

## Supplement for DataColada[76]

This version: 2019 04 16

Written by Uri Simonsohn ([urisohn@gmail.com](mailto:urisohn@gmail.com))

### I. Maluma-Takiti example (get everything: [.zip](#))

- 1) Survey ([.qsf](#) | [.pdf](#))
- 2) Data: Wave 1 ([.csv](#))
- 3) Data: Wave 2 ([.csv](#))
- 4) R Code ([.R](#))

[For Figures 1 & 2 in post, and bootstrap under the null](#)

### II. Probability $I^2 > 0$ under homogeneity is at least 40%

This [R Code](#) reports Monte Carlo simulations that support that.

### III. Re-analysis of Klein et al Many Labs, MTurk sample, across days

The post notes that while McShane et al interpreted  $I^2=21%$  in the Klein et al Many Labs paper, MTurk sample, as “non-trivial” heterogeneity, such number is slightly *below* what’s expected under homogeneity ( $E(I^2)=24%$ ).

[R Code](#)

### IV. Ebersole et al. overall $p$ -value for heterogeneity

The post reports, in Table 1, an average heterogeneity of 12.9%,  $p=.17$ , for the 16 studies in Ebersole et al.

[R Code](#)

Note: as mentioned in the post, Table 4 in Ebersole et al. almost surely reports results obtained with a coding error that noticeably increase heterogeneity, the correct overall  $p$ -value for heterogeneity in that sample is much higher than  $p=.17$

### V. Links to Many Labs papers in Table 1

**Table 1. These are Many Labs results not cited in papers claiming heterogeneity is unavoidable**

Paper	Topic	Heterogeneity Results		Paper
O'Donnell et al (2018)	Professor priming and trivial pursuit	$I^2 = 17.4%$	$p = .170$	<a href="#">.pdf</a>
Bouwmeester et al (2017)	Contribution of \$ to common project	$I^2 = 2.7%$	$p = .660$	<a href="#">.pdf</a>
Cheung et al (2017)	Response to betrayal in relationship	$I^2 = 3.1%$	$p = .496$	<a href="#">.pdf</a>
Verschuere et al (2018)	Moral reminders and cheating behavior	$I^2 = 0.0%$	$p = .780$	<a href="#">.pdf</a>
Alogna et al (2016) - Design 1	Does describing a suspect reduce recognition?	$I^2 = 0.0%$	$p = .502$	<a href="#">.pdf</a>
Alogna et al (2016) - Design 2	Does describing a suspect reduce recognition?	$I^2 = 0.0%$	$p = .810$	(same)
Ebersole et al (2016)	16 different designs (average, Stouffer's p)	$I^2 = 12.8%$	$p = .170$	<a href="#">.pdf</a>