Foody et al. (2013)	Unpublished direct replication (thesis experiment 10)	Confounds common to both

START

Should Foody et al.'s (2013) results be accepted as presented?

Yes → Weak/mixed evidence
- 1/3 outcomes significant

→ No evidence
- 0/3 outcomes significant

No ↓

Is it adequate to merely correct Foody et al.'s (2013) *p* values for multiple comparisons?

Yes → No evidence
- 0/3 outcomes significant

→ No evidence
- 0/3 outcomes significant

No ↓

Instead, recalculate effect sizes from the summary statistics.

Should we consider the three outcomes separately or create a single pooled outcome variable?

Single pooled → No evidence
- 0/1 outcomes significant, regardless of whether we assume the reported intervals are 95%CIs or SEMs

→ No evidence
- 0/1 outcomes significant, regardless of whether intervals are 95%CIs or SEMs

Separate ↓

Do we assume the intervals reported in Foody et al.'s (2013) plots are 95% CIs or SEMs?

SEM → No evidence
- 0/3 outcomes significant

→ No evidence
- 0/3 outcomes significant

95% CI → Weak/mixed evidence
- 2/3 outcomes significant
- Outcomes do not differ significantly from one another
- Implausibly large effect sizes

→ Weak/mixed evidence
- 1/3 outcomes significant
- Outcomes do not differ significantly from one another

→ Results confounded by regression to the mean