

should update their beliefs. If it turns out that researchers do not update their beliefs in this way, we will have learned something. These findings, and the comments of the researchers on why they differed from Strevens' prescription (if they do), should illuminate how science progresses and how researchers reason.

Such a program may also help to pinpoint the disagreements that can occur between original researchers and replicating researchers. Presently, after a failed replication, a common practice is for authors of the original study to write a commentary. Frequently, the commentary highlights differences between the replication and the original study, sometimes without giving much indication of how much the authors' beliefs have changed as a result of the failed replication. This makes it difficult to determine the degree of disagreement on the issues.

Our proposal is closely related to several proposed reforms in the literature (and already in the Registered Replication Reports now published by *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, replicating labs are routinely asked what they expect the effect size to be). The key point is the addition of a suitable quantitative framework. Zwaan et al. mention the "Constraints on Generality" proposal of Simons et al. (2017) that authors should "spend some time articulating theoretically grounded boundary conditions for particular findings" as this would mean disagreements with replicating authors "are likely to be minimized" (sect. 4, para. 11). But it may be difficult for an author to testify that a result should replicate in different conditions, as she is likely to be uncertain about various aspects. Rather than making a black-and-white statement, then, it may be better if the author communicates their uncertainty by attaching subjective probabilities to some of the auxiliary hypotheses involved. A further benefit of this system would be that authors, and the theories they espouse, would then develop a track record of making correct predictions (Rieth et al. 2013).

We recognize that in many circumstances, it may not be realistic to expect researchers to be able to quantify their confidence in the hypotheses that are part and parcel of an original experiment and potential replication experiments. Areas that are less mature, in the sense that many auxiliary hypotheses are uncertain, may be especially poor candidates. But other areas may be suitable. There are good reasons for researchers to try.

An argument for how (and why) to incentivise replication

doi:10.1017/S0140525X18000705, e135

Piers D. L. Howe and Amy Perfors

School of Psychological Sciences, University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, Australia.

pdowne@unimelb.edu.au amy.perfors@unimelb.edu.au

<https://www.findanexpert.unimelb.edu.au/display/person340666>

<http://psychologicalsciences.unimelb.edu.au/research/chdh/ccs>

Abstract: Although Zwaan et al. (2018) have made a compelling case as to why direct replications should occur more frequently than they do, they do not address how such replications attempts can best be encouraged. We propose a novel method for incentivising replication attempts and discuss some issues surrounding its implementation.

Zwaan et al. (2018) convincingly argue that replication attempts should become mainstream, but they say little as to how this can best be achieved. The problem is that there are currently few mechanisms in place to encourage replication attempts. For example, a survey conducted in 2015 found that only 3% of psychology journals explicitly state that they will consider publishing replications (Martin & Clarke 2017). Although there have been some notable attempts to encourage more replications (Klein et al. 2014a; Open Science Collaboration 2015), they have been of

limited scope, and replications remain scarce: A survey of the top 100 psychology journals found that only 1% of reported studies involved replication (Makel et al. 2012). Given the enormous publication pressures on academics, if replications are rarely publishable, then a mainstream culture of replication will not emerge.

Here, we propose a novel solution to this problem: Make it standard practice for journals to pre-commit to publishing adequately powered, technically competent direct replications (at least in online form) for any article they publish and link to it from the original article. This would be comparatively simple to implement and would have a relatively low cost, but would greatly change the incentive structure for researchers. It would also lead to a virtuous cycle in which the more replications are published, the more other people would be encouraged to perform replications of their own. Indeed, performing replications might become an important part of academic training: Running replications would enable early postgraduate students to gain valuable skills in research implementation and analysis while also contributing to the scientific literature.

If our proposal were to be adopted, one expectation might be that authors of the original article would discuss the extent to which they predict that their findings would replicate. For instance, authors might become more explicit in identifying when they believe that their findings are likely to apply only to a particular demographic or to occur only in particular circumstances. These discussions would enhance the interpretability of the original article and encourage authors to think more clearly about these issues during the design and analysis of their studies.

Why should journals adopt our proposal? We suggest that a simple modification to the calculation of impact would encourage journals to publish replications of original articles, regardless of how those replications turn out. Currently, the Thomas Reuters journal's impact factor is determined by the number of citations of that journal within a designated period, divided by the number of citable documents published overall during that period. Importantly, the denominator does not include documents considered to be "Editorial Material" — a term covering a wide range of document types from true editorials to commentaries such as this one (even when the commentaries report original data). It should be comparatively simple to agree that non-peer-reviewed, online-only, direct replication attempts should also not count toward the denominator. If so, then hosting direct replication attempts on the journal's website would never hurt. Indeed, if these replication attempts could still be cited (just like editorials can be cited), they would only increase the journal's impact factor. This creates an incentive for journals to publish replications, which is a necessity for replications to become mainstream.

What about funding agencies? Like journals, grant agencies greatly value novelty, but they even more greatly value reliable science; a novel finding can have a long-term impact only if it is true. It should, therefore, be in a funding body's interest either to offer grants that are focused solely on replication or to mandate that a certain percentage of each grant be devoted to replicating previous research.

In one sense, our suggestion is a minor alteration in how science is traditionally done but, in another sense, it is a paradigm shift in how to evaluate scientific work. Although novelty and originality are clearly vital, replicability is no less important. Our failure to systematically replicate our findings results in biased estimates of effect sizes, hampers future work, and makes it hard to obtain a realistic evaluation of what we know (Anderson et al. 2017). Because the best way to obtain accurate estimates of a finding's effect size and robustness is to combine multiple independent replication attempts, we need to actively encourage replications. Within our paradigm, the initial publication of an article is just the starting point in an extended conversation that will conclude with a multitude of replication attempts, an increasingly accurate estimate of the effect size, and a much greater understanding of the circumstances for which the findings hold.

How might we appropriately acknowledge replication attempts for the purposes of career advancement? One obvious possibility would be to adopt a convention on curricula vitae in which replication attempts are classified as distinct from other types of publications — much as books, journal articles, and conference proceedings are classified separately now. It would then be up to the individual's university, grant review panel or promotion committee to decide how much to value replication attempts relative to other forms of publication.

Our proposal represents a “win” for academics, journals, and the progress of science as a whole. The ability to easily publish replications would mean that academics would be incentivised to perform replications. Indeed, doing so may become a routine and accepted part of academic training. Within a culture of replicability, the impact of any single replication failure would diminish, making replications less personally threatening and simply part of the process (much as reviews are part of science now). Journals would increase in prestige and citation rates by publishing replications. Fundamentally, incentivising replication attempts is the only way to achieve a mainstream culture of replicability. It is vital for our future that science is built on truth rather than sand.

How to make replications mainstream

doi:10.1017/S0140525X18000717, e136

Hans IJzerman,^a Jon Grahe,^b and Mark J. Brandt^c

^aDepartment of Psychology (LIP/PC2S), Université Grenoble Alpes, BP 47-38040, Grenoble Cedex 9, France; ^bDepartment of Psychology, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447; ^cDepartment of Social Psychology, Tilburg University, Tilburg 5000 LE, The Netherlands.

h.ijzerman@gmail.com graheje@plu.edu

m.j.brandt@tilburguniversity.edu

www.hansijzerman.org

www.tbslaboratory.com

Abstract: Zwaan et al. integrated previous articles to promote making replications mainstream. We wholeheartedly agree. We extend their discussion by highlighting several existing initiatives—the *Replication Recipe* and the *Collaborative Education and Research Project* (CREP) — which aim to make replications mainstream. We hope this exchange further stimulates making replications mainstream.

Zwaan et al. integrated previous articles to promote making replications mainstream. We wholeheartedly agree. We extend their discussion by highlighting several existing initiatives that aim to make replications mainstream and that have already helped resolve several of the concerns discussed by Zwaan et al. Specifically, we discuss how to *Increase Replication Quality* and how to *Make Replications Habitual*. These facets should facilitate addressing the concerns of not having a standard method and that expertise of the original and replication authors may not be sufficiently relevant.

Increasing replication quality. Zwaan et al. discussed criticisms of the limited theoretical value of replication and the role of contextual variable in replications. This criticism stems from a well-known discussion in psychology whether quality of research should be results- or theory-centered (e.g., Greenberg et al. 1988; Greenwald et al. 1986). One strategy to resolve the conflict between theoretical value and obtained results is to follow the guidelines outlined in the *Replication Recipe* (RR; Brandt, IJzerman et al. 2014). The RR suggests that replications include 36 “ingredients” for high-quality replications (including, but not limited to, choosing a finding with high replication value, sufficient power, exclusion criteria that are defined *a priori*, identified differences between original and replication studies, and pre-registration). Following the RR helps replication researchers identify the central parameters of a study and thus the key components

of the replication, so that the replication is as convincing as possible. This not only facilitates communication between original and replication researchers, but also between readers of both the replication and the original research. The RR, for example, suggests that replication researchers list contextual features that likely differ between the original and replication research (e.g., Different cultural setting? Different population?). This helps communicate to the original authors and readers what the differences in the studies are and the degree the study is a direct or more of a conceptual replication. There may not always be agreement on these designations, but at least the information is clearly available for the reader to make up their own mind. The results from the RR can also be used by future scholars to identify (and then test with pre-registered studies) potential moderators of the effect across both original studies and replication studies, increasing the theoretical value of replications.

Interestingly, Zwaan et al. misinterpreted the RR as something that should be included in original articles. Our original paper was focused on replications and so we did not discuss original articles, but this misinterpretation highlights the important point that many, if not all, of the qualities of a convincing and high-quality replication are exactly the same as the qualities of a convincing and high-quality original study. Therefore, authors can specify the conditions they consider necessary and relevant for their finding and any limits on generalizability (Simons et al. 2017), resulting in increasingly specified psychological theories.

Making replications habitual. Another key facet to making replication mainstream is making replications habitual. One way of doing so is by developing an appreciation for replication early in the academic career. We created the Collaborative Education and Research Project (CREP; Grahe et al. 2015) with the goal of training undergraduate researchers to conduct high quality replication research through standardized procedures as part of research methods courses. The CREP board selects — through a rigid selection process — impactful studies that are feasible to conduct by bachelor students. Prior to data collection, the CREP board communicates with original authors that we selected their study and invite them to provide any original materials and to comment about any conditions that would facilitate successful replication. Students — often in groups and always under the supervision of a faculty supervisor — create a project page on the Open Science Framework, submit their proposed protocol (including video, methods, and evidence of international review board approval) for review by a CREP review team (three advanced researchers and a student administrative advisor). This review process is at least as stringent (and perhaps sometimes more so) than the journal review process. After receiving approval, they complete a general registration of their study, and then collect data. Upon project completion, they go through a second review where the CREP review team reviews their presentation of their data and findings.

CREP projects directly contribute to the research literature by reporting high-quality replications (with one manuscript published [Leighton et al. 2018] and two more in progress [Ghelfi et al. in preparation; Wagge et al. in preparation]). Additionally, and more importantly, the CREP educates students about modern psychological research methods, training them to be the researchers with the relevant expertise we need. These skills transfer to original research. Students must understand the hypothesis and theory from the original study as they identify which materials are necessary in an original study. They learn to properly document a study (including, but not limited to, obtaining informed consent, collecting and analyzing data, and reporting findings requires the same resources as original research). Further, by interacting with the CREP team, these students experience a review process with faculty at different institutions than their own. As a bonus, instructors are not challenged with reading and supervising poorly conceptualized or poorly planned research that is developed quickly, without adequate preparation that can understandably be typical of students' first research project.

NOTE

1. Current address: Department of Psychology, Psychology Building, 316 Physics Road, Room 249A, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824.

References

[The letters “a” and “r” before author’s initials stand for target article and response references, respectively]

[Author name initials “AG” are same for both [Ana Gantman] and [Andrew Gelman] and the initials “GP” are the same for both [Gabriele Paolacci] and [Gordon Pennycook]. Please confirm the change of author name initials [Ana Gantman as “AGa”], [Andrew Gelman as “AGe”], [Gabriele Paolacci as “GPa”] and [Gordon Pennycook as “GPe”] in reference list just to differentiate the author names.

