

Week 14 Lecture - Replication and Transparency

Undergraduate Research Methods in Psychology

Quinton Quagliano, M.S., C.S.P

Department of Psychology

Ta	Table of Contents			
1	Learning Objectives21.1 Textbook Objectives21.2 Professor's Objectives2			
2	Chapter Overview22.1 Chapter Overview			
3	Replication 2 3.1 Overview 2 3.2 Types of Replication 3 3.2.1 Direct 3 3.2.2 Conceptual 3 3.2.3 Replication and Extension 3 3.3 Real Projects 4 3.3.1 One Study, Many Labs 4 3.3.2 Many Studies, Many Labs 4 3.3.3 When It Doesn't Work 4 3.4 Meta-analysis 5 3.4.1 Strengths and Limitations 5 3.5 In Popular Culture 5			
4	Transparency and Credibility 4.1 Overview 6 4.2 Questionable Practices 6 4.2.1 Under-report Null Findings 6 4.2.2 HARKing 6 4.2.3 P-hacking 7 4.3 Transparent Practices 7 4.3.1 Open Data and Open Materials 7 4.3.2 Preregistration 7			
5	When Do We Need (Really) External Validity85.1 Overview85.2 Generalization to Other People85.3 Generalization to Other Settings85.4 Do We Always Need to Generalize95.4.1 Theory-testing Mode95.4.2 Generalization Mode95.5 Do We Always Need to be in the Real World?9			

1 Learning Objectives

1.1 Textbook Objectives

- Explain why it is essential for a study to be replicated.
- Describe why transparent research practices help ensure credible science.
- Evaluate, in a nuanced way, a study's quality in the context of scientific progress and external validity

1.2 Professor's Objectives

 Appreciate science as an ongoing and continuous process of improvement, guided by replication

2 Chapter Overview

2.1 Chapter Overview

As we'v	e learned over the course of this class	9	of scientific work
can lool	a lot of different ways.		_
	, valid studies are those that provide epresents a real effect, change, or d		that a tluke.
	the best ways tongs can be produced again under th	our evidence is to o	

3 Replication

3.1 Overview

•	Replication is a subtype of	validity, where we determine whether
	a finding can be reproduced or if it appears to	be a statistical anomaly
•	Recall: Our findings are often judged against of some room for "random	lpha=0.05, which means we do leave ."

•	Often, we evaluate as being of core importance to a study's value - because we want to know if the results tell a consistent story
3.2	Types of Replication
•	"Replication" is a fairly loose term, and actually applies to many scientific
•	We may separate study replications into a few different types
3.2.1	Direct
•	This is the type of replication, where we attempt to largely keep all factors, measures, and circumstances consistent with the original study
•	It is, of course, done on a new, but from the same theoretical population.
•	Design issues are forward in direct replications, as we attempt to stay largely the same (even when that may be a bad thing)
•	Example: Imagine if I re-did the Harlow Monkey study exactly the same way Harlow did it.
3.2.2	Conceptual
•	Our central hypothesis stays the same as the study, but we may change minor procedures, designs, and how we operationalize our latent constructs
•	This can be a useful way to some glaring validity issues in an original study and do a more refined investigation
•	However, it should be viewed critically as a version of the original, so corrections to the original's effects may not be as cleare
•	Example: Harlow's Monkey's again, but this time I've changed the food with the wire mother to be more appealing and I have turned up the heating element on the felt mother just a little bit more
3.2.3	Replication and Extension
•	In this type, we add conditions or variables to add more nuance and context to findings.

 Such procedures cou other relevant outcom 			, or just present
 Like any replication, t study, and also add th 	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	the finding mation at the same time	s of the original
 Examples: Harlow's M see if their behavior d 	•	ad, I am also going to add ba	aby gorillas in to
3.3 Real Projects			
A replication effort/proconsuming and	oject can look diff	erent ways, but is almost al	ways very time-
 It is beneficial to have an effect to reduce the 	·	and sets of reseangle experimenter's bias affe	•
3.3.1 One Study, Many L	abs		
 In this scenario, one reto a single central 	esearch lab "leads'	numerous other labs in appland research design.	ying replications
Then, all labs' their convergence or		looked together at once an	nd examined for
 Because the scope of focused on just one of extent, conceptual rep 	riginal study, we a	tends to be veryare more likely to see direct	and and, to a lesser
3.3.2 Many Studies, Man	y Labs		
This is largely an broader issue or topic		of the above type, where we studies within that area.	now focus on a
of conceptual and e	xtension replicati	approaching a hypothesis ons, to see how different significant findings (or not)	-
3.3.3 When It Doesn't W	ork		
 Some replications find study! 		or even opposite results	from the original

