

The Effects of Visual and Design Features on the Perception of Correlation in Scatterplots

A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Science and Engineering

2024

Gabriel Strain
Department of Computer Science

Contents

Contents	2
List of figures	6
List of tables	7
List of publications	8
Abstract	9
Lay abstract	10
Declaration of originality	11
Copyright statement	12
Acknowledgements	13
1 Introduction	14
1.1 Research Motivation	14
1.2 Contributions	14
1.3 Included Publications	14
1.4 Overview of Thesis	14
2 Literature Review	15
2.1 Data Visualisation: A Brief History	15
2.2 Measuring Relatedness	15
2.3 Conceptions of Correlation	15
2.4 Visualising Correlation	15
2.4.1 History	15
2.4.2 Present Landscape	15
2.4.3 Scatterplots	15
2.5 Correlation Perception	15
2.6 Correlation Cognition	15
2.7 Underestimation: What's Really Going On?	15
2.8 Underestimation: Potential Consequences	15
2.9 Data Visualisation Literacy	15
2.10 Objectives and Contributions	15

3	General Methodology	16
3.1	Introduction	16
3.2	Experimental Methods	16
3.2.1	Experimental Design	16
3.2.2	Tools for Testing	17
3.2.3	Recruitment & Participants	18
3.2.4	Creating Stimuli	18
3.3	Analytical Methods	19
3.3.1	Linear Mixed-Effects Models	20
3.3.2	Ordinal Modelling	20
3.3.3	Model Construction	21
3.3.4	Effects Sizes	22
3.3.5	Reporting Analyses	22
3.4	Computational Methods	22
3.4.1	Executable Reporting	22
3.4.2	Containerised Environments	23
3.5	Reproducibility In This Thesis	24
3.5.1	Sharing Data and Code	25
3.5.2	Executable Papers and Docker Containers	25
3.5.3	Pre-Registration of Hypotheses and Analysis Plans	25
3.5.4	Experimental Resources	26
3.6	Conclusion	26
4	Adjusting the Opacities of Scatterplot Points Can Affect Correlation Estimates	27
4.1	Abstract	28
4.2	Preface: Learning From an Early Pilot Study	28
4.3	Introduction	28
4.3.1	Overview	28
4.4	Related Work	28
4.4.1	Transparency, Contrast, Opacity, and Formal Definitions	28
4.4.2	Effects of Point Opacity on Correlation Estimation	28
4.5	Experiment 1: Uniform Opacity Adjustments	28
4.5.1	Introduction	28
4.5.2	Methods	28
4.5.3	Analysis	28
4.5.4	Discussion	28
4.6	Experiment 2: Spatially-Dependent Opacity Adjustments	28
4.6.1	Introduction	28
4.6.2	Methods	28
4.6.3	Analysis	28
4.6.4	Discussion	28
4.7	General Discussion	28

5	Adjusting the Sizes of Scatterplot Points Can Correct for a Historic Correlation Underestimation Bias	29
5.1	Abstract	29
5.2	Overview	29
5.3	Related Work	29
5.3.1	Size and Perception	29
5.3.2	Scatterplot Point Size and Correlation Perception	29
5.4	Experiment: Adjusting Point Size to Facilitate More Accurate Correlation Perception in Scatterplots	29
5.4.1	Introduction	29
5.4.2	Methods	29
5.4.3	Analysis	29
5.4.4	Discussion	29
5.5	General Discussion	29
6	Interactions of Opacity and Size Adjustments	30
6.1	Abstract	30
6.2	Overview	30
6.3	Related Work	30
6.3.1	Size and Opacity	30
6.4	Experiment: Adjusting Point Size and Opacity Together	30
6.4.1	Introduction	30
6.4.2	Methods	30
6.4.3	Analysis	30
6.4.4	Discussion	30
6.5	General Discussion	30
7	Visual Features Affecting Perceptual Estimates Also Affect Beliefs About Correlations	31
7.1	Abstract	32
7.2	Overview	32
7.3	Related Work	32
7.3.1	From Perception to Cognition	32
7.3.2	From Cognition to Belief	32
7.4	Pre-Study: Investigating Beliefs About Relatedness Statements	32
7.4.1	Introduction	32
7.4.2	Methods	32
7.4.3	Analysis	32
7.4.4	Discussion	32
7.5	Experiment: Potential for Belief Change Using Atypical Scatterplots	32
7.5.1	Introduction	32
7.5.2	Methods	32
7.5.3	Analysis	32
7.5.4	Discussion	32

7.6 General Discussion	32
8 Conclusion	33
8.1 Main Findings	33
8.2 Relationship to Prior Work	33
8.3 Reproducibility	33
8.4 Contributions	33
8.5 Implications	33
8.5.1 For Design	33
8.5.2 For Society	33
8.6 Limitations	33
8.7 Future Directions	33
8.8 Closing Remarks	33
References	34
Appendices	40
A First appendix	41

Word count: 1000

List of figures

3.1	An example of the slider participants used to estimate correlation in experiments 1-4. . .	17
3.2	placeholder	17
3.3	The basic design of scatterplots in experiments 1 to 4.	19
3.4	Visualising random intercepts and slopes for a theoretical experiment with 4 participants. The grand mean of the dependent variable is shown as a solid line, while each separate random intercept is drawn with dashed lines. Each line has a different gradient, repre- senting different random slopes for each participant. This graphic was inspired by those featured in Brown, 2021 [13].	21
3.5	Peng’s (2011) Reproducibility Spectrum. This figure has been reproduced from Peng (2011) [42].	25

List of tables

List of publications

Publications go here.

Abstract

put abstract here

Lay abstract

This is lay abstract text.

Declaration of originality

I hereby confirm that no portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Copyright statement

- i The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the “Copyright”) and s/he has given The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.
- ii Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made *only* in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.
- iii The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trademarks and other intellectual property (the “Intellectual Property”) and any reproductions of copyright works in the thesis, for example graphs and tables (“Reproductions”), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.
- iv Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialisation of this thesis, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy (see <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=24420>), in any relevant Thesis restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, The University Library’s regulations (see <http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/about/regulations/>) and in The University’s policy on Presentation of Theses.

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements go here.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Research Motivation

1.2 Contributions

1.3 Included Publications

The research described in chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7 in this thesis is adapted from earlier publications, the last of which under review as of writing. To avoid repetition, information and discussion that would be repeated has been consolidated into the literature review and general methodology chapters. *Gabriel Strain* is the primary author of all included papers.

