

Paywall:

Problematic

Such high profit margin(?)

Universities are not open to disclosing how much they're paying for information.

Confidentiality agreements don't need to be signed, but are often signed because they may provide slight advantage in the short run. Prevents collective bargaining

Notes

The research is paid for by the citizens, but they are not receiving access to it for free

The tuition fees are rising, the reason could be because the paywall for unis is so high.

After graduation, you lose the access to the resources

Open access: free access to information and democratize information

Negative: need to also think of possible costs that open access can bring.

The research you decide to do can be limited to only ones whose research is open to your access

Royal Society

The beginning of science journals

- Archival
 - For the future
- Registration
 - Basic information
- Dissemination
 - Shared
- Verification
 - Peer review
 -
 -

Publishing in conventional journals, they reach everybody who is lucky to be in an institution that can provide access to the journal

Openness is fundamental for conversation. Also, if it's open access, if the researcher missed something, it can be easily discovered

For scientists, even if they are for open access, they need to be published in prestigious journals, for their research career to flourish. *Self sacrifice is not gonna be helpful, if they cannot secure the funds needed to continue researching their topic.

Impact factor: the average number of citations that a journal gets over a 2 year period.

Dora: assess scientists in ways that does not take into account impact factor, and instead only the actual research paper

Elsevier ???

Paywall is too high

Good contributor to the publishing community

Despite the research and funding being done by the public, the information is not open to the public

Commercial vs non profit

Free information act: EIS received

? Publishing needs to be expensive, since it requires copywriters, editors, etc. : that's the idea that many seem to have

Universities have to buy package deals instead of individual titles, since that's more affordable

But, A publisher can remove content without notice.

Universities can't disclose how much they pay for the subscription ????

Does not have a better way of making money

"Making the uncommon common"????

Lingua Glosa

Editorial board members resigned and started a new journal with the same quality journal but open access, the quality is made by the editorial board, not the name of a journal

Policy makers don't know that tax payer funded research is not available to tax payers

Generational change: younger scientists are more for open access

Questions about IP and copywriters, what happens if you publish with one journal

Sci hub

Civil disobedience against the academic

Technically illegal:

Is even used in places that have access, due to it working in a simple and efficient way

Level of frustration due to paywalls

The ergodicity solution of the cooperation puzzle

Ole Peters and Alexander Adamou

- When two entities cooperate by sharing resources, one relinquishes something of value to the other.
 - While I agree, the sentence made it seem like only one side is constantly relinquishing something
- **Classical explanations of cooperation:** 1) net benefit arises when two entities cooperate (the gain exceeds the cost); 2) over time, some of the net benefit finds its way back to the donor
- **Research Question:** Is cooperation predictable without assuming that combining resources will create an immediate benefit, e.g. through complementarity or thresholds?
 - **Model** used to theoretically study this question: one in which “resources self-multiply with fluctuations, a null model of a range of phenomena from viral spread to financial investment.” In this case, geometric Brownian motion (GBM) model was used, where the change in resources over a short time step is a normally distributed random multiple of the existing resources
 - Resources follow noisy multiplicative growth, and are identical in all respects other than their random fluctuations.
 - **Ensemble-average growth rate:** one achieved by the population average in the large-population limit. It is independent of fluctuations. It is the *growth rate of the average resources of a population in the large-population limit*.
 - **Time-average growth rate:** one achieved by a single entity in the long-time limit. It is lower than the ensemble-average growth rate by a fluctuation-dependent term. The entity with the *highest time-average growth rate* will, regardless of its ensemble-average growth rate, *come to dominate the environment's resources in the long-time limit*. The ratio of its resources to those of other entities will grow exponentially.
 - The model sits naturally in the individual selection paradigm.
 - Individuals **pool and share resources because**, over a temporal sequence of interactions, it is **individually advantageous for them to do so**. Behavioural traits are good for the group precisely because they are good for every member of the group. Group selection is not needed because the *interests of the group and its members are fully aligned*.
 - **Things to note:**
 - Cooperation has **no direct cost** in this protocol. Costs and benefits emerge as the effects of cooperation on time-average growth rates. The cheating problem or the walk-away option are **not considered**.
 - **Breaking the cooperative pact** once creates a **short-term advantage** for the pact-breaker. However, provided regulation exists to prohibit repeated

pact-breaking, this **will NOT translate into a long-term advantage** (like refusing to work with them in the future).