•	• One possibility is that the two studies differ in some notable,way, i.e., if you change many things, it is no surprise that the results are different		
•	Or, either the or original study is flawed or a fluke		
•	So what next? Replicate some more! - A single replication likely to not be sufficient to full dissuade the scientific audience from the origin finding.		
3.4	Meta-analysis		
•	Instead of embarking on running many replications ourselves, we may choose summarize the existing evidence.	to	
•	We have previously learned about reviews, where we attent to synthesize many original studies and replications to describe the state of the science in an area	-	
•	-analyses quantitatively averages results across many simistudies to determine an aggregate/composite average.	ilar	
•	The averaging can be done with any of effect size, such Cohen's d and r.	as	
3.4.1	Strengths and Limitations		
•	Meta-analyses can be an way to give a summary of certarea with a clear number, informing future researchers of the state of the science that time.		
•	However, thislives and dies by its attention to detail and find all relevant studies.	ing	
•	Especially, null findings may be subject to the "drawer proble and may be obscured from being collected and aggregated.	m",	
3.5	In Popular Culture		
•	Rarely, does popular journalism adequately capture thea changing nature of science.	ınd	
•	Journalism is also partially drawn to and new research, but m give less emphasis to historical, but still relevant, studies.	ıay	

•	In general, it is much better to start with a peer-remediate meta-analysis or literature review new area.	_
4	Transparency and Credibility	
4.1	Overview	
•	Even well-meaning scientists (and malicious actors) can make truthfully reporting results	in
•	It should always be our goal to makedesigns - not making changes just for beneficial results.	driven predictions and
•	We have a variety of questionable practices to practices to try to stick to which aid in reproducability	and transparent
4.2	Questionable Practices	
4.2.1	L Under-report Null Findings	
•	"Real" research tends to involve more than one outcome vasometimes more than one	ariable of interest, and
•	But, some authors may downplay many null on the shiny significant findings.	in favor of focusing
•	This creates a narrative of importance findings, when the majority of evidence in a study actually po	and reproducability of pints to the contrary.
4.2.2	2 HARKing	
•	This stands for "Hypothesis After Results are	17
•	Generally, we want to make predictions and hypothese and analyses	es prior to our data
•	As a general ethical rule, it is bad to say "I knew it all along!" literature driven.	" - as it is not theory or

4.2.3 P-ha	acking
------------	--------

	ultiple analysis methods are d, and usually only the final		a signifi-
•	oorting null findings, this ten tate otherwise weak findings		contrary
Early decisions on foremost by	design, hypotheses, and an	alyses need to be gui	ded first-and-
4.3 Transparent Pi	actices		
• Tostrategies to increas	the previous, questiona	•	ay use a few
•	" methods intentionally mal pader public - but this is good		to wide
4.3.1 Open Data and C	pen Materials		
• Open re-analyzed by anyo	is when we publicly one to ensure results were c	share anonymized dat orrect	a that can be
Open materials pro- any	vide all in-depth procedures	, measures, and tools	to be used in
Both of these may be a second to the se	oe posted on repositories like	https://github.com or	https://osf.io
4.3.2 Preregistration			
 As previously ment hypothesis and plar 	ioned, this is the astudy		nent of one's

• Doing this helps discourage any desire to HARK or p-hack, as any interested party

could easily point out that you changed your future analysis.

5 When Do We Need (Really) External Validity

5.1	Overview			
•	Replication (especially spread and generalizable e) can help us establish just how wide just our original sample of individuals	
•	As we people and contexts they c		we are able to better see just wha	t
•	External validity is one of validities - therefore we mu		and difficult to establish calance our priorities with it	1
5.2	Generalization to Ot	her People		
•	Remember that our sample chose, not just everyone in		population that we	9
•	Samples are primarily stro size!	ng by virtue of the	ir, not only thei	r
•	Samples can be easily the impact that it is likely to		by convenience - think carefully abou	t
•	Results may not generalize this is vitally important to us		, but we must consider whethe	r
5.3	Generalization to Ot	her Settings		
•	Many world" settings	-based studies ma -	ay benefit from replication in more "rea	l-
•	On the other hand, we may be havior within the confines of		if we can isolate a	be
•	More broadly, we likely als geographic and		e how our studies look outside of the ney are conducted.	9

5.4 Do We Always Need to Generalize

5.4.1	Theory-testing Mode		
	This is the "first" stage, where we att theory accurately under more controlle	·	
	We work knowing external validity is _ lish other strong validity.	, but taking care to estab-	
•	In this scenario, often	validity is treated as most important.	
•	Association and	claims usually work in a "theory-testing" mode	
5.4.2	Generalization Mode		
•	claims more often aim to be widely applicable and relevant.		
•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	emphasis on making sure theories have strongess focus on internal, like when theory-testing	
•		sub-discipline almost entirely determined to nd similarities, working in generalization mode	
5.5	Do We Always Need to be in	the Real World?	
	Valuable research happens in completely ecological (i.e., the "real w	setting, both lab-controlled, and orld")!	
	Researchers in these separate settin mutual shared knowledge.	g often greatly from the	