

## **Readings to consider for an updated curriculum**

### **Psychology**

Dienes, Z. (2008). *Understanding psychology as a science: An introduction to scientific and statistical inference*. Bloomsbury Publishing. (Available as e-book via UiO).

Most relevant chapters

Chapter 1 – Karl Popper and demarcation

Chapter 2 – Kuhn and Lakatos: paradigms and programmes

Chapter 3 – Neyman, Pearson and hypothesis testing

### **Podcasts**

**Nullis in Verba, Episode 15: Novum Crisi Replicati (a history of the replication crisis)**

Link: <https://www.podbean.com/ew/pb-nmuqd-148bd4a>

**Nullis in Verba, Episode 32: Impartialitas (objectivity and disinterestedness in science)**

Link: <https://www.podbean.com/ew/pb-j79xp-15ca620>

**BJKS Podcast, Episode 31. Stuart Ritchie: Science Fictions, fraud, and open science**

Link: <https://www.buzzsprout.com/1390924/9027285>

**Everything Hertz, Episode 56, Registered reports (with Chris Chambers)**

Link: <https://everythinghertz.com/56>

### ***Climate change relevant work***

Večkalov, B., Geiger, S.J., Bartoš, F. *et al.* A 27-country test of communicating the scientific consensus on climate change. *Nat Hum Behav* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01928-2>

Crandon, T.J., Dey, C., Scott, J.G. *et al.* The clinical implications of climate change for mental health. *Nat Hum Behav* 6, 1474–1481 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01477-6>

### ***Epistemology***

Uygun Tunç, D., Tunç, M. N., & Lakens, D. (2023). The epistemic and pragmatic function of dichotomous claims based on statistical hypothesis tests. *Theory & Psychology*, 33(3), 403–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09593543231160112>

Fidler F, Singleton Thorn F, Barnett A, Kambouris S, Kruger A. The Epistemic Importance of Establishing the Absence of an Effect. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*. 2018;1(2):237-244. doi:[10.1177/2515245918770407](https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245918770407)

Faulkner, Cathy, Fiona Fidler, and Geoff Cumming. The value of RCT evidence depends on the quality of statistical analysis. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 46.2 (2008): 270-281.

## **Replication**

Haefel, G. J. (2022). Psychology needs to get tired of winning. *Royal Society Open Science*, 9(6), 220099.

Nosek, B. A., Hardwicke, T. E., Moshontz, H., Allard, A., Corker, K. S., Dreber, A., ... & Vazire, S. (2022). Replicability, robustness, and reproducibility in psychological science. *Annual review of psychology*, 73(1), 719-748.  
Methods

Scheel, A. M. (2022). Why most psychological research findings are not even wrong. *Infant and Child Development*, 31(1), e2295. <https://doi.org/10.1002/icd.2295>

Scheel, A. M., Schijen, M. R. M. J., & Lakens, D. (2021). An Excess of Positive Results: Comparing the Standard Psychology Literature With Registered Reports. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 4(2), 25152459211007467. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25152459211007467>

Lakens, D. (2019). The value of preregistration for psychological science: A conceptual analysis. *Japanese Psychological Review*, 62(3), 221–230. [https://doi.org/10.24602/sjpr.62.3\\_221](https://doi.org/10.24602/sjpr.62.3_221)

## **Theory**

Levitt, H. M., Bamberg, M., Creswell, J. W., Frost, D. M., Josselson, R., & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative meta-analytic, and mixed methods research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report. *American Psychologist*, 73(1), 26–46. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uio.no/10.1037/amp0000151>

Meehl, P. E. (1990). Appraising and Amending Theories: The Strategy of Lakatosian Defense and Two Principles that Warrant It. *Psychological Inquiry*, 1(2), 108–141.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0102\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0102_1)

Derksen, M. (2024). The methods and principles of the natural sciences are not a diet we need to follow: A close look at the terms of the question. *Theory & Psychology*, 34(3), 311–327.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/09593543241228876>

Guest, O. (2024). What Makes a Good Theory, and How Do We Make a Theory Good? *Computational Brain & Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42113-023-00193-2>

Borsboom, D., van der Maas, H. L. J., Dalege, J., Kievit, R. A., & Haig, B. D. (2021). Theory Construction Methodology: A Practical Framework for Building Theories in Psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 16(4), 756–766. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620969647>

Muthukrishna, M., & Henrich, J. (2019). A problem in theory. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 3, 221–229.  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0522-1>

## **Political Science**

Dowding, Keith. 2016. *The Philosophy and Methods of Political Science*. London: Palgrave, chap. 3 ("What is an explanation?"), chap. 4 ("What is a theory?"), and chap. 5 ("Hypotheses and theory testing"), and chap. 6 ("Narratives, mechanisms and causation").

Gerring, John. 2012. "Mere description." *British Journal of Political Science* 42 (4): 721–746.

List, Christian, and Kai Spiekermann. 2013. "Methodological individualism and holism in political science: a reconciliation." *American Political Science Review* 107 (4): 629–643.

### **Sociology**

Blossfeld, H.-P. (2009). Causation as a Generative Process. The Elaboration of an Idea for the Social Sciences and an Application to an Analysis of an Interdependent Dynamic Social System. In *Causal Analysis in Population Studies* (pp. 83–109). Springer Netherlands.

Flemmen, M. (2023, May 9). Klasse er ikke natur. *Sosiologen*. <https://sosiologen.no/debatt/klasse-er-ikke-natur/>

Goldthorpe, J. H. (2001). Causation, Statistics, and Sociology. *European Sociological Review*, 17(1), 1–20.