- *The Effects of Contrast on Correlation Perception in Scatterplots* [52] is reproduced in Chapter 4. Sections 4.5.2, 4.6.2, 4.5.3, 4.6.3, 4.5.4, 4.6.4, and 4.7 contain minimally altered parts of the published article.
- *Adjusting Point Size to Facilitate More Accurate Correlation Perception in Scatterplots* [51] is reproduced in Chapter 5. Sections 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, and 5.5 contain minimally altered parts of the published article.
- *Effects of Point Size and Opacity Adjustments in Scatterplots* [53] is reproduced in Chapter 6. Sections 6.4.2, 6.4.3, 6.4.4, and 6.5 contain minimally altered parts of the published article.
- *Effects of Alternative Scatterplot Designs on Belief (under review)* is reproduced in Chapter 7. Sections 7.4, 7.5.2, 7.5.3, 7.5.4, and 7.6 contain minimally altered parts of the published article.

1.4 Overview of Thesis

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Data Visualisation: A Brief History

2.2 Measuring Relatedness

2.3 Conceptions of Correlation

2.4 Visualising Correlation

2.4.1 History

2.4.2 Present Landscape

2.4.3 Scatterplots

2.5 Correlation Perception

2.6 Correlation Cognition

2.7 Underestimation: What's Really Going On?

2.8 Underestimation: Potential Consequences

2.9 Data Visualisation Literacy

2.10 Objectives and Contributions

Chapter 3

General Methodology

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I describe our research methodologies. The experiments described in chapters 4, 5, and 6 share most aspects of experimental method, and are therefore described in full in this chapter. Chapter 7 features a different methodology, and is described therein. This chapter discusses experimental designs, the tools used to build and run the experiments, the approach to statistical analyses, and the computational methods and practices employed, particularly with regards to reproducibility and open science.

3.2 Experimental Methods

It is important to acknowledge that the way in which we conduct experiments influences what research questions we can ask and the conclusions that we may draw. The decisions that lead us to designing experiments in certain ways must be based not only on theory, but also on the practical constraints imposed by external factors on the research team. Concerns such as time, practicality, and cost must be addressed, and a compromise between research that is *valuable* and research that is *doable*.

3.2.1 Experimental Design

All but the final experiment utilised within-participants designs. In such a design, each participant is exposed to each level of the intervention. This is in contrast with between-participants designs, where separate groups are exposed to only a single level of the intervention each. Where possible, within-participants designs are preferred. These designs do not rely on random allocation, and as each participant is able to provide as many data points as there are levels [16], offer a significant boost in statistical power over between-participant designs where each participant only provides a single data point. In experiments 1 to 3, each participant saw all experimental stimuli and provided a judgement of correlation using a sliding scale between 0 and 1 (see Figure 3.1). Experiment 1 featured a single factor of global scatterplot point opacity with 4 levels (see Figure 3.2). Experiment 2 featured a single factor of scatterplot point design regarding opacity with 4 levels (see ?@fig-exp2-examples). Experiment 3 featured a single factor of scatterplot point design regarding size with 4 levels (see ?@fig-exp3-examples). Experiment 4 featured a factorial 2×2 design; IV1 was the scatterplot point opacity




Figure 3.1. An example of the slider participants used to estimate correlation in experiments 1-4.




Figure 3.2. placeholder

design used with 2 levels, and IV2 was the scatterplot point size design used with 2 levels (see ?@fig-exp4-examples). Experiment 5 is a departure from the shared experimental paradigm of the previous experiments, and features a 1 factor, 2 level between-participants design.

3.2.2 Tools for Testing

However we design experiments, software plays a crucial role in allowing us to carry them out. Fortunately, there is a wealth of tools available to facilitate the testing of visualisations both in traditional lab-based tests and in online experiments. Following the principles of open and reproducible research [6], closed-source software, such as Gorilla [4] or E-prime [20] was discounted, as these rely on paid licences and do not allow for the sharing of code with future researchers. I settled on using PsychoPy [40] due to its open-source status, flexibility regarding graphical and code-based experimental design, and high level of timings accuracy [12]. Using such a open-source tool not only facilitated my own learning with regard to experiment building, but also enables the contribution of further examples of visualisation studies by hosting the resulting experiments online for use and modification by future researchers.

I elected to pursue online testing throughout this thesis. Doing so is much quicker than carrying out in-person lab-based testing, facilitating the collection of data from a much larger number of participants. This reduces the chances of detecting false positives during analysis and ensures adequate levels of power despite the potential for small effects sizes (see Section 3.2.3 . Online testing also affords access to diverse groups of participants across our populations of interest, especially when compared to the relatively homogeneous student populations usually accessed by doctoral researchers. Research has identified online experimentation as producing reliable results that closely match those found in traditional lab-based experiments [5, 21, 44], especially with large sample sizes. Due to its integration with PsychoPy, Pavlovia was used to host all the experiments described in this thesis. Section 3.5.4 contains links to all experiments publicly hosted on Pavlovia's GitLab instance.

3.2.3 Recruitment & Participants

Recruitment of participants online is possible through a range of service providers, each with advantages and disadvantages. Research evaluating a number of these providers recently found that Prolific [45] and CloudResearch provide the highest quality data for the lowest cost [19]; I elected to use the former due to my familiarity with the system. Despite these findings, there has also been evidence of low data quality and skewed demographics affecting even high quality platforms tailored towards academic research. On the 24th of July, 2021, the Prolific.co platform went viral on social media [15], leading to a participant pool heavily skewed towards young people identifying as female. At the time, Prolific did not manually balance the participants recruited for a study. This was addressed in the pilot study (see Section 4.2) by preventing participants who joined after this date from participating, in addition to manually requesting a 1:1 ratio of male to female participants. The demographic issues settled quickly, however the screened 1:1 ratio was maintained for the remainder of the experiments.

The first experiment conducted was a pilot study (see Section 4.2 for full details) investigating a very early iteration of the point opacity manipulation in combination with exploratory work around plot size and correlation estimation. At the time, I was relatively naive to the intricacies of recruiting research participants online, and thus experienced issues regarding participant engagement. Each experiment included attention check questions in which participants were instructed to ignore the stimulus and provide a specific answer. The advert for each experiment stated that failure of more than 2 attention check items would result in a submission being rejected. This pilot study suffered from a rejection rate of 57.5%, indicating very low levels of participant engagement. For the following studies, published guidelines [39] were followed to address these issues; specifically, it was required that participants:

- Had previously completed at least 100 studies on Prolific.
- Had an acceptance rate of at least 99% for those studies.¹

Following implementation of these pre-screen criteria, the rejection rate for the next experiment fell to ~5%. Rejection rates were similar for the remainder of experiments. Exact numbers of accepted and rejected participants can be found in the **Participants** sections of each experiment.

