6060 Practice: RMarkdown

Brooke Charbonneau

1 Comparing rating-complaint to rating-critical correlations

The comparison for the correlations between ratings and complaints and ratings and critical was delta r = .67, 95% CI [.32,1.00], N = 30. However, the CI is quite long, and is consistent with anywhere from a medium positive to a very strong positive relationship. This indicates that the rating-complaint correlation (r = .83, 95% CI [.66,.91]) is likely stronger than the ratings-critical (r = .16, 95% CI[-.22, .49) correlation.

2 Comparing rating-complaint to raises-critical correlations

The comparison for the correlation between ratings and complaints and raises and critical was delta r = .45, 95% CI [.14,.81], N = 30. However, the CI is quite long, and is consistent with anywhere from a weak positive to a very strong positive relationship. This indicates that the rating-complaint correlation (r = .83, 95% CI [.66,.91]) is likely stronger than the ratings-critical (r = .38, 95% CI[.02, .65) correlation.

3 Replication of rating-privileges correlation

The original study found a ratings-privileges correlation of r = .43, 95% CI [08, .68], 95% PI[.05, 0.74], N = 30. This means that if the replication correlation differs from the original correlation only due to sampling error, there is a 95% chance that a replication result with a sample size of N = 100 will fall in the interval of .05 and .74. If the replication correlation falls outside of this range, factors beyond sampling error are likely also responsible for the difference.

4 Replication of rating-privileges correlation

It is not possible to do this because of the small sample size; the width does not change with a sample size of 1000. Additionally, even if it were possible, it wouldn't matter due to the small sample size from the original study. If the original study had small n and the replication study has large n, but the original study had a narrow PI and the replication r does not with within this PI, it still not very meaningful as the replication study may be more valid than the original one.

5 Comparing two correlations of rating-privileges

The comparison correlation between orginal and replication studies on the correlation of ratings and privileges was delta r = .33, 95% CI [-.02,.59]. However, the CI is quite long and could indicate either a positive or very weak negative relationship. This means that, while it is likely that the two correlations are different, we cannot rule out that they came from the same population.

6 Strength of rating-privileges

The correlation between ratings and privileges obtained in Table 1 was $r = .43$, 95% CI [.08, .68]. Additionally, we could not rule out that a correlation of .10 came from a different population. This correlation has a long CI, and indicates that the relationship between ratings and privileges is likely positive. However, the result is consistent with anywhere from a weak positive to a strong positive relationship.