- Agnoli, F., Wicherts, J. M., Veldkamp, C. L. S., Albiero, P. & Cubelli, R. (2017) Questionnaire research practices among Italian research psychologists. *PLoS One* 12(3):e0172792. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0172792>. [MBN]
- Aklin, M. & Urpelainen, J. (2014) Perceptions of scientific dissent undermine public support for environmental policy. *Environmental Science and Policy* 38:173–77. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2013.10.006>. [MB]
- Alexander, D. M., Jurica, P., Trengove, C., Nikolaev, A. R., Gepstein, S., Zvyagintsev, M., Mathiak, K., Schulze-Bonhage, A., Reuscher, J., Ball, T. & van Leeuwen, C. (2013) Traveling waves and trial averaging: The nature of single-trial and averaged brain responses in large-scale cortical signals. *NeuroImage* 73:95–112. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.01.016>. [DMA]
- Alexander, D. M., Trengove, C. & van Leeuwen, C. (2015) Donders is dead: Cortical traveling waves and the limits of mental chronometry in cognitive neuroscience. *Cognitive Processing* 16(4):365–75. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-015-0662-4>. [DMA]
- Alogna, V. K., Attaya, M. K., Aucoin, P., Bahnik, Š., Birch, S., Birt, A. R., Bornstein, B. H., Bouwmeester, S., Brandimonte, M. A., Brown, C., Buswell, K., Carlson, C., Carlson, M., Chu, S., Cislak, A., Colarusso, M., Colloff, M. F., Dellapaolera, K. S., Delvenne, J.-F., Di Domenico, A., Drummond, A., Echterhoff, G., Edlund, J. E., Eggleston, C. M., Fairfield, B., Franco, G., Gabbert, F., Gamblin, B. W., Garry, M., Gentry, R., Gilbert, E. A., Greenberg, D. L., Halberstadt, J., Hall, L., Hancock, P. J. B., Hirsch, D., Holt, G., Jongs, J. C., Jong, J., Kehn, A., Koch, C., Kopietz, R., Körner, U., Kunar, M. A., Lai, C. K., Langton, S. R. H., Leite, F. P., Mammarella, N., Marsh, J. E., McConaughy, K. A., McCoy, S., McIntyre, A. H., Meissner, C. A., Michael, R. B., Mitchell, A. A., Mugayar-Baldocchi, M., Musselman, R., Ng, C., Nichols, A. L., Nunez, N. L., Palmer, M. A., Pappagianopoulos, J. E., Petro, M. S., Poirier, C. R., Portch, E., Rainsford, M., Rancourt, A., Romig, C., Rubínová, E., Sanson, M., Satchell, L., Sauer, J. D., Schweitzer, K., Shaheed, J., Skelton, F., Sullivan, G. A., Susa, K. J., Swanner, J. K., Thompson, W. B., Todaro, R., Ulatowska, J., Valentine, T., Verkoijen, P. P. J. L., Vranka, M., Wade, K. A., Was, C. A., Weatherford, D., Wiseman, K., Zaksaitė, T., Zuj, D. V. & Zwaan, R. A. (2014) Registered replication report: Schooler & Engstler-Schooler (1990). *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 9:556–78. [aRAZ]
- Anderson, C. J., Bahnik, Š., Barnett-Cowan, M., Bosco, F. A., Chandler, J., Chartier, C. R., Cheung, F., Christopherson, C. D., Cordes, A., Cremata, E. J., Della Penna, N., Estel, V., Fedor, A., Fitneva, S. A., Frank, M. C., Grange, J. A., Hartshorne, J. K., Hasselman, F., Henninger, F., van der Hulst, M., Jonas, K. J., Lai, C. K., Levitan, C. A., Miller, J. K., Moore, K. S., Meixner, J. M., Munafò, M. R., Neijenhuijs, K. I., Nilsson, G., Nosek, B. A., Plessow, F., Premeaux, J. M., Ricker, A. A., Schmidt, K., Spies, J. R., Steiger, S., Strohminger, N., Sullivan, G. B., van Aert, R. C. M., van Assen, M. A. L. M., Vanpaemel, W., Vianello, M., Voracek, M. & Zuni, K. (2016) Response to comment on “estimating the reproducibility of psychological science.” *Science* 351(6277):1037. [aRAZ, TEH]
- Anderson, S. F., Kelly, K. & Maxwell, S. E. (2017) Sample-size planning for more accurate statistical power: A method of adjusting sample effect sizes for publication bias and uncertainty. *Psychological Science* 28(11):1547–62. [PDLH]
- Arechar, A. A., Kraft-Todd, G. T. & Rand, D. G. (2017) Turking overtime: How participant characteristics and behavior vary over time and day on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Journal of the Economic Science Association* 3(1):1–11. [GPa]
- Baker, M. (2015, August 27) Over half of psychology studies fail reproducibility test. *Nature News*. Available at: <https://www.nature.com/news/over-half-of-psychology-studies-fail-reproducibility-test-1.18248>. [FS]
- Baker, M. (2016) Is there a reproducibility crisis? *Nature* 533:452–54. [aRAZ]
- Bakker, M., van Dijk, A. & Wicherts, J. M. (2012) The rules of the game called psychological science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 7(6):543–54. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612459060>. [EHW, MBN]
- Bakker, M. & Wicherts, J. M. (2011) The (mis)reporting of statistical results in psychology journals. *Behavior Research Methods* 43(3):666–78. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-011-0089-5>. [MBN]
- Bakker, M. & Wicherts, J. M. (2014) Outlier removal and the relation with reporting errors and quality of research. *PLoS One* 9(7):e103360. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0103360>. [MBN]
- Baribault, B., Donkin, C., Little, D. R., Trueblood, J. S., Oravecz, Z., van Ravenzwaaij, D., White, C. N., De Boeck, P. & Vandekerckhove, J. (2018) Metastudies for robust tests of theory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 115(11):2607–12. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708285114>. [rRAZ, TEH]
- Barrera, M., Jr. & Rosen, G. M. (1977) Detrimental effects of a self-reward contracting program on subjects’ involvement in self-administered desensitization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 45:1180–81. [SOL]
- Barsalou, L. W. (2016) Situated conceptualization offers a theoretical account of social priming. *Current Opinion in Psychology* 12:6–11. [aRAZ]
- Baumeister, R. F. (2016) Charting the future of social psychology on stormy seas: Winners, losers, and recommendations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 66:153–58. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2016.02.003>. [aRAZ]
- 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):1252–65. [AK]
- Bem, D. J. (2003) Writing the empirical journal article. In: *The compleat academic: A career guide, 2nd edition*, ed. J. M. Darley, M. P. Zanna & H. L. Roediger III, pp. 185–219. American Psychological Association. [aRAZ]
- Bem, D. J. (2011) Feeling the future: Experimental evidence for anomalous retroactive influences on cognition and affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 100:407–25. [aRAZ]
- Benjamin, D. J., Berger, J. O., Johannesson, M., Nosek, B. A., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Berk, R., Bollen, K. A., Brembs, B., Brown, L., Camerer, C., Cesarini, D., Chambers, C. D., Clyde, M., Cook, T. D., De Boeck, P., Dienes, Z., Dreber, A., Easwaran, K., Efferson, C., Fehr, E., Fidler, F., Field, A. P., Forster, M., George, E. I., Gonzalez, R., Goodman, S., Green, E., Green, D. P., Greenwald, A. G., Hadfield, J. D., Hedges, L. V., Held, L., Ho, T.-H., Hoijtink, H., Hruschka, D. J., Imai, K., Imbens, G., Ioannidis, J. P. A., Jeon, M., Jones, J. H., Kirchler, M., Laibson, D., List, J., Little, R., Lupia, A., Machery, E., Maxwell, S. E., McCarthy, M., Moore, D. A., Morgan, S. L., Munafò, M., Nakagawa, S., Nyhan, B., Parker, T. H., Pericchi, L., Perugini, M., Roulder, J., Rousseau, J., Savalei, V., Shönbrodt, F. D., Sellke, T., Sinclair, B., Tingley, D., Van Zandt, T., Vazire, S., Watts, D. J., Winship, C., Wolpert, R. L., Xie, Y., Young, C., Zinman, J. & Johnson, V. E. (2017) Redefine statistical significance. *Nature Human Behaviour* 2:6–10. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0189-z>. [JPAI]
- Berk, R. A., Campbell, A., Klap, R. & Western, B. (1992) The deterrent effect of arrest in incidents of domestic violence: A Bayesian analysis of four field experiments. *American Sociological Review* 57:698–708. [RJM]
- Berman, J. S. & Reich, C. M. (2010) Investigator allegiance and the evaluation of psychotherapy outcome research. *European Journal of Psychotherapy and Counselling* 12:11–21. [WT]
- Blakeley, B., McShane, B. B., Gal, D., Gelman, A., Robert, C. & Tackett, J. L. (2018) Abandon statistical significance. Preprint. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.07588>. [FS]
- Blakey, S. M. & Abramowitz, J. S. (2016) The effects of safety behaviors during exposure therapy for anxiety: Critical analysis from an inhibitory learning perspective. *Clinical Psychology Review* 49:1–15. [SOL]
- Boekel, W., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Belay, L., Verhagen, J., Brown, S. & Forstmann, B. U. (2015) A purely confirmatory replication study of structural brain-behavior correlations. *Cortex* 66:115–33. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2014.11.019>. [KG]
- Bohannon, J. (2014) Replication effort provokes praise – and ‘bullying’ charges. *Science* 344:788–89. [GPe, WT]
- Bonett, D. G. (2012) Replication-extension studies. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 21:409–12. [rRAZ]
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T. & Rothstein, H. R. (2009) *Introduction to meta-analysis*. Wiley. [TEH]
- Bowen, A. & Casadevall, A. (2015) Increasing disparities between resource inputs and outcomes, as measured by certain health deliverables, in biomedical research. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 112:11335–40. [JPAI]
- Box, G. E. P. (1979) Robustness in the strategy of scientific model building. In: *Robustness in statistics*, ed. R. L. Launer & G. N. Wilkinson, pp. 201–36. Academic. [rRAZ]
- Brandt, M. J., Ijzerman, H., Dijksterhuis, A., Farach, F., Geller, J., Giner-Sorolla, R., Grange, J. A., Perugini, M., Spies, J. & van ’t Veer, A. (2014) The replication