Each experiment recruited until 150 participants had completed successfully. Due to the novelty of this work, it was difficult to get a sense of the size of the effect that would be seen. I assumed a small effect size (Cohen's $d \sim 0.2$), and aimed to recruit enough participants that the experiments would be adequately powered [14]. NB: I did not conduct an *a priori* power analysis. A post-hoc power analysis of the first experiment revealed a power of 0.54. Effect sizes were larger in the subsequent experiments, however to facilitate comparison, it was decided that $n = 150$ would remain the target recruitment rate.

3.2.4 Creating Stimuli

All stimuli were created using `ggplot2` in R. Specific versions are cited separately with regard to the specific visualisations produced for each experiment. Identical principles were followed regarding data visualisation design for each experiment bar the last, which is discussed *in situ*.

¹this is a more strict rate than the 95% recommended by Peer et al. [39].




Figure 3.3. The basic design of scatterplots in experiments 1 to 4.

Experiments were designed with the intention of isolating and addressing a perceptual effect; the underestimation of correlation in positively correlated scatterplots. To achieve this, confounding extraneous design factors were removed, including axis labels, tick labels, grid lines, and titles. The axis ticks themselves were preserved. Figure 3.3 demonstrates the basic design of the scatterplots used in experiments 1 to 4.

3.3 Analytical Methods

To investigate whether the experimental manipulations have actual effects on the interpretations participants provide, appropriate statistical testing must be employed. This involves taking into account the variability in responses that can be attributed to an experimental manipulation against the backdrop of other variability inherent in the dataset. Traditional analysis of the data collected throughout this

thesis would involve the use of repeated measures analyses of variance (ANOVAs). This technique assesses whether there are significant differences in means of dependent variables between conditions. While these techniques are commonplace, they do not allow for comparisons of differences across the full range of individual participant responses, nor do they allow for simultaneous consideration of by-item and by-participant variance. It is for these reasons that linear mixed-effects models were used throughout. Linear mixed-effects modelling is a reliable approach that is resistant to a variety of distributional assumption violations [49], and facilitates the appreciation of the data story in a broader and more detailed fashion.

3.3.1 Linear Mixed-Effects Models

In a mixed-effects modelling paradigm, a distinction is made between variability that is thought to arise as a result of an experimental manipulation (fixed effects), and that which arises due to differences between, for example, participants or particular experimental items (random effects). When a variable is manipulated by a researcher in an experiment, each level of that variable is present, meaning it is appropriate to be modelled as a fixed effect. When only a *subset* of levels of a variable is present, such as a sample of all possible participants or experimental items, then this variable is appropriate for modelling as a random effect. Typically, mixed-effects models require the specification of *intercepts*; these are different baselines for each participant or item that reflect random deviations from the mean of the dependent variable. Mixed-effects models may also specify random *slopes*; these are differences in the magnitude of the difference between levels of the independent variable for each random effect [13]. Figure 3.4 visualises these concepts.

Throughout the course of this thesis, analyses attempt to model both random intercepts and slopes in order to capture the maximum amount of variability present in our datasets. In order to ascertain the goodness-of-fit of models, their ability to explain variance is compared to that of a nested null model [50]; such a model is identical bar the removal of the fixed effect of interest. The likelihood ratio test (LRT) is used here to assess goodness-of-fit. In cases where a model has in total more than two levels (here, all experiments bar experiment 5), the *emmeans* package [28] is used to calculate estimated marginal means between levels of fixed effects.

3.3.2 Ordinal Modelling

In experiment 5, participants used Likert scales to provide responses. These scales capture whether one rating is higher or lower than another, however they do not quantify the magnitude of the difference between levels of rating. Metric modelling, such as linear regression, treats the response options to a Likert scale as if they were numeric. Doing so assumes equal levels of difference between ratings, when in reality there is no theoretical reason to assume so. Metric modelling is therefore considered inappropriate for modelling responses to Likert scales [29]. In light of these issues, the *ordinal* package [17] in R was used to build cumulative link mixed effects models for the analysis of Likert scale data. This allows for the treatment of Likert responses as ordered factors as opposed to continuous response scales.




Figure 3.4. Visualising random intercepts and slopes for a theoretical experiment with 4 participants. The grand mean of the dependent variable is shown as a solid line, while each separate random intercept is drawn with dashed lines. Each line has a different gradient, representing different random slopes for each participant. This graphic was inspired by those featured in Brown, 2021 [13].

3.3.3 Model Construction

Choices are inherent in every type of statistical analysis, and can play a large role in the conclusions that are drawn from them. In linear mixed-effects modelling, deciding *what* is a fixed or random effect is straightforward; deciding *how to specify* random effects is a more complicated matter. Barr et al. [7] argue that for fully repeated measures designs, we should prefer a maximal model; one with random intercepts and slopes for each participant and experimental item. More recently, Bates et al. [8] have argued that attempting to specify maximal models for insufficiently rich datasets may lead to overfitting and unreliable conclusions. In light of this I sought a more systematic approach to selecting the random effects structure of a given model.

In an attempt to balance simplicity, explanatory power, and model convergence (whether or not a solution can be found), the *buildmer* package [57] in R was used to automate the selection of model specifications. Having been provided with a maximal model, *buildmer* uses stepwise regression to select the most complex model structure that successfully converges. Following this, random effects terms that fail to explain a significant amount of variance in the dataset are dropped; this stepwise elimination of terms is evaluated using successive likelihood ratio tests. This results in a model that captures the maximal amount of feasible variability while minimising redundancy. Note that *buildmer* was not relied upon as a modelling *panacea*; models are still based on theoretical underpinnings and are evaluated critically.

3.3.4 Effects Sizes

My approach to effects sizes evolved throughout the course of the research project due to reviewer feedback and a growing appreciation of the complexities of effect sizes when discussing linear mixed-effects models. Experiments 1, 2, and 3 featured a condition with no scatterplot manipulation present (henceforth referred to as a *baseline*); accordingly, the `EMAtools` package [25] was used to calculate equivalent Cohen’s d effect sizes of manipulation-present conditions relative to the baseline. Experiment 4 did not feature a baseline condition, meaning Cohen’s d was deemed inappropriate. The `r2glmm` package [23] was used instead to calculate semi-partial R^2 . In lieu of a traditional measure of effect size, this demonstrated the unique variance in the dependent variable explained by each level of the independent [35]. Experiment 5 features a much simpler modelling situation, and returns to providing equivalent Cohen’s d values for the pre- vs post- plot viewing conditions, this time calculated by converting odds ratios using the `effectsize` package [9]. More details on specific calculations, measures, and conclusions can be found *in situ*.

