



**Mondays from 1 ~ 2:10pm on Zoom, [Retracted](#)**

Organized by Jacob Miranda; All article PDFs linked [Retracted](#)

| Spring 2022  | Theme  | Article  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Week 3</b><br>Jan. 24 <sup>th</sup> ,<br>2022   | <b><i>The problem defined: the general overview</i></b>                                | Whitt, C. M., Miranda, J. F., & Tullett, A. M. (Accepted). History of Replication Failures in Psychology. [See PDF link for accepted version of book chapter].   |
| <b>Week 5</b><br>Feb. 7 <sup>th</sup> ,<br>2022    | <b><i>Questionable Research Practices</i></b>  | Ioannidis (2005) Why Most Published Research Findings are Wrong<br><br>John, L. K., Loewenstein, G., & Prelec, D. (2012). Measuring the Prevalence of Questionable Research Practices With Incentives for Truth Telling. <i>Psychological Science</i> , 23(5), 524–532   |
| <b>Week 7</b><br>Feb. 21 <sup>st</sup> ,<br>2022   | <b><i>Reproducibility Now: Many studies don't reproduce and why</i></b>                | Open Science Collaboration (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. <i>Science</i> , 349(6251), aac4716-aac4716  |
| <b>Week 9</b><br>March 7 <sup>th</sup> ,<br>2022   | <b><i>Has the debate gone too far? Things will just turn out fine, won't they?</i></b> | Pashler, H., & Harris, C. R. (2012). Is the Replicability Crisis Overblown? Three Arguments Examined. <i>Perspectives on Psychological Science</i> , 7(6), 531–536   |
| <b>Week 11</b><br>March 21 <sup>st</sup> ,<br>2022 | <b><i>The case for open access</i></b>   | Tennant JP, Waldner F, Jacques DC et al. The academic, economic and societal impacts of Open Access: an evidence-based review [version 3; referees: 4 approved, 1 approved with reservations]. <i>F1000Research</i> 2016, 5:632<br><br>Recent addition in Contrast About Pitfalls, Short 1 page Piece:<br>Ross-Hellauer, T. (2022). <a href="#">Open science, done wrong, will compound inequities</a> . <i>Nature</i> . |
| <b>Week 13</b><br>April 4 <sup>th</sup> ,<br>2022  | <b><i>Analytical flexibility illustrated</i></b>                                       | Silberzahn, R., et al. (2018). Many Analysts, One Data Set: Making Transparent How Variations in Analytic Choices Affect Results. <i>Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science</i> , 1(3), 337–356  |
| <b>Week 15</b><br>April 18 <sup>th</sup> ,<br>2022 | <b><i>And the future? The myth of self-correction</i></b>                              | Smaldino, P. E., & McElreath, R. (2016). The natural selection of bad science. <i>Royal Society Open Science</i> , 3(9), 160384  |

Read the paper and come along for discussion & open science!