

### Online Supplementary Materials for LeBel et al. (in press, PPS)

#### Description of Open Science Framework (OpenScienceFramework.org):

The OSF is a website characterized by several important features that promote greater scientific openness and transparency by allowing researchers to make public as much of their daily research workflow as they desire. For instance, all study materials, stimuli, data, and syntax files can be stored in the cloud to facilitate collaboration among lab members and collaborators, reducing the likelihood that materials and data are lost due to computer malfunction or changing personnel. The website also allows registration of materials and study protocols which certifies planned procedural and analytic decisions prior to data collection (Wagenmakers et al., 2012). The OSF also facilitates independent direct replications by easily allowing researchers to make publicly available the exact research materials, stimuli, and all procedural details to outside researchers. Finally, the infrastructure also facilitates re-analyses by outside researchers and meta-analytic efforts.

#### Current working version of email sent to corresponding authors:

\*\*\*\*\*

Dear [Authors],

As you may know, several common research practices in psychology have been highlighted as potentially impeding knowledge development and hurting the reputation of our field. For instance, it has become acceptable -- and action editors often have required authors -- to selectively exclude and report measures, manipulations, samples, and analyses on the basis of whether these practices yield significant results or tell more compelling stories rather than for principled reasons. (Though of course many methodological design specifications are also often not reported for reasons which have nothing to do with increasing the statistical significance or compellingness of the story.)

Regardless of the source of these suboptimal research practices, **it is our belief that many of us would appreciate the opportunity to provide more details about the methods actually used to obtain findings reported in published articles (indeed over 40% of contacted authors have provided such details). Our initiative provides this opportunity.** Our effort builds upon a recently proposed initiative wherein authors submitting manuscripts for publication voluntarily include a 21-word disclosure statement regarding crucial methodological details that are not required to be disclosed under currently accepted reporting standards (see appendix to this email for details).

We are inviting a subset of corresponding authors of recently published articles (2012 and onward) in prominent psychology journals to make these details publicly available to increase the information value of their article. Within 5 minutes, you can answer the four questions below by replying to this email. Responses will be posted on a [public website](#) (please visit to see exactly how this will be posted)

#### QUESTIONS:

For all studies in your recently published [Journal Name] article titled [Article Title], please endorse the following statements: (please type an X to indicate your answer)

1. We reported the total number of observations which were excluded (if any) and the criterion for doing so. (If no observations excluded, please indicate Yes)

Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ No: \_\_\_\_\_

**If no, please report this information here** (e.g., data from 3 participants in Study 2 excluded (e.g. due to computer malfunction; 4 participants in Study 1 excluded for not following instructions):

2. We reported all tested experimental conditions, including failed manipulations.

Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ No: \_\_\_\_\_

**If no, please provide brief explanation for not reporting this information** (e.g., critical software implementation error; editorial request):

3. We reported all administered measures/items.

Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ No: \_\_\_\_\_

**If no, please provide brief explanation for not reporting this information** (e.g., measures not related to research question; scores from unreported measure insufficiently reliable):

4. We reported (a) how we determined our sample size **and** (b) our data collection stopping rule.

Yes: \_\_\_\_\_ No: \_\_\_\_\_

**If no, please describe (a) the basis for the sample sizes used and (b) how you decided to stop collecting data** (e.g., decided ahead of time to collect data until minimum sample size achieved and this was followed; sample size determined by power analysis but didn't achieve it by the end of term):

This initiative has received appropriate ethics clearance in accordance with APA guidelines. To protect the anonymity of non-respondents, only a randomly determined subset (i.e., half) of the corresponding authors in your journal and issue have been contacted.

We emphasize that the additional information requested is not intended to question or stigmatize published research, but to

give a more accurate picture of the actual methods used to obtain the findings, correcting for artificially rigid standards of evidence in publication. The project is committed to transparency and open science practices (information and project materials available [here](#)).

Please let us know if you have any questions (see FAQ section below). Thank you for considering our request.

Best regards,

Etienne P. LeBel  
*University of Western Ontario*  
Fred Hasselman  
*Radboud University Nijmegen*

Denny Borsboom  
*University of Amsterdam*  
Kurt R. Peters  
*ICF International*

Roger Giner-Sorolla  
*University of Kent*  
Kate A. Ratliff    Colin Tucker Smith  
*University of Florida*

*Appendix*

Proposed 21-word disclosure statement:

*We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions (if any), all manipulations, and all measures in the study.*

Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2012). A 21 Word Solution. *SPSP Dialogue*, 26, 2, Fall 2012 issue.

Available at: [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2160588](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2160588)

Or, alternatively – and the one we prefer -- an 18-word disclosure statement:

*We report all measures in the study, all manipulations, any data exclusions, and the sample size determination rule.*

*Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)*

**Q: Won't people just lie when providing additional information for the public website?**

A: We think they won't. We are confident that in spite of recent high-profile cases, actual data and reporting fraud is very infrequent in psychology. Much more common – and therefore worrisome – is the extent to which post-hoc reporting decisions based on significance have become acceptable. We think almost all researchers want to play by the rules of the game; we just propose realigning the rules so that they conform to statistical reality and common-sense ideas of honesty.

**Q: I'm concerned that if I report the practices we actually used, people will question my research.**

A: Your article represents a great achievement. It has addressed an interesting question and passed through a tough process of peer review. We don't think supplying additional information will take that achievement away from you. However, we hope you will agree that as scientists, our primary commitment is to the truth – not to any given idea, no matter how personally invested we are in it. Ultimately, truth does not reside in any one study, any one paper, or any one lab, but in the overall body of evidence. More accurate reporting in any one article will allow better assessment of this body of evidence overall.

**Q: What exactly is sound reporting practice?**

A: We have chosen to focus this project on the goal of increasing the amount of information in a research report rather than defining what is good and bad research. However, our basic assumption is that sound practice is principled. That is, it accurately reports any ideas and procedures determined a priori; if these were modified in the course of the research, it reports this fact, along with the reason for doing so. We are not seeking to impose standards that further restrict how people can run studies or analyze their data. We are encouraging standards under which people can feel free to report honestly what they did and why.

**Q: If I don't respond, will my research be judged as dishonest?**

A: Because only 50% of the authors in your journal and issue have been randomly chosen to take part, there will be no way of identifying you if you choose not to participate. Information regarding who was and was not contacted will be kept strictly confidential as research data. Using this selection approach, we are emphasizing the positive benefits of adding information to your article, rather than the negative judgment of not doing so.

**Q: Which journals are being targeted and why?**

A: We are focusing on articles published in all 2012 issues (and onward) of *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Psychological Science*, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, and *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* because they represent prominent journals in psychology that are widely read. However, our effort may eventually expand to other psychology journals and other publication years.

**Reminder #1 email:**

\*\*\*\*\*

A couple of weeks ago, we sent you an email (see below) regarding disclosing methodological details for the studies of your recently published article in [*Journal Name*] entitled [*Article Title*]. This is simply a polite reminder. Thank you for considering our request.

**Reminder #2 email:**

\*\*\*\*\*

This is a second (and final) reminder regarding disclosing methodological details for the studies of your recently published article in [*Journal Name*] entitled [*Article Title*]. Thank you for considering our request.