3.3.5 Reporting Analyses

Throughout this thesis, a broad approach to the reporting of statistical analyses was taken; while I consider our analytical methods and conclusions valid, I also present a range of statistics to allow the reader to draw their own conclusions should they wish. Statistical results are visualised where appropriate, and where visualisation aids understanding and interpretation. In addition, details about model structures and the issues we tackled when modelling are included for transparency [33].

3.4 Computational Methods

The approach to computational methods in this thesis sought to marry practicality, simplicity, and reproducibility. Often, this meant that what would otherwise be a makeshift script followed by copy-pasting of results into Overleaf ended up being an involved exercise in literate programming (knuth ref) and code wrangling. This involved effort and time, particularly in the early stages of the project, however has yielded a number of benefits. Many of the techniques developed early in the project proved to be instrumental later on, resulting in time-savings overall. Additionally, these techniques, principles, and practices are shared to enable future researchers to learn, where I struggled. In this section, we detail our approaches to computational methods, including how the idea of **executable papers** was utilised, and how containerised environments were used to capture a freeze-frame of the analyses.

3.4.1 Executable Reporting

Each paper published throughout this project, and this thesis, has been written to be executable. Packaging research in such a way means a lay person can follow simple instructions to recreate the work,

while also facilitating and encouraging literate programming, or the close alignment of documentation and underlying code [43].

The use of a literate programming paradigm to generate reports (usually using LaTeX) has a rich history. This section focuses on this history as it pertains to the language used throughout this project, R. Sweave [27], written in 2002, allowed R code to be integrated into LaTeX documents. This was followed by Yihui Xie’s knitr [59], which expanded Sweave functionality and improved integration with tools such as pandoc [31]. knitr uses Rmarkdown [60] to mix markdown-flavoured text with code chunks into a document that can be rendered into an appropriately-formatted conference or journal pdf; this workflow was used for the paper associated with experiments 1 and 2. Quarto [2], released in 2022, further expands on Rmarkdown functionality, and removes reliance on R or Rstudio. Quarto was used for the remainder of the papers associated with this project, and for the present thesis.

Writing executable or dynamic documents allows results to be re-generated whenever the document is rendered. This includes any associated data visualisations and statistical modelling. Structuring documents like this effectively “open up” research by allowing others to view the code that performed the analysis and generated the data visualisations, in addition to guarding against accusations of questionable research practices through high levels of transparency [22]. This paradigm also allows for the caching of computationally expensive statistical models.

3.4.2 Containerised Environments

Providing the code associated with a project, even when that code is integrated into a literately programmed executable paper, is necessary, but not sufficient, for enabling adequate reproducibility. Previous work has found many instances where publicly-accessible code could not reproduce the results included in the corresponding document or failed to run entirely [18, 47, 56]. Poor programming practices accounted for a significant portion of these problems, highlighting the issue of researchers without technical backgrounds being expected to produce high quality technical documentation. Elsewhere, differences in computational environment, package versions, and operating systems have been identified as responsible for the non-replication of results. Large research projects, such as this, can include hundreds of functions from scores of packages, meaning that small changes can critically break code.

These issues were addressed using containers, specifically, those created by Docker [10, 32]. 1979 saw the development of chroot (change root), which is able to isolate an application’s file access to a ‘chroot jail’. Since then, we have seen the rapid development and uptake of containerisation software, mostly within the software development and security communities. Docker, released in 2014, is a popular, lightweight containerisation tool that enables a precise recreation of computational environments. Recording software versions and dependencies avoids the potential for broken code in the future, and publicly hosting papers as GitHub repositories that build into Docker containers ensures that future researchers can interact with code and data in the same computational environment used when carrying out the research. While virtual machines make isolated sections of hardware available, containers abstract protected parts of the operating system [32]. This makes containers smaller and more lightweight than full virtual machines, while still conferring the advantages of virtualisation.

For the Docker implementation here, portable R environments provided by the Rocker project [11] are used. These environments are agnostic regarding the host operating system, allowing the reader to reproduce the analyses featured here in a replica of the computational environment they were conducted in.

Building Docker containers is facilitated through a Dockerfile. This file instructs Docker to build a container with the appropriate version of R, the files required, and the correct package versions used during analysis. Below is the Dockerfile used to reproduce this thesis.

I first specify the Rocker image that will form the basis of the container. This includes the version of R required (version 4.4.1), the Rstudio Integrated Development Environment (IDE), Quarto, and the tidyverse package.

```
FROM rocker/version:4.4.1
```

Next, I add the files and folders required, including the Quarto document and related files, chapter folder, bibliography, additional scripts, LaTeX class file and template, the folders containing the cached models and raw data, and the R project file:

```
ADD thesis.qmd /home/rstudio/ADD _quarto.yml /home/rstudio/ADD chapters_quarto/
/home/rstudio/chapters_quarto/ADD thesis.bib /home/studio/ADD reformat_tex.R /home/stud
ADD finalise_thesis.R /home/rstudio/ADD helper_functions.R /home/rstudio/ADD uom_thesis
/home/rstudio/ADD main.tex /home/rstudio/ADD data/ /home/rstudio/data/ADD cache/
/home/rstudio/cache/ADD thesis.Rproj /home/rstudio/
```

Finally, I add the specific versions of the R packages used throughout the course of this thesis. For brevity, I only display the addition of the first three here:

```
RUN R -e "devtools::install_version('MASS', version = '7.3-60', dependencies = T)"
RUN R -e "devtools::install_version('buildmer', version = '2.10.1', dependencies
= T)"RUN R -e "devtools::install_version('emmeans', version = '1.8.8', dependencies
= T)"
```

3.5 Reproducibility In This Thesis

Reproducibility is a broad spectrum [42] (see Figure 3.5. As discussed above, even when code and data are provided, results are often not replicable, and this is before issues around poor research practice, inappropriate analysis, and dishonest science even rear their heads. While for most, the reproducibility crisis [36] crystallised in the early 2010s [41], concerns had been voiced since at least the late 1960s [46]. Since coming into the wider academic conscious, numerous studies have identified reasons for the crisis, ranging from poor practice (e.g Potti et al., 2006 [1]) to outright deception and fabrication (e.g the Woo-Suk Hwang scandal [48]). These issues led this project to strive for a gold standard [42] of reproducibility throughout. In this section, I detail how this was accomplished, and in doing so, expose my work to welcome critique.




Figure 3.5. Peng's (2011) Reproducibility Spectrum. This figure has been reproduced from Peng (2011) [42].

