Protect Yourself from p-Hacking:
7 Things to Do to
Avoid Committing Scientific Malpractice

Frederick Solt
frederick-solt@uiowa.edu

Yue Hu
yue-hu@uiowa.edu

Kevan Hudson
kevan-hudson@uiowa.edu

Jungmin Song
jungmin-song@uiowa.edu

Dong 'Erico' Yu
dong-yu@uiowa.edu

October 31, 2015

Abstract

Replication crisis

LaCour scandal

p-Hacking

malpractice not always so blatent or intentional: confirmation bias, garden of forking paths (see http://www.stat.columbia.edu/~gelman/research/unpublished/p_hacking.pdf)

Introduce Newman, Johnston, and Lown (2015), perhaps noting the press attention it has received (e.g., http://www.psmag.com/health-and-behavior/five-studies-bernie-sanders-says-the-rich-are-deranged)

1 Ensure Reproducibility

Reproducibility as bare minimum for replication

script all work

packrat and checkpoint packages in R; version command in Stata

quote Newman, Johnston, and Lown (2015) replication materials

Table 1 and 2 cannot be reproduced exactly

Table 3 cannot be reproduced at all: more parameters than observations

2 Work in Public

Github as baseline

discuss preregistration as option, at least for some research designs

Newman, Johnston, and Lown (2015) didn't do either of these things, of course

3 Examine All Available Data

examine as much relevant evidence as possible

discuss Figure 1

discuss Figure 2

Figure 1: Local Inequality and the Perception of America as Divided into 'Haves' and 'Have-Nots': Results Using All Available Data

Notes: Results from replications of the model presented in Table 2 of Newman, Johnston, and Lown (2015) on the 2006 Pew survey analyzed in that article and on pooled data from the six Pew surveys that included the same item and were conducted in the time period the article examines. The statistically significant result for county income inequality in the 2006 survey presented in that article is not evident when all of the available data are examined.

Figure 2: Local Inequality and the Perception of America as Divided into 'Haves' and 'Have-Nots': Results Using Each Available Dataset

Notes: Results for county income inequality from replications of the model presented in Table 2 of Newman, Johnston, and Lown (2015) on data from each of six available surveys conducted in the in the time period examined in Newman, Johnston, and Lown (2015). Of the six surveys, the only one that yields a statistically significant result is the 2006 survey presented in that article.

4   Use Consistent Measures

text

5   Handle Data with Care

need to be really careful: double-check! Also need to be transparent.

merging: data on Bush share of vote don't match

input../figures/05$_h$andle$_d$ata$_w$ith$_c$are$_b$ush$_a$l.tex

coding and recoding: NJL's five point party id scale collapses leaners and weak partisans (not weak and strong partisans, and not leaners and 'true' independents). Should really use the full seven point scale; no reason to throw away that information (or to deviate from common practice)

unemployment is mismeasured in 2005, 2007, and 2009 in Table 1 due

to missing employ2 variable—all of those who are not working (students, retired, etc.) are coded as unemployed

6 Multiply Impute Missing Data

missing data should be multiply imputed (e.g., King et al. 2001)

church attendance—all missing are simply assigned "once or twice a month"

income, a variable of interest, is missing for over 10% of the sample, but values are mysteriously single-imputed (where did these values come from? they aren't meaningful–they fall between categories)

ideology, partyid also single-imputed, it seems

7 Plot Interaction Terms

It has been well known for over a decade that models containing multiplicative interaction terms require particular care in interpretation (see, e.g., Golder 2003; Braumoeller 2004; Brambor, Clark, and Golder 2006; Kam and Franzese 2007).

Figure 3: Logit Coefficients of Local Income Inequality by Respondent Income: Table 1, Model 1, From Replication Data

Notes: The coefficient for county income inequality fails to reach statistical significance for any observed level of respondent family income.

References

Brambor, Thomas, William Roberts Clark, and Matt Golder. 2006. "Understanding Interaction Models: Improving Empirical Analyses." *Political Analysis* 14(1):63–82.

Braumoeller, Bear F. 2004. "Hypothesis Testing and Multiplicative Interaction Terms." *International Organization* 58(4):807–820.

Golder, Matt. 2003. "Electoral Institutions, Unemployment, and Extreme Right Parties: A Correction." *British Journal of Political Science* 33(3):525–534.

Kam, Cindy D., and Robert J. Franzese. 2007. *Modeling and Interpreting*

Interactive Hypotheses in Regression Analysis. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

King, Gary, James Honaker, Anne Joseph, and Kenneth Scheve. 2001. "Analyzing Incomplete Political Science Data: An Alternative Algorithm for Multiple Imputation." *American Political Science Review* 95(1):49–69.

Newman, Benjamin J., Christopher D. Johnston, and Patrick L. Lown. 2015. "False Consciousness or Class Awareness? Local Income Inequality, Personal Economic Position, and Belief in American Meritocracy." *American Journal of Political Science* 59(2):326–340.