

Open Science Badges foster lay people's trust in scientists

(Re)Building trust?

Jürgen Schneider^{1, ID}
@artzyatfailing2
juergen.schneider@uni-tuebingen.de

Samuel Merk^{1, ID} Tom Rosman^{2, ID}
¹ University of Tübingen
² Leibniz Institute for Psychology Information

Introduction

Trust in science and scientists is generally high, but drops when learning about challenges in replication (Hendriks et al., 2020). Approaches to outline 'open reforms' in science on a general level do not seem to rebuild trust in science (Anvari & Lakens, 2019; Wingen et al., 2019). We thus shift the focus to concrete applications of open science practices (OSP) in journal articles such as open practice badges. As their effect may interact with epistemic beliefs (Hofer & Pintrich, 1997), we further will investigate their role in this context.

Research Questions

- Does the **visibility of OSP** influence perceived **trustworthiness** in scientists?
- Is there a relationship between **multiplistic epistemic beliefs** and the perceived **trustworthiness** in scientists?
- Do **multiplistic epistemic beliefs** moderate the effect of [1.]?
- Does the **visibility of OSP** influence **multiplistic epistemic beliefs**?

Preregistration: osf.io/ybs7f

Methods

Sample: 270 student teachers

Design:

- Stimuli: title pages of artificial journal article research reports
- Conditions:
 - visOSP: author *engaged* in OSP, visible through badges
 - nonOSP: author *did not engage* in OSP, visible through badges
 - nonvis: no information about engagement in OSP, no badges
- randomized assignment to two of the conditions




Figure 1: Stimuli of condition visOSP

Measures:

- Laypeople's Trust in Experts (Hendriks et al., 2015)
- Topic specific multiplistic epistemic beliefs (Merk et al., 2017)
- Topic specific treatment check

Questionnaire: rbt-demo.formr.org

Results

Research Question 1

$$\begin{aligned} \text{H1: } \mu_{\text{nonOSP}} &= \mu_{\text{nonvis}} = \mu_{\text{visOSP}} \\ \text{H2: } \mu_{\text{nonOSP}} &< \mu_{\text{nonvis}} < \mu_{\text{visOSP}} \\ \text{H3: } \mu_{\text{nonOSP}} &< \mu_{\text{nonvis}} = \mu_{\text{visOSP}} \end{aligned}$$

- ✓ Highest posterior probability for H2.
- ✓ $BF_{21} = 5.24 \cdot 10^7$; $BF_{23} = 5.60 \cdot 10^1$




Figure 2: Trustworthiness subscales by treatment. Violinplots and means $\pm 1 \cdot SD$

Research Question 2

$$\begin{aligned} \text{H1: } r_{\text{mult-trust}} &< 0 \\ \text{H2: } r_{\text{mult-trust}} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

- ✓ Highest posterior probability for H1.
- ✓ $BF_{12} = 1.17 \cdot 10^{21}$

Research Question 3

$$\begin{aligned} \text{H1: } r_{\text{mult-trust}}^{\text{nonOSP}} &< r_{\text{mult-trust}}^{\text{nonvis}} < r_{\text{mult-trust}}^{\text{visOSP}} \\ \text{H2: } (r_{\text{mult-trust}}^{\text{nonOSP}}, r_{\text{mult-trust}}^{\text{nonvis}}) &< r_{\text{mult-trust}}^{\text{visOSP}} \\ \text{H3: } r_{\text{mult-trust}}^{\text{nonOSP}} &= r_{\text{mult-trust}}^{\text{nonvis}} = r_{\text{mult-trust}}^{\text{visOSP}} \end{aligned}$$

- × Highest posterior probability for H3.
- × $BF_{31} = 13.76$; $BF_{32} = 17.38$



Figure 3: Multiplistic epistemic beliefs with integrity per treatment.

Research Question 4

$$\begin{aligned} \text{H1: } \mu_{\text{nonOSP}} &= \mu_{\text{nonvis}} = \mu_{\text{visOSP}} \\ \text{H2: } \mu_{\text{nonOSP}} &> \mu_{\text{nonvis}} > \mu_{\text{visOSP}} \\ \text{H3: } (\mu_{\text{nonOSP}}, \mu_{\text{nonvis}}) &> \mu_{\text{visOSP}} \end{aligned}$$

- ✓ Highest posterior probability for H2.
- ✓ $BF_{21} = 7.32$; $BF_{23} = 1.85$




Figure 4: Treatment on multiplistic epistemic beliefs. Violinplots and means $\pm 1 \cdot SD$

References

- Anvari, F., & Lakens, D. (2019). The Replicability Crisis and Public Trust in Psychological Science [Preprint]. PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/vtmpe>
- Hendriks, F., Kienhues, D., & Bromme, R. (2020). Replication crisis – trust crisis? The effect of successful vs failed replications on laypeople's trust in researchers and research. *Public Understanding of Science*, 096362520902383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/096362520902383>
- Hendriks, F., Kienhues, D., & Bromme, R. (2015). Measuring Laypeople's Trust in Experts in a Digital Age: The Muenster Epistemic Trustworthiness Inventory (METI). *PLOS ONE*, 10(10). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0139309>
- Hofer, B. K., & Pintrich, P. R. (1997). The Development of Epistemological Theories: Beliefs About Knowledge and Knowing and Their Relation to Learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 67(1), 88–140. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543067001088>
- Merk, S., Kelava, A., Schneider, J., Syring, M., & Bohl, T. (2017). Epistemologische Überzeugungen von Lehramtsstudierenden bezüglich pädagogischen Wissens: Gegenstands-, Quellen- und Kontextspezifität. *Journal for Educational Research Online*, 9(1), 169–189.
- Wingen, T., Berkessel, J., & English, B. (2019). No Replication, no Trust? How Low Replicability Influences Trust in Psychology [Preprint]. Open Science Framework. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/4u8qg>