3.5.1 Sharing Data and Code

The open and public sharing of data and code facilitates external assessment [3, 26], secondary use of data [54], and guards against reproducibility issues [34]. Quite aside from external motivating factors, I found that developing and embedding the reproducibility practices described here have resulted in longer term savings in time and effort. Favouring a gold-standard reproducible approach is also a way of “paying it forward”; having come from a non-technical background, I found previous work that adhered to the same standard critical to learning and development. GitHub is used to host both this thesis and the papers associated with the project; links to these repositories can be found throughout. I favour permissive and lenient licencing, such as the MIT licence [55] for GitHub repositories and the CC-BY 4.0 license for pre-registrations. These enable future researchers to re-use data and code while providing clear guidance for appropriate use and facilitating long-term sustainability [24].

3.5.2 Executable Papers and Docker Containers

As detailed above, Quarto and Docker were used to produce executable journal/conference papers for each of the published works this thesis describes. For simplicity, all analyses from these papers have been repeated using up to date packages here. Accordingly, a single implementation of Docker to is provided to reproduce this thesis. All statistics have been checked against those provided in the original analyses, and repositories for the corresponding papers are provided complete with separate Docker implementations.[d]

3.5.3 Pre-Registration of Hypotheses and Analysis Plans

Often touted as a low-cost entry point into reproducible research practices [30], pre-registration is the practice of clarifying hypotheses and analysis plans prior to data collection. While this may not be able to prevent research fraud and QRPs entirely, it does lend credibility to the researcher [38]. All hypotheses and analysis plans were pre-registered with the Open Science Framework [37]. Pre-registrations are embargoed by the research team prior to data collection, and then made public in a frozen state following publication of the corresponding research. Deviations from registered analysis plans are detailed in the methods sections of the corresponding experiments.

3.5.4 Experimental Resources

Everything needed to run each experiment is included in the corresponding GitLab repository. Links to these repositories are also provided in the sections concerning each experiment.

Chapter 4

Experiment 1: https://gitlab.pavlovia.org/Strain/exp_uniform_adjustments

Experiment 2: https://gitlab.pavlovia.org/Strain/exp_spatially_dependent

Chapter 5

Experiment 3: https://gitlab.pavlovia.org/Strain/exp_size_only

Chapter 6

Experiment 4: https://gitlab.pavlovia.org/Strain/size_and_opacity_additive_exp

Chapter 7

Experiment 5 Pre-Study: https://gitlab.pavlovia.org/Strain/beliefs_scatterplots_pretest

Experiment 5 Main Study (Group A): https://gitlab.pavlovia.org/Strain/atypical_scatterplots_main_a

Experiment 5 Main Study (Group B): https://gitlab.pavlovia.org/Strain/atypical_scatterplots_main_t

3.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have established the broad methodological approach taken by this thesis. This project sought to investigate novel ways of visualising data and their effects on perception and cognition. I have provided justifications for the designs used, the methodological challenges faced, and how the use of a broad array of tools and techniques was able to overcome these challenges. Throughout, I have detailed how I have learnt from my mistakes. Open research and reproducibility is at the core of the work described here, and I hope this thesis can serve as an example for future work facing similar challenges and with similar commitments to open science. To this end, I have produced a template to facilitate future reproducible theses. We satisfy FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable) data principles [58] through public sharing of data and code, literate programming, and containerisation.

Chapter 4

Adjusting the Opacities of Scatterplot Points Can Affect Correlation Estimates

4.1 Abstract

4.2 Preface: Learning From an Early Pilot Study

4.3 Introduction

4.3.1 Overview

4.4 Related Work

4.4.1 Transparency, Contrast, Opacity, and Formal Definitions

4.4.2 Effects of Point Opacity on Correlation Estimation

4.5 Experiment 1: Uniform Opacity Adjustments

4.5.1 Introduction

4.5.2 Methods

4.5.3 Analysis

4.5.4 Discussion

4.6 Experiment 2: Spatially-Dependent Opacity Adjustments

4.6.1 Introduction

4.6.2 Methods

4.6.3 Analysis

Chapter 5

Adjusting the Sizes of Scatterplot Points Can Correct for a Historic Correlation Underestimation Bias

5.1 Abstract

5.2 Overview

5.3 Related Work

5.3.1 Size and Perception

5.3.2 Scatterplot Point Size and Correlation Perception

5.4 Experiment: Adjusting Point Size to Facilitate More Accurate Correlation Perception in Scatterplots

5.4.1 Introduction

5.4.2 Methods

5.4.3 Analysis

5.4.4 Discussion

5.5 General Discussion

Chapter 6

Interactions of Opacity and Size Adjustments

6.1 Abstract

6.2 Overview

6.3 Related Work

6.3.1 Size and Opacity

6.4 Experiment: Adjusting Point Size and Opacity Together

6.4.1 Introduction

6.4.2 Methods

6.4.3 Analysis

6.4.4 Discussion

6.5 General Discussion

Chapter 7

Visual Features Affecting Perceptual Estimates Also Affect Beliefs About Correlations