- **Generalisations:** 1) Real cooperatives have members of differing abilities as well as differing fortunes—> can be interpreted to mean that even in simple set-ups, a better-skilled individual motivated by nothing but greed can still do better as part of society. 2) Fluctuations experienced by different entities are uncorrelated in this model—> provided fluctuations are not perfectly correlated, a cooperation benefit always exists. IN this model, cooperation is enhanced by diversity in individual outcomes
- **Phases:** 1) growth phase (where each cooperator increases its resources by a certain amount), 2) cooperation phase (where resources are pooled and shared equally among the cooperators)
- **In the case of non-cooperants:** there seems to be no incentive to cooperate at first glance
 - Analysing the growth of the ensemble average of resources **gives no reason for cooperation** to arise and, if it does arise, a good reason for it to end. From this perspective, cooperation looks **fragile** at best and its frequent observation in nature seems puzzling.
 - BUT: The ensemble-average growth rate is **uninformative of the growth of a single entity** over time. From the perspective of an individual, it is the growth rate achieved by averaging over infinitely many parallel realisations of its resources
- **In the case of cooperators:** in the presence of fluctuations, $\sigma > 0$, **cooperators grow faster** than non-cooperators in the **long run**.
 - Larger cooperatives are favoured over smaller ones, but as the cooperative expands, the benefit gained by adding each new member diminishes.
- **Result:** cooperation in the model is **advantageous** for the simple reason that **those who do it outgrow those who do not**.
 - Over a long enough time, the resources of each member of a cooperating pair grow faster than not only the resources of the corresponding non-cooperators, but also the average resources of the non-cooperators, showing that **cooperation and averaging are not equivalent operations**.
 -

Liar game

What about cooperates that are fighting for the opposite?

Cooperation (for english)

1) J John Lennon "Dark Tourism" (2017): seems to be a highly cited (2000+) paper made by one of the most important researchers in the field

2) Malcolm Foley & J. John Lennon "JFK and dark tourism: A fascination with assassination" (1996): seems to be one of the foundational papers where the terminology was introduced in an academic setting

3) Duncan Light "Progress in dark tourism and thanatourism research: An uneasy relationship with heritage tourism" (2017): discusses the evolution of the dark tourism research field by analyzing the various academic papers that were written in the last 2 decades before this review was written

I searched the topic on Google Scholar, and looked at one of the first papers that seemed to have a good amount of citations. After looking through the abstract, I looked at the structure of the paper, specifically if it discussed what "dark tourism" was. In that part, I found the year that this research field started to gain its foundation, and added it to the search on Google scholar. For the last paper, I searched using the "cited by" function of the first paper, and looked up somewhat recent reviews of the topic that had a relatively good amount of citations.

Video 1 psychology in crisis

Replication: if you get the same outcome after the doing a similar study

Crisis of confidence: how much can be trusted?

Math in psychology: something concrete

P-value: statistically significant or not, made psychology an empirical science

"Feeling the future" "false-positive psychology"

Inconclusive or opposite results: often don't get published. Journals are more likely to publish studies with significant results

Publication bias

Questionable research practices: random coincidence, confirmation bias

P-hacking: math, cherry picking data

Lack of transparency

More replication and accurate

- Open science
- Include raw data(?)
- Preregistration (outlining research plan before starting the research) and registered reports (the journal decides if they would publish the study before it is even run)
- Considering the demographic

Video 2: feeling the future

How much is false positives?

Statistical power

Under powered

P hacking: too many measurements

- 2 dependent variables
- Adding more observations
- Controlling for gender
- Dropping one of three conditions

Pentaquark

Data needs to be interpreted, and scientists have varying incentives, like having their studies published, encouraging more surprising and novel sciences

Replication studies are not published often

Retraction watch: published papers that have been withdrawn

Online repositories for unpublished results, and a move toward submitting unpublished hypothesis or research methods for peer review before conducting the experiment, guaranteeing that research would be unlisted regardless of results as long as the procedure is followed

Video 3: 50 min

- Idea that science is always objective

Disembodied knowledge

- 19th century, new priesthood
 - Started using passive voice when discussing the experiment and discussing the results
- An assumption that science needs to be written in passive voice

Reproducibility crisis

- Citation index,
- Constant pressure on journals to become significant and get prestige
- Publication results
- Selective data is published

Parapsychology

- Have even started publish negative results, but still has
- Pioneered the process of preregistration

Medical research

- Drug companies publish mostly positive results

Unconscious

- People's expectations influence what they observe
- Preschool experiment

Blind method

- Double blind clinical trial (both the doctors and the patients don't know which drug is a placebo)

Nature itself is blind, and there's no need for it (?)

Is it possible to influence experiments with the power of intentions?