Foody et al. (2013)	Foody's unpublished direct replication (thesis experiment 10)	Confounds common to both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 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 →

Is is appropriate to create a single pooled outcome variable to test the general claim?

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

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

No →

Were the intervals reported in Foody et al.'s (2013) plots 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 did not differ significantly from one another
- Implausibly large effect sizes

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

→ Results confounded by regression to the mean