missing data points without reporting that those data were imputed, e.g., through multiple imputation, mean substitution, etc (22) |  |  |
| 10- Falsification of research data (tampering with a very small amount of data or completely falsifying data) (24) |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page Break |  |

Q21 How likely do you think it is that researchers around you will admit when they engage in the following behaviours? (%)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | My discipline does not involve this practice |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1- Not reporting studies or key variables that failed to reach statistical significance (e.g., p < .05) () |  |
| 2- Collecting more data for a study after first inspecting whether the results are statistically significant () |  |
| 3- Adding or dropping covariates in order to reach statistical significance (e.g., p < .05) on a key variable () |  |
| 4- Reporting a set of results as the complete set of analyses when other analyses were also conducted but these are not reported () |  |
| 5- Rounding off a p value to meet a prespecified threshold (e.g., reporting p = .054 as p = .05 () |  |
| 6- Adopting another type of statistical analysis after the analysis initially chosen failed to reach statistical significance. For instance, using OLS instead of logit () |  |
| 7- Excluding data points, such as outliers, after first checking the impact on statistical significance () |  |
| 8- Reporting an unexpected finding or a result from exploratory analysis as having been predicted from the start. () |  |
| 9- Filling in missing data points without reporting that those data were imputed, e.g., through multiple imputation, mean substitution, etc () |  |
| 10- Falsification of research data (tampering with a very small amount of data or completely falsifying data) () |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page Break |  |

Q23 Do you think the following behaviours are acceptable?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Unacceptable (4) | Probably acceptable (5) | Acceptable (6) |
| 1- Not reporting studies or key variables that failed to reach statistical significance (e.g., p < .05) (14) |  |  |  |
| 2- Collecting more data for a study after first inspecting whether the results are statistically significant (15) |  |  |  |
| 3- Adding or dropping covariates in order to reach statistical significance (e.g., p < .05) on a key variable (16) |  |  |  |
| 4- Reporting a set of results as the complete set of analyses when other analyses were also conducted but these are not reported (17) |  |  |  |
| 5- Rounding off a p value to meet a prespecified threshold (e.g., reporting p = .054 as p = .05) (18) |  |  |  |
| 6- Adopting another type of statistical analysis after the analysis initially chosen failed to reach statistical significance. For instance, using OLS instead of logit (19) |  |  |  |
| 7- Excluding data points, such as outliers, after first checking the impact on statistical significance (20) |  |  |  |
| 8- Reporting an unexpected finding or a result from exploratory analysis as having been predicted from the start. (21) |  |  |  |
| 9- Filling in missing data points without reporting that those data were imputed, e.g., through multiple imputation, mean substitution, etc (22) |  |  |  |
| 10- Falsification of research data (tampering with a very small amount of data or completely falsifying data) (26) |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page Break |  |

Q24 How important do you think the generalizability of research results and the sample's representativeness are for the natural or social sciences?  
 (\*Sample representativeness: A sample is considered to be highly representative if it is drawn using an appropriate sampling method and with a sample size sufficiently large so that it closely matches the characteristics of the population as a whole.)

* 1- Totally unimportant (4)
* 2- Unimportant (5)
* 3- Moderately important (6)
* 4- Important (7)
* 5- Very important (8)

Q25 Does your research discipline require human sample?

* Yes, need human sample (1)
* No (2)

Q26 Please estimate the representativeness of the sample in your research discipline.

* 1- Very low representativeness (4)
* 2- Low representativeness (5)
* 3- Medium representativeness (6)
* 4- High representativeness (7)
* 5- Very high representativeness (9)

Q27 In your past or future studies, what percentage of all study samples were obtained using Convenience Sampling? (%)  
 (\*Convenience sampling: where the researcher takes a sample from the population that is easily accessible or available to the researcher)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percentage () |  |

End of Block: 影响研究质量的关键因素（QRP&样本代表性）

Start of Block: 人口学信息

Q28 Your gender?

* Male (4)
* Female (5)
* Other\_\_\_\_ (6) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Q29 Your age?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Q30 Your career stage is?

* Undergraduate (25)
* Postgraduate (26)
* PhD (27)
* Post-doc (29)
* Tutor (30)
* Associate Professor (31)
* Professor (32)
* Researcher (34)
* Other\_\_\_\_ (33) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page Break |  |

Q31 Are you doing your PhD domestically (mainland China) or internationally (including Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan)? How many years has it been since your PhD graduation?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Non-graduating (1) | 1~5 years (2) | 6~10 years (3) | More than 10 years (4) |
| Domestically (Mainland China) (4) |  |  |  |  |
| Internationally (including Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan) (5) |  |  |  |  |
| Other (6) |  |  |  |  |
| No PhD (8) |  |  |  |  |

Q32 What is the name of the university where you are undertaking your PhD program? (if you are in or have graduated from a PhD program)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Page Break |  |

Q33 What is your current research discipline?

* Psychology (18)
* Pedagogical (4)
* Management (including Business Management, Public Administration) (5)
* Philosophy (6)
* Economics (7)
* Law (including Political Science, Ethnography) (8)
* Literature (including Journalism and Communication, Linguistics) (9)
* History (10)
* Science (including science and technology) (11)
* Engineering (12)
* Agriculture (13)
* Medicine and Health (14)
* Military Science (15)
* Art (16)
* Interdisciplinary (17)

Q34 If you have had an open science practice, what year did it start?

* 2008 (4)
* 2009 (5)
* 2010 (6)
* 2011 (7)
* 2012 (8)
* 2013 (9)
* 2014 (10)
* 2015 (11)
* 2016 (12)
* 2017 (13)
* 2018 (14)
* 2019 (15)
* 2020 (16)
* 2021 (17)
* 2022 (18)
* 2023 (19)
* **I haven't had any relevant practice.** (20)
* **Not remember** (21)

Q35 Please estimate the proportion of researchers in your discipline who have undertaken at least one open science practice (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proportion () |  |

End of Block: 人口学信息

Start of Block: 意见填写&科普跳转链接

Q36 The questionnaire is coming to an end, if you have suggestions or anything else you would like to comment on this questionnaire you can write it here:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Q37   
Thank you for answering all of the questions, and if you are interested in Open Science, we have some references for you:   
https://docs.qq.com/doc/DSGFESnRxU0lqTUti

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Q38   
      Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire survey; we are aware that your time is valuable and your insights are vital to our research.

To gain further insights into this area, we are conducting another related study looking at how researcher attitudes towards open science practice influence behavioral intentions. If this is also of interest to you and you would like to contribute more to scientific research, we invite you to participate in this follow-up survey.

As a reward, all participants who complete the follow-up survey will be able to receive a bonus surprise. If you would like to participate in the follow-up survey, please leave your email address. We guarantee that your information will be used only for the purpose of this study and will be kept strictly confidential.

Thank you again for your valuable time and support! (･ω･)ﾉ

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

End of Block: 意见填写&科普跳转链接