- recipe: What makes for a convincing replication? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 50:217–24. [aRAZ, HI]
- Brown, N. J. L. & Heathers, J. A. J. (2017) The GRIM test: A simple technique detects numerous anomalies in the reporting of results in psychology. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 8(4):363–69. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1177/1948550616673876>. [MBN]
- Button, K. S., Ioannidis, J. P., Mokrysz, C., Nosek, B. A., Flint, J., Robinson, E. S. & Munafò, M. R. (2013) Power failure: Why small sample size undermines the reliability of neuroscience. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 14(5):365–76. [aRAZ]
- Camerer, C. F., Dreber, A., Forsell, E., Ho, T. H., Huber, J., Johannesson, M., Kirchler, M., Almenberg, J., Altmédj, A., Chan, T., Heikensten, E., Holzmeister, F., Imai, T., Isaksson, S., Nave, G., Pfeiffer, T., Razen, M. & Wu, H. (2016) Evaluating replicability of laboratory experiments in economics. *Science* 351(6280):1433–36. [aRAZ]
- Campbell, D. T. (1969) Reforms as experiments. *American Psychologist* 24(4):409. [AGa]
- Campbell, D. T. (1991) Methods for the experimenting society. *Evaluation Practice* 12(3):223–60. [AGa]
- Carlin, J. B. (2016) Is reform possible without a paradigm shift? *The American Statistician*, Supplemental material to the ASA statement on *p*-values and statistical significance 10. [JLT]
- Casey, L., Chandler, J., Levine, A. S., Proctor, A. & Strolovitch, D. Z. (2017, April–June) Intertemporal differences among MTurk worker demographics. *SAGE Open*, 1–15. doi: 10.1177/2158244017712774. [GPa]
- Cesario, J. (2014) Priming, replication, and the hardest science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 9:40–48. [aRAZ]
- Chambers, C. (2017) *The 7 deadly sins of psychology: A manifesto for reforming the culture of scientific practice*. Princeton University Press. [aRAZ]
- Chambers, C. D. (2013) Registered reports: A new publishing initiative at *Cortex*. *Cortex* 49(3):609–10. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2012.12.016>. [ARK]
- Chambers, C. D., Dienes, Z., McIntosh, R. D., Rotshtein, P. & Willmes, K. (2015) Registered reports: Realigning incentives in scientific publishing. *Cortex* 66:A1–A2. [RG-S]
- Chambless, D. L. & Ollendick, T. H. (2001) Empirically supported psychological interventions: Controversies and evidence. *Annual Review of Psychology* 52:685–716. [SOL]
- Chandler, J., Mueller, P. & Paolacci, G. (2014) Nonnaïveté among Amazon Mechanical Turk workers: Consequences and solutions for behavioral researchers. *Behavior Research Methods* 46(1):112–30. [GPa]
- Chandler, J., Paolacci, G., Peer, E., Mueller, P. & Ratliff, K. A. (2015) Using nonnaïve participants can reduce effect sizes. *Psychological Science* 26(7):1131–39. [GPa]
- Chandler, J. & Shapiro, D. (2016) Conducting clinical research using crowdsourced convenience samples. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology* 12:53–81. [GPa]
- Chartier, C. R. (2017) The psychological science accelerator: A distributed laboratory network. Blog post. Available at: <https://christopherchartier.com/2017/09/21/the-psychological-science-accelerator-a-distributed-laboratory-network>. [WT]
- Chavalarias, D., Wallach, J., Li, A. & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2016) Evolution of reporting of *p*-values in the biomedical literature, 1990–2015. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 315(11):1141–48. [JPAI]
- Chavla, D. S. (2017, April 7) Online platform aims to facilitate replication studies. *The Scientist*. Available at: <https://www.the-scientist.com/?articles.view/articleNo/49161/title/Online-Platform-Aims-to-Facilitate-Replication-Studies/>. [MAG]
- Cheung, I., Campbell, L., LeBel, E. P., Ackerman, R. A., Aykutoğlu, B., Bahnik, Š., Bowen, J. D., Bredbow, C. A., Bromberg, C., Caprariello, P. A., Carcedo, R. J., Carson, K. J., Cobb, R. J., Collins, N. L., Corretti, C. A., DiDonato, T. E., Ellithorpe, C., Fenrnández-Rouco, N., Fuglestad, P. T., Goldberg, R. M., Golom, F. D., Gündođdu-Aktürk, E., Hoplock, L. B., Houdek, P., Kane, H. S., Kim, J. S., Kraus, S., Leone, C. T., Li, N. P., Logan, J. M., Millman, R. D., Morry, M. M., Pink, J. C., Ritchey, T., Root Luna, L. M., Sinclair, H. C., Stinson, D. A., Sucharyna, T. A., Tidwell, N. D., Uysal, A., Vranka, M., Winczewski, L. A. & Yong, J. C. (2016) Registered replication report: Study 1 from Finkel, Rusbult, Kumashiro & Hamon (2002). *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 11(5):750–64. [aRAZ]
- Cohen, J. (1990) Things I have learned (so far). *American Psychologist* 45(12):1304. [aRAZ]
- Cohen, J. (1994) The earth is round ($p < .05$). *American Psychologist* 49:997–1003. [TC]
- Collaborative Replications and Education Project (2018) Current study list and selection methods. Available at: <https://osf.io/flaue/wiki/home/>. [RG-S]
- Cook, D. J., Guyatt, C. H., Ryan, G., Clifton, J., Buckingham, L., Willan, A., Mcllor, W. & Oxman, A. D. (1993) Should unpublished data be included in meta-analyses? Current convictions and controversies. *JAMA* 269(21):2749–53. [aRAZ]
- Cook, T. D., Campbell, D. T. & Peracchio, L. (1990) Quasi-experimentation. In: *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, vol. 1, 2nd edition*, ed. M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough, pp. 491–576. Consulting Psychologists. [SOL]
- Cortina, J. M., Aguinis, H. & DeShon, R. P. (2017) Twilight of dawn or of evening? A century of research methods in the Journal of Applied Psychology. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 102(3):274–90. [RJM]
- Coyne, J. C. (2016) Replication initiatives will not salvage the trustworthiness of psychology. *BMC Psychology* 4:28. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-016-0134-3>. [aRAZ, SOL]
- Crandall, C. S. & Sherman, J. W. (2016) On the scientific superiority of conceptual replications for scientific progress. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 66:93–99. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.10.002>. [aRAZ, AMT, US]
- Cronbach, L. J. & Meehl, P. E. (1955) Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin* 52:281–302. [SOL]
- Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (2017) *Die Replizierbarkeit von Forschungsergebnissen (The replicability of research findings)*. Available at: www.dfg.de/download/pdf/dfg_im_profil/reden_stellungnahmen/2017/170425_stellungnahme_replizierbarkeit_forschungsergebnisse_en.pdf. [FS]
- DeVoe, S. E. & House, J. (2016). Replications with MTurkers who are naïve versus experienced with academic studies: A comment on Connors, Khamitov, Moroz, Campbell, and Henderson (2015). *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 67:65–67. [GPa]
- Difallah, D., Filatova, E. & Ipeirotis, P. (2018) Demographics and dynamics of mechanical Turk workers. In: *Proceedings of WSDM 2018: The Eleventh ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, Marina Del Rey, CA, USA February 5–9, 2018*, pp. 135–143. Available at: <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doi=3159652.3159661>. [GPa]
- Donnellan, M. B., Lucas, R. E. & Cesario, J. (2015) On the association between loneliness and bathing habits: Nine replications of Bargh and Shalev (2012): Study 1. *Emotion* 15(1):109–19. [rRAZ]
- Dreber, A., Pfeiffer, T., Almenberg, J., Isaksson, S., Wilson, B., Chen, Y., Nosek, B. A. & Johannesson, M. (2015) Using prediction markets to estimate the reproducibility of scientific research. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 112:15343–47. [WT]
- Duarte, J. L., Crawford, J. T., Stern, C., Haidt, J., Jussim L. & Tetlock, P. E. (2015) Political diversity will improve social psychological science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 38:e130. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X14000430>. [BE]
- Dubé, C., Rotello, C. M. & Heit, E. (2010) Assessing the belief bias effect with ROCs: It's a response bias effect. *Psychological Review* 117:831–63. [EH]
- Dudo, A., Dunwoody, S. & Scheufele, D. A. (2011) The emergence of nano news: Tracking thematic trends and changes in US newspaper coverage of nano-technology. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 88:55–75. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1177/107769901108800104>. [MB]
- Duhem, P. (1954) *The aim and structure of physical theory*. Princeton University Press. [AOH]
- Dunlap, K. (1926) The experimental methods of psychology. In: *Psychologies of 1925*, ed. C. Murchison, pp. 331–53. Clark University Press. [aRAZ, WT]
- Dunning, T., Grossman, G., Humphreys, M., Hyde, S. & McIntosh, C., eds. (in press) *Information and accountability: A new method for cumulative learning*. Cambridge University Press. [AGa]
- Ebersole, C. R., Alaei, R., Atherton, O. E., Bernstein, M. J., Brown, M., Chartier, C. R., Chung, L. Y., Hermann, A. D., Joy-Gaba, J. A., Line, M. J., Rule, N. O., Sacco, D. F., Vaughn, L. A. & Nosek, B. A. (2017) Observe, hypothesize, test, repeat: Luttrell, Petty & Xu (2017) demonstrate good science. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 69:184–86. [DTW]
- Ebersole, C. R., Atherton, O. E., Belanger, A. L., Skulborstad, H. M., Allen, J. M., Banks, J. B., Baranski, E., Bernstein, M. J., Bofiglio, D. B. V., Boucher, L., Brown, E. R., Budima, N. I., Cairo, A. H., Capaldi, C. A., Chartier, C. R., Chung, J. M., Cicero, D. C., Coleman, J. A., Conway, J. G., Davis, W. E., Devos, T., Fletcher, M. M., German, K., Grahe, J. E., Hermann, A. D., Hicks, J. A., Honeycutt, N., Humphrey, B., Janus, M., Johnson, D. J., Joy-Gaba, J. A., Juzeler, H., Keres, A., Kinney, D., Kirschenbaum, J., Klein, R. A., Lucas, R. E., Lustgraff, C. J. N., Martin, D., Menon, M., Metzger, M., Moloney, J. M., Morse, P. J., Prislun, R., Razza, T., Re, D. E., Rule, N. O., Sacco, D. F., Sauerberger, K., Shrider, E., Shultz, M., Siesman, C., Sobocko, K., Sternglanz, R. W., Summerville, A., Tskhay, K. O., van Allen, Z., Vaughn, L. A., Walker, R. J., Weinberg, A., Wilson, J. P., Wirth, J. H., Wortman, J. & Nosek, B. A. (2016a) Many Labs 3: Evaluating participant pool quality across the academic semester via replication. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 67:68–82. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.10.012>. [DTW, RG-S, SS]
- Ebersole, C. R., Axt, J. R. & Nosek, B. A. (2016b) Scientists' reputations are based on getting it right, not being right. *PLoS Biology* 14(5):e1002460. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002460>. [aRAZ, GPe]
- Ebrahim, S., Sohani, Z. N., Montoya, L., Agarwal, A., Thorlund, K., Mills, E. J. & Ioannidis, J. P. (2014) Reanalysis of randomized clinical trial data. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 312(10):1024–32. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2014.9646>. [MBN]
- Eerland, A., Sherrill, A. M., Magliano, J. P., Zwaan, R. A., Armal, J. D., Aucoin, P., Berger, S. A., Birt, A. R., Capezza, N., Carlucci, M., Crocker, C., Ferretti, T. R., Kibbe, M. R., Knepp, M. M., Kurby, C. A., Melcher, J. M., Michael, S. W.,

