

Special Issue proposal: *Replicability in Cognitive Science*

Editors: Brent Strickland and Helen De Cruz

Invited authors: Edouard Machery, Deborah Mayo

Open Call for papers

We are inviting submissions to a special issue on the issue of replicability and systematic error in cognitive science in the *Review of Philosophy and Psychology* (deadline November 1st, 2017).

One of the primary missions of the *Review of Philosophy and Psychology* is to provide philosophically and theoretically insightful analyses of issues related to the fields of cognitive science and experimental psychology. Currently, authors in these areas are doing some thorough soul searching as they attempt to understand why the published results of psychology studies fail to replicate as often as they should (OSF, 2015). In particular, the OSF (2015) provided evidence that roughly 60% of all studies published in top psychology journals fail to replicate perfectly and 30% fail to replicate even approximately. These and related findings have led to a number of publications, news articles, and blog posts that attempt to (i) assess the extent to which there actually are systematic problems in how psychological science is being carried out (ii) understand the root causes of such problems and (iii) offer practical solutions for systematically improving scientific output.

Philosophers have been notably absent in these discussions. This is a missed opportunity, as philosophers of science, mind, or even economics can offer a valuable perspective on these issues, as well as philosophers versed into experimental methods more broadly. To encourage philosophical engagement with the questions of replicability and systematic in cognitive science, we are inviting contributions to this special issue.

This is a non-exhaustive list of possible topics:

- (1) The impact of the replicability problem on long standing theories of scientific progress.
- (2) The impact of the replicability problem on theories about the nature of science, particularly on whether science is self-correcting.
- (3) Analyses of the impact of the current incentive structure in science.
- (4) Analyses of the root causes of non-replicability in the psychological sciences.
- (5) The problem of replicability in experimental philosophy and arm-chair philosophy (e.g. should one worry about the testability or reliability of thought

experiments? What would be the best practices in replicating experimental philosophical research?)

- (6) The impact of the replicability problem on our theories regarding the goals and values central to the scientific enterprise.
- (7) The relation between theory and experimentation: while data analysis should be driven by scientific hypothesis, can the interpretive process be made immune to interpretive biases?

This list is non-exhaustive and we are open to submissions on related topics. The deadline for submissions will be **midnight EST, November 1st, 2017**. If you are unsure about whether a given topic would fit, do not hesitate to contact us.

All submissions will be reviewed through a process of double-anonymized review. The acceptance or rejection of each paper is subject to the vetting of at least two referees, and the decision of the guest editors and editor-in-chief.

Finally, we mention that the issue will contain the results of a large-scale collaboration meant to assessing replicability in Experimental Philosophy (led by Florian Cova). There is currently an open call for scientists and experimental philosophers to participate in this project. If interested, please see the call [here](#).

Brent Strickland & Helen De Cruz