Instructions:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our survey. Recently, there has been a push for replication in psychological (and other) sciences. As such, various members have been performing large scale replications of previous work. We are interested in the opinions of members of the research community in relation to such work. Please answer the following questions as honestly as possible with the presented scenario in mind.

Self\_Admission

Think about a study that you published that you are particularly proud of. It could even be the one that has “made” your career. Now imagine that another lab, with members that you are unfamiliar with, decides to do a replication of that finding. They run the study exactly according to your methods. However, they are unable to replicate it. They run it again, with a few extra tweaks, and are still unable to replicate your initial finding. The authors then publish the work and blog about their attempts. Their conclusion is, while not final, that it seems likely that your initial finding is a Type I error (you rejected the null, when it was true) and, more importantly, that your effect is not real.

What do you think the broader research community would conclude about you if you were to go on the blog or any other media and say “In light of the evidence, it looks like I was wrong about the effect.”

Self\_No Admission

Think about a study that you published that you are particularly proud of. It could even be the one that has “made” your career. Now imagine that another lab, with members that you are unfamiliar with, decides to do a replication of that finding. They run the study exactly according to your methods. However, they are unable to replicate it. They run it again, with a few extra tweaks, and are still unable to replicate your initial finding. The authors then publish the work and blog about their attempts. Their conclusion is, while not final, that it seems likely that your initial finding is a Type I error (you rejected the null, when it was true) and, more importantly, that your effect is not real.

What do you think the broader research community would conclude about you if you were to go on the blog or any other media and say “In light of the evidence, it looks like I was wrong about the effect.”

Please respond honestly about your real impressions, not what you think would be best.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neither Agree nor Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

1. Other researchers would assume that I used questionable research practices in the initial study.
2. Other researchers would assume that I partook in p-hacking to find my original effect.
3. Other researchers would assume that my other work is probably suspect as well.
4. Other researchers might call for an investigation of my other work.
5. Other researchers would suggest that this is a part of science and not blame me for anything.
6. Other researchers would be suspicious of any of the future work I submit for publication.
7. Other researchers would trust my work.
8. Other researchers would look at me as an example of how to handle such a situation.
9. Other researchers would consider me a good scientist.
10. Other researchers would trust in my integrity.
11. Other researchers would suspect me of fraud.
12. Other researchers would invite me to be part of a future conference symposium.
13. Other researchers would not want to collaborate with me.
14. Other researchers would invite me to give talks at their institution.
15. Other researchers would not cite my other work.

Other\_Admission

Think about a prominent, interesting study that you know of (not your own). It could even be the one that made you choose to be a researcher. Now imagine that another lab, with members not related to the original authors, decides to do a replication of that finding. They run the study exactly according to the original methods. However, they are unable to replicate it. They run it again, with a few extra tweaks, and are still unable to replicate the initial finding. The authors then publish the work and blog about their attempts. Their conclusion is, while not final, that it seems likely that the initial finding is a Type I error (they rejected the null, when it was true) and, more importantly, that the effect is not real.

What would you conclude about the original researchers if they were to go on the blog or any other media and say “In light of the evidence, it looks like we were wrong about the effect.”

Other\_No Admission

Think about a prominent, interesting study that you know of (not your own). It could even be the one that made you choose to be a researcher. Now imagine that another lab, with members not related to the original authors, decides to do a replication of that finding. They run the study exactly according to the original methods. However, they are unable to replicate it. They run it again, with a few extra tweaks, and are still unable to replicate the initial finding. The authors then publish the work and blog about their attempts. Their conclusion is, while not final, that it seems likely that the initial finding is a Type I error (they rejected the null, when it was true) and, more importantly, that the effect is not real.

What would you conclude about the original researchers if they were to go on the blog or any other media and say “We have concerns about the replication study. We still think the effect is real.”

Please respond honestly about your real impressions, not what you think would be best.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neither Agree nor Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

1. I would assume that the original authors used questionable research practices in the initial study.
2. I would assume that the original authors partook in p-hacking to find the original effect.
3. I would assume that the original authors’ other work is probably suspect as well.
4. I might call for an investigation of the original authors’ other work.
5. I would suggest that this is a part of science and not blame the original authors for anything.
6. I would be suspicious of any of the future work the original authors submit for publication.
7. I would trust the original authors’ work.
8. I would look at the original authors as an example of how to handle such a situation.
9. I would consider the original authors as good scientists.
10. I would trust in the original author’s integrity.
11. I would suspect the original authors of fraud.
12. I would invite the original authors to be part of a future conference symposium.
13. I would not want to collaborate with the original authors
14. I would invite the original authors to give talks at my institution.
15. I would not cite the original authors’ other work.

Demographic information

What is your age?

What is your gender?

What is your race?

Your broad field of research (e.g., Social psychology, Personality, Cognitive, Clinical, I/O, biology, chemistry etc.)

Years in the field

Approximate amount of publications

Current Position

Are you tenured?

If you do not mind adding your institution, please do so here.

Country of residence

Not to force a dichotomy, but what side of the current arguments do you identify with?

1 = Hardcore replicator

2

3

4

5 = Replication is not important