

**INTRODUCTION TO DIGITAL OPEN RESEARCH IN CLINICAL
PSYCHOLOGY**

1. GENERAL

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|---------------|
| SCHOOL | SOCIAL SCIENCES | | |
| DEPARTMENT | PSYCHOLOGY | | |
| LEVEL | Undergraduate | | |
| COURSE CODE | Ψ-4722 | SEMESTER | 6th and above |
| COURSE TITLE | INTRODUCTION TO DIGITAL OPEN RESEARCH IN CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY | | |
| INSTRUCTOR | Sofia Triliva | | |
| TITLE | Professor of Clinical Psychology | | |
| TEACHING ACTIVITIES | WEEKLY HOURS | ECTS | |
| Lectures, group discussions, videos, presentations | 3 | 6 | |
| COURSE TYPE | Acquiring skills | | |
| PREREQUISITES COURSES: | Statistics and research methods | | |
| INSTRUCTION/EXAM LANGUAGE: | English / Greek | | |
| OFFERED TO ERASMUS STUDENTS | No | | |
| COURSE WEB PAGE (URL) | | | |

2. LEARNING OUTCOMES

| |
|--|
| Learning Outcomes |
| <p>In the aftermath of the replication crisis in psychology open science gained an ever increasing importance. Open science strives to make scientific research, data and dissemination accessible to a wider audience. This lab course provides an introduction to the basic principles of digital open science and how to apply them in clinical psychological research. Participants will learn how to use modern research frameworks and tools by planning and conducting a small research project on their own.</p> <p>By the end of the lab course, students will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Know what the replication crisis is • Know what p-hacking and HARKing is • Have a basic understanding of the open science research process • Know how open science differs from "conventional" science • Have learned about the pros and cons of open science • Know what preregistration means • Know what a registered report is • Have gained experience in working in a team with students from another university |

General Competencies

- Conduct research by the principles of open science
- Plan, organize, and conduct research by using digital communication channels
- Review research projects conducted by others
- Present research results

3. SYLLABUS

1. Introduction to digital open science
 2. Scientific pitfalls and how to avoid them
 3. Your personal open science project
 4. Digital open scientist's toolbox - Part I
 5. *Prepare your proposal presentation
 6. Present and review your research proposals
 7. Present and review your research proposals
 8. *Data collection
 9. Digital open scientist's toolbox Part II
 10. * Prepare your final presentation
 11. Present your project results
 12. Present your project results
 13. Summary and reflections
- * Online only sessions

4. TEACHING and LEARNING METHODS - EVALUATION

| | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|---------------------|--|
| INSTRUCTION METHOD | Lectures, group discussions, videos, presentations | | | |
| INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES USED | Video conferences, wikis, blogs, forums, email | | | |
| TEACHING ORGANIZATION | <i>Activity</i> | <i>Semester Workload</i> | <i>ECTS credits</i> | |
| | Lectures and lab exercises | 13 x 3 hours = 39 | 1,32 | |
| | Research project | 60 hours | 2,40 | |
| | Collaboration with fellow students | 25 hours | 1,00 | |
| | Preparation for presentation and research report writing | 40 hours | 1,60 | |
| | Course Total | 164 | 6 | |
| STUDENT EVALUATION | Research presentation and research report in English | | | |

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bell, J. (2010). *Doing your research project*. NY: Open University Press.
- Munafo, M. R. (2017). A manifesto for reproducible science. *Nature: Human Behavior*.
- Ioannidis, J.P.A. (2018) All science should inform policy and regulation. *PLoS Med* 15(5): e1002576. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002576>
- Szucs, D, Ioannidis, J.P.A. (2017) Empirical assessment of published effect sizes and power in the recent cognitive neuroscience and psychology literature. *PLoS Biol* 15(3): e2000797. doi:10.1371/ journal.pbio.2000797
- Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Research*.
- Ioannidis, J.P.A. (2018) Meta-research: Why research on research matters. *PLoS Biol* 16(3): e2005468. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2005468>
- Fanelli, D., Rodrigo, C., Ioannidis, J. (2017). Meta-assessment of bias in science. *PNAS*, 114(14). www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1618569114
- Nosek, B.A., Spies, J.S. & Motyl, M. (2012). Scientific Utopia: II. Restructuring Incentives and Practices to Promote Truth Over Publishability. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(6), 615–631. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612459058>
- Open Science (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251), aac4716. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4716>
- Klein, R. A., Ratliff, K. A., Vianello, M., Adams, R. B., Bahník, Š., Bernstein, M. J., ... Nosek, B. A. (2014). Investigating Variation in Replicability. *Social Psychology*, 45(3), 142–152. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000178>
- John, L.K., Loewenstein, G., & Prelec, D. (2012). Measuring the Prevalence of Questionable Research Practices With Incentives for Truth Telling. *Psychological Science*, 23(5), 524–532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611430953>
- Nosek, B.A., & Lakens, D. (2014). Registered Reports. *Social Psychology*, 45(3), 137–141. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000192>

** Additional literature will be assigned