- Poirier, C. & Prenoveau, J. M. (2016) Registered replication report: Hart & Albarracín (2011). *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 11:158–71. [arRAZ]
- Epskamp, S. & Nuijten, M. B. (2016) *statcheck*: Extract statistics from articles and recompute p-values. Available at: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/statcheck/> (R package version 1.2.2). [MBN]
- Errington, T. M., Iorns, E., Gunn, W., Tan, F. E., Lomax, J. & Nosek, B. A. (2014) An open investigation of the reproducibility of cancer biology research. *Elife* 3: e04333. [arAZ]
- Estes, W. K. (1956) The problem of inference from curves based on group data. *Psychological Bulletin* 53(2):134–40. [DMA]
- Etz, A. (2015, August 30) The Bayesian Reproducibility Project. Weblog post. Retrieved 23 August 2017 from: <https://web.archive.org/web/20160407113631/http://alexanderezet.com:80/2015/08/30/the-bayesian-reproducibility-project/>. [arAZ]
- Etz, A., Haaf, J. M., Rouder, J. N. & Vandekerckhove, J. (in press) Bayesian inference and testing any hypothesis you can specify. Preprint. Available at: <https://psyarxiv.com/wmf3r/>. [rRAZ]
- Etz, A. & Vandekerckhove, J. (2016) A Bayesian perspective on the reproducibility project: Psychology. *PLoS ONE* 11(2):e0149794. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0149794>. [arAZ]
- Etz, A. & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2017) JBS Haldane's contribution to the Bayes factor hypothesis test. *Statistical Science* 32(2):313–29. [arAZ]
- Evans, J. St. B. T., Barston, J. L. & Pollard, P. (1983) On the conflict between logic and belief in syllogistic reasoning. *Memory and Cognition* 11:295–306. [EH]
- Everett, J. A. & Earp, B. D. (2015) A tragedy of the (academic) commons: Interpreting the replication crisis in psychology as a social dilemma for early-career researchers. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6:1–4. [WT]
- Fabrigar, L. R. & Wegener, D. T. (2016) Conceptualizing and evaluating the replication of research results. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 66:68–80. [arAZ, DTW]
- Fanelli, D. (2011) Negative results are disappearing from most disciplines and countries. *Scientometrics* 90(3):891–904. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-011-0494-7>. [ARK]
- Fanelli, D., Costas, R. & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2017) A meta-assessment of bias in science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 114:3714–19. [JPAI]
- Fayant, M. P., Sigall, H., Lémonnier, A., Retsin, E. & Alexopoulos, T. (2017) On the limitations of manipulation checks: An obstacle toward cumulative science. *International Review of Social Psychology* 30(1):125–30. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5334/irsp.102>. [EHW]
- Ferguson, C. J. & Brannick, M. T. (2012) Publication bias in psychological science: Prevalence, methods for identifying and controlling, and implications for the use of meta-analyses. *Psychological Methods* 17(1):120–28. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0024445>. [arAZ, ARK]
- Ferguson, C. J. & Heene, M. (2012) A vast graveyard of undead theories publication bias and psychological science's aversion to the null. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 7(6):555–61. [arAZ]
- Fetterman, A. K. & Sassenberg, K. (2015) The reputational consequences of failed replications and wrongness admission among scientists. *PLoS One* 10(12):e0143723. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0143723>. [arAZ, GPe]
- Fiedler, K. & Schwarz, N. (2015) Questionable research practices revisited. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 7:45–52. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1177/1948550615612150>. [arAZ]
- Finkel, E. J., Eastwick, P. W. & Reis, H. T. (2015) Best research practices in psychology: Illustrating epistemological and pragmatic considerations with the case of relationship science. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 108:275–97. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000007>. [arAZ]
- Fiske, S. T. (1992) Thinking is for doing: Portraits of social cognition from daguerreotype to laserphoto. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 63(6):877. [AGa]
- Fletcher, P. C. & Grafton, S. T. (2013) Repeat after me: Replication in clinical neuroimaging is critical. *NeuroImage: Clinical* 2:247–48. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2013.01.007>. [KG]
- Foss, D. J. & Blank, M. A. (1980) Identifying the speech codes. *Cognitive Psychology* 12(1):1–31. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(80\)90002-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(80)90002-X). [MAG]
- Foss, D. J. & Gernsbacher, M. A. (1983) Cracking the dual code: Toward a unitary model of phoneme identification. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 22:609–32. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(83\)90365-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(83)90365-1). [MAG]
- Franco, A., Malhotra, N. & Simonovits, G. (2014) Publication bias in the social sciences: Unlocking the file drawer. *Science* 345(6203):1502–505. [arAZ]
- Frankfurt, H. (2005) *On bullshit*. Princeton University Press. Available at: <http://journals.cambridge.org/production/action/cjoGetFulltext?fulltextid=5452992>. [GPe]
- Freudenburg, W. R., Gramling, R. & Davidson, D. J. (2008) Scientific certainty argumentation methods (SCAMs): Science and the politics of doubt. *Sociological Inquiry* 78:2–38. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.2008.00219.x>. [MB]
- Garnham, A., Traxler, M., Oakhill, J. & Gernsbacher, M. A. (1996) The locus of implicit causality effects in comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language* 35:517–43. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1996.0028>. [MAG]
- Gelman, A. (2013) I'm negative on the expression "false positives." Blog post. Available at: <http://andrewgelman.com/2013/11/07/nix-expression-false-positives/>. [AGe]
- Gelman, A. (2015) The connection between varying treatment effects and the crisis of unreplicable research: A Bayesian perspective. *Journal of Management* 41(2):632–43. [JLT]
- Gelman, A. (2016a) The problems with p-values are not just with p-values. *The American Statistician*, Supplemental material to the ASA statement on p-values and statistical significance 10. [JLT]
- Gelman, A. (2016b) The time-reversal heuristic – A new way to think about a published finding that is followed up by a large, preregistered replication (in context of Amy Cuddy's claims about power pose). Blog post. Available at: <http://andrewgelman.com/2016/01/26/more-power-posing/>. [AGe, AMT]
- Gelman, A. & Carlin, J. B. (2014) Beyond power calculations: Assessing Type S (sign) and Type M (magnitude) errors. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 9:641–51. [AGe]
- Gelman, A. & Loken, E. (2014) The statistical crisis in science data-dependent analysis – a "garden of forking paths" – explains why many statistically significant comparisons don't hold up. *American Scientist* 102(6):460. [arAZ]
- Gernsbacher, M. A. (1989) Mechanisms that improve referential access. *Cognition* 32:99–156. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(89\)90001-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(89)90001-2). [MAG]
- Gernsbacher, M. A. & Hargreaves, D. J. (1988) Accessing sentence participants: The advantage of first mention. *Journal of Memory and Language* 27:699–717. [MAG]
- Gernsbacher, M. A., Keysar, B., Robertson, R. R. W. & Werner, N. K. (2001a) The role of suppression and enhancement in understanding metaphors. *Journal of Memory and Language* 45:433–50. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.2000.2782>. [MAG]
- Gernsbacher, M. A., Robertson, R. R. W. & Werner, N. K. (2001b) The costs and benefits of meaning. In: *On the consequences of meaning selection: Perspectives on resolving lexical ambiguity*, ed. D. S. Gorfein, pp. 119–37. APA. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/10459-007>. [MAG]
- Ghelfi, E., Christopherson, C. D., Fischer, M. A., Legate, N., Lenne, R., Urry, H., Wagemans, F. M. A., Wiggins, B., Barrett, T., Glass, M., Guberman, J., Hunt, J., Issa, N., Paulk, A., Peck, T., Perkinson, J., Sheelar, K., Theado, R. & Turpin, R. (in preparation) The influence of gustatory disgust on moral judgement: A pre-registered multi-lab replication. [HI]
- Gilbert, D. T., King, G., Pettigrew, S. & Wilson, T. D. (2016) Comment on "estimating the reproducibility of psychological science." *Science* 351(6277):1037. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad7243>. [arAZ, MB, RG-S, TEH]
- Giner-Sorolla, R. (2016) Approaching a fair deal for significance and other concerns. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 65:1–6. [RG-S]
- Giofrè, D., Cumming, G., Fresco, L., Boedker, I. & Tressoldi, P. (2017) The influence of journal submission guidelines on authors' reporting of statistics and use of open research practices. *PLoS One* 12(4):e0175583. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175583>. [MBN]
- Glick, A. R. (2015) The role of serotonin in impulsive aggression, suicide, and homicide in adolescents and adults: A literature review. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health* 27:143–50. [SOL]
- Goldin-Meadow, S. (2016) Preregistration, replication, and nonexperimental studies. *Association for Psychological Science Observer* 29(8):2. [NAC]
- Goodman, J. K. & Paolacci, G. (2017) Crowdsourcing consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research* 44(1):196–210. [GPa]
- Gorgolewski, K., Nichols, T., Kennedy, D. N., Poline, J.-B. & Poldrack, R. A. (2017a) Promoting replications through positive incentives. *Figshare*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5278327.v1>. [KG]
- Gorgolewski, K., Nichols, T., Kennedy, D. N., Poline, J.-B. & Poldrack, R. A. (2017b) Replication award creation kit. *Figshare*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5567083.v1>. [KG]
- Grahe, J., Brandt, M., IJzerman, H. & Cohoon, J. (2014, February 28) Replication education. *Association for Psychological Science: Observer*. Available at: <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/replication-education>. [MAG]
- Grahe, J. E., Brandt, M. J., IJzerman, H., Cohoon, J., Peng, C., Detweiler-Bedell, B. & Weisberg, Y. (2015) Collaborative Replications and Education Project (CREP). Available at: <http://osf.io/vf6cu>. [HI]
- Gray, K. (2017) How to map theory: Reliable methods are fruitless without rigorous theory. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 12(5):731–41. [TC]
- Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T. & Steinberg, L. (1988) A reaction to Greenwald, Pratkanis, Leippe, and Baumgardner (1986): Under what conditions does research obstruct theory progress? *Psychological Review* 95:566–71. [HI]
- Greenwald, A. G. (1975) Significance, nonsignificance, and interpretation of an ESP experiment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 11:180–91. [arAZ]

