Comment on target article by Zwaan, Etz, Lucas, and Donnellan (2017)

Selecting target papers for replication

Anton Kühberger^{1,2} & Michael Schulte-Mecklenbeck^{3,4}

¹University of Salzburg, Department of Psychology, ²Centre for Cognitive Neuroscience

³University of Bern, Department of Business Administration, ⁴Max Planck Institute for
Human Development, Berlin

Anton Kühberger

Department of Psychology, University of Salzburg,

Hellbrunnerstr. 34, 5020 Salzburg, Austria

Phone: +43 662 8044 5112

E-mail: anton.kuehberger@sbg.ac.at

Abstract

Randomness in the selection process of the to-be-replicated target papers is of critical importance for replication success or failure. If target papers are chosen due to ease of doing a replication, or because replicators doubt the reported findings, replications are likely to fail. To date, the selection of replication targets is biased.

Main Text

While running a replication study is difficult to impossible in some domains, it is quite easy in others. Zwaan, Etz, Lucas, and Donnellan (2017) state, in their Concern III, that direct replications are not feasible in some domains, e.g., large-scale observational studies, or even not possible, e.g., for studies capitalizing on rare events. This argument pertains to domains, but more directly to journal articles, i.e., experimental studies. We argue that, beyond the larger obstacles described above, studies that are easier to replicate are indeed more frequently replicated, which introduces selection-bias into the replication enterprise.

The selection of a to-be-replicated experiment often depends on how easy it is to do a direct replication. An instructive example is the multilab preregistered replication of the ego-depletion effect (Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2016). The authors selected, as the target of their replication, a procedure introduced by Sripada, Kessler, and Jonides (2014) and not by the original authors of ego-depletion (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Muraven, & Tice, 1998; note that Baumeister recommended the alternative procedure!). The reason for selecting this procedure was described as follows: “tasks used in the original experiments were deemed too elaborate or complex to be appropriate for a multilab replication” (p. 548; Sripada et al., 2014). Why is selection bias at work here? Ease of application is frequently related to the quality of manipulating the independent variable, such that the strength of the manipulation is often limited in easy to administer operationalization. A vicious circle is generated: ease of application breeds a multitude of primary studies (e.g., using simple procedures like questionnaires or vignettes). Many of these studies lead to significant results and therefore publication, but often they are false positives and effect sizes are overestimated (e.g., due to publication bias). If such studies become predominantly targets for direct replication, these replications have little power and are doomed to fail. We end up with many failed replications that are also published, even using the new gold-standards of pre-registration and multilab

collaborations. This circle artificially increases the number of replication failures. The choice of the to-be-replicated target study thus is crucial.

Another selection criterion could be even more harmful: doubt. Many papers become replication targets, not because they are theoretically interesting or important, but because other researchers doubt their results. If there is something to researchers' intuitions of whether a result is likely to be true or not, less likely results have a lower base-rate to be true. Even after a significant result the posterior probability of the hypotheses tested in studies with a small prior is low. Selecting "doubted studies" as targets for direct replication also is doomed to result in failure under most definitions of successful replication. Again, if people select replication targets because they doubt the original findings, and if their doubt is reasonable, the literature will be filled with many failed replications.

The process for choosing the to-be-replicated target study thus is crucial. Ease of application and doubt may contribute to the selection of target papers, leading to an overestimation of replication failures. The best way to avoid this is random selection of replication targets. We pick the *Replication Project: Psychology* (Open Science Collaboration, 2015) as an example for such a procedure. However, inspection of this selection process reveals a variety of judgments, deviating from a purely random choice. The decision tree in Figure 1 illustrates the selection that cuts down an overall of 488 articles in the 2008 issues of three journals (*Psychological Science*; *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*; *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*) to an ultimate 100 completed replications.

Figure 1: Selection process for to be replicated papers in the Replication Project: Psychology (RPP); texts in small print are citations from the Open Science Collaboration, 2015.

We identify the following non-random selections in the RPP: (a) Publication (only published papers are included); (b) year (papers published in 2008); (c) journal (Psychological Science, Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology); (d) type (488 original research papers); (e) eligibility (158 of 488, i.e., 32.4%); (f) claim (113 of 158 claimed by replicators, i.e., 71.5%); (g) completion (100 of 113 papers completed and data uploaded to OSF within given timeframe, i.e., 88.5%). Eventually thus, a fifth (100 of 488, i.e., 20.5%) of all possible replications was run and ultimately published. Bias due to difficulty of doing a replication surely exists for eligibility (step e, see description in Open Science Initiative, 2015 Methods appendix), and additionally is likely for claiming (step f) and completion (step g). Bias due to doubt influences claiming (step f). In sum, there is plenty of room for bias in the selection of replication targets. In our opinion, this problem has not yet been addressed adequately.

References

- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(5), 1252–1265.
- Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., Alberts, H., Anggono, C. O., Batailler, C., Birt, A. R., . . . Zwienenberg, M. (2016). A multilab preregistered replication of the ego-depletion effect. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11, 546–573.
- Open Science Collaboration, (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251), aac4716.
- Sripada, C., Kessler, D., & Jonides, J. (2014). Methylphenidate blocks effort-induced depletion of regulatory control in healthy volunteers. *Psychological Science*, 25, 1227–1234.