7.1 Abstract

7.2 Overview

7.3 Related Work

7.3.1 From Perception to Cognition

7.3.2 From Cognition to Belief

7.4 Pre-Study: Investigating Beliefs About Relatedness Statements

7.4.1 Introduction

7.4.2 Methods

7.4.3 Analysis

7.4.4 Discussion

7.5 Experiment: Potential for Belief Change Using Atypical Scatterplots

7.5.1 Introduction

7.5.2 Methods

7.5.3 Analysis

7.5.4 Discussion

Chapter 8

Conclusion

8.1 Main Findings

8.2 Relationship to Prior Work

8.3 Reproducibility

8.4 Contributions

8.5 Implications

8.5.1 For Design

8.5.2 For Society

8.6 Limitations

8.7 Future Directions

8.8 Closing Remarks

References

- [1] Potti A, Dressman Hk, Bild A, Riedel Rf, Chan G, Sayer R, Cragun J, Cottrill H, Kelley Mj, Petersen R, Harpole D, Marks J, Berchuck A, Ginsburg Gs, Febbo P, Lancaster J, and Nevins Jr. “Genomic Signatures to Guide the Use of Chemotherapeutics”. In: *Nature medicine* 12.11 (Nov. 2006). ISSN: 1078-8956. DOI: 10.1038/nm1491. (Visited on 10/10/2024) (cited on p. 24).
- [2] JJ Allaire and Christophe Dervieux. *Quarto: R Interface to 'quarto' Markdown Publishing System*. Manual. 2024 (cited on p. 23).
- [3] George Alter and Richard Gonzalez. “Responsible Practices for Data Sharing”. In: *The American psychologist* 73.2 (2018), pp. 146–156. ISSN: 0003-066X. DOI: 10.1037/amp0000258. (Visited on 10/10/2024) (cited on p. 25).
- [4] Alexander L. Anwyl-Irvine, Jessica Massonnié, Adam Flitton, Natasha Kirkham, and Jo K. Evershed. “Gorilla in Our Midst: An Online Behavioral Experiment Builder”. In: *Behavior Research Methods* 52.1 (Feb. 2020), pp. 388–407. ISSN: 1554-3528. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-019-01237-x. (Visited on 10/03/2024) (cited on p. 17).
- [5] Antonio A. Arechar, Simon Gächter, and Lucas Molleman. “Conducting Interactive Experiments Online”. In: *Experimental Economics* 21.1 (Mar. 2018), pp. 99–131. ISSN: 1573-6938. DOI: 10.1007/s10683-017-9527-2. (Visited on 10/04/2024) (cited on p. 17).
- [6] Paul Ayris, Isabel Bernal, Valentino Cavalli, Bertil Dorch, Jeannette Frey, Martin Hallik, Kistiina Hormia-Poutanen, Ignasi Labastida i Juan, John MacColl, Agnès Ponsati Obiols, Simone Sacchi, Frank Scholze, Birgit Schmidt, Anja Smit, Adam Sofronijevic, Jadranka Stojanovski, Martin Svoboda, Giannis Tsakonas, Matthijs van Otegem, Astrid Verheusen, Andris Vilks, Wilhelm Widmark, and Wolfram Horstmann. “LIBER Open Science Roadmap”. In: (July 2018). DOI: 10.20350/digitalCSIC/15061. (Visited on 09/13/2023) (cited on p. 17).
- [7] Dale J. Barr, Roger Levy, Christoph Scheepers, and Harry J. Tily. “Random Effects Structure for Confirmatory Hypothesis Testing: Keep It Maximal”. In: *Journal of memory and language* 68.3 (Apr. 2013), 10.1016/j.jml.2012.11.001. ISSN: 0749-596X. DOI: 10.1016/j.jml.2012.11.001. (Visited on 08/23/2022) (cited on p. 21).
- [8] Douglas Bates, Reinhold Kliegl, Shravan Vasishth, and Harald Baayen. *Parsimonious Mixed Models*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.04967v2>. 2018. (Visited on 10/09/2024) (cited on p. 21).

- [9] Mattan S. Ben-Shachar, Daniel Lüdtke, and Dominique Makowski. “effectsize: Estimation of Effect Size Indices and Standardized Parameters”. In: *Journal of Open Source Software* 5.56 (2020), p. 2815. DOI: 10.21105/joss.02815 (cited on p. 22).
- [10] Carl Boettiger. “An Introduction to Docker for Reproducible Research”. In: *SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.* 49.1 (Jan. 2015), pp. 71–79. ISSN: 0163-5980. DOI: 10.1145/2723872.2723882. (Visited on 10/09/2024) (cited on p. 23).
- [11] Carl Boettiger and Dirk Eddelbuettel. “An Introduction to Rocker: Docker Containers for R”. In: *The R Journal* 9.2 (2017), p. 527. ISSN: 2073-4859. DOI: 10.32614/RJ-2017-065. (Visited on 10/16/2024) (cited on p. 24).
- [12] David Bridges, Alain Pitiot, Michael R. MacAskill, and Jonathan W. Peirce. “The Timing Mega-Study: Comparing a Range of Experiment Generators, Both Lab-Based and Online”. In: *PeerJ* 8 (July 2020), e9414. ISSN: 2167-8359. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.9414. (Visited on 10/03/2024) (cited on p. 17).
- [13] Violet A. Brown. “An Introduction to Linear Mixed-Effects Modeling in R”. In: *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science* 4.1 (Jan. 2021), p. 2515245920960351. ISSN: 2515-2459. DOI: 10.1177/2515245920960351. (Visited on 10/08/2024) (cited on pp. 20, 21).
- [14] Marc Brysbaert. “How Many Participants Do We Have to Include in Properly Powered Experiments? A Tutorial of Power Analysis with Reference Tables”. In: *Journal of cognition* 2.1 (2019) (cited on p. 18).
- [15] Nick Charalambides. *We Recently Went Viral on TikTok - Here’s What We Learned*. <https://www.prolific.com/resources/we-recently-went-viral-on-tiktok-heres-what-we-learned>. Aug. 2021. (Visited on 10/04/2024) (cited on p. 18).
- [16] Gary Charness, Uri Gneezy, and Michael A. Kuhn. “Experimental Methods: Between-subject and within-Subject Design”. In: *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 81.1 (Jan. 2012), pp. 1–8. ISSN: 0167-2681. DOI: 10.1016/j.jebo.2011.08.009. (Visited on 10/14/2024) (cited on p. 16).
- [17] Rune H. B. Christensen. *Ordinal—Regression Models for Ordinal Data*. Manual. 2023 (cited on p. 20).
- [18] Christian Collberg and Todd A. Proebsting. “Repeatability in Computer Systems Research”. In: *Communications of the ACM* 59.3 (Feb. 2016), pp. 62–69. ISSN: 0001-0782, 1557-7317. DOI: 10.1145/2812803. (Visited on 10/09/2024) (cited on p. 23).
- [19] Benjamin D. Douglas, Patrick J. Ewell, and Markus Brauer. “Data Quality in Online Human-Subjects Research: Comparisons between MTurk, Prolific, CloudResearch, Qualtrics, and SONA”. In: *PLOS ONE* 18.3 (Mar. 2023), e0279720. ISSN: 1932-6203. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0279720. (Visited on 10/04/2024) (cited on p. 18).

