

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

These errata are not errors of fact and concern typographical errors or short sections of text that benefit from 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

The sentence on line 11 beginning ‘Similarly,’ should become the first sentence of the preceding paragraph.

Page 161

The final line on this page which starts ‘Finally,’ should read ‘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

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

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).

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 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.'

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.

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

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 written.