- Greenwald, A. G., Pratkanis, A. R., Leippe, M. R. & Baumgardner, M. H. (1986) Under what conditions does theory obstruct research progress? *Psychological Review* 93:216. [HI]
- Grice, J., Barrett, P., Cota, L., Felix, C., Taylor, Z., Garner, S., Medellin, E. & Vest, A. (2017) Four bad habits of modern psychologists. *Behavioral Sciences* 7:53. [DRL]
- Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., Alberts, H., Anggono, C. O., Batailler, C., Birt, A. R., Brand, R., Brandt, M. J., Brewer, G., Bruyneel, S., Calvillo, D. P., Campbell, W. K., Cannon, P. R., Carlucci, M., Carruth, N. P., Cheung, T., Crowell, A., De Ridder, D. T. D., Dewitte, S., Elson, M., Evans, J. R., Fay, B. A., Fennis, B. M., Finley, A., Francis, Z., Heise, E., Hoemann, H., Inzlicht, M., Koole, S. L., Koppel, L., Kroese, F., Lange, F., Lau, K., Lynch, B. P., Martijn, C., Merckelbach, H., Mills, N. V., Michirev, A., Miyake, A., Mosser, A. E., Muise, M., Muller, D., Muzi, M., Nalis, D., Nurwanti, R., Otgaar, H., Philipp, M. C., Primoceri, P., Rentzsch, K., Ringos, L., Schlinkert, C., Schmeichel, B. J., Schoch, S. F., Schrama, M., Schütz, A., Stamos, A., Tinghög, G., Ullrich, J., vanDellen, M., Wimbarti, S., Wolff, W., Yusainy, C., Zerhoumi, O. & Zwiener, M. (2016) A multilab preregistered replication of the ego-depletion effect. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 11(4):546–73. [arRAZ, AK, EHW]
- Hawthorne, J. (2014) Bayesian confirmation theory. In: *The Bloomsbury Companion to the Philosophy of Science*, ed. S. French & J. Saatsi, p. 197. Bloomsbury Academic. [AOH]
- Heit, E., Hahn, U. & Feeney, A. (2005) Defending diversity. In: *Categorization inside and outside the laboratory: Essays in honor of Douglas L. Medin*, ed. W.-K. Ahn, R. L. Goldstone, B. C. Love, A. B. Markman & P. Wolff, pp. 87–99. American Psychological Association. [EH]
- Heit, E. & Rotello, C. M. (2014) Traditional difference-score analyses of reasoning are flawed. *Cognition* 131:75–91. [EH]
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J. & Norenzayan, A. (2010) Most people are not WEIRD. *Nature* 466(7302):29. [DJS]
- Hewitt, J. K. (2012) Editorial policy on candidate gene association and candidate gene-by-environment interaction studies of complex traits. *Behavior Genetics* 42(1):1–2. [arRAZ]
- Hofstee, W. K. B. (1984) Methodological decision rules as research policies: A betting reconstruction of empirical research. *Acta Psychologica* 56:93–109. [arAZ]
- Hovland, C. I. & Weiss, W. (1951) The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 15:635–50. [REP]
- Hüffmeier, J., Mazei, J. & Schultze, T. (2016) Reconceptualizing replication as a sequence of different studies: A replication typology. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 66:81–92. [arAZ]
- Hultsch, D. F. & Hickey, T. (1978) External validity in the study of human development: Theoretical and methodological issues. *Human Development* 21(2):76–91. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1159/000271576>. [DMA]
- IntHout, J., Ioannidis, J. P. & Borm, C. (2016) Obtaining evidence by a single well-powered trial or by several modestly powered trials. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 25:538–52. [JPAI]
- Ioannidis, J. P. (2005) Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Medicine* 2(8):e124. [arAZ, JPAI]
- Ioannidis, J. P. (2008) Why most discovered true associations are inflated. *Epidemiology* 19:640–48. [JPAI]
- Ioannidis, J. P. (2013a) Implausible results in human nutrition research. *British Medical Journal* 347:f6698. [JPAI]
- Ioannidis, J. P. (2013b) Discovery can be a nuisance, replication is science, implementation matters. *Frontiers in Genetics* 4:33. [JPAI]
- Ioannidis, J. P., Allison, D. B., Ball, C. A., Coulibaly, I., Cui, X., Cullhane, A. C., Falchi, M., Furlanello, C., Game, L., Jurman, G., Mangion, J., Mehta, T., Nitzburg, M., Page, G. P., Petretto, E. & van Noort, V. (2009) Repeatability of published microarray gene expression analyses. *Nature Genetics* 41(2):149–55. [MBN]
- Ioannidis, J. P. & Trikalinos, T. A. (2007) An exploratory test for an excess of significant findings. *Clinical Trials* 4:245–53. [TEH]
- James, W. (1907) Pragmatism's conception of truth. *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods* 4(6):141–55. [AGa]
- Jeffreys, H. (1961) *Theory of probability*. Oxford University Press. [arAZ]
- John, L. K., Loewenstein, G. & Prelec, D. (2012) Measuring the prevalence of questionable research practices with incentives for truth telling. *Psychological Science* 23(5):524–32. [arAZ, MBN]
- Kahneman, D. (2003) Experiences of collaborative research. *American Psychologist* 58:723. [arAZ]
- Kahneman, D. (2014) A new etiquette for replication. *Social Psychology* 45(4):310–11. [BAS, DJS, WT]
- Kanai, R., Bahrami, B., Roylance, R. & Rees, C. (2012) Online social network size is reflected in human brain structure. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences* 279(1732):1327–34. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.1959>. [KG]
- Kane, M. T. (2001) Current concerns in validity theory. *Journal of Educational Measurement* 38:319–42. [SOL]
- Kerr, N. L. (1998) HARKing: Hypothesizing after the results are known. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 2:196–217. Available at: http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0203_4. [arAZ]
- Kevic, K., Murphy, B., Williams, L. & Beckmann, J. (2017) Characterizing experimentation in continuous deployment: A case study on bing. In: *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice Track*, pp. 123–32. IEEE Press. [AGa]
- Kidwell, M. C., Lazarevic, L. B., Baranski, E., Hardwicke, T. E., Piechowski, S., Falkenberg, L.-S., Kennett, C., Slowik, A., Sonnleitner, C., Hess-Holden, C., Errington, T. M., Fiedler, S. & Nosek, B. A. (2016) Badges to acknowledge open practices: A simple, low-cost, effective method for increasing transparency. *PLoS Biology* 14(5):e1002456. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002456>. [MBN]
- Klein, J. R. & Roodman, A. (2005) Blind analysis in nuclear and particle physics. *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Physics* 55:141–63. [RJM]
- Klein, R. A., Ratliff, K. A., Vianello, M., Adams, R. B., Jr., Bahník, S., Bernstein, M. J., Bocian, K., Brandt, M. J., Brooks, B., Brumbaugh, C. C., Cemalcilar, Z., Chandler, J., Cheong, W., Davis, W. E., Devos, T., Eisner, M., Frankowska, N., Furrow, D., Galliani, E. M., Hasselman, F., Hicks, J. A., Hovermale, J. F., Hunt, S. J., Hunzinger, J. R., Ijzerman, H., John, M.-S., Joy-Gaba, J. A., Kappes, H. B., Krueger, L. E., Kurtz, J., Levitan, C. A., Mallett, R. K., Morris, W. L., Nelson, A. J., Nier, J. A., Packard, G., Pilati, R., Rutchick, A. M., Schmidt, K., Skorinko, J. L., Smith, R., Steiner, T. G., Storbeck, J., Van Swol, L. M., Thompson, D., van't Veer, A. E., Vaughn, L. A., Vranka, M., Wichman, A. L., Woodzicka, J. A. & Nosek, B. A. (2014a) Investigating variation in replicability: A “Many Labs” replication project. *Social Psychology* 45(3):142–52. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000178>. [arAZ, PDLH, SS, JLT]
- Klein, R. A., Ratliff, K. A., Vianello, M., Adams, R. B., Jr., Bahník, S., Bernstein, M. J., Bocian, K., Brandt, M. J., Brooks, B., Brumbaugh, C. C., Cemalcilar, Z., Chandler, J., Cheong, W., Davis, W. E., Devos, T., Eisner, M., Frankowska, N., Furrow, D., Galliani, E. M., Hasselman, F., Hicks, J. A., Hovermale, J. F., Hunt, S. J., Hunzinger, J. R., Ijzerman, H., John, M.-S., Joy-Gaba, J. A., Kappes, H. B., Krueger, L. E., Kurtz, J., Levitan, C. A., Mallett, R. K., Morris, W. L., Nelson, A. J., Nier, J. A., Packard, G., Pilati, R., Rutchick, A. M., Schmidt, K., Skorinko, J. L., Smith, R., Steiner, T. G., Storbeck, J., Van Swol, L. M., Thompson, D., van't Veer, A. E., Vaughn, L. A., Vranka, M., Wichman, A. L., Woodzicka, J. A. & Nosek, B. A. (2014b). Data from investigating variation in replicability: A “Many Labs” Replication Project. *Journal of Open Psychology Data* 2(1):e4. [RG-S]
- Klein, R. A., Ratliff, K. A., Vianello, M., Adams, R. B., Jr., Bahník, S., Bernstein, M. J., Bocian, K., Brandt, M. J., Brooks, B., Brumbaugh, C. C., Cemalcilar, Z., Chandler, J., Cheong, W., Davis, W. E., Devos, T., Eisner, M., Frankowska, N., Furrow, D., Galliani, E. M., Hasselman, F., Hicks, J. A., Hovermale, J. F., Hunt, S. J., Hunzinger, J. R., Ijzerman, H., John, M.-S., Joy-Gaba, J. A., Kappes, H. B., Krueger, L. E., Kurtz, J., Levitan, C. A., Mallett, R. K., Morris, W. L., Nelson, A. J., Nier, J. A., Packard, G., Pilati, R., Rutchick, A. M., Schmidt, K., Skorinko, J. L., Smith, R., Steiner, T. G., Storbeck, J., Van Swol, L. M., Thompson, D., van't Veer, A. E., Vaughn, L. A., Vranka, M., Wichman, A. L., Woodzicka, J. A. & Nosek, B. A. (2014c). Theory building through replication: Response to commentaries on the “Many Labs” replication project. *Social Psychology* 45(4):299–311. [TEH]
- Koehler, D. J. (2016) Can journalistic “false balance” distort public perception of consensus in expert opinion? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* 22(1):24–38. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000073>. [MB]
- Krupnikov, Y. & Levine, A. S. (2014). Cross-sample comparisons and external validity. *Journal of Experimental Social Science* 1(1), 59–80. [GPa]
- Kühberger, A., Fritz, A. & Scherndl, T. (2014) Publication bias in psychology: A diagnosis based on the correlation between effect size and sample size. *PLoS One* 9(9):e105825. [arAZ]
- Kunert, R. (2016) Internal conceptual replications do not increase independent replication success. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 23(5):1631–38. [arAZ]
- Lakatos, I. (1970) Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. In: *Criticism and the growth of knowledge*, ed. I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave, pp. 91–196. Cambridge University Press. [arRAZ]
- Lakatos, I. (1978) *The methodology of scientific research programs, vol. I*. Cambridge University Press. [EHW]
- Lakens, D. (2013) Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: A practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Frontiers in Psychology* 4:863. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00863>. [DMA]
- Lakens, D. (2016) The replication value: What should be replicated? Blog post. Available at: <http://daniellakens.blogspot.co.uk/2016/01/the-replication-value-what-should-be.html>. [RG-S]
- Lakens, D. (2017) Five reasons blog posts are of higher scientific quality than journal articles. Blog post. Available at: <http://daniellakens.blogspot.de/2017/04/five-reasons-blog-posts-are-of-higher.html>. [BE]
- Lawrence, P. A. (2003) The politics of publication. *Nature* 422:259–61. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1038/422259a>. [ARK]

