



---

# **Week 14 Lecture - Replication and Transparency**

Undergraduate Research Methods in Psychology

---

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

Department of Psychology

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Learning Objectives</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Textbook Objectives . . . . .	2
1.2	Professor's Objectives . . . . .	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Chapter Overview</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Chapter Overview . . . . .	2
<b>3</b>	<b>Replication</b>	<b>2</b>
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
<b>4</b>	<b>Transparency and Credibility</b>	<b>6</b>
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
<b>5</b>	<b>When Do We Need (Really) External Validity</b>	<b>8</b>
5.1	Overview . . . . .	8
5.2	Generalization to Other People . . . . .	8
5.3	Generalization to Other Settings . . . . .	8
5.4	Do We Always Need to Generalize . . . . .	9
5.4.1	Theory-testing Mode . . . . .	9
5.4.2	Generalization Mode . . . . .	9
5.5	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've learned over the course of this class, \_\_\_\_\_ of scientific work can look a lot of different ways.
- In short, valid studies are those that provide enough \_\_\_\_\_ that a finding represents a real effect, change, or description - not some fluke.
- One of the best ways to \_\_\_\_\_ our evidence is to demonstrate that our findings can be produced again under the same or similar conditions.

# 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  $\alpha = 0.05$ , which means we do leave some room for "random \_\_\_\_\_."
-

- 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 clear
- *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 could reveal \_\_\_\_\_ and mediators, or just present other relevant outcomes for convergence
- Like any replication, this type may \_\_\_\_\_ the findings of the original study, and also add their own new information at the same time
- *Examples:* Harlow's Monkeys, but instead, I am also going to add baby gorillas in to see if their behavior differs.

### 3.3 Real Projects

- A replication effort/project can look different ways, but is almost always very time-consuming and \_\_\_\_\_.
- It is beneficial to have multiple \_\_\_\_\_ and sets of researchers replicate an effect to reduce the chance that a single experimenter's bias affects results.

#### 3.3.1 One Study, Many Labs

- In this scenario, one research lab "leads" numerous other labs in applying replications to a single central \_\_\_\_\_ and research design.
- Then, all labs' \_\_\_\_\_ are looked together at once and examined for their convergence or divergence.
- Because the scope of such an effort tends to be very \_\_\_\_\_ and focused on just one original study, we are more likely to see direct and, to a lesser extent, conceptual replications.

#### 3.3.2 Many Studies, Many Labs

- This is largely an \_\_\_\_\_ of the above type, where we now focus on a broader issue or topic and try different studies within that area.
- A project such as this adds value by approaching a hypothesis with a variety of conceptual and extension replications, to see how different outcomes and \_\_\_\_\_ may contribute to significant findings (or not)

#### 3.3.3 When It Doesn't Work

- Some replications find \_\_\_\_\_ or even opposite results from the original study!
-

- 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 is likely to not be sufficient to full dissuade the scientific audience from the original finding.

### 3.4 Meta-analysis

- Instead of embarking on running many replications ourselves, we may choose to \_\_\_\_\_ summarize the existing evidence.
- We have previously learned about \_\_\_\_\_ reviews, where we attempt to synthesize many original studies and replications to describe the state of the science in an area
- \_\_\_\_\_-analyses quantitatively averages results across many similar studies to determine an aggregate/composite average.
- The averaging can be done with any \_\_\_\_\_ of effect size, such as Cohen's d and r.

#### 3.4.1 Strengths and Limitations

- Meta-analyses can be an \_\_\_\_\_ way to give a summary of certain area with a clear number, informing future researchers of the state of the science at that time.
- However, this \_\_\_\_\_ lives and dies by its attention to detail and finding all relevant studies.
- Especially, null findings may be subject to the “\_\_\_\_\_ drawer problem”, and may be obscured from being collected and aggregated.

### 3.5 In Popular Culture

- Rarely, does popular journalism adequately capture the \_\_\_\_\_ and changing nature of science.
  - Journalism is also partially drawn to \_\_\_\_\_ and new research, but may give less emphasis to historical, but still relevant, studies.
-

- In general, it is much better to start with a peer-reviewed, scientifically meta-analysis or literature review when orienting to a new area.

