

Ellis, D. A. (2020). *Smartphones within Psychological Science*. Cambridge University Press Errata. April 2021.

These errata are not errors of fact and concern typographical errors or short sections of text that would benefit from some additional clarification.

Page 42

A word is missing on line 5. This should read ‘When contrasted with some cohort designs (Khouja et al., 2019).’

Page 57

There is a missing space in the left-hand corner of Figure 2.3. This should read ‘collectively by’.

Page 62

The sentence starting on line 3 should refer to smaller samples and read:

‘Alternatively, carefully mapping and extrapolating specific psychiatric symptoms onto smartphone sensor metrics (in smaller samples) would also provide a stronger frame of reference going forward.’

Page 81

From line 6 the text should read:

‘These advantages also extend to group co-operation on a larger scale with virtual communities often founded on common interests or goals. Recent examples include the open science movement. Despite efforts of some states to control technology, collective group action, for example, has also become possible where this would have previously been dangerous in F2F contexts (Liu, 2017). Breaking down social barriers, contact theory would support the notion that the processes involved with multifaceted cross-group interaction will provide many benefits that include improving attitudes towards outgroups. Such interactions may also assist with problem-solving, increasing cognitive flexibility and fostering creativity (Hodson et al., 2018). Even without social interaction, experiential diversity is associated with improved cognitive and affective functioning (Heller et al., 2020; Van Praag, Kempermann and Gage, 2000).’

The sentence on line 11 beginning ‘Similarly,’ should become the first sentence of the next paragraph and read:

‘Similarly, as the number of people connected to online dating platforms has increased, the diversity and number of potential partners has also increased accordingly.’

Page 82

The text on line 10 starting ‘Indeed’ and ending ‘Gage, 2000)’ on line 18 should be removed.

Page 110

On line 28 the word ‘increase’ should read ‘improve’.

Ellis, D. A. (2020). *Smartphones within Psychological Science*. Cambridge University Press Errata. April 2021.

Page 112

On line 20 ‘from behaviour’ to the end of the sentence should read:

‘from behaviour might augment or transform traditional (latent) measures of personality (Boyd et al., 2020).’

Page 140

One line 17 the sentence that begins ‘In terms of’ should read:

‘More broadly, psychological impacts are often yoked to physical health, and smartphones may encourage sedentary behaviour. Physical injuries from distracted walking are increasingly common as mobile devices have become more popular (Povolotskiy et al., 2019).’

Page 161

The final line that begins ‘Finally,’ should instead begin ‘CyBOK also aims.’

Page 171

The first paragraph under the subheading *Theory and Measurement* should be separated into 2 paragraphs and read:

‘Issues pertaining to transparency remain front and centre. The replication crisis is well documented across psychological science as an increasing number of research findings have not held up to further scrutiny (Open Science Collaboration, 2015). Many studies across social science continue to be underpowered (Lakens, 2015; Maxwell, 2004) and distorted by publication bias (Francis, 2012). At the same time, an alarming number of individuals have been less than reliable in psychology, specifically including Eysenck, Zimbardo and Rosenhan (Cahalan, 2019; Pelosi, 2019; Reicher and Haslam, 2006). Other problems, however, may reflect serious theoretical and methodological shortcomings that will not be overcome by embracing open science practices.

In theory, many theoretical models and the statistics that support them can make useful predictions provided they are developed in an iterative fashion where new data leads to genuine modification or replacement (Box, 1976). In practice, the number and a complexity of interacting entities remains high in the real-world and will limit the formulation of perfect mathematical models (Hand, 2014; Phaf, 2020). Theory certainly appears to mean different things across sub-disciplines within psychological science. If a theory is only used to simplify the phenomena under investigation and allow for an improved understanding, this serves a very different purpose to how it is often described. As a whole, psychological theory has not attained the same standards in elucidating mechanisms as the physical sciences. Klein (2014) suggests this is due to the discipline’s tendency to investigate hypotheses via binary opposition rather than via quantitative manipulation. Many theories are simply unable to fully explain a phenomenon, let alone generalise. Recently, this has been described as a gulf between qualitative claims made following empirical investigations and the statistical entities from which they draw breath (Yarkoni, 2019).’

Ellis, D. A. (2020). *Smartphones within Psychological Science*. Cambridge University Press Errata. April 2021.

Page 172

The sentence starting ‘Unlike gambling’ on line 27 should read:

‘Unlike gambling or allied behavioural addictions, we know even less about how similar processes might apply to general or specific technology use.’

Page 173

The paragraph on line 8 that begins ‘Theory certainly appears’ should be deleted.

Page 175

An additional sentence after ‘(Szot et al., 2019).’ on line 15 should read:

‘These issues equally apply to many short measures involving self-report as part of ecological momentary assessments.’

‘becuase’ on line 26 should read ‘because’

The first sentence of the paragraph that begins on line 18 should read ‘Unfortunately, across applied research at the present time, issues of...’

Page 177

The sentence beginning ‘This involves’ on line 3 should read:

‘This involves the use of purpose-built apps to capture complex patterns of usage from smartphones and has shifted from tracking general use (in hours) alongside single smartphone interactions (pickups) to generating feature level metrics from specific apps.’

The sentence on line 17 that begins ‘Taken together’ should read:

‘Taken together, a deeper understanding of how technology interactions map onto psychological processes or affordances will help researchers distinguish between positive and negative outcomes across multiple domains.’

Page 179

At the end of the second paragraph where the final sentence ends ‘(Johannes et al., 2019).’, the following text should be added:

‘Psychology therefore has a tendency to consider why new technology is harmful at such a high-level to the point where it struggles to be involved productively when the same technology becomes a key component of everyday life. Genuine harms are very real and we only now starting to better understand issues that pertain to unequal access, cyberbullying, misinformation and security vulnerabilities. However, these harms are not specific to smartphones. They are universal and are as relevant to software developers as they are to behavioural scientists.’

Ellis, D. A. (2020). *Smartphones within Psychological Science*. Cambridge University Press Errata. April 2021.

Page 180

The sub-heading should read ‘Speed, Productivity and Interdisciplinary Research’.

After ‘(Martin, 2011).’ an additional sentence should read ‘It also determines how much funding is allocated to each institution by the UK Government’.

Page 182

From line 11 the text that begins ‘For example’ should read:

‘For example, publication expectations placed on researchers in terms of the REF appear on paper to be somewhat incompatible with an (often fundable) interdisciplinary research agenda (REF 2021, n.d.). Papers make up the bulk of REF outcomes, but these publications are submitted to traditional subject panels. Psychology, psychiatry and neuroscience form a single panel for example. Unfortunately, every discipline has its own hierarchy of what might be considered excellent research. While such hierarchies or related metrics like impact factor, are not meant to directly impact REF outcomes, having specific papers in the ‘right’ places remains core to hiring, probation and promotion decisions in the UK and further afield.

Researchers who wish to pursue such a line of enquiry are driven to publish across multiple fields by default, to meet both personal research goals and those determined by their primary discipline in order to ensure long-term success. This can place early-career academics under significant pressure as they attempt to establish themselves as future leaders. Attempts to mold findings or methods to a specific journal can come at the expense of conducting the best science possible. This can also reduce the potential impact of work that might be better placed elsewhere and capture a readership who can put the research into practice.’

From line 17 starting ‘Many perhaps’, the text should continue as originally written.