- Leary, M. R., Diebels, K. J., Davison, E. K., Jongman-Sereno, K. P., Isherwood, J. C., Raimi, K. T., Deffler, S. A. & Hoyle, R. H. (2017) Cognitive and interpersonal features of intellectual humility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(6):793–813. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217697695>. [GPe]
- LeBel, E. P., Berger, D., Campbell, L. & Loving, T. J. (2017) Falsifiability is not optional. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 113:254–61. [aRAZ]
- LeBel, E. P. & Peters, K. R. (2011) Fearing the future of empirical psychology: Bem's (2011) evidence of psi as a case study of deficiencies in modal research practice. *Review of General Psychology* 15(4):371–79. [RG-S]
- Lee, M. D. & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2005) Bayesian statistical inference in psychology: Comment on Trafimow (2003). *Psychological Review* 112:662–68. [DRL]
- Leek, J., McShane, B. B., Gelman, A., Colquhoun, D., Nuijten, M. B., and Goodman, S. N. (2017) Five ways to fix statistics. *Nature* 551(7682):557–59. [JLT]
- Leighton, D. C., Legate, N., LePine, S., Anderson, S. F. & Grahe, J. (2018) Self-esteem, self-disclosure, self-expression, and connection on Facebook: A collaborative replication meta-analysis. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research* 23:98–109. [HI]
- Levitt Committee, Noort Committee & Drent Committee (2012, November 28) Flawed science: The fraudulent research practices of social psychologist Diederik Stapel. Retrieved 21 August 2017 from www.tilburguniversity.edu/upload/3ff904d7-547b-40ae85f5bea38e05a34a_Final%20report%20Flawed%20Science.pdf. [aRAZ]
- Lewin, K. (1943/1997). Psychological ecology. In G. W. Lewin & D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Resolving social conflicts & field theory in social science* (pp. 289–300). American Psychological Association. [AGa]
- Lewis, M. L. & Frank, M. C. (2016) Understanding the effect of social context on learning: A replication of Xu and Tenenbaum (2007b) *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 145:e72–80. [TEH]
- Lilienfeld, S. O. & Pinto, M. D. (2015) Risky tests of etiological models in psychopathology research: The need for meta-methodology. *Psychological Inquiry* 26:253–58. [SOL]
- Lindsay, D. S., Simons, D. J. & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2016) Research preregistration 101. *Association for Psychological Science Observer* 29:14–17. [SOL]
- Lipsey, M. W. & Wilson, D. B. (1993) The efficacy of psychological, educational, and behavioral treatment: Confirmation from meta-analysis. *American Psychologist* 48:1181–209. [RJM]
- Little, D. R., Altieri, N., Fific, M. & Yang, C.-T. (2017) *Systems factorial technology: A theory driven methodology for the identification of perceptual and cognitive mechanisms*. Academic. [DRL]
- Lord, F. M. & Novick, M. R. (1968) *Statistical theories of mental test scores*. Addison-Wesley. [EHW]
- Lucas, R. E. & Donnellan, M. B. (2013) Improving the replicability and reproducibility of research published in the *Journal of Research in Personality*. *Journal of Research in Personality* 4(47):453–54. [rRAZ]
- Lupia, A. & Elman, C. (2014) Openness in political science: Data access and research transparency. *PS – Political Science and Politics* 47:19–42. [aRAZ, SS]
- Luttrell, A., Petty, R. E. & Xu, M. (2017) Replicating and fixing failed replications: The case of need for cognition and argument quality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 69:178–83. [DTW]
- Ly, A., Etz, A., Marsman, M. & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2017) Replication Bayes factors from evidence updating. *PsyArXiv preprints*. Available at: <https://psyarxiv.com/u8m2s/>. [aRAZ]
- Ly, A., Verhagen, J. & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2016) Harold Jeffreys's default Bayes factor hypothesis tests: Explanation, extension, and application in psychology. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 72:19–32. [aRAZ]
- Lykken, D. T. (1968) Statistical significance in psychological research. *Psychological Bulletin* 70:151–59. [aRAZ, SOL]
- MacCoun, R. J. & Perlmutter, S. (2015) Hide results to seek the truth. *Nature* 526:187–89. [RJM]
- MacCoun, R. J. & Perlmutter, S. (2017) Blind analysis as a correction for confirmatory bias in physics and in psychology In: *Psychological science under scrutiny: Recent challenges and proposed solutions*, ed. S. O. Lilienfeld & I. Waldman, pp. 297–322. Wiley. [RJM]
- MacKay, D. J. (1992) Information-based objective functions for active data selection. *Neural Computation* 4(4):590–604. [TEH]
- Maher, B. & Anfres, M. S. (2016) Young scientists under pressure: What the data show. *Nature* 538:444–45. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1038/538444a> [ARK]
- Makel, M. C., Plucker, J. A. & Hegarty, B. (2012) Replications in psychology research: How often do they occur? *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 7(6):537–42. [aRAZ, PDLH]
- Manicas, P. T. & Secord, P. F. (1983) Implication for psychology of the new philosophy of science. *American Psychologist* 38(4):399–413. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.38.4.399>. [DMA]
- Many junior scientists need to take a hard look at their job prospects. Editorial. (2017) *Nature* 550(7677):429. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1038/550429a>. [ARK]
- Martin, G. N. & Clarke, M. (2017) Are psychology journals anti-replication? A snapshot of editorial practices. *Frontiers in Psychology* 8(523):1–6. [PDLH]
- Martinez, J. E., Funk, F. & Todorov, A. (2018). Quantifying idiosyncratic and shared contributions to stimulus evaluations. Available at: <http://psyarxiv.com/6vr8z>. [AGa]
- Matzke, D., Nieuwenhuis, S., van Rijn, H., Slagter, H. A., van der Molen, M. W. & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2015) The effect of horizontal eye movements on free recall: A preregistered adversarial collaboration. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 144(1):e1–15. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000038>. [aRAZ]
- Maxwell, S. E., Lau, M. Y. & Howard, G. S. (2015) Is psychology suffering from a replication crisis? What does “failure to replicate” really mean? *American Psychologist* 70:487–98. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039400>. [aRAZ]
- McShane, B. B. & Bockenholt, U. (2017) Single paper meta-analysis: Benefits for study summary, theory-testing, and replicability. *Journal of Consumer Research* 43(6):1048–63. [JLT]
- McShane, B. B. & Bockenholt, U. (2018) Multilevel multivariate meta-analysis with application to choice overload. *Psychometrika* 83(1):255–271. [JLT]
- McShane, B. B., Bockenholt, U. & Hansen, K. T. (2016) Adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis: An evaluation of selection methods and some cautionary notes. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 11(5):730–49. [JLT]
- McShane, B. B. & Gal, D. (2016) Blinding us to the obvious? The effect of statistical training on the evaluation of evidence. *Management Science* 62(6):1707–18. [JLT]
- McShane, B. B. & Gal, D. (2017) Statistical significance and the dichotomization of evidence. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 112(519):885–95. [JLT]
- McShane, B. B., Gal, D., Gelman, A., Robert, C. & Tackett, J. L. (2017) *Abandon statistical significance*. Technical report, Northwestern University. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.07588>. [AGe, JLT]
- Meehl, P. E. (1967) Theory-testing in psychology and physics: A methodological paradox. *Philosophy of Science* 34(2):103–15. [DMA, DRL]
- Meehl, P. E. (1990a) Why summaries of research on psychological theories are often uninterpretable. *Psychological Reports* 66(1):195–244. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1990.66.1.195>. [DMA, TC, DRL]
- Meehl, P. E. (1990b) Appraising and amending theories: The strategy of Lakatosian defense and two principles that warrant it. *Psychological Inquiry* 1:108–41. Available at: http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965phi0102_1. [aRAZ, TC, SS]
- Mellers, B., Hertwig, R. & Kahneman, D. (2001) Do frequency representations eliminate conjunction effects? An exercise in adversarial collaboration. *Psychological Science* 12:269–75. [aRAZ]
- Merton, R. K. (1942) The normative structure of science. In: *The sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations*, ed. R. K. Merton, pp. 267–80. University of Chicago Press. [SS]
- Mihura, J. L., Meyer, G. J., Dumitrascu, N. & Bombel, G. (2013). The validity of individual Rorschach variables: Systematic reviews and meta-analyses of the comprehensive system. *Psychological Bulletin* 139, 548–605. [SOL]
- Mill, J. S. (1882/2014) *A system of logic, 8th edition*. Harper and Brothers. (Original work published 1882.) Available at: https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/m/mill/john_stuart/system_of_logic/index.html [SS]
- Morey, R. D. & Lakens, D. (2016) Why most of psychology is statistically unfalsifiable. Available at: https://github.com/richardmorey/psychology_resolution/blob/master/paper/response.pdf [aRAZ]
- Motyl, M., Demos, A. P., Carsel, T. S., Hanson, B. E., Melton, Z. J., Mueller, A. B., Prims, J. P., Sun, J., Washburn, A. N., Wong, K., Yantis, C. A. & Skitka, L. J. (2017) The state of social and personality science: Rotten to the core, not so bad, getting better, or getting worse? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 113(1):34. [TC]
- Mullen, B., Muellerleile, P. & Bryant, B. (2001) Cumulative meta-analysis: A consideration of indicators of sufficiency and stability. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27(11):1450–62. [TEH]
- Munafò, M. R., Nosek, B. A., Bishop, D. V., Button, K. S., Chambers, C., Nosek, B., Pericé du Sert, N., Simonsohn, U., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Ware, J. J. & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2017) A manifesto for reproducible science. *Nature Human Behaviour* 1:0021. [JPAI]
- National Cancer Institute—National Human Genome Research Institute (NCI-NHGR) Working Group on Replication in Association Studies (2007) Replicating genotype-phenotype associations. *Nature* 447:655–60. [aRAZ]
- Nelson, L. D., Simmons, J. P. & Simonsohn, U. (2018) Psychology's renaissance. *Annual Review of Psychology* 69:511–34. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011836>. [BE, BAS]
- Nosek, B. A., Alter, G., Banks, G. C., Borsboom, D., Bowman, S. D., Breckler, S. J., Buck, S., Chambers, C. D., Chin, G., Christensen, G., Contestabile, M., Dafoe, A., Eich, E., Freese, J., Glennerster, R., Goroff, D., Green, D. P., Hesse, B., Humphreys, M., Ishiyama, J., Karlan, D., Kraut, A., Lupia, A., Mabry, P., Madon, T. A., Malhotra, N., Mayo-Wilson, E., McNutt, M., Miguel, E., Levy Paluck, E., Simonsohn, U., Soderberg, C., Spellman, B. A., Turitto, J., VandenBos, G., Vazire, S., Wagenmakers, E. J., Wilson, R. & Yarkoni, T. (2015) Promoting an open research culture. *Science* 348:1422–25. [BAS]