## 4 Transparency and Credibility

### 4.1 Overview

- Even well-meaning scientists (and malicious actors) can make \_\_\_\_\_ in truthfully reporting results
- It should always be our goal to make \_\_\_\_\_-driven predictions and designs - not making changes just for beneficial results.
- We have a variety of questionable practices to \_\_\_\_\_ and transparent practices to try to stick to which aid in reproducibility

### 4.2 Questionable Practices

#### 4.2.1 Under-report Null Findings

- “Real” research tends to involve more than one outcome variable of interest, and sometimes more than one \_\_\_\_\_
- But, some authors may downplay many null \_\_\_\_\_ in favor of focusing on the shiny significant findings.
- This creates a narrative of \_\_\_\_\_ importance and reproducibility of findings, when the majority of evidence in a study actually points to the contrary.

#### 4.2.2 HARKing

- This stands for “Hypothesis After Results are \_\_\_\_\_”
  - Generally, we want to make predictions and hypotheses prior to our data \_\_\_\_\_ and analyses
  - As a general ethical rule, it is bad to say “I knew it all along!” - as it is not theory or literature driven.
-

### 4.2.3 P-hacking

- This occurs when multiple analysis methods are used \_\_\_\_\_ a significant p-value is found, and usually only the final method is reported
- Similar to under-reporting null findings, this tends to \_\_\_\_\_ contrary evidence and overstate otherwise weak findings
- Early decisions on design, hypotheses, and analyses need to be guided first-and-foremost by \_\_\_\_\_

## 4.3 Transparent Practices

- To \_\_\_\_\_ the previous, questionable techniques - we may use a few strategies to increase public and scientific confidence in our results.
- Often, these “open” methods intentionally make us \_\_\_\_\_ to wide critique from the broader public - but this is good for science!

### 4.3.1 Open Data and Open Materials

- Open \_\_\_\_\_ is when we publicly share anonymized data that can be re-analyzed by anyone to ensure results were correct
- Open materials provide all in-depth procedures, measures, and tools to be used in any \_\_\_\_\_.
- Both of these may be posted on repositories like <https://github.com> or <https://osf.io>

### 4.3.2 Preregistration

- As previously mentioned, this is the \_\_\_\_\_ announcement of one's hypothesis and plans prior to completing a study.
  - 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 \_\_\_\_\_) can help us establish just how widespread and generalizable effects are outside just our original sample of individuals.
- As we \_\_\_\_\_ original studies, we are able to better see just what people and contexts they can apply to
- External validity is one of the most \_\_\_\_\_ and difficult to establish validities - therefore we must discern how to balance our priorities with it

### 5.2 Generalization to Other People

- Remember that our sample comes from a \_\_\_\_\_ population that we chose, not just everyone in general
- Samples are primarily strong by virtue of their \_\_\_\_\_, not only their size!
- Samples can be easily \_\_\_\_\_ by convenience - think carefully about the impact that it is likely to have!
- Results may not generalize to \_\_\_\_\_, but we must consider whether this is vitally important to us.

### 5.3 Generalization to Other Settings

- Many \_\_\_\_\_-based studies may benefit from replication in more “real-world” settings
  - On the other hand, we may be interested to see if we can isolate a \_\_\_\_\_ behavior within the confines of the lab
  - More broadly, we likely also want to examine how our studies look outside of the geographic and \_\_\_\_\_ areas they are conducted.
-

## 5.4 Do We Always Need to Generalize

### 5.4.1 Theory-testing Mode

- This is the “first” stage, where we attempt to \_\_\_\_\_ and describe a theory accurately under more controlled conditions
- We work knowing external validity is \_\_\_\_\_, but taking care to establish other strong validity.
- 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.
- Generalization mode places a special emphasis on making sure theories have strong \_\_\_\_\_ validity, putting less focus on internal, like when theory-testing
- \_\_\_\_\_ psychology is a sub-discipline almost entirely determined to investigate cross-cultural differences and similarities, working in generalization mode.

## 5.5 Do We Always Need to be in the Real World?

- Valuable research happens in \_\_\_\_\_ setting, both lab-controlled, and completely ecological (i.e., the “real world”)!
  - Researchers in these separate setting often \_\_\_\_\_ greatly from the mutual shared knowledge.
-