- [20] *E-Prime*. Psychology Software Tools. 2020 (cited on p. 17).
- [21] Naoyasu Hirao, Koyo Koizumi, Hanako Ikeda, and Hideki Ohira. “Reliability of Online Surveys in Investigating Perceptions and Impressions of Faces”. In: *Frontiers in Psychology* 12 (Sept. 2021). ISSN: 1664-1078. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.733405. (Visited on 10/04/2024) (cited on p. 17).
- [22] Daniel T. Holmes, Mahdi Mobini, and Christopher R. McCudden. “Reproducible Manuscript Preparation with RMarkdown Application to JMSACL and Other Elsevier Journals”. In: *Journal of Mass Spectrometry and Advances in the Clinical Lab* 22 (Nov. 2021), pp. 8–16. ISSN: 2667145X. DOI: 10.1016/j.jmsacl.2021.09.002. (Visited on 10/09/2024) (cited on p. 23).
- [23] Byron Jaeger. *R2glmm: Computes R Squared for Mixed (Multilevel) Models*. Manual. 2017 (cited on p. 22).
- [24] Rafael C. Jiménez, Mateusz Kuzak, Monther Alhamdoosh, Michelle Barker, Bérénice Batut, Mikael Borg, Salvador Capella-Gutierrez, Neil Chue Hong, Martin Cook, Manuel Corpas, Madison Flannery, Leyla Garcia, Josep Ll Gelpí, Simon Gladman, Carole Goble, Montserrat González Ferreiro, Alejandra Gonzalez-Beltran, Philippa C. Griffin, Björn Grüning, Jonas Hagberg, Petr Holub, Rob Hooft, Jon Ison, Daniel S. Katz, Brane Leskošek, Federico López Gómez, Luis J. Oliveira, David Mellor, Rowland Mosbergen, Nicola Mulder, Yasset Perez-Riverol, Robert Pergl, Horst Pichler, Bernard Pope, Ferran Sanz, Maria V. Schneider, Victoria Stodden, Radosław Suchecki, Radka Svobodová Vařeková, Harry-Anton Talvik, Ilian Todorov, Andrew Treloar, Sonika Tyagi, Maarten van Gompel, Daniel Vaughan, Allegra Via, Xiaochuan Wang, Nathan S. Watson-Haigh, and Steve Crouch. *Four Simple Recommendations to Encourage Best Practices in Research Software*. June 2017. DOI: 10.12688/f1000research.11407.1. F1000Research: 6:876. (Visited on 10/15/2024) (cited on p. 25).
- [25] Evan Kleiman. *EMAtools: Data Management Tools for Real-Time Monitoring/Ecological Momentary Assessment Data*. Manual. 2021 (cited on p. 22).
- [26] Olivier Klein, Tom E. Hardwicke, Frederik Aust, Johannes Breuer, Henrik Danielsson, Alicia Hofelich Mohr, Hans IJzerman, Gustav Nilsson, Wolf Vanpaemel, and Michael C. Frank. “A Practical Guide for Transparency in Psychological Science”. In: *Collabra: Psychology* 4.1 (June 2018). Ed. by Michéle Nuijten and Simine Vazire, p. 20. ISSN: 2474-7394. DOI: 10.1525/collabra.158. (Visited on 10/10/2024) (cited on p. 25).
- [27] Friedrich Leisch. “Sweave, Part I: Mixing R and LaTeX”. In: *R News* 2.3 (Dec. 2002), pp. 28–31. ISSN: 1609-3631. (Visited on 10/09/2024) (cited on p. 23).
- [28] Russell V. Lenth. *Emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, Aka Least-Squares Means*. Manual. 2024 (cited on p. 20).

- [29] Torrin M. Liddell and John K. Kruschke. “Analyzing Ordinal Data with Metric Models: What Could Possibly Go Wrong?” In: *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 79 (Nov. 2018), pp. 328–348. ISSN: 0022-1031. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2018.08.009. (Visited on 09/03/2024) (cited on p. 20).
- [30] Jennifer M. Logg and Charles A. Dorison. “Pre-Registration: Weighing Costs and Benefits for Researchers”. In: *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 167 (Nov. 2021), pp. 18–27. ISSN: 0749-5978. DOI: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2021.05.006. (Visited on 10/10/2024) (cited on p. 25).
- [31] John MacFarlane. *Pandoc*. <https://pandoc.org/index.html>. (Visited on 10/09/2024) (cited on p. 23).
- [32] Dirk Merkel. “Docker: Lightweight Linux Containers for Consistent Development and Deployment”. In: *Linux J.* 2014.239 (Mar. 2014), 2:2. ISSN: 1075-3583 (cited on p. 23).
- [33] Lotte Meteyard and Robert A. I. Davies. “Best Practice Guidance for Linear Mixed-Effects Models in Psychological Science”. In: *Journal of Memory and Language* 112 (June 2020), p. 104092. ISSN: 0749-596X. DOI: 10.1016/j.jml.2020.104092. (Visited on 10/09/2024) (cited on p. 22).
- [34] Tsuyoshi Miyakawa. “No Raw Data, No Science: Another Possible Source of the Reproducibility Crisis”. In: *Molecular Brain* 13.1 (Feb. 2020), p. 24. ISSN: 1756-6606. DOI: 10.1186/s13041-020-0552-2. (Visited on 10/10/2024) (cited on p. 25).
- [35] Shinichi Nakagawa and Holger Schielzeth. “A General and Simple Method for Obtaining R² from Generalized Linear Mixed-Effects Models”. In: *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 4.2 (2013), pp. 133–142. ISSN: 2041-210X. DOI: 10.1111/j.2041-210x.2012.00261.x. (Visited on 09/07/2023) (cited on p. 22).
- [36] Open Science Collaboration. “Estimating the Reproducibility of Psychological Science”. In: *Science* 349.6251 (Aug. 2015), aac4716. DOI: 10.1126/science.aac4716. (Visited on 10/10/2024) (cited on p. 24).
- [37] *OSF*. <https://osf.io/>. (Visited on 10/10/2024) (cited on p. 25).
- [38] Joseph P. Simmons, Leif D. Nelson, and Uri Simonsohn. “Pre-Registration: Why and How”. In: *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 31.1 (2021), pp. 151–162. ISSN: 1532-7663. DOI: 10.1002/jcpy.1208. (Visited on 10/10/2024) (cited on p. 25).
- [39] Eyal Peer, David Rothschild, Andrew Gordon, Zak Evernden, and Ekaterina Damer. “Data Quality of Platforms and Panels for Online Behavioral Research”. In: *Behavior Research Methods* 54.4 (Sept. 2021), pp. 1643–1662. ISSN: 1554-3528. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-021-01694-3. (Visited on 07/05/2022) (cited on p. 18).