- Nosek, B. A. & Bar-Anan, Y. (2012) Scientific utopia: I. Opening scientific communication. *Psychological Inquiry* 23:217–43. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2012.692215>. [BE]
- Nosek, B. A. & Errington, T. M. (2017) Making sense of replications. *eLife* 6:e23383. [arRAZ]
- Nosek, B. A., Spies, J. R. & Motyl, M. (2012) Scientific utopia: II. Restructuring incentives and practices to promote truth over publishability. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 7(6):615–31. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612459058>. [ARK, GPe]
- Nuijten, M. B., Borghuis, J., Veldkamp, C. L. S., Dominguez-Alvarez, L., Van Assen, M. A. L. M. & Wicherts, J. M. (2017) Journal data sharing policies and statistical reporting inconsistencies in psychology. *Collabra: Psychology* 3(1):1–22. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.102>. [MBN]
- Nuijten, M. B., Hartgerink, C. H. J., Van Assen, M. A. L. M., Epskamp, S. & Wicherts, J. M. (2016) The prevalence of statistical reporting errors in psychology (1985–2013). *Behavior Research Methods* 48(4):1205–26. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0664-2>. [EH, MBN]
- Open Science Collaboration (2015) Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science* 349(6251):aac4716. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4716>. [arRAZ, MB, BE, RG-S, EH, PDLH, AK, JLT, US, WT, EHW]
- Paluck, E. L. & Shafir, E. (2017) The psychology of construal in the design of field experiments. *Handbook of Economic Field Experiments* 1:245–68. [AGa]
- Pashler, H. & Harris, C. (2012) Is the replicability crisis overblown? Three arguments examined. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 7:531–36. [arRAZ]
- Pashler, H. & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2012) Editors' introduction to the special section on replicability in psychological science: A crisis of confidence? *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 7:528–30. [arRAZ]
- Peer, E., Vosgerau, J. & Acquisti, A. (2014) Reputation as a sufficient condition for data quality on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Behavior Research Methods* 46(4):1023–31. [GPa]
- Pennycook, G., Cheyne, J. A., Barr, N., Koehler, D. J. & Fugelsang, J. A. (2015) On the reception and detection of pseudo-profound bullshit. *Judgment and Decision Making* 10(6):549–63. [GPe]
- Petrocelli, J., Clarkson, J., Whitmire, M. & Moon, P. (2012) When $ab \neq c'$: Published errors in the reports of single-mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods* 45(2):595–601. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-012-0262-5> [MBN]
- Petty, R. E. (2015) The replication crisis: Social psychology versus other sciences. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Denver, CO. [REP]
- Petty, R. E. & Cacioppo, J. T. (2016) Methodological choices have predictable consequences in replicating studies on motivation to think: Commentary on Ebersole et al. (2016). *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 67:86–87. [DTW]
- Phillips, J., Ong, D. C., Surtees, A. D. R., Xin, Y., Williams, S., Saxe, R. & Frank, M. C. (2015) A second look at automatic theory of mind. *Psychological Science* 26(9):1353–67. [TEH]
- Pitt, J. C. (1990) The myth of science education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 10:7–17. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00367684> [MB]
- Platt, J. R. (1964) Strong inference. *Science* 146(3642):347–53. [TEH]
- Poldrack, R. A., Baker, C. I., Durnez, J., Gorgolewski, K. J., Matthews, P. M., Munafò, M. R., Nichols, T. E., Poline, J. B., Vul, E. & Yarkoni, T. (2017) Scanning the horizon: Towards transparent and reproducible neuroimaging research. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 18(2):115–26. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1038/nrn.2016.167> [ARK]
- Popper, K. (1959) *The logic of scientific discovery*. Routledge. [SS]
- Popper, K. R. (1959) *Logic of scientific discovery*. Basic. [WT]
- Popper, K. R. (1959/2002) *The logic of scientific discovery*, translation of Logik der Forschung. Routledge. [arRAZ]
- Rand, D. G., Peysakhovich, A., Kraft-Todd, G. T., Newman, G. E., Wurzbacher, O., Nowak, M. A. & Greene, J. D. (2014) Social heuristics shape intuitive cooperation. *Nature Communications* 5:3677. [GP]
- Rewarding negative results keeps science on track. Editorial. (n.d.). *Nature* 551:414. Available at: <http://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-017-07325-2>. [KG]
- Rieth, C. A., Piantadosi, S. T., Smith, K. A. & Vul, E. (2013) Put your money where your mouth is: Incentivizing the truth by making nonreplicability costly. *European Journal of Personality* 27:120–44. [AOH]
- Robertson, C. T. & Kesselheim, A. S. (2016) *Blinding as a solution to bias: Strengthening biomedical science, forensic science, and law*. Academic. [RJM]
- Rohrer, D., Pashler, H. & Harris, C. R. (2015) Do subtle reminders of money change people's political views? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 144(4):e73. [arRAZ]
- Rosen, G. M. (1993). Self-help or hype? Comments on psychology's failure to advance self-care. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 24:340–45. [SOL]
- Rosenthal, R. (1979) The "file drawer problem" and tolerance for null results. *Psychological Bulletin* 86(3):638–41. [arAZ]
- Rotello, C. M., Heit, E. & Dubé, C. (2015) When more data steer us wrong: Replications with the wrong dependent measure perpetuate erroneous conclusions. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 22:944–54. [arAZ, EH]
- Rotello, C. M., Masson, M. E. J. & Verde, M. F. (2008) Type I error rates and power analyses for single-point sensitivity measures. *Perception and Psychophysics* 70:389–401. [EH]
- Rothstein, H. R. & Bushman, B. J. (2012) Publication bias in psychological science: Comment on Ferguson and Brannick (2012). *Psychological Methods* 17:129–36. [arAZ]
- Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (2018) *Replication studies. Improving reproducibility in the empirical sciences*. KNAW. [MBN]
- Salmon, W. C. (1984) *Scientific explanation and the causal structure of the world*. Princeton University Press. [EH]
- Schimmack, U. (2012) The ironic effect of significant results on the credibility of multiple-study articles. *Psychological Methods* 17:551–56. [US]
- Schimmack, U. (2014) The test of insufficient variance (TIVA): A new tool for the detection of questionable research practices. Working paper. Available at: <https://replicationindex.wordpress.com/2014/12/30/the-test-of-insufficient-variance-tiva-a-new-tool-for-the-detection-of-questionable-research-practices/>. [US]
- Schimmack, U. (2017) 'Before you know it' by John A. Bargh: A quantitative book review. Available at: <https://replicationindex.wordpress.com/2017/11/28/before-you-know-it-by-john-a-bargh-a-quantitative-book-review/>. [US]
- Schimmack, U. & Brunner, J. (submittrd for publication) Z-Curve: A method for estimating replicability based on test statistics in original studies. Submitted for Publication. [US]
- Schimmack, U., Heene, M. & Kesavan, K. (2017) Reconstruction of a train wreck: How priming research went off the rails. Blog post. Available at: <https://replicationindex.wordpress.com/2017/02/02/reconstruction-of-a-train-wreck-how-priming-research-went-off-the-rails/>. [US]
- Schmidt, F. L. & Oh, I.-S. (2016) The crisis of confidence in research findings in psychology: Is lack of replication the real problem? Or is it something else? *Archives of Scientific Psychology* 4(1):32–37. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/arc0000029>. [arAZ]
- Schmidt, S. (2009) Shall we really do it again? The powerful concept of replication is neglected in the social sciences. *Review of General Psychology* 13:90–100. [arAZ, AGe]
- Schnall, S. (2014a) An experience with a registered replication project. Blog post. Available at: <http://www.psychol.cam.ac.uk/cece/blog#anchor-2>. [WT]
- Schnall, S. (2014b) Further thoughts on replications, ceiling effects and bullying. Blog post. Available at: <http://www.psychol.cam.ac.uk/cece/blog>. [WT]
- Schnall, S. (2014c) Social media and the crowd-sourcing of social psychology. Blog post. Available at: <http://www.psychol.cam.ac.uk/cece/blog>. [WT]
- Schönbrodt, F. D. (2018). *p-checker: One-for-all p-value analyzer*. Available at: <http://shinyapps.org/apps/p-checker/>. [MBN]
- Schooler, J. (2011) Unpublished results hide the decline effect. *Nature* 470:37. [WT]
- Schooler, J. (2014) Metascience could rescue the 'replication crisis'. *Nature* 515:9. [WT]
- Schweinsberg, M., Madan, N., Vianello, M., Sommer, S. A., Jordan, J., Tierney, W., Awtrey, E., Zhu, L. L., Diermeier, D., Heinze, J. E., Srinivasan, M., Tannenbaum, D., Bivolaru, E., Dana, J., Davis-Stober, C. P., du Plessis, C., Gronau, Q. F., Hafenbrack, A. C., Liao, E. Y., Ly, A., Marsman, M., Murase, T., Qureshi, I., Schaefer, M., Thornley, N., Tworek, C. M., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Wong, L., Anderson, T., Bauman, C. W., Bedwell, W. L., Brescoll, V., Canavan, A., Chandler, J. J., Cheries, E., Cheryan, S., Cheung, F., Cimpian, A., Clark, M. A., Cordon, D., Cushman, F., Ditto, P. H., Donahue, T., Frick, S. E., Gamez-Djokic, M., Hofstein Grady, R., Graham, J., Gu, J., Hahn, A., Hanson, B. E., Hartwich, N. J., Hein, K., Inbar, Y., Jiang, L., Kellogg, T., Kennedy, D. M., Legate, N., Luoma, T. P., Maibuecher, H., Meindl, P., Miles, J., Mislin, A., Molden, D. C., Motyl, M., Newman, G., Ngo, H. H., Packham, H., Ramsay, P. S., Ray, J. L., Sackett, A. M., Sellier, A.-L., Sokolova, T., Sowden, W., Storage, D., Sun, X., Van Bavel, J. J., Washburn, A. N., Wei, C., Wetter, E., Wilson, C. T., Darrous, S.-C. & Uhlmann, E. L. (2016) The pipeline project: Pre-publication independent replications of a single laboratory's research pipeline. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 66:55–67. [arAZ, WT]
- Shanks, D. R., Vadillo, M. A., Riedel, B., Clymo, A., Govind, S., Hickin, N., Tamman, A. J. & Puhlmann, L. (2015) Romance, risk, and replication: Can consumer choices and risk-taking be primed by mating motives? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 144(6):e142–58. [arAZ]
- Silberzahn, R., Uhlmann, E. L., Martin, D., Anselmi, P., Aust, F., Awtrey, E., Bahnik, Š., Bai, F., Bannard, C., Bonnier, E., Carlsson, R., Cheung, F., Christensen, G., Clay, R., Craig, M. A., Dalla Rosa, A., Dam, L., Evans, M. H., Flores Cervantes, I., Fong, N., Gamez-Djokic, M., Glenz, A., Gordon-McKeon, S., Heaton, T. J., Hederes, K., Heene, M., Hofelisch Mohr, A. J., Högden, F., Hui, K., Johannesson, M., Kalodimos, J., Kaszubowski, E., Kennedy, D. M., Lei, R., Lindsay, T. A., Liverani, S., Madan, C. R., Molden, D., Molleman, E., Morey, R. D., Mulder, L. B., Nijstad, B. R., Pope, N. G., Pope, B., Prenoaveau, J. M.,

