# Supplement for DataColada[76]

This version: 2019 04 29
Written by Uri Simonsohn (urisohn@gmail.com)

## I. Maluma-Takiti example (get everything: .zip)
1) Survey (.qsf | .pdf)
2) Data: Wave 1 (.csv) – updated after post with stimuli order information
3) Data: Wave 2 (.csv) – updated after post with stimuli order information
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 | .pdf |
| Bouwmeester et al (2017) | Contribution of $ to common project | $I^2$ = 2.7% | *p* = .660 | .pdf |
| Cheung et al (2017) | Response to betrayal in relationship | $I^2$ = 3.1% | *p* = .496 | .pdf |
| Verschuere et al (2018) | Moral reminders and cheating behavior | $I^2$ = 0.0% | *p* = .780 | .pdf |
| Alogna et al (2016) - Design 1 | Does describing a suspect reduce recognition? | $I^2$ = 0.0% | *p* = .502 | .pdf |
| 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 | .pdf |