

- 1 What do incoming university students believe about open science practices in psychology?

Abstract

One or two sentences providing a **basic introduction** to the field, comprehensible to a scientist in any discipline. Two to three sentences of **more detailed background**, comprehensible to scientists in related disciplines. One sentence clearly stating the **general problem** being addressed by this particular study. One sentence summarizing the main result (with the words “**here we show**” or their equivalent). Two or three sentences explaining what the **main result** reveals in direct comparison to what was thought to be the case previously, or how the main result adds to previous knowledge. One or two sentences to put the results into a more **general context**. Two or three sentences to provide a **broader perspective**, readily comprehensible to a scientist in any discipline.

Keywords: open science, psychology, teaching, reproducibility, replication

Word count: X

14 What do incoming university students believe about open science practices in psychology?

15 The last decade has seen unprecedented change in methodological and reporting
16 practices in psychology. These changes were partly precipitated by what is popularly
17 known as the “replication crisis”: The discovery that close replications of published
18 psychological studies are often unable to replicate the original findings. For example, in an
19 attempt to replicate 100 published psychological studies, only 38% were adjudged to have
20 replicated the original result, and the average effect size was half that in the original
21 studies (Open Science Collaboration, 2015).

22 These apparent problems with replicability led to speculation regarding its causes,
23 and a variety of potential solutions being proffered. Some of these potential solutions
24 include more frequently conducting and publishing replication studies (see Brandt et al.,
25 2014), more transparent reporting of methods and results (Simmons, Nelson, & Simonsohn,
26 2012), open sharing of data (see Meyer, 2018), and preregistration of data collection and
27 analysis plans (Nosek, Ebersole, DeHaven, & Mellor, 2018).

28 **Methods**

29 We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions (if any), all
30 manipulations, and all measures in the study.

31 **Participants**

32 **Material**

33 **Procedure**

34 **Data analysis**

35 We used R (Version 4.0.3; ???) and the R-package *papaja* (Version 0.1.0.9997; ???)
36 for all our analyses.

37 **Results**

38 **Discussion**

References

- Brandt, M. J., IJzerman, H., Dijksterhuis, A., Farach, F. J., Geller, J., Giner-Sorolla, R.,
... van 't Veer, A. (2014). The replication recipe: What makes for a convincing
replication? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 50, 217–224.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2013.10.005>
- Meyer, M. N. (2018). Practical tips for ethical data sharing. *Advances in Methods and
Practices in Psychological Science*, 1(1), 131–144.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245917747656>
- Nosek, B. A., Ebersole, C. R., DeHaven, A. C., & Mellor, D. T. (2018). The preregistration
revolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11), 2600–2606.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708274114>
- Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological
science. *Science*, 349(6251), aac4716–aac4716.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4716>
- Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2012). *A 21 word solution* (SSRN
Scholarly Paper No. ID 2160588). Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network.