- Rink, F., Robusto, E., Roderique, H., Sandberg, A., Schlüter, E., Schönbrodt, F. D., Sherman, M. F., Sommer, S. A., Sotak, K., Spain, S., Spörlein, C., Stafford, T., Stefanutti, L., Tauber, S., Ullrich, J., Vianello, M., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Witkowski, M., Yoon, S. & Nosek, B. A. (2017) Many analysts, one dataset: Making transparent how variations in analytical choices affect results. PsyArXiv Preprint. Available at: <https://psyarxiv.com/qkwst/>. [aRAZ]
- Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D. & Simonsohn, U. (2011) False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychological Science* 22:1359–66. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417632>. [aRAZ, BE, MBN, BAS]
- Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D. & Simonsohn, U. (2018) False-positive citations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 13(2):255–59. [BE]
- Simmons, J. & Simonsohn, U. (2015) Power posing: Reassessing the evidence behind the most popular TED talk. Blog post. Available at: <http://datacolada.org/37>. [AGe]
- Simons, D. J., Holcombe, A. O. & Spellman, B. A. (2014) An introduction to Registered Replication Reports at *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 9(5):552–55. [BAS, JLT]
- Simons, D. J., Shoda, Y. & Lindsay, D. S. (2017) Constraints on generality (COG): A proposed addition to all empirical papers. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 12:1123–28. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617708630>. [aRAZ, AOH, HI, DJS]
- Simonsohn, U. (2015) Small telescopes: Detectability and the evaluation of replication results. *Psychological Science* 26:559–69. [aRAZ, GPa]
- Simonsohn, U. (2016, March 3) [47] Evaluating replications: 40% full ≠ 60% empty. Available at: <https://web.archive.org/web/20170709184952/http://datacolada.org/47>. [aRAZ]
- Simonsohn, U., Nelson, L. D. & Simmons, J. P. (2014) P-curve: A key to the file-drawer. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 143(2):534–47. [TEH]
- Simpson, E. H. (1951) The Interpretation of interaction in contingency tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 13(2):238–41. [JpDR]
- Smaldino, P. E. & McElreath, R. (2016) The natural selection of bad science. *Royal Society Open Science* 3:160384. [aRAZ]
- Smart, R. G. (1964) The importance of negative results in psychological research. *Canadian Psychologist* 5:225–32. [aRAZ]
- Smith, G. T., McCarthy, D. M. & Anderson, K. G. (2000) On the sins of short-form development. *Psychological Assessment* 12:102–11. [SOL]
- Smith, P. L. & Little, D. R. (2018) Small is beautiful: In defence of the small-N design. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-018-1451-8>. [DRL]
- Spellman, B. A. (2015) A short (personal) future history of Revolution 2.0. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 10:886–99. [aRAZ, BAS]
- Sripada, C., Kessler, D. & Jonides, J. (2014) Methylphenidate blocks effort-induced depletion of regulatory control in healthy volunteers. *Psychological Science* 25:1227–34. [AK]
- Srivastava, S. S. (2011, December 31) Groundbreaking or definitive? Journals need to pick one. Blog post. Available at: <https://spsptalks.wordpress.com/2011/12/31/groundbreaking-or-definitive-journals-need-to-pick-one/>. [SS]
- Srivastava, S. (2012, September 17) A Pottery Barn rule for scientific journals. Blog post. Available at: <https://hardsci.wordpress.com/2012/09/27/a-pottery-barn-rule-for-scientific-journals/>. [aRAZ]
- Ståhl, T., Zaal, M. P. & Skitka, L. J. (2016) Moralized rationality: Relying on logic and evidence in the formation and evaluation of belief can be seen as a moral issue. *PLoS One* 11(11):e0166332. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0166332>. [GPe]
- Stanley, T. D., Carter, E. C. & Doucouliagos, H. (November 2017) What meta-analyses reveal about the replicability of psychological research. Deakin Laboratory for the Meta-Analysis of Research, Working Paper . [JLT]
- Steege, S., Tuerlinckx, F., Gelman, A. & Vanpaemel, W. (2016) Increasing transparency through a multiverse analysis. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 11(5):702–12. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616658637>. [THE, MBN]
- Sterling, T. D. (1959) Publication decisions and their possible effects on inferences drawn from tests of significance—or vice versa. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 54(285):30–34. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.2307/2282137>. [aRAZ, US]
- Sterling, T. D., Rosenbaum, W. L. & Weinkam, J. J. (1995) Publication decisions revisited: The effect of the outcome of statistical tests on the decision to publish and vice versa. *The American Statistician* 49:108–12. [aRAZ]
- Sternberg, S. (1969) The discovery of processing stages: Extensions of Donders' method. *Acta Psychologica* 30:276–315. [DRL]
- Stewart, N., Chandler, J. & Paolacci, G. (2017) Crowdsourcing samples in cognitive science. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 21(10):736–48. [GPa]
- Stewart, N., Ungemach, C., Harris, A. J., Bartels, D. M., Newell, B. R., Paolacci, G. & Chandler, J. (2015) The average laboratory samples a population of 7,300 Amazon Mechanical Turk workers. *Judgment and Decision Making* 10(5):479–91. [GPa]
- Stirman, S. W., Gamarra, J. M., Bartlett, B. A., Calloway, A. & Gutner, C. A. (2017) Empirical examinations of modifications and adaptations to evidence based psychotherapies: Methodologies, impact, and future directions. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice* 24:396–420. [SOL]
- Stodden, V., McNutt, M., Bailey, D. H., Deelman, E., Gil, Y., Hanson, B., Heroux, M. A., Ioannidis, J. P. & Tauber, M. (2016) Enhancing reproducibility for computational methods. *Science* 354(6317):1240–41. [TEH]
- Strack, F. (2017) From data to truth in psychological science. A personal perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology* 8:702. Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5432643/>. [FS]
- Strevens, M. (2001) The Bayesian treatment of auxiliary hypotheses. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 52(3):515–37. [AOH, rRAZ]
- Strevens, M. (2006) The Bayesian approach to the philosophy of science. In: *Encyclopedia of philosophy*, ed. D. M. Borcherdt, pp. 495–502. Macmillan Reference. [TEH]
- Strevens, M. (2017) Notes on Bayesian confirmation theory [paper]. Available at: <http://www.nyu.edu/classes/strevens/BCT/BCT.pdf>. [AOH]
- Stroebe, W. & Strack, F. (2014) The alleged crisis and the illusion of exact replication. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 9:59–71. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691613514450>. [aRAZ, FS, AMT, DTW]
- Szucs, D. & Ioannidis, J. P. (2017a) Empirical assessment of published effect sizes and power in the recent cognitive neuroscience and psychology literature. *PLoS Biology* 15(3):e2000797. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2000797>. [ARK]
- Szucs, D. & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2017b) When null hypothesis significance testing is unsuitable for research: A reassessment. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 11:390. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2017.00390>. [DMA]
- Tackett, J. L., Brandes, C. M. & Reardon, K. W. (in press) Leveraging the Open Science Framework in clinical psychological assessment research. *Psychological Assessment* [JLT]
- Tackett, J. L., Lilienfeld, S. O., Patrick, C. J., Johnson, S. L., Krueger, R. F., Miller, J. D., Oltmans, T. F. & Shrout, P. E. (2017a) It's time to broaden the replicability conversation: Thoughts for and from clinical psychological science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 12(5):742–56. [JLT, SOL]
- Tackett, J. L., McShane, B. B., Bockenholt, U. & Gelman, A. (2017b) Large scale replication projects in contemporary psychological research. Technical report, Northwestern University. Available at: arXiv:1710.06031. [JLT]
- Thomson, K. S. & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2016) Investigating an alternate form of the cognitive reflection test. *Judgment and Decision Making* 11(1):99–113. [GPa]
- Tierney, W., Schweinsberg, M., Jordan, J., Kennedy, D. M., Qureshi, I., Sommer, A., Thornley, N., Madan, N., Vianello, M., Avtry, E., Zhu, L. L., Diermeier, D., Heinze, J. E., Srinivasan, M., Tannenbaum, D., Bivolaru, E., Dana, J., Davis-Stober, C. P., du Plessis, C., Gronau, Q. F., Hafenbrack, A. C., Liao, E. Y., Ly, M. M., Murase, T., Schaefer, M., Tworek, C. M., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Wong, L., Anderson, T., Bauman, C. W., Bedwell, W. L., Brescoll, V., Canavan, A., Chandler, J. J., Cheries, E., Cheryan, S., Cheung, F., Cimpian, A., Clark, M. A., Cordon, D., Cushman, F., Ditto, P. H., Amell, A., Frick, S. E., Gamez-Djokic, M., Hofstein Grady, R., Graham, J., Gu, J., Hahn, A., Hanson, B. E., Hartwich, N. J., Hein, K., Inbar, Y., Jiang, L., Kellogg, T., Legate, N., Luoma, T. P., Maibeuch, H., Meindl, P., Miles, J., Mislin, A., Molden, D. C., Motyl, M., Newman, G., Ngo, H. H., Packhan, H., Ramsay, P. S., Ray, J. L., Sackett, A. M., Sellier, A.-L., Sokolova, T., Sowden, W., Storage, D., Sun, X., Van Bavel, J. J., Washburn, A. N., Wei, C., Wetter, E., Wilson, C. T., Darroux, S.-C. & Uhlmann, E. L. (2016) Data from a pre-publication independent replication initiative examining ten moral judgement effects. *Nature Scientific Data* 3:160082. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.82>. [WT]
- Tracy, J. L. & Beall, A. T. (2014) The impact of weather on women's tendency to wear red or pink when at high risk for conception. *PLoS One* 9(2):e88852. [AGe]
- Traxler, M. J. & Gernsbacher, M. A. (1992) Improving written communication through minimal feedback. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 7:1–22. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01690969208409378>. [MAG]
- Traxler, M. J. & Gernsbacher, M. A. (1993) Improving written communication through perspective-taking. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 8:311–34. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01690969308406958>. [MAG]
- van Aert, R. C. & van Assen, M. A. (2017) Bayesian evaluation of effect size after replicating an original study. *PLoS One* 12(4):e0175302. [aRAZ]
- Van Bavel, J. J., Mende-Siedlecki, P., Brady, W. J. & Reinero, D. A. (2016) Contextual sensitivity in scientific reproducibility. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 113(23):6454–59. [aRAZ]
- van Erp, S., Verhagen, A. J., Grasman, R. P. P. & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2017) Estimates of between-study heterogeneity for 705 meta-analyses reported in *Psychological Bulletin* from 1990–2013. *Journal of Open Psychology Data* 5(1):4. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/jopd.33>. [JLT]
- Vanpaemel, W., Vermorgen, M., Deriemaecker, L. & Storms, G. (2015) Are we wasting a good crisis? The availability of psychological research data after the storm. *Collabra* 1(1):1–5. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.13>. [MBN]
- Veldkamp, C. L. S., Nuijten, M. B., Dominguez-Alvarez, L., van Assen, M. A. L. M. & Wicherts, J. M. (2014) Statistical reporting errors and collaboration on statistical analyses in psychological science. *PLoS One* 9(12):e114876. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0114876>. [MBN]
- Verhagen, A. J. & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2014) Bayesian tests to quantify the result of a replication attempt. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 143:1457–75. [aRAZ]

- Vohs, K. D. (2018) A pre-registered depletion replication project: The paradigmatic replication approach. Presented at the Symposium at the 2018 Society of Personality and Social Psychology Annual Convention, Atlanta, GA. [BAS]
- Vul, E., Harris, C., Winkielman, P. & Pashler, H. (2009) Puzzlingly high correlations in fMRI studies of emotion, personality, and social cognition. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 4:274–90. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01125.x>. [BE]
- Wagenmakers, E.-J., Beek, T., Dijkhoff, L., Gronau, Q. F., Acosta, A., Adams, R. B., Jr., Albohn, D. N., Allard, E. S., Benning, S. D., Blouin-Hudon, E.-M., Bulnes, L. C., Caldwell, T. L., Calin-Jageman, R. J., Capaldi, C. A., Carfagno, N. S., Chasten, K. T., Cleeremans, A., Connell, L., DeCicco, J. M., Dijkstra, K., Fischer, A. H., Foroni, F., Hess, U., Holmes, K. J., Jones, J. L. H., Klein, O., Koch, C., Korb, S., Lewinski, P., Liao, J. D., Lund, S., Lupianez, J., Lynott, D., Nance, C. N., Oosterwijk, S., Ozdoğru, A. A., Pacheco-Unguetti, A. P., Pearson, B., Powis, C., Riding, S., Roberts, T.-A., Rumiati, R. I., Senden, M., Shea-Shumsky, N. B., Sobocko, K., Soto, J. A., Steiner, T. G., Talarico, J. M., van Allen, Z. M., Vandekerckhove, M., Wainwright, B., Wayand, J. F., Zeelenberg, R., Zetzer, E. E. & Zwaan, R. A. (2016a) Registered replication report: Strack, Martin & Stepper (1988). *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 11:917–28. [arRAZ]
- Wagenmakers, E.-J., Verhagen, A. J. & Ly, A. (2016b) How to quantify the evidence for the absence of a correlation. *Behavior Research Methods* 48:413–26. [aRAZ]
- Wagge, J., Johnson, K., Meltzer, A., Baciú, C., Banas, K., Nadler, J. T., Ijzerman, H. & Grahe, J. E. (in preparation). Elliott *et al.*'s (2011) “Red, rank, and romance” effect: A meta-analysis of CREP replications. [HI]
- Wald, A. (1947) *Sequential analysis*. Wiley. [EHW]
- Wald, A. (1950) *Statistical decision functions*. Wiley. [NAC]
- Wallot, S. & Kely-Stephen, D. G. (2018) Interaction-dominant causation in mind and brain, and its implication for questions of generalization and replication. *Minds and Machines* 28(2):353–74. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-017-9455-0>. [DMA]
- Washburn, A. N., Hanson, B. E., Motyl, M., Skitka, L., Yantis, C., Wong, K., Sun, J., Prims, J., Mueller, A. B., Melton, Z. J. & Carsel, T. S. (2018) Why do some psychology researchers resist using proposed reforms to research practices? A description of researchers' rationales. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*. Published online March 7, 2018. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245918757427>. [TC]
- Wicherts, J. M., Bakker, M. & Molenaar, D. (2011) Willingness to share research data is related to the strength of the evidence and the quality of reporting of statistical results. *PLoS One* 6(11):e26828. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0026828>. [MBN]
- Wicherts, J. M., Borsboom, D., Kats, J. & Molenaar, D. (2006) The poor availability of psychological research data for reanalysis. *American Psychologist* 61:726–28. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.61.7.726>. [MBN]
- Widaman, K. (2015) Confirmatory theory testing: Moving beyond NHST. The score. Newsletter. Available at: <http://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2015/01/issue.pdf>. [DMA]
- Witte, E. H. & Melville, P. (1982) Experimentelle Kleingruppenforschung: Methodologische Anmerkungen und eine empirische Studie. [Experimental small group research: Methodological remarks and an empirical study.] *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie* 13:109–24. [EHW]
- Witte, E. H. & Zeelenberg, R. (2016a) Reconstructing recent work on macro-social stress as a research program. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 38(6):301–307. [EHW]
- Witte, E. H. & Zeelenberg, R. (2016b) Beyond schools – reply to Marsman, Ly & Wagenmakers. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 38(6):313–17. [EHW]
- Witte, E. H. & Zeelenberg, R. (2017a) Extending a multilab preregistered replication of the ego-depletion effect to a research program. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 39(1):74–80. [EHW]
- Witte, E. H. & Zeelenberg, R. (2017b) From discovery to justification. Outline of an ideal research program in empirical psychology. *Frontiers in Psychology* 8:1847. Available at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01847/full>. [EHW]
- Wood, J. M., Garb, H. N., Nezworski, M. T., Lilienfeld, S. O. & Duke, M. C. (2015) A second look at the validity of widely used Rorschach indices: Comment on Mihura, Meyer, Dumitrascu, and Bombel (2013). *Psychological Bulletin* 141:236–49. [SOL]
- Wrinch, D. & Jeffreys, H. (1921) XLII. On certain fundamental principles of scientific inquiry. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science* 42(249):369–90. [aRAZ]
- Yarkoni, T. & Westfall, J. (2017) Choosing prediction over explanation in psychology: Lessons from machine learning. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 1–23. [DRL]
- Zwaan, R. A. (2017, May 8) Concurrent replication. Blog post. Available at: <https://rolfzwaan.blogspot.nl/2017/05/concurrent-replication.html>. [rRAZ, MAG]
- Zwaan, R. A., Pecher, D., Paolacci, G., Bouwmeester, S., Verkoeijen, P., Dijkstra, K. & Zeelenberg, R. (2017) Participant nonnaïveté and the reproducibility of cognitive psychology. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1348-y>. [aRAZ, GPa]

