

Open Science Initiatives & Experiences In Psychological Science

Anita Eerland

Radboud University Nijmegen



Open Science Initiatives & Experiences In Psychological Science


Anita Eerland

Radboud University Nijmegen






OPEN SCIENCE



Scientific progress can be accelerated by increasing *accessibility, transparency, robustness and inclusiveness*

Open Science **Experiences**



Open Science Experiences

OPEN ACCESS Freely available online



The Influence of Direct and Indirect Speech on Mental Representations

Anita Eerland^{1*}, Jan A. A. Engelen², Rolf A. Zwaan²

¹ Department of Psychology, Open University, Heerlen, The Netherlands, ² Department of Psychology, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract

Language can be viewed as a set of cues that modulate the comprehender's thought processes. It is an instrument. For example, the literature suggests that people perceive direct speech (e.g., *Joanne said: 'I went out last night'*) as more vivid and perceptually engaging than indirect speech (e.g., *Joanne said that she went out last night*). But how is this alleged vividness evident in comprehenders' mental representations? We sought to answer this question in a series of experiments. Our results do not support the idea that, compared to indirect speech, direct speech enhances the accessibility of information from the communicative or the referential situation during comprehension. Neither do our results support the idea that the hypothesized more vivid experience of direct speech is caused by the visual to the auditory modality. However, our results do show that direct speech leads to a stronger representation of the exact wording of a sentence than does indirect speech. These results show that language has a subtle influence on memory representations that was previously suggested.

Registered Replication Report: Hart & Albarracín (2011)

Proposing Authors: A. Eerland, A. M. Sherrill, J. P. Magliano, and R. A. Zwaan

Contributing authors: Anita Eerland, Andrew M. Sherrill, Joseph P. Magliano, Rolf A. Zwaan, Jack D. Arnal, Philip Aucoin, Stephanie A. Berger, Angela R. Birt, Nicole Capezza, Marianna Carlucci, Candace Crocker, Todd R. Ferretti, Mackenzie R. Kibbe, Michael M. Knepp, Christopher A. Kurby, Joseph M. Melcher, Stephen W. Michael, Christopher Poirier, Jason M. Prenoveau

Protocol vetted by: William Hart

Protocol edited by: Alex O. Holcombe




Perspectives on Psychological Science
2016, Vol. 11(1) 158–171
© The Author(s) 2015
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1745691615605826
pps.sagepub.com



Open Science Initiatives






*"We should
all adopt OS
practices"*

Policy
makers



Researchers





"We should all adopt OS practices"



"We should all adopt OS practices"



*"We should
all adopt OS
practices"*



Goals Open Science Community

- 1) Make Open Science more visible and accessible
 - Promote peer-to-peer knowledge exchange
- 2) Inspire and enable researchers to take the next small step
- 3) Identify obstacles and need for support to inform policy makers







INOSC
International Network of
Open Science & Scholarship Communities



PRO

SIPS

Ψ

A

χ

COS

INOSC

International Network of
Open Science & Scholarship Communities

OSCU

Open Science Community Utrecht

Some observations

- Tone of voice is crucial
- Listen to critique/fears/perceived obstacles
- Personal approach goes a long way
- Structure resources
- Approach OS as a buffet



~~Open~~
Science

✉ Anita.eerland@ru.nl

🐦 @AnitaEerland