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Theme: “Failing Forward”: In our 2018 Annual Conference, the ACRL New England Chapter is highlighting experimentation and creativity in college and research libraries by acknowledging that missteps and roadblocks are all part of the process. We want to hear about your innovative ideas that went bust; your project development blunders; your event planning faux pas! Tell us how failure has helped you and your library to learn and grow. Give us insight into the missteps that have led you to unanticipated success. How has expanding your capacity for failure helped you to take risks and experience breakthroughs?

Submission title: Failure to Reproduce: The Replication Crisis in Research — Can Librarians Help?

Names, affiliations, and email addresses of all authors:
Andrée Rathemacher, University of Rhode Island, andree@uri.edu
Amanda Izenstark, University of Rhode Island, amanda@uri.edu
Harrison Dekker, University of Rhode Island, hdekker@uri.edu
Session format: Presentation (40-minute talk with 10-minute Q&A)

Description of session, or abstract (250-500 words): [Be sure to include two or three takeaways, learning objectives, or questions for attendees. Highlight practical takeaways for attendees.]

IMPORTANT: Selection will be done by blind review, meaning that author information will not be made available to reviewers. To ensure the integrity of blind review, do not include identifying information, including the names of institutions, in the abstract. Proposals that do not adhere to this direction will not be considered for the conference.

“"It can be proven that most claimed research findings are false.” Those are the words of John Ioannidis in a highly-cited article from 2005. Ioannidis is referring to the “reproducibility crisis,” a phenomenon whereby researchers are not able to replicate published results in later experiments. A recent survey by Nature found that more than 70% of researchers have tried and failed to reproduce another scientist’s experiments and more than half have failed to reproduce their own.

In this presentation, we will introduce attendees to the replication crisis and provide real-life examples of reproducibility problems in the fields of psychology, economics, animal research, and biomedical research. We will outline the primary causes of the problem (the “file-drawer” problem, publication bias, poor experimental design, and the incentive structure for researchers) and will also note the unfortunate failure of peer review to weed out many false findings.

From there, we will discuss how librarians are assisting researchers in designing reproducible workflows that can help prevent research replication failure. These workflows include proper experimental design, proper management and documentation of research data and code, and the use of open-science tools for registering experiments, collaborating with colleagues, and sharing research outputs. We will conclude with a demonstration of one important tool in this area, the Open Science Framework from the Center for Open Science. We will cover how it works, how to use it to connect to outside services, and its support for versioning, collaboration, and sharing preprints.
Attendees will come away with a better understanding of the reproducibility crisis, the role librarians are playing in assisting researchers with reproducible workflows, and a popular tool they can use for doing so.
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**Brief description of how your proposed session broadens the conversation in our field regarding your topic:**

This presentation fits into general conversations about the need to move the scholarly communication system toward greater openness and the opportunities provided by digital technologies and platforms to bring about systemic change.

**Brief summary (1-2 sentences) to be used in program agenda:**

A recent survey by *Nature* found that more than 70% of researchers have tried and failed to reproduce another scientist’s experiments and more than half have failed to reproduce their own experiments! Learn more about the “reproducibility crisis” in research and how librarians are helping by teaching researchers about reproducible workflows, proper management of code and data, and tools like the Open Science Framework.

**Selected conference tags:**
- Scholarly Communication
- Technology and Tools
- Data Services

**Type of library:** University Library