- [40] Jonathan Peirce, Jeremy R. Gray, Sol Simpson, Michael MacAskill, Richard Höchenberger, Hiroyuki Sogo, Erik Kastman, and Jonas Kristoffer Lindeløv. “PsychoPy2: Experiments in Behavior Made Easy”. In: *Behavior Research Methods* 51.1 (Feb. 2019), pp. 195–203. ISSN: 1554-3528. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-018-01193-y (cited on p. 17).
- [41] Roger Peng. “The Reproducibility Crisis in Science: A Statistical Counterattack”. In: *Significance* 12.3 (2015), pp. 30–32. ISSN: 1740-9713. DOI: 10.1111/j.1740-9713.2015.00827.x. (Visited on 10/10/2024) (cited on p. 24).
- [42] Roger D. Peng. “Reproducible Research in Computational Science”. In: *Science* 334.6060 (Dec. 2011), pp. 1226–1227. DOI: 10.1126/science.1213847. (Visited on 10/09/2024) (cited on pp. 24, 25).
- [43] Stephen R Piccolo and Michael B Frampton. “Tools and Techniques for Computational Reproducibility”. In: *GigaScience* 5.1 (Dec. 2016), s13742-016-0135–4. ISSN: 2047-217X. DOI: 10.1186/s13742-016-0135-4. (Visited on 10/09/2024) (cited on p. 23).
- [44] Benjamin Prissé and Diego Jorrat. “Lab vs Online Experiments: No Differences”. In: *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* 100 (Oct. 2022), p. 101910. ISSN: 2214-8043. DOI: 10.1016/j.socec.2022.101910. (Visited on 10/04/2024) (cited on p. 17).
- [45] *Prolific.Co*. Prolific. 2024 (cited on p. 18).
- [46] Felipe Romero. “Philosophy of Science and the Replicability Crisis”. In: *Philosophy Compass* 14.11 (2019), e12633. ISSN: 1747-9991. DOI: 10.1111/phc3.12633. (Visited on 10/10/2024) (cited on p. 24).
- [47] Sheeba Samuel and Daniel Mietchen. “Computational Reproducibility of Jupyter Notebooks from Biomedical Publications”. In: *GigaScience* 13 (Jan. 2024), giad113. ISSN: 2047-217X. DOI: 10.1093/gigascience/giad113. (Visited on 10/09/2024) (cited on p. 23).
- [48] R. Saunders and J. Savulescu. “Research Ethics and Lessons from Hwanggate: What Can We Learn from the Korean Cloning Fraud?” In: *Journal of Medical Ethics* 34.3 (Mar. 2008), pp. 214–221. ISSN: 1473-4257. DOI: 10.1136/jme.2007.023721 (cited on p. 24).
- [49] Holger Schielzeth, Niels J. Dingemanse, Shinichi Nakagawa, David F. Westneat, Hassen Allegeue, Céline Teplitsky, Denis Réale, Ned A. Dochtermann, László Zsolt Garamszegi, and Yimén G. Araya-Ajoy. “Robustness of Linear Mixed-Effects Models to Violations of Distributional Assumptions”. In: *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 11.9 (2020), pp. 1141–1152. ISSN: 2041-210X. DOI: 10.1111/2041-210X.13434. (Visited on 11/29/2023) (cited on p. 20).
- [50] Henrik Singmann and David Kellen. “An Introduction to Mixed Models for Experimental Psychology”. In: *New Methods in Cognitive Psychology*. Routledge, 2019, pp. 4–31 (cited on p. 20).

- [51] Gabriel Strain, Andrew J. Stewart, Paul Warren, and Caroline Jay. “Adjusting Point Size to Facilitate More Accurate Correlation Perception in Scatterplots”. In: *2023 IEEE Vis X Vision*. Melbourne, Australia: IEEE, Oct. 2023, pp. 1–5. ISBN: 9798350329841. DOI: 10.1109/VisXVision60716.2023.00006. (Visited on 02/15/2024) (cited on p. 14).
- [52] Gabriel Strain, Andrew J. Stewart, Paul Warren, and Caroline Jay. “The Effects of Contrast on Correlation Perception in Scatterplots”. In: *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 176 (Aug. 2023), p. 103040. ISSN: 1071-5819. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhcs.2023.103040. (Visited on 04/11/2023) (cited on p. 14).
- [53] Gabriel Strain, Andrew J. Stewart, Paul A. Warren, and Caroline Jay. “Effects of Point Size and Opacity Adjustments in Scatterplots”. In: *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. CHI ’24. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, May 2024, pp. 1–13. ISBN: 9798400703300. DOI: 10.1145/3613904.3642127. (Visited on 05/29/2024) (cited on p. 14).
- [54] Tsaone Tamuhla, Eddie T Lulamba, Themba Mutemaringa, and Nicki Tiffin. “Multiple Modes of Data Sharing Can Facilitate Secondary Use of Sensitive Health Data for Research”. In: *BMJ Global Health* 8.10 (Oct. 2023), e013092. ISSN: 2059-7908. DOI: 10.1136/bmjgh-2023-013092. (Visited on 10/10/2024) (cited on p. 25).
- [55] *The MIT License*. <https://opensource.org/license/mit>. (Visited on 10/15/2024) (cited on p. 25).
- [56] Ana Trisovic, Matthew K. Lau, Thomas Pasquier, and Mercè Crosas. “A Large-Scale Study on Research Code Quality and Execution”. In: *Scientific Data* 9.1 (Feb. 2022), p. 60. ISSN: 2052-4463. DOI: 10.1038/s41597-022-01143-6. (Visited on 10/09/2024) (cited on p. 23).
- [57] Cesko C. Voeten. *Buildmer: Stepwise Elimination and Term Reordering for Mixed-Effects Regression*. Manual. 2023 (cited on p. 21).
- [58] Mark D. Wilkinson, Michel Dumontier, IJsbrand Jan Aalbersberg, Gabrielle Appleton, Myles Axton, Arie Baak, Niklas Blomberg, Jan-Willem Boiten, Luiz Bonino da Silva Santos, Philip E. Bourne, Jildau Bouwman, Anthony J. Brookes, Tim Clark, Mercè Crosas, Ingrid Dillo, Olivier Dumon, Scott Edmunds, Chris T. Evelo, Richard Finkers, Alejandra Gonzalez-Beltran, Alasdair J. G. Gray, Paul Groth, Carole Goble, Jeffrey S. Grethe, Jaap Heringa, Peter A. C. ’t Hoen, Rob Hooft, Tobias Kuhn, Ruben Kok, Joost Kok, Scott J. Lusher, Maryann E. Martone, Albert Mons, Abel L. Packer, Bengt Persson, Philippe Rocca-Serra, Marco Roos, Rene van Schaik, Susanna-Assunta Sansone, Erik Schultes, Thierry Sengstag, Ted Slater, George Strawn, Morris A. Swertz, Mark Thompson, Johan van der Lei, Erik van Mulligen, Jan Velterop, Andra Waagmeester, Peter Wittenburg, Katherine Wolstencroft, Jun Zhao, and Barend Mons. “The FAIR Guiding Principles for Scientific Data Management and Stewardship”. In: *Scientific Data* 3 (2016). DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2016.18. (Visited on 10/10/2024) (cited on p. 26).

- [59] Yihui Xie. *Dynamic Documents with R and Knitr*. 2nd ed. Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2015 (cited on p. 23).
- [60] Yihui Xie, Christophe Dervieux, and Emily Riederer. *R Markdown Cookbook*. Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2020. ISBN: 978-0-367-56383-7 (cited on p. 23).

Appendices

Appendix A

First appendix